

RESEARCH ON
FAMILY STRUCTURE IN TÜRKİYE
TAYA 2006



RESEARCH ON FAMILY STRUCTURE IN TÜRKİYE
TAYA 2006

**RESEARCH ON
FAMILY STRUCTURE IN TÜRKİYE
TAYA 2006**



**THE MINISTRY OF FAMILY AND SOCIAL POLICIES
GENERAL DIRECTORATE OF FAMILY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**

**RESEARCH ON
FAMILY STRUCTURE IN TÜRKİYE
TAYA 2006**

The Ministry of Family and Social Policies
General Directorate of Family and Community Services

Research On Family Structure In Türkiye

Project Director

Mustafa Nuri Nuruan

Project Monitoring and Appraisal Team

Ahmet Rasim Kalaycı, Rahime Beder Şen, Sadık Güneş

Editor

Mustafa Turğut

Proof Reading

Haşim Akman, Oben Alper

Academic Content Consulting

Ipsos Social Research Institute

Graphic Design

Serap Ergel

Cover Photo

mycteria/Shutterstock

Typesetting and Press Preparation

Ipsos Social Research Institute

Translation

Çınar Kiper, İpek İlter

Research and Social Policies Series 02

Second Reviewed Print, 2014, Ankara

ISBN 978-975-19-4930-1

Printing

Uzerler Matbaacılık San. Ltd. Şti.

Turan Güneş Bulvarı 22/8 Çankaya/Ankara

T: +90 312 441 9015

Correspondence

Eskişehir Yolu Söğütözü Mahallesi 2177. Sokak No:

10/A Kat: 24 Çankaya/Ankara

T: +90 312 705 5513 F: + 90 312 705 5599

e-mail: arsopol@aile.gov.tr

www.aile.gov.tr

©2014 All rights reserved. No rights of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior permission of T.R. Ministry of Family and Social Policies.

PREFACE

Family, as the institution which guides the actions of individuals and ensures the continuity of the society, where values and attitudes take shape and are conveyed to the next generations, emerges as an important subject of social sciences.

Understanding the structure of the family closely as a social institution is important at the point of identifying the lifestyles of the society and individuals. In all stages of life, from pregnancy to infancy, from infancy to childhood and young adulthood and from here to adulthood and old age, individuals form their relationships with the other actors in their social network through family ties. In the same vein, healthy family relationships are particularly important for a balanced social life.

Faced with an accelerating social transformation, individuals and the family institution cannot utilize their inherent problem solving skills. In order to fight emerging problems more efficiently, especially during times of crises and painful social transformation, the need for research to determine the problems and perceptions about the family and to understand problems families and individuals are facing is clear.

Research on Family Structure in Türkiye, included in the Official Statistics Program, is conducted by our ministry and repeated every five years. I am happy to present the revised second edition of this study originally conducted in 2006 to eliminate the scarcity of data and information on the subject of family themed research across Türkiye to all parties currently working on the family focused research.

I hope similar studies increase to form one of the foundations of information to base our social policies on and I would like to thank everyone involved in this study.

Assoc. Prof. Ayşenur İSLAM
Minister

INTRODUCTION

Besides speeding up the efforts to understand important social institutions such as the legal system, health, education and culture, the rapid social transformation taking place in the world and in Türkiye forces us to try to understand the family as the basic institution regulating relationships between such organizations.

It can be said that one of the most basic platforms social sciences share is the struggle to structurally determine and understand the elements that cause social transformation and the adjustment the parties faced with this change have to make. The family is one of the rare institutions that is both the instigator and the recipient of change. The family has a very dynamic structure because while being a determinant of the guiding static elements of the life of the individual, the family also has the capacity to protect itself and the members of the family in times of social transformation and crisis.

I believe that along with the changes in the roles and changes in status experienced during intra-family relationships, understanding family typologies is one of the most important starting points to understand the resistance and adaptation capabilities of the individual and family.

While formulating and applying social policies, the structure of the family incorporating static and dynamic elements forces the research and social policy institutions of the state to make structural determinations on the basis of the family.

From this starting point, our Directorate has conducted the first Research on Family Structure in Türkiye in 2006 which is planned to be repeated at regular intervals. The study was repeated for the second time in 2011. While analyzing the results of both studies in 2013, the 2006 study was revised by adding new charts and the need for a second edition was determined. In this context, I would like to thank all those that gave their efforts to revise this study and present the results to interested departments.

With the hope that this study opens the door for new ideas and is helpful to social policy makers ...

Ömer BOZOĞLU
General Manager

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The representational sampling of direct studies on the family in Türkiye is scarce; however the need for such studies is very high. In this context, we see it as our duty to thank everyone involved in this study.

This important study was initiated by the managers, specialists and staff of the Prime Ministry General Directorate of Family and Social Research. To all the staff involved in preparing the questionnaire, literature review and report preparation,

To the staff of the Turkish Statistical Institute who determined the sampling, finalized the difficult fieldwork processes and raised the bar in data quality and reliability with their presence and experience in all preparatory stages of the study,

To the Prime Ministry State Planning Organization for their support in social research by providing the financial resources for the study and the staff of Ministry of Development who made the revision of the second edition possible,

To Mustafa Nuri Nuruan for writing the first draft of the report and making the finalization of the study by being a part of the revised second edition,

To the staff of Department of Research and Policies Mustafa Nuri Nuruan, Dursun Ayan, Emre Ertekin, Nurtan Aslan, Neriman Kaya, Ercan Üçpınar, Serdal Altun and Ebru Doğan for their efforts in the evaluation phase of the study,

To Semiha Feyzioğlu, Müfit Onur, Neyir Zerey, Selçuk Akbaş and Tutku Kutlu from Ipsos along with Oben Alper, Haşim Akman and Ömer Eren for their contributions during the review of the study,

To Serap Ergel for the graphic design and execution of the report,

To our valued teachers Rauf Nişel, Ferhunde Özbay, İsmet Koç, Mustafa Otrar, Fatma Umut Beşpınar and İdil Aybars for their time and sharing their ideas with us, we would like to extend our sincere thanks.

Mustafa TURĞUT
Department of Research and Policies

CONTENT

1. DESCRIPTIVE FRAMEWORK

1.1. Subject and Purpose	14
1.2. Literature	14
1.3. Research Design	15
1.3.1. Data Collection Tools	15
1.3.2. Sample	15
1.3.3. Implementation	16
1.3.4. Definitions and Concepts	16
1.3.5. Weighting	17
1.3.6. Variables Produced in Dataset	18

2. HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

2.1. Household Population Characteristics	22
2.2. Economic Status of the Household	25
2.2.1. Meeting Basic Needs and Real Estate Ownership	25
2.2.2. Loans and Saving Behaviors of Households	28

3. MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

3.1. Age at First Marriage	34
3.2. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate	36
3.2.1. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Women	36
3.2.2. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Men	39
3.3. Way of Meeting the Spouse	41
3.4. Decision for Marriage	42
3.5. Form of Solemnization	46
3.6. Bride Price	48
3.7. Consanguineous Marriage	50
3.8. Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate	53
3.9. Coming from the Same City with the Spouse	56
3.10. Marriage Ceremonies	58
3.11. Qualities Sought in Future Spouse	60
3.12. Status of Marriage	65
3.13. Reason for Divorce	66
3.14. Possible Reasons for Divorce	67

4. INTRA-FAMILIAL RELATIONS

4.1. The Times Household Members Regularly Get Together	74
4.2. The Activities Household Members Do Together	75
4.3. Individuals Responsible for Housework	78
4.4. Day-Care of Small Children in the Household	81
4.5. Decision Makers In The Households	82
4.6. Relationship Level between Spouses	84
4.7. Matters of Conflict between Spouses	86
4.8. Reactions of Spouses towards Areas of Conflict	90
4.9. Instances When Husbands Engage in Physical Violence during Conflict	95

5. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN RELATIVES AND NEIGHBORS

5.1. Relationships between Relatives	100
5.2. Proximity of Residence with Relatives	102
5.3. Frequency of Meeting with Relatives and Neighbors	104

6. CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY AND APPROACHES TOWARDS CHILDREN

6.1. Number of Children	108
6.2. Desired Number of Children	110
6.3. Perceptions regarding Children	112
6.4. Matters of Conflict with Children	116
6.5. Punishments Imposed on Children	120

7. PERCEPTIONS ON FAMILY AND COMMUNITY LIFE

7.1. Attitudes towards Living out of Wedlock and Having Children out of Wedlock.....	134
7.2. Approaches to Women's Working in a Paid Job	138
7.3. Individuals' Perceptions on the Happiness of their Families.....	142
7.4. Perceptions on the Future of Family Relationships	144
7.5. The Effects of the EU Membership on the Family Structure.....	146
7.6. Source of Religious Knowledge and the Determinant Effects of Religion on Everyday Life	148

8. SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

8.1. Visiting Relatives, Friends and Acquaintances	156
8.2. Giving Presents to Family Members and Acquaintances	160
8.3. Reading Books	162
8.4. Reading Newspapers	164
8.5. Going to the Cinema	166
8.6. Going to the Theatre	168
8.7. Going to Places such as Local, Club, Fraternity, Association	170
8.8. Going to Places such as Bars, Night Clubs etc	172
8.9. Going to Coffeehouses	174
8.10. Going on Holiday	176
8.11. Smoking	178
8.12. Alcohol Consumption	180
8.13. Watching TV and Daily Time Spent to Watch TV	182

9. ELDERLINESS

9.1. Households with Elderly in Need of Constant Care	188
9.2. Issues Where Families Need Support for Elderly Care	189
9.3. Life Preferences Regarding Elderliness	190
9.4. Health of the Elderly	198
9.5. Reasons of the Elderly to Live with Their Children at the Same House	202
9.6. Reasons of the Elderly to Live in Separate Houses with Their Children and How Often They are Visited	204

RESULTS	208
---------------	-----

REFERENCES	218
------------------	-----

TABLES

2. HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Table 1. Household Sizes throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES.....	22
Table 2. Number of People Living in the Household.....	23
Table 3. Household Types throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, and SES.....	23
Table 4. 8 Household Types throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, and SES.....	24
Table 5. Meeting the Basic Needs of the Household throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES	25
Table 6. Property/Vehicles Ownership throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	26
Table 7. Property/Vehicles Ownership by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	27
Table 8. People or Institutions Loaning Money throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, Household Type, and SES.....	28
Table 9. Investing Savings throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Regions, Three Major Cities, Household Type, and SES.....	29

3. MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

Table 10. Age of First Marriage throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS.....	34
Table 11. Age of First Marriage by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, SES.....	35
Table 12. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Women and Men.....	36
Table 13. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Women throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	37
Table 14. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Women by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES.....	38
Table 15. Age Of Marriage Deemed Appropriate For Men throughout Türkiye, By Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	39
Table 16. Age Of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Men by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES	40
Table 17. Way of Meeting Spouses throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	42
Table 18. Way of Meeting Spouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	43
Table 19. Marriage Decision throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	44
Table 20. Marriage Decision by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	45
Table 21. Form of Solemnization throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS.....	46
Table 22. Form of Solemnization by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	47
Table 23. Bride Price throughout Türkiye, Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	48
Table 24. Bride Price by Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	49
Table 25. Consanguineous Marriage throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	50
Table 26. Consanguineous Marriage by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	51
Table 27. Degree of Kinship between Spouses throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, SES	52
Table 28. Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	53
Table 29. Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES.....	54
Table 30. Reasons for Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	55
Table 31. Reasons for Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	56
Table 32. Marriage between People from the Same Town throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household Types, and SES.....	57

Table 33. Marriage Ceremonies throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, SES	59
Table 34. Qualifications Sought by Women in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye.....	60
Table 35. Qualifications Sought by Women in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	61
Table 36. Qualifications Sought by Women in Future Spouse by Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES.....	62
Table 37. Qualifications Sought by Men in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye.....	63
Table 38. Qualifications Sought by Men in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	63
Table 39. Qualifications Sought by Men in Future Spouse by Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES.....	64
Table 40. Status of Marriage throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	65
Table 41. Status of Marriage by Gender, Age, Educational Status, and SES.....	66
Table 42. Reasons for Divorce	67
Table 43. Possible Reasons for Divorce throughout Türkiye	67
Table 44. Possible Reasons for Divorce throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	68
Table 45. Possible Reasons for Divorce by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES.....	70

4. INTRA-FAMILIAL RELATIONS

Table 46. The Times Household Members Regularly Get Together throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, and SES.....	74
Table 47. Activities Household Members Participate in Together throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area.....	76
Table 48. Activities Household Members Participate in Together throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES (Often & Sometimes).....	77
Table 49. Individuals Responsible for Housework	79
Table 50. Women's Housework Responsibilities throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES.....	80
Table 51. Day-Care of Small Children in the Household throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES.....	81
Table 52. Decision Makers in The Household throughout Türkiye	82
Table 53. Topics Where the Man is the Decision Maker throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES.....	83
Table 54. Topics Where The Woman is The Decision Maker throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES.....	84
Table 55. Relationship Level between Spouses throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS.....	85
Table 56. Relationship Level between Spouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	86
Table 57. Matters of Conflict between Spouses throughout Türkiye.....	87
Table 58. Matters of Conflict between Spouses throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Sometimes & Often).....	88
Table 59. Matters of Conflict between Spouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Sometimes & Often).....	89
Table 60. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict According to Women.....	90
Table 61. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict According to Men.....	90
Table 62. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict According to Women throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household, and SES (Often & Sometimes & Rarely).....	92
Table 63. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict According to Men throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household, and SES (Often & Sometimes & Rarely).....	94
Table 64. Husband's Physically Abusing their Spouse upon conflict according to Women throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household, and SES.....	96

5. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN RELATIVES AND NEIGHBORS

Table 65. Level of Relationship with Relatives throughout Türkiye	100
---	-----

Table 66. Level of Relationship with Relatives throughout Türkiye, By Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status Household Type, and SES (Very Good).....	101
Table 67. Residential Proximity to Relatives	102
Table 68. Residential Proximity to Relatives throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Educational Status, Type of Household, and SES (at Same House).....	103
Table 69. Frequency of Meeting with Family Members, Relatives, and Neighbors.....	104
Table 70. Frequency of Meeting With Family Members, Relatives and Neighbors throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Everyday and Several Times a Week).....	105

6. CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY AND APPROACHES TOWARDS CHILDREN

Table 71. Number of Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES	108
Table 72. Desired Number of Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities,, and NUTS.....	110
Table 73. Desired Number of Children by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES.....	111
Table 74. Perceptions regarding Children	112
Table 75. Perceptions regarding Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities ('Yes').....	114
Table 76. Perceptions regarding Children by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES ('Yes').....	115
Table 77. Matters of Conflict with Children	116
Table 78. Matters of Conflict with Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Often & Sometimes).....	118
Table 79. Types of Punishments Imposed on Children by Fathers over the last one year throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Often & Sometimes& Rarely).....	120
Table 80. Types of Punishments Imposed By Fathers On Their Children Over The Last One Year by Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Often & Sometimes & Rarely).....	122
Table 81. Types of Punishments Imposed By Mothers On Their Children Over The Last One Year throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS (Often & Sometimes & Rarely).....	124
Table 82. Types of Punishments Imposed By Mothers On Their Children Over The Last One Year by Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Often & Sometimes & Rarely).....	126
Table 83. Reasons for Beating Children.....	128
Table 84. Reasons for Beating Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS (Top 5 Reasons).....	129
Table 85. Reasons for Beating Children by Gender, Age Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Top 5 Reasons)	130

7. PERCEPTIONS ON FAMILY and COMMUNITY LIFE

Table 86. Attitudes towards Living Out of Wedlock throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities,, and NUTS	134
Table 87. Attitudes towards Living out of Wedlock by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES.....	135
Table 88. Attitudes towards Having Children out of Wedlock throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	136
Table 89. Attitudes towards Having Children out of Wedlock by Gender Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES...137	137
Table 90. Approaches to Women's Working in Paid Jobs throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	138
Table 91. Approaches to Women's Working in Paid Jobs by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES	139
Table 92. Reasons for Disapproval of Women's Working throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS	140
Table 93. Reasons for Disapproval of Women's Working by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	141
Table 94. Individuals' Perceptions on the Happiness of their Family throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS....	142
Table 95. Individuals' Perceptions on the Happiness of their Family by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	143
Table 96. The Future of Family Relationships throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	144
Table 97. The Future of Family Relationships by Gender, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	145
Table 98. The Effects of Turkish EU Membership on Family Structure throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS...146	146
Table 99. The Effects of Turkish EU Membership on Family Structure by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES.....	147
Table 100. Sources of Religious Knowledge throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area , Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	148

Table 101. Sources of Religious Knowledge by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES.....	150
Table 102. The Extent to Which Religious Beliefs Determine Daily Life	152
Table 103. Determining Effect of Religion on Daily Life throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	152
Table 104. Determining Power of Religion on Daily Life by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES.....	153

8. SOCIAL and CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

Table 105. Visiting Relatives, Friends and Acquaintances throughout Türkiye.....	156
Table 106. Visiting Relatives, Friends and Acquaintances throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Absolutely & Usually).....	158
Table 107. Giving Presents to Family Members and Acquaintances throughout Türkiye	160
Table 108. Giving Presents to Family Members and Acquaintances throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Absolutely & Usually).....	160
Table 109. Giving Presents to Family Members and Relatives by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES (Absolutely & Usually)	162
Table 110. Reading Books throughout Türkiye, By Residence Area, and NUTS	163
Table 111. Reading Books By Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES	164
Table 112. Newspaper Readership throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES	165
Table 113. Going to the Cinema throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	166
Table 114. Going to the Cinema by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES	167
Table 115. Going to the Theatre throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS	168
Table 116. Going to the Theatre by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES	169
Table 117. Going to Places such as Local, Club, Fraternity, Associations throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS	170
Table 118. Going to Places such as Local, Club, Fraternity, Associations by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES	171
Table 121. Going to Coffeehouses throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	174
Table 122. Going to Coffeehouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES	175
Table 123. Going on Holiday throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS	176
Table 124. Going on Holiday by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES	177
Table 125. Smoking throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	178
Table 126. Smoking by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES.....	179
Table 127. Alcohol Consumption throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS.....	180
Table 128. Alcohol Consumption by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES	181
Table 129. Daily Average Time Spent Watching TV throughout Turkey, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities and NUTS.....	182
Table 130. Daily Average Time Spent Watching TV by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type and SES.....	183
Table 131. Thoughts on TV Viewership throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities and NUTS (Yes).....	184
Table 132. Thoughts on TV Viewership by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type and SES (Yes)	185

9. ELDERLINESS

Table 133. Households with Elderly in Need of Constant Care throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, NUTS, Household Type and SES	188
Table 134. Issues Where Families Need Support for Elderly Care throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, NUTS, Household Type and SES	189
Table 135. Life Preferences regarding Elderliness throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities and NUTS.....	191
Table 136. Life Preferences regarding Elderliness by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, SES.....	192

Table 137. Reasons of Preference to Go to Seniors Center throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type and SES.....	193
Table 138. Primary Reason for not Living with One's Parents throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS.....	194
Table 139. Primary Reason for not Living with One's Parents by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type and SES.....	196
Table 140. Elderly Individual's Self Evaluation on Health Compared to Peers throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS.....	198
Table 141. Elderly Individual's Self Evaluation on Health Compared to Peers by Gender, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type and SES.....	199
Table 142. Difficulty of Performing Activities.....	199
Table 143. Ability to Perform Activities throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, NUTS and Household Type (with Difficulty & with the Help of Somebody).....	200
Table 144. Ability to Perform Activities by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type and SES (with Difficulty & with Assistance).....	201
Table 145. Reasons of the Elderly to Live with Their Children at the Same House throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type and SES.....	202
Table 146. Desire to Live with Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area and Gender.....	204
Table 147. Reasons of the Elderly for Not Living with their Children at the Same House throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area and Gender.....	204
Table 148. Frequency of Visits by Their Children	205
Table 149. Frequency of Visits by Their Kids by Residence Area and Gender (Son).....	206
Table 150. Frequency of Visits by Their Kids by Residence Area and Gender (Daughter).....	206
Table 151. People Who Visit the Elderly Most Aside From Their Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area and Gender	207

ABBREVIATIONS

EU	European Union
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ASAGEM	General Directorate of Family and Social Research
SPO	State Planning Organization
EGSF	The Guatemalan Survey of Family Health
FRS	Family Resources Survey
GGP	Generations and Gender Survey
HÜNEE	Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies
IFLS	Indonesia Family Life Survey
MFLS	The Malaysian Family Life Survey
NUTS	Nomenclature of Units for Territorial Statistics
RAND	Research and Development
SES	Socioeconomic Status
TAYA	Research in Family Structure in Türkiye
TDASA	Turkish Population and Health Survey
TDSA	Turkish Population and Health Survey
TNNSA	Turkey Population Structure and Population Problems Research
TNSA	Turkey Demographic and Health Survey
TURKSTAT	Turkish Statistical Institute



Chapter 1

DESCRIPTIVE FRAMEWORK



Subject and Purpose

Literature

Research Design

1.1. Subject and Purpose

To be able to create social policies on one of the most basic units of social life, the family institution, collecting current data and defining the problems within is important in terms of determining structural transformation during the process of social change. The purpose of Research on Family Structure in Türkiye (TAYA), which is repeated once every five years and included to the Official Statistic Program, is to determine the family structure in Türkiye, lifestyles of individuals in the family and the values regarding family life. The aim is to understand the current status of families in Türkiye by analyzing information gathered on household structures, marriage, domestic relations, relations with relatives, children, elders and perceptions about other social subjects in terms of different variables and obtaining data on determining how these changes take place over time.

1.2. Literature

Nation-wide studies regarding population, family, health, fulfillment and similar subjects entered the domain of sociology, psychology and social policy disciplines mostly with the help of science of statistics. Nation-wide studies regarding individuals and family in particular have three main sources. First of those is national records that can be compiled from population, address, insurance, motor vehicles, land registry, justice, social welfare and health department systems. Another source regarding individuals and their families is the population census repeated once every five to ten years. The third source is periodical research done within a pre-determined national sampling framework. Because they use electronic records and only collect concrete and material information, sources of the first type cannot be used to define the feelings and thoughts of individuals regarding family institution. While the second type of sources can provide dependable information on individuals and families, the high cost and the low frequency of these studies and the necessity of short questionnaires provide information within a narrow framework. The national sampling studies which make up the sources of third

type however, are more useful compared to other two, since they have the capacity to collect many different kinds of information regarding individuals and families. TAYA 2006 belongs to third type sources periodically collecting data on a national basis. Currently, sociological and social policy studies done on population and family adopt two kinds of approaches. One is a macro-sociological or social studies aiming to determine the function and structural transformation of individuals and families at a larger social level. The other one tries to understand individuals and family at a micro-sociological level to determine structural transformation of individuals and families in private and public life by focusing on the roles and relations. Especially since the 1980s, this first approach and the nation-wide quantitative studies resulting from it have been replaced by the second approach, qualitative studies. However, studies specifically regarding poverty, employment, consumption, savings, use of time and life fulfillment are still being conducted as nation-wide quantitative studies and continue their monopoly on such data. with the help of psychology, sociology and anthropology, studies regarding population, health and family structure seem to utilize a qualitative approach on a micro sociological level and a quantitative approach on a national level. In social policy studies on the other hand, because of the need to determine problems on a macro and regional basis, macro quantitative studies supported by statistics are still being commonly used. Whether qualitative or quantitative, both approaches verify the information that is out there. Output from micro level research can transform study themes and questionnaires at macro level, even if they do not actually transform the tools themselves. For example, the TAYA 2006 questionnaire made use of questionnaires from many macro level quantitative studies (Timur, 1972; TDHS, 1973; TDASA, 1978; TDASA, 1983; TDSA, 1988; TDHS, 2003; TDHS, 2008; SPO 1992; TURKSTAT, 2006) and micro level regional city studies (Yasa 1966; Yasa, 1969; Kiray, 1964; Kongar, 1978).

Like TAYA 2006, there are many other quantitative studies conducted abroad that study family structure on a nationwide basis. For example, studies

conducted by RAND Corporation within the context of Family Living Studies in Malaysia (MFLS, 1978; MLFS, 1993), Guatemala (EGSF, 1997), and Indonesia (IFLS, 1994); the Family Resources Study carried on by England since 1992 (FRS, 2002) and Generations and Gender Study realized in 19 countries (GGS, 2004) aim to determine the values regarding family structure, marriage, fertility, health, income, savings and family.

1.3. Research Design

With the cooperation of the Turkish Statistical Institute (TURKSTAT) and Prime Ministry General Directorate of Family and Social Research (ASAGEM), Research on Family Structure in Türkiye was designed in 2006 by reviewing numerous national and international studies previously conducted within this context. For this revised edition, data control and cleaning, internal consistency analysis, tabulation and reporting were conducted by Ipsos Social Research Institute.

1.3.1. Data Collection Tools

Pre-study preparation was completed between 2005 and 2006. The questionnaire was formulated by the cooperation of ASAGEM, TURKSTAT and the State Planning Organization (SPO). It took a year to shape the questionnaire after examining questions used in the previous studies, taking into account expert discussions from three different agencies and obtaining reviews from relevant governmental agencies. The pilot was applied in March 2006 and the questionnaire was finalized according to the results found.

The questionnaire uses closed-end questions that can be applied to individuals over 18. In the field, two separate questionnaires, one for the household and one for individuals and a family member list where the basic demographic data on individuals under 18 are kept were used.

To gather adequate basic demographic data on all individuals in the household, in the family member list there are questions regarding gender, age,

education level, marital status of family members and their closeness to the head of the household directed at the reference person.

Household questionnaire, on the other hand, is a questionnaire applied to any 18+ individuals (reference person) who can answer these questions during the visit to the house. This questionnaire covers subjects such as the basic qualities of the household, income, domestic socialization, television, child and elderly care, distribution of house work, decision makers for important family issues, loans and savings.

The individual questionnaire, on the other hand, is the one applied to individuals in the household who are 18+ and present during the house visit. This questionnaire covers subjects on the demographic characteristics of the individual in question, his/her individual income, ownership of real estate/vehicles, children, marital status, status of the marriage itself, desire to become a foster family, divorce, participation of women in the labor force, the ideal number of children, the relationship between children and parents, domestic relations, relations between spouses, domestic violence, neighbor and blood relative relations, religion, smoking and alcohol usage, spare time activities, television, vacations, the possible effects of the European Union on families, senior members and life fulfillment.

Questions in household and individual questionnaires can be divided into two subgroups. The first group is made up of questions such as age, gender, occupation and marital status are aimed to determine a concrete/observable characteristic, a fact or an incidence about the individual, the second group is made up of questions to measure an individual's subjective perceptions in the face of an incident or a situation such as reasons for divorce or expectations on the process of getting old.

1.3.2. Sample

Sample design within the scope of the study was prepared by TURKSTAT. Study population is all households within the Republic of Türkiye. Sampling was done according to multi-stage, layered

and random method. Study samples were planned to show the differences between residential areas (urban areas/rural areas) and regions. For this purpose, sampling was chosen to represent Türkiye in terms of urban and rural areas, separately for Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir and at Level 1 of Nomenclature of Units for Territorial Statistics (NUTS). In the sample design, *Urban residential areas* were defined as settlements with a population of 20.001 and more, while rural residential areas were defined as places with a population of 20.000 and less. However, since they cannot reach the meaningful number of samples, residential areas with populations less than 200 were left out. A sample population defined as institutional populations such as seniors' houses, prisons, military barracks, hospitals, hotels and kindergartens, making up 2.6% of total population were excluded from research. Lastly, nomadic populations were not included in the sample. The sources used in the sampling is the total of *Residential areas with municipal organizations* (Form Population 1 information of Numeration Study conducted in 2000 by the Turkish Statistical Institute) and *residential areas without municipal organizations (villages)* (all the residential areas).

Final sampling unit is households and 18+ individuals in these households. A sampling size of 14,380 households was selected to represent Türkiye in terms of urban and rural areas and NUTS Level 1 without the application of the replacement principle.

In order to conduct socioeconomic analyses of the relevant areas and to produce data comparable with the ones obtained by European Union (EU), Classification of Statistical Territorial Units (CSTU) was defined in terms of the Nomenclature of Units for Territorial Statistics (NUTS), a regional classification of EU. As a result of classifying cities that are similar with regard to economic, social, cultural and geographical terms, taking into consideration the size of their population, 12 units were defined as 1st level regional units. This classification catalogues the cities of *Istanbul*: Istanbul; *West Marmara*: Balıkesir, Çanakkale, Edirne, Kırklareli, Tekirdağ; *Aegean*: Afyon, Aydın, Denizli, İzmir, Kütahya, Manisa, Muğla, Uşak;

East Marmara: Bursa, Eskişehir, Bilecik, Kocaeli, Sakarya, Düzce, Bolu, Yalova; *West Anatolia*: Ankara, Konya, Karaman; *Mediterranean*: Adana, Antalya, Burdur, Hatay, Isparta, Mersin (İçel), Kahramanmaraş, Osmaniye; *Central Anatolia*: Kırıkkale, Aksaray, Niğde, Nevşehir, Kırşehir, Kayseri, Sivas, Yozgat; *West Black Sea*: Zonguldak, Karabük, Bartın, Kastamonu, Çankırı, Sinop, Samsun, Tokat, Çorum, Amasya; *East Black Sea*: Trabzon, Ordu, Giresun Rize, Artvin, Gümüşhane; *North-east Anatolia*: Erzurum, Erzincan, Bayburt, Ağrı, Kars, Iğdır, Ardahan; *Mideast Anatolia*: Malatya, Elazığ, Bingöl, Tunceli, Van, Muş, Bitlis, Hakkâri; *Southeast Anatolia*: Gaziantep, Adıyaman, Kilis, Şanlıurfa, Diyarbakır, Mardin, Batman, Şırnak and Siirt.

1.3.3. Implementation

Selection and training of the interviewees, implementation of the method plan, fieldwork, supervision and the coding were conducted by TURKSTAT. Fieldwork was conducted between June 10 and August 8 of 2006 by means of face to face interviews using tablet computers. To prevent individuals from being influenced by the other members of the household, two interviewers visited the houses and interviews were conducted separately so that the answers cannot be overheard by others. As of the end of the fieldwork phase, interviews with 12.208 households out of 14.380 were completed. A total number of 24.647 18+ individuals were interviewed and demographic information of 48.235 household members were compiled.

1.3.4. Definitions and Concepts

Household: The group formed by one or more people who live in the same residence(s) or in a different part of the same residence and who participate in household management and service regardless of being related to each other.

Individual: Individual in the study is a member of the household who is 18+.

Reference Person: Reference person in this study is an 18+ person who is responsible for the income

support of the household. This person was determined upon declaration in the study and was entered as the reference person on the questionnaire.

Household Member: Notwithstanding their age, every member of the household was defined as a person in this study.

Neighborhood: It is a group of households who live close to each other; depending on their place of residence, who live in the same neighborhood but in separate housing units side by side/on the top of the other and who are in a social relationship.

Nuclear Family: It is a type of family, comprised of a wife and husband without a child or a father and a mother and unmarried child(ren).

Extended Family: It is a type of household where, along with a husband and a wife or a mother and a father with unmarried child(ren), other relatives live together. The participation of a relative to the nuclear family would also be sufficient to describe the extended family. At the same time, the cases where multiple families with kinship relations live together are also considered as extended families.

Transient Extended Family: It is the type of extended family in which the household head is the married child. In these households, the household head's mother and/or father and other relatives are assumed to leave the family in the course of time and it is thought that the family will turn to a nuclear family type.

Patriarchal Extended Family: Within this family type, the household head and his spouse and along with them, their married child(ren) and/or the household head's married sibling(s) (brother-in-law, sister-in-law) live together. In this family type where the older generation is the household head, married child(ren) and other relatives depend on the household head.

Broken Family: It is a term that is used to describe the households without married couples. The ones living alone, single parent families, relatives living together and even those who are not relatives but

who live together are classified under this family type.

One-person Households: In this type of household, there is only one person living alone.

Single Parent: Families comprised of a single parent and unmarried child(ren) are considered to be under this group. These households are formed when parents are divorced, not living together or due to the loss of either one of them.

Other Broken Family: It is a type of household where relatives live together but there is lack of relationship among parent and children (grandmother&grandchild(ren), two siblings, aunt&niece(s) etc).

Non-relatives Households: In this type of household, any household member living together are not related to each other by birth or kinship.

In addition to the household classification type of 3 and 8, a classification of 13 was also made. Household type of 13 was calculated by considering the age of the parent and the number of children in the nuclear family.

Nuclear Nuclear Family without Children (age<45): This is the type of family which is formed by spouses younger than 45.

Nuclear Nuclear Family without Children (age≥45): This is the type of family which is formed by spouses older than 45.

Nuclear Nuclear Family with Children (1 child/2 children/3 or more children): This is the family formed of parents and 1 child, 2, 3 or more unmarried children.

This is a variable classified according to the closeness of household members in terms of family and blood relation. Definitions regarding household used in Turkey Demographic and Health Survey (TNSA) was used while defining the households. Types of households were considered in 3 groups as nuclear family, extended family, and broken family while the research book was being written.

1.3.5. Weighting

Weighting in Research on Family Structure in Türkiye was calculated in a way that it will represent the houses in urban areas, rural areas, 12 regions and Izmir and Ankara provinces over a sampling formed with the addresses of 14,280 houses of 100 blocks in urban areas and 50 blocks in rural areas which was taken from TURKSTAT.

By the end of the fieldwork, 12,280 houses were visited since not all the families living in 14,380 houses could be reached for various reasons. Non-response corrections were made for F2 over these 12,280 houses. F1 corrections were made for the blocks that could not be reached by assuming that blocks in NUTS Level 1 regions were homogenous. F0 values were calculated by using F1 and F2 corrections and the approximate number of houses in Türkiye was reached. Later, number of houses calculated for each rural and urban area was calibrated according to the distribution of the number households in the estimations made by TURKSTAT in the middle of 2006 and the households were weighted. To calculate Individual and Person weights, household weights were taken as reference and were calibrated according to the gender distribution in urban and rural areas as stated in population estimations TURKSTAT made in the middle of 2006, to weight people below age 18 and individuals for ages above 18.

1.3.6. Variables Produced in Dataset

Household and Individual Factor Base Variables: To be able to conduct statistical analyses (ANOVA, t-test, chi-square test etc.) on the dataset, household and individual factor bases were developed.

Household Factor Base: The household factor variable was multiplied by the number 0.00065091236435499600 to align its total value to the number of samples.

Individual Factor Base: The individual factor variable was multiplied by the number

0.00051702502375600300 to align its total value to the number of samples.

Socioeconomic Status Variable: To arrive at a socioeconomic status (SES) classification, TAYA 2006 used the calculations of Kalaycıoğlu et al. (2010) as a basis for the five variables developed by the questions on education, income, residence and motor vehicle ownership in the dataset. Educational status of household members and the educational mean of the households in question were calculated by taking into consideration the schools they graduated as individuals. For this calculation, years defined for schools by Kalaycıoğlu et al. (2010) were taken as reference. Household per capita income was calculated by dividing the mean value of this data by the number of individuals in the household. Property questions regarding motor vehicles and residences were also analyzed by keeping the same dataset.

In order to converge the income per capita in the household, educational mean values of the household, values regarding ownership of motor vehicles and residences, Z transformation was applied, each value was transformed into points with an average of 0 and standard deviation of 1. Later these variables were reduced into a single dimension by subjecting them to a factor analysis. The average of this variable was then transformed into T points with an average of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. The obtained value was subjected to multiple regression analyses along with the variables used to determining this value. Within this framework, an equation of $SES = 32.81 + (\text{Educational Year Mean Value}) \times 1.33 + (\text{Income Per Capita in the Household}) \times 0.006 + (\text{Residence Ownership}) \times 2.20 + (\text{Motor Vehicle Ownership}) \times 5.62$ was found.

As a result, SES groups were defined by taking into consideration the SES variable with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10 and the group with a mean close to 50 (40-60) was defined as *Middle*, the group with a point that is 10 points higher than the mean was defined as *Upper* and the group with a point that is 10 points lower than the mean was defined as *Lower*.

Important Note: The figures in the tables might not add up to 100% due to rounding. Additionally, questions where multiple answers were given might not add up to 100%.

The margin of error in the study, with a 95% statistical significance, is 0.6% for the individual and 0.9% for the household.



Chapter 2

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Household Population Characteristics

Economic Status of the Household

In this section, the household population features and household economic status are covered within the scope of the Research on Family Structure in Türkiye. Within this context, the number of people living in the house, type of individuals in the household, whether or not the household can meet their basic needs, real estate ownership of the individuals, borrowing and saving behaviors of the household are analyzed.

2.1. Household Population Characteristics

Table 1 shows household size based on the number of individuals living in the house. On average household size in Türkiye is 3.9 people. Household

size in rural areas (4.1 people) is higher than urban areas (3.9 people).

Household sizes in the three major cities are close to each other. Number of people in the household is slightly higher in Istanbul (3.6 people).

When considered by regions, household size in the eastern regions of Türkiye is larger than the western regions. The region with the highest average household size is Southeast Anatolia (5.6 people). It is followed by Northeast Anatolia (4.9 people) and Central Anatolia regions (4.9 people). Regions with the smallest size of households are West Marmara (3.2 people) and Aegean regions (3.4 people).

Table 1. Household Sizes throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Person
Türkiye	3,9
RESIDENCE AREA	
Urban	3,7
Rural	4,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES	
Istanbul	3,6
Ankara	3,4
Izmir	3,3
NUTS	
Istanbul	3,6
West Marmara	3,2
Aegean	3,4
East Marmara	3,8
West Anatolia	3,6
Mediterranean	3,7
Central Anatolia	3,9
West Black Sea	3,8
East Black Sea	4,2
Northeast Anatolia	4,9
Mideast Anatolia	4,9
Southeast Anatolia	5,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE	
Nuclear	3,8
Extended	5,9
Broken	2,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS	
Lower Group	3,8
Middle Group	3,9
Upper Group	3,4

As expected, large families have the largest household sizes (5.9 people). They are followed by nuclear (3.8 people) and broken families (2.0).

The socioeconomic group with the highest average household size is middle SES group (3.9 people). It is followed by lower SES group (3.8 people) and upper SES group (3.4).

Single person households throughout the country is 6% while in 19% of the households is comprised of 2 people, 21% have 3 people and 25% have 4 people in the household. The percentage of families who have 7 or more members is approximately 8%. Almost half of the households (46%) are comprised by 3 people or less (Table 2).

Table 2. Number of People Living in the Household

Number of people living in the household	%
1	6,2
2	18,9
3	20,6
4	24,8
5	14,3
6	7,1
7	3,5
8	2,1
9	1,1
10 or more	1,5

Table 3. Household Types throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, and SES

	Nuclear	Extended	Broken
Türkiye	73,0	14,5	12,5
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	75,9	10,9	13,2
Rural	67,7	21,1	11,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	74,7	10,5	14,8
Ankara	74,1	9,4	16,5
Izmir	74,7	8,5	16,8
NUTS			
Istanbul	74,7	10,5	14,8
West Marmara	72,8	12,5	14,7
Aegean	74,5	12,3	13,2
East Marmara	73,0	17,0	10,0
West Anatolia	71,5	13,7	14,8
Mediterranean	78,1	8,7	13,2
Central Anatolia	71,6	18,9	9,5
West Black Sea	65,4	21,0	13,6
East Black Sea	65,7	23,2	11,1
Northeast Anatolia	67,0	23,8	9,2
Mideast Anatolia	70,8	19,5	9,7
Southeast Anatolia	74,5	18,2	7,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Lower group	61,8	13,5	24,7
Middle Group	73,8	15,7	10,5
Upper Group	82,7	6,5	10,8

According to data regarding the type of household in Table 3, it is clear that the most common type in Türkiye is the nuclear family (73%). While extended families make up 15% in Türkiye, broken families comprise 13%. Nuclear family is the most common family type in both urban and rural areas. Percentage of nuclear families is higher in urban areas whereas the percentage of extended families

is higher in rural areas. Two things stand out when regions are compared. The region in which the extended family type is observed most is Northeast Anatolia (24%). It is followed closely by East Black Sea (23%) and West Black Sea (21%). Broken families are observed more frequently in West Marmara (15%), Istanbul (15%) and West Anatolia (15%).

Table 4. 8 Household Types throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, and SES

	Without child	With child	Patriarchal	Transient	One-person	Single parent	Other broken	Non-relative
Türkiye	15,7	57,4	8,2	6,3	6,2	4,0	2,0	0,3
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	13,3	62,6	5,8	5,1	6,3	4,4	2,1	0,4
Rural	20,0	47,7	12,7	8,5	6,0	3,4	1,7	0,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	12,4	62,3	6,2	4,3	7,1	4,3	3,1	0,3
Ankara	14,4	59,6	5,9	3,5	9,0	4,6	2,2	0,8
Izmir	15,9	58,8	4,3	4,2	7,4	6,8	2,4	0,2
NUTS								
Istanbul	12,4	62,3	6,2	4,3	7,1	4,3	3,1	0,3
West Marmara	23,5	49,3	6,1	6,4	7,8	4,2	2,4	0,3
Aegean	20,5	54,1	6,8	5,4	7,1	4,4	1,5	0,2
East Marmara	14,7	58,2	7,9	9,1	4,3	3,6	1,8	0,3
West Anatolia	16,3	55,2	7,8	5,9	8,6	3,7	2,0	0,5
Mediterranean	16,0	62,1	4,7	4,0	6,3	4,9	1,6	0,4
Central Anatolia	17,5	54,1	11,6	7,4	4,7	3,4	1,2	0,2
West Black Sea	18,0	47,5	13,9	7,2	6,3	4,8	1,9	0,6
East Black Sea	15,2	50,5	12,2	11,0	5,5	3,4	2,2	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	11,7	55,3	14,0	9,8	4,2	3,5	1,4	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	11,5	59,3	12,8	6,7	4,4	3,6	1,7	0,0
Southeast Anatolia	8,2	66,2	9,6	8,6	3,0	2,6	1,7	0,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
Lower group	21,5	40,3	6,8	6,7	17,9	4,5	2,3	0,0
Middle Group	14,6	59,2	9,0	6,7	4,2	4,0	1,9	0,3
Upper Group	15,7	67,0	3,8	2,7	5,0	3,4	2,1	0,3

Nuclear families are seen the most in the upper socioeconomic group (83%). The percentage of extended families is close for both middle (16%) and lower (14%) socioeconomic groups. 40% of the lower SES group is comprised of nuclear families with children. This percentage rises to 67% for the upper group.

Percentages of patriarchal and transient extended families are close to each other. Compared to urban areas, percentages of both households are higher in rural areas.

The largest share of broken households belongs to single person families. People live alone in 6% of the households in Türkiye. Among three major cities, the percentage of families with one member is relatively high in Ankara (9%) and also in the western part of the country. The socioeconomic group with the highest percentage of single person households is the lower SES group with a percentage of 18%. This percentage is 4% in middle SES group and 5% in the upper SES group.

The percentage of families comprised of one parent and a child because of divorce or death is 4%. Among three major cities, the percentage of families with one parent is relatively higher in Izmir (7%) and also in the western part of the country. Although there is no significant difference based on socioeconomic level, the socioeconomic group with the highest rate of such households is the lower SES group (5%).

Other broken households without parents comprise 2% of all households. The percentage of households in which members are not related to each other yet live together (such as off-campus student houses) are quite low (3%).

2.2. Economic Status of the Household

2.2.1. Meeting Basic Needs and Real Estate Ownership

Questioned about the household's income and whether it was enough to meet the needs of the household, individuals were requested to choose a response from "very hardly", "hard", "so-so", "easy" and "very easily" (Table 5). The percentage of families who chose the "very easily" option is low. Half of the households (50%) chose either the "very hardly" or "hard" option. This percentage increases to 55% in rural areas.

Table 5. Meeting the Basic Needs of the Household throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Very easily	Easily	Not that hard	Hard	Very hardly
Türkiye	1,4	11,5	37,4	34,6	15,1
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	1,6	12,6	39,1	32,2	14,5
Rural	1,0	9,5	34,4	38,9	16,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	0,8	11,6	41,7	32,1	13,8
Ankara	1,3	16,7	42,5	30,0	9,5
Izmir	1,0	10,6	39,8	27,7	20,9
NUTS					
Istanbul	0,8	11,6	41,7	32,1	13,8
West Marmara	2,1	15,3	40,5	32	10,1
Aegean	1,3	11,4	37,2	33,8	16,3
East Marmara	0,8	12,3	38,6	30,9	17,4
West Anatolia	1,1	13,0	37,4	35,4	13,1
Mediterranean	1,2	9,0	36,3	34,9	18,5
Central Anatolia	1,4	11,6	39,5	38,1	9,3
West Black Sea	1,9	11,9	36,7	36,3	13,2
East Black Sea	2,4	12,8	37,4	35,1	12,3
Northeast Anatolia	4,5	15,3	36,7	35,2	8,4
Mideast Anatolia	1,0	12,1	35,6	35,4	16,0
Southeast Anatolia	2,4	7,1	26,1	41,4	23,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	1,6	12,1	38,1	33,9	14,4
Extended	0,6	7,8	36,2	37,9	17,4
Broken	1,4	12,4	35,1	34,4	16,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower group	0,6	3,4	20,0	45,5	30,4
Middle Group	0,7	9,9	39,9	35,5	14,0
Upper Group	7,7	35,0	43,4	11,9	2,1

Among three major cities, the percentage of individuals who feel that covering household needs is “hard” or “very hardly” is higher in Izmir (49%). This percentage is 46% for Istanbul and 40% for Ankara. When compared to other regions, Southeast Anatolia has the highest percent (64%).

When results are evaluated by household type, the percentage of families that find it “hard” or “very hardly” to meet their basic needs is higher in extended families (55%) compared to nuclear and broken families. As expected, this percentage rises as the SES status decreases. 14% in upper SES status that they find it “hard” or “very hardly” to cover their basic needs while it is 49% for the middle SES group and 76% for the lower SES group.

When asked whether or not they owned real estate (Table 6), more than half (67%), did not have any real estate. Among real estate owned, house/flat is the most common type of property with a

percentage of 24%. House/flat is followed by land, farms, vineyards, gardens (11%) and cars (10%). Similar results are observed by rural and urban residential areas. Percentage of real estate ownership is lower in rural areas; real estate owned is usually farms, land, vineyards and gardens. The percentage of individuals who own farms, land, vineyards and gardens is higher in rural areas (21%) compared to urban areas.

Throughout Türkiye, house/flat ownership of is the most popular choice in three major cities and the percentages for other real estate are close to each other. While West Marmara (31%), Central Anatolia (29%), Aegean (27%), West Anatolia (26%), West Black Sea (25%) and Istanbul (24%) have the highest percentages in terms of house/flat ownership, the percentages in Southeast Anatolia (20%), Central Anatolia (18%) and Northeast Anatolia (17%) are lower.

Table 6. Property/Vehicles Ownership throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	None	House/ flat	Land, farm, vineyard, garden	Car (for private use)	Workplace (Office/shop)	Other
Türkiye	66,9	23,8	11,0	10,2	2,3	1,0
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	68,8	22,9	5,6	10,7	2,6	0,5
Rural	63,6	25,4	20,5	9,2	1,9	1,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	69,7	24,0	2,5	9,7	2,3	0,5
Ankara	66,9	26,5	3,6	11,6	1,7	0,1
Izmir	63,8	27,1	5,1	12,1	3,1	0,2
NUTS						
Istanbul	69,7	24,0	2,5	9,7	2,3	0,5
West Marmara	58,5	31,4	14,7	12,8	2,8	2,7
Aegean	59,4	27,3	16,5	13,2	2,8	2,2
East Marmara	69,8	20,2	10,5	10,4	2,5	1,1
West Anatolia	65,4	25,6	10,0	10,5	1,8	0,9
Mediterranean Region	64,9	23,1	11,7	11,6	2,7	1,1
Central Anatolia	63,4	28,6	16,4	11,1	1,6	0,3
West Black Sea Region	64,5	24,7	14,0	12,3	3,0	0,5
East Black Sea Region	69,6	20,0	16,9	8,6	3,1	0,4
Northeast Anatolia	77,8	17,0	9,1	4,6	1,3	0,3
Mideast Anatolia	73,9	18,0	13,6	5,6	1,5	0,3
Southeast Anatolia	76,0	19,5	7,2	4,3	1,6	0,6

When considered by gender, there is a serious difference between women and men in terms of real estate ownership. Half of the men own property while this percentage is only 17% for women. Percentage regarding real estate ownership increases with age. The percentage of real estate owners in the age group of 18-24 is 4% while it is over 51% for the 45+ age group.

House ownership percentage (33%) is highest among broken families while the percentage of people who own land, vineyards, gardens etc. is highest among extended families (14%) similarly; vehicle ownership percentage is highest among nuclear families (12%).

As expected, the percentage of real estate ownership increases with socioeconomic level. 76% of the individuals in lower SES group do not have any real estate. This percentage decreases to 47% in the upper SES group. House/flat ownership percentage is higher in all SES groups compared to other real estate. 18% of the people in lower SES group, 23% of the people in middle SES group and 37% of the people in the upper SES group own a house or flat. In the ownership of land, farms, vineyards and gardens, no difference was observed between SES groups, 12% of people in lower SES group own farms, land, vineyards and gardens. This percentage is 11% in middle and upper SES groups.

Table 7. Property/Vehicles Ownership by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	None	House/ flat	Land, farm, vineyard, garden	Car (for private use)	Workplace (Office/shop)	Other
GENDER						
Male	50,5	36,1	16,8	18,4	4,0	1,8
Female	82,8	11,9	5,4	2,2	0,8	0,3
AGE						
18-24	95,7	1,7	0,7	1,4	0,4	0,6
25-34	79,6	10,1	4,4	9,7	1,6	1,0
35-44	61,7	25,4	11,3	15,0	3,0	1,2
45-54	48,8	40,4	16,1	16,7	4,4	1,2
55-64	43,9	47,7	23,2	11,4	3,3	1,1
65+	41,8	49,3	28,3	4,1	2,3	1,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
Illiterate	74,9	19,3	12,7	0,6	0,2	0,4
Literate, but no schooling	64,1	29,3	15,8	1,9	1,3	1,1
Primary school	65,4	25,8	13,3	8,5	2,4	1,2
Elementary education	68,2	20,9	8,3	13,6	3,4	1,1
Regular high schools and their equivalents	72,6	17,8	5,8	13,3	2,6	1,0
Undergraduate and graduate studies	51,4	32,9	9,0	26,4	3,5	0,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	66,0	24,5	10,4	11,5	2,6	1,0
Extended	72,2	17,9	13,7	7,6	1,6	1,4
Broken	61,4	32,7	9,5	4,9	1,6	0,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Lower group	76,0	18,3	12,1	0,0	0,0	0,6
Middle Group	68,3	22,8	10,9	8,5	2,1	1,1
Upper Group	46,9	36,6	10,9	33,2	6,8	1,1

2.2.2. Loans and Saving Behaviors of Households

Individuals were asked whether or not they borrowed money within the last year (Table 8). As illustrated in the following table, banks lead as the main institution to borrow money (19%). Family members and relatives follow banks closely with similar percentages. Loans can also be asked of friends (13%) and neighbors (8%).

In terms of where the subjects live, behavior of borrowing from neighbors shows the biggest difference. The percentage of households borrowing

money from neighbors is 6% in urban areas as opposed to 11% in rural areas.

The percentage of people who prefer to take loans from banks is higher in Izmir when compared to the other major cities (26%). While 10% of the people living in Istanbul and Izmir borrow money from their friends, this percentage is a little lower in Ankara 7%. When considered by regions, a difference is determined in the Mediterranean. The percentage of people who borrow money from parents (19%), siblings (22%), friends (19%) or banks (24%) is higher in this region compared to other regions.

Table 8. People or Institutions Loaning Money throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Bank (Credit cards and loans)	Friends	Siblings	Other siblings	Mother/father	Neighbors	Children living outside the household
Türkiye	19,3	12,6	11,2	9,9	9,6	7,5	3,4
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	19,5	11,7	11,4	9,2	10,8	5,8	3,0
Rural	18,7	14,3	10,7	11,3	7,5	10,7	4,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	15,5	10,0	10,7	7,4	10,3	5,6	3,4
Ankara	16,5	6,5	8,8	7,2	7,6	2,0	1,0
Izmir	26,0	10,9	8,2	9,4	11,0	4,8	2,9
NUTS							
Istanbul	15,5	10,0	10,7	7,4	10,3	5,6	3,4
West Marmara	22,1	7,8	7,5	5,8	5,1	4,4	2,2
Aegean	23,4	11,7	8,3	7,6	9,7	6,9	2,8
East Marmara	21,8	8,6	10,2	9,1	7,9	5,6	2,3
West Anatolia	16,5	11,0	9,5	9,0	8,4	5,6	2,7
Mediterranean	23,5	18,8	21,9	14,0	18,7	12,5	7,0
Central Anatolia	20,5	14,5	10,3	10,9	7,6	9,4	2,5
West Black Sea	23,7	17,2	12,0	13,3	8,7	13,7	3,9
East Black Sea	19,4	11,0	9,9	9,1	7,6	6,3	2,2
Northeast Anatolia	18,4	14,2	9,9	16,2	8,7	9,5	2,1
Mideast Anatolia	15,1	16,1	13,3	13,3	8,9	10,6	5,8
Southeast Anatolia	8,0	13,4	4,0	11,6	2,9	2,9	1,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	20,3	13,1	11,9	9,8	11,5	6,9	3,1
Extended	21,7	14,3	10,9	13,7	4,9	10,9	3,3
Broken	10,6	7,5	7,4	6,1	4,4	7,0	5,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower group	4,6	13,9	10,9	11,3	6,9	12,7	6,2
Middle Group	19,9	13,1	11,5	10,4	10,3	7,3	3,1
Upper Group	34,4	6,8	8,9	4,7	8,4	2,2	1,5

Another region where people take out loans from banks is the West Black Sea (24%). The region with the highest number of people borrowing money from relatives is Northeast Anatolia (16%).

The percentage of people who prefer to take loans from banks is higher in Izmir when compared to the other major cities (26%). While 10% of the people living in Istanbul and Izmir borrow money from their friends, this percentage is a little lower in

Ankara 7%. When considered by regions, a difference is determined in the Mediterranean. The percentage of people who borrow money from parents (19%), siblings (22%), friends (19%) or banks (24%) is higher in this region compared to other regions. Another region where people take out loans from banks is the West Black Sea (24%). The region with the highest number of people borrowing money from relatives is Northeast Anatolia (16%).

Table 9. Investing Savings throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type and SES

	We cannot have savings	Banking accounts	Gold	Real estate	Foreign currency	Business investments/development	Stock certificates/bill of exchange/sale bills	Individual retirement	Other
Türkiye	86,4	4,7	3,9	3,6	2,3	1,5	0,6	0,5	0,3
RESIDENCE AREA									
Urban	84,6	5,5	4,4	3,8	2,9	1,4	0,7	0,6	0,3
Rural	89,8	3,2	2,9	3,3	1,3	1,6	0,4	0,3	0,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES									
Istanbul	84,4	7,1	4,0	2,0	3,7	1,3	0,9	0,6	0,1
Ankara	86,6	6,2	3,4	5,6	2,0	0,8	1,1	0,4	0,0
Izmir	81,7	8,9	4,4	3,9	2,5	1,7	0,8	0,4	0,5
NUTS									
Istanbul	84,4	7,1	4,0	2,0	3,7	1,3	0,9	0,6	0,1
West Marmara	84,8	6,9	3,9	4,9	1,1	0,4	0,5	1,3	0,3
Aegean	82,3	6,6	5,0	5,5	2,4	1,6	1,0	0,9	0,7
East Marmara	86,2	4,2	5,5	3,0	2,6	0,9	0,7	0,7	0,8
West Anatolia	88,1	4,1	3,5	4,6	2,0	0,9	0,7	0,2	0
Mediterranean	83,6	4,9	3,0	5,8	1,8	3,6	0,5	0,5	0,1
Central Anatolia	87,8	1,7	3,5	4,9	2,4	1,7	0,1	0,2	0,4
West Black Sea	88,4	4,3	3,1	2,6	2,0	1,4	0,7	0,3	0,1
East Black Sea	86,8	5,1	6,2	2,1	2,6	0,6	0,3	0,2	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	93,5	0,7	4,6	0,2	1,1	0,9	0,1	0,0	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	92,2	0,3	2,6	2,3	1,6	1,5	0,0	0,1	0,3
Southeast Anatolia	94,9	1,0	1,6	0,8	1,5	0,6	0,2	0,0	0,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE									
Nuclear	84,6	5,2	4,5	4,1	2,6	1,8	0,7	0,6	0,3
Extended	91,8	2,2	2,3	2,8	1,3	1,3	0,3	0,3	0,1
Broken	90,6	4,6	1,9	1,8	1,9	0,0	0,4	0,2	0,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS									
Lower group	98,5	0,4	0,4	0,2	0,4	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,0
Middle Group	88,2	3,6	3,8	2,8	1,8	1,2	0,3	0,3	0,3
Upper Group	55,7	19,1	9,5	15,1	9,2	5,4	3,9	3,0	0,5

When asked how they used their savings, most of the households in Türkiye stated they did not have any savings (87%) (Table 9). The percentage of people who do not have any savings is higher in rural areas (90%).

