RESEARCH ON

FAMILY STRUCTURE IN TÜRKİYE

TAYA 2011

T.R.
Ministry of
Family and
Social Policies

RESEARCH ON

FAMILY STRUCTURE IN TÜRKİYE

TAYA 2011

T.R.
Ministry of
Family and
Social Policies

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

RESEARCH ON
FAMILY STRUCTURE IN TÜRKİYE
TAYA 2011

PREFACE

As an institution that guides peoples' lives and enables the continuity of societies, through which value judgments and behaviors are shaped and handed down from generations to generations, family stands as an important subject matter of research in the field of social sciences.

A closer understanding of family as a social institution is essential in comprehending the lifestyle of society and individuals. In all life stages, from mother's womb to babyhood, from babyhood to childhood and to adolescence and further to adulthood and old ages, an individual builds her/his relations with other actors in the social network based on their family relations in many different ways. In this context, familial relations play a very important role for steady social life.

Individuals and families may, from time to time, fail to put their inherent ability to solve problems into action in the face of fast social change. Particularly at times of crisis and painful social transformation, research on family problems and perceptions becomes evidently necessary in forming a better insight of the problems of families and individuals and to cope with the resulting problems more effectively.

Research on Family Structure in Türkiye has been conducted by our Ministry and is repeated every five years as a part of Official Statistics Program. I feel happy on behalf of my Ministry to present the second revised publication of this research which was repeated in 2011 for the purpose of covering the gap of family related data and information that represents the entirety of Türkiye due to scarcity of research studies in this field.

I wish such research studies will grow in number to become one of our basic sources of knowledge as a basis of social policies and thank everyone who put their efforts into this study.

Ayşenur İSLAM
Minister

INTRODUCTION

The fast process of social transformation that the world and Türkiye undergo does not only induce the society to understand important social institutions such as law, health, education and culture, but it also forces us to have a scientific understanding of family as a basic institution that sets the relations between these institutions.

It can be concluded that one of the most important common grounds of social sciences is the quest for establishing and understanding factors that drive social change as well as the structural change that the addressees of such social change undergo. Family is a rare institution that both acts as a driver of change and as an object of such change itself to the same extent. Family has quite a dynamic nature for setting the static perspectives that shape the life of the individual as well as for its problem-solving capacity which protects itself and its members in cases of crisis or transformation.

I hold the perspective that understanding family typologies along with the changes in roles and status within intra-familial relations throughout social transformation processes is one of the main starting points for revealing the ability of the individual and the family to resist and adapt to change.

The structure of the family that embodies both static and dynamic nature at the same time forces the institutions of the state related with research and social policies to set down structural evaluations based on family when shaping and implementing social policies.

In this context, Our General Directorate realized the Research on Family Structure in Türkiye for the first time in 2006 as a study which was agreed to conduct regularly. In 2011 too, this research was repeated. In 2013, both of the previous research studies were analyzed and the new tables were incorporated in the report for 2011 study, which required a revised publication. Thus, we thank those who contributed to the submission of the study at the disposal of relevant institutions by revising it.

With my wishes that this study paves the way to new ideas for prospective researches and benefits social policy makers…

Ömer BOZOĞLU
General Manager

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENT

4. INTRA-FAMILIAL RELATIONS

5. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELATIVES

6. CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY AND APPROACHES TOWARD CHILDREN

7. PERCEPTIONS ON FAMILY AND COMMUNITY LIFE

8. SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

9. ELDERLINESS

RESULTS

REFERENCES

TABLES

2. HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

3. MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

4. INTRA-FAMILIAL RELATIONS

5. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELATIVES

6. CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY AND APPROACHES TOWARD CHILDREN

7. PERCEPTIONS ON FAMILY AND COMMUNITY LIFE

8. SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

9. ELDERLINESS

ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ASAGEM	General Directorate of Family and Social Research
EGSF	The Guatemalan Survey of Family Health
EU	European Union
FRS	Family Resources Survey
GGP	Generations and Gender Survey
GDSAS	General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity
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
SPO	State Planning Organization
TAYA	Research on 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

Since family is one of the most fundamental units of society, gleaning updated scientific data about the family and its problems bears significance in terms of identifying the structural transformation within the social change process and creating social policies. Research on Family Structure in Türkiye (TAYA) which was held twice- first in 2006 and the second in 2011- and which was included in the Official Statistics Program, aims at figuring out the family structure in Türkiye, life style of individuals in the family setting, and their value judgments regarding family life. The research reveals the current condition of families in Türkiye, gathering information about household characteristics, marriage, relations within the family, kinship relations, values regarding children, elderly and other social values as well as family problems; analyzing these factors across a number of variables, and collecting data that will allow identifying what changes are taking place over time.

1.2. Literature

Research at national level regarding demographics, family, health, satisfaction and similar issues has entered the realm of sociology, psychology, and social policy disciplines mainly through the assistance of statistical science. Research regarding the individual and the family in particular stems from three major sources: The first is national records, which can be compiled via population, address, insurance, motorized vehicles, deed, justice, social aid and health systems. Another source regarding individuals and their families is the census that is held every five or ten years. A third source is research set within the framework of a national sample and conducted periodically. The first type of resource where electronic records are used, gleans tangible and material data for the most part, and fails to identify feelings and thoughts of individuals about family. The second type of resource is expensive and is held with very long intervals, and the questionnaire needs to be brief; in that sense, it is a reliable source of information about individuals and families, but it collects data within a narrow framework. The third type of

source, research with a national sample, has the capacity to collect various types of data about individuals and families, which renders it quite handy compared to the other two sources. TAYA exemplifies the third type of source that collects periodical data at a national level. Today sociology and social policy research about populations and family follow two approaches. One is macro sociological research that aims at identifying the functions and structural transformations of individuals and families across a broad social plane. Another is the effort to understand individual and family at a micro sociological level, and it focuses on the roles and relations of individuals and family and aims at identifying the structural transformation in private and public life. The first approach and ensuing nationwide quantitative research have begun to get replaced by the second type of approach since 1980's, and have been superseded by qualitative research. However, especially research on poverty, employment, consumption, saving, use of time and life satisfaction is still based on nationwide quantitative methods and maintains its data-generation monopoly in these areas. Population health, and family structure research seems to follow the path of qualitative research more, through the help of psychology, sociology and anthropology both at nationwide quantitative and micro-sociological level. In social policy work, there is a tendency to identify problems at the macro and regional level in the eyes of the state, therefore the statistics-supported macro quantitative work still maintains its power. Nevertheless, be it quantitative or qualitative, both methods complement each other. Research output at the micro level transforms the study themes or questionnaire, if not the measurement tools at the macro level. For example, TAYA questionnaire has leveraged on questionnaires from several macro-level research studies conducted previously in Türkiye (Timur, 1972; TNNSA, 1973; TDA, 1978; TDASA, 1983; TDSA, 1988; TNSA, 1993; TNSA, TNSA, 1998; TNSA, 2003; DPT 1992; TurkStat, 2006) as well as micro-level regional studies (Yasa 1966; Yasa, 1969; Kıray, 1964; Kongar, 1978), and studies conducted in villages and towns. In parallel with TAYA 2006, there are several international research studies that examine family structure at a national level. For ex-

ample, RAND Corporation's Family Life Research conducted in Malaysia (MFLS, 1978; MFLS, 1993), Guatemala (EGSF, 1997) and Indonesia (IFLS, 1994); Family Resources Study that has been going on since 1992 in the UK (FRS, 2002), and Generations and Gender Study (GGS, 2008) that is practiced in 19 countries, aim at identifying family structure, marriage, fertility, health, income, savings and family values. TAYA's questionnaires dated 2006 was reviewed after an analysis of the questionnaires of past large-scale studies in Türkiye with a nationally representative sample (HÜNEE, 2008, 2003, 1998, 1993, 1990, 1983, 1978; AAK, 1992, 1991), with a view to understand Internet use, family values, divorce reasons, main characteristics of family structure, functions and change, reasons of violence against women as well as life satisfaction of individuals.

1.3. Research Design

TAYA 2011 was designed by General Directorate of Family and Social Research (ASAGEM); sample design by Turkish Statistical Institute (TURKSTAT); field application by ANAR Ankara Social Studies Center Ltd. Co.; data control, cleaning, internal consistency analyses, tabulation, and report writing by Ipsos Social Research Institute.

1.3.1. Data Collection Tools

Preparation for the research study started in 2010. Questionnaire was written as a result of a review of the study questionnaire prepared upon collaboration of ASAGEM, TURKSTAT and State Planning Organization (SPO) in 2006, by a group of experts and academicians working in the field of family studies. The pre-test for the revised questionnaire was carried out in three different neighborhoods in Ankara in May 2011, after which the questionnaire and field guides were finalized. The questionnaire comprised closed-ended questions to be posed to household members that were 18 and older. In the field practice of the study, two separate questionnaires were used- one for the household and another for the individual. Additionally, a list

of individuals was used to record main demographic data of individuals younger than 18 in a household.

In the list of individuals in household, the reference person for gathering demographic data about all individuals in the household, was asked questions about gender, age, educational status, marital status and relationship with head of household for all individuals living in that household.

Household questionnaire, on the other hand, is the questionnaire that is applied to any individual (reference person) 18 or older that is capable of answering questions about the household during visit to household. This questionnaire covers questions on household characteristics, inhabited dwelling, goods ownership, household income, and socialization in family, child and elderly care, sharing of housework, decision makers for main issues of family, borrowing and savings.

Individual questionnaire is applied to 18 years old and older household members who are present at household during the visit. This questionnaire covers questions on individual's own demographic characteristics, individual income, property/ vehicle ownership, having children, marital status, status of marriage, desire to be a foster family, divorce, woman's participation in work life, ideal number of children, child-parent relationship, relations in family, relations between spouses, domestic violence, relations between neighbors and relatives, religion, smoking and alcohol use, leisure time activities, TV, vacation, senior age, and life satisfaction.

Questions on household and individual questionnaires can be categorized into two groups. The first group queries conceptual issues such as age, gender, profession and marital status that aim at identifying tangible/observable features/phenomena/events regarding the individual. The second group of questions aims at measuring the subjective perception of an individual vis-a-vis a situation or an event, such as reasons for divorce or expectations from senior years of life.

1.3.2. Sample

Sample design of the study was carried out by TurkStat on the basis of the 2010 Address-Based Population Registration System. The study universe is households within Republic of Türkiye. Sample is identified based on multi-phase, layered and random sampling method. Study sample was created so as to depict variations across areas of residence (urban/rural) and regions. The sample was selected to represent Türkiye across urban and rural areas of residence; Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir cities; and Nomenclature of Units for Territorial Statistics (NUTS) 1st Level.

In sample design, *urban areas of residence* were defined as those with a population of 20.001 and more, while *rural areas of residence* were defined as those with a population of 20.000 and less. However, since it was considered impossible to attain adequate sample size areas of residence below 200, sheltered housing, nursing homes, prisons, military barracks, hospitals, hotels, nurseries which constitute 3% of the society and is described as institutional population, and nomadic population were left outside the scope of the study.

Final sampling unit includes households and all the individuals older than 18 years of age in the chosen households. Sample size was designed to contain 16.500 households without applying replacement principle and in a way to represent Türkiye in terms of urban and rural areas at NUTS 1st level.

For the sake of comparability to European Union (EU) data and for performing socioeconomic analyses of regions, Statistical Region Unit Classification was defined on the basis of Nomenclature of Units for Territorial Statistics (NUTS) criteria which is an EU classification. As a result of a grouping of cities which recognizes certain population size of cities with similar economic, social, cultural and geographical characteristics, 12 units were defined as 1st level region units. Accordingly; *Istanbul* classifies the city of Istanbul; *West Marmara* classifies the cities of Balıkesir, Çanakkale, Edirne, Kırklareli, Tekirdağ; *Aegean*: Afyon, Aydın, Denizli, Izmir,

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

1.3.3. Implementation

Recruitment and training of interviewers, planning of application method, field study, auditing and coding were handled by ANAR (Ankara Sosyal Araştırmalar Merkezi Ltd. Şti). Field study of the research has been carried out between 23 August – October 2011 by applying face-to-face interviewing method. At the end of the field study, interviewing of 12.056 households out of a sample of 16.500 households was completed. A total of 23.279 individuals above 18 years of age in these households have been interviewed and the demographic data of 44.117 family members in these households have been compiled.

Interviews in 4.444 households could not be carried out due to reasons such as field study coinciding with summer months and Ramadan, change of addresses in some places because of urban transformation, rejection of some households to participate in the research or failure to find any qualifying interviewee in the household. Reasons of non-response are recorded on questionnaires for the sake of weighing and calibration.

5% of questionnaires have been checked by field su-

pervisors in the field during the field study and 5% have been checked on the phone in the management center once field study was concluded.

1.3.4. Definitions and Concepts

Household: Is a group comprised of 1 or more people, who live under one roof or occupying the same housing unit or in the part of the same dwelling, and who takes part in the services and management of the household.

Individual: Household members who are 18+ years old and available at home during the interview are ac-cepted as individuals.

Reference person: Eighteen years old or older member of the household in charge of the sustenance of the household to whom the questionnaire was applied face-to-face.

Household member: It's defined as each of the family members to whom questionnaire was applied face-to-face without limitation of 18 years of age.

Neighborhood: It is a group of households who live clo-se to each other; depending on their place of residence, who live in the same neighborhood but in separate ho-using units side by side/on the top of the other.

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 fa-milies 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 de-pend 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 to-gether 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 house-hold 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 house-hold, any household member living together are not related to each other by birth or kinship. In addition to triple and octal household types, another classification with 13 elements was made. This household type was calculated by taking the age of the parent and the number of children into account.

Nuclear Family without Children (age<45): Family type made up of parents younger than 45 years of age with no children.

Nuclear Family without Children (age≥45): Family type made up of parents older than 45 years of age with no children.

Nuclear Family with Children (1 child/2 children/3 children and more): The type of family that includes mother, father and 1, 2, 3 or more single child/children.

It's a variable that is classified on the basis of closeness of household members in terms of family relations and relations with relatives. The definition of household type was based on the household definitions of Research of Population and Health in Türkiye (TNSA-Türkiye Nüfus ve Sağlık Araştırması). In the compilation of the book, the classification of three household types namely nuclear family, extended family and broken family was used.

1.3.5. Weighted Calculation

Weighted calculation in the Research on Family Structure in Türkiye was carried out on the basis of a sample provided by TURKSTAT, comprising addresses of 16.500 households representing urban, rural, 12 regions, Izmir and Ankara cities. It is a total of 768 clusters (blocks), with 1266 clusters (blocks) of 100 in the urban, and 768 clusters of 50 in the rural area.

Since 16.500 households were not accessed fully for various reasons, it was only possible to interview 12.056 households as a result of fieldwork. F2 non-response corrections were made for these 12.056 households. For clusters that were entirely inaccessible, F1 corrections were made, based on the assumption that clusters in IBBS Level 1 are homogeneous. Corrected F1 and F2 were used to calculate F0 values, and the approximate number of households in Türkiye. The number of households calculated for every rural and urban area in every region was calibrated on the basis of the distribu-

tion in the TURKSTAT 2011 mid-year estimation of number of households, and the households were weighted on that basis. Household Member and Individual weighted averages were found out by taking the household weighted averages generated as a reference, and were calibrated according to TURKSTAT's 2011 mid year population predictions, based on the gender distribution in urban and rural populations of the regions, and the weighted average was found out for household members under 18 and for individuals over 18.

1.3.6. Variables Produced in the Data Set

Household, Individual and Household Member Factor Base Variables: In order to conduct statistical analyses (ANOVA, t-test, chi-square test etc.) in the data set, household, individual and household member factor bases were generated.

Household Factor Base: Household Factor variable is formed by multiplying the total value by the number 0.000618837860138579 so as to make it equal to the number of samples.

Household Member Factor Base: Household Member Factor variable is formed by multiplying the total value by the number 0.000594390440995397 so as to make it equal to the number of samples.

Individual Factor Base: Individual Factor variable is formed by multiplying the total value by the number 0.000453803637621807 so as to make it equal to the number of samples.

Socioeconomic Status Variable: Referring to the Journal of Sociological Research article "Developing a tool for the measurement of socioeconomic status (SES) from a representative sample: The case of Ankara City Center" (Volume:13, Issue: 1 – Spring 2010) prepared by Sibel Kalaycıoğlu, Kezban Çelik, Ümit Çelen and Sinan Türkyılmaz, the socioeconomic status (SES) classification of households are calculated. Following variab-les are used to calculate SES scores: Lastly graduated school, income per household member, ownership status of

the property lived in, type of heating system in the house, automobile ownership, dish-washer owners-hip, ownership of second television set and DVD player, and availability of internet. Based on the calculated scores, households are assigned one of the following 5 SES groups: High Upper Class, Upper Class, Upper Middle Class, Lower Middle Class, and Lower Class.

To converge per capita income in the household, average education in the household, ownership of dwelling, ownership of a car, heating system of the house, ownership of a dishwasher, ownership of a second television, ownership of a DVD player, having internet connection and household employee score values on the same scale, Z transform was applied, and each one of them were transformed into scores with 0 average and 1 standard deviation. Later these variables were reduced to a single dimension by factor analysis. The variable which was reduced to a single dimension was then transformed to T scores with 50 average and 10 standard deviation. The calculated score was applied a multiple regression analysis with the variables used to find this score. Within the framework of calculations, SES = 30.978 + (Average Year of Education)

x 0.775 + (Per Capita Income) x 0.003 + (Inhabited Dwelling) x 1.975 + (Car) x 1.975 + (Heating System of the House) x 1.775 + (Dishwasher) x 1.775 + (Second TV) x 1.775 + (DVD Player) x 1.775 + (Internet Connection) x 1.775 + (Household Work Status Score) x 6.446 equation was found out.

As a result, SES groups were grouped at standard deviation intervals of 1, by considering the SES variable with 50 average and 10 standard deviation. Accordingly, SES scores were defined as follows: (between 30 and 39.99) high upper class, (between 40 and 49.99) upper class, (between 50 and 59.99) upper middle class, (between 60 and 69.99) lower middle class, (70 and above) lower class.

Important Note: In some of the tables in the book, since the numbers were rounded off in questions with a single answer, in questions with multiple responses the sum of the rates may not add up to 100%.

The margin of error in the study, with a 95% statistical significance, is 0.5% for the houlsehold member, 0.6% for the individual and 0.9% for the household.

Chapter 2

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

In this chapter, population characteristics and economic status of the households are explored within the scope of Research on Family Structure in Türkiye. Within this scope, matters such as the number of people living in the household, household type, characteristics of the inhabited dwelling, if the households are able to meet their basic needs or not, real estate ownership of individuals, and borrowing and saving behaviors of the households were investigated.

2.1. Household Population Characteristics

In Türkiye, the average household comprises 3,6 members. The average household size is quite close to each other in urban and rural areas. Among the

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

	Number of Household Members
Türkiye	3,57
RESIDENCE AREA	
Urban	3,56
Rural	3,62
THREE MAJOR CITIES	
Istanbul	3,53
Ankara	3,30
Izmir	3,11
NUTS	
Istanbul	3,53
West Marmara	2,70
East Marmara	3,19
Aegean	3,19
Mediterranean	3,53
West Anatolia	3,55
Central Anatolia	3,61
West Black Sea	3,27
East Black Sea	3,28
Northeast Anatolia	4,54
Mideast Anatolia	4,74
Southeast Anatolia	5,35
HOUSEHOLD TYPE	
Nuclear	3,65
Extended	5,61
Broken	1,87
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS	
Higher Upper Class	3,12
Upper Class	3,29
Upper Middle Class	3,62
Lower Middle Class	3,73
Lower Class	4,31

three major cities, Istanbul ranks at the top with the largest household size on average (3,5 members) whereas Izmir ranks the lowest (with 3,1 people). A comparison of the regions indicates that the Southeast Anatolia Region accommodates the largest household size (5,4 members). Mideast Anatolia and Northeast Anatolia Regions follow, with 4,7 and 4,5 household members respectively. The region with the smallest household size in Türkiye is West Marmara (2,7 members) (Table 1).

As expected, extended families are the largest with an average of 5,6 household members. This is fol-

lowed nuclear families and broken families with 3,6 and 1,9 household members respectively. SES level and household size are inversely proportional. In families with the lowest SES level, household size is 4,3 individuals while this drops down to 3,1 people in households with the highest SES level.

Across the country, 9% of the households has 1 person, 22% has 2 people, 21% has 3 people, 25% has 4 people. Nearly 6% of the households have 7 and more individuals. Almost half of the households (51%) are composed of 3 and fewer people (Table 2).

Table 2. Number of Individuals in a Household

Number of Individuals in a Household	%
1	9,2
2	21,5
3	20,6
4	24,7
5	12,7
6	5,9
7	2,6
8	1,1
9	0,7
Above 10	1,1

2.1.1. Household Types

The most widespread household type in Türkiye is the nuclear family (70%). Though extended families sustain their presence to this day, they represent a smaller portion of the society (12%). The share of broken families is 18% (Table 3).

Nuclear family prevails in the urban areas (71%), whereas the extended family is more common in rural settlements (16%). Extended families are settled mainly in Central Anatolia (19%), Southeast

Anatolia (19%), Northeast Anatolia (19%), and Mideast Anatolia (18%).

Moving from lower to upper SES levels the share of the nuclear family goes up, as that of the extended family declines. 70% of the lower SES group is composed of nuclear families while the rate goes up to 82% in the higher upper SES group. On the other hand, the rate of the extended family in higher upper SES class is 7% whereas it soars to 14% in the lower SES class.

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

	Nuclear	Extended	Broken
Türkiye	70,0	12,3	17,7
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	71,2	11,0	17,8
Rural	66,8	15,8	17,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	69,3	11,4	19,3
Ankara	70,4	9,9	19,7
Izmir	69,7	8,2	22,1
NUTS			
Istanbul	69,3	11,4	19,3
West Marmara	70,8	6,2	22,9
East Marmara	68,3	11,5	20,2
Aegean	72,8	9,2	18,0
Mediterranean	73,0	9,0	18,0
West Anatolia	70,3	12,8	16,9
Central Anatolia	68,3	19,4	12,3
West Black Sea	66,4	15,1	18,6
East Black Sea	68,0	13,3	18,7
Northeast Anatolia	63,6	18,8	17,6
Mideast Anatolia	71,7	17,7	10,5
Southeast Anatolia	69,1	18,9	12,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Higher upper class	81,7	6,8	11,5
Upper class	77,6	8,3	14,1
Upper middle class	75,7	12,8	11,5
Lower middle class	73,9	15,2	10,9
Lower class	70,0	13,7	16,2

Nuclear families with child outnumber (53%) those without a child. The highest level of differentiation based on the Residence Area is observed in the nuclear family type. Nuclear families with child represent a higher share in the urban areas (56%) compared to the rural (Table 4).

On the other hand, nuclear family without a child is more common in the rural areas (24%). A comparison of household types on the basis of the three major cities reveals that the number of nuclear family without a child in Izmir (18%) is higher compared to the other two major cities. In Mideast Anatolia and Southeast Anatolia, there is a lower rate of nuclear families without a child (9%), and a higher rate of nuclear families with a child.

As for the extended family, transient extended families represent a higher share (7%). Solely in Central Anatolia (10%), Mideast Anatolia (10%) and Southeast Anatolia (9%), the share of the patriarchal extended family, in other words, the share of households where the older generation is the household head is closer to that of the transient extended family.

Broken households with one household member, with single parent, and other broken families represent 9%, 5% and 3% of the society respectively. The share of one-person households is 11% in the rural, 10% in the lower SES class, and 16% in West Marmara. On the other hand, this household type is represented at a lower rate in Southeast Anatolia (3%) and Mideast Anatolia (4%).

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

	Nuclear without a child	Nuclear with child	Patriarchal extended	Transient. extended	Single member	Single parent	Other broken	Non-relative
Türkiye	17,1	52,9	5,1	7,2	9,2	4,6	3,1	0,8
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	14,9	56,3	4,4	6,7	8,4	5,1	3,4	0,9
Rural	23,5	43,2	7,2	8,6	11,3	3,4	2,4	0,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	12,2	57,1	4,1	7,3	8,9	6,1	3,5	0,8
Ankara	14,8	55,6	3,9	6,0	9,5	5,9	3,4	0,9
Izmir	18,2	51,5	2,9	5,2	11,3	6,2	3,9	0,7
NUTS								
Istanbul	12,2	57,1	4,1	7,3	8,9	6,1	3,5	0,8
West Marmara	28,7	42,2	1,8	4,5	16,2	3,5	2,7	0,6
East Marmara	17,4	50,9	3,5	8,0	12,0	4,7	2,6	0,9
Aegean	21,0	51,8	4,2	5,0	9,1	4,4	3,7	0,8
Mediterranean	16,8	56,2	3,8	5,2	9,5	4,4	3,2	0,8
West Anatolia	15,1	55,2	6,1	6,7	8,3	4,7	3,2	0,6
Central Anatolia	22,7	45,6	9,6	9,9	6,6	2,8	1,8	1,1
West Black Sea	23,8	42,5	6,1	9,0	11,0	4,0	3,3	0,2
East Black Sea	26,1	41,9	4,6	8,7	11,8	2,6	3,6	0,7
Northeast Anatolia	8,9	54,7	6,5	12,3	7,3	6,1	2,5	1,6
Mideast Anatolia	9,1	62,6	9,6	8,1	3,6	3,8	2,1	1,0
Southeast Anatolia	8,6	60,5	9,1	9,8	3,4	5,1	2,8	0,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
Higher upper class	19,3	62,4	1,9	4,9	5,9	3,3	1,6	0,7
Upper class	16,4	61,3	3,0	5,4	6,9	4,1	1,9	1,3
Upper middle class	14,7	61,0	5,9	6,9	4,7	3,3	3,0	0,5
Lower middle class	21,4	52,5	6,3	8,9	4,6	3,8	2,4	0,1
Lower class	13,9	56,1	5,6	8,1	10,1	3,9	2,3	0,0

2.2. The Inhabited Dwelling

This section includes information regarding the inhabited dwelling type, condition of property, whether there are other inhabited dwellings such as summerhouse or rural house, number of rooms, whether there are separate rooms for children and senior members living in the household, soil material of the dwelling, and heating system.

2.2.1. Soil Material of the Dwelling

Concrete is the most widely available soil material in households throughout Türkiye (23%). Concrete is followed by parquet (19%) and laminated flooring (15%).

23% of urban households are equipped with parquet material whereas this rate drops down to 6% in the rural. In a similar vein, laminate flooring has an 18% share in the urban areas whereas this is 6% in the rural areas. In the rural areas, 18% of the floors are covered with wood whereas the rate of wood in urban dwellings is 8%. Nevertheless, concrete is the most common soil material used in the rural areas (39%), whereas the share of urban households with concrete flooring represents 18% of the total (Table 5).

Parquet is the most common soil material used in Istanbul (31%) and Ankara (45%). Laminate flooring (29%) and vinyl (16%) are the two other soil

materials used widely in Istanbul. Differently from the other two major cities, in Ankara, carpet is used more widely (12%). In Izmir, floor tile (23%) use doubles that in the other two major cities and is the most preferred soil material in this province.

The soil material in inhabited dwellings varies across NUTS. Concrete is most widely used in Southeast Anatolia (54%), Mideast Anatolia (36%), Central Anatolia (34%), Mediterranean (35%), West Marmara (31%) and Aegean (24%). Parquet use is at a higher level in West Anatolia (36%) and Istanbul' (31%), whereas in East Black Sea (%35) and West Black Sea (%28) wood floor covering is more common. Differently from all other regions, Northeast Anatolia stands out with the highest rate of soil (29%) use as floor covering.

Table 5. Soil Material of the Inhabited Dwelling throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Concrete	Parquet	Laminate	Tile	Wood	Carpet	Vinyl	Soil	Mosaic	Other
Türkiye	23,1	18,9	15,0	10,4	10,4	8,8	5,7	3,6	2,4	1,8
RESIDENCE AREA										
Urban	17,7	23,4	18,4	11,9	7,7	8,2	7,0	0,9	2,8	2,1
Rural	38,7	5,9	5,6	6,1	17,8	10,2	2,1	11,4	1,3	0,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES										
Istanbul	9,0	31,0	28,6	3,6	3,5	3,9	15,7	0,2	2,1	2,4
Ankara	11,0	44,8	15,3	5,7	3,0	11,9	4,2	0,5	2,6	1,1
Izmir	16,4	20,0	20,0	22,6	5,2	6,1	2,0	1,6	3,2	2,7
NUTS										
Istanbul	9,0	31,0	28,6	3,6	3,5	3,9	15,7	0,2	2,1	2,4
West Marmara	30,6	11,1	15,5	11,0	3,0	9,5	10,3	4,7	1,8	2,5
East Marmara	10,1	21,2	18,1	2,9	9,4	26,2	7,1	1,7	0,1	3,2
Aegean	23,8	14,9	19,4	14,5	15,5	3,5	2,0	1,4	3,4	1,6
Mediterranean	34,9	10,4	1,9	30,5	12,2	2,3	0,9	1,9	3,9	1,1
West Anatolia	11,7	35,5	11,3	6,3	9,2	16,9	3,0	3,5	1,8	0,9
Central Anatolia	33,8	13,7	15,0	3,9	6,9	9,4	3,3	8,5	4,0	1,5
West Black Sea	24,7	8,8	17,4	2,5	27,6	8,2	4,3	3,3	1,3	1,9
East Black Sea	25,4	14,0	8,8	7,6	34,7	7,2	0,2	1,1	0,1	0,7
Northeast Anatolia	20,0	9,7	7,7	1,1	16,4	15,5	0,1	29,2	0,2	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	36,3	16,1	6,1	5,2	1,8	16,3	7,7	7,3	2,0	1,2
Southeast Anatolia	53,7	6,6	0,2	20,1	0,4	1,9	0,0	10,8	4,7	1,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE										
Nuclear	22,0	19,3	16,2	11,2	9,9	8,4	5,7	3,2	2,3	1,8
Extended	31,6	14,4	11,4	7,4	11,0	10,3	5,2	4,9	2,2	1,7
Broken	22,0	20,2	12,7	9,1	11,5	9,3	6,3	4,5	2,7	1,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS										
Higher upper class	6,5	43,6	28,9	7,2	1,4	5,4	4,6	0,0	1,6	0,8
Upper class	6,4	36,3	28,6	10,1	5,7	6,0	3,3	0,0	1,9	1,8
Upper middle class	11,3	28,0	22,4	11,8	9,1	7,1	5,4	0,4	2,8	1,8
Lower middle class	28,0	12,3	11,6	10,0	12,1	10,3	7,5	3,8	2,5	1,9
Lower class	48,4	3,4	2,1	9,9	11,2	9,7	2,9	9,7	1,8	0,9

Though no major variation was observed on the basis of family structure, 32% of the dwellings of the extended families have concrete flooring. In nuclear and broken families, the share of households with parquet covering (22%) is quite high as well. In the nuclear family, the rate of parquet soil material is 19%, while it stands at 20% in the broken family type (Table 5).

As socioeconomic status rises, the use of parquet and laminate flooring rise correspondingly, whereas the share of dwellings with wood, concrete or carpet for flooring diminishes. In the high upper class SES group, parquet is used at 3% and laminate flooring is at 2%. In the lower SES group, the most widely used material is concrete (48%), followed by wood (11%), carpet (10%), floor tile and soil. There is no dwelling with soil flooring in the high upper, upper and upper middle class SES groups.

2.2.2. Inhabited Dwelling

In Türkiye, nearly half of the households (49%) reside in an apartment/flat, 25% in detached house, and 15% in detached-squatter house (Table 6).

3% of the households reside in a gated community, in other words, in an apartment located inside a building complex with security; and 1% resides in a detached house within a building complex with security. Including those dwelling in public/mass housing, it is observed that 4% of the households live in a gated community. Since there is a relatively higher rate of rejection in gated communities during the field practice, one can draw the conclusion that the share of this type of dwelling in total is higher.

Important differences in dwelling type emerge particularly with respect to the rural-urban distinction. The most common type of dwelling in the urban areas is apartment/flat with 62%, whereas the rate of detached houses reaches 53% in the rural Residence Areas. Regarding the total of detached-squatter house and detached house, 81% of the dwellings in the rural areas is detached, while 72% of the dwellings in the urban areas are within multiple-floor buildings, including the apartments in gated communities and apartment- squatter houses.

An assessment of the three major cities reveals that 76% of the families in Istanbul reside in apartments whereas that is 77% in Ankara. In Izmir, the rate is lower (59%). Differently from the other two major cities, in Izmir, there is a larger population living in detached houses (17%) and detached-squatter houses (12%).

Istanbul (76%) and West Anatolia (64%) accommodate the highest number households living in apartments/flats. Other than Northeast, Mideast and Southeast Anatolia; apartments/flats rank at the top as the most common type of inhabited dwelling. On the other hand, in Northeast Anatolia, there are more households living in detached-squatter houses (46%), whereas in Mideast Anatolia (44%) and Southeast Anatolia (36%) those who live in a detached house is at a higher rate. The population living in detached-squatter houses is also high in Southeast Anatolia (29%), Mediterranean, (26%) and East Black Sea (21%) regions.

There are more extended families living in detached houses (35%) compared to other types of household (24% in nuclear families, 22% in broken families). Half of nuclear (51%) and broken families (50%) reside in an apartment/flat.

The type of inhabited dwelling varies across SES groups too. 37% of the lower class households dwell in a detached house and another 37% in detached-squatter houses, whereas in the high upper class, the share of apartments/flats is 70% and dwelling in gated community is 15%

Table 6. Type of Inhabited Dwelling throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Apartment/ flat	Detached house	Detach. squatter house	Apartment squatter house	Gated community	Detached house in gated community	Public/ mass housing	Villa/ mansion	Other
Türkiye	49,1	25,1	15,2	5,8	2,5	1,1	0,6	0,2	0,3
RESIDENCE AREA									
Urban	61,6	15,5	10,6	6,9	3,1	1,3	0,6	0,2	0,2
Rural	13,8	52,5	28,3	2,6	0,9	0,5	0,9	0	0,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES									
Istanbul	75,8	5,4	4,2	6,7	5,5	1,4	0,4	0,3	0,1
Ankara	76,8	4,3	9,8	3,5	2,1	0,8	1,5	0,6	0,6
Izmir	58,7	16,7	11,6	8,5	2,2	1,4	0,7	0,1	0
NUTS									
Istanbul	75,8	5,4	4,2	6,7	5,5	1,4	0,4	0,3	0,1
West Marmara	52,9	24	15,4	3,4	2,5	0,7	0,4	0,5	0,3
East Marmara	45,7	28,8	12,4	6,9	3,5	1,9	0,5	0,1	0,2
Aegean	43,6	31,4	14,2	6,3	1,9	2,3	0,3	0,2	0
Mediterranean	35	26,2	26,3	10,3	1,3	0,4	0,5	0	0,1
West Anatolia	63,6	17,8	9,9	2,8	2	1,5	1,2	0,5	0,7
Central Anatolia	42,4	34,5	17,5	4,5	0,5	0	0,5	0,1	0,1
West Black Sea	44	44,3	8,6	1,1	0,4	0	0,4	0	1,3
East Black Sea	43,7	26,2	21,4	1,8	4,3	0	2,6	0	0
Northeast Anatolia	27,3	23,8	46,2	1,7	0	0,2	0,9	0	0
Mideast Anatolia	24,8	44,1	17,7	7,4	3,4	0,7	1,3	0,4	0,2
Southeast Anatolia	26,3	36,2	29,3	6,4	0,5	0,5	0,8	0	0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE									
Nuclear	51,1	24,2	14,0	5,9	2,7	1,1	0,7	0,2	0,2
Extended	36,6	34,9	18,5	6,6	2,1	0,7	0,1	0,1	0,5
Broken	50,2	22,1	17,8	4,9	2,4	1,6	0,6	0,1	0,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS									
Higher Upper Class	70,3	4,5	1,0	2,1	14,6	4,2	1,5	1,7	0,0
Upper Class	74,7	9,2	1,4	1,7	7,3	2,3	2,7	0,6	0,2
Upper Middle Class	67,5	17,1	4,3	4,7	3,6	1,6	0,8	0,2	0,2
Lower Middle Class	41,3	31,4	18,1	7,4	0,7	0,5	0,3	0,0	0,3
Lower Class	16,9	37,3	36,6	8,4	0,1	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,6

2.2.3. Number of Rooms

The questionnaire explored the number of rooms including the saloon in the inhabited dwelling. In Türkiye, the most common dwelling size is the three-room (2+1) dwelling (43%), followed by those with four rooms (3+1) (41%). However, the breakdown varies across the rural and urban Residence Areas. In the urban areas, 87% of the dwellings have either three (2+1) or four-rooms (3+1). Smaller or larger

dwellings are relatively fewer in number. Yet, in the rural areas, both small (14% with two rooms) and very large (10% with five rooms or more) dwellings are more widespread compared to the urban areas; in other words, the dwelling size in the rural areas exhibits more variety (Table 7).

In parallel with the general landscape in Türkiye, households in the three major cities reside in 2+1 or 3+1 dwellings. However, in Istanbul, 2+1 dwell-

ings dominate the scene with 53%, whereas in Ankara the rate of 3+1 dwellings is higher (65%). It is observed that two-room (1+1) dwellings are at a noticeably low rate in Ankara (4%).

Regarding the NUTS breakdown, 2+1 or 3+1 dwellings are common in all regions. Nevertheless, two-room (1+1) dwellings are most common in Northeast Anatolia (26%) ensued by Southeast Anatolia (17%) and East Black Sea (12%). Another conspicuous difference across the regions is that dwellings with five rooms or more are predominant in West Black Sea (11%), Central Anatolia (11%), East Black Sea (10%) and West Anatolia (9%).

As anticipated, in all dwellings, the extended family is the most common type of household. For example, in dwellings with five rooms (4+1) or more, the share of the extended family is 14%, whereas it is 6% in the nuclear family and 4% in the broken family. On the other hand, the share of the broken family in the small-sized dwellings of 1+1 rooms (16%) is at a higher rate compared to other household types. In terms of SES, lower class (49%) and lower middle class (47%) households reside predominantly in three-room (2+1) dwellings, whereas four-room dwellings stand out in the higher upper class households (53%).

Table 7. Number of Rooms in the Inhabited Dwelling throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+
Türkiye	1,0	8,7	42,8	40,9	5,2	0,9	0,6
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	0,6	6,9	42,7	44,2	4,2	0,8	0,4
Rural	2,3	13,6	42,8	31,4	7,9	1,1	0,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	0,4	8,4	52,9	33,9	3,1	0,6	0,5
Ankara	0,5	3,8	23,4	64,7	5,2	1,4	0,9
Izmir	0,8	9,2	41,4	44,9	3,7	0,1	0,0
NUTS							
Istanbul	0,4	8,4	52,9	33,9	3,1	0,6	0,5
West Marmara	1,9	8,2	48,3	37,1	4,4	0,0	0,1
East Marmara	0,5	6,6	41,7	44,3	4,8	1,1	1,1
Aegean	0,8	8,1	40,8	44,3	5,3	0,3	0,3
Mediterranean	1,0	9,4	45,7	38,2	4,4	0,9	0,4
West Anatolia	0,4	3,9	29,3	57,4	6,0	1,8	1,4
Central Anatolia	0,6	5,5	30,4	52,8	8,7	1,5	0,4
West Black Sea	0,9	7,3	40,3	40,5	8,4	1,6	1,1
East Black Sea	1,4	11,7	39,5	37,7	8,4	1,0	0,4
Northeast Anatolia	3,6	25,5	43,0	25,2	2,2	0,4	0,1
Mideast Anatolia	1,2	8,1	41,8	41,0	6,0	1,6	0,3
Southeast Anatolia	3,7	16,5	44,9	29,3	4,9	0,4	0,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	0,8	7,5	43,0	42,6	5,0	0,7	0,5
Extended	0,1	5,3	36,0	45,1	9,9	2,0	1,5
Broken	2,5	15,7	46,8	31,3	2,5	0,9	0,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Higher upper class	0,4	2,4	22,9	53,4	15,6	3,2	2,1
Upper class	0,2	2,3	29,2	60,5	5,5	1,1	1,2
Upper middle class	0,2	3,2	40,0	49,6	5,5	0,8	0,6
Lower middle class	0,6	8,7	47,3	36,7	5,4	0,9	0,4
Lower class	3,9	20,2	49,3	23,4	2,4	0,4	0,4

2.2.4. Type of Heating in the Dwelling

Households were queried regarding the type of heating used in the dwelling and the responses are depicted on Table 8. 50% of the households in Türkiye use firewood/coal stove for heating. Next comes combi boiler with natural gas (23%), and central heating with natural gas (9%).

In tandem with other features, the heating system varies across the rural and urban to great extent. The most pervasive heating system in the rural areas is firewood/coal stoves (83%) in the rural, ensued by stoves burning turd (6%). While the firewood/coal stoves dominate the rural areas, there is a notable variety in the urban areas. The most common heating system is again the firewood/coal stoves with 38%. The next most common heating is room heater/ combi boiler with natural gas (31%), and central heating with natural gas (12%).

The breakdown of the three major cities indicates a difference as well. In Istanbul and Ankara, room heater/ combi boiler/natural gas and central heat-

Table 8. Type of Heating in the Inhabited Dwelling throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Firewood/coal stove	Room heater combi boiler/ natural gas	Central heating natural gas	Central heating firewood/coal	AC	Stove natural gas
Türkiye	49,9	22,9	8,7	4,3	3,8	2,8
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	38,1	30,5	11,5	4,8	4,8	3,5
Rural	83,4	1,2	0,5	2,9	0,9	1,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	16,4	54,7	17,6	0,6	0,1	7,3
Ankara	19,1	54,0	23,4	1,5	0,0	1,0
Izmir	48,2	8,9	5,5	3,0	20,4	0,7
NUTS						
Istanbul	16,4	54,7	17,6	0,6	0,1	7,3
West Marmara	60,5	16,1	5,1	10,3	0,8	2,0
East Marmara	42,6	31,8	11,4	3,5	0,1	7,4
Aegean	59,5	10,0	3,3	3,5	12,0	0,4
Mediterranean	70,0	0,6	1,2	1,3	15,2	0,0
West Anatolia	33,9	42,1	19,1	1,7	0,0	1,1
Central Anatolia	55,5	16,3	9,8	9,9	0,0	1,8
West Black Sea	70,6	11,6	3,5	7,2	0,5	2,1
East Black Sea	74,8	1,3	1,5	14,2	0,0	2,8
Northeast Anatolia	41,5	9,1	2,7	10,8	0,0	0,7
Mideast Anatolia	72,9	6,6	6,5	7,4	0,0	0,5
Southeast Anatolia	67,9	4,5	2,4	6,7	0,6	0,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	49,2	23,4	9,0	4,5	3,7	2,7
Extended	59,4	20,6	5,6	3,2	2,3	2,2
Broken	46,0	22,2	9,4	4,4	5,1	4,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	3,0	50,0	25,0	6,9	6,9	1,2
Upper class	8,7	40,8	19,7	11,3	8,6	1,4
Upper middle class	26,8	37,2	12,3	6,5	7,0	2,7
Lower middle class	65,9	15,3	4,8	2,4	1,8	3,7
Lower class	85,7	1,2	0,6	0,0	0,2	1,4

ing/natural gas use is much more widespread compared to Izmir, while households opt for firewood/coal stove (48%) and air conditioners (20%) for heating purposes. In Izmir, central heating/natural gas use is a meager 6 %, and room heater/ combi boiler/natural gas use stands at 9%.

Room heater/ combi boiler with natural gas is the most common heating system used in Istanbul (55%) and West Anatolia (42%). Although room heater/combi boiler with natural gas is quite widespread in East Marmara as well (32%), the most widely used heating system is firewood/coal stove with 43%. In Istanbul, the use of firewood/coal stove is much lower in comparison to other regions (16%). In contrast with other regions, central heating/natural gas system is the most widely used in Istanbul (18%). Another region where central heating/natural gas use is quite common is West Anatolia (19%). The only region that is different from all the other regions is Northeast Anatolia. Though firewood/coal stove is the most prevalent type of heating (42%), the use of stove with turd is the highest among all regions with 33%.

Stove electricity	Stove turd	Room heater other	Room heater fuel oil gas	Central heating fuel oil gas	Central heating other	Stove catalytic heater	Other
2,0	1,8	1,7	0,7	0,4	0,3	0,2	0,5
RESIDENCE AREA							
2,4	0,3	1,6	0,8	0,5	0,3	0,3	0,6
0,8	6,2	1,9	0,4	0,2	0,3	0,1	0,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
1,6	0,0	0,3	0,7	0,5	0,2	0,0	0,1
0,2	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,0	0,0
6,7	0,0	1,5	1,1	0,5	1,0	0,6	2,1
NUTS							
1,6	0,0	0,3	0,7	0,5	0,2	0,0	0,1
0,2	0,0	1,4	1,5	0,4	1,4	0,0	0,5
0,0	0,4	1,0	0,6	1,0	0,3	0,0	0,0
4,0	0,3	2,0	1,1	0,4	0,5	1,2	1,8
7,1	0,4	2,3	0,7	0,5	0,2	0,3	0,3
0,2	0,1	0,9	0,4	0,1	0,2	0,0	0,0
0,4	2,6	1,3	0,5	0,3	0,1	0,0	1,5
0,6	0,8	2,3	0,4	0,1	0,2	0,0	0,2
1,0	0,0	1,2	1,5	0,1	0,8	0,0	0,7
0,3	32,5	0,9	1,0	0,3	0,0	0,2	0,0
0,4	2,6	2,6	0,0	0,2	0,3	0,0	0,0
1,1	9,9	5,4	0,3	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
1,6	1,7	2,0	0,7	0,4	0,3	0,1	0,5
0,9	3,1	1,2	0,5	0,2	0,3	0,3	0,1
4,2	1,6	0,6	0,8	0,5	0,3	0,4	0,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
1,1	0,0	2,4	1,2	0,8	1,3	0,0	0,0
1,4	0,0	3,9	1,7	0,9	0,9	0,0	0,5
2,0	0,0	2,5	1,3	0,5	0,4	0,3	0,5
2,0	1,4	1,1	0,4	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,5
1,8	8,2	0,4	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,2	0,2

The heating system used in the inhabited dwelling does not vary greatly depending on the household type, however the use of firewood/coal stove is higher in the extended family (59%) compared to the nuclear family (49%) and the broken family (46%) (Table 8).

Significant variation is also observed in the breakdown based on socioeconomic status. 86% of lower class households use firewood/coal stove for heating while this drops to 66% in lower middle class, 27% in upper middle class, 9% in upper class, and as low as 3% in the high upper class SES groups. 50% of the high upper class households use room heater/ combi boiler with natural gas. This is 37% in upper middle class households. The second most common heating system in the high upper SES group is central heating with natural gas (25%), while only 1% of the lower class households use this type of heating.

Table 9. Availability of a Separate Room for Children in the Dwelling throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	There is	There isn't
Türkiye	56,6	43,4
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	60,6	39,4
Rural	43,6	56,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	63,2	36,8
Ankara	76,9	23,1
Izmir	63,1	36,9
NUTS		
Istanbul	63,2	36,8
West Marmara	70,1	29,9
East Marmara	66,8	33,2
Aegean	57,1	42,9
Mediterranean	52,1	47,9
West Anatolia	70,6	29,4
Central Anatolia	58,3	41,7
West Black Sea	62,2	37,8
East Black Sea	60,8	39,2
Northeast Anatolia	36,6	63,4
Mideast Anatolia	39,7	60,3
Southeast Anatolia	26,9	73,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	60,1	39,9
Extended	39,5	60,5
Broken	58,9	41,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Higher upper class	94,3	5,7
Upper class	87,4	12,6
Upper middle class	76,0	24,0
Lower middle class	48,5	51,5
Lower class	21,3	78,7

2.2.5. Room for Children and Elderly in the Dwelling

Households with children of 17-years-old and younger were queried regarding the availability of separate rooms for the children in the house. The responses are depicted on Table 9. In case there is more than one child in the household, even if there is a separate room for only child or even if all children stay in the same room, this is considered a separate room for the children in the house. 57% of the households in Türkiye accommodate a separate bedroom for children. The breakdown on the basis of the Residence Area is 61% for the urban, and 44% for the rural areas.

The share of households with a separate room for children is 77% in Ankara, whereas it goes down to 63% in both Istanbul and Izmir. An analysis of the results on NUTS basis reveals that the number of households with a separate room for children is higher in West Anatolia (71%), West Marmara (70%) and East Marmara (67%). In Southeast Anatolia (27%), Northeast Anatolia (37%) and Mideast Anatolia (40%), there is a lower share of households with a separate room for children.

In the extended family, the share of households with a separate room for children is 40%, which is lower compared to other types of households (60% in the nuclear family, and 59% in the broken family). As the socioeconomic status rises, the number of households with a separate room for children increases. 94% of the households in the high upper class versus a meager 21% of the households in the lower class SES group comprise a separate room for the children in the house.

Within the scope of the study, in households without a household head and with members at age 60 and older, the reference people were asked whether they had a separate room for the elderly in the house (Table 10).

In Türkiye, in general households spare a separate room for the elderly (64%). The breakdown on the basis of the Residence Area is 66% for the urban and 60% for the rural areas. Among the three major cities, the city with the lowest rare of households with a room for the elderly is Istanbul (60%). In Izmir and Ankara, the share of such households is above 70%. On NUTS basis, the share of households with a separate room for the elderly is higher in West Marmara (79%), West Anatolia (77%), West Black Sea (76%) and East Marmara (75%) and lower in Mideast Anatolia (33%), Southeast Anatolia (38%) and Northeast Anatolia (50%).

On SES basis, 88% of the households in the high upper class reserve a separate room for the elderly in the house. On the other hand, the rate of such households declines to 39% in the lower class households.

Table 10. Availability of a Separate Room for the Elderly in the Dwelling throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, and SES

	There is	There isn't
Türkiye	64,3	35,7
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	66,4	33,6
Rural	60,8	39,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	60,2	39,8
Ankara	74,4	25,6
Izmir	71,7	28,3
NUTS		
Istanbul	60,2	39,8
West Marmara	77,9	22,1
East Marmara	74,3	25,7
Aegean	68,1	31,9
Mediterranean	56,6	43,4
West Anatolia	76,9	23,1
Central Anatolia	74,7	25,3
West Black Sea	76,8	23,2
East Black Sea	74,8	25,2
Northeast Anatolia	49,7	50,3
Mideast Anatolia	33,4	66,6
Southeast Anatolia	38,3	61,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Higher upper class	87,6	12,4
Upper class	96,7	3,3
Upper middle class	73,5	26,5
Lower middle class	60,4	39,6
Lower class	38,9	61,1

2.2.6. Ownership Status of the Dwelling

Households were asked about the ownership property of the dwelling where they live. 61% of the households in Türkiye are owned by one of the members of the household, and there is no rent payment involved. The ratio of tenants in Türkiye is 26% (Table 11).

72% of the dwellings in the rural area are owned by a member of the household, while this kind of ownership is measured at 56% in the urban areas. Households with tenants in the urban areas reach 31% versus 12% in the rural. Ownership status of the inhabited dwelling is parallel across the three

major cities. Among the NUTS, Istanbul is the city the highest number of tenants in the households (34%). The ratio of households living in a dwelling owned by one of the household members is higher in Central Anatolia (71%), and lower in Istanbul (56%).

An evaluation on the basis of the household type indicates that the broken family has the highest ratio of tenants with 32%. 26% of the nuclear families, and 17% of the extended families are tenants. In the majority of the households where the extended families live (74%), the dwelling belongs to one of the members of the household.

Ownership of the property varies greatly across the SES groups. As socioeconomic status rises, the ratio of households with a tenant declines. 33% of the households in the lower class have tenants, while this is 25% in the high upper class. On the other hand, 70% of the households in the high upper class are in a dwelling that belongs to a member of the household. This is 43% in the lower class.

Table 11. Ownership Status of the Inhabited Dwelling throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Owned by household member	Shared ownership with someone outside the household	Owned by the relative of the household but no rent paid	Owned by the relative of the household but pays rents	Tenant	Public housing	Housekeeper's flat	Other
Türkiye	60,7	2,2	8,2	1,0	26,3	0,8	0,4	0,3
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	56,6	1,8	7,7	1,2	31,2	0,6	0,6	0,3
Rural	72,4	3,5	9,6	0,3	12,2	1,6	0,1	0,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	55,6	1,1	7,3	1,2	33,6	0,4	0,5	0,3
Ankara	58,0	1,4	5,4	1,5	30,3	1,7	1,4	0,3
Izmir	58,6	1,8	8,4	1,3	28,0	0,9	0,5	0,4
NUTS								
Istanbul	55,6	1,1	7,3	1,2	33,6	0,4	0,5	0,3
West Marmara	67,0	2,4	5,7	0,4	22,9	1,4	0,0	0,3
East Marmara	55,9	2,4	12,4	2,0	25,1	0,9	0,5	0,8
Aegean	59,2	3,8	9,2	0,7	26,0	0,4	0,4	0,3
Mediterranean	59,7	1,5	9,4	1,0	27,3	0,3	0,8	0,2
West Anatolia	61,6	1,2	5,3	1,3	28,2	1,2	1,0	0,2
Central Anatolia	71,2	3,1	5,2	0,8	18,8	0,4	0,4	0,0
West Black Sea	63,5	4,0	9,4	0,6	21,0	1,2	0,3	0,0
East Black Sea	69,4	1,2	5,8	0,2	20,2	2,8	0,0	0,4
Northeast Anatolia	65,4	1,7	6,4	0,6	23,6	0,7	0,0	1,6
Mideast Anatolia	67,7	4,0	5,3	1,2	18,9	2,9	0,0	0,0
Southeast Anatolia	60,3	2,0	11,4	0,8	24,2	0,9	0,1	0,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	60,2	1,9	8,6	1,1	26,4	1,0	0,6	0,2
Extended	73,7	2,7	5,4	0,3	17,3	0,2	0,1	0,3
Broken	53,5	3,3	8,6	1,0	32,1	0,7	0,1	0,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
Higher upper class	70,2	0,6	2,5	0,2	25,1	1,4	0,0	0,0
Upper class	65,4	0,8	3,6	0,6	25,6	3,2	0,1	0,6
Upper middle class	67,4	1,2	5,7	0,7	23,3	1,5	0,1	0,1
Lower middle class	60,2	2,3	8,3	0,9	27,0	0,2	0,7	0,3
Lower class	42,7	3,9	16,0	2,2	33,3	0,1	0,9	0,9

2.2.7. Use of Other Dwelling beside the Inhabited Dwelling

Households were queried regarding their use of other housing such as summerhouse, vineyard house, country house, or mountain house, in addition to the inhabited dwelling. 22% of the households in the urban areas, and 11% of those in the rural areas use another type of housing in addition to the inhabited dwelling. This other dwelling is used during certain times of the year for vacation or for visit purposes (Table 12).

Among the three major cities, use of another dwelling in addition to the inhabited dwelling is the highest in Istanbul with 33%. This is 21% in Ankara and 16% in Izmir. An analysis on the basis of NUTS reveals that the use of a second dwelling is common particularly in Istanbul (33%) and East Black Sea (31%). On the other hand, use of a second dwelling is at a relatively lower rate in Northeast Anatolia (4%) and Southeast Anatolia (6%).

No variation is observed across the household type. As the socioeconomic status rises, in certain times of the year, the ratio of those who live in a second

Table 12. Use of Other Dwelling beside the Inhabited Dwelling throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Yes	No
Türkiye	19,5	80,5
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	22,2	77,8
Rural	11,6	88,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	33,3	66,7
Ankara	21,4	78,6
Izmir	15,9	84,1
NUTS		
Istanbul	33,3	66,7
West Marmara	20,2	79,8
East Marmara	19,4	80,6
Aegean	16,7	83,3
Mediterranean	16,1	83,9
West Anatolia	18,3	81,7
Central Anatolia	11,4	88,6
West Black Sea	14,0	86,0
East Black Sea	30,9	69,1
Northeast Anatolia	3,9	96,1
Mideast Anatolia	16,8	83,2
Southeast Anatolia	6,3	93,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	20,1	79,9
Extended	17,7	82,3
Broken	18,2	81,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Higher upper class	37,2	62,8
Upper class	29,9	70,1
Upper middle class	24,5	75,5
Lower middle class	16,1	83,9
Lower class	7,8	92,2

dwelling such as a summerhouse or country house during certain times of the year increases. In upper class, 37% of the households use a second dwelling at certain times of the year, while this is 8% for the lower class.

2.3. The Economic Status of the Households

This section analyses the economic opportunities available to the household. It is explored what goods they own, their income and expenditure levels, and whether they borrow or receive any aid.

2.3.1. Ownership of Goods in the Household

The existence of certain goods and appliances in the household was explored with a view to grasp the prosperity level of the house. The table of goods ownership depicts the goods and appliances that the households own. The goods and appliances that are most widely available in the households are refrigerator (98%), washing machine (94%), mobile phone (91%), TV set (89%) and iron (89%). The least common goods and appliances are garbage disposer (2%), clothes dryer (4%), cab/minibus/bus (4%), tractor (5%), motorbike (5%), and home sports equipment (5%). Households with landline (53%) are at a much lower rate compared to those with mobile phone (91%). Desktop ownership is much higher compared to laptop ownership (22%) (Table 13).

Table 13. Goods and Appliances Available in the Households in Türkiye

	Available	Not available
Refrigerator	98,4	1,6
Washing machine	93,7	6,3
Mobile phone	90,5	9,5
Iron	89,2	10,8
TV set	88,7	11,3
Vacuum cleaner	87,0	13,0
Gas/electric furnace	75,4	24,6
Satellite dish	68,3	31,7
Telephone	53,3	46,7
Dishwasher	48,7	51,3
Food processor /mixer/blender	47,5	52,5
Camera	33,5	66,5
DVD/VCD player	32,4	67,6
Private car	31,1	68,9
Desktop computer	30,3	69,7
Laptop computer	22,1	77,9
Microwave oven	21,1	78,9
LCD/plasma TV	20,9	79,1
AC	16,0	84,0
Paid TV channels	12,7	87,3
Video camera	11,7	88,3
Home sports equipment	5,3	94,7
Tractor	4,9	95,1
Motorbike	4,9	95,1
Clothes dryer	4,3	95,7
Cab/minibus/bus	4,2	95,8
Garbage disposer	2,1	97,9

The general ownership status for the most common seven products is depicted on the table based on the demographics (Table 14). No significant variation is observed across the groups in terms of refrigerator ownership. As anticipated, there is a higher level of ownership in the urban areas regarding the top seven products in Turkey with the sole exception of TV set. 88% of households in the urban areas comprise a TV set, while this is 91% in the rural. As for refrigerator ownership, no significant differentiation is observes across the urban (99%) versus rural (97%) areas.

Among the three major cities, the major source of variation is TV and gas/electric furnace. In Ankara, there is a higher ratio of households with a TV set (92%) and electric/gas furnace (89%).

Examining the picture on a NUTS basis, North-

Table 14. Goods and Appliances with the Highest Level of Ownership throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES (Top 7 Goods)

	Refrigerator	Gas/electric furnace	Washing machine	Iron	Vacuum cleaner	TV set	Mobile phone
Türkiye	98,4	75,4	93,7	89,2	87,0	88,7	90,5
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	99,0	81,5	96,3	94,4	92,6	87,9	93,2
Rural	96,6	58,3	86,1	74,5	71,2	90,9	82,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	99,4	83,0	97,7	97,1	95,1	82,9	95,2
Ankara	99,3	89,2	97,0	95,1	95,4	92,4	93,9
Izmir	99,2	83,4	95,8	93,7	92,3	85,3	91,6
NUTS							
Istanbul	99,4	83,0	97,7	97,1	95,1	82,9	95,2
West Marmara	98,6	84,1	94,2	88,6	87,0	91,0	81,6
East Marmara	98,8	79,1	95,9	92,9	93,9	88,5	89,3
Aegean	98,8	77,4	94,4	87,2	85,0	87,2	89,3
Mediterranean	99,3	69,2	94,1	89,2	83,2	91,7	92,4
West Anatolia	99,1	86,6	96,6	93,3	93,7	92,8	93,7
Central Anatolia	99,4	68,5	92,8	84,2	86,9	91,4	87,3
West Black Sea	97,2	72,5	93,6	85,8	83,4	92,4	87,9
East Black Sea	98,0	63,5	90,6	83,5	82,1	87,6	87,4
Northeast Anatolia	91,7	52,7	72,3	79,0	77,2	87,6	79,9
Mideast Anatolia	95,1	69,5	88,2	85,7	80,7	92,6	89,2
Southeast Anatolia	95,7	57,5	84,0	75,6	68,2	88,2	90,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	98,9	78,6	95,5	92,0	89,8	88,9	93,3
Extended	98,7	72,9	94,3	89,0	84,9	91,9	94,8
Broken	96,1	64,9	85,9	78,3	77,3	85,9	76,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Higher upper class	100,0	97,7	99,1	99,5	98,7	73,4	99,4
Upper class	99,9	94,0	99,2	99,2	99,2	80,5	98,6
Upper middle class	99,7	90,8	98,3	98,7	97,8	87,7	97,9
Lower middle class	99,2	73,3	96,0	91,6	88,4	92,2	91,0
Lower class	94,6	43,6	80,2	64,8	57,4	92,2	79,1

east Anatolia is the region with the lowest rate of ownership for refrigerator (92%), gas/electric furnace (53%), washing machine (72%), TV set (80%), and mobile phone (80%). The lowest share of iron (76%) and vacuum cleaner (68%) in households is observed in Southeast Anatolia.

The broken family has the lowest rate of ownership regarding the seven products in question. Mobile phone is the product that exhibits the highest rate of variation across the household type. In the extended family (95%) and the nuclear family (93%), mobile phone ownership is at a noticeably high level. The ratio is 76% for the broken family.

As the socioeconomic status goes up, ownership of these seven products increases. The main item exhibiting a variation across SES groups is gas/electric furnace. 98% of the high upper class owns this product, while this ratio drops to 44% in the lower class. Sharp variation is observed across ownership of vacuum cleaner and iron in households. The entirety of the households in the high upper class (100%) owns irons and vacuum cleaners (99%). In the lower class, iron ownership is at 65% while vacuum cleaner ownership is at 57%.

2.3.2. Support Offered for the Households by Organizations or Private Individuals

Households were queried whether they received any support in the past one year. The ratio of households that received support in the past one year is 10%. The ratio of those who borrow money or loans is higher in the rural areas. 14% of those living in the rural areas borrowed money or loans in the past one year, whereas this is 8% in the urban areas (Table 15).

Among the three major cities, the share of households that received support is 13% in Ankara, which is higher than in Izmir (7%) and Istanbul (6%). The number of households that received support in the past one year is the highest in Northeast Anatolia with 28%, and the lowest in West Marmara in 5%.

An evaluation on the basis of the household type reveals that the broken family receives the highest level of support with 15%. This is 11% for the extended family, and 8% in the nuclear family. As the socioeconomic status goes lower, the ratio of households receiving support goes up. For instance, households from the lower class receive support by 25%, while this is only 1% in the high upper class.

Table 15. Support Offered for the Households throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	No	Yes
Türkiye	90,5	9,5
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	92,0	8,0
Rural	86,1	13,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	93,7	6,3
Ankara	86,9	13,1
Izmir	93,3	6,7
NUTS		
Istanbul	93,7	6,3
West Marmara	94,7	5,3
East Marmara	93,2	6,8
Aegean	92,3	7,7
Mediterranean	91,8	8,2
West Anatolia	89,0	11,0
Central Anatolia	90,1	9,9
West Black Sea	92,3	7,7
East Black Sea	91,0	9,0
Northeast Anatolia	72,0	28,0
Mideast Anatolia	83,5	16,5
Southeast Anatolia	78,0	22,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	92,1	7,9
Extended	89,1	10,9
Broken	85,1	14,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Higher upper class	99,5	0,5
Upper class	98,3	1,7
Upper middle class	97,4	2,6
Lower middle class	91,5	8,5
Lower class	74,7	25,3

Those who received material support in the past one year were asked which organizations or individuals they received this support from. In Türkiye, 39% of the subsidies come from the General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity (GDSAS), followed by the municipalities (24%). In the urban areas, municipalities are more prominent in extending support (32%). On the other hand, in the rural areas, GDSAS stands out with 55% (Table 16).

The households receiving subsidies from the municipalities vary across the three major cities. The share of municipalities offering subsidies is 75% in Ankara, 40% in Istanbul, and 26% in Izmir. In Izmir, the ratio

of those receiving subsidies from GDSAS (27%) approaches those who receive subsidies from the municipalities (26%). Those who receive support from GDSAS is at 17% in Istanbul and 14% in Ankara. Among the three major cities, Izmir is the province where subsidies provided by relatives is the most common type (20%). This ratio is 15% in Istanbul and 6% in Ankara.

In the extended family, those who receive subsidies from GDSAS (48%) and those on sick/disability allowance (15%) is higher, whereas in the nuclear family, there is a higher ratio of households receiving subsidies from the relatives compared to other household types (13%).

Table16. Organizations or Individuals Offering Subsidies to Households throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Municipality	Office of mufti	GDSAS (Governorship, District Head)	Conditional cash transfer (Child allowance/ education fund)	Old age allowance	Sickness and disability allowance	Relatives	Neighbors/ fellow townsmen	Voluntary individuals and organizations	Neighborhood unit	Other
Türkiye	24,2	1,3	38,8	8,2	7,6	8,4	9,3	3,1	2,2	3,2	6,7
RESIDENCE AREA											
Urban	32,1	1,5	28,8	6,3	4,9	7,9	12,2	3,8	2,7	3,3	7,8
Rural	11,3	0,9	55,2	11,2	11,8	9,2	4,7	1,9	1,3	3,0	4,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES											
Istanbul	40,2	3,0	17,4	0,7	2,3	4,5	15,2	6,1	2,5	2,9	8,7
Ankara	75,2	1,4	13,6	0,7	2,0	5,4	6,4	0,9	1,1	0,5	4,8
Izmir	26,4	1,2	26,8	1,0	8,6	9,2	20,4	2,4	4,2	1,0	16,2
NUTS											
Istanbul	40,2	3,0	17,4	0,7	2,3	4,5	15,2	6,1	2,5	2,9	8,7
West Marmara	9,6	0,0	15,8	3,0	19,3	3,7	5,9	4,6	0,0	11,6	33,6
East Marmara	13,1	0,0	31,5	2,4	11,6	11,4	19,9	2,7	6,8	4,9	6,9
Aegean	18,1	0,4	39,8	2,6	7,4	9,3	19,9	6,6	4,3	4,2	10,1
Mediterranean	26,0	1,8	25,9	10,1	11,0	12,3	6,7	5,4	1,5	3,1	5,6
West Anatolia	66,7	1,2	15,6	2,5	2,5	4,5	6,7	0,8	1,7	3,9	4,1
Central Anatolia	20,3	0,0	50,2	1,0	14,0	4,4	9,9	4,7	2,0	3,6	8,0
West Black Sea	16,2	2,9	40,6	3,0	13,6	16,1	5,2	3,3	0,0	5,5	3,9
East Black Sea	13,9	6,7	60,7	0,0	3,2	10,7	9,9	1,2	1,9	0,0	2,8
Northeast Anatolia	3,9	0,7	86,2	4,6	5,9	4,4	0,7	0,0	0,6	0,3	2,7
Mideast Anatolia	15,5	0,8	54,1	22,8	3,6	5,8	2,5	0,0	1,3	2,2	1,1
Southeast Anatolia	8,0	0,4	54,4	26,7	8,3	11,7	3,5	0,3	1,3	1,6	5,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE											
Nuclear	25,9	1,2	38,3	10,8	3,7	8,2	12,6	3,3	1,5	2,6	3,5
Extended	14,4	1,1	48,1	9,1	10,7	14,5	3,8	0,0	0,6	4,1	7,6
Broken	25,5	1,6	35,2	2,3	14,1	5,7	5,2	4,2	4,4	4,1	13,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS											
Higher upper class	0,0	0,0	42,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	57,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Upper class	5,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,5	56,6	5,1	0,0	0,0	29,3
Upper middle class	19,6	2,7	12,9	2,4	5,4	16,0	30,1	4,1	3,1	1,2	8,8
Lower middle class	30,6	2,1	33,9	5,0	3,9	9,1	12,2	4,2	1,7	2,5	4,8
Lower class	26,2	0,5	49,3	17,1	3,4	6,5	1,8	1,3	1,4	4,3	2,9

2.3.3. Status of Households Regarding the Borrowing of Debt or Loans

The households were asked whether they borrowed any debt or loans in the past one year. The ratio of those who have borrowed debt or loans across Turkey is 35%. This is 32% in the rural and 36% in the urban area (Table 17).

There is no variation across the three major cities. In all three provinces, the ratio of borrowing debt/loans is over 35% and quite close. Although no differences are observed on NUTS basis, Istanbul, Aegean and West Anatolia are the regions where the borrowing of debt or loans is the highest. The lowest rate of borrowing is observed in West Black Sea with 27%.

In the broken family, the ratio of borrowing debt/loans is (20%) is lower than other household types. In terms of socioeconomic status, the ratio of those who borrow is 25% in the lower class, 42% in the upper middle class, and 40% in the high upper class. The highest rate of borrowing is in the high upper class group with 47%.

Table 17. Status of Households Regarding the Borrowing of Debt or Loans throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Yes	No
Türkiye	34,9	65,1
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	36,0	64,0
Rural	31,7	68,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	36,9	63,1
Ankara	39,2	60,8
Izmir	36,8	63,2
NUTS		
Istanbul	36,9	63,1
West Marmara	35,2	64,8
East Marmara	35,8	64,2
Aegean	37,3	62,7
Mediterranean	34,2	65,8
West Anatolia	37,2	62,8
Central Anatolia	31,0	69,0
West Black Sea	27,3	72,7
East Black Sea	30,3	69,7
Northeast Anatolia	31,3	68,7
Mideast Anatolia	30,6	69,4
Southeast Anatolia	35,9	64,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	37,9	62,1
Extended	38,6	61,4
Broken	20,3	79,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Higher upper class	39,6	60,4
Upper class	46,7	53,3
Upper middle class	41,9	58,1
Lower middle class	34,5	65,5
Lower class	24,7	75,3

The families who borrowed cash or loans in the last one year were asked about the underlying need for borrowing. 17% of the debtors responded that they borrowed in order to buy a house. The second outstanding need underneath the borrowing was buying a private car/automobile by 13% (Table 18).

In addition to borrowing for buying a house, 14% of the families living in the urban area stated that they borrowed for buying a private car/automobile, while in the rural area, 9% of families borrowed in order to purchase tractor/irrigation systems/livestock.

In congruence with the situation across Türkiye, the households in the three major cities mainly borrow loans to buy a house. The borrowing reasons of the households in these cities are similar in other respects as well. Solely in Ankara, borrowing so as to clear commercial debts is lower (3%), compared to Istanbul (12%) and Izmir (8%).