Among the three major cities, Ankara is the city with the highest number of people who do not have any savings (87%). Percentage of savings decreases in regions as we go from west to east. Regions with the most savings are the Aegean (18%), Mediterranean (16%), Istanbul (16%), West Marmara (15%) and East Marmara (14%).

While nuclear families have the largest amount of savings (15%) among household types, they are followed by broken families with 9% and extended families with 8%.

As expected, the percentage of households that has savings increases as the socioeconomic level increases. While only 1% of the families in lower SES group could save, this rate increases to 12% in middle SES group and to 44% in upper SES group. The upper SES group, the group that has the highest amount of savings, saved 19% by keeping money in bank accounts, 15% by purchasing real estate, 9% by buying gold and 9% by buying foreign currency. In the upper SES group the percentage of people saving money by individual retirement insurance is 3% while the percentage of people who saving money by buying stock certificates/bills of exchange/sale bills is 4%. These two saving methods are not preferred by the other two SES groups.



Chapter 3

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

-
- *Age at First Marriage*
 - *Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate*
 - *Way of Meeting the Spouse*
 - *Decision for Marriage*
 - *Form of Solemnization*
 - *Bride Price*
 - *Consanguineous Marriage*
 - *Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate*
 - *Coming from the Same City with the Spouse*
 - *Marriage Ceremonies*
 - *Qualities Sought in Future Spouse*
 - *Status of Marriage*
 - *Reasons for Divorce*
 - *Possible Reasons for Divorce*

In this section, age at first marriage, ways of meeting the spouse, marriage decision, wedding type, bride price, points of view regarding marriage between cousins, wedding ceremonies, qualities sought in the future spouse, coming from the same town with the spouse, number of marriages, marital status and divorce are discussed. The aim is to have a better understanding about marital relationships in Türkiye.

3.1. Age at First Marriage

The age at first marriage is an important demographic indicator in Türkiye where civil and/or religious weddings are common. A large majority of the marriages in Türkiye (77%) occur between the ages of 18 and 29 (Table 10). More than half of married couples (59%) got married between the ages of 18 and 24 with 20% of married individuals getting married before the age of 18. The percentage of people who got married between the ages of 35 and 39 is very low (1%).

Throughout Türkiye, the most favored ages for mar-

riage are between 18 and 24. In both urban and rural areas, the percentage of people who fall within this age range is 59%. While the percentage of people who got married before the age of 18 is 17% in the urban areas, this percentage increases in the rural areas and reaches 24% as expected. The percentage of people who got married in the urban and rural areas after the age of 25 decreases accordingly. The percentage of people who got married in both urban and rural areas between the ages of 35 and 39 is quite low.

18-24 is the most preferred age range for first marriages in three major cities as throughout Türkiye. Among three major cities, the percentage of people who got married between the ages of 25 and 29 was higher in Izmir (27%) than in Istanbul and Ankara.

Among 12 regions, the percentage of people who got married before the age of 18 is lower in Istanbul (13%) and West Marmara (15%). This percentage is higher among people living in Mideast Anatolia (29%) and Northeast Anatolia (27%), Central Anatolia (26%), Southeast Anatolia (25%) and

Table 10. Age of First Marriage throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS

	-18	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39
Türkiye	19,5	59,0	17,5	3,1	0,9
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	16,6	59,2	19,7	3,5	1,0
Rural	24,3	58,6	14,0	2,4	0,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	12,6	60,6	22,0	3,9	0,9
Ankara	16,2	58,1	19,5	4,9	1,3
Izmir	14,5	52,2	27,0	5,0	1,3
NUTS					
Istanbul	12,6	60,6	22,0	3,9	0,9
West Marmara	15,4	61,1	18,3	4,1	1,0
Aegean	17,9	59,0	19,1	3,0	1,0
East Marmara	18,1	61,8	17,1	2,5	0,6
West Anatolia	18,8	62,0	15,6	2,8	0,7
Mediterranean	18,4	55,2	19,9	5,0	1,6
Central Anatolia	25,6	58,7	13,9	1,3	0,5
West Black Sea	24,0	58,7	14,2	2,0	1,1
East Black Sea	22,6	58,5	15,0	2,8	1,2
Northeast Anatolia	27,0	53,2	16,7	2,0	1,2
Mideast Anatolia	28,9	53,8	14,2	2,5	0,6
Southeast Anatolia	25,4	59,4	12,6	2,0	0,5

West Black Sea (24%). The percentage of people who marry for the first time between the ages of 25 and 29 decreases as we go from west to east.

The percentage of individuals who got married before the age of 18 is higher among women (31%) than men (7%). This finding shows that from a general point of view, women marry at an earlier age than men throughout Türkiye. Both women (60%) and men (59%) prefer to marry for the first time between the ages of 18 and 24 more than other age groups.

Percentages regarding the age of first marriage differ between genders as the age advances. 29% of men marry between the ages of 25 and 29 whereas only 8% of women marry between these ages.

Moreover, for both men and women, the age of first marriage do not transfer so much into the older age

groups; only 2% of women and 7% of men get married after the age of 30. This situation shows that most of the marriages in our country occur when the individuals are in their twenties (Table 11).

Individual's age at marriage makes it partly possible to evaluate the change in marriage age over time. While the percentage of marriages before age 18 is 32% among individuals over the 65, this percentage decreases in younger age groups and goes down to 14% in the age group 25-34. These percentages show that the number of marriages made before age 18 started to decrease significantly within the last 30 to 40 years. On the other hand, the percentage of marriage before age 18 increases to 22% in the age group of 18-24. This small increase can be assessed in two different ways. According to one interpretation, this decreasing trend occurred within the last 10 years and the number of marriages before the age of 18 increased a little compared to the previous

Table 11. Age of First Marriage by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, SES

	-18	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39
GENDER					
Male	6,5	58,5	28,5	5,1	1,4
Female	31,2	59,5	7,6	1,2	0,5
AGE					
18-24	22,2	77,1	0,7	0,0	0,0
25-34	13,9	61,4	22,5	2,1	0,0
35-44	15,1	58,6	20,2	5,0	1,0
45-54	20,2	57,4	17,2	3,4	1,8
55-64	27,8	54,1	14,2	2,6	1,3
65+	31,6	52,3	12,1	2,5	1,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	47,1	46,5	4,6	1,3	0,5
Literate, but no schooling	32,2	55,6	10,1	1,2	0,9
Primary school graduate	19,0	64,3	14,0	2,2	0,6
Elementary education	11,4	64,0	20,7	2,9	1,0
Regular high schools and their equivalents	3,6	60,4	30,2	4,6	1,2
Undergraduate and studies	0,6	39,1	45,5	11,5	3,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	16,5	59,4	19,7	3,5	1,0
Extended	25,2	60,0	12,3	1,8	0,6
Broken	35,5	50,8	9,6	2,4	1,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower group	35,6	52,1	9,7	1,5	1,0
Middle Group	18,6	61,3	16,5	2,8	0,7
Upper Group	6,1	49,2	35,1	7,3	2,3

period. According to another interpretation, since marriage age for the people in the age group of 18-24 will be younger than 18 or between the ages of 18 and 24, it can be expected that these percentages would be higher.

When the data regarding first marriage age is analyzed by educational status, we see that literacy plays a part and that almost half of illiterate people (47%) married before the age of 18. On the other hand, 32% of literate people who never attended school got married before the age of 18. Among university graduates or postgraduates, marriage before age 18 falls to 6 per thousand. The other half of illiterate individuals married between the ages of 18 and 24 (47%). The percentage of literate people who never attended to school 56% married between the ages of 18 and 24. In this case, in Türkiye most people who are illiterate or who are literate but never attended school got married by age of 24.

39% of university graduates and postgraduates got married between the ages of 18 and 24 while 46% of them got married between the ages of 25 and 29

and 12% of them got married between the ages of 30 and 34. Only 3% of people who graduated from higher education institutions got married between the ages of 35 and 39. As can be seen from the table, the percentage of early marriages decreases as the education level increases (Table 11).

When considered in terms of the type of the household, the percentage of marriage before age 18 is higher in broken families (36%). This percentage is 17% for nuclear families and 25% for extended families.

The percentage of people getting married before age 18 decreases as the socioeconomic level increases. 36% of people in the lower SES group got married before age 18. This percentage decreases to 19% in the middle SES group and to 6% in the upper SES group. On the other hand, the percentage of people who got married between the ages of 25 and 29 and 30 and 34 increases as the socioeconomic level increases. 35% of the high SES group got married between the age of 25 and 29 while 7% of them got married between the ages of 30 and 34.

Table 12. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Women and Men

	Women	Men
15-19	13,0	2,5
20-24	61,0	37,2
25-29	24,3	49,6
30-34	1,5	10,0
35-39	0,1	0,5
40-44	0,0	0,0
45+	0,0	0,0

3. 2. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate

Individuals participating in the study were asked about the appropriate age range for first marriage (Table 12). Most of the individuals (61%) stated that the appropriate age for marriage is between 20 and 24 for women. For men the appropriate age for marriage is considered to be between 25 and 29 (50%).

In Türkiye, while the ages between 20 and 34 are deemed appropriate for women to get married by 87%, this percentage is 97% for men. 13% stated that the appropriate age at first marriage for women

is between the ages of 15-19 while this percentage falls to 3% for men. In other words, the age for first marriage deemed appropriate for men is higher than the one for women.

3.2.1. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Women

Most people living in the urban (60%) and rural areas (64%) define 20-24 as the age range appropriate for women. The most significant difference concerning marriageable age between urban and rural areas is in the age group of 15-19. 9% of people in urban areas and 20% of people in the rural

areas defined the age range of 15-19 as the ideal age range of marriage for women (Table 13). The assessment made for three major cities shows that Istanbul (60%) deeming appropriate marriageable age for women between the ages of 20 and 24 has a higher percentage compared to Ankara and Izmir. The percentage of people who consider 25-29 as the appropriate age range in Ankara (41%) and Izmir (40%) is higher than in Istanbul (32%).

The majority finds 20-24 as the ideal age range of marriage for women in all regions. Compared to oth-

er regions, the percentage of people who considered 15-19 as the ideal age range for marriage for women is higher in Mideast Anatolia and Southeast Anatolia. Percentage of people who deems this age range as appropriate in Mideast Anatolia is 24% while it is 30% in Southeast Anatolia. On the other hand, an important percentage of people living in Istanbul, East Marmara and West Marmara consider 25-29 as the appropriate range for women. The percentage of people who consider this as the ideal age range for marriage for women in Istanbul and East Marmara is 32% while it is 27% for West Marmara.

Table 13. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Women throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities and NUTS

	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45 +
Türkiye	13,0	61,0	24,3	1,4	0,1	0,0	0,0
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	8,7	59,5	29,6	2,0	0,2	0,0	0,0
Rural	20,4	63,8	15,0	0,7	0,1	0,0	0,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	5,1	60,1	32,2	2,2	0,4	0,1	0,0
Ankara	4,6	50,5	41,2	3,5	0,1	0,0	0,1
Izmir	4,3	51,1	40,2	4,1	0,2	0,0	0,1
NUTS							
Istanbul	5,1	60,1	32,2	2,2	0,4	0,1	0,0
West Marmara	8,7	61,9	27,3	1,9	0,1	0,0	0,2
Aegean	12,7	62,3	22,8	2,1	0,1	0,0	0,0
East Marmara	6,3	59,5	32,4	1,8	0,0	0,0	0,0
West Anatolia	11,8	58,9	27,1	2,1	0,1	0,0	0,1
Mediterranean	15,4	59,0	24,4	1,1	0,1	0,0	0,0
Central Anatolia	19,4	68,9	11,2	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,0
West Black Sea	9,3	66,9	22,8	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
East Black Sea	13,3	60,4	24,7	1,1	0,5	0,0	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	16,0	62,2	20,5	1,1	0,2	0,0	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	23,5	58,2	17,9	0,5	0,0	0,0	0,0
Southeast Anatolia	29,5	59,4	10,4	0,6	0,1	0,0	0,1

The majority of both women (60%) and men (62%) think that women need to get married between the ages of 20 and 24 (Table 13).

Showing parallels with the level of education throughout Türkiye, people from different age groups also stated 20-24 as the ideal age range for women to get married. Similarly, people from all age groups think 25-29 is the second ideal age range for women. The percentage of people deeming 15-19 as the appropriate age range for women increases

with the age. Similarly, the percentage of people thinking 25-29 is the ideal age range for women decreases with age.

In terms of marital status, married and single people share the same opinion. Divorced and single people also think the same. Married or widowed individuals deem it more appropriate for women to get married at an early age compared to single or divorced individuals. 15% of the married individuals and 17% of widowed individuals think that the

Table 14. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Women by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type and SES

	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45+
GENDER							
Male	15,2	61,7	21,8	1,1	0,1	0,0	0,0
Female	10,8	60,4	26,7	1,9	0,2	0,0	0,0
AGE							
18-24	9,2	61,3	28,4	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0
25-34	10,6	59,0	28,2	2,0	0,2	0,0	0,0
35-44	12,2	61,1	24,4	2,0	0,2	0,0	0,0
45-54	13,9	62,5	22,3	1,1	0,1	0,0	0,0
55-64	17,9	61,3	19,3	1,3	0,1	0,1	0,0
65+	22,6	63,8	12,8	0,7	0,0	0,0	0,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
Illiterate	27,7	62,8	9,2	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,0
Literate, but no schooling	23,5	61,8	14,0	0,7	0,0	0,0	0,0
Primary school	13,5	66,4	19,0	1,0	0,1	0,0	0,0
Elementary education	11,3	62,6	24,9	1,2	0,0	0,0	0,1
Regular high schools and their equivalents	5,5	55,1	36,7	2,5	0,2	0,0	0,0
Undergraduate and graduate studies	2,8	41,8	50,1	4,8	0,5	0,0	0,0
MARITAL STATUS							
Single	6,8	54,3	35,7	2,7	0,4	0,0	0,1
Married	14,5	62,8	21,4	1,1	0,1	0,0	0,0
Divorced	5,7	51,3	36,9	5,5	0,0	0,5	0,0
Widowed	16,6	63,4	18,9	1,2	0,0	0,0	0,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	11,6	61,3	25,5	1,4	0,1	0,0	0,0
Extended	19,6	63,2	16,3	0,7	0,1	0,0	0,0
Broken	8,7	53,2	33,1	4,0	0,7	0,2	0,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower group	27,8	60,2	11,4	0,5	0,1	0,0	0,0
Middle Group	12,2	63,4	22,9	1,3	0,1	0,0	0,0
Upper Group	3,8	44,1	47,6	4,3	0,1	0,0	0,0

appropriate age range of marriage for women is 15-19. Among the single (7%) and divorced (6%) people this percentage is lower. On the other hand, the percentage of people who think that women should get married by 25-29, is 36% among single people and 37% in divorced people.

28% of literate people stated that 15-19 was the ideal age range for women to get married while 63% of them stated the appropriate age range was 20-24, 9% stated it as 25-29 and 4 per thousand stated 30-34 as the appropriate age range for women to

get married. People who think women should get married between the ages of 15 and 19 are found mostly in groups with low educational levels. Half of university students or graduates or postgraduates (50%) state the appropriate age for a woman to get married is between the ages of 25 and 29. While most individuals in other educational groups considered the age range 20-24 as appropriate for women to get married, there is a significant difference with university graduates and this is an important clue in terms of the effects of education.

The age range of 20-24 is considered to be the ideal marriage age range for women in all household types. Compared to other household types, broken families think it is more appropriate for women to marry later. 33% of broken families stated 25-29 to be the appropriate age range for women to get married while this percentage was 26% for nuclear families and 16% for extended families.

A large majority of lower and middle SES groups (more than 60%) thinks 20-24 is the appropriate age range of marriage for women. This percentage is 44% in the upper SES group. The percentage of people, who think it is appropriate for women to get married between the ages of 25 and 29, increases as the socioeconomic level increases. 11% of the lower SES group thinks this age range is appropriate while 48% of upper SES group do so. On the other hand, the percentage of people who think that women should get married between the ages of 15 and 19, increases as the socioeconomic level decreases. This percentage which is 28% for the lower SES group decreases to 4% in the upper SES group.

3.2.2. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Men

As shown in Table 14, more than half of the rural people (51%) think that the ages of 20 and 24 is appropriate for men to marry whereas more than half the people living in urban areas (56%) think that the ideal age for men to marry is between 25 and 29.

More than half the people living in three major cities think that the ideal age of marriage for men is between the ages of 25 and 29 reflecting the situation throughout the country. The percentage of people who put the marriageable age for men between 30-34 is higher in Ankara (20%) and Izmir (19%). In all regions the majority thinks 25-29 is the ideal age range of marriage for men. The majority of people living in Southeast Anatolia however think 20-24 is the ideal age range. On the other hand, an important percentage of people living in Istanbul (15%), the Aegean (10%), East Marmara (12%) and West Anatolia (12%), East Black Sea (12%) and Northeast Anatolia (11%) consider 30-34 as the appropriate age range for men.

Table 15. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate For Men throughout Türkiye, By Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45+
Türkiye	2,5	37,2	49,6	10,0	0,5	0,0	0,0
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	1,5	29,6	55,5	12,6	0,7	0,0	0,0
Rural	4,3	50,7	39,2	5,5	0,3	0,0	0,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	0,6	23,5	59,5	15,2	1,1	0,1	0,0
Ankara	0,8	20,7	57,3	20,1	0,9	0,0	0,2
Izmir	0,6	22,8	56,9	18,6	0,9	0,0	0,0
NUTS							
Istanbul	0,6	23,5	59,5	15,2	1,1	0,1	0,0
West Marmara	1,8	41,5	47,5	8,7	0,5	0,0	0,0
Aegean	2,0	39,7	47,6	10,2	0,4	0,0	0,0
East Marmara	1,5	27,3	59,0	11,5	0,5	0,1	0,0
West Anatolia	1,5	38,3	47,2	12,3	0,5	0,0	0,1
Mediterranean	2,7	39,8	46,7	10,3	0,5	0,0	0,0
Central Anatolia	2,7	47,1	46,3	3,7	0,2	0,0	0,0
West Black Sea	2,9	44,7	45,8	6,4	0,3	0,0	0,0
East Black Sea	3,0	32,4	51,2	12,0	1,3	0,0	0,1
Northeast Anatolia	2,5	33,9	52,6	10,5	0,4	0,0	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	6,6	43,1	45,0	5,4	0	0,0	0,0
Southeast Anatolia	7,7	53,0	36,1	3,0	0,2	0,0	0,0

The percentage of people from Mideast Anatolia and Southeast Anatolia who think 15-19 the appropriate age range for men have a very similar percentage (7%) (Table 15).

Individuals from both genders share the same idea about the ideal marriage age for men (Table 16) Both men and women think men should get married between the ages of 25-29.

When the findings are analyzed in terms of the age of the individuals, people from different age groups

state the ideal marriage age for men as 25-29. People who think it is 20-24 come second. This situation changes with the individuals over 55 years of age. The percentage of people who think the ideal marriage age is 20-24 is higher in 55-64 and +65 age groups. The percentages are 44% in 55-64 the age group and 53% in the 65+ age group.

When considered in terms of marital status, married and widowed people share the same opinion whereas single and divorced people differ. The percentage of people who consider 20-24 as the ideal age range

Table 16. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Men by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type and SES

	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45+
GENDER							
Male	3,0	39,2	48,4	9,0	0,4	0,0	0,0
Female	2,1	35,4	50,7	11,0	0,7	0,0	0,0
AGE							
18-24	1,5	32,9	56,7	8,7	0,2	0,1	0,0
25-34	1,9	30,7	53,1	13,4	0,8	0,0	0,0
35-44	2,1	37,5	48,9	10,7	0,7	0,0	0,1
45-54	3,0	39,9	48,4	8,0	0,7	0,0	0,0
55-64	3,6	44,4	43,6	8,1	0,3	0,1	0,0
65+	5,7	52,9	35,3	6,0	0,1	0,0	0,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
Illiterate	7,4	59,1	30,1	3,1	0,2	0,0	0,0
Literate, but no schooling	4,5	51,5	37,8	5,9	0,3	0,0	0,0
Primary schools	2,3	41,7	48,7	6,9	0,4	0,0	0,0
Elementary education	1,7	35,2	51,4	11,1	0,4	0,1	0,1
Regular high schools or their equivalents	1,1	21,5	61,2	15,2	0,9	0,0	0,0
Undergraduate and graduate studies	0,4	13,3	59,5	25,1	1,5	0,0	0,1
MARITAL STATUS							
Single	1,0	25,2	57,6	14,7	1,4	0,1	0,1
Married	2,9	40,2	47,9	8,6	0,3	0,0	0,0
Divorced	0,4	23,5	48,4	24,6	2,6	0,5	0,0
Widowed	3,4	44,3	43,2	8,8	0,3	0,0	0,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	2,2	35,5	51,7	10,2	0,4	0,0	0,0
Extended	4,4	47,3	42,3	5,7	0,3	0,1	0,0
Broken	1,2	27,4	49,8	18,9	2,3	0,2	0,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower group	6,7	57,0	31,7	4,2	0,4	0,0	0,0
Middle Group	2,2	37,5	50,7	9,0	0,5	0,0	0,0
Upper Group	0,5	14,9	59,8	23,5	1,3	0,0	0,0

is higher among married (40%) and widowed (44%) people. More than half of the single individuals (58%) think the appropriate age for men is between 25-29. 25% of divorced individuals think the appropriate age range for men is between 30-34 (Table 16).

A large majority of university graduates or postgraduates (85%) state that the age range of 25-34 is the ideal age range for men to get married. As the educational level increases the age range also increases. Similarly, the marriage age of 45 and older is not considered ideal in all educational levels.

In nuclear (52%) and broken (50%) families the percentage of people who think the ideal marriage age for men is 25-29 is higher. On the other hand, in extended families (47%), the percentage of people who think 20-24 age range is appropriate is higher.

Generally speaking, ideal age of marriage for men increases as socioeconomic level increases. More than half the people in the lower SES group (57%) state that the ideal marriage age for men is 20-24. This percentage is 15% for the upper SES group. On the other hand, the percentage of people who think 25-29 is the ideal age range is high in middle and upper SES group. 51% of the middle SES group and 60% of the upper SES group state that the ideal age range for men is 25-29.

3.3. Way of Meeting the Spouse

People with marriage experience were asked during the study about how they met their spouses. 84% of the people, who had a marriage experience in our country, chose a person from the family and neighbor network. These are followed by getting married through meeting in friends' network (7%) and work circle (5%). A big majority of people living both in rural and urban areas married to people from the family and neighborhood network. The percentage of people married from the work circle, friends' network and school network is higher in the urban areas when compared to rural areas (Table 17).

It is seen from the examination of three major cities that Izmir differs from other two cities in this aspect. The percentage of people married from the family or

neighborhood network (70%) is lower compared to two other major cities (80%) while the percentage of people married by meeting in the work circle is higher (12%).

No big difference is observed between people with marriage experience in different regions in terms of ways for meeting the spouses. However, the percentage of people getting married from the family or neighborhood network in Istanbul (79%), Aegean (80%), West Marmara (73%) and East Marmara (81%) is a little lower compared to other regions and the percentage of being married from the work circle and from the friends' network is a little higher. Also, it is seen that number of people married by meeting through internet or a marriage agency is little if any throughout all the regions of our country.

When the findings regarding the way of meeting the spouse is examined by gender, it is seen that a big majority of women and men (86% of women and 83% of men) interviewed during the study stated that they met their spouses in the family or neighborhood network. Percentages for other ways of meeting are similar for women and men (Table 18).

Percentage of marrying someone from the family and neighborhood network is higher among older people. For example, while this percentage is 95% for people at the age of 65 and older, it is 77% for the people within the age range of 18-24. The percentage of people who stated that they met their spouses in the work circle or the friends' network is higher in the age groups of 18-24 and 25-29 when compared to other age groups.

Almost all of the illiterate people (97%) stated that they got married with a person from the family or neighborhood network. There is a significant increase in the percentage of other options about meeting the spouses as the education level increases. As a matter of fact, half of people who are university graduates or postgraduates (48%) stated that they met their spouses in a family or neighborhood network while 21% of them stated they married with someone from the friends' network, 15% of them stated they married with some from the work circle and 14% of them stated they married with someone from the school network.

Table 17. Way of Meeting Spouses throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Family, neighborhood network	Friends' network (Outside school & work)	Work circle	School network	Internet / marriage agency	Other
Türkiye	84,4	7,4	4,8	2,5	0,0	0,8
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	81,0	8,8	6,3	3,0	0,1	0,9
Rural	90,0	5,0	2,4	1,8	0,0	0,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	79,6	11,0	6,7	2,2	0,0	0,6
Ankara	79,6	8,7	7,3	3,2	0,4	0,9
Izmir	69,7	12,0	11,7	5,1	0,2	1,2
NUTS						
Istanbul	79,6	11,0	6,7	2,2	0,0	0,6
West Marmara	72,8	14,7	6,0	4,3	0,2	2,0
Aegean	79,5	8,2	7,4	3,6	0,0	1,3
East Marmara	81,0	10,8	4,9	2,3	0,0	1,0
West Anatolia	86,8	5,8	4,3	2,2	0,2	0,6
Mediterranean	85,3	6,6	4,8	2,6	0,0	0,7
Central Anatolia	91,9	2,8	2,3	2,5	0,0	0,6
West Black Sea	85,4	6,5	4,4	2,7	0,0	0,9
East Black Sea	88,7	5,2	3,0	2,1	0,0	1,0
Northeast Anatolia	91,9	2,9	2,3	2,6	0,0	0,3
Mideast Anatolia	91,5	4,4	1,9	1,8	0,2	0,1
Southeast Anatolia	94,5	1,7	1,7	1,4	0,0	0,6

When considered in terms of household type, no significant difference is observed and it is seen that a big majority of people married with people from family and neighborhood network. It is seen that marrying someone from the family and neighborhood environment is observed more in extended families while members of nuclear and broken families married someone from the work circle more.

The percentage of people who married someone by meeting them in the family and neighborhood network decreases as the socioeconomic level increases but the percentage of people marrying someone they met in the school network or work circle and in the friends' network increases. Almost all of the people in the lower SES group (95%) met their spouses in the family and neighborhood network while this percentage was 56% for the upper SES group. 1% of the people in the lower SES group stated that they married someone they met in the work circle while 3% of them stated they met their spouses in the school network. The percentage of people married someone from the work circle increases to

16% in the upper SES group while this percentage increases to 17% in terms of people who met their spouses in the friends' network (Table 18).

3.4. Decision for Marriage

How decisions for marriage are made is important. For this purpose, married people were asked how they met and married their spouses, who made the choice of spouses and whether or not the other person's opinion was asked.

According to the findings regarding marriage decisions, 61% of the people made arranged marriages (Table 19). Half of those got married by family decisions while the other half although their marriages were arranged, made the decision themselves. 31% of the individuals got married to their own choice of spouse after getting the approval of their families. According to the findings, people who made the marriage decision on their own without the consent or approval of their families or people who eloped to marry was 8%.

Table 18. Way of Meeting Spouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Family, neighborhood network	Friends' network (Outside school & work)	Work circle	School network	Internet / marriage agency	Other
GENDER						
Male	82,8	8,1	5,4	2,8	0,0	0,9
Female	85,8	6,8	4,3	2,3	0,1	0,8
AGE						
18-24	76,6	10,7	6,9	3,3	0,4	2,1
25-34	78,5	9,8	7,0	3,9	0,0	0,9
35-44	82,5	9,4	5,0	2,3	0,1	0,7
45-54	88,0	5,3	3,7	2,4	0,0	0,6
55-64	90,0	4,1	3,6	1,7	0,0	0,6
65+	95,1	2,3	1,4	0,4	0,0	0,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
Illiterate	96,7	1,9	0,4	0,2	0,0	0,7
Literate, but no schooling	95,4	2,9	0,7	0,3	0,0	0,6
Primary school	90,3	5,5	2,6	0,9	0,0	0,6
Elementary education	80,1	9,2	5,7	3,2	0,2	1,6
Regular high schools and their equivalents	66,7	13,6	13,1	5,4	0,1	1,1
Undergraduate and graduate studies	48,3	21,2	15,1	14,2	0,3	0,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	82,3	8,2	5,7	3,0	0,0	0,8
Extended	90,8	5,1	2,0	1,3	0,1	0,7
Broken	86,1	6,6	4,0	2,1	0,0	1,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Lower group	95,3	2,8	0,6	0,4	0,0	0,9
Middle Group	86,3	6,9	4,1	2,0	0,0	0,7
Upper Group	55,7	17,2	15,6	9,9	0,2	1,4

It shows that people living in urban areas made their own marriage decisions while families were more dominant in decision making in rural areas. Although 35% of urban people got married with the approval of their families, this percentage decreases to 24% among rural people. In addition, the percentage of arranged marriages or those married by the decisions of their families is 37% in rural areas and 28% for urban areas.

Among three major cities, the percentage of family decision and arranged marriages is the highest in Ankara (32%). The percentage of people who elope to get married is higher in Izmir (8%) compared to

Istanbul and Ankara.

There is a significant difference between regions in terms of how get married. The percentage of people who married their own choice of spouse after the approval of their families is the highest in Istanbul with 43%. It is followed by West Marmara with 38%, East Marmara with 36%, the Aegean with 31% and Mideast Anatolia with 31%. The lowest percentage is observed in Central Anatolia (17%) and Southeast Anatolia (23%). The highest number of people who made an arranged marriage but made their own decisions live in Northeast Anatolia (41%).

Table 19. Marriage Decision throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	My decision, with the approval of my family	Arranged marriage, with the decision of my family	Arranged marriage, my decision	Eloped	With my own decision, outside of my family's knowledge	Got married despite my family's disapproval	Other
Türkiye	31,2	31,2	29,7	5,8	1,3	0,6	0,1
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	35,3	27,8	29,7	4,8	1,5	0,8	0,1
Rural	24,3	36,9	29,8	7,6	1,0	0,6	0,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	42,8	22,1	27,9	4,4	1,4	1,2	0,2
Ankara	36,9	32,2	26,4	2,0	2,3	0,2	0,0
Izmir	40,2	19,9	29,3	7,7	2,4	0,3	0,2
NUTS							
Istanbul	42,8	22,1	27,9	4,4	1,4	1,2	0,2
West Marmara	38,4	16,2	27,7	14,9	1,9	0,7	0,1
Aegean	30,7	27,5	34,2	5,5	1,8	0,3	0,1
East Marmara	36,0	27,2	24,9	9,3	1,9	0,7	0,0
West Anatolia	25,7	39,0	31,0	2,4	1,6	0,3	0,0
Mediterranean	28,2	34,1	29,3	6,0	1,3	0,8	0,2
Central Anatolia	17,1	41,1	34,7	5,7	0,9	0,4	0,1
West Black Sea	28,0	37,1	23,8	9,5	0,8	0,6	0,1
East Black Sea	30,3	32,1	26,2	9,7	1,4	0,3	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	29,7	21,9	40,8	5,6	1,5	0,5	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	30,8	35,1	30,5	2,3	0,4	0,4	0,5
Southeast Anatolia	23,3	45,7	29,4	1,1	0,3	0,1	0,1

On the other hand, 46% of married people in Southeast Anatolia, 41% of married people in Central Anatolia 39% of married people in West Anatolia and 37% of married people in West Black Sea stated their marriages were arranged by their families. The highest number of people (%15) who elope to get married live in West Marmara.

When decision-making behavior for marriage was analyzed, some differences between men and women were found. A large majority of women (37%) had arranged marriages by the decisions of their families. Percentage of men doing the same is lower (25%). The percentage of men making their own marriage decisions and marrying someone with the approval of their families is a little higher than the other options (Table 20).

Younger individuals made their own marriage deci-

sions however they asked for the approval of their families. While 39-40% of individuals between ages 18-34 married by this approach, for age range of 55-64 it is 22% and it is 15% for individuals over 65.

The number of arranged marriages rises at advanced ages. While the percentage of people who had arranged marriages with the blessing of their families is 54% for ages 65 and older, this percentage decreases to 20% in the age range of 18-24.

When it comes to the relation between educational status and making the decision for marriage, people with higher education made their own decisions. As a matter of fact, 65% of university graduates and postgraduates and 52% of high school graduates made their own decisions regarding marriage. On the other hand, the percentage of people who had arranged marriages where the decision-maker

is the family is higher among primary school graduates and people with an even lower educational status. From these findings, it is clear that as educational level increases and age decreases individuals made their own choices in deciding who to marry.

Marriage decision changes with the type of the household. While the percentage of people who make their own marriage choice but get the approval of their families is 35% for the nuclear families, this percentage is 22% for other household types. Almost half of the broken families (46%) had an arranged marriage by the de-

cision of their family. This percentage is 38% for extended families and 28% for nuclear families. The percentage of people, who made their own decisions about marriage increases with the socioeconomic level. Almost half of the individuals in the lower SES (48%) had arranged marriages with the decision of their families while this percentage decreases to 31% in the middle SES and to 13% in upper SES. On the other hand, the percentage of people who made their own choices and with the approval of their families is 15% in the lower SES group, this percentage is 30% in middle SES group and 58% in upper SES group.

Table 20. Marriage Decision by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type and SES

	My decision, with the approval of my family	Arranged marriage, with the decision of my family	Arranged marriage, my decision	Eloped	With my own decision, outside of my family's knowledge	Got married despite my family's disapproval	Other
GENDER							
Male	35,5	25,2	31,6	5,6	1,3	0,6	0,1
Female	27,3	36,6	27,9	6,1	1,3	0,6	0,2
AGE							
18-24	39,1	20,2	29,0	9,2	2,0	0,3	0,1
25-34	40,9	20,1	30,9	5,8	1,5	0,7	0,1
35-44	33,5	27,5	31,4	5,3	1,4	0,8	0,1
45-54	26,9	34,3	31,0	5,8	1,5	0,5	0
55-64	21,7	44,8	26,9	5,1	0,8	0,6	0,2
65+	15,0	53,5	23,7	6,3	0,9	0,3	0,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
Illiterate	11,4	57,7	22,9	7,3	0,4	0,1	0,2
Literate, but no schooling	16,8	46,9	27,5	7,1	1,0	0,6	0,2
Primary school	26,1	32,6	32,8	6,8	1,2	0,4	0,1
Elementary education	41,2	18,0	32,5	6,0	1,4	0,9	0,0
Regular high schools and their equivalents	51,7	13,5	28,2	3,2	2,1	1,1	0,1
Undergraduate and graduate studies	65,4	8,6	21,1	0,4	2,9	1,5	0,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	34,5	28,1	29,7	5,5	1,4	0,6	0,1
Extended	22,6	37,8	31,3	6,8	1,1	0,4	0,0
Broken	21,5	46,2	23,4	6,7	1,5	0,5	0,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower Group	15,3	48,0	28,5	7,1	0,4	0,5	0,2
Middle Group	30,3	30,9	30,7	6,1	1,3	0,5	0,1
Upper Group	58,4	12,7	23,2	2,0	2,5	1,2	0,0

3.5. Form of Solemnization

Married people were also asked about the form of solemnization they made so the percentages of religious marriage only, civil marriage only, both together and also who did not do any of these would be determined.

A large majority of people (87%) had both civil and religious marriages (Table 21). The percentage of people who only had civil marriages is 10% while the percent of people who only had a religious marriage is 3%. In addition, the percentage of people living together is very low in Türkiye (6%).

The relationship between the residential area and

the type of marriage is considered, we see that most people living in urban and rural areas (86% in urban and 88% in rural areas) had both civil and religious marriages. On the other hand, while the percentage of people who only had a civil marriage (11%) is higher in urban areas, the percentage of people who only had a religious marriage is higher in rural areas (8%).

There are also some differences between different regions. Among these regions, the percentage of people who only had civil marriages is higher in Istanbul (17%) and Central Anatolia (14%) and the percentage of people who only had religious marriages is higher in Southeast Anatolia (16%), Mideast Anatolia (8%) and Northeast Anatolia (7%).

Table 21. Form of Solemnization throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS

	Both official/civil and religious	Official/civil	Religious	No solemnization
Türkiye	86,5	9,7	3,2	0,6
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	85,8	11,1	2,4	0,7
Rural	87,5	7,5	4,6	0,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	80,9	16,7	1,3	1,0
Ankara	82,3	16,0	1,0	0,8
Izmir	83,0	15,0	1,3	0,7
NUTS				
Istanbul	80,9	16,7	1,3	1,0
West Marmara	93,2	5,5	0,5	0,8
Aegean	90,6	7,8	1,4	0,3
East Marmara	88,2	9,8	1,7	0,3
West Anatolia	88,8	8,6	2,1	0,6
Mediterranean	83,5	13,5	2,6	0,3
Central Anatolia	83,1	13,6	2,7	0,7
West Black Sea	92,2	5,3	1,5	1,0
East Black Sea	95,4	1,8	2,6	0,2
Northeast Anatolia	91,6	1,7	6,5	0,3
Mideast Anatolia	88,7	2,9	7,8	0,6
Southeast Anatolia	75,2	8,4	15,5	0,9

For all the age groups, people who have both a civil and a religious marriage are in the majority. However, within the age range of 18-24 the percentage of people who only had religious marriages is higher compared to other age groups. While the percenta-

ge of people who had religious marriages is 7% in this age group, this percentage is around 3%-4% for other age groups (Table 22). There is no difference between three major cities in terms of the type of marriage.

On the other hand, percentage of civil marriages is higher among people with a higher education while the percentage of religious marriages is high among people with low levels of education.

People with both civil and religious marriages are the majority in all household types. However, the percentage of religious marriages only (2%) were lower among nuclear families and it is around 5% for other household types. The percentage of people who had only civil marriages is 7% for extended families which is low when compared to other household types. This percentage is around 10% for nuclear families and 11% for broken families.

As is true for the whole country, the percentage of people who have both religious and civil marriages is very high in all socioeconomic groups. The percentage of people who only have civil marriages increases and the percentage of people who only have religious marriages decreases as the socioeconomic level increases. While 7% of the individuals in lower SES group had civil marriages only, this percentage rose to 16% in the upper SES group. The percentage of people who only had religious marriages is 9% in the lower SES group. This percentage decreases to 3% in the middle SES group and to 1% in the upper SES group.

Table 22. Form of Solemnization by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type and SES

	Both official/civil and religious	Official/civil	Religious	No solemnization
GENDER				
Male	86,2	10,2	2,9	0,7
Female	86,7	9,3	3,5	0,5
AGE				
18-24	83,4	8,2	7,1	1,3
25-34	86,0	9,9	3,5	0,6
35-44	87,4	9,7	2,1	0,7
45-54	87,3	9,7	2,5	0,5
55-64	84,9	11,0	3,6	0,4
65+	87,1	8,9	3,6	0,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
Illiterate	83,7	6,7	9,0	0,6
Literate, but no schooling	87,7	6,7	5,2	0,4
Primary school	87,5	9,6	2,4	0,6
Elementary education	88,3	8,4	2,6	0,7
Regular high schools and their equivalents	86,3	11,7	1,3	0,6
Undergraduate and graduate studies	81,3	17,3	0,7	0,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	86,7	10,4	2,4	0,5
Extended	86,8	7,1	5,3	0,8
Broken	82,7	11,1	5,1	1,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Lower group	83,5	6,8	9,0	0,7
Middle Group	87,5	9,4	2,6	0,5
Upper Group	82,1	16,3	0,8	0,9

3.6. Bride Price

During the Research on Family Structure in Türkiye, people were asked if they paid a bride price before marriage. The results showed that in 18% a bride price was paid. 14% of the people living in urban areas and 25% of the people living in rural areas paid a bride price (Table 23).

While there is no significant difference between

the three major cities in terms of bride price, the highest percentage belongs to Ankara with 12%. When regions are considered, bride price seems most prevalent in Northeast Anatolia (49%). It is followed by Mideast Anatolia with 46% and Southeast Anatolia with 43%. In almost half of the marriages in these regions there was a bride price involved. The regions where this payment is seen the least are the Aegean (7%), Istanbul (10%), West Marmara (11%) and West Anatolia (11%).

Table 23. Bride Price throughout Türkiye, Residence Area, Three Major Cities and NUTS

	Yes	No
Türkiye	17,8	82,2
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	13,8	86,2
Rural	24,5	75,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	10,2	89,8
Ankara	12,0	88,0
Izmir	9,6	90,4
NUTS		
Istanbul	10,2	89,8
West Marmara	10,7	89,3
Aegean	6,7	93,3
East Marmara	17,3	82,7
West Anatolia	11,3	88,7
Mediterranean	11,2	88,8
Central Anatolia	23,6	76,4
West Black Sea	23,3	76,7
East Black Sea	18,1	81,9
Northeast Anatolia	48,9	51,1
Mideast Anatolia	45,4	54,6
Southeast Anatolia	42,7	57,3

Bride price payment decreases as the age group gets younger. While the percentage of bride price is 11% in the age group of 25-34, it is 29% in the 55-64 age group and 31% for 65 and older. This difference between age groups can be interpreted as a change taking place over a period of time (Table 24).

The percentage of bride price is higher among people with low education and lower among people with a higher education. While 45% of illiterate people and 33% of literate with no schooling pe-

ople paid a bride price, this percentage decreases to 3% among university graduates and postgraduates.

Bride price is more common among extended families compared to others. While the percentage of bride price is 26% in extended families, this percentage is 18% in broken families and 15% in nuclear families. The percentage of bride price decreases as the socioeconomic level increases. While 37% of people in lower SES group paid a bride price, this percentage decreases to 16% in middle SES and to 5% in upper SES group.

Table 24. Bride Price by Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes	No
AGE		
18-24	12,3	87,7
25-34	11,0	89,0
35-44	13,9	86,1
45-54	19,6	80,4
55-64	29,4	70,6
65+	30,9	69,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
Illiterate	44,9	55,1
Literate, but no schooling	32,5	67,5
Primary schools	16,3	83,7
Elementary education	8,6	91,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	4,1	95,9
Undergraduate and graduate studies	2,5	97,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	15,3	84,7
Extended	26,3	73,7
Broken	17,5	82,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Lower group	37,2	62,8
Middle Group	16,4	83,6
Upper Group	4,6	95,4

3.7. Consanguineous Marriage

Married individuals were asked whether they had any kinship with their spouse. The results show that 22% of married people in Türkiye have kinship with their spouse. 20% of people living in the urban area married a relative while 26% of the people in the rural area married a relative (Table 25).

Although there is no significant difference among three major cities, it is highest in Ankara (19%). 43% of the married people in Southeast Anatolia are related to their spouses by blood. Other regions where blood relatives marry are Mideast Anatolia (34%) and Northeast Anatolia (32%). West Marmara, on the other hand, has the lowest percentage (5%).

No significant difference was determined in terms of

marriage with blood relatives when young and senior people were compared. The percentage is relatively lower among younger people.

The findings by educational status show that the percentage of marriage between blood relatives increase as educational level decreases (Table 26). For example, while this percentage is 23% for primary school graduates it decreases to 11% for university graduates/postgraduates.

This percentage is higher in extended families (27%) compared to nuclear families and broken families. The percentage decreases as the socioeconomic level increases. While 33% of individuals in lower SES group are related to their spouses this percentage is 22% for the middle SES group and 12% for the upper SES group.

Table 25. Consanguineous Marriage throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	People who married blood relatives	People who did not marry blood relatives
Türkiye	22,4	77,6
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	20,2	79,8
Rural	25,9	74,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	16,2	83,8
Ankara	18,6	81,4
Izmir	14,9	85,1
NUTS		
Istanbul	16,2	83,8
West Marmara	4,8	95,2
Aegean	19,2	80,8
East Marmara	14,4	85,6
West Anatolia	22,7	77,3
Mediterranean	25,1	74,9
Central Anatolia	24,3	75,7
West Black Sea	21,0	79,0
East Black Sea	30,4	69,6
Northeast Anatolia	31,5	68,5
Mideast Anatolia	33,8	66,2
Southeast Anatolia	43,1	56,9

Similarly, people who married a blood relative were asked about the degree of their relation (Table 27). The results show that 20% married the children

of their uncles while 13% married the children of their aunts, 12% married the children of their maternal uncles and 11% married the children of their

Table 26. Consanguineous Marriage by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	People who married blood relatives	People who did not marry blood relatives
GENDER		
Male	22,0	78,0
Female	22,7	77,3
AGE		
18-24	21,3	78,7
25-34	20,8	79,2
35-44	22,4	77,6
45-54	22,7	77,3
55-64	23,8	76,2
65+	24,5	75,5
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
Illiterate	32,5	67,5
Literate, but no schooling	30,5	69,5
Primary schools	23,2	76,8
Elementary Education	17,3	82,7
Regular high schools and their equivalents	14,7	85,3
Undergraduate and graduate studies	11,1	88,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	21,3	78,7
Extended	26,6	73,4
Broken	19,9	80,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Lower group	32,6	67,4
Middle Group	22,0	78,0
Upper Group	12,2	87,8

maternal aunts. Almost half the people who married their blood relatives married more distant relatives (44%). No significant difference was found between urban and rural areas in terms of the degree of relation between spouses.

When the relationship degree between the spouses is not taken into consideration, the percentage of people who married the children of their uncles is higher in Northeast Anatolia (25%), Mideast Anatolia (28%) and especially Southeast Anatolia (37%) compared to other regions.

When the marriages made between close and distant relatives are taken into consideration, the results show that the percentage of people who married "other relatives" is 46% in nuclear families while this

percentage is around 39% in other household types (Table 27). Considering this data, it can be seen that the percentage of close relative marriages (with children of uncles, aunts, paternal aunts and paternal uncles) are lower in nuclear families compared to other types of households.

When the details regarding spouses who are blood relatives are taken into consideration, the results show that the percentage of people marrying relations from the father's side of the family decreases as the socioeconomic level increases. While 37% of the individuals in lower SES group are married to the children of their uncles or paternal aunts, this percentage is 22% for upper SES group. On the other hand, the percentage of people married to "other relatives" increases as the socioeconomic level increases.

Table 27. Degree of Kinship between Spouses throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status Household Type, SES

	Son/daughter of paternal uncle	Son/daughter of paternal aunt	Son/daughter of maternal uncle	Son/daughter of maternal aunt	Other relative
Türkiye	19,8	13,1	12,2	11,1	43,8
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	19,4	13,1	11,8	10,8	45,0
Rural	20,5	13,0	12,7	11,5	42,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	18,3	9,1	11,6	7,9	53,0
Ankara	13,5	13,5	10,9	7,1	55,1
Izmir	18,2	12,3	9,6	12,3	47,6
NUTS					
Istanbul	18,3	9,1	11,6	7,9	53,0
West Marmara	17,0	19,3	12,1	8,5	43,1
Aegean	14,3	13,2	12,8	12,5	47,3
East Marmara	9,0	15,8	12,5	10,1	52,6
West Anatolia	17,1	15,6	10,1	10,0	47,2
Mediterranean	19,1	16,3	12,6	12,6	39,4
Central Anatolia	11,0	14,9	10,3	13,7	50,1
West Black Sea	20,7	17,5	13,2	13,8	34,8
East Black Sea	11,4	8,6	14,1	11,0	54,8
Northeast Anatolia	26,5	13,2	10,7	11,3	38,3
Mideast Anatolia	24,5	10,6	10,7	12,4	41,8
Southeast Anatolia	36,8	9,9	13,9	9,5	29,9
GENDER					
Male	20,3	13,5	12,4	10,5	43,3
Female	19,5	12,7	12,0	11,6	44,2
AGE					
18-24	15,4	13,6	11,4	12,1	47,6
25-34	17,2	13,5	11,1	9,2	48,9
35-44	21,1	13,0	11,9	10,7	43,3
45-54	20,0	13,0	13,3	13,4	40,2
55-64	23,8	12,0	12,3	9,4	42,5
65+	20,5	13,3	13,4	13,5	39,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	26,6	11,5	14,2	11,8	35,9
Literate, but no schooling	24,1	10,8	13,5	9,0	42,6
Primary schools	19,1	13,6	11,4	11,3	44,6
Elementary education	14,3	14,5	13,5	10,7	46,9
Regular high schools and their equivalents	13,7	14,7	10,4	9,2	52,1
Undergraduate and graduate studies	10,5	12,3	10,6	15,3	51,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	19,3	13,0	11,5	10,3	45,9
Extended	20,3	13,4	13,8	13,5	39,0
Broken	25,1	11,8	13,8	10,1	39,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower group	26,7	12,9	13,4	10,1	36,9
Middle Group	18,9	12,8	12,0	11,3	45,0
Upper Group	10,5	17,0	10,8	11,9	49,9

3.8. Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate

When asked if they found marriages between close relatives (children of uncles, paternal aunts, maternal uncles and aunts) appropriate 13% "Yes" to this question, 87% said "No".

The percentage of individuals who find this kind of marriage appropriate is higher in rural areas. 12% living in urban areas thought marriage between blood

relatives was appropriate while 14% living in rural areas thought so.

Among the three major cities, this percentage is lowest in Izmir (4%). Between regions, the highest number of people thinking marriage between blood relatives is appropriate live in Southeast Anatolia (37%), Mideast Anatolia (23%), Northeast Anatolia (19%) and the Mediterranean (15%) while this percentage is lowest in West Marmara (3%) and the Aegean (6%).

Table 28. Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Consanguineous marriage appropriate	Consanguineous marriage not appropriate
Türkiye	12,5	87,5
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	11,6	88,4
Rural	14,2	85,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	9,1	90,9
Ankara	8,8	91,2
Izmir	4,4	95,6
NUTS		
Istanbul	9,1	90,9
West Marmara	2,5	97,5
Aegean	5,7	94,3
East Marmara	7,6	92,4
West Anatolia	13,1	86,9
Mediterranean	15,3	84,7
Central Anatolia	11,0	89,0
West Black Sea	7,6	92,4
East Black Sea	8,7	91,3
Northeast Anatolia	19,2	80,8
Mideast Anatolia	22,8	77,2
Southeast Anatolia	37,3	62,7

Opinions regarding this kind of marriage do not differ significantly by gender. While 13% of men considered kinship marriage appropriate, this percentage is 12% for women. While individuals with lower education and older people consider it more appropriate, this percentage decreases among younger people and people with higher education (Table 29).

In terms of marital status, the percentage of people who think marriage between blood relatives is ap-

propriate is higher among married (14%) and widowed (16%) people.

As the socioeconomic level increases, the percentage of people who do not have a problem with this kind of marriage falls. Almost one quarter of individuals in lower SES group (24%) find it appropriate while 12% of middle SES group and 5% of upper SES group do so.

Table 29. Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Consanguineous marriage appropriate	Consanguineous marriage not appropriate
GENDER		
Male	12,7	87,3
Female	12,4	87,6
AGE		
18-24	9,7	90,3
25-34	11,6	88,4
35-44	12,2	87,8
45-54	13,0	87,0
55-64	15,8	84,2
65+	17,0	83,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
Illiterate	25,8	74,2
Literate, but no schooling	20,5	79,5
Primary schools	12,5	87,5
Elementary education	9,4	90,6
Regular high schools and their equivalents	7,3	92,7
Undergraduate and graduate studies	5,1	94,9
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	8,1	91,9
Married	13,6	86,4
Divorced	6,0	94,0
Widowed	16,3	83,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	11,7	88,3
Extended	16,2	83,8
Broken	10,0	90,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Lower group	23,9	76,1
Middle Group	11,9	88,1
Upper Group	5,0	95,0

People who thought such marriages were appropriate were asked why they thought these types of marriages were appropriate. 37% thought that it would be good for their "knowing the family roots well" while 30% of them thought "relative kids better get along". 13% stated that they deemed kinship marriage appropriate "preserving traditions and customs" while 13% stated that it is about "more respect for elderly family members in kinship mar-

riages". "Property and wealth not be divided" is not considered as an important reason for this kind of marriage (2%) (Table 30).

When considered by residential areas, "knowing the family roots well" and "relative kids better get along" were the most common reasons. No significant difference was found between rural and urban areas in terms of reasons.

Table 30. Reasons for Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Knowing family roots well	Relative kids better get along	Preserving traditions and customs	More respect for elderly family members	Property and wealth will not be divided	Other
Türkiye	36,8	29,5	12,9	12,8	2,2	5,8
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	37,9	27,3	13,1	13,4	2,1	6,3
Rural	35,2	32,7	12,6	12,0	2,3	5,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	47,2	24,9	11,0	7,1	1,6	8,3
Ankara	38,5	21,1	15,6	18,1	5,1	1,7
Izmir	29,3	20,0	16,8	16,5	10,8	6,5
NUTS						
Istanbul	47,2	24,9	11,0	7,1	1,6	8,3
West Marmara	13,1	22,9	14,1	23,4	4,3	22,2
Aegean	30,5	23,7	16,6	14,3	8,3	6,7
East Marmara	26,8	25,7	22,9	14,5	2,0	8,0
West Anatolia	45,5	19,9	13,7	15,3	2,6	3,0
Mediterranean	45,0	17,6	14,2	10,4	1,8	11,0
Central Anatolia	45,8	28,2	8,7	9,1	1,9	6,3
West Black Sea	28,9	35,1	4,7	16,5	2,6	12,1
East Black Sea	58,2	16,4	6,9	8,2	1,2	9,1
Northeast Anatolia	29,6	30,6	17,2	16,3	1,5	4,8
Mideast Anatolia	30,1	38,1	9,4	18,3	1,8	2,3
Southeast Anatolia	26,9	45,3	12,7	13,2	1,3	0,6

Just as it is true for residential area variable, when considered by regions, knowing the roots of the family well is the most common reason for preference of such marriages. This reason is more dominant for people living in East Black Sea (58%) and Istanbul (47%). People justifying kinship marriages suggesting that relative kids would get along better comes second. This justification is more common in Southeast Anatolia (45%).

The reasons for finding marriages between blood relatives as appropriate is similar for women and men, all age groups, education levels and household types.

The percentage of people using "preserving traditions and customs" and "kids of relatives would get along better" reasons increase as the socioeconomic level decreases.

Table 31. Reasons for Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Knowing family roots well	Relative kids better get along	Preserving traditions and customs	More respect for elderly family members	Property and wealth will not be divided	Other
GENDER						
Male	36,3	27,4	15,2	11,4	2,6	7,0
Female	37,3	31,7	10,6	14,1	1,8	4,6
AGE						
18-24	32,5	33,2	8,7	15,0	1,5	9,1
25-34	35,5	28,2	14,0	12,4	1,9	8,0
35-44	37	32,7	12,3	10,4	1,9	5,7
45-54	38,2	30,1	12,3	12,9	2,1	4,4
55-64	38,6	29,1	13,4	14,2	3,1	1,6
65+	40,1	22,6	16,5	13,8	3,3	3,7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
Illiterate	33,3	34,4	13,9	13,9	2,3	2,2
Literate, but no schooling	35,5	28,5	17,0	11,9	3,5	3,6
Primary schools	39,9	29,7	10,8	12,2	1,5	5,9
Elementary schools	37,7	24,9	11,8	15,7	3,6	6,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	33,5	26,7	15,8	11,0	1,9	11,0
Undergraduate and graduate studies	33,0	16,9	13,8	15,1	4,7	16,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	37,3	30,2	12,0	12,0	1,8	6,6
Extended	35,7	29,0	15,1	14,1	2,8	3,3
Broken	35,4	24,9	13,1	16,0	3,3	7,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Lower group	32,0	35,5	16,0	12,8	1,9	1,8
Middle Group	38,0	28,3	12,3	12,7	2,3	6,5
Upper Group	39,0	22,8	7,2	15,1	2,6	13,4

3. 9. Coming from the Same City with Spouse

During the Research on Family Structure in Türkiye married individuals were asked whether or not they came from the same city as their spouses. According to the results, 69% of married individuals in Türkiye share the same town (Table 32).

When this is taken into consideration by area of residence, a large majority of married people in rural areas come from the same town as their spouses. 79% of people living in rural areas and 63% of peo-

ple living in urban areas come from the same town. Among the three major cities, Izmir is the city with the lowest percentage (44%) of people who do not come from the same city as their spouses. In terms of distribution by regions, on the other hand, this percentage was higher in eastern regions compared to western regions. 86% of marriages in East Black Sea, 85% of the marriages in Southeast Anatolia, 81% of marriages in Mideast Anatolia and Northeast Anatolia are marriages between people who share the same town while this percentage is 56% for Istanbul and 57% for East Marmara.

Table 32. Marriage between People from the Same Town throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household Types, and SES

	Yes	No
Türkiye	69,2	30,8
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	63,4	36,6
Rural	78,9	21,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	56,1	43,9
Ankara	54,8	45,2
Izmir	43,8	56,2
NUTS		
Istanbul	56,1	43,9
West Marmara	60,5	39,5
Aegean	67,8	32,2
East Marmara	57,2	42,8
West Anatolia	71,8	28,2
Mediterranean	72,8	27,2
Central Anatolia	78,4	21,6
West Black Sea	68,4	31,6
East Black Sea	86,4	13,6
Northeast Anatolia	80,6	19,4
Mideast Anatolia	80,8	19,2
Southeast Anatolia	84,9	15,1
AGE		
18-24	66,5	33,6
25-34	66,1	33,9
35-44	68,4	31,6
45-54	70,3	29,7
55-64	72,8	27,2
+65	74,8	25,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
Illiterate	78,9	21,1
Literate, but no schooling	76,5	23,5
Primary school	72,7	27,3
Elementary education	65,6	34,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	57,4	42,6
Undergraduate and graduate studies	46,8	53,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	67,9	32,1
Extended	75,4	24,6
Broken	62,6	37,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Lower group	77,2	22,8
Middle Group	70,6	29,4
Upper Group	48,7	51,3

While no significant difference was observed between age groups, sharing the same town with a spouse is more prevalent among older individuals. Therefore it can be said that this percentage decreased in newer generations due to the process of social change (Table 32).

The percentage is higher in extended families (75%) compared to other household types (68% in nuclear families and 63% in broken families).

The percentage of marrying a person from the same town is around 70% in lower and middle SES groups while it decreases to 49% in the upper SES group.

3.10. Marriage Ceremonies

When married people were asked about their wedding ceremonies, 84% said they had asking for the girl's hand and betrothal ceremonies while 88% said they had a wedding ceremony. This shows that traditions regarding marriage still exist in our country. The percentage of people who did not have any kind of ceremony is quite low (2%) (Table 33).

By residential areas, the percentages of married people who had some kind of ceremony in rural and urban areas are similar to each other. The biggest difference is observed between people who went through civil marriages. Percentage of people who had civil marriages in urban areas (75%) is higher than the percentage of people who had civil marriages in rural areas (66%).

When we look at the three major cities, the percentage of people who asked for the girl's hand in marriage/who had betrothal ceremonies is higher in Ankara (88%). The percentage of people who made religious marriage ceremonies in Ankara (63%) is relatively low, while the percentage of people who had a henna night (79%) and wedding ceremonies (79%) in Izmir is relatively low.

The biggest difference among regions is about the percentage of people who had civil marriages. The regions with the highest percentage of people with civil marriages is Aegean with 87%, West Marmara

with 85%, Central Anatolia with 84%, Istanbul with 82% and East Marmara with 80% while the lowest percentage of civil marriages were observed in Southeast Anatolia with 35%, East Black Sea with 29% and Mideast Anatolia with 46%. The regions with the highest percentage of people who had religious marriage ceremonies are the Aegean region with 82%, Central Anatolia and East Marmara with 83% and West Marmara with 80%. The regions with the lowest percentage are East Black Sea with 54% and Mideast Anatolia with 59%. An engagement period is more common in West Anatolia (85%) and Northeast Anatolia (84%).

As the age of the group increases the percentage of people who had a henna night, wedding ceremonies and religious marriage ceremonies decrease. Engagement is a ceremony more common among the 25-54 age group. When people over 65 are getting married the incidence of ceremonies is lower compared to other age groups.

The percentage of people who had engagement and civil marriage ceremonies increases with the educational status. Religious marriage ceremonies, however, do not show a difference across educational levels.

When analyzed by household type, the percentage of betrothal/civil wedding ceremony (77%), henna night (72%) and wedding ceremonies (81%) is relatively lower among broken families when compared to other household types. The percentage of people with civil marriages is lower among individuals from extended families (66%).

The percentage of people who had engagement and civil wedding ceremonies increases as the socioeconomic level increases. While 69% of people in the lower SES group stated that they had engagement ceremonies, this percentage increases to 81% in the upper SES group. Percentage of people who had civil marriage ceremonies is 55% for the lower SES group while it is 73% for the middle SES and 81% for the upper SES. With 74%, the percentage of people who had religious marriage ceremonies and with 89%, the percentage of people who had a wedding ceremony are higher in middle SES group.

Table 33. Marriage Ceremonies throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Betrothal/ asking for the girl's hand	Engagement	Henna night	Wedding Ceremony	Civil wedding ceremony	Religious wedding ceremony	No ceremony
Türkiye	84,1	77,4	83,1	88,3	71,7	72,3	1,7
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	84,1	78,7	83,4	87,6	75,0	72,5	1,2
Rural	84,2	75,3	82,7	89,5	66,4	71,8	2,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	79,6	79,5	81,8	84,8	81,2	71,4	1,0
Ankara	87,6	82,5	84,8	86,7	78,7	63,0	0,4
Izmir	81,4	78,6	77,5	79,3	82,9	68,7	1,1
NUTS							
Istanbul	79,6	79,5	81,8	84,8	81,2	71,4	1,0
West Marmara	78,8	72,7	84,7	91,8	84,6	80,2	1,3
Aegean	86,1	80,2	83,6	88,2	86,9	82,2	,7
East Marmara	82,6	73,6	84,4	87,2	79,8	83,1	1,7
West Anatolia	88,2	84,6	88,2	90,6	69,0	62,7	1,2
Mediterranean	84,6	69,2	78,5	88,8	71,6	67,7	2,5
Central Anatolia	90,6	82,4	87,2	91,9	83,7	83,4	2,5
West Black Sea	83,5	73,0	82,5	87,5	71,0	74,8	2,3
East Black Sea	81,6	65,4	68,9	81,7	39,0	53,5	5,5
Northeast Anatolia	84,6	84,4	85,5	90,8	64,5	72,2	3,2
Mideast Anatolia	90,6	82,0	90,2	93,0	46,4	58,7	1,7
Southeast Anatolia	82,0	80,5	83,8	89,0	34,5	65,1	1,1
AGE							
18-24	84,3	76,9	88,6	91,6	71,2	77,6	1,0
25-34	86,1	80,7	88,0	91,2	72,8	74,0	1,1
35-44	85,7	79,5	85,4	88,7	71,7	71,5	1,8
45-54	84,8	78,0	82,2	87,2	73,0	71,5	1,7
55-64	81,6	73,7	75,9	85,0	71,5	71,3	2,0
65+	77,1	67,6	72,3	83,6	67,7	69,5	3,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
Illiterate	78,8	67,2	76,3	84,4	57,3	68,7	3,8
Literate, but no schooling	80,2	70,3	77,6	85,8	64,1	71,5	2,6
Primary schools	85,0	78,2	85,4	90,0	72,5	73,3	1,5
Elementary education	85,5	79,8	85,8	88,3	76,7	76,3	0,8
Regular high schools and their equivalents	86,5	82,8	84,1	87,9	78,0	72,1	0,9
Undergraduate and graduate studies	85,2	84,1	79,2	86,1	81,8	67,4	1,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	84,8	78,4	84,0	88,4	73,5	73,0	1,5
Extended	83,7	75,3	83,2	89,8	65,5	70,9	2,1
Broken	76,8	72,3	71,6	80,7	72,4	68,8	2,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower group	79,0	69,3	85,1	85,1	55,4	66,7	4,1
Middle Group	85,0	78,3	89,1	89,1	73,2	73,6	1,4
Upper Group	83,6	80,7	85,5	85,5	80,9	68,6	1,0

3.11. Qualifications Sought in Future Spouse

In the study, unmarried people were asked whether or not they thought of getting married and the people who responded to this question with a "yes" or "I have not decided yet" were asked what kind of qualities they sought in their potential spouses. Those qualities were ranked as "very important", "important", "not important" and "I would not want it". Responses to this question are presented in Tables 34 and 35.

The most common quality that women sought in

a future spouse is "having a job" (55%). Only 4% of women stated that this was not important. In addition, qualities like "His/her not being married before" (47%), "Similarity of the family structures" (37%) and "His/her being in love with you" (36%) are other qualities that are stated to be important. The subjects, about which women care the least while choosing a future spouse are "the man working short hours even if this means a smaller income", "the man is handsome" and "the man having a higher education than the woman". The percentage of women who stated that these are not important is 61%, 55% and 54%, respectively.

Table 34. Qualifications Sought by Women in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye

	Very important	Important	Not important	I would not want it
His being handsome/beautiful	6,4	37,4	55,1	1,1
His being in love with you	35,2	55,2	9,0	0,5
His being more educated than you	8,5	34,8	54,4	2,3
His having more personal income than you	12,1	44,7	41,8	1,4
His having a job	54,9	40,2	4,0	0,8
Less working hours even though the salary is also less	5,6	29,8	60,5	4,0
His not being married before	46,6	33,0	19,6	0,8
Similarity of the family structures	36,8	50,2	12,4	0,5

The total percentages of women responding to the choices of "important" or "very important" for three qualities throughout Türkiye and in different demographic breakdowns are illustrated in Table 35. The qualities which are sought by women in a future spouse are "having a job" (95%) and "being in love with his future spouse" (90%) throughout Türkiye. Differences by residential areas occur about the question of the man to be married for the first time. The percentage of women this is "important" or "very important" is higher in rural areas (88%).

The city which differs among three major cities is Ankara. The fact that the man will get married for the first time (88%), the man has a higher income (66%), the man has higher education (51%) and the man is handsome (50%) is more important when compared to other two cities. When assessed in terms of regions, the man having higher education and income is more important in Northeast Anatolia, the man to be married for the first time is important in Northeast, Mideast and Southeast Anatolia and the man to be handsome is important in Southeast Anatolia

compared to the other regions.

When considered by age group, it was found that for women between the ages of 18-24 the fact that men should be in love with their future spouse (94%) and that it should be the first marriage for the man (89%) are more important when compared to other age groups. When compared to other age groups the percentage of women who think the man should have a higher education to be "important" or "very important" is lower among women 65 or older (28%) (Table 36).

When differences are considered in terms of educational status, illiterate women consider the handsomeness of the man to be important while women who are literate but who never attended school consider the marriage being the first for the man as important, women with a higher education consider the man being in love with them and at a higher education level more important when compared to other levels of education.

Table 35. Qualifications Sought by Women in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities and NUTS

	His having a job	His being in love with you	Coming from similar family structures	This being the first marriage for him	His being more educated than you	His being handsome/beautiful	His having more personal income than you	Working short hours even if this means a smaller income
Türkiye	95,2	90,5	87,0	79,7	56,8	43,8	43,3	35,5
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	95,2	91,0	88,1	75,5	56,5	43,2	42,5	35,7
Rural	95,2	89,5	84,8	88,1	57,2	44,9	45,0	35,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	94,6	95,0	89,8	61,9	58,1	41,7	37,2	26,6
Ankara	94,6	81,2	88,2	80,6	66,2	50,3	51,0	23,2
Izmir	93,9	91,8	81,8	61,2	55,6	38,2	42,4	30,8
NUTS								
Istanbul	94,6	95,0	89,8	61,9	58,1	41,7	37,2	26,6
West Marmara	94,9	97,3	81,9	75,2	53,5	47,4	39,4	25,0
Aegean	95,6	92,4	81,6	74,4	53,5	38,0	42,6	36,2
East Marmara	96,3	91,9	95,3	80,5	61,3	40,2	43,3	49,7
West Anatolia	95,9	87,3	87,3	81,3	66,9	44,8	52,1	33,5
Mediterranean Region	93,1	92,5	84,5	80,6	49,6	45,6	39,1	29,2
Central Anatolia	95,5	85,1	89,2	84,5	65,3	37,4	35,6	35,2
West Black Sea Region	94,7	90,2	85,6	77,1	56,9	49,4	43,6	42,4
East Black Sea Region	94,9	91,5	85,7	88,6	49,5	34,7	44,1	33,4
Northeast Anatolia	95,9	87,0	90,5	91,8	73,1	38,4	70,1	52,4
Mideast Anatolia	95,7	84,8	81,4	91,0	59,1	39,3	51,5	41,9
Southeast Anatolia	96,3	85,0	90,7	93,3	48,7	60,9	41,6	37,8

In terms of marital status, single women think it is important for the man to be in love with their future spouse (92%), men to be handsome (46%) and the marriage to be the first for the man (85%). Men with a high income potential among divorced (70%) and widowed (67%) women are highly important. Men working short hours although they make less are "important" or "very important" by single and divorced women.

Difference by household type is observed more among women from nuclear families. These women think the handsomeness of the man (47%), the man being in love with their future spouse (93%) and it should be a first time marriage for the man (85%) as more important when compared to other household types (Table 36).

As the socioeconomic level increases the percentage of those who thinks it is important for the man to be in love with their future spouse as important or very important increases and the percentage of women who think it is important that the marriage should be the first one for the man as important or very important decreases. The biggest difference found in the comparison of SES is about the expectation of handsomeness regarding men. This percentage of people who find it important or very important is around 40% in lower and middle SES groups while it increases to 62% in the upper SES group. The percentage of women who that the man should be in love with their future spouse as important or very important is 81% in lower SES group, 90% in the middle SES group and 98% in the upper SES group.

Table 36. Qualifications Sought by Women in Future Spouse by Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type and SES

	His/her having a job	His/her being in love with you	Coming from similar family structures	This being the first marriage for him/her	His/her being more educated than you	His/her being handsome/beautiful	His/her having more personal income than you	Working short hours even if this means a smaller income
AGE								
18-24	95,7	94,4	87,1	89,4	44,0	48,9	55,8	36,9
25-34	95,0	86,9	86,9	73,6	43,4	38,3	57,0	33,6
35-44	94,4	79,7	88,8	50,7	41,1	28,0	65,3	37,9
45-54	94,0	85,3	88,0	39,7	38,8	35,4	59,9	26,7
55-64	81,8	80,3	78,1	56,3	36,2	55,7	32,4	23,6
65+	84,0	74,7	72,3	36,5	27,7	46,5	46,5	18,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS								
Illiterate	91,7	83,1	86,7	78,2	37,0	52,5	45,4	37,9
Literate, but no schooling	92,2	81,2	90,1	93,7	42,7	49,4	51,2	27,8
Primary schools	92,1	86,4	86,5	77,5	41,1	36,9	61,3	37,5
Elementary education	95,4	90,5	85,2	81,4	37,0	44,1	54,0	35,9
Regular high schools and their equivalents	96,5	93,4	86,6	80,5	46,3	46,1	59,3	36,2
Undergraduate and graduate studies	98,5	95,3	89,1	75,6	46,5	44,6	51,3	32,4
MARITAL STATUS								
Single	95,4	92,0	87,4	85,0	44,0	45,5	55,6	35,8
Divorced	94,7	75,3	86,3	17,6	31,1	24,3	70,2	35,2
Widowed	84,6	69,6	74,2	28,3	50,5	22,7	67,4	22,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	95,6	92,5	87,6	84,9	44,3	47,1	56,8	36,6
Extended	92,9	87,6	84,0	78,6	39,6	38,3	56,2	37,7
Broken	96,3	87,5	88,5	65,6	44,2	39,7	57,2	30,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
Lower group	95,7	81,1	86,9	84,8	44,9	40,5	55,3	30,6
Middle Group	94,7	90,1	86,2	80,0	42,0	41,3	57,1	37,0
Upper Group	98,0	98,0	93,1	74,4	51,5	62,3	55,5	27,8

The quality which 56% of men thought was very important is that it should be a first time marriage for the woman. The percentage of men who thought this was not important is 14%. Other qualities that men look for in their future spouse are that the woman should be in love with him (35%) and to have a similar family structure (30%). The subjects that are the least important are women to have higher education and a higher income than the man. The percentage of men who think it is not

important for women to have higher education is 72% while the percentage of men who say they do not want this is 12%. While the percentage of men who think it is not important for women to have lower income than men is 71%, the percentage of men who do not care about this is 15%. (Table 37).

The total percentages of men to answer "important" or very important" to these qualities throughout Türkiye and in different demographic breakdowns

Table 37. Qualifications Sought by Men in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye

	Very important	Important	Not important	I would not want it
His/her being handsome/beautiful	9,2	50,0	40,0	0,8
His/her being in love with you	35,2	55,0	9,7	0,1
His/her being more educated than you	2,7	14,1	70,8	12,4
His/her having more personal income than you	1,8	11,8	71,8	14,5
His/her having a job	6,6	29,5	56,9	7,0
Less working hours even though the salary is also less	3,7	25,9	64,1	6,3
His/her not being married before	56,1	29,8	13,6	0,5
Similarity of the family structures	29,8	51,0	18,8	0,4

are given in Table 38. The qualities which were paramount throughout Türkiye were that the woman should be in love with the spouse (96%) and that this should be the first marriage for the woman (86%). There are small differences between residential areas. Working women seem to be more important for men in urban areas (38%) and that it should be the woman's first marriage are more important in rural areas (90%).

Among the three major cities, the percentage of men considering it important for women to have a job (50%) and woman to be married for the first time (82%) is highest in Ankara. Men in Izmir, on the other hand, think the beauty of the woman (56%) and having similar family structures (74%) are less important.

Table 38. Qualifications Sought by Men in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Her being in love with you	This being the first marriage for him/her	Coming from similar family structures	Her being handsome/beautiful	Her having a job	Working short hours even if this means a smaller income	Her being more educated than you	Her having more personal income than you
Türkiye	90,2	85,9	80,8	59,2	36,1	29,6	16,8	13,7
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	90,9	83,8	81,0	59,4	38,3	30,7	15,9	13,4
Rural	88,9	89,9	80,3	58,8	31,7	27,3	18,5	14,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	92,9	74,9	82,8	63,5	37,7	39,4	17,2	12,8
Ankara	90,2	82,1	84,2	61,9	50,2	26,9	16,9	13,1
Izmir	94,5	77,5	73,9	56,8	42,7	31,4	13,5	13,1
NUTS								
Istanbul	92,9	74,9	82,8	63,5	37,7	39,4	17,2	12,8
West Marmara	88,8	92,7	86,1	59,7	41,8	38,9	14,3	13,3
Aegean	88,8	85,3	77,8	57,0	36,2	26,4	17,9	18,1
East Marmara	93,0	85,7	77,6	54,4	37,6	34,8	13,3	12,5
West Anatolia	90,0	88,1	84,0	62,3	35,0	26,9	14,0	11,4
Mediterranean	89,7	86,7	74,7	54,6	39,4	27,5	17,1	15,1
Central Anatolia	86,3	86,3	86,3	55,3	53,3	26,4	17,6	17,0
West Black Sea	92,6	85,0	80,7	58,5	35,0	34,1	21,8	15,7
East Black Sea	87,6	90,8	74,0	44,5	47,6	24,7	18,0	10,1
Northeast Anatolia	85,9	84,4	75,0	55,7	23,2	31,4	12,4	12,0
Mideast Anatolia	84,6	87,4	88,3	65,2	26,7	28,1	29,4	12,0
Southeast Anatolia	93,3	95,4	94,1	79,1	13,9	15,2	11,5	7,1

When regions are considered, men living in Southeast Anatolia think the beauty of their future spouse (79%) and to have similar family structures (94%) as more important when compared to other regions. Even though the fact that this should be the first marriage for the woman is thought to be very important in all areas, this percentage is higher in Southeast Anatolia (95%) and West Marmara (93%) when compared to other regions. Women's having a job is an "important" or "very important" factor for men in Central Anatolia, while this percentage is 58% throughout Türkiye in general.

Differences by age groups occur more in young and middle age groups. Factors that are more important for men between the age group 18-24 are that the woman should be in love with them (94%) and that this should be the first marriage for the woman (90%). Percentage of men who consider the beauty of the woman as important is higher in age groups 18-24 and 25-34. The woman to have a job and higher income are the qualities deemed important more by the age group 35-44.

In terms of educational status, men with the highest education level considered women to be in love with

Table 39. Qualifications Sought by Men in Future Spouse by Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type and SES

	Her being in love with you	This being the first marriage for her	Coming from similar family structures	Her being handsome/beautiful	Her having a job	Working short hours even if this means a smaller income	Her being more educated than you	Her having more personal income than you
AGE								
18-24	94,4	90,1	80,6	63,5	33,7	26,1	16,3	12,4
25-34	87,8	87,1	82,5	57,2	39,5	34,1	17,2	14,5
35-44	84,6	62,8	80,5	46,6	45,8	33,0	19,9	24,8
45-54	77,3	45,4	75,5	24,1	41,4	47,8	15,1	5,9
55-64	25,9	23,2	52,5	43,4	17,5	17,7	24,4	23,4
65+	49,4	22,3	62,4	20,8	13,3	27,0	16,7	12,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS								
Illiterate	69,0	61,6	74,6	38,0	23,6	36,4	23,1	3,9
Literate, but no schooling	82,0	80,2	84,3	37,9	23,6	20,7	14,9	3,4
Primary schools	86,3	87,2	81,1	51,8	35,2	26,5	12,3	14,4
Elementary education	90,2	88,4	76,6	65,7	28,2	27,4	18,4	14,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	91,2	86,2	84,0	60,7	35,2	29,3	17,8	12,8
Undergraduate and graduate studies	95,9	82,6	76,5	63,0	51,4	38,1	18,6	16,3
MARITAL STATUS								
Single	91,6	88,4	81,4	60,5	36,8	29,9	16,9	13,7
Divorced	76,2	46,3	77,3	40,2	25,6	25,5	14,2	13,7
Widowed	38,5	27,8	56,6	26,0	16,6	21,8	15,8	13,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	92,3	90,3	81,0	61,1	35,3	30,5	17,1	13,2
Extended	87,6	84,9	79,8	56,7	28,6	25,1	14,1	10,9
Broken	86,6	74,8	81,0	56,2	43,8	30,5	18,1	17,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
Lower group	82,2	85,2	84,8	42,2	45,9	33,0	20,0	21,6
Middle Group	89,6	87,7	81,0	58,6	32,6	27,4	16,4	13,0
Upper Group	95,8	76,8	78,7	67,5	51,4	39,7	18,0	14,7

their future spouse (95%) and women with a job (51%) more important compared to other education levels. Having short working hours with a smaller income was considered important more by university graduates/postgraduates (39%) and illiterate men (36%).

Single men think it more important for their future spouse to be in love with them (92%), their beauty (61%) and to have a job (37%). Although it is important for all other marital statuses, the factors deemed less important by married men are women to have higher education (8%) and to have a job (3%).

According to the types of households, it is seen that men from nuclear families think being in love (92%) and beauty (61%) to be more important compared to the other households. On the other hand, percentage of men from broken families who consider for the woman to be married for the first time (74%) as important is lower compared to the other household types.

The percentage of men who think the beauty of a

woman and her love as important or very important increases and the percentage of men who think coming from similar family structures as important or very important decreases as the socioeconomic level increases. The largest difference between socioeconomic statuses is about the expectation regarding the beauty of the woman. The percentage of men who stated that this was important or very important is 42% in the lower SES group, 59% in the middle SES group and 68% in the upper SES group.

3.12. Status of Marriage

People were asked about the status of their marriage and the relevant data was presented in Table 40. 88% of people are still married while 8% of them lost their spouses and 4% of them got divorced. When considered in terms of distribution by residential area, the percentage of widowed people is higher in rural areas (9%) while the percentage of divorced people is higher in urban areas (5%).

Table 40. Status of Marriage throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Continuing	Spouse passed away	Divorced/separated	Live apart
Türkiye	87,8	7,7	4,0	0,5
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	88,2	6,8	4,5	0,5
Rural	87,0	9,3	3,2	0,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	88,4	6,5	4,7	0,4
Ankara	89,0	6,2	4,6	0,3
Izmir	84,5	7,1	7,5	0,9
NUTS				
Istanbul	88,4	6,5	4,7	0,4
West Marmara	85,8	9,2	4,8	0,2
Aegean	87,0	6,9	5,5	0,5
East Marmara	89,3	7,5	2,7	0,4
West Anatolia	86,6	8,5	4,5	0,4
Mediterranean	87,0	7,1	5,0	0,9
Central Anatolia	87,3	8,7	3,8	0,2
West Black Sea	85,9	9,6	4,0	0,5
East Black Sea	88,1	8,9	2,4	0,7
Northeast Anatolia	89,6	8,4	1,2	0,8
Mideast Anatolia	87,2	9,3	2,9	0,5
Southeast Anatolia	91,5	6,6	1,3	0,5

Answers regarding the status of marriage do not differ among three major cities. However, percentage of divorced people is a little higher in Izmir.

Distribution by regions show that the lowest percentage of divorced individuals are observed in Southern Anatolia (1%) and Northeast Anatolia (1%) while the highest percentage of divorced individuals are observed in the Aegean (6%), West Marmara (5%), West Anatolia (5%), Is-

tanbul (5%) and the Mediterranean regions(5%). When gender is taken into consideration, no difference is observed between divorced people while the percentage of widows among women (12%) is higher compared to men (5%) (Table 41).

In terms of distribution by age groups, the percentage of widowed individuals is naturally higher among people with advanced ages when compared to the younger age group.

Table 41. Status of Marriage by Gender, Age, Educational Status, and SES

	Continuing	Spouse passed away	Divorced/separated	Live apart
GENDER				
Male	92,0	3,9	3,7	0,4
Female	84,0	11,2	4,3	0,6
AGE				
18-24	95,2	0,6	3,7	0,5
25-34	95,1	1,1	3,1	0,7
35-44	92,6	2,3	4,5	0,5
45-54	88,6	6,6	4,3	0,5
55-64	81,3	13,9	4,4	0,4
65+	59,9	35,3	4,5	0,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
Illiterate	72,8	23,8	3,0	0,5
Literate, but no schooling	80,1	15,3	4,0	0,6
Primary schools	90,2	5,4	3,9	0,5
Elementary education	91,1	3,4	4,9	0,7
Regular high schools and their equivalents	92,0	3,3	4,3	0,5
Undergraduate and graduate studies	93,0	1,4	5,1	0,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Lower group	78,2	17,4	3,7	0,7
Middle Group	88,7	6,7	4,1	0,5
Upper Group	92,4	3,6	3,9	0,1

On the other hand, the percentage of widowed people is higher among individuals with lower education levels while it is lower among people with higher education levels. No such difference occurs between divorced individuals according to education level.

The percentage of people with ongoing marriages increases and the percentage of widowed people decreases as the socioeconomic level increases. Marriages of 78% of the people in lower SES group, 89% of the people in middle SES group and 92% of the upper SES group are still going on. The percentage of widowed people is 17% for the lower SES group while it is 4% for the upper SES group.

3. 13. Reasons for Divorce

The study was interested to know the reasons for divorce. According to the results in Table 42, 29% of divorced men and 21% of divorced women see the reason for their divorce as "cheating." 11% of divorced women and 5% of divorced men cite cheating by their spouses as the reason for divorce. 17% of divorced women declared domestic violence and abuse by their spouses. None of men, on the other hand, state this reason for their divorce.

The percentage of women, who cite alcohol and gambling as the most important reason for divorce,

Table 42. Reasons for Divorce

	For males	For females	Türkiye
Cheating	28,7	20,5	23,1
Irresponsible and disinterested attitude	17,8	21,1	20,1
Abandonment	24,0	9,6	14,1
Beating/ill treatment	0,0	17,2	11,9
Alcohol and gambling	3,9	11,7	9,3
Being cheated on	4,6	10,7	8,8
Spouses' disrespectful attitude towards in-laws	16,0	3,9	7,7
Inability to financially maintain the household	1,6	1,3	1,3
Not having kids	0,5	1,5	1,2
Crime (robbery, fraud, seizure etc.)	1,0	1,1	1,1
Bad treatment to the kids in the family	1,5	0,3	0,6
In-law interference in family matters	0,0	0,7	0,5
One of the spouses becoming incurably ill	0,5	0,3	0,4

is 12%. This percentage is 4% in men. Percentage of men suggesting disrespect against his family as the reason for divorce is 16%. The percentage of women who divorced their husbands because their husbands disrespected their families is 4%.

"Not having kids", is observed at the same level for both genders is one of the most important reasons for divorce. Percentages regarding this situation as a reason are 18% for men and 21% for women.

Although divorce because of "crime", "not having kids", "Bad treatment to the kids in the family", "inability to financially maintain the household", "in-law interference in family matters" and "abandonment" can be considered as possible reasons for divorce, they were encountered very rarely during the study.

3.14. Possible Reasons for Divorce

Individuals were shown various statements asked whether or not these statements could be a reason for divorce. Data obtained is presented in Table 43. According to results in the table, "the husband's cheating on his wife(even once)" is expressed as a reason for divorce by 60% of the individuals. The percentage of people considering "the wife's cheating on her husband(even once)" as a reason for divorce is 89%. The percentage of people considering "the husband's being an alcoholic/gambler" as a certain reason for divorce is 71%, while the percentage of people considering "the wife's being an alcoholic/gambler" as a certain reason for divorce is 83%.

Table 43. Possible Reasons for Divorce throughout Türkiye

	Yes	No	I have no idea
The wife's cheating on her husband (even once)	89,4	7,6	3,0
The wife's being an alcoholic/gambler	83,3	12,6	4,0
The wife's abusive treatment of her husband (beating, swearing etc.)	77,0	18,3	4,7
The husband's abusive treatment of his wife (beating, swearing etc.)	71,9	24,7	3,4
Alcoholic/gambling on the part of the husband	71,3	25,1	3,7
The husband's cheating on his wife (even once)	59,6	35,8	4,6
The husband's failing to maintain the household financially	27,2	68,4	4,4
The wife's failing at properly performing chores	18,3	77,4	4,3
The husband's inability to get along with the spouse's family	13,8	82,3	4,0
The infertility of the wife	12,3	83,5	4,2
The wife's inability to get along with the husband's family	12,2	83,4	4,4
The infertility of the husband	7,6	88,2	4,2

Table 44. Possible Reasons for Divorce throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Husband's bad treatment to his wife (beating, swearing etc.)	Husband's being an alcoholic/gambler	Husband's cheating on his wife (even for once)	Husband's failing at financially maintaining the household	Husband's inability to get along with the spouse's family	Infertility of the husband
Türkiye	71,9	71,3	59,6	27,2	13,8	7,6
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	75,6	74,4	61,4	28,5	13,8	7,0
Rural	65,5	65,8	56,3	25,1	13,7	8,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	75,4	74,4	62,3	25,6	9,6	5,2
Ankara	82,7	83,8	74,2	39,1	22,2	8,0
Izmir	81,9	75,1	58,6	33,3	14,3	5,8
NUTS						
Istanbul	75,4	74,4	62,3	25,6	9,6	5,2
West Marmara	82,5	79,4	67,3	37,7	23,3	13,5
Aegean	77,8	75,3	60,1	35,0	14,8	7,5
East Marmara	79,4	74,5	59,9	28,5	13,6	6,9
West Anatolia	77,8	79,5	64,7	35,7	19,5	8,0
Mediterranean	68,1	67,0	52,4	26,2	13,3	8,0
Central Anatolia	58,0	61,8	58,0	17,4	10,3	5,5
West Black Sea	72,6	71,9	62,4	26,8	15,5	6,9
East Black Sea	73,0	67,7	53,9	23,7	10,7	6,3
Northeast Anatolia	49,5	49,3	47,0	15,4	14,1	6,4
Mideast Anatolia	57,9	63,0	56,1	16,5	9,1	4,6
Southeast Anatolia	63,4	66,7	62,2	20,3	14,2	13,5

The percentage of people considering "the husband's bad treatment of his wife (beating, swearing etc.)" as a reason for divorce is 72% while the percentage of people considering "the wife's bad treatment of her husband (beating, swearing etc.)" as a reason for divorce is 77%. On the whole, when the results are assessed, cheating, acting irresponsibly and inattention, abandonment, and beating/mistreatment are seen as the most important reasons for divorce.

In Table 44, the percentage of people who responded "Yes" to each of these reasons throughout Türkiye is presented with demographic breakdowns. "The wife's cheating on her husband (even once)" (89%) and "the wife's being an alcoholic/gambler" (83%) are stated as two of the major reasons for divorce throughout Türkiye. The differences which occur based on the residential area are "the husband's abusive treatment of his wife" and "the husband's being an alcoholic/gambler". The percentage of people who think these are good reasons for

divorce is higher in the urban areas.

Among three major cities, with the exception of "the husband's abusive treatment of his wife" all reasons received a higher response in Ankara. The biggest differences observed between Istanbul and Izmir, is about men mistreating their wives and men being unable to provide for the family. Percentage of people who stated these as reasons for divorce are higher in Izmir compared to Istanbul.

When a comparison is made between regions, the percentage of people who consider "the husband's cheating on his wife (even once)" (67%), "the husband's abusive treatment of his wife", "the wife's failing at properly performing chores" (24%) and "the wife's inability to get along with the husband's family" as reasons for divorce are higher in West Marmara compared to other regions. The number of people stating "the husband's being an alcoholic/gambler" (80%) to be a reason for divorce is higher

The wife's cheating on her husband (even for once)	The wife's being an alcoholic/gambler	Wife's bad treatment to her husband (beating, swearing etc.)	The wife's failing at properly performing chores	The infertility of the wife	Wife's inability to get along with the husband's family
89,4	83,3	77,0	18,3	12,3	12,2
RESIDENCE AREA					
90,4	84,5	78,6	17,5	11,1	11,5
87,6	81,3	74,2	19,8	14,4	13,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
90,1	82,6	76,3	14,9	8,7	9,0
93,6	90,0	86,0	20,9	11,9	16,4
88,0	82,1	77,0	17,4	8,3	11,5
NUTS					
90,1	82,6	76,3	14,9	8,7	9,0
87,8	84,1	80,2	23,6	16,4	20,1
88,9	84,1	78,3	21,3	10,3	12,0
89,6	82,9	78,9	18,8	10,5	13,3
93,0	89,0	83,7	21,2	12,7	15,0
86,5	79,6	72,7	19,7	13,9	11,2
90,4	78,7	70,6	16,9	11,8	9,9
85,9	79,1	73,7	17,0	12,9	13,9
85,2	79,6	74,1	13,7	11,5	10,9
89,7	78,8	68,1	12,7	12,9	10,6
89,7	86,9	76,7	16,0	9,8	8,8
93,7	91,3	83,0	19,0	21,3	15,0

in West Anatolia, while the number of people stating "the husband's inability to get along with the spouse's family" to be a reason for divorce is higher in the Aegean (15%) and the number of people stating "the infertility of the wife" to be a reason for divorce is higher in Southeast Anatolia (21%). "The infertility of the husband" is more of a reason for divorce for a married individuals living in West Marmara and Southeast Anatolia (14% for both regions) than other regions.

For both men and women, the woman's cheating on her husband is among the topmost reasons for divorce. It is worth to note that women consider a cheating wife more of a reason for divorce than a cheating husband. In both men and women, this reason is followed by alcoholism/gambling of the woman and the wife's abuse towards the husband. While 73% of the women think the abusive behavior of the man (beating, insulting etc.) is a reason for divorce, 24% do not think so (Table 45).

Among the 18-34 age group, "husband cheating on the wife", "the man abusing his wife" and "the alcoholism/gambling of the husband" are among the highest reasons for divorce. In the over 55 age group, the infertility of the woman or the man was cited as a reason with a higher percentage than the other age groups.

Differentiation was noted by educational level. Reasons like the man's cheating on his wife even for once, the husband's alcoholism/gambling, abusive behavior towards the wife, the husband's inability to meet the needs of the household were cited as reasons for divorce by a higher percentage of individuals. On the other hand, the infertility of the man, the infertility of the woman and the inability of the woman to do housework to a standard were cited as reasons for divorce by a higher percentage of individuals as the educational level decreases.

Table 45. Possible Reasons for Divorce by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Husband's bad treatment to his wife (beating, swearing etc.)	Husband's being an alcoholic/gambler	Husband's cheating on his wife (even for once)	Husband's failing at financially maintaining the household	Husband's inability to get along with the spouse's family	Infertility of the husband
GENDER						
Male	71,1	71,3	57,6	29,2	14,7	8,2
Female	72,7	71,3	61,5	25,3	12,9	7,0
AGE						
18-24	77,0	74,4	65,0	27,5	14,2	6,8
25-34	74,1	73,5	62,4	27,5	12,6	6,8
35-44	72,3	71,5	59,0	27,3	13,2	7,1
45-54	70,7	68,4	54,7	26,8	14,7	7,8
55-64	68,3	68,7	56,6	28,6	15,4	9,5
65+	60,9	65,9	53,8	25,2	14,4	9,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
Illiterate	52,5	57,0	50,3	18,2	12,3	9,3
Literate with no schooling	62,4	66,1	52,9	22,7	13,2	10,5
Primary school	69,9	70,2	57,1	26,5	13,8	7,5
Elementary education	76,5	75,0	60,2	27,8	13,4	7,0
Regular high schools and their equivalents	82,1	78,1	67,1	33,1	14,6	6,8
Graduate and undergraduate studies	86,1	79,6	71,9	32,4	14,1	5,8
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	80,7	78,7	67,0	32,1	15,9	7,9
Married	70,0	69,5	58,1	26,0	13,0	7,4
Divorced	82,5	80,7	61,5	37,9	21,1	8,9
Widowed	63,0	65,3	51,2	24,0	14,0	8,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	73,9	72,2	61,2	27,3	13,7	7,4
Extended	63,1	66,0	53,8	25,3	13,3	7,6
Broken	76,8	76,4	59,7	31,2	15,8	8,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Lower group	55,7	60,0	52,4	20,5	13,7	10,0
Middle group	72,2	71,9	59,4	27,8	13,9	7,6
Upper group	86,3	78,7	68,2	30,0	13,1	4,8

Compared by marital status, “The husband’s cheating on his wife” was cited as a reason for divorce at a higher percentage among single individuals (67%). As a reason, “The husband’s inability to get along with the spouse’s family” was found to be higher among divorced individuals (21%). “The husband’s being an alcoholic/gambler”, “The husband’s bad treatment to his wife (beating, swearing etc.)”, “The husband’s failing at financially maintaining the ho-

usehold” were cited as important reasons for divorce at a higher percentage among both single and divorced individuals.

Among individuals from broken families, many more issues are considered to be reasons for divorce. This is quite the opposite for extended families, their percentages are lower compared to other household types.

The wife's cheating on her husband (even for once)	The wife's being an alcoholic/gambler	Wife's bad treatment to her husband (beating, swearing etc.)	The wife's failing at properly performing chores	The infertility of the wife	Wife's inability to get along with the husband's family
GENDER					
92,0	83,7	77,4	19,5	12,1	13,1
86,9	83,0	76,6	17,1	12,4	11,3
AGE					
89,9	83,8	78,0	17,0	12,2	12,1
90,4	83,6	76,7	16,3	10,9	11,4
90,6	83,7	77,1	18,8	11,7	11,2
88,4	82,8	76,3	19,1	12,0	12,9
89,3	83,7	78,8	21,7	14,4	13,5
84,2	81,5	74,9	20,7	16,2	14,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
83,4	79,5	71,7	19,7	18,1	13,1
87,9	85,5	76,0	21,9	16,5	12,8
89,2	82,9	76,0	19,0	12,7	12,1
91,0	84,9	78,7	18,0	10,3	11,0
92,5	85,1	80,3	17,2	9,5	12,5
90,1	83,3	80,6	13,1	7,8	11,7
MARITAL STATUS					
89,7	84,2	79,3	17,9	12,1	13,5
89,8	83,2	76,5	18,2	12,0	11,7
89,7	87,0	82,0	21,5	14,6	17,2
82,6	80,7	74,0	20,2	16,2	12,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
90,2	83,7	77,5	17,9	11,7	11,7
87,8	81,9	74,9	18,3	12,9	12,6
86,3	83,9	78,2	21,6	15,0	15,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
85,8	80,8	73,1	19,8	19,0	13,0
89,7	83,5	76,8	18,7	12,0	12,3
90,5	85,0	82,5	13,8	7,4	10,7

The greatest differentiation between SES groups was found to be on the issue of "The husband's bad treatment to his wife (beating, swearing etc.)". The percentage of those who cited this as a reason for divorce is 56% in the lower SES group, 72% in the middle and 86% in the upper SES group. Another high differentiation area is "The husband's being an alcoholic/gambler". While the percentage of those

who consider this as a reason for divorce is 60% in the lower SES group, this number increases to 79% in the upper SES group. The reasons cited often for divorce by the lower SES group are fewer. In this SES group, the percentage of individuals who think the infertility of the spouse is a reason for divorce is higher.



Chapter 4

INTRA-FAMILIAL RELATIONS

The Times Household Members Regularly Get Together

The Activities Household Members Do Together

Individuals Responsible for Housework

Day-Care of Small Children in the Household

Decision Makers in The Households

Relationship Level between Spouses

Matters of Conflict between Spouses

Reactions of Spouses towards Areas of Conflict

*Instances When Husbands Engage in Physical
Violence during Conflict*

This section contains data on the times household members regularly come together, their activities together, which members perform housework, the individuals responsible for daytime care of little children, who is responsible for decision making in the household, the relationship level between spouses, the issues that cause conflict and the reactions of spouses to disagreement.

4.1. The Times Household Members Regularly Get Together

The majority of household members were asked whether or not they regularly gathered for breakfast, dinner and on weekends.

Table 46 contains data on the frequency with which

household members gather for breakfast, dinner and on weekends. The results indicate that a notable majority of household members gather on weekends (90%) and dinner (89%), while gathering for breakfast occurs a little less, though at 73% it is still not too low.

When you compare the rates of these activities along rural and urban areas, a notable 20% difference stands out for breakfast. The proportion of those who gather for breakfast is 66% in urban environments, while it is 86% in rural settings. Meanwhile there was a 6% discrepancy in gathering for dinner, with urban dwellers congregating less often. By contrast there was little difference in gathering for weekends between urban and rural residents.

Table 46. The Times Household Members Regularly Get Together throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS and SES

	At breakfast	At dinner	At the weekend
Türkiye	73,4	88,8	90,2
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	66,4	86,6	89,2
Rural	86,3	93,0	91,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
İstanbul	58,5	84,6	89,8
Ankara	68,9	91,0	89,0
İzmir	54,4	83,7	87,6
NUTS			
Istanbul	58,5	84,6	89,8
West Marmara	82,1	91,8	91,7
Aegean	74,5	88,9	90,1
East Marmara	63,4	85,5	90,0
West Anatolia	77,1	92,1	91,0
Mediterranean	75,7	87,1	90,1
Central Anatolia	83,8	91,4	92,7
West Black Sea	82,7	90,3	92,1
East Black Sea	74,1	88,3	86,3
Northeast Anatolia	78,6	88,4	87,4
Mideast Anatolia	78,5	94,8	91,2
Southeast Anatolia	82,3	93,0	88,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Lower group	85,4	91,3	88,7
Middle group	73,0	88,7	90,2
Upper group	62,0	87,1	91,8

Comparing the three major cities no variation was observed in gathering for the weekend, however the number of Ankara households that gather for breakfast (69%) and dinner (91%) is greater than the other two major cities.

In all regions a clear majority of households (in rates varying from 85% to 93%) come together for dinner and on weekends. While the rates for breakfast vary from region to region, the regions where they are lowest are Istanbul (59%) and East Marmara (63%).

As the socioeconomic level rises it was observed that the percentage of households that gather for breakfast and dinner decreases, while those that gather for weekends increases. Comparing socioeconomic statuses the greatest variation occurs for breakfast. The percentage of households that gather for breakfast is 85% for the lower socioeconomic group while the number drops to 62% for the upper socioeconomic group.

4.2. The Activities Household Members Do Together

The activities household members engage in together are important as indicators of the relationship between members and the lifestyle of the household itself. And so household members were asked about how frequently they engaged in various activities together, such as visiting relatives, visiting neighbors, visiting friends/family acquaintances, dining out, having a picnic, going to the cinema/theatre and shopping. The results and urban-rural distribution are displayed in Table 47.

According to the results of the question regarding visiting relatives, 25% of family members responded "Yes, often" and 65% responded "Yes, sometimes," indicating nearly 90% of families visit relatives together. On the other hand, this household activity

persists in urban settings just as it does in rural ones as does relationships with relatives.

Households that often visited neighbors together was 23%, those that sometimes visited neighbors together was 58%, while those who never visited neighbors together was 18%. Comparing rural-urban distribution for visiting neighbors, rural households tended to visit neighbors more often than urban households (with a roughly 8% discrepancy). Those who often visited friends/family acquaintances together were 21%, those who sometimes visited were 65%, and those who never visited were 14%. There is no significant variation in rural and urban percentages on this topic.

Households were also asked about their dining out habits. The percentage of households that responded "Yes, often" was 6%, those who responded "Yes, sometimes" was 26% while 69% responded "No, never." The results indicate that Türkiye's culture of families dining at home largely persists.

Of the households that participated in the study, 7% said they often picnicked, 41% said they sometimes picnicked while 52% said they never picnicked.

Household members who often went to the cinema or theatre together was 3%, with 13% attending sometimes. The vast majority (84%) never attended the cinema or theatre together. Of the households that participated in the study, 22% often went shopping together while 50% sometimes did so. Those who never went shopping together was 28%.

When comparing rural-urban variation for dining out, having picnics, attending the cinema/theatre and shopping, these three activities occurred more often in urban settings as was expected.

Table 47. Activities Household Members Participate in Together throughout Türkiye, and by Residence Area

		Often	Sometimes	Never
Visiting Relatives	Urban	24,8	64,7	10,5
	Rural	25,0	64,7	10,2
	Türkiye	24,9	64,7	10,4
Visiting Neighbors	Urban	20,4	58,7	20,9
	Rural	29,0	57,7	13,2
	Türkiye	23,4	58,4	18,2
Visiting Friends/Family Friends	Urban	19,9	66,1	14,0
	Rural	22,6	62,5	14,9
	Türkiye	20,8	64,9	14,3
Eating out	Urban	6,1	31,7	62,2
	Rural	4,3	15,3	80,5
	Türkiye	5,5	25,9	68,6
Going on a Picnic	Urban	7,7	47,7	44,6
	Rural	5,6	27,7	66,7
	Türkiye	7,0	40,6	52,4
Going to the Cinema/Theatre	Urban	3,2	16,6	80,3
	Rural	2,1	6,2	91,7
	Türkiye	2,8	12,9	84,3
Going Shopping	Urban	26,3	51,3	22,4
	Rural	14,3	47,0	38,7
	Türkiye	22,1	49,8	28,1

Table 48 displays the activities households engaged in together across Türkiye and according to various demographic breakdowns. The percentages given on the table are the sum of the "Yes, often" and "Yes, sometimes" responses.

Across Türkiye the most common activity household members engage in together is visiting relatives at 90%, visiting friend/family friends at 86% and visiting neighbors at 82%. The least common activity is going to the cinema/theatre at 16%.

There is variation depending on area of residence. The activities urban households engage in together more often than rural households is "going shopping" (72%), "going on a picnic" (55%), "dining out" (38%) and "going to the cinema/theatre" (20%). "Visiting neighbors" occurs more often in rural settings (87%) than it does in urban ones (79%).

Comparing the three major cities, the percentage of households that engaged in every activity listed to-

gether was highest in Ankara. However the greatest differentiation was in "dining out." While 51% of households in Ankara dined out together, this proportion was 44% in Izmir and 35% in Istanbul.

Comparing regions, the 82% of households in West Anatolia that "go shopping," the 39% in the Mediterranean Region that "dine out" and the 56% in East Marmara that enjoy "going on picnics" are higher in relation to other regions.

When evaluated according to the type of household, extended families spend less time "dining out" (18%) and "going to the cinema/theatre" (8%) while broken families spend less time "visiting relatives" (72%) and "visiting neighbors" (66%) relative to other household types. Meanwhile the percentage of nuclear families that "go on picnics" (53%) and "go shopping" (73%) are higher.

When evaluated according to socioeconomic level, all household activities except "visiting neighbors"

Table 48. Activities Household Members Participate in Together throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES (Often & Sometimes)

	Visiting relatives	Visiting friends	Visiting neighbors	Going shopping	Going on a picnic	Eating out	Going to the cinema/theatre
Türkiye	89,6	85,7	81,8	71,9	47,6	31,4	15,7
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	89,5	86,0	79,1	77,6	55,4	37,8	19,7
Rural	89,8	85,1	86,8	61,3	33,3	19,5	8,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	89,5	85,8	74,7	78,2	56,9	35,1	22,5
Ankara	89,7	86,9	80,1	87,7	61,2	51,1	31,7
Izmir	86,3	83,0	70,3	80,2	52,3	43,8	23,5
NUTS							
Istanbul	89,5	85,8	74,7	78,2	56,9	35,1	22,5
West Marmara	85,7	82,3	80,3	75,5	45,2	35,5	19,7
Aegean	89,8	84,5	81,7	73,8	47,0	32,6	14,6
East Marmara	88,3	85,9	79,3	74,1	56,0	31,2	12,9
West Anatolia	91,4	87,1	84,5	82,4	53,0	36,2	19,2
Mediterranean	88,2	84,7	81,2	69,1	47,4	38,6	18,9
Central Anatolia	92,2	90,4	88,5	66,7	41,9	18,0	8,9
West Black Sea	86,8	85,6	83,2	71,5	45,3	28,7	15,2
East Black Sea	87,1	83,2	84,5	62,7	39,4	26,2	11,3
Northeast Anatolia	88,0	80,4	81,3	61,6	44,8	24,5	5,1
Mideast Anatolia	93,9	87,6	88,7	59,2	38,1	24,9	8,0
Southeast Anatolia	93,4	87,7	88,6	57,8	27,7	18,9	8,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	92,3	88,3	83,6	74,5	52,6	34,4	16,6
Extended	91,2	85,2	86,6	65,3	39,1	18,2	8,2
Broken	71,8	71,0	65,7	64,0	28,6	28,7	19,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower group	82,3	75,5	80,0	48,4	15,3	7,8	4,1
Middle group	90,5	86,5	82,8	73,8	50,2	29,5	12,8
Upper group	93,0	93,7	76,9	90,4	73,6	79,3	54,7

increases as the socioeconomic level increases. The greatest differentiation is in "dining out." 92% of households in the lower socioeconomic group indicate that they have never dined out, while this percentage drops to 21% in the upper socioeconomic group. 61% of the households in the upper socioeconomic group sometimes dine out together. This percentage drops to 25% for the middle socioeconomic group and 6% for the lower group. Another

activity with significant variation is having picnics. 85% of the lower socioeconomic group indicate that they have never picnicked together. This percentage is 26% for the upper socioeconomic group. On the other hand, visiting neighbors together is an activity that all socioeconomic groups participate in with roughly similar percentages (between 77% and 83%).

4.3. Individuals Responsible for Housework

The study asked households who was generally responsible for housework. The results are presented on Table 49.

Questioned about who was responsible for the cooking, the wife was responsible in the clear majority of households with 87%, followed by family members together at 10% and the husband at 2%. The percentage of households who pay for cooking (4%) and those who don't cook at home (2%) were quite low.

In 84% of households ironing was done by the woman, in 10% it was done together by family members, in 2% by the man and in 1% by someone from outside of the household. The percentage of people who pay to have their ironing done is very low (1%). Like cooking and ironing, the critical chore of laundry is predominantly done by the woman (89%). In 2% of households the man does the laundry and in 8% of households family members do it together. In 1% of households a relative outside the household does the laundry, while the number of households who pay to have their laundry done by someone else is a very low percentage at 5%.

While the woman is responsible for dishes in 87% of households, in 9% of households the family do the dishes together. This chore is done by the man in 2% of households, by an outside relative in 0.8% and by paid help in 0.4%.

Like other housework, basic needlework tasks are also predominantly done by the woman (90%). In 7% of households this task is done by family members together and in 2% by the man. 0.5% of households pay for outside help and 0.9% have an outside relative to do it. The percentage of households where sewing wasn't done was found to be 0.7%.

In 80% of families the after dinner tea was served by the woman, in 16% by family members together and in 2% by the man. In 1% of households this task was not done, in 6% it was done by an outside relative and in 0.2% by paid outside help.

Evaluating the responses to the question on who sets and clears the table, it was observed that there is a greater instance of helping each other out relative to other housework. While in 74% of households the woman is responsible for setting and clearing the table, the percentage of households where the family do it together is a little higher than for other housework rising up to 23%. The number of households where the man performs this task is 2%.

The distribution of those responsible for the households' daily shopping for food-beverage shows differentiation from other housework. For this task we observe that men are also active (33%) alongside women. Still, women are slightly more involved (38%) with regards to daily shopping for food-beverage. The number of households who do their daily shopping together is also high (27%), while the percentage of those who have a relative shop for them is 1%.

The study shows that the individual responsible for paying the monthly bills is mostly the man (69%). The percentage of households where the woman pays is 17%, while the percentage of households where members pay together is 10%. In 3% of households who participated in the study the bills were paid by a relative.

Basic maintenance and repair around the house is generally done by the man (68%). The percentage of households who pay outside help for this task are 14%, while in 7% of households the woman does it and in 6% family members do it together. Of the individuals in the study 4% stated they had a relative do basic maintenance and repairs.

One of the household chores covered in the study is painting and whitewash jobs. In 38% of households this task is done by the man, in 33% they pay for outside help. In 13% household family members did this task together and in 10% the woman did it while 4% of participating households had a relative to do it.

In summary, cooking, laundry, dishes, ironing and sewing are generally performed by the woman, with

Table 49. Individuals Responsible for Housework

	Man	Woman	Household members together	Relative outside the household	Someone outside the family in return for a fee	Not done at home
Cooking	2,0	87,1	9,5	0,8	0,4	0,2
Ironing	2,2	84,3	9,5	1,0	0,9	2,2
Laundry	1,9	88,7	7,7	1,1	0,5	0,2
Dishes	2,0	87,2	9,4	0,8	0,4	0,2
Basic needlework	2,0	88,9	7,1	0,9	0,5	0,7
Serving tea in the evenings	2,3	80,1	15,6	0,6	0,2	1,2
Laying and cleaning the table	2,4	74,1	22,6	0,6	0,2	0,1
Daily shopping for food-beverage	33,3	37,7	26,8	1,3	0,3	0,6
Paying monthly bills	69,1	17,0	10,2	2,8	0,4	0,5
Basic maintenance and repair	68,4	6,7	6,3	4,0	13,5	1,2
Painting the house	37,7	10,0	13,3	4,4	32,9	1,7

rates varying between 84% and 89%. This percentage declines a bit for tea service, laying and cleaning the table and tidying up the house. Meanwhile tasks such as daily shopping, paying monthly bills, repairs and painting the house are generally taken up by the man.

Instead of paying outside help to do standard housework, households tend to prefer having members do them. The tasks that are most often performed by paid outside help are Painting the house and repairs.

Table 50 displays the tasks women are responsible for in the home across Türkiye and according to various demographic divisions.

The greatest variation according to area of residence is with the woman's role in daily food shopping. While 43% of women perform this task in urban households, 29% do in rural ones. The percentage of women who pay the monthly bills is higher in urban settings as well (20%). By contrast, the percentage of women who paint the house is higher in rural settings with 14%.

Comparing the three major cities, the percentage of women responsible for serving tea in the evenings (80%) and daily food shopping (58%) is highest in Istanbul.

Comparing different regions there are several variations on the tasks the woman is responsible for.

The percentage of households where the woman is responsible for ironing and laying and cleaning the table is even higher in Southeast Anatolia. On the other hand, a greater percentage of women are responsible for daily food shopping in the West Marmara, East Marmara and Aegean regions.

Comparing the types of household, broken families exhibit greater variation. In this type of household, the percentage of women responsible for housework that is generally performed by men such as "daily shopping for food and beverage," "paying monthly bills," "basic maintenance and repairs" and "painting the house" is greater.