Table 18. Reasons for Borrowing Cash or Loans throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Buying a house	Buying a private car	Education	Credit card debt	Buying a tractor/ irrigation system/ livestock	Buying field/ land	Clearing commercial debt	Vacation	Other
Türkiye	16,6	12,7	6,5	10,5	2,4	1,2	11,1	0,2	41,7
RESIDENCE AREA									
Urban	17,9	13,9	6,9	12,0	0,5	0,7	11,0	0,3	39,8
Rural	12,7	8,6	5,0	5,8	8,5	2,7	11,4	0,0	47,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES									
Istanbul	17,8	13,6	6,9	12,2	0,1	0,2	12,3	0,2	40,1
Ankara	21,9	14,8	4,2	15,8	0,4	0,3	3,2	0,6	42,2
Izmir	20,7	15,9	5,3	16,2	0,8	0,2	7,6	0,8	37,5
NUTS									
Istanbul	17,8	13,6	6,9	12,2	0,1	0,2	12,3	0,2	40,1
West Marmara	10,8	9,2	6,9	9,8	7,4	0,1	6,2	0,0	50,8
East Marmara	15,4	12,5	4,7	7,5	2,6	1,9	10,4	0,9	46,1
Aegean	16,7	16,0	4,5	10,1	1,8	2,5	10,0	0,3	43,1
Mediterranean	16,3	11,4	7,7	12,8	1,7	2,7	17,2	0,0	32,2
West Anatolia	19,8	12,8	4,4	13,9	1,1	0,2	4,2	0,4	46,0
Central Anatolia	18,3	14,6	3,2	9,9	7,5	1,5	14,3	0,4	31,2
West Black Sea	11,0	12,3	7,3	7,6	6,7	2,0	9,5	0,0	45,6
East Black Sea	16,5	7,5	4,9	7,3	4,6	0,0	8,5	0,0	54,4
Northeast Anatolia	12,0	12,4	3,7	9,9	5,1	0,0	6,9	0,0	51,2
Mideast Anatolia	23,8	6,2	8,6	8,1	0,4	1,2	20,2	0,0	34,3
Southeast Anatolia	16,1	11,6	15,1	6,9	2,1	0,3	11,9	0,0	38,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE									
Nuclear	17,9	14,0	6,1	10,7	2,4	1,3	11,2	0,2	39,4
Extended	14,9	9,7	5,8	9,1	4,0	1,5	13,0	0,2	43,7
Broken	9,7	6,7	10,2	10,8	0,4	0,4	7,4	0,5	55,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS									
Higher upper class	39,9	37,0	3,6	3,5	0,0	1,4	5,0	0,0	18,8
Upper class	24,6	23,5	4,5	9,4	0,0	1,7	8,0	0,0	31,0
Upper middle class	21,5	15,3	7,0	13,2	1,8	1,2	11,6	0,4	31,1
Lower middle class	11,1	8,2	5,7	11,7	3,7	1,2	11,5	0,2	49,9
Lower class	8,4	3,5	8,9	6,2	3,4	2,2	11,9	0,0	55,8

The primary reason for borrowing across all regions is "buying a house". However, there is a higher proportion of households borrowing for education in Southeast Anatolia (15%), for buying a private/car automobile in the Aegean (16%), and for clearing commercial debts in the Mediterranean (17%) and Mideast Anatolian (20%) regions, compared to the rest of Turkey (Table 18).

The reasons for borrowing cash or loan do not vary significantly across household type. Nevertheless, the proportion of borrowing in order to clear commercial debts in the extended families (13%), and closing credit card debt (11%) and education (10%) in the broken families, is as high as the proportion of borrowing in order to buy a house.

In the high upper class households, borrowing for buying a house (40%) or a private car (37%); in the upper middle class (13%) and lower middle class (12%) households, borrowing for closing the credit card debt rank higher compared to other SES groups. The proportion of those who borrow in order to clear their commercial debts is higher in middle and lower class SES groups (12%).

The households who borrowed cash or loans were asked about the lending individual or the organization. With 79%, banks rank at the top of the list of lending organizations. This is ensued by other relatives (10%) and friends (9%). The lowest rate is children older than 18 (2%) and usurers (1%).(Table 19).

Banks are the main lending source both in the urban and rural areas. However, it is observed that those who borrow from the bank are at a higher proportion in the urban areas (80%). On the other hand, the proportion of those borrowing from the neighbors is higher in the rural areas (9%).

The proportion of households borrowing from the bank is high in the three major cities. Nevertheless, Istanbul ranks the lowest among the three (79%). On the other hand, the proportion of those borrowing from the relatives is higher in Istanbul (11%).

Southeast Anatolia is the region where the proportion of borrowing loans from the banks is the lowest (44%), and borrowing from other relatives is the highest (30%). Southeast Anatolia is followed by Mideast Anatolia (20%) when it comes to borrowing from other relatives. Borrowing from friends is more common in Southeast Anatolia (20%), Mideast Anatolia (19%) and Northeast Anatolia (16%) compared to other regions. Borrowing from neighbors is less common in Northeast Anatolia (26%).

The tendency of borrowing from the bank declines as the socioeconomic status rises. Among the borrowers, almost all households from the high upper class (98%) borrow from banks, where this proportion falls in the lower class (39%). On the other hand, in the lower class, there is a high proportion of borrowing from other relatives (26%), siblings (16%), or parents (11%).

The households participating in the research were asked who they would prefer to borrow from. Banks rank at the top of the preferred lender list with 53%. This is followed by siblings (34%) and parents/senior members of the household (Table 20).

Based on the residence area those who live in the urban areas prefer to borrow from their parents and senior members of the household (34%) and from banks (56%), whereas in the rural areas, top lenders are children older than 18 (27%), other relatives (26%), and neighbors (22%).

Those who prefer to borrow from the bank in the three major cities (Istanbul 58%, Ankara 65%, Izmir 66%), is higher compared to the trend in Türkiye in general (53%). These results were analyzed on NUTS basis and variations were observed across regions.

Across Türkiye, the proportion of those who prefer to borrow from their siblings is 34%, while this is 25% in Aegean and West Black Sea and 49% in Mideast Anatolia. Those who turn to their neighbors for borrowing across Türkiye is 14%, while this increases to 29% in Northeast Anatolia, 26%

Table 19. Lending Organizations or Individuals throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Parents (Seniors of the household)	Siblings	Children older than 18 y.o.	Other relatives	Friends	Neighbors	Banks	Usurers	Other
Türkiye	5,7	6,4	1,9	10,2	8,6	4,9	78,6	0,6	3,4
RESIDENCE AREA									
Urban	5,9	6,6	1,7	9,9	8,4	3,7	79,9	0,3	2,8
Rural	5,3	6,1	2,7	11	9,4	8,8	74,1	1,5	5,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES									
Istanbul	6,4	8,1	1,5	11,0	9,0	3,6	79,3	0,1	2,8
Ankara	6,1	4,6	1,5	6,6	6,0	2,8	85,4	0,4	0,8
Izmir	3,4	3,7	0,4	6,0	6,7	2,5	86,3	0,8	1,9
NUTS									
Istanbul	6,4	8,1	1,5	11,0	9,0	3,6	79,3	0,1	2,8
West Marmara	5,9	3,1	0,8	6,6	6,5	4,4	83,3	0,0	4,8
East Marmara	4,6	7,1	3,5	6,6	7,0	4,5	84,5	0,8	2,3
Aegean	4,2	4,2	2,1	8,0	8,1	4,0	83,8	1,0	2,5
Mediterranean	5,5	4,2	2,0	7,3	5,2	1,3	83,8	0,4	4,3
West Anatolia	6,5	6,2	1,6	7,7	7,5	3,2	85,7	0,3	2,1
Central Anatolia	3,8	4,0	1,5	3,2	4,0	3,8	87,5	0,9	3,2
West Black Sea	3,9	3,9	2,2	7,4	4,4	6,1	82,2	0,0	4,9
East Black Sea	5,1	5,1	1,0	12,8	8,0	8,2	70,1	1,8	4,1
Northeast Anatolia	7,1	9,4	4,8	12,1	15,5	26,3	50,6	1,9	6,8
Mideast Anatolia	8,3	12,5	2,0	19,8	19,0	8,5	59,5	0,3	3,2
Southeast Anatolia	9,2	13,1	1,9	29,5	19,8	11,0	44,0	0,9	6,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE									
Nuclear	6,3	6,8	1,7	10,1	8,5	4,2	78,8	0,6	3,4
Extended	4,7	6,6	1,7	12,9	9,7	8,3	77,2	0,5	3,8
Broken	2,7	4,0	4,1	7,0	8,0	5,5	78,3	0,3	3,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS									
Higher upper class	2,9	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,9	0,7	97,5	0,4	1,9
Upper class	4,0	3,2	1,3	6,8	4,2	1,2	89,4	1,1	1,8
Upper middle class	4,1	3,4	1,3	6,6	4,7	2,1	89,0	0,1	1,8
Lower middle class	6,3	8,1	2,1	11,7	10,0	5,1	76,6	0,4	3,9
Lower class	10,7	16,2	2,4	26,4	20,5	17,2	39,2	1,6	7,8

in East Black Sea, and 24% in Mideast Anatolia. Those who prefer to borrow loans/cash from banks is higher in Central Anatolia (62%) and lower in Southeast Anatolia (28%).

The proportion of borrowing from all other sources aside from children 18 or older is lower in the broken family. On the other hand, the proportion of those who prefer to borrow from neighbors is higher in the extended family (20%).

As the socioeconomic status rises, the proportion of those who prefer to borrow from their parents/senior members of the household and from banks rises whereas the proportion of borrowing from neighbors and other relatives drops. The highest variation across socioeconomic status is in terms of borrowing from the bank. 80% of the high upper class households borrow from the bank whereas this is 26% in the lower class households.

Table 20.Preferred Lenders of Debt/Loans throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Parents (Seniors of the household)	Siblings	Children older than 18 y.o.	Other relatives	Friends	Neighbors	Banks	Usurers	Other
Türkiye	32,5	33,7	19,7	21,3	20,7	14,3	52,9	0,4	1,4
RESIDENCE AREA									
Urban	34,3	34,1	17,2	19,5	19,6	11,6	55,6	0,3	1,4
Rural	27,2	32,7	26,7	26,4	24,0	22,0	45,5	0,5	1,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES									
Istanbul	38,9	37,3	12,1	20,5	23,0	13,9	58,1	0,3	1,8
Ankara	34,0	31,3	17,1	16,5	20,4	10,9	65,2	0,5	1,0
Izmir	30,0	30,5	18,9	15,6	16,3	9,8	66,2	0,3	0,9
NUTS									
Istanbul	38,9	37,3	12,1	20,5	23,0	13,9	58,1	0,3	1,8
West Marmara	29,9	31,4	24,6	22,5	14,6	11,7	50,6	0,1	1,6
East Marmara	32,1	30,8	20,5	19,8	19,8	10,6	57,4	0,5	1,5
Aegean	26,3	25,4	16,3	17,3	15,8	12,6	60,6	0,3	0,6
Mediterranean	31,8	36,2	19,5	18,2	16,2	10,0	51,1	0,5	1,9
West Anatolia	36,2	35,8	21,9	19,5	23,9	14,3	58,6	0,4	1,2
Central Anatolia	35,5	37,0	27,6	17,3	23,2	14,5	62,1	0,2	1,9
West Black Sea	26,4	25,3	25,0	19,9	16,4	14,9	51,1	0,1	0,6
East Black Sea	33,5	39,5	34,7	32,7	27,9	25,5	39,6	0,5	1,2
Northeast Anatolia	29,2	33,4	22,0	22,9	30,7	29,0	31,5	1,6	2,2
Mideast Anatolia	39,2	49,3	33,7	34,8	32,0	23,9	39,3	0,3	1,2
Southeast Anatolia	27,2	34,7	13,9	33,2	24,3	18,3	27,9	0,6	1,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE									
Nuclear	34,9	35,2	18,5	22,5	21,6	14,0	56,0	0,4	1,4
Extended	29,9	35,1	21,5	25,4	23,3	20,1	53,1	0,6	1,2
Broken	24,6	26,7	23,1	13,8	15,6	11,6	40,6	0,3	1,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS									
Higher upper class	40,7	37,0	11,6	16,1	20,9	6,1	80,3	0,0	0,5
Upper class	38,1	33,5	12,9	16,7	20,1	8,9	77,6	0,8	0,7
Upper middle class	34,3	34,2	17,3	19,6	21,4	11,3	66,4	0,3	1,4
Lower middle class	31,4	33,8	22,0	23,2	21,4	15,9	50,9	0,3	1,4
Lower class	31,1	37,2	19,4	27,0	21,5	23,0	26,0	0,4	2,1

2.4. The Residence Area and Duration of Living

This section comprises data regarding where household members live until the age of 18 and how long they have been living in their current province of residence.

2.4.1. Accommodation until the Age of 18

The individuals participating in the research were asked about the accommodation unit they lived un-til the age of 18. The results reveal that throughout Türkiye, almost all individuals (99%) have lived in Türkiye until the age of 18. 37% of the individuals have lived in their respective district center until the age of 18. Those lived in a village or town make up 35% of the total, whereas the proportion of those who lived in the province is 27%. 40% of those who lived in the urban area were in the district until the age of 18, while 35% were in the province. The share of those who lived in a village/town is 23%. 64% of those who lived in the rural area lived in the village/

town, 6% in the province and 29% in the district until 18 (Table 21).

An analysis of the situation in the three major cities shows that the share of those who live in the district until the age of 18 is higher in all three cities. This is 37% across Turkey and 45%, 46% and 47% in Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir respectively.

As per NUTS, the proportion of those who lived in the province until 18 were the highest in Central Anatolia with 35% and Southeast Anatolia with 34%; while the proportion of those who lived in the village/town is the highest in West Black Sea with 49% and East Black Sea with 48%. The proportion of those who lived in the district is the highest in the Aegean Region with 46% and in Istanbul with 45%.

Table 21. Accommodation Unit until the Age of 18 throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Province	District	Village or town	Overseas
Türkiye	27,1	37,0	34,7	1,2
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	35,3	40,0	23,1	1,6
Rural	6,0	29,2	64,3	0,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	29,3	44,7	24,1	1,9
Ankara	31,1	45,6	22,4	0,8
Izmir	30,0	46,8	21,9	1,4
NUTS				
Istanbul	29,3	44,7	24,1	1,9
West Marmara	18,8	39,8	37,8	3,6
East Marmara	23,1	38,5	34,9	3,5
Aegean	21,9	45,8	31,1	1,2
Mediterranean	29,9	35,5	34,1	0,5
West Anatolia	28,8	43,2	27,3	0,6
Central Anatolia	34,6	22,0	42,9	0,5
West Black Sea	21,0	29,4	49,3	0,3
East Black Sea	21,4	30,7	47,8	0,1
Northeast Anatolia	28,0	28,6	43,4	0,1
Mideast Anatolia	31,1	23,8	44,7	0,4
Southeast Anatolia	34,3	23,7	42,0	0,0

There is no variation across gender regarding the accommodation unit until the age of 18. The higher the age of respondents, the lower the rate of those living in the province or district. For example, 38% of those between 18-24, and 13% of those 65+ years of age have lived in the province. On the other hand, it is observed that the rate of those who lived in the village or town until the age of 18 is higher amongst senior members. 21% of individuals aged 18-24 have lived in the village or town until 18, while this is 55% for those aged 65 and up (Table 22).

An evaluation on the basis of marital status reveals that the proportion of those who lived in the province until 18 is higher among divorced or never-married individuals (41%), whereas the proportion of those who lived in the village/town is higher among widows (51%).

As the level of education rises, the proportion of those living in the province and district until 18 also rises, while the proportion of those who lived in the village or town decreases. Among respondents who never went to school, the rate of those who lived in the province until 18 is 11% and those who lived in the district is 26%. These rates are 47% and 42% for university graduates respectively.

Almost half of the individuals (45%) from an extended family have lived in the village or town until 18. As for the individuals from nuclear and broken families, the share of those who lived in the province and district is high. 38% of nuclear family members and 40% of broken family members have lived in the district until 18 (Table 22).

As the socioeconomic status rises, the share of those who lived in the province also rises, while the share of those who lived in the village or town drops. 60% of individuals from the lower class have lived in the village/town until 18. On the other hand, it was identified that 54% of individuals in the higher SES group lived in the province until 18.

Table 22. Duration of Living in the Current Province by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Province	District	Village or Town	Overseas
GENDER				
Male	28,2	37,6	33,3	0,9
Female	26,0	36,5	36,0	1,5
AGE				
18-24	38,0	40,8	20,5	0,6
25-34	32,9	40,9	25,5	0,7
35-44	26,7	38,6	33,3	1,4
45-54	21,5	34,5	42,8	1,2
55-64	19,6	31,5	47,2	1,8
65+	13,4	28,5	55,3	2,7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
No schooling	10,9	25,5	62,6	1,0
Primary school	18,1	33,0	48,3	0,7
Elementary/secondary school	28,0	41,4	29,5	1,2
High school	40,2	44,7	12,9	2,3
Undergraduate/graduate studies	47,1	42,3	9,2	1,4
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	41,4	41,5	16,6	0,5
Married	23,8	36,1	38,8	1,2
Separated/lives apart	24,7	47,8	24,2	3,4
Widowed	14,8	31,0	51,1	3,1
Divorced	41,0	38,9	18,0	2,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	27,5	38,0	33,4	1,1
Extended	22,4	31,0	45,3	1,2
Broken	31,5	40,2	26,4	2,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Higher upper class	54,1	37,5	6,8	1,7
Upper class	44,6	42,8	10,7	1,8
Upper middle class	33,4	43,5	21,4	1,7
Lower middle class	21,3	34,2	43,9	0,7
Lower class	12,2	27,2	60,4	0,3

2.4.2. Duration of Living in their Current Province

The individuals participating in the research were asked their duration of living in their current province. 56% have been in the same province since birth. 9% have been in their current province for more than 30 years, whereas another 9% have been living in their current province for 5 years maximum (Table 23).

The rate of those who have been in their current province since birth is higher in the rural area (80%) compared to the urban (46%). Among the three major cities, the proportion of those who have been in the same province since birth is the highest in Izmir (48%). This is 37% in Ankara, and 27% in Istanbul. The results were analyzed on NUTS basis, and it was observed that 81% of those who dwell in Northeast Anatolia region have lived in the same province as of birth. The other two regions where the proportion of those who have been living in the same province throughout their lives is higher are Mideast Anatolia (76%) and West Black Sea (76%).

Table 23. Duration of Living in the Current Province throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	0-5 yrs.	6-10 yrs.	11-20 yrs.	21-30 yrs.	31+ yrs.	Since birth
Türkiye	9,4	6,2	12,1	8,1	8,5	55,7
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	10,8	7,5	15,1	10,0	10,6	46,1
Rural	5,9	2,8	4,6	3,4	3,1	80,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	9,7	9,5	22,9	15,1	15,3	27,4
Ankara	12,3	8,9	14,1	12,3	15,0	37,4
Izmir	9,2	5,5	14,0	10,1	13,7	47,6
NUTS						
Istanbul	9,7	9,5	22,9	15,1	15,3	27,4
West Marmara	9,4	4,6	8,3	8,6	7,0	62,0
East Marmara	11,3	9,0	16,0	10,9	9,7	43,1
Aegean	10,4	5,2	10,7	7,0	9,1	57,6
Mediterranean	10,6	4,9	9,7	5,9	5,1	63,9
West Anatolia	11,0	8,2	12,1	9,9	12,1	46,7
Central Anatolia	7,8	5,3	6,2	3,5	5,8	71,4
West Black Sea	6,4	3,4	5,4	4,1	4,6	76,2
East Black Sea	7,9	2,5	6,8	4,2	5,4	73,2
Northeast Anatolia	5,3	3,4	5,5	2,5	1,9	81,4
Mideast Anatolia	7,3	4,0	6,6	3,2	2,5	76,3
Southeast Anatolia	7,3	3,9	7,9	4,4	3,4	73,0

The proportion of those who have been living in the same province for 0-5 years is higher in the 18-24 (17%) and 25-34 (15%) age groups. The share of those who have lived in the same province since birth is higher in the 1-24 (64%) an 65+ (64%) age group. The proportion of those who lived in the same province is higher among individuals who never married (64%) (Table 24).

As the educational status rises, the rate of those who lived in the same province since birth declines whereas the rate of those who live in their current province for 0-5 and 5-10 years increases. 63% of individuals with no schooling state that they have lived in the same province since birth, while this falls to 42% among university/graduate studies graduates.

Table 24. Duration of Living in the Current Province by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	0-5 yrs.	6-10 yrs.	11-20 yrs.	21-30 yrs.	31+ yrs.	Since birth
GENDER						
Male	9,4	6,1	11,5	8,3	8,1	56,6
Female	9,4	6,3	12,8	8,0	8,8	54,7
AGE						
18-24	17,4	6,0	10,8	1,9	,0	63,9
25-34	14,8	11,3	13,6	6,4	,9	53,1
35-44	7,4	6,6	19,0	11,0	5,5	50,6
45-54	3,9	3,5	10,8	15,3	14,0	52,5
55-64	3,6	2,9	7,5	7,7	23,5	54,7
65+	2,7	1,4	5,1	6,1	20,5	64,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	5,1	3,8	8,7	6,6	12,6	63,1
Primary school	5,2	4,8	12,9	9,9	10,9	56,3
Elementary/secondary school	8,8	6,8	11,8	7,0	5,9	59,6
High school	13,2	7,0	12,9	7,1	4,8	55,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	20,6	10,5	12,6	8,0	6,6	41,9
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	14,4	6,1	10,7	3,8	1,0	64,0
Married	8,6	6,6	12,9	9,4	9,3	53,2
Separated/lives apart	11,8	4,5	10,9	11,9	9,2	51,8
Widowed	3,6	1,8	6,7	6,5	21,8	59,5
Divorced	7,1	7,2	14,1	9,8	10,7	51,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	8,1	6,8	13,0	8,9	8,1	55,0
Extended	8,1	4,7	11,6	6,7	7,5	61,4
Broken	18,4	5,0	7,8	5,9	11,8	51,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	20,6	13,9	16,2	9,5	9,0	30,8
Upper class	17,2	9,5	11,9	8,8	9,7	42,9
Upper middle class	9,8	5,6	13,6	10,9	10,4	49,7
Lower middle class	6,1	5,7	12,2	7,8	8,4	59,9
Lower class	6,3	7,3	10,7	3,8	3,9	68,1

The share of individuals who have lived in their current province for only 0-5 years is higher among the broken family members. On the other hand, the proportion of those who lived in the same province is higher among the extended family members.

As the socioeconomic status goes lower, the proportion of individuals who lived in the same province since birth goes up. For instance, in the high upper class, the share of those who lived in the same province since birth is 31%, whereas this goes up to 68% in the lower class.

Chapter 3

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

Among the topics researched in detail in this study regarding the concept of marriage are the age of the individual at the time of first marriage and the marriage age deemed appropriate, how the individual met his/her spouse, how the marriage decision was taken, how the marriage tie was built, the wedding ceremonies, any payment of bride price, whether the spouse is a relative or not, how marriage to relatives is viewed, and the characteristics sought in a spouse. On the topic of divorce, the perspective of the society at large was examined through the lens of the rationale underlying divorce.

Table 25. Age at First Marriage throughout Türkiye and by Gender

	17 y.o. and younger	18 - 24	25-29	30-34	35+
Türkiye	17,6	57,0	19,8	4,3	1,3
GENDER					
Male	5,7	54,0	31,6	6,8	1,8
Female	28,0	59,7	9,4	2,0	0,8

3.1 Age at the First Marriage

All individuals with marriage experience were asked what age they got married the first time. It was found out that more than half of all the first-time marriages throughout Türkiye (57%) took place between 18-24 years of age. The rate of marriages younger than 18 is not negligible either (17%). The first marriage taking place at 35+ is quite rare (1%) (Table 25).

The time of first marriage was also analyzed by gender. Both females (60%) and males (54%) marry for the first time in the 18-24 age group. The rate of females getting married younger than 18 is noteworthy. Across Türkiye, more than one fourth of females (28%) have got married younger than 18. This is a lower rate among males (6%). On the other hand, the rate of males marrying between 25-29 years of age is higher (32%). Marriage after the age of 35 is quite rare both for males and females (Table 25).

An analysis based on residence area shows that majority of males marry between the ages of 18-24 both in the rural and urban areas. Marriage at this age group is more common in the rural area (60%). On the other hand, the rate of males who marry between the ages of 25-29 in the urban area (35%) is higher than in the rural (25%). Marriage younger than 18 is somewhat more pervasive among females living in the rural areas. One third of women (33%) in the rural area and one fourth of those in the urban areas (26%) have married before the age of 18 for the first time (Table 26 & 27).

A comparison of the three major cities shows that the percentage of males who marry between 18-24 years of age is lower compared to the other two major cities (45%), whereas the percentage of those who marry between 25-29 years of age is slightly higher (37%). The rate of females marrying before the age of 18 is relatively higher in Ankara (28%).

Moving from the west to the east, getting married at an early age becomes more common. The rate of women who marry younger than 18 is 21% in West Marmara, while this goes up to 39% in Southeast Anatolia. The same is true for males marrying younger than 18. This is 4% in Istanbul, West Marmara and East Marmara and goes up to 10% in Southeast Anatolia region.

Table 26. Age at First Marriage for Males throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	17 y.o. and younger	18 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 34	35+
Türkiye	5,7	54,0	31,6	6,8	1,8
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	4,3	51,3	34,5	7,9	2,0
Rural	8,9	60,1	25,1	4,5	1,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	3,5	51,6	33,1	8,9	2,8
Ankara	5,5	53,4	31,1	9,0	0,9
Izmir	5,1	44,8	37,0	10,7	2,4
NUTS					
Istanbul	3,5	51,6	33,1	8,9	2,8
West Marmara	4,0	54,1	35,6	4,8	1,5
East Marmara	4,0	53,9	32,5	7,4	2,3
Aegean	5,5	52,6	33,8	6,8	1,3
Mediterranean	4,5	48,4	37,2	7,1	2,7
West Anatolia	5,9	59,4	26,7	7,5	0,6
Central Anatolia	8,0	62,6	24,9	4,0	0,5
West Black Sea	8,6	59,1	24,8	5,8	1,7
East Black Sea	6,1	52,8	31,6	7,1	2,4
Northeast Anatolia	5,9	51,0	36,0	5,9	1,2
Mideast Anatolia	9,3	56,1	28,4	5,4	1,0
Southeast Anatolia	10,2	54,9	28,0	5,6	1,3
AGE					
18-24	4,4	95,6	0,0	0,0	0,0
25-34	2,3	50,8	41,6	5,3	0,0
35-44	3,8	49,5	34,6	10,0	2,2
45-54	6,4	54,8	28,6	7,1	3,1
55-64	7,6	60,4	24,1	5,9	2,0
65+	13,4	53,7	25,4	5,1	2,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
No schooling	14,3	59,7	19,6	3,7	2,6
Primary school	8,3	61,0	24,7	4,7	1,2
Elementary/secondary school	4,5	61,4	28,8	4,6	0,7
High school	1,6	46,4	42,0	7,3	2,7
Undergraduate/graduate studies	0,2	31,1	48,8	16,6	3,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	5,2	52,5	33,3	7,2	1,8
Extended	8,0	61,0	25,1	4,5	1,4
Broken	7,1	53,5	26,1	10,3	3,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Higher upper class	0,0	20,8	52,3	21,8	5,1
Upper class	1,1	36,8	44,4	14,4	3,3
Upper middle class	3,7	52,2	35,9	6,6	1,6
Lower middle class	6,8	59,7	27,4	4,7	1,4
Lower class	10,5	60,6	23,4	3,7	1,8

The percentage of those who married younger than 18 is higher among the 65+ age group. This is 48% among females and 13% among males. Marriage at this age is the least common in the age group between 25-34 (Table 26 & 28).

As the educational status rises, the rate of early marriage falls both among males and females. 14% of males and almost half of females (48%) with no schooling have married younger than 18. Among those who completed their undergraduate/graduate studies, the rate of women who married younger than 18 is 1%. Half of women who completed their undergraduate/graduate studies (52%) have married between 18-24 while more than one third (37%) have married between 25-29 years of age. As

the educational status increases across males, the rate of marriage between the age of 25-29 and 30-34 age group also increases. 20% of males with no schooling married between 25-29, while 4% married between 30-34 years of age. This is 49% for 25-29 year-old-males with undergraduate/graduate degree and 17% for those in the 30-34 age range.

As the socioeconomic status rises, the age of marriage goes up, particularly among females. In the high upper class, the rate of those who married younger than 18 is 4%, whereas this is 37% in the lower class. On the other hand, the rate of women who married between 25-29 is 8% in the lower class and 31% is the high upper class.

Table 27. Age at First Marriage for Females throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	17 y.o. and younger	18 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 34	35+
Türkiye	28,0	59,7	9,4	2,0	0,8
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	25,8	60,7	10,4	2,2	0,9
Rural	33,4	57,4	7,0	1,5	0,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	22,7	62,5	10,9	3,0	0,9
Ankara	27,8	58,0	10,7	2,4	1,2
Izmir	24,0	60,0	12,5	2,9	0,6
NUTS					
Istanbul	22,7	62,5	10,9	3,0	0,9
West Marmara	21,4	66,3	9,3	1,6	1,4
East Marmara	25,1	62,5	9,5	2,0	0,9
Aegean	27,3	60,7	9,7	2,1	0,2
Mediterranean	27,7	57,7	10,4	2,3	1,9
West Anatolia	28,0	58,8	10,0	2,3	0,8
Central Anatolia	36,3	56,1	6,0	1,2	0,4
West Black Sea	28,7	59,8	10,0	0,6	0,9
East Black Sea	29,4	61,2	7,6	0,9	1,0
Northeast Anatolia	32,4	60,5	4,3	2,5	0,4
Mideast Anatolia	35,3	55,0	8,2	1,2	0,3
Southeast Anatolia	38,7	51,8	8,0	1,1	0,4

Table 28. Age at First Marriage for Females by Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	17 y.o. and younger	18 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 34	35+
AGE					
18-24	24,7	75,3	0,0	0,0	0,0
25-34	17,8	65,0	15,8	1,4	0,0
35-44	22,7	61,4	12,0	3,1	0,8
45-54	28,6	58,4	8,0	3,1	1,9
55-64	36,8	54,6	5,4	1,7	1,4
65+	47,7	45,6	4,9	1,0	0,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
No schooling	47,9	45,7	4,6	1,2	0,5
Primary school	29,9	60,8	6,9	1,5	0,9
Elementary/secondary school	23,5	70,0	5,2	1,2	0,1
High school	6,5	75,2	14,5	2,8	1,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	1,3	52,1	37,3	6,7	2,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	23,9	62,3	10,7	2,2	0,9
Extended	35,6	56,6	6,3	1,1	0,4
Broken	39,0	50,6	6,7	2,4	1,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Higher upper class	4,1	52,1	31,1	9,5	3,3
Upper class	10,3	64,0	21,3	3,2	1,3
Upper middle class	23,1	66,0	8,5	1,6	0,7
Lower middle class	31,7	59,3	6,8	1,5	0,7
Lower class	37,4	52,0	8,0	1,5	1,0

3.2. Age of Marriage Deemed Appropriate

The individuals participating in the research were asked about the appropriate age of marriage for males and females. 28% of females in Türkiye have married before the age of 18 for the first time, yet, throughout Türkiye, only 1% of females state that the appropriate age of marriage for females is younger than 18. 64% of the population in Türkiye believes that the ideal age of marriage for females is between 18-24. Solely one third (32%) of females deem it appropriate for females to marry between the ages of 25-29. A mere 3% expresses the ideal age of marriage for females to be between 30-34 (Table 29).

Those who live in the rural area deem it appropriate for females to get married at a younger age. For example, around three fourth of those who live in

the rural area (76%) believe that the ideal marriage age for females is between 18-24, while the rate of those who think as such is below the Türkiye average in the urban area (59%).

The responses to the ideal age for marriage for females were analyzed across the three major cities. In all three cities, the rate of those who believed the ideal marriage is between 18-24 is below Türkiye average, whereas those who deem 25-29 as the ideal age is above Türkiye average. Among the three cities, the proportion of those who deem it appropriate for females to marry between 18-24 years of age is slightly higher in Istanbul (56%).

The main regions that deem 18-24 as the appropriate age of marriage for females are Northeast Anatolia (76%) and Central Anatolia (75%), while it is the lowest in Istanbul with 56%.

Table 29. Age of First Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Women throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	17 y.o. and younger	18 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 34	35- 39	40+
Türkiye	1,0	64,0	32,1	2,8	0,1	0,0
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	0,7	59,2	36,4	3,4	0,2	0,0
Rural	1,6	76,2	21,1	1,1	0,1	0,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	0,4	56,3	38,0	5,0	0,2	0,0
Ankara	0,2	51,6	43,3	4,6	0,3	0,0
Izmir	0,7	49,5	44,0	5,5	0,1	0,2
NUTS						
Istanbul	0,4	56,3	38,0	5,0	0,2	0,0
West Marmara	0,5	59,1	38,6	1,5	0,1	0,1
East Marmara	0,7	61,4	35,1	2,6	0,1	0,1
Aegean	0,8	61,0	35,1	3,0	0,0	0,1
Mediterranean	1,0	67,5	28,8	2,6	0,0	0,0
West Anatolia	0,4	60,8	35,1	3,4	0,3	0,0
Central Anatolia	1,1	75,0	22,8	1,0	0,1	0,1
West Black Sea	0,9	67,6	29,8	1,6	0,1	0,0
East Black Sea	0,3	62,8	35,3	1,6	0,1	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	2,7	76,0	20,3	1,0	0,0	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	2,1	69,0	26,7	1,9	0,4	0,0
Southeast Anatolia	3,0	75,0	20,6	1,2	0,1	0,0

69% of males believe that the appropriate age of marriage for females is between 18-24. This drops down to 59% among females. The rate of females who deem 25-29 as the appropriate age of marriage is higher (37%) than males (28%) who think that way (Table 30).

Individuals across all age groups including 65+ argue that females should get married after the age of 18 and mainly between 18-24 years of age. Majority of those 65 and older (75%) think that females should marry between 1824, while 21% believe 25-29 is a more appropriate age range for marriage. There is a higher group of younger individuals who believe that females should marry between 25-29. For instance, the proportion of 18-24 year olds who believe that females should marry between 25-29 is 34%, while it is 38% among individuals of 25-29 years of age. On the other hand, none of the age groups deem it ideal for a female to be married after the age of 34.

An analysis on the basis of marital status indicates that the rate of those who deem 18-24 years of age

an appropriate time for females to marry is higher among individuals who are widowed (71%) compared to married individuals (68%). As for divorced or separated individuals, almost half of them (49%) state that the appropriate age of marriage for females is between 25-29. This is lower than 30% among married individuals and those who are widowed. 8% of divorced individuals and 6% of those who live separate deem 3-34 years age more appropriate for marriage.

As the educational status rises, the rate of those who believe 18-24 is the appropriate age of marriage for females goes lower, while the rate of those who deem 25-29 more appropriate goes higher. 17% of individuals with no schooling believe that it is appropriate for females to marry between 25-29, while this soars to 53% among individuals with undergraduate/graduate diploma. 8% of individuals with undergraduate/graduate diploma state that the appropriate age of marriage for females is between 30-34.

When approached from a marital status perspec-

Table 30. Age of First Marriage Deemed Appropriate for Women by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	17 y.o. and younger	18 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 34	35- 39	40+
GENDER						
Male	1,2	68,8	27,6	2,1	0,1	0,1
Female	0,7	59,2	36,5	3,4	0,2	0,0
AGE						
18-24	0,5	64,1	33,6	1,7	0,2	0,0
25-34	0,9	57,4	37,5	4,0	0,2	0,0
35-44	0,8	62,0	33,8	3,2	0,2	0,1
45-54	1,0	66,2	30,4	2,2	0,1	0,0
55-64	1,2	67,8	28,1	2,9	0,1	0,1
65+	2,2	75,3	20,9	1,5	0,0	0,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	2,9	79,3	16,6	1,1	0,1	0,0
Primary school	0,9	72,3	25,1	1,5	0,1	0,1
Elementary/secondary school	0,6	68,0	29,6	1,7	0,1	0,0
High school	0,7	51,8	43,7	3,7	0,1	0,1
Undergraduate/graduate studies	0,3	38,8	52,5	8,1	0,3	0,0
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	0,4	52,1	42,5	4,6	0,3	0,1
Married	1,1	67,5	29,2	2,1	0,1	0,0
Separated/lives apart	0,4	44,5	49,0	5,7	0,4	0,0
Widowed	2,2	70,9	24,6	2,2	0,1	0,0
Divorced	0,2	42,7	48,8	8,2	0,2	0,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	0,8	64,1	32,4	2,5	0,1	0,0
Extended	1,7	72,5	24,2	1,5	0,2	0,0
Broken	0,8	50,9	42,0	6,0	0,2	0,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	0,4	28,0	59,2	12,3	0,1	0,0
Upper class	0,2	41,1	52,2	6,0	0,3	0,2
Upper middle class	0,5	58,2	38,1	3,1	0,2	0,0
Lower middle class	1,2	72,0	25,2	1,5	0,1	0,0
Lower class	2,4	80,5	15,9	1,2	0,0	0,0

tive, the rate of those who believe that females should marry between 18-24 is higher among married individuals and those who are widowed. The same goes for single individuals, and those who are separated or divorced. The rate of those who believe that a female should marry between 25-29 years of age is higher among single individuals (%43) and those who are divorced (49%) (Table 30).

An analysis on the basis of household type reveals that the majority of individuals from extended families (73) deem it appropriate for females to marry between 18-24 years of age. This is 64% among members of the nuclear family and 51% among members of the broken family. The major type of household where it is deemed appropriate for females to marry between 25-29 is the broken family (42%). This goes down to 32% in the nuclear family and 24% in the extended family. As the socioeconomic status rises, the age of marriage deemed appropriate for females also goes up. For instance, the rate of those who believe that 18-24 is the ideal age range for females to marry is 81% in the lower class and 28% in the high upper class. The share of higher upper class (59%) and upper class (52%) individuals who believe that 25-29 is a more appropriate range for females to marry is higher.

As for the ideal age of marriage for males, it is deemed appropriate for males to marry at a later age compared to females throughout Türkiye. 64% of Türkiye believes that females should get married between 18-24, while this rate is 29% for males. Only 3% think that the ideal age of marriage for females is 30-34 while 19% believe that this is the ideal age range for males to marry. Half of the population (50%) deems it appropriate for males to get married between 25-29 years of age. A meager 2% deem 35+ as the ideal marriage age for males (Table 31).

No significant variation is observed between the rural and urban areas regarding the appropriate age for marriage for males, with the exception of 18-24 years of age. Those who deem it appropriate for males to marry between 18-24 is 24% in the urban area and 42% in the rural.

Across the three major cities, the rate of those who state that the appropriate age of marriage for males as 18-24 is lower in Izmir (16%).

The appropriate marriage age for males has been analyzed on the basis of NUTS. Among those who deem 18-24 as the ideal marriage age for males, the cities that diverge most from Türkiye average (29%) are Istanbul (20%) and Southeast Anatolia (39%). The proportion of those who believe 30-34 is the ideal marriage age for males is the highest in Istanbul (27%) and lowest in Central Anatolia (11%) and Southeast Anatolia (12%).

The share of those who state that both males and females should get married between 25-29 years of age is higher across the two genders. On the other hand, the share of those who deem 18-24 is the ideal marriage age for males is higher among males (34%) whereas a higher percentage of females (23%) deem 30-34 years of age a more appropriate time for males to get married (Table 32).

As the age group goes up, the proportion of those who believe 25-29 as a more appropriate age range for males to marry goes down. More than half (57%) of the 18-24 year old participants state that

Table 31. Age of First Marriage Deemed Appropriate For Men Throughout Türkiye, By Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	17 y.o. and younger	18 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 34	35- 39	40+
Türkiye	0,2	28,7	49,9	19,2	1,9	0,2
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	0,2	23,7	51,4	22,2	2,3	0,2
Rural	0,3	41,5	45,8	11,5	0,8	0,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	0,1	19,5	50,1	26,8	3,2	0,1
Ankara	0,1	23,1	48,6	25,7	2,6	0,0
İzmir	0,2	15,8	52,1	28,4	3,0	0,4
NUTS						
Istanbul	0,1	19,5	50,1	26,8	3,2	0,1
West Marmara	0,0	22,3	53,5	22,7	1,3	0,2
East Marmara	0,1	24,3	52,4	20,9	1,8	0,4
Aegean	0,1	26,5	50,2	21,1	1,9	0,3
Mediterranean	0,1	30,2	51,9	15,9	1,9	0,1
West Anatolia	0,2	29,4	48,0	20,0	2,3	0,1
Central Anatolia	0,2	38,2	49,8	11,2	0,4	0,1
West Black Sea	0,2	37,9	47,5	13,1	1,2	0,0
East Black Sea	0,2	27,6	47,7	22,4	2,0	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	0,5	35,8	49,0	14,2	0,5	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	0,8	37,1	48,0	13,0	1,0	0,1
Southeast Anatolia	0,6	39,3	46,7	12,0	1,3	0,1

their age group is the ideal age group for marriage, while this proportion decreases to 41% among the 65+ group. The proportion of those who deem 30-34 years of age the ideal marriage age for males is the highest across individuals in the 25-34 age group (24%).

The proportion of those who deem it suitable for males to marry at a young age is inversely propor-

tional with educational status. 46% of individuals with no schooling deem 18-24 as the ideal age for males to marry, while this is only 12% across individuals with university/graduate degree. On the other hand, 50% of those with a university/graduate degree believe that males should get married between 25-29, while one third (34%) deem 30-34 years of age more appropriate.

Table 32. Age of First Marriage Deemed Appropriate For Men by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	17 y.o. and younger	18 - 24	25 - 29	30 - 34	35- 39	40+
GENDER						
Male	0,3	34,2	48,7	15,3	1,4	0,1
Female	0,1	23,2	51,0	23,1	2,4	0,2
AGE						
18-24	0,0	26,5	57,4	15,1	0,9	0,1
25-34	0,2	22,8	49,9	24,2	2,8	0,2
35-44	0,2	26,5	50,1	20,7	2,3	0,3
45-54	0,2	31,5	49,2	17,2	1,8	0,1
55-64	0,3	31,4	47,6	19,3	1,3	0,1
65+	0,4	42,8	40,8	14,4	1,4	0,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	0,5	45,7	42,0	11,0	0,8	0,1
Primary school	0,2	33,9	49,7	14,8	1,2	0,2
Elementary/secondary school	0,2	28,8	52,3	16,9	1,6	0,1
High school	0,1	19,0	53,1	25,0	2,6	0,2
Undergraduate/graduate studies	0,1	11,5	50,0	33,9	4,4	0,1
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	0,0	19,7	54,2	22,6	3,2	0,2
Married	0,3	31,0	49,5	17,6	1,5	0,1
Separated/lives apart	0,4	18,0	48,4	29,1	4,0	0,0
Widowed	0,2	35,5	43,8	18,9	1,4	0,1
Divorced	0,0	14,7	40,1	40,6	4,6	0,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	0,2	27,6	51,6	18,9	1,7	0,2
Extended	0,4	38,0	46,7	13,4	1,4	0,1
Broken	0,1	21,4	44,7	29,7	3,9	0,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	0,2	6,8	44,4	42,7	5,9	0,0
Upper class	0,1	12,2	50,9	33,2	3,3	0,3
Upper middle class	0,1	21,0	54,0	22,4	2,4	0,1
Lower middle class	0,2	33,4	50,8	14,4	1,1	0,2
Lower class	0,6	47,0	41,3	10,2	0,8	0,0

With the exception of divorced individuals, across all other types of marital status, the proportion of those who believe that 25-29 is the ideal age of marriage for males is higher. 41% of divorced individuals think that males should get married between 30-34 years of age. This is followed by single (23%) and separated (30%) individuals. The share of married (31%) individuals and individuals whose spouse died (36%) who believe 18-24 is the ideal age of marriage for males is higher (Table 32).

The proportion of extended family members who deem 18-24 is the ideal age of marriage for males is higher (38%) compared to other types of household (28% in the nuclear family; 21% in the broken family). The share of those who believe that males should get married at a later age such as 30-34 is higher across the broken family members (30%), compared to the nuclear family (19%) and the extended family (13%).

As the socioeconomic status rises, the share of those who believe that males should get married at a young age drops. For instance, the share of those who deem 18-24 as the ideal age of marriage is 47% in the lower class, while it drops down to 7% in the high upper class. The high upper class believes that males should get married between 25-34 years of age.

3.3. Number of Marriages

Within the scope of the research, individuals with marriage experience were asked how many times they got married be it civil or religious marriage. The results reveal that majority of the individuals (96%) married once. The share of those who married twice is 4% across Türkiye, while 3% of the population has married three times or more (Table 33).

Table 33. Number of Marriages throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	1	2	3+
Türkiye	95,6	4,0	0,3
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	95,8	3,8	0,3
Rural	95,1	4,6	0,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	96,1	3,6	0,3
Ankara	95,5	4,2	0,3
Izmir	95,2	4,4	0,5
NUTS			
Istanbul	96,1	3,6	0,3
West Marmara	94,5	5,2	0,3
East Marmara	95,7	4,0	0,3
Aegean	94,7	4,9	0,5
Mediterranean	95,7	4,0	0,3
West Anatolia	95,6	4,2	0,2
Central Anatolia	94,2	4,5	1,3
West Black Sea	96,2	3,6	0,2
East Black Sea	96,9	3,0	0,2
Northeast Anatolia	97,5	2,3	0,2
Mideast Anatolia	95,1	4,5	0,4
Southeast Anatolia	96,4	3,5	0,1

There is no observed variation in the number of marriages across the three major cities. On a NUTS basis, the regions where marrying twice is the highest is West Marmara and the Aegean Region with 5%. The lowest is Northeast Anatolia with 2%.

There is a difference in the results in terms of age groups. As the age group goes up, the number of marriages naturally goes up. There is a reverse correlation between educational background, socioeconomic status and second marriage. The rate of second marriage is lower across individuals with higher education and higher economic status. The group with the highest rate of second marriage (6%) is those with no schooling. Although no major variation is observed, lower class SES presents the highest rate of second marriage with 5%. As for the breakdown across household types, the proportion of second marriage is higher in the broken family (10%) type compared to others (Table 34).

Table 34. Number of Marriages by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	1	2	3+
GENDER			
Male	94,7	4,8	0,5
Female	96,4	3,4	0,2
AGE			
18-24	99,2	0,6	0,2
25-34	98,0	1,9	0,0
35-44	96,6	3,1	0,2
45-54	95,2	4,5	0,3
55-64	93,2	6,3	0,5
65+	91,1	7,8	1,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	93,7	5,7	0,6
Primary school	95,2	4,4	0,3
Elementary/secondary school	96,3	3,4	0,3
High school	96,9	3,1	0,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	97,2	2,4	0,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	96,1	3,7	0,2
Extended	96,1	3,3	0,5
Broken	90,0	8,9	1,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Higher upper class	96,4	3,6	0,0
Upper class	97,6	2,4	0,0
Upper middle class	96,6	3,1	0,3
Lower middle class	95,4	4,1	0,5
Lower class	94,3	5,2	0,5

3.4. Way of Meeting the Spouse

Individuals with marriage experience were asked how they met their spouse in their first marriage. 39% met their first spouse through the family and relative network, 39% through the neighborhood network, and 8% through their friend network. There is no observed difference regarding how individuals met their first spouse between the urban and rural areas. However, in the rural area, the proportion of neighborhood network is higher (48%) whereas the proportion of work (8%) and friend (9%) network is higher in the urban area (Table 35).

A comparison of the three major cities shows that in Ankara, the proportion of those who met their spouse through their family and relative network is higher (45%) compared to the other two major cities, whereas in Istanbul and Izmir the rate of marriage with someone from the neighborhood network is higher (37%) than in Ankara (31%).

An analysis of the regions reveals that the proportion of those who meet their first spouse through their family and relative network is much lower in West Marmara Region compared to the Türkiye average and the rest of the regions (23%). This is higher than 55% in Southeast and Northeast Anatolia Regions. In Northeast Anatolia, individuals have met their spouse mainly through the neighborhood network (53%). In West (16%) and East Marmara (12%) the proportion of those who met their first spouse through their friend network is higher compared to the other regions.

Table 35.Way of Meeting the Spouse throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (First Marriage)

	Family and relative network	Neighborhood network	School/ educational institution network	Work network	Friends network	Internet	Marriage Agency	Other
Türkiye	39,4	39,0	4,4	6,1	8,1	0,1	0,0	3,0
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	39,9	35,0	5,0	7,6	9,3	0,1	0,0	3,0
Rural	38,2	48,1	3,0	2,6	5,1	0,2	0,1	2,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	38,1	37,0	5,0	8,9	8,8	0,0	0,0	2,3
Ankara	45,1	30,8	4,8	8,3	9,1	0,2	0,0	1,7
Izmir	35,4	37,1	4,5	11,3	8,2	0,0	0,0	3,5
NUTS								
Istanbul	38,1	37,0	5,0	8,9	8,8	0,0	0,0	2,3
West Marmara	22,7	47,0	4,6	7,1	16,1	0,1	0,0	2,5
East Marmara	31,4	41,5	4,9	8,3	11,5	0,1	0,0	2,2
Aegean	34,2	42,3	5,6	8,9	6,0	0,0	0,0	2,9
Mediterranean	38,7	35,6	5,3	4,9	9,3	0,2	0,1	5,9
West Anatolia	45,6	32,6	4,2	6,6	8,9	0,1	0,0	2,0
Central Anatolia	38,3	48,3	3,8	2,8	5,0	0,1	0,1	1,6
West Black Sea	42,2	41,4	3,2	4,4	5,7	0,0	0,0	3,0
East Black Sea	44,9	39,9	4,3	3,2	5,5	0,0	0,0	2,1
Northeast Anatolia	38,1	53,4	3,5	1,4	1,5	0,0	0,0	2,2
Mideast Anatolia	55,2	33,6	1,4	1,4	7,7	0,0	0,0	0,8
Southeast Anatolia	55,0	30,8	1,9	1,7	5,0	0,5	0,1	5,1

An analysis across genders shows that males and females have met their first spouses through more or less the same networks (Table 36).

As the age group rises, the proportion of those who meet through the neighborhood network increases, whereas that of those who meet through school, educational institutions, courses and friends decre-

ases. 28% of individuals between 18-24 have met their first spouse through their neighborhood network. This is a higher rate among individuals 65 and older (53%). 12% of the 18-24 year-old have met their spouse through their friend network while this is 13% among the 25-34 year-old individuals.

Based on the educational status, 47% of those with no schooling have met their first spouse through the family and relative network, while 46% met through the neighborhood network. This proportion is lower among university graduates. 25% of university graduates met their first spouse through family and relative network, while 18% met through the neighborhood network. Additionally, 22% of university graduates met their first spouse through the school and educational institutions network, while 17% met through the work network.

Almost half (45%) of individuals from extended families have met their spouse through the family and relative network, while this is 39% for the nuclear family and 35% for the broken family. 43% of individuals from the broken family type have met their first spouse through their neighborhood network, compared to 38% in the nuclear family and 39% in the extended family.

An analysis based on socioeconomic status reveals that 90% of individuals from the lower class have met their first spouse through their family and relative network. This is 74% in the upper middle class, and 37% in the high upper class. In the high upper class, meeting the first spouse through school and educational institutions (27%) or work (21%) networks is quit high compared to other SES groups.

Table 36. Way of Meeting the Spouse by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (First Marriage)

	Family and relative network	Neighborhood network	School/ educational institution network	Work network	Friends network	Internet	Marriage agency	Other
GENDER								
Male	38,8	39,2	4,7	6,3	8,1	0,1	0,0	2,7
Female	39,9	38,8	4,1	5,9	8,0	0,1	0,0	3,2
AGE								
18-24	43,3	27,8	7,1	6,5	11,7	0,5	0,2	2,9
25-34	37,0	29,2	7,7	10,3	12,5	0,3	0,0	3,1
35-44	39,7	36,7	4,2	7,9	8,7	0,1	0,1	2,6
45-54	42,2	42,3	2,8	3,6	6,1	0,0	0,0	3,0
55-64	40,4	46,2	2,6	3,0	4,8	0,0	0,0	3,0
65+	36,4	52,9	1,8	2,0	3,7	0,0	0,0	3,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS								
No schooling	46,7	45,8	0,6	0,9	2,7	0,1	0,0	3,2
Primary school	41,7	45,5	1,1	3,0	5,6	0,0	0,0	3,0
Elementary/secondary school	41,0	37,7	2,4	6,0	9,6	0,2	0,1	3,1
High school	33,9	29,7	6,9	12,9	13,6	0,1	0,0	3,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	25,3	17,6	22,1	16,8	15,6	0,3	0,0	2,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	38,5	38,4	4,8	6,9	8,5	0,1	0,0	2,8
Extended	45,0	39,4	2,8	3,2	6,1	0,1	0,0	3,4
Broken	35,4	42,7	3,9	5,4	8,8	0,1	0,0	3,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
Higher upper class	22,6	14,0	26,6	21,1	14,4	0,0	0,0	1,3
Upper class	28,7	25,0	13,4	15,4	15,2	0,3	0,0	1,9
Upper middle class	38,8	35,4	5,1	8,0	9,4	0,1	0,1	3,1
Lower middle class	41,7	43,7	1,6	3,7	6,3	0,0	0,0	3,0
Lower class	46,9	43,0	0,5	1,4	4,8	0,2	0,0	3,1

There is significant variation across individuals who got married more than once, regarding how they met their first spouse. The proportion of the family and relative network drops, while that of the work (12%) and friends network (15%) increases. Even in the rural area where the family has the highest impact on the marriage process, the rate of meeting the last spouse through the family network goes down to 29%. This is 38% for the first spouse.

Table 37. Way of Meeting the Spouse throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area (Last Marriage)

	Family and relative network	Neighborhood network	School/ educational institution network	Work network	Friends network	Internet	Marriage agency	Other
Türkiye	31,0	35,9	1,2	11,5	15,3	0,3	0	4,7
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	32,4	32,7	1,3	13,7	15,7	0,5	0	3,8
Rural	28,5	41,9	1,2	7,3	14,8	0,0	0	6,4

The findings for individuals who had multiple marriages were compared to find out how they met. 63% of those who met their last spouse through their family and relative network met their first spouse the same way. On the other hand, 27% of them had their first marriage with someone from their neighborhood. 64% of those who had their last marriage with someone from the neighborhood network followed the same path for their first marriage, while 29% married through the family and relative network for the first time. In other words, those who got married through their family and relative network for the first time have met their last spouse through the same network.

On the other hand, this finding is not valid for those who met their last spouse via their work network. 31% of such individuals have met their first spouse through their family and relative network while 30% met through the neighborhood network. Those who marry someone from the work network both in their first and last marriage rank in the third place (23%).

One third (34%) of those who married a friend the last time have married a friend in their first marriage too. One third of those individuals (33%) married someone from the family and relative network while 26% married someone from their neighborhood network the first time (Table 38).

Table 38. Way of Meeting the Spouse throughout Türkiye (Comparison of First & Last Marriage)

		Last Marriage				
		Family and relative network	Neighborhood network	Work circle	Friends network	Other
First Marriage	Family and relative network	62,9	28,5	31,3	33,3	16,7
	Neighborhood network	26,7	64,4	29,8	26,0	36,8
	School/ educ. Inst. network	1,8	0,3	4,7	0,3	7,2
	Work circle	1,1	1,4	22,6	4,2	13,4
	Friends network	4,0	4,7	8,7	34,3	2,0
	Other	3,3	0,8	3,2	2,0	22,8

3.5. Decision for Marriage

Individuals with marriage experience were asked how they married their first and last spouse, who chose the spouse, and if the spouse-to-be was ever consulted regarding the decision to marry.

An evaluation throughout Türkiye reveals that half of the first marriages were arranged (51%). The other half was built upon the decision of the person to be married as well as the support and approval of the family (41%) (Table 39).

As for the rural vs. urban breakdown of the first marriage decision; it is observed that arranged marriage takes place at a higher level in the rural area. The proportion of those who get married through arranged marriage or their own decision is 41% in the urban area, while it increases to 46% in the rural. A similar situation is observed among individuals who marry upon the decision of their family, through arranged marriage, without their own consent. This is 8% in the urban area, and goes up to 12% in the rural. The rural-urban difference in the first marriage decision is observed in marriages upon eloping/abduction. The rate of such marriages is 4% in the urban and 6% in the rural area. On the other hand, the rate of marriages upon the individual's own consent and approval of the family is higher in the urban areas (44%).

Across the three major cities, the rates are more or less the same in Istanbul and Izmir regarding the decision to marry. In Ankara, the rate of individual decision of arranged marriage (47%), and arranged marriage through the decision of the family without the consent of the individual (10%), is higher compared to Istanbul and Izmir.

The main regions where individuals get married through their own decision and approval of their family are Istanbul and West Marmara with 55%. This is followed by East Marmara (49%) and Aegean Region (45%). The lowest rate of such marriage is observed in Central Anatolia with 23%. Arranged marriage without the individual's consent is the highest in Central Anatolia (60%). The phenomenon of bride exchange is still present in the Southeast Anatolia region as a social fact. 3% of marriages in the region occur through bride exchange.

Table 39. Decision for Marriage throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (First Marriage)

	My decision with approval of my family	My decision without approval of my family	Arranged marriage, my decision	Arranged marriage, my family's decision, without my opinion	Eloping/ abduction	Bride exchange	Other
Türkiye	41,0	2,9	42,4	8,9	4,4	0,3	0,1
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	44,4	3,2	40,7	7,8	3,7	0,3	0,1
Rural	33,2	2,3	46,4	11,5	6,1	0,5	0,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	55,2	4,3	30,9	5,7	3,6	0,1	0,2
Ankara	36,7	3,1	47,1	10,4	2,5	0,2	0,0
Izmir	50,8	2,0	35,3	7,0	4,6	0,1	0,1
NUTS							
Istanbul	55,2	4,3	30,9	5,7	3,6	0,1	0,2
West Marmara	54,9	,6	31,3	4,8	8,4	0,1	0,0
East Marmara	49,2	1,6	33,7	8,6	6,9	0,0	0,0
Aegean	45,4	3,2	38,7	8,3	4,2	0,1	0,0
Mediterranean	34,4	4,0	49,3	7,0	5,0	0,2	0,1
West Anatolia	34,7	2,5	49,4	10,6	2,5	0,1	0,1
Central Anatolia	22,7	2,5	59,6	11,2	3,8	0,2	0,1
West Black Sea	31,8	1,2	50,2	11,9	4,7	0,1	0,0
East Black Sea	29,9	2,2	42,4	17,1	8,4	0,0	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	33,3	5,0	46,9	12,1	2,6	0,0	0,1
Mideast Anatolia	37,7	2,1	46,8	10,8	2,4	0,3	0,0
Southeast Anatolia	30,1	3,0	51,2	10,8	1,6	3,3	0,1

An analysis of findings across genders reveals that the rate of males who marry upon their own decision and family consent (45%) is higher compared to the rate of women who marry under those circumstances (37%) (Table 40).

An analysis of marriage decision across age groups indicates that as the age group gets younger, individuals marry on the basis of their own decision, yet they get the approval of their family. Between 18-24 and 25-34 the rate of those individuals who make their own decisions of marriage and marry upon approval of their family is higher compared to other age groups. 52% of 18-24 year olds, and 54% of 25-34 year-olds have married on the basis of their own decision and approval of their family. This is as low as 23% in the 65 + age group. As the age group goes up, there is an increase of arranged marriages and marriages without the individual's own consent. The rate of arranged marriage is 23% for 65 + age group, and it goes lower with the younger age groups and declines to as low as 2% in the 18-24 age group. The rate of those who are consulted with before an arranged marriage is lower among younger populations; 34% in the 18-24 age group and 35% in the 25-34 age group. Almost half of the individuals in the 45 + age group (47-49%) have married under such circumstances.

Table 40. Decision for Marriage by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (First Marriage)

	My decision with approval of my family	My decision without approval of my family	Arranged marriage, my decision	Arranged marriage, my family's decision, without my opinion	Eloping/ abduction	Bride exchange	Other
GENDER							
Male	45,2	2,7	41,8	5,6	4,3	0,3	0,1
Female	37,3	3,1	42,9	11,7	4,5	0,4	0,1
AGE							
18-24	52,2	5,3	33,8	2,2	6,2	0,2	0,0
25-34	53,7	3,4	34,6	3,3	4,7	0,3	0,0
35-44	46,0	2,8	41,3	5,7	3,7	0,4	0,1
45-54	34,8	2,8	48,5	9,3	4,2	0,4	0,2
55-64	32,0	2,6	47,4	13,1	4,6	0,3	0,0
65+	23,3	1,6	47,6	22,5	4,5	0,4	0,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
No schooling	21,2	2,3	47,9	22,7	4,5	1,3	0,0
Primary school	32,0	2,8	50,2	9,6	5,1	0,2	0,1
Elementary/secondary school	43,5	3,6	42,1	4,6	6,0	0,2	0,0
High school	58,8	3,4	32,1	2,3	3,2	0,0	0,1
Undergraduate/graduate studies	78,1	2,4	17,7	0,9	0,7	0,0	0,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	44,1	2,8	41,3	7,2	4,3	0,3	0,1
Extended	33,5	2,6	47,8	10,9	4,5	0,6	0,1
Broken	30,7	4,5	40,3	18,6	5,3	0,4	0,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
Higher upper class	84,8	2,2	11,7	0,6	0,4	0,0	0,1
Upper class	67,8	2,3	25,6	2,5	1,6	0,0	0,1
Upper middle class	48,9	2,3	39,5	5,9	3,3	0,0	0,1
Lower middle class	33,6	2,9	47,1	10,6	5,5	0,3	0,0
Lower class	27,8	3,6	49,8	12,6	5,1	1,0	0,0

As the educational status rises, the rate of those who marry upon their own will and the approval of the family also rises, while the rate of arranged marriage declines. 78% of university graduates, and 59% of high school graduates make their own marriage decision and upon approval of their family. On the other hand, the rate of arranged marriage upon the decision of the family is higher across elementary school graduates and those with lower levels of education. The proportion of arranged marriage is 23% among individuals with no schooling and 1% among university graduates. Among individuals with no schooling, the rate of those who had an arranged marriage and were consulted with is 48%. This is down to 18% among university graduates (Table 40).

The proportion of individuals who chose their spouse and married upon consent of their family is 44% in the nuclear family, while the proportion of individuals who had an arranged marriage without presenting their own opinion is 19% in the broken family. In the extended family, almost half of the members of the household (48%) have had an arranged marriage, yet the individual himself/herself also gave consent.

As the socioeconomic status rises, the proportion of individuals who choose their spouse on their own also

increases. For instance, solely 28% of individuals in the lower class marry on the basis of their own decision and family consent, while this is 85% in the high upper class. On the other hand, the rate of arranged marriage increases as the socioeconomic status declines. To given an example, only 12% of individuals in the high upper class have an arranged marriage and present their own opinion in that, while this is 50% in the lower class. In a similar vein, arranged marriage without the opinion of the individual increases as the socioeconomic status decreases. This is how 1% of individuals in the high upper class get married and it goes up to 13% in the lower class.

An assessment throughout Türkiye shows that individuals who have had multiple marriages have made the first marriage decision on their own, though it was upon the consent of their family for the majority. This is 41% for the first marriage and 48% for the last. Self-decision to marry without the consent of the family is higher (6%) compared to the first marriage (3%). In the first marriage decision, "arranged marriage, my decision" option (42%) is less common among individuals who had more than one marriage (35%) and ranks the second. This holds true for individuals from both urban and rural areas (Table 41).

Table 41. Decision for Marriage throughout Türkiye by Residence Area (Last Marriage)

	My decision with approval of my family	My decision without approval of my family	Arranged marriage, my decision	Arranged marriage, my family's decision, without my opinion	Eloping/ abduction	Bride exchange	Other
Türkiye	48,4	6,3	34,6	6,2	3,2	0,4	0,9
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	50,3	7,4	33,2	5,5	2,7	0,3	0,6
Rural	44,7	4,2	37,2	7,5	4,2	0,5	1,6

58% of individuals whose last marriage decision was their own choice and supported by their family presented a similar picture in their first marriage as well. On the other hand, 36% of these individuals had an arranged marriage the first time (Table 42).

Individuals who made their own decision and had an arranged marriage the last time, presented the same pattern during the time of their first marriage (68%). On the other hand, 15% of these individuals have married a person of their choice in their first marriage.

Table 42. Decision for Marriage throughout Türkiye (Comparison of First & Last Marriage)

	Last Marriage			
	My decision with approval of my family	My decision without approval of my family	Arranged marriage, my decision	Arranged marriage, my family's decision, without my opinion
My decision with approval of my family	57.9	21,5	10,8	4,5
My decision without approval of my family	3,3	19,0	4,0	1,0
Arranged marriage, my decision	22,3	19,8	67,6	18,4
Arranged marriage, my family's decision, without my opinion	13,4	31,7	14,3	64,3
Eloping/ abduction	3,0	8,7	2,8	10,1
Bride exchange	0,0	0,0	0,2	2,5
Other	0,0	0,0	0,3	0,0

(Left axis label spanning rows: **First Marriage**)

3.6. Form of Solemnization

Individuals were asked which form of solemniza-tion was practiced in their first and last marriage. An evaluation of findings in their first marriage has revealed that majority (94%) of married individuals practice both civil and religious ceremony. The rate of civil marriage alone is 3% while the rate of religious marriage alone is 3% across Türkiye (Table 43).

The relationship between residence area and the form of solemnization reveals that the majority of individuals who live in the urban (93%) and rural (96%) areas have had both civil and religious mar-riage. On the other hand, the proportion of urban-ites that only have civil marriage is 4% versus 2% in the rural area.

There is no variation in the form of solemnization across the three major cities. On the other hand, it is observed that individuals have different forms of

Table 43. Form of Solemnization throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (First Marriage)

	Only official/civil	Only religious	Both
Türkiye	3,4	2,6	93,9
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	4,2	2,5	93,3
Rural	1,7	2,8	95,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	8,1	1,9	90,0
Ankara	4,9	1,4	93,7
Izmir	6,2	2,3	91,5
NUTS			
Istanbul	8,1	1,9	90,0
West Marmara	2,3	0,7	97,0
East Marmara	1,5	1,9	96,7
Aegean	3,2	1,4	95,5
Mediterranean	1,6	3,5	94,9
West Anatolia	3,6	1,4	95,0
Central Anatolia	1,0	2,5	96,5
West Black Sea	5,1	3,1	91,9
East Black Sea	0,6	2,1	97,2
Northeast Anatolia	0,6	3,3	96,1
Mideast Anatolia	6,2	5,3	88,5
Southeast Anatolia	0,8	7,5	91,8

solemnization on the basis of regions. Istanbul is the region where the number of individuals with civil marriage and without religious marriage is the highest (8%). After Istanbul comes Mideast Anatolia (6%). Individuals without civil marriage and with religious marriage are concentrated in Southeast Anatolia with 8%.

There is no significant variation across gender and age group. However, in the 18-24 age group, the rate of those who only had religious marriage (6%) is slightly higher compared to the 25-64 age group (Table 44).

Among individuals with the highest level of education, the rate of those who only have civil marriage (9%) is higher, while the rate of religious marriage is the highest among individuals with the lowest level of education (7%). The same is true for the upper class: 13% of individuals in the high upper class have only had civil marriage, while this is 1% in the lower class.

Although there is no variation across household types, the rate of individuals who have had both civil and religious marriage is slightly lower in the broken family (89%) compared to other types.

Table 44. Form of Solemnization by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES (First Marriage)

	Only official/civil	Only religious	Both
GENDER			
Male	3,6	2,4	94,0
Female	3,3	2,9	93,8
AGE			
18-24	1,4	5,5	93,1
25-34	3,5	2,0	94,6
35-44	3,0	1,7	95,2
45-54	3,7	2,5	93,8
55-64	4,5	3,0	92,5
65+	3,4	4,2	92,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	1,6	6,5	91,9
Primary school	2,5	2,3	95,2
Elementary/secondary school	3,1	2,2	94,7
High school	4,3	1,4	94,3
Undergraduate/graduate studies	9,2	0,6	90,2
MARITAL STATUS			
Married	3,2	2,3	94,5
Separated/lives apart	6,0	8,5	85,5
Spouse has died	3,7	5,2	91,0
Divorced	9,9	4,4	85,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	3,3	2,0	94,8
Extended	3,0	4,1	92,9
Broken	6,1	5,3	88,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
Higher upper class	13,1	1,2	85,7
Upper class	5,8	0,6	93,6
Upper middle class	3,5	1,9	94,7
Lower middle class	2,7	2,7	94,7
Lower class	1,3	4,1	94,6

An examination of the form of solemnization in the last marriage of individuals shows that the preference for both civil and religious marriage (80%) decreases significantly compared to the first marriage (94%). Furthermore, the rate of religious marriage alone soars from 3% to 13% in the last marriage, and similarly, the preference for civil marriage alone goes up from 4% to 7% (Table 45).

An analysis across Residence Area indicates that, for last marriage, only religious marriage is more widespread in rural areas (18%) versus urban areas (10%)

Table 45.Form of Solemnization throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area (Last Marriage)

	Only official/civil	Only religious	Both
Türkiye	7,0	12,6	80,4
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	6,9	9,9	83,2
Rural	7,1	17,7	75,2

Majority of those who had both civil and religious marriage the last time (86%) have done the same in their first marriage, while 11% had only religious marriage the first time (Table 46).

It is noteworthy that 78% of those who had only religious marriage the last time had both civil and religious marriage the first time, while 18% of them had only religious marriage the first time.

Table 46. Form of Solemnization throughout Türkiye (Comparison of First & Last Marriage)

		Last Marriage		
		Only official/civil	Only religious	Both
First Marriage	**Only official/civil**	64,3	4,3	1,9
	Only religious	1,4	17,9	10,6
	Both	33,7	78,1	87,5

3.7. Bride Price

Within the scope of the Family Structure Research, individuals with marriage experience were asked if they paid any bride price during their first and last marriage. It is observed that 16% paid bride price in their first marriage. This is a more common practice in the rural area. Bride price is paid in 13% of marriages in the urban area, while this is 23% in the rural area (Table 47).

An analysis of regions reveals that bride price is most common in Northeast and Mideast Anatolia with 40%, and Southeast Anatolia with 39%. Bride price is the least common in the Aegean Region with 5%. In parallel with this finding, across the three major cities, Izmir is the city where bride price practice is at the lowest level (6%).

On the basis of age groups, bride price is mostly concentrated in the 55 + age group. 25% of those between 55-64, and 26% of those in the 65+ group paid bride price as they married. As the age group gets younger, the rate of bride price practice declines. In the 25-30 group, only 9% of individuals have married on bride price basis. Surprisingly enough, bride price practice increases in the 18-24 age group (13%).

Bride price practice is inversely proportional with the educational status and socioeconomic status. Merely 2% of university graduates have married upon bride price. This is 38% among individuals with no schooling. In the high upper class, the proportion of those who married upon bride price is only 2%, compared to the 30% in the lower class.