For all the housework inquired for the study, as the household's socioeconomic level grew the percentage of women who performed these chores decreased. The greatest variation occurred in "laying and cleaning the table" and "serving tea in the evenings." "laying and cleaning the table" is performed by women 84% of the time in the lower socioeconomic group, and 63% of the time in the upper group. In households of the lower socioeconomic group 86% of serving tea in the evenings is performed by women, which drops to 70% in the upper group. As socioeconomic level increases the percentage of households where family members perform these tasks together also increases.

Table 50. Women's Housework Responsibilities throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Basic ne- edlework	Laundry	Dishes	Cooking	Ironing	Tidying up house during the day	Serving tea in the evenings	Laying and cleaning the table	Daily shopping for food- beverage	Paying monthly bills	Painting and whitewashing the house	Basic maintenance and repair
Türkiye	88,9	88,7	87,2	87,1	84,3	80,2	80,1	74,1	37,7	17,0	10,0	6,7
RESIDENCE AREA												
Urban	89,1	88,8	86,9	86,7	84,8	79,1	79,0	72,1	42,5	20,3	7,9	7,1
Rural	88,4	88,5	87,9	87,8	83,3	82,3	82,1	77,6	29,0	11,1	13,9	5,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES												
Istanbul	88,3	88,1	86,6	86,2	84,7	78,9	79,8	72,0	57,5	23,7	6,2	7,2
Ankara	87,4	86,3	84,2	85,8	80,9	76,2	74,0	71,0	40,0	21,3	6,1	9,0
Izmir	86,2	88,5	84,1	82,5	83,4	74,0	71,8	59,5	43,6	27,1	8,4	9,6
NUTS												
Istanbul	88,3	88,1	86,6	86,2	84,7	78,9	79,8	72,0	57,5	23,7	6,2	7,2
West Marmara	91,2	91,0	89,8	87,0	88,5	83,9	83,4	77,0	42,1	18,7	15,9	7,8
Aegean	89,0	89,7	87,5	86,6	85,6	80,7	79,4	69,1	38,9	18,5	11,3	7,0
East Marmara	91,2	88,9	88,3	88,5	84,9	80,1	79,1	70,5	39,1	19,6	12,8	6,1
West Anatolia	87,9	88,0	85,7	86,0	82,0	77,1	77,2	72,7	34,0	17,3	10,6	8,1
Mediterranean	87,9	87,6	86,5	86,3	81,8	76,3	77,9	70,4	37,1	17,3	8,8	6,4
Central Anatolia	90,3	90,5	90,7	90,3	84,8	86,0	83,1	83,0	21,9	11,7	12,8	6,5
West Black Sea	85,9	86,6	85,3	85,1	82,0	79,1	78,3	75,5	32,7	16,7	7,6	5,8
East Black Sea	84,8	84,6	83,0	81,3	75,4	79,6	75,5	72,9	32,8	13,8	5,0	3,9
Northeast Anatolia	88,0	87,8	85,6	87,2	83,0	84,4	84,0	82,3	18,6	10,8	16,9	11,5
Mideast Anatolia	91,8	90,4	89,8	92,4	87,8	84,6	85,1	81,6	23,5	7,4	13,3	5,7
Southeast Anatolia	91,3	91,4	89,1	91,2	89,9	84,5	86,8	85,6	24,3	7,1	8,9	4,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE												
Nuclear	92,8	92,7	91,0	90,5	88,0	83,1	82,9	75,5	36,0	12,8	8,5	4,5
Extended	85,1	84,5	82,8	83,8	82,0	77,7	78,3	74,9	29,9	11,3	10,8	5,3
Broken	70,2	70,2	70,4	71,1	64,7	66,2	65,6	64,7	56,7	48,2	18,3	21,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS												
Lower group	88,6	89,5	89,3	89,2	81,6	84,2	85,8	84,0	39,9	20,9	16,8	10,9
Middle group	89,4	89,0	87,3	87,5	85,5	80,6	80,3	73,7	37,6	16,7	9,6	6,0
Upper group	85,5	85,3	83,9	80,8	78,8	71,6	69,8	62,7	35,4	14,2	3,4	5,8

4.4. Day-Care of Small Children in the Household

Households with children between the ages of 0-5 were asked who was responsible for care of the children during the day. The results of these questions are tabulated in Table 51. Looking at percentages across Türkiye, the mother is most often responsible for the care of little children (92%), followed by 2% for the paternal grandmother and 2% for the maternal grandmother.

Comparing urban-rural distribution regarding the care of little children during the day, both urban and rural households predominantly responded with "mother." The percentage of households where the mother took care of the children during the day was 91% for urban households and 94% for rural ones. Additionally, urban dwelling families were more likely to utilize nannies and kindergartens than their rural counterparts. Of urban households 2% used nannies and 1% used nurseries or kindergartens. Only 1% of rural dwellers had nannies look after their children and 0.2% used nurseries or kindergartens.

Table 51. Day-Care of Small Children in the Household throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Mother	Father	Older sister	Maternal grandmother	Paternal grandmother	Close relatives	Care-taker	Kindergarten or preschool	Other
Türkiye	92,1	0,5	0,3	1,5	1,8	0,6	1,4	0,9	0,9
RESIDENCE AREA									
Urban	91,3	0,4	0,1	1,8	2,0	0,7	1,6	1,2	0,9
Rural	93,9	0,8	0,7	0,7	1,3	0,4	1,1	0,2	1,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES									
Istanbul	93,4	0,0	0,0	2,2	1,1	0,5	1,0	0,5	1,3
Ankara	90,2	0,0	0,0	1,8	0,0	0,0	1,7	6,2	0,0
Izmir	83,2	0,0	1,8	9,0	1,5	0,0	3,0	1,6	0,0
NUTS									
Istanbul	93,4	0,0	0,0	2,2	1,1	0,5	1,0	0,5	1,3
West Marmara	80,4	2,0	1,1	1,8	3,1	1,2	4,1	1,3	5,0
Aegean	91,5	0,5	0,4	3,3	2,6	0	1,1	0,7	0,0
East Marmara	88,8	1,5	0,0	0,8	4,6	1,2	1,3	1,2	0,7
West Anatolia	93,4	0,5	0,0	0,9	0,4	0,0	1,5	3,2	0,0
Mediterranean	92,1	0,4	0,5	0,3	1,3	0,6	2,1	1,4	1,4
Central Anatolia	92,8	1,7	0,0	2,8	2,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
West Black Sea	89,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,7	0,0	0,9	1,6	3,1
East Black Sea	87,8	0,0	1,1	0,0	2,0	2,9	3,9	0,0	2,3
Northeast Anatolia	95,5	0,0	0,0	1,2	2,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,1
Mideast Anatolia	95,6	0,0	1,1	0,6	0,0	2,3	0,0	0,4	0,0
Southeast Anatolia	96,3	1,0	0,0	1,0	0,0	0,0	1,8	0,0	0,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE									
Nuclear	93,0	0,5	0,2	1,3	1,5	0,5	1,5	0,9	0,5
Extended	87,6	0,5	0,0	1,9	4,8	1,2	0,0	0,0	4,0
Broken	66,4	0,0	11,3	7,4	0,0	0,0	8,1	3,3	3,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS									
Lower group	98,5	0,7	0,4	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,3
Middle group	94,4	0,5	0,3	1,1	1,8	0,5	0,4	0,2	0,0
Upper group	61,9	0,5	0,0	6,4	4,6	2,3	13,2	8,6	2,5

Comparing the three major cities, Izmir's reliance on maternal grandmothers (9%) and Ankara's on nurseries and kindergartens (6%) is higher in relation to the other two. There is no variation between regions.

For nearly all of lower and middle socioeconomic groups (98% for the lower group, 94% for the middle) the mother is responsible for the daytime care of children. However in the upper socioeconomic group this percentage drops to 62%. On the other hand, 13% of upper socioeconomic households use a "care-taker" and 9% use a "kindergarten or pre-school."

Table 52. Decision Makers in the Household throughout Türkiye

	Men	Women	Household members together
Selection of house	29,1	17,2	53,8
General Order of House	13,5	44,8	41,7
Matters regarding the Kids	14,8	19,2	61,4
Shopping	20,1	22,7	57,3
Relationship with relatives	17,9	15,5	66,7
Relationship with neighbors	15,7	21,0	63,2
Holidays and entertainment	18,6	12,1	69,3

Evaluating the responses, over 50% of households tended to make decisions with "household members together," household organization is generally decided on by women with 45% while men tended to have higher percentages in other categories.

Tables 53 and 54 display the topics women and men decide on respectively across Türkiye and according to demographic divisions.

The topic men have the most say in at 29% is the choice of house. The percentage of men who have the final say in every topic is higher in rural households than in urban ones. The greatest variation between urban and rural households is for "selection of house" and "shopping." In the three major cities the percentages for all topics except choice of house are similar. The percentage of households where the man makes the decision on this topic is highest in Istanbul (27%). Comparing regions Southeast Anatolia and Northeast Anatolia differ from other regions. In these regions the percentage of house-

4.5. Decision Makers in The Households

The topic of how and by whom decisions are made in the household should be taken into consideration to understand relationships in the household. As part of the study, decision-making process of the families was also examined. Towards this end households were asked about who made the final decision on their choice of house, household organization, child rearing, shopping, relationships with relatives and neighbors, vacations and entertainment. The responses to these questions are given on Table 52.

holds where the man makes the ultimate decision are much higher. Comparing household types, the households where the man makes the decisions for shopping, vacations and entertainment are higher in extended families.

The topic women have the most say in at 45% is the organization of the house. Comparing area of residence, the percentage of households where the woman makes the ultimate decision is higher in urban households than in rural ones. In the three major cities have similar percentages, with the largest variation occurring in house organization. In Izmir 57% of women make the decisions when it comes to house organization, with 49% in Istanbul and 48% in Ankara (Table 54).

Comparing the type of households, broken households differentiate from other household types. In broken households the percentage of women who make the ultimate decision are significantly higher (ranging between 54% and 68%).

Table 53. Topics Where the Man is the Decision Maker throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Selection of house	Shopping	Holidays and entertainment	Relationship with relatives	Relationship with neighbors	Kids	General order of house
Türkiye	29,1	20,1	18,6	17,9	15,7	15,5	13,5
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	25,0	14,9	15,3	14,6	12,6	11,6	10,2
Rural	36,5	29,6	24,6	23,9	21,6	22,5	19,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	26,9	9,9	14,1	14,8	13,8	7,8	9,5
Ankara	18,1	12,2	11,4	10,9	9,7	9,7	8,1
Izmir	21,7	11,5	11,7	9,8	7,3	9,3	6,0
NUTS							
Istanbul	26,9	9,9	14,1	14,8	13,8	7,8	9,5
West Marmara	27,8	17,1	18,2	16,4	13,8	16,0	14,5
Aegean	29,3	20,4	19,8	18,7	16,4	18,7	16,1
East Marmara	22,5	15,4	12,9	13,4	11,3	14,2	10,6
West Anatolia	21,6	16,2	13,2	12,1	10,0	11,3	9,5
Mediterranean	33,7	20,4	20,4	18,4	16,1	17,1	14,8
Central Anatolia	26,8	22,8	18,0	14,0	11,5	11,7	11,5
West Black Sea	23,8	20,3	17,6	18,1	15,6	17,9	15,7
East Black Sea	20,0	15,7	14,1	13,0	12,2	11,7	9,4
Northeast Anatolia	43,1	38,7	30,5	32,2	30,7	26,4	23,4
Mideast Anatolia	38,2	34,9	22,5	23,2	19,1	17,4	12,4
Southeast Anatolia	46,5	42,2	36,3	35,2	32,2	26,5	24,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	29,5	19,1	17,8	17,2	14,9	14,7	12,2
Extended	34,9	26,2	23,2	21,2	18,7	18,9	17,1
Broken	19,8	18,5	17,6	17,5	17,2	16,5	17,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower Group	37,8	32,5	26,0	26,1	24,8	23,2	21,7
Middle Group	29,2	19,2	18,6	17,5	15,1	15,2	13,0
Upper Group	15,4	9,5	8,3	8,9	8,1	6,9	6,3

As the socioeconomic level increases, the percentage of decisions made by only the man or the woman decreases for all topics, with the percentage of decisions made together increasing. The topics that differentiate the most according to socioeconomic level are "holidays and entertainment," "relation-

ship with relatives," "shopping" and "selection of house." For example regarding "holidays and entertainment," 51% of households in the lower socioeconomic group make decisions together while that percentage increases to 71% for the middle group and 80% for the upper group.

Table 54. Topics Where the Woman is The Decision Maker throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	General order of house	Shopping	Relationship with neighbors	Kids	Selection of house	Relationship with relatives	Holidays and entertainment
Türkiye	44,8	22,7	21,0	20,1	17,2	15,5	12,1
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	47,6	25,9	23,7	21,6	19,0	17,1	12,9
Rural	39,7	16,6	16,2	17,3	13,9	12,5	10,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	49,3	32,9	26,4	20,6	19,7	19,2	13,7
Ankara	48,3	25,3	22,4	28,5	21,0	18,2	15,9
Izmir	57,4	29,5	29,0	26,6	24,2	19,0	15,0
NUTS							
Istanbul	49,3	32,9	26,4	20,6	19,7	19,2	13,7
West Marmara	45,5	23,9	19,0	19,0	19,2	14,9	11,7
Aegean	41,7	21,8	21,6	19,5	17,8	15,0	12,3
East Marmara	41,2	19,3	19,7	15,7	15,7	13,0	9,4
West Anatolia	44,1	21,8	20,3	22,2	17,3	15,1	13,3
Mediterranean	45,4	22,5	20,7	21,7	15,1	15,5	11,6
Central Anatolia	49,1	18,8	24,2	26,3	22,1	20,5	16,2
West Black Sea	33,8	22,6	18,5	15,5	16,4	15,3	13,6
East Black Sea	43,6	24,1	14,0	16,5	17,3	12,4	10,6
Northeast Anatolia	44,0	16,2	18,2	17,7	19,4	14,9	13,1
Mideast Anatolia	62,3	17,8	21,3	23,9	17,1	16,1	10,6
Southeast Anatolia	40,9	11,7	15,8	19,9	9,6	9,0	6,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	43,0	18,0	15,7	15,3	11,6	9,5	6,1
Extended	38,7	15,2	15,1	16,6	11,0	10,0	6,5
Broken	62,2	58,2	58,8	58,2	57,2	56,8	53,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower Group	47,4	29,6	29,5	30,9	26,1	26,1	23,4
Middle Group	44,6	21,2	19,7	18,6	15,3	13,7	10,1
Upper Group	42,4	23,8	19,5	16,8	19,0	14,1	11,4

4.6. Relationship Level Between Spouses

Individuals that were currently married were asked how they evaluated their relationship with their spouse. Most responded to this inquiry with "very good" (46%) and "good" (47%); 6% said "Average" and under 1% said "bad" and "very bad" (Table 55). These results show that most individuals consider their relationship with their spouse as positive. The responses to this question display the perception of the relationship quality of the individuals.

How an individual evaluates their relationship with their spouse shows no significant variation between rural and urban settings.

The percentage of individuals who reported they were "very good" with their spouse was lower in Ankara (35%).

Evaluating the responses according to gender, men had more "very good" responses (48%) and women more had more "Average" (8%) responses.

Table 55. Relationship Level between Spouses throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS

	Very good	Good	Average	Bad	Very bad
Türkiye	45,8	47,2	6,1	0,5	0,4
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	33,8	34,7	4,8	0,4	0,3
Rural	35,3	36,7	4,3	0,3	0,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	44,8	48,4	6,0	0,5	0,3
Ankara	35,4	57,5	6,3	0,6	0,2
Izmir	42,9	46,6	9,5	0,3	0,7
NUTS					
Istanbul	44,8	48,4	6,0	0,5	0,3
West Marmara	49,9	42,0	7,4	0,5	0,1
Aegean	44,6	47,9	6,4	0,4	0,7
East Marmara	44,0	48,3	6,9	0,4	0,3
West Anatolia	39,6	53,6	5,9	0,6	0,3
Mediterranean	37,8	52,7	7,6	1,1	0,7
Central Anatolia	42,3	51,7	5,4	0,2	0,4
West Black Sea	49,7	43,5	6,3	0,3	0,3
East Black Sea	51,2	40,5	7,5	0,4	0,4
Northeast Anatolia	48,6	46,1	3,8	1,1	0,3
Mideast Anatolia	63,6	30,3	5,3	0,2	0,6
Southeast Anatolia	55,5	41,1	3,1	0,2	0,1

And so, while there is no major discrepancy between male and female responses, we could conclude that the number of men who perceive their relationship with their spouse as positive is a little higher than for women (Table 56).

Comparing age groups there is no significant discrepancy between those who evaluated their relationship as "Average," "bad" and "very bad." For positive responses younger age groups had more "very good" and older age groups had more "good" responses. While 53% of those aged 18-21 said their relationship was "very good," this percentage dropped to 44% for those over 55.

Comparing the distribution of responses according to educational level there is little variation in "Av-

erage," "bad" and "very bad" responses, but those of the upper educational group had more "very good" responses (34%) while those of the lowest educational group had more "good" responses (37%).

Nuclear families tend to evaluate their relationships as more positive than extended families. While 77% of nuclear families evaluate their relationship with their spouse as "good" or "very good," only 69% of extended families do so.

Comparing the total of everyone who responded with "very good" and "good," there is no significant variation among socioeconomic groups, though the upper socioeconomic group had a greater incidence of "very good" (53%).

Table 56. Relationship Level between Spouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Very good	Good	Average	Bad	Very bad
GENDER					
Male	48,3	46,4	4,8	0,3	0,3
Female	43,2	48,0	7,5	0,8	0,5
AGE					
18-24	53,2	41,2	4,9	0,3	0,5
25-34	48,7	45,3	5,2	0,5	0,3
35-44	45,3	46,7	7,1	0,5	0,4
45-54	41,1	51,0	6,9	0,5	0,5
55-64	44,5	48,0	6,1	0,9	0,6
65+	43,6	49,8	5,9	0,3	0,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	31,6	37,1	4,4	0,6	0,4
Literate but no schooling	33,1	36,7	5,0	0,2	0,2
Primary school	37,3	42,7	5,9	0,5	0,3
Elementary education	35,0	29,6	3,8	0,2	0,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	29,1	23,3	2,8	0,2	0,2
Undergraduate and graduate studies	34,4	28,3	3,1	0,3	0,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	38,0	39,4	5,3	0,3	0,2
Extended	34,7	34,6	3,6	0,4	0,5
Broken	2,7	3,1	0,9	1,1	1,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower group	43,5	49,5	6,2	0,3	0,6
Middle group	45,2	47,5	6,4	0,6	0,4
Upper group	52,6	42,2	4,5	0,4	0,3

4.7. Matters of Conflict Between Spouses

Individuals who were currently married were asked if they had any trouble with 12 issues regarding their family life and, if they were the frequency of the trouble. The results of are tabulated in Table 57.

When comparing the results of the different topics of conflict, respondents reported within a range of 60% to 90% that they had never had trouble with the issue in question. Between 0.5% and 5% of individuals "often" dealt with the issues, with the greatest variation occurring in the "sometimes" responses ranging from 1% to 34%.

Taking a closer look at the topics that cause conflict, among the issues that "sometimes" cause trouble the highest percentages were regarding home and

child-related responsibilities (34%), expenditures (29%) and insufficient income (28%). The second group was regarding jealousy (20%), smoking habit (15%), how style of dressing (13%), who they meet (11%), the man/woman's relations with their family (11%). The third group includes topics that are least likely to cause conflict such as religious differences (4%), alcohol habit (4%) and gambling (1%). Ranging between 0.5% and 5%, the percentages for "frequent" conflicts also follows a similar grouping and distribution. The results indicate that the topics that cause the most conflict are over child-rearing responsibilities, income and expenditures (Table 57).

Table 58 displays the percentages of the issues across Türkiye and by demographic divisions. The numbers tabulated are the sum of the "Sometimes" and "often" responses.

Table 57. Matters of Conflict between Spouses throughout Türkiye

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Irrelevant
Responsibilities regarding kids and the house	62,5	33,6	2,6	1,3
Expenses	66,9	29,3	3,4	0,5
Style of Clothing	85,1	12,5	1,7	0,7
Differences in Religious Views	89,8	3,9	0,4	5,9
Relationship with in-laws	87,5	10,7	1,0	0,8
His/her alcohol habits	59,7	3,8	1,0	35,5
His/her smoking habits	61,2	14,5	3,8	20,4
His/her gambling habits	58,0	1,3	0,5	40,2
Out of jealousy	73,0	20,2	3,7	3,1
Reflecting problems at work onto his/her home life	82,6	12,4	1,1	4,0
His/her income's being insufficient	66,5	27,5	5,1	0,9
People in contact	86,5	11,1	0,9	1,5

Across Türkiye the highest percentage of conflicts arises from home and child related responsibilities (36%) and expenditures (33%). Comparing the results based on area of residence, the percentage of each listed topic is greater in urban households. But the greatest discrepancy occurs over home and child related responsibilities and expenditures.

Among the three major cities Ankara exhibited fewer conflicts over jealousy, bringing work related problems home and insufficient income than the other two cities.

Comparing regions, the child related responsibility and expenditures issues that cause the most problems across Türkiye are quite low in Northeast Anatolia. In Northeast Anatolia the percentage of those who have problems with home and children are 25%, while those who have problems with expenditures are 20%. The region with the highest percentage of problems related to jealousy was Mideast Anatolia with 32%, with the lowest being Southeast Anatolia with 13%. On the other hand, insufficient income is the topic with the greatest variation. The region that suffers the most from this problem is the Mediterranean region with 37%, while the region that suffers the least is Northeast Anatolia with 20%.

When it comes to conflict between spouses there is generally no variation between men and women. However the percentage of women who think there are problems regarding home and child related responsibilities (39%) is slightly higher than men who think there are such problems (34%).

Comparing age groups, the percentage of those who have conflicts over dress and jealousy decrease as the age group increases (Table 59).

As educational level rises the percentage of people who have issues related to home and child related responsibilities, dress and a man/woman's relationship with their family increases. Jealousy is more prevalent among primary/middle school and high school graduates.

Comparing household types the greatest variation is seen in expenditures and insufficient income. Nuclear families have a higher incidence of conflicts over expenditures with 34%. This same issue is a problem for 28% of extended families and 22% for broken ones. Individuals who belong to broken households have a lower incidence of conflicts over insufficient income (23%).

As the socioeconomic level increases, the percentage of those who have problems with their spouses over home and child related responsibilities and how the dress increases. On the other hand, as the socioeconomic level increases conflicts over insufficient income decrease. The greatest differentiation between socioeconomic groups is over insufficient income and home and child related responsibilities. For 40% of individuals in the lower socioeconomic group insufficient income causes conflict with their spouse, which drops to 34% for the middle socioeconomic group and 19% for the upper group. Meanwhile 34% of individuals in the lower socioeconomic group have issues over home and child related responsibilities, which increases to 43% for the upper socioeconomic group.

Table 58. Matters of Conflict between Spouses throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Sometimes & Often)

	Responsibilities regarding kids and the house	Expenses	His/her income's being insufficient	Out of jealousy	His/her smoking habits	Style of clothing	Reflecting problems at work onto his/her home life	People in contact	Relationship with in-laws	His/her alcohol habits	Differences in religious Views	His/her gambling habits
Türkiye	36,2	32,7	32,6	23,9	18,3	14,2	13,5	12,0	11,7	4,8	4,3	1,8
RESIDENCE AREA												
Urban	39,6	36,1	34,2	25,7	18,5	16,4	14,7	13,3	13,3	5,0	4,7	1,9
Rural	30,5	26,9	29,8	21,0	17,9	10,5	11,4	9,8	9,1	4,4	3,7	1,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES												
Istanbul	42,1	41,5	38,2	25,9	14,9	17,2	17,5	13,9	14,7	5,3	5,6	2,3
Ankara	45,1	44,4	30,8	22,8	19,4	20,3	11,9	16,2	14,2	5,2	5,3	1,7
Izmir	45,6	40,4	42,3	31,7	19,1	19,9	18,5	16,9	14,4	7,1	5,2	1,7
NUTS												
Istanbul	42,1	41,5	38,2	25,9	14,9	17,2	17,5	13,9	14,7	5,3	5,6	2,3
West Marmara	27,8	22,5	30,7	22,3	17,1	11,6	11,1	10,0	9,9	7,3	4,1	1,9
Aegean	37,3	29,0	33,8	25,2	16,4	12,8	13,8	12,8	11,0	5,2	3,1	1,3
East Marmara	40,9	34,2	32,5	30,9	20,1	15,1	12,3	13,7	11,5	4,6	3,3	2,0
West Anatolia	38,9	35,3	30,8	21,8	20,7	16,5	11,4	12,7	12,7	4,5	4,2	1,1
Mediterranean	34,1	32,5	37,4	24,0	15,8	14,1	16,3	13,0	11,7	4,8	4,0	2,5
Central Anatolia	35,8	29,9	23,2	23,7	27,0	13,8	8,3	9,6	10,2	4,3	4,6	1,0
West Black Sea	36,8	35,1	34,0	18,7	18,7	13,2	13,4	13,8	9,9	5,5	4,0	1,8
East Black Sea	31,3	23,1	21,3	20,6	19,1	9,2	8,7	5,6	6,0	7,6	3,6	2,5
Northeast Anatolia	25,2	20,1	19,7	25,2	19,2	14,0	9,6	8,5	8,2	2,9	4,5	1,1
Mideast Anatolia	31,3	31,8	30,9	32,0	22,4	15,8	17,0	15,3	16,0	1,4	6,5	2,4
Southeast Anatolia	30,4	32,1	31,6	13,4	18,5	10,9	11,4	6,1	11,5	2,6	4,7	1,7

Table 59. Matters of Conflict between Spouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Sometimes & Often)

	Responsibilities regarding kids and the house	Expenses	His/her income's being insufficient	Out of jealousy	His/her smoking habits	Style of Clothing	Reflecting problems at his/her home life	People in contact	Relationship with in-laws	His/her alcohol habits	Differences in religious Views	His/her gambling habits
GENDER												
Male	33,9	31,0	31,8	23,9	17,1	14,4	13,3	12,1	10,7	4,3	3,6	1,5
Female	38,5	34,3	33,3	23,9	19,5	14,0	13,6	11,9	12,8	5,3	5,0	2,1
AGE												
18-24	29,4	29,3	29,8	46,9	19,2	22,8	15,5	16,5	13,6	4,4	3,6	2,7
25-34	40,4	36,2	35,1	33,8	19,9	21,3	16,7	16,2	15,9	4,7	5,3	2,1
35-44	41,3	36,2	36,8	22,8	19,6	14,4	16,3	12,9	12,1	5,6	4,5	1,6
45-54	34,6	31,6	32,1	16,3	19,0	9,4	11,5	8,9	9,0	5,9	3,8	1,7
55-64	30,0	27,0	26,4	12,2	15,3	6,2	7,1	7,0	8,3	3,3	3,4	1,5
65+	22,1	21,0	20,6	9,0	9,9	3,8	4,5	5,0	5,2	2,0	3,1	1,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS												
Illiterate	30,2	29,2	30,0	13,4	15,5	8,4	9,6	7,5	8,9	2,8	5,0	1,8
Literate but no schooling	27,6	28,0	30,7	17,1	16,1	9,2	9,3	7,3	8,2	2,3	4,0	2,3
Primary school	36,1	32,8	35,7	24,4	18,9	13,1	12,9	11,5	10,7	5,2	4,2	2,0
Elementary education	37,0	32,6	30,6	29,3	18,6	16,7	14,7	14,7	13,1	5,2	3,8	1,6
Regular high schools and their equivalents	40,9	35,3	30,3	30,0	19,9	20,5	16,8	16,0	13,7	5,5	4,6	1,8
Undergraduate and graduate studies	43,0	35,8	22,6	23,6	16,4	19,1	18,5	14,9	20,2	4,7	3,9	,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE												
Nuclear	37,5	33,8	33,3	23,9	18,4	14,6	14,1	12,5	12,4	4,9	4,3	1,8
Extended	31,5	28,4	30,0	24,1	17,7	12,7	11,2	10,0	9,3	4,1	4,2	1,8
Broken	30,9	21,6	23,3	27,4	21,6	14,8	10,9	13,1	11,2	7,6	4,8	4,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS												
Lower group	32,1	33,8	39,0	18,1	17,4	10,5	11,9	9,3	10,2	2,9	4,0	2,5
Middle group	36,1	32,7	33,6	24,9	18,7	14,5	13,3	12,2	11,3	5,0	4,4	1,8
Upper group	41,8	31,4	17,4	23,1	16,6	15,6	16,4	13,2	16,6	4,8	3,7	1,0

4.8. Reactions of Spouses towards Areas of Conflict

One of the indicators of the relationship between individuals in a family is how they react to disagreements and problems that cannot be resolved by discussion. To identify these reactions married individuals were asked two different questions: how they reacted during conflicts and how their spouses reacted during conflicts. Women's and men's responses to these questions are displayed on Tables 60 and 61.

Table 60. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict According to Women

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Raising voice	31,3	34,9	9,6	24,2
Getting cross	7,3	19,9	9,4	63,4
Leaving location (house)	1,9	3,7	3,9	90,5
Resorting to force	0,9	3,2	3,6	92,2
Remaining silent	22,0	33,6	13	31,3

Looking at the responses of married men to the same question, 14% of women "often," 28% "sometimes" and 12% "rarely" raised their voices, while 46% never had such a reaction (Table 61). In other words during conflicts roughly half of women raised their voices to various degrees while the other half never had such a reaction.

When they cannot resolve their disagreements with discussion, 7% of men "often," 20% "sometimes" and 9% "rarely," get cross, while 63% "never" resort to such a reaction. Meanwhile 9% of women "often," 27% "sometimes" and 11% "rarely," get cross, with 53% "never" react this way. Leaving the location (home) during times of conflict occurs with varying degrees 10% of the time with men and 5% with women.

Table 61. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict According to Men

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Raising voice	14,0	27,9	12,4	45,7
Getting cross	9,9	27,0	10,6	52,5
Leaving the place (home)	0,7	1,9	2,3	95,1
Using force (physical violence)	0,3	0,7	1,7	97,3
Remaining silent	39,5	32,1	8,5	19,9

Married women were asked, "How does your spouse react when there is a conflict with you (that cannot be resolved with dialogue)?" The percentage of women who said he "often" raised his voice was 31%, while 35% responded that he raised his voice "sometimes" and 10% responded "rarely." Thus we see that when the spouse is unable to resolve a disagreement by talking, nearly three fourths of men raise their voices to varying degrees (adding the often, sometimes and rarely responses).

The percentage of men who "never" resort to force (physical violence) against their spouse is 92%. For women this percentage climbs to 97%. The percentage who "often" resorts to force is 1% for men and 0.3% for women. The percentage who "sometimes" resorts to force is 3% for men and 0.7% for women, and those who "rarely" do so are 4% for men and 2% for women.

The study also covers how frequently spouses resort to the silent treatment during conflicts that cannot be resolved by discussion. During disagreements the percentage who "often," "sometimes" and "rarely" resort to the silent treatment is 69% for men and 80% for women. While 22% of men often prefer staying silent, this jumps to 40% for women.

In Table 62, the reactions of the spouse according to the women are tabulated across Türkiye and demographic breakdowns. The percentages shown in the table are the sum of "often", "sometimes" and "rarely" responses.

When there is a problem that cannot be resolved by discussion 76% of women said their husband raised their voices and 69% said they resorted to the silent treatment. There is no variation according to area of residence. Comparing the three major cities, 80% of women who reside in Istanbul said their husband raised their voices. This percentage is 74% in Ankara and 83% in Izmir. The percentage of individuals who said their spouse grew cross during conflict was higher in Ankara (47%).

Comparing the regions, the greatest variation among reactions occurs for "getting cross" and "remaining silent." The highest percentage of women who said their husbands got cross after a disagreement was Mideast Anatolia with 50%, and the lowest was in the Aegean region with 30%. The silent treatment on the other hand is a far more common reaction in West Marmara (75%). According to women's responses, the lowest incidence of this reaction according to women is in Central Anatolia and Northeast Anatolia with 59%. According to women the highest incidence of using force is in the Southeast Anatolia region (16%).

As age increases the percentage of women who say their spouse raises his voice and gets cross decreases. As educational level rises the spouse's "getting cross," "leaving the place (home)" and "remaining silent" reactions increase. 10% of women in the lower education level said their husband used force. As the educational level rises the percentage of women who report that their husband uses force decreases.

Comparing responses by household type, the percentage of women who say their husband raises his voice when they are in the middle of a disagreement that cannot be resolved by discussion is lowest in broken families (63%). As socioeconomic level increases the percentage of women who report that their husbands use the "remaining silent" reaction increases while the percentage of those who use force decreases. The greatest variation among socioeconomic groups is in the "using force (domestic violence)" and "remaining silent" reactions. While 14% of the lower socioeconomic group women reported that their husbands resorted to force when there was a disagreement, this percentage dropped to 7% for the middle group and 4% for the upper group. Women who reported that their husbands resorted to the silent treatment was 64% for the lower socioeconomic group, but increased to 75% for the upper group.

Table 62. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict According to Women throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Often & Sometimes & Rarely)

	Raising voice	Remaining silent	Getting cross	Leaving the place (home)	Using force (physical violence)
Türkiye	75,8	68,7	36,6	9,5	7,8
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	76,0	68,4	38,4	10,5	7,2
Rural	75,5	69,1	33,6	7,8	8,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	80,4	69,0	40,0	12,4	5,6
Ankara	74,2	65,8	46,9	13,1	8,8
Izmir	72,9	67,8	34,2	13,4	5,4
NUTS					
Istanbul	80,4	69,0	40,0	12,4	5,6
West Marmara	70,8	74,6	32,7	5,7	3,4
Aegean	74,7	71,0	29,7	11,0	5,4
East Marmara	78,5	71,3	38,9	10,0	5,6
West Anatolia	75,8	69,1	38,8	9,7	9,9
Mediterranean	71,5	69,7	32,7	8,2	8,6
Central Anatolia	78,0	59,0	36,7	6,9	9,1
West Black Sea	74,5	68,1	32,0	5,5	6,2
East Black Sea	70,5	64,7	35,3	12,2	6,6
Northeast Anatolia	70,3	59,0	43,8	6,0	9,8
Mideast Anatolia	79,6	73,0	50,2	6,0	12,0
Southeast Anatolia	76,2	66,4	36,8	12,2	15,6
AGE					
18-24	77,0	68,9	41,9	9,0	9,3
25-34	77,5	69,6	39,4	10,0	8,0
35-44	74,5	69,4	34,2	10,8	7,9
45-54	75,6	68,4	35,4	10,2	7,8
55-64	74,3	67,6	35,3	6,9	6,1
65+	73,5	63,4	30,6	4,5	6,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	72,5	63,6	34,6	8,5	11,4
Literate but no schooling	77,6	66,4	35,1	8,5	9,7
Primary school	76,6	69,0	35,1	9,2	7,4
Elementary education	77,4	71,9	38,8	11,0	6,6
Regular high schools and their equivalents	76,1	71,7	44,5	10,8	5,0
Undergraduate and graduate studies	74,5	76,7	43,5	12,9	2,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	75,9	68,8	37,0	9,9	7,3
Extended	76,0	68,3	35,6	8,0	9,7
Broken	63,3	64,9	34,1	10,6	9,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower Group	74,4	64,1	34,8	9,7	14,4
Middle Group	76,4	68,6	36,3	9,1	7,2
Upper Group	72,4	75,5	41,9	12,3	3,9

Table 63 features a similar analysis from the male perspective. This table displays spousal reactions from the husband's perspective for across Türkiye by demographic breakdowns.

When a disagreement that cannot be solved with discussion arises, 80% of men reported that their wives gave them the silent treatment, 54% raise their voices and 48% get cross. Comparing variations according to area of residence, the percentages of women who raise their voices and get cross are higher in urban households.

In the three major cities the greatest variation occurs in "getting cross." According to men, the city which uses this tactic the most is Ankara (60%).

Comparing regions, men report that East Marmara has the highest rate of women raising their voices (62%), and Northeast Anatolia the lowest (34%). With 59% Mideast Anatolia has the highest rate of wives who get cross, and the Aegean region has the lowest with 40%.

As age increases the percentage of women who get cross decreases. Men between 18-24 re-

port that 38% of their spouses raise their voices when there is a disagreement that cannot be resolved by discussion. In other age groups this percentage ranges from 50% to 56%.

As education increases, men report that the percentage of getting cross and raising voice also increases.

Comparing household types, men report that 56% of women belonging to nuclear families raise their voice when there is a disagreement. In broken families the percentage of wives who get cross is higher (57%).

As socioeconomic level increases, there is also an increase in the percentage of men who report that their wives resort to raising their voices, getting cross and the silent treatment. Comparing socioeconomic groups, the greatest discrepancy is in raising voice and getting cross. In 48% of the lower socioeconomic group the wife raises her voice during conflict, whereas they raise their voice in 53% of the middle socioeconomic group and 67% of the upper socioeconomic group. Men who report that their wives get cross whenever they have a disagreement are 45% of the lower socioeconomic group, 47% of the middle group and 56% of the upper group.

Table 63. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict According to Men throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household, and SES (Often & Sometimes & Rarely)

	Remaining silent	Raising voice	Getting cross	Leaving the place (home)	Using force (physical violence)
Türkiye	80,1	54,3	47,5	4,9	2,7
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	79,5	58,0	51,5	5,3	2,9
Rural	81,1	47,9	40,9	4,1	2,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	84,7	63,2	56,4	5,8	3,2
Ankara	71,9	65,0	59,6	5,9	4,2
Izmir	79,3	60,2	48,4	6,3	2,2
NUTS					
Istanbul	84,7	63,2	56,4	5,8	3,2
West Marmara	80,5	54,8	43,7	3,0	,9
Aegean	79,5	53,1	39,5	5,0	2,0
East Marmara	78,8	62,3	54,6	3,9	2,1
West Anatolia	78,5	54,2	53,6	5,1	3,6
Mediterranean	80,6	50,7	40,6	4,8	2,7
Central Anatolia	76,0	55,1	44,2	3,8	1,0
West Black Sea	78,5	55,5	41,6	3,9	1,5
East Black Sea	75,4	48,3	42,5	2,8	1,6
Northeast Anatolia	79,8	33,7	41,5	2,8	1,7
Mideast Anatolia	86,6	50,3	58,6	7,1	6,0
Southeast Anatolia	77,6	44,2	48,6	6,8	5,1
AGE					
18-24	81,1	38,0	58,2	3,5	,8
25-34	81,5	56,4	55,9	5,2	3,0
35-44	79,8	54,9	49,1	5,6	2,1
45-54	79,1	55,5	41,4	4,4	2,9
55-64	81,5	53,1	40,6	3,4	3,2
65+	77,3	49,9	38,7	5,3	3,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	76,0	52,9	44,9	5,8	3,3
Literate but no schooling	76,8	49,4	42,0	7,0	3,9
Primary school	80,8	50,7	42,4	4,0	2,6
Elementary education	80,2	55,9	49,3	4,2	1,7
Regular high schools and their equivalents	79,5	57,0	57,4	6,0	3,1
Undergraduate and graduate studies	80,9	68,7	57,7	7,0	3,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	79,9	55,7	48,1	5,1	2,7
Extended	80,9	48,6	45,0	3,8	2,6
Broken	85,4	49,8	57,4	9,0	2,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower group	78,3	48,2	44,7	6,6	3,8
Middle group	80,2	53,3	46,7	4,4	2,5
Upper group	81,5	67,2	56,2	6,5	3,4

4.9. Instances When Husbands Engage in Physical Violence during Conflict

Due to the gravity of the topic, the data on domestic violence was given a little more detail. Based on the responses of married women regarding how their spouses reacted to disagreements, the "uses force (physical violence)" responses were expanded upon along with several variables (Table 64).

Taking the sum of "often," "sometimes" and "rarely" responses, the percentage of men who engage in domestic violence is 8%. Breaking it down to frequency, 0.9% responded "often," 3% responded "sometimes" and 4% responded "rarely." Comparing area of residence, the percentage of "often" responses are roughly the same in urban and rural households, however the "sometimes" response occurs roughly 1% more often in rural than in urban environments.

There is variation between the three major cities when it comes to women who report domestic abuse, with Ankara having the highest incidence of abuse with 9%. In a comparison between the different regions, the percentage of domestic abuse towards women is higher in eastern regions than in western ones. When the "often," "sometimes" and "rarely" responses are added, the highest incidence is found in Southeast Anatolia (15%) and the lowest percentages are in West Marmara (3%) and the Aegean region (5%)

There is very little variation by age group. Instances where the man has engaged in violence against his spouse in the past year are one or two points higher for young and middle-aged women compared to older women. For example while 9% of women aged 18-24 suffer physical abuse, this percentage drops to around 6% for women over 55.

Comparing educational status, there is no major variation along educational lines. However the percentages of women in the lower educational group who are physically abused are a little higher. For example while 10% of women who are illiterate and literate but no schooling suffer domestic abuse, this percentage drops to 4% for women who have completed undergraduate and graduate studies.

There is little variation between household types; however physical violence occurs less often in nuclear families than in other types of family. Women suffering abuse comprise 7% of nuclear families, but 10% in other household types.

The percentage of women who reported being abused by their husbands dropped as their socioeconomic status increased. 14% of women belonging to the lower socioeconomic group suffered abuse to varying degrees (either often, sometimes or rarely). This percentage dropped to 7% for the middle group and 4% for the upper group.

Table 64. Husband's Physically Abusing Their Spouse upon Conflict according to Women throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Türkiye	0,9	3,2	3,6	92,2
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	0,8	2,9	3,5	92,8
Rural	1,0	3,8	3,9	91,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	0,7	1,9	3,0	94,4
Ankara	1,1	4,5	3,2	91,2
Izmir	0,0	3,3	2,1	94,6
NUTS				
Istanbul	0,7	1,9	3,0	94,4
West Marmara	0,7	1,8	0,9	96,6
Aegean	0,2	2,6	2,6	94,6
East Marmara	1,4	1,7	2,6	94,4
West Anatolia	1,3	5,2	3,4	90,1
Mediterranean	1,2	3,7	3,7	91,4
Central Anatolia	1,2	3,6	4,3	90,9
West Black Sea	0,5	2,1	3,6	93,8
East Black Sea	1,1	2,3	3,1	93,4
Northeast Anatolia	2,1	4,1	3,6	90,2
Mideast Anatolia	1,2	4,4	6,4	88,0
Southeast Anatolia	0,6	7,3	7,7	84,4
AGE				
18-24	0,5	4,1	4,7	90,7
25-34	0,8	3,2	4,0	92,0
35-44	1,0	3,3	3,6	92,1
45-54	1,4	3,2	3,2	92,2
55-64	0,7	2,4	3,0	93,9
65+	0,8	3,2	2,3	93,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
Illiterate	1,3	5,2	4,8	88,6
Literate but no schooling	0,7	4,0	5,0	90,3
Primary school	1,0	3,0	3,4	92,6
Elementary education	0,6	2,5	3,5	93,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	0,6	1,9	2,5	95,0
Undergraduate and graduate studies	0,0	0,7	1,9	97,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	0,9	3,0	3,4	92,7
Extended	0,9	4,1	4,7	90,3
Broken	0,8	7,0	2,0	90,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Lower Group	1,4	6,5	6,5	85,6
Middle Group	0,9	3,0	3,4	92,8
Upper Group	0,7	1,4	1,9	96,1



Chapter 5

**RELATIONSHIPS
BETWEEN RELATIVES
AND NEIGHBORS**



Relationships between Relatives

Proximity of Residence with Relatives

Frequency of Meeting with Relatives and Neighbors

Relationships with relatives make up an aspect of inter-family relationships. For a deeper understanding of these relationships, the research looked at the level of relationship between relatives, distance between their places of residence and the frequency of visits.

5.1. Relationships between Relatives

Participants were asked to evaluate their relationship with their spouses, children, parents and relatives of various degrees of closeness and were told to choose between “Very Good”, “Good”, “Fair”, “Poor” and “Very Poor”. The answers are tabulated in Table 65. The table shows in thoughts about relationships relatives change with the closeness of the relative. In this perspective “Very Good” and “Good” relationships are experienced mostly between children and parents. The percentage of those who have a “Very Good” relationship with

their children is 51%, and who have “good” relationship is 46%. The percentage of participants who think their relationship with their mother is “very good” is 46%, who think it is “good” is 51%. When it comes to the relationship with the father “Very Good” is 43% and “good” is 51%.

When answers about siblings are analyzed, it should be noted that some of these relationships are within the family and some are relationships between sibling who are married or live apart. Ultimately, relationship between siblings got the most “Very Good” and “Good” evaluations following the evaluation on children and parents’.

When relationships with in-laws and other relatives are assessed, the percentage of “very good” evaluations decreases. However, many participants declare their relationships with them as “good”.

Table 65. Level of Relationship with Relatives throughout Türkiye

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
Children	51,5	46,0	2,1	0,3	0,1
Mother	45,9	50,7	2,6	0,7	0,2
Father	42,5	51,4	4,3	1,2	0,6
Siblings	34,9	57,9	5,4	1,4	0,4
Other Relatives	22,4	67,0	9,4	1,0	0,3
Mother-in-law	28,1	62,2	6,8	2,1	0,9
Father-in-law	28,0	62,5	6,3	2,4	0,9
Sister/brother-in-law	22,5	67,3	7,2	2,3	0,6
Spouse's other relatives	18,4	69,7	9,8	1,6	0,5

Table 66 illustrates, the percentage of individuals evaluating their relationships with their children, parents and with relatives of varying degrees of closeness as “Very Good” throughout Türkiye by several demographic variables.

The percentage of individuals evaluating their relationship with their children is 51% countrywide. This is closely followed by 46% for relationship with the mother. Between three major cities, the percentage of people evaluating their relationship with all relatives as “very good” is the lowest in Ankara. Among regions, the greatest difference is about the percentage of people assessing their re-

lationship with their mother and children as “very good”. The highest percentage belongs to Mideast Anatolia.

There is no differentiation between the percentages of mothers and fathers who define their relationship with their children and their parents as very good. The percentage of women who define their relationship with their siblings as very good and the percentage of men who define their relationship with their father and mother-in-laws are higher.

As age increases, the percentage of people who think their relationship with all relatives as “very good” falls.

Table 66. Level Of Relationship with Relatives throughout Türkiye, By Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status , Household Type, and SES (Very Good)

	Children	Mother	Father	Siblings	Other Relatives	Mother-in-law	Father-in-law	Sister/brother-in-law	Spouse's other relatives
Türkiye	51,3	32,7	24,5	33,7	22,1	18,1	14,2	17,4	14,7
RESIDENCE AREA									
Urban	52,0	34,2	25,4	34,6	22,0	19,3	15,3	17,7	14,5
Rural	50,1	30,0	22,7	32,1	22,3	16,0	12,3	16,9	15,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES									
İstanbul	51,2	34,4	25,0	35,0	21,4	20,2	15,3	18,4	15,1
Ankara	43,1	28,1	22,9	29,9	17,8	15,1	13,3	15,3	11,4
İzmir	51,7	31,8	22,9	31,2	19,2	16,3	13,6	14,0	10,5
NUTS									
Istanbul	51,2	34,4	25,0	35,0	21,4	20,2	15,3	18,4	15,1
West Marmara	52,4	32,0	21,8	34,2	22,9	17,8	12,3	17,2	15,3
Aegean	51,4	30,8	23,5	30,9	20,8	16,0	13,1	16,0	13,6
East Marmara	49,2	30,6	23,9	32,7	23,1	18,2	14,8	18,3	17,1
West Anatolia	47,9	28,6	22,0	29,6	16,4	14,7	12,0	14,8	11,0
Mediterranean	42,6	27,4	19,3	27,3	17,3	14,7	11,9	13,6	10,9
Central Anatolia	43,2	26,3	22,0	27,0	19,5	14,1	11,9	13,7	12,8
West Black Sea	55,1	33,4	26,0	36,8	27,5	19,8	15,4	21,1	18,4
East Black Sea	58,1	39,6	28,7	39,8	24,7	19,5	15,1	17,0	15,0
Northeast Anatolia	57,4	37,7	28,5	43,5	33,5	23,2	17,2	27,2	25,2
Mideast Anatolia	72,8	46,3	34,2	46,5	28,2	23,4	19,2	20,8	14,2
Southeast Anatolia	55,6	39,3	29,7	40,3	28,6	23,3	16,6	21,0	18,8
AGE									
18-24	57,4	52,2	44,1	44,9	24,8	30,7	27,0	8,6	7,2
25-34	56,4	44,1	34,9	39,5	24,6	27,0	23,1	20,9	16,5
35-44	52,1	32,9	22,8	32,9	21,9	20,7	15,8	21,3	17,6
45-54	47,6	22,7	13,0	26,6	20,1	14,0	9,5	18,4	16,2
55-64	48,8	10,1	4,0	24,2	18,7	7,8	3,6	17,1	15,3
65+	44,8	1,5	,9	19,2	17,3	1,6	,9	12,7	13,5
EDUCATIONAL STATUS									
Illiterate	46,5	15,2	10,1	25,4	19,7	8,3	5,1	15,7	15,1
Literate but no schooling	47,5	21,7	15,2	28,8	21,6	11,2	8,2	15,8	14,8
Primary school	48,7	28,8	20,7	30,6	21,5	17,2	13,5	18,3	15,8
Elementary education	55,8	38,8	30,2	38,5	24,5	23,4	19,0	18,8	14,9
Regular high schools and their equivalents	60,6	46,6	37,0	41,1	23,7	26,5	22,2	15,8	12,6
Undergraduate and graduate studies	60,4	44,8	34,2	41,8	22,7	25,9	19,8	18,0	12,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE									
Nuclear	51,4	32,9	26,1	33,6	22,0	19,1	15,3	18,5	15,3
Extended	51,0	33,1	23,3	34,1	23,0	18,3	13,5	17,8	15,8
Broken	50,7	30,1	13,3	34,0	20,8	5,3	2,9	7,1	6,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS									
Lower Group	46,3	22,3	14,7	27,5	20,9	12,3	9,3	16,1	14,6
Middle Group	51,3	33,0	24,8	33,5	22,1	18,2	14,3	17,2	14,6
Upper Group	57,8	40,9	32,1	41,6	23,6	24,9	19,0	20,6	15,7

As the educational level rises, the percentage of those who assess their relationships with all relatives as “very good” increases. The greatest difference in relationships with siblings is found in educational level. 27% of illiterates find their relationship with their siblings as “very Good”. This percentage rises to 43% in among individuals with undergraduate or graduate degrees (Table 66).

The percentage of broken families who define their relationship with their father as “very good” is much lower (%13). As socioeconomic level rises, the number of those who report their relationships with all relatives as “very good” increases.

5.2. Proximity of Residence with Relatives

Individuals were asked how close they live to their

Table 67. Residential Proximity to Relatives throughout Türkiye

	At the same house	At the same building/garden	In the same neighborhood/district	In the same city	In another city	Abroad
Mother/Father	30,0	4,9	13,3	31,1	20,0	0,7
Sibling(s)	16,7	3,5	16,8	41,5	20,4	1,0
Kids	76,4	2,4	4,1	10,8	5,7	0,5
Parents in law	9,1	5,6	16,9	41,9	25,8	0,8
Grandparents	1,6	1,0	4,0	11,4	7,9	0,2
Maternal/Paternal uncles and aunts	0,3	0,8	13,5	44,5	25,4	0,7

In Table 68, the percentages of relatives living in the same house are given for Türkiye in general and demographic breakdowns. 76% of individuals in Türkiye live with their children, 30% with their parents and 17% with siblings. People living with in-laws are 9%, with grandparents 6%.

In rural areas the percentage of living with in-laws (15%) and with grandparents (10%) is higher compared to urban areas. In urban areas, the percentage of people living with their children is higher (79%) (Table 68).

When a regional comparison is made, the highest percentage of people living with in-laws is highest in Northeast Anatolia (18%) and lowest in the Mediterranean (5%). The percentage of people who live with their grandparents is highest in East Black

relatives. The answers are tabulated in Table 67. “In the same city” was the response most widely given. This percentage is followed by “At the same house” and “In another city”. 30% of 18+ individuals live with their parents. 20% on the other hand, live in different cities.

As an indicator of the extended family structure, the percentage of living with in-laws is 9%. Living with in-laws in the same apartment building/courtyard is 6%. Similarly an indicator of extended family structure or the family type where relatives live together, the percentage of living with grandparents is 6%. The percentage of people living together or in the same building with other relatives such as maternal/paternal uncles, maternal/paternal aunts is very low (1%).

Sea (14%) and Northeast Anatolia (13%).

As the educational level increases, the percentage of people living in the same house with their parents and children rises while the percentage of people living in the same house with their in-laws falls. With 10%, the highest percentage of people living in the same house with their grandparents is the illiterate group.

As expected, 41% of people belonging to extended families live in the same house with their in-laws and 26% with their grandparents. These percentages fall to 1% and 9% respectively among nuclear and broken families. The percentage of broken family members living with their children (44%) and nuclear family members living with their parents (22%) is lower compared to other family types.

As the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of people living in the same house with their parents and children increases and the percentage of living with in-laws and grandparents decreases.

12 % of the lower SES group lives with their in-laws and 9% with their grandparents. In the upper SES group, these percentages fall to 5% for living with in-laws and 3% for grandparents.

Table 68. Residential Proximity to Relatives throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (at Same House)

	Mother/ father	Sibling(s)	Kids	Parents-In- law	Grandparents	Maternal/paternal uncles and aunts
Türkiye	30,0	16,7	76,4	9,1	6,1	0,3
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	28,3	17,1	79,7	6,1	4,5	0,3
Rural	33,3	16,0	71,0	14,8	9,6	0,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	25,1	15,2	81,7	5,2	3,3	0,4
Ankara	34,8	20,0	73,9	4,8	2,2	0,1
Izmir	33,0	18,1	73,9	4,2	3,0	0,2
NUTS						
Istanbul	25,1	15,2	81,7	5,2	3,3	0,4
West Marmara	28,6	12,2	67,3	6,6	7,3	0,4
Aegean	29,5	14,9	72,1	7,6	5,6	0,5
East Marmara	25,7	13,9	77,9	10,9	6,3	0,4
West Anatolia	32,7	17,3	71,9	9,2	6,2	0,1
Mediterranean	30,5	18,3	75,4	5,2	4,9	0,3
Central Anatolia	26,6	13,1	76,6	11,3	7,3	0,3
West Black Sea	31,7	13,7	73,8	15,9	10,5	0,3
East Black Sea	37,0	20,0	75,8	15,5	14,0	0,4
Northeast Anatolia	36,1	20,4	81,4	17,8	12,8	0,2
Mideast Anatolia	34,8	20,8	77,6	14,1	4,8	0,1
Southeast Anatolia	35,1	24,4	84,7	10,4	4,9	0,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
Illiterate	11,7	4,3	61,0	16,9	10,0	0,3
Literate but no schooling	26,6	12,4	60,7	13,6	4,9	0,2
Primary school	19,1	9,3	78,2	10,8	4,6	0,3
Elementary education	41,2	25,7	83,1	6,6	7,0	0,1
Regular high schools and their equivalents	48,6	35,3	85,4	4,6	7,3	0,4
Undergraduate and graduate studies	34,6	21,2	83,4	1,7	5,1	0,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	22,2	14,1	76,4	0,5	0,6	0,1
Extended	51,1	23,1	85,2	41,0	25,6	0,9
Broken	51,2	23,1	43,5	6,6	9,4	0,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Lower Group	23,3	9,7	60,8	12,0	9,3	0,1
Middle Group	30,6	17,4	78,2	9,4	6,4	0,4
Upper Group	30,8	18,7	81,9	4,6	2,7	0,2

5. 3. Frequency of Meeting with Relatives and Neighbors

Members of household types were asked how often they had a face to face visit with different relatives living in different houses. While 50% see their parent several times during the week, the other half, 48%, reported a lesser frequency of several times a month or less. The closeness of the percentages suggests relationships go on at various levels.

Participants show different behavior when it comes to the frequency of visiting with siblings. While the percentage of people who see their siblings several times a month or less is 52%, 46% see siblings several times a week or more (Table 69).

The majority of parents (66%) declare they see their children several times a week or more. Children are the ones seen most among all other relatives. The frequency of visits seems to be dynamic.

While 35% of the participants see their grandpar-

Table 69. Frequency of Meeting with Family Members, Relatives and Neighbors throughout Türkiye

	Every day	Several times a week	Several times a month	Several times a year/less	Never
Mother/Father	22,7	27,1	21,8	26,5	2,0
Sibling(s)	18,1	28,0	26,6	25,3	1,9
Kids	42,8	24,1	16,2	15,9	1,1
Parents in law	19,2	25,4	24,1	27,7	3,6
Grandparents	11,9	19,9	26,9	34,5	6,9
Maternal/Paternal Uncles and Aunts	6,6	17,1	33,1	39,6	3,6
Neighbors	62,8	22,1	7,6	2,1	5,4

In Table 70, the percentage of people who see their relatives and neighbors frequently (Several times a week or every day) is given both by Türkiye in general and with demographic breakdowns.

The people seen most frequently in Türkiye are neighbors (85%), children (67%) and parents (50%). The percentage of participants who see second degree relatives such as maternal/paternal uncles and aunts frequently is 24%. With the exception of children, the frequency of visiting with all relatives and neighbors is higher in rural areas.

Evaluated by age group, the results show that the older the individual the higher the incidence of

ents once every year, 27% see them several times a month and 20% several times a week. People who see their grandparents every day are in the minority (12%).

The majority of the participants do not see second degree relatives such as maternal/paternal uncles and aunts every week. 40% see those several times a year while 33% several times a month.

The percentage of people who state they never see their family or relatives is very low. Among those who are never visited, in-laws and grandparent have the higher percentage.

After relatives, the people seen most during the day for various reasons and therefore formed a close relationship with are neighbors in Türkiye. Asked about the frequency with which they see their neighbors, 63% state they see them every day. This is followed by 22% several times a week and 8% several times a month.

seeing neighbors frequently and the lower the frequency of seeing in-laws and grandparents.

A similar distribution is also true for educational level. The higher the educational level, the lesser the frequency of seeing neighbors and in-laws. The frequency of visiting with maternal/paternal uncles and aunts are less (17%) in the highest educational level.

By household type, broken families are the ones with the lowest frequency of visiting with all relatives and neighbors. As the socioeconomic level rises, the incidence of seeing maternal/paternal uncles and aunts and neighbors frequently falls.

The greatest difference between socioeconomic groups is seen in the frequency of visiting with neighbors. While 92% of the lower SES group sees

their neighbors every day, this percentage falls to 86 in the middle SES group and to 66% in the upper SES group.

Table 70. Frequency of Meeting With Family Members, Relatives, and Neighbors throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Everyday and Several Times a Week)

	Mother/father	Sibling(s)	Child(ren)	Parents-in-law	Grand-parents	Maternal/paternal uncles and aunts	Neighbors
Türkiye	49,8	46,1	66,9	44,5	31,7	23,7	84,9
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	44,9	42,9	73,6	39,0	24,7	17,0	79,2
Rural	59,9	51,7	59,1	56,0	48,3	36,3	94,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	35,0	38,0	81,4	30,4	18,9	12,3	74,0
Ankara	35,3	36,9	72,3	31,0	25,0	13,2	72,6
Izmir	45,8	39,6	71,3	43,2	21,0	12,6	72,7
NUTS							
Istanbul	35,0	38,0	81,4	30,4	18,9	12,3	74,0
West Marmara	46,9	42,9	55,0	45,2	34,5	24,7	90,8
Aegean	57,4	50,6	71,8	50,7	36,0	28,3	86,7
East Marmara	47,5	45,0	72,0	42,6	32,9	20,2	87,3
West Anatolia	47,3	43,5	66,4	41,0	31,6	19,0	81,0
Mediterranean	55,6	49,7	68,0	49,0	37,7	24,5	85,1
Central Anatolia	58,9	49,8	62,1	51,7	32,4	30,1	89,7
West Black Sea	48,8	42,4	48,3	45,0	30,4	28,1	90,5
East Black Sea	60,3	53,7	52,3	56,4	45,0	39,4	95,9
Northeast Anatolia	41,5	38,5	46,1	45,5	29,9	24,4	91,0
Mideast Anatolia	53,2	46,9	67,9	51,9	40,5	24,5	87,6
Southeast Anatolia	59,4	55,9	73,0	50,4	31,5	30,6	85,2
AGE							
18-24	49,0	50,9	74,1	57,9	39,1	34,2	80,4
25-34	50,1	50,4	82,4	45,9	27,3	22,0	82,1
35-44	50,2	47,6	78,8	43,4	25,5	20,4	85,4
45-54	48,6	42,5	65,8	42,1	23,5	19,4	87,5
55-64	50,1	42,3	65,1	38,8	25,3	21,8	90,5
65+	45,8	37,2	62,7	28,0	28,0	22,8	90,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
Illiterate	39,9	37,2	61,6	49,2	24,2	22,5	94,1
Literate but no schooling	48,9	44,9	66,4	47,5	31,1	27,2	89,8
Primary school	49,1	47,2	71,3	44,3	28,3	23,5	90,2
Elementary education	59,0	55,3	67,0	46,0	38,5	25,7	83,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	53,9	48,7	63,9	45,1	33,2	25,8	76,3
Undergraduate and graduate studies	44,3	39,1	53,9	38,1	32,0	16,6	62,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	50,8	46,5	66,0	45,4	31,4	22,2	84,1
Extended	46,6	47,6	70,5	41,4	35,7	30,4	90,0
Broken	42,1	38,5	68,1	27,5	26,3	19,7	78,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower Group	50,0	44,9	62,5	46,8	27,2	25,5	91,8
Middle Group	49,9	46,8	68,8	44,3	31,8	24,4	86,4
Upper Group	48,6	42,2	60,4	43,9	33,5	16,9	66,4



Chapter 6

**CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY AND
APPROACHES
TOWARDS CHILDREN**

Number of Children

Desired Number of Children

Perceptions regarding Children

Matters of Conflict with Children

Punishments Imposed on Children

In this section the findings about the number of children the family has, the number they want, their views towards children, problems they have and punishment towards children will be shown.

6.1. Number of Children

In Table 71 percentages about the number of children a individuals have are illustrated. Throughout Türkiye, individuals mostly have 2 children (29%), followed by 3 (20%). Next come individuals with 1(17%) and 4 children (11%). People with 5 children make up 6% and individuals with 6 or more children make up 9%, followed by individuals who have no children or those with no surviving children follow with 9%.

When the number of children is compared in terms of urban-rural differences, individuals living in rural areas have more children. Percentage of having 2 children are higher in urban areas (32%), this is followed with those who have 3 children (20%) and 1 child (20%). The percentage of individuals who have 2 children is also high in rural areas. On the other hand, the percentage of having 3 children is higher than urban areas.

Between three major cities, Ankara has the highest percentage of individuals with 3 or more children (39%). The percentage of those who have 1 child is highest in Izmir (27%).

As we move from the east to the west, the number of children individuals have decreases. Having 1 child appears to possess the highest percentages in Istanbul (22%), West Marmara (22%), and the Aegean (21%) while the lowest percentages belong

to Southeast Anatolia (9%), Northeast Anatolia (16%) and Mideast Anatolia (17%).

While percentages for those who have 6 or more children predominantly exist in Southeast Anatolia (30%), Northeast Anatolia (21%) and Mideast Anatolia (21%), these percentages drop for West Marmara (3%), Aegean (3%) and Istanbul (3%).

The percentages for individuals with no children or 1 child decreases as age increases. Similarly, the percentages for 4 or more children increase as the ages of the participants increase.

Evaluations by educational level show a parallel picture. As educational level increases, the number of individuals with 1 or 2 children and those with no children increase, the percentages for 4 or more children decrease.

Across all household types, the percentage for 2 children is the highest. This ratio is higher in nuclear families (31%) compared to broken (24%) and extended families (24%). On the other hand, the percentage for 6 or more children is higher in broken and extended families (12%) compared to nuclear families.

In middle and upper socioeconomic groups percentages for having 2 children, in the lower SES group percentages for having 3 children are higher. 30% of the Middle SES group and 38% of the upper SES group have 2 children. This ratio is 16% for the lower SES group. 19% of the lower SES group has 3 children. As the socioeconomic level rises, the percentages for 2 or less children rise, and the percentages for 4 or more children decrease.

Table 71. Number of Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type and SES

	No child	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 Children	5 Children	6 Children and more
Türkiye	8,5	17,1	29,3	20,2	10,6	5,7	8,5
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	9,2	19,6	32,0	19,8	9,2	4,3	5,9
Rural	7,4	12,9	24,8	20,7	13,1	8,1	13,0

	No child	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 Children	5 Children	6 Children and more
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	10,4	21,8	34,6	19,5	7,2	3,5	3,1
Ankara	7,4	20,8	33,4	25,2	8,6	2,2	2,5
Izmir	9,6	27,2	35,6	14,8	7,3	2,5	2,9
NUTS							
Istanbul	10,4	21,8	34,6	19,5	7,2	3,5	3,1
West Marmara	8,8	21,8	39,2	18,9	5,5	3,0	2,7
Aegean	9,2	21,1	35,4	19,0	9,0	3,1	3,2
East Marmara	8,5	19,5	33,7	20,5	8,9	4,3	4,7
West Anatolia	7,9	16,0	31,0	26,4	10,4	4,0	4,4
Mediterranean	8,2	17,6	28,7	18,5	11,1	6,3	9,7
Central Anatolia	8,5	12,5	23,6	23,9	14,3	7,1	10,1
West Black Sea	6,3	12,6	30,3	22,2	13,4	7,8	7,4
East Black Sea	5,1	13,0	22,1	23,9	17,5	7,5	10,9
Northeast Anatolia	9,4	10,5	15,7	17,0	17,8	8,9	20,7
Mideast Anatolia	8,6	12,5	16,7	19,0	12,1	10,3	20,8
Southeast Anatolia	8,0	8,9	13,7	13,7	13,6	12,3	29,9
GENDER							
Male	9,2	17,7	30,0	19,7	10,1	5,5	7,8
Female	7,9	16,5	28,7	20,6	11,2	5,9	9,2
AGE							
18-24	36,6	45,1	13,8	3,4	0,9	0,1	0,0
25-34	12,8	32,1	33,1	13,9	4,9	1,9	1,3
35-44	5,0	11,4	38,0	24,1	11,1	4,8	5,7
45-54	3,2	8,2	30,4	26,3	14,1	7,2	10,7
55-64	3,4	6,1	21,3	24,2	16,6	9,9	18,5
65+	5,9	5,2	15,3	20,6	16,6	13,1	23,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
Illiterate	5,4	5,2	9,7	16,3	17,5	13,7	32,1
Literate but no schooling	5,9	8,5	15,6	22,7	18,4	10,8	18,1
Primary school	6,7	14,8	32,1	24,2	11,4	5,4	5,4
Elementary education	11,8	22,6	35,7	18,4	6,6	2,6	2,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	14,0	30,4	35,9	13,6	4,0	1,3	0,9
Undergraduate and graduate studies	14,6	31,3	37,5	11,9	3,3	1,1	0,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	7,6	17,7	31,4	21,0	10,2	5,1	7,1
Extended	11,3	16,5	23,8	17,4	11,3	7,4	12,3
Broken	10,1	12,3	23,8	20,5	13,9	6,9	12,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower Group	7,4	7,9	16,0	19,1	14,8	12,0	22,7
Middle Group	8,4	17,2	30,3	21,1	10,7	5,2	7,2
Upper Group	11,1	28,1	38,3	14,0	5,1	2,1	1,3

6.2. Desired Number of Children

Individuals who participated the study were asked about the number of children they would want if the conditions were right. The majority wants 2 (48%) and 3 children (26%). The percentage who wants 4 or more children is 13%. The percentages for 1 child is 5% and 5 children is 4% (Table 72).

Compared to those living in rural areas, individuals living in the urban area want fewer children. Participants who want 2 children in urban areas are 51%, while in rural areas it is 45%. On the other hand, while the percentage of participants who want 3 children in urban areas is 43%, this percentage rises to 51% in rural areas.

When three major cities are compared, Izmir is different from Istanbul and Ankara. The percentage of participants who want 2 children (62%) is higher than the other two cities. As opposed to this, the percentage of individuals who want 3 children in Is-

tanbul (24%) and Ankara (25%) is higher compared to Izmir (18%).

Even though it is not as sharp a difference as the actual number of children, people living in the eastern regions of Türkiye generally want to have more children than the individuals living in the western regions. For instance, the percentage of people who want 2 or 3 children is 82% in the Aegean region and 85% in west Marmara. This percentage falls as we go from the west to the east and the percentage of people who want more than 3 children rise. 48% of those living in Southeast Anatolia and 37% of those who live in Mideast Anatolia want more than 3 children.

There is no significant difference between men and women on the number of children desired. A finding shows that as age increases, the number of children desired also increases. For instance, between the ages of 18-24 the percentage of individuals who want 1 child is 8% and 62% for 2 children, between the ages

Table 72. Desired Number of Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Don't want children	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 Children	5 Children	6 Children and more
Türkiye	0,8	4,6	48,4	26,3	12,7	3,5	3,7
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	0,7	5,3	50,6	25,1	12,0	3,0	3,2
Rural	0,8	3,5	44,5	28,3	13,8	4,5	4,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	0,9	5,1	54,7	24,1	10,3	2,8	2,0
Ankara	1,2	7,7	51,7	24,6	11,1	2,1	2,0
Izmir	0,9	8,3	62,4	17,8	7,0	1,6	11,1
NUTS							
Istanbul	0,9	5,1	54,7	24,1	10,3	2,8	2,0
West Marmara	1,1	7,3	68,0	16,7	4,2	1,4	1,4
Aegean	0,5	5,3	57,7	24,6	7,4	2,3	2,2
East Marmara	0,6	4,8	52,3	27,3	9,2	3,0	2,8
West Anatolia	0,8	4,9	46,9	29,6	12,3	2,7	2,8
Mediterranean	0,4	4,5	45,6	25,3	15,6	3,7	4,9
Central Anatolia	0,7	3,2	50,0	31,1	10,4	2,1	2,4
West Black Sea	1,9	5,0	51,7	26,6	9,0	3,2	2,5
East Black Sea	0,7	3,6	45,5	30,7	12,4	4,0	3,1
Northeast Anatolia	1,8	3,8	36,7	29,1	17,0	5,6	6,0
Mideast Anatolia	0,7	2,2	28,9	30,8	24,6	5,9	6,9
Southeast Anatolia	0,3	3,5	22,4	25,6	28,1	9,0	11,1

of 35–44 the percentage of participants who want 1 child falls to 4% and 2 children to 44% (Table 73).

Similarly, as educational level increases, the number of children desired decreases. While 32% of individuals from the lowest educational levels desire 1 or 2 children, at the highest educational level it is 65%.

Compared to other household types, the number of desired children is fewer than other household types. While 60% of participants from broken homes desire 1 or 2 children, this percentage is 53% in nuclear

families and 49% for extended families.

Among all socioeconomic groups, the percentage of people who want 2 children is high. 34% of the lower SES group, 49% of middle SES group and 59% of the upper SES group declare they would have 2 children given the right conditions. As was true for the number of actual children the participants have, as the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of people who desire 2 children or less increase, the percentage of those who want 4 or more children decrease.

Table 73. Desired Number of Children by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type and SES

	Don't want children	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 Children	5 Children	6 Children and more
GENDER							
Male	0,7	4,3	48,6	26,2	11,7	4,1	4,5
Female	0,9	5,0	48,3	26,4	13,6	3,0	3,0
AGE							
18-24	1,1	7,6	61,9	19,3	7,7	1,5	0,8
25-34	0,6	5,2	52,4	26,0	11,4	2,5	2,0
35-44	0,5	3,9	44,3	28,8	14,7	4,0	3,8
45-54	0,5	3,4	44,8	28,3	14,3	4,1	4,6
55-64	0,9	3,3	40,6	29,3	13,8	5,0	7,1
65+	1,7	2,7	34,7	27,8	17,0	7,0	9,1
EDUCATION STATUS							
Illiterate	1,5	3,0	29,2	28,5	20,2	7,2	10,3
Literate but no schooling	0,7	2,7	35,8	29,4	18,5	6,0	6,9
Primary school	0,6	3,7	47,6	28,4	13,6	3,3	2,9
Elementary education	0,6	4,5	53,9	25,4	9,9	2,5	3,2
Regular high schools and their equivalents	0,9	7,3	58,4	21,4	8,1	2,1	1,9
Undergraduate and graduate studies	0,9	7,2	57,4	22,3	7,7	3,0	1,5
MARITAL STATUS							
Single	1,6	8,4	61,6	18,1	7,3	1,7	1,2
Married	0,5	3,6	45,5	28,5	13,9	3,9	4,1
Divorced	2,9	9,8	60,9	14,5	7,3	1,7	3,0
Widowed	1,6	3,5	36,5	28,6	16,8	5,8	7,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	0,6	4,5	48,8	26,5	12,7	3,3	3,5
Extended	0,9	3,7	45,5	27,3	13,7	4,4	4,5
Broken	2,0	8,0	52,0	21,5	10,2	3,2	3,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower Group	1,4	2,8	33,8	28,4	19,2	6,5	8,0
Middle Group	0,8	4,6	49,1	26,6	12,3	3,3	3,3
Upper Group	0,4	6,9	58,6	21,6	8,6	2,0	1,8

6.3. Perceptions regarding Children

To understand the value they attribute to children, participants were asked if they agreed with some statements. The results are tabulated in Table 74.

“The kid should take care of the parent once they get old”, “Each family should have kids depending on their economic standing”, “A kid makes the couple closer”

Table 74. Perceptions regarding Children

	Yes	No
The kid should take care of the parent once they get old	88,3	9,5
Each family should have kids depending on their economic standing	84,9	13,3
A kid makes the couple closer	84,1	12,7
Once having grown up, the kid should financially support the parent	76,6	20,5
A kid has a negative impact on the mother's social/educational and professional life	45,8	48,8
Only a son can assure the continuation of the bloodline	40,5	57,6
A woman who has a kid is more respectable than a woman who does not have a kid	33,7	61,1
A son makes the mother more respectable	32,0	64,3
A kid has a negative impact on the father's social/educational and professional life	21,6	73,4

Tables 75 & 76 illustrate perceptions towards children by some social and demographic properties. In this context, the percentage of individuals that agree with the statement “The kid should take care of the parent once they get old” is higher in rural areas (95%). Those agree with this statement among three major cities have the highest concentration in Istanbul (87%). The highest agreement with this statement is found in Southeast Anatolia with 95%.

This expectation is high in individuals from lower educational levels and from extended families. With respect to age, no differentiation was found. As the SES rises, the percentage of people who agree with this statement decreases. While 91% of the lower SES group agrees with this statement, it falls to 77% in the upper SES group.

“The percentage of people who agree with the statement “Each family should have kids depending on their economic standing” is a little higher in urban areas (86%) than rural areas (83%). Among three major cities, the percentage of participants who agree with this statement is a little lower in Ankara and among regions, a little lower in Mideast Anatolia with 75%. Even though there are no significant dif-

and “Once having grown up, the kid should financially support the parent” are the statements agreed on most.

Half of the participants disagreed with the statements designed to show the value attributed to having male children in Türkiye. For instance, 64% of the participants disagree with the statements “Male child raises the standing of the mother in the family” and “Lineage of the family goes through the male child”.

ferences between men and women, this percentage is a little higher for women (86%). This percentage is 84% for men. Because of their higher education, there are some differences between people in the upper educational level and there are more people who agree with this statement. For instance, agreement with this statement is 81%, this percentage rises to 87% among graduates of high school or equivalent. Compared by household type, there are no significant differences in agreement with this statement. As the socioeconomic level rises the percentage that agrees with this statement rises. While 80% of the lower SES group agrees with this statement, the percentage rises to 87% in the upper SES group.

Agreement with the statement “A kid makes the couple closer” is higher in rural areas (87%), than in urban areas (82%). Among three major cities, agreement is higher in Istanbul (81%) compared to the other two cities. By region, the highest agreement with this statement is in Southeast Anatolia with 90%. On the other hand, agreement is lower among women (82%), among university graduates (77%), advanced age groups (76%) and broken families (76%). The group with the lowest agreement with this statement is the upper socioeconomic group with 77%.

There are no significant differences between the lower (84%) and middle (85%) SES groups.

Agreement with the statement “Once having grown up, the kid should financially support the parent” is higher in rural areas (83%). Among three major cities the percentage of people who agree with this statement is lowest in Izmir with 59%. By regions the lowest agreement percentage is in West Marmara with 66%, the highest in Southeast Anatolia with 90%. There are no significant differences between men and women in agreement to this statement. This statement is supported more in advanced age groups. For instance, while agreement with the statement is 86% in people over 65, it is 75% in the age group 18-24. Moreover agreement is significantly higher in lower educational levels like 90% of illiterates and extended families (85%). The most significant differentiation among socioeconomic groups is in agreement with this statement. While 88% of the lower SES group agrees with the statement, this percentage falls to 78% in middle SES and to 54% in the upper SES groups .

While there is very little difference between urban (46%) and rural (45%) areas in agreement with the statement “A kid has a negative impact on the mother’s social/educational and professional life” it is a little different in large cities. Among three major cities the one with the lowest percentage of agreement is Ankara with 38%. Central Anatolia has the lowest percentage among all regions with 38%. Agreement with this statement is a little higher among men than women (48% and 44% respectively). Agreement with this statement is a little lower in the 18-24 age group compared to others (43%). Among lower educational levels, the percentage of people who agree with the statement is higher. Agreement with this statement shows no significant differentiation by household type and SES.

Agreement with “Only a son can assure the continuation of the bloodline” is higher in urban areas (46%) than in rural areas (38%). Between three major cities, agreement is quite low in Izmir (26%). In more advanced age groups (for example 51% in over 65 age group), people with a lower education (for example among illiterates 58%), extended families (47%) and men (45%) this percentage is higher. As the socioec-

onomic level increases, the number of people agreeing with this statement decreases. 54% of the lower SES group agree with this statement while this percentage decreases to 29% in the upper SES group.

The statement “A woman who has a kid is more respectable than a woman who does not have a kid” is accepted more by people in rural areas (42%). There is no significant differentiation between three major cities. When regions are compared, Northeast Anatolia with 49% has the highest agreement rate among all other regions. There are no significant differences between men and women. In advanced age groups (for example 46% in the over 65 age group) and among people with low education levels (for example 52% among illiterates), there is greater agreement with this statement. It is interesting to note that among participants from extended families (41%), this statement finds a wider agreement. As the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of people who agree with this statement falls. While 47% of the participants from the lower SES group, this falls to 18% among the upper SES group .

People living in rural areas agree more with the statement “A son makes the mother more respectable” (40%). Among three major cities, Ankara is the one that has the highest agreement percentage with 28% and Izmir is the lowest with 18%. Among women (40%) and advanced age groups (44% with the over 65 age group), people with low education levels (51% among illiterates) and extended families (41%) agreement with this statement is higher. This is one of the statements showing a high differentiation by socioeconomic groups. Agreement with this statement is 48% in the lower SES, 32% in the middle SES and 16% in the upper SES.

Agreement with the statement “A kid has a negative impact on the father’s social/educational and professional life” is a little higher in rural areas with 24% than urban areas with 20%. Among three major cities, no differences by gender, age and household type were found; however it is clear that as educational level increases agreement with this statement falls. Although as the socioeconomic level increases, the percentage of agreement with this statement falls, there is no significant differentiation between groups.

Table 75. Perceptions regarding Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Yes)

	The kid should take care of the parent once they get old	Each family should have kids depending on their economic standing	A kid makes the couple closer	Once having grown up, the kid should financially support the parent	A kid has a negative impact on the mother's social/educational and professional life	Only a son can assure the continuation of the bloodline	A woman who has a kid is more respectable than a woman who does not have a kid	A son makes the mother more respectable	A kid has a negative impact on father's social/educational and professional life
Türkiye	88,3	84,9	84,1	76,6	45,8	40,5	33,7	32,0	21,6
RESIDENCE AREA									
Urban	86,6	86,1	82,4	72,4	46,0	37,6	28,7	27,2	20,0
Rural	95,1	82,9	87,4	83,4	45,4	45,5	42,3	40,3	24,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES									
Istanbul	86,7	86,0	81,2	75,0	48,0	38,4	24,0	22,7	18,7
Ankara	81,9	83,1	75,3	70,1	37,9	40,6	23,8	27,8	17,7
Izmir	78,6	88,0	73,2	58,6	49,3	26,2	21,0	18,0	14,7
NUTS									
Istanbul	86,7	86,0	81,2	75,0	48,0	38,4	24	22,7	18,7
West Marmara	82,7	83,4	78,5	65,7	42,3	32,9	29,7	23,0	16,2
Aegean	87,4	89,0	85,0	71,5	49,9	34,6	31,9	27,8	19,5
East Marmara	85,9	85,4	84,7	74,0	47,2	33,2	30,6	29,0	20,2
West Anatolia	86,7	84,9	82,0	75,2	43,6	43,5	29,6	31,4	20,3
Mediterranean	89,6	84,0	84,5	78,4	46,1	42,7	36,4	34,3	23,4
Central Anatolia	89,8	85,5	85,4	82,2	37,6	43,2	38,7	38,1	17,6
West Black Sea	86,8	84,5	86,1	76,1	43,6	35,8	35,3	31,4	25,8
East Black Sea	90,0	83,3	85,9	78,0	43,6	41,7	42,0	38,3	28,0
Northeast Anatolia	92,6	87,2	86,6	84,3	47,4	48,8	49,0	47,6	32,5
Mideast Anatolia	90,6	74,8	83,7	78,0	42,4	45,9	35,3	33,6	26,0
Southeast Anatolia	95,4	83,4	89,5	89,9	46,8	55,5	48,2	50,6	23,5

Table 76. Perceptions regarding Children by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type and SES (Yes)

	The kid should take care of the parent once they get old	Each family should have kids depending on their economic standing	A kid makes the couple closer	Once having grown up, the kid should financially support the parent	A kid has a negative impact on the mother's social/ educational and professional life	Only a son can assure the continuation of the bloodline	A woman who has a kid is more respectable than a woman who does not have a kid	A son makes the mother more respectable	A kid has a negative impact on father's social/ educational and professional life
GENDER									
Male	89,8	83,6	87,4	77,8	47,7	44,6	33,8	27,2	21,9
Female	88,0	85,7	82,2	78,4	44,0	36,4	33,6	40,3	21,2
AGE									
18-24	90,1	87,7	82,5	74,7	43,3	38,9	27,3	27,5	20,6
25-34	87,1	85,6	84,1	71,0	46,6	36,3	28,9	26,7	19,4
35-44	88,5	84,1	84,9	75,7	46,5	39,2	34,0	31,0	22,1
45-54	88,2	83,6	85,2	77,5	44,6	40,8	36,1	34,5	21,9
55-64	90,5	84,8	86,8	83,6	49,6	47,0	43,3	41,4	25,2
65+	90,2	82,4	83,5	85,6	44,6	51,4	45,5	44,3	24,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS									
Illiterate	92,4	80,8	84,6	89,7	42,8	58,1	51,9	51,3	25,6
Literate but no schooling	92,9	82,7	85,6	88,9	49,4	51,1	44,2	43,9	24,7
Primary school	91,2	85,0	86,7	82,8	48,3	40,8	37,5	36,0	22,4
Elementary education	87,5	86,4	84,5	74,7	47,5	39,3	28,5	27,5	20,6
Regular high schools and their equivalents	84,9	87,0	81,2	64,9	42,4	33,9	21,4	19,0	18,5
Undergraduate and graduate studies	73,2	86,2	76,8	47,3	40,2	24,3	16,7	11,8	18,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE									
Nuclear	87,3	85,1	84,1	74,5	45,6	38,6	31,8	29,7	21,0
Extended	92,4	84,5	87,5	85,3	46,7	47,4	41,0	40,5	23,6
Broken	86,8	84,6	76,1	73,2	45,2	39,4	32,0	30,0	20,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS									
Lower Group	91,2	79,8	83,8	88,1	44,9	54,5	47,4	47,9	25,3
Middle Group	89,4	85,4	85,1	78,1	46,7	40,1	33,8	31,8	21,6
Upper Group	77,3	86,8	77,4	53,8	40,0	28,9	18,4	16,4	17,6

6.4. Matters of Conflict with Children

Participants who had children between ages 3-17 were asked about the problems they had with their children and the frequency of the problems (Table 77). Parents reported problems mostly in the areas of spending and consumption habits (30%), choice of friends (28%) and inappropriate dressing (24%). Parents have sometimes or often problems with their children on other issues as well, approximately

22% of individuals who have kids have problems on Habits pertaining to diet and house order, 20% on entertainment, 18% interfamilial relations, 16% on perceptions on marriage and family life, 15% on choice of school and friends, 15% commitment to traditions and 14% on relationships with relatives. Areas where least problems are experienced include political views and religious conduct/behavior.

Table 77. Matters of Conflict with Children

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Choice of friends	72,1	25,0	2,9
Spending and consumption habits	70,3	26,2	3,5
Clothing	75,7	21,2	3,1
Habits pertaining to diet and house order	78,4	18,9	2,7
Entertainment	79,9	17,8	2,3
Interfamilial relations	82,2	16,4	1,4
Choice of school and profession	84,9	12,9	2,3
Views on marriage and family life	83,9	14,5	1,6
Commitment to traditions	85,4	13,3	1,3
Relations with relatives	86,1	12,9	1,1
Religious views/practices	88,5	9,9	1,6
Political views	92,3	7,2	0,6

In Table 78, the results of problems “sometimes” and “often” encountered are given across Türkiye with different demographic breakdowns.

In almost every issue, the number of people who experience problems with their children is higher in urban areas. The greatest differentiations are on “spending and consumption habits”, “clothing”, “habits pertaining to diet and house order” and “entertainment”.

Compared to each other, among three major cities, the most problems were experienced in Ankara, the least was in Istanbul. A comparison between regions shows that Mideast Anatolia and West Anatolia experience the highest problems with children on almost every issue. The greatest differentiation between regions is on spending and consumption habits. The greatest problems experience on this issue is Mideast Anatolia (37%), the least problems are experienced in Northeast Anatolia (18%). The region where participants experience the most

problems with their children about intra-family relationships is West Anatolia with 25%, the least is East Black Sea with 7%. The percentage of those who have problems about entertainment choices is higher in Mideast Anatolia compared to other regions (28%). Clothing choices in West Anatolia and East Marmara is another important area of conflict.

The evaluations of men and women are similar in general. The only issue of high differentiation is spending and consumption habits. While women report problems with children on this issue by 27%, this percentage is 22% for men.

The greatest differentiation by age groups is on the issue of choosing friends. This percentage is higher with the 35-44 age group (36%) than other age groups. This age group similarly experiences problems on spending and consumption habits, dressing style, choice of entertainment and school and career choices.

As the educational level increases, the incidence of experiencing problems on spending and consumption habits, dressing style, home rules and eating habits and perceptions on marriage and family life also increases.

On almost all issues, the household type that experiences the least problems with children is extended families. The greatest differentiation by household type is on home rules and eating habits. This problem is prevalent in broken families by 30%.

The problems experienced most by socioeconomic status are choice of entertainment and home rules and eating habits. The percentage of people who have problems with their children/parents on choices of entertainment is 9% in the lower SES, 20% in the middle and 22% in the upper SES groups. Problems experienced about home rules and eating habits is 14% in lower SES, 21% in middle and 26% in upper SES groups (Table 78).

Table 78. Matters of Conflict with Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type and SES (Often & Sometimes)

	Spending and consumption habits	Choice of friends	Clothing	Habits pertaining to diet and house order	Entertainment
Türkiye	29,7	27,9	24,3	21,6	20,1
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	32,7	29,5	26,6	24,3	22,4
Rural	23,8	24,7	19,7	16,3	15,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	37,1	25,0	23,7	26,0	21,4
Ankara	39,1	37,8	35,7	31,1	31,9
Izmir	36,4	31,1	30,3	26,7	25,7
NUTS					
Istanbul	37,1	25,0	23,7	26,0	21,4
West Marmara	21,6	21,3	16,6	13,9	16,1
Aegean	28,1	29,9	22,7	21,3	20,3
East Marmara	36,3	32,8	31,2	23,9	20,8
West Anatolia	35,4	34,1	29,5	23,6	24,7
Mediterranean	24,8	25,5	24,7	20,2	18,9
Central Anatolia	25,8	26,8	29,2	22,7	18,9
West Black Sea	31,7	30,8	24,9	26,4	18,8
East Black Sea	19,7	25,6	18,4	11,8	20,2
Northeast Anatolia	17,5	29,0	28,2	16,9	20,2
Mideast Anatolia	37,3	35,0	25,1	24,6	27,8
Southeast Anatolia	21,1	19,4	14,5	15,6	10,4
GENDER					
Male	30,8	28,5	21,8	21,6	19,9
Female	28,5	27,2	27,0	21,6	20,3
AGE					
18-24	32,0	26,0	22,9	24,0	22,2
25-34	26,7	17,5	19,4	20,8	15,1
35-44	32,0	36,3	31,5	23,0	21,3
45-54	28,0	30,9	25,3	19,8	19,1
55-64	21,3	19,9	18,4	12,7	13,5
65+	21,0	13,1	13,8	13,8	15,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	21,7	23,5	22,2	16,5	12,9
Literate but no schooling	25,4	23,1	21,1	17,2	17,0
Primary school	26,5	27,5	23,2	18,4	17,7
Elementary education	29,9	29,5	24,4	21,2	20,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	35,8	30,3	26,2	26,4	25,8
Undergraduate and graduate studies	33,7	26,7	26,6	28,2	20,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	30,7	28,6	25,2	22,2	21,1
Extended	23,7	23,5	20,2	16,2	15,1
Broken	35,9	32,7	25,5	30,0	23,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower Group	21,3	20,5	16,2	13,8	9,2
Middle Group	29,7	28,5	24,7	21,3	20,4
Upper Group	32,7	26,9	24,7	26,4	21,9

Interfamily relations	Views on marriage and family life	Choice of school and profession	Commitment to traditions	Relations with relatives	Religious views/practices	Political views
17,8	16,1	15,1	14,6	13,9	11,5	7,7
RESIDENCE AREA						
18,8	17,1	15,9	16,1	15,3	11,3	7,7
15,8	14,1	13,7	11,8	11,3	11,8	7,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
19,4	16,3	12,6	13,8	14,5	8,7	5,6
31,1	23,8	25,3	24,5	25,9	14,3	12,5
21,4	19,0	19,6	18,0	19,2	9,3	10,8
NUTS						
19,4	16,3	12,6	13,8	14,5	8,7	5,6
10,8	11,4	13,5	8,2	10,4	7,3	5,7
16,3	14,7	15,4	14,1	12,6	9,4	7,1
16,1	17,0	14,0	14,4	11,8	12,2	8,1
24,9	21,9	20,7	21,6	20,9	14,8	11,3
16,6	13,5	14,7	13,1	13,7	12,4	7,9
15,8	18,3	19,3	13,0	15,4	12,3	11,3
23,3	16,9	14,6	14,4	13,2	12,6	8,8
7,4	11,3	11,3	10,1	7,5	9,4	6,8
12,6	13,8	18,8	13,7	13,4	11,9	10,3
22,2	16,2	18,4	24,4	18,0	21,7	8,1
16,6	17,0	11,1	10,6	10,2	8,2	4,6
GENDER						
18,2	15,4	14,8	15,1	14,5	11,2	7,9
17,3	16,9	15,5	14,1	13,4	11,7	7,5
AGE						
20,0	17,1	14,5	15,3	14,2	10,7	8,3
13,3	21,6	13,6	11,3	13,0	9,5	8,2
17,1	14,2	17,4	15,0	14,0	13,3	7,1
16,3	15,3	16,3	14,2	14,2	11,9	7,5
15,9	13,2	11,2	14,3	12,1	11,9	6,8
15,2	13,2	13,4	11,4	13,6	9,6	4,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
17,1	14,4	12,2	11,4	13,0	11,9	5,0
18,0	15,4	14,8	13,3	11,9	13,5	9,8
15,0	15,0	14,4	12,4	11,7	12,4	6,7
17,3	15,0	16,1	14,6	13,0	11,9	8,0
21,4	17,9	16,7	16,9	16,9	9,8	9,0
18,8	18,7	14,5	20,7	17,3	10,7	8,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
18,3	16,4	15,6	15,1	14,7	11,7	7,9
14,0	14,0	14,0	11,7	10,2	10,6	8,0
23,1	19,2	13,1	17,3	15,7	11,0	4,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
18,4	14,9	10,2	10,7	13,2	12,2	10,4
17,9	16,3	15,6	14,6	13,5	11,7	7,5
17,1	15,1	14,2	16,2	16,9	9,7	8,1

6.5. Punishments Imposed on Children

Participants with children between 3-17 years of age were asked the kind of punishments they gave their children in the last year. The results are tabulated between Table 79 and Table 80.

For fathers, the most common form of punishment to scold their children (73%). One third of fathers punish their children by "I banned him/her from watching TV" (32%), "I did not buy what s/he likes for a while" (29%), "I banned him/her from playing games" (28%). "I beat him/her up" (22%), "I

did not let him/her see his/her friends" (17%), "I did not talk to him/her for a while" (17%), "I did not give him/her pocket money" (14%) are among punishments given. The least common punishment is "Locked him/her in a room" (7%).

Table 79 tabulates the percentages of punishment fathers used "often", "sometimes" or "rarely" across Türkiye and by demographic breakdowns.

Evaluated by area of residence, almost all punishment types are used more frequently in urban areas. However, the situation changes when it comes

Table 79. Types of Punishments Imposed on Children by Fathers over the Last One Year throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities and NUTS (Often & Sometimes & Rarely)

	Reprimanded him/her	I banned him/her from watching TV	I did not buy what s/he likes for a while	I banned him/her from playing games
Türkiye	72,9	31,8	28,8	27,7
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	72,6	34,3	31,4	30,9
Rural	73,4	26,6	23,3	21,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	70,4	39,3	35,2	34,4
Ankara	65,3	37,8	37,6	36,2
Izmir	79,9	38,8	51,2	37,5
NUTS				
Istanbul	70,4	39,3	35,2	34,4
West Marmara	73,2	29,8	28,7	28,2
Aegean	74,8	30,2	32,6	28,9
East Marmara	78,4	34,9	28,0	30,2
West Anatolia	71,6	34,7	31,6	31,9
Mediterranean	74,6	30,4	28,2	24,6
Central Anatolia	76,3	26,2	24,2	19,7
West Black Sea	81,9	31,1	25,3	29,4
East Black Sea	56,2	24,6	15,7	22,1
Northeast Anatolia	65,8	24,2	22,9	20,4
Mideast Anatolia	77,3	44,8	33,0	30,3
Southeast Anatolia	67,5	17,1	16,8	15,1

to “beating”. While the percentage of fathers who punish by beating their children in urban areas is 20%, this percentage rises to 25% in rural areas. The most common punishments used in urban areas are no TV time, (34%), no play time (31%) and not buying them what they want for a time (31%).

Across three major cities, the greatest differentiation on punishments given by fathers are reprimanding, delaying to get children what they want, not talking for a while and withholding pocket money. The percentage of fathers who use all four types of punishment is higher in Izmir compared to the other two.

The greatest differentiation by regions is seen in scolding and no TV time. The percentage of fathers who reprimand their children the most is in west Black Sea with 82%, and those who scold their children the least are found in East Black Sea with 45%. The punishment of no TV time is used most frequently in Mideast Anatolia (44%) and least frequently in Southeast Anatolia (17%). The highest incidences of beating as punishment are found in the Mediterranean region by 31%. The lowest percentage is observed in East Black Sea Region with 14%.

Beat them up	I did not talk to him/her for a while	I did not let him/her see his/her friends	I did not give him/her pocket money	Locked them in a room
21,7	16,9	17,0	14,2	6,9
RESIDENCE AREA				
20,0	18,8	17,3	14,7	8,2
25,3	13,0	16,6	13,3	4,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
16,7	21,2	19,1	18,5	9,7
21,7	24,9	22,0	17,2	7,9
19,6	34,5	23,2	26,3	8,2
NUTS				
16,7	21,2	19,1	18,5	9,7
16,0	18,5	15,9	11,9	7,3
20,6	15,2	17,8	17,8	5,5
14,7	22,1	14,5	13,5	4,9
21,2	19,1	18,6	16,7	6,8
30,7	14,2	18,0	11,5	6,2
24,6	13,1	18,1	10,3	5,4
23,3	14,7	15,6	13,7	6,5
14,0	10,2	8,6	8,4	4,1
27,2	13,9	16,2	10,3	5,1
24,4	20,7	27,2	12,9	7,9
29,0	11,5	9,8	9,0	7,8

The highest differentiation by age group is seen in reprimanding, no play time and beating. Fathers from 18-24 age group use these three punishments less than other age groups. Those who scold their children is highest in the 25-34 age group with 77%. This percentage is 46% for fathers in the 18-24 age group. Beating children as punishment is higher among fathers 65 years of age or older (33%). This percentage is 15% in the 18-24 age group (Table 80).

Evaluated by educational level, the greatest differentiation is found in punishing the child by closing him in his room. While this punishment is rarely given in other educational levels by 3% and 8%, fathers with undergraduate / -graduate degrees use this punishment more often with 12%. As the educational level increases, the percentage of fathers who beat their children decreases.

Table 80. Types of Punishments Imposed By Fathers On Their Children Over The Last One Year by Age, Educational Status, Household Type and SES (Often & Sometimes & Rarely)

	Reprimanded him/her	I banned him/her from watching TV	I did not talk to him/her for a while	I banned him/her from playing games
AGE				
18-24	46,1	21,5	0,0	5,7
25-34	77,3	30,6	15,8	32,1
35-44	75,7	36,9	18,1	31,2
45-54	63,6	25,5	16,9	18,0
55-64	61,9	20,2	12,6	10,8
65+	74,7	21,8	16,9	22,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
Illiterate	75,2	26,0	18,6	19,6
Literate but no schooling	66,3	24,6	15,3	17,4
Primary school	71,1	26,6	13,8	24,7
Elementary education	75,8	36,8	17,8	32,5
Regular high schools and their equivalents	75,5	39,9	18,4	33,9
Undergraduate and graduate studies	74,4	39,6	28,8	29,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	73,5	32,6	17,4	28,6
Extended	68,7	25,7	14,0	21,7
Broken	73,2	33,7	10,8	18,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Lower Group	71,9	27,1	12,5	25,9
Middle Group	73,0	31,3	16,2	27,3
Upper Group	73,0	41,1	27,2	33,2

Evaluated by household type, almost all forms of punishment are used less by fathers from broken families. Punishments with the highest differentiation are seen in no TV time and denying them what they want for a time. Fathers from nuclear families use these two types of punishment more than others are found in nuclear families.

The greatest differentiation by socioeconomic groups is found in the percentage of fathers who

use beating as punishment. 38% of fathers from the lower SES group have used beating as a form of punishment in the last year. This percentage is 20% in the middle SES group and 16% in the upper SES group. Other punishments with higher differentiation levels are silent treatment, no TV time and denying children what they want for a time. In all these three punishments, the percentage of fathers who use these forms of punishment decreases as the socioeconomic level increases.

Beat them up	I did not buy what s/he likes for a while	I did not let him/her see his/her friends	I did not give him/her pocket money	Locked them in a room
AGE				
14,6	41,2	12,0	5,7	0,0
22,8	30,9	14,1	10,5	9,6
24,8	31,4	19,4	17,7	7,2
14,2	22,0	16,3	12,3	3,1
17,5	19,1	14,8	9,9	4,6
33,3	27,2	24,6	25,7	10,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
33,2	23,0	21,3	15,0	2,8
38,4	20,7	18,1	15,9	4,1
23,7	25,5	16,5	14,5	6,0
17,8	29,8	16,9	12,4	5,4
17,9	34,0	19,3	15,3	8,2
16,9	37,7	14,6	13,0	12,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
21,6	29,7	17,4	14,3	7,1
22,6	22,5	14,4	13,6	4,9
22,8	20,1	15,7	20,4	11,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
37,8	22,3	19,3	13,2	4,9
20,3	28,8	16,9	14,1	6,5
16,2	35,3	15,6	15,9	12,6

As among mothers, the most widely used punishment is reprimanding (81%). Similarly second comes no TV time (36%). The high incidence of beating for punishment (36%) among mothers is not to be neglected. Other punishments mothers use “I did not buy what s/he likes for a while” (33%), “I banned him/her from playing games” (33%), “I did not talk to him/her for a while” (26%) and “I did not let him/her see friends” (23%). “I did not give him/her pocket money” (17%) and “I locked them

in their room” (10%) are not among punishments mothers often use.

In Table 81 & 82, the percentages of punishments mothers use “often”, “sometimes” or “rarely” on their children are given across Türkiye and demographic breakdowns.

Other than beating as types of punishments, other types of punishments are used more by urban moth-

Table 81. Types of Punishments Imposed By Mothers On Their Children Over The Last One Year throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS (Often & Sometimes & Rarely)

	Reprimanded him/her	I banned him/her from watching TV	Beat him/her up	I banned him/her from playing games
Türkiye	81,1	35,8	35,7	32,9
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	81,3	38,4	33,8	35,6
Rural	80,9	30,4	39,6	27,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	80,6	43,2	27,5	39,0
Ankara	71,3	42,4	28,0	40,8
Izmir	79,0	43,7	28,2	39,0
NUTS				
Istanbul	80,6	43,2	27,5	39,0
West Marmara	80,4	33,0	24,0	30,9
Aegean	81,7	34,0	33,4	35,6
East Marmara	84,9	42,5	35,0	37,7
West Anatolia	79,5	39,6	33,1	38,2
Mediterranean	84,5	32,2	42,8	32,5
Central Anatolia	78,3	28,3	41,0	23,4
West Black Sea	84,9	31,9	35,7	30,3
East Black Sea	80,2	30,8	34,8	24,7
Northeast Anatolia	75,1	30,2	49,9	19,5
Mideast Anatolia	85,1	51,2	48,6	41,6
Southeast Anatolia	73,3	18,5	36,9	17,2

ers. As is true for fathers, the percentage of mothers who beat their children (39%) is higher in rural areas. The greatest differentiation between punishments used in urban and rural areas is in denying children what they want for a time. While the percentage of mothers who use this punishment is 36% in urban areas, it is 26% for rural areas.

Among three major cities, the percentage of mothers who give their children the silent treatment is less in Istanbul (30%). Those who scold their children seems to be less in Ankara (71%) compared to

the other two. The percentage of mothers who punish their children by denying them what they want for a time is higher in Izmir (53%).

Between regions, the percentage of mothers who use almost every punishment is less in Southeast Anatolia. The only differentiation is in beating. With 50%, the percentage of mothers who beat their children for punishment purposes is the highest in Northeast Anatolia and lowest in West Marmara with 24%.

I did not buy what s/he likes for a while	I did not talk to him/her for a while	I did not let him/her see his/her friends	I did not give him/her pocket money	Locked them in their room
32,8	25,9	23,3	17,1	10,4
RESIDENCE AREA				
36,4	29,0	25,3	18,8	11,4
25,5	19,8	19,5	13,6	8,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
42,8	30,2	29,4	24,0	15,2
43,9	36,1	29,6	19,1	14,8
52,8	41,7	37,1	24,0	14,3
NUTS				
42,8	30,2	29,4	24,0	15,2
25,3	28,9	17,4	14,9	8,6
35,5	26,1	24,1	18,9	10,1
36,4	34,7	24,4	20,4	11,4
36,7	30,7	24,8	18,2	10,9
33,3	24,5	24,5	13,5	5,8
22,2	17,9	17,8	12,4	7,7
32,3	21,9	22,6	15,0	9,8
24,8	19,1	13,1	14,8	12,5
24,5	22,3	15,9	14,3	7,5
36,2	28,1	37,5	17,3	11,6
14,7	13,0	10,2	8,0	8,3

When age groups are compared, the greatest differentiation is seen in reprimanding, beating and canceling play time. The percentages of mothers who use these three forms of punishment belong to the age group 25-34. Compared by educational level, the percentage of mothers who mostly use “no TV time”, giving the silent treatment and denying them what they want for a time increases as

the educational level increases. The percentage of women who beat their children as punishment is higher among lower educational levels.

Comparison by household type shows that mothers from extended families use every type of punishment lesser than mothers from other household types. However, the percentage of mothers who

Table 82. Types of Punishments Imposed by Mothers on Their Children over the Last One Year by Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Often & Sometimes & Rarely)

	Reprimanded him/her	I banned him/her from watching TV	Beat him/her up	I banned him/her from playing games
AGE				
18-24	75,3	24,7	39,2	30,2
25-34	86,6	41,6	45,9	41,3
35-44	80,7	35,3	30,8	29,9
45-54	68,8	23,3	17,9	17,4
55-64	61,2	16,7	18,3	8,9
65+	21,2	11,9	3,6	11,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
Illiterate	74,9	24,5	38,4	21,4
Literate but no schooling	76,8	27,3	34,2	27,9
Primary school	82,3	36,0	38,4	34,0
Elementary education	82,1	45,0	30,1	37,5
Regular high schools and their equivalents	84,3	42,7	29,3	39,2
Undergraduate and graduate studies	81,7	45,5	19,1	37,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	82,1	36,4	35,5	34,0
Extended	75,9	31,5	38,5	25,7
Broken	75,7	36,1	31,9	31,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Lower Group	84,7	32,9	49,8	31,0
Middle Group	80,7	35,9	34,9	33,0
Upper Group	79,3	39,5	20,6	34,5

beat their children as punishment is the highest (39%) in this group.

Evaluated by socioeconomic level, the percentage of women who beat their children as punishment differentiates. The results show that as socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of women who beat their children decreases. Half of the mothers in lower SES group (50%) state that they have beat their

children in the last year while this percentage decreases to 35% in the middle SES group and 21% in the upper group. As the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of women who use the silent treatment and denying children what they want for a time also rises. These two punishments also show the greatest differentiation among all socioeconomic groups (Table 82).

I did not buy what s/he likes for a while	I did not talk to him/her for a while	I did not let him/her see his/her friends	I did not give him/her pocket money	Locked them in their room
AGE				
28,0	22,3	14,9	9,4	13,7
38,2	27,0	25,1	18,8	14,5
31,6	26,8	24,6	17,9	7,6
22,2	21,0	17,3	12,1	4,6
11,8	18,9	13,2	9,7	7,3
8,3	11,9	8,3	11,9	3,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
20,4	17,6	20,3	12,7	7,8
27,0	22,4	22,9	13,4	6,0
32,1	23,9	24,6	18,1	10,1
39,9	33,7	26,3	17,6	12,5
44,6	36,1	21,4	16,9	14,5
46,6	44,5	17,4	21,2	12,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
33,5	26,2	23,9	17,4	10,9
27,9	22,8	19,6	13,8	8,2
32,1	29,1	24,4	22,8	5,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
26,8	18,8	22,1	15,1	9,1
32,6	25,8	23,9	17,2	10,2
44,3	38,5	20,0	19,1	14,0

The study inquired about the reasons parents beat their children (Table 83). The primary reason is “disrespecting elders” (36%). Parents also beat their children for “lying” (26%), “neglecting their studies (not doing homework etc.)” (25%), “violence

towards siblings, friends” (22%) Moreover, 13% of parents beat children for “personal hygiene, messy room etc.” and 5% “making friends with the wrong people”.

Table 83. Reasons for Beating Children

Disrespectful attitude towards elders	36,4
Lying	26,3
Being negligent towards his/her education (Does not study)	24,9
Being violent towards his/her siblings and friends	22,1
Not doing his/her own personal care/not tidying up his/her room)	13,0
Making friends with the wrong people	4,8
Committing a theft	3,0
Not assisting chores	2,5
Excessive spending habits	2,0
Smoking	2,0
Not performing his/her religious duties	1,2
Clothing	1,2
Failing to perform his/her duties	0,8
Drinking alcohol	0,4
Using drugs	0,3
Other	13,8

The first five reasons were analyzed across Türkiye with demographic breakdowns. Data is tabulated in Table 84.

There are two reasons that differ from the rest by area of residence. The percentage of parents who beat their children for reasons of “Not doing his/her own personal care/not tidying up his/her room.” is higher in rural areas (15%) and the percentage of those who do the same because of “disrespecting elders” is higher in rural areas (41%).

A comparison between three major cities shows

that 35% of parents in Ankara beat their children for lying and 31% for neglecting their studies. In relation to other cities, the primary reason for beating a child is violence towards siblings and friends in Istanbul.

The differentiation between regions is seen in the reasons of neglecting studies and violence towards siblings and friends. The percentage of parents who beat their children for neglecting their studies is the highest with 42% in Mideast Anatolia and beatings because of violence towards siblings and friends is highest in Southeast Anatolia (33%).

Table 84. Reasons for Beating Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS (Top 5 Reasons)

	Disrespectful attitude towards elders	Lying	Being negligent towards his/her education (Does not study)	Violence towards siblings, friends	Not doing his/her own personal care/ not tidying up his/her room
Türkiye	36,4	26,3	24,9	22,1	13,0
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	33,7	26,1	25,5	21,9	14,6
Rural	40,8	26,8	24,0	22,6	10,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	31,3	27,5	25,6	22,7	17,0
Ankara	30,3	33,3	31,6	17,8	11,3
Izmir	32,5	17,7	15,4	18,0	21,4
NUTS					
Istanbul	31,3	27,5	25,6	22,7	17,0
West Marmara	33,8	24,3	28,9	10,5	9,0
Aegean	45,3	25,3	15,1	18,9	12,4
East Marmara	34,8	16,4	17,8	21,0	13,6
West Anatolia	29,6	29,2	28,3	21,5	12,0
Mediterranean	40,6	30,1	27,2	20,3	13,4
Central Anatolia	43,8	30,3	30,2	17,2	11,6
West Black Sea	39,6	27,7	22,8	17,5	12,1
East Black Sea	30,6	20,6	14,1	17,8	15,2
Northeast Anatolia	30,7	25,7	21,9	31,8	24,3
Mideast Anatolia	35,2	16,4	42,1	28,8	8,5
Southeast Anatolia	31,2	31,5	24,7	32,6	8,6

Analyzed by gender, there are differences between reasons for beating children. While fathers punish children for lying and neglecting their studies, this percentage is lower among mothers. Mothers however, punish children more for violence towards siblings and friends (Table 85).

As age increases, the percentage of parents who beat their children for lying rises. While lying to elders and violence towards siblings and friends are common reasons for all age groups, this percentage is less in the over 65 age group.

Compared by educational level, while lying is seen as a similar reason for beating a child across all educational levels, this percentage is lower for parents with Undergraduate and graduate studies (17%). The most common reason for this group is disrespecting elders.

Household type shows the greatest differentiation on violence towards siblings and friends. The percentage of parents who beat their children for this reason is lower in broken families.

Based on the evaluation by socioeconomic group, the greatest differentiation is on neglecting studies and lying. For either one of these reasons, the percentage of parents who beat their children decreases when socioeconomic level increases. Beating children for neglecting their studies is 29% in the lower SES group, 25% in the middle group and 18% in the upper SES group. While the percentage of parents who beat their children or lying is 32% for the lower SES group, this percentage falls to 26% in the middle SES group and to 22% in the upper SES group.

Table 85. Reasons for Beating Children by Gender, Age Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Top 5 Reasons)

	Disrespectful attitude towards elders	Lying	Being negligent towards his/her education (does not study)	Violence towards siblings, friends	Not doing his/her own personal care/ not tidying up his/her room
GENDER					
Male	35,6	32,9	28,9	18,7	11,0
Female	36,8	22,4	22,5	24,2	14,3
AGE					
18-24	49,5	14,3	7,7	21,6	8,9
25-34	38,3	25,9	19,5	23,4	12,6
35-44	34,2	26,4	30,9	23,0	13,6
45-54	33,2	28,9	28,6	14,8	14,9
55-64	35,8	34,8	30,2	11,6	12,6
65+	15,9	64,4	37,8	2,8	0,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	37,3	23,5	25,5	26,3	10,9
Literate but no schooling	36,4	27,2	25,1	19,1	7,1
Primary school	36,8	27,4	25,0	22,3	13,8
Elementary education	38,0	26,6	22,7	21,3	12,5
Regular high schools and their equivalents	29,5	26,2	27,4	19,4	13,7
Undergraduate and graduate studies	42,6	17,1	20,5	22,1	13,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	36,7	25,7	24,7	22,1	13,7
Extended	33,8	30,2	26,0	23,7	9,0
Broken	37,0	30,0	28,7	13,5	10,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower group	38,5	31,7	28,2	26,2	9,2
Middle group	35,8	25,4	24,6	21,0	14,1
Upper group	36,8	22,3	18,2	24,9	11,4



Chapter 7

**PERCEPTIONS ON FAMILY
AND COMMUNITY LIFE**

Attitudes towards Living out of Wedlock and Having Children out of Wedlock

Approaches to Women's Working in a Paid Job

Individuals' Perceptions on the Happiness of Their Families

Perceptions on the Future of Family Relationships

The Effects of the EU Membership on the Family Structure

*Source of Religious Knowledge and the
Determinant Effects of Religion on Everyday Life*

In this section, results on value judgments about family, opinions on living together without matrimony, having children out of wedlock, women working outside of the house, happiness perceptions about their families, the future of family relationships, the effects of the EU membership on the family structure and issues where religion is a determining factor are analyzed.