The practice of bride price is more widespread in the extended family compared to other household types. 24% of individuals from the extended family have married upon bride price payment, while this is 15% in the broken family and 14% in the nuclear family.

Table 47. Bride Price throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (First Marriage)

	Yes	No
Türkiye	15,6	84,4
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	12,6	87,4
Rural	22,8	77,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	12,9	87,1
Ankara	12,8	87,2
Izmir	6,1	93,9
NUTS		
Istanbul	12,9	87,1
West Marmara	8,3	91,7
East Marmara	11,1	88,9
Aegean	5,1	94,9
Mediterranean	9,8	90,2
West Anatolia	10,6	89,4
Central Anatolia	23,8	76,2
West Black Sea	21,3	78,7
East Black Sea	11,3	88,7
Northeast Anatolia	39,7	60,3
Mideast Anatolia	39,6	60,4
Southeast Anatolia	38,8	61,2
AGE		
18-24	13,3	86,7
25-34	9,4	90,6
35-44	10,7	89,3
45-54	16,3	83,7
55-64	24,9	75,1
65+	26,2	73,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
No schooling	37,6	62,4
Primary school	17	83
Elementary/secondary school	9,3	90,7
High school	4,5	95,5
Undergraduate/graduate studies	2,2	97,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	13,6	86,4
Extended	23,8	76,2
Broken	14,9	85,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Higher upper class	1,7	98,3
Upper class	4,0	96,0
Upper middle class	9,3	90,7
Lower middle class	18,1	81,9
Lower class	29,9	70,1

Individuals who marry more than once sustain the bride price tradition in their last marriage as well. Across Türkiye, the proportion of bride price practice is 16% in first marriages, and is maintained in the last marriages though at a slightly lower level (12%). Based on Residence Area, the share of those who pay bride price in the urban area is 13% in the first marriage and 8% in the second marriage, while this is 23% in the rural area, dropping to 19% in the last marriage (Table 48).

Table 48. Bride Price throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area (Last Marriage)

	Bride price	No bride price
Türkiye	11,6	88,4
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	7,9	92,1
Rural	18,7	81,3

In other words, 70% of individuals who married on bride price basis the last time have paid pride price in their first marriage as well. 10% of those with no bride price experience in the last marriage were found to have the bride price experience in their first marriage. (Table 49).

Table 49. Bride Price throughout Türkiye (Compasion of First & Last Marriage)

		Last Marriage	
		Bride price	No bride price
First Marriage	**Bride price**	70,3	9,7
	No bride price	30,2	90,2

3.8. Consanguineous Marriage

Married individuals were asked if they had any kinship with their spouse in their first marriage and others. Based on the research results, 21% of individuals married in Türkiye have kinship with their first spouse. This is 20% in the urban and 25% in the rural area (Table 50).

Across the three major cities, Ankara is the city with the highest rate of marriage between relatives (23%). This is down to 17% in Istanbul. Izmir is the city with the lowest rate of marriage between relatives with 12%.

An analysis of regions indicates that marriage between relatives is most common in Southeast Anatolia. The rate of first marriage with a relative is around 44% in Southeast Anatolia, followed by Mideast Anatolia with 36%. This is the lowest in West Marmara with 7%.

Table 50. Consanguineous Marriage throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (First Marriage)

	People who married blood relatives	People who did not marry blood relatives
Türkiye	21,3	78,7
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	19,8	80,2
Rural	24,6	75,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	17,1	82,9
Ankara	23,0	77,0
Izmir	11,5	88,5
NUTS		
Istanbul	17,1	82,9
West Marmara	6,8	93,2
East Marmara	13,5	86,5
Aegean	15,3	84,7
Mediterranean	23,1	76,9
West Anatolia	24,5	75,5
Central Anatolia	25,1	74,9
West Black Sea	19,4	80,6
East Black Sea	25,6	74,4
Northeast Anatolia	22,8	77,2
Mideast Anatolia	35,5	64,5
Southeast Anatolia	43,6	56,4

Across age groups, the rate of those related to their spouse ranges from 19% to 24%, yet there is no parallel trend based on age groups. The proportion of kinship with spouse is more or less the same within the 45-64 group (23%) and the 18-24 age group (24%) (Table 51).

Differently from age groups, there is a strong correlation between the educational status and kinship with spouse. As the educational level rises, the rate of kinship to spouse decreases. 31% of those with no schooling, 14% of high school graduates, 12% of university graduates are related to their spouse. The same strong correlation applies to socioeconomic status and kinship with spouse. As the SES level goes down, the rate of marriage with a relative goes up. In the high upper class, the rate of marriage to a relative is 8% versus 32% in the lower class.

The highest rate of marriage to a relative is in the extended family with 26%.

Table 51. Consanguineous Marriage by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (First Marriage)

	People who married blood relatives	People who did not marry blood relatives
GENDER		
Male	21,2	78,8
Female	21,3	78,7
AGE		
18-24	23,6	76,4
25-34	19,4	80,6
35-44	20,3	79,7
45-54	23,4	76,6
55-64	22,8	77,2
65+	20,7	79,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
No schooling	30,5	69,5
Primary school	22,8	77,2
Elementary/secondary school	21,4	78,6
High school	14,0	86,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	11,7	88,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	20,4	79,6
Extended	26,4	73,6
Broken	17,8	82,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Higher upper class	8,4	91,6
Upper class	11,7	88,3
Upper middle class	19,2	80,8
Lower middle class	22,9	77,1
Lower class	32,4	67,6

For individuals with multiple marriages, the rate of kinship to their spouse in their last marriage is 8%. Compared to the first marriage (21%), there is a significant decline in preferring to marry a relative in the later marriages. The proportion of last marriage with a relative is close in the urban and rural areas (Table 52).

Majority of individuals who are not married to a relative the last time (85%) do not have kinship with their spouse in their first marriage either. The proportion of those who marry a non-relative the last time after marrying a relative the first time is 16% (Table 53).

Table 52. Consanguineous Marriage throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area (Last Marriage)

	People who married blood relatives	People who did not marry blood relatives
Türkiye	7,5	92,5
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	7,8	92,2
Rural	6,9	93,1

Table 53. Consanguineous Marriages throughout Türkiye (Comparison of First & Last Marriage)

		Last Marriage	
		People who married blood relatives	People who did not marry blood relatives
First Marriage	People who married blood relatives	40,1	15,5
	People who did not marry blood relatives	60,1	84,5

Those who married a relative in their first marriage were asked what kind of kinship they had to their spouse. It was found out that most of the time the marriage was with a relative from the paternal side of the family (59%). 18% of the marriages were with "son/daughter of paternal uncle", 12% with "son/daughter of paternal aunt", and 29% with "other relatives from the father's side". In the rural area, the rate of marriage with paternal relatives is higher (61%) (Table 54).

In Ankara, the share of those who marry "relatives from the mother's side" (25%) is higher compared to Izmir and Istanbul.

Marriage with a relative from the father's side is the highest in Mideast Anatolia (67%) and Southeast Anatolia (66%), while marriage with a relative from the mother's side is the highest in Aegean (49%), Northeast Anatolia (47%), East Black Sea (46%) and West Black Sea regions (45%).

Table 54. Degree of Kinship between Spouses throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (First Marriage)

	Child of paternal uncle	Child of paternal aunt	Child of maternal uncle	Child of maternal aunt	Other relative from the father's side	Other relative from the mother's side
Türkiye	18,4	11,8	11,7	11,8	28,7	17,5
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	17,3	12,1	11,8	12,9	28,5	17,4
Rural	20,5	11,2	11,5	9,8	29,1	17,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	14,9	13,1	12,2	11,7	30,6	17,5
Ankara	15,2	10,6	12,5	9,5	27,2	25,1
Izmir	15,1	8,7	12,1	12,8	33,6	17,7
NUTS						
Istanbul	14,9	13,1	12,2	11,7	30,6	17,5
West Marmara	13,0	14,2	7,3	4,8	36,4	24,3
East Marmara	10,4	10,4	10,9	10,5	34,8	23,0
Aegean	10,3	7,7	8,9	14,8	32,9	25,4
Mediterranean	16,2	13,7	12,5v	11,1	28,6	17,9
West Anatolia	17,6	11,6	12,0	11,4	28,2	19,1
Central Anatolia	24,4	13,6	12,0	12,9	24,0	13,2
West Black Sea	14,4	12,4	11,1	11,9	28,2	22,0
East Black Sea	20,1	10,2	11,0	13,4	23,7	21,6
Northeast Anatolia	21,2	18,8	23,6	9,3	13,1	14,0
Mideast Anatolia	23,6	9,8	11,0	12,8	33,1	9,7
Southeast Anatolia	29,2	11,3	11,4	11,2	25,7	11,1

An evaluation across age groups reveals that in the 18-24 age group, those who married a relative from the father's side is higher (66%) while in the 45-54 age group marriage with a relative from the mother's side is more common (45%) (Table 55).

As the educational status goes lower, the rate of marriage to a relative from the paternal side increases. In marriage to a relative, 64% of those with no schooling are married to a relative from the father's side while this decreases to 48% among university graduates, and the rate of those who marry a relative from the mother's side increases.

No significant variation is observed on the basis of the household type. Across individuals from the extended family who married a relative, the rate of those who married a relative from the father's side (62%) is slightly higher compared to other types of household.

In marriages with a relative, only in the higher upper class marriage with a relative from the mother's side is higher compared to other SES groups (63%) In other SES groups, there is no major differentiation between marriages from a relative from the mother's or father's side.

Table 55. Degree of Kinship between Spouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (First Marriage)

	Child of paternal uncle	Child of paternal aunt	Child of maternal uncle	Child of maternal aunt	Other relative from the father's side	Other relative from the mother's side
GENDER						
Male	18,4	10,4	12,1	12,6	29,2	17,3
Female	18,5	13,0	11,3	11,2	28,3	17,7
AGE						
18-24	19,3	12,8	5,4	12,5	33,7	16,3
25-34	14,2	11,7	10,9	12,5	31,5	19,3
35-44	19,7	12,5	12,4	11,9	26,1	17,4
45-54	17,4	12,0	13,6	14,3	26,0	16,7
55-64	21,0	10,0	10,2	10,3	30,5	17,9
65+	22,2	11,9	13,1	7,9	28,6	16,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	25,1	13,0	12,7	9,4	25,5	14,3
Primary school	18,3	12,0	11,3	10,6	29,8	18,1
Elementary/secondary school	14,1	12,9	10,5	14,2	31,2	17,1
High school	14,0	9,3	12,7	15,4	27,8	20,9
Undergraduate/graduate studies	13,0	7,1	12,5	19,1	27,5	20,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	16,4	11,5	11,7	12,4	29,9	18,0
Extended	23,8	12,8	12,0	10,3	25,7	15,4
Broken	21,5	11,0	10,4	10,8	26,7	19,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	8,3	5,3	17,3	21,4	23,7	23,9
Upper class	13,4	14,3	14,1	8,5	26,2	23,5
Upper middle class	17,1	10,8	9,9	15,1	28,8	18,3
Lower middle class	18,7	10,9	11,7	10,6	30,6	17,5
Lower class	18,8	13,5	13,8	10,5	28,3	15,1

3.9. Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate

Individuals participating in the questionnaire were asked if they approved of kinship between couples. 13% answered "yes", while 87% answered "no". There is no observed variation between the rural (14%) and urban (13%) areas (Table 56).

An analysis across the three major cities shows that

Izmir the city that stands most distant to kinship between spouses with 5%, while the rate of approval is 11% in Istanbul and Ankara.

Kinship between spouses receives the highest level of approval in Southeast Anatolia with 34%. In Mideast Anatolia, marriage with a relative is highly approved compared to other regions (27%). The lowest rate of approval is in West Marmara (2%), East Marmara (6%) and Aegean Region (7%).

Table 56. Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Consanguinesous marriages appropriate	Consanguinesous marriages not appropriate
Türkiye	12,9	87,1
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	12,5	87,5
Rural	14,0	86,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	11,1	88,9
Ankara	10,9	89,1
Izmir	5,2	94,8
NUTS		
Istanbul	11,1	88,9
West Marmara	1,8	98,2
East Marmara	6,1	93,9
Aegean	6,6	93,4
Mediterranean	13,6	86,4
West Anatolia	13,7	86,3
Central Anatolia	15,0	85,0
West Black Sea	9,6	90,4
East Black Sea	11,3	88,7
Northeast Anatolia	16,2	83,8
Mideast Anatolia	26,6	73,4
Southeast Anatolia	34,2	65,8

There is no variation across gender. As for age groups, the rate of approval is more or less equal in all age groups. The highest rate is in 25-34 and 35-44 age groups (14%). The age group that displays the lowest level of approval regarding kinship between spouses is the 18-24 group (11%) (Table 57).

As the educational status rises, the share of those who have a positive outlook to kinship between couples decreases. 24% of individuals with no schooling deem such marriage appropriate, while this is 8% among individuals with the highest level of education.

The proportion of those who think kinship between

couples is acceptable is higher among married individuals (14%) and those whose spouse has died (13%), and lower among divorced (8%) and single (7%) individuals. As for the level of approval across household types, approval of kinship between couples is the highest in the extended family (18%) and the lowest in the broken family (8%).

As the socioeconomic status rises, the rate of those who deem kinship between couples acceptable goes lower. For instance, 23% of the lower class deems such marriage appropriate while this is 6% in the high upper class.

Table 57. Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes	No
GENDER		
Male	13,2	86,8
Female	12,6	87,4
AGE		
18-24	10,9	89,1
25-34	13,5	86,5
35-44	14,1	85,9
45-54	13,1	86,9
55-64	12,3	87,7
65+	13,2	86,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
No schooling	23,6	76,4
Primary school	13,1	86,9
Elementary/secondary school	12,2	87,8
High school	9,3	90,7
Undergraduate/graduate studies	8,0	92,0
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	8,3	91,7
Married	14,4	85,6
Separated/lives apart	9,8	90,2
Widowed	12,6	87,4
Divorced	6,5	93,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	12,5	87,5
Extended	17,9	82,1
Broken	8,4	91,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
Higher upper class	5,6	94,4
Upper class	8,7	91,3
Upper middle class	10,8	89,2
Lower middle class	13,9	86,1
Lower class	22,6	77,4

On the other hand, those who approve of kinship between couples were asked the most important underlying reason for that. 37% responded "knowing and preserving the family roots". 22% responded "better relations among children of relatives". 3% (the lowest rate) responded, "Property and wealth will not be divided" (Table 58).

Across all age groups, levels of educational status, SES groups and household types, the major rea-

son for approval of kinship between couples was knowledge and preservation of family roots. Another significant reason was the belief that children of relatives would get along better. The perception that children of relatives would be more respectful to the elderly in the family was the third-ranking reason for support of kinship between spouses.

In parallel with the general landscape in Türkiye, the most crucial two reasons for approval of kin-

ship between spouses in the rural and urban areas is "knowing and preserving the family roots" and "better relations among children of relatives". No significant variation is observed in that respect.

No outstanding variation is observed across the three major cities, yet "more respect for elderly family members" stands at 15% in Ankara and Izmir while it is 9% in Istanbul. In Istanbul "preserving traditions and customs" is a more prominent rationale for kinship marriage (20%).

Obvious variation is observed across regions. In Southeast Anatolia, "knowing and preserving family roots" is the main rationale for kinship marriage with 54%. Southeast Anatolia is followed by Northeast Anatolia (44%) and East Black Sea (42%). In general, "better relations among children of relatives" ranks at the top in West Marmara and Central Anatolia with 36%. Another important difference is that "preserving traditions and customs" is much higher in Northeast Anatolia (30%) compared to all other regions.

Table 58. Reasons for Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Property and wealth will not be divided	Information and preservation of family roots	Kids of relatives get along better	More respect for elderly family members	Preserving traditions and customs	Other
Türkiye	2,5	37,3	21,5	13,3	13,1	12,3
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	2,3	36,4	20,7	12,7	13,2	14,7
Rural	2,9	39,4	23,3	14,7	12,8	6,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	2,2	37,5	16,3	9,0	19,5	15,4
Ankara	2,1	32,5	11,5	15,4	13,7	24,8
Izmir	3,2	33,5	13,7	15,2	16,7	17,8
NUTS						
Istanbul	2,2	37,5	16,3	9,0	19,5	15,4
West Marmara	6,1	19,6	36,4	4,2	18,9	14,9
East Marmara	2,2	19,8	24,1	9,3	10,6	34,1
Aegean	9,8	29,3	25,3	7,7	11,5	16,5
Mediterranean	1,7	32,4	26,0	13,8	13,0	13,0
West Anatolia	1,5	32,6	16,1	14,7	14,6	20,4
Central Anatolia	3,5	29,4	35,9	15,4	10,2	5,6
West Black Sea	3,1	36,3	12,0	10,5	15,2	22,9
East Black Sea	2,9	42,0	22,8	5,0	14,1	13,3
Northeast Anatolia	5,7	44,2	9,1	5,3	30,1	5,8
Mideast Anatolia	0,7	25,9	30,5	23,8	13,3	5,8
Southeast Anatolia	0,9	54,0	19,1	16,4	6,2	3,2

There is no variation observed across gender and age group. "Knowing/preserving family roots" is the top reason stated at every level of education. The highest degree of differentiation on the basis of educational status is "better relations among children of rela-

tives". The rate of those who support kinship marriage on that ground is higher among elementary (25%) and primary/secondary school (24%) graduates, and lower among university graduates (11%). (Table 59).

The ranking does not vary across types of household, yet "knowing/preserving family roots" stands out as a more significant reason in the broken family (43%). In the extended family, "better relations among children of relatives" (24%) and "more respect for elderly family members" (17%) stand at a higher level compared other types of household (Table 59).

An assessment on the basis of socioeconomic status reveals that "more respect for elderly family members" in kinship marriages is stated at a higher rate in lower middle (14%) and lower class (16%). On the other hand, "knowing/preserving family roots", which is at a high level across all groups, is voiced less by individuals in the high upper class (23%).

Table 59. Reasons for Considering Consanguineous Marriage Appropriate by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Property and wealth will not be divided	Information and preservation of family roots	Kids of relatives get along better	More respect for elderly family members	Preserving traditions and customs	Other
GENDER						
Male	2,1	37,8	20,8	13,1	13,3	12,9
Female	2,9	36,8	22,2	13,5	12,9	11,7
AGE						
18-24	1,7	43,8	20,4	11,9	10,3	12,0
25-34	2,4	35,3	20,6	12,6	12,4	16,7
35-44	2,4	37,1	20,3	13,2	14,2	12,8
45-54	3,0	34,6	24,1	13,1	14,2	11,1
55-64	2,5	36,1	24,1	15,9	10,6	10,7
65+	3,0	39,3	20,7	14,8	17,1	5,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	2,0	41,7	20,4	16,6	14,2	5,1
Primary school	2,5	35,0	25,0	13,1	12,5	11,8
Elementary/secondary school	2,7	35,2	23,6	13,6	13,1	11,8
High school	3,5	37,4	17,5	9,1	12,5	19,9
Undergraduate/graduate studies	1,7	38,5	11,3	11,2	13,5	23,9
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	2,9	42,8	19,9	10,2	13,2	11,1
Married	2,4	36,2	22,0	13,7	12,8	12,9
Separated/lives apart	0,0	31,6	49,7	12,8	5,8	0,0
Widowed	3,0	43,6	15,0	14,5	17,3	6,6
Divorced	2,7	25,5	22,0	14,4	17,8	17,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	2,3	36,8	21,0	12,0	14,0	14,0
Extended	2,8	36,9	24,3	17,1	10,7	8,3
Broken	3,2	43,1	16,8	12,7	13,2	11,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	1,7	23,1	20,0	6,3	6,0	42,9
Upper class	3,4	36,5	13,6	10,0	16,4	20,2
Upper middle class	3,2	32,9	24,6	10,4	12,6	16,2
Lower middle class	1,7	38,0	21,6	14,2	14,3	10,1
Lower class	2,7	41,2	22,4	15,9	11,5	6,3

3.10. Marriage Ceremonies

All individuals with marriage experience were asked about the ceremonies performed for marriage. The most common type of ceremonies in Türkiye are "wedding" (89%) and "betrothal/asking for the hand of a girl". The least common type of ceremony is engagement. However even that has been performed by 82% of couples in their first marriage. Therefore, no significant variation is observed across demographics of individuals regarding the ceremonies performed for marriage (Table 60).

No important difference is observed in the ceremonies across the rural and urban areas, however, with the exception of wedding, the rate of ceremonies is slightly higher in the urban area compared to the rural.

All ceremonies performed for marriage are common across the three major cities. We observe that such ceremonies take place at a higher rate in Ankara compared to Izmir.

There is no significant variation across regions regarding the ceremonies held for marriage. The only major difference stems from the finding that in Mediterranean, Mideast Anatolia and Southeast Anatolia civil and religious wedding ceremonies take place at a much lower level compared to other regions (the rate of civil ceremony varies between 47%-%63; religious ceremony varies between 56% -69%).

Table 60. Marriage Ceremonies throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (First Marriage)

	Betrothal/asking for girl's hand in marriage	Engagement	Henna night	Wedding ceremony	Civil wedding ceremony	Religious wedding ceremony
Türkiye	88,2	81,6	84,9	89,4	84,2	84,6
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	88,8	82,9	86,0	89,6	85,7	85,0
Rural	87,0	78,6	82,3	88,9	80,8	83,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	85,2	82,4	85,2	86,7	91,8	87,6
Ankara	92,6	86,0	88,5	90,1	92,3	90,6
Izmir	86,5	78,8	78,5	85,9	89,4	87,2
NUTS						
Istanbul	85,2	82,4	85,2	86,7	91,8	87,6
West Marmara	87,4	81,0	86,5	91,6	93,3	92,0
East Marmara	88,1	83,1	87,5	91,9	94,3	95,0
Aegean	88,9	82,8	84,2	89,9	93,7	92,1
Mediterranean	86,8	75,7	82,9	90,8	63,2	61,4
West Anatolia	93,1	86,3	88,8	91,0	92,5	91,9
Central Anatolia	90,8	84,3	85,8	89,3	94,4	95,6
West Black Sea	90,7	81,6	87,0	90,7	89,1	89,2
East Black Sea	83,0	69,8	69,4	83,9	94,4	95,6
Northeast Anatolia	86,1	83,0	83,9	91,7	85,6	94,9
Mideast Anatolia	92,6	89,7	91,3	92,8	47,1	56,0
Southeast Anatolia	87,2	78,8	81,4	84,1	57,0	68,5

Due to the fact that all wedding ceremonies are quite common in general, there is no outstanding variation across age groups either. However, it is possible to assert that 25-34 year-old group perform betrothal, engagement, henna night and wedding ceremonies at a higher level compared to the 18-24 age group and 44 + group (Table 61).

Aside from religious wedding ceremony, the level of any ceremony is relatively lower among individuals with no schooling. Betrothal, asking for hand of a girl, engagement and civil wedding ceremony is relatively higher across the high school and university graduates.

Nuclear families perform all ceremonies but religious ceremony at a higher rate compared to other types of household. On the other hand, ceremonies in the broken family perform all ceremonies but the civil wedding ceremony at a lower rate.

As it is the case in other types of demographic breakdown, the rate of ceremonies is high across all socioeconomic groups. On the other hand, the rate of upper and upper middle class who perform ceremonies is higher compared to the lower classes. For example, engagement is 88% in the upper class and 86% in the upper middle class, while it is 74% in the lower class.

Table 61. Marriage Ceremonies by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (First Marriage)

	Betrothal/asking for girl's hand in marriage	Engagement	Henna night	Wedding ceremony	Civil wedding ceremony	Religious wedding ceremony
GENDER						
Male	88,4	82,8	85,4	90,0	84,8	85,2
Female	88,0	80,5	84,5	88,9	83,7	84,1
AGE						
18-24	84,9	80,9	86,6	91,0	81,5	85,4
25-34	90,5	85,1	90,3	92,3	85,1	85,6
35-44	89,5	83,2	86,5	90,0	84,3	84,2
45-54	88,4	81,5	84,2	88,7	84,3	84,9
55-64	87,2	80,8	81,1	87,2	85,7	84,5
65+	83,7	73,3	76,5	85,6	81,9	82,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	83,8	73,5	77,7	84,6	75,0	82,1
Primary school	88,4	81,1	85,4	89,8	84,0	85,3
Elementary/secondary school	86,9	82,5	87,2	91,1	85,1	84,6
High school	90,7	86,4	88,2	91,4	89,3	87,5
Undergraduate/graduate studies	92,3	87,4	85,5	89,5	90,1	81,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	89,6	83,3	86,3	90,5	85,3	85,2
Extended	86,8	79,5	84,4	89,0	81,7	83,9
Broken	79,5	71,2	73,7	80,2	80,6	80,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	89,9	85,4	80,8	87,2	93,0	77,9
Upper class	93,0	88,4	88,7	89,5	90,1	86,1
Upper middle class	90,9	85,9	88,2	91,2	88,8	86,9
Lower middle class	87,8	80,2	85,0	90,2	82,8	84,4
Lower class	84,9	74,1	79,5	85,2	75,6	81,7

The type of ceremonies performed in the last marriage of individuals was examined. The most prominent issue was that there was a significant decrease across all types of ceremonies with the last marriage compared to the first one. Comparing the first marriage to the last, it was observed that the rate of betrothal/asking for girl's hand in marriage fell from 88% to 50%, engagement from 82% to 39%, henna night from 85% to 34%, and wedding ceremony from 89% to 40% (Table 62).

Two percentages that exhibited a relatively lower decline were civil wedding ceremonies (84% to 79%) and religious ceremonies (85% to 79%).

In the urban area; betrothal, asking for the hand of girl (53%), engagement (42%), and civil wedding ceremony (82%) were observed at a higher level in the last marriage compared to the rural area.

Table 62. Marriage Ceremonies throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area (Last Marriage)

	Betrothal/asking for girl's hand in marriage	Engagement	Henna night	Wedding	Civil wedding ceremony	Religious wedding ceremony
Türkiye	49,5	39,0	33,9	39,8	78,6	78,6
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	53,0	41,9	34,7	42,1	81,8	76,9
Rural	42,4	33,2	32,2	35,1	72,2	82,0

Majority of individuals perform the ceremonies of their first marriage in their last marriage as well. Those who had a religious ceremony the last time have almost always performed it the first time as well (94%). In the case of multiple marriage ceremonies, the biggest decline is in the rate of those who perform an engagement ceremony. 84% of those who held an engagement ceremony in their last marriage had also performed that in the first marriage (Table 63).

Table 63. Marriage Ceremonies throughout Türkiye (Comparison of First & Last Marriage)

		Last Marriage					
		Betrothal	Engagement	Henna night	Wedding	Civil wedding ceremony	Religious wedding ceremony
First Marriage	**Betrothal**	89,0					
	Engagement		84,0				
	Henna night			85,0			
	Wedding				88,8		
	Civil wed. cer.					88,8	
	Religious wed. cer.						94,4

3.11. Social Qualifications Sought in Future Spouse

The individuals in the research study were asked to categorize the social qualifications of the person they would marry as "important" "does not matter" and "not important". For males, the most important qualification is "her not being married before" (85%). "Similarity of family structures" (75%) and "her being religious (73%) are the second and third important social qualifications (Table 64).

Females deem all of the qualifications in the questionnaire more important compared to males. When the same question is posed to females, 92% reply "him having a job" as the most important qualifications. This is the top-ranking qualification females seek in their future spouse. "His not being married before" ranks the second with 83%. The third is "similarity of family structures" with 82%. "His being religious" is identified as another important qualification with 79%. For both females (45%) and males (29%), "his or her having a high level of income" ranks at the bottom of the list.

Table 64. Social Qualifications Sought by Men and Women in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye

	Men			Women		
	Not important	Does not matter	Important	Not important	Does not matter	Important
A good education	16,7	24,9	58,5	11,0	21,5	67,5
High income level	31,7	39,0	29,3	18,9	36,2	44,8
Having a job	22,9	24,5	52,7	2,1	6,1	91,7
Not working for long hours	22,4	31,4	46,3	11,6	34,5	53,9
Being married for the first time	6,3	9,0	84,7	6,1	10,5	83,4
Similarity of family structures	8,4	16,4	75,3	4,8	13,7	81,5
Being religious	9,3	17,4	73,3	6,3	14,4	79,3
Being from the same religious sect	14,6	27,8	57,6	10,2	22,0	67,8
Being from the same hometown	25,4	38,5	36,1	21,7	37,1	41,2
Being from the same social circle	19,1	33,7	47,2	15,0	31,9	53,0
Coming from same ethnic origin	19,7	31,0	49,3	14,8	28,8	56,4

Table 65 lists the responses regarding the qualifications that are "important" for males across Türkiye and by various demographic subsets.

Excluding "Having a good education", "having a job", and "not working for long hours", the proportion of males who find all the other social qualifications to be important for a woman is higher in the rural area. The main difference between the rural and urban regarding the social qualifications sought in a woman is "being from the same hometown". The percentage of males that seek this qualification

in a woman is 47% in the rural and 32% in the urban area.

Across the three major cities, the highest level of differentiation is observed in "similarity of family structures", "her being religious", and "her not working for long hours". The percentage of males who believe that family structures should be similar is higher in Ankara (77%), and lower in Izmir (52%). "Her not working for long hours" is a social qualifications that males in Istanbul find particularly important (51%).

Table 65. Social Qualifications Sought by Men in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES (Important)

	A good education	High income level	Having a job	Not working for long hours	Being married for the first time
Türkiye	58,5	29,3	52,7	46,3	84,7
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	59,9	28,3	53,3	48,1	83,5
Rural	54,8	31,9	50,9	41,6	87,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	59,6	27,3	56,2	50,7	81,0
Ankara	60,5	25,5	54,2	42,8	80,0
Izmir	52,4	27,5	50,4	38,3	77,3
NUTS					
Istanbul	59,6	27,3	56,2	50,7	81,0
West Marmara	58,4	33,6	55,1	52,3	85,6
East Marmara	59,9	29,7	50,5	48,5	84,7
Aegean	50,1	25,8	54,2	36,9	78,2
Mediterranean	60,9	30,1	50,8	54,1	87,9
West Anatolia	57,8	25,9	49,3	40,6	82,5
Central Anatolia	62,9	45,7	57,6	51,2	88,0
West Black Sea	50,9	20,9	43,6	37,4	91,2
East Black Sea	61,9	31,3	57,8	44,5	92,3
Northeast Anatolia	59,6	35,5	52,8	43,3	84,7
Mideast Anatolia	57,3	26,7	42,9	46,3	86,8
Southeast Anatolia	67,0	34,6	56,3	45,8	89,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	58,9	29,8	53,5	46,5	85,5
Extended	54,5	28,8	49,8	45,3	88,1
Broken	62,2	26,7	51,4	46,2	73,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Higher upper class	74,8	20,9	54,1	45,3	66,8
Upper class	69,2	27,4	53,1	49,8	78,8
Upper middle class	60,4	26,1	51,0	47,6	85,6
Lower middle class	54,6	30,7	53,4	45,6	87,1
Lower class	50,0	33,8	52,6	41,2	85,8

Important variations are observed across regions with regard to qualifications males seek in women they will marry. The highest level of differentiation was in terms of "being from the same religious sect" and "coming from the same ethnic origin". This expectation is highest in Central Anatolia, and lowest in Mideast Anatolia. 75% of males in Central Anatolia believe that their spouse should be from the same religious sect, and 65% believe that they should come from the same ethnic background. In Mideast Anatolia, these percentages are 45% for sect and 35% for ethnic origin.

Compared across household types, the percentage of males who reply "important" for social qualifications sought in their future spouse is generally lower in the broken family. The highest level of differentiation is with respect to "her being religious" and "her being from the same religious sect". The share of males who expect their future spouse to be religious is 58% in the broken family. This is 74% in males from the nuclear family, and 79% in males from the extended family. The rate of males who believe that the woman should be from the same sect as the man is 44% in the broken family, 58% in the nuclear family, and 65% in the extended family.

	Similarity of family structures	Being religious	Being from the same religious sect	Being from the same hometown	Being from the same social circle	Coming from same ethnic origin
Türkiye	75,3	73,3	57,6	36,1	47,2	49,3
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	73,9	70,1	54,4	32,1	45,0	45,9
Rural	78,8	81,6	65,8	46,5	53,0	58,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	70,0	63,9	51,5	32,2	45,2	43,6
Ankara	76,6	64,3	49,3	24,4	42,8	41,7
Izmir	64,7	52,2	42,6	24,0	35,4	37,5
NUTS						
Istanbul	70,0	63,9	51,5	32,2	45,2	43,6
West Marmara	81,1	71,4	62,5	40,8	53,2	54,4
East Marmara	80,1	80,1	56,7	26,8	47,3	44,9
Aegean	69,2	65,2	49,8	28,3	36,7	45,9
Mediterranean	76,7	74,7	66,9	40,3	49,8	56,0
West Anatolia	77,6	71,0	57,5	31,9	48,4	49,6
Central Anatolia	81,4	85,9	75,0	51,1	61,3	65,1
West Black Sea	82,7	81,5	69,1	45,7	59,0	60,1
East Black Sea	80,7	85,1	62,1	37,1	47,1	54,4
Northeast Anatolia	72,3	84,7	51,1	38,4	39,2	41,6
Mideast Anatolia	71,8	67,3	44,8	33,8	38,4	35,1
Southeast Anatolia	74,3	81,7	54,5	47,2	49,0	48,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	76,2	74,0	57,8	35,9	47,4	49,6
Extended	77,1	79,0	64,7	41,5	50,0	53,6
Broken	65,3	58,4	43,7	28,2	41,2	39,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	58,9	36,2	29,2	19,1	33,8	25,3
Upper class	73,3	55,9	42,3	24,1	40,8	35,7
Upper middle class	75,6	70,4	55,7	31,1	46,2	46,7
Lower middle class	76,9	80,6	64,0	41,1	49,9	55,1
Lower class	76,2	83,5	63,5	46,3	53,1	57,3

An analysis based on socioeconomic status indicates that "her being religious", "her being from the same religious sect", "her being from the same home-town", "her coming from the same ethnic origin" ", "high level of income", "being from the same social circle" are qualifications that are sought less as the socioeconomic status rises. On the other hand, as the socioeconomic status rises, the rate of males who believe that the woman should have " a good educa-tion" increases. The highest level of differentiation based on socioeconomic status is about "her being religious". The rate of males who seek this qualifica-tion in their future spouse is 84% in the lower class and 36% in the high upper class (Table 65).

Table 66 lists the responses regarding the qualifica-tions that are "important" for females throughout Türkiye, by various demographic subsets.

Males and females are seen to have made similar assessments by residence area. As it is the case with males, with the exception of "having a good educa-

Table 66. Social Qualifications Sought by Women in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS Household Type, and SES (Important)

	A good education	High income level	Having a job	Not working for long hours	Being married for the first time	Similarity of family structures
Türkiye	67,5	44,8	91,7	53,9	83,4	81,5
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	69,7	44,9	93,1	54,9	82,2	80,7
Rural	61,9	44,8	88,1	51,2	86,6	83,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	70,4	43,2	93,7	58,2	80,8	79,7
Ankara	70,8	40,3	93,7	45,8	76,0	82,7
Izmir	63,2	42,0	88,9	44,8	71,5	71,6
NUTS						
Istanbul	70,4	43,2	93,7	58,2	80,8	79,7
West Marmara	66,9	49,3	94,3	61,2	87,4	84,1
East Marmara	69,3	42,9	93,8	49,5	82,8	86,6
Aegean	62,2	41,1	90,4	43,5	76,5	77,7
Mediterranean	67,1	48,3	90,5	63,9	85,3	82,9
West Anatolia	69,4	40,6	94,5	46,4	79,6	84,0
Central Anatolia	76,6	65,1	90,9	60,7	91,0	89,5
West Black Sea	54,6	32,6	92,2	46,3	85,8	82,8
East Black Sea	71,7	44,4	92,3	55,5	91,6	88,1
Northeast Anatolia	64,0	45,3	80,1	48,9	83,1	75,8
Mideast Anatolia	62,8	46,6	91,0	58,7	86,3	75,4
Southeast Anatolia	73,3	50,8	88,3	57,3	90,1	75,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	67,5	44,8	92,2	54,7	84,7	81,7
Extended	65,7	45,3	90,0	53,8	86,7	82,8
Broken	69,9	44,5	91,9	50,5	73,5	78,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	85,6	39,4	95,3	41,4	62,7	76,7
Upper class	76,5	38,5	94,3	50,2	76,3	80,9
Upper middle class	70,7	42,6	93,6	52,8	82,0	82,5
Lower middle class	63,6	45,6	91,3	56,0	87,1	82,1
Lower class	60,8	50,6	89,1	55,6	86,3	78,7

tion", "having a job", "having a high income level" and "not working for long hours", the proportion of females who find all the other social qualifications to be important for a man is higher in the rural area. The highest level of differentiation between the urban and rural areas regarding social qualifications is "his being from the same hometown". The rate of females who seek this in their future husband is 51% in the rural and 37% in the urban areas.

Across the three major cities, the highest level of differentiation comes from "his being religious", "his being from the same religious sect", and "his not working for long hours". The rate of females who believe "his being religious" and "his being from the same religious sect" are important qualifications are lower in Izmir (59%). The rate of males who reply "important" to both is the highest in Istanbul (72% for being religious, and 62% for religious sect). Following the pattern with males, not working for long hours is a major qualification expressed by females in Istanbul particularly (58%).

	Being religious	Being from the same religious sect	Being from the same hometown	Being from the same social circle	Coming from same ethnic origin
Türkiye	79,3	67,8	41,2	53,0	56,4
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	76,5	65,6	37,4	51,0	53,6
Rural	86,3	73,3	51,0	58,1	63,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	72,4	62,4	38,1	53,5	51,9
Ankara	68,1	59,1	26,3	48,1	46,8
Izmir	58,7	49,3	26,1	38,0	40,1
NUTS					
Istanbul	72,4	62,4	38,1	53,5	51,9
West Marmara	80,5	75,3	49,2	59,5	61,0
East Marmara	83,2	71,3	35,5	55,5	57,2
Aegean	71,6	58,6	31,8	41,6	52,2
Mediterranean	81,1	73,2	46,6	57,1	62,3
West Anatolia	76,4	67,5	31,5	50,8	52,8
Central Anatolia	90,9	85,7	56,2	66,4	74,8
West Black Sea	84,6	76,2	49,1	58,9	63,8
East Black Sea	89,8	72,1	48,1	58,0	66,6
Northeast Anatolia	86,9	62,8	45,1	47,2	50,1
Mideast Anatolia	77,9	60,5	41,6	45,0	45,1
Southeast Anatolia	85,7	66,1	51,3	53,5	53,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	79,1	67,7	40,0	52,4	56,0
Extended	85,0	73,3	47,7	56,1	60,7
Broken	72,6	61,6	38,8	51,8	52,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
Higher upper class	41,5	35,3	15,2	40,5	31,5
Upper class	63,1	55,6	26,2	46,5	45,6
Upper middle class	76,4	67,0	35,8	50,9	54,0
Lower middle class	84,9	72,5	46,1	55,3	60,6
Lower class	88,9	71,9	50,6	56,4	61,7

In parallel with males, responses of females show great variation across regions regarding the qualifications sought in future spouse. The qualifications where differences are the highest are again similar. "His being from the same religious sect", and "his coming from the same ethnic origin", are the areas with the highest level of differentiation. 86% of females in Central Anatolia' believe that the man should be from the same religious sect, while 75% believe that he should" come from the same ethnic origin. These rates are the lowest in Aegean (%59) in terms of "his being from the same religious sect", and in Mideast Anatolia in terms of "his coming from the same ethnic origin" (%45) (Table 66).

A comparison of household types displays a similar pattern of differences with other subsets. "His being religious" (85%) and "his being from the same religious sect" (73%) is more important for females from the extended family. "His being married for the first time" is more important for females from the nuclear family (85%) and extended fam-

ily (87%). This is 74% for females from the broken family.

An analysis based on socioeconomic status reveals that, with the exception of "his having a good education", and "his having a good job", the share of females who deem these are all important social qualifications falls as the socioeconomic status rises. The highest level of differentiation comes from "being religious". 89% of females from the lower class believe that their future husband should be religious, while this is 42% in the high upper class.

3.12. Personal Qualifications Sought in Future Spouse

At this stage of the research, individuals were asked which personal qualifications they sought in the person they would marry, and asked to categorize those qualifications as "important", "does not matter", and "not important". It is observed that personal qualifications are much more important for

Table 67. Personal Qualifications Sought in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye by Gender

	Men			Women		
	Not Important	Doesn't matter	Important	Not Important	Doesn't matter	Important
His/her being in love with him/her	5,8	11,6	82,6	6,0	13,0	81,1
Being handsome/beautiful	14,7	30,2	55,0	18,9	33,1	48,0
Taking care of herself (such as hygiene)	2,5	6,2	91,4	1,5	5,8	92,7
Fidelity to partner	0,4	1,5	98,1	0,3	1,7	98,0
Enjoying to spend time with her family	0,8	3,1	96,1	0,5	2,7	96,9
Being a reliable person, not lying	0,3	1,4	98,3	0,2	1,4	98,4
Caring about the feelings of the other person	0,3	1,9	97,8	0,2	1,8	98,0
Being thrifty	0,6	3,5	95,9	0,6	3,4	95,9
Being generous	0,8	4,2	95,0	0,4	3,5	96,1
Being patient and tolerant	0,3	1,8	97,9	0,2	1,3	98,5
Protecting partner against her family	0,8	2,5	96,7	0,3	1,7	98,0
Behaving properly in society	0,3	1,5	98,3	0,1	1,4	98,4

both males and females compared to social qualifications.

Both females and males deem beauty or good looks as a less important qualification compared to others. However, males deem physical beauty more important (55%) compared to females (48%) (Table 67).

Table 68 depicts responses throughout Türkiye, by various demographic subsets as to the personal qualifications that are "important" for males.

There is no significant variation regarding important personal qualifications by residence area.

The highest level of variation across three major cities is in terms of "her being in love". The rate of males with such expectation is lower in Izmir (76%) compared to the Ankara (83%) and Istanbul (89%). There is significant variation across regions in three topics. Males deem it important that the woman they will marry "is in love with him"(90%), "takes care of herself"(98%), and "is beautiful" (65%). These rates are the lowest in Northeast Anatolia. In that region, the importance of "being in love with him" is (60%), while the woman taking care of herself is important by 74%, and beauty is important by 45%.

No significant variation is observed across types of household in terms of the personal qualifications males seek in females.

On the basis of socioeconomic status, the major element of differentiation across groups is regarding "her being beautiful" and "her being in love". These qualifications gain importance as the socioeconomic status rises. The percentage of males who deem it important for their future wife to be beautiful is 50% in the lower class, and 64% in the high upper class. The expectation of woman being in love with the man is 74% in the lower class and 88% in the high upper class.

Table 68. Personal Qualifications Sought By Men In Future Spouse throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES (Important)

	Being in love with him	Being handsome/ beautiful	Taking care of herself (such as hygiene)	Fidelity to partner	Enjoying to spend time with her family	Being a reliable person, not lying
Türkiye	82,6	55,0	91,4	98,1	96,1	98,3
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	83,7	54,1	91,9	98,2	95,9	98,4
Rural	79,7	57,6	89,9	97,8	96,8	98,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	89,0	54,5	94,2	97,5	94,8	97,5
Ankara	83,3	51,7	91,3	98,9	97,0	98,9
Izmir	76,4	54,1	88,4	97,8	94,6	97,5
NUTS						
Istanbul	89,0	54,5	94,2	97,5	94,8	97,5
West Marmara	89,8	64,6	98,3	99,9	98,8	99,7
East Marmara	82,3	55,4	94,7	99,3	96,7	99,6
Aegean	80,3	52,0	91,0	97,7	95,3	98,1
Mediterranean	86,6	52,4	90,0	98,8	97,8	98,7
West Anatolia	83,5	52,0	91,8	98,8	96,1	99,0
Central Anatolia	72,4	57,4	82,9	97,2	94,7	97,4
West Black Sea	75,7	56,3	92,5	98,3	96,8	98,9
East Black Sea	83,5	55,2	93,6	97,1	96,8	98,4
Northeast Anatolia	59,8	44,8	74,4	96,6	93,9	97,8
Mideast Anatolia	72,3	52,5	90,5	97,7	96,1	98,1
Southeast Anatolia	84,1	64,8	88,7	97,1	96,6	97,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	83,2	55,2	91,6	98,2	96,1	98,4
Extended	79,7	53,8	90,2	97,9	97,7	98,2
Broken	82,8	55,9	91,7	97,4	93,8	97,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	88,3	64,4	94,1	98,8	91,3	98,6
Upper class	87,7	58,5	93,8	97,8	95,1	98,5
Upper middle class	83,8	54,3	93,4	98,6	96,8	98,9
Lower middle class	82,0	55,1	90,5	98,2	96,5	98,1
Lower class	74,4	49,6	85,9	97,6	97,1	98,0

	Caring about the feelings of the other person	Being thrifty	Being generous	Being patient and tolerant	Protecting partner against her family	Behaving properly in society
Türkiye	97,8	95,9	95,0	97,9	96,7	98,3
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	97,8	95,6	94,4	97,9	96,6	98,3
Rural	97,6	96,7	96,5	97,8	97,0	98,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	96,6	93,5	91,8	97,1	95,5	98,0
Ankara	98,7	95,7	95,4	99,2	97,0	98,9
Izmir	96,9	93,9	93,5	97,0	95,9	97,4
NUTS						
Istanbul	96,6	93,5	91,8	97,1	95,5	98,0
West Marmara	99,5	98,0	97,5	99,5	98,5	98,8
East Marmara	98,9	98,1	97,3	99,1	97,8	99,5
Aegean	97,2	95,6	94,9	97,1	95,9	97,7
Mediterranean	98,4	97,3	96,2	98,3	97,9	98,6
West Anatolia	98,6	96,0	95,5	98,3	96,7	98,7
Central Anatolia	95,9	94,9	93,6	97,2	95,3	97,3
West Black Sea	98,4	97,3	96,5	98,2	97,8	98,9
East Black Sea	98,9	96,7	94,5	98,6	97,9	99,0
Northeast Anatolia	96,9	94,5	95,9	97,4	95,3	95,8
Mideast Anatolia	97,7	95,6	94,2	98,5	94,7	97,9
Southeast Anatolia	97,8	95,8	96,6	97,2	97,4	97,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	97,9	96,2	95,2	98,0	96,8	98,2
Extended	97,5	96,2	95,5	97,9	97,1	98,7
Broken	97,2	93,0	93,1	97,1	95,1	97,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	95,6	88,5	86,3	96,7	91,8	96,8
Upper class	97,8	95,0	93,3	98,0	96,1	98,7
Upper middle class	98,4	96,5	95,9	98,6	96,8	98,7
Lower middle class	97,6	96,5	95,5	97,9	97,0	98,2
Lower class	98,0	96,6	96,7	97,9	97,7	98,1

Table 69 depicts responses throughout Türkiye, by various demographic subsets as to the personal qualifications that are "important" for females.

The highest level of variation by residence area is in the field of "being in love". Females in the urban setting deem this personal qualification more important (83%).

The same qualification shows the highest variation

across the three major cities as well. The share of females who deem it important for the man to be in love with them is lower in Izmir (77%).

There is significant variation in two area across the regions: In West Marmara, 89% of females expect the man they would get married to be in love with them, whereas this percentage falls to 60% in Northeast Anatolia. The rate of females who deem

Table 69. Personal Qualifications Sought By Women in Future Spouse throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES (Important)

	Being in love with her	Being handsome/ beautiful	Taking care of himself (such as hygiene)	Fidelity to partner	Enjoying to spend time with his family	Being a reliable person, not lying
Türkiye	81,1	48,0	92,7	98,0	96,9	98,4
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	82,9	47,6	93,8	98,1	97,1	98,6
Rural	76,4	49,1	89,8	97,7	96,3	98,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	87,4	47,3	94,6	97,1	96,6	98,1
Ankara	84,0	43,5	95,1	98,1	96,8	98,4
Izmir	76,8	43,5	90,8	97,8	95,4	96,9
NUTS						
Istanbul	87,4	47,3	94,6	97,1	96,6	98,1
West Marmara	89,2	58,0	98,2	99,6	99,1	99,8
East Marmara	80,3	47,2	96,8	99,3	98,0	99,5
Aegean	79,3	43,7	92,7	97,5	95,7	97,5
Mediterranean	86,2	48,6	90,7	98,7	97,1	98,9
West Anatolia	83,1	44,4	95,6	98,5	97,0	98,9
Central Anatolia	72,2	51,6	84,1	98,0	96,1	97,3
West Black Sea	70,9	46,1	90,7	98,1	97,3	98,7
East Black Sea	80,5	47,4	91,7	98,6	97,4	99,4
Northeast Anatolia	59,6	44,0	75,8	95,9	95,5	97,8
Mideast Anatolia	70,4	42,9	93,0	98,2	97,3	98,2
Southeast Anatolia	82,3	60,0	92,4	96,5	96,4	97,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	83,2	48,8	93,2	98,2	97,1	98,6
Extended	78,0	48,0	91,6	97,9	97,0	98,3
Broken	75,2	44,8	91,7	97,2	95,7	98,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	92,1	46,5	97,1	98,9	96,1	98,9
Upper class	85,2	47,1	96,5	98,5	97,6	99,0
Upper middle class	84,7	46,9	95,3	98,6	97,6	99,0
Lower middle class	80,0	49,1	91,4	98,0	96,6	98,4
Lower class	78,2	50,8	88,6	97,5	96,9	97,9

good looks an important quality in the man they would marry is the highest in Southeast Anatolia (60%), and lowest in Mideast Anatolia (43%).

Regarding personal qualifications females seek in males, the highest level of variation across household types and socioeconomic status is observed in the expectation of "him being in love" This is an important qualification for females in the nuclear family (83%) more than the other types of household.

As socioeconomic status rises, the percentage of females who deem "him being in love" an important qualification also increases. 78% of females in the lower class deem this important while this soars to 92% in the high upper class.

	Caring about the feelings of the other person	Being thrifty	Being generous	Being patient and tolerant	Protecting partner against his family	Behaving properly in society
Türkiye	98,0	95,9	96,1	98,5	98,0	98,4
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	98,1	95,5	95,9	98,5	98,1	98,5
Rural	97,7	97,0	96,5	98,4	97,9	98,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	97,4	95,1	94,8	97,9	97,2	98,0
Ankara	98,1	93,7	95,5	98,6	97,3	98,7
Izmir	96,6	93,2	93,5	97,1	96,6	97,2
NUTS						
Istanbul	97,4	95,1	94,8	97,9	97,2	98,0
West Marmara	99,4	98,0	99,0	99,8	99,4	99,3
East Marmara	99,3	97,7	97,7	99,2	98,7	99,2
Aegean	97,5	95,5	95,7	97,9	97,1	97,6
Mediterranean	98,3	97,4	97,6	99,3	99,4	99,3
West Anatolia	98,7	94,3	95,7	99,0	98,0	99,0
Central Anatolia	97,2	94,5	93,1	97,6	98,1	98,7
West Black Sea	98,0	97,0	97,4	98,4	98,0	98,5
East Black Sea	99,3	95,6	94,5	99,0	99,2	99,2
Northeast Anatolia	97,2	94,9	94,1	98,2	96,0	95,3
Mideast Anatolia	98,0	94,5	95,1	98,4	98,1	98,8
Southeast Anatolia	97,0	96,5	96,6	97,7	97,7	97,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	98,3	96,2	96,4	98,6	98,3	98,6
Extended	97,7	96,2	95,8	98,3	97,8	98,4
Broken	97,3	94,4	94,7	97,9	97,0	97,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
Higher upper class	98,4	90,0	95,0	99,3	97,6	99,1
Upper class	98,7	94,2	95,2	98,7	98,3	99,4
Upper middle class	98,6	96,5	96,6	99,1	98,8	99,1
Lower middle class	97,9	96,5	96,2	98,3	98,0	98,3
Lower class	98,0	97,0	96,8	98,2	98,1	98,2

3.13. Status of Marriage

Individuals with marriage experience were asked about the status of their marriage. The results are depicted on Table 70. It is observed that 86% of individuals continue their first marriage, 8% lost their spouse, and 5% took a divorce.

There is no important variation across rural/urban areas, yet the rate of those whose spouse has died is 11% in the rural area, and the rate of those who divorced is slightly higher (6%) in the urban area.

An assessment of the regions reveals that the rate of continuing marriages is very high in all regions. The percentage of those whose spouse passed way is higher in West Marmara (13%) and Northeast Anatolia (12%).

Table 70. Status of Marriage throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Continuing	Spouse passed away	Divorced	Separated/lives apart
Türkiye	85,8	8,3	5,3	0,6
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	86,3	7,2	5,9	0,6
Rural	84,5	10,9	4,0	0,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	85,9	6,9	6,6	0,6
Ankara	84,3	7,8	6,9	1,0
Izmir	83,0	8,9	7,5	0,5
NUTS				
Istanbul	85,9	6,9	6,6	0,6
West Marmara	81,6	13,1	4,8	0,5
East Marmara	85,0	8,9	5,5	0,6
Aegean	85,2	7,6	6,7	0,5
Mediterranean	85,6	8,5	5,1	0,8
West Anatolia	85,1	7,6	6,3	0,9
Central Anatolia	86,5	8,0	5,3	0,3
West Black Sea	86,1	8,9	4,8	0,2
East Black Sea	86,3	10,9	2,0	0,7
Northeast Anatolia	86,1	12,0	1,6	0,3
Mideast Anatolia	89,2	6,6	3,8	0,5
Southeast Anatolia	88,9	7,2	3,3	0,6

As expected, in senior ages, the proportion of individuals whose spouse passed away gets higher. For example, 38% of 65+ age group has lost their spouse (Table 71).

As the educational status goes higher, the rate of continuing marriages also goes higher. 69% of individuals with no schooling continue their marriage while 26% of individuals with no schooling have lost their spouse. As for university graduates, 91% continue their marriage relationship.

In parallel with the expectation, in the broken family type, the share of divorced (28%) individuals or individuals whose spouse passed away (65%) is higher than other types of household.

In the lower class, the share of those whose spouse passed away is higher compared to other SES groups. For example, in the high upper class, the percentage of those whose spouse passed away is 2%, while this is 7% in the lower middle class and 10% in the lower class.

Table 71. Status of Marriage by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Continuing	Spouse passed away	Divorced	Separated/lives apart
GENDER				
Male	90,7	3,8	5,1	0,4
Female	81,5	12,2	5,6	0,7
AGE				
18-24	96,9	0,2	2,4	0,5
25-34	94,2	0,6	4,8	0,4
35-44	91,4	1,7	6,0	0,9
45-54	88,2	4,4	6,9	0,5
55-64	80,6	13,4	5,3	0,7
65+	57,3	38,3	4,1	0,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
No schooling	69,2	25,6	4,5	0,7
Primary school	87,5	7,3	4,6	0,6
Elementary/secondary school	90,3	3,7	5,6	0,4
High school	89,8	2,3	7,1	0,7
Undergraduate/graduate studies	91,3	1,5	6,6	0,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	96,1	1,3	2,5	0,1
Extended	83,0	10,0	6,2	0,8
Broken	2,5	65,1	28,0	4,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
Higher upper class	91,8	1,7	6,5	0,0
Upper class	91,7	3,4	4,2	0,7
Upper middle class	90,0	4,0	5,8	0,3
Lower middle class	87,8	7,1	4,7	0,5
Lower class	84,7	9,8	4,7	0,7

3.14. Reason for Divorce

Individuals who divorced at least once were asked the top three reasons underlying the divorce. The results are depicted on Table 72. The most common reason for divorce across Türkiye was "irresponsible and indifferent attitude" (27%).

The most important reason for divorce by gender was "irresponsible and indifferent attitude" (27%) for both genders. This parallels the Türkiye average.

For females, this is followed by "beating/maltreatment" by 21% and "cheating" by 16%. "Being unable to provide financially for the family" and "alcoholism and gambling" (14%) are other important reasons for divorce among females.

For males, the second most important reason for divorce is "disrespectful attitude towards spouse's family", (11%) and "in-law interference in family matters" (8%).

Table 72. Reasons for Divorce throughout Türkiye and by Gender

	Türkiye	Male	Female
Irresponsible and indifferent attitude	26,8	26,5	27,1
Beating/maltreatment	11,7	0,7	20,7
Being unable to provide financially for the family	11,0	7,1	14,1
Cheating	11,0	4,9	16,0
Alcoholism and gambling	8,3	1,1	14,2
Disrespectful attitude towards spouse's family	7,9	11,3	5,1
In-law interference in family matters	6,5	7,6	5,7
Abandoning/being abandoned	6,3	6,7	6,0
Failing to have a baby	2,7	1,6	3,6
Maltreatment of kids in the family	1,8	1,4	2,2
The spouse suffering from a refractory disease	1,7	1,7	1,6
Infamous crime (robbery, fraud, seizure, harassment etc.)	0,9	1,1	0,7
Domestic sexual harassment	0,6	0,0	1,1
Other	31,8	42,7	23,0

3.15. Possible Reasons for Divorce

Individuals participating in the questionnaire were read a list of statements and asked if that statement alone would constitute an absolute reason for divorce from their perspective. In this section scrutinizing the possible reasons for divorce for males and females, it was identified that certain behaviors constitute an important reason for divorce for both genders: Cheating, alcoholism and gambling, maltreatment (beating, defamation, etc.), and some infamous crimes. An evaluation of the responses on the table indicates that "her cheating" is an absolute reason for divorce for 93% of males. On the other hand, "him cheating" is a reason for divorce for 88%

Table 73. Possible Reasons for Divorce throughout Türkiye

	Yes	No	No idea
Wife cheating husband (even for once)	93,3	4,2	2,6
Husband cheating wife (even for once)	88,2	8,6	3,3
Husband engaged in theft, robbery type of crime	84,5	10,7	4,8
Wife engaged in theft, robbery type of crime	84,4	10,8	4,8
Husband with bad habits such as alcohol and gambling	80,3	15,6	4,1
Wife with bad habits such as alcohol and gambling	80,2	15,3	4,5
Wife's maltreatment towards husband (beating, insulting, etc.)	78,1	17,5	4,3
Husband's maltreatment towards wife (beating, insulting, etc.)	77,9	18,4	3,7
Irresponsible and indifferent attitude of male towards home/wife	58,6	35,2	6,2
Irresponsible and indifferent attitude of female towards home/husb.	58,2	35,5	6,3
Husband failing to provide for the family	31,3	64,0	4,7
Wife's family interfering with his family matters	22,7	70,4	6,8
Husband's family interfering with family matters	22,0	71,2	6,8
Wife's disrespectful attitude towards spouse's family	16,1	78,2	5,7
Husband's disrespectful attitude towards spouse's family	15,5	78,8	5,7
Wife failing to do housework properly	14,1	81,8	4,1
Wife failing to have a baby	7,8	87,6	4,5
Husband failing to have a baby	7,5	87,9	4,6
Husband suffering from a refractory disease	3,7	93,8	2,6
Wife suffering from a refractory disease	3,5	94,0	2,4

of females. Theft, robbery, and similar crimes (84% for both males and females) are the most prominent reasons for divorce for both genders. 80% of individuals deem alcoholism and gambling as definitive reasons for divorce regardless of gender. 78% deem maltreatment such as beating/ defamation between couples as a reason for divorce (Table 73).

The issues that are not generally agreed on as a reason for divorce are "the spouse suffering from a refractory disease" (3%) and "failing to have a baby" (8%).

Table 74 depicts "yes" responses to reasons for divorce under various demographic subsets.

Across residence areas, the rate of those who deem each statement a reason for divorce is higher in the urban area. The major variation across urban and rural is that "wife's indifferent and irresponsible attitude towards home, spouse, and children", "husband's indifferent and irresponsible attitude towards home, spouse, and children" and "husband's maltreatment (beating, defamation etc.). 82% of individuals in the urban area and 69% of those in the rural area deems "husband's maltreatment of wife (beating, defamation, etc.) a reason for divorce. Wife or husband's indifferent or irresponsible attitude towards home, spouse and children is rated as a reason by 62% in the urban and 49% in the rural area.

A comparison of regions depicts that the lowest rate of deeming those statements a reason for divorce is in Northeast Anatolia. For example, the rate of those that deem theft or robbery a reason for divorce for both genders is 62% in Northeast Anatolia, whereas this is 90% in West Marmara.

No major variation across genders is observed regarding the reasons for divorce. Females deem indifferent and irresponsible attitude of spouse, maltreatment, and in-law interference in family matters reasons for divorce at a higher rate compared to males (Table 75).

As the age groups increase, the rate of considering the statements reasons for divorce declines. The most important difference is regarding indifferent or irresponsible attitude towards home, spouse and children by the woman or man. Those who see this as an absolute reason for divorce is 69& in the 18-24 year-old group and 48% in the 65+ group.

As educational status rises, there is a parallel rise in the proportion of those who deem the statements a reason for divorce. The biggest variation is regarding "husband's indifferent and irresponsible attitude towards home, spouse, and children" and "husband's maltreatment (beating, defamation etc.). Irresponsible attitude of male is seen as an absolute reason for divorce by 44% of those with no schooling and 69% of university graduates. 63% of those with no schooling and 88% of university graduates point at maltreatment of woman as a reason for divorce.

In comparison to other types of marital status, divorced individuals deem most statements a valid reason for divorce. "Husband failing to provide for the family" and husband or wife's "indifferent and irresponsible attitude towards home, spouse and children" are considered reasons for divorce at a higher rate across divorced individuals compared to other groups. On the other hand, the rate of those who deem the questioned statements reasons for divorce is lower across married individuals.

An analysis on the basis of SES groups reveals that the rate of those who deem the statements reasons for divorce is the lowest in the lower class for the most part. For example, 46% of individuals from the lowers class believe that "wife's indifferent and irresponsible attitude towards home, spouse, and children" will end up in divorce, while this is 66% in the high upper class. Another example is "husband's maltreatment of wife". The high upper class deems this a reason for divorce by 87% versus 62% in the lower class.

Table 74. Possible Reasons for Divorce throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, and Gender (Top 10 Statements)

	Wife cheating husband at least once	Husband cheating wife at least once	Husband engaged in theft, robbery type of crime	Wife engaged in theft, robbery type of crime	Husband with bad habits such as alcohol and gambling	Wife with bad habits such as alcohol and gambling	Husband's maltreatment towards wife (beating, defamation, etc.)	Wife's maltreatment towards husband (beating, defamation etc.)	Irresponsible and indifferent attitude of male towards home/wife	Irresponsible and indifferent attitude of female towards home/hus.
Türkiye	93,3	88,2	84,5	84,4	80,3	80,2	77,9	78,1	58,6	58,2
RESIDENCE AREA										
Urban	93,5	89,3	86,2	85,7	81,4	81,1	81,5	81,3	62,3	61,8
Rural	92,6	85,4	80,2	80,8	77,4	77,7	68,8	69,9	49	49,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES										
Istanbul	92,2	88,5	85,7	84,8	83,6	82,3	85,3	84,8	65,2	64,6
Ankara	92,5	88	87,8	87,7	81,6	81,7	83,7	83,4	66,3	65,6
Izmir	94,8	90,8	87,5	87,3	82,9	82,8	85,9	85,5	65,5	64,9
NUTS										
Istanbul	92,2	88,5	85,7	84,8	83,6	82,3	85,3	84,8	65,2	64,6
West Marmara	94,4	91,8	89,6	88,9	76,3	75,5	80,6	80,9	62,6	61,9
East Marmara	94	92,5	88,1	88,1	81,7	81,1	82,6	81,4	62,5	62,3
Aegean	91,9	88	84,4	84	79,1	79,4	78,5	78,5	57,2	57
Mediterranean	94,9	89,1	86,5	86,2	82,6	82,6	77	77,9	58,9	58,5
West Anatolia	92,9	86,7	86,1	86,2	81	81,4	81,1	80,6	63,8	63,4
Central Anatolia	97,6	86,6	89,6	89,2	78,9	79	70,7	71,9	53	53,3
West Black Sea	95,9	91,7	84,1	84,9	81,7	83	79,3	79,6	59,9	58,9
East Black Sea	92,6	86,2	86,4	86,3	78	77,4	75,1	75,1	41,3	41
Northeast Anatolia	90,4	86,4	61,9	62,2	73,5	69,4	61,1	61,8	38,8	37,8
Mideast Anatolia	89,7	81,1	74,4	75,4	72,9	75,9	65,2	66,3	47,8	48,4
Southeast Anatolia	92,8	84,4	78,3	79,8	77,7	78,4	67,4	70	54,4	54,2
GENDER										
Male	94,4	88,7	84,9	84,8	78,9	79	76	76,7	57,1	57,3
Female	92,2	87,7	84,1	83,9	81,7	81,4	79,9	79,6	60	59,2

Table 75. Possible Reasons for Divorce by Age, Educational Status, Marital status, Household Type, and SES (Top 10 Statements)

	Wife cheating husband at least once	Husband cheating wife at least once	Husband engaged in theft, robbery type of crime	Wife engaged in theft, robbery type of crime	Husband with bad habits such as alcohol and gambling	Wife with bad habits such as alcohol and gambling	Husband's maltreatment towards wife (beating, defamation, etc.)	Wife's maltreatment towards husband (beating, defamation, etc.)	Irresponsible and indifferent attitude of male towards home/wife	Irresponsible and indifferent attitude of female towards home/hus.
AGE										
18-24	94,3	90,2	86,4	86,5	81,3	80,4	83,3	82,5	69,1	68,6
25-34	94	89	84,8	84,7	80,4	80,5	80,1	80,1	63,1	62,6
35-44	93,7	88,7	85,3	85	81,1	80,9	79,2	79,1	59,2	58,6
45-54	93,8	88,6	84	84,2	79,8	79,8	75,9	77	52,9	52,6
55-64	92,9	87,1	84,4	83,7	80	80	74,3	75,3	50,2	50,1
65+	88,7	82,8	79,9	80	77,7	78,3	68,7	69,6	48	48,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS										
No schooling	87,6	79,3	75,2	75,9	73,9	75,3	62,5	64,4	44,1	44,6
Primary school	93,3	87,9	83,8	83,6	80,4	80,3	75,1	75,7	53,6	53,1
Elementary/secondary school	94,8	89,6	86,7	86,9	81,6	81,4	79,9	79,9	61,8	61,2
High school	95,2	91,2	88	87,7	82,8	82,3	85	84,1	67,6	67,4
Undergraduate/graduate studies	94	91,2	87,4	86,7	80,7	79,9	87,8	87,2	68,9	68,2
MARITAL STATUS										
Single	93,5	89,5	87,6	87,4	81,4	80,6	86,1	85,2	71,1	70,6
Married	93,7	88,2	83,8	83,7	79,9	80	75,6	76,1	55	54,7
Separated/lives apart	93,4	90,7	87,2	85,6	78,7	78,9	85,1	86,6	67,4	65,7
Widowed	87,4	81,5	80,4	80,4	78,3	78,3	72,5	73,9	52,5	52,4
Divorced	94,8	92,3	89,5	89,6	87,5	87,2	92	91,2	79,1	78,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE										
Nuclear	93,9	88,9	84,7	84,6	80,3	80,2	78	78,1	57,9	57,4
Extended	92,7	86,2	83,2	82,9	79,5	79,5	73,5	74,7	55,7	55,8
Broken	90,9	87,1	85,2	85,1	81,1	80,7	83,7	83,1	66,7	66,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS										
Higher upper class	92,4	90,4	83,2	81,8	79,9	75,8	87,2	85,8	66	65,8
Upper class	95	92,1	87,9	87,4	80,8	80,7	87,4	87,4	67,4	66,7
Upper middle class	95	91	88,4	88,1	82,3	82,5	82,8	82,4	63,5	63
Lower middle class	93,3	87,7	84,6	84,4	81,1	81	76,3	76,7	56,5	56,3
Lower class	90,5	81,2	74,7	76,5	73,4	74,8	62,1	64,8	46,5	46,2

Chapter 4

INTRA-FAMILIAL RELATIONS

This section shares important clues that help understand the family structure in Turkey. Habits of spending time together, shared activities, job distribution regarding daily chores in the household, how household members in need of care (child, disabled, sick) are cared for, how family decided around various issues, what kind of problems are experienced in the family, and how the spouses react when there are problems.

4.1. The Times Household Members Get Together

It was research whether household members get to-gether during breakfast, dinner and weekends. Results are shared on Table 76. Family members frequently get together on the weekends (80%) and dinners (81%). The rate of families who generally have breakfast together is 64%.

Individuals in the rural area have a high rate of getting together for breakfast (81%). This drops to 59% in the urban area. People living in the rural area get together more frequently for dinners and weekends compared to those in the urban area. Individuals in rural area gather around dinner table by 87% whereas this is 79% in the urban area. As for the weekend

Table 76. Frequency of Get-Togethers for Breakfast, Dinner and Weekends throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Breakfast			Dinner			Weekends		
	Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Never	Occasionally	Frequently
Türkiye	6,7	28,9	64,4	2,4	16,4	81,2	2,8	17,8	79,5
RESIDENCE AREA									
Urban	8,1	33,2	58,7	2,9	18,0	79,1	3,2	19,0	77,8
Rural	2,6	16,2	81,1	1,2	11,7	87,2	1,5	14,1	84,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES									
Istanbul	10,7	39,4	49,9	3,6	17,8	78,6	3,1	19,0	77,9
Ankara	12,1	31,3	56,6	3,9	16,5	79,6	3,6	15,8	80,6
Izmir	7,6	33,9	58,5	1,8	20,4	77,8	1,7	19,5	78,8
NUTS									
Istanbul	10,7	39,4	49,9	3,6	17,8	78,6	3,1	19,0	77,9
West Marmara	4,6	20,3	75,1	2,3	12,0	85,7	2,4	9,9	87,7
East Marmara	6,4	28,2	65,4	2,1	16,6	81,3	3,1	15,5	81,5
Aegean	6,0	24,5	69,5	1,9	15,3	82,8	2,1	17,0	80,9
Mediterranean	4,9	27,6	67,6	2,4	16,0	81,6	2,7	19,9	77,4
West Anatolia	10,0	27,7	62,3	2,9	14,5	82,5	3,6	14,6	81,8
Central Anatolia	7,0	25,9	67,0	2,7	17,2	80,1	3,5	18,6	77,9
West Black Sea	4,3	21,1	74,6	0,8	12,5	86,7	1,7	16,5	81,8
East Black Sea	5,1	27,7	67,2	2,2	15,9	81,9	4,0	16,8	79,1
Northeast Anatolia	3,8	27,6	68,6	2,3	22,5	75,2	2,9	24,4	72,7
Mideast Anatolia	2,2	33,5	64,3	2,1	20,2	77,8	1,5	21,2	77,3
Southeast Anatolia	3,8	28,7	67,5	1,6	20,6	77,8	2,8	22,3	74,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE									
Nuclear	7,0	28,5	64,5	2,4	15,6	82,0	2,8	16,9	80,3
Extended	3,9	31,6	64,5	1,6	18,4	79,9	2,2	20,2	77,7
Broken	8,3	28,6	63,1	3,8	19,9	76,3	3,6	21,8	74,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS									
Higher upper class	11,1	27,6	61,3	2,4	11,0	86,6	0,5	12,3	87,2
Upper class	7,7	30,1	62,1	1,6	14,9	83,5	1,3	14,7	84,0
Upper middle class	8,1	32,9	59,0	2,4	17,3	80,2	2,4	17,7	79,8
Lower middle class	6,2	27,4	66,4	2,7	15,7	81,6	3,5	17,4	79,1
Lower class	5,1	26,7	68,2	2,8	19,0	78,2	3,3	22,6	74,1

get-together it is 84% in the rural area and 78% in the urban.

Across the three major cities, there is a parallel with the urban area in terms of getting together for breakfast, particularly in Ankara (57%) and Izmir (59%). In Istanbul, this is a lower rate (50%). Among the three major cities, there is no variation in terms of getting together for dinners or weekends.

Regions where families get together most for breakfast are, in the same order, West Marmara (75%), West Black Sea (75%) and Aegean (70%). As for the practice of getting together for dinners and weekends, these three regions stand out with a rate of more than 80%. The other regions that exceed 80% for getting together during dinner are Mediterranean (82%), East Black Sea (82%) and East Marmara (81%). On the weekends, in addition to these three regions, East Marmara (82%) and West Anatolia also display high percentages (82%).

There is no variation of getting together for breakfast across household types. Although there is no absolute variation regarding dinners or weekends, in the nuclear family this occurs at a higher rate compared to other types of household. 82% of the nuclear family spends dinners together and 80% spends weekends together. These rates are lower in the broken family where getting together for dinner is 76% and for weekends is 75%.

An analysis on the basis of SES shows that in the lower class getting together for breakfast (68%) is higher compared to middle and upper class families. Getting together for dinner or weekend is around 74% to 87% across all SES groups, but the highest rate for both situations is in the high upper class with 87%.

4.2. The Activities Household Members Do Together

Within the scope of the research, household members were asked about the frequency of engaging in social activities together, and asked to choose one of the options of 'never', 'occasionally' and 'frequently' in order to establish the frequency.

According to the table, the activity that household members in Türkiye get engaged the most together is watching TV (60%). Second in the ranking is visiting relatives, neighbors and friends (26%). These two activities are at the same time the top two activities for which household members gather most often as "occasional" events. Generally speaking, these two activities gather families at a rate higher than 90%. The proportions of households that watch TV are similar in rural and urban areas. All activities except for watching TV are engaged in together as a family in greater proportions across urban households (Table 77).

The activity for which family members get engaged with together the least is going to cinema or theatre. The proportion of those who haven't gone to cinema or theatre as a family is 78%. The proportion of families that go to cinema or theatre occasionally is 19%. Only 3% of families stated getting engaged in one of these activities frequently and with their family members.

56% of households mentioned not ever having eaten out with family members. The proportion of families that occasionally engage in this activity is 38%. The proportion of families that frequently eat out is only 7%.

45% of households stated not having gone for a picnic with family members. The proportion of families that get engaged with this activity occasionally is 49%. The proportion of families that go for a picnic frequently is 6%.

One of the main activities that household members engage in together is going out for shopping. Going out for shopping together with family is a frequent activity for 23%. 57% of households mention dealing with this activity occasionally. 20% of households have never been to shopping together.

61% of households have never gone on a holiday as a family before. The proportion of families that occasionally go on holiday with household members is 31%. The rate of going on holidays with household members is low (8%).

Table 77. Activities Household Members Participate in Together throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area

		Never	Occasionally	Frequently
Watching TV together	Urban	5,6	33,9	60,5
	Rural	6,4	36,6	57,0
	Türkiye	5,8	34,6	59,6
Visiting relatives / neighbors /friends	Urban	9,8	64,8	25,4
	Rural	6,9	65,8	27,3
	Türkiye	9,0	65,0	25,9
Going out for shopping	Urban	16,2	57,5	26,2
	Rural	32,1	53,3	14,6
	Türkiye	20,3	56,5	23,3
Going on a holiday	Urban	54,9	35,9	9,2
	Rural	79,7	16,2	4,1
	Türkiye	61,2	30,9	7,9
Eating out	Urban	50,0	42,6	7,4
	Rural	72,7	22,5	4,8
	Türkiye	55,8	37,5	6,7
Going on a picnic	Urban	40,4	53,3	6,3
	Rural	58,3	36,7	5,1
	Türkiye	44,9	49,1	6,0
Going to cinema, theatre	Urban	73,7	22,5	3,7
	Rural	89,7	7,9	2,5
	Türkiye	77,8	18,8	3,4

In Table 78, joint activities of household members are presented generally for Türkiye and also as broken down to several demographic characteristics. Rates covered in the table are the sums of responses given as "occasionally" and "frequently".

When compared on the basis of residence area, rural and urban areas differ in all activities except for "visiting relatives/neighbors/friends" and "watching TV together". The activities with the highest degree of variation are understood to be "going on a holiday" and "eating out". 45% of urban households indicate going on holidays as a family whereas this figure drops down to 20% in rural areas. Half of those who live in urban areas (50%) eat out occasionally or frequently. This rate is 27% in the rural areas.

There's no pronounced divergence among the three major cities. The highest degree of variation is seen in the activity of "going on a picnic". 64% of households in Istanbul mention going on a picnic together. This rate is 60% in Ankara and 59% in Izmir.

An overview of regions indicates a declining proportion of households engaging with all activities together -except for "visiting relatives/neighbors/friends" and "watching TV together"- towards Western regions. Activities with the highest degree of variation across regions are "going on a holiday" and "eating out". More than half of the households in Istanbul (55%) mention going on a holiday as a family. Istanbul varies from the rest of the regions in this regard. Southeast Anatolia is the region with the lowest rate of going on holiday together (16%). Regions with the highest rates of eating out either occasionally or frequently are East Marmara (56%) and Istanbul (54%). This rate drops down to 21% in Southeast Anatolia.

When analyzed by household type, extended families are observed to engage in activities of "eating out" (30%), "going to cinema/theatre" (13%), "going on holidays" (28%) together less than other household types whereas broken families "visit relatives/neighbors/friends" together less often than other household types (79%). The proportion of nuclear families that "go on picnic" (58%) and "go out

shopping" (81%) together is relatively higher.

An evaluation based on socioeconomic status reveals growing proportions of households engaging in all activities except for "going on picnic" as the socioeconomic status rises. The greatest point of variation is seen in "going on holiday". Almost all of the households in the high upper class (94%) go on holidays together either occasionally or frequently. However, this rate drops down to 7% in the lower class. Another activity that shows a high level of divergence is "eating out". 96% of the high upper class state eating out as a family. This rate is 12% in the lower class. "Visiting relatives/neighbors/friends" and "watching TV together" are the activities that all socioeconomic classes get engaged at similar rates (varying between 88% and 99%) and that vary the least across socioeconomic classes.

Table 78. Activities Household Members Participate in Together throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES (Occasionally & Often)

	Visiting relatives/ neighbors/friends	Going out for dinner	Going to the picnic	Going to cinema & theatre	Going shopping	Watching TV together	Going on a holiday
Türkiye	91,0	44,2	55,1	22,2	79,7	94,2	38,8
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	90,2	50,0	59,6	26,3	83,8	94,4	45,1
Rural	93,1	27,3	41,7	10,3	67,9	93,6	20,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	89,7	54,2	64,4	34,0	85,6	94,7	55,2
Ankara	90,5	56,7	60,0	31,6	86,8	95,9	55,3
Izmir	91,5	55,3	58,8	30,2	87,3	95,2	51,1
NUTS							
Istanbul	89,7	54,2	64,4	34,0	85,6	94,7	55,2
West Marmara	92,6	42,0	49,9	19,3	85,9	94,2	36,2
East Marmara	90,9	55,5	63,9	24,0	85,4	93,6	45,3
Aegean	92,4	47,6	59,1	22,5	88,4	95,3	41,3
Mediterrenean	90,4	42,7	54,0	20,1	75,4	95,0	34,7
West Anatolia	91,3	47,7	60,1	24,4	85,9	96,0	47,7
Central Anatolia	92,8	29,4	54,2	12,8	76,3	95,1	22,9
West Black Sea	91,2	39,1	49,6	19,8	78,5	94,5	31,0
East Black Sea	92,4	37,5	35,5	14,1	65,3	95,7	23,8
Northeast Anatolia	94,4	35,1	50,8	20,6	65,1	88,3	26,5
Mideast Anatolia	90,9	36,3	43,1	13,6	67,5	92,9	23,0
Southeast Anatolia	87,3	21,0	31,2	8,8	55,0	88,5	15,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	92,4	46,5	58,4	23,0	81,2	94,7	41,5
Extended	91,3	30,0	46,4	12,9	76,0	94,4	27,9
Broken	78,6	46,2	39,5	29,5	72,9	89,3	32,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
High upper class	96,4	95,9	76,2	74,0	98,9	98,8	94,1
Upper class	94,8	87,9	81,0	56,5	95,2	96,6	81,4
Upper middle class	92,9	61,4	71,5	30,3	89,7	94,9	54,4
Lower middle class	90,8	29,3	48,5	9,5	77,6	94,3	24,6
Lower class	88,2	12,2	24,2	3,4	54,2	91,0	7,2

4.3. Individuals Responsible for Housework

Within the scope of the research, people were asked as to who generally takes care of housework in the household. Housework tasks requiring technical knowledge and skills (maintenance, repair, painting) or tasks such as bill payment are undertaken by fathers/men, and all other tasks are mostly handled by mothers/women and girl children. Boy children make less of contribution to housework than girl children (Table 79).

On the other hand side, daily tasks and issues such as preparing food, ironing, doing the laundry, doing the dishes, handling basic needlework, serving tea in the evening, setting the table, daily tidying

of home and monthly/weekly cleaning are taken care of by women/mothers by percentages ranging between 89-95. The rates at which these tasks are handled by men are lower than 5% except for serving tea in the evening (7%) and setting and clearing the table (10%). These tasks are undertaken by girl children at rates ranging between 11-18% following women/mothers.

Daily shopping is generally a responsibility of the women for 74% whereas it's a duty of men in 42% of households. Jobs such as minor repair and maintenance work, payment of bills and painting are undertaken by men in higher rates. The said jobs are done by men in degrees varying between 47-74%.

Table 79. Individuals Responsible for Housework throughout Türkiye (Generally)

	Man/ father	Woman/ mother	Girl child	Boy child	A relative out-side household	Another person in return of a fee	Not done in our household
Cooking	5,0	95,1	11,0	0,6	1,3	0,4	0,1
Daily shopping for food-beverages	41,6	74,0	8,6	4,3	0,7	0,3	0,4
Paying monthly bills	74,2	26,3	3,6	6,6	1,0	0,4	0,4
Minor repair & maintenance	70,3	11,6	1,4	6,4	2,3	15,8	0,7
Home painting	46,9	13,7	1,7	5,3	3,2	38,4	1,6
Ironing	3,7	89,0	12,9	0,8	1,2	0,8	3,1
Laundry (including using the washing machine)	2,6	94,3	11,2	0,6	1,1	0,5	0,1
Dishwashing (including using the dishwasher)	3,3	93,5	12,7	0,6	1,1	0,5	0,2
Basic needlework, sewing buttons	2,2	93,4	10,0	0,5	1,0	0,6	0,6
Serving tea in the evenings	7,4	89,9	16,5	1,7	1,0	0,3	0,9
Setting & clearing of table	9,7	91,7	18,1	2,7	1,0	0,3	0,1
Daily tidying and cleaning of home	4,4	92,8	15,2	1,1	1,2	0,8	0,1
Weekly & monthly home cleaning	4,6	91,0	15,2	0,9	1,5	3,1	0,1

Table 80 lays out the housework done by women in the generality of Türkiye and as split into several demographic breakdowns.

The main variation in terms of residence area is seen in the proportion of women doing the daily food shopping. 78% of ladies in urban areas are in charge of daily shopping for food whereas this rate is 63% in rural areas. The proportion of women who pay monthly bills is relatively higher in the urban areas (30%).

There's no sharp variation across three major cities in terms of jobs that women are in charge of. The widest discrepancy in this field is seen in the payment of monthly bills. This task is undertaken by women in 35% of households in Ankara, 34% in Istanbul and %30 in Izmir.

The greatest variation across regions is observed mostly in daily shopping for food and in payment of monthly bills. The proportion of households where women are in charge of daily shopping for food is 83% in West Marmara and 82% in Istanbul. This rate drops down to 50% in Central Anatolia and 47% in Northeast Anatolia. Women pay monthly bills in 34% of the households in Istanbul. This rate is 12% in Northeast Anatolia.

In almost all tasks, responsibilities of women weigh heavier in nuclear and extended families. As opposed to this, the proportion of women who handle tasks such as "payment of monthly bills", "minor maintenance and repair" and "home painting" which are undertaken by men in the generality of Türkiye to a greater extent is understood to be relatively higher in broken families compared to other household types. In broken families, the proportion of women who pay bills is 56%, who take care of minor maintenance and repair is 27%, and who paint the house is 20%.

The tasks with greatest rate of variation across socio-economic classes are "weekly/monthly home cleaning", "home painting" and "daily shopping for food". "Weekly/monthly home cleaning" which is mostly undertaken by women in middle and middle lower classes (ranging between 89-94%) is done by women in 71% of households in high upper class. As socio-economic status rises, the proportion of women doing the daily shopping for food increases, but that of women who paint their homes decreases. 69% of women in the lower class are in charge of daily shopping for food. This rate is 80% in the high upper class. Home painting is usually taken care of by women in 19% of the households in the lower class whereas this rate drops down to 5% in the high upper class.

Table 80. Women's/Mother's Housework Responsibilities throughout Türkiye , by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Cooking	Laundry (Including using washing machine)	Dishes (Including using dishwasher)	Basic needlework, button sewing	Daily tidying/ cleaning of home	Setting-clearing of table
Türkiye	95,1	94,3	93,5	93,4	92,8	91,7
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	95,2	94,5	93,6	93,5	92,8	91,6
Rural	94,8	93,6	93,1	93,0	92,7	91,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	95,8	94,7	93,1	93,4	93,2	90,8
Ankara	96,4	95,9	95,5	94,5	94,1	94,3
Izmir	96	95,9	95,5	94,7	94,2	94
NUTS						
Istanbul	95,8	94,7	93,1	93,4	93,2	90,8
West Marmara	96,9	95,8	96,2	96	94,8	95,0
East Marmara	96,0	95,6	95,2	95,4	94,6	93,8
Aegean	95,9	96	95,4	94,7	94,8	94,9
Mediterranean	95,5	94,2	93,8	93,4	92,9	92,7
West Anatolia	95,0	94,6	94	93,4	92,9	91,8
Central Anatolia	94,2	93,2	93	92,8	91,8	89,6
West Black Sea	95,0	94	94,1	92,9	93,5	92,5
East Black Sea	96,0	94,9	95,4	94,3	94,5	94,7
Northeast Anatolia	93,6	91,2	90	91,4	91,7	90,3
Mideast Anatolia	93,3	91,8	89,4	90,2	88,4	87,2
Soutseast Anatolia	90,7	89,9	87,7	88,7	85,9	83,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	97,4	97,0	96,3	95,7	95,5	94,6
Extended	92,6	90,5	89,4	90,4	88,8	86,5
Broken	77,8	75,3	74,2	76	73,9	73,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	94,8	93,9	94,1	91,1	91,2	93,6
Upper class	97,3	97,1	95,7	95,6	95,8	93,8
Upper middle class	96,6	96,0	95,4	95	94,8	93,1
Lower middle class	94,8	93,9	93,3	93,5	92,7	91,4
Lower class	94,6	93,5	92,5	92,1	91,3	90,3

	Weekly/monthly home cleaning	Serving tea in the evenings	Ironing	Daily shopping for food-beverage	Paying monthly bills	Painting of the house	Minor maintenance and repair
Türkiye	91,0	89,9	89,0	74,0	26,3	13,7	11,6
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	90,6	89,7	90,9	77,9	30,0	12,6	12,3
Rural	92,2	90,5	83,7	62,6	15,7	16,6	9,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	89,6	88,7	91,0	82,1	34,2	11,0	13,9
Ankara	91,9	92,5	91,7	82,3	35,0	11,8	11,9
Izmir	91,0	89,9	91,6	79,2	29,8	13,1	11,1
NUTS							
Istanbul	89,6	88,7	91,0	82,1	34,2	11,0	13,9
West Marmara	93,5	92,8	91,5	82,8	27,4	20,2	13,4
East Marmara	92,0	92,9	93,0	72,0	29,1	15,1	10,2
Aegean	92,2	92,3	89,5	80	25,8	16,2	11,6
Mediterranean	92,2	91,3	91,2	79,1	27,1	10,9	11,7
West Anatolia	91,5	89,8	90,1	74,2	29,8	15,8	11,6
Central Anatolia	91,2	87,6	84,7	50,1	14,3	13,6	5,2
West Black Sea	91,5	91,0	89,0	67,3	21,7	12,7	9,6
East Black Sea	94,2	92,8	88,5	73	22,1	9,1	11,6
Northeast Anatolia	88,9	89,1	88,4	46,9	12,1	14,2	10,7
Mideast Anatolia	88,1	83,6	81,1	61,3	18,8	13,6	9,8
Soutseast Anatolia	86,7	82,2	78,4	66,6	19,3	13,3	13,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	93,6	92,9	92	75,9	24,2	13,0	10,3
Extended	89	85	84,4	67,1	20,5	13,5	9,3
Broken	70,3	69,7	68,4	67,3	55,9	20,3	27,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
High upper class	71,4	89,8	90,0	80,1	30,7	4,5	11,6
Upper class	89,4	92,8	94,1	78,7	27,7	6,4	8,9
Upper middle class	93,8	91,0	93,1	76,7	25,8	9,8	11,0
Lower middle class	92,6	89,7	89	72,5	24,4	16,2	11,2
Lower class	91,4	88,8	80,8	69,1	23,6	19,1	11,9

4.4. Day-care of Small Children in the Household

Households with kids between 0-5 years of age were asked who takes care of their small children in daytime.

Mothers take care of kids in 88% of households with small kids who need care in the family. This job is undertaken by maternal grandmothers in 4% of households and by paternal grandmothers in 5%.

Daycare is provided by nursery schools in 3% of households, and by care-takers in 1%. The proportion of mothers who take care of their kids in the urban areas is 87%. This rate rises to 92% in the rural areas. Proportions are comparable across three major cities (Table 81).

Regionwise, proportion of mothers taking care of their kids gets as high as 97% in Northeast Anatolia and Mideast Anatolia regions. The proportion of

Table 81. Day-care of Small Children in the Household throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Mother	Father	Elder sister	Elder brother	Grandfather	Maternal grandmother
Türkiye	88,3	1,6	0,9	0,1	0,4	3,9
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	86,9	1,5	0,8	0,1	0,4	4,7
Rural	92,4	1,8	1,4	0,0	0,4	1,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	85,2	1,8	0,7	0,2	0,5	4,7
Ankara	80,9	0,4	0,3	0,0	0,0	7,8
Izmir	88,0	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,4
NUTS						
Istanbul	85,2	1,8	0,7	0,2	0,5	4,7
West Marmara	82,2	2,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,0
East Marmara	86,2	0,9	0,0	0,0	1,4	3,1
Aegean	83,4	0,6	1,4	0,0	0,5	6,1
Mediterranean	88,2	1,6	1,9	0,0	0,0	4,8
West Anatolia	85,9	0,9	0,2	0,0	0,0	5,5
Central Anatolia	89,9	1,8	1,9	0,0	0,0	2,9
West Black Sea	93,4	1,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,1
East Black Sea	89,2	0,8	0,5	0,0	1,0	2,8
Northeast Anatolia	97,3	0,4	1,4	0,0	0,0	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	96,9	6,5	0,8	0,0	2,1	2,3
Southeast Anatolia	93,9	1,4	1,2	0,3	0,0	1,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	88,8	1,5	0,9	0,1	0,2	3,7
Extended	89,2	1,5	0,6	0,0	1,3	3,8
Broken	58,8	5,8	5,0	0,0	0,0	15,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	44,7	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	18,0
Upper class	66,9	1,8	0,0	0,0	1,2	10,3
Upper middle class	89,1	1,9	0,2	0,2	0,3	4,4
Lower middle class	94,7	1,3	0,9	0,0	0,5	2,1
Lower class	96,9	1,0	2,1	0,2	0,2	1,1

care-takers is low in all regions.

In broken families, the proportion of mothers taking care of small kids in need of care is lower compared to other household types (59%). On the other hand side, maternal grandmothers (16%), caretakers (12%) and nursery schools (11%) take precedence in this type of families. In these households, elder sisters are also seen to be in charge of small children's care.

In terms of socioeconomic classes, the predominant role of mothers in the care of children prevails in lowest and middle socioeconomic classes. This rate is 97% in the lower class, and 89% in the upper middle class. In the high upper class, the proportion of households where mothers take care of children lags back to 45% and the proportions of households where maternal grandmothers (%18), caretakers (%13) and nursery schools (%18) take charge increase.

	Paternal grandmother	Close relative	Caretaker	Neighbor	Kindergarten or preschool	Other
Türkiye	5,3	0,5	1,4	0,0	2,8	0,3
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	5,0	0,5	1,6	0,1	2,9	0,4
Rural	6,3	0,3	0,9	0,0	2,6	0,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	4,5	0,7	1,7	0,0	2,0	0,6
Ankara	6,2	0,3	1,3	0,7	7,1	0,0
Izmir	5,6	0,4	0,9	0,0	4,1	0,3
NUTS						
Istanbul	4,5	0,7	1,7	0,0	2,0	0,6
West Marmara	5,3	0,8	2,8	0,0	4,8	0,0
East Marmara	6,2	0,5	3,4	0,0	5,2	0,0
Aegean	9,4	0,1	0,9	0,0	6,2	0,1
Mediterranean	5,8	0,0	1,8	0,0	1,1	0,9
West Anatolia	7,1	1,1	1,2	0,4	4,5	0,0
Central Anatolia	4,3	0,4	0,9	0,0	1,1	0,0
West Black Sea	4,2	1,0	2,2	0,0	2,1	0,0
East Black Sea	5,8	0,5	1,6	0,0	5,1	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	1,3	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,5	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	3,3	0,4	0,8	0,0	0,0	0,0
Southeast Anatolia	1,9	0,5	0,2	0,0	1,1	0,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	3,4	0,3	1,5	0,1	3,1	0,4
Extended	13,3	1,1	0,0	0,0	1,2	0,1
Broken	0,8	0,0	11,8	0,0	11,0	0,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	7,5	1,3	13,0	0,0	18,1	0,0
Upper class	12,8	1,4	3,5	0,2	10,6	1,9
Upper middle class	6,1	0,1	0,6	0,1	2,8	0,0
Lower middle class	4,3	0,5	0,4	0,0	0,4	0,3
Lower class	1,3	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0

4.5. Attendance of Young Kids to Kindergarten

Households with kids between 3-6 years of age were asked if their kids attended to kindergarten. According to findings, only 25% of children between 3-6 ages are attending to kindergarten. Among the three major cities, Izmir has a higher percentage of children attending to kindergarten (30%) (Table 82).

Upon a look, the proportion of respondents who send their kids to kindergarten is seen to rise as one moves from eastern regions into western regions. 16% of children in this age range in Northeast Anatolia attend to kindergarten while 20% of them attend to kindergarten in Southeast Anatolia, and this rate is 33% in Central Anatolia, 31% in West Marmara, 30% in East Marmara and 29% in Aegean Region.

The rate of kindergarten attendance among the children of broken families is notable. 41% of children in these households attend to kindergarten. On the contrary, this rate is low among extended families (21%). When socioeconomic classes are analyzed, attendance rates are observed tor ise from the lower socioeconomic levels towards high classes. This rate is 18% in lower class and lower middle class, but 46% in the upper class and 48% in high upper class.

Table 82. Attendance to Kindergarten throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Attending kindergarten, prep-class or nursery school	Not attending kindergarten, prep-class or nursery school
Türkiye	24,5	75,5
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	23,9	76,1
Rural	24,6	75,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	23,0	77,0
Ankara	24,2	75,8
Izmir	29,7	70,3
NUTS		
Istanbul	23,0	77,0
West Marmara	31,2	68,8
East Marmara	29,9	70,1
Aegean	29,0	71,0
Mediterranean	24,5	75,5
West Anatolia	23,3	76,7
Central Anatolia	32,5	67,5
West Black Sea	20,0	80,0
East Black Sea	25,3	74,7
Northeast Anatolia	16,2	83,8
Mideast Anatolia	24,0	76,0
Southeast Anatolia	20,2	79,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	24,9	75,1
Extended	20,7	79,3
Broken	41,3	58,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
High upper class	45,8	54,2
Upper class	48,2	51,8
Upper middle class	30,4	69,6
Lower middle class	18,2	81,8
Lower class	18,4	81,6

4.6. Care of the Disabled Individuals in Need of Care in the Household

Within the scope of the research, households were asked if there were any disabled persons in the household in need of care, and if any, they were probed as to who took care of disabled persons.

5% of the households in Türkiye have a disabled person in need of care. The proportion of households with a disabled person in need of care is 5% in the urban areas. This rate rises up to 8% in rural areas. There's no variation among the three major cities in this regard. Southeast Anatolia is the region with the highest proportion of households that have disabled persons in need of care (12%) and West Marmara has the lowest proportion of households with disabled persons in need of care (3%) (Table 83).

The household type with the highest proportion of disabled persons in need of care is extended families (14%). This proportion is 4% in nuclear families and 5% in broken families. The proportion of disabled persons in need of care which is 10% in the lower class is reduced as socioeconomic status rises. In upper middle class this rate is 3% whereas it's drawn back to 1% in high upper class.

Table 83. Households with Disabled Persons in Need of Care throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	No, there isn't	Yes, there is
Türkiye	95,2	5,3
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	95,9	4,5
Rural	93,2	7,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	96,3	4,0
Ankara	96,9	3,5
Izmir	96,2	4,1
NUTS		
Istanbul	96,3	4,0
West Marmara	97,3	2,7
East Marmara	96,2	4,3
Aegean	96,2	4,4
Mediterranean	94,1	6,4
West Anatolia	96,5	3,9
Central Anatolia	95,7	4,5
West Black Sea	93,7	7,4
East Black Sea	94,5	5,5
Northeast Anatolia	92,9	7,5
Mideast Anatolia	94,5	6,4
Southeast Anatolia	88,9	11,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	96,3	4,0
Extended	88,1	13,5
Broken	95,5	4,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
High upper class	99,6	0,4
Upper class	98,9	1,3
Upper middle class	97,3	2,8
Lower middle class	94,9	5,7
Lower class	90,3	10,4

Disabled persons in need of care are taken care of by families to a great extent. The care of disabled persons in need of care is handled by the spouse in 28%, by the mother in 27%, by the son in 14% and by the daughter in 11% of the households across Türkiye (Table 84).

The highest degree of variation is seen in the care of disabled person in the household by his/her children. 18% of disabled persons living in the urban areas are taken care of by their sons and 13% of them are taken care of by their daughters whereas

this rate drops down to 8% for sons and to 7% for daughters. On the other hand side, the proportion of households with disabled persons who are taken care of by their spouses is higher in rural areas.

On the basis of household type, disabled persons in need of care are mostly taken care of by the spouse (24%) or daugther-in-law (25%) in extended families. In broken families, the proportions of disabled persons taken care of by their mothers (27%), and, as differentiated from the other two household types, by their daughters (22%) are higher.

Table 84. Caretaking of the Disabled Individuals in Need of Care throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, and Household Type

	Spouse	Mother	Father	Son	Daughter	Daughter-in-law	Sibling	Grandchild
Türkiye	28,4	27,2	5,2	14,4	10,8	7,8	6,2	1,8
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	24,5	27,2	4,3	18,1	13,1	6,0	5,1	1,8
Rural	35,0	27,1	6,9	8,1	6,9	11	8,1	1,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	39,1	32,6	5,9	14,6	8,8	0,2	3,2	0,2
Extended	23,5	17,8	3,9	12,6	8,6	25,1	9,0	3,4
Broken	2,4	26,5	5,5	17,4	21,5	0,9	10,6	4,3

	Other female relatives	Other male relatives	Grandfather	Neighbor	Paternal grandmother	Care-taker	Maternal grandmother	Other
Türkiye	0,8	0,8	0,6	0,4	0,3	0,2	0,1	4,6
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	0,8	0,8	1,0	0,6	0,5	0,3	0,2	4,0
Rural	0,8	0,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	0	0,1	0,6	0,5	0,6	0,2	0,0	3,3
Extended	2,2	2,4	0	0	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,0
Broken	1,0	0,0	1,9	0,6	0,0	0,5	0,8	8,1

4.7. Care of Ill Persons in Need of Care in the Household

Within the scope of the research, households were probed if an ill person in need of care was present in the household, and if any, who took care of this person (Table 85).

According to the research data, 8% of households in Türkiye have got an ill person who requires care. The proportion of households with ill persons in

need of care is 7% in the urban areas and 11% in rural areas. The proportion of households with ill persons in need of care in all three major cities is 6%. Regionwise, this rate was 15% in Northeast Anatolia, and 11% in Southeast Anatolia and East Black Sea respectively. The city with the lowest proportion of households that with ill persons in need of care is Istanbul (6%).

The highest rate of ill persons in need of care is seen among extended families. 22% of extended family

households have ill persons in need of care whereas this rate is 9% among broken families and 5% among nuclear families. The proportion of households with ill persons in need of care is 12% among lower class whereas this proportion gets as low as 1% in the high upper class.

Table 85. Households with Ill Persons in Need of Care throughout Türkiye and Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	No, there isn't	Yes, there is
Türkiye	92,8	7,9
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	94,1	6,6
Rural	89,2	11,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	94,7	5,7
Ankara	95,1	5,7
Izmir	94,2	6,3
NUTS		
Istanbul	94,7	5,7
West Marmara	93,5	7,1
East Marmara	93,6	7,1
Aegean	93,2	7,3
Mediterranean	93,2	7,3
West Anatolia	94,1	7,4
Central Anatolia	91,1	9,1
West Black Sea	91,8	9,7
East Black Sea	89,6	10,8
Northeast Anatolia	85,9	15,1
Mideast Anatolia	91,5	9,6
Southeast Anatolia	89,3	11,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	95,2	5,1
Extended	80,7	22,3
Broken	92,0	8,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
High upper class	98,7	1,4
Upper class	98,3	2,0
Upper middle class	96,1	4,3
Lower middle class	91,7	9,1
Lower class	91,7	9,1

In households with ill persons in need of care, the care is given by spouse (36%), daugther-in-law (16%) and mother (15%). It's conspicious that daughters-in-law have a higher proportion (16%) than the daughter (14%) and son (14%) of the ill person. The proportion that shows the highest degree of variation by Residence Area is the that of ill persons taken care of by their daughters versus daughters-in-law. In 18% of the urban households, ill persons in need of care are taken care of by their daughters whereas this rate drops down to 7% in rural areas. The proportion of ill persons taken care of by the daughters-in-law at home is 20% in rural areas and 13% in urban areas (Table 86).

Ill persons in need of care in nuclear families are mostly taken care of by their spouses (62%). In extended families, this duty falls to daughter-in-law in the household (41%). In broken families, ill persons are taken care of by their daughters (35%) or their sons (21%).

Table 86. Caretaking of Ill Persons in Need of Care throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, and Household Type

	Spouse	Daughter-in-law	Mother	Son	Daughter	Father	Grandchild	Sibling
Türkiye	35,7	15,8	14,7	13,8	13,5	3,3	2,3	2,1
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	34,8	13,4	15,8	13,4	17,6	2,4	2,3	2
Rural	37,2	19,5	13,1	14,5	7,1	4,7	2,3	2,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	62,3	1,6	17,2	9,3	7	3,7	0,1	1,1
Extended	19,1	41,1	12,3	16,2	9,6	3,3	4,9	1,7
Broken	0,3	7,1	13	20,7	35,3	2,5	3,1	5,1

	Other female relatives	Other male relatives	Care-taker	Paternal grand mother	Neigh-bor	Son-in-law	Grand father
Türkiye	1,2	1,0	1,0	0,6	0,4	0,2	0,1
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	1,1	1,2	1,6	0,5	0,4	0,1	0,2
Rural	1,3	0,6	0,0	0,7	0,5	0,3	0,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	0,0	0,4	0,3	0,9	0,4	0,0	0,0
Extended	2,7	2,4	0,0	0,5	0,2	0,5	0,4
Broken	1,4	0	4,4	0	0,9	0,0	0,0

4.8. Decision Makers in the Households

Households were asked as to who the decision maker usually is with regard to the choice of home, order of home, children, shopping, relations with relatives, relations with neighbors, holidays and entertaining. According to the research findings, mother/woman has a more predominant role in many decisions to be taken about the family.

It's understood that man/father and mother/woman take decisions jointly in some matters in Turkey.

Table 87. Decision Maker in the Household throughout Türkiye

	Male /father	Female /mother	Children of the household	Seniors of the household
Home choice	75,8	74,4	10,7	1,8
Order of home	47,8	89,6	10,0	1,1
Children related matters	69,8	86,3	7,3	1,1
Shopping	70,0	83,1	9,5	1,0
Relations with relative	77,0	83,7	7,8	1,7
Relations with neighbors	71,5	86,2	7,6	1,6
Holidays and entertaining	80,0	76,3	14,0	1,5

It's seen that mother and father may make joint decisions with regard to home choice, holidays and entertaining. The priority of women in the decision-making of matters such as order of the house (90%), children-related issues (86%), relations with neighbors (86%), shopping (83%), relations with relatives (84%) is slightly higher. The participation and influence of children into family decisions is higher than that of seniors of the family (Table 87).

In Table 88, the matters in which the man/father is the decisionmaker are shown both for the generality of Türkiye and as split into demographic breakdowns. The main matter in which the man/father plays the role of decisionmaker is holidays and entertaining (80%). Proportions of men who make the final decision in all matters is higher in rural areas than in urban areas. The matters that have the highest variation between urban and rural areas are relations with neighbors and shopping.

Table 88. Topics Where Man/Father is the Decision Maker throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Selection of house	Order of house	Matters regarding the kids	Household shopping	Relations with relatives	Relations with neighbors	Holidays & Entertainment
Türkiye	75,8	47,8	69,8	70,0	77,0	71,5	80,0
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	74,1	45,9	67,3	66,8	74,4	68,2	77,7
Rural	80,6	53,3	77,3	79,2	84,3	80,9	86,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
İstanbul	67,3	35,2	57,8	54,5	65,9	56,9	69,2
Ankara	75,1	49,5	74,0	71,3	79,6	72,3	81,6
İzmir	77,2	53,0	70,4	70,9	74,7	71,2	80,0
NUTS							
Istanbul	67,3	35,2	57,8	54,5	65,9	56,9	69,2
West Marmara	84,7	57,3	77,5	79,2	82,5	79,2	86,5
East Marmara	75,8	52,1	78,2	72,9	82,2	77,7	82,6
Aegean	80,0	56,8	72,0	73,8	78,1	75,2	83,4
Meditarrenean	76,6	54,8	68,3	68,7	74,9	70,8	78,3
West Anatolia	76,4	47,9	74,8	73,6	81,1	74,1	82,9
Central Anatolia	74,2	46,9	75,4	80,0	85,4	80,6	85,1
West Black Sea	74,8	37,3	75,4	74,9	82,1	76,9	84,3
East Black Sea	72,9	53,4	70,8	70,1	78,5	77,6	80,3
Northeast Anatolia	73,0	55,6	67,7	75,7	81,4	75,6	77,7
Mideast Anatolia	83,3	40,3	70,7	78,6	81,3	77,2	83,0
Southeast Anatolia	81,1	45,7	68,0	71,6	75,1	66,7	83,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	82,0	51,6	75,5	75,9	83,4	77,4	86,6
Extended	76,6	47,1	70,2	70,2	77,1	72,2	80,9
Broken	15,3	11,7	12,2	13,3	14,7	13,4	14,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
High upper class	75,9	50,7	73,3	71,5	79,9	72,4	82,1
Upper class	75,8	52,3	74,9	72,0	79,1	74,6	81,6
Upper middle class	76,5	46,4	71,1	69,7	77,6	70,7	81,7
Lower middle class	78,1	49,0	71,3	72,2	79,2	73,6	82,0
Lower class	80,0	48,3	70,3	72,5	79,2	74,9	82,5

In this regard, among the three major cities, Istanbul diverts dramatically from Izmir and Ankara. In all matters probed within the scope of the research, proportion of households where man/father is the decisionmaker is lower in Istanbul. The matter in which Istanbul diverts most from the two other major cities is the order of home. The proportion of households where men are the decision makers with regard to the order of home is about 50% in Ankara and Izmir, but 35% in Istanbul (Table 88).

As for the regions, West Marmara and Central Anatolia stand out of other regions. In these regions, proportion of men making the final decisions in any matter is relatively higher than other regions while this proportion is lower in Istanbul.

When it comes to household type, broken families differ from nuclear and extended families. In all fields explored in the research, proportions of households where the man/father is the decision maker are lower in broken families. The subject matter with the highest rate of differentiation

is holidays and entertainment. In 87% of nuclear families and 81% of extended families, the decision maker is man/father in this matter. However, this percentage drops down to 15% among broken families. No variation is seen across different socio-economic classes in this regard.

4.9. Relationship Level between Spouses

Currently married individuals were asked about their relations with their spouses. Married individuals mentioned having "very good relation" (%62) and "good relation" (33%) to a greater extent whereas smaller percentages of them stated having "bad relation" (5%) and "very bad relation" (1%) with their spouses. Hence, spouses define their marital relations as good to a higher proportion (Table 89).

When responses of married individuals were analysed by residence area, responses of "good relations" weighed heavily in urban areas and responses of "very good relations" weighed heavily in rural areas.

Table 89. Level of Relations between Spouses throughout Türkiyeand by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Very good	Good	Average	Bad	Very Bad
Türkiye	62,2	32,6	4,6	0,4	0,2
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	60,0	34,2	5,2	0,4	0,2
Rural	67,6	28,8	3,3	0,3	0,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	62,4	32,1	5,1	0,4	0,0
Ankara	60,3	33,8	5,0	0,8	0,1
Izmir	71,1	23,4	4,9	0,4	0,2
NUTS					
Istanbul	62,4	32,1	5,1	0,4	0,0
West Marmara	76,5	21,8	1,6	0,0	0,1
East Marmara	43,2	52,8	3,5	0,3	0,1
Aegean	66,2	29,1	4,1	0,4	0,1
Mediterranean	61,3	30,6	7,2	0,5	0,4
West Anatolia	58,1	35,8	5,5	0,6	0,1
Central Anatolia	57,6	36,4	5,2	0,8	0,0
West Black Sea	60,2	35,7	3,8	0,2	0,1
East Black Sea	67,4	29,2	3,3	0,1	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	85,7	12,1	2,0	0,2	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	79,8	17,9	2,1	0,1	0,1
Southeast Anatolia	61,0	32,3	6,0	0,3	0,4

Proportions of those who report having "very happy relations" with their spouses are higher in Northeast Anatolia (86%) and Mideast Anatolia (80%) regions. Similarly, this rate is relatively higher in Izmir compared to other two major cities (71%).

Gender based distribution of responses indicate that response of "very good" is slightly higher among men in percentage (48%) and the responses of "average" and "good" are slightly higher among women. For this reason, it can be concluded that the proportion of men stating having good relations with their wives is sligthly higher than that of women stating the same despite the fact that there's no great difference between responses of men and women (Table 90).

In terms of age groups, there's no significant varia-

tion among respondents stating that their relations with spouses were "average", "bad" and "very bad". It's outstanding that proportion of respondents who report having "very good" relation with spouse in the age range of 18-24 and above 65 years of age is relatively higher (67%).

The proportion of those who report having a very good relation with spouse is higher among primary school, High school, and university graduates. When analysed by socioeconomic status of individuals, some variations between responses of "very good" and "average" emerge. The proportion of those who reply like this is higher in high upper and upper classes (67%). The proportion of those who define their relations with their spouses as very good in the lower class is relatively lower than individuals in other classes (57%).

Table 90. Level of Relations between Spouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, and SES

	Very good	Good	Average	Bad	Very Bad
GENDER					
Male	65,9	30,6	3,1	0,3	0,1
Female	58,5	34,6	6,1	0,5	0,3
AGE					
18-24	67,2	28,9	3,5	0,2	0,3
25-34	63,7	31,8	4,1	0,3	0,1
35-44	61,0	33,2	5,2	0,4	0,2
45-54	60,2	33,9	5,2	0,6	0,1
55-64	59,5	35,1	4,9	0,4	0,1
65+	67,0	29,1	3,5	0,2	0,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
No schooling	59,8	34,3	5,0	0,5	0,3
Primary school	59,9	34,0	5,4	0,4	0,2
Elementary /secondary school	64,2	31,0	4,3	0,3	0,2
High school	64,7	31,0	4,0	0,3	0,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	67,9	29,6	2,3	0,2	0,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
High upper class	67,2	31,2	1,6	0,0	0,0
Upper class	67,0	28,9	3,8	0,4	0,0
Upper middle class	62,7	32,1	4,8	0,4	0,0
Lower middle class	61,6	33,5	4,6	0,3	0,1
Lower class	56,9	35,4	6,7	0,7	0,3

4.10. Matters of Conflict between Spouses

Within the scope of the research, married individuals were asked if they had any disputes with their spouses in several matters and, if any, how often they've experienced such disputes.

The table below indicates matters of conflict between spouses. Accordingly, proportions of individuals ranging between 56% and 96% reported having no problems in these matters. The greatest matter of conflict which is seen in varying degrees is "household related responsibilites". The proportion of those who occasionally have problems with their spouses in this respect is 35%, and that of those

who frequently have problems with their spouses is 3%. The second most commonly seen problem area is "responsibilities regarding the kids" (Table 91).

The proportion of those who experience problems with their spouses in this regard is 31%. These two problem areas are followed by "expenses". The proportion of individuals who state having occasional problems with their spouses in this regard is 5%. Another area that raises frequent problems is "insufficient income" (6%). The areas that cause least of problems are "gambling habit" (2%), "differences in religious views" (3%), "sexuality" (3%) and "political views" (3%).

Table 91. Matters of Conflict s between Spouses throughout Türkiye

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Irrelevant
Responsibilities regarding the household	62,0	35,4	2,5	0,1
Responsibilities regarding the kids	60,7	30,9	2,7	5,7
Not spending time as a family	78,7	18,0	2,8	0,5
Expenses	67,9	27,4	4,5	0,1
Clothing style	89,4	9,0	1,3	0,4
Difference of religious views	89,4	2,4	0,3	7,9
Relations with in-laws	89,4	8,0	1,2	1,4
Alcoholism	58,4	3,0	0,8	37,8
Smoking	60,6	11,3	3,5	24,6
Gambling	56,0	1,3	0,2	42,5
Reflecting problems at work onto home life	83,4	10,5	0,9	5,2
Insufficient income	68,0	25,1	6,0	0,9
Persons met with	91,2	7,6	0,7	0,5
Not sufficiently taking care of himself/herself	90,8	7,3	0,9	1,0
Internet	70,1	3,9	0,7	25,4
Jealousy	84,4	12,0	1,9	1,7
Cultural differences	92,8	3,5	0,5	3,2
Personality differences	90,6	7,4	0,8	1,3
Differences of entertainment habits	92,4	4,6	0,7	2,4
Sexuality	95,5	2,8	0,4	1,3
Political views	95,1	2,5	0,4	2,0

Table 92. Matters of Conflict between Spouses throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Sometimes & Often)

	Household related responsibilities	Kids related responsibilities	Expenses	Insufficient income	Not spending time as a family	Smoking	Jealousy	Reflecting the problems at work onto his/her home life	Clothing style	Relations with in-laws	Persons met with	Not sufficiently taking care of himself/herself
Türkiye	37,9	33,6	32,0	31,1	20,8	14,8	14,0	11,4	10,2	9,2	8,3	8,2
RESIDENCE AREA												
Urban	40,3	36,8	33,7	31,6	23,6	15,4	15,1	12,7	11,9	10,6	9,3	9,3
Rural	32,3	26,0	27,9	29,8	14,4	13,3	11,4	8,4	6,2	5,9	6,0	5,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES												
Istanbul	45,4	43,7	39,4	33,0	27,8	15,6	14,2	16,7	12,3	13,5	8,8	9,8
Ankara	38,8	33,1	28,0	28,4	23,5	15,5	14,3	10,2	12,4	11,8	11,5	10,6
Izmir	41,0	34,4	34,0	30,2	24,5	16,5	15,7	10,9	11,6	12,2	10,2	11,8
NUTS												
Istanbul	45,4	43,7	39,4	33,0	27,8	15,6	14,2	16,7	12,3	13,5	8,8	9,8
West Marmara	32,8	23,8	29,5	26,9	15,8	13,8	6,7	5,8	5,8	4,0	3,6	4,6
Aegean	32,3	29,0	23,4	26,6	20,1	13,2	10,7	10,9	9,0	9,8	7,4	7,6
East Marmara	36,9	32,8	32,7	30,7	19,0	16,2	17,0	9,0	9,3	9,2	7,5	8,3
West Anatolia	36,0	33,6	31,2	35,4	22,6	13,0	16,1	15,8	12,2	9,7	11,5	10,6
Mediterranean	36,2	30,5	26,5	29,0	20,6	17,8	14,3	9,6	10,6	10,3	9,9	9,4
Central Anatolia	36,0	31,0	30,8	26,4	19,2	14,9	17,8	9,7	10,0	7,6	7,8	7,8
West Black Sea	41,5	29,9	26,5	29,2	10,9	11,7	10,2	7,2	5,5	4,8	5,1	3,4
East Black Sea	33,5	28,5	27,3	24,0	17,3	12,8	9,6	9,1	8,0	6,8	5,3	3,9
Northeast Anatolia	56,2	50,0	43,5	32,9	32,5	15,4	23,7	14,7	15,0	14,1	19,6	12,2
Mideast Anatolia	34,2	30,1	28,8	30,2	19,5	15,4	12,0	7,0	11,1	6,1	8,1	8,1
Southeast Anatolia	35,4	32,7	40,2	39,8	18,9	15,3	13,3	11,0	11,4	5,9	6,3	6,8

Table 93. Matters of Conflict between Spouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Sometimes & Often)

	Household related responsibilities	Kids related responsibilities	Expenses	Insufficient income	Not spending time as a family	Smoking	Jealousy	Reflecting the problems at work onto his/her home life	Clothing style	Relations with in-laws	Persons met with	Not sufficiently taking care of himself/herself
GENDER												
Male	35,4	31,1	30,1	29,4	19,6	13,6	13,5	10,6	9,7	7,3	7,9	6,9
Female	40,5	36,1	33,9	32,8	22,1	16,0	14,4	12,2	10,8	11,0	8,7	9,4
AGE												
18-24	32,4	20,3	28,2	28,0	21,9	17,5	29,1	13,2	17,9	12,6	10,8	9,1
25-34	43,8	38,1	36,3	32,4	29,1	16,2	21,7	15,2	15,0	13,0	11,0	10,5
35-44	43,9	44,9	38,5	36,1	26,7	17,4	14,4	15,0	12,3	10,8	10,0	8,9
45-54	36,7	33,1	30,8	33,1	16,3	15,2	8,7	9,5	7,3	6,9	6,3	7,9
55-64	28,8	22,5	24,2	26,5	9,8	11,8	5,8	5,6	3,6	4,8	5,4	5,3
65+	24,1	15,4	18,0	17,7	6,8	5,8	5,2	2,7	2,8	3,1	3,2	3,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS												
No schooling	33,9	27,6	31,2	35,1	14,9	12,8	8,9	8,4	7,6	6,3	5,8	7,3
Primary school	37,0	33,1	33,2	35,2	18,6	15,4	11,6	10,7	8,0	7,3	7,1	7,6
Elementary/secondary school	38,8	34,0	32,0	31,6	23,0	16,2	19,2	12,6	12,3	10,5	9,4	8,0
High school	40,8	38,4	32,3	26,9	26,4	13,7	18,6	13,2	13,7	12,7	11,5	10,1
Undergraduate/graduate studies	40,9	35,0	27,6	15,8	25,7	14,4	15,3	13,9	14,3	13,2	9,8	8,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE												
Nuclear	38,7	34,4	32,6	31,0	21,4	14,7	13,9	11,9	10,4	9,7	8,4	8,3
Extended	34,7	29,9	29,0	31,6	18,0	15,2	14,1	9,4	9,6	6,8	7,8	7,7
Broken	5,2	14,4	26,0	20,4	46,8	13,5	36,4	4,6	8,7	0,0	21,8	7,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS												
High upper class	41,7	35,5	27,2	6,3	26,6	14,5	13,2	16,6	15,2	14,3	10,1	8,2
Upper class	43,2	36,7	30,9	17,4	24,7	13,5	16,1	14,3	14,1	13,4	11,1	10,0
Upper middle class	37,8	36,4	28,5	24,4	23,2	14,5	14,3	10,9	10,1	9,8	8,7	8,5
Lower middle class	36,8	31,6	32,5	34,5	18,7	14,7	13,3	10,3	8,8	7,9	7,4	7,5
Lower class	40,3	35,6	41,3	52,4	23,6	18,7	15,5	14,4	11,9	8,5	8,9	9,7

4.11. Reactions of Spouses towards Areas of Conflict

In the research, the reactions of spouses in case of conflict were asked. The following table covers the statements of women regarding reactions of their spouses in response to disputes (Table 94).

65% of women state that their spouses raise their voice in case of conflict. "Raising voice / shouting" is generally the most widely given reaction (12%) among others. 43% of women state that their husbands remain silent / endure in silence (Table 95).

Table 94. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict according to Women throughout Türkiye

	Generally	Sometimes	Never
Raises voice, shouts	12,0	52,8	35,1
Reprimands	5,9	35,5	58,5
Gets cross with me	5,0	26,8	68,2
Insults me	2,1	8,7	89,3
Leaves the room	2,8	14,9	82,3
Leaves the place (home)	1,0	3,9	95,1
Destroys/smashes the belongings around	0,9	4,5	94,5
Uses force/ physical violence	0,7	3,8	95,5
Remains silent/endures in silence	9,0	34,2	56,8
Separates bedrooms	0,8	3,9	95,2

Table 95. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict according to Women throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Sometimes & Generally)

	Raises voice, shouts	Reprimands	Gets cross with me	Insults me	Leaves the place/ room	Leaves the home	Destroys / smashes belongings around	Uses force/ physical violence	Remains silent/ endures in silence	Separates bedrooms
Türkiye	64,9	41,5	31,8	10,7	17,7	4,9	5,5	4,5	43,2	4,8
RESIDENCE AREA										
Urban	65,5	41,4	33,8	11,4	20,1	5,5	6,0	4,9	43,6	5,6
Rural	63,3	41,7	26,9	9,1	12,0	3,5	4,0	3,7	42,3	2,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES										
Istanbul	62,0	43,3	33,2	12,1	20,8	4,7	6,1	5,4	38,7	6,5
Ankara	70,8	45,1	39,2	13,4	25,1	5,8	6,0	4,3	48,3	6,8
Izmir	61,7	39,1	33,5	13,3	23,8	7,4	7,6	4,3	43,9	6,6
NUTS										
Istanbul	62,0	43,3	33,2	12,1	20,8	4,7	6,1	5,4	38,7	6,5
West Marmara	68,0	31,9	27,9	4,3	17,4	4,0	5,6	2,3	36,7	2,5
East Marmara	63,1	33,8	28,6	9,5	18,0	4,8	4,2	2,4	45,7	4,7
Aegean	63,5	41,9	29,2	11,1	20,3	6,4	7,2	4,7	40,9	4,1
Mediterranean	65,4	48,2	36,5	11,8	17,5	5,3	5,9	5,7	51,2	6,4
West Anatolia	70,4	46,6	34,4	11,4	22,1	5,0	6,5	4,2	47,9	6,3
Central Anatolia	67,3	48,9	37,9	12,4	13,8	3,9	5,1	5,9	40,7	3,3
West Black Sea	64,3	35,2	23,0	9,2	14,7	4,5	2,3	1,8	39,7	1,1
East Black Sea	63,5	32,7	29,8	6,5	9,9	3,6	3,0	1,3	46,6	3,6
Northeast Anatolia	82,7	46,8	49,6	10,6	7,3	2,8	3,8	8,4	49,8	2,3
Mideast Anatolia	63,6	32,2	28,3	10,7	15,4	3,0	3,4	3,9	46,6	3,3
Southeast Anatolia	60,2	42,5	29,1	12,4	14,0	6,4	5,8	6,8	38,3	5,0

The proportion of women who say that their spouses "sometimes" reprimand them is 36% whereas the proportion of women who say that their spouses "generally" reprimand them is 6% (Table 95).

For the opinion of women, the less frequently seen reactions of their spouses are "leaving the place / home" (5%), "separating bedroom" (5%) and "destroying / smashing belongings around" (6%). The proportion of women who state that their spouses use force/ physical violence in case of conflict is 5%.

Table 96. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict according to Women by Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Sometimes & Generally)

	Raises voice, shouts	Reprimands	Gets cross with me	Insults me	Leaves the place/ room	Leaves the home	Destroys/ smashes belongings around	Uses force/ physical violence	Remains silent/ endures in silence	Separates bedrooms
AGE										
18-24	61,6	38,5	30,9	8,1	16,8	3,4	4,4	3,8	44,8	2,4
25-34	67,2	41,4	35,4	11,4	22,4	5,4	7,1	5,5	46,4	5,8
35-44	67,5	43,9	34,2	12,0	20,7	5,8	6,5	4,8	45,6	5,8
45-54	65,2	43,5	29,8	11,4	15,6	5,0	5,2	4,4	39,3	4,6
55-64	62,8	40,4	30,6	9,2	12,0	4,9	3,3	3,8	42,0	3,8
65+	54,2	33,9	18,3	8,1	6,4	2,3	1,5	2,4	33,2	2,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS										
No schooling	61,7	44,1	26,1	11,2	10,3	3,9	3,9	5,6	40,6	3,5
Primary school	67,6	43,4	31,2	11,9	15,7	4,9	5,7	4,4	42,8	4,8
Elementary/secondary school	63,8	41,4	33,9	9,1	18,9	4,6	6,2	4,3	43,0	4,4
High school	63,6	37,7	34,4	9,7	28,2	7,0	5,9	4,5	46,4	6,6
Undergraduate /graduate studies	61,2	30,0	40,6	7,9	27,6	4,7	5,7	2,9	47,0	5,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE										
Nuclear	65,3	41,2	32,9	10,8	18,7	5,1	5,6	4,6	43,5	5,0
Extended	63,2	42,6	26,8	10,4	13,5	4,2	4,9	4,3	42,0	3,5
Broken	75,8	64,6	37,5	27,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	48,7	0,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS										
High upper class	65,3	26,7	39,2	9,3	27,9	3,4	2,8	2,1	44,0	6,9
Upper class	65,1	35,3	36,1	8,6	27,1	5,6	6,2	2,6	44,4	5,2
Upper middle class	65,4	40,7	33,3	9,7	20,9	4,9	5,0	3,5	43,5	5,0
Lower middle class	65,3	43,8	30,3	11,5	14,5	4,8	5,7	5,0	43,6	4,5
Lower class	67,9	48,3	30,1	13,6	13,3	5,3	6,5	7,8	43,0	5,1

Table 97 covers the statements of men with regard to the reactions of their wives to conflicts with them. More than half of men (55%) report that their wives remain silent / endure in silence in case of a conflict. Generally speaking, the reaction with the highest proportion is "remaining silent / enduring in silence" (16%). 39% of men reported that their wives sometimes raised their voice/ shouted in case of conflict, whereas 5% of them stated that their wives generally react like this. For the opinion of men, another widely seen reaction across wives is "getting cross with". 33% of men say that

their wives sometimes get cross and 6% say that they usually react by getting cross with them. For the opinion of men, less frequent reactions of their wives were "using force / physical violence" (1%), "leaving home" (2%) and "destroying / smashing belongings around"(2%).

4.12. Institutions or Individuals from Whom Support is Sought in Case of Conflict between Spouses

In order to learn about the attitudes of their

Table 97. Reactions of Spouses in Case of Conflict according to Men throughout Türkiye

	Generally	Sometimes	Never
Raises voice, shouts	4,9	39,2	55,9
Reprimands	1,4	17,4	81,1
Gets cross with me	6,1	32,7	61,1
Insults me	0,6	4,1	95,3
Leaves the room	1,7	14,3	84,0
Leaves the place (home)	0,2	1,7	98,1
Destroys/smashes the belongings around	0,2	2,1	97,7
Uses force/ physical violence	0,2	1,0	98,8
Remains silent/endures in silence	16,3	38,8	44,9
Separates bedrooms	0,5	4,0	95,5

spouses, married individuals were probed as to who or where they first consider getting support from when they have serious problems with their spouses. Responses to this question are covered in Table 98 & 99. Accordingly, 62% of married individuals in Türkiye report not considering to get support from anyone in such a situation. The proportion of those who would get such help from the seniors of the family is 23%. Only 3% mentioned having recourse to expert institutions or individuals.

In rural areas, the proportion of those who state that they wouldn't seek any help (67%) is greater than those living in urban areas (60%). Similarly, a greater proportion rural residents consider getting expert support (4%) compared to urban dwellers.

In the comparison of three major cities, the proportions of people living in Ankara and Izmir stating that they wouldn't prefer to get help from anyone are comparable (61% vs 62%), but higher than Istanbul. In Istanbul this rate lags back to 48% and getting the support of particularly the seniors of the family takes precedence (31%). Again, Istanbul diverts from two other major cities for having a higher percentage (8%) of seeking expert support from individuals and institutions.

Regionwise, respondents in West Black Sea , Southeast Anatolia and Central Anatolia mark percentages higher than 70% in terms of "not getting any help from anyone". Proportion of those who say they would consider getting support from expert individuals and institutions reaches 8% only in Istanbul, but remains at very low levels in other regions.

A gender-based analysis reveals that the proportion of men who state that they wouldn't get support from anyone (66%) is higher than that (58%) of women (Table 99).

42% of respondents in the young age group (18-24 year olds) state that they would have recourse to seniors in the family. As age gets older, the proportion of those who consult with seniors of the family is reduced; for instance, it gets down to 26% in the age group of 35-44 year olds. Contrastively, the option of not getting support from anyone is chosen at higher levels at later ages. Those who would not get any support from anyone account for 49% in 18-24 age range whereas this proportion rises to 59% in the age range of 35-44. Additionally, the proportion of 45+ respondens who state they would get support from their children amounts to 10%.

Getting the support of expert individuals and institutions rises in proportion to educational status. This options is chosen only by 0.3% of respondents who have no school graduation and its frequency reaches to 6% among university graduates.

In terms of household type, greater percentages of broken families consider getting support from expert individuals or institutions (8%) and from their friends (10%) upon having problems with their spouses (Table 99).

In the lower socioceconomic class, there's a very low percentage of people who consider getting support from expert individuals and institutions. A relative rise is seen in upper middle socioeconomic class, and this rate goes up to 10% in the high upper class

Table 98. Institutions or Individuals from Whom Support is Sought Upon Conflict between Spouses throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Seniors of my family	My relatives	My siblings	My children	Expert individuals or institutions (Psychologist, family and marriage counselor)	My friends	My neighbors	Clergymen	I don't get support from anyone	Other
Türkiye	23,1	2,3	2,2	5,5	2,7	1,6	0,4	0,2	61,9	1,4
RESIDENCE AREA										
Urban	24,1	2,0	2,6	5,4	3,6	2,0	0,4	0,2	59,7	1,4
Rural	20,7	2,9	1,2	5,9	0,6	0,7	0,5	0,2	67,3	1,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES										
Istanbul	31,1	2,2	2,9	4,6	8,0	1,9	0,3	0,1	48,1	1,8
Ankara	22,5	1,0	2,3	4,9	2,6	2,9	0,9	0,0	62,0	2,0
Izmir	22,1	4,6	3,8	5,3	3,1	3,5	1,1	0,1	60,9	1,5
NUTS										
Istanbul	31,1	2,2	2,9	4,6	8,0	1,9	0,3	0,1	48,1	1,8
West Marmara	15,7	1,5	2,1	11,3	1,7	1,7	0,7	0,1	66,2	1,0
East Marmara	24,4	1,7	3,5	9,1	2,5	1,5	0,3	0,3	57,5	0,7
Aegean	22,2	3,2	2,5	6,7	2,2	2,4	0,8	0,3	61,6	1,4
Mediterranean	23,3	1,9	1,4	4,6	1,4	1,4	0,5	0,2	65,7	0,2
West Anatolia	22,5	0,7	2,7	5,3	2,3	2,5	0,8	0,0	62,4	1,8
Central Anatolia	17,5	1,0	1,5	5,1	1,3	1,0	0,2	0,4	71,9	0,7
West Black Sea	15,1	2,4	1,6	6,0	0,8	0,8	0,0	0,0	73,9	0,8
East Black Sea	20,5	2,6	1,6	3,1	1,0	1,3	0,3	0,2	69,3	0,6
Northeast Anatolia	35,9	3,5	0,3	2,9	0,3	0,3	0,3	1,0	55,1	0,9
Mideast Anatolia	22,6	6,2	0,9	2,8	0,7	0,8	0,7	0,2	58,5	7,7
Southeast Anatolia	18,8	2,6	1,5	2,4	0,7	1,2	0,0	0,1	72,7	0,5

Table 99. Institutions or Individuals from Whom Support is Sought Upon Conflict Between Spouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Seniors of my family	My relatives	My siblings	My children	Expert individuals or institutions (Psychologist, family and marriage counselor)	My friends	My neighbors	Clergymen	I don't get support from anyone	Other
GENDER										
Male	21,9	2,2	1,1	4,4	2,6	1,3	0,2	0,3	65,6	1,5
Female	24,4	2,3	3,3	6,6	2,8	1,9	0,7	0,1	58,2	1,2
AGE										
18-24	42,4	2,6	2,1	0,1	2,1	1,7	0,1	0,4	49,4	1,0
25-34	34,8	2,6	3,1	0,1	3,6	2,4	0,5	0,2	53,7	1,0
35-44	26,2	2,4	3,1	3,2	3,5	2,3	0,5	0,2	58,9	1,3
45-54	17,4	2,4	1,4	10,1	2,2	0,9	0,4	0,2	64,6	1,5
55-64	7,9	1,6	0,9	11,5	1,8	0,7	0,4	0,3	73,7	1,8
65+	4,5	1,7	0,5	11,6	0,7	0,4	0,5	0,2	78,1	2,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS										
No schooling	16,9	3,0	1,2	9,0	0,3	0,4	0,4	0,1	68,5	1,0
Primary school	21,2	2,1	2,1	6,9	1,3	1,0	0,6	0,2	64,2	1,5
Elementary/secondary school	29,5	2,5	2,1	3,7	4,5	0,9	0,4	0,2	56,2	1,3
High school	27,0	2,3	2,9	2,8	4,1	2,6	0,3	0,2	58,1	1,2
Undergraduate / graduate studies	23,5	1,8	2,7	2,6	6,3	5,1	0,1	0,5	58,9	1,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE										
Nuclear	22,4	2,3	2,4	5,7	2,9	1,8	0,5	0,2	61,9	1,3
Extended	26,6	2,1	1,2	4,9	1,5	0,5	0,2	0,3	62,1	1,6
Broken	28,7	0,0	0,0	8,4	8,1	10,7	0,0	0,0	44,1	0,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS										
High upper class	18,6	3,9	4,2	2,2	9,7	8,1	0,0	0,0	58,0	1,9
Upper class	23,2	1,4	3,0	5,1	5,9	3,2	0,3	0,4	57,8	1,6
Upper middle class	22,2	2,0	2,4	6,9	3,8	1,9	0,3	0,3	60,0	1,5
Lower middle class	23,0	2,4	1,9	5,6	1,5	1,0	0,5	0,1	63,9	1,2
Lower class	26,8	2,9	1,9	3,4	0,6	0,8	0,8	0,1	62,7	0,8

Chapter 5

RELATIONSHIPS
BETWEEN RELATIVES

In this part of the research, the data regarding views about relations with relatives, proximity of residence, frequency of meeting and the types of relations built are all laid out based on the viewpoint that types of kinship relationship should be taken into account for understanding family structuring in Türkiye.

5.1. Relationships between Relatives

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked to evaluate their relations with their parents and with their relatives in several degrees of kinship by choosing one of the options among "very good", "good", "average", "bad" and "very bad". A review of the data in the Table 100 points to a variety of opinions regarding kinship relationships based on degree of kinship. Within this framework, options of "very good" and "good" are most highly rated for children. The response of "very good" is chosen by 62% for daughters, and 60% for sons. When it

comes to relations with parents, the option of "very good" is chosen by 54% for mothers and 50% for fathers.

The second highest proportion of responses for "very good" and "good" are given for relations with siblings. Relations with elder/younger sister are defined as "good" by 53% of individuals, and as "very good" by 40%. Relations with elder/younger brother are defined as "good" by 54% and as "very good" by 37%. The third group consists of other relatives such as the parents of the spouse, paternal uncle, maternal uncle, maternal aunt and paternal aunt. Kinship types that were rated as "bad" and "very bad" most often were the relationships with paternal grandmothers and grandfathers. 5% of individuals that participated in the research defined their relations with their paternal grandmothers and grandfathers as "very bad" while 3% described them as "bad".

Table 100. Level of Relationships with Relatives throughout Türkiye

	Very good	Good	Average	Bad	Very bad
Mother	53,5	41,6	3,3	0,9	0,7
Father	49,9	42,1	4,9	1,7	1,4
Daughter	62,3	35,2	1,6	0,5	0,5
Son	60,4	36,5	2,1	0,7	0,4
Elder/younger sister	39,8	52,8	5,5	1,3	0,5
Elder/younger brother	37,0	53,6	7,0	1,7	0,7
Paternal uncle	20,0	54,7	18,0	4,5	2,9
Maternal uncle	20,2	56,7	17,3	4,1	1,8
Maternal aunt	21,4	59,7	14,8	2,7	1,4
Paternal aunt	19,5	58,0	16,7	3,5	2,3
Mother-in-law	27,3	60,0	9,3	1,8	1,6
Father-in-law	27,3	59,7	9,0	2,1	1,8
Maternal grandmother	31,3	55,0	9,1	1,5	3,1
Paternal grandmother	28,4	54,4	9,2	3,0	4,9
Grandfather	28,8	55,0	8,4	2,8	5,0

Tables 101 & 102 cover the proportion of those who define their relation with relatives as "very good" throughout Türkiyeand by several demographic breakdowns. No significant variation was detected in terms of residence area in this regard.

In the comparison of three major cities, we can see a much higher percent of respondents who report having "very good" relations with their daughters (74%) and sons (72%) in Izmir; and with their fathers-in-law (37%) and mothers-in-law (36%) in Ankara.

A regional analysis shows that the greatest extent of variation is in relations with kids. More than 80% of individuals living in Central Anatolia and Northeast Anatolia define their relations with their daughters and sons as "very good". This rate is reduced to 39% in East Marmara.

Although not much of variation is seen between genders, the proportion of women who define their relations with their elder/ younger sister as "very good" (43%) is higher than that of men (37%).

The highest degree of variation among age groups is seen in relations with siblings. 56% of individuals in the 18-24 age range state having very good

relations with elder/younger sister and 53% mention having very good relations with elder/younger brother whereas these rates are 31% for elder/younger sister and 29% for elder/younger brother in 45-54 age range.

The proportion of those who mention having "very good" relations with relatives in high educational status group is higher. The relationship with highest rate of variation by educational status is the relation with mother. 44% of elementary school graduates state having very good relations with their mothers. This rate rises to 60% among high-school graduates and 64% among undergraduates/graduates.

When evaluated on the basis of household type, the proportions of those who report having "very good" relations with mother-in-law (15%) and with father-in-law (12%) are found to be lower in broken families than other household types. As opposed to this, 67% of individuals in broken families state having very good relations with their mothers. This rate is 57% in extended families and 51% in nuclear families.

In almost all kinship relations, percentages of those who define their relations as "very good" rise in proportion to socioeconomic class.