7.1. Attitudes towards Living out of Wedlock and Having Children out of Wedlock

In the study, two questions to clarify thoughts on living together without matrimony and having children out of wedlock were asked. The first question in this context was if participants were bothered by having people who are not married (civil or religious) around where they as a family live. 66% of the participants reported being bothered by people living

together, 20% reported they are not (Table 86). It can be deduced from these percentages that the majority of people in Turkey have negative attitudes towards people who live together without matrimony. The percentage of people who are not comfortable with this is higher in rural areas (71%) than in urban areas. In Northeast Anatolia (79%), Southeast Anatolia (77%) and Mideast Anatolia (75%) the percentages are similarly higher. Although the percentages do not differ much in three major cities, Izmir is the one with the lowest percentage (52%).

Women and men have similar attitudes towards this issue. When compared by age groups, those who report that they are not disturbed are younger individuals. Among the 18-24 age group, 24% of individuals stated they would not be bothered by this. This percentage is around 15-16% among participants over age 55 (Table 87).

Table 86. Attitudes towards Living Out of Wedlock throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes I would be disturbed	No I would not be disturbed	I do not care	No idea
Türkiye	65,8	19,9	12,5	1,9
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	62,8	21,1	14,4	1,8
Rural	71	17,8	9,1	2,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	58,3	21,8	17,7	2,3
Ankara	59,1	24,1	15,1	1,7
Izmir	51,8	27,3	19,6	1,3
NUTS				
Istanbul	58,3	21,8	17,7	2,3
West Marmara	69,3	21,9	7,6	1,2
Aegean	61,4	22,2	15,3	1,1
East Marmara	67,4	20,2	11,6	0,8
West Anatolia	68,1	20,3	10,2	1,5
Mediterranean	61,3	23,1	13,2	2,4
Central Anatolia	69,1	17,9	10,5	2,4
West Black Sea	65,5	18,2	14,1	2,2
East Black Sea	68,1	18,0	12,5	1,4
Northeast Anatolia	78,7	14,3	5,4	1,6
Mideast Anatolia	74,8	17,6	6,4	1,2
Southeast Anatolia	76,6	11,7	7,9	3,9

Similarly, as educational status rises, the percentage of people who report that they are not uncomfortable with the situation rises. While this percentage is 16% among literates with no schooling and primary school graduates, it rises to 34% among participants with undergraduate/graduate degrees.

Compared to married and widowed individuals, single or divorced participants have a more positive attitude towards living together without matrimony. For instance, while the percentage of divorced individuals who say they are not bothered by the issue is 31%,

this percentage is 16% among married participants. Among participants coming from broken households, this issue is less bothersome (55%) than among people from extended families (70%).

When findings are evaluated by socioeconomic level, those who are bothered by such a situation are mostly found among lower (69%) and middle SES groups (68%). Those who are not uncomfortable with the issue are 16% in the lower SES group, 18% in the middle and 35% in the upper SES group.

Table 87. Attitudes towards Living out of Wedlock by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes I would be disturbed	No I would not be disturbed	I do not care	No idea
GENDER				
Male	65,5	21,0	12,1	1,4
Female	66,1	18,8	12,8	2,3
AGE				
18-24	59	23,9	15,0	2,1
25-34	63,9	21,3	13,3	1,4
35-44	66,6	19,9	11,4	2,0
45-54	69,3	18,3	11,0	1,4
55-64	71,2	15,6	11,4	1,8
65+	70,4	15,1	11,1	3,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
Illiterate	71,2	14,6	9,8	4,4
Literate with no schooling	71,6	16,1	10,4	1,8
Primary school	71,1	16,4	10,9	1,5
Elementary education	63,7	20,7	13,8	1,8
Regular high schools and their equivalents	57,1	25,6	15,7	1,6
Undergraduate and graduate studies	48,4	33,9	16,6	1,0
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	56,0	25,3	16,8	2,0
Married	68,6	18,5	11,2	1,7
Divorced	48,5	30,5	19,9	1,1
Widowed	67,8	16,1	12,0	4,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	65,7	20,0	12,4	1,8
Extended	70,1	17,5	10,6	1,7
Broken	55,2	24,5	17,4	2,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Lower group	69,2	16,0	10,9	3,8
Middle group	67,8	18,4	12,0	1,8
Upper group	46,9	35,0	17,5	0,7

Individuals were also asked if they would be bothered to have individuals with kids born out of wedlock (Tables 88 & 89). 69% reported being uncomfortable and 17% reported they are not bothered by the issue. The percentage of individuals who think it is acceptable to have children out of wedlock is higher in cities (19%) and Istanbul and Mediterranean regions (21%). Those who are not bothered by having people around them that had children out of wedlock increase in numbers in younger age groups and as the educational level rises. While those who do not feel uncomfortable by this issue is 20% in the age group 18-24 and 30% among those with

undergraduate/graduate degrees, it falls to 13% in the over 65 age group and to 11% among illiterates.

Among divorced (27%) and single (22%) people, the percentage of participants who state that they are not uncomfortable with the issue is higher compared to married and widowed participants. This percentage is higher in people from broken households (22%). In the upper SES, the percentage of people who are bothered by this issue is less (52%). This percentage is 72% for the lower SES group and 71% in the middle SES.

Table 88. Attitudes towards Having Children out of Wedlock throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes I would be disturbed	No I would not be disturbed	I do not care	No idea
Türkiye	69,2	17,3	11,5	2,0
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	66,1	18,6	13,3	2,0
Rural	74,5	15	8,4	2,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	59,2	20,7	17,3	2,8
Ankara	61,6	22,1	14,6	1,6
Izmir	59,3	23,4	15,8	1,5
NUTS				
Istanbul	59,2	20,7	17,3	2,8
West Marmara	71,7	19,3	7,6	1,3
Aegean	67,1	18,1	13,6	1,3
East Marmara	72,4	16,2	10,3	1,1
West Anatolia	70,2	18,5	9,8	1,5
Mediterranean	65,5	20,5	11,6	2,5
Central Anatolia	71,9	16,4	9,7	2,0
West Black Sea	69,1	16,2	12,2	2,5
East Black Sea	70,4	16,7	11,8	1,1
Northeast Anatolia	82,5	11,1	4,8	1,6
Mideast Anatolia	82,1	10,2	6,5	1,1
Southeast Anatolia	78,6	9,8	7,6	4,0

Table 89. Attitudes towards Having Children out of Wedlock by Gender Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes I would be disturbed	No I would not be disturbed	I do not care	No idea
GENDER				
Male	68,6	18,6	11,2	1,6
Female	69,7	16,0	11,9	2,5
AGE				
18-24	63,2	20,4	14,3	2,1
25-34	68,1	17,9	12,3	1,7
35-44	70,1	17,7	10,4	1,9
45-54	71,2	16,2	10,8	1,8
55-64	73,7	14,5	9,9	2,0
65+	73,3	13	9,9	3,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
Illiterate	73,4	12,5	9,6	4,5
Literate with no schooling	73,9	14,4	9,8	2,0
Primary school	73,9	14,3	9,8	1,9
Elementary education	67,1	17,7	13,8	1,5
Regular high schools and their equivalents	61,9	21,9	14,5	1,7
Undergraduate and graduate studies	54,2	30,2	14,6	1,0
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	59,9	22,0	16,2	1,9
Married	71,9	16,1	10,2	1,9
Divorced	52,2	26,5	18,5	2,8
Widowed	70,5	14,1	10,6	4,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	69,1	17,5	11,6	1,9
Extended	73,5	14,6	9,7	2,2
Broken	59,3	21,9	15,9	2,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Lower group	72,1	13,9	10,1	3,9
Middle Group	71,0	15,8	11,2	1,9
Upper group	52,2	31,5	15,4	0,9

7.2. Approaches to Women's Working in a Paid Job

To understand the attitudes towards women in the workforce, household members were asked if they thought it is appropriate for women to have a paid job. The results show that 84% of the participants think it is appropriate for women to have a job, while 16% think it is not. These responses reflect the fact that a large majority of participants have positive attitudes towards women in the workforce (Table 90).

The percentage of those who think it is appropriate for women to have a paid job is a little higher compared to rural areas (85% and 81% respectively). Compared by region, the percentage of those who think it is appropriate is the highest in West Marmara (94%) and lowest in Southeast Anatolia (63%). Results show that the highest percentage of people who think it is appropriate is in Izmir with 91% and lowest in Istanbul with 84%.

Table 90. Approaches to Women's Working in Paid Jobs throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Appropriate	Inappropriate
Türkiye	83,6	16,4
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	84,9	15,1
Rural	81,4	18,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	84,1	15,9
Ankara	89,1	10,9
Izmir	90,7	9,3
NUTS		
Istanbul	84,1	15,9
West Marmara	94,2	5,8
Aegean	87,9	12,1
East Marmara	87,8	12,2
West Anatolia	84,5	15,5
Mediterranean	84,3	15,7
Central Anatolia	81,7	18,3
West Black Sea	88,2	11,8
East Black Sea	87,4	12,6
Northeast Anatolia	75,7	24,3
Mideast Anatolia	78,1	21,9
Southeast Anatolia	62,8	37,2

The percentage of participants who think it is appropriate for women to have a paid job differentiates by gender, educational level, marital status and household type (Table 91). While 77% of men think it is appropriate, this percentage rises to 90% in women. Compared to advanced age groups, those

who think it is suitable for women to have a paid job is a little higher among younger age groups.

This percentage increases as educational level increases. While this percentage is 75% among illiterates, it is 94% among university graduates.

Divorced (93%) and single individuals (87%) are more in favor of women's working in a paid job. In broken and nuclear families, those who approve of working women is higher compared to extended families.

As the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of

participants in favor of working women increases. While those who think it is appropriate for women to have a paid job are 73% in the lower SES group, this percentage rises to 84% in the middle SES group. Almost all participants from the upper SES group are in favor of working women (94%).

Table 91. Approaches to Women's Working in Paid Jobs by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Appropriate	Inappropriate
GENDER		
Male	77,0	23,0
Female	90,0	10,0
AGE		
18-24	85,7	14,3
25-34	83	17,0
35-44	82,9	17,1
45-54	84,8	15,2
55-64	82,8	17,2
65+	82	18
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
Illiterate	75,0	25,0
Literate with no schooling	79,3	20,7
Primary school	82,2	17,8
Elementary education	82,9	17,1
Regular high schools and their equivalents	88,9	11,1
Undergraduate and graduate studies	94,0	6,0
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	87,2	12,8
Married	82,4	17,6
Divorced	92,7	7,3
Widowed	85,3	14,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	84,1	15,9
Extended	79,4	20,6
Broken	89,9	10,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Lower group	73,4	26,6
Middle group	83,6	16,4
Upper group	94,3	5,7

Those who think it is inappropriate for women to work were asked the reason for this attitude (Table 92 & 93). The primary reason for this attitude is the value judgment that “A woman’s primary duties are household management and childbearing” (62%). The percentage of those who agree with this statement is higher in participants from rural areas, Istanbul, East Black Sea and Mideast Anatolia and in Istanbul among three major cities. Agreement with the statement is also high among participants from advanced age groups and lower educational levels.

The statements “Work environments are not safe for women” with 14% and “Against our traditions and customs” with 13% come right after the first statement. The percentage of those who think the workplace is not a safe environment for women is a little higher in urban areas compared to rural areas. More-

over, agreement with those statements is higher among men, younger age groups, those with a higher educational level, single and divorced individuals.

The percentage of those who think it is not appropriate for women to work because it does not fit with traditions and customs is higher in Southeast Anatolia and Northeast Anatolia. It is worth to note that the attitudes towards this issue is similar among participants over the age of 65 (18%) and the 18-24 age group (16%). As the educational level and the socioeconomic status decreases, the percentage of those who think it is not appropriate women to work because of this reason increases. While the percentage of those who agree with this statement is 7% among undergraduates and graduates, it rises to 18% among illiterates. Similarly, while 4% of the upper SES mentions this as a reason, this percentage

Table 92. Reasons for Disapproval of Women’s Working throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	A woman’s primary duty is to look after the children and do housework	Work environments are not safe for women	Against our traditions and customs	Working women’s kids are aggrieved	A paid work wears the woman out	Other
Turkey	61,9	14,3	12,6	7,3	2,2	1,7
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	58,5	16,1	12,4	8,7	2,1	2,1
Rural	66,7	11,7	12,9	5,3	2,3	1,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	59,2	16,1	12,9	8,5	1,6	1,7
Ankara	53,9	19,2	11,8	11,3	1,2	2,6
Izmir	39,1	23,3	16,5	14,6	5,9	0,6
NUTS						
Istanbul	59,2	16,1	12,9	8,5	1,6	1,7
West Marmara	48,1	14,6	6,9	18,4	10,2	1,8
Aegean	61,6	17,2	9,8	8	2,2	1,2
East Marmara	43,7	23,5	13,4	12,7	5,1	1,5
West Anatolia	59,3	17,9	13,0	6,9	1,0	2,0
Mediterranean	65,1	12	10,5	8	3,1	1,3
Central Anatolia	69,5	19,2	4,5	4,2	1,3	1,2
West Black Sea	58,6	18,6	11,9	5,4	2,9	2,6
East Black Sea	79,1	6,2	5,4	3,1	3,1	3,1
Northeast Anatolia	65,4	8,8	18,3	3,1	1,5	2,8
Mideast Anatolia	69,1	13,7	6,8	7,3	0,4	2,7
Southeast Anatolia	63,2	7,3	21	5,8	1,5	1,1

rises to 20% in the lower SES group. The percentage of those who cite this as a reason is higher among participants from extended families (18%).

The reason "Working women's kids are aggrieved" is cited less across Turkey (7%). However, the percentage of those that do not approve of women to have a paid job rises to 21% in the upper SES group, and to 24% among undergraduates/graduates.

Table 93. Reasons for Disapproval of Women's Working by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	A woman's primary duty is to look after the children and do housework	Work environments are not safe for women	Against our traditions and customs	Working women's kids are aggrieved	A paid work wears the woman out	Other
GENDER						
Male	60,7	16,5	12	7,0	2,0	1,8
Female	64,7	9,5	14,1	7,8	2,5	1,4
AGE						
18-24	54,1	19,9	15,9	6,9	2,2	1
25-34	60,9	16,2	10,6	7,9	2,5	1,9
35-44	62,7	13,8	10,9	8,9	2	1,9
45-54	66,1	11,1	12,2	6,4	2,7	1,5
55-64	66,0	11,9	13,4	5,4	0,9	2,3
65+	64,5	9,1	17,5	5,6	2,1	1,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
Illiterate	65,8	10,4	17,9	3,4	1,8	0,7
Literate with no schooling	65,3	11	13,6	6,1	3,2	0,9
Primary school	63,6	13,6	12,1	7	2	1,8
Elementary education	56,4	18,4	11,2	9,7	1,5	2,9
Regular high schools and their equivalents	57,6	19,8	9,8	8,3	2,8	1,7
Undergraduate and graduate studies	42,9	18,6	6,8	23,8	4,3	3,6
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	55,5	19,5	13,3	7,9	2,4	1,5
Married	63,0	13,5	12,3	7,3	2,2	1,8
Divorced	72,1	15,9	4,9	4,2	,0	2,9
Widowed	61,8	11,0	18,3	6,0	1,9	1,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	62,8	14,9	10,6	8,0	2,0	1,7
Extended	60,2	13,3	18,2	4,8	2,3	1,2
Broken	58,6	12,2	12,3	9,8	3,6	3,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Lower group	60,5	12,4	19,5	4,0	3,0	0,5
Middle group	62,5	14,9	11,5	7,4	2,0	1,8
Upper group	56,8	11,7	3,7	21,0	2,2	4,7

7.3. Individuals' Perceptions on the Happiness of their Families

To measure the perception on the happiness of their family, participants were asked how they saw their family in general. While 78% of individuals define their families as happy or very happy, 22% said their families were unhappy or very unhappy (Table 94).

The happiness perceptions of individuals do not show any important differentiation by residence area. The percentages of those who define their families as "very happy" are similar (12% and 13% respectively). Likewise, the percentage of those who

see their families as "happy" is the same with 65%. Again, the percentage of individuals who declare their families are "unhappy" is the same in urban and rural areas (2%).

Among three major cities, the percentage of people who see their families as "happy" or "very happy" is the highest in Istanbul (81%).

In Mideast Anatolia and Northeast Anatolia, the percentage of participants who perceive their families as "very happy" (22% and 20% respectively) is higher than other regions.

Table 94. Individuals' Perceptions on the Happiness of their Family throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Very happy	Happy	Moderate	Unhappy	Very unhappy
Türkiye	12,6	65,1	20,1	1,8	0,4
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	13,0	64,9	19,9	1,8	0,3
Rural	11,9	65,4	20,5	1,8	0,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	13,2	68,2	17,1	1,1	0,5
Ankara	8,3	64,5	24,7	2,3	0,2
Izmir	13,8	59,8	23,9	2,2	0,3
NUTS					
Istanbul	13,2	68,2	17,1	1,1	0,5
West Marmara	13,2	65,0	19,7	1,7	0,4
Aegean	13,8	65,5	18,4	2,0	0,4
East Marmara	12,9	63,1	22,4	1,3	0,3
West Anatolia	11,0	65,7	21,3	1,9	0,2
Mediterranean	7,9	64,6	24,7	2,5	0,4
Central Anatolia	8,7	69,6	20,0	1,2	0,5
West Black Sea	11,8	62,3	23,1	2,1	0,7
East Black Sea	14,9	61,7	21,9	1,0	0,4
Northeast Anatolia	20,3	63,5	13,5	2,5	0,2
Mideast Anatolia	22,4	60,0	15,9	1,6	0,2
Southeast Anatolia	12,3	64,2	20,0	3,1	0,3

The perceptions of happiness do not differentiate by gender and age. Although there is no significant differentiation on the happiness perceptions of the family by educational status, as the level increases, the percentage of those who define their families as happy and very happy increases slightly. While 10% of participants from the lowest educational level think their families are happy, this percentage rises to 15% in the highest educational level (Table 95).

Among single and married participants, the percentage of those who report their families as happy is higher than divorced or widowed participants.

Analyzed by household type, the percentage of individuals from nuclear and extended families who think their families are happy or very happy is higher than those from broken households.

As socioeconomic level increases, the percentage of people who perceive their families as generally happy or very happy increases. 9% of the individuals from the lower SES group report their families as very happy while 61% see the family as happy. In the upper SES group, these percentages increase to 17% and 68% respectively.

Table 95. Individuals' Perceptions on the Happiness of their Family by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Very happy	Happy	Moderate	Unhappy	Very unhappy
GENDER					
Male	12,3	65,2	20,3	1,8	0,3
Female	12,9	64,9	19,9	1,9	0,4
AGE					
18-24	14,5	64,2	19,0	1,8	0,5
25-34	13,5	64,8	20,0	1,5	0,2
35-44	12,2	64,9	20,7	1,8	0,4
45-54	11,6	66,1	20,1	1,7	0,4
55-64	11,8	65,4	20,2	2,3	0,3
65+	9,6	65,8	21,5	2,5	0,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	9,8	63,6	22,0	3,7	0,9
Literate with no schooling	11,1	64,0	22,6	1,8	0,5
Primary school	12,0	65,9	20,2	1,6	0,3
Elementary education	12,6	64,7	21,1	1,3	0,3
Regular high schools and their equivalents	15,1	63,5	19,0	1,9	0,4
Undergraduate and graduate studies	14,7	66,9	17,1	0,9	0,3
MARITAL STATUS					
Single	11,5	61,6	24,1	2,3	0,5
Married	13,3	66,4	18,5	1,5	0,3
Divorced	4,8	50,9	34,1	8,4	1,8
Widowed	7,2	59,7	27,7	4,1	1,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	13,0	66,1	19,1	1,5	0,3
Extended	12,8	64,4	20,3	2,1	0,4
Broken	6,9	55,1	31,4	4,8	1,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower group	8,6	61,4	24,7	4,4	1,0
Middle group	12,5	65,1	20,4	1,6	0,3
Upper group	17,0	67,9	13,9	0,9	0,2

7.4. Perceptions on the Future of Family Relationships

Participants were asked which direction their family relationships are headed. More than half of the participants stated that they believed family relationships are headed for the worse (56%) and 23% think it is headed for the better (Tablo 96).

Although in both urban and rural areas the percentage of those who think it is headed for the worse is higher than those who think it is changing for the better, the percentage of participants in urban areas who think it is headed for the worse is higher than in

rural areas (urban 61%, rural 46%).

Among three major cities, the highest percentage of those who think family relationships are headed for the worse is the highest in Izmir with 73%. This percentage falls to 67% in Ankara and 62% in Istanbul. While the percentage of those who think that it is going to be worse is high, in Southeast Anatolia the percentage of people who think it is headed for the better was found to be high (41%). When compared to other regions, the percentage of those who think family relationships are headed for the worse was found to be a little lower in West Black Sea, East Black Sea and Northeast Anatolia.

Table 96. The Future of Family Relationships throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Going for the better	Going for the worse	Remaining the same	No idea
Türkiye	22,9	55,5	12,2	9,5
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	19,1	60,6	12,1	8,3
Rural	29,5	46,6	12,4	11,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	15,2	61,8	14,0	8,9
Ankara	10,6	66,6	13	9,8
Izmir	11,1	72,8	9,9	6,2
NUTS				
Istanbul	15,2	61,8	14	8,9
West Marmara	23,2	58,7	9,4	8,7
Aegean	19,1	62,6	11,5	6,9
East Marmara	21,5	60,8	12,9	4,8
West Anatolia	16	63,6	11	9,4
Mediterranean	23,2	54,8	12,3	9,6
Central Anatolia	21,3	53,9	12,8	12
West Black Sea	26,7	48,7	11,9	12,7
East Black Sea	30	47,4	10,3	12,4
Northeast Anatolia	40,2	40,6	8,1	11,2
Mideast Anatolia	27,2	50,8	8,6	13,4
Southeast Anatolia	41,1	31,1	16,1	11,8

Although the percentage of both women and men who think family relationships are headed for the worse is higher than those who think it is going better, the percentage of men who think family relationships are taking a negative turn is higher (60%) than women (51%) (Table 97).

With the exception of the over 65 age group, more than half of the participants from other age groups believe that family relationships are going for the worse. This percentage is highest among 25-34 age group with 59% and lowest in the over 65 age group with 45%.

The percentage of those who think family relationships are taking a negative turn is higher among people with a high educational level. While this percentage is 34% among those with the lowest educational level, it rises to 77% among people from the highest educational levels.

On the subject of family relationships taking a turn for the worse, divorced individuals present a higher percentage (68%) compared to other groups. Among the

group of broken households, this percentage is higher than other groups (61%). The most positive evaluation about this issue came from extended families (44%).

As the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of those who think family relationships are headed for the worse rises. While 39% of participants from the lower SES group state agreement with this idea, this percentage rises to 56% in the middle SES group and to 72% in the upper SES group.

Table 97. The Future of Family Relationships by Gender, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Going for the better	Going for the worse	Remaining the same	No idea
GENDER				
Male	20,5	59,8	12,9	6,8
Female	25,1	51,3	11,5	12,1
AGE				
18-24	22,6	52,4	14,7	10,3
25-34	20,7	58,5	12,6	8,2
35-44	22,3	58,4	10,9	8,4
45-54	23,5	55,9	12,4	8,2
55-64	25,1	54,8	10,6	9,6
65+	28,0	45,2	10,5	16,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
Illiterate	32,2	34,3	11,8	21,7
Literate with no schooling	34,4	41,7	11,7	12,3
Primary school	26,0	52,0	13,0	9,0
Elementary education	18,2	60,9	13,6	7,3
Regular high schools and their equivalents	14,7	67,9	11,6	5,8
Undergraduate and graduate studies	10,4	76,6	8,6	4,4
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	20,7	57,3	14,0	8,0
Married	23,5	55,3	11,9	9,3
Divorced	13,4	67,8	10,2	8,6
Widowed	24,7	46,9	10,1	18,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	20,9	58,3	12,1	8,7
Extended	31,8	43,9	13,1	11,2
Broken	17,5	60,5	10,3	11,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Lower group	31,3	39,2	11,6	17,8
Middle group	23,0	55,6	12,6	8,8
Upper group	12,9	71,7	9,6	5,8

7.5. The Effects of the EU Membership on the Family Structure

To understand attitudes towards the future of family relationships, participants were asked their thoughts on how the EU membership will affect family relationships (Tablo 98). The results show that participants were mostly undecided or thought it would not affect relationships. While 28% of the respondents chose not to further an opinion, 20% think it would have no effect. On the other hand, the percentage of those who think the EU membership is going to affect family relationships for the better is 23% while those who think the opposite is 29%.

When those who think family relationships will be positively affected by the EU membership are analyzed, Southeast Anatolia, Northeast Anatolia and Mideast Anatolia come forth. There is no differentiation among those who think this will have a negative effect; however, this percentage is a little higher in Mideast Anatolia than other regions (35%).

One third of individuals from rural areas (35%) and one fourth of participants from urban areas (24%) reported they had no idea on the subject. In both residence areas the percentage of those who think the membership will have a negative effect is a little higher.

Table 98. The Effects of Turkish EU Membership on Family Structure throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Positively	No impact	Negatively	No idea
Türkiye	23,3	19,6	29,0	28,1
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	24,0	21,5	30,0	24,4
Rural	22,1	16,2	27,1	34,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	21,6	24,2	27,5	26,8
Ankara	17,1	23	32,2	27,7
Izmir	23,5	25,6	32,6	18,4
NUTS				
Istanbul	21,5	22,9	27,3	28,3
West Marmara	22,1	19,6	27,5	30,7
Aegean	20	23	32,1	24,9
East Marmara	21,4	25,9	32,2	20,5
West Anatolia	17,2	19,6	32,3	31
Mediterranean	21,7	17,6	30,5	30,1
Central Anatolia	20,5	18	29	32,4
West Black Sea	21,3	18,4	25,9	34,5
East Black Sea	17,4	19	30,2	33,4
Northeast Anatolia	32,2	13,3	27,6	26,8
Mideast Anatolia	29,4	10,2	34,8	25,6
Southeast Anatolia	47,4	12,7	15,6	24,4

The majority of women reported no opinion on the subject (37%). Among men however, the percentage of those who think it will affect relationships negatively is higher (34%). In advanced age groups, the percentage of those with no opinion increases. Among those who declare an opinion, the percentage of those who think it will affect relationships positively is higher in younger age groups (Table 99).

Analyzed on educational status, the percentage of those who do not have an opinion on the effects of EU membership increases as the educational level decreases. It is worth to note that the percentage of individuals from higher educational levels who declare an

expectation of negative influence is higher.

There is no differentiation among those who report a favorable attitude to the effect of EU membership by socioeconomic level. However, the percentage of those who present a negative attitude or those who think it will have no effect increases as the socioeconomic level increases. While 19% of the individuals coming from lower SES group declare that EU membership will affect family relationships negatively, this percentage increases to 34% in the upper SES group. Almost half of the individuals from the lower SES group (47%) report no opinion on the issue.

Table 99. The Effects of Turkish EU Membership on Family Structure by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Positively	No impact	Negatively	No idea
GENDER				
Male	25,3	22,3	33,8	18,5
Female	21,4	16,9	24,3	37,4
AGE				
18-24	28,4	21,9	28,1	21,6
25-34	24,3	21,7	29	25
35-44	22,3	20,3	31,2	26,1
45-54	22,7	19,1	29,5	28,7
55-64	21,4	16,1	28,9	33,6
65+	15,9	11,7	24,4	47,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
Illiterate	18,8	9,3	15	56,9
Literate with no schooling	23,3	12,7	25,0	39,0
Primary school	22,7	18,2	27,6	31,4
Elementary education	24,8	20,6	34,2	20,3
Regular high schools and their equivalents	26,2	25,2	35,1	13,5
Undergraduate and graduate studies	24,0	31,1	37,1	7,8
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	26,9	24,3	30,8	18,0
Married	23,1	18,9	29,1	29,0
Divorced	17,3	24,9	30,8	27,1
Widowed	14,5	10,6	20,3	54,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	23,4	20,1	30,6	25,8
Extended	24,4	18,4	22,4	34,8
Broken	19,8	17,9	31,1	31,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Lower group	23,8	10,0	19,2	47,0
Middle group	22,9	19,9	29,6	27,6
Upper group	25,9	27,6	34,4	12,2

Table 100. Sources of Religious Knowledge throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area , Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Family/relatives	Religious officials (imam, mufti etc.)	School	Religious books	Quran courses
Türkiye	58,0	15,7	10,3	6,6	6,4
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	60,3	11,9	11,2	7,4	5,9
Rural	54,0	22,4	8,8	5,3	7,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	61,6	10,4	12,2	6,2	6,9
Ankara	64,0	5,4	13,3	7,1	2,6
Izmir	65,3	6,5	10,3	10,9	2,9
NUTS					
Istanbul	61,6	10,4	12,2	6,2	6,9
West Marmara	60,0	11,3	12,4	6,3	6,2
Aegean	51,7	20,0	12,1	8,1	5,6
East Marmara	51,2	18,8	7,9	9,0	8,0
West Anatolia	56,3	13,1	11,3	6,1	8,3
Mediterranean	55,5	17,9	11,0	7,3	5,5
Central Anatolia	54,2	18,6	11,8	4,6	7,6
West Black Sea	51,3	23,8	10,2	4,6	7,8
East Black Sea	41,0	31,1	6,3	5,8	14,4
Northeast Anatolia	71,5	12,9	5,9	5,3	2,9
Mideast Anatolia	70,3	7,3	8,4	8,7	2,8
Southeast Anatolia	80,5	6,5	6,3	4,7	0,6

7.6. Source of Religious Knowledge and the Determinant Effects of Religion on Everyday Life

Individuals were asked about where they mostly get their religious information and how operative religion is in their everyday life. In Table 100, the results on sources of religious information are tabulated. Religious education is primarily gained in the family (58%), secondly from religious officials (16%) and thirdly from school (10%).

In Tables 100 & 101, the results of resources of religious information are tabulated by some social and demographic breakdowns. When analyzed by residence area, those resources are family and relatives (60%), school (11%) and religious books (7%)

in urban areas, in rural areas on the other hand, those resources are mostly religious officials (22%).

As is true for the whole of Turkey, the main resource people get their religious information is family and relatives in three major cities. However, religious texts in Izmir (11%) and religious officials (10%) and Quran study courses (7%) in Istanbul are higher compared to other major cities.

Although there is no differentiation based on regions, it was found that the percentage of people who get their information from religious officials (31%) and from Quran study courses (14%) is higher in East Black Sea region, while the main sources are family and relatives in the Southeast Anatolia region (81%).

Radio and TV	Friends	I do not have religious knowledge	Newspapers	Other
1,3	1,1	0,3	0,0	0,2
RESIDENCE AREA				
1,4	1,2	0,4	0,1	0,3
0,9	1,0	0,2	0,0	0,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
0,9	0,9	0,6	0,0	0,4
5,4	1,1	0,6	0,1	0,5
1,8	1,2	0,5	0,0	0,5
NUTS				
0,9	0,9	0,6	0,0	0,4
1,1	1,5	0,5	0,2	0,5
0,8	1,0	0,4	0,0	0,2
2,6	2,0	0,1	0,1	0,2
3,5	0,7	0,3	0,1	0,3
0,7	1,3	0,3	0,0	0,4
1,3	1,4	0,5	0,1	0,0
0,6	1,5	0,2	0,0	0,0
0,5	0,5	0,2	0,0	0,2
0,9	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,1
1,5	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
0,4	0,8	0,1	0,1	0,1

Examined by gender, results show the percentages of women learning religion mostly through family and relatives (63%), and men mostly through religious officials (18%), is higher. Between age groups, the percentage of individuals from younger groups who get their learning through the school and the percentage of learning through religious officials and family and relatives at more advanced ages are higher (Table 101).

On the other hand, as the educational level increases, the importance of family as a religious resource loses its effect while the influence of learning through the school increases. The impact of religious officials in extended families and family and

relatives in broken families is higher compared to other household types.

Across all socioeconomic groups, individuals predominantly learn religion through family and relatives. While individuals from the lower SES group report learning through family and relatives by 70%, this percentage drops to 57% in the middle SES group and to 52% in the upper SES group. The percentage of individuals who get their information through religious officials is higher in lower (17%) and middle (16%) SES groups compared to the upper SES group (8%). One of the more prevalent sources for the upper SES group is schools (21%).

Table 101. Sources of Religious Knowledge by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Family/ relatives	Religious officials (imam, mufti etc.)	School	Religious books	Quran courses
GENDER					
Male	52,9	18,0	13,5	7,2	5,4
Female	62,9	13,5	7,3	6,1	7,3
AGE					
18-24	57,5	11,5	15,1	6,3	7,3
25-34	54,7	14,0	13,5	6,9	7,6
35-44	57,0	16,9	8,9	7,0	6,8
45-54	60,3	16,2	8,1	7,2	5,6
55-64	60,5	18,9	6,5	6,2	4,6
65+	64,4	22,1	2,8	5,0	3,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	76,0	16,0	1,1	0,6	3,0
Literate with no schooling	66,2	18,0	2,5	5,1	5,8
Primary school	57,3	20,0	6,1	5,7	8,2
Elementary education	53,7	14,0	13,3	8,2	7,9
Regular high schools and their equivalents	53,1	9,8	20,5	9,0	5,0
Undergraduate and graduate studies	47,9	7,0	23,7	13,4	3,2
MARITAL STATUS					
Single	56,6	10,6	16,6	7,5	5,8
Married	57,4	17,2	9,1	6,6	6,8
Divorced	64,7	9,0	13,3	6,0	3,5
Widowed	70,3	15,8	2,6	3,9	4,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	57,8	15,0	10,8	7,2	6,2
Extended	57,0	20,0	8,6	4,2	7,6
Broken	62,1	11,5	10,2	7,7	4,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower group	70,2	17,5	3,6	2,3	4,1
Middle group	57,1	16,5	9,8	6,7	6,9
Upper group	51,9	8,2	20,7	10,5	4,9

Radio and TV	Friends	I do not have religious knowledge	Newspapers	Other
GENDER				
1,1	1,1	0,4	0,0	0,3
1,4	1,1	0,2	0,0	0,2
AGE				
0,7	1,0	0,3	0,0	0,3
1,3	1,3	0,3	0,1	0,3
1,4	1,3	0,5	0,1	0,1
1,4	0,7	0,3	0,0	0,2
1,6	1,3	0,2	0,0	0,1
1,2	0,8	0,3	0,0	0,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
1,2	1,3	0,6	0,1	0,2
1,6	0,8	0,0	0,1	0,0
1,2	1,1	0,3	0,0	0,1
1,3	1,0	0,3	0,0	0,3
1,1	1,1	0,2	0,1	0,3
1,7	1,3	0,8	0,0	0,9
MARITAL STATUS				
1,2	1,1	0,3	0,0	0,3
1,3	1,1	0,3	0,1	0,2
1,6	1,1	0,8	0,0	0,0
1,3	1,3	0,5	0,0	0,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
1,3	1,1	0,3	0,1	0,3
1,0	1,1	0,3	0,0	0,1
1,5	1,4	0,5	0,0	0,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
0,8	1,0	0,3	0,0	0,1
1,3	1,1	0,3	0,0	0,2
1,1	1,3	0,6	0,1	0,7

During the study, individuals were asked how determining religious belief is in choosing a spouse, friends, dressing style, food and drink, career, voting behavior and neighbor relationships. In Table 102, results on the centrality of religion on everyday life are tabulated. Individuals report religious beliefs as the most decisive issue in their choice of spouse

(81%). This percentage is followed by the choice of food and drink by 72%. The third area where religion is a determinant factor is choice of style of dressing. Half of the individuals indicated that religious beliefs are not a determining factor in their choice of careers (54%), voting (53%) and neighbor relationships (50%).

Table 102. The Extent to Which Religious Beliefs Determine Daily Life

	Very determining	Determining	Not determining	Does not want to answer
Choice of spouse	40,4	40,8	17,1	1,7
Choosing friends	20,3	37,8	40,4	1,5
Choice of clothing / in dressing	19,9	40,0	38,7	1,5
Voting for political election	13,5	29,8	53,2	3,4
In relation with neighbors	14,3	33,6	50,3	1,8
In food and beverage preferences	28,9	42,7	26,4	1,9
Choice of profession	13,3	28,7	54,1	3,9

In almost all of the issues studied, the results show that religion is more dominant in the lives of individuals from rural areas. For the majority of individuals, religion is a determining factor in the choice of a spouse (87%). As is true across Turkey, religion plays a major role in the choice of food and drink (79%) and choice of dressing style (72%).

It was found that religion is more dominant in the everyday lives of individuals from the eastern part of Turkey. The percentages of the dominance of religion fall between the western and eastern parts of Turkey only on the issues of choice of spouse and food and drink.

Table 103. Determining Effect of Religion on Daily Life throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Choice of spouse	In food and beverage preferences	Choice of clothing / in dressing	Choice of friends	In relation with neighbors	Voting for political election	Choice of profession
Türkiye	81,2	71,6	59,8	58,1	47,9	43,3	42,0
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	77,7	67,5	53,1	51,5	41,0	38,6	36,3
Rural	87,3	78,8	71,5	69,5	60,0	51,5	51,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	71,7	60,6	43,1	38,5	30,0	30,5	23,0
Ankara	71,3	53,9	41,6	44,3	30,1	31,5	27,6
Izmir	63,1	63,6	37,8	32,1	23,2	25,9	25,4
NUTS							
Istanbul	71,7	60,6	43,1	38,5	30,0	30,5	23,0
West Marmara	77,6	69,4	51,0	54,3	45,5	36,5	38,8
Aegean	77,1	67,9	55,1	51,0	40,5	34,9	39,3
East Marmara	87,7	76,1	64,2	66,6	53,9	49,2	41,3
West Anatolia	81,7	69,0	58,1	58,4	45,3	41,1	43,3
Mediterranean	76,6	68,3	54,7	50,3	39,1	41,2	39,7
Central Anatolia	86,2	77,5	71,4	72,2	63,0	53,2	52,4
West Black Sea	85,2	82,4	67,8	65,0	58,1	50,6	51,2
East Black Sea	85,9	84,4	67,4	67,0	57,0	42,7	50,4
Northeast Anatolia	86,7	79,4	75,4	76,1	71,3	64,1	65,4
Mideast Anatolia	91,2	80,8	73,4	69,1	55,6	56,2	47,2
Southeast Anatolia	93,0	78,4	82,2	83,7	74,7	61,3	61,4

Those who report that religion is a determining factor in their everyday life are higher among women than men; this is true for every instance. As age progresses religion becomes more dominant in the lives of individuals. For instance, while the percentage of individuals who report religion as a determining factor in their choice of friends is 55% among the 18-24 age group, this percentage is 65% for the 55-64 age group. Similarly, the determinacy of religion increases as the educational level decreases (Table 104).

Among widowed and married individuals, the percentage of those who think religion is a determining factor in their lives, is higher than single and

divorced individuals. This is also true for individuals from extended families.

When analyzed, the results show that religion is a determining factor in all areas of life for individuals who belong to the lower socioeconomic group. Although there is major differentiation on all issues by socioeconomic status, the greatest difference is in the choice of food and drink. For 79% of individuals from the lower SES group and for 73% of the middle SES group, religion is a determining factor on their choice of food and drink; however, this percentage falls to 57% in the upper SES group.

Tablo 104. Determining Power of Religion on Daily Life by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Choice of spouse	In food and beverage preferences	Choice of clothing / in dressing	Choice of friends	In relation with neighbors	Voting for political election	Choice of profession
GENDER							
Male	77,9	69,2	55,2	55,3	45,4	40,4	38,8
Female	84,4	74,0	64,3	60,8	50,4	46,2	45,2
AGE							
18-24	80,4	70,0	54,8	55,0	44,0	38,0	41,4
25-34	80,2	71,5	56,7	54,2	44,7	40,5	39,3
35-44	80,8	72,0	60,7	57,4	47,9	42,7	41,7
45-54	79,4	68,8	58,9	58,1	47,1	44,0	41,2
55-64	83,7	73,4	66,1	64,5	53,4	49,4	44,6
65+	87,4	77,2	72,0	70,4	60,6	55,6	50,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
Illiterate	91,4	81,3	82,0	78,7	69,9	63,6	56,9
Literate with no schooling	89,0	77,3	72,9	71,9	61,5	55,8	53,1
Primary school	85,2	74,5	65,8	63,8	52,7	46,9	44,7
Elementary education	77,6	71,2	52,6	52,8	42,3	38,8	39,1
Regular high schools and their equivalents	73,7	64,9	44,4	44,2	34,5	30,1	32,8
Undergraduate and graduate studies	62,5	55,7	33,8	29,0	21,5	24,5	24,8
MARITAL STATUS							
Single	77,7	66,2	48,3	49,4	38,8	33,7	38,0
Married	81,9	72,9	62,2	59,7	49,7	45,3	42,7
Divorced	70,8	61,7	49,8	48,1	40,6	33,7	37,5
Widowed	87,4	77,5	72,6	70,4	59,2	54,1	48,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	79,9	70,4	57,6	55,4	45,4	41,4	39,6
Extended	87,4	77,4	69,9	69,7	59,2	52,1	52,0
Broken	76,4	67,7	54,2	52,6	41,4	37,6	37,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower group	90,1	78,7	78,8	76,7	67,7	60,6	56,7
Middle group	82,5	72,7	60,7	59,2	48,4	43,4	42,3
Upper group	62,7	56,6	33,7	30,3	24,1	25,0	25,0



Chapter 8

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

Visiting Relatives, Friends and Acquaintances

Giving Presents to Family Members and Acquaintances

Reading Books

Reading newspapers

Going to the Cinema

Going to the Theatre

*Going to Places such as Local, Club,
Fraternity, Association*

Going to Places such as Bars, Night Clubs etc

Going to Coffeehouses

Going on Holiday

Smoking

Alcohol Consumption

Watching TV and Daily Time Spent to Watch TV

In this section, the study looked at whether household members participated in different social and cultural activities together. Within this scope, results on the habits of social visits of household members, gift giving, book and newspaper readership, TV viewing, going to the movies or theatre, attendance to lodges, clubs, NGO activities, bars, night clubs and coffee houses were considered.

8.1. Visiting Relatives, Friends and Acquaintances

The frequency of visiting relatives is an important indicator of traditional values and family ties in Turkey. Participants were asked whether they visited relatives and friends on religious holidays, wedding ceremonies, those who recently bought a house, those who recently had a baby, if they saw off those going on compulsory military service, patients, if they saw off/welcome people from the Hajj, if they made visits to offer condolences, visited graves or attended funerals. Visits during religious holidays to wish each other a

happy holiday is very high with 98%. The percentage of participants attending weddings and wedding ceremonies “sometimes”, “Usually” or “Absolutely” are summed up the result is 97%. This percentage is 90% for visits for seeing a newly purchased home, visiting the parents of a new baby 91%, another 91% in seeing off or welcoming those from the military service, 92% for patient visits and 90% for those who see off or welcome people from pilgrimage.

These percentages are 97% and 93% respectively for visits to offer condolences and grave visits. It was found that visits between families generally had a high percentage. Visits for religious holidays, considered to be the most important visit reason, have the highest percentage followed by attending weddings, patient visits, visiting those going on to military service, new baby visits, hajj and new house visits. When analyzed by frequency, looking at “Absolutely” and “Usually” answers, it can be deduced that three fourths of participants think these visits are important (Table 105).

Table 105. Visiting Relatives, Friends and Acquaintances throughout Türkiye

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Absolutely
In religious holidays to exchange greetings	1,8	5,3	21,1	71,8
To ceremonies & celebrations such as wedding & circumcision	3,0	12,1	31,7	53,2
To see the newly purchased house of your acquaintance	9,9	19,6	29,4	41,1
To see the newly born baby of your acquaintance	9,2	16,2	30,7	43,8
Farewell & greet an acquaintance who is leaving to do/coming back from military service	9,1	17,6	31,0	42,3
Visiting patients	2,3	11,4	31,6	54,8
When an acquaintance returns from pilgrimage	9,8	15,3	28,9	46,0
To give condolences	3,1	9,5	30,0	57,4
Visiting the graves	7,2	20,6	29,1	43,1
Funeral ceremony	14,2	14,1	25,3	46,4

The percentages are given in Table 106 across Turkey by demographic breakdowns. By residence area, the percentage of those who “To bid farewell & to greet an acquaintance who is leaving to do/coming back from doing his military service”, “When an acquaintance returns from pilgrimage” and “visiting graves” are higher in rural areas. Compared by three major cities, the percentage of those who go to see off or welcome people from pilgrimage and people who make grave visits is higher in Istanbul than the other two. The percentage of those who make patient visits and visits to offer condolences is lower in Ankara.

The greatest differentiation by regions is seen in attending funerals, seeing military conscripts off, cemetery visits and child/new baby visits. The percentage of those who definitely or generally attend funerals is higher in East Black Sea region (83%). This percentage falls to 60% in Mideast Anatolia. Visits to see military conscripts off are higher (84%) in Mideast Anatolia and lower (66%) in the Mediterranean region. Cemetery visits are highest in East Black Sea by 85%; visits for a new child/baby are highest in Mid Anatolia by 80%. Differentiation by gender is present in three areas. The percentage for attending funerals is higher among men by 83% and visits for new home and new child/baby are higher among women.

Analyzed by age group, the greatest differentiation is in attending weddings. The percentage of those

who attend wedding/marriage ceremony is higher in the 45-54 age group by 91% and lower in the over 65 age group by 66%. Among the 18-24 age group, the percentages are lower for visits for a new home, new child/baby and attending funerals.

The greatest differentiation by educational level is seen in the percentage of those seeing off outgoing pilgrims and welcoming them back. While 81% of primary school graduates make those visits, this percentage falls to 62% among university graduates and those with graduate degrees. Among those with undergraduate/graduate degrees, they visit people less for the occasion of sending off military conscripts, and illiterate people visit people less for wedding and marriage ceremonies.

In all areas, the percentage of people who visit others is lower among participants from broken households compared to others. By socioeconomic status, the greatest differentiation is seen in new baby visits and attending wedding/marriage ceremonies. In both cases, as the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of people who “Absolutely” or “Usually” make those visits increase. While 64% of the participants from the lower socioeconomic level make new baby visits, this percentage rises to 75% in the middle and 79% in the upper SES groups. The percentage of those who attend wedding/marriage ceremonies is 75% in the lower SES group, while this number rises to 86% in the middle SES and to 89% in the upper SES group (Table 106).

Table 106. Visiting Relatives, Friends and Acquaintances throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Absolutely & Usually)

	In religious holidays to exchange greetings	To give condolences	Visiting patients	Ceremonies & celebrations such as weddings and circumcision	When an acquaintance returns from pilgrimage
Türkiye	92,9	87,4	86,4	84,9	74,9
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	93,0	86,8	85,9	85,2	72,5
Rural	92,6	88,4	87,2	84,4	79,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	92,6	88,6	86,7	85,7	71,3
Ankara	90,8	77,9	79,0	84,5	62,2
Izmir	92,1	91,3	88,3	84,2	66,2
NUTS					
Istanbul	92,6	88,6	86,7	85,7	71,3
West Marmara	91,5	90,1	89,9	86,7	76,8
Aegean	93,6	90,0	88,4	85,6	73,9
East Marmara	94,7	90,0	89,7	88,6	81,8
West Anatolia	92,3	84,2	84,1	85,4	71,8
Mediterranean	91,4	84,3	81,5	79,3	68,4
Central Anatolia	93,5	88,9	88,9	90,1	81,1
West Black Sea	91,2	85,8	84,9	85,4	75,3
East Black Sea	93,8	89,5	88,7	80,4	80,1
Northeast Anatolia	88,8	81,9	82,5	80,1	75,8
Mideast Anatolia	93,6	86,0	87,4	83,0	78,2
Southeast Anatolia	95,5	87,1	85,9	86,6	79,9
GENDER					
Male	93,5	88,7	86,7	85,1	74,3
Female	92,3	86,2	86,1	84,7	75,4
AGE					
18-24	92,3	73,9	75,5	81,8	57,3
25-34	93,6	87,4	86,5	86,0	72,3
35-44	95,5	92,4	90,7	88,5	80,4
45-54	95,6	94,2	92,8	91,3	83,7
55-64	93,6	93,3	91,6	86,5	85,7
65+	79,9	83,3	79,5	65,8	76,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	86,7	85,0	82,3	75,0	78,5
Literate with no schooling	90,5	85,7	84,0	80,9	78,0
Primary school	94,4	91,0	89,5	87,3	81,1
Elementary education	93,8	85,8	84,8	87,7	71,8
Regular high schools and their equivalents	93,6	82,9	82,6	84,2	64,8
Graduate and undergraduate studies	92,1	85,5	87,3	86,6	62,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	94,1	88,6	87,5	86,6	75,6
Extended	92,4	86,9	86,1	84,5	78,0
Broken	83,7	79,2	77,3	71,4	61,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower group	87,5	83,0	81,1	75,4	74,3
Middle group	93,5	87,9	86,7	85,6	76,2
Upper group	94,0	88,2	89,3	89,4	65,7

To see the newly born baby of your acquaintance	Farewell & greet an acquaintance who is leaving to do/coming back from military service	Visiting the graves	Funeral ceremony	To see the newly purchased house of your acquaintance
74,5	73,2	72,2	71,7	70,5
RESIDENCE AREA				
75,2	71,4	70,2	70,5	71,2
73,4	76,5	75,9	73,8	69,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
75,7	69,3	70,2	74,9	68,7
73,2	66,1	64,0	66,2	69,7
79,6	70,6	72,4	68,0	71,7
NUTS				
75,7	69,3	70,2	74,9	68,7
78,8	79,4	78,4	81,3	70,8
76,3	76,6	72,3	66,5	71,2
78,9	78,7	71,7	75,7	77,6
76,2	73,2	68,5	68,0	72,3
69,7	66,4	69,0	71,2	65,1
80,3	84,2	71,6	64,8	79,1
76,6	76,0	72,9	79,6	72,2
75,1	69,6	84,8	83,3	66,5
71,0	70,3	75,3	65,4	68,2
64,8	70,8	72,5	59,8	64,7
67,8	71,6	75,2	70,4	70,7
GENDER				
66,9	78,6	76,8	82,9	65,6
82,0	68,0	67,8	60,7	75,3
AGE				
60,6	65,5	62,4	56,0	55,8
76,0	72,6	69,3	69,8	70,0
80,9	76,4	75,3	77,4	76,8
83,0	80,3	78,9	79,8	80,8
79,0	79,4	80,3	79,8	77,4
62,2	63,7	72,2	70,6	59,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
71,0	66,9	70,9	64,8	66,2
71,1	70,0	72,6	69,2	68,7
78,2	77,9	75,6	75,9	75,0
72,9	73,9	71,1	70,9	69,4
69,5	70,8	68,5	68,5	64,0
75,8	64,0	66,0	68,5	70,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
76,4	73,9	72,1	73,0	72,2
73,7	76,2	74,6	71,3	70,2
61,0	60,2	67,5	61,5	56,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
64,2	66,2	71,8	67,3	61,9
75,4	75,0	72,3	72,1	71,5
79,0	67,6	71,8	73,3	72,3

8.2. Giving Presents to Family Members and Acquaintances

Participants were asked if they gave gifts to family members and relatives in certain situations. The percentage of those who “Usually” or “Absolutely” give gifts to family members and others are 50%.

This percentage was found to be 41% for birthdays and 18% for the New Year. This percentage rises significantly (65%) in gift giving for newlyweds and for a new house. Gift giving for sending off conscripts is 59%, for a new baby is 70% and 75% for patient visits (Table 107).

Table 107. Giving Presents to Family Members and Acquaintances throughout Türkiye

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Absolutely
Religious feasts	24,7	25,6	23,6	26,2
Birthdays	37,5	22,0	20,6	19,9
On new year's eve	68,2	13,7	9,2	8,9
To an acquaintance who gets married & buys a house	14,6	20,3	31,2	33,9
To an acquaintance who goes into army to do his military service	19,4	21,6	29,3	29,7
When going to see a baby	13,3	16,6	31,4	38,6
When visiting a patient	8,7	16,0	30,9	44,3

In Tables 108 & 109, the percentages of those who usually or definitely give gifts to family members and relatives are tabulated across Turkey by demographic breakdowns.

When the study looked at differentiations on the basis of the area of residence, the greatest difference between urban and rural areas was found in birthdays and New Year. While the percentage of people who give gifts to family members on their birthdays is 48% in urban areas, this percentage falls to 28% in rural areas. The percentage of gift giving on the New Year is 22% in urban and 12% in rural areas.

When three major cities were compared by newlyweds and new home owners, military conscripts and patient visits, the percentage of gift giving is higher in Izmir than the other two cities. The percentage of giving gifts for religious holidays are higher while gift giving for birthdays and New Year is lower in Istanbul. Compared by region, gift giving for religious holidays, birthdays, New Year and patient visits are higher in percentage than other regions.

The percentages of gift giving are lower in Mideast Anatolia for religious holidays and New Year while the percentages are lower in Southeast Anatolia for birthdays and patient visits.

The percentage of those who give gifts on religious holidays (53%) and for military conscripts (62%) are higher among men than women. On the other hand, it is more common among women to give gifts for newlyweds/new home owners (69%) and new baby (76%) (Table 109).

Analyzed by age group, as the age of the group increases, the percentage of people who give gifts on birthdays decreases. The percentage of people giving gifts for newlyweds/new home owners, for military conscripts, new baby or patient visits are the highest among the 45-54 age group and lowest among the 18-24 age group. As the educational level rises, the percentage of gift giving for birthdays, New Year and buying a house/getting married also rises.

Table 108. Giving Presents to Family Members and Acquaintances throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Absolutely & Usually)

	Visiting patients	Newly born baby	To see newly purchased house of the acquaintances	Farewell & greet an acquaintance who is leaving to do/coming back from military service	Religious feasts	Birthdays	On New Year' eve
Türkiye	75,3	70,0	65,1	59,0	49,7	40,5	18,1
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	76,2	72,1	67,3	59,1	52,1	47,9	21,6
Rural	73,6	66,4	61,3	58,9	45,6	27,7	11,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	76,0	74,5	66,4	57,2	62,6	49,1	23,7
Ankara	68,6	68,0	64,4	53,0	51,4	59,1	33,9
Izmir	85,7	79,5	76,7	66,2	49,1	64,4	38,2
NUTS							
Istanbul	76,0	74,5	66,4	57,2	62,6	49,1	23,7
West Marmara	85,8	77,9	74,3	70,5	64,0	53,2	32,7
Aegean	84,1	76,4	71,2	68,7	52,9	46,2	21,0
East Marmara	80,6	75,8	73,6	67,1	51,0	44,9	15,7
West Anatolia	74,3	71,5	67,7	62,0	51,0	47,3	21,2
Mediterranean	64,5	61,1	56,5	44,5	40,5	37,8	16,7
Central Anatolia	81,4	76,3	72,9	75,4	39,6	32,1	9,6
West Black Sea	71,6	67,1	61,1	55,1	41,8	37,8	19,1
East Black Sea	73,7	69,2	58,8	45,2	52,8	33,7	16,2
Northeast Anatolia	68,5	63,0	57,0	55,2	39,1	31,3	13,3
Mideast Anatolia	78,2	64,3	64,0	61,5	34,1	29,3	7,1
Southeast Anatolia	64,6	55,0	52,0	49,0	46,1	17,4	7,9

Compared by marital status, in almost all occasions, the percentage of gift giving is lower among singles and higher among married people. However, this situation changes for birthdays, and almost half of the singles and divorced individuals buy gifts for family and friends.

By household type, in almost all occasions, gift giving is higher in nuclear families. Among broken families, the percentage of participants who get gifts for military conscripts is lower and gift giving

for birthdays, New Year and new baby is lower.