Table 101. Level of Relationships with Relatives throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Very Good)

	Mother	Father	Daughter	Son	Elder/ younger sister	Elder/ younger brother	Paternal uncle	Maternal uncle	Maternal aunt	Paternal aunt	Mother-in-law	Father-in-law	Maternal grand-mother	Paternal grand-mother	Grand-father
Türkiye	53,5	49,9	62,3	60,4	39,8	37,0	20,0	20,2	21,4	19,5	27,3	27,3	31,3	28,4	28,8
RESIDENCE AREA															
Urban	53,5	49,5	62,5	59,9	40,2	36,8	19,1	19,3	20,9	18,8	26,6	26,5	32,0	29,1	29,0
Rural	53,6	51,1	61,8	61,5	38,9	37,5	22,9	23,0	23,1	21,5	29,4	29,7	28,5	25,8	28,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES															
Istanbul	58,5	54,3	67,6	63,9	43,9	42,0	22,9	22,5	24,1	22,7	29,4	29,5	37,3	35,5	35,7
Ankara	57,3	52,5	66,4	61,6	47,0	43,9	23,0	24,1	27,0	24,8	36,5	37,0	42,2	34,6	35,5
Izmir	60,1	57,7	74,2	71,5	42,8	36,8	17,4	19,8	20,7	17,9	28,6	27,5	36,6	38,1	37,9
NUTS															
Istanbul	58,5	54,3	67,6	63,9	43,9	42,0	22,9	22,5	24,1	22,7	29,4	29,5	37,3	35,5	35,7
West Marmara	58,9	54,7	66,0	64,3	44,6	41,0	29,0	26,3	27,7	24,7	31,2	31,6	33,4	20,6	29,0
East Marmara	36,3	31,1	39,1	39,5	24,6	19,2	8,0	9,4	11,1	9,0	13,2	14,3	15,9	13,1	15,4
Aegean	50,0	47,7	67,1	65,9	33,5	28,9	12,5	14,5	15,4	13,5	23,0	21,4	24,8	21,9	21,7
Mediterranean	53,3	49,7	68,9	66,1	42,2	38,8	20,2	20,7	21,2	18,5	28,3	27,7	36,2	28,5	29,6
West Anatolia	51,5	48,4	61,7	57,6	42,0	39,2	20,2	20,0	22,9	21,4	30,7	30,9	34,7	30,4	29,7
Central Anatolia	45,7	44,5	47,9	48,4	30,7	29,6	13,6	13,9	15,7	12,7	25,2	26,2	26,5	28,9	31,6
West Black Sea	51,8	49,0	54,2	52,5	34,7	34,8	22,3	22,0	22,9	20,9	27,0	27,6	33,9	35,2	28,3
East Black Sea	57,3	54,2	61,2	60,4	43,5	41,2	25,2	24,8	29,2	24,1	31,7	31,7	36,0	36,3	40,3
Northeast Anatolia	74,1	71,8	84,8	86,0	41,0	38,7	19,3	18,6	18,6	18,0	31,4	27,4	26,8	29,7	22,7
Mideast Anatolia	77,3	71,4	84,4	82,0	66,6	62,7	35,4	35,4	36,6	34,2	46,1	46,8	37,3	42,4	34,2
Southeast Anatolia	53,5	47,9	54,8	54,2	41,1	39,8	24,8	24,8	23,9	22,7	29,3	29,3	28,7	25,8	25,6

Table 102. Level of Relationships with Relatives by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Very Good)

	Mother	Father	Daughter	Son	Elder/younger sister	Elder/younger brother	Paternal uncle	Maternal uncle	Maternal aunt	Paternal aunt	Mother-in-law	Father-in-law	Maternal grand-mother	Paternal grand-mother	Grand-father
GENDER															
Male	54,8	50,9	61,3	59,4	36,8	37,1	20,7	20,5	21,1	19,4	27,0	27,1	33,1	30,3	30,8
Female	52,3	48,9	63,1	61,2	42,8	37,0	19,3	20,0	21,9	19,6	27,7	27,5	29,4	26,5	26,8
AGE															
18-24	64,3	57,8	70,5	72,6	55,8	52,9	23,9	25,4	28,3	23,7	34,4	36,4	35,7	32,3	31,5
25-34	54,8	49,9	67,6	66,5	43,9	40,9	19,8	20,1	22,0	19,0	28,3	27,8	30,0	25,6	27,7
35-44	48,8	45,1	64,4	62,1	36,7	32,5	17,3	18,3	18,3	17,7	26,0	25,7	22,7	24,1	24,1
45-54	43,7	41,1	59,4	57,2	31,4	29,1	18,3	16,9	16,2	17,2	24,3	23,7	20,5	15,4	12,5
55-64	44,3	40,5	57,1	54,8	32,4	30,4	18,4	16,6	18,5	17,4	28,5	26,9	12,2	19,8	14,2
65+	39,1	46,8	60,3	58,1	34,5	31,9	26,5	20,7	20,1	18,2	22,1	20,4	,0	,0	,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS															
No schooling	46,5	42,9	58,0	57,1	34,7	32,3	19,6	20,4	18,9	19,0	28,0	28,0	23,6	23,0	18,3
Primary school	44,0	41,2	59,6	57,6	32,8	30,8	17,4	16,1	16,2	16,0	22,8	22,7	19,7	16,8	18,8
Elementary /secondary school	54,6	50,7	64,8	64,3	45,4	41,9	20,7	22,6	23,9	21,6	29,4	30,2	30,9	27,2	23,9
High school	60,0	55,0	68,4	64,7	46,2	42,7	21,9	22,1	25,1	21,2	30,0	28,2	35,5	33,9	34,7
Undergraduate /graduate studies	63,5	57,8	73,3	70,4	49,7	45,5	21,6	23,0	25,3	21,3	33,8	33,5	36,6	29,9	33,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE															
Nuclear	51,0	48,9	62,8	60,5	39,0	35,6	19,3	19,5	20,7	19,2	26,1	26,4	30,4	27,2	27,7
Extended	56,5	52,4	60,2	61,4	39,3	38,9	22,2	21,5	21,7	21,0	32,8	31,2	31,2	30,3	27,6
Broken	66,5	53,5	62,6	57,5	45,8	43,3	21,3	23,2	26,2	18,9	44,7	42,5	37,1	33,0	36,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS															
High upper class	62,7	56,3	75,1	71,6	48,8	45,7	19,0	21,7	24,7	20,3	36,0	36,9	32,5	25,4	26,6
Upper class	59,0	55,6	69,9	66,2	44,7	42,3	20,8	21,8	23,1	20,0	30,8	30,6	36,0	29,1	33,2
Upper middle class	56,7	53,4	63,1	61,3	42,5	38,8	22,0	21,9	24,0	21,3	28,6	28,4	36,3	33,5	34,7
Lower middle class	49,1	46,2	60,7	59,0	36,7	34,3	17,9	18,2	18,9	17,7	24,9	25,2	25,6	25,2	22,3
Lower class	42,9	38,3	55,2	55,8	32,8	29,9	17,7	16,8	16,6	16,9	24,1	22,5	22,9	13,5	16,8

5.2. Proximity of Residence with Relatives

Families were asked about proximity of their residence to their living relatives. In 60% of households, individuals live with their daughters and in 65% of households with sons. For the proximity of residence with family members and relatives except for the aforementioned ones, the most commonly given response is "a different city". It's followed by responses of "same city, same town" and "same city, different town" (Table 103).

The percentage of households where individuals live with their mother-in-law is 5% whereas the proportion of households where individuals live with their father-in-law is 3%. The proportion of those living in the same building/yard with their mother-in-law/father-in-law is 6%. Percentages of those who live with the same house or same building/yard with their maternal grandmother, paternal grandmother and grandfather range between 1-3%. Generally speaking, these family seniors live in a different city (in percentages ranging from 47-49).

Table 103. Residential Proximity to Relatives throughout Türkiye

	Same house	Same building	Same neighborhood/ district	Same city, same town	Same city, different town	Different city	Abroad
Mother	13,8	5,7	14,6	20,4	15,0	29,6	0,9
Father	10,8	5,6	14,4	20,8	15,0	32,0	1,5
Daughter	60,0	2,1	6,3	11,3	7,4	11,7	1,2
Son	65,2	4,8	4,8	7,4	5,2	10,8	1,8
Elder/younger sister	3,8	2,3	16,3	26,6	18,9	30,1	2,0
Elder/younger brother	4,3	4,0	17,0	26,0	17,9	28,5	2,2
Paternal uncle	0,3	1,8	15,0	24,9	18,3	37,7	2,0
Maternal uncle	0,1	0,7	12,2	25,6	19,1	40,5	1,8
Maternal aunt	0,3	0,6	11,5	25,3	20,3	40,4	1,7
Paternal aunt	0,3	0,9	11,8	25,1	19,4	40,6	1,8
Mother-in-law	4,7	6,2	16,1	26,0	17,2	29,0	0,8
Father-in-law	2,6	6,4	15,5	26,4	17,3	30,4	1,3
Maternal grandmother	0,9	1,8	9,9	20,5	17,1	47,4	2,5
Paternal grandmother	2,0	2,7	10,6	19,5	14,9	46,7	3,7
Grandfather	1,9	1,1	10,0	18,5	15,8	48,5	4,3

In Table 104, proportions of relatives living in the same house throughout Türkiyeand by demographic breakdowns are provided. In 65% of the households in Türkiye, individuals live with their sons, in 60% with their daughters, in 14% with their mothers, in 11% with their father, and in 4% with their siblings. Proportions of those who live in the same house with their mothers-in-law (5%) and their fathers-in-law (3%) are very low.

Proportions of respondents who live with their daughters (65%) and their sons (70%) in the urban areas are higher than in rural areas. In rural areass, 48% live with their daughters and 54% with their sons in the same house.

In the three major cities and in regions, the greatest degree of variation is seen in the percentage of households where individuals live with their kids. The proportion of households where individuals live in the same house with their kids in Northeast, Mideast and Southeast Anatolia regions range between 70-84%. In West Marmara, the proportion of those who live in the same house with their daughters gets down to 43% and those who live in the same house with their sons to 44%. Among the three major cities, those who live in the same house with their kids are understood to account for a lower percentage in Izmir, but a relatively higher percentage in Istanbul.

Table 104. Proximity of Residence with Relatives throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES (Same House)

	Mother	Father	Daughter	Son	Elder/ younger sister	Elder/younger brother	Mother-in-law	Father-in-law
Türkiye	13,8	10,8	60,0	65,2	3,8	4,3	4,7	2,6
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	12,8	10,2	64,8	70,0	4,1	4,7	4,4	2,3
Rural	17,6	13,1	48,1	53,5	2,9	3,3	5,6	3,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	13,5	11,1	71,2	77,0	4,6	5,5	4,4	2,3
Ankara	12,6	10,2	64,7	68,0	3,6	3,9	4,2	3,8
Izmir	12,2	8,0	57,8	61,8	2,9	3,6	2,7	1,4
NUTS								
Istanbul	13,5	11,1	71,2	77,0	4,6	5,5	4,4	2,3
West Marmara	11,9	8,0	42,7	43,8	1,1	2,3	2,6	0,7
East Marmara	11,3	5,9	56,6	63,6	2,3	2,9	5,2	2,4
Aegean	11,8	8,2	52,2	58,6	2,9	2,7	2,8	1,1
Mediterranean	11,3	9,4	61,7	63,3	3,5	4,0	4,3	1,7
West Anatolia	11,8	10,0	62,6	68,2	2,9	3,9	4,7	3,0
Central Anatolia	18,1	14,7	44,9	51,4	2,8	3,5	4,6	3,8
West Black Sea	16,0	12,3	46,2	53,4	2,5	2,8	5,4	2,1
East Black Sea	13,8	6,9	47,8	51,7	1,4	3,3	6,7	6,2
Northeast Anatolia	22,6	16,7	70,3	74,0	6,3	6,5	6,9	3,8
Mideast Anatolia	23,0	21,5	72,9	78,2	8,0	8,3	8,0	7,6
Southeast Anatolia	18,9	16,2	79,4	84,4	8,1	8,2	7,2	3,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	6,8	8,2	65,0	68,7	2,7	3,0	0,5	0,4
Extended	46,6	35,7	63,3	81,6	6,7	9,5	31,6	20,6
Broken	23,3	4,9	30,4	30,7	6,3	6,6	6,6	2,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
High upper class	6,9	7,1	83,4	82,7	5,6	4,7	2,2	1,0
Upper class	11,1	8,8	74,6	77,2	3,6	4,4	1,9	1,0
Upper middle class	15,1	13,4	65,6	73,7	4,2	5,0	4,6	2,8
Lower middle class	14,2	11,5	56,8	62,5	3,4	4,3	5,6	3,0
Lower class	9,7	6,4	65,0	70,6	2,3	2,8	4,9	2,9

As expected, the rate of living in the same house among extended families is much higher compared to other household types. Proportion of broken families that live in the same house with their daughters (30%) and sons (31%) are lower in broken families.

The highest degree of variation in terms socioeconomic status is found in the proportion of households where individuals live in the same house with their kids. In 80% of the high upper class households, individuals live in the same house with their kids . This rate drops down to 57% for daughters and 63% for sons in lower middle class (Table 104).

5.3. Frequency of Meeting with Relatives

Household members were asked of their frequency of face-to-face meeting with relatives that don't live in the same household and they were asked to choose an option among "we don't meet at all", "Several Times a year", "Several Times a Month", "Several Times a Week" and "everyday" (Table 105).

As for the frequency of seeing their mothers, 41% of individuals mentioned everyday, 22% mentioned Several Times a Week, 18% mentioned Several Times a year, and 18% mentioned Several Times a Month. Frequency of meeting with fathers was everyday for 39%, Several Times a Week for 21%, Several Times a year for 19% and Several Times a Month again for 19%.

Frequency of meeting with elder/younger sister is Several Times a Month for 30%, Several Times a Week for 25%, Several Times a year for 24% and everyday for 18%. Frequency of meeting with elder/younger brother is Several Times a Month for 29%, Several Times a Week for 23%, Several Times a year for 24% and everyday for 21%.

Different proportions were found in the frequency of meeting with kids. 69% of individuals meet with their daughters everyday, 13% of them meet their daughters Several Times a Week, 9% meet their daughters Several Times a Month and 8% of them meet their daughters Several Times a year. The proportion of those who meet with their sons everyday is 74% whereas 10% meet with their sons Several Times a Week, 8% of them meet with their daughters Several Times a year, and 7% meet with their daughters Several Times a Month.

The highest frequency of seeing maternal grandmothers, paternal grandmothers and grandfathers is Several Times a year. Again, the highest frequency of meeting relatives of third degree kinship such as paternal uncle, paternal aunt and maternal uncle is Several Times a year. Frequency of meeting with mother-in-law is Several Times a Week for 29%, Several Times a year for 27%, Several Times a Week for 24% and everyday for 17%. Frequency of meeting with father-in-law is Several Times a Month for 29%, Several Times a year for 28%, Several Times a Week for 24% and everyday for 16%. Nevertheless, relatives that are not met with at all most widely are paternal uncle (7%), maternal uncle (7%), paternal aunt (7%), paternal grandmother (6%), grandfather (5%) and maternal aunt (5%).

Table 105. Frequency of Meeting with Relatives throughout Türkiye

	Everyday	Several times a week	Several times a month	Several times a year	We don't meet with at all
Mother	40,8	22,2	17,7	18,3	0,9
Father	39,1	21,1	18,9	19,2	1,8
Daughter	68,7	13,3	9,2	8,3	0,6
Son	74,2	10,1	7,2	7,9	0,6
Elder/younger sister	18,4	25,4	30,2	24,3	1,8
Elder/younger brother	21,0	23,2	29,4	24,0	2,4
Paternal uncle	5,6	16,1	32,0	38,9	7,4
Maternal uncle	3,3	14,7	33,0	42,6	6,5
Maternal aunt	2,8	14,8	34,2	42,8	5,3
Paternal aunt	2,9	13,4	34,5	42,4	6,8
Mother-in-law	17,3	23,5	29,2	26,9	3,1
Father in-law	15,8	23,8	29,4	27,7	3,3
Maternal grandmother	6,4	17,2	31,4	41,0	4,0
Paternal grantmother	10,5	18,3	28,6	36,7	6,0
Grandfather	7,4	17,5	30,5	39,2	5,4

In Tables 106 & 107, proportions of frequently met (Several Times a Week or everyday) relatives both across Türkiye and as split into demographic breakdowns can be seen.

The most frequently met individuals across Türkiye are sons (84%), daughters (82%), mothers (63%) and fathers (60%). Proportions of individuals who meet with relatives of second degree kinship such as paternal uncle/paternal aunt/maternal aunt/maternal uncle range between 16 and 22%.

Proportions of individuals who frequently meet with all relatives apart from kids is higher in rural areas. Among the three major cities, the one with the highest percentage of households where individuals meet with all of their relatives apart from their kids for Several Times a Week or everyday is Izmir. Proportion of those who meet with their kids is higher in Istanbul.

A comparison of regions presents variation across regions with regard to frequency of meeting with paternal grandmother, grandfather, father-in-law and mother-in-law. The proportions of individuals who meet these relatives in the Mideast Anatolia (in percentages ranging from 38–53%) are relatively higher, but lower in Istanbul (in percentages ranging from 15-32%).

Proportions of those who meet with their mothers-in-law (49%) and fathers-in-law (%48) are higher among women as opposed to a higher proportion of men who meet with their own mothers (70%) and fathers (66%) (Table 107).

When evaluated by age group, as the age of the respondents get older, their frequencies of meeting with their mothers/fathers and siblings are seen to drop.

An evaluation based on educational status finds higher percentages of individuals who frequently meet with their relatives of first degree kinship (mother, father, kids, siblings) among those with no schooling, but lower percentages of individuals who frequently meet with their relatives of second degree kinship (paternal uncle, maternal uncle, paternal aunt, maternal aunt, maternal grandmother, paternal grandmother, grandfather, mother-in-law, father-in-law) among undergraduates/graduates. There's a higher proportion of individuals who frequently meet with all of their relatives among primary school/secondary school graduates. The greatest extent of variation based on educational status emerges in the frequency of meeting with parents. 72% of primary/secondary graduates meet with their mothers, and 69% of them with their fathers Several Times a Week or everyday. Among individuals with no schooling, the proportion of those who meet with their mothers with this frequency drops down to 50%, and that of those who meet with their fathers with this frequency to 46%.

As for household type analysis, the household type with the highest rate of meeting with relatives of all degrees is extended families whereas broken families rank the lowest in this regard. The area with the greatest degree of variation is seen in the frequency of meeting with father. 33% of individuals in broken families meet with their fathers Several Times a Week or everyday. This percentage is 61% in nuclear families and 69% in extended families.

The proportion of those who meet with their relatives of second kinship frequently is lower among high upper class. The greatest point of variation across socioeconomic classes is seen in the frequency of meeting with father-in-law. 27% of the individuals in the high upper class meet with their fathers-in-law Several Times a Week or everyday. This proportion is 43% in the lower class (Table 107).

Table 106. Frequency of Meeting with Relatives throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Everyday & Several Times a Week)

	Mother	Father	Daughter	Son	Elder/younger sister	Elder/younger brother	Paternal uncle	Maternal uncle	Maternal aunt	Paternal aunt	Mother-in-law	Father-in-law	Maternal grand-mother	Paternal grand-mother	Grand-father
Türkiye	63,0	60,1	82,0	84,3	43,8	44,2	21,7	17,9	17,6	16,3	40,8	39,6	23,6	28,7	24,9
RESIDENCE AREA															
Urban	61,1	57,9	86,3	87,7	43,8	43,8	18,6	15,4	16,0	14,2	37,6	36,0	21,8	25,4	21,7
Rural	69,4	67,6	72,8	77,1	43,7	45,1	31,5	25,6	22,7	23,0	49,9	50,4	30,9	43,2	38,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES															
Istanbul	57,0	53,7	89,3	91,4	43,7	44,5	17,8	13,7	13,9	11,2	31,7	29,5	18,7	18,5	15,3
Ankara	59,1	55,2	84,9	86,7	36,0	35,2	9,7	8,6	10,3	8,0	32,3	33,8	20,2	19,0	17,0
Izmir	68,0	65,0	84,6	86,0	49,2	46,6	22,7	19,4	21,1	19,1	44,2	45,4	33,4	37,0	27,7
NUTS															
Istanbul	57,0	53,7	89,3	91,4	43,7	44,5	17,8	13,7	13,9	11,2	31,7	29,5	18,7	18,5	15,3
West Marmara	60,2	56,9	74,9	71,2	41,7	41,4	24,3	20,1	22,4	18,6	39,6	38,6	21,9	23,9	27,1
East Marmara	61,3	57,6	82,1	85,0	41,8	42,4	18,3	14,0	14,6	13,1	39,0	37,3	16,4	22,7	20,8
Aegean	66,3	62,6	82,1	83,8	46,9	43,7	21,8	21,1	20,0	18,6	45,3	43,7	31,9	37,9	30,1
Mediterranean	64,1	61,4	85,5	86,8	43,5	44,7	20,0	16,9	17,4	14,9	41,4	40,1	20,2	24,1	25,2
West Anatolia	62,1	59,1	85,7	87,7	39,6	39,8	14,5	11,7	12,6	12,1	38,2	38,7	24,0	27,0	24,0
Central Anatolia	68,4	67,3	68,9	74,7	41,6	42,6	25,4	21,1	21,4	18,1	48,1	47,7	28,0	34,7	30,6
West Black Sea	63,7	60,2	67,7	71,6	37,6	37,7	24,5	19,6	16,6	19,6	42,6	43,0	23,8	37,4	31,7
East Black Sea	65,0	61,3	64,8	69,2	40,9	41,1	29,0	23,1	19,0	19,7	43,1	39,8	25,1	35,9	30,2
Northeast Anatolia	57,3	54,0	83,9	85,9	34,7	36,1	18,1	14,5	15,0	14,2	40,1	37,7	27,9	29,1	24,7
Mideast Anatolia	67,2	66,2	83,0	87,2	49,3	51,7	33,5	24,6	24,0	25,3	53,4	52,0	23,8	47,6	37,8

Table 107. Frequency of Meeting with Relatives by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Everyday & Several Times a Week)

	Mother	Father	Daughter	Son	Elder/younger sister	Elder/younger brother	Paternal uncle	Maternal uncle	Maternal aunt	Paternal aunt	Mother-in-law	Father-in-law	Maternal grand-mother	Paternal grand-mother	Grand-father
GENDER															
Male	69,5	66,3	82,5	84,2	45,6	49,9	25,5	20,8	18,5	17,7	33,8	32,1	24,6	32,0	28,3
Female	56,5	53,8	81,5	84,4	42,0	38,8	17,8	14,9	16,7	14,9	48,6	48,4	22,5	25,2	21,4
AGE															
18-24	80,1	75,6	95,1	94,7	69,8	70,4	29,1	23,7	23,9	22,2	57,3	56,9	29,4	34,7	31,7
25-34	60,5	57,8	97,3	96,7	45,3	46,7	20,0	16,5	16,7	15,0	41,5	40,3	18,3	23,3	17,9
35-44	54,2	50,3	93,4	93,4	40,6	39,3	17,6	15,2	15,5	13,7	38,4	36,5	18,6	21,1	18,1
45-54	56,9	51,2	80,1	83,9	34,4	35,2	19,5	16,3	14,4	14,6	36,9	35,4	29,2	25,2	14,4
55-64	57,6	45,4	67,1	72,0	35,2	34,2	21,1	17,4	16,4	14,7	39,0	32,5	17,2	5,6	7,0
65+	50,0	38,3	60,2	65,3	31,8	31,1	27,8	22,4	14,4	14,2	34,1	23,3	,0	,0	,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS															
No schooling	50,0	45,9	71,9	77,8	33,5	35,8	22,6	18,0	16,5	17,2	49,5	46,3	19,1	29,0	24,4
Primary school	54,7	51,7	80,9	84,2	38,9	39,0	20,4	16,5	15,7	15,4	40,1	38,2	18,5	26,0	18,4
Elementary school /secondary school	71,9	69,0	88,4	87,4	54,8	55,1	25,5	21,4	20,2	19,0	44,1	45,6	29,2	32,1	28,0
High school	70,1	66,1	89,6	89,0	50,9	52,1	23,3	18,8	20,0	17,2	41,0	39,7	25,8	31,7	29,7
Undergraduate /graduate studies	62,4	58,4	88,8	87,4	43,3	40,8	15,9	15,1	15,4	12,7	33,6	32,3	17,3	20,6	17,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE															
Nuclear	61,7	61,2	83,5	84,2	42,8	43,5	21,7	17,7	17,3	16,1	38,2	37,5	23,3	28,2	25,6
Extended	71,4	68,7	82,4	91,5	47,2	49,2	26,4	21,0	19,3	19,5	54,3	51,3	26,2	39,7	30,3
Broken	58,1	32,7	68,0	69,9	44,4	40,6	13,9	14,3	17,2	12,5	24,5	18,0	20,9	15,1	15,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS															
High upper class	55,3	50,1	90,5	88,6	40,7	36,2	12,1	8,8	12,5	8,2	34,2	26,7	21,3	17,8	19,5
Upper class	59,4	55,2	86,9	89,1	40,7	38,1	15,1	15,0	14,5	11,4	37,1	37,3	17,7	20,5	14,6
Upper middle class	65,5	64,7	85,1	86,8	43,9	45,5	21,2	17,0	17,7	15,8	40,8	40,9	25,5	29,1	26,3
Lower middle class	64,7	61,5	80,9	83,2	45,1	45,7	23,4	19,4	18,3	18,0	41,7	40,1	26,1	33,1	29,4
Lower class	56,9	53,9	83,1	86,0	40,3	44,4	26,3	21,1	17,2	18,3	45,1	43,1	19,5	26,3	23,9

5.4. Sharing Feelings and Thoughts with Family Members

Within the scope of the research, all individuals were asked questions regarding the frequency of sharing their feelings and thoughts with their relatives.

Individuals share their feelings and thoughts mostly with their kids. The proportion of those who always share their feelings and thoughts with their daughters is 63% and that of those who share their feelings and thoughts with their sons is 60%. When the responders of this question were analysed in terms of sharing feelings and thoughts with parents, it's seen that 52% of them always share their feelings and thoughts with their mothers, whereas 39% of them do this occasionally; and that 42% of them always share their feelings and thoughts with their fathers and 43% sometimes do. The proportion of not sharing feelings and thoughts is 9% for mothers, and this rate rises to 15% for fathers (Table 108).

Those who always share their feelings and thoughts with their sisters account for 34% whereas the proportion of those who occasionally do this is 51%. This rate lags back to 28% for elder / younger brother in "always" option, and rises to 52% in "occasionally" option.

When sharings with in-laws are analysed, it's understood that 16% always share their feelings with their mothers-in-law, 51% occasionally do this, and 33% don't share their feelings and thoughts with mothers-in-law at all. 14% always share their feelings and thoughts with their fathers-in-law whereas 50% share them occasionally and 36% don't share them at all with their fathers-in-law.

Among relatives with whom feelings and thoughts are not shared at all, there are paternal aunts, maternal uncle, paternal uncle, maternal aunt, paternal grandmother, maternal grandmother and grandfather. Individuals state not sharing their feelings and thoughts with this group of relatives at all with proportions ranging from 41-46%
.

Table 108. Frequency of Sharing Feelings and Thoughts with Relatives throughout Türkiye

	Always	Occasionally	Never
Mother	51,9	39,4	8,7
Father	41,5	43,2	15,3
Daughter	62,5	25,8	11,7
Son	60,2	27,6	12,3
Elder/younger sister	33,9	50,6	15,5
Elder/younger sister	27,9	51,9	20,3
Paternal uncle	9,3	44,9	45,9
Maternal uncle	8,7	46,7	44,7
Maternal aunt	9,9	49,0	41,1
Paternal aunt	7,9	48,2	43,9
Mother-in-law	15,8	51,0	33,2
Father-in-law	13,6	50,3	36,0
Maternal grandmother	9,9	47,5	42,5
Paternal grandmother	9,7	45,7	44,6
Grandfather	8,4	46,8	44,8

In Tables 109 & 110, proportions of individuals sharing their feelings and thoughts with their relatives are provided in several breakdowns. Values covered in the table indicate proportions of individuals who state sharing feelings and thoughts "always".

Although similar proportions are observed in rural and urban breakdowns, rural areas present a higher proportion of people sharing feelings and thoughts with their parents. Those who share their feelings and thoughts with their parents account for 55% in the rural areas and 51% in the urban areas whereas those who share their feelings and thoughts with their fathers account for 45% in the rural areas and 40% in the urban areas.

The three major cities differ from one another mostly in terms of sharings with immediate relatives (mother, father, kids). The city with the highest rate of individuals who always share their feelings and thoughts with mother, father and kids is Izmir; and Ankara ranks as the lowest in this regard.

Across the regions, it's generally seen that the proportion of those who state sharing their feelings and thoughts with almost all of their relatives is relatively higher in East Black Sea , but lower in Southeast Anatolia. A wider degree of discrepancy is seen among regions in terms of proportion of individuals sharing their feelings and thoughts with their kids. 74% of individuals in Mideast Anatolia and 72% of those in East Black Sea mention always sharing their feelings and thoughts with their daughters whereas this rate is 38% in Southeast Anatolia. The proportion of those who state sharing their feelings and thoughts with their sons accounts for 71% in Mideast Anatolia, 68% in East Black Sea and 36% in Southeast Anatolia.

Greater proportions of female population always share their feelings and thoughts with their daughters (67%), their elder/younger sisters (41%) and their mothers-in-law (20%) compared to male population. However, men have a higher proportion who share their feelings and thoughts with their fathers (44%) (Table 110).

The age group of 18-24 seems to have a greater

proportion that always shares feelings and thoughts with almost all relatives. Since their kids are at younger ages, this rate of sharing drops when it comes to their kids. But there's frequent and higher degree of sharing with relatives of secondary kinship such as paternal uncles, maternal aunts, paternal aunts and maternal uncles in the age group of 65+.

When evaluated by marital status, the greatest extent of variation is seen in terms of sharings with siblings. 54% of single individuals always share their feelings and thoughts with elder/younger sisters and 49% with their elder/younger brothers. This proportion gets down to 29% for elder/younger sisters and to 23% for elder/younger brothers among married individuals.

With rising levels of educational status, the proportions of always sharing feelings and thoughts with mothers/fathers rise. Among those with no schooling, 44% frequently share their feelings and thoughts with their mothers, 33% with their fathers, 28% with their elder/younger sisters, and 22% with their elder/younger brothers. Among undergraduates/graduates, these rates rise up to 58% for mothers, 48% for fathers, 41% for elder/younger sisters and 34% for elder/younger brothers.

When compared by household type, individuals from broken families are seen to share feelings and thoughts with their mothers (63%), daughters (71%), sons (65%), elder/younger sisters (46%) and elder/younger brothers (38%) in greater proportions whereas extended families have a higher proportion of individuals sharing their feelings and thoughts with mothers-in-law(24%) and father-in-law (21%).

As socioeconomic class is raised, the proportion of those who always share their feelings and thoughts with their kids and siblings rises. The greatest point of divergence across socioeconomic classes is about sharings with elder/younger sister. In the lower class, 25% of individuals state always sharing their feelings and thoughts with their elder/younger sisters whereas this rate is raised up to 42% in the high upper class (Table 110).

Table 109. Frequency of Sharing Feelings and Thoughts with Relatives throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Always)

	Mother	Father	Daughter	Son	Elder/younger sister	Elder/younger brother	Paternal uncle	Maternal uncle	Maternal aunt	Paternal aunt	Mother-in-law	Father-in-law	Maternal grandmother	Paternal grandmother	Grandfather
Türkiye	51,9	41,5	62,5	60,2	33,9	27,9	9,3	8,7	9,9	7,9	15,8	13,6	9,9	9,7	8,4
RESIDENCE AREA															
Urban	50,9	40,3	63,3	59,9	34,6	28,2	8,8	8,3	9,8	7,8	15,3	13,1	10,0	9,6	8,4
Rural	55,0	45,4	60,9	60,6	32,2	27,1	10,8	9,7	10,5	8,2	17,3	15,3	9,6	10,0	8,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES															
Istanbul	52,8	43,1	68,2	65,2	37,9	32,8	13,3	11,5	11,6	9,5	17,0	14,4	11,5	10,7	7,1
Ankara	48,2	35,5	65,2	60,5	36,8	26,8	5,4	5,2	7,4	6,4	16,4	14,5	11,2	10,6	12,8
Izmir	58,7	50,6	73,7	71,6	37,0	29,7	7,3	7,6	9,7	7,5	16,2	13,4	11,5	14,2	8,4
NUTS															
Istanbul	52,8	43,1	68,2	65,2	37,9	32,8	13,3	11,5	11,6	9,5	17,0	14,4	11,5	10,7	7,1
West Marmara	53,4	44,0	63,7	63,1	32,1	24,2	5,4	6,5	9,4	5,9	17,2	14,6	7,7	5,2	3,4
East Marmara	53,4	43,0	66,8	64,1	35,5	30,4	10,6	9,3	11,7	9,8	15,6	13,7	11,6	11,1	10,8
Aegean	53,3	45,3	68,8	66,4	33,2	24,6	6,1	6,6	9,3	5,8	13,6	11,4	8,8	8,5	5,1
Mediterranean	48,2	37,6	62,3	61,9	30,5	26,1	5,7	7,0	7,5	5,0	13,6	12,5	10,5	7,2	10,6
West Anatolia	43,2	31,8	63,2	59,6	33,8	25,4	5,2	5,1	7,0	5,9	15,1	12,8	9,0	8,9	10,7
Central Anatolia	50,3	39,7	50,2	48,2	29,0	24,8	11,2	7,9	7,7	7,3	16,6	15,4	6,8	7,2	6,9
West Black Sea	54,8	45,6	62,0	56,5	29,4	24,4	7,3	7,2	6,9	5,7	12,6	11,2	5,4	7,1	8,6
East Black Sea	67,8	58,7	72,2	68,0	50,4	43,5	26,2	24,3	28,1	25,0	35,5	31,9	19,9	27,6	22,5
Northeast Anatolia	50,7	39,7	52,4	51,7	24,9	20,7	7,4	6,7	7,9	6,9	11,1	12,7	6,0	13,8	11,4
Mideast Anatolia	63,7	49,1	73,7	70,5	48,3	38,3	14,4	12,4	16,6	14,8	25,3	21,8	14,9	21,3	15,1
Southeast Anatolia	48,3	35,9	38,0	36,4	26,3	21,6	6,3	6,1	6,0	5,0	11,5	8,1	6,7	5,5	3,4

Table 110. Frequency of Sharing Feelings and Thoughts with Relatives by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES (Always)

	Mother	Father	Daughter	Son	Elder/younger sister	Elder/younger brother	Paternal uncle	Maternal uncle	Maternal aunt	Paternal aunt	Mother-in-law	Father-in-law	Maternal grand-mother	Paternal grand-mother	Grand-father
GENDER															
Male	50,1	44,0	57,4	57,9	26,8	29,2	10,2	9,1	8,6	6,6	12,0	11,4	9,7	9,8	8,4
Female	53,7	38,9	67,0	62,1	40,9	26,6	8,3	8,1	11,4	9,2	20,0	16,3	10,2	9,6	8,5
AGE															
18-24	64,6	49,3	50,9	48,7	49,4	42,4	10,0	9,9	12,2	8,8	23,8	20,2	11,5	10,7	9,3
25-34	52,1	41,8	53,5	49,9	35,2	28,9	8,3	8,3	9,4	7,3	16,0	14,2	8,9	9,1	7,7
35-44	44,9	34,9	64,7	62,0	30,7	23,5	9,1	8,5	9,3	7,8	14,1	12,3	7,7	7,8	7,2
45-54	43,8	35,2	67,6	65,3	27,9	22,5	9,4	7,8	8,8	7,8	15,2	10,7	8,0	6,4	5,7
55-64	44,6	32,0	65,0	63,2	28,8	23,9	11,6	7,8	9,3	7,6	14,3	13,5	11,3	,0	,0
65+	47,6	46,1	62,9	61,6	30,3	25,5	12,7	14,4	11,9	13,1	16,0	12,6	,0	,0	,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS															
No schooling	44,3	32,7	59,5	58,2	28,1	22,0	6,6	6,3	8,2	8,2	17,5	12,2	5,8	5,2	3,9
Primary school	45,0	35,8	63,8	61,5	29,4	23,0	8,9	7,2	7,5	6,8	14,3	12,0	7,3	9,2	6,6
Elementary/secondary school	55,3	42,8	62,5	57,9	38,9	33,3	12,0	11,1	11,9	9,6	19,0	17,3	11,0	10,1	8,4
High school	56,0	44,5	63,6	61,0	38,3	33,0	8,9	9,3	11,1	8,3	16,2	13,9	9,8	9,9	8,7
Undergraduate/graduate studies	57,5	47,6	60,8	59,3	41,0	33,5	8,2	8,8	11,6	7,0	14,5	13,4	11,8	9,9	9,7
MARITAL STATUS															
Single	68,6	53,7	53,6	55,0	54,3	48,9	10,9	10,8	12,9	9,1	11,4	22,7	12,7	11,8	10,5
Married	44,8	35,6	61,6	59,5	28,5	22,7	8,6	7,9	8,8	7,4	15,9	13,7	7,6	7,4	6,1
Separated / live apart	66,8	50,5	61,8	63,1	50,8	45,3	13,4	11,9	10,5	10,2	6,1	5,3	,0	12,2	,0
Widowed	52,1	40,0	69,8	67,3	37,6	27,6	7,9	5,5	9,2	6,7	20,4	12,3	,0	,0	9,3
Divorced	64,3	48,4	73,7	60,8	44,7	29,6	9,1	9,0	12,2	9,1	1,8	3,3	18,6	21,4	19,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE															
Nuclear	48,9	40,1	62,2	59,3	32,2	26,1	8,9	8,2	9,5	7,4	14,0	12,3	9,1	8,5	7,1
Extended	57,2	46,5	59,7	61,3	33,8	29,3	10,6	9,1	9,8	8,7	24,2	20,5	9,5	13,4	10,9
Broken	63,4	43,6	71,1	64,8	45,5	37,8	9,4	11,0	13,2	9,6	13,5	9,6	15,6	11,4	13,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS															
High upper class	52,4	42,6	63,6	64,6	42,3	32,0	6,2	8,6	12,9	7,6	14,8	13,9	16,8	12,3	8,9
Upper class	54,0	45,7	66,0	63,0	38,0	30,5	9,3	8,7	11,6	7,7	17,6	15,4	11,4	8,0	8,7
Upper middle class	53,9	43,4	66,3	62,1	37,1	29,6	10,1	8,7	10,5	8,4	17,1	14,2	9,7	10,5	9,2
Lower middle class	51,1	40,3	62,9	60,5	32,4	26,5	10,0	8,9	9,4	7,9	15,4	13,7	9,6	10,1	8,1
Lower class	44,0	34,2	51,3	51,0	25,0	22,2	5,4	5,4	6,0	6,3	14,5	11,7	4,6	5,4	1,6

Chapter 6

CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY AND APPROACHES TOWARDS CHILDREN

The data regarding the Number of Children individuals have, their willingness to have kids, relationship parents build with kids, opinions regarding kids, areas of conflict with kids and the punishments parents impose on kids are covered.

6.1. Number of Children

32% of individuals who have kids in Türkiye have two kids. The proportion of individuals with three kids is 20%. In this case, it's understood that a number of people slightly higher than half of those who have kids have two and three kids. The proportion of individuals with four kids is 10%, and that of those with five kids is 5%; and 17% of individuals have one kid (Table 111).

When analysed by Residence Area, it can be concluded that inhabitants of rural areas have more kids than those who live in the urban areas. For instance, the proportion of individuals with four or more kids is 18% in the urban areas whereas this rate goes up to 34% in the rural areas. Those with a single kid account for 12% of rural population, but for 19% in the urban.

A comparison of three major cities indicate similar number of children in families. Nevertheless, Izmir has a higher proportion of individuals with two kids.

When regions are compared, the Number of Children individuals have drops from the East towards the West. The proportion of individuals with six or more kids is 8% throughout Türkiye, but 30% in Southeast Anatolia. West Marmara is the region with the highest frequency of having a single kid. One fourth of individuals with children (23%) in this region have a single kid. The proportion of individuals with two kids is 32% throughout Türkiye, and the regions that vary most from the rest of Türkiye are Aegean (41%) and Southeast Anatolia (17%) regions.

Table 111. Number of Children throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	With no living kid	1 Kid	2 Kids	3 Kids	4 Kids	5 Kids	6 Kids+
Türkiye	8,2	16,7	31,9	20,1	10,0	5,1	7,9
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	8,7	18,8	34,3	19,8	8,8	4,0	5,5
Rural	6,9	11,7	26,4	20,8	12,9	7,8	13,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	9,8	19,9	36,5	19,3	7,9	3,0	3,6
Ankara	8,6	19,5	38,0	19,3	7,8	4,0	2,8
Izmir	8,6	20,9	43,6	15,3	6,0	2,7	2,8
NUTS							
Istanbul	9,8	19,9	36,5	19,3	7,9	3,0	3,6
West Marmara	8,2	23,2	37,4	21,4	6,2	2,3	1,3
East Marmara	8,8	21,4	34,1	19,4	9,8	3,6	2,9
Aegean	6,8	20,6	40,7	19,3	6,8	3,3	2,6
Meditarrenean	9,0	13,6	32,9	20,2	10,4	4,9	9,1
West Anatolia	8,3	17,2	33,0	22,8	10,1	4,6	4,1
Central Anatolia	8,7	12,7	24,0	21,4	13,5	7,7	11,9
West Black Sea	7,3	12,6	28,4	23,7	15,1	8,0	5,0
East Black Sea	7,3	11,6	26,5	24,9	11,3	7,4	11,0
Northeast Anatolia	5,4	13,1	19,9	18,3	16,3	11,0	15,9
Mideast Anatolia	5,6	10,9	19,9	18,7	12,4	10,7	21,8
Southeast Anatolia	8,2	9,7	17,1	15,0	12,2	8,2	29,5

In more advanced age groups, proportions of those with no kid or a single kid get lower. On the other hand, the proportion of those with no kid or a single kid in 18-34 age group is relatively higher. The age group of 35-44 is has got the highest proportion of individuals with two kids (Table 112).

In broken and extended families, numbers of kids are higher compared to nuclear families. The proportion of those with four or more kids is 28% among extended families, 32% among broken families and 21% among nuclear families.

As educational status rises, the number kids drops. For instance, among the individuals with no school-ing, those who have a single kid account for 6%, but the proportion of those with four or more kids is 57%. Among university graduates, the proportion of those with a single kid is 30% whereas only 3% have got four or more kids.

A similar condition prevails in terms of socioeconomic classes. With rising socioeconomic status, the Number of Children drops. For instance, 34% of individuals in the high upper class have single kids whereas the same rate drops as low as 11% in the lower class. Individuals with four or more kids account for 3% of high upper class, and this rate reaches to 38% in the lower class.

Table 112. Number of Children by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	With no living kid	1 Kid	2 Kids	3 Kids	4 Kids	5 Kids	6 Kids+
GENDER							
Male	8,8	17,0	32,1	19,8	9,7	4,9	7,7
Female	7,7	16,4	31,8	20,4	10,3	5,3	8,1
AGE							
18-24	37,3	40,6	18,7	3,0	,1	,2	,1
25-34	15,3	31,1	36,6	10,9	3,8	1,5	,7
35-44	4,2	15,1	40,3	24,4	8,5	3,4	4,2
45-54	3,6	9,9	33,5	26,3	12,4	5,6	8,6
55-64	2,9	6,4	25,9	24,9	16,8	9,5	13,5
65+	3,5	5,0	17,1	21,4	17,3	11,8	23,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
No schooling	3,7	6,4	14,3	18,7	15,8	11,9	29,3
Primary school	4,1	11,0	32,5	26,2	13,3	6,2	6,6
Elementary /secondary school	12,4	25,1	34,3	17,4	6,9	2,2	1,6
High school	12,6	26,3	41,4	14,1	3,7	,9	1,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	19,2	29,9	38,7	9,6	1,5	,8	,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	7,5	16,6	34,6	20,5	9,7	4,5	6,5
Extended	10,5	17,3	25,2	18,5	10,5	6,0	11,9
Broken	9,4	16,0	22,9	20,1	11,6	8,9	11,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
High upper class	20,1	33,7	37,2	6,0	2,2	,0	,8
Upper class	15,2	23,7	40,4	14,5	3,5	1,0	1,7
Upper middle class	8,4	19,1	36,6	22,1	8,2	2,7	2,8
Lower middle class	6,9	14,7	29,9	21,5	11,7	6,4	8,8
Lower class	3,7	10,9	27,2	19,7	14,1	7,3	17,0

6.2. Desired Number of Children

Individuals who participated in the research were asked about the number of children they wanted to have if they had the means for it. Across Türkiye, 38% of individuals want two kids and 32% want three kids. The proportion of those who want a single kid is pretty low (4%). And the proportion of those who want to have six or more kids is only 5% (Table 113).

Although not much of variation is seen in the number of children wanted by Residence Area, individuals living in rural areas have a higher proportion who want three or more kids. The proportion people who want to have two kids in rural areas is 33%, and 40% in urban areas. On the other hand, the proportion who want to have three or more kids is 55% in the urban areas and 64% in the rural areas.

From the East towards the West, the desired number of children tends to drop. The proportion of individuals who want to have two kids in Southeast Anatolia Region is 19% and who want to have three kids is 26%. Again in this region, those who want to

have four kids account for 26%. In West Marmara region an opposite tendency to Southeast Anatolia region is seen. Those who want two kids in West Marmara Region account for 52%, and those who want three kids account for 29% whereas 7% want four kids.

In the comparison of three major cities, those who want two kids in Izmir account for 53% which is higher than other two major cities. Istanbul and Ankara have higher proportions of individuals who want three kids.

Although not much of differentiation is recorded genderwise, there's a relatively greater proportion of women who want to have one or two kids versus a higher proportion of men who desire to have five or more kids (Table 114).

When age groups are analysed, the number of children desired is seen tor ise as the age gets older. 27% of individuals at 65 years or older want two kids and 37% want to have more than three kids. Among the 18–24 year olds, 52% want to have two kids and 14% want to have more than three.

Table 113. Desired Number of Children throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Don't want kids	1 kid	2 kids	3 kids	4 kids	5 kids	6+ kids
Türkiye	0,5	3,8	38,1	32,2	14,3	5,7	5,4
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	0,5	4,3	40,2	31,6	13,7	5,3	4,4
Rural	0,6	2,6	32,8	33,7	15,9	6,7	7,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	0,4	4,5	45,1	31,1	11,9	4,5	2,5
Ankara	0,8	5,3	44,9	30,1	11,6	4,2	3,1
Izmir	0,4	5,9	52,3	24,3	10,3	3,5	3,3
NUTS							
Istanbul	0,4	4,5	45,1	31,1	11,9	4,5	2,5
West Marmara	0,8	7,8	51,7	28,6	6,4	3,2	1,5
East Marmara	0,6	4,5	41,5	36,2	10,0	3,7	3,5
Aegean	0,4	4,7	46,4	31,9	10,1	3,6	2,9
Mediterranean	1,1	2,3	30,8	31,5	20,7	7,1	6,5
West Anatolia	0,6	4,3	39,3	33,1	13,4	4,8	4,5
Central Anatolia	0,4	3,3	33,2	34,7	14,3	7,1	7,0
West Black Sea	0,3	4,0	44,7	33,2	10,0	4,7	3,0
East Black Sea	0,4	3,0	30,6	41,0	13,1	6,0	5,9
Northeast Anatolia	0,3	1,0	28,4	30,6	22,6	7,5	9,5
Mideast Anatolia	0,2	1,5	22,9	33,6	19,9	10,2	11,6
Southeast Anatolia	0,2	1,7	18,8	25,9	26,4	11,5	15,5

Educational status and the desired number of children are inversely proportional. As educational status raises, the desired number of children is reduced. Similarly, as socioeconomic status rises the desired number of children drop. Half of university graduates (51%) intend to have two kids and this figure drops down to 33% among primary school graduates, and to 21% among those with no schooling. Among broken families, the desired number of children is smaller compared to other household types, but higher in extended families. 51% of individuals in broken families want either one or two

kids whereas 53% of nuclear families and 36% of extended families prefer to have this number of children.

The desired number of children increase as socioeconomic class gets lower. 26% of lower class, 43% of upper middle class, and 54% of high upper class state that they do / would desire to have two kids if had the means for it. On the other hand, the proportion of individuals who want four or more kids is 17% in high upper class, and 40% in lower class.

Table 114. Desired Number of Children by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Don't want kids	1 kid	2 kids	3 kids	4 kids	5 kids	6+ kids
GENDER							
Male	0,5	3,1	36,4	33,5	12,9	7,1	6,6
Female	0,6	4,5	39,9	30,9	15,7	4,3	4,1
AGE							
18-24	0,4	5,6	51,7	28,5	9,5	2,6	1,7
25-34	0,4	4,0	41,8	33,3	13,1	4,5	2,8
35-44	0,3	3,3	34,1	34,3	16,2	6,1	5,7
45-54	0,5	3,1	33,9	32,8	16,5	6,5	6,7
55-64	0,9	3,0	33,6	31,0	16,1	7,7	7,7
65+	1,1	3,0	27,0	31,6	15,8	9,5	12,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
No schooling	1,1	3,0	21,1	27,8	21,7	10,0	15,3
Primary school	0,4	2,7	33,2	35,7	16,2	6,4	5,4
Elementary/secondary school	0,2	4,2	41,4	35,0	12,5	3,7	3,1
High school	0,5	5,4	47,1	29,5	10,7	4,2	2,6
Undergraduate/graduate studies	0,6	4,6	50,8	27,3	9,7	4,4	2,5
MARITAL STATUS							
Single	0,5	6,0	52,9	27,9	8,5	2,6	1,6
Married	0,5	3,1	34,3	33,8	16,0	6,4	6,1
Separated / live apart	1,3	10,6	47,9	22,4	10,8	2,9	4,1
Widowed	1,0	3,1	30,6	30,2	16,0	9,2	10,0
Divorced	0,9	8,4	52,8	24,8	7,8	3,0	2,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	0,5	3,6	38,1	32,8	14,4	5,6	5,0
Extended	0,4	2,7	33,6	33,2	16,1	6,7	7,3
Broken	0,9	6,4	45,0	27,2	11,3	4,8	4,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
High upper class	0,8	5,7	54,2	22,3	9,8	5,2	2,0
Upper class	0,5	4,2	47,0	28,8	12,2	4,3	3,1
Upper middle class	0,3	4,3	43,3	32,2	12,2	4,5	3,2
Lower middle class	0,5	3,3	35,4	34,0	15,2	6,2	5,3
Lower class	0,5	2,3	25,7	31,7	20,1	8,5	11,2

6.3. Desired Gender of Children

Respondents were asked the gender of kids they wanted if they had one kid. According to findings, 15% of individuals in Türkiye indicated their desire to have boy child whereas 13% wanted to have girl child. 71% of individuals said that the gender of the desired kid "didn't matter" for them (Table 115).

In terms of residence area, no significant difference is detected across the desired gender of kids. Only the proportion of those who want girls is higher in urban areas (15%) compared to rural areas while a relatively larger proportion of individuals (74%) in rural areas state that the gender doesn't matter for them.

Opinions regarding the gender of the kid vary in certain regions. Southeast Anatolia stands out with the highest proportion of respondents (27%) who want to have boy child. This region is followed by Mideast Anatolia with 20%. The regions with highest proportion of respondents who think that gender doesn't matter are East Marmara and Aegean Regions (77%). An analysis of the breakdown of

three major cities shows that Ankara has the highest frequency of individuals who want to have girl child (19%). A greater proportion of respondents in Izmir do not mind having either gender of kids compared to other two major cities.

The proportion of those who want boy child is higher among men (19%) whereas a higher proportion of women who want girl child (18%). In terms of age, a greater proportion of 18-24 year olds stated that they want either girl or boy. Accordingly, this is the age group with the lowest proportion of respondents who say gender of the kid doesn't matter (65%) (Table 116).

Upon a look at marital status, a greater proportion of single individuals is understood to desire boy child (20%) compared to other individuals. Divorced respondents have a higher proportion who want girl child (22%) than other individuals.

It's remarked that there's no strong corelation between educational status and the number of people who want boy child. 18% of individuals with no schooling want boy child whereas this rate is 15%

Table 115. Desired Gender of Children throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Boy	Girl	Doesn't matter
Türkiye	15,4	13,4	71,2
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	15,3	14,5	70,2
Rural	15,9	10,4	73,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	13,4	15,4	71,2
Ankara	14,8	19,3	66,0
Izmir	11,2	12,8	76,0
NUTS			
Istanbul	13,4	15,4	71,2
West Marmara	14,1	14,6	71,3
East Marmara	12,8	9,8	77,4
Aegean	11,3	11,4	77,3
Mediterranean	14,7	12,4	72,9
West Anatolia	16,1	17,9	66,1
Central Anatolia	18,2	13,1	68,7
West Black Sea	15,5	13,3	71,1
East Black Sea	17,8	12,7	69,6
Northeast Anatolia	13,2	11,5	75,3
Mideast Anatolia	19,8	14,0	66,2
Southeast Anatolia	27,0	12,6	60,5

among university graduates. However, greater variation is seen in terms of the desire to have girl child. It can be concluded that the number of people who want to have girl child rises as educational status gets higher. The proportion of those who want girl child is 12% among respondents with no schooling, but it gets as high as 18% among university graduates.

A similar finding applies to the corelation between the desired gender of kid and socioeconomic class. The rate of those who want boy child doesn't differ much across socioeconomic classes. For example,

14% of high upper class want boy child while the same rate is 16% in the lower class. The proportion of those who want girl child rises as socioeconomic class gets higher. 21% of high upper class want girl child, and this rate is 12% in lower class. Preferences regarding the desired gender of kid varies by household type. The proportion of those who want boy child is higher (18%) in extended families, those who want girl child account for a greater proportion of broken families (17%) and there's a greater proportion of people who don't mind having either gender of kids among nuclear families (72%).

Table 116. Desired Gender of Children by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Boy	Girl	Doesn't matter
GENDER			
Male	19,2	8,5	72,3
Female	11,7	18,2	70,1
AGE			
18-24	19,7	15,5	64,9
25-34	15,3	15,7	69,0
35-44	15,1	12,2	72,7
45-54	12,9	12,1	75,0
55-64	14,0	11,0	75,0
65+	15,1	11,3	73,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	17,5	11,8	70,7
Primary school	13,6	11,6	74,7
Elementary school /secondary school	16,0	12,5	71,5
High school	17,0	15,4	67,6
Undergraduate/graduate studies	15,2	17,7	67,1
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	19,5	15,5	64,9
Married	14,6	12,5	72,9
Separated / live apart	8,4	17,9	73,8
Widowed	13,6	12,6	73,9
Divorced	13,0	22,3	64,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	14,9	13,0	72,1
Extended	18,1	12,2	69,8
Broken	15,0	16,9	68,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	14,3	21,4	64,2
Upper class	14,1	17,9	68,1
Upper middle class	14,9	14,2	71,0
Lower middle class	15,4	11,7	72,9
Lower class	16,2	12,2	71,6

6.4. Adopted Children and Kinship with Adopted Children

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked if they have foster kids or not, and if any, whether they have adopted them or not. According to findings, having foster kids is not a common phenomenon in the generality of Türkiye. Only

0.4% of individuals throughout Türkiye have foster kids and only half of this percentage have adopted their foster kids. These findings do not vary in urban and rural areas (Table 117).

Within the scope of the research, individuals were found to have kinship relation to their foster kids (57%) (Table 118).

Table 117. Adoption of Children throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area

	Yes, I have adopted	Yes, but I haven't adopted	No
Türkiye	0,2	0,2	99,6
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	0,2	0,2	99,6
Rural	0,2	0,2	99,6

Table 118. Adoption of Children / Kinship with Foster Children

	Yes	No
Türkiye	57,0	43,0

6.5. Perceptions regarding Methods That Couples Who Fail to Have Children through Natural Means Should Use

Within the scope of the research, individuals were explained the methods that may be used in case natural means of having kids don't work and they were asked to indicate their attitudes by choosing one of the options of "yes", "no" and "no idea". The unnatural method that individuals regarded most positively about having a kid is fostering a kid (83%). The second most popular method is test-tube baby service

(78%). The method of being foster parents follows the first two methods with 77% of votes. Adopting the kid of a relative is another method which receives a higher percentage of positive responses (61%). Although votes for options such as "Applying to sperm bank or egg bank" are smaller, 16% of individuals are open to this idea. The proportion of those who think that one may get a divorce and marry someone else in case of failure to have a child is 12%. On the other hand, there's a lower percentage of people who think that they should not try any methods at all (6%).(Table 119).

Table 119. Perceptions regarding Methods Couples Who Fail to Have Kids through Natural Means Should Use throughout Türkiye

	Yes	No	No idea
A kid may be fostered (from Social Services and Child Protection Institution)	82,7	12,1	5,2
The kid of a relative may be adopted	60,7	32,5	6,9
They may become foster parents	76,6	15,8	7,7
They may use test-tube baby service	78,4	15,0	6,6
They should not try anything (Act of God)	6,1	88,1	5,8
They may get a divorce and marry someone else	11,7	82,0	6,3
They may apply to sperm bank	15,9	68,3	15,8
They may apply to egg bank	16,2	67,9	16,0

Opinions regarding the behaviors of couples who fail to have kids through natural means are analysed in several breakdowns (Table 120 & 121). Accordingly, there's a greater proportion of respondents who are open to adopting the kid of a relative in rural ar-

eas (68%) than in urban areas (58%). As opposed to this, having a kid through sperm or egg bank is a more acceptable view in urban areas (18%) than in (12%) rural areas. 81% of urban residents and 71% of rural residents are open to test-tube baby service.

The proportion of people who regard adopting kids from Social Services and Child Protection Institution positively is 83% across Türkiye whereas the region with the lowest rating in this regard is Northeast Anatolia (69%). This region is at the same time the one with the lowest proportion of respondents who are open to test-tube baby service (51%) and with the highest proportion of respondents who think that couples who fail to have kids through natural means should not try to do anything (16%).

The proportion of respondents who regard the method of adopting a child of a relative positively is 61% throughout Türkiye. In this regard, the regions that differentiate most from the rest of Türkiye are Aegean (55%) and Mediterranean (70%) regions. 77% of respondents are positive about being foster parents across Türkiye. This proportion is 86% in East Marmara and 55% in Northeast Anatolia.

Those who are positive about adopting a child (89%) and getting a divorce and marrying someone else (%19) are divorced individuals. Those who say they may apply to a sperm or egg bank are mostly single and divorced individuals.

Opinions with regard to the behaviors of couples who fail to have kids through natural means vary by socioeconomic class. The proportion of those who are open to adopting a relative's child is 67% in lower socioeconomic class whereas this rate drops back to 52% in high upper class. The number of people who like the idea of becoming foster parents and using test-tube baby service rises with rising levels of socioeconomic class. In lower class, 66% are open to becoming foster parents whereas this rate is 89% in high upper class (Table 121).

Table 120. Perceptions regarding Methods Couples Who Fail to Have Child through Natural Means Should Use throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Yes)

	Adopting child	Adopting one the relatives' kids	Becoming foster parents	Test-tube baby service	Should not try anything (act of God)	Getting a divorce and marrying someone else	Sperm bank	Egg bank
Türkiye	82,7	60,7	76,6	78,4	6,1	11,7	15,9	16,2
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	82,9	57,8	78,0	81,3	5,9	11,7	17,3	17,7
Rural	82,1	68,0	72,8	70,8	6,5	11,7	12,2	12,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	81,3	56,1	75,3	81,2	5,0	9,4	17,7	18,0
Ankara	87,2	56,7	83,2	88,3	4,6	10,0	20,8	21,5
Izmir	88,0	55,6	84,8	86,9	4,4	9,0	24,9	24,9
NUTS								
Istanbul	81,3	56,1	75,3	81,2	5,0	9,4	17,7	18,0
West Marmara	84,6	62,4	78,5	77,9	9,0	10,5	15,3	15,2
East Marmara	87,0	62,4	85,6	82,6	5,9	14,2	12,0	12,4
Aegean	84,9	54,6	80,1	80,3	3,8	8,1	18,6	18,6
Mediterranean	88,0	69,7	79,8	83,5	6,0	17,6	19,0	19,0
West Anatolia	83,9	57,7	81,9	84,5	5,4	10,8	19,9	20,8
Central Anatolia	88,9	62,2	84,0	78,9	8,6	19,5	16,4	16,9
West Black Sea	79,1	57,7	74,7	79,2	4,2	5,3	7,5	7,8
East Black Sea	78,1	65,5	77,5	77,8	4,6	7,9	7,6	7,5
Northeast Anatolia	68,5	58,5	54,7	51,3	16,0	13,0	14,1	14,8
Mideast Anatolia	79,2	67,1	70,7	65,9	9,3	11,0	15,2	15,8
Southeast Anatolia	74,1	64,7	56,9	63,2	7,9	14,5	13,0	13,9

A similar approach is even more sharpened with respect to test-tube baby service. 66% of lower class and 94% of high upper class are open to test-tube baby service. Having a child through sperm or egg bank is found acceptable more widely in high socioeconomic class than low socioeconomic class. 28-29% of high upper class find it appropriate to have kids through this method while only 11% of lower class find it appropriate (Table 121).

The proportions of those who regard the idea of becoming foster parents, using test-tube baby service and sperm and egg bank methods positively rise in proportion to increasing levels of educational status. However, the proportion of those who are open to adopting one of the relatives' kids is reduced as educational status gets higher.

Table 121. Perceptions regarding Methods Couples Who Fail to Have Child through Natural Means Should Use by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES (Yes)

	Adopting child	Adopting one the relatives' kids	Becoming foster parents	Test-tube baby service	Should not try anything (act of God)	Getting a divorce and marrying someone else	Sperm bank	Egg bank
GENDER								
Male	82,6	63,1	76,3	75,7	7,0	13,0	16,6	17,0
Female	82,8	58,3	76,8	81,0	5,2	10,4	15,2	15,4
AGE								
18-24	82,4	51,9	75,3	80,2	6,3	12,4	18,2	19,0
25-34	83,2	55,8	78,3	82,6	5,5	11,1	17,0	17,4
35-44	83,3	61,9	77,9	81,3	5,9	10,8	15,2	15,5
45-54	83,3	66,3	77,3	77,6	5,8	11,4	16,6	16,8
55-64	83,3	68,9	77,7	76,1	6,5	13,3	15,5	15,6
65+	79,5	66,2	69,7	63,7	7,6	12,3	10,1	10,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS								
No schooling	75,4	63,2	62,6	62,4	8,4	12,9	8,7	8,6
Primary school	83,3	66,6	76,6	76,2	5,9	11,4	13,7	13,9
Elementary school /secondary school	82,8	58,8	76,1	78,6	6,8	11,2	16,4	16,7
High school	84,7	54,6	80,5	84,1	5,4	11,6	18,6	19,3
Undergraduate /graduate studies	85,6	53,6	85,2	91,4	4,6	12,3	24,3	24,9
MARITAL STATUS								
Single	83,2	53,9	78,1	81,5	6,2	12,8	20,1	20,8
Married	82,7	62,3	76,4	78,0	6,0	11,1	15,0	15,2
Separated / live apart	84,9	60,6	83,8	81,3	6,8	12,9	15,2	16,0
Widowed	79,1	63,5	70,3	68,9	7,0	12,9	10,7	10,4
Divorced	89,2	59,8	81,5	86,3	5,6	18,8	22,4	23,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	83,3	60,7	77,7	79,6	5,8	11,3	16,1	16,5
Extended	78,6	61,2	70,5	73,0	7,0	11,3	13,5	13,8
Broken	85,2	59,9	78,8	79,0	6,5	14,5	17,9	18,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
High upper class	87,7	52,3	88,8	94,4	5,4	12,0	27,7	29,0
Upper class	84,7	54,4	83,3	88,4	4,7	10,6	21,7	22,0
Upper middle class	84,2	57,9	80,6	84,4	4,6	10,8	17,2	17,4
Lower middle class	81,9	62,6	74,4	75,1	6,7	11,6	13,9	14,3
Lower class	79,1	67,2	65,5	65,7	7,0	13,9	10,6	10,7

6.6. Perceptions regarding Children

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked whether or not they agreed with some statements for the purpose of establishing the value they attach to kids. Perceptions around the probed areas are presented in Table 122. The opinion individuals have the greatest extent of consensus on is that "A kid draws couples closer" (87%). Other opinions that are agreed upon by 80% or more of respondents are "A daughter is closer to the family" (82%) and "The kid takes care of the parents when they are old" (80%). 56% of individuals agree that "The son enhances the respectability of the mother". The opinion which individuals agree with the least is that "Only a son can assure the continuation of the bloodline" (47%).

Table 122. Perceptions regarding Children throughout Türkiye

	I agree	I'm indecisive	I disagree
Only a son can assure the continuation of the bloodline	46,7	6,3	47,0
A daughter is closer to the family	81,6	7,8	10,6
A son enhances the respectability of a mother	55,6	13,2	31,3
A kid draws couples closer	86,7	6,3	7,0
Once having grown up, the kid should financially support parents	74,2	13,3	12,6
The kid takes care of parents when they are old	79,7	12,7	7,6

Tables 123 & 124 cover kid related perceptions as split into some social and demographic breakdowns. Although the proportion of respondents who agree with the statement that "A kid draws couples closer" is high in all regions, the highest rate is seen in Mideast Anatolia Region (93%). Men agree with this opinion more widely (90%) than women do (83%). Agreement with this statement is found to be higher in extended families (89%), but lower in broken families (80%). Expectations from kids in the extended families are higher than in other family types in every matter probed. The proportions of people who hold this view are lower in high upper class (78%) and upper class (%82) than in lower and lower middle classes (90%). Similarly, as the educational status drops, agreement levels with this statement are reduced.

There's a higher proportion of respondents who agree with the statement that "Only a son can assure the continuation of the bloodline" in rural areas. 44% of urban residents agree with this statement urban areas, but 55% agree with it in the rural areas. The region that agrees with this opinion the most is Southeast Anatolia (69%). Conversely, the regions with lowest rates of agreement are East Marmara (35%) and West Anatolia (33%). Among the three major cities, those who live in Istanbul have a higher proportion (46%) of agrement than those of oth-

er two major cities and present a similar tendency to the generality of Türkiye. When household types are compared, the opinion that "only a son can assure the continuation of bloodline" is preponderate among individuals in extended families (54%). As socioeconomic class and education level drops, expectations from kids are increased. Agreement with all areas questioned increases as educational status and socioeconomic class decreases. This is particularly demonstrable in the statement of "A son assuring the contintuation of the bloodline". For instance, the proportion of those who agree with this statement is 29% in high upper class, but 57% in lower class. 31% of university graduates, 50% of primary school graduates and 63% of individuals with no schooling agree with this statement.

65% of respondents in rural areas, and 52% of respondents in urban areas agree that a son enhances the respectability of the mother. When genders are compared, 59% of men agree with this opinion whereas 52% of women hold the same opinion. Individuals at later ages have higher levels of agreement with this opinion. For instance, 63% of respondents in 55-64 age range agree with it whereas 50% of 25-29 year old agree with it. Proportions of agreement with this statement are higher in extended families, lower classes and lower educational status.

Table 123. Perceptions regarding Children throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (I Agree)

	Only a son can assure the continuation of the bloodline	A daughter is closer to the family	A son enhances the respectability of mother	A kid draws the couple closer	Once having grown up, the kid should financially support the parents	The kid takes care of the parents when they are old
Türkiye	46,7	81,6	55,6	86,7	74,2	79,7
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	43,6	80,3	51,8	85,6	71,2	77,9
Rural	54,5	84,7	65,3	89,6	81,9	84,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	46,3	76,5	50,6	82,8	70,3	76,7
Ankara	30,0	81,0	38,9	80,7	61,7	68,7
Izmir	37,8	76,9	43,0	81,2	62,1	70,9
NUTS						
Istanbul	46,3	76,5	50,6	82,8	70,3	76,7
West Marmara	59,6	86,1	63,9	88,3	75,2	84,2
East Marmara	35,3	80,2	47,0	87,0	74,3	81,7
Aegean	42,5	76,1	43,4	85,1	68,5	76,9
Mediterranean	48,9	82,7	61,0	88,9	78,4	83,8
West Anatolia	33,3	82,0	44,5	83,9	67,4	73,1
Central Anatolia	55,9	89,6	70,5	93,3	83,3	86,8
West Black Sea	46,7	83,9	62,0	89,5	80,5	84,3
East Black Sea	45,4	86,2	65,0	86,6	75,0	79,7
Northeast Anatolia	53,6	78,5	62,3	81,5	72,5	72,8
Mideast Anatolia	41,6	84,5	55,2	88,6	75,3	77,7
Southeast Anatolia	68,5	89,6	77,2	91,6	82,4	83,7

Another approach which prevails in the rural areas (82%) more widely than urban areas (71%) is about kids providing financial contribution to their parents when they grow up. In Istanbul too, the proportion of those who agree with this statement (77%) is higher than Ankara and Izmir. Agreement with the statement rises in 65+ age group (81%), among extended families (81%), among lower classes and in lower educational status groups.

The opinion that kids should take care of their parents when they grow up weighs more heavily in rural areas (84%) than in urban areas (78%). Among the three major cities, Istanbul has a higher percentage of agreement with this statement (77%). Southeast Anatolia Region differentiates from other regions

in all areas probed. This is the region with the highest level of agreement. The only exception to this is about kids taking care of their parents when they grow. The highest level of agreement with this statement is seen in Central Anatolia Region (87%). As socioeconomic class rises, rate of agreement drops. 84% of lower class agree with this statement while this rate drops down to 62% in high upper class.

The statement that daughter would be closer to the family is understood to have wider acceptance across rural areas just like other statements (85%). In the region-based comparison, Central Anatolia (90%) and Southeast Anatolia (90%) indicate highest rates of agreement. This opinion is accepted more widely by women (85%). A higher propor-

tion of 35+ individuals agree with this statement. Among individuals with lower educational status, a greater level of agreement is seen. This rate is 88% among individuals with no schooling, 75% among High school graduates, and 72% among university graduates. Similarly, as socioeconomic class rises, agreement with this statement drops. 88% of lower class agree with this statement while this rate drops down to 73% in high upper class.

Table 124. Perceptions regarding Children throughout Türkiye Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (I Agree)

	Only a son can assure the continuation of the bloodline	A daughter is closer to the family	A son enhances the respectability of mother	A kid draws the couple closer	Once having grown up, the kid should financially support the parents	The kid takes care of the parents when they are old
GENDER						
Male	52,3	78,3	58,9	90,0	74,7	81,1
Female	41,1	84,8	52,3	83,4	73,6	78,4
AGE						
18-24	44,1	72,6	52,1	86,1	77,3	83,6
25-34	42,3	79,4	50,0	84,9	68,1	76,0
35-44	45,0	83,7	52,8	86,4	71,3	77,1
45-54	46,8	85,4	58,5	87,7	76,5	80,3
55-64	50,9	86,1	63,1	88,6	78,4	82,9
65+	59,7	86,0	66,6	88,8	80,5	83,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	62,5	88,2	72,8	89,2	84,8	85,2
Primary school	50,2	86,4	62,2	88,9	80,3	83,1
Elementary /secondary school	46,9	81,4	59,2	87,2	76,0	80,8
High school	40,3	75,0	44,3	83,6	67,7	76,4
Undergraduate /graduate studies	30,6	71,8	32,4	82,2	54,0	68,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	45,2	81,9	54,8	87,4	73,1	79,1
Extended	53,5	83,4	63,1	88,8	81,0	84,6
Broken	45,5	76,9	48,8	79,9	70,3	76,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	28,8	73,0	31,5	78,0	42,5	61,9
Upper class	34,4	73,8	35,7	82,2	57,0	70,6
Upper middle class	42,0	80,2	49,8	86,0	72,7	79,5
Lower middle class	50,3	83,6	61,9	88,7	79,8	82,7
Lower class	57,2	87,8	70,9	89,7	81,9	83,5

6.7. Matters of Conflict between Parents and Children

Within the scope of the research, individuals were probed as to whether or not several issues were matters of conflict between parents and kids. This question was asked to individuals in the age range of 18-25, living with their parents as well as parents living with their kids between the ages of 13-25 (Table 125).

According to findings, the biggest issues of conflict between parents and kids are "Spending and consumption habits" (32%), "Choice of friends" (31%) and "Style of clothing" (28%). These main issues are followed by "Habits pertaining to eating and house order" (24%), "The use of Internet and computer games" (20%) and "Entertainment" (20%). The least problematic area is political views (5%).

Table 125. Matters of Conflict between Parents and Kids throughout Türkiye

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Irrelevant
Style of clothing	71,7	25,2	2,9	0,2
Choice of friends	68,5	28,1	3,1	0,3
Entertaining	79,3	17,4	1,8	1,5
Choice of school and profession seçimi	82,6	13,8	2,0	1,7
Political views	90,7	4,7	0,6	4,0
Religious views / practices /davranışlar	89,2	8,8	1,2	0,8
Commitment to traditions	87,5	11,1	1,0	0,4
Views on marriage and family life	84,7	9,5	1,1	4,8
Habits pertaining to eating and house order	75,5	20,8	3,4	0,3
Spending and consumption habits	68,2	27,2	4,4	0,2
Relations with relatives	87,6	11,0	1,1	0,4
Intra-familial relations	85,5	13,1	1,2	0,3
Use of Internet /computer games	68,7	15,6	4,6	11,1
Use of mobile phone	78,7	13,4	3,3	4,6
Dating	83,3	9,9	2,0	4,7
Smoking	63,7	8,9	3,7	23,7

In Tables 126 & 127, percentages of areas causing problems with kids "sometimes" or "often" are provided for the generality of Türkiye and as split into several demographic breakdowns.

Sixteen areas of potential problems between parents and kids have been examined and urban residents are found to confront more problems. The area with greatest variation between urban and rural areas is the use of Internet / computer games. This matter is followed by style of clothing, choice of friends, and habits pertaining to eating and house order. Among the three major cities, Istanbul presents a different character. In Istanbul, parents and kids experience more problems in most of the these areas than people in other cities.

A comparison of regions reveals that regions with highest levels of problems between parents and kids are Istanbul and Northeast Anatolia (40%). West Marmara can be highlighted as the region with least of problems. The highest extent of variation across regions relates to spending and consumption habits and clothing style. For instance, 40% of respondents in Northeast Anatolia experience problems with respect to clothing style, but this rate is 18% in West Marmara.

Types of problems experienced in the family do not vary by household type. Habits pertaining to eating and house order is deemed more of a problem by broken families compared to other household types (28%). It's remarkable to observe increasing percentages of people experiencing particularly in the fields of entertaining, political view, habits pertaining to eating and house order, relations with relatives, intra-familial relations, use of the Interent / computer games, and the use of mobile phone as the socioeconomic status rises.

Table 126. Matters of Conflict between Parents and Children throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Often & Sometimes)

	Style of clothing	Choice of friends	Entertai-ning	Choice of school and profession	Political views	Religious views and practices	Commitment to traditions	Views on marriage and family life
Türkiye	28,1	31,2	19,2	15,7	5,3	10,0	12,1	10,5
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	30,7	33,9	20,9	16,3	5,7	10,3	13,3	11,8
Rural	20,7	23,8	14,3	14,0	4,2	8,9	8,5	7,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	36,7	39,2	24,0	17,8	6,9	12,6	16,7	13,8
Ankara	29,6	33,5	20,6	16,0	6,3	8,9	15,0	11,2
Izmir	24,6	30,4	21,2	15,9	4,7	6,5	9,1	10,9
NUTS								
Istanbul	36,7	39,2	24,0	17,8	6,9	12,6	16,7	13,8
West Marmara	18,0	19,7	8,1	7,9	3,3	3,2	3,5	3,7
East Marmara	22,5	27,7	16,7	13,0	2,6	8,5	9,9	9,6
Aegean	22,2	31,6	19,4	17,3	4,0	8,3	9,3	8,9
Mediterranean	30,5	33,4	21,4	14,5	5,9	9,6	13,6	11,9
West Anatolia	29,5	33,3	22,0	16,3	7,0	11,0	14,9	10,9
Central Anatolia	26,2	29,4	19,5	11,4	5,2	8,7	12,5	9,5
West Black Sea	26,8	27,7	12,4	11,2	2,5	6,4	7,4	6,2
East Black Sea	33,1	30,2	18,7	17,8	7,8	12,1	11,0	8,2
Northeast Anatolia	39,5	37,8	23,5	24,9	6,2	18,8	22,8	18,9
Mideast Anatolia	22,8	24,2	18,7	19,6	7,0	13,6	10,8	11,1
Southeast Anatolia	22,2	22,3	12,4	14,3	3,9	7,2	7,0	8,1

	Style of clothing	Choice of friends	Entertai-ning	Choice of school and profession	Political views	Religious views and practices	Commitment to traditions	Views on marriage and family life

	Habits pertaining to eating and house order	Spending and consumption habits	Relations with relatives	Intra-familial relations	Use of Internet/ computer games	Use of mobile phone	Dating	Smoking
Türkiye	24,2	31,6	12,1	14,3	20,2	16,7	11,9	12,6
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	26,9	34,1	13,7	16,3	23,4	18,9	13,0	13,8
Rural	16,7	24,6	7,5	8,5	11,2	10,5	9,0	9,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	32,9	40,0	15,8	19,3	24,7	18,7	12,7	12,8
Ankara	27,5	31,8	17,8	18,6	28,1	23,6	14,5	17,9
Izmir	28,9	31,7	14,4	19,4	29,0	23,5	16,6	13,8
NUTS								
Istanbul	32,9	40,0	15,8	19,3	24,7	18,7	12,7	12,8
West Marmara	19,1	16,9	3,3	4,4	13,4	10,4	3,7	7,5
East Marmara	23,5	23,6	9,9	11,1	23,0	16,0	9,5	13,1
Aegean	21,6	30,6	9,7	13,4	23,1	20,5	14,7	13,0
Mediterranean	25,0	33,5	14,7	13,3	21,3	17,8	16,4	13,2
West Anatolia	26,5	30,5	16,8	17,3	24,2	21,3	14,0	17,6
Central Anatolia	19,5	27,7	10,5	11,8	13,6	12,3	11,4	9,8
West Black Sea	20,9	26,1	5,7	9,3	17,3	14,3	8,8	12,7
East Black Sea	23,9	34,7	9,8	11,0	20,9	14,6	7,8	8,6
Northeast Anatolia	28,8	38,9	17,8	20,3	13,1	17,0	10,7	11,5
Mideast Anatolia	19,6	25,3	11,0	14,8	15,3	15,9	11,3	12,1
Southeast Anatolia	15,7	31,2	8,0	12,1	11,9	9,2	7,2	10,3

	Habits pertaining to eating and house order	Spending and consumption habits	Relations with relatives	Intra-familial relations	Use of Internet/ computer games	Use of mobile phone	Dating	Smoking

Table 127.Matters of Conflict between Parents and Children by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Often & Sometimes)

	Style of clothing	Choice of friends	Entertaining	Choice of school and profession	Political views	Religious views and practices	Commit-ment to traditions	Views on marriage and family life
GENDER								
Male	25,0	29,9	18,9	15,0	5,4	9,5	12,1	10,0
Female	31,3	32,6	19,4	16,5	5,2	10,5	12,0	11,1
AGE								
18-24	24,9	26,1	22,0	13,8	7,8	10,9	13,8	15,2
25-34	26,9	30,9	14,6	13,7	5,7	9,0	11,1	8,9
35-44	34,3	38,5	21,5	19,7	4,1	9,8	11,8	8,0
45-54	27,8	31,2	17,3	15,5	4,9	9,6	11,5	9,4
55-64	19,1	24,0	12,5	11,3	2,8	9,9	10,5	9,1
65+	13,5	11,6	2,8	2,5	1,6	5,4	7,2	6,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS								
No schooling	25,0	26,2	13,4	15,1	4,0	9,2	9,9	10,0
Primary school	28,8	33,6	17,1	16,1	4,1	9,5	10,8	8,2
Elementary/secondary school	30,0	31,9	20,0	15,1	6,4	11,4	13,1	10,4
High school	27,7	30,5	23,5	15,8	7,1	9,5	12,9	13,1
Undergraduate/graduate studies	25,8	27,7	21,5	15,9	5,0	10,7	15,4	13,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	29,1	32,3	19,7	15,7	5,4	9,8	12,0	10,2
Extended	23,8	27,7	17,0	16,3	5,0	10,0	12,0	10,9
Broken	26,7	27,9	18,5	14,6	4,7	11,3	13,8	13,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
High upper class	32,1	26,9	29,7	19,0	10,0	14,9	17,0	14,5
Upper class	32,8	33,9	24,7	22,8	7,0	12,9	17,2	12,4
Upper middle class	26,7	31,5	19,9	14,3	5,4	8,8	12,2	10,1
Lower middle class	28,6	32,1	18,2	15,3	5,0	10,2	11,8	10,8
Lower class	26,8	29,0	16,3	16,7	3,9	8,6	10,3	10,4

	Habits pertaining to eating and house order	Spending and consumption habits	Relations with relatives	Intra-familial relations	Use of Internet/computer games	Use of mobile phone	Dating	Smoking
GENDER								
Male	22,6	31,9	11,9	13,3	19,8	15,9	10,6	13,6
Female	25,9	31,3	12,2	15,3	20,6	17,5	13,3	11,5
AGE								
18-24	25,6	34,6	16,6	16,8	17,2	15,2	15,2	14,7
25-34	25,8	29,9	13,3	16,3	20,2	14,5	10,0	7,8
35-44	27,9	33,6	10,6	14,6	27,3	20,9	11,8	9,6
45-54	21,6	29,8	10,1	12,3	18,6	16,4	10,9	14,5
55-64	14,8	22,7	8,5	10,4	11,4	9,9	6,6	14,9
65+	9,1	17,7	3,7	4,9	5,4	8,3	6,0	6,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS								
No schooling	16,5	27,2	7,9	10,2	8,7	8,9	8,6	11,3
Primary school	21,4	29,8	8,4	12,5	19,1	15,6	10,8	12,1
Elementary/secondary school	25,2	35,2	13,3	15,7	20,4	16,6	14,1	14,1
High school	27,9	32,4	16,1	15,9	23,6	19,8	13,8	13,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	32,8	34,3	18,4	18,3	28,6	22,4	10,8	12,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	24,6	32,1	12,2	14,4	21,6	17,7	12,4	12,5
Extended	21,0	28,3	10,5	12,9	14,3	12,9	10,3	11,9
Broken	28,3	34,5	14,5	16,4	19,0	15,3	10,9	15,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
High upper class	34,6	34,7	20,4	20,8	30,2	24,8	14,2	13,5
Upper class	33,2	35,4	19,1	20,2	31,9	25,1	13,0	13,3
Upper middle class	24,9	29,8	13,2	13,8	24,0	17,4	11,2	12,7
Lower middle class	23,3	31,7	11,0	14,7	17,5	15,6	13,2	13,5
Lower class	20,8	33,8	7,8	11,7	10,7	10,6	11,2	10,0

6.8. Punishments Imposed on Children

In the research, parents were asked how they punished their kids over the last one year. Generally speaking, mothers are understood to punish their kids more than fathers.

As can be viewed on the table, 60% of mothers reprimand their kids. This punishment is followed by responses of "I banned him/her from watching TV" (38%) and "I banned him from playing games" (34%). The punishment type that mothers avoid most widely is locking kids into a room. The second

least applied punishment method in the ranking is not giving pocket money (82%) and not letting them see their friends (81%) (Table 128).

When the same question regarding the types of punishment used over the last one year was asked to fathers, it was understood that, just like in the case of mothers, the method of punishment used by fathers least frequently is locking in a room (93%). The most frequently used method of punishment used by fathers is reprimanding (51%). This is followed by not letting kids watch TV (33%) and not letting them play games (28%).

Table 128. Types of Punishments Used by Mothers and Fathers throughout Türkiye

	Father				Mother			
	Never	Sometimes	Often	Not relevant	Never	Sometimes	Often	Not relevant
Locked him/her in a room	93,4	5,8	0,2	0,6	89,1	9,8	0,2	0,8
Banned him/her from playing games	71,4	26,5	1,4	0,8	65,9	31,7	1,9	0,5
Didn't give him/her pocket money	84,4	13,5	0,9	1,3	82,4	15,2	0,7	1,7
Banned him/her from watching TV	66,3	30,3	2,8	0,5	61,6	34,4	3,5	0,5
Reprimanded him/her	48,3	46,3	5,1	0,3	39,9	52,2	7,7	0,2
Did not talk to him/her for a while	85,3	13,6	0,6	0,6	74,7	23,0	1,9	0,4
Did not buy what s/he likes for a while	77,3	21,5	0,7	0,6	70,8	27,5	1,4	0,3
Did not let him/her see his friends	86,3	12,2	0,8	0,7	80,9	17,5	1,1	0,5
Beat him/her	87,1	11,8	0,4	0,7	78,9	19,6	1,0	0,4
Slapped in the face	78,4	20,3	0,7	0,6	70,0	28,5	1,0	0,4
Banned him/her from using Internet/computer	61,2	16,8	3,8	18,2	58,4	18,6	4,0	19,1
Banned him/her from using mobile phone	67,6	7,4	1,3	23,7	65,3	8,1	1,4	25,2

In Table 129, the proportions of punishments imposed "sometimes" or "frequently" by fathers on their kids are presented for the generality of Türkiye and as split into demographic breakdowns. In line with the greater rate of problems experienced between parents and kids in the urban areas, fathers in the urban areas have imposed more punishments on their kids than fathers in rural areas over the last one year. The only exception for this is the punishment by beating and slapping on the face. Proportions of fathers who beat their kids or slap them on the face are similar in the urban and rural areas.

When the punishing style of fathers across three major cities is analyzed, not buying what the kid likes for a while seems to be a more widely used practice in Izmir than two other major cities. Reprimanding and slapping on the face is a rather uncommon type of punishment in Izmir when compared to two other major cities. In Istanbul, reprimanding and slapping on the face are more commonly practiced means of punishment, but not talking to kids for a while or banning them from using the mobile phone is seen less frequently.

Fathers who have beaten their kids over the last one year accounts to 12% in the generality of Türkiye whereas this rate goes up to 22% in Central Anatolia. The region with the lowest percentage of fathers who beat their kids is West Marmara (6%). Punishing kids by slapping on the face is a behavior seen in 21% of fathers over the last one year throughout Türkiye . The regions that diverge most from the generality of Türkiye is Central and Northeast Anatolia (29%), Southeast Anatolia (28%) and West Marmara (12%).

Banning kids from playing games, not letting them see their friends, and banning them from using Internet/computer is a less frequently used punishment by fathers in extended families. Fathers in nuclear families use the methods of not letting kids watch TV, not talking to kids for a while, not buying what they like for a while more often than fathers in other household types. Fathers in broken families use several methods such as not let-

ting them watch TV less frequently than fathers in other household types.

Among fathers in the high class, methods of punishment such as locking into a room, not letting them watch TV, reprimanding, not talking to them for a while and banning them from using the Internet/computer and mobile phone are used more widely than fathers in the low class. Beating and slapping on the face are methods of punishment seen less frequently as socioeconomic class gets higher.

As can be expected, with increasing levels of educational status, the proportion of fathers who punish their kids by beating or by slapping on the face is reduced. Nevertheless, all other punishment methods except for these two and for not letting them see their friends are used more frequently as the education level drops.

Table 129.Types of Punishment Imposed by Fathers on Their Children over the Last One Year throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Often & Sometimes)

	Locked him/her in a room	Banned him/her from playing games	Didn't give him/her pocket money	Banned him/her from watching TV	Reprimanded him/her	Didn't talk to him/her for a while
Türkiye	6,0	27,8	14,4	33,2	51,4	14,1
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	6,6	30,0	15,0	34,9	53,4	15,6
Rural	4,6	22,5	12,9	28,8	46,3	10,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	6,6	32,1	16,8	34,0	58,4	14,1
Ankara	8,6	29,5	15,4	36,3	54,9	20,7
Izmir	5,3	29,1	15,4	38,1	51,5	19,5
NUTS						
Istanbul	6,6	32,1	16,8	34,0	58,4	14,1
West Marmara	6,1	26,9	11,1	25,7	44,7	12,5
East Marmara	5,8	36,1	15,4	37,2	48,7	17,2
Aegean	6,2	27,1	16,1	34,7	51,0	15,4
Mediterranean	7,0	29,7	17,1	41,0	51,6	12,6
West Anatolia	7,9	28,8	12,6	34,7	54,9	20,4
Central Anatolia	7,2	34,1	10,7	34,5	56,1	17,3
West Black Sea	3,0	21,3	8,0	27,0	47,2	10,9
East Black Sea	6,3	26,0	10,9	34,9	57,9	7,1
Northeast Anatolia	10,1	37,6	15,9	42,7	47,5	17,7
Mideast Anatolia	4,5	13,4	11,6	22,2	43,6	11,7
Southeast Anatolia	1,6	15,3	13,4	20,5	43,8	9,5
AGE						
25-34	9,2	37,3	15,4	39,8	55,2	12,4
35-44	6,5	32,7	16,1	38,6	56,4	16,4
45-54	3,8	17,0	12,4	23,2	44,2	11,6
55-64	2,1	10,0	6,0	13,8	33,4	11,0
65+	,0	5,7	10,4	16,6	27,2	22,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	2,9	12,6	6,6	17,7	35,4	9,0
Primary school	3,7	24,4	13,5	29,0	48,6	10,5
Elementary/secondary school	8,2	26,9	16,1	31,1	50,5	15,6
High school	7,7	33,7	13,3	38,6	55,1	14,8
Undergraduate/graduate studies	10,0	38,8	20,1	48,7	63,4	26,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	6,2	29,0	15,0	34,3	52,0	14,9
Extended	4,5	21,0	10,8	27,8	47,9	10,2
Broken	6,4	27,8	11,8	13,2	53,3	7,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	14,4	35,9	16,9	45,6	68,4	29,1
Upper class	8,3	38,7	17,3	48,8	63,0	25,2
Upper middle class	6,9	28,7	15,7	34,9	50,9	17,3
Lower middle class	5,8	27,5	13,8	31,8	51,5	12,6
Lower class	3,3	25,4	14,2	27,9	48,7	8,4

	Didn't buy what s/he likes for a while	Didn't let him/her see friends for a while	Beat him /her	Slapped him/ her on the face	Banned him/her from using Internet/computer	Banned him/ her from using mobile phone
Türkiye	22,2	13,0	12,2	21,1	20,6	8,7
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	25,4	14,7	12,3	20,6	24,0	9,2
Rural	14,2	8,9	12,0	22,1	12,2	7,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	25,2	13,6	10,5	22,0	26,7	9,4
Ankara	27,4	17,4	10,2	18,5	25,9	13,5
Izmir	31,7	16,2	9,5	15,2	29,2	13,6
NUTS						
Istanbul	25,2	13,6	10,5	22,0	26,7	9,4
West Marmara	14,9	5,8	6,0	12,1	17,5	6,1
East Marmara	30,2	14,7	7,7	13,6	27,0	9,9
Aegean	25,9	13,5	8,8	16,2	24,8	10,3
Mediterranean	21,4	14,6	15,9	24,0	21,4	10,3
West Anatolia	22,9	16,1	12,3	21,7	23,7	12,7
Central Anatolia	26,8	16,3	22,2	28,9	16,1	7,7
West Black Sea	14,9	8,7	8,7	15,7	14,0	5,5
East Black Sea	18,7	8,7	9,9	10,8	17,5	8,3
Northeast Anatolia	16,1	14,8	14,2	28,6	8,4	7,0
Mideast Anatolia	16,7	11,7	14,8	26,2	15,1	7,1
Southeast Anatolia	15,4	9,7	16,6	28,2	9,5	3,1
AGE						
25-34	26,1	13,3	17,5	28,0	14,4	3,7
35-44	24,8	14,7	12,6	21,7	25,4	10,5
45-54	17,0	11,1	9,0	16,5	18,7	9,6
55-64	11,9	8,0	8,6	15,5	10,2	5,5
65+	18,6	6,3	6,4	16,4	7,2	5,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	7,1	8,4	16,2	22,7	8,6	6,5
Primary school	19,8	11,4	13,4	22,4	14,8	7,3
Elementary/secondary school	20,6	15,0	11,7	19,9	17,9	8,6
High school	26,0	15,6	11,4	20,2	28,3	8,1
Undergraduate/graduate studies	33,1	14,5	8,4	18,2	38,6	15,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	23,3	13,6	12,7	21,4	21,7	9,2
Extended	16,3	9,6	10,0	19,7	14,1	6,2
Broken	12,0	16,3	4,4	14,5	20,9	5,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	42,1	12,4	8,2	13,8	36,6	16,3
Upper class	29,7	13,3	9,4	18,5	43,4	15,8
Upper middle class	24,0	15,3	8,8	17,4	28,3	12,3
Lower middle class	21,7	13,7	12,9	22,2	17,9	6,9
Lower class	16,3	8,8	19,2	27,8	5,3	3,5

In Table 130, the proportions of punishment types imposed by mothers on their kids "sometimes" or "frequently" are laid out for the generality of Türkiye and in demographic breakdowns. In parallel to the greater levels of problems experienced between parents and kids in the urban areas, mothers in the urban areas have punished their children more than their rural counterparts over the last one year.

Mothers who beat their kids over the last one year account for 21% across Türkiye, and this proportion goes up to 29% in Central Anatolia and Mediterranean regions. The region with the smallest percentage of mothers who beat their children is East

Table 130. Types of Punishments Imposed by Mothers on Their Children over the Last One Year throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Often & Sometimes)

	Locked him/her in a room	Banned him/her from playing games	Didn't give him/her pocket money	Banned him/her from watching TV	Reprimanded him/her	Didn't talk to him/her for a while
Türkiye	10,1	33,6	15,8	37,9	59,9	24,9
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	10,8	35,4	16,8	39,6	61,9	27,8
Rural	8,2	28,2	13,2	33,1	54,3	16,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	11,9	35,8	17,8	42,3	65,9	27,7
Ankara	11,9	35,8	19,5	39,0	68,3	45,1
Izmir	11,0	36,1	15,4	44,3	64,5	32,8
NUTS						
Istanbul	11,9	35,8	17,8	42,3	65,9	27,7
West Marmara	3,1	24,2	10,0	27,0	46,0	16,7
East Marmara	9,5	44,1	15,6	44,8	61,1	30,3
Aegean	11,4	32,1	13,2	39,0	61,6	28,2
Mediterranean	13,5	43,3	22,3	46,9	67,2	22,1
West Anatolia	11,3	34,5	17,8	39,8	68,0	39,6
Central Anatolia	7,6	38,7	15,0	40,8	60,5	25,4
West Black Sea	11,1	33,9	14,1	39,5	56,4	20,3
East Black Sea	4,3	27,4	12,7	29,0	57,2	17,5
Northeast Anatolia	13,7	35,3	14,1	41,0	41,4	17,4
Mideast Anatolia	5,9	20,5	8,4	22,0	51,1	17,5
Southeast Anatolia	5,4	16,5	13,9	19,2	44,0	12,2

Black Sea (12%). Punishing kids by slapping on the face was seen in 30% of mothers across Türkiye. The regions that vary most from the generality of Türkiye in this regard have been Mediterranean (40%) and East Black Sea Regions (17%).

Among the mothers living in three major cities, those in Izmir have the lowest frequency of punishing their kids by beating and slapping on the face. Punishing kids by not talking to them for a while is a more common practice among mothers living in Ankara than those living in two other major cities.

	Didn't buy what s/he likes for a while	Didn't let him/her see friends for a while	Beat him / her	Slapped him/her on the face	Banned him/her from using Internet/computer	Banned him/her from using mobile phone
Türkiye	28,9	18,6	20,6	29,5	22,6	9,5
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	32,3	20,2	21,2	30,5	26,4	10,8
Rural	19,3	14,0	18,9	26,7	11,6	5,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	36,2	21,7	18,4	30,7	31,6	13,0
Ankara	41,4	21,9	20,4	26,5	33,3	15,1
Izmir	39,5	23,4	15,1	24,1	33,4	16,1
NUTS						
Istanbul	36,2	21,7	18,4	30,7	31,6	13,0
West Marmara	18,9	11,4	13,8	19,4	21,6	4,9
East Marmara	38,9	19,1	16,0	20,3	27,9	10,9
Aegean	31,5	15,8	14,8	20,5	25,5	13,8
Mediterranean	27,2	20,6	29,4	41,0	24,7	8,4
West Anatolia	37,7	23,6	23,1	30,7	29,9	12,8
Central Anatolia	23,5	20,5	29,0	35,6	13,2	8,6
West Black Sea	22,6	19,0	15,9	24,4	14,3	4,8
East Black Sea	21,3	10,5	11,6	16,5	19,9	8,2
Northeast Anatolia	21,1	21,2	20,4	28,9	5,2	2,7
Mideast Anatolia	17,7	16,2	24,2	36,0	10,7	4,3
Southeast Anatolia	16,1	11,9	24,3	34,7	8,4	3,5

Just like in the case of fathers, mothers too pun-ish their kids by beating and slapping on the face least often among broken families. In broken fami-lies, punishment method of not letting them watch TV is practiced less often than in other household types (Table 131).

Methods of punishment used more frequently by mothers of the high class than the mothers in low class are locking in a room, banning him/her from watching TV, reprimanding, not talking to him/her for a while, not buying what s/he likes for a while, and banning him/her from using Internet and mo-

Table 131. Types of Punishments Imposed by Mothers on Their Children Over the Last One Year by Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Often & Sometimes)

	Locked him/her in a room	Banned him/her from playing games	Didn't give him/her pocket money	Banned him/her from watching TV	Reprimand-ed him/her	Didn't talk to him/her for a while
AGE						
18-24	16,1	35,1	11,4	34,4	68,2	25,0
25-34	15,4	45,5	18,6	49,7	68,3	26,5
35-44	8,5	31,5	16,5	35,7	58,9	26,1
45-54	3,5	16,2	10,2	22,6	47,8	19,4
55-64	2,7	17,7	6,1	12,3	30,7	18,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	4,6	19,7	12,5	23,1	45,0	11,2
Primary school	9,6	32,6	16,4	37,4	59,9	23,1
Elementary/secondary school	11,7	39,6	16,8	40,8	66,5	28,4
High school	14,3	44,3	16,4	48,3	67,4	36,9
Undergraduate/graduate studies	15,8	40,0	16,7	49,7	67,3	40,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	10,9	34,7	16,4	39,6	60,6	25,3
Extended	7,3	30,5	12,3	34,2	56,3	22,2
Broken	4,6	25,2	16,7	21,9	58,3	26,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	21,8	38,5	21,0	48,6	69,0	50,1
Upper class	10,4	42,3	17,0	49,0	63,7	32,5
Upper middle class	9,0	31,8	14,7	37,7	61,7	32,4
Lower middle class	10,9	34,6	17,2	38,2	61,1	23,4
Lower class	8,3	33,5	16,8	33,1	58,0	14,2

bile phone. Beating and slapping on the face are seen less commonly as socioeconomic class drops.

As can be expected, the proportion of mothers who punish their kids by beating or slapping on the face is reduced as the educational status rises. However, all other methods of punishment except for these and not letting kids see their friends are used more frequently as the educational status increases.

	Didn't buy what s/he likes for a while	Didn't let him/her see friends for a while	Beat him / her	Slapped him/her on the face	Banned him/her from using Internet/computer	Banned him/her from using mobile phone
AGE						
18-24	30,5	14,6	41,1	49,1	4,1	,0
25-34	35,4	21,4	27,5	37,4	21,0	6,2
35-44	28,4	18,6	17,4	27,0	27,1	12,3
45-54	18,8	13,7	14,1	19,4	17,6	9,7
55-64	12,2	14,9	12,1	19,0	9,6	10,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	16,2	15,3	25,7	33,2	8,3	4,6
Primary school	27,3	20,1	20,5	30,0	19,4	8,3
Elementary/secondary school	33,7	19,2	21,0	30,6	26,9	11,2
High school	37,8	17,8	21,1	27,4	36,3	14,4
Undergraduate/graduate studies	44,7	14,7	6,6	19,1	46,9	16,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	29,8	19,3	20,9	30,1	23,5	9,8
Extended	24,7	16,0	21,2	30,0	16,9	7,1
Broken	26,8	14,7	15,0	18,5	24,4	10,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	49,7	19,7	8,7	18,9	52,0	23,7
Upper class	38,8	16,5	10,9	20,2	48,7	18,1
Upper middle class	30,8	17,1	16,2	24,6	30,5	10,6
Lower middle class	28,7	20,0	23,3	32,9	19,4	8,5
Lower class	22,2	22,1	28,1	38,9	6,8	2,7

6.9. Reasons for Punishing Children

38% of parents mentioned not punishing their kids at all. When reasons for punishing kids are reviewed, 40% of parents are understood to punish their kids due to negligence of education. This reason of punishment is followed by lying (15%), by disrespectful attitude towards elders (12%) and by failing to perform duties such as personal care/ordering of his/her room (11%) (Table 132).

Table 132. Reasons for Punishing Children throughout Türkiye

	Türkiye
Neglecting his/her education	39,6
Never punish him/her	38,1
Lying	15,0
Disrespectful attitude towards the elders	12,1
Failing to perform duties such as personal care/ordering his/her room	11,3
Being violent towards his/her siblings and friends	7,8
Spending too much time playing on Internet	7,0
Making friends to wrong people	4,3
Committing a theft	2,5
Not assisting to chores	2,1
Smoking	1,6
Excessive spending habits	1,4
Clothing style	1,3
Not performing his religious duties	0,8
Drinking alcohol	0,4
Having friends from the opposite sex	0,4
Using drugs	0,2
Disobedience	0,1
Naughtiness	0,1
Others	2,9

Top five reasons for punishing kids have been analysed in several demographic breakdowns (Table 133).

In the urban areas, proportions of parents punishing kids due to neglecting education (41%), lying (16%), failing to perform his/her personal care (12%) are higher compared to those in rural areas. When results of three major cities are analysed, no significant difference is detected.

Across Türkiye, the proportion of individuals who punish their kids for lying amounts to 15% whereas this rate is goes up to 28% in Northeast Anatolia Region and to 25% in Mediterranean Region. The regions where parents punish their kids for being violent towards their siblings/friends most commonly are Southeast Anatolia (13%) and Mideast Anatolia (13%). The proportion of those who punish their kids due to their disrespectfulness towards their elderly is 12% throughout Türkiye while the same rate goes up to 21% in Mideast Anatolia Region. The number of those who punish kids due to failing to perform duties such as personal care/ordering his/her room rises with increasing levels of socioeconomic class and educational status.

Table 133. Reasons for Punishing Children throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Top 5 Reasons)

	Neglecting his/her education	Lying	Disrespectful attitude towards the elders	Failing to perform duties such as personal care/ ordering his/her room	Being violent towards his/her siblings and friends
Türkiye	39,6	15,0	12,1	11,3	7,8
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	41,0	15,5	11,9	12,4	7,7
Rural	35,9	13,6	12,7	8,4	7,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	40,4	14,7	12,9	15,2	5,4
Ankara	43,3	13,8	12,4	14,9	5,2
Izmir	41,9	14,8	8,5	14,9	6,2
NUTS					
Istanbul	40,4	14,7	12,9	15,2	5,4
West Marmara	36,7	12,6	6,5	12,9	2,7
East Marmara	46,9	9,1	8,5	9,9	6,3
Aegean	37,9	11,5	9,5	12,9	10,0
Mediterranean	46,4	25,3	14,7	10,1	10,0
West Anatolia	40,0	12,0	11,3	12,0	5,3
Central Anatolia	45,6	21,2	15,4	8,8	7,7
West Black Sea	43,8	8,9	8,5	11,8	5,5
East Black Sea	39,0	14,4	10,8	5,7	4,1
Northeast Anatolia	38,3	27,9	15,8	13,2	4,9
Mideast Anatolia	35,8	11,7	20,5	10,8	12,6
Southeast Anatolia	22,0	12,1	11,8	6,1	12,9

Women punish their kids more than fathers due to reasons of neglecting their education (42%), failing to perform duties (14%) and being disrespectful towards elderly (13%). Respondents in the age range of 25-44 have a higher incidence of punishing their kids due to negligence of education. The proportions of those who punish their kids due to being violent towards their siblings/friends and being disrespectful towards elderly are higher in the age range of 18-34 (Table 134).

The proportions of those who punish kids due to negligence of education are higher in nuclear families (41%) compared to extended families (34%). In other matters, rates are similar.

The educational status with the highest rate of punishing due to negligence of education is High school graduates (45%). The groups with the highest proportion of individuals who punish their kids due to failing to perform duties are understood to be parents who are High school (14%) and university graduates (18%). In socioeconomic terms, higher socioeconomic classes include greater proportions of parents who punish their kids only due to failing to perform their duties. There's no significant variation in other matters among socioeconomic classes.

Table 134. Reasons for Punishing Children by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Top 5 Reasons)

	Neglecting his/her education	Lying	Disrespectful attitude towards the elders	Failing to perform duties such as personal care/ ordering his/her room	Being violent towards his/her siblings and friends
GENDER					
Male	37,3	15,1	11,3	8,7	7,3
Female	41,8	14,9	12,9	13,8	8,2
AGE					
18-24	15,4	19,9	22,2	17,1	12,5
25-34	43,8	17,5	17,4	13,7	11,3
35-44	41,9	15,6	11,1	12,1	7,9
45-54	33,7	11,3	8,3	8,3	3,7
55-64	23,4	10,2	7,6	2,4	3,7
65+	17,8	2,0	7,0	5,5	,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
No schooling	27,9	12,7	13,6	6,9	8,6
Primary school	40,2	14,8	11,5	10,0	7,1
Elementary/secondary school	38,2	15,8	11,4	11,4	8,8
High school	44,7	14,7	11,9	14,4	8,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	42,6	17,6	15,2	18,1	8,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	40,8	15,2	12,1	11,6	8,1
Extended	33,9	14,3	11,5	9,8	7,0
Broken	34,5	11,5	16,0	11,7	4,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
High upper class	43,6	17,6	15,2	24,6	10,7
Upper class	43,0	15,5	12,3	16,2	6,1
Upper middle class	43,0	12,3	11,1	13,7	6,0
Lower middle class	38,9	14,6	11,6	9,8	7,8
Lower class	36,5	16,6	15,4	10,2	12,4

6.10. Individuals from Whom Support is Sought in Case of Problems with Children

When asked the question of whose support they would seek in case of experiencing problems with their kids, 72% of parents said that they would seek support from their spouses. This response is followed by those who wouldn't seek any support at all (15%), those who would seek the support of expert individuals and institutions (7%), and those who would ask for the support of family seniors (6%) (Table 135).

72% of parents in the urban areas and 73% of parents in the rural areas stated getting the help of their spouses for the problems they experience with their kids. The proportions of individuals getting the support of expert individuals or institutions vary in rural and urban areas. 8% of parents in urban areas, and 3% of parents in the rural areas get support from expert individuals and institutions for the problems they experience with their kids.

In all regions, the main person from which parents seek support for the problems they experience with their kid is their spouses. This rate is above 60% in all regions. When regions are analysed, Southeast Anatolia and East Black Sea (25%) regions stand out for having the highest percentage of parents who don't seek support from anyone. This rate is followed by Mediterranean Region (21%). As can be seen in the table too, the highest proportion of individuals seeking the support of expert individals

and institutions is in Istanbul (13%), and the lowest ranking region in this regard is Northeast Anatolia (0.4%).

The three major cities do not vary much from one another in terms of seeking support. Getting the support of spouse is again the first ranking behavior. However, the percentage of seeking the support of experts is higher than the average percentage of Türkiye.

Table 135. Individuals from Whom Support is Sought in Case of Child related Problems throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	I don't get support from anyone	Spouse	Family seniors	Relatives	Siblings	Expert individuals or institutions	Friends	Neighbors	Clergymen	Other
Türkiye	15,3	71,9	5,9	0,6	0,8	6,6	0,6	0,1	0,1	0,5
RESIDENCE AREA										
Urban	14,6	71,5	6,0	0,5	0,9	7,9	0,5	0,1	0,1	0,5
Rural	17,0	73,1	5,5	0,7	0,5	3,2	0,9	0,0	0,1	0,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES										
Istanbul	9,3	70,8	7,1	0,6	0,6	12,8	0,4	0,2	0,0	0,7
Ankara	13,0	70,1	6,9	0,5	1,1	11,8	0,4	0,3	0,1	0,4
Izmir	13,4	74,4	4,5	0,1	1,3	8,2	1,3	0,0	0,0	0,6
NUTS										
Istanbul	9,3	70,8	7,1	0,6	0,6	12,8	0,4	0,2	0,0	0,7
West Marmara	14,0	72,1	5,9	0,2	1,9	5,8	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,6
East Marmara	11,8	74,4	6,6	0,4	0,4	8,2	0,4	0,0	0,0	0,8
Aegean	9,3	77,8	5,1	0,3	1,4	6,8	0,9	0,0	0,3	0,6
Mediterranean	21,0	68,6	4,6	0,5	0,8	5,5	1,6	0,3	0,0	0,5
West Anatolia	14,3	70,5	6,7	0,6	0,8	9,3	0,3	0,2	0,0	0,4
Central Anatolia	19,7	69,4	6,8	0,6	0,8	3,5	0,3	0,0	0,2	0,4
West Black Sea	18,3	74,0	5,3	1,0	0,9	2,7	0,5	0,2	0,0	0,2
East Black Sea	24,5	62,2	6,7	0,1	0,7	7,3	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,2
Northeast Anatolia	17,7	74,8	6,8	0,1	0,1	0,4	0,1	0,0	0,5	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	11,1	81,3	5,7	1,9	0,5	0,8	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,3
Southeast Anatolia	25,3	68,0	4,2	0,8	0,9	0,8	0,3	0,0	0,2	0,1

The individuals parents have recourse to for support in case of kid related problems do not vary between mothers and fathers. Nevertheless, a greater proportion of fathers mention not getting support from anyone (17%) (Table 136).

In terms of age groups, those who can't get any support from anyone at 55 years of age or older for kid related problems is relatively higher than in other age groups (35%). This percentage is observed to drop in younger age groups.

When educational status of individuals is analysed, it's seen in the table that the proportion of individuals mostly get the support of their "spouses" for problems they experience with their kids. This rate varies between 74% and 68%. The percentage of getting support of expert individuals or institutions for problems related with kids is 2% among parents with no schooling. This rate rises to 12% among university graduates. As the educational status of parents rise, their frequency of seeking support of expert individuals and insitutions for kids related problems increases (Table 136).

Table 136. Individuals from Whom Support is Sought in Case of Child related Problems by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	I don't get support from anyone	Spouse	Family seniors	Relatives	Siblings	Expert individuals or institutions	Friends	Neigh-bors	Clergy-men	Other
GENDER										
Male	17,0	71,8	5,9	0,4	0,5	5,7	0,5	0,0	0,1	0,2
Female	13,6	72,1	5,8	0,7	1,1	7,4	0,7	0,2	0,0	0,7
AGE										
18-24	8,6	83,2	6,4	0,0	0,0	3,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
25-34	11,3	73,9	7,7	0,6	0,7	6,8	0,7	0,2	0,2	0,5
35-44	13,9	73,1	5,6	0,6	1,0	7,4	0,5	0,1	0,0	0,4
45-54	21,3	68,1	4,4	0,5	0,6	5,3	0,6	0,0	0,1	0,7
55-64	25,1	65,2	4,6	0,8	0,7	4,4	0,5	0,0	0,1	0,3
65+	36,1	60,5	1,7	1,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS										
No schooling	20,0	71,7	5,3	1,3	0,9	1,7	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,8
Primary school	15,7	73,4	5,5	0,6	0,7	4,8	0,6	0,1	0,1	0,5
Elementary/secondary school	15,5	68,0	6,4	0,2	1,3	9,4	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,2
High school	12,7	70,1	7,2	0,4	0,8	9,6	1,1	0,1	0,0	0,5
Undergraduate/graduate studies	12,2	73,8	4,8	0,5	0,6	11,7	1,0	0,0	0,5	0,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE										
Nuclear	14,3	74,8	4,3	0,4	0,6	6,9	0,6	0,1	0,1	0,3
Extended	15,8	70,1	10,4	0,7	0,7	3,6	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,3
Broken	38,0	5,4	25,7	4,6	6,6	13,2	3,0	0,5	0,0	4,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS										
High upper class	7,9	78,5	3,7	1,0	1,3	16,2	1,9	0,0	0,0	0,0
Upper class	11,9	73,9	5,8	0,3	0,7	11,1	0,8	0,1	0,6	0,1
Upper middle class	13,0	73,6	5,0	0,3	0,6	8,2	0,4	0,1	0,1	0,4
Lower middle class	16,2	71,9	5,7	0,4	1,0	5,9	0,3	0,1	0,0	0,5
Lower class	17,2	72,2	6,1	0,9	0,5	2,6	1,7	0,3	0,2	0,1

This can be traced also in the socioeconomic status distribution. The proportion of parents who state getting the support of expert individuals or institutions in case of problems with their kids is 3% the lower class, 8% in upper middle class, and 16% in high upper class.

When evaluated on the basis of household type, marked variations are revealed. The proportion of individuals who get the support of their spouses is very low among broken families (5%). In contrast to this, proportions of individuals who get the support of family seniors (26%) and of those who get the support of expert individuals and institutions (13%) are higher than other household types. A similar differentiation appears in terms of not getting any support from anyone. The proportion of individuals who don't get any support from anyone is 38% in broken families whereas this rate is 16% in extended families and 14% in nuclear families (Table 136).

Chapter 7

PERCEPTIONS ON FAMILY AND COMMUNITY LIFE

Attitudes towards Marriage, Living out of Wedlock and Having Child out of Wedlock

Approaches to Women's Working in A Paid Job

Individuals' Perceptions of Their Own and Their Family's Happiness

Personal Perception of Individuals with regard to Beliefs

Effects of Religious Beliefs on Daily Life

Source of Religious Knowledge and Determinant Effects

This section aims to portray the value judgments of individuals regarding family and community life. With this view, individuals were asked several questions regarding couples living out of wedlock, having kids out of wedlock, participation of women into workforce, happiness perceptions of individuals about family members and the role of religion in the lives of individuals.

7.1. Attitudes towards Marriage, Living out of Wedlock and Having Child out of Wedlock

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked to state their opinions by choosing the options of "I disagree", "I'm indecisive" or "I agree" with respect to marriage, living out of wedlock and having babies out of wedlock.

Table 137. Attitudes towards Marriage, Living out of Wedlock and Having Child out of Wedlock

	I disagree	I'm indecisive	I agree
A man can get married to a woman of different ethnicity & religion	47,2	8,8	44,0
Being from the same religious sect is not important for marriage	49,6	11,2	39,2
A woman can get married to a man of different ethnicity & religion	53,2	9,0	37,9
One can marry someone that s/he has met online (via Internet)	73,0	11,5	15,5
Couples can live out of wedlock (official or religious)	89,7	2,7	7,6
Couples can have babies out of wedlock	91,1	3,0	5,9

As can be seen in Table 137, the matter on which respondents have the greatest extent of consensus were the statements that "a man can get married to a woman of different ethnicity & religion" (38%) and "a woman can get married to a man of different ethnicity & religion (%44). Levels of agreement with these judgements are similar in different breakdowns. Agreement to both of these statements is higher in urban areas than in rural areas, in western regions and especially in Aegean and West Anatolia Regions; and when it comes to three major cities, agreement to these two judgements are higher among men, in the upper class, among single and divorced men, among high educational status members, younger age ranges and in Ankara and Izmir (Table 138 & 139). For instance, level of agreement with the statement that a woman can get married to a man from a different ethnicity and religion is 42% in urban areas, but 28% in rural areas, 46% in Aegean Region, 22% in Northeast Anatolia, 65% in high upper class, and 22% in lower class.

The level of agreement with the statement of "Being from the same religious sect is not important for marriage" is 39%, and those who have the opposite view account for 50%. Similarly, proportions of those who state agreeing with this statement are higher in urban areas, in Aegean and West Anatolia Regions, in Ankara and Izmir, among men,

in young age groups, in high educational status, among single and divorced individuals, among broken and nuclear families, and in upper class.

According to the data collected, the matters individuals agree with the least are the judgements that "couples may have babies out of wedlock" (6%) and "couples may live out of wedlock (official or religious) (8%). The level of agreement with the statement that couples may have babies out of wedlock is pretty low and a similar approach is seen in almost all breakdowns in this regard. Just like in other matters, individuals living in urban areas agree with the statement that couples may have babies out of wedlock slightly more (7%). Regions that have higher percentages of agreement with this statement are Istanbul (8%), Aegean (7%) and West Anatolia (7%) Regions with lowest percentages of agreement are East Black Sea (3%), Northeast Anatolia and Southeast Anatolia (3%). Attitude of individuals in high classes (16%), university graduates (11%), singles (9%) and divorced individuals (12%) is more positive than other individuals.

Another judgement that has received a lower level of agreement is about "Couples living out of wedlock (official or religious)" presents quite much of variation across breakdowns. 9% of individuals living in urban areas agree with this statement

whereas this rate drops down to 4% in rural areas. In terms of regions, Istanbul (11%), Aegean and West Anatolia Regions (10%) have the highest levels of agreement with this statement whereas East Black Sea and Northeast Anatolia (2%) show the lowest level of agreement. Although level of agreement seems to be similar in three major cities, individuals in Izmir have a more positive regard of it than those in Istanbul. Just like in other statements, men (9%) and individuals in 18-24 age group have a more positive perspective in this matter too. The most accentuated variations are seen in the break-downs of marital status, household type, socioeconomic class and educational status. Level of agreement with this judgement is 19% among divorced individuals, 14% among single individuals and 4% among widowed individuals. In broken families, it goes up to 15%, and drops to 5% in extended families. 23% of the high upper class and 15% of upper class agree with this statement whereas only 4% of lower class have a positive opinion of it. It goes up to 18% among university graduates and is between 3-4% among people with lowest educational status (Table 138 & 139).

Table 138. Attitudes towards Marriage, Living out of Wedlock and Having Child out of Wedlock throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (I agree)

	Couples can live out of wedlock (official or religious)	A man can get married to a woman of different ethnicity & religion	A woman can get married to a man of different ethnicity & religion	Couples can have babies out of wedlock	One can marry someone that s/has met online (via Internet)	Being from the same religious sect is not important for marriage
Türkiye	7,6	44,0	37,9	5,9	15,5	39,2
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	8,9	48,5	41,8	6,7	16,7	42,9
Rural	4,1	32,3	27,6	3,6	12,5	29,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	10,9	46,8	39,8	7,9	18,5	43,3
Ankara	12,1	57,6	52,7	8,2	17,3	51,8
Izmir	13,4	55,6	51,3	10,2	19,8	52,5
NUTS						
Istanbul	10,9	46,8	39,8	7,9	18,5	43,3
West Marmara	6,8	40,9	39,2	4,1	8,7	34,0
East Marmara	5,8	49,8	43,6	5,4	17,1	44,2
Aegean	9,8	50,5	46,4	7,0	19,0	46,5
Mediterranean	7,3	41,7	35,0	6,1	16,0	37,2
West Anatolia	10,0	52,7	46,3	7,3	16,8	44,7
Central Anatolia	6,1	40,6	29,7	4,0	13,8	25,2
West Black Sea	5,9	35,3	30,2	4,9	13,7	29,0
East Black Sea	2,3	33,1	26,5	2,6	10,1	34,8
Northeast Anatolia	2,4	24,9	21,6	3,3	8,2	27,5
Mideast Anatolia	5,2	43,8	37,6	5,1	13,4	49,6
Southeast Anatolia	3,8	34,1	26,8	3,3	11,3	28,3

Table 139. Attitudes towards Marriage, Living out of Wedlock and Having Child out of Wedlock by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES (I agree)

	Couples can live out of wedlock (official or religious)	A man can get married to a woman of different ethnicity & religion	A woman can get married to a man of different ethnicity & religion	Couples can have babies out of wedlock	One can marry someone that s/has met online (via Internet)	Being from the same religious sect is not important for marriage
GENDER						
Male	9,3	49,0	41,8	7,5	18,9	44,2
Female	5,9	39,0	33,9	4,3	12,2	34,3
AGE						
18-24	10,5	52,9	46,3	7,6	23,1	44,9
25-34	8,7	50,4	43,9	5,7	20,4	44,8
35-44	7,2	45,1	38,3	6,0	14,2	39,2
45-54	7,2	40,6	35,2	6,4	12,0	37,5
55-64	5,9	36,2	31,0	4,7	9,8	34,3
65+	3,3	25,9	20,8	3,6	6,3	24,7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	3,1	20,7	16,6	3,2	7,4	23,4
Primary school	3,6	35,6	29,8	3,6	11,5	32,9
Elementary/secondary school	6,4	45,5	39,7	5,7	17,0	40,4
High school	12,1	58,4	51,5	8,5	20,7	48,3
Undergraduate/graduate studies	17,9	66,4	58,3	11,1	25,0	57,2
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	13,8	56,5	49,8	9,1	26,1	48,4
Married	5,8	41,6	35,5	5,0	13,1	37,6
Separated / live apart	12,3	52,2	43,8	7,0	16,2	42,4
Widowed	3,6	25,5	21,2	3,1	7,4	24,5
Divorced	19,4	56,1	52,9	11,8	21,5	48,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	7,0	45,0	38,7	5,6	15,0	40,2
Extended	5,1	36,1	30,5	4,9	15,4	33,3
Broken	14,6	49,3	43,7	8,6	18,6	42,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	23,3	70,6	64,6	15,6	29,5	62,8
Upper class	15,1	62,4	55,2	8,8	20,8	51,3
Upper middle class	8,3	52,0	45,1	6,3	17,1	44,4
Lower middle class	4,6	37,5	31,6	4,5	13,4	34,4
Lower class	4,3	26,7	22,4	3,6	11,8	30,8

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

The proportion of women who have a positive opinion of women's working in paid jobs in the generality of Türkiye is 82%. It can be concluded that similar percentages are reached in urban and rural breakdowns. 84% of respondents living in the urban areas and 78% of those who live in rural areas have a positive opinion of women's working in paid jobs.

In terms of variations across regions, the first ranking regions that have a more positive opinion are West Marmara (92%), Aegean and East Marmara (87%) Regions. The regions with lowest percentages of respondents who have the least positive attitude for women's working in paid jobs are Northeast Anatolia (61%) and Southeast Anatolia (64%) (Table 140).

Table 140. Approach to Women's Working in Paid Jobs throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes	No
Türkiye	82,2	17,8
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	83,9	16,1
Rural	77,8	22,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	86,4	13,6
Ankara	90,1	9,9
Izmir	90,5	9,5
NUTS		
Istanbul	86,4	13,6
West Marmara	92,3	7,7
East Marmara	87,0	13,0
Aegean	87,3	12,7
Mediterranean	81,8	18,2
West Anatolia	84,8	15,2
Central Anatolia	76,2	23,8
West Black Sea	80,8	19,2
East Black Sea	81,9	18,1
Northeast Anatolia	60,7	39,3
Mideast Anatolia	77,3	22,7
Southeast Anatolia	64,0	36,0

Individuals in Ankara and Izmir have a more positive opinion than the urban average of Türkiye in this regard. Istanbul, on the other hand, is in greater parallelism with urban average and stands as the city with the most negative approach (14%).

In terms of gender, women (91%) are seen to support this matter more than men (74%). Although no apparent tendency is detected across age groups, the group with the most negative approach to women's working in a paid job the individuals above 65 years of age (21%) (Table 141).

Individuals' approaches vary by their educational status. The participants who support women's working in a paid job the least are those with no schooling (73%). The support of respondents who are High school graduates and above for this matter is higher than other respondents in other educational statuses. 88% of High school graduates, and 94% of university graduates find women's working in a paid job appropriate.

When it comes to socioeconomic status, the greatest support for women's working in paid jobs comes from the high upper class (98%). The least of support is given by the members of the lower class (66%).

The household type that supports women's working in paid jobs is broken families (91%). 82% of nuclear families and 76% of extended families find the working of women in paid jobs appropriate (Table 141).

Table 141. Approach to Women's Working in Paid Jobs by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes	No
GENDER		
Male	73,7	26,3
Female	90,5	9,5
AGE		
18-24	83,8	16,2
25-34	82,2	17,8
35-44	80,5	19,5
45-54	82,6	17,4
55-64	84,4	15,6
65+	79,3	20,7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
No schooling	73,2	26,8
Primary school	79,9	20,1
Elementary /secondary school	78,5	21,5
High school	87,6	12,4
Undergraduate/graduate studies	93,8	6,2
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	86,8	13,2
Married	80,4	19,6
Separated / live apart	87,8	12,2
Widowed	84,3	15,7
Divorced	91,5	8,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	82,1	17,9
Extended	76,3	23,7
Broken	90,9	9,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
High upper class	97,8	2,2
Upper class	93,1	6,9
Upper middle class	87,4	12,6
Lower middle class	78,7	21,3
Lower class	65,8	34,2

Within the scope of the research, individuals who stated that women should not work in paid jobs were asked about the reasons of their opinions. Across Türkiye, 56% of individuals declared that women should not work on the grounds that women's primary duties are household management and childbearing. 20% of those who have a negative opinion of women's working think that work environments are not safe for women. Among those who don't want women to work, the proportions of those who find it against our traditions and customs, who think that working women aggrieve their kids and who think that a paid work wears the woman out are lower than 10% (Table 142).

Among the respondents who don't find women's working appropriate, majority of urban residents (55%) hold the view that women's primary duties are household management and childbearing just like in the generality of Türkiye. The proportion of rural residents is higher in this group (59%). 22% of urban residents find working environment dangerous for women. This rate is lower among individuals who live in the rural areas (16%).

The proportions of those who object to the idea of

working women on the grounds that women's primary duties are household management and childbearing are high in all regions. This rate is highest in Mideast Anatolia Region (79%). The lowest rate is seen in West Marmara Region (35%). When the proportions of individuals who think that working environment is not safe for women are examined, West Marmara is in the first ranking with 37%. The region that agrees with this idea the least is Mideast Anatolia Region (11%). The region with the highest proportion of individuals who state that women should not work on the grounds that it's against our

traditions and customs is Northeast Anatolia (30%). In all three major cities, among those who don't have a positive opinion of women's working, the most widely accepted view is that women's primary duties are household management and childbearing. However, this justification is chosen less often in Istanbul (46%) than in two other major cities. The opinion that working environments are not safe for women is the second most widely supported view. Nevertheless, the proportions of respondents who choose this answer in Istanbul (26%) and Izmir (24%) are higher than in Ankara (19%).

Table 142. Reasons for Disapproval of Women's Working throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Women's primary duties are household management and childbearing	Working environments are not safe for women	Against our traditions	Working women's kids are aggrieved	Working in a paid job wears the woman out	Other
Türkiye	56,3	19,9	9,2	8,4	2,9	3,2
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	54,7	22,2	7,6	9,2	2,7	3,7
Rural	59,4	15,7	12,2	7,0	3,3	2,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	46,2	25,8	9,6	10,2	2,7	5,5
Ankara	54,5	18,8	7,9	10,2	5,4	3,2
Izmir	55,9	23,4	2,7	8,1	4,3	5,6
NUTS						
Istanbul	46,2	25,8	9,6	10,2	2,7	5,5
West Marmara	34,8	37,2	9,8	12,0	2,8	3,4
East Marmara	58,1	24,0	3,1	7,7	3,4	3,8
Aegean	61,0	13,9	7,5	11,2	3,7	2,7
Mediterranean	57,9	17,7	2,2	14,1	5,4	2,6
West Anatolia	47,7	29,8	9,2	5,8	3,7	3,8
Central Anatolia	48,2	26,4	14,2	7,5	,7	3,1
West Black Sea	56,9	16,2	6,4	12,7	5,4	2,4
East Black Sea	67,9	21,1	2,2	4,8	1,7	2,3
Northeast Anatolia	43,3	18,3	29,9	5,1	,3	3,2
Mideast Anatolia	69,8	10,8	10,0	4,5	2,0	3,0
Southeast Anatolia	67,4	13,7	11,2	3,8	1,4	2,5

When data are evaluated on the basis of gender, women and men interestingly are found to respond in a similar fashion. Among both women and men, the justification that women's primary duties are household management and childbearing is the most widely accepted reason. 57% of women and 56% of men who don't find women's working appropriate agreed with this view. The view agreed at similar percentages by both genders is that working environment is not safe for women (men: 20%

and women: 19%). Th e opinion agreed the least by both genders is that work life wears the women out (Table 143).

The view that women's primary duties are household management and childbearing is the justification which is verbalized with the highest rates by all age groups. Among those who object to the idea of working women, the proportion of those who agree with this view is above 50% in all age groups.

In the age group of 65 and above, agreement with this view reaches its peak (67%). The age group that agrees with this view the least is 18-24 (51%). Although the opinion that working environment is not safe for women is the second most widely supported view in all age groups, it's been accepted at higher rates in the age groups of 18–24 and 25-34. The proportions of individuals at 45 years of age or older who think that women's working in paid jobs is against our traditions range between 9–12%. Those who justify their objection to women's working by the opinion that women's primary duties are household management and childbearing account for highest levels in all educational statuses. However, as the educational status drops, the proportion of those who support this justification is reduced, and the percentage of university graduates with this view drops down to 45%. It's notable that the

Table 143. Reasons for Disapproval of Women's Working by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Women's primary duties are household management and childbearing	Working environments are not safe for women	Against our traditions	Working women's kids are aggrieved	Working in a paid job wears the woman out	Other
GENDER						
Male	56,2	20,4	9,0	8,4	2,7	3,3
Female	56,6	18,7	9,7	8,6	3,4	3,0
AGE						
18-24	51,2	28,0	7,7	6,1	4,7	2,3
25-34	53,1	22,6	8,1	10,8	2,4	2,9
35-44	54,0	17,0	9,6	11,7	2,7	5,0
45-54	59,0	17,2	9,8	7,6	3,0	3,5
55-64	59,7	20,3	9,2	4,4	3,1	3,4
65+	67,3	12,9	11,8	4,9	1,8	1,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	60,3	14,5	13,1	6,4	2,3	3,5
Primary school	59,2	17,7	10,1	7,7	2,8	2,4
Elementary /secondary school	53,6	25,1	6,7	6,8	3,6	4,2
High school	50,0	25,7	6,2	11,7	3,2	3,2
Undergraduate /graduate studies	44,8	23,1	3,9	20,4	2,1	5,7
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	49,2	29,0	8,7	6,3	5,2	1,6
Married	57,3	18,7	9,2	8,7	2,7	3,5
Separated / live apart	36,4	15,2	24,2	20,7	,0	3,4
Widowed	62,4	14,4	11,3	9,7	,2	2,0
Divorced	58,8	21,6	1,1	6,6	3,6	8,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	55,6	20,6	8,5	8,5	3,4	3,5
Extended	58,7	17,8	11,4	8,2	1,7	2,2
Broken	56,0	20,6	8,7	8,5	1,8	4,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	40,0	27,7	6,2	10,2	14,0	1,9
Upper class	51,1	22,7	8,0	12,2	2,2	3,7
Upper middle class	53,5	22,2	6,6	10,8	3,5	3,4
Lower middle class	55,8	20,7	9,2	7,4	3,5	3,4
Lower class	63,0	15,4	11,8	6,2	1,3	2,4

proportion of those who agree that working environment is not safe for women rises in proportion to rising levels of educational status. Another remarkable finding is that 20% of university graduates who are against the working of women believe that working women aggrieve their kids. 13% of individuals with no schooling hold the view that working of women is against traditions (Table 143).

Divorced individuals support the working of women at higher percentages (92%) whereas married individuals support it to a lower extent (80%). On the other hand, when socioeconomic status and household types are reviewed, no apparent tendency is detected in terms of the justifications of respondents for objecting the idea of working women.

7.3. Individuals' Perceptions of Their Own and Their Family's Happiness

When individuals were asked how happy they thought their families were, 18% of them said "very happy", and 59% said "happy". The proportion of respondents who state having unhappy families is only 3%. Perception of family happiness does not vary in urban and rural areas. Although not much of variation is seen across three major cities with respect to this perception, the proportions of those who state having very happy or happy families is higher in Izmir (81%) two other major cities. An overview of regions indicates that around 80% individuals think their families are either happy or very happy. On the other hand, this rate is lowest in Southeast Anatolia Region (65%) (Table 144).

Table 144. Individuals' Perception on the Happiness of Their Families throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Very happy	Happy	Average	Unhappy	Very unhappy
Türkiye	18,0	59,4	19,9	2,3	0,4
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	18,8	58,1	20,2	2,5	0,4
Rural	16,1	62,7	18,9	1,7	0,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	16,8	58,3	21,7	2,9	0,2
Ankara	25,8	51,9	19,5	2,4	0,4
Izmir	19,6	61,1	17,4	1,4	0,5
NUTS					
Istanbul	16,8	58,3	21,7	2,9	0,2
West Marmara	15,1	66,4	16,2	2,1	0,2
East Marmara	20,9	57,2	19,8	1,6	0,4
Aegean	18,3	62,3	17,2	1,7	0,5
Mediterranean	17,7	56,5	22,9	2,3	0,6
West Anatolia	25,2	53,3	19,1	2,1	0,3
Central Anatolia	20,9	62,2	14,1	2,3	0,6
West Black Sea	12,2	69,1	16,9	1,3	0,6
East Black Sea	14,9	65,5	17,5	1,6	0,5
Northeast Anatolia	22,1	63,7	11,3	2,5	0,3
Mideast Anatolia	26,3	54,8	16,9	1,6	0,5
Southeast Anatolia	9,0	56,0	29,9	4,6	0,6

In terms of gender and age distribution, no serious variation is found with respect to how they regard the happiness of their families. Only the age group of 18-44 has a greater proportion of individuals who think that their families are very happy (Table 145).

Educational status of individuals has some impact on their perception about their families' happiness. The proportion of those who respond as "very happy" rises in proportion to educational status. For instance, 11% of people with no schooling mention being very happy whereas this rate is 25% among university graduates. Similar tendency applies with respect to socioeconomic status. Those who respond as "very happy" is 10% in lower class, 22% in upper middle class and 28% in high upper class.

The proportion of those who indicate having happy families is higher among single and married individuals. In line with this finding, individuals in nuclear families think that their families are happier (80%) whereas this rate is lower among individuals in broken families (65%).

Table 145. Individuals' Perception on the Happiness of Their Families by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Very happy	Happy	Average	Unhappy	Very unhappy
GENDER					
Erkek	19,3	59,1	19,3	2,0	0,3
Kadın	16,8	59,7	20,4	2,6	0,5
AGE					
18-24	20,1	58,6	18,8	2,2	0,3
25-34	19,8	58,0	19,6	2,1	0,5
35-44	19,1	58,6	19,9	2,0	0,4
45-54	15,3	60,7	21,4	2,3	0,2
55-64	15,7	62,0	19,4	2,3	0,6
65+	15,2	60,4	20,2	3,5	0,7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
No schooling	10,8	58,9	24,6	4,8	0,9
Primary school	15,9	60,2	21,2	2,2	0,4
Elementary/secondary school	19,3	57,6	20,5	2,1	0,4
High school	20,7	59,2	18,1	1,7	0,3
Undergraduate/graduate studies	25,3	60,2	13,0	1,3	0,2
MARITAL STATUS					
Single	17,6	57,1	21,8	3,1	0,4
Married	19,1	60,8	18,4	1,4	0,3
Separated / live apart	13,7	36,6	34,2	13,7	1,8
Widowed	9,4	57,4	25,4	6,6	1,2
Divorced	10,3	44,3	32,5	10,2	2,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	19,0	60,8	18,4	1,5	0,3
Extended	17,7	58,8	21,1	2,1	0,3
Broken	12,9	52,5	26,3	6,9	1,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
High upper class	28,4	62,7	8,4	0,5	0,1
Upper class	25,6	61,9	11,6	0,9	0,1
Upper middle class	21,9	59,4	17,2	1,3	0,2
Lower middle class	15,5	61,0	20,8	2,3	0,3
Lower class	9,5	55,4	29,8	4,3	0,9

Individuals were asked how happy they regard themselves. According to findings, 16% of individuals responded as "very happy", 57% of them as "happy", and 23% of them as "average". The proportion of those who define themselves as "unhappy or very unhappy" is 4% (Table 146).

17% of urban residents, and 15% of rural residents reported being very happy while 55% of urban residents and 61% of rural residents reported being happy.

On the basis of regions, the regions with the highest proportions of individuals who regard themselves happy or very happy are Northeast Anatolia and Central Anatolia (80%). This percentage is lowest in Southeast Anatolia Region (60%). In other words, 40% of individuals in Southeast Anatolia Region do not feel happy.

Personal perception of happiness is similar across three major cities. In Ankara and Izmir, the proportions of those who think they're happy or very happy (74%) are slightly higher than in Istanbul (70%).

Table 146. Personal Perception of Happiness throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Very happy	Happy	Average	Unhappy	Very unhappy
Türkiye	16,3	56,6	22,8	3,3	1,0
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	16,9	55,1	23,6	3,4	1,0
Rural	14,8	60,6	20,6	3,0	1,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	14,8	55,6	25,7	3,5	0,4
Ankara	24,9	49,4	21,6	2,9	1,2
Izmir	17,5	56,5	21,6	2,9	1,4
NUTS					
Istanbul	14,8	55,6	25,7	3,5	0,4
West Marmara	14,0	64,6	18,3	2,4	0,7
East Marmara	18,3	55,5	22,3	3,1	0,9
Aegean	17,4	58,8	20,4	2,5	1,0
Mediterranean	16,5	51,7	26,0	4,1	1,8
West Anatolia	23,6	51,5	20,8	2,9	1,2
Central Anatolia	19,9	59,9	15,6	3,3	1,4
West Black Sea	11,0	65,9	20,2	2,2	0,8
East Black Sea	14,0	63,8	18,3	3,0	0,8
Northeast Anatolia	15,8	64,0	16,4	3,2	0,6
Mideast Anatolia	22,2	54,9	19,2	2,7	1,0
Southeast Anatolia	8,0	51,8	33,0	5,4	1,7

Happiness levels of women and men are similar; however, men have a relatively greater proportion who feel happy (Table 147). Similarly, not much of variation is seen across age groups. Only people above 65 years of age have a higher proportion of individuals who feel unhappy (6%).

As the education status rises, the percentage of individuals who regard themselves happy is understood to increase; and as educational status is reduced, the percentage of individuals who regard themselves unhappy increases. For example, 10% of individuals with no schooling report feeling very happy while

this rate is 22% among university graduates.

The type of household with the greatest percentage of individuals who say that they're happy or very happy is nuclear families (76%); broken families rank the lowest in this respect (59%) .

With the rising of socioeconomic status, individuals regard themselves happier. On the other hand, feeling of unhappiness gets more common towards lower classes. This rate is 6% in the lower class, 2% in upper middle class, and 1% in high upper class.

Table 147. Personal Perception of Happiness by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Very happy	Happy	Average	Unhappy	Very unhappy
GENDER					
Male	17,7	56,3	22,1	3,0	0,9
Female	15,0	56,9	23,4	3,5	1,2
AGE					
18-24	18,6	53,9	23,1	2,9	1,4
25-34	17,5	55,5	23,1	2,9	1,0
35-44	16,0	56,2	23,7	3,3	0,9
45-54	14,8	57,5	23,6	3,3	0,8
55-64	14,7	60,3	20,8	3,0	1,1
65+	14,6	58,9	20,5	5,0	1,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
No schooling	9,8	56,9	25,3	6,2	1,8
Primary school	14,7	56,7	24,3	3,2	1,0
Elementary/secondary school	17,4	55,5	22,7	3,2	1,3
High school	18,7	56,0	22,2	2,5	0,7
Undergraduate/graduate studies	22,3	58,4	16,8	1,9	0,5
MARITAL STATUS					
Single	16,1	52,7	25,6	4,2	1,4
Married	17,4	58,7	21,1	2,1	0,7
Separated / live apart	10,9	32,5	32,7	14,6	9,3
Widowed	7,6	53,6	28,1	8,7	2,0
Divorced	9,2	38,4	34,4	15,3	2,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	17,5	58,1	21,4	2,2	0,8
Extended	15,1	56,9	23,3	3,7	1,0
Broken	11,4	47,7	29,8	8,6	2,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
High upper class	25,4	63,2	10,5	0,9	0,0
Upper class	23,4	58,6	16,2	1,5	0,3
Upper middle class	20,0	56,8	20,5	2,0	0,8
Lower middle class	14,1	58,4	23,4	3,2	0,9
Lower class	7,8	52,7	31,3	6,0	2,2

7.4. Personal Perception of Individuals with regard to Beliefs

Individuals were read out several statements about beliefs and they were asked to choose the definition which they thought to fit themselves. According to findings, almost all of the individuals stated being religious (99%). 49% of individuals reported trying to perform all religious requirements whereas 43% mentioned performing some religious requirements (Table 148).

When analysed by residence area, those saying they perform all the religious requirements account for 45% in the urban areas whereas this rate increases to 60% in the rural areas. The regions with the highest percentages of individuals stating this are

Northeast Anatolia and East Black Sea (68%). East Marmara follows these two regions with 60%. The lowest percentage belongs to Aegean Region (35%). The percentage of individuals living in the Aegean Region and stating that they perform some of their religious requirements is higher than other regions.

When three major cities are analysed, individuals living in Izmir differ from those living in Istanbul and Ankara in terms of the definition they choose for themselves with respect to beliefs. Respondents in Izmir have a greater percentage of agreement to the statement of "I perform some of my religious requirements" (58%) whereas individuals living in Ankara and Istanbul have a higher level of agreement with the statement of "I perform all of my religious requirements" (43%).

Table 148. Personal Perception of Individuals with regard to Beliefs throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	I'm religious, trying to perform all religious requirements	I'm religious, trying to perform some of religious requirements	I'm religious, failing to perform religious requirementes	I'm not religious
Türkiye	48,7	44,6	5,9	0,9
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	44,5	47,7	6,8	1,0
Rural	59,5	36,7	3,4	0,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	43,0	48,0	7,3	1,8
Ankara	43,3	47,1	8,4	1,2
Izmir	30,3	57,7	10,2	1,9
NUTS				
Istanbul	43,0	48,0	7,3	1,8
West Marmara	49,0	41,5	9,2	0,3
East Marmara	60,1	36,1	3,2	0,6
Aegean	34,7	56,6	7,6	1,1
Mediterranean	43,9	47,3	7,9	0,9
West Anatolia	48,9	43,6	6,7	0,8
Central Anatolia	53,9	41,9	3,9	0,3
West Black Sea	55,3	40,2	3,9	0,6
East Black Sea	68,1	29,3	2,6	0,0
Northeast Anatolia	68,2	30,5	1,2	0,1
Mideast Anatolia	60,5	36,2	3,1	0,2
Southeast Anatolia	49,5	46,2	4,0	0,3

The percentage of those who say that they try to perform all of their religious requirements is higher among women compared to men (53%). In advanced age groups, the proportion of those who try to perform all religious requirements is higher than the proportion of those who state performing some religious requirements in younger age groups. For example, the percentage of those who perform all religious requirements in the age group of 65 and older is 71%, but this rate is 37% in 18–24 year old (Table 149).

As educational status rises, the percentage of indi-

viduals who say that they're trying to perform all of religious requirements drops. This rate is 30% among university graduates, but 66% among individuals with no schooling. University and high school graduates have higher percentages of individuals who fail to perform religious requirements (11%) and who are not religious (3%) compared to other educational statuses.

It's mostly the widowed individuals (68%) who state being religious and trying to perform all religious requirements. This rate is lowest among singles (34%)

Table 149. Personal Perception of Individuals with regard to Beliefs by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	I'm religious, trying to perform all religious requirements	I'm religious, trying to perform some of religious requirements	I'm religious, failing to perform religious requirementes	I'm not religious
GENDER				
Male	44,4	46,8	7,5	1,3
Female	52,9	42,4	4,3	0,4
AGE				
18-24	37,1	53,8	7,9	1,2
25-34	40,7	51,4	6,5	1,3
35-44	46,7	46,6	6,0	0,7
45-54	52,7	41,4	5,3	0,6
55-64	60,3	34,8	4,3	0,6
65+	70,8	25,6	3,4	0,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
No schooling	65,7	31,1	2,9	0,4
Primary school	57,0	39,1	3,7	0,2
Elementary/secondary school	45,7	47,9	6,0	0,4
High school	37,1	53,3	8,4	1,2
Undergraduate/graduate studies	30,0	55,9	11,1	3,0
MARITAL STATUS				
Single	34,1	54,9	9,3	1,7
Married	51,4	42,9	5,1	0,6
Separated / live apart	50,7	41,0	7,3	0,9
Widowed	68,2	29,0	2,3	0,4
Divorced	34,3	52,9	11,2	1,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	47,8	45,7	5,8	0,7
Extended	55,7	39,8	4,1	0,3
Broken	43,8	45,2	8,8	2,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
High upper class	22,8	59,6	12,8	4,8
Upper class	36,3	52,1	10,1	1,5
Upper middle class	46,1	47,1	6,0	0,8
Lower middle class	53,4	41,9	4,5	0,3
Lower class	55,5	40,1	3,8	0,6

and divorced individuals (34%).