In every situation in the study, the percentage of participants buying gifts for family members and relatives rise as the socioeconomic level rises. The greatest differentiation by socioeconomic level is found in birthdays. While 71% of individuals from the upper SES group definitely and generally give family members and to Relatives gifts on birthdays, this percentage falls to 15% in the lower SES group.

Table 109. Giving Presents to Family Members and Relatives by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES (Absolutely & Usually)

	Visiting patients	Newly born baby	To see newly purchased house of the acquaintances	Farewell & greet an acquaintance who is leaving to do/coming back from military service	Religious feasts	Birthdays	On New Year' eve
GENDER							
Male	74,3	64,3	61,5	61,5	52,9	39,1	17,1
Female	76,2	75,7	68,6	56,6	46,6	42,0	19,0
AGE							
18-24	61,5	54,1	47,8	42,9	36,7	46,3	19,8
25-34	76,5	72,9	67,4	57,4	50,1	44,8	19,5
35-44	80,4	76,4	71,4	64,3	54,8	40,3	17,2
45-54	81,5	77,8	73,5	69,5	55,0	39,9	18,7
55-64	80,0	73,7	70,4	68,1	54,7	34,2	17,0
65+	69,9	59,3	56,0	54,3	47,0	25,1	12,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
Illiterate	65,1	60,6	54,2	50,1	38,7	16,3	7,7
Literate with no schooling	68,5	62,6	57,2	55,9	45,4	24,5	8,7
Primary school	78,5	73,3	67,8	63,5	52,1	34,7	13,6
Elementary education	75,3	69,6	65,6	59,3	51,1	45,3	20,3
Regular high schools and their equivalents	74,0	68,2	63,3	56,5	49,3	57,6	27,7
Graduate and undergraduate studies	79,0	75,6	74,5	54,6	54,1	70,3	37,2
MARITAL STATUS							
Single	60,2	50,1	46,1	41,8	37,0	48,1	22,4
Married	80,0	76,2	71,1	64,3	53,6	39,3	17,1
Divorced	69,3	62,7	55,9	50,7	49,5	49,4	29,2
Widowed	66,1	59,9	53,5	50,6	41,9	27,3	13,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	77,1	72,8	67,5	60,5	51,5	43,3	19,4
Extended	72,4	65,6	61,0	59,3	46,2	30,5	12,3
Broken	66,4	58,3	55,2	46,1	43,9	41,9	21,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower group	60,2	53,2	47,7	45,3	37,4	15,3	6,7
Middle group	76,4	71,1	66,0	60,7	50,4	39,9	16,5
Upper group	82,4	79,4	76,6	61,0	57,5	71,1	41,5

8.3. Reading Books

During the study, participants were asked if they read a book in the past year. The percentages are given in Table 110. The percentage of those who did not read a book in the past year is approximately 54%; the percentage of those who read frequently is 15%. The percentage of participants who read a book in the last year is higher (52%) in urban areas than rural areas (36%).

The percentage of participants who have read a book in the past year is similar among three major cities. Among regions, the highest concentration of people who read a book in the past year is highest in Istanbul (21%), West Anatolia (17%) the Aegean (14%) and Northeast Anatolia (14%); the lowest percentages are in Southeast Anatolia (9%), Mideast Anatolia (11%) and West Black Sea (11%).

Analyzed by gender, the percentage of men who read a book in the past year is a little higher. A close

relationship was observed between age and educational level and book readership. Although in the 18-24 age group frequent readership is 24%, this steadily falls with age and decreases to 12% and below among age groups over age 45 (Table 111).

As the educational level rises, so does readership. By marital status, the percentage of book readership in the past year is higher among singles (70%) and divorced individuals (55%). Singles report frequent reading by 30%. In extended families on the other hand, the percentage of people who have read a book in the past year is lower.

It was observed that as the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of those who have read a book in the past year also rises. While 3% of participants in the lower SES group report that they read frequently in the past year, this percentage rises to 13% in the middle and to 35% in the upper SES groups.

Table 110. Reading Books throughout Türkiye, By Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
Türkiye	14,5	31,6	53,9
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	17,5	34,3	48,2
Rural	9,3	27,0	63,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	20,5	33,8	45,7
Ankara	22	35,1	42,9
Izmir	18,4	38,1	43,5
NUTS			
Istanbul	20,5	33,8	45,7
West Marmara	12,7	31,8	55,5
Aegean	14,3	35,4	50,3
East Marmara	14,1	32,7	53,2
West Anatolia	17,1	32,9	50,0
Mediterranean	12,6	31,8	55,6
Central Anatolia	10,9	30,8	58,2
West Black Sea	11,2	28,9	59,9
East Black Sea	14,2	29,9	56,0
Northeast Anatolia	14,4	28,4	57,2
Mideast Anatolia	13,5	31,0	55,5
Southeast Anatolia	9,3	21,9	68,8

Table 111. Reading Books By Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
GENDER			
Male	14,6	35,1	50,3
Female	14,4	28,2	57,4
AGE			
18-24	24,2	40,8	35,0
25-34	15,1	37,4	47,4
35-44	12,5	31,8	55,7
45-54	11,6	27,5	60,8
55-64	11,0	21,7	67,4
65+	7,6	13,5	78,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
Illiterate	0,0	0,0	100
Literate with no schooling	6,2	18,4	75,3
Primary school	8,1	32,1	59,8
Elementary education	13,7	39,9	46,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	27,3	44,0	28,7
Graduate and undergraduate studies	45,4	41,9	12,7
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	28,7	41,2	30,1
Married	11,1	30,3	58,6
Divorced	22,3	32,7	45,0
Widowed	8,0	13,5	78,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	15,0	33,3	51,8
Extended	10,4	27,0	62,6
Broken	20,9	28,9	50,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Lower group	3,0	14,0	83,0
Middle group	13,4	32,8	53,8
Upper group	34,7	40,7	24,5

8. 4. Reading newspapers

In the study participants were asked if they read newspaper in the past year. The percentages are given in Table 112. Looked as a whole, it was observed that 38% of participants read frequently while 31% read rarely. The percentage of participants who read frequently is higher in urban areas (46%) than in rural areas (25%).

Among three major cities, Ankara has a higher per-

centage of people who have not read a newspaper in the past year (21%). The percentage of those who read frequently is higher in Istanbul (58%) and in Izmir (55%).

Between regions, the highest frequency of readership was in Istanbul (58%), West Marmara (48%) and the Aegean (43%); the lowest percentages were found in Southeast Anatolia (16%), Northeast Anatolia (22%), Central Anatolia (22%) and Mid-east Anatolia (24%).

Table 112. Newspaper Readership throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type and SES

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
Türkiye	38,3	30,5	31,2
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	45,9	30,8	23,4
Rural	25,1	30,1	44,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	57,7	26,1	16,2
Ankara	47,9	31,4	20,7
Izmir	54,6	30	15,4
NUTS			
Istanbul	57,7	26,1	16,2
West Marmara	47,1	29,1	23,8
Aegean	42,7	33,0	24,3
East Marmara	40,4	35,5	24,1
West Anatolia	37,8	33,0	29,3
Mediterranean	35,2	33,6	31,2
Central Anatolia	22,1	33,5	44,5
West Black Sea	31,8	33,4	34,8
East Black Sea	42,4	25,6	32,0
Northeast Anatolia	21,6	23,5	54,9
Mideast Anatolia	24,4	30,8	44,7
Southeast Anatolia	16,0	22,8	61,3
GENDER			
Male	52,9	30,0	17,2
Female	24,1	31,1	44,8
AGE			
18-24	43,5	37,1	19,4
25-34	43,2	33,9	22,9
35-44	40,0	32,1	27,9
45-54	38,4	27,9	33,7
55-64	30,7	23,1	46,2
65+	17,4	16,4	66,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
Illiterate	0,0	0,0	100,0
Literate with no schooling	10,8	27,0	62,2
Primary school	30,0	39,8	30,2
Elementary education	49,8	37,3	12,9
Regular high schools and their equivalents	64,2	29,5	6,4
Graduate and undergraduate studies	78,9	19,0	2,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	41,6	31,0	27,4
Extended	26,1	31,4	42,5
Broken	40,5	24,2	35,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Lower Group	8,4	17,8	73,8
Middle group	37,7	33,7	28,6
Upper group	73,4	20,6	6,1

Men have a higher frequency of newspaper readership in the past year than women. This percentage is 53% for men, while it drops down to 24% for women (Table 112).

By age group, it was observed that as in book readership, the percentage of newspaper readership decreases as age increases and as educational level increases, newspaper readership also increases.

In extended families, the percentage of those who read newspapers in the past year was found to be lower than other household types. 43% of participants from extended families have not read a newspaper in the past year.

As the socioeconomic level rises, the number of those who have frequently read newspapers last year also increases. In the lower SES group 8% of the participants, in the middle group 38% and in the upper SES group, 73% of participants reported frequent newspaper readership in the past year.

8.5. Going to the Cinema

Individuals were asked if they went to the movies in the past year. Across Türkiye, the percentage of participants who have not gone to a movie in the past year is 78%. The percentage of those who frequently go to movies is a significantly low at 4%. While 6% of individuals from urban areas have gone to the movies frequently in the past year, this percentage drops to 1% in rural areas (Table 113).

Although similar percentages are seen across three major cities, the highest percentage of people who have not gone to the movies in the past year is Istanbul by 67%. This ratio is 65% in Izmir and 63% in Ankara.

Among regions, the percentage of those who go to movies frequently is the highest in Istanbul (8%), West Marmara (5%) and East Black Sea (5%). The lowest percentages are found in Southeast Anatolia (1%), Central Anatolia (2%) and Mideast Anatolia (2%).

Table 113. Going to the Cinema throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
Türkiye	4,4	17,3	78,3
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	6,0	22,2	71,8
Rural	1,8	8,7	89,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	8,3	25,0	66,7
Ankara	7,4	29,9	62,7
Izmir	8,4	27,0	64,6
NUTS			
Istanbul	8,3	25,0	66,7
West Marmara	5,2	18,7	76,0
Aegean	4,1	17,3	78,6
East Marmara	4,8	16,9	78,3
West Anatolia	4,8	20,4	74,8
Mediterranean	4,0	17,2	78,7
Central Anatolia	1,5	9,7	88,8
West Black Sea	3,8	15,1	81,1
East Black Sea	5,0	17,1	77,9
Northeast Anatolia	1,8	8,4	89,8
Mideast Anatolia	1,7	12,3	86,0
Southeast Anatolia	1,0	9,8	89,2

The percentage of men who go to movies frequently is slightly higher than women. The percentage of men who went to the movies in the past year is 5%, while this number is 4% for women. As age increases, the percentage of participants who go to the movies decreases. In the 18-24 age group, the percentage of frequent movie goers is 12% while this percentage falls to 2% among the 35-44 age group (Table 114).

As the educational level increases, this percentage also increases. The frequency of going to movies frequently is higher among singles (15%). The percentage of widowed individuals who report that they

have not gone to a movie in the past year is 95%.

In extended families, the percentage of those who have gone to see a movie in the past year is lower compared to other household types. Among extended families, 87% of participants have not gone to a movie in the past year.

As the socioeconomic status falls, the percentage of those who have not gone to a movie in the past year rises. Almost all of the participants (98%) from the lower SES group report that they have not gone to a movie in the past year. This percentage is 81% in the middle SES group and 42% in the upper group.

Table 114. Going to the Cinema by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
GENDER			
Male	5,2	20,8	74,0
Female	3,7	13,9	82,5
AGE			
18-24	12,2	31,0	56,8
25-34	5,6	21,9	72,5
35-44	2,1	15,2	82,6
45-54	1,3	11,8	86,9
55-64	1,1	6,9	92,0
65+	0,4	2,7	96,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
Illiterate	0,0	1,0	99,0
Literate with no schooling	1,1	3,2	95,6
Primary school	1,0	7,5	91,5
Elementary education	4,1	21,8	74,1
Regular high schools and their equivalents	11,6	37,0	51,4
Graduate and undergraduate studies	14,8	49,8	35,4
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	14,9	36,6	48,5
Married	1,9	13,0	85,1
Divorced	7,1	21,8	71,2
Widowed	0,8	4,3	94,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	4,8	18,3	76,9
Extended	1,9	11,2	86,9
Broken	7,7	23,7	68,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Lower group	0,3	2,1	97,6
Middle group	3,4	16,1	80,6
Upper group	16,6	41,8	41,6

8.6. Going to the Theatre

Participants from different households were asked if they went to the theatre in the past year. Across Türkiye, the percentage of those who did not go to the theatre in the past year is 89%. The percentage of those who go to the theater frequently is a low 1%. Among urban participants, the percentage of people who have gone to the theatre is a little higher (14%) than rural areas (6%) (Table 115).

Although there are no differences between three major cities, the city with the highest percentage of participants who have gone to the theatre in the past year is Ankara (21%).

Among regions, the area where people go to the theatre most is Istanbul (16%) and West Anatolia (13%); the least percentages are found in Mideast Anatolia (6%), and Southeast Anatolia (6%).

Table 115. Going to the Theatre throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
Türkiye	1,4	9,5	89,0
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	2,0	12,1	85,9
Rural	0,5	4,9	94,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	3,0	13,0	83,9
Ankara	3,3	17,6	79,1
Izmir	3,0	15,6	81,4
NUTS			
Istanbul	3,0	13,0	83,9
West Marmara	1,2	9,0	89,8
Aegean	1,5	9,1	89,4
East Marmara	0,9	8,9	90,2
West Anatolia	1,8	10,9	87,2
Mediterranean	1,0	11,5	87,5
Central Anatolia	0,3	6,2	93,5
West Black Sea	0,9	9,8	89,2
East Black Sea	1,4	9,5	89,1
Northeast Anatolia	0,8	4,1	95,1
Mideast Anatolia	0,6	5,3	94,1
Southeast Anatolia	0,8	5,1	94,1

There is no differentiation on the percentage of going to the theater by gender. (Table 116).

As age increases, the percentage of theater goers decreases. While the incidence of going to the theater is 20% among the 18-24 age group, this percentage falls to 9% in the group 35 and over.

The percentage of theater goers increase by educational level.

This ratio is higher among singles. While 4% of singles report to going to the theatre often, 20% say they rarely went to the theater in the past year.

When analyzed by household type, the percentage of participants who attended the theatre in the past year is low among extended families, while it is higher in broken families.

port they have not gone to the theatre in the past year and 91% of the middle SES group reports the same. The percentage of participants who have attended the theatre is 38% in the upper SES group.

99% of participants from the lower SES group re-

Table 116. Going to the Theatre by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type and SES

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
GENDER			
Male	1,4	10,5	88,1
Female	1,4	8,5	90,0
AGE			
18-24	3,0	16,5	80,5
25-34	1,7	10,7	87,6
35-44	0,8	8,4	90,8
45-54	1,0	8,0	91,0
55-64	0,9	5,1	94,0
65+	0,3	2,7	97,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
Illiterate	0,0	0,9	99,1
Literate with no schooling	0,2	1,9	97,9
Primary school	0,3	3,8	95,9
Elementary education	1,2	9,0	89,8
Regular high schools and their equivalents	3,5	19,6	76,9
Graduate and undergraduate studies	5,9	33,9	60,2
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	4,0	20,3	75,7
Married	0,8	7,1	92,1
Divorced	4,0	9,4	86,5
Widowed	0,4	3,7	95,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	1,5,0	10,3	88,1
Extended	0,3	4,7	95,0
Broken	3,3	14,4	82,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Lower group	0,0	1,3	98,7
Middle group	1,0	7,7	91,3
Upper group	6,0	31,6	62,4

8.7. Going to Places such as Local, Club, Fraternity, Association

All participants were asked if to places such as local, club, fraternity, associations in the past year (Table 117). Looking at the responses, it was clear that attendance to these places was low. Only 3% of the individuals go to these places regularly while 9% attend rarely. The percentage of those from urban

areas who go to these places (14%) is higher than rural areas (7%).

This percentage does not differ among three major cities. Among regions, the percentage of those who frequent these places is higher in Istanbul (5%), West Marmara (4%) and East Marmara (4%); lower in Southeast Anatolia (1%) and Central Anatolia (1%).

Table 117. Going to Places such as Local, Club, Fraternity, Associations throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
Türkiye	3,0	8,5	88,5
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	3,9	10,4	85,8
Rural	1,4	5,3	93,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	4,7	13,3	81,9
Ankara	4,2	13,4	82,4
Izmir	5,2	11,3	83,5
NUTS			
Istanbul	4,7	13,3	81,9
West Marmara	4,4	11,0	84,6
Aegean	3,2	8,1	88,6
East Marmara	4,0	9,0	87,0
West Anatolia	2,9	8,6	88,5
Mediterranean	2,0	8,6	89,4
Central Anatolia	1,1	4,0	94,8
West Black Sea	3,3	10,2	86,5
East Black Sea	3,4	7,6	89,0
Northeast Anatolia	1,6	4,5	93,9
Mideast Anatolia	1,5	5,1	93,5
Southeast Anatolia	0,8	2,3	96,9

The percentage of men who go to these places is higher (18%) than women (5%). There are no meaningful differences by age groups; only with the above 65 age group, the percentage of people attending such places decreases. On the other hand, as the educational level increases, the percentage of people who attend these places rises (Table 118).

The percentage of singles who attended lodges, clubs and NGO locales is higher among singles

(19%). 4% of single participants reported going to these places regularly. Participants coming from nuclear and broken families frequent these places more than participants from extended families.

98% of the lower SES group, 90% of the middle SES group reported not going to such places last year. The percentage of people who attended such places in the past year is 33% in the upper SES group.

Table 118. Going to Places such as Local, Club, Fraternity, Associations by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
GENDER			
Male	5,1	12,7	82,2
Female	0,9	4,5	94,6
AGE			
18-24	3,0	10,8	86,2
25-34	3,0	9,1	87,9
35-44	3,3	8,7	88,0
45-54	3,6	9,2	87,2
55-64	2,8	6,6	90,5
65+	1,4	2,5	96,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
Illiterate	0	0,7	99,3
Literate with no schooling	0,7	1,9	97,4
Primary school	1,6	5,0	93,4
Elementary education	3,4	10,2	86,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	5,1	15,3	79,6
Graduate and undergraduate studies	10,5	24,4	65,1
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	4,4	14,2	81,4
Married	2,8	7,5	89,8
Divorced	4,7	8,5	86,8
Widowed	0,3	1,9	97,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	3,4	9,1	87,5
Extended	1,4	5,6	92,9
Broken	3,4	10,9	85,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Lower group	0,4	1,9	97,7
Middle group	2,5	7,4	90,2
Upper group	9,5	23,7	66,7

8.8. Going to Places such as Bars, Night Clubs etc.

Another question asked the participants was if they went to places such as bars/pubs, night clubs etc. in the past year (Table 119). 93% of the respondents reported that have never gone to such places, while 1% reported they go frequently.

Naturally, this percentage is higher (9%) in urban areas than in rural areas (4%). Among three major cities, the highest percentage of participants who have gone to such places in the past year is in Izmir by 17%. Only 4% of participants from Izmir report they go to these places frequently.

Table 119. Going to Places such as Bars, Night Clubs throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
Türkiye	1,0	6,3	92,7
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	1,2	8,0	90,8
Rural	0,5	3,4	96,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	1,7	10,3	88,1
Ankara	0,6	10,9	88,4
Izmir	3,7	13,0	83,3
NUTS			
Istanbul	1,7	10,3	88,1
West Marmara	1,1	7,6	91,3
Aegean	1,8	7,2	91,0
East Marmara	1,0	7,1	92,0
West Anatolia	0,6	6,4	93,0
Mediterranean	1,0	7,3	91,7
Central Anatolia	0,1	2,2	97,7
West Black Sea	0,6	4,8	94,6
East Black Sea	0,3	5,5	94,2
Northeast Anatolia	0,6	2,3	97,1
Mideast Anatolia	0,0	2,4	97,6
Southeast Anatolia	0,2	1,2	98,5

The percentage of men (10%) who go to these places is higher than women (4%). Compared by age groups, as age increases, the percentage of people who attend these places falls (Table 120).

On the other hand, as educational level rises, the percentage of people who go to these places increases.

Compared by marital status, this percentage is higher among singles (19%) and divorcees (12%).

When compared to other household types, although rarely, participants from broken families show a higher percentage of going to such places in the past year.

Almost all participants from the lower and middle SES groups report that they have not gone to bars, night clubs etc. in the past year (99% of the lower

SES group and 94% of the middle SES group). Among the upper SES group, the percentage of people who have gone to such places is 24%.

Table 120. Going to Places such as Bar, Night Clubs by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
GENDER			
Male	1,5	8,7	89,8
Female	0,4	4,0	95,6
AGE			
18-24	1,9	12,8	85,3
25-34	1,5	7,9	90,5
35-44	0,6	4,6	94,9
45-54	0,3	3,8	95,9
55-64	0,3	2,7	97
65+	0,0	1,2	98,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
Illiterate	0,0	1,0	99,3
Literate with no schooling	0,2	1,7	97,4
Primary school	0,3	2,8	93,4
Elementary education	1,3	6,8	86,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	2,1	13,5	79,6
Graduate and undergraduate studies	2,9	18,2	65,1
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	2,8	15,8	81,4
Married	0,5	4,1	95,4
Divorced	4,4	7,8	87,8
Widowed	0,1	1,1	98,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	1,0	6,5	92,4
Extended	0,4	3,7	95,9
Broken	1,8	10,8	87,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Lower group	0,1	1,4	98,6
Middle group	0,7	5,1	94,2
Upper group	3,9	20,2	76,0

8.9. Going to Coffeeshouses

Coffeeshouses which have survived from the past to the present day, are an important part of neighborhood culture in Türkiye. In the study, participants were asked if they have gone to coffee houses in the past year. 26% of the participants have gone to a coffee house last year. The percentage of those who report going to coffee houses frequently is 11%. The percentage of those who go to coffee houses is higher in rural areas compared to urban areas (Table 121).

Among three major cities, the percentage of those

who have gone to a coffee house in the past year is lower in Ankara (15%). This percentage is 24% in Izmir and 25% in Istanbul.

On the other hand, when compared by regions, a marked increase in the incidence of going to coffee houses was observed as we go from the east to the west. Between regions, those with the highest percentage of participants who go to coffee houses frequently is highest in West Marmara (23%), the Aegean (16%) and East Marmara (15%); the lowest in Northeast Anatolia (5%) and Southeast Anatolia (6%).

Table 121. Going to Coffeeshouses throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
Türkiye	10,6	15,0	74,4
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	8,1	14,7	77,3
Rural	15,0	15,7	69,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	10,4	14,8	74,7
Ankara	3,4	11,9	84,7
Izmir	8,1	15,5	76,4
NUTS			
Istanbul	10,4	14,8	74,7
West Marmara	23,0	16,3	60,7
Aegean	15,6	17,5	66,9
East Marmara	14,5	14,0	71,5
West Anatolia	6,8	13,4	79,8
Mediterranean	7,9	15,1	77,0
Central Anatolia	8,6	11,0	80,4
West Black Sea	10,6	17,8	71,6
East Black Sea	9,8	15,8	74,4
Northeast Anatolia	5,2	16,2	78,6
Mideast Anatolia	6,9	13,5	79,7
Southeast Anatolia	5,9	14,2	79,8

As expected, this percentage is higher among men (21%) than women (14%). Traditionally, coffeehouses are where men gather, however, even though a few do it, the results show that women also do it. By age groups, 45-54 is the age group with the highest percentage (29%) (Table 122).

On the other hand, as the educational level rises, the percentage of coffeehouse goers increases. 30% of single individuals, 26% of married people and 21% of divorcees have gone to coffee houses in the past year. This percentage is 7% for widowed individuals. Among individuals from broken house-

holds, the percentage of going to a coffee house in the past year is lower (18%). This percentage is 26% in nuclear and extended families and 7% among widowed participants.

Although no significant differentiation was found between the different levels of socioeconomic status, the middle SES group has the highest percentage by 27%.

Table 122. Going to Coffeehouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes, often	Yes, seldom	No
GENDER			
Male	21,1	28,5	50,4
Female	0,4	2,0	97,6
AGE			
18-24	7,4	15,4	77,3
25-34	9,2	16,5	74,3
35-44	11,4	15,8	72,8
45-54	13,3	15,2	71,5
55-64	13,6	12,5	73,9
65+	11,0	10,7	78,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
Illiterate	2,8	4,2	93,0
Literate with no schooling	7,9	11,5	80,6
Primary school	13,2	15,0	71,7
Elementary education	14,3	19,6	66,0
Regular high schools and their equivalents	9,8	19,6	70,6
Graduate and undergraduate studies	6,2	16,0	77,9
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	9,7	18,3	72,0
Married	11,3	15,1	73,6
Divorced	11,1	9,5	79,3
Widowed	3,2	3,8	93,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	10,7	15,6	73,7
Extended	11,7	14,7	73,6
Broken	6,7	11,2	82,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Lower group	8,7	12,3	79,1
Middle group	11,3	15,5	73,2
Upper group	7,6	14,5	77,9

8.10. Going on Holiday

Individuals were asked how they spent their annual vacation time longer than a week or their holidays (Table 123). On the subject of taking a vacation, an important majority of individuals reported “I do not have such time” (36%). The percentage of those who say “I rest at the place where I live” is 29%. The percentage of those who spend their holidays in hotels, rent houses and summer cottages is found to be 15%.

Analyzed by residence area, the percentage of those who declare that they “do not have the time” is higher in rural areas (51%) than in urban areas. This percentage is 28% in urban areas. The percentage of urban individuals who take their vacations in hotels, guest-

houses or summer vacation homes is 20%, while 23% goes back to their hometowns.

When three major cities are compared, those who report that “I do not have such time” is higher in Izmir (26%) than in Istanbul (12%). The percentage of people who travel to their hometowns is higher in Istanbul (39%). An evaluation between regions shows that the highest percentage of people who report “I do not have such time” is higher in Southeast Anatolia (73%). The highest percentage of people who spend their vacation time where they presently are is in Central Anatolia (48%). Those who spend their vacation in a hotel, rent house or a summer cottage are highest in Istanbul by 23%, West Marmara by 19% and in East Marmara and Western Anatolia.

Table 123. Going on Holiday throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities and NUTS

	I do not have such time	I rest at the place where I live	I go to my hometown	I go to a hotel, a rent house or summer cottage	I visit my kids, parents, other family relatives	I work on a sideline job	Other
Türkiye	36,3	28,9	17,1	15,0	1,2	0,8	0,6
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	27,9	26,4	23,3	19,7	1,1	1,0	0,6
Rural	50,9	33,4	6,3	6,7	1,3	0,6	0,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	12,4	24,4	38,6	22,7	0,4	1,2	0,4
Ankara	18,4	23,4	29,7	25,9	1,5	1,0	0,2
Izmir	25,9	23,8	20,5	27,2	0,7	1,3	0,6
NUTS							
Istanbul	12,4	24,4	38,6	22,7	0,4	1,2	0,4
West Marmara	29,3	33,3	16,0	18,7	1,2	1,0	0,5
Aegean	41,2	27,5	12,6	16,4	,7	1,0	0,6
East Marmara	30,3	29,0	20,1	18,8	,7	0,6	0,5
West Anatolia	26,6	31,4	20,1	18,8	1,6	1,0	0,6
Mediterranean	39,9	31,4	11,7	12,8	2,1	0,7	1,3
Central Anatolia	30,4	48,0	11,8	7,8	,6	1,0	0,3
West Black Sea	41,2	34,3	11,5	10,1	2,2	0,7	0,1
East Black Sea	59,1	19,0	8,4	8,8	2,5	0,3	2,0
Northeast Anatolia	38,5	39,6	8,2	9,7	2,2	1,2	0,6
Mideast Anatolia	52,7	32,1	6,5	6,3	1,8	0,2	0,5
Southeast Anatolia	73,1	12,7	4,7	8,0	0,7	0,4	0,4

Analyzed by age, as age increases, the percentage of people who spend their vacation where they live also increases while the percentage of those who go to their hometowns decreases. This is different only in the 18-24 age group (Table 124).

As the educational level increases, those who declare they do not have the time to take a vacation decreases, and the percentage of those who go to hotels, guesthouses or summer vacation homes increases. Evaluated by marital status, the percentage of those who spend their vacations in hotels, guesthouses and

summer vacation homes is higher among single people and divorcees by 22%, low among widowed individuals by 6%. The percentage of those who report they do not have the time for a vacation is higher among widowed individuals by 47%.

Almost half of the individuals from extended families (47%), report that they do not have the time for a vacation. The percentage of those who spend their vacations in hotels, guesthouses and summer vacation homes is higher in nuclear and broken families by 17%. Those who go to their hometowns for their vacations are higher among nuclear families by 19%.

61% of lower SES group report they cannot find the time for vacations. This percentage falls as the socioeconomic level rises. It was observed that the percentage of individuals who spend their vacation time where they are is higher in lower (29%) and middle SES groups (31%); the percentage of those who go to their hometowns is higher among the middle (18%) and upper SES groups (19%). The percentage of people who spend their vacations in hotels, guesthouses and summer vacation homes rises as the socioeconomic level rises. While only 2% of the lower SES group spends their holidays in this manner, this percentage rises to 48% in the upper SES group.

Table 124. Going on Holiday by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	I do not have such time	I rest at the place where I live	I go to my hometown	I go to a hotel, a rent house or summer cottage	I visit my kids, parents, other family relatives	I work on a sideline job	Other
GENDER							
Male	34,4	29,0	17,3	16,4	0,9	1,4	0,6
Female	38,1	28,8	17,0	13,6	1,6	0,3	0,6
AGE							
18-24	35,9	28,7	15,2	18,0	1,3	0,6	0,4
25-34	34,4	25,4	22,0	15,7	1,1	1,1	0,4
35-44	36,5	25,6	19,1	16,2	0,8	1,1	0,7
45-54	34,0	31,4	16,5	15,5	1,1	0,9	0,6
55-64	38,8	33,6	12,4	12,1	1,9	0,5	0,7
65+	43,1	38,8	7,6	6,8	1,9	0,1	1,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
Illiterate	55,8	31,2	8,7	1,8	1,5	0,1	0,9
Literate with no schooling	51,5	32,4	9,8	4,8	0,5	0,3	0,6
Primary school	40,2	30,9	18,3	8,1	1,0	0,9	0,6
Elementary education	33,6	28,5	16,2	18,3	1,7	1,3	0,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	23,5	26,0	20,1	27,1	1,4	1,1	0,8
Graduate and undergraduate studies	10,9	20,2	21,8	44,3	1,3	0,8	0,7
MARITAL STATUS							
Single	31,8	30,0	13,2	21,8	1,7	0,8	0,7
Married	36,7	28,1	18,9	13,7	1,1	0,9	0,6
Divorced	34,6	29,5	10,7	22,1	1,2	1,1	0,8
Widowed	46,8	36,1	8,2	5,7	1,6	0,2	1,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	33,2	28,1	19,0	16,9	1,3	0,9	0,6
Extended	47,4	31,3	11,4	7,5	1,0	0,8	0,5
Broken	34,6	30,2	15,2	17,0	1,2	0,5	1,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower group	61,2	28,5	6,3	2,0	0,9	0,4	0,6
Middle group	35,8	30,6	18,5	12,4	1,2	0,9	0,6
Upper group	13,7	17,4	18,6	47,9	1,3	0,5	0,7

8.11. Smoking

Individuals over 18 were asked if they smoked, and the results are given in Table 125. The results show that in general 33% of individuals smoke. Smoking cigarette is more prevalent in urban areas (36%) than in rural areas (30%).

Although three major cities do not differ significantly from the rest of Turkey, the city where ciga-

rette smoking is the lowest is in Ankara by 34%. Not much difference was observed between regions; however, smoking is highest in West Marmara (41%) Istanbul (37%) and East Marmara (37%) while it is the lowest in Northeast Anatolia (28%), Mideast Anatolia (29%) and East Black Sea (29%).

Men smoke three times more than women. While half of the male individuals smoke (51%), this percentage falls to 17% among women. Presently the

Table 125. Smoking throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Smoker	Non-smoker
Türkiye	33,4	66,6
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	35,6	64,4
Rural	29,5	70,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	37,0	63,0
Ankara	33,5	66,5
Izmir	38,8	61,2
NUTS		
Istanbul	37,0	63,0
West Marmara	40,9	59,1
Aegean	35,1	64,9
East Marmara	36,6	63,4
West Anatolia	32,6	67,4
Mediterranean	31,1	68,9
Central Anatolia	30,6	69,4
West Black Sea	31,4	68,6
East Black Sea	28,9	71,1
Northeast Anatolia	28,3	71,7
Mideast Anatolia	28,8	71,2
Southeast Anatolia	30,2	69,8

highest percentage of smoking is among the 25-44 age group (41%), the lowest percentage is in the over 65 age group (12%). By educational level, while it is the lowest among illiterates (11%), this percentage rises to 35% among primary school graduates, 40% in the high school graduate group and 45% among elementary school graduates (Table 126).

Smoking among nuclear families is a little higher

in nuclear families compared to other household types. This percentage is 35% in nuclear families, 31% in broken families and 30% in extended families.

Smoking cigarette is more prevalent in middle (34%) and upper (36%) SES groups. 26% of the individuals from the lower SES group smoke.

Table 126. Smoking by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Smoker	Non-smoker
GENDER		
Male	50,6	49,4
Female	16,6	83,4
AGE		
18-24	26,7	73,3
25-34	41,5	58,5
35-44	40,5	59,5
45-54	34,9	65,1
55-64	24,2	75,8
65+	11,8	88,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
Illiterate	10,9	89,1
Literate with no schooling	21,9	78,1
Primary school	34,7	65,3
Elementary education	45,1	54,9
Regular high schools and their equivalents	39,8	60,2
Graduate and undergraduate studies	35,4	64,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	34,5	65,5
Extended	30,3	69,7
Broken	31,3	68,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Lower group	26,1	73,9
Middle group	34,0	66,0
Upper group	36,0	64,0

8.12. Alcohol Consumption

Individuals were asked about alcohol consumption during the study and were given the choices of “every day”, “1-2 times a week”, “several times a month” and “on special occasions” as well as “never”.

In Table 127, the findings on the present alcohol consumption of individuals over 18 from different households are given. The percentage of people who reported they never drink is 85%, while those that drink every day is around 2%. The percentage of individuals from rural areas who never consume alcohol (88%), is higher than people living in urban areas (83%).

When three major cities are compared, the highest percentage of alcohol consumption is in Izmir (33%). This percentage is 22% in Ankara and 20% in Istanbul. More than half of those who report consuming alcohol in Izmir, drink on special occasions.

Compared by regions, those who never drink alcohol are concentrated highly in Southeast Anatolia (97%), Northeast Anatolia (94%), Central Anatolia (94%) and Mideast Anatolia (93%); these percentages are lower in West Marmara (73%), Aegean (79%) and Istanbul (80%). While the percentage of everyday alcohol users does not show a significant differentiation between regions, other consumption choices have higher percentages in western regions than eastern regions.

Table 127. Alcohol Consumption throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Every day	1-2 times a week	Several times a month	On special occasions
Türkiye		1,8		2,9	8,5
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	82,6	1,8	2,6	3,2	9,8
Rural	87,8	1,8	1,9	2,4	6,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	80,4	2,0	4,0	3,8	9,8
Ankara	78,3	2,3	2,5	4,0	12,8
İzmir	67,4	2,9	5,1	5,9	18,7
NUTS					
Istanbul	80,4	2,0	4,0	3,8	9,8
West Marmara	73,1	1,7	6,0	3,2	16,1
Aegean	78,8	2,0	3,3	4,6	11,3
East Marmara	84,9	2,4	1,6	3,1	8,0
West Anatolia	84,9	1,8	1,8	3,0	8,4
Mediterranean	80,3	2,2	2,0	2,8	12,7
Central Anatolia	94,0	1,5	0,4	0,9	3,1
West Black Sea	86,5	0,9	2,1	3,7	6,7
East Black Sea	87,8	0,5	2,3	2,6	6,8
Northeast Anatolia	94,1	1,7	0,5	0,9	2,8
Mideast Anatolia	93,3	2,1	0,7	1,0	2,9
Southeast Anatolia	96,7	1,0	0,2	0,6	1,4

Alcohol consumption among men (25%) is higher than among women (6%). Compared by age groups the percentage of alcohol consumption is lower in advanced age groups than younger ones (Table 128).

Generally alcohol consumption is less among individuals from a lower educational level, higher among people with a higher educational level.

Alcohol consumption is lower among individuals

from extended families than other household types.

As the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of individuals who consume alcohol also rises. While 93% of individuals from the lower SES group report no alcohol consumption, this percentage is 65% in the upper SES group. 20% of those who consume alcohol in the upper SES group report that they drink only on special occasions.

Table 128. Alcohol Consumption by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Every day	1-2 times a week	Several times a month	On special occasions
GENDER					
Male	75,2	2,1	4,3	5,3	13,1
Female	93,5	1,5	0,4	0,7	4,0
AGE					
18-24	84,9	1,1	1,9	3,0	9,0
25-34	81,5	1,8	2,7	3,7	10,3
35-44	82,6	1,5	2,9	3,2	9,8
45-54	82,4	2,4	3,1	2,9	9,2
55-64	89,9	2,2	1,3	2,1	4,5
65+	95,0	2,1	0,5	0,8	1,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	96,7	2,2	0,2	0,3	0,6
Literate with no schooling	94,2	1,6	1,3	1,3	1,5
Primary school	88,0	1,7	1,6	2,3	6,4
Elementary education	80,1	2,0	3,2	3,6	11,1
Regular high schools and their equivalents	76,5	1,5	3,7	4,9	13,5
Graduate and undergraduate studies	66,4	2,1	5,7	5,9	20,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	83,2	1,9	2,5	3,1	9,3
Extended	90,6	1,4	1,0	1,8	5,2
Broken	80,0	2,2	4,4	4,3	9,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower group	93,3	2,0	0,7	1,4	2,5
Middle group	85,9	1,7	1,9	2,7	7,8
Upper group	65,2	1,9	7,2	6,2	19,6

8.13. Watching TV and Daily Time Spent to Watch TV

During the study, individuals were asked how long they spent watching TV every day. According to the responses, while the percentage of those who spend 1-3 hours watching TV is 46%, the percentage of those who spend 4-6 hours is 30%, and the percentage for 0-1 hours is 17%. Those who watch TV for 7 hours or more is about 7% (Table 129).

When we look at differences based on residence

area, the percentage of those who spend 0-1 hours watching TV is higher in rural areas by 23%, and the percentage of those who spend 4-6 hours is higher in urban areas by 33%.

Between three major cities, the percentage of those who watch TV between 0-1 hours is higher in Izmir (13%) and the percentage of those who watch TV for 7 hours or more is higher in Ankara (13%). The highest percentage of individuals who report spending 0-1 hours watching TV come from East Black Sea with 23%.

Table 129. Daily Average Time Spent Watching TV throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	0-1 hour	1-3 hours	4-6 hours	7 hours or more
Türkiye	16,8	46,2	30,2	6,9
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	13,4	45,8	33,0	7,9
Rural	22,7	46,9	25,2	5,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	7,8	47,0	37,8	7,4
Ankara	8,2	40,1	38,7	13,0
Izmir	13,3	45,9	31,6	9,2
NUTS				
Istanbul	7,8	47,0	37,8	7,4
West Marmara	16,8	46,8	30,7	5,8
Aegean	20,0	47,9	25,6	6,5
East Marmara	17,2	41,9	32,9	8,0
West Anatolia	13,0	42,4	35,0	9,7
Mediterranean	21,8	45,7	26,6	5,8
Central Anatolia	18,5	45,1	32,1	4,3
West Black Sea	20,5	48,2	25,3	6,0
East Black Sea	23,1	49,7	23,5	3,7
Northeast Anatolia	21,1	42,0	30,4	6,5
Mideast Anatolia	18,5	51,7	24,1	5,7
Southeast Anatolia	15,9	47,1	27,9	9,2

As the age of the group increases, so does the percentage of individuals who report spending 0-1 hour watching TV. In the 18-24 age group, 15% spend 0-1 hour watching TV while this percentage is 28% among the over 65 age group (Table 130).

One third of illiterate individuals (32%) report

watching TV for only 0-1 hour. As the educational level increases, the percentage of those who watch TV for 1-3 hours increases.

The percentage of individuals who report watching TV for 7 hours or more is higher among individuals from broken families (10%).

Table 130. Daily Average Time Spent Watching TV by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	0-1 hour	1-3 hours	4-6 hours	7 or more hours
GENDER				
Male	15,5	49,4	29,5	5,6
Female	18,0	43,1	30,8	8,1
AGE				
18-24	14,6	45,0	32,2	8,2
25-34	14,7	48,8	30,3	6,2
35-44	15,5	47,9	30,6	6,0
45-54	16,1	46,2	30,1	7,6
55-64	20,3	42,7	30,0	7,0
65+	27,8	40,3	24,8	7,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
Illiterate	31,9	41,7	20,9	5,6
Literate with no schooling	21,4	42,4	29,3	6,9
Primary school	14,8	46,2	31,7	7,3
Elementary education	11,9	47,3	33,3	7,5
Regular high schools and their equivalents	13,2	47,0	32,4	7,5
Graduate and undergraduate studies	18,3	51,4	26,0	4,4
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	15,8	46,2	30,2	7,7
Married	16,3	46,8	30,4	6,5
Divorced	16,6	44,4	30,3	8,7
Widowed	28,0	37,7	26,3	8,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	15,5	46,2	31,3	7,0
Extended	19,9	48,1	26,5	5,4
Broken	19,7	41,4	29,4	9,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Lower group	26,6	44,4	23,7	5,3
Middle group	15,5	45,7	31,5	7,3
Upper group	16,3	51,7	26,7	5,3

To understand attitudes towards television, individuals were given some statements on TV viewership and were asked if they agreed with these statements. The percentage of those who answered yes to the question “Do you think that TV prevents you from sparing time for yourself and for your family??” is 29%. Approximately two thirds of the individuals think TV does not prevent family time or time for one’s self. The percentage of those who agree with

this statement is higher in urban areas (33%), in Izmir among three major cities (40%) and in the 18-44 age group (33%). As the educational level increases, the percentage of those who agree with this statement also increase. Evaluated by marital status, the findings show that agreement with this statement is lower among widowed individuals (18%) (Tables 131& 132).

Another question asked is “do you think the kids could watch any programme they like on TV?” Those who answered yes to this statement are 16%, and those who answer no or do not agree is 84%. It was observed that the majority of individuals think it is inappropriate for children to watch whatever they want. The percentage of those who answer yes to this question is higher in rural areas (20%) and among individuals 45 or over (20%). The percentage of individuals to agree with this statement falls as the educational level and socioeconomic status rises (Tables 131 & 132).

On the other hand, 69% of individuals report they watch TV as a family. The percentage of individuals who watch TV together is higher in Istanbul (72%) and Izmir (71%), among the 25-44 age group (about 70%) and married individuals (74%).

The percentage of those who watch TV together as a family is relatively low among broken families (46%) compared to other household types.

61% of individuals think TV affects family relationships negatively. The percentages of people who agree with the statement are higher in Izmir (69%) and Istanbul (65%). Compared by regions, the percentage of people who think TV affects family relationships negatively are higher in Mideast Anatolia (69%) and lower in West Marmara (46%). As educational and socioeconomic levels increase, the percentage of individuals who agree with this statement also increase. By marital status, the percentages for married (62%) and divorced (63%) individuals who agree with this statement are higher than the rest.

Table 131. Thoughts on TV Viewership throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Yes)

	Do you think that TV prevents you from sparing time for yourself and for your family?	Do you think the kids could watch any programme they like on TV?	Do you think the TV has a negative impact on familial relations?	Do you usually watch TV together as a family?	Have you ever filed a complaint or considered doing so regarding TV programmes? Did you think about it?
Türkiye	29,4	16,4	61,1	69,2	27,9
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	32,9	14,2	63,8	69,3	31,5
Rural	23,2	20,3	56,5	69,0	21,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	34,0	11,2	65,1	72,4	28,3
Ankara	35,6	15,5	58,2	62,4	30,4
Izmir	40,3	13,9	68,6	71,2	40,2
NUTS					
Istanbul	34,0	11,2	65,1	72,4	28,3
West Marmara	25,5	19,8	45,6	63,4	24,9
Aegean	28,0	19,3	65,0	73,2	28,7
East Marmara	34,5	11,7	61,8	67,5	33,4
West Anatolia	33,9	15,6	60,6	69,3	28,6
Mediterranean	23,6	20,7	53,9	67,2	31,2
Central Anatolia	26,4	12,5	58,2	67,2	24,2
West Black Sea	22,2	16,3	65,2	70,3	25,5
East Black Sea	25,3	17,4	63,1	66,4	29,2
Northeast Anatolia	30,1	18,2	53,2	64,2	25,4
Mideast Anatolia	34,8	16,4	68,5	73,7	36,7
Southeast Anatolia	28,7	21,6	62,6	64,5	13,9

Those who have officially complained or thinking about complaining about TV programs make up 28%. This percentage is higher in urban areas (32%), Izmir among three major cities (40%), Mid-

east Anatolia (37%), men (30%) and in the 25-44 age group (31%). As the educational and socioeconomic level rises, this percentage also rises.

Table 132. Thoughts on TV Viewership by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES (Yes)

	Do you think that TV prevents you from sparing time for yourself and for your family?	Do you think the kids could watch any programme they like on TV?	Do you think the TV has a negative impact on familial relations?	Do you usually watch TV together as a family?	Have you ever filed a complaint or considered doing so regarding TV programmes? Did you think about it?
GENDER					
Male	28,9	17,7	62,2	70,1	30,1
Female	29,8	15,1	60,1	68,3	25,7
AGE					
18-24	32,6	16,2	58,2	64,2	27,6
25-34	32,7	12,8	63,6	72,2	30,6
35-44	33,8	14,6	64,6	73,7	31,5
45-54	27,2	20,9	59,1	70,8	28,0
55-64	20,5	20,3	60,5	66,0	24,1
65+	15,8	20,2	55,2	59,3	15,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	19,8	22,6	54,5	61,8	11,9
Literate with no schooling	24,0	21,4	57,1	66,1	17,6
Primary school	26,9	17,7	60,7	72,3	24,6
Elementary education	30,7	14,1	64,4	71,7	32,1
Regular high schools and their equivalents	37,0	13,0	63,2	67,2	37,4
Graduate and undergraduate studies	39,6	8,5	66,1	65,9	47,0
MARITAL STATUS					
Single	32,4	16,8	59,3	59,1	30,1
Married	29,4	16,3	62,0	73,6	28,1
Divorced	26,3	15,6	63,2	52,3	35,3
Widowed	18,1	17,1	54,7	48,4	14,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	30,9	15,9	62,0	71,1	29,5
Extended	26,7	19,3	59,1	72,3	22,5
Broken	23,2	13,7	58,6	45,8	27,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower group	20,0	21,6	54,9	62,3	13,5
Middle group	29,7	16,2	61,7	70,3	27,9
Upper group	36,4	12,7	63,0	67,9	42,7



Chapter 9

ELDERLINESS

Households with Elderly in Need of Constant Care

Issues Where Families Need Support for Elderly Care

Life Preferences Regarding Elderliness

Health of the Elderly

*Reasons of the Elderly to Live with Their
Children at the Same House*

*Reasons of the Elderly to Live in Separate Houses
with Their Children and How Often They are Visited*

The study collected data on whether or not the household had elderly members in need of constant care, issues where families need support for elderly care, preferences for living arrangements in old age, and the health of the elderly, whether or not the elderly live with their children and why.

9.1. Households with Elderly in Need of Constant Care

Table 133 displays whether or not a household has an elderly member that requires constant care. According to the study data 5% of households have elderly in need of constant care. The percentage of

elderly dependent on care is higher for rural households (8%) than urban ones (4%).

While there is no significant variation among the three major cities, the percentage in Ankara is the lowest (2%).

Comparing regions, the highest percentage of elderly in need of care is in the West Black Sea region (9%), Mideast Anatolia (8%) and Northeast Anatolia (8%); the lowest is in Istanbul (4%), the Mediterranean Region (4%) and West Anatolia (4%).

As expected, extended families have a notably high-

Table 133. Households with Elderly in Need of Constant Care throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Yes	No
Türkiye	5,3	94,7
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	3,8	96,2
Rural	8,0	92,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	3,8	96,2
Ankara	2,2	97,8
Izmir	3,1	96,9
NUTS		
Istanbul	3,8	96,2
West Marmara	5,5	94,5
Aegean	4,8	95,2
East Marmara	5,4	94,6
West Anatolia	4,1	95,9
Mediterranean	4,2	95,8
Central Anatolia	5,2	94,8
West Black Sea	9,1	90,9
East Black Sea	7,3	92,7
Northeast Anatolia	7,8	92,2
Mideast Anatolia	8,0	92,0
Southeast Anatolia	6,9	93,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	1,6	98,4
Extended	22,6	77,4
Broken	7,0	93
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Lower Group	11,4	88,6
Middle Group	4,5	95,5
Upper Group	2,8	97,2

er percentage of elderly in need of care (23%) than the other household types. This percentage is 2% in nuclear families and 7% in broken families (Table 133).

Comparing socioeconomic levels, the group with the highest instance of elderly in need of care is the lower socioeconomic group with 11%.

9.2. Issues Where Families Need Support for Elderly Care

Families with elderly in need of constant care were

asked what they needed for the care, and their responses are displayed on Table 134. Looking at the data from across Türkiye, the families with elderly in need of constant care most needed health service (43%), financial support (26%) and care-giving support (12%).

A higher percentage of rural households needed healthcare (46%) and financial support (27%). On the other hand, urban households had greater need for care-giving support (16%).

Table 134. Issues Where Families Need Support for Elderly Care throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Health service	Financial support	Care-giving support	Nothing	Rehabilitation	Guidance and counseling	Social, cultural activities	Other
Türkiye	42,9	25,7	12,3	12,0	5,6	0,4	0,1	1,1
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	39,5	24,1	16,2	13,0	5,7	0,5	0,2	0,8
Rural	45,9	27,1	8,9	11,2	5,5	0,3	0,0	1,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	32,9	30,7	20	6,2	7,7	1,9	0,0	0,6
Ankara	25,8	14,9	30,9	19,7	8,7	0,0	0,0	0,0
Izmir	41,8	5,9	17,2	30,3	0	0,0	0,0	4,7
NUTS								
Istanbul	32,9	30,7	20	6,2	7,7	1,9	0,0	0,6
West Marmara	48,6	26,2	12,7	10,3	0	0,0	0,0	2,2
Aegean	45,5	18,4	15,4	16,0	1,2	0,0	0,0	3,6
East Marmara	49,6	23,7	11,7	8,7	4,4	0,7	0,0	1,3
West Anatolia	28,9	28,3	14,7	21,3	4,2	0,0	1,3	1,3
Mediterranean	44,5	28,7	6,3	15,6	4,9	0,0	0,0	0,0
Central Anatolia	60,8	21,5	11,8	4,7	1,2	0,0	0,0	0,0
West Black Sea	46,0	25,4	14,4	8,9	4,5	0,8	0,0	0,0
East Black Sea	47,1	16,4	14,8	7,4	14,3	0,0	0,0	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	38,6	34,1	0	25,6	1,7	0,0	0,0	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	38,0	22,7	9,8	11,6	17,9	0,0	0,0	0,0
Southeast Anatolia	40,9	32,9	5,5	12,1	6,6	0,0	0,0	2,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	40,7	23,9	19,0	7,7	6,2	0,0	0,0	2,5
Extended	45,7	26,9	7,6	13,7	5,0	0,5	0,0	0,6
Broken	35,5	23,4	21	11,5	6,8	0,5	0,6	0,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
Lower Group	39,9	36,9	10,4	4,9	6,5	0,3	0,0	1,0
Middle Group	45,2	21,8	12,9	13,7	4,8	0,5	0,2	1,0
Upper Group	31,9	8,9	16,0	31,5	9,8	0,0	0,0	1,9

Comparing the three major cities, Istanbul had a higher percentage needing financial support (31%) and Ankara a higher percentage needing caregiver support (31%). In Izmir the percentage of households who said they didn't need anything (30%) was higher than the other two cities (Table 134).

Comparing the regions, households in need of "health services" were highest in the Central Anatolia (61%) and East Marmara (50%) regions, lowest in West Anatolia (29%) and Istanbul (33%). Households in need of "financial support" were highest in Northeast Anatolia (34%) and Southeast Anatolia (33%), with the lowest percentages in the East Black Sea (16%) and Aegean regions (18%). Households in need of "care-giving support" were highest in Istanbul (20%) and lowest in the Southeast Anatolia region (6%). The Northeast Anatolia region on the other hand has no need for caregiver assistance.

For all household types the need for health-care was paramount. The need for caregiver assistance was higher in nuclear (19%) and broken families (21%) than in extended families.

As the socioeconomic level increases, the percentage of those in need of financial support decreases, but the need for caregiver support increases. In 37% of the lower socioeconomic households there is need for financial support. While the need for caregivers is 10% for the lower group, it is 16% for the upper group. The need for healthcare is high in all socioeconomic groups, but the group that needs it the most is the middle socioeconomic group (45%). One third of the upper socioeconomic group (32%) report that they need no assistance. This percentage is 5% for the lower group and 14% for the middle group.

9.3. Life Preferences Regarding Elderliness

Evaluating the responses of individuals under 60 who were asked "How would you live when you get

too old to look after yourself?", the majority of individuals across Türkiye would like to live with their children in their old age (55%). Meanwhile 18% of individuals would like care service at their own house, 9% would go to a seniors center and 17% said they "have no idea" (Table 135).

Of those living in urban households 11% said they would be going to a seniors center, while only 6% of those in rural households said they would do so. The percentage of those who want to move in with their children was 50% for urban dwellers and 65% for rural ones. "I would get care service at my own house" responses were higher for urban residents (19%) than rural ones (15%).

Comparing the three major cities, Izmir had the highest incidence of those who want to go to a seniors center in their old age (22%) as well as those who wanted home care (24%), while Istanbul had the highest percentage for those who wish to move in with their children (51%). 36% of those living in Ankara did not have an opinion on this matter.

Comparing regional preferences; the highest percentages for "I would move to a seniors center" were in West Marmara (14%) and the Aegean region (13%), the lowest percentages were in the Southeast Anatolia (2%) and Northeast Anatolia (6%) regions. The percentage of those who wish to spend their old age living with their children is high in all regions, but the regions with the highest incidence are Southeast Anatolia (78%) and Northeast Anatolia (66%), while the lowest are in West Anatolia (47%) and the Mediterranean (48%) regions. On the other hand, the highest percentages for "I would get care service at my own house" were in the Mediterranean (24%), West Marmara (21%), East Marmara (21%) and Aegean (21%) regions; the lowest percentages were in the Southeast Anatolia (7%), East Black Sea (14%) and West Black Sea (15%) regions.

Table 135. Life Preferences Regarding Elderliness throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Live with my children	Get care service at my own house	Move to a seniors center	Other	No idea
Türkiye	55,0	17,8	9,3	1,1	16,8
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	50,0	19,1	10,9	1,2	18,9
Rural	64,7	15,3	6,2	1,1	12,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	50,8	16,1	8,1	1,4	23,7
Ankara	35,9	16,2	10,1	1,3	36,4
Izmir	31,8	24,2	22,3	0,9	20,7
NUTS					
Istanbul	50,8	16,1	8,1	1,4	23,7
West Marmara	52,6	20,8	14,3	1,3	11,0
Aegean	50,7	20,7	12,9	0,9	14,8
East Marmara	57,4	20,9	11,6	1,0	9,1
West Anatolia	46,7	17,2	8,7	1,0	26,4
Mediterranean	47,5	23,9	9,9	2,0	16,8
Central Anatolia	61,3	17,8	8,8	0,4	11,8
West Black Sea	57,2	14,6	11,5	1,2	15,5
East Black Sea	61,7	13,6	8,5	1,1	15,2
Northeast Anatolia	66,0	15,6	5,8	1,9	10,7
Mideast Anatolia	57,9	19,5	6,4	0,9	15,3
Southeast Anatolia	77,7	6,8	2,3	0,4	12,8

Comparing preferences by gender, the percentage of women who say they would move to a seniors center" (10%) is a little higher than that of men (8%). The percentage of men who prefer to stay with their children (56%) is a little higher than that of women (54%). Meanwhile, the percentage of "I would get care service at my own house" responses was a little higher for women (19%) (Table 136).