In the evaluated based on household type, a greater proportion of (56%) individuals from extended families are found to define themselves as religious and 3say that they try to perform all the religious requirements. The percentage of individuals who define themselves with this statement is 48% in nuclear families and 44% in broen families.

The response of being a religious person, trying to perform all religious requirements is observed to drop from lower socioeconomic levels towards higher socioeconomic ones. This rate is 56% in the lower class, and 23% in the high upper class.

7.5. Source of Religious Knowledge & Determinant Effects of Religious Beliefs on Daily Life

Within the scope of the research, individual were probed as to the most frequently used sources of religious knowledge and the matters of daily life influenced most by religion and the extent of this influence.

Individuals are observed to get influenced mostly by their families and relatives (55%). The second source of religious knowledge is clergymen (13%). The third source of knowledge is Koran courses (11%). The proportion of those who get religious information from school and religious books is 9%. The total percentage of those who state getting their religious knowledge from mass media tools such as newspapers, radios and TV is below 1% (Table 150).

In all demographic breakdowns, family and relatives stand as the primary source of knowledge. Family and relatives (56%), religious books (10%) and school (9%) function as sources of information more widely in urban areas whereas clergymen (21%) are rank higher in rural areas as a source of information.

Table 150. Sources of Religious Knowledge throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	I don't have religious knowledge	Family, relatives	Clergymen	Koran course	School	Religious books	Religious community	Friends' circle	TV	Other
Türkiye	0,6	54,6	13,3	11,2	8,6	8,5	0,9	0,8	0,7	0,7
RESIDENCE AREA										
Urban	0,6	55,6	10,5	10,8	9,2	9,7	0,9	0,9	0,8	0,9
Rural	0,5	52,0	20,5	12,3	7,1	5,4	0,7	0,6	0,5	0,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES										
Istanbul	1,0	52,8	11,2	9,4	9,8	11,2	1,1	1,2	1,1	1,2
Ankara	0,5	53,6	8,7	10,3	10,5	12,3	0,9	0,9	1,1	0,9
Izmir	0,6	63,9	4,8	5,2	10,1	11,8	0,9	0,7	1,1	0,8
NUTS										
Istanbul	1,0	52,8	11,2	9,4	9,8	11,2	1,1	1,2	1,1	1,2
West Marmara	0,6	59,2	14,8	7,4	9,8	6,7	0,2	0,5	0,2	0,5
East Marmara	0,2	52,5	13,9	14,9	8,0	8,1	0,1	0,6	0,9	0,7
Aegean	0,4	58,9	7,9	9,4	11,1	9,0	1,4	0,5	0,9	0,6
Mediterranean	0,8	51,2	16,5	13,6	6,2	7,5	1,1	1,7	0,3	1,2
West Anatolia	0,6	50,0	10,8	15,7	9,3	9,9	0,8	1,1	0,9	0,9
Central Anatolia	0,1	56,2	15,4	10,3	7,8	8,2	1,1	0,3	0,3	0,3
West Black Sea	0,3	48,5	22,5	12,4	7,7	7,2	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,5
East Black Sea	0,0	32,4	32,0	18,9	8,5	6,1	0,4	0,8	0,5	0,4
Northeast Anatolia	1,4	54,3	16,6	13,5	3,3	7,3	0,6	1,3	1,5	0,2
Mideast Anatolia	0,7	61,4	10,3	4,6	9,1	10,8	1,6	0,2	0,7	0,6
Southeast Anatolia	0,5	71,7	7,3	6,4	7,5	4,3	0,6	0,6	0,7	0,4

Region wise analysis shows that the region with the highest percentage of getting information from family and relatives is Southeast Anatolia (72%). The regions with higher percentages of getting information from school are East Black Sea (32%) and West Black Sea (23%) respectively. East Black Sea is at the same time the region with the highest percentage of people who get information from Koran courses (19%) (Table 150).

When three major cities are compared, the proportion of those who get religious knowledge from their families and relatives is 64% in Izmir, 54% in Ankara and 53% in Istanbul. The proportion of individuals who point to clergymen and Koran courses as their sources of religious knowledge is higher in Ankara and Istanbul than in Izmir.

For both women and men, the first ranking source of information is family and relatives. On the other

Table 151. Sources of Religious Knowledge by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	I don't have religious knowledge	Family, relatives	Clergymen	Koran course	School	Religious books	Religious community	Friends' circle	TV	Other
GENDER										
Male	0,7	48,9	16,6	9,6	11,0	9,6	1,2	0,9	0,5	0,9
Female	0,4	60,2	10,0	12,8	6,2	7,4	0,6	0,8	0,9	0,6
AGE										
18-24	0,7	56,8	8,3	12,7	10,4	8,1	1,0	1,0	0,5	0,6
25-34	0,6	51,2	10,5	12,4	12,5	9,4	1,1	0,7	0,9	0,8
35-44	0,5	52,0	13,0	12,3	9,4	9,2	0,8	1,1	0,8	0,7
45-54	0,6	54,2	15,9	10,4	6,9	8,6	0,7	1,1	0,9	0,7
55-64	0,2	56,3	17,4	10,1	4,5	8,6	0,8	0,4	0,8	1,0
65+	0,5	62,8	19,6	6,5	2,5	5,6	0,7	0,6	0,4	0,7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS										
No schooling	0,7	70,1	15,7	7,1	0,7	2,8	0,6	0,8	0,8	0,6
Primary school	0,4	53,0	18,1	14,0	4,4	6,9	0,8	0,7	0,9	0,6
Elementary/secondary school	0,3	52,5	11,7	14,7	10,4	7,4	1,0	0,9	0,5	0,5
High school	0,6	52,2	9,1	8,7	14,7	11,3	0,9	1,0	0,7	0,6
Undergraduate /graduate studies	1,1	49,6	5,6	6,8	16,7	16,0	0,9	0,8	0,6	1,7
MARITAL STATUS										
Single	0,9	53,9	8,4	10,8	12,6	9,5	1,2	1,1	0,7	0,8
Married	0,5	53,8	14,5	11,7	8,0	8,4	0,8	0,8	0,7	0,7
Separated / live apart	1,5	58,4	5,0	14,9	7,3	7,7	1,4	3,0	0,6	0,0
Widowed	0,4	65,9	17,0	7,5	2,1	5,0	0,3	0,6	0,6	0,5
Divorced	1,1	55,3	8,9	8,1	10,9	11,6	0,1	0,9	1,6	1,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE										
Nuclear	0,5	53,5	13,2	11,4	9,3	8,9	0,9	0,8	0,7	0,7
Extended	0,4	56,9	14,7	12,6	5,9	6,4	0,7	1,0	0,6	0,6
Broken	1,3	57,6	11,4	7,9	9,0	9,2	0,6	0,9	1,0	1,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS										
High upper class	2,1	48,3	5,6	3,5	18,3	18,9	1,3	0,5	0,6	0,9
Upper class	0,5	52,8	7,1	7,4	13,1	14,9	0,9	0,9	0,8	1,5
Upper middle class	0,4	53,2	10,8	11,7	10,7	9,6	1,0	0,9	0,7	0,7
Lower middle class	0,4	54,0	16,2	12,9	6,7	6,8	0,8	0,7	0,7	0,6
Lower class	0,9	59,7	16,8	10,5	4,9	4,5	0,7	0,9	0,9	0,2

hand, there's a higher proportion of women who get their religious knowledge from family, relatives and Koran courses. Those who say that clergymen, schools and religious books are their sources of information are mostly men (Table 151).

A similar condition applies in terms of educational status. As educational status drops, the clergymen and Koran courses are accentuated as references whereas schools and religious books take precedence at higher levels of education.
The proportion of widowed individuals who get information from family and relatives (66%) and clergymen (17%) is higher than other individuals. It should be noted that married individuals have a higher percentage of getting information from clergymen (15%).

Although the variation among household types is not dramatic, there's a smaller percentage of individuals who learn from school and religious books in extended families, and again a smaller percentage who learn from clergymen and Koran course in broken families.

In terms of socioeconomic status, the most signifi-

cant variation is the outstanding position of clergymen in low, middle and lower classes as well as the schools and religious books taking precedence as a source of information in the high upper class and upper class (Table 151).

In all the matters probed, the field in which religion plays the determining role the most is the mate selection / choice of spouse. 50% of individuals declare that religion is determines their mate selection/ choice of spouse whereas 26% say that religion is very determining in terms of their mate selection / choice of spouse. Food-beverage preferences are second in the ranking. The percentage of those who say that religion has an impact on their choice of food-beverage is 69%. The other two matters influenced by religion are choice of friends (56%) and choice of clothing (57%) (Table 152).

The field which is least influenced by religion is choice of profession. The total percentage of respondents who state that religion is determining or very determining in terms of choice of profession is 42%. The percentage of respondents who say that religion is not determining in terms of choice of profession was established as 11%.

Table 152. The Extent to Which Religious Beliefs Determine Daily Life

	Not determining at all	Not determining	Neither determining nor not determining	Determining	Very determining	Does not want to answer
Mate selection/choice of spouse	4,8	11,9	6,7	49,5	26,2	0,9
Choice of friends	8,1	23,6	12,0	40,5	15,1	0,7
In relations with neighbors	8,9	26,3	13,5	36,7	13,9	0,7
Choice of profession	11,1	29,9	15,4	29,8	12,2	1,6
Voting in political elections	9,7	25,3	12,4	36,3	14,7	1,6
Choice of clothing/in dressing	7,8	23,2	11,8	40,2	16,3	0,7
In food-beverage preferences	6,0	15,7	9,1	47,3	21,3	0,7

When the extent to which religion is a determing factor was examined on the basis of breakdowns, religion is found to be a more influential determinant in any matter probed in rural areas compared urban areas. The matters that have the greatest extent of variation are relations with neighbors, choice of clothing and choice of profession (Table 153).

Among three major cities, Ankara and Istanbul present a more similar attitude whereas the role and determining power of religion is smaller in Izmir

than in Ankara and Istanbul.

When it comes to regions, the role of religion is more influential in Central Anatolia, West Black Sea and Southeast Anatolia, and most influential in Northeast Anatolia and East Black Sea compared to other regions. For instance, the proportion of those who think that religion is influential in the choice of friends is 81% in Northeast Anatolia and 44% in Aegean Region.

Table 153. Determining Power of Religion on Daily Life throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Determining & Very Determining)

	Mate selection/ choice of spouse	Choice of friends	Relations with neighbors	Choice of profession	Voting in political elections	Choice of clothing / in dressing	Choice of food and beverages
Türkiye	75,7	55,6	50,6	42,0	51,0	56,5	68,6
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	72,8	51,1	45,5	37,0	46,6	51,7	65,9
Rural	83,1	67,1	63,6	55,0	62,2	68,9	75,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	67,4	45,5	39,8	31,1	44,6	45,8	58,9
Ankara	69,3	48,9	43,9	36,1	47,0	49,4	71,1
Izmir	62,2	39,7	35,9	27,4	34,6	40,5	60,0
NUTS							
Istanbul	67,4	45,5	39,8	31,1	44,6	45,8	58,9
West Marmara	73,2	55,6	49,3	33,8	39,8	46,6	62,6
East Marmara	77,6	54,8	49,8	39,5	51,4	58,3	79,5
Aegean	64,9	44,0	39,3	29,8	37,9	46,9	59,9
Mediterranean	75,4	51,8	45,5	40,0	47,6	53,7	67,3
West Anatolia	75,5	57,8	54,0	44,5	55,5	55,9	72,5
Central Anatolia	90,6	67,6	58,6	53,8	65,4	66,9	68,3
West Black Sea	85,4	67,6	64,2	57,7	62,7	68,6	76,2
East Black Sea	86,8	70,8	69,1	62,4	65,9	71,6	79,7
Northeast Anatolia	90,7	80,7	79,5	76,1	77,7	78,0	81,1
Mideast Anatolia	74,4	60,5	55,8	46,5	59,6	65,8	70,5
Southeast Anatolia	86,7	68,3	63,4	53,4	55,4	70,9	77,3

It's possible to say that religion is more influential as a determining factor for women than for men (Table 154).

This applies to all matters. When age groups are analysed, higher percentages of older individuals feel the determining power of religion on their lives. This difference is accentuated even more in the choice of friends, voting in political elections and the choice of clothing. For instance, 46% of 18-24 year olds say that religion is a determining factor in voting whereas this rate goes up to 55% among 55-64 year olds, and to 65% above 65 years of age (Table 154).

A higher percentage of widowed individuals perceive religion to be a determining factor in their lives compared to single and divorced individuals.

Widowed individuals are followed by married individuals in this respect.

For individuals in extended families the impact of religion on daily life is greater than other family types. Additionally, the percentage of widowed and married individuals who think of religion as a determinnig factor in their lives is higher than single and divorced individuals.

The influence of religion in all matters increases as education status drops. 90% of individuals with no schooling and 82% of primary school graduates say that their religious beliefs are influential on their mate selection / choice of spouse whereas this rate is 58% among university graduates. 31% of university graduates stated that religion is not influential in this regard.

Table 154. Determining Power of Religion on Daily Life by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES (Determining & Very Determining)

	Mate selection/ choice of spouse	Choice of friends	Relations with neighbors	Choice of profession	Voting in political elections	Choice of clothing / in dressing	Choice of food and beverages
GENDER							
Male	72,0	52,6	47,8	39,4	48,5	51,8	66,0
Female	79,3	58,6	53,3	44,6	53,5	61,2	71,2
AGE							
18-24	72,1	49,8	45,0	38,4	45,5	51,1	63,8
25-34	73,3	50,3	44,7	37,3	47,9	52,6	66,9
35-44	75,0	54,1	48,8	39,1	49,3	54,9	67,6
45-54	75,9	57,9	52,4	42,5	51,1	56,5	69,1
55-64	78,6	60,3	56,4	46,5	54,8	60,9	70,8
65+	85,0	71,7	67,2	59,0	65,6	72,8	78,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
No schooling	89,8	74,4	70,4	59,8	68,2	76,9	81,0
Primary school	82,1	64,8	59,6	48,8	58,1	65,1	73,4
Elementary /secondary school	75,6	56,1	50,2	42,3	51,5	55,7	67,3
High school	66,4	41,9	37,4	30,3	38,7	42,4	60,4
Undergraduate /graduate studies	57,8	30,7	25,4	22,4	31,2	34,1	56,5
MARITAL STATUS							
Single	66,8	44,0	38,8	33,8	41,4	44,7	59,7
Married	78,0	58,2	53,0	43,4	53,0	59,0	70,6
Separated / live apart	62,4	47,5	48,3	37,2	42,7	47,8	60,4
Widowed	84,6	69,2	64,8	56,8	62,9	71,0	77,1
Divorced	60,5	40,8	36,8	32,0	38,2	41,7	61,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	75,4	54,9	49,6	40,6	49,8	55,4	67,7
Extended	82,1	63,5	59,1	50,3	59,4	65,4	75,3
Broken	68,0	48,3	44,0	38,4	45,7	49,9	63,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
High upper class	45,0	19,3	16,1	16,6	22,3	25,1	48,7
Upper class	63,5	37,5	31,3	26,0	36,0	39,5	60,1
Upper middle class	72,5	49,2	43,9	35,9	45,7	50,0	66,2
Lower middle class	80,4	62,5	57,6	47,0	56,3	62,4	71,0
Lower class	85,2	68,9	64,1	54,3	61,2	71,5	76,5

A similar situation holds true across socioeconomic status breakdowns. As socioeconomic status rises, the impact of religion diminishes. For instance, 19% of individuals in the high upper class state that their religious beliefs play a role in their choice of friends while this rate goes up to 69% in lower class.

Chapter 8

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

Visiting Relatives, Friends and Acquaintances

Giving Presents to Family Members and Relatives

Reading Books

Reading Newspapers

Going to the Cinema & Theatre

Going To Places Such As Restaurants, Diners, Pastry Shops, Cafes

Going to Places such as Local, Club, Fraternity, Association

Going to Places such as Bar, Night Club

Going to Coffeehouses

Working out

Doing Manual Work

Watching TV/VCD/DVD

Watching Sports Games

Playing Cards, Rummikub, Backgammon and Computer
Games at Home

Smoking

Alcohol Consumption

Using the Internet

Watching Television

Going on Holiday

In this section of the research, social activities of family members such as visiting others, giving presents, reading books and newspapers, watching TV, going to cinema and theatre, locals, clubs, bars, night clubs, coffeehouses are reviewed.

8.1. Visiting Relatives, Friends and Acquaintances

All individuals who participated the research were asked whether or not they visit their friends and acquaintances for occasions such as religious holidays, wedding invitations, for celebrating newly purchased house, for seeing the newly born babies, bidding farewell and greeting an acquaintance who is leaving to do/coming back from military service, seeing patients, upon their return from /when leaving for pilgrimage, for giving condolences, visiting graves, joining funerals. The types of visit which individuals necessarily pay in greater percentages are understood to be "for paying condolences" and "for exchanging greetings in religious holidays". The percentages of individuals who pay visits to their acquaintances for

the purposes of "Seeing the new home of their acquaintance" and "seeing them after their return from pilgrimage" are smaller (Table 155).

The type of visit which is attached greatest importance, in other words, the type of visit which is absolutely paid by household members is giving condolences. 39% of individuals reported making sure to visit their relatives, friends and acquaintances for giving condolences under relevant conditions. The proportion of individuals who generally pay visits for giving condolences is 45%. The visit type of second priority was established as "exchanging greetings in religious holidays". The percentage of individuals who absolutely pay this kind of visit goes up to 38% whereas the percentage of those who generally pay this kind of visit is 45%. However, the percentages of individuals who visit those who return from pilgrimage and who buy new homes are comparatively lower. The proportion of individuals who do not visit their acquaintances at all for these reasons is 11%.

Table 155. Visiting Relatives, Friends and Acquaintances throughout Türkiye

	Never	Sometimes	Generally	Always
For exchanging greetings in religious holidays	3,1	13,3	45,4	38,3
To ceremonies & celebrations such as wedding	4,4	19,8	47,1	28,6
To celebrate the newly purchased home of acquaintance	10,8	26,6	41,9	20,7
To see the new born baby of acquaintance	7,5	22,6	45,0	24,8
To bid farewell& to greet an acquaintance for military service	10,0	24,7	42,0	23,3
Visiting patients	3,1	17,3	47,9	31,7
Upon their return from pilgrimage	10,8	22,3	41,6	25,4
To give condolences	2,8	13,3	45,0	38,9
Visiting graves	4,8	20,6	43,0	31,5

Tables 156 & 157 lay out the proportions of individuals who "absolutely" or "generally" pay these visits across Türkiye and in several breakdowns.

Analysis of Residence Area reveals that individuals living in rural areas have greater proportions who visit their acquaintances for almost all occasions. However, the greatest extent of differentiation between rural and urban areas is seen with respect to visiting acquaintances who return from pilgrimage. 65% of urban residents visit their acquaintances for

this occasion. This rate goes up to 73% in the rural areas.

Among the three major cities, Istanbul has a lower percentage of individuals who visit their acquaintances upon all occasions apart from visiting graves. The greatest differentiation is seen in the percentage of individuals who visit their acquaintances for bidding farewell or greet them when they are leaving to do / coming back from military service. The percentage of individuals who visit their acquaint-

ances "for bidding farewell / greeting those who go / come back from military service" is 61% in Istanbul. This rate is 67% in Ankara and 71% in Izmir.

The proportion of individuals who visit their acquaintances in almost all occasion is highest in East Black Sea Region and lowest in Southeast Anatolia Region. The matter in which regions vary most is the visits paid to graves. In this case, those who visit their acquaintances account for 88% in East Black Sea 'de 88% and 55% in Southeast Anatolia.

In all occasions except for visiting to see a new born baby and bidding farewell/greeting acquaintances who go to / come from military service, no serious differentiation is seen between women and men. The proportion of women who visit their acquaintances for their new baby is 74% whereas this rate drops down to 66% among men. In contrast to this, men have a higher percentage who visit their acquaintances for bidding farewell to / greeting those who go to / come from military service (69%).

The proportion of individuals who visit their acquaintances for almost all occasions is relatively smaller in the age group of 65 and above compared to other age groups. The greatest degree of variation among age groups is seen in the percentages of people visiting their acquaintances for ceremonies & celebrations such as wedding. The proportion of those who visit their acquaintances for this occasion is 60% in the age group of 65 and above and 81% in the age group of 45-54.

In terms of marital status, the proportion of people who visit their acquaintances for any occasion is higher among married individuals. Demonstrative differentiation is seen among different marital statuses with respect to visiting proportions. However, the matter with the greatest extent of differ-

entiation is visiting acquaintances for ceremonies & celebrations such as wedding. 79% of married individuals visit their acquaintances for these occasions whereas this rate drops down to 56% among widowed individuals.

The proportions of individuals who visit their acquaintances for almost all occasions are smaller among people with no schooling, but higher in primary school graduates. A significant variation is found with respect to educational status. However, the greatest differentiation is seen in the proportion of individuals who visit their acquaintances for ceremonies & celebrations such as wedding. Among individuals with no schooling, the proportion of those who visit their acquaintances for this occasion is 62% and this rate is 80% among university graduates.

When household types are analysed, a smaller percentage of broken families, and a higher percentage of nuclear families are found to visit their acquaintances for any occasion. The highest degree of variation is seen in terms of visiting to see new babies, to farewell/greet those who go to / come back from military service. The percentages of individuals who visit their acquaintances for these three occasions range between 51- 56% among broken families. These rates are ranging from 66-72% among nuclear and extended families.

In terms of socioeconomic status, the percentage of people who visit their acquaintances for almost all occasions is smaller in lower class. The greatest differentiation is seen in the proportion of people who visit their acquaintances for ceremonies & celebration such as wedding. The proportion of those who visit their acquaintances for this occasion is 83% in high upper class, and 63% in lower class.

Table 156.Visiting Relatives, Friends or Acquaintances throughout Türkiye by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS (Always & Generally)

	For exchanging greetings in religious holidays	To give condolences	Visiting patients	Ceremonies & celebrations such as wedding
Türkiye	83,7	83,9	79,7	75,8
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	83,7	83,6	79,4	76,1
Rural	83,6	84,5	80,4	74,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	82,9	82,6	78,7	76,4
Ankara	84,6	85,5	81,9	80,0
Izmir	85,8	88,8	84,3	81,7
NUTS				
Istanbul	82,9	82,6	78,7	76,4
West Marmara	87,9	90,6	84,4	79,3
East Marmara	83,5	85,6	83,6	78,6
Aegean	87,7	87,2	84,7	83,2
Mediterranean	83,8	86,2	80,7	73,0
West Anatolia	84,6	85,2	81,4	78,8
Central Anatolia	80,7	75,1	69,2	73,2
West Black Sea	87,3	86,5	81,9	73,1
East Black Sea	90,3	91,5	87,1	80,4
Northeast Anatolia	78,2	73,9	65,4	65,2
Mideast Anatolia	81,3	86,0	83,0	77,2
Southeast Anatolia	74,1	72,0	66,4	61,1

	Visiting graves	To see new born baby of acquaintances	Upon their return from pilgrimage	To bid farewell & to greet an acquaintance for military service	To celebrate the newly purchased home of acquaintance
Türkiye	74,5	69,8	66,9	65,3	62,6
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	73,2	69,2	64,5	63,5	62,0
Rural	78,0	71,4	73,2	69,9	64,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	74,7	69,4	62,6	60,8	60,4
Ankara	73,0	73,3	66,1	66,7	67,6
Izmir	75,8	76,1	67,1	71,1	67,0
NUTS					
Istanbul	74,7	69,4	62,6	60,8	60,4
West Marmara	80,1	74,5	68,7	66,4	69,7
East Marmara	75,8	72,5	70,2	68,5	66,1
Aegean	79,2	78,9	73,1	76,4	71,2
Mediterranean	79,4	70,1	66,8	65,5	60,9
West Anatolia	71,8	73,6	69,0	68,6	66,5
Central Anatolia	67,6	61,1	61,1	58,7	57,7
West Black Sea	80,3	70,5	70,2	67,8	62,6
East Black Sea	88,1	79,0	83,0	74,8	71,8
Northeast Anatolia	57,0	61,7	63,8	55,9	54,2
Mideast Anatolia	77,2	68,5	68,7	65,3	62,8
Southeast Anatolia	55,4	49,1	53,3	48,4	44,7

	Visiting graves	To see new born baby of acquaintances	Upon their return from pilgrimage	To bid farewell & to greet an acquaintance for military service	To celebrate the newly purchased home of acquaintance

Table 157. Visiting Relatives, Friends or Acquaintances by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES (Always & Generally)

	For exchanging greetings in religious holidays	To give condolences	Visiting patients	Ceremonies & celebrations such as wedding
GENDER				
Male	84,4	84,8	79,8	76,0
Female	82,9	82,9	79,6	75,5
AGE				
18-24	83,0	78,9	73,9	73,1
25-34	85,2	83,9	79,0	76,8
35-44	86,6	87,2	83,8	79,3
45-54	86,9	87,7	84,4	80,8
55-64	84,8	87,6	83,9	78,3
65+	69,4	75,5	70,5	60,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
No schooling	71,9	74,8	70,0	61,5
Primary school	85,7	86,8	83,0	78,2
Elementary/secondary school	84,6	83,2	78,3	77,5
High school	85,1	83,6	79,4	76,8
Undergraduate/graduate studies	86,6	86,1	82,2	79,5
Single	80,8	77,8	72,2	72,0
MARITAL STATUS				
Married	86,4	86,9	83,1	79,0
Separated / live apart	72,7	75,9	73,4	59,7
Widowed	66,1	71,7	65,9	55,8
Divorced	71,5	73,8	72,0	60,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	86,1	85,8	81,6	78,2
Extended	82,4	82,8	78,6	75,6
Broken	72,0	74,4	70,3	62,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
High upper class	87,0	86,2	79,9	83,4
Upper class	87,8	87,6	84,1	80,6
Upper middle class	86,8	86,3	83,7	80,4
Lower middle class	84,2	84,4	79,7	76,0
Lower class	75,2	76,8	70,9	63,2

	Visiting graves	To see new born baby of acquaintances	Upon their return from pilgrimage	To bid farewell& to greet an acquaintance for military service	To celebrate the newly purchased home of acquaintance
GENDER					
Male	76,0	65,9	66,3	68,7	59,3
Female	73,1	73,7	67,6	61,8	65,9
AGE					
18-24	68,9	58,7	55,5	61,8	51,0
25-34	72,2	71,6	63,9	63,8	61,5
35-44	77,1	75,0	70,6	67,5	67,8
45-54	79,2	76,1	74,1	71,9	71,1
55-64	80,9	75,0	75,9	70,6	70,6
65+	69,9	58,2	64,5	54,0	52,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
No schooling	65,8	58,9	63,0	54,0	52,0
Primary school	78,7	74,4	74,3	70,6	68,1
Elementary/secondary school	74,5	69,4	65,2	67,6	61,8
High school	73,8	68,0	62,6	64,0	60,1
Undergraduate/graduate studies	73,0	71,8	59,4	60,9	63,3
Single	68,2	55,8	51,9	60,7	49,1
MARITAL STATUS					
Married	77,2	75,1	72,1	68,3	67,7
Separated / live apart	71,5	65,2	59,4	58,7	52,3
Widowed	67,3	55,9	61,0	50,0	52,1
Divorced	63,3	60,7	50,9	48,9	49,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	76,0	72,4	68,8	67,6	64,9
Extended	73,6	69,7	69,6	65,9	63,3
Broken	67,5	55,5	52,7	51,0	48,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
High upper class	66,5	76,5	56,9	56,0	65,9
Upper class	78,2	76,2	65,3	66,1	68,3
Upper middle class	78,5	73,4	69,5	67,8	66,7
Lower middle class	75,6	70,7	69,5	68,1	63,7
Lower class	65,8	58,3	61,8	57,3	50,0

8.2. Giving Presents to Family Members and Relatives

Within the scope of the research, all individuals were asked if and how often they get presents for family members and relatives at various occasions. It is understood from the answers that the rate of those who give presents to relatives on occasions of "visiting of a patient" and "going to see a baby" is higher. In the table below it can be seen that giving presents on "New Year's Eve" and on "Valentine's Day" has not yet become widespread.

27% of the individuals state that they always take a present with them, and 39% state that they generally take a present when visiting a patient. The rate of those who stated that they always take a present with them when going to see a baby is 24%, and those who generally take a present is 38%. The rate of those individuals who bring a present to those who get married or buy a house is also high. The rate of those who said that they always give a present to the acquaintance who buys a house or gets married is 19%, and those who generally give a present on these occasions is 35%. The occasion where giving presents is the lowest is on New Year's Eve.

Table 158. Giving Presents to Family Members and Relatives throughout Türkiye

	Never	Sometimes	Generally	Always	Irrelevant
On religious fests	23,7	31,0	28,7	16,2	0,4
On birthdays	31,6	26,8	25,5	14,2	2,0
On New Year's Eve	62,5	16,3	10,6	5,1	5,5
Upon marriage/buying a house	16,9	28,1	35,3	19,1	0,5
Leaving for military service	21,9	28,9	32,4	16,2	0,7
Going to see a baby	12,8	24,6	38,0	23,9	0,7
Visiting of a patient	10,8	23,1	39,3	26,5	0,3
On blessed days	46,0	24,0	19,6	9,6	0,8
On wedding anniversaries	42,0	16,7	14,8	11,0	15,5
On Mothers' Day	30,5	17,7	22,4	18,4	10,9
On Fathers' Day	34,8	16,0	18,9	14,5	15,9
On Valentines' Day	46,6	15,2	14,5	11,9	11,8

The rate of those individuals who stated that they always buy a present for their relatives and family members on New Year's Eve is 5%. The rate of those who stated that they generally get a present for family members or relatives on New year's Eve is 11% (Table 158).

Tables 159 & 160 show the overall Türkiye rate and the demographic breakdown of those who "always" and "generally" give present to family members or relatives on various occasions.

According to area of residence, generally on every occasion the present-giving rate of those who live

in the rural areas is lower compared to those who live in the urban areas. The differentiation in giving presents between urban and rural areas is the highest on Mothers' Day, Fathers' Day and birthdays. On these three occasions almost half of the urban dwellers (at varying rates between 38% and 47%) give presents to their relatives. In rural, these rates are between 21% and 26% (Table 159).

Amongst the three major cities, it is determined that on each occasion the rate of those who give presents is lower than in Istanbul. The differentiation between these provinces is noteworthy in giving presents to relatives departing for military ser-

vice. 44% of those who live in Istanbul give presents on departure for the military, this rate is 57% in Ankara, and 59% in Izmir.

Amongst NUTS, Southeast Anatolia is the region with the lowest rate of giving presents for every occasion. According the NUTS, it is understood that there is a high differentiation on occasions of visiting relatives getting married/buying a house, going to see a baby and visiting of a patient. In Southeast Anatolia, 20% gives always or generally a present to those who get married/buy a house, whereas this rate rises to 68% in East Marmara. Again in Southeast Anatolia the rates of 28% who buy a present when going to see a baby, and 31% when visiting a patient are the lowest. The rate of those who always or generally give a present to relatives on these occasions is high in West Marmara. Out of those who live in West Marmara, 78% take a present when they visit a patient and 73% when they go to see a baby.

It is understood that the rate of giving presents amongst women is higher when going to see a baby (66%), and amongst men on Valentines' Day (31%) There is not a significant difference between women and men on other occasions (Table 160).

The highest differentiation between age groups is in the rate of those who give presents on Mothers' Day and Fathers' Day. 61% of those between 18 and 24 give presents on Mothers' Day , however this rate drops to 31% in age group 45-54, and to 20% in age group 55-64. 52% of age group 18-24 give presents on Fathers' Day. This rate drops down to 23% in age group 45-54 and to 15% in age group 55-64.

Almost on every occasion, the rate of those giving presents amongst the widowed individuals is lower compared to those of other marital status. Once again, the occasions where the highest differentiation occurs depending on the marital status

is on Mothers' Day and Fathers' Day. Those who are separated or live apart are the ones with the highest rate for giving presents on Mothers' Day (43%). On Fathers' Day, single individuals have the highest rate in giving presents (51%). On both occasions, widowed individuals have the lowest rate in giving presents. 11% of this group gives presents to relatives on Mothers' Day and 7% gives presents on Fathers' Day.

According to educational status, individuals who received no schooling have the lowest rate in giving presents on every occasion. Mothers' Day and birthdays are the occasions of highest differentiation depending on educational status. On both occasions, 67%-68% of university graduates give presents and this rate drops to 13% on Mothers' Day, and to 16% on birthdays for those who received no schooling.

In broken families the rate of those giving presents is lower compared to other household types, and it is higher in nuclear families. The highest differentiation based on household types is observed on wedding anniversaries. As expected, the rate of those giving presents in broken families on wedding anniversary occasions is low (8%). This rate is 22% in extended families, and 30% in nuclear families.

According to socioeconomic status, the lower class has the lowest rate of giving presents on each occasion. Occasions of highest differentiation are Mothers' Day and birthdays. Only 14% of the lower class mentioned always or generally buying presents for relatives on birthdays, whereas this rate goes up to 76% in the high upper class. The rate of those giving presents on Mothers' Day is 17% in the lower class, and 74% in the high upper class. Another point to note is that the rate of giving presents on New Year's Eve which is very low in overall Türkiye (16%) is at high rates like 44% for the high upper class and 31% for the upper class.

Table 159. Giving Presents to Family Members and Relatives throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, and Gender (Always & Generally)

	Visiting of a patient	Going to see a baby	Upon marriage/ buying a house	Leaving for military service	Religious fests	Mothers' Day	Birth-days	Fathers' Day	Blessed Days	Valentines' Day	Wedding anniversaries	New Year's Eve
Türkiye	65,8	61,9	54,5	48,5	44,9	40,9	39,6	33,4	29,2	26,4	25,8	15,7
RESIDENCE AREA												
Urban	67,5	63,3	56,1	48,2	45,9	46,8	45,1	38,3	30,2	30,2	29,1	18,1
Rural	61,4	58,6	50,2	49,4	42,6	25,6	25,4	20,6	26,7	16,8	17,3	9,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES												
Istanbul	67,9	62,6	56,1	44,2	52,3	51,3	47,0	43,1	34,3	32,0	30,2	20,1
Ankara	72,0	70,4	66,6	56,8	45,0	55,9	54,6	47,0	34,7	33,8	34,4	25,4
Izmir	77,9	74,4	65,7	58,7	50,9	54,3	60,9	44,0	36,9	38,3	38,3	32,7
NUTS												
Istanbul	67,9	62,6	56,1	44,2	52,3	51,3	47,0	43,1	34,3	32,0	30,2	20,1
West Marmara	77,7	72,5	65,0	55,6	62,4	35,8	43,2	29,4	42,2	21,9	26,5	19,4
East Marmara	76,7	73,4	67,7	59,9	54,4	45,3	47,4	37,9	37,0	29,6	30,3	15,8
Aegean	72,9	70,1	62,1	59,7	50,5	46,8	49,6	38,0	39,7	31,8	31,7	22,3
Mediterranean	62,4	60,5	48,2	43,9	34,3	39,4	36,6	32,6	20,5	26,6	23,9	14,7
West Anatolia	70,3	68,1	62,4	55,5	44,3	50,5	47,4	40,8	29,6	31,0	29,8	19,4
Central Anatolia	60,3	56,8	52,4	49,6	37,0	33,7	31,5	27,3	24,3	22,6	23,0	7,9
West Black Sea	67,7	60,9	52,8	49,1	47,2	36,3	33,6	30,5	26,0	23,1	24,9	15,3
East Black Sea	74,3	70,2	65,3	57,6	48,6	32,9	30,3	25,3	28,4	19,0	22,5	8,5
Northeast Anatolia	49,5	46,3	33,3	38,1	51,0	24,9	20,3	20,0	19,2	17,9	15,6	5,1
Mideast Anatolia	68,0	61,4	56,5	49,7	29,7	32,9	25,9	23,3	19,0	18,6	17,2	7,6
Southeast Anatolia	31,4	27,8	19,9	18,2	22,3	16,6	17,2	11,9	10,6	13,2	10,0	4,9
GENDER												
Male	64,8	58,2	51,8	50,1	46,4	40,0	37,7	32,4	29,4	31,0	27,4	14,8
Female	66,8	65,7	57,1	46,9	43,5	41,8	41,5	34,4	29,0	21,9	24,2	16,5

Table 160. Giving Presents to Family Members and Relatives by Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES (Always & Generally)

	Visiting of a patient	Going to see a baby	Upon marriage/ buying a house	Leaving for military service	Religious fests	Mothers' Day	Birthdays	Fathers' Day	Blessed Days	Valentines' Day	Wedding anniversaries	New Year's Eve
AGE												
18-24	57,0	49,7	42,9	38,1	33,4	61,0	47,5	52,1	24,5	41,0	18,5	18,7
25-34	66,5	64,5	55,2	45,9	44,9	53,9	46,2	46,0	28,0	37,3	35,0	17,9
35-44	70,6	67,7	59,2	51,7	48,7	44,9	41,7	34,9	29,8	25,2	32,7	14,3
45-54	69,7	66,0	60,0	55,4	47,7	31,0	33,6	22,7	32,0	17,9	24,5	14,4
55-64	70,2	67,1	60,9	57,3	51,1	19,8	32,8	15,0	34,3	12,8	19,1	14,8
65+	58,3	52,5	46,7	45,2	45,4	8,4	24,5	7,1	28,7	7,9	12,1	11,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS												
No schooling	48,6	45,3	37,4	36,7	32,9	12,8	16,3	10,0	21,3	6,6	8,0	5,0
Primary school	68,1	64,4	56,3	52,8	47,3	27,6	29,8	21,4	31,2	15,6	20,3	10,1
Elementary/secondary school	63,2	59,0	51,5	47,4	43,8	47,2	39,5	38,0	28,6	32,4	28,0	14,4
High school	69,0	63,8	56,2	48,2	45,2	60,5	55,2	50,5	30,0	39,3	33,3	23,0
Undergraduate/ grad. studies	75,3	73,0	68,1	50,6	51,8	67,5	66,7	57,9	31,3	49,1	44,7	32,3
MARITAL STATUS												
Single	57,3	48,8	42,8	39,1	33,8	61,0	49,0	51,3	23,9	38,4	9,7	20,5
Married	69,3	66,7	58,7	52,1	48,5	37,8	38,2	30,8	30,9	25,6	32,4	14,5
Separated/Live apart	63,1	55,7	52,7	46,9	42,8	42,7	42,3	32,7	32,8	15,1	21,0	21,8
Widowed	53,1	49,9	43,7	39,2	40,9	11,3	24,5	6,6	27,4	3,4	5,6	11,1
Divorced	62,2	58,0	49,6	39,2	38,6	42,6	44,9	29,5	26,0	12,3	8,2	21,3
HOUSEHOLD TYPE												
Nuclear	67,9	64,5	56,6	50,3	47,0	42,7	41,5	36,3	30,5	28,5	29,9	16,2
Extended	63,3	59,5	52,2	48,7	41,5	35,6	31,9	28,3	26,9	22,8	21,9	10,8
Broken	57,5	51,2	45,6	38,3	38,3	38,2	40,2	24,3	25,6	20,1	8,2	19,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS												
High upper class	76,6	76,4	72,4	48,6	57,8	73,9	76,2	60,3	29,4	53,0	53,5	44,3
Upper class	78,9	77,1	70,6	55,9	55,0	63,6	66,2	55,2	36,3	45,8	47,9	30,9
Upper middle class	72,8	68,6	62,9	54,3	50,8	54,0	51,5	44,8	32,9	34,4	34,5	19,2
Lower middle class	65,3	61,1	52,5	49,7	43,9	32,7	30,9	25,6	29,2	20,4	19,4	10,5
Lower class	45,3	41,8	33,0	32,6	30,5	16,9	14,3	12,9	18,4	11,6	11,0	4,8

8.3. Reading Books

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked how often they read books and they were asked to choose one from "never", "sometimes" and "often". As it can be seen at the table below, 41% of individuals in Türkiye never read. This rate is 56% in rural and 35% in urban area (Table 161).

Amongst the three major cities the rate of those who never read is higher in Izmir (37%). This rate is 31% in Istanbul and Ankara. The rate of those who mentioned that they read often is slightly higher in Ankara (22%).

The rate of those who never read reaches high proportions like Güneydoğu Anadolu'da 56% in Southeast Anatolia and 55% in Northeast Anatolia. It does not seem possible to state based on the rates of "never" readers that the reading activity amongst regions increases or decreases as one goes from the west to the east or from north to south. Nevertheless, it is possible to say that rate of reading books is lower in eastern regions compared to the others. The highest rate of respondents who said they read often comes from West Anatolia (19%).

If females and males are compared in terms of reading, 44% of females state that they never read, and

Table 161. Reading Books throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	40,9	44,3	14,7
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	35,3	48,0	16,7
Rural	55,5	34,9	9,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	31,0	51,2	17,8
Ankara	31,4	46,9	21,7
Izmir	36,8	45,3	17,9
NUTS			
Istanbul	31,0	51,2	17,8
West Marmara	43,0	41,0	16,0
East Marmara	36,7	47,3	16,0
Aegean	42,4	41,2	16,5
Mediterranean	42,3	43,3	14,4
West Anatolia	34	47,5	18,5
Central Anatolia	41,9	49,2	8,9
West Black Sea	45,1	42,5	12,4
East Black Sea	46,1	40,3	13,6
Northeast Anatolia	54,8	34,4	10,9
Mideast Anatolia	49,3	39,7	11,0
Southeast Anatolia	56,2	36,3	7,6

this rate drops to 38% in males. However, amongst females the rate of those who read often is 16% and the rate is 14% for males. Although these figures show that non-reading females are higher in ratio than males, they also demonstrate that the females who read books read relatively more often (Table 162).

As the age group increases the rate of those who never read rises and the rate of those who read often falls. 25% of 18-24 age group state that they read often. This rate drops down to 9% at the age of 65 and above.

As the educational status improves, the rate of those who never read books decreases and the rate of those who often read increases. However, there is a proportion of 8% amongst the university graduates who never read books.

More than half of those individuals from extended families (51%) never read. The household type with the highest rate of individuals who often read books is the broken family with a rate of 24%.

The rate of those who never read books at the lowest socioeconomic status is 70%. Only 10% of individuals form the highest SES mention never reading books, and almost half of this class (45%) state that they often read books. The rate at the highest SES is well above the Türkiye average (15%).

Table 162. Reading Books by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	38,4	47,9	13,6
Female	43,5	40,8	15,8
AGE			
18-24	22,1	52,5	25,4
25-34	33,4	50,7	15,9
35-44	38,9	48,9	12,3
45-54	48,6	40,9	10,6
55-64	52,4	35,9	11,7
65+	69	22,1	8,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	89,2	9,4	1,4
Primary school	50,8	42,8	6,4
Elementary/secondary school	34,4	55,4	10,2
High school	18,9	57,0	24
Undergraduate/graduate studies	8,4	49,1	42,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	39,0	46,5	14,5
Extended	50,6	40,6	8,8
Broken	38,1	37,6	24,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	10,8	43,9	45,3
Upper class	14,8	53,2	32,0
Upper middle class	29,6	52,8	17,6
Lower middle class	48,0	43,5	8,6
Lower class	70,2	27,0	2,8

8.4. Reading Newspapers

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked how often they read newspapers and just like in the reading activity, they were asked to choose one from "never", "sometimes" and "often". The individuals gave similar answers to the question regarding reading newspapers, although not exactly the same way with reading books. In overall Türkiye, 30% of individuals never read the newspaper, and 26% mentioned often reading the newspaper. (Table 163).

The rate of those who never read newspapers is higher in the rural area (47%) than the urban area (23%). In terms of based on three major cities, there is not a noteworthy differentiation between cities. The respondents who often read the newspaper are the highest in Istanbul with 35% and in West Marmara regions with 34%. The rate of those who never read the newspaper are higher in Northeast Anatolia (56%) and Southeast Anatolia regions (54%).

Table 163. Reading Newspapers throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	29,7	44,7	25,6
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	23,1	47,2	29,7
Rural	46,8	38,4	14,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	16,1	48,7	35,1
Ankara	21,4	43,8	34,8
Izmir	18,9	43,8	37,4
NUTS			
Istanbul	16,1	48,7	35,1
West Marmara	22,7	43,6	33,7
East Marmara	23,4	48,4	28,3
Aegean	24,5	43,8	31,7
Mediterranean	27,8	48,7	23,5
West Anatolia	26,6	45,5	27,9
Central Anatolia	39,3	46,4	14,2
West Black Sea	36,1	42,9	21,0
East Black Sea	39,2	41,0	19,9
Northeast Anatolia	55,8	30,3	13,8
Mideast Anatolia	48,9	38,5	12,6
Southeast Anatolia	54,0	36,4	9,6

According to the female and male breakdown of newspaper reading habit, it is understood that females read much less newspaper than males. 43% of females state that they never read the newspaper. This rate is 17% in males. 35% of males mention reading the newspaper often, whereas this rate drops to 16% in females (Table 164).

As the age group increases, so does the rate of those who never read the newspaper. On the other hand,

as age progresses, the rate of those who often read the newspaper decreases. In age group 65+, 62% never read the newspaper. The rate of those who mention often reading the newspaper is higher amongst individuals from age groups 18-24 and 25-34 (29%).

As the educational status increases, the rate of those who never read the newspaper decreases, and the rate of those who often read the newspaper

Table 164. Reading Newspapers by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	16,7	48,1	35,2
Female	42,6	41,4	16,0
AGE			
18-24	18,4	52,6	29,0
25-34	21,8	49,5	28,7
35-44	23,9	49,8	26,3
45-54	32,9	42,7	24,4
55-64	39,9	36,0	24,0
65+	61,8	23,3	14,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	87,8	9,8	2,4
Primary school	34,3	49,6	16,1
Elementary/secondary school	20,7	55,2	24,1
High school	8,0	53,3	38,7
Undergraduate/graduate studies	5,0	38,5	56,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	26,3	46,9	26,8
Extended	40,6	42,1	17,2
Broken	33,4	36,2	30,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	5,1	33,1	61,7
Upper class	9,0	42,5	48,6
Upper middle class	15,8	51,0	33,2
Lower middle class	35,0	46,7	18,2
Lower class	62,1	30,8	7,1

increases. The rate of those who mentioned often reading the newspaper is 39% in high school graduates, and 57% amongst university graduates, both of which are well above the overall Türkiye rate (26%).

The household type where the rate of those who never read the newspaper is the highest in extended families (41%). The household type with the highest rate of individuals who often read the news-paper is the broken family with 30% and nuclear families with 27%.

In lower class, the rate of those who never read the newspaper is 62%. 5% of the high upper class mention that they never read the newspaper, and 65% of this group say they often read the newspaper. This rate of the high upper class is well above Türkiye average (26%).

8.5. Going to the Cinema & Theater

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked how often they go to the cinema/theater. In overall Türkiye, 70% mentioned never going to the cinema or theater, and the rate of those who sometimes go is 26%, and a mere 4% is the rate for those who often go to theater/cinema (Table 165).

The rate of those who never go to the cinema/theater is higher in rural area (88%). This rate is 63% in urban area. The rate of those who sometimes go to the cinema/ theater is 32% in urban, 10% in rural.

When the three major cities are compared, the rate of those who often go to the cinema/theater are higher in Ankara and Istanbul (7%). The rate of those who never go to the cinema/theater is 53% in Istanbul, 59% in Ankara and 63% in Izmir.

Istanbul is the highest NUTS with a rate of 7% of individuals going often to the cinema and theater, and the rate of those who said they never go to the cinema or theater is higher in Northeast Anatolia (86%), Southeast Anatolia (85%) and Mideast Anatolia (84%) regions.

Table 165. Going to the Cinema & Theater throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	70,2	25,6	4,2
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	63,3	31,5	5,2
Rural	88,2	10,4	1,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	52,5	40,1	7,4
Ankara	58,9	34,0	7,0
Izmir	63,2	32,4	4,4
NUTS			
Istanbul	52,5	40,1	7,4
West Marmara	73,7	22,1	4,1
East Marmara	66,0	28,6	5,4
Aegean	69,5	27,3	3,1
Mediterranean	74,4	21,9	3,7
West Anatolia	65,8	28,7	5,5
Central Anatolia	79,3	18,4	2,3
West Black Sea	79,2	17,9	2,8
East Black Sea	78,9	18,7	2,4
Northeast Anatolia	85,6	12,7	1,7
Mideast Anatolia	84,2	13,9	1,9
Southeast Anatolia	85,0	13,9	1,1

From the gender perspective, the rate of females who often go to the cinema and theater is the same with the rate of males (4%). However, the rate of females who never go to the theater or cinema is higher (74%) than males (67%) (Table 166).

As the age group drops, educational status increases and the socioeconomic status rises, the rate of those who say they never go to the cinema or theater drops. From the age group aspect, it is understood that almost all of the 65+ age group (95%) never go to the cinemaya/theater. This rate is 43% in 18-24 age group. The highest rate in those who often g oto the cinema/theater can be found in 18-24 age group. 11% of the individuals in this age group often go to the cinema/theater and 46% sometimes goes to the cinema/theater.

As the educational status improves, the rate of those who often go to the cinema/theater increases, and

the rate of those who never go drops. Almost none of those who have not graduated from any school (98%) go to the cinema/theater. This rate is 25% in those who went through undergraduate/graduate studies. On the other hand, the rate of those who often go to the cinema/theater exceeds the Türkiye average (4%) with 15% in university graduates.

Just like in reading books, the type of households with the highest rate of individuals who do not go to the theater and cinema is the extended family with 80%. This rate is 70% in nuclear families, and 58% in broken households. The rate of those who often go

to the cinema/theater is higher amongst individuals from broken households (9%).

Just like in educational status, as the socioeconomic status increases, so does the rate of those who often go to the cinema/theater, and the rate of those who never go drops. Almost all of the lower class (97%) never go to the cinema/theater. This rate is 16% in high upper class. The rate of those who often go to the cinema/theater is well above the Türkiye average (4%) with 11% in upper class, and 21% in high upper class.

Table 166. Going to the Cinema & Theater by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	66,8	28,8	4,4
Female	73,6	22,5	3,9
AGE			
18-24	43,2	46,1	10,7
25-34	59,3	35,0	5,7
35-44	73,2	24,6	2,2
45-54	83,1	15,0	1,9
55-64	88,0	11,1	1,0
65+	94,7	4,7	0,5
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	98,1	1,8	0,0
Primary school	90,7	8,8	0,5
Elementary/secondary school	72,0	26,0	2,0
High school	43,0	48,6	8,3
Undergraduate/graduate studies	25,0	60,1	14,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	70,1	26,2	3,7
Extended	79,5	18,4	2,1
Broken	57,9	32,7	9,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	15,8	63,7	20,5
Upper class	32,4	56,8	10,9
Upper middle class	57,2	38,3	4,5
Lower middle class	84,1	14,2	1,7
Lower class	96,9	3,1	0,0

8.6. Going to Places such as Restaurants, Diners, Pastry Shops, Cafes

As part of the research, one of the questions asked to individuals was how frequently they go to places such as restaurants, diners, pastry shops, cafes. In overall Türkiye, 50% of individuals have mentioned never going to places such as restaurants, diners, pastry shops, cafes, the rate of those who sometimes go to such places 42% and the rate of those who often go is 8% (Table 167).

The rate of those who never go to places such as restaurants, diners, pastry shops, cafes is a high figure like 67% in the rural. This rate is 43% in the urban area.

There is not a huge difference in terms of the results concerning the three major cities but in Izmir the rate of those who never go to such places (41%) is slightly higher. The rate of those who often go is slightly higher in Ankara (14%).

Depending on the NUTS, the rate of those who said they never go to places such as restaurants, diners, pastry shops, cafes is higher in Northeast Anatolia (72%) and in Southeast Anatolia (70%). As the table demonstrates, the rate of those who never go to such places is higher in eastern regions. It is noteworthy that the rate 12% of those who often go to places such as restaurants, diners, pastry shops, cafes is higher in Istanbul and in West Anatolia.

Table 167. Going to Places such as Restaurants, Diners, Pastry Shops, Cafes throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	49,7	42,4	7,9
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	43,2	47,2	9,6
Rural	66,6	29,9	3,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	37,3	51,2	11,5
Ankara	38,6	47,2	14,2
Izmir	41,1	49,5	9,4
NUTS			
Istanbul	37,3	51,2	11,5
West Marmara	50,5	41,9	7,7
East Marmara	44,8	45,7	9,5
Aegean	46,6	46,5	6,9
Mediterranean	51,2	42,5	6,4
West Anatolia	43,8	44	12,2
Central Anatolia	57,3	37,9	4,7
West Black Sea	54,6	37,9	7,5
East Black Sea	59,4	35	5,6
Northeast Anatolia	71,9	24,2	3,9
Mideast Anatolia	56,8	37,9	5,4
Southeast Anatolia	69,8	27,6	2,6

From the gender aspect, 58% of females said that they never go to places such as restaurants, diners, pastry shops, cafes, in males this rate drops to 42%. As the age group increases, the rate of individuals who say they never go to such places also rises, but the same rate drops as the educational status and socioeconomic status increase. 31% of 18-24 age group say tey never go to such places, and 16% say they often go there. The rate of those who often go to places such as restaurants, diners, pastry shops, cafes drops down to 2% in 65+ age group (Table 168).

The rate of individuals who often go to such places amongst high school (15%) and university graduates (22%) is above the Türkiye average (8%). 88% of those who have not received any schooling mention that they never go to such places.

As the socioeconomic status increases, the rate of those who often go to places such as restaurants, diners, pastry shops, cafes rises considerably, in the high upper class it is noteworthy that the rate is well above the Türkiye average (8%) with a 33% rate. In the high upper class, only 7% says that they never go to such places, and this rate reaches 83% in lower class.

An evaluation based on the household type shows that those who never go to such places is the highest in extended households (61%) and that those who often go have the highest rate in broken families (14%).

Table 168. Going to Places such as Restaurants, Diners, Pastry Shops, Cafes by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	41,6	49,1	9,3
Female	57,8	35,7	6,4
AGE			
18-24	31,4	52,3	16,3
25-34	38,1	51,2	10,7
35-44	48,6	45	6,4
45-54	57,5	38,5	4,0
55-64	65,3	31,7	3,0
65+	79,8	18,3	1,9
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	88,4	10,8	0,8
Primary school	65,5	32,2	2,3
Elementary/secondary school	46,0	47,3	6,6
High school	23,7	61,7	14,5
Undergraduate/graduate studies	12,0	66,1	21,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	47,5	44,8	7,7
Extended	60,5	34,9	4,6
Broken	46,7	39,6	13,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	7,2	59,6	33,1
Upper class	13,5	67,4	19,1
Upper middle class	33,4	57,5	9,1
Lower middle class	60,4	35,6	4,0
Lower class	83,1	15,8	1,1

8.7. Going to Places such as Local, Club, Fraternity, Association

Another question asked to individuals in the research was how often they go to places such as local, club, fraternity, association. In overall Türkiye, 88% of individuals say they never go to places such as local, club, fraternity, association. The rate of those who sometimes go to such places is 10%, and the rate of those who often go is 2% (Table 169).

The rate of those who never go to places such as local, club, fraternity, association is higher in rural areas (94%), and the rate of those who sometimes go are higher in the urban area (12%). Amongst the three major cities, the rate of those who go to places such as local, club, fraternity, association is higher in Istanbul. The rate of those who sometimes go to such places is 18% in Istanbul, and 13% in other two cities. Almost all of the individuals who live in Northeast Anatolia (97%) and Southeast Anatolia (96%) regions say they never go to places such as local, club, fraternity, association. The rate of those who sometimes go is higher in Istanbul (18%).

Table 169. Going to Places such as Local, Club, Fraternity, Association throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	87,8	10,2	2,0
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	85,4	12,1	2,5
Rural	94,0	5,1	1,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	78,3	18,4	3,3
Ankara	83,9	13,4	2,7
Izmir	83,3	13,3	3,5
NUTS			
Istanbul	78,3	18,4	3,3
West Marmara	86,6	10,8	2,6
East Marmara	86,3	11,1	2,5
Aegean	86,9	11,0	2,1
Mediterranean	89,9	8,0	2,0
West Anatolia	86,5	11,4	2,2
Central Anatolia	93,7	5,6	0,7
West Black Sea	92,4	6,4	1,2
East Black Sea	93,1	5,8	1,0
Northeast Anatolia	96,6	2,8	0,6
Mideast Anatolia	94,3	4,2	1,5
Southeast Anatolia	95,9	3,5	0,7

Evaluation based on gender shows that among females rate of those who say they never go to places such as local, club, fraternity, association is 94%, and in males the rate drops to 82% (Table 170).

The rate of individuals who mentioned never going to places such as local, club, fraternity, association is very high in all breakdown groups. However, this rate rises as the age group increases, and decreases as the educational status and socioeconomic status increase. 82% of the 18-24 age group mentions never going to such places and 15% says that they sometimes go. The rate of those who sometimes go to places such as local, club, fraternity, association is 4% for 65+.

The rate of those who sometimes (24%) and often (7%) go to such places among undergraduate/graduate studies graduates is well above the Türkiye average. On the other hand, almost none of the individuals who have not graduated from a school go to such places (99%). In primary school graduates the rate of those who never go is also very high (95%).

As the socioeconomic status improves, the rate of those who often go to places such as local, club, fraternity, association also rises, and for high upper class, with a rate of 9%, it is noteworthy that the proportion is well above the Türkiye average (2%). 63% of the high upper class mention never going to such places, however almost all of the lower class (98%) has never been in such a place.

According to the household type, the rate of those who never go to such places is higher in extended households (92%), the rate of those who sometimes go is higher in broken households (14%) and in nuclear households (10%).

Table 170. Going to Places such as Local, Club, Fraternity, Association by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	81,5	15,4	3,1
Female	94,1	4,9	1,0
AGE			
18-24	81,9	15,0	3,1
25-34	85,5	12,3	2,1
35-44	88,8	9,5	1,7
45-54	89,0	9,4	1,7
55-64	91,1	6,7	2,2
65+	95,3	3,5	1,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	99,2	0,5	0,3
Primary school	94,6	4,7	0,7
Elementary/secondary school	88,9	9,8	1,3
High school	79,6	17,4	3,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	68,5	24,4	7,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	87,6	10,4	2,0
Extended	91,9	6,9	1,2
Broken	83,1	13,6	3,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	62,8	28,7	8,5
Upper class	74,7	20,6	4,7
Upper middle class	83,9	14,0	2,1
Lower middle class	92,6	6,4	1,1
Lower class	97,7	2,2	0,1

8.8. Going to Places such as Bar, Night Club

In the research, individuals were asked if they go to places such as bars/pubs or night clubs and if yes, how often. In overall Türkiye, 92% of individuals mention never going to places such as bar sor night clubs. The rate of those who sometimes go to such places is 7%, the rate of those who often go is only 1% (Table 171).

The rate of those who never go to places such as bars or night clubs is higher in the rural area (96%), and the rate of those who sometimes go is higher in the urban area (8%). The rate of those who often go to such places is very low and there is no differentiation between urban and rural. Amongst three major cities the rates of going to places such as bars and night clubs are similar, and there is no differentiation. The rate of those who never go to places such as bars and night clubs is very high in all regions. It is noted that the rate of those who sometimes go is higher in west NUTS. The rate of those who sometimes go to places such as bars and night clubs is higher in Istanbul with 11%, in West Marmara with 8%, in West Anatolia 8%, in East Marmara, in Aegean and Mediterranean (7%).

Table 171. Going to Places such as Bars and Night Clubs throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	92,2	6,6	1,2
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	90,6	7,9	1,5
Rural	96,3	3,1	0,5
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	86,4	11,2	2,4
Ankara	88,1	10,6	1,3
Izmir	86,9	10,4	2,7
NUTS			
Istanbul	86,4	11,2	2,4
West Marmara	90,5	8,0	1,4
East Marmara	91,8	7,0	1,1
Aegean	91,3	7,2	1,5
Mediterranean	91,7	7,0	1,3
West Anatolia	90,7	8,2	1,1
Central Anatolia	97,9	1,9	0,3
West Black Sea	95,5	3,9	0,6
East Black Sea	95,7	3,6	0,7
Northeast Anatolia	97,1	2,5	0,5
Mideast Anatolia	97,5	1,9	0,6
Southeast Anatolia	98,6	1,0	0,4

According to gender, 96% of females say they never go to places such as bars or night clubs. This rate is 89% in males (Table 172).

As the age group increases, so does the rate of those who never go to bars or night clubs, however the rate of those who sometimes or often go decreases.

13% of the 18-24 age group mentions sometimes going to places such as bars and night clubs and 4% state that they often go to such places. In the next age range, which 25-34, the rate of those who sometimes go to such places drops to 10% and the rate of those who often go drops to 2%.

In terms of educational status, the rate is reversely corrolated. As the educational status of individuals increases, the rate of those who say they never go to places such as bars or night clubs decreases. 85% of high school graduates and 78% of the university graduates say they never go to places such as bars or night clubs. The rate of those who sometimes go is 13% in high school graduates, and 18% in university graduates.

The highest rate of those who sometimes go to bars and night clubs is the highhest in broken households with 13%. This rate is 6% in nuclear households, and 4% in extended households.

As the socioeconomic status improves, the rate of those who go to places such as bars and night clubs increases. 13% of the upper class and 30% of the high upper class mention sometimes going to such places.

Table 172. Going to Places such as Bars and Night Clubs by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	88,5	9,5	2,0
Female	95,9	3,6	0,5
AGE			
18-24	83,1	13,4	3,5
25-34	88,8	9,7	1,5
35-44	94,0	5,3	0,7
45-54	96,0	3,5	0,4
55-64	98,1	1,5	0,4
65+	98,9	0,9	0,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	99,5	0,3	0,2
Primary school	98,1	1,7	0,3
Elementary/secondary school	93,6	5,5	0,9
High school	84,6	12,9	2,5
Undergraduate/graduate studies	78,3	18,1	3,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	92,9	6,1	1,0
Extended	95,3	4,0	0,7
Broken	83,7	13,0	3,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	65,6	29,5	4,9
Upper class	84,7	13,2	2,1
Upper middle class	90,2	8,5	1,3
Lower middle class	96,3	3,1	0,6
Lower class	98,6	1,1	0,3

8.9. Going to Coffeehouses

As part of research, individuals were asked if they go to coffeehouses and if yes, how often. 79% of individuals throughout Türkiye say they never go to places such as coffeehouses. The rate of those who sometimes go is 17%, and the rate of those who often go is 4% (Table 173).

The rate of those who go to coffeehouses is higher in rural areas. The rate of those who say they often go to places such as coffeehouses is 7% in rural and 3% in urban areas. Amongst three major cities, the lowest rate of those who go to places such as cof-feehouses is in Ankara. The rate of those who never go to such places in Ankara is 88%. This rate is 77% in Istanbul, and 75% in Izmir.

The rate of 11% of those who say they often go to places such as coffeehouses is the highest in West Marmara, and this rate is 7% in the Aegean and in East Marmara. The rate of those who say they never go to places such as coffeehouses is the highest in West Anatolia with 86%, and the lowest in West Marmara with 66%. In the overall comparison of regions, the rate of those who never go to places such as coffeehouses decreases from the east to the west.

Table 173. Going to Coffeehouses throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	78,9	16,7	4,4
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	80,3	16,6	3,2
Rural	75,4	17,2	7,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	77,0	19,6	3,5
Ankara	88,3	10,4	1,3
Izmir	74,6	17,7	7,7
NUTS			
Istanbul	77,0	19,6	3,5
West Marmara	66,0	23,3	10,8
East Marmara	74,0	19,0	7,0
Aegean	74,3	18,3	7,4
Mediterranean	83,3	13,8	2,9
West Anatolia	86,3	11,7	2,0
Central Anatolia	82,3	14,1	3,5
West Black Sea	79,3	16,4	4,3
East Black Sea	80,7	16,3	3,0
Northeast Anatolia	78,0	18,1	3,9
Mideast Anatolia	83,9	13,5	2,6
Southeast Anatolia	83,3	14,8	1,9

From the gender perspective, almost all of females (99%) say they never go to places such as coffee-houses. This rate is 59% in males. The rate of males who sometimes go to these places is 33% (Table 174).

From the age group perspective, the most promi-nent point is that the rate of those who say they never go to places such as coffeehouses (83%) and the rate of those who say they often go (7%) is higher in the same age group, 65+ group compared to other age groups. 21% of 18-24 age group males sometimes or often go to coffeehouses.

According to educational status, the rate of those who never go to coffeehouses is higher amongst those who received no schooling (92%), and the rate of those who often go is slightly higher amongst primary and Elementary school/secondary school graduates (5%).

Comparison based on household types shows that there is no differentiation in terms of often going to coffeehouses, however the rate of those who some-times go is a little higher amongst individuals from nuclear and extended households with 17%. This rate is 13% in broken households.

Based on socioeconomic status, in lower middle class and lower class the rate of those who often go to coffeehouses is 5%, slightly higher than other socioeconomic classes. The rate of those who never go to such places is higher in high upper class (85%) and upper class (83%).

Table 174. Going to Coffeehouses by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	58,9	32,6	8,5
Female	98,7	1,0	0,3
AGE			
18-24	79,2	17,5	3,3
25-34	78,7	18,1	3,2
35-44	79,0	17,3	3,7
45-54	76,1	18,4	5,5
55-64	78,6	15,5	5,9
65+	83,4	9,9	6,7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	92,1	5,4	2,6
Primary school	77,4	17,2	5,4
Elementary/secondary school	74,0	21,2	4,8
High school	76,1	19,7	4,2
Undergraduate/graduate studies	80,3	16,6	3,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	78,3	17,4	4,4
Extended	78,8	16,6	4,6
Broken	82,6	13,3	4,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	85,3	13,1	1,6
Upper class	82,6	14,6	2,9
Upper middle class	78,7	17,4	3,9
Lower middle class	76,5	18,2	5,3
Lower class	78,4	16,2	5,4

8.10. Working out

Within the scope of the research, another question asked to individuals was how often they work out. Across Türkiye, 65% of individuals say they never work out. The rate of those who sometimes work out is 29%, and the rate of those who often work out is 6% (Table 175).

The rate of those who never work out goes up to 79% in rural areas. The rate is 60% in urban areas. Izmir is the city amongst three major cities, with the highest rate (60%) of people who never work out. The rates of those who sometimes work out are similar in Ankara (38%) and in Istanbul (39%), and the rate of those who often work out is slightly higher in Ankara (11%).

West Anatolia is the region where the rate of those who say they often work out (9%) is the highest. On the other hand, the rate of those who say they never work out is the highest in Northeast Anatolia (83%) and in Southeast Anatolia (79%).

Table 175. Working Out throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	65,0	28,8	6,2
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	59,6	33,1	7,2
Rural	78,9	17,5	3,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	53,4	39,4	7,3
Ankara	51,1	38,0	10,8
Izmir	60,4	30,8	8,8
NUTS			
Istanbul	53,4	39,4	7,3
West Marmara	69,7	24,1	6,2
East Marmara	61,7	31,1	7,2
Aegean	64,8	29,4	5,8
Mediterranean	65,8	27,4	6,9
West Anatolia	55,5	35,1	9,4
Central Anatolia	72,0	23,0	5,0
West Black Sea	71,0	23,9	5,2
East Black Sea	74,8	20,9	4,3
Northeast Anatolia	82,6	14,3	3,0
Mideast Anatolia	75,1	20,9	4,0
Southeast Anatolia	79,2	17,6	3,2

From the gender perspective, 73% of females and 57% of males say they never work out. As the age group progresses, the rate of those who never work out increases and reaches 88% in 65+ age group. 42% of 18-24 age group say they sometimes work out, and 11% say they often work out. In the next age range of 25-34, these rates decrease, and the rate of those who sometimes work out drops down to 34%, and the rate of those who often work out declines to 8% (Table 176).

As the age groups get older, there is an increase in the rate of those who say they never work out, and this rate drops as educational status increases. The rate of those who work out at various frequencies is 7% amongst those who have not graduated from a school and 67% amongst university graduates.

In terms of the frequency of working out, nuclear and broken households show similar rates. Individuals from extended households have a differ-

ent relation to working out, compared to these two household types. 73% of extended families say they never work out, the rate is 64% in nuclear households and 60% in broken households. The rate of those who say they often work out is 9% in broken households and 6% in nuclear households.

It is understood that as the socioeconomic status increases, the rate of those who never work out decreases, and the rate of those who say they often work out increases. 17% of individuals in high upper class and 14% of upper class say they often work out. These rates are well above the Türkiye average (6%).

Table 176. Working Out by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	56,6	34,5	8,9
Female	73,3	23,1	3,6
AGE			
18-24	47,2	42,1	10,7
25-34	58,7	33,7	7,6
35-44	64,8	30,2	5,1
45-54	71,5	24,1	4,4
55-64	75,5	20,1	4,3
65+	87,7	9,7	2,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	93,0	6,1	0,8
Primary school	78,1	19,2	2,7
Elementary/secondary school	64,0	29,8	6,2
High school	45,0	45,2	9,8
Undergraduate/graduate studies	32,6	51,3	16,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	63,7	29,9	6,3
Extended	73,4	23,0	3,6
Broken	60,4	30,4	9,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High Upper class	25,2	58,1	16,8
Upper class	41,5	44,9	13,6
Upper middle class	54,2	38,2	7,6
Lower middle class	73,8	22,3	3,9
Lower class	88,4	10,1	1,5

8.11. Doing Manual Work (Needlework, Carpentry, Repairs etc.)

Within the scope of research, individuals were asked how frequently they do manual work such as needlework, carpentry and repairs. Across Türkiye almost half of the individuals (47%) say they never do manual work such as needlework, carpentry and repairs. The rate of those who sometimes do manual work is 40%, and the rate of those who often do is 13%. There is no differentiation between urban and rural.

Amongst three major cities the rate of those who say they never do such work is higher in Izmir (47%), and the rate of those who say they often do such work is higher in Ankara (17%). The highest rate of those who say they often do manual work such as needlework, carpentry and repairs is in West Anatolia, with a rate of 17%. The rate of those who say they never do manual work such as needlework, carpentry and repairs is the highest in Southeast Anatolia with a proportion of 68%. (Table 177).