Comparing preferences by education, as the educational level increases the percentage of those who are thinking about seniors centers also increases. The highest percentage of "I would move to a seniors center" responses at 19% was for those who have completed undergraduate and graduate studies. By contrast, as the educational level decreases the percentage of those who wish to live with their children increases. 74% of illiterate respondents

said they would like to stay with their children in old age. The highest percentage of "I would get care service at my own house" responses was again from those of the top educational levels (30%).

Comparing preferences by household type, "I will move to a seniors center" responses were highest for broken families (14%). The percentage of those who preferred home care was higher for nuclear (19%) and broken families (21%).

As socioeconomic level increases the percentage of those who prefer seniors centers or home care also increases. While 4% of the lower socioeconomic group is considering a seniors center, it is 18% for the upper group. While the percentage of those who prefer home care is 10% for the lower socioeconomic group, it is 30% for the upper group.

Table 136. Life Preferences regarding Elderliness by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Live with my children	Get care service at my own house	Move to a seniors center	Other	No idea
GENDER					
Male	56,2	16,5	8,2	1,4	17,7
Female	53,8	19,0	10,4	0,9	15,8
AGE					
18-24	49,1	17,0	9,4	1,2	23,3
25-34	54,4	16,8	8,9	1,1	18,8
35-44	56,9	18,5	9,1	1,2	14,3
45-54	58,1	19,0	10,0	1,1	11,8
55-64	60,5	19,0	9,5	1,3	9,7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	74,0	8,8	3,1	1,2	12,9
Literate but no schooling	65,3	13,4	5,7	1,7	13,9
Primary school	62,6	15,6	6,6	0,8	14,5
Elementary education	51,3	16,5	10,7	1,2	20,3
Regular high schools and their equivalents	42,8	22,0	13,2	1,5	20,5
Undergraduate and graduate studies	30,2	29,8	18,7	1,8	19,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	53,0	19,2	9,9	1,1	16,9
Extended	68,0	11,4	5,6	1,0	14,0
Broken	39,3	21,1	13,8	2,4	23,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower Group	68,8	10,4	3,6	1,5	15,7
Middle Group	56,6	16,8	8,7	1,0	16,9
Upper Group	33,3	30,3	17,9	2,0	16,5

The study asked those who chose to live in a seniors center the reason why this was their preference. Responses to the "why would you prefer to go to a seniors center?" question are displayed on Table 137. Evaluating the data, the highest percentages were for "I would not like to be a burden on my kids" (55%), "My children might not like to live with me" (16%) and "because the facilities in seniors center is better/more convenient " (11%).

Comparing residence area, those who responded with "rather than being alone, I prefer to be with my peers" was higher for urban residents (10%) than rural ones.

Comparing the three major cities, the percentage of those who responded that they didn't want to be a burden on their children was the highest in Ankara (56%), while those who said "I believe there would be no one to take care of me " was highest in Istanbul (10%).

No difference between male and female views was found regarding preference for seniors centers in old age.

As age increases, the percentage of respondents who respond with "my children might not like to live with me" decreases. Those who prefer seniors centers because they do not want to be a burden on their children is highest in the 55-60 age group (60%).

Comparing household types, the percentage of individuals in extended families responding with "my children might not like to live with me" was 24%, while the 57% of individuals in nuclear families who said "I wouldn't want to be a burden on my kids" was very high (57%). Choosing seniors centers because the conditions would be more comfortable (16%) and because they have no one to look after them (15%) are high in broken families.

Table 137. Reasons of Preference to Go to Seniors Center throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	I would not like to be a burden on my kids	My children might not like to live with me	Facilities in seniors centers is better/more convenient	Rather than being alone, I prefer to be with my peers	Because I don't have anyone to look after me	My daughter-in-law/son-in-law might not like to live with me	Other
Türkiye	55,2	15,6	11,0	8,4	6,7	3,0	0,1
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	55,8	15,2	10,4	9,6	6,2	2,8	0,0
Rural	53,0	17,2	12,9	4,4	8,4	3,9	0,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	43,3	15,4	16,0	10,5	10,2	4,6	0,0
Ankara	55,8	17,6	9,3	10,9	4,4	1,9	0,0
Izmir	47,5	18,2	13,8	12,3	4,0	4,2	0,0
NUTS							
Istanbul	43,3	15,4	16,0	10,5	10,2	4,6	0,0
West Marmara	73,4	8,2	11,7	3,9	2,2	,6	0,0
Aegean	53,8	14,1	10,2	11,1	6,0	4,8	0,0
East Marmara	52,8	16,7	6,5	12,3	8,7	2,9	0,0
West Anatolia	54,2	20,4	7,7	9,6	5,5	2,5	0,0
Mediterranean	63,0	18,7	7,2	5,0	4,4	1,7	0,0
Central Anatolia	62,5	5,5	17,2	5,8	4,9	4,0	0,0
West Black Sea	57,5	12,6	11,5	7,7	6,6	2,6	1,4
East Black Sea	54,8	22,8	4,9	2,4	14,0	1,1	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	36,2	23,5	30,3	6,4	3,6	,0	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	48,5	13,9	21,3	7,7	8,6	,0	0,0
Southeast Anatolia	59,7	26,4	4,9	1,9	1,5	5,7	0,0
GENDER							
Male	53,8	17,3	13,1	7,3	5,4	2,9	0,2
Female	56,2	14,3	9,4	9,2	7,7	3,2	0,0
AGE							
18-24	56,8	18,8	9,1	9,2	3,5	2,6	0,0
25-34	53,1	18,1	12,0	7,1	5,6	3,9	0,2
35-44	54,4	13,0	9,5	10,6	10,2	2,1	0,1
45-54	56,1	12,5	13,8	8,2	6,8	2,5	0,0
55-64	59,5	13,3	9,4	4,4	7,7	5,6	0,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
Illiterate	38,3	24,3	10,8	1,2	15,0	10,5	0,0
Literate but no schooling	39,2	20,5	9,5	7,9	15,6	7,3	0,0
Primary school	53,1	20,1	10,7	3,9	8,5	3,5	0,2
Elementary education	55,3	12,0	10,3	11,2	7,3	3,9	0,0
Regular high schools and their equivalents	58,2	14,9	10,8	9,2	4,9	2,0	0,0
Undergraduate and graduate studies	58,1	9,7	12,7	14,0	3,6	1,7	0,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	57,0	15,1	10,3	8,8	5,7	3,0	0,0
Extended	51,7	23,9	11,0	3,8	5,8	3,1	,6
Broken	44,8	10,3	16,2	10,4	15,1	3,2	0,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Lower Group	40,0	24,8	10,2	3,7	14,0	7,3	0,0
Middle Group	54,9	16,0	11,2	7,2	7,2	3,4	0,1
Upper Group	58,4	13,0	10,4	13,2	3,7	1,1	0,2

On the other hand, individuals under 60 whose mother or father was still alive but lived away were asked why they lived apart from their parents. The most common response was "my mother/father does not need special care" (61%). The second most common was " Since I/ my siblings live close to my parents, we can take care of them " (14%) and "they don't want to leave their villages/neighborhoods/ community" (11%) (Table 138).

When comparing the areas of residence, the percentage of rural residents who say "Since I/ my siblings live close to my parents, we can take care of them " is higher (19%). "My mother or father doesn't need special care" (63%) and "they don't want to leave their village/neighborhood/ community" (13%) is higher among urban dwellers.

Table 138. Primary Reason for not Living with One's Parents throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Mother or father doesn't need special care	My home/My siblings' home is close enough to my parents that we can care for them	They do not want to leave their village/neighborhood/ community
Türkiye	61,2	13,7	11,3
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	62,7	11,0	12,7
Rural	57,9	19,3	8,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	60,7	9,9	16,3
Ankara	73,6	4,5	12,7
Izmir	64,8	10,5	10,9
NUTS			
Istanbul	60,7	9,9	16,3
West Marmara	52,7	13,6	21,8
Aegean	61,0	18,6	8,5
East Marmara	56,4	15,2	16,1
West Anatolia	70,1	9,6	9,3
Mediterranean	60,2	16,2	8,1
Central Anatolia	73,5	7,5	7,4
West Black Sea	48,1	19,5	10,4
East Black Sea	51,7	17,5	11,1
Northeast Anatolia	54,0	20,1	10,5
Mideast Anatolia	64,3	11,9	6,0
Southeast Anatolia	72,5	9,5	5,0

Comparing the three major cities, the percentage of respondents from Ankara who said their mother or father did not need care was higher than the other two cities (74%). Those who said their mother or father did not want to leave their village/neighborhood were highest in Istanbul (16%).

The most common reason for all regions is that the mother or father doesn't need care. The regions

where the percentage is highest is Central Anatolia (74%) and Southeast Anatolia (73%). Those who responded saying their or their siblings' home was close enough to care for their parents without living with them was highest in the West Black Sea and Northeast Anatolia regions with 20%. The percentage of those who said they don't live with their parents because they did not want to leave their village/neighborhood was highest in West Marmara (22%).

They have a vineyard/garden/farm/field/shop where they live that they are responsible for	They do not want to live with us	We do not have the financial means to take care of them	We do not want to live with them	There is no one in the house that can take care of them	Other
5,6	4,2	1,6	1,5	0,4	0,6
RESIDENCE AREA					
5,6	4,1	1,5	1,5	0,4	0,6
5,6	4,3	1,9	1,5	0,6	0,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
6,3	3,8	1,3	1,1	0,2	0,5
3,3	1,9	1,3	1,3	0,6	0,6
4,1	4,3	1,4	2,1	0,8	1,2
NUTS					
6,3	3,8	1,3	1,1	0,2	0,5
7,9	1,6	0,9	0,7	0,3	0,5
3,6	3,4	1,5	2,3	0,2	0,8
4,1	5,0	1,1	1,7	0,0	0,5
5,3	2,6	1,2	1,0	0,5	0,4
5,2	4,6	2,0	2,4	0,8	0,7
3,8	2,7	2,5	1,6	1,0	0,1
11,2	5,1	1,9	1,0	0,8	1,9
11,9	3,8	2,3	0,9	0,5	0,2
3,6	5,6	1,9	3,4	0,2	0,8
4,4	10,6	1,4	0,3	0,4	0,7
3,4	4,9	2,9	0,8	0,7	0,2

The percentage of women who say their parents do not need care (63%) is higher than the percentage of men (59%). As the age of respondents increases the percentage of those who say their house or their siblings house is close enough to their parents to care for them gets higher, the percentage of those who say their parents don't need care gets lower (Table 139).

As the educational level gets higher the percentage of respondents who said their parents don't need care increases, the percentage who says they or their siblings live close enough to their parents to care for them and that they don't want to leave their village/neighborhood decreases.

Table 139. Primary Reason for not Living with One's Parents by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Mother or father doesn't need special care	My home/My siblings' home is close enough to my parents that we can care for them	They do not want to leave their village/neighborhood/community
GENDER			
Male	58,6	16,1	11,6
Female	63,2	11,7	11,1
AGE			
18-24	69,2	7,9	6,5
25-34	65,7	10,5	10,4
35-44	60,5	14,7	11,3
45-54	53,2	18,9	14,3
55-64	42,0	24,8	15,7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
Illiterate	53,7	17,1	13,3
Literate but no schooling	49,9	16,1	12,6
Primary school	59,4	14,8	12,3
Elementary education	62,9	15,2	9,4
Regular high schools and their equivalents	68,0	10,4	9,3
Undergraduate and graduate studies	67,1	8,4	9,4
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	47,9	7,7	14,6
Married	61,8	13,9	11,1
Divorced	65,0	8,7	7,9
Widowed	46,8	17,3	16,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	62,2	13,5	11,3
Extended	57,6	16,4	11,0
Broken	52,2	9,4	12,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Lower Group	58,5	14,7	8,5
Middle Group	60,1	14,3	11,9
Upper Group	70,2	8,3	9,2

The percentage of respondents who say their parents don't need care is higher among married respondents (62%) as well as single individuals (65%). The same response is highest for individuals belonging to nuclear families (62%). While lower socioeconomic group (15%) and middle so-

cioeconomic group (14%) are more likely to say they or their siblings live close enough to their parents to care for them, the percentage of upper socioeconomic group respondents who say their parents don't need care is quite high (70%).

They have a vineyard/garden/farm/field/shop where they live that they are responsible for	They do not want to live with us	We do not have the financial means to take care of them	We do not want to live with them	There is no one in the house that can take care of them	Other
GENDER					
5,9	3,4	1,7	1,5	0,5	0,7
5,3	4,8	1,6	1,5	0,4	0,5
AGE					
4,3	4,7	1,5	2,7	0,3	3,0
6,3	3,3	1,5	1,6	0,4	0,3
5,4	4,3	1,7	1,4	0,4	0,4
4,7	5,0	1,8	1,0	0,7	0,4
6,7	6,3	2,0	0,3	0,8	1,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
3,8	6,4	3,2	1,2	0,6	0,7
6,1	7,4	4,0	2,1	1,2	0,6
5,6	4,1	1,8	1,4	0,4	0,3
4,5	4,1	0,9	2,4	0,2	0,4
5,0	2,9	1,1	1,3	0,3	1,8
9,1	3,7	0,3	1,1	0,5	0,4
MARITAL STATUS					
10,4	5,1	1,3	1,5	2,0	9,5
5,5	4,1	1,6	1,5	0,4	0,3
1,8	5,7	3,7	3,1	2,5	1,5
5,5	3,8	5,8	0,9	0,8	2,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
5,4	4,0	1,6	1,5	0,4	0,3
6,0	5,4	1,7	1,0	0,4	0,6
7,1	4,3	2,7	3,0	2,0	6,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
4,5	5,8	3,9	2,3	1,2	0,6
5,6	4,1	1,6	1,4	0,4	0,6
6,2	3,7	0,3	1,2	0,1	0,6

9.4. Health of the Elderly

Individuals over 60 were asked how they would describe their physical health compared to their peers. 10% said "very good," 54% "good," 19% "same," 15% "bad" and 2% "very bad" (Table 140). Over half (64%) of the over 60 individuals considered their own health better than that of their peers; those who saw it as worse were 17%. Those who

feel "very good" are higher in urban settings (13%).

Comparing the three major cities respondents who said they felt "good" or "very good" was lower in Ankara. Comparing regions, the percentage of respondents who consider themselves "very good" was higher in Istanbul (16%) and West Marmara (17%) than in other regions.

Table 140. Elderly Individual's Self Evaluation on Health Compared to Peers throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Very Good	Good	Same	Bad	Very Bad
Türkiye	10,1	53,7	19,1	15,3	1,9
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	13,0	54,0	18,1	13,1	1,8
Rural	7,3	53,5	20,0	17,3	2,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	16,4	55,2	17,3	9,8	1,2
Ankara	7,0	52,6	28,0	11,9	0,7
Izmir	15,2	57,6	17,3	7,8	2,0
NUTS					
Istanbul	16,4	55,2	17,3	9,8	1,2
West Marmara	16,5	54,7	16,7	10,6	1,5
Aegean	11,8	54,1	19,8	12,8	1,4
East Marmara	9,3	54,0	21,8	13,0	1,9
West Anatolia	8,5	52,8	20,9	16,5	1,2
Mediterranean	8,3	53,6	19,1	16,3	2,8
Central Anatolia	6,7	57,1	17,1	18,5	0,6
West Black Sea	4,5	58,2	15,8	18,6	2,8
East Black Sea	4,8	48,2	21,0	22,8	3,2
Northeast Anatolia	13,4	52,1	11,3	20,1	3,1
Mideast Anatolia	7,0	49,3	21,6	19,9	2,2
Southeast Anatolia	10,5	48,9	23,6	14,7	2,3

Males were more likely to consider themselves "very good" or "good" when compared to their peers. Among those who completed undergraduate and graduate studies the percentage of those who answered "very good" and "good" was also higher (83%) than the other educational levels. By contrast, the percentage who said they were "bad" or "very bad" was higher in the illiterate group (25%).

Comparing marital status, the percentage of those who described their physical health as "bad" or

"very bad" was higher for widowed individuals (21%). Comparing household types, members of broken families had a higher incidence of reporting "bad" or "very bad" health compared to their peers (21%).

As socioeconomic status increases so does the percentage of those who feel "very good." While only 5% of the lower socioeconomic group reports "very good" health, this number climbs to 17% for the upper socioeconomic group. (Table 141).

Table 141. Elderly Individual's Self Evaluation on Health Compared to Peers by Gender, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Very Good	Good	Same	Bad	Very Bad
GENDER					
Male	13,9	58,1	16,1	10,6	1,2
Female	6,7	50,0	21,6	19,2	2,5
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	5,0	49,2	21,1	21,9	2,8
Literate but no schooling	11,3	51,8	22,4	12,8	1,7
Primary school	12,9	57,5	17,1	11,1	1,4
Elementary education	18,4	58,6	14,5	8,5	0,0
Regular high schools and their equivalents	14,3	53,6	16,9	14,0	1,1
Undergraduate and graduate studies	15,8	67,0	10,5	5,0	1,6
MARITAL STATUS					
Single	2,3	48,2	33,1	12,0	4,5
Married	11,1	55,8	17,5	14,0	1,7
Divorced	10,9	63,7	12,1	11,2	2,1
Widowed	7,7	48,0	23,0	18,9	2,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	11,3	56,3	16,8	13,9	1,7
Extended	8,3	52,8	21,6	15,6	1,6
Broken	8,9	47,4	22,2	18,7	2,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower Group	5,2	48,4	22,7	20,6	3,2
Middle Group	11,4	54,9	18,4	13,8	1,5
Upper Group	16,5	65,0	9,4	7,8	1,3

Additionally, participants over 60 were also asked the difficulty with which they performed certain tasks such as eating, daily chores, shopping, travel, personal hygiene and errands or whether or not they needed assistance. "Eating" was easy for 87% of participants over 60, difficult for 9% and requiring assistance for 1%; "managing daily household chores" were easy for 65%, difficult for 16% and requiring assistance for 4%; "shopping" was easy for

62%, difficult for 13% and requiring assistance for 7%; "traveling" was easy for 57%, difficult for 14% and requiring assistance for 8%; "personal care (having a shower, etc.)" was easy for 81%, difficult for 13% and requiring assistance for 6%; "out of home affairs (paying the bills, banking, hospital, working at field/garden, etc.)" was easy for 54%, difficult for 11% and requiring assistance for 9% (Table 142).

Table 142. Difficulty of Performing Activities

	With ease	With difficulty	With the help of somebody	Not Applicable
Eating	87,5	8,9	1,3	2,4
Managing daily household chores	64,9	16,4	4,2	14,5
Shopping	61,8	13,3	6,9	18,0
Travelling	57,1	13,6	8,1	21,3
Personal care (having a shower, etc.)	80,7	12,9	5,8	0,6
Out of home affairs (paying the bills, banking, hospital, working at field/garden, etc.)	53,8	10,6	8,6	27,0

The greatest discrepancy according to area of residence occurs on the topics of travel and errands. There was a higher percentage of urban dwellers who said they could perform both tasks with ease. The percentage of individuals over 60 who said they could travel with ease was 84% for urban dwellers and 78% for rural residents. The percentage of those who could perform errands out of the house, pay bills, banking, hospital and field work with ease was 58% for urban individuals and 50% for rural ones.

Comparing the three major cities, the percentage

of respondents over 60 who could perform shopping (74%) and errands outside the home (68%) with ease was higher in Izmir. Those who had difficulty shopping or required assistance to shop were higher in Ankara (26%) and Istanbul (22%) than in Izmir (14%). The area with the highest percentage of respondents who could travel easily was Istanbul (70%) and the lowest was Southeast Anatolia (42%). Participants over 60 who said they could perform errands outside the house with ease were higher in the West Marmara (64%), Istanbul (63%) and the Aegean (62%) regions (Table 143).

Table 143. Ability to Perform Activities throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (with Difficulty & with the Help of Somebody)

	Traveling	Managing daily household chores	Shopping	Out of home affairs (paying the bills, banking, hospital, working at field/garden, etc.)	Personal care (having a shower, etc.)	Eating
Türkiye	21,7	20,6	20,2	19,2	18,7	10,2
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	20,1	18,7	20,3	18,6	15,7	9,2
Rural	23,3	22,4	20,0	19,8	21,6	11,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	21,4	17,1	22,3	19,8	11,0	8,6
Ankara	24,9	19,3	26,0	19,3	13,1	8,3
Izmir	14,1	17,6	13,8	14,0	8,3	3,9
NUTS						
Istanbul	21,4	17,1	22,3	19,8	11,0	8,6
West Marmara	15,8	15,8	13,1	13,7	13,7	7,6
Aegean	18,0	18,7	15,8	15,5	11,7	5,9
East Marmara	21,9	19,1	19,1	18,4	19,4	9,3
West Anatolia	24,1	22,9	24,9	21,0	18,3	9,0
Mediterranean	24,0	20,6	20,6	20,0	19,5	9,0
Central Anatolia	14,3	19,1	16,7	15,7	17,5	11,6
West Black Sea	23,0	23,7	21,7	25,0	23,0	10,5
East Black Sea	24,7	25,9	22,2	17,1	26,0	14,6
Northeast Anatolia	18,4	16,5	15,9	15,6	23,4	14,9
Mideast Anatolia	29,8	27,2	23,9	24,1	31,0	15,8
Southeast Anatolia	28,5	24,3	26,2	25,2	34,4	21,7

For all tasks included in the study, the percentage of women who said they had difficulty or needed assistance was higher than the percentage of men. But the greatest discrepancy is over daily chores. The percentage of women who have difficulty per-

forming daily chores is 24% while the percentage of men drops to 8% (Table 144).

As the educational status increases the percentage of respondents who indicate they have dif-

difficulty or need assistance decreases. While this is true for pretty much every task included in the study, the greatest variation occurs in personal hygiene/bathing. 31% of illiterate people have difficulty or need assistance for personal hygiene/bathing while the percentage drops to 4% for those who completed undergraduate/graduate studies.

Comparing marital status, the percentage of respondents who have difficulty or need assistance is higher for widowed individuals.

A similar situation is seen for members of broken families. Among the tasks covered in the study, the greatest divergence is seen in shopping and errands

outside the house. While 36% of individuals over 60 who belong to broken families have difficulty or need assistance shopping, that number drops to 16% for those in nuclear families. The percentage of respondents who have difficulty or need assistance with errands outside the house is 35% for broken families while 15% for extended families.

As the socioeconomic status increases, the percentage of respondents who have difficulty performing the tasks covered in the study decreases. For example the percentage of those who have difficulty performing daily chores is 25% for the lower socioeconomic group but drops to 7% for the upper group.

Table 144. Ability to Perform Activities by Gender, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES (with Difficulty & with the Help of Somebody)

	Traveling	Managing daily household chores	Shopping	Out of home affairs (paying the bills, banking, hospital, working at field/garden, etc.)	Personal care (having a shower, etc.)	Eating
GENDER						
Male	14,6	9,7	13,9	15,4	12,1	6,1
Female	27,8	29,9	25,6	22,4	24,3	13,7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
Illiterate	29,7	29,1	26,9	23,7	30,9	15,9
Literate but no schooling	21,0	21,3	19,3	22,0	17,6	9,3
Primary school	15,8	14,3	14,5	14,7	10,5	6,5
Elementary education	16,2	14,7	17,9	14,2	6,8	5,9
Regular high schools and their equivalents	16,3	11,4	18,2	20,4	7,2	3,7
Undergraduate and graduate studies	13,2	6,8	15,2	7,5	3,5	3,8
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	20,5	21,1	27,2	20,1	16,8	14,6
Married	18,0	16,3	15,8	15,5	14,5	7,8
Divorced	28,8	26,7	23,2	27,1	16,1	6,7
Widowed	31,1	31,5	31,2	28,6	30,1	16,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	18,5	16,5	16,3	15,8	14,0	7,2
Extended	22,3	19,7	17,1	14,9	22,3	11,9
Broken	30,4	33,9	35,8	35,3	27,3	16,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Lower Group	30,5	30,7	31,6	31,3	32,3	18,0
Middle Group	19,1	17,5	16,5	15,5	14,6	7,7
Upper Group	13,5	11,3	12,6	8,2	6,8	5,1

9.5. Reasons of the Elderly to Live with Their Children at the Same House

Participants who were both over 60 and living with their children were asked why they lived together. The most common responses were "because I am happy to live with my children" (22%), "to support each other" (20%), "because our traditions and customs require to do so" (15%) and "because my children did not want me to live alone" (15%) (Table 145).

Additionally, "Because I require special care" (10%) and "Because I do not have any other chances" (9%) and 0.4% responded "Because I do not have the means to stay in a seniors center." Comparing area of residence, while 17% of urban dwellers cited "Because my children don't want me to live alone" this percentage drops to 13% for rural residents. On the other hand, 12% of rural residents say they live with their children because they need care. For urban dwellers this percentage is 8%.

The reasons individuals over 60 cite for living with their children varies by gender. The percentage of women who said their children did not want them to live by themselves (20%) is greater than men who gave the same reason (9%). While 12% of women who said they needed, the percentage of men who did was 7%. "To support each other" is the answer mostly given by men more often than by women. The percentage of men who live with their children is 23%, whereas for women it is 18%.

"To support each other" was higher for the 60-64 age group (24%). For those over 65 the percentages of "my children didn't want me living alone" (18%) and "because I need special care" (13%) responses are higher.

Comparing household types, "because our customs and traditions require to do so" is higher for nuclear (17%) and extended (16%) families; "my children didn't want me living alone" is higher for extended (19%) and broken (18%) families; and "because I require special care" is higher for extended families (13%).

Table 145. Reasons of the Elderly to Live with Their Children at the Same House throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Gender, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Because I am happy to live with my children	To support each other	Because our traditions and customs require it	Because my children do not want me to live alone	Because I require special care	Because I have no other chances	Because I do not have the means to stay in a seniors center	Other
Türkiye	22,3	20,0	16,2	15,3	9,8	8,7	0,4	7,2
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	22,2	21,1	15,1	17,7	8,0	7,8	0,6	7,5
Rural	22,4	18,8	17,4	12,7	11,8	9,6	0,3	6,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	19,7	22,5	20,6	24,6	6,6	0,3	1,3	4,4
Ankara	18,6	17,9	11,6	17,9	9,6	9,6	2,5	12,2
Izmir	26,0	20,1	11,3	1,9	5,6	20,1	0,0	15,0
NUTS								
Istanbul	19,7	22,5	20,6	24,6	6,6	0,3	1,3	4,4
West Marmara	31,2	26,0	4,6	12,0	4,0	16,2	0,0	6,0

	Because I am happy to live with my children	To support each other	Because our traditions and customs require it	Because my children do not want me to live alone	Because I require special care	Because I have no other chances	Because I do not have the means to stay in a seniors center	Other
Aegean	23,8	19,6	17,1	5,5	8,8	11,3	0,0	14,0
East Marmara	22,0	29,4	12,9	11,7	12,9	6,7	0,0	4,5
West Anatolia	23,8	18,1	11,2	17,3	11,4	8,5	1,2	8,6
Mediterranean	26,9	14,0	15,5	6,3	8,2	17,0	0,0	12,2
Central Anatolia	12,7	28,5	9,1	22,8	8,0	13,8	0,0	5,1
West Black Sea	27,7	21,2	9,5	16,9	13,1	7,0	0,6	3,9
East Black Sea	28,7	9,1	13,5	11,8	20,2	4,4	0,0	12,2
Northeast Anatolia	15,5	15,2	28,6	19,4	10,7	3,7	1,7	5,3
Mideast Anatolia	13,1	28,6	18,2	25,0	1,4	10,8	0,0	2,9
Southeast Anatolia	20,1	9,0	31,3	15,2	12,4	9,2	0,0	2,8
			GENDER					
Male	22,7	22,7	19,2	9,6	6,9	8,6	0,5	9,8
Female	22,0	17,8	13,8	20,0	12,2	8,8	0,3	5,0
			EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
Illiterate	17,9	17,5	16,9	18,3	15,1	9,0	0,2	5,2
Literate but no schooling	18,6	19,1	15,9	19,4	7,7	10,5	0,0	8,8
Primary school	26,6	24,5	15,5	11,0	6,0	8,1	1,0	7,3
Elementary education	38,2	16,3	7,8	16,8	4,3	3,9	0,0	12,7
Regular high schools and their equivalents	23,1	24,1	21,9	14,1	2,7	3,3	0,0	10,9
Undergraduate and graduate studies	42,7	5,8	18,3	0,0	0,0	14,2	0,0	18,9
			MARITAL STATUS					
Married	25,4	22,6	18,9	9,2	5,6	8,1	0,6	9,6
Divorced	20,5	22,3	0,0	43,1	0,0	14,2	0,0	0,0
Widowed	16,4	14,9	11,5	26,5	18,4	9,6	0,0	2,6
			HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	24,6	20,5	17,4	8,2	4,5	8,7	1,1	15,0
Extended	21,2	19,4	16,3	19,0	13,1	8,6	2,4	0,1
Broken	21,2	22,2	11,6	18,1	8,5	9,4	0,0	9,0
			SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Lower Group	13,3	15,2	19,4	17,0	17,2	12,9	0,6	4,4
Middle Group	23,3	21,2	15,4	14,8	8,9	8,5	0,4	7,5
Upper Group	27,0	14,0	20,8	18,3	8,1	3,5	0,0	8,3

9.6. Reasons of the Elderly to Live in Separate Houses with Their Children and How Often They are Visited

Individuals over 60 who didn't live with their children were asked about their thoughts on living

apart. Responses to the first question, "Would you ever like to live with your children," was 51% "yes" and 49% "no" (Table 146). The percentage of those who would like to live with their children is a little higher among rural residents (60%) and women (52%).

Table 146. Desire to Live with Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, and Gender

	Yes	No
Türkiye	50,5	49,5
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	40,1	59,9
Rural	59,7	40,3
GENDER		
Male	49,4	50,6
Female	51,6	48,4

Table 147. Reasons of the Elderly for not Living with Their Children at the Same House throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Gender, and Age

	I do not want to leave where I live and they can't come here either	My spouse and I are self-sufficient	I do not want to live with my children	My children's houses are not convenient	My children's financial means are limited
Türkiye	28,7	25,9	17,1	7,7	7,5
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	21,1	29,9	20,7	8,9	4,4
Rural	35,3	22,4	14,1	6,7	10,2
GENDER					
Male	28,2	30,9	13,8	6,5	7,3
Female	29,3	21,1	20,3	8,8	7,7
AGE					
55-64	25,5	30,6	16,2	8,2	7,6
65+	30,0	24,0	17,5	7,5	7,5
	My children do not want me	Their house is small to inhabit me	My daughter-in-law/son-in-law/grandchildren do not want me	There is no one at my children's home who could look after me	
Türkiye	3,4	2,8	2,5	2,2	
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	2,7	2,8	4,0	2,9	
Rural	4,0	2,8	1,2	1,5	
GENDER					
Male	4,0	3,2	1,9	2,4	
Female	2,9	2,4	3,1	1,9	
AGE					
55-64	4,1	2,9	1,5	1,5	
65+	3,1	2,8	2,9	2,4	

When the elderly were also asked "why they did not live with their children in the same house" the most common responses were "I do not want to leave where I live and they cannot come here either" (29%), "My spouse and I are self-sufficient" (26%), and "I do not want to stay with my children" (17%) (Table 147).

Comparing area of residence, "I do not want leave where I live and they cannot come here either" (35%) and "my children's financial means are limited" (10%) responses are higher for rural respondents; "My spouse and I are self-sufficient" (30%) and "I do not want to stay with my children" (20%) responses are more common for urban residents.

Comparing variation by gender, "my spouse and I are self-sufficient" is higher among men (31%) and "I do not want to live with my children" is higher

among women (20%).

Comparing age groups, the percentage of "my spouse and I are self sufficient" responses is higher for the 60-64 age group (31%). "I do not want to leave where I live and they cannot come here either" responses are higher for the over 65 group (30%).

Responses to the question "how often do your children visit you?" are displayed on Table 148. The frequency with which sons and daughters visit is generally parallel to each other. The percentage of sons who visit "once a week or often" is 47%, while the same percentage for a daughter is 44%. The percentage of both sons and daughters who haven't visited for over a year is around 3%. The percentage of elderly who are never visited by their sons and daughters is the same percentage (3%).

Table 148. Frequency of Visits by Their Children

	Son	Daughter
Once a week or often	46,9	43,8
At the weekends	10,6	11,0
Once a month	14,7	16,3
Only on religious fest	5,6	6,2
Once or twice a year	17,9	18,9
When they need help	0,7	0,3
We have not seen each other for more than a year	2,5	2,7
We never seen each other	1,1	1,0

When comparing area of residence, the percentage of "once a week or often" visits is higher for urban residents. The percentage of elderly visited by their sons is 55% in urban settings and 40% in rural ones; the percentage visited by their daughters is 56% in urban settings and 34% in rural ones. Area of residence does not vary for elderly who are never visited (Table 149 & 150).

There is variation among visits by the daughter depending on the gender of the elderly person being visited. The percentage of women who are visited by their daughter "once a week or often" (48%) is higher than that of men (39%). There is no variation for age.

Table 149. Frequency of Visits by Their Kids by Residence Area and Gender (Son)

	Once a week or often	At the weekends	Once a month	Only on religious fest	Once or twice a year	When they need help	We have not seen each other for more than a year	We never see each other
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	55,1	13,4	13,7	3,7	10,6	0,6	1,6	1,2
Rural	40,2	8,3	15,4	7,2	23,8	0,8	3,3	1,0
GENDER								
Male	45,4	11,2	14,6	6,7	18,4	0,7	1,9	1,1
Female	48,2	10,0	14,7	4,7	17,4	0,7	3,2	1,1

Table 150. Frequency of Visits by Their Kids by Residence Area and Gender (Daughter)

	Once a week or often	At the weekends	Once a month	Only on religious fest	Once or twice a year	When they need help	We have not seen each other fo more than a year	We never see each other
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	55,7	13,3	13,2	4,0	11,3	0,4	1,2	1,0
Rural	33,5	9,1	19,0	8,0	25,4	0,2	3,9	0,9
GENDER								
Male	39,6	12,0	17,0	6,6	21,1	0,5	2,3	0,8
Female	47,5	10,2	15,6	5,7	16,9	0,0	3,0	0,8

In addition, individuals who were over 60 and living away from their children were asked who visited them the most outside their children. The people who visit the most are neighbors (46%), grandchildren (18%), other relatives (16%) and siblings (11%) (Table 151).

Those visited by neighbors varies depending on whether it is in an urban or a rural setting. While over half of those living in rural environments are visited by their neighbors (53%), this percentage is 37% in urban environments.

The greatest variation by gender is once again over neighbor visits. While 52% of women are visited by

their neighbors, this percentage is 39% for men. By contrast men are more frequently visited by other relatives (19%) and friends (7%).

There is no significant variation based on age. Being visited by neighbors (47%) and grandchildren (19%) is more common for people over 65. For the 60-64 age group, the percentage visited by neighbors is 43% and by grandchildren 16%.

Table 151. People Who Visit the Elderly Most Aside From Their Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Gender, and Age

	Neighbors	Grandchildren	Other relatives	Siblings	Friends	Nobody visits	Other
Türkiye	45,8	18,3	16,3	10,7	4,9	3,4	0,6
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	37,0	20,3	19,1	11,0	6,7	4,7	1,1
Rural	53,5	16,6	13,9	10,4	3,3	2,1	0,2
GENDER							
Male	39,3	18,6	19,0	10,5	7,1	4,4	1,1
Female	51,7	18,1	13,9	10,9	2,9	2,4	0,2
AGE							
55-64	42,6	15,8	17,7	13,8	5,8	3,5	0,8
65+	47,0	19,3	15,8	9,5	4,6	3,3	0,6



RESULTS



According to the results of the Research on Family Structure in Turkey, the approximate number of people living in the same house, in other words the household size is 3.9. In general, the size of the household is smaller in urban areas and western regions compared to rural areas and eastern regions. While the largest households are in Southeast Anatolia (5.6 individuals), Mideast Anatolia (4.9 individuals) and in Northeast Anatolia (4.9 individuals), those with the smallest households are in West Marmara (3.2 individuals) and the Aegean (3.4 individuals).

Throughout the country, 6% of households have one person, 19% have 2, 20% 3 and 24% have 4 individuals. The percentage of households where there are 7 or more people is about 10%. Almost half of the households (45%) are made up of 3 members or less.

Across the country, 73% of the households are made up of nuclear families, 15% extended families and 13% broken families. The incidence of nuclear families is high in both urban and rural areas. However, the ratio of nuclear families is higher in urban areas and the ratio for extended families is higher in rural areas. While the percentage of nuclear families is higher in the upper SES households (83%), the percentage for extended families is lower (7%). In the lower SES group, the percentage of broken families is higher (25%) than other SES groups.

In the study, participants were asked questions to understand the financial situation of the individual and household. Participants were asked how they met their basic needs within the limits of their salary. Half of the households in Turkey report that they can meet those needs with difficulty or with great difficulty (50%). This percentage increases in rural households (55%) and in households in the lower SES (76%).

More than half of the participants do not have real estate (67%). House/Flat is the primary real estate participants own (24%). There is an important differentiation between men and women on the subject of real estate ownership. While half of the men

own real estate, this percentage is only 17% among women. While the majority of participants from the lower SES group do not own real estate (76%), this is valid for only half of the upper SES group (47%).

A great majority of households in Turkey do not have savings (87%). This percentage is higher in rural areas (90%). A similar situation is true for the lower SES group; nearly all the participants in this group have no savings (99%).

Participants who have or have had marriage experience were asked several questions about their married life. In addition, some of these questions were directed to single individuals to understand their perceptions about marriage better.

The findings show that 20% of marriages were made before 18 years of age and more than half were made between the ages of 18-24 (59%). Marriages made between the ages of 35-39 are extremely rare (4 in a thousand). The great majority of marriages in Turkey are made between the ages of 18-29 (77%).

Marriage in the 18-24 age group is more prevalent in Turkey. There is a similar trend for both men (59%) and women (60%). The percentage of marriage before 18 years of age is higher among women (31%) than men (7%) (Men: 59%, Women: 60%). While 29% of men marry between the ages of 25-29, only 8% of women marry between those ages. Both of these findings point toward women getting married earlier than men. In both women and men, the marriage age does not overflow into more advanced age groups; only 2% of women and 7% of men marry after age 30. These results illustrate the fact that people in our country get married in their 20s.

A great majority of participants (61%) think that the most favorable ages for women to get married is between 20-24. The percentage of people who think 20-24 is the appropriate age group for men is 37%. The percentage of those who think 15-19 is the ideal age range to get married is low; however, this age range is considered the ideal age more for

women (13%) than men (3%).

84% of married individuals in the country chose their spouses among family and neighbors, 5% made their choices among their circle of friends and 4% met through work. Among urban participants, the percentage of those who met their future spouses at work or through their friends is a little higher than rural participants. However, in both urban and rural areas, the great majority of individuals met their spouses through the family or neighbors.

One of the other areas the study looked closer is how the marriage decision is made. Arranged marriages are still prevalent in Turkey (61%). Half of those who made arranged marriages married by the decision of their families, the other half made the decision themselves. 31% of married people chose their future spouses themselves. While 35% of people from urban areas took the marriage decision themselves, this percentage falls to 24% in rural areas. The percentage of those who got married without parental permission and those who eloped to get married is (8%).

The results show what kind of marriage ceremony is preferred by the participants, most of the individuals in Turkey were married by both religious and civil ceremonies (87%). The percent of those with only a civil ceremony is 10% while those that only had a religious ceremony is 3%.

In 18% of marriages in the country there is a payment of bride price. The results show that 14% of participants from urban areas and 25% of the individuals from rural areas made the payment of the bride price. Analyzed by region, the highest percentage of bride price is seen in Northeast Anatolia (49%). This is followed by Mideast Anatolia by 45% and Southeast Anatolia by 43%. Almost half of the marriages in these regions were made by the payment of the bride price. The regions where this practice is the lowest is the Aegean (7%), Istanbul (10%), West Marmara (11%) and West Anatolia (11%). As the socioeconomic level rises and participants get younger, the percentage of the practice of bride price decreases.

According to the results of the study, 22% of married individuals in Turkey are blood relatives. 20% of those from urban areas and 26% of participants from rural areas have married a relative. As the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of those who married a relative decreases. 20% of those who married their relatives is married to a child of the paternal uncle, 13% with the child of a maternal aunt, 12% married a child of the maternal uncle and 11% with the child of a paternal aunt. Close to half of the people in a marriage with a relative report they married a distant relative (44%). When asked about what they thought about marriage between blood relatives, it was found that the majority disapproved (87%).

When marriage ceremonies are examined closely, the results show that the great majority (89%) of participants had a marriage ceremony. The rituals of asking the permission of the woman's family and betrothal are also prevalent in Turkey (85%). The percentage of those who had no ceremony at all is quite low (2%).

During the study, it was found that 69% of married individuals come from the same hometown with their spouses; 79% of participants from the rural areas and 63% of participants from urban areas come from the same town. Analyzed by regions, this percentage is higher in eastern parts of Turkey than western parts. While 86% of marriages made in East Black Sea, 85% of those made in Southeast Anatolia and 81% of those made in Mideast Anatolia are made with people coming from the same town, these percentages fall to 56% in Istanbul and 57% in East Marmara. The percentage of marriages made between people coming from the same town is around 70% in lower and middle SES groups. This percentage falls to 49% in the upper SES group.

The qualities sought in a future spouse were graded "very important", "important", "not important" and "I do not want this quality". The quality most sought after in a future spouse among women is for the man to "have a job" (55%). Only 4% of women thought this was not important. That "this should

be the first marriage for the man" (47%), that "they have similar family structures" (37%) and the man "being in love with the woman" (36%) are the other qualities reported to be very important. The most important quality for men is that "this should be the first marriage for the woman" by 56%. Those that do not think it is important make up 14%. Other qualities sought in a future spouse by men are "the woman being in love with the man" (35%) and "they have similar family structures" (30%).

88% of the marriages are still going on, 9% are widowed and 4% is divorced. According to the results by area of residence, percentages of widowed participants in rural areas (9%) and divorced individuals in urban areas (5%) are a little higher. When analyzed by gender, the results show no differentiation between divorced participants, the percentage of widowed women (11%) is higher than widowed men (4%).

According to the responses of divorced individuals, 29% of men and 21% of women see cheating as the main cause of the divorce. 17% of divorced women reported they divorced their spouses because of marital violence and abuse. None of the men however, reported domestic violence and abuse as a reason for divorce. The percentage of women who show alcohol consumption and gambling as the cause of their divorce is 12%. The percentage of men who cite disrespect to his family as the cause for divorce is 16%. The reason "acting irresponsible and disinterested" seen equally between men and women is also among the important reasons for divorce (Men: 18%, women: 21%).

Individuals were given some statements and were asked if these statements could be a reason for divorce.

Cheating, alcohol/gambling and abuse are reasons for divorce for the majority. For women to display those traits is seen as an even higher reason for divorce. For instance, while 89% of the participants see cheating on the woman's part as a reason for divorce, this percentage falls to 60% if it is the man who cheats. Not getting along with the spouse's

family and the inability to have children are seen as reasons for divorce for the minority.

When the times family members come together are analyzed, it was observed that family members usually come together at a high percentage on weekends (90%) and for dinner (89%). While the percentage of having breakfast together is a little lower than the other two, it is still high at 73%. The greatest differentiation between urban and rural areas was found to be in having breakfast together. While this percentage is 66% in urban areas, it is 86% in rural areas. As the socioeconomic level increases, the percentage of those who come together for breakfast and dinner decreases and the percentage of coming together on the weekend increases.

When the study looked at the activities members of the household did together, it was observed that visiting relatives and friends was common. On the other hand, sociocultural activities are rare. For the most part families continue the tradition of eating at home, and do not go to the movies or theatre together. With the exception of "visiting neighbors", the percentage of family members who do activities together increases as socioeconomic level increases.

According to the findings on who does the household work such as cooking, laundry, doing the dishes, ironing and sewing, it was found that these chores were done mostly by the women by a higher percentage. The percentages of those chores range between 84% and 89%. In chores such as tea service, setting and cleaning the table, tidying up the house this percentage falls somewhat. Chores such as daily grocery shopping, paying the bills, maintenance and painting/whitewashing is mostly done by men. For all the chores listed in the study, the percentage of women who do these chores falls as the socioeconomic level of the household rises. The greatest differentiation was found to be in "setting and cleaning the table" and "serving tea after dinner".

In households with a child between the ages of 0-5, the mother is the main person responsible for looking after the child during the day (92%). This percentage is followed by the paternal grandmother

by 2% and maternal grandmother by another 2%. There is no differentiation between urban and rural areas on the subject of the mother being the responsible party to look after children in the household. On the other hand the responsibility of the mother during daytime decreases a little in higher educational levels and responses start to include the maternal grandmother, paternal grandmother, nurseries and kindergartens. Similarly, households where the mother is the sole person responsible for looking after the children is lower in the upper SES group compared to lower and middle SES groups.

Results on the decision making process in the family, “family members decide together” by 50%. In 44% of household women are the predominant decision makers on the organization of the house; on other subjects, men are more predominant. As the socioeconomic level increases, the percentage of only men as decision makers or only women as decision makers decrease while the percentage of family members deciding together increases.

Married participants were asked how good their relationship with their spouses was. It was observed family members report their relationships as good. While 93% of participants report their relationship with their spouses as good or very good, the percentage of those who rate their relationship as bad or very bad is only 1%.

The study inquired if there were problems on 12 different issues about family life between spouses and if there are problems, the frequency of the problems experienced. When “sometimes” and “frequently” responses are taken together, the study found that the issues of “responsibilities about the home and children” (36%) and “spending habits” (33%) were the ones that caused the most conflict between spouses.

The kind of reaction shown by the spouse is one of the indicators of intra-family relationships when there is a disagreement between spouses and this disagreement cannot be solved by discussion. When “generally”, “sometimes” and “very rarely” responses are taken as a whole across the country,

it was found that men usually react by raising their voices (70%) and women react by giving the silent treatment (80%). The percentage of men who react violently towards their spouses is 8%. When taken by educational level, although there is no significant differentiation between percentages, the spouses of women from the lower SES group are more prone to domestic violence.

On the subject of relationships with relatives, participants were asked about the level of their “relationships with family members and close relatives”. In this context, “very good” and “good” responses were found to be mostly concentrated on the relationships with children and parents. The percentage of those who rate their relationships with their children as “very good” and “good” is 97%; a good relationship with the mother is 97%, with the father 94%.

According to the findings on the proximity of living quarters of participants over 18 years of age, 31% of participants live apart from their families but they live in the same city. This is followed by 30% living with their parents. As a good indicator of extended family structure, the percentage of living in the same house with the in-laws is 9%. The highest percentage of responses to the proximity of living quarters with the in-laws belongs to those living in the same city by 42%. The percentage of those living in a different city is 26%, while the percentage of participants who live in the same neighborhood/district is 17%.

76% of participants live with their children, 30% with their parents and 17% with their siblings. The percentage of those who live together with their in-laws is 9% and the percentage of those who live with their grandparents is 6%. The percentages of living with in-laws (15%) and living with grandparents (10%) in rural areas are higher than in urban areas. The highest percentage of those who live with their in-laws is in Northeast Anatolia (18%) and the lowest is in the Mediterranean (5%). The percentage of those who live with their grandparents is higher in East Black Sea (14%) and Northeast Anatolia (13%).

Across Turkey, the people visited most often (several times a week or every day) are neighbors (85%), children (66%) and parents (50%). The percentage of those who visit second degree relatives like maternal/paternal uncles and aunts is 24%. With the exception of children, the percentage of participants who see their relatives and neighbors often is higher in rural areas.

For families to have children and the number of their children is a good indicator of the quality of intra-family relationships, as well as demographic trends. When individuals across Turkey were studied, they mostly had 2 (29%) and 3 (20%) children. This is followed by 1 (17%) and 4 (11%) children. Individuals with more than 5 children make up 6% while those with 6 children or more is 9%, it is another 9% for those who could not have children or have no surviving children.

Participants were asked how many children they would want if the conditions were right. The majority reported wanting 2 (48%) and 3 (26%) children. The percentage of those who say they want 4 or more children is 13%. Among participants 5% want 1 child and 4% want 5 children. Participants from urban areas or from the western parts of Turkey want to have less children compared to rural areas and eastern regions. On the other hand, people from a lower educational level want more children compared to people with a higher education. The percentage of people who want 2 children is higher in all socioeconomic groups. Moreover, as was true for the number of children the family has, as the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of people who want 2 children or less increases while the percentage of people who want 4 or more children decreases.

Participants who had children between the ages of 3-17 were asked about the kind of problems they experienced with their children. The highest problem areas are "choice of friends" (25%), "spending and consumption habits" (26%) and "choice of dressing style" (21%). It was observed that at least one fourth of participants with children have problems over these issues. On the other hand, 19%

of participants who have children between the ages of 3-17 experience problems with their children on eating, home rules, choice of entertainment, 16% on intra-family relationships, 13% on choice of school and career, 15% on attitudes towards marriage and family life, 13% on adherence to traditions and another 13% on relationships with relatives. The least problematic issues are political views and religious conduct and behavior.

Participants were asked if they are bothered by the fact that there would be people who are not married (civil or religious) in their vicinity. 66% of the participants reported they would be bothered by this fact, while 20% reported they would not be bothered. Those who report they are not bothered by having unmarried people living in their vicinity are younger, have a higher educational level, from the upper SES group, divorced and single individuals.

The results show that when asked about their attitudes toward women working outside of the home, 84% of participants think it is suitable while 16% think it is not suitable. From these responses it can be concluded that the majority of the people have a positive attitude towards working women. Those who think it is suitable for women to work is higher among women, younger age groups, individuals with a higher educational level, the upper SES group and divorced or single individuals.

The most important reason given by those who think it is not appropriate for women to work is idea that "the real job of a woman is looking after the children and the home". This is followed by "work environments are not safe for women" at 14% and "it does not fit with our customs and traditions" by 13%. The percentage of those who think the workplace is not a safe environment for women to work is higher in urban areas.

To measure the perception of participants on the happiness of their families, individuals were asked how they perceived their families on a happiness scale. 78% of the participants responded with "happy" or "very happy"; 12% defined their families as "unhappy" or "very unhappy".

Participants were also asked which direction they thought family relationships are headed. More than half of the participants (56%) think that family relationships are going for the worse while 23% think relationships are getting better.

To understand the attitudes towards the direction of the family, participants were asked how EU membership would affect the family structure. Findings on this subject suggest that the majority of the individuals were undecided or thought it would have no effect at all. While 28% do not venture a thought on the subject, 20% said "it would have no effect". An important percentage of women (37%), reported they had no idea on the subject. The percentage of those who think it will have a negative effect is higher among men.

When the study looked at where participants mostly got their religious information, the percentage of family as a source is high (58%). This is followed by religious officials (16%) and school/10%). In urban areas while family and relatives (60%), school (11%) and religious texts (7%) are important sources of religious information, in rural areas religious officials are consulted more often as a source (22%). In younger age groups, the percentage of participants learning from the school and in advanced age groups the percentage of learning from religious officials and through the family were found to be higher. Individuals reported religious beliefs to be most decisive in their choice of spouse (81%). This percentage is followed by the choice of food and drink by 72%. The third area where religion is a definitive factor is style of dressing. In choosing a career (54%), voting (53%) and relations with neighbors (50%), half of the individuals report religion is not a defining factor.

Participants were asked questions about visiting relatives, friends and close associates. Almost all of the participants have reported visiting during religious holidays to wish others a happy holiday (98%), patient visits (98%), attending wedding receptions or marriage ceremonies (97%) and visits to offer condolences for a lost family member (97%) sometimes, generally or definitely. Going to visit

others during religious holidays is the primary visit that is definitely made.

Family members or their close associates were asked if they gave gifts on various occasions. According to the results, the primary occasion where family members generally or definitely give gifts is during patient visits (75%).

Giving gifts for a new baby (70%), newlyweds or those who have recently bought a house (65%) and military conscripts (59%) is customary. Across Turkey, giving gifts on the New Year (generally/definitely) is not very usual (18%).

5% of the participants have an older member who needs constant care in the household. The percentage of those who need constant care is higher in rural areas (8%) than in urban areas (4%). Compared by region, households which have a senior member needing constant care are the highest in West Black Sea (9%), Mideast Anatolia (8%) and Northeast Anatolia (8%); and the lowest in Istanbul (4%), Mediterranean (4%) and West Anatolia (4%). Analyzed by socioeconomic level, the highest percentage of senior family members who need constant care is found to be in the lower socioeconomic level by 11%.

Families with a senior member who needs constant care mostly need health services (43%), financial support (26%) and the support of a care giver (13%). Those who report they need health services (46%) and financial support (27%) are higher in rural areas than in urban areas. As opposed to this, those who report they need a care giver support are higher in urban areas (16%). As the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of those who need financial support decreases, however, the need for a care giver increases.

Participants under 60 were asked how they wanted to live when they were too old to take care of themselves. According to the results the majority of individuals want to live with their children in their seniority (55%).

In addition, 18% of the participants responded by "I will employ a care giver", 9% "I will go to a nursing home" and 17% by "I have no idea". 11% of those who live in urban areas and 6% of those who live in rural areas responded by "I will go to a nursing home". While 50% of urban individuals want to stay with their children, this percentage is 65% in rural areas. The percentage of those who responded by "I will employ a care giver" is higher in urban areas compared to rural areas (19% and 16% respectively). As the socioeconomic level rises, the percentage of those who want to go to a nursing home or employ a care giver increases.

Those who prefer going to a nursing home for their senior years were asked about the reason for this

preference. The percentage of responses "I do not want to be a burden to my children" (55%), "My children may not want to live with me" (16%) and "Conditions would be better in a nursing home" (11%) were found to be higher.

Participants over 60 were asked to evaluate their physical condition. 10% of the participants thought they were physically "very good" and 54% thought they were "good". 15% felt physically "bad" and 15% felt "very bad". From these responses it can be deduced that more than half (64%) of the over 60 participants see themselves as better than other people their own age; those who evaluate themselves as worse is 17%.



REFERENCES



- HÜNEE. (1973). Research on Population Structure and Population Issues in Turkey (TNNSA). Ankara: Hacettepe University Publications.
- HÜNEE. (1978). Research on Fertility in Turkey (TDA). Ankara: Hacettepe University Population Studies Institute.
- HÜNEE (1983). Research on Fertility and Family Health in Turkey (TDASA). Ankara: Hacettepe University Publications.
- HÜNEE (1988). Research on Fertility and Health in Turkey (TDSA). Ankara: Hacettepe University Publications.
- HÜNEE. (1993). Research on Population and Health in Turkey (TNSA). Ankara: Hacettepe University Publications.
- HÜNEE. (1998). Research on Population and Health in Turkey (TNSA). Ankara: Hacettepe University Publications.
- HÜNEE. (2003). Research on Population and Health in Turkey (TNSA). Ankara: Hacettepe University Publications.
- Kalaycıoğlu, S., Çelik, K., Çelen, Ü., Türkyılmaz, S. (2010). Development of Measurement Tools for Socioeconomic Status (SES) in a Representative Sample: Ankara City Center Example. *Sociology Research Magazine*, v.13 (1) pg.182-220
- Kıray, M. (1964). Ereğli: A Coastal Town Before Heavy Industry. Ankara: Middle East Technical University Publications.
- Kongar, E. (1972). Izmir Family Study. Ankara: Turkish Social Sciences Association Publications.
- Office for National Statistics (2002). Family Resources Survey (TFS). London: Office For National Statistics.
- Peterson, C., Goldman, N., & Pebley, A. (1997). The 1995 Guatemalan Survey Of Family Health (EGSF): Overview And Codebook. RAND Corporation
- RAND Corporation. (1994). Indonesia Family Life Survey (IFLS). Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
- RAND Corporation. (1978). The Malaysian Family Life Survey (MFLS). Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
- RAND Corporation. (1993). The Malaysian Family Life Survey (MFLS). Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
- RAND Corporation (1997). The Guatemalan Family Life Survey (EGSF). Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
- SPO. (1992). Research On Family Structure in Turkey. Ankara: State Planning Organization.
- Timur, S. (1972). Research on Family Structure and Population Issues in Turkey. Ankara: Hacettepe University Publications.
- TÜİK (2006). Research on Household Budget. Ankara: Turkish Statistical Institute Press.
- Vikat, A., Spéder, Z., Beets, G., Billari, F. C., Bühler, C., Désesquelles, A., and Solaz, A. (2008). Generations and Gender Survey (GGS): Towards A Better Understanding Of Relationships And Processes In The Life Course. *Demographic Research*, 17, 389-440.
- Yasa, İ. (1966). Shanty Towns in Ankara. Ankara: Ministry of Health and Social Welfare.