Table 177. Doing Manual Work (Needlework, Carpentry, Repairs etc.) throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	47,3	40,1	12,5
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	46,6	40,4	13,0
Rural	49,3	39,3	11,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	42,2	47,5	10,3
Ankara	41,3	42,0	16,7
Izmir	46,7	38,3	15,0
NUTS			
Istanbul	42,2	47,5	10,3
West Marmara	40,2	48,4	11,4
East Marmara	45,7	39,3	15,0
Aegean	47,4	38,8	13,8
Mediterranean	45,4	38,2	16,4
West Anatolia	39,0	43,8	17,3
Central Anatolia	50,0	38,5	11,6
West Black Sea	47,7	41,9	10,4
East Black Sea	53,2	38,0	8,9
Northeast Anatolia	60,6	28,1	11,3
Mideast Anatolia	48,5	40,7	10,7
Southeast Anatolia	68,4	24,7	6,9

It is understood that females do these types of manual work at a higher rate and more often than males. 57% of males say they never do manual work such as needlework, carpentry and repairs, and this rate drops to 38% in females. Similarly, the rate of females who often do such work (18%) is more than twice as much as the rate of males (7%) (Table 178).

Amongst age groups, it is understood that age group 25-44 does manual work such as needlework, carpentry and repairs at the highest rate and the most often. 44% of 35-44 age group does such work sometimes, and 15% does such work often. In age group 25-34, the rate of those who sometimes do such work is 43% and the rate of those who often do such work is 13%.

It is indicated that primary school graduates do

such work at a higher rate and more often. 44% of this group sometimes does manual work such as needlework, carpentry and repairs. The rate of those who often do such work is 15%.

Broken households, with a proportion of 55%, have the highest rate in terms of those who say they never do manual work such as needlework, carpentry and repairs. This rate is 49% in extended households, and 46% in nuclear households.

According to socioeconomic status, the highest rate of those who say they never do manual work such as needlework, carpentry and repairs is the lower class (55%). The highest rates of those who do such work can be found in upper middle class and lower middle class. 14% of individuals in the middle SES class say they often do such work.

Table 178. Doing Manual Work (Needlework, Carpentry, Repairs etc.) by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	56,7	36,0	7,3
Female	38,1	44,2	17,7
AGE			
18-24	52,7	37,3	10,0
25-34	44,7	42,8	12,6
35-44	41,1	44,1	14,8
45-54	41,3	44,5	14,1
55-64	46,8	39,5	13,7
65+	66,8	24,6	8,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	59,0	29,9	11,0
Primary school	41,5	43,5	15,0
Elementary/secondary school	45,7	40,8	13,5
High school	48,2	41,0	10,8
Undergraduate/graduate studies	52,4	38,7	8,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	45,7	41,6	12,7
Extended	48,5	39,1	12,4
Broken	55,0	33,3	11,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	48,9	39,7	11,4
Upper class	49,0	41,0	10,0
Upper middle class	43,3	43,0	13,7
Lower middle class	45,4	41,0	13,6
Lower class	55,3	34,3	10,4

8.12. Watching TV/VCD/DVD

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked how often they watch TV/VCD/DVD. 51% of individuals say they often watch TV/VCD/DVD. The rate of those who say they never watch TV/VCD/DVD 8% (Table 179).

The rate of those who say they often watch TV/VCD/DVD is higher in the urban area (52%). This rate is 47% in the rural area. Amongst three major cities, the rate of those who say they never watch TV/VCD/DVD is slightly higher in Istanbul. This rate is 7% in Izmir, and 6% in Ankara. The highest rate of those who say they often watch TV/VCD/DVD is West Anatolia with a rate of 59%. Southeast Anatolia has the lowest rate, which is 33%.

Table 179. Watching TV/VDV/DVD throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	8,2	41,0	50,7
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	7,5	40,4	52,1
Rural	10,1	42,7	47,2
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	9,4	38,5	52,0
Ankara	6,0	36,4	57,6
Izmir	7,0	36,6	56,5
NUTS			
Istanbul	9,4	38,5	52,0
West Marmara	6,0	36,8	57,2
East Marmara	8,1	44,0	48,0
Aegean	6,0	37,3	56,7
Mediterranean	7,9	38,6	53,4
West Anatolia	5,3	36,0	58,7
Central Anatolia	5,4	43,0	51,5
West Black Sea	7,3	47,1	45,7
East Black Sea	10,2	51,0	38,9
Northeast Anatolia	16,9	35,7	47,4
Mideast Anatolia	10,2	37,9	51,9
Southeast Anatolia	12,4	54,8	32,8

It is seen that females and males watch TV/VCD/DVD at similar rates, 51% of both genders often watch TV/VCD/DVD. In terms of the age group, 53% of 45–64 age group declare that they often watch TV/VCD/DVD. The rate of those who say they never watch TV/VCD/DVD amongst 65+ age group individuals is above the Türkiye average (%8) with 18% (Table 180).

As the educational status improves, the rate of those who never watch TV/VCD/DVD drops. For example, this rate is 4% amongst university gradu-

ates, and 18% for individuals who have not graduated from a school. The rate of those who often watch TV/VCD/DVD is similar in all educational status groups, except for the group who received no schooling.

The rate of those who say they never watch TV/VCD/DVD is the highest in broken households with 14%. This rate is 7% in nuclear households, and 9% in extended households. The rate of those who say they often watch TV/VCD/DVD is slightly higher in nuclear households (52%).

As the socioeconomic status improves, the rate of those who say they never watch TV/VCD/DVD decreases, and the rate of those who say they often watch TV/VCV/DVD increases. 14% of lower SES class say they never watch TV/VCD/DVD. This rate is 3% in high upper class. In this SES class, the rate of those who say they often watch TV/VCD/DVD is 57%.

Table 180. Watching TV/VDV/DVD by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	7,1	42,0	50,9
Female	9,3	40,1	50,6
AGE			
18-24	6,0	43,0	51,0
25-34	6,9	42,4	50,6
35-44	6,7	41,6	51,6
45-54	7,7	39,0	53,2
55-64	9,0	38,2	52,7
65+	17,6	39,6	42,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	18,1	43,8	38,1
Primary School	8,0	38,9	53,2
Elementary/secondary school	7,2	39,8	53,0
High school	5,5	42,3	52,1
Undergraduate/graduate studies	4,3	44,0	51,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	7,0	40,7	52,3
Extended	9,1	43,8	47,1
Broken	13,9	38,9	47,2
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	2,7	40,6	11,4
Upper class	4,9	41,8	10,0
Upper middle class	5,5	39,9	13,7
Lower middle class	8,2	41,1	13,6
Lower class	14,2	44,4	10,4

8.13. Watching Sports Games

One of the areas which was questioned in the research is how often individuals go to watch sports games. As can be seen in the table, 76% of the individuals say that they never go to watch sports games. The rate of those who sometimes go is 18%, and the rate of those who often go is 6% (Table 181).

The rate of those who never go to watch sports games is 85% in rural areas. This rate is 73% in urban areas. The rate of individuals who sometimes do this activity in urban areas is 21% and 11% in the rural area.

The breakdown of three major cities shows that the rate of those who go to watch sports games in lower in Ankara, compared to Istanbul and Izmir. 77% of the individuals in Ankara have never watched sports games. This rate is 71% in Izmir and 66% in Istanbul.

The rate of those never watch sports games is the highest in Southeast Anatolia (87%) and in Mideast and Northeast Anatolia (84%). The highest rate of those who often go to watch games is West Marmara with 9%. Almost one thirds (27%) of those who live in the Istanbul Region sometimes go to watch sports games.

Table 181. Watching Sports Games throughout Türkiye, by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	76,2	18,1	5,7
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	72,7	20,8	6,4
Rural	85,1	11,1	3,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	65,9	26,6	7,5
Ankara	77,2	17,8	5,0
Izmir	70,5	21,8	7,7
NUTS			
Istanbul	65,9	26,6	7,5
West Marmara	75,3	16,0	8,7
East Marmara	75,6	18,6	5,8
Aegean	72,0	20,9	7,1
Mediterranean	78,7	16,5	4,8
West Anatolia	78,0	16,8	5,2
Central Anatolia	81,6	13,3	5,2
West Black Sea	80,8	13,3	5,9
East Black Sea	79,0	16,2	4,8
Northeast Anatolia	83,8	12,3	3,9
Mideast Anatolia	83,7	14,3	1,9
Southeast Anatolia	87,2	10,5	2,3

From the gender perspective, the rate of males who say they never watch sports games is 60%, and this rate goes up to 92% in females (Table 182).

As the age group decreases, so does the rate of those who say they never go to watch sports games. 26% of those in the 18-24 age group say they sometimes watch sports games and 11% say they often watch sports games. These rates are considerably high compared to other age groups.

It is possible to observe that as the educational status increases, the rate of those who say they never go to watch sports games decreases. Only 3% of

those who did not graduate from a school watch sports games and this is spread at various frequencies as 40% in high school graduates and 46% in university graduates.

Although there is not a very sharp differentiation based on household type, extended households with 81% have the highest rate of those who never go to watch sports games. This rate is 75% in nuclear households and 74% in broken households.

As the socioeconomic status improves, the rate of those who say they never watch sports games drops. 9% of individuals of lower class watch sports games. This rate is 47% in the highest SES group.

Table 182. Watching Sports Games by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	60,2	29,6	10,3
Female	92,1	6,8	1,2
AGE			
18-24	62,8	25,9	11,2
25-34	71,0	23,1	5,9
35-44	76,3	18,8	4,9
45-54	80,5	14,9	4,6
55-64	85,4	10,6	3,9
65+	92,8	5,8	1,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	97,3	2,3	0,5
Primary school	86,7	10,4	2,9
Elementary/secondary school	73,0	20,2	6,8
High school	60,3	30,0	9,7
Undergraduate/graduate studies	54,2	34,8	10,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	75,2	18,9	5,8
Extended	81,1	14,5	4,4
Broken	74,4	18,8	6,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	52,8	35,9	11,3
Upper class	59,4	31,4	9,2
Upper middle class	67,5	24,6	7,9
Lower middle class	82,4	13,5	4,2
Lower class	90,8	8,0	1,2

8.14. Playing Cards, Rummikub, Backgammon and Computer Games at Home

All individuals who participated in the research were asked if they play cards, rummikub, backgammon and computer games at home. Across Türkiye 77% of individuals say that they never play cards, rummikub, backgammon and computer games at home. 18% sometimes plays these games, and 4% often plays such games (Table 183).

The rate of those who never play these games is higher in rural areas (89%), rates of those who sometimes play them (22 %) or who often play (5%) these games are higher in urban areas. The rates of playing cards, rummikub, backgammon and computer games at home are similar in three major cities, and it is observed that the rate of those who sometimes play is slightly higher in Istanbul (27%),and the rate of those who often play is slightly higher in Ankara (8%).

The rate of individuals who say they never play cards, rummikub, backgammon and computer games at home has reached the highest rates with 95% iin Northeast Anatolia and 89% in Southeast Anatolia. The rate of those who often play these games is high in West Anatolia at a rate of 7%.

Table 183.Playing Cards, Rummikub, Backgammon and Computer Games at Home throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Sometimes	Often
Türkiye	77,4	18,2	4,3
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	72,9	21,8	5,3
Rural	89,1	9,1	1,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	67,1	27,2	5,7
Ankara	67,7	24,2	8,1
Izmir	70,0	23,1	6,9
NUTS			
Istanbul	67,1	27,2	5,7
West Marmara	83,7	12,4	4,0
East Marmara	78,1	16,9	5,0
Aegean	74,1	21,6	4,4
Mediterranean	75,5	20,9	3,6
West Anatolia	70,5	22,4	7,0
Central Anatolia	83,4	12,4	4,2
West Black Sea	86,8	10,1	3,0
East Black Sea	87,0	10,0	2,9
Northeast Anatolia	95,0	3,0	2,1
Mideast Anatolia	85,2	12,8	2,0
Southeast Anatolia	88,5	9,4	2,0

84% of females say they never play cards, rummikub, backgammon and computer games at home, and this rate drops to 71% in males (Table 184).

As the age group increases, the rate of those who never play such games increases, and reaches 95% in 65+. It is noteworthy that in young age groups the rates of those who sometimes and often play games at home are higher. 29% of age group 18-24 says they sometimes play games and 11% says they often play games as such.

As the educational status improves, the rate of individuals who play cards, rummikub, backgammon and computer games at home increases considerably. Only 2% of those who have not graduated from

a school says they play such games at home, this rate is 33% at high school graduates and goes up to 37% in university graduates. The rate of those who often play is 8% in high school graduates, and 9% in university graduates.

Broken households are the household type where cards, rummikub, backgammon and computer games at home are played at the highest rate, which is 28%. The rate is the lowest (17%) in extended families.

Similar to the educational status, as socioeconomic status increases, so does the rate of those who play such games at home. The rate of those who play cards, rummikub, backgammon and computer games at home are well above the Türkiye average (18%) with 34% in upper class, and 43% in high upper class.

Table 184. Playing Cards, Rummikub, Backgammon and Computer Games at Home by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Sometimes	Often
GENDER			
Male	70,9	23,1	6,0
Female	83,9	13,5	2,6
AGE			
18-24	59,9	28,8	11,3
25-34	71,8	23,5	4,7
35-44	78,6	18,9	2,5
45-54	84,1	13,3	2,6
55-64	88,2	10,0	1,8
65+	94,6	4,4	1,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	97,3	2,1	0,6
Primary school	89,9	8,7	1,4
Elementary/secondary school	75,9	19,4	4,7
High school	58,5	32,8	8,7
Undergraduate/graduate studies	54,1	37,0	8,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	76,8	19,0	4,1
Extended	83,3	14,1	2,6
Broken	72,3	19,8	7,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	45,8	43,0	11,2
Upper class	57,4	33,8	8,8
Upper middle class	68,9	25,9	5,3
Lower middle class	85,2	12,0	2,8
Lower class	95,1	4,5	0,4

8.15. Smoking

Another subject which was examined within the scope of the research is about smoking. The question "do you smoke" was asked and the individuals were requested to choose one from the options "yes, everyday", "yes, sometimes", "no, never" ve "I used to but I quitted".

The question aimed at measuring the frequency of smoking in Türkiye, and as the table indicates 57% of individuals responded as "no, never", and 26% as "yes, everyday". The rate of those who used to smoke but who quitted is 11% (Table 185).

Amongst three major cities the rates of smokers are different. However, the rate of those who used to smoke but quitted is higher in Izmir (14%). The rate of individuals who never smoke in urban residential areas is 55% and 62% in rural areas. The rate of those who answered "No, I do not smoke at all" is the highest in Southeast Anatolia (66%). This rate is the lowest in East and West Marmara (51%). The rate of those who quitted is 12% in rural areas, and 10% in urban residential areas. East Black Sea is the region where this rate is the highest with 16%, and Southeast Anatolia has a rate of 5%, which is the lowest.

Table 185. Smoking throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes, everyday	Yes, sometimes	No, never	I used to but I quitted
Türkiye	26,4	5,8	57,1	10,7
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	28,1	6,4	55,2	10,3
Rural	22,1	4,2	61,9	11,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	28,5	8,2	54,0	9,2
Ankara	28,9	7,0	53,2	11,0
Izmir	27,6	6,8	51,4	14,1
NUTS				
Istanbul	28,5	8,2	54,0	9,2
West Marmara	31,4	4,7	50,6	13,3
East Marmara	30,0	5,4	51,1	13,5
Aegean	26,3	5,5	55,9	12,4
Mediterranean	25,0	5,9	59,9	9,1
West Anatolia	28,8	6,2	53,6	11,3
Central Anatolia	23,8	4,9	58,1	13,2
West Black Sea	23,3	4,4	60,1	12,2
East Black Sea	18,2	3,6	62,3	15,8
Northeast Anatolia	24,8	5,8	63,9	5,5
Mideast Anatolia	23,0	4,6	63,1	9,3
Southeast Anatolia	24,0	4,5	66,3	5,2

According to gender, the study revealed that 77% of females and 38% of males do not smoke and 40% of males and 13% of females smoke everyday (Table 186).

The rate of those who smoke everyday is higher in 25-34 (32%) and 35-44 (33%) age groups. The rate

of those who quitted smoking is higher in upper age groups. This rate is 14% in 45-54 age group, 18% in 55-64 age group, and 19% in 65+ age group.

It is not possible to suggest any clear correlation between the rise and fall of educational status and the rise and fall of smoking ratios. The highest rate of

everyday smokers is elementary/secondary school graduates with a rate of 33%. The rate of those who quitted smoking is higher amongst primary school (13) and university graduates (11%).

There is not a very sharp differentiation in terms of household type, however the rate of those who used to smoke but quitted is slightly higher in nuclear household members, with a ratio of 12%.

As the socioeconomic status increases, it is observed that the rate of those who sometimes smoke also increases. 5% of the lower class report that they sometimes smoke, and this rate is 10% in high upper class. The rate of those who quitted smoking is 13% in high upper class, 11% in upper class, 10% in upper middle class, 12% in lower middle class and 10% in lower class.

Table 186. Smoking by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes, everyday	Yes, sometimes	No, never	I used to but I quitted
GENDER				
Male	40,0	6,6	37,5	15,8
Female	13,0	5,0	76,5	5,6
AGE				
18-24	22,3	5,7	68,6	3,4
25-34	32,4	7,7	52,6	7,4
35-44	33,1	7,6	50,0	9,2
45-54	28,8	5,1	52,1	14,1
55-64	19,9	3,3	58,4	18,4
65+	9,7	1,9	69,1	19,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
No schooling	12,1	3,2	75,7	9,1
Primary school	26,0	5,1	55,7	13,2
Elementary/secondary school	32,8	6,3	52,7	8,3
High school	31,0	7,4	52,5	9,2
Undergraduate/graduate studies	26,8	7,3	55,2	10,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	26,4	6,0	56,0	11,6
Extended	25,7	4,8	60,5	9,0
Broken	27,8	6,0	58,5	7,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
High upper class	27,1	10,5	49,2	13,2
Upper class	27,0	6,9	55,7	10,5
Upper middle class	28,1	6,2	55,4	10,2
Lower middle class	26,0	5,1	57,4	11,5
Lower class	28,0	5,2	57,3	9,5

8.16. Alcohol Consumption

Table 187 indicates the responses to the question, "Do you use alcohol?". Across Türkiye 81% of individuals have stated never using alcohol. The rate of those who say they use alcohol only on special occasions is 8% and the rate of those who say they use alcohol several times a month is 4%. The rate of those who never use alcohol is higher in rural areas (87%). This rate is 79% in urban areas.

Izmir is the city amongst three major cities with the highest rate of alcohol usage. The rate of those who say "never" is 76% in Ankara and in Istanbul and this rate regresses to 65% in Izmir. On the other hand, it is noticed that the rate of those who quitted is also higher in Izmir (6%).

The rate of those who report that they never use alcohol is found at highest ratest of 95% in Northeast Anatolia and 94% in Southeast Anatolia. West Marmara is the region where the highest rate of those who use alcohol several times a month can be found, at a rate of 7%. It can be stated that higher rates in alcohol usage can be found in western regions, compared to the eastern and central regions.

Table 187. Alcohol Consumption throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Never	Every day	1-2 times a week	Several times a month	Only on special occasions	I used to but quitted
Türkiye	81,0	0,6	2,3	4,1	8,2	3,7
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	78,9	0,7	2,7	4,6	9,5	3,7
Rural	86,5	0,4	1,3	2,6	5,1	4,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	76,0	0,8	2,9	5,9	11,4	3,0
Ankara	76,3	0,4	3,1	4,2	12,6	3,4
Izmir	64,8	1,3	6,2	8,8	13,2	5,6
NUTS						
Istanbul	76,0	0,8	2,9	5,9	11,4	3,0
West Marmara	70,8	0,9	4,0	6,7	12,1	5,3
East Marmara	79,7	0,4	2,6	3,6	8,2	5,7
Aegean	74,0	0,9	4,0	5,7	11,0	4,4
Mediterranean	81,8	0,8	2,0	4,0	9,1	2,3
West Anatolia	79,1	0,3	2,6	3,8	10,2	4,0
Central Anatolia	87,3	0,3	0,9	2,2	3,0	6,2
West Black Sea	83,4	0,3	1,1	2,8	6,5	5,9
East Black Sea	88,8	0,2	0,5	2,4	3,7	4,4
Northeast Anatolia	94,7	0,0	0,5	1,6	1,6	1,6
Mideast Anatolia	92,3	0,4	0,5	2,3	3,6	1,0
Southeast Anatolia	93,9	0,7	0,5	1,2	1,9	1,8

From the gender perspective, in terms of individuals who said they never use alcohol, it is understood that 92% of females and 70% males report never using alcohol. 12% of males report alcohol consumption only on special occasions. 7% of males say that they used to but they quitted. This rate is 1% in females (Table 188).

88% of 65+ age group report not using alcohol. 10% of 25-44 age group report consuming alcohol only on special occasions.

The rate of alcohol users increases as the educational status improves. 37% of university graduates report alcohol consumption at various frequencies and

occasions, and this rate is 14% in primary school graduates. Amongst university graduates, the rate of those who use alcohol only on special occasions is 19%. In other words, half of alcohol users consume alcohol only on special occasions.

Broken households are the household types with the highest rate (25%) of alcohol users at various frequencies. 11% of individuals from these house-

holds (almost half of those who use alcohol) say they use alcohol only on special occasions.

Alcohol usage rate increases from the lower SES group to the high SES group. For example, 49% of the high upper class use alcohol at various frequencies and occasions, with 24% overwhelmingly using alcohol only on special occasions, this rate is 23% in upper middle class.

Table 188. Alcohol Consumption by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	Never	Every day	1-2 times a week	Several times a month	Only on special occasions	I used to but quitted
GENDER						
Male	69,6	1,1	4,0	6,8	12,0	6,5
Female	92,3	0,1	0,6	1,4	4,5	1,1
AGE						
18-24	80,3	0,6	3,4	5,1	9,1	1,6
25-34	79,3	0,5	2,5	5,1	10,0	2,6
35-44	79,9	0,8	2,4	4,2	9,6	3,2
45-54	80,3	0,6	2,0	3,6	8,3	5,2
55-64	82,4	0,7	2,1	3,3	6,0	5,6
65+	88,4	0,4	0,6	1,4	2,7	6,5
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	95,6	0,3	0,5	0,8	0,9	2,1
Primary school	86,5	0,4	1,3	2,6	4,4	4,8
Elementary/secondary school	81,4	0,8	2,2	3,5	9,2	2,9
High school	73,0	0,9	4,0	6,1	12,5	3,4
Undergraduate/graduate studies	63,0	0,8	4,3	9,1	18,7	4,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	80,8	0,6	2,1	4,1	8,6	4,0
Extended	86,5	0,4	1,7	2,5	5,1	3,7
Broken	74,9	1,2	4,3	6,4	10,9	2,3
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	50,9	1,1	7,1	12,0	23,6	5,3
Upper class	68,4	1,2	4,0	6,2	17,0	3,2
Upper middle class	77,3	0,6	2,7	5,0	10,2	4,1
Lower middle class	85,7	0,5	1,5	2,9	5,6	3,8
Lower class	90,7	0,4	0,5	1,8	2,8	3,7

8.17. Using the Internet

Within the scope of the research, households were asked if they have internet connection in their dwelling. 64% of the households in Türkiye does not have internet connection (Table 189).

The rate of those with internet connection in urban areas (42%) is much higher compared to households in rural areas (17%). Amongst three major cities, more than half of the households in Istanbul and in Ankara have internet connection, and this rate is slightly lower in Izmir (46%).

Istanbul is the region where home internet connection is at the highest rate of 53%, Northeast Anatolia has the lowest rate with 14%. Nuclear households have the highest rate of 38% in terms of households having internet connection. This rate is 33% in extended households, and 30% in broken households. Only 1% of households from lower class has internet connection. This rate is 90% in high upper class.

Table 189. Households with Internet Connection throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	Yes	No
Türkiye	35,7	64,3
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	42,3	57,7
Rural	17,0	83,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	52,9	47,1
Ankara	50,4	49,6
Izmir	45,9	54,1
NUTS		
Istanbul	52,9	47,1
West Marmara	34,0	66,0
East Marmara	41,2	58,8
Aegean	36,4	63,6
Mediterranean	27,9	72,1
West Anatolia	43,7	56,3
Central Anatolia	26,9	73,1
West Black Sea	25,1	74,9
East Black Sea	30,9	69,1
Northeast Anatolia	13,8	86,2
Mideast Anatolia	20,0	80,0
Southeast Anatolia	16,4	83,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	37,5	62,5
Extended	32,8	67,2
Broken	30,4	69,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
High upper class	89,8	10,2
Upper class	76,8	23,2
Upper middle class	58,7	41,3
Lower middle class	21,1	78,9
Lower class	1,0	99,0

Everyone who participated in the research were asked how often they use the internet. 60% of individuals above the age of 18 across Türkiye reported not using the internet at all. The rate of those who use the internet everyday is 17%, the rate of those who often use the internet is 5%, and the rate of those who occasionally use it is 19% (Table 190).

Depending on the area of residence, 78% of individuals over 18 years of age living in the rural areas has stated that they never use the internet. This rate is 53% in urban areas. The rate of those who use the internet everyday is 20% in urban areas and 8% in rural areas. Amongst three major cities, Izmir is the city where internet usage is the lowest, with a rate of 46%. In Istanbul and in Ankara internet usage frequencies are at similar rates.

Northeast Anatolia Region (75%) is the region where the rate of those who never use the internet is the highest. Istanbul and West Anatolia have the highest rates of those who use the internet everyday, 25% and 21% respectively.

Table 190. Using the Internet throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	I use it everyday	I often use it	I occasionally use it	I have never used it
Türkiye	16,6	4,8	18,6	59,9
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	20,1	5,6	21,3	52,9
Rural	7,6	2,8	11,8	77,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	25,1	5,8	23,2	46,0
Ankara	25,3	6,2	21,7	46,8
Izmir	22,6	4,3	19,0	54,1
NUTS				
Istanbul	25,1	5,8	23,2	46,0
West Marmara	12,8	8,0	14,2	65,0
East Marmara	17,0	4,8	20,1	58,1
Aegean	18,1	3,6	20,5	57,9
Mediterranean	15,6	5,5	16,9	62,0
West Anatolia	20,5	6,5	20,7	52,3
Central Anatolia	12,4	3,1	14,7	69,7
West Black Sea	11,2	5,4	14,8	68,6
East Black Sea	15,4	2,5	15,8	66,3
Northeast Anatolia	7,3	2,9	14,8	75,1
Mideast Anatolia	10,5	3,2	14,9	71,4
Southeast Anatolia	7,5	2,8	16,3	73,4

The rate of females who never use the internet (70%) is higher than males (50%). The rate of males and females who use the internet everyday also differs. 22% of males say that they use the internet everyday. This rate is 12% in females (Table 191).

As the age group increases, so does the rate of individuals who never use the internet. 27% of 18-24 age group say they never use the internet and this rate reaches 97% in 65+ age group. As the age group increases, the frequency of use decreases. 30% of 18-24 age group,25% of 25-34 age group, and 17% of 35-44 age group use the internet everyday.

As the educational status increases, so does the frequency of internet usage. Only 3% of individuals who have not graduated from a school uses the internet, and this rate is 89% amongst university graduates, in various frequencies. However, there is an 11% population amongst university graduates who never uses the internet.

It is noted that the internet usage amongst individuals from extended households is lower compared to other household types. 69% of individuals over 18 from extended households say that they never use the internet and this rate is 59% in nuclear households, and 54% in broken households. The rate of individuals who use the internet everyday is 24% in broken households and 17% in nuclear households (Table 191).

Likewise, as the socioeconomic status increases, so does the frequency of internet usage. The rate of those who use the internet everyday is 1% in lower class and this amounts to 63% in high upper class.

Table 191. Using the Internet by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	I use it everyday	I often use it	I occasionally use it	I have never used it
GENDER				
Male	21,9	6,4	22,1	49,6
Female	11,5	3,2	15,2	70,1
AGE				
18-24	30,0	10,5	32,7	26,8
25-34	24,5	6,1	25,2	44,2
35-44	17,1	4,6	20,2	58,2
45-54	9,1	2,7	12,3	76,0
55-64	4,8	1,2	5,9	88,1
65+	0,8	0,1	1,7	97,4
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
No schooling	0,6	0,2	2,0	97,2
Primary school	3,3	0,9	10,4	85,4
Elementary/secondary school	12,7	5,0	27,4	54,9
High school	30,7	9,6	34,2	25,6
Undergraduate/graduate studies	53,8	12,8	22,7	10,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	17,0	4,9	19,6	58,6
Extended	10,4	3,9	16,3	69,4
Broken	23,5	5,8	16,8	53,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
High upper class	62,8	11,1	14,1	12,0
Upper class	44,5	10,7	23,6	21,2
Upper middle class	24,1	6,7	25,5	43,7
Lower middle class	6,5	3,0	17,3	73,3
Lower class	1,3	0,3	5,4	93,0

Individuals who said they use the internet were asked where they use the internet at most. Across Türkiye home has the highest rate with 58%. 21% of individuals uses the internet at work and 13% uses it at internet cafe. The rate of those who use the internet at most via mobile/Iphone/Ipad is only 3% (Table 192).

Based on area of residence, the highest differentiation between urban and rural areas can be found in at home and internet cafe usage rates. It is understood that home usage is more prevalent amongst urban dwellers (59%) and internet cafe usage is more widespread amongst rural dwellers (20%).

The results of three major cities show that compared to other two cities, home internet usage rate in Izmir is higher (68%) and the rate of using the internet at work is lower (17%).

East Marmara, with 64%, has the highest rate of internet usage at home and Northeast Anatolia is the lowest with 36%. Internet cafe rates are high in Northeast (27%), Mideast (24%) and Southeast Anatolia (31%).

Table 192. Using the Internet throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	At home	At work	At Internet cafe	At school	Via mobile/ iPhone/iPad	Other
Türkiye	57,8	21,3	13,2	1,6	3,2	2,8
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	58,9	21,7	11,9	1,5	3,2	2,8
Rural	52,4	18,8	20,2	2,6	3,0	3,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	60,5	22,4	9,2	1,0	3,9	3,1
Ankara	60,3	24,6	8,3	1,1	3,2	2,5
Izmir	67,6	16,7	9,3	1,0	3,0	2,4
NUTS						
Istanbul	60,5	22,4	9,2	1,0	3,9	3,1
West Marmara	57,5	25,3	11,1	0,7	2,4	3,0
East Marmara	63,5	21,8	8,3	1,9	2,3	2,1
Aegean	62,0	19,2	11,3	1,9	2,7	2,8
Mediterranean	53,9	19,2	19,4	2,3	2,2	3,1
West Anatolia	58,5	24,3	8,8	1,1	3,9	3,4
Central Anatolia	59,5	19,4	15,1	1,7	2,9	1,3
West Black Sea	56,1	20,7	13,6	2,1	4,9	2,5
East Black Sea	60,1	21,0	12,1	1,6	3,5	1,7
Northeast Anatolia	35,6	26,4	27,3	6,1	4,3	0,3
Mideast Anatolia	49,0	19,4	24,3	0,7	2,6	4,1
Southeast Anatolia	43,3	17,4	31,0	3,0	2,6	2,8

From the gender perspective, 70% of females and 51% of males use the internet at home. In males, the rates of usage at work (25%) and at internet cafe (18%) are higher compared to females (Table 193).

As the age group increases, so does the internet usage at home. 52% of 18-24 age group uses the internet at home. This rate reaches 75% in 65+ age group. Highest differentiation between age groups in terms of internet usage places is at work and internet cafe. The rate of those who use the internet at work is higher in 35-44 age group (31%) and the rate for using the internet at internet cafe is higher in 18-24 age group (25%).

From the educational status perspective, it is understood that the overwhelming majority of all educational status use the internet at most at home. Work and internet cafe are the two internet usage places where differentiation is the highest. The highest rate of those who use the internet at most at work can be found in university graduates, with a rate of 35%. Internet cafe usage can be found amongst elementary/secondary school graduates with 24% and amongst those who received no schooling with a rate of 20%.

There is no sharp differentiation in terms of household type. It has only been found out that the rate of using the internet from work is higher in nuclear households (23%) compared to other household types.

The majority of upper middle class (66%) connect to the internet at home, and in individuals from lower class internet cafe usage (66%) is prominent. Amongst individuals from high upper class (36%) and upper class (32%) the rate of people who connect to the internet from work is higher (Table 193).

Table 193. Using the Internet by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	At home	At work	At Internet cafe	At school	Via mobile/ iPhone/iPad	Other
GENDER						
Male	50,9	25,4	17,5	1,4	2,9	1,9
Female	69,5	14,4	6,0	2,1	3,7	4,3
AGE						
18-24	52,0	9,0	25,3	3,8	6,2	3,7
25-34	55,8	25,3	12,2	0,8	2,8	3,1
35-44	61,9	31,2	3,7	0,3	1,2	1,6
45-54	67,4	26,7	3,2	0,8	0,4	1,5
55-64	75,4	18,6	1,8	1,0	0,2	3,0
65+	75,0	7,2	10,6	0,0	0,0	7,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	95,6	0,3	0,5	0,8	0,9	2,1
Primary school	86,5	0,4	1,3	2,6	4,4	4,8
Elementary/secondary school	81,4	0,8	2,2	3,5	9,2	2,9
High school	73,0	0,9	4,0	6,1	12,5	3,4
Undergraduate/graduate studies	63,0	0,8	4,3	9,1	18,7	4,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	58,0	23,3	11,5	1,2	2,9	3,1
Extended	56,8	17,0	19,3	1,6	4,0	1,3
Broken	58,1	15,0	16,0	4,0	4,0	2,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	58,4	35,7	1,8	1,6	1,8	0,7
Upper class	62,8	32,2	1,3	1,3	1,8	0,6
Upper middle class	65,6	21,6	7,4	1,3	1,9	2,1
Lower middle class	49,1	14,6	25,2	1,2	5,1	4,8
Lower class	9,7	15,2	65,8	2,8	2,9	3,6

Within the scope of research, another question asked to internet users about internet use is the purpose of internet use.

Across Türkiye internet use purposes show that 38% of individuals uses the internet for research and information purposes. The rate of those who use the internet to have access to social networking sites throughout Türkiye is 26%. Another purpose for internet use with a rate of 22% is for job and to keep up with business (Table 194).

According to area of residence, there is a differentiation in terms of job/keeping up with business and for research and information purposes. The rate of job/keeping up with business is higher in urban areas (23%) and the rate for research and information purposes is higher in the rural areas (42%).

Purposes of internet use is different amongst three major cities. The rate of those who use the internet for research and information purposes is higher in Ankara (44%) and the rate of those who use the internet for social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter,etc is higher in Istanbul (29%) and in Izmir (27%).

There are regional differences in terms of purpose for internet use. The biggest difference is in terms of the primary purpose, which is research and information. The rate of those who use the internet for this purpose is the highest in East Black Sea (47%); and the lowest is in the Aegean (34%).

Table 194. Purposes for Internet Use throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	For my job/to keep up with my business	Chat	Mailing	Games& Entertainment	Social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter,etc	Research and information	Banking	Other
Türkiye	22,1	4,1	0,4	6,3	26,4	38,1	0,8	1,7
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	23,2	3,8	0,4	6,3	26,1	37,4	1,0	1,8
Rural	15,9	5,8	0,3	6,7	27,9	41,9	0,2	1,3
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	24,5	4,1	0,8	4,4	29,2	34,1	0,7	2,3
Ankara	22,2	3,8	0,3	7,1	20,3	43,9	1,1	1,3
Izmir	22,9	4,9	1,0	6,7	26,8	33,0	2,0	2,6
NUTS								
Istanbul	24,5	4,1	0,8	4,4	29,2	34,1	0,7	2,3
West Marmara	21,7	2,8	0,3	5,1	26,7	39,0	0,9	3,4
East Marmara	23,2	2,7	0,4	7,5	23,1	40,6	1,3	1,2
Aegean	23,0	4,0	0,5	9,2	26,6	33,8	0,9	2,0
Mediterranean	19,6	5,2	0,0	6,6	22,9	44,0	1,3	0,4
West Anatolia	20,9	3,8	0,4	7,6	23,8	40,8	1,0	1,7
Central Anatolia	19,6	4,7	0,0	6,3	30,4	36,8	1,1	1,2
West Black Sea	21,4	3,5	0,0	7,2	30,6	35,4	0,3	1,7
East Black Sea	16,8	4,1	0,1	4,4	26,0	47,2	0,4	1,0
Northeast Anatolia	25,4	6,5	0,0	3,2	26,9	35,9	0,0	2,1
Mideast Anatolia	19,7	4,9	0,1	6,0	24,3	44,7	0,3	0,2
Southeast Anatolia	21,1	6,3	0,2	4,3	26,0	39,7	0,3	2,1

Internet use purposes with the highest differentiation between females and males are for job/to keep up with business and for research and information. The rate of those who use the internet for job is higher amongst males (25%), and the rate of those who use it for research and information is higher amongst females (43%) (Table 195).

The highest differentiation amongst age groups in terms of purpose for internet use is to have access to social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, etc. 44% of the 18-24 age group uses the internet for the mentioned purpose, this rate is 7% in 55-64 age group, and 9% in 45-54 age group.

Primary school graduates have the highest rate of those who use the internet for research and information purposes (47%), individuals who have not graduated from a school have the lowest rate (25%). Internet use for job/ to keep up with business is high amongst university graduates (40%).

Based on household type, it is observed that in broken households internet use for accessing social networking sites (33%), in nuclear households internet use for research and information (39%) are higher compared to other household types. Nuclear households are the type where job/keeping up with business is the highest (23%).

As one proceeds from lower class to higher class, the rate of those who use the internet for accessing social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, etc. drops, but the rate of those who use it for job/to keep up with business increases. For instance, 16% of individuals in lower class uses the internet for their job, whereas this rate is 43% in high upper class. 38% of lower class uses the internet to have access to social networking sites. This rate is 14% in high upper class.

Table 195. Purposes for Internet Use by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	For my job/to keep up with my business	Chat	Mailing	Games& Entertainment	Social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter,etc	Research and information	Banking	Other
GENDER								
Male	25,3	4,1	0,3	6,6	26,0	35,2	1,1	1,5
Female	16,8	4,2	0,5	5,9	27,0	43,0	0,5	2,0
AGE								
18-24	11,0	5,6	0,3	5,8	44,1	31,1	0,5	1,5
25-34	25,3	3,2	0,3	5,8	24,7	38,2	0,8	1,7
35-44	30,8	3,5	0,2	6,4	14,4	41,9	1,1	1,7
45-54	28,1	4,2	0,3	9,1	9,1	46,1	1,4	1,5
55-64	22,9	2,2	1,9	8,3	7,2	52,8	1,6	3,1
65+	12,9	12,7	6,2	2,8	11,0	49,8	0,0	4,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS								
No schooling	15,0	19,7	0,0	6,4	28,9	24,5	0,0	5,5
Primary school	13,0	5,8	0,5	11,2	20,7	46,6	0,3	2,0
Elementary/secondary school	11,0	6,3	0,3	9,5	36,8	33,8	0,6	1,6
High school	17,7	4,0	0,2	5,7	31,4	38,6	0,8	1,4
Undergraduate/graduate studies	39,9	1,6	0,5	2,8	15,2	36,9	1,3	1,8
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	23,3	3,8	0,3	6,3	24,5	39,4	0,9	1,6
Extended	18,3	5,3	0,6	8,5	28,8	35,6	0,9	2,0
Broken	19,9	4,7	0,7	4,7	33,2	34,1	0,6	2,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
High upper class	43,4	2,3	0,6	3,1	13,8	33,9	1,1	1,8
Upper class	35,4	1,6	0,6	3,9	18,1	37,5	1,2	1,6
Upper middle class	22,1	4,5	0,3	6,9	25,0	39,2	0,7	1,4
Lower middle class	11,5	5,9	0,2	7,7	33,2	39,0	0,9	1,7
Lower class	15,5	6,3	0,1	5,9	38,2	32,2	0,0	1,7

8.18. Watching Television

The rate of those who responded as "I never watch TV" to the question "Approximately, how many hours do you watch TV?" can be found under the "no" heading in Table 136. According to these data, the rate of those who never watch TV across Türkiye is 7% (Table 196).

It is observed that the rates of those who do not watch television are slightly higher in rural areas (8%), in Istanbul amongst three major cities (7%), in Northeast Anatolia (11%) and Southeast Anatolia (11%) amongst regions, in females (8%), in 18-24 age group (9%), amongst widowed individuals (14%), amongst those who received no schooling (15%), amongst individuals from broken households (12%) and in the lower and high upper classes (10%) (Table 197).

Table 196. Watching TV throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	No	Yes
Türkiye	7,0	93,1
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	6,4	93,6
Rural	8,3	91,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	7,1	92,9
Ankara	4,6	95,4
Izmir	5,9	94,1
NUTS		
Istanbul	7,1	92,9
West Marmara	8,1	91,9
East Marmara	6,3	93,7
Aegean	6,6	93,4
Mediterranean	5,6	94,4
West Anatolia	5,0	95,0
Central Anatolia	6,6	93,5
West Black Sea	5,3	94,7
East Black Sea	6,8	93,2
Northeast Anatolia	11,1	88,9
Mideast Anatolia	9,5	90,5
Southeast Anatolia	10,9	89,1

Table 197. Watching TV by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	No	Yes
GENDER		
Male	6,3	93,7
Female	7,6	92,4
AGE		
18-24	9,0	91,0
25-34	5,9	94,1
35-44	5,3	94,7
45-54	5,6	94,4
55-64	5,7	94,3
65+	12,9	87,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
No schooling	14,5	85,5
Primary school	5,1	95,0
Elementary/secondary school	5,1	94,9
High school	7,0	93,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	7,0	93,0
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	10,0	90,0
Married	5,5	94,5
Separated/live apart	4,1	95,9
Widowed	14,4	85,6
Divorced	8,5	91,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	5,9	94,1
Extended	7,5	92,5
Broken	12,1	87,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
High upper class	9,7	90,3
Upper class	5,1	94,9
Upper middle class	5,2	94,8
Lower middle class	6,1	93,9
Lower class	10,0	90,0

Durations of watching TV were defined based on the answers given to the same question. Across Türkiye daily time to watch TV show that more than half of individuals (56%) watch 2-3 hours TV a day. 18% watches TV 1 hour or less, 22% watches between 4 to 6 hours. 3% watches TV 7 hours and more (Table 198).

According to area of residence, there is not a high differentiation. However, the rate of those who watch TV 4-6 hours a day is slightly higher in the urban areas (24%) and the rate of those who watch TV for 1 hour or less is slightly higher in rural areas (20%).

Amongst three major cities, durations of watching TV are similar to the rates across Türkiye, nevertheless the rate of those watching TV for 4 hours or more in Izmir and Ankara is over 30%, and that is higher than in Istanbul.

A comparison of regions shows that the rate of

Table 198. Daily Time Spent to Watch TV throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	1 hour	2 – 3 hours	4 – 6 hours	7+hours
Türkiye	18,2	56,0	22,4	3,4
RESIDENCE AREA				
Urban	17,4	55,4	23,5	3,7
Rural	20,2	57,5	19,6	2,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES				
Istanbul	15,8	58,1	23,1	3,0
Ankara	16,0	54,0	24,6	5,4
Izmir	14,3	53,5	25,6	6,6
NUTS				
Istanbul	15,8	58,1	23,1	3,0
West Marmara	18,4	58,6	19,8	3,1
East Marmara	17,5	56,0	23,1	3,4
Aegean	17,5	54,3	24,1	4,1
Mediterranean	14,7	59,3	22,1	3,9
West Anatolia	20,6	50,2	24,5	4,7
Central Anatolia	17,8	54,0	25,2	2,9
West Black Sea	20,5	56,4	20,6	2,5
East Black Sea	19,6	57,4	20,2	2,8
Northeast Anatolia	16,8	60,0	19,6	3,6
Mideast Anatolia	21,7	56,8	19,9	1,5
Southeast Anatolia	24,6	53,4	18,9	3,1

those who watch TV for 1 hour or shorter a day is higher in Southeast Anatolia (25%), and the rate of those who watch TV for 4 hours or more is higher in West Anatolia (29%).

The rate of those who watch TV 2-3 hours a day is higher in males (60%) and the rate of those who watch TV between 4 to 6 hours is higher in females (26%). From the age group perspective, the rate of those who watch TV 4 hours or more a day is higher in 55-64 age group (30%) and the rate of those who watch TV 2-3 hours a day is higher in 35-44 age group (%59) (Table 199).

Exploring durations of watching TV based on educational status, it is indicated that the rate of those who watch 1 hour or less TV a day is higher amongst those who received no schooling (26%) and the rate of those who watch TV 4 hours or more a day is higher amongst elementary/secondary school graduates (30%).

In terms of the durations of watching TV, there is not a high differentiation based on household types. Based on socioeconomic status on the other hand, the rate of those who watch TV 4 hours or more a day is higher in upper middle (27%) and lower middle (26%) classes.

Table 199. Daily Time Spent to Watch TV by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Household Type, and SES

	1 hour	2 – 3 hours	4 – 6 hours	7+hours
GENDER				
Male	19,0	59,6	19,0	2,3
Female	17,3	52,4	25,8	4,5
AGE				
18-24	18,4	53,6	23,8	4,3
25-34	17,5	57,9	21,8	2,8
35-44	19,0	59,3	19,5	2,1
45-54	17,0	56,7	22,9	3,4
55-64	17,4	52,3	25,7	4,6
65+	20,9	51,5	22,7	4,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS				
No schooling	25,8	50,6	19,5	4,1
Primary school	17,5	56,1	22,8	3,5
Elementary/secondary school	14,4	55,2	25,8	4,5
High school	16,9	57,0	23,1	3,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	20,0	60,3	18,1	1,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE				
Nuclear	17,3	56,9	22,6	3,2
Extended	20,1	55,3	21,5	3,1
Broken	20,5	51,8	22,7	5,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS				
High upper class	19,5	62,6	16,3	1,6
Upper class	17,7	58,5	21,6	2,2
Upper middle class	16,1	57,1	23,4	3,4
Lower middle class	18,0	55,6	22,6	3,8
Lower class	23,6	55,8	18,3	2,2

The individuals who reported watching TV were asked when in the day time they mostly watch TV. It was found out that throughout Türkiye a vast majority of individuals who watch TV (79%) watch it in the evening. The rate of those who watch TV all day long is 6% (Table 200).

In urban areas, the rate of watching TV in the evening is 78% and this rate is 82% in rural areas. In general, the rate of those who watch TV in the evenings is the highest in all three cities. However, this rate is slightly lower in Izmir (75%) compared to the other two cities. Still, the rate of those who report watching TV all day long is higher in Izmir (10%).

Amongst the regions, Central Anatolia (85%) and Mideast Anatolia (84%) are the places with the highest rates of watching TV in the evening. Northeast Anatolia (10%) is the region where rates of watching TV all day are the highest. 11% of individuals who live in Southeast Anatolia watches TV mostly in the afternoon.

Table 200. Times of Day When Individuals Watch TV throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Morning	Afternoon	Evening	Night	All day
Türkiye	2,2	7,1	79,4	5,2	6,0
RESIDENCE AREA					
Urban	2,4	7,6	78,4	5,7	5,9
Rural	1,8	5,8	82,2	3,8	6,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES					
Istanbul	1,8	8,2	79,4	6,1	4,5
Ankara	3,1	7,4	80,2	3,9	5,5
Izmir	2,2	6,7	75,2	6,4	9,5
NUTS					
Istanbul	1,8	8,2	79,4	6,1	4,5
West Marmara	2,3	6,2	80,1	7,6	3,8
East Marmara	1,5	6,0	79,4	6,8	6,4
Aegean	2,4	6,0	79,0	5,1	7,4
Mediterranean	1,9	6,0	79,5	4,3	8,3
West Anatolia	3,2	7,4	79,4	3,9	6,0
Central Anatolia	2,8	6,9	85,4	2,6	2,3
West Black Sea	1,0	6,7	81,8	3,8	6,7
East Black Sea	2,3	4,9	81,4	5,4	6,0
Northeast Anatolia	1,1	8,5	79,2	1,5	9,8
Mideast Anatolia	1,8	7,5	84,2	2,2	4,4
Southeast Anatolia	4,1	10,9	70,9	8,0	6,0

The rate of those who watch TV in the evenings is higher in males (86%). This rate is 73% in females. 9% of females report watching TV all day long and this rate is 3% in males. The female rate of those who say they watch TV mostly in the afternoon (12%) is a lot higher than the rate of males (3%) (Table 201).

According the age groups shows that there is not a significant differentiation. However, it was found out that the rate of 65+ individuals who watch TV all day long is 12% and this rate is higher than other age groups.

The rate of those who watch TV all day is higher among widowed individuals (14%) and the rate of those who watch TV in the evenings is higher among married individuals (80%).

As the educational status improves, so does the rate of those who watch TV mostly in the evening and at night. 73% of those who have not graduated from a school say that they mostly watch TV in the evening, this rate is 86% among university graduates. The rate of those who say they watch TV mostly in the afternoon among individuals who have not graduated from a school (12%) is higher than other educational groups.

There is not a differentiation based on household types in terms of durations for watching TV during the day.

A tendency similar to educational status can be foung in SES groups. As the socioeconomic status improves, so does the rate of those who watch TV mostly in the evening and at night. For example, 79% of lower class reports watching TV mostly in the evening and this rate is 83% in high upper class. In high upper class the rate of those who say they watch TV at night (11%) is higher compared to other SES groups.

Table 201. Times of Day When Individuals Watch TV by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Morning	Afternoon	Evening	Night	All day
GENDER					
Male	1,2	2,7	85,9	6,8	3,4
Female	3,2	11,6	73,0	3,5	8,7
AGE					
18-24	2,4	9,0	76,1	7,2	5,3
25-34	1,9	7,0	80,0	6,1	5,0
35-44	2,0	5,8	82,6	5,0	4,5
45-54	2,4	6,6	80,6	4,5	5,8
55-64	2,7	7,3	79,4	3,2	7,4
65+	2,1	7,7	74,9	3,1	12,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS					
No schooling	2,8	11,8	73,1	2,8	9,6
Primary school	2,4	7,5	79,3	3,9	6,9
Elementary/secondary school	2,1	8,5	77,0	6,1	6,3
High school	2,2	5,2	81,3	6,8	4,6
Undergraduate/graduate studies	1,3	3,0	86,3	7,0	2,3
MARITAL STATUS					
Single	1,9	6,3	79,2	8,7	3,9
Married	2,3	7,1	80,4	4,3	5,9
Separated/ live apart	1,8	11,1	72,2	6,1	8,7
Widowed	2,5	11,1	70,1	2,7	13,6
Divorced	2,3	4,7	74,4	9,2	9,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE					
Nuclear	2,4	7,0	80,2	4,9	5,6
Extended	1,8	8,1	79,0	5,1	6,1
Broken	1,9	6,7	75,9	6,9	8,6
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS					
High upper class	0,5	4,0	82,6	10,5	2,3
Upper class	1,9	4,4	84,7	5,1	3,8
Upper middle class	2,5	6,8	79,3	5,9	5,4
Lower middle class	2,5	7,8	78,6	4,6	6,6
Lower class	1,8	8,6	79,0	4,6	5,9

Individuals were asked if they watch TV mostly alone or with other household members. Accordingly, it was revealed that 77% watches it with other household members. As Table 139 shows this rate is 80% in rural areas and it is higher than the rate of individuals in urban areas (Table 202).

76% of those in Istanbul and Izmir watches TV with other household members, and this rate drops to 69% in Ankara. Northeast Anatolia, with a rate of 86%, has the highest rate in terms of watching TV mostly with other household members. East Marmara has the lowest rate with 70%, in terms of watching TV with other household members.

Table 202. Preferences of Individuals while Watching TV throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Alone	With other household members
Türkiye	23,0	77,0
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	24,1	75,9
Rural	20,3	79,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	23,8	76,2
Ankara	30,8	69,2
Izmir	24,5	75,5
NUTS		
Istanbul	23,8	76,2
West Marmara	28,5	71,5
East Marmara	30,3	69,7
Aegean	21,3	78,7
Mediterranean	19,5	80,5
West Anatolia	27,7	72,3
Central Anatolia	17,7	82,3
West Black Sea	23,5	76,5
East Black Sea	20,1	79,9
Northeast Anatolia	13,8	86,2
Mideast Anatolia	17,7	82,3
Southeast Anatolia	21,7	78,3

There is not differentiation in gender breakdown. 35–44 age group ranks the highest with a proportion of 84% in terms of watching TV with other household members. Another interesting point in findings is that 65+ age group watches TV alone with a high rate of 38% (Table 203).

Based on educational status, there is not a significant differentiation, still, primary school graduates are the highest educational group in terms of watching TV with other household members (80%).

Widowed (60%), divorced (48%) and separated individuals (46%) are the groups where the rates of watching TV alone are higher. The vast majority of nuclear (80%) and extended households (84%) watch TV with other household members and this rate is 42% in broken households.

As the socioeconomic status improves, the rate of watching TV alone also increases slightly. For example, 20% of lower class watches TV alone and this rate is 24% in high upper class.

Table 203. Preferences of Individuals while Watching TV by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Alone	With other household members
GENDER		
Male	22,0	78,0
Female	24,1	75,9
AGE		
18-24	27,1	72,9
25-34	20,6	79,4
35-44	16,4	83,6
45-54	20,8	79,2
55-64	24,7	75,3
65+	37,9	62,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
No schooling	26,5	73,5
Primary school	20,3	79,7
Elementary/secondary school	23,2	76,8
High school	24,5	75,5
Undergraduate/graduate studies	24,9	75,1
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	32,7	67,3
Married	16,8	83,2
Separated/ live apart	45,7	54,3
Widowed	60,2	39,8
Divorced	47,5	52,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	19,0	81,0
Extended	16,2	83,8
Broken	57,9	42,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
High upper class	24,1	75,9
Upper class	24,7	75,3
Upper middle class	24,0	76,0
Lower middle class	19,8	80,2
Lower class	19,9	80,1

As part of research, individuals who reported watching TV were asked if they had the opportunity, if they would prefer to watch TV alone. Across the country 24% has responded as "yes" to this question. Once again, it is revealed that watching TV is thought of as a collective action by the vast majority of households (76%) (Table 204).

The rate of those who would prefer to watch TV alone is higher in urban areas (26%) than in rural areas (19%). Among three major cities, the rate of those who prefer to watch TV alone is lower in Izmir (23%). The regions with highest rates of those who prefer to watch TV alone is West Anatolia with 30%, East Marmara with 29% and Istanbul with 28%; and the regions where the rates are the lowest are West Marmara with 12% and Northeast Anatolia with 14%.

Table 204. Preference to Watch TV Alone throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes	No
Türkiye	24,2	75,8
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	26,1	73,9
Rural	19,2	80,8
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	28,2	71,8
Ankara	27,7	72,3
Izmir	22,9	77,1
NUTS		
Istanbul	28,2	71,8
West Marmara	12,1	87,9
East Marmara	28,8	71,2
Aegean	24,0	76,0
Mediterranean	24,1	75,9
West Anatolia	29,8	70,2
Central Anatolia	19,8	80,2
West Black Sea	16,3	83,7
East Black Sea	19,1	80,9
Northeast Anatolia	13,9	86,1
Mideast Anatolia	25,1	74,9
Southeast Anatolia	24,8	75,2

There is not a differentiation in females and males in terms of preference to watch TV alone. As the age group increases, the rate of people who prefer to watch TV alone decreases. 33% of individuals between the ages 18-24 say that they prefer to watch TV alone and this rate is 24% in individuals from 35-44 age group, and 14% in individuals from 65+ age group (Table 205).

In elementary school and higher school graduates, the rate of those who prefer to watch TV alone is higher. 17% of individuals who have not graduated from a school prefers to watch TV alone, this rate is 27% in elementary school graduates, 30% in high school graduates and 26% in university graduates. There is no differentiation in breakdown based on households in preference to watch TV alone.

As the socioeconomic status improves, the rate of those who prefer to watch TV alone increases. For example, 23% of individuals in lower class, 27% of individuals from upper middle class and 28% of individuals from high upper class say they prefer to watch TV alone.

Table 205. Preference to Watch TV Alone by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes	No
GENDER		
Male	23,5	76,5
Female	24,8	75,2
AGE		
18-24	33,3	66,7
25-34	26,9	73,1
35-44	24,5	75,5
45-54	20,8	79,2
55-64	17,2	82,8
65+	13,5	86,5
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
No schooling	17,4	82,6
Primary school	21,5	78,5
Elementary/secondary school	26,9	73,1
High school	29,5	70,5
Undergraduate/graduate studies	26,2	73,8
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	36,3	63,7
Married	21,9	78,1
Separated/ live apart	27,0	73,0
Widowed	13,7	86,3
Divorced	28,6	71,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	23,9	76,1
Extended	24,8	75,2
Broken	25,6	74,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
High upper class	23,9	76,1
Upper class	24,8	75,2
Upper middle class	25,6	74,4
Lower middle class	23,9	76,1
Lower class	24,8	75,2

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked who mostly gives the final decision on which program and/or channel to watch. As indicated in Table 206, it was revealed that across Türkiye it is the father who decides which channel to watch on TV at the highest rate (57%). The mother/woman rate who decide which TV channel and/or program to watch is 19%. Grandfather and grandmother are the household members who have the least say in this subject, at rates lower than 1%.

In terms of urban and rural breakdown, the 20% rate of mother's decision in urban areas is higher compared to rural areas (15%) and in rural areas the 65% rate of father's decision is higher compared to urban areas (54%).

In terms of channel preference on TV, a similar behaviour can be observed in three major cities. The impact of both parents' and children' on the channel decision are similar.

It is the mother in West Marmara with a rate of 26%, the father in Northeast Anatolia with a rate of 77%, the son in Southeast Anatolia with a rate of 13% who is in the decisive position in choosing the TV channel at a higher rate compared to other regions.

Table 206. Decision on TV Channel throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Mother/ woman	Father/man	Son	Daughter	Grandfather	Grandmother	Other
Türkiye	18,9	56,8	8,6	7,1	0,3	0,2	8,2
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	20,3	53,7	8,9	7,4	0,3	0,2	9,3
Rural	15,3	64,8	7,8	6,3	0,3	0,1	5,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	22,7	48,3	9,1	7,9	0,2	0,3	11,5
Ankara	23,6	47,8	9,1	7,4	0,1	0,2	11,7
Izmir	23,4	51,0	9,0	7,0	0,0	0,3	9,3
NUTS							
Istanbul	22,7	48,3	9,1	7,9	0,2	0,3	11,5
West Marmara	26,3	52,8	4,2	7,1	0,0	0,0	9,7
East Marmara	20,1	54,5	8,8	6,3	0,4	0,2	9,6
Aegean	23,6	50,7	7,3	6,8	0,1	0,3	11,3
Mediterranean	14,4	64,7	8,1	6,7	0,1	0,1	5,9
West Anatolia	19,0	52,7	8,8	7,0	0,6	0,6	11,3
Central Anatolia	15,9	64,6	9,6	5,2	0,7	0,0	3,9
West Black Sea	21,7	59,7	8,1	7,1	0,2	0,2	2,9
East Black Sea	19,3	59,3	6,9	6,9	0,4	0,1	7,1
Northeast Anatolia	9,2	76,7	5,7	5,1	0,5	0,0	2,9
Mideast Anatolia	13,2	58,0	10,2	9,5	0,3	0,0	8,8
Southeast Anatolia	11,0	64,9	13,0	7,9	0,0	0,0	3,1

51% of females and 63% of males say that it is the "father/man" who decides which channel will be watched on TV (Table 207).

Age group evaluation shows that the father's decision rate in which TV channel to watch increases as the age group increases. 50% of individuals from 18-24 age group say the father is the decisive one, and this rate goes up to 63% in 65+ age group. On the other hand, the rate of those who say that the son decides which channel to watch on TV among 18-24 age group is higher compared to other age groups, with a rate of 13%.

The father's decision rate decreases as the educational status of the individuals rise. In other words, as the educational status increases, the right to have a say about the TV channel shifts towards the mother. For instance, for individuals who have not received any schooling, mother's decision rate is 15% and this rate is 24% in university graduates.

In nuclear (61%) and extended households (58%), the father is overwhelmingly decisive, and this rate is 9% in broken households. However, in broken households the mother decides on the TV channel to be watched with a rate of 33%. On the other hand, in broken households, the children's influence in deciding on the TV channel is higher compared to other household types. In broken households sons, with a rate of 20% and daughters, with a rate of 19% are in the decisive position.

In terms of socioeconomic status, the father's superiority continues. However, as socioeconomic status improves, this rate drops and shifts towards the mother. For example, in lower class 14% reports that the mother is in the decisive position and this rate is 31% in high upper class.

Table 207. Decision on TV Channel by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Mother/ woman	Father/man	Son	Daughter	Grand-father	Grand-mother	Other
GENDER							
Male	15,1	62,5	9,6	4,1	0,2	0,0	8,4
Female	22,8	50,8	7,6	10,2	0,3	0,3	7,9
AGE							
18-24	15,0	50,0	13,4	9,0	0,5	0,2	11,8
25-34	21,0	54,4	9,3	6,2	0,3	0,2	8,4
35-44	19,2	57,4	8,3	8,3	0,2	0,1	6,6
45-54	18,4	59,5	6,9	7,8	0,1	0,1	7,3
55-64	19,1	62,7	5,4	4,2	0,1	0,2	8,3
65+	19,7	63,1	5,3	4,9	0,4	0,5	6,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
No schooling	14,6	63,3	8,3	8,3	0,3	0,3	5,0
Primary school	17,4	62,0	7,4	6,5	0,2	0,2	6,4
Elementary/secondary school	18,9	56,3	10,3	7,5	0,5	0,1	6,4
High school	20,9	49,2	9,3	7,8	0,2	0,1	12,6
Undergraduate/graduate studies	24,3	47,9	9,1	6,1	0,1	0,2	12,2
MARITAL STATUS							
Single	14,9	42,9	16,9	12,1	0,2	0,2	12,9
Married	19,0	62,0	6,1	5,4	0,2	0,1	7,1
Separated/ live apart	32,2	34,4	13,8	14,9	2,5	0,0	2,3
Widowed	27,3	25,3	20,3	14,9	0,7	1,9	9,7
Divorced	35,1	17,8	17,3	19,9	0,3	0,0	9,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	19,1	60,8	6,9	6,3	0,0	0,0	7,0
Extended	13,3	58,2	11,3	5,9	1,2	0,8	9,2
Broken	32,9	9,1	20,0	18,9	0,2	0,4	18,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
High upper class	31,2	42,4	6,4	6,0	0,0	0,0	14,0
Upper class	24,9	48,8	7,1	6,5	0,0	0,2	12,5
Upper middle class	21,3	53,6	8,2	6,7	0,2	0,3	9,8
Lower middle class	16,3	61,9	8,9	6,5	0,4	0,2	5,9
Lower class	13,8	65,4	9,2	7,4	0,2	0,1	3,9

Individuals were asked if they have serious discussions with members of their family while deciding which channel or program to watch. Across Türkiye 91% of individuals say that they do not have discussions. As indicated in the table, there are similar tendencies in individuals living in the urban and rural areas, in both more than 90% have reported that they do not have discussions and this rate is slightly higher in rural areas with 93% compared to urban areas (90%) (Table 208).

In three major cities, once again the vast majority of individuals think that they do not experience any discussions in the selection of channel/program. However, this rate is slightly higher in Istanbul, with a rate of 92%, than the other two major cities.

Regions where discussions are mostly experienced in channel and program selection are West Anatolia with 13%, and the region where discussions are experienced at the least is West Marmara with 6%.

Table 208. Having Discussions with Family Members in TV Channel Selection throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes	No
Türkiye	9,2	90,8
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	9,9	90,1
Rural	7,4	92,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	8,5	91,5
Ankara	12,0	88,0
Izmir	10,9	89,1
NUTS		
Istanbul	8,5	91,5
West Marmara	6,0	94,0
East Marmara	10,3	89,7
Aegean	10,6	89,4
Mediterranean	7,6	92,4
West Anatolia	13,0	87,0
Central Anatolia	7,4	92,6
West Black Sea	8,9	91,1
East Black Sea	9,7	90,3
Northeast Anatolia	9,1	90,9
Mideast Anatolia	8,3	91,7
Southeast Anatolia	8,3	91,7

In data based on gender, the opinion that discussions on TV channel selection are not experienced is dominant. "No" responses for both genders are again over 90% (Table 209).

As the age group increases, the rate of those who have discussion on TV channel or program selection decreases. 11% of individuals in 18-24 age range report having discussions in their households about this subject and this rate is 4% in individuals over 65.

Regardless of the marital status, vast majority of individuals report having no discussions about which channel to watch in their household. However, widowed individuals, with a percentage of 96%, have the highest percentage of those who report having no problems about that.

Although there is not a significant differentiation in terms of educational status, it is observed that those who have not graduated from a school have the least discussions with 7% and the population who has discussions mostly with 10% is elementary/secondary school graduates and also with 11% high school graduates.

There is not a differentiation in terms of household type. Nuclear households mostly have discussions about which TV channel and program to be watched, with a rate of 10%.

The table shows similar results in terms of socioeconomic status levels as well. The SES groups who have the most discussions are upper middle class with 11% and lower SES group with 10%.

Table 209. Having Discussions with Family Members in TV Channel Selection by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes	No
GENDER		
Male	8,7	91,3
Female	9,7	90,3
AGE		
18-24	10,6	89,4
25-34	10,0	90,0
35-44	11,4	88,6
45-54	8,3	91,7
55-64	5,9	94,1
65+	3,8	96,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
No schooling	6,6	93,4
Primary school	8,9	91,1
Elementary/secondary school	10,4	89,6
High school	10,9	89,1
Undergraduate/graduate studies	7,8	92,2
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	10,3	89,7
Married	9,1	90,9
Separated/ live apart	9,7	90,3
Widowed	4,3	95,7
Divorced	8,4	91,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	9,5	90,5
Extended	8,2	91,8
Broken	8,0	92,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
High upper class	6,5	93,5
Upper class	8,4	91,6
Upper middle class	10,8	89,2
Lower middle class	9,2	90,8
Lower class	9,5	90,5

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked how they would react when they come across sexually explicit scenes when watching TV with other household members and they were given three different options, which were "I would not be disturbed, I would continue to watch", "I would feel disturbed and try to distract the younger members of the family" and "I would feel disturbed and change the channel" (Table 210).

81% of individuals feels disturbed by the sexually explicit scenes on TV and changes the channel, and 13% tries to distract kids and youngsters. Only 7% does not feel disturbed and continues to watch TV.

The rate of people who feel disturbed and change the channel is 87% in the rural areas and is higher than those who gave that answer in urban areas (78%). A larger share of those living in urban areas

(14%) compared to those in rural areas (8%) prefers to distract kids and youngsters instead of changing the channel.

The rates of feeling disturbed and changing the channel are quite paralel in three major cities. However, in Istanbul "I would feel disturbed and try to distract kids and youngsters" response is higher (19%), and "I would not be disturbed" response is higher in the other two cities. The rates of those who said they would not be disturbed is 12% in Ankara, 11% in Izmir, and 7% in Istanbul.

Southeast Anatolia, Northeast Anatolia and Central Anatolia are the places where people are at most disturbed by sexually explicit scenes, with a rate of 98%. In these regions, people who are disturbed by sexually explicit scenes behave differently. 95% of those in Central Anatolia changes the channel, 78% of those in Southeast Anatolia changes the channel, and 20% tries to distract kids and youngsters. People in Northeast Anatolia show a similar reaction with those in Southeast Anatolia. 72% of those living in this region changes channel, and 26% tried to distract kids and youngsters.

Table 210. Reactions to Sexually Explicit Scenes throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	I would not be disturbed, I would continue to watch	I would feel disturbed and try to distract the younger members of the family	I would feel disturbed and change the channel
Türkiye	6,6	12,6	80,8
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	7,5	14,4	78,2
Rural	4,4	8,2	87,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	7,1	19,2	73,7
Ankara	12,0	13,5	74,5
Izmir	10,5	15,4	74,1
NUTS			
Istanbul	7,1	19,2	73,7
West Marmara	7,2	7,0	85,8
East Marmara	5,8	8,1	86,1
Aegean	8,4	11,9	79,6
Mediterranean	8,3	12,6	79,1
West Anatolia	9,3	10,6	80,1
Central Anatolia	1,7	3,1	95,2
West Black Sea	5,9	7,0	87,1
East Black Sea	7,4	8,6	84,0
Northeast Anatolia	2,2	25,8	72,0
Mideast Anatolia	5,9	9,0	85,1
Southeast Anatolia	2,2	19,5	78,3

There is not a differentiation based on gender. Evaluation of age groups shows that 18-24 age group is not disturbed by the sexually explicit scenes and continues to watch, with the highest rate of 11%. The rate of those who are disturbed is similar in other age groups, but their reactions are different. Vast majority of people in 55+ group changes channel (In 55-64 age group 86%, in 65+ 89%), and the

majority of 45-54 age group changes the channel and a 10% also prefers trying to distract kids and youngsters (Table 211).

The rate of those who are not disturbed by the sexually explicit programs and continue to watch is higher in single and divorced individuals (13%).

Depending on the educational status, the rate of those who are not disturbed and continue to watch sharply increases as the educational level increases. For example, in individuals who have not graduated from a school the rate of those who are not disturbed is 2%, and this rate goes up to 11% in high school graduates and reaches 16% in university graduates (Table 211).

Based on household type, broken households with 15% have the highest rate of those who are not disturbed by sexually explicit scenes. Vast majority of individuals from nuclear and extended households (81% of nuclear households, 85% of extended households) is disturbed and changes the channel.

A similar tendency can be found in data based on socioeconomic status breakdown. In high upper class 22% is not disturbed by sexual content and continues to watch, and in lower class this rate is only 2%.

Table 211. Reactions to Sexually Explicit Scenes by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	I would not be disturbed, I would continue to watch	I would feel disturbed and try to distract the younger members of the family	I would feel disturbed and change the channel
GENDER			
Male	7,1	12,1	80,8
Female	6,1	13,2	80,8
AGE			
18-24	10,6	13,3	76,1
25-34	6,9	15,6	77,5
35-44	4,9	15,6	79,5
45-54	5,5	10,0	84,5
55-64	6,4	7,7	85,9
65+	4,9	5,9	89,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	2,1	9,8	88,1
Primary school	3,2	11,0	85,9
Elementary/secondary school	5,3	11,8	82,9
High school	11,0	14,1	74,8
Undergraduate/graduate studies	15,9	18,6	65,5
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	12,5	12,7	74,9
Married	5,4	12,6	82,1
Separated/ live apart	8,7	10,2	81,1
Widowed	3,0	10,0	87,0
Divorced	12,5	17,9	69,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	6,5	13,0	80,5
Extended	4,1	11,4	84,4
Broken	15,2	11,3	73,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	22,4	23,3	54,3
Upper class	14,0	18,0	68,0
Upper middle class	7,4	12,6	80,0
Lower middle class	3,9	11,1	85,0
Lower class	1,9	13,0	85,1

Within part of the research, the same question was asked for scenes of violence and the reactions of individuals to scenes of violence on TV were measured in terms of feeling disturbed, not feeling disturbed and changing the channel. 70% of individuals throughout Türkiye is disturbed by scenes of violence on TV and changes the channel. 13% is not disturbed and continues to watch. The rate of those who are disturbed in rural areas and who change channels is 80% and this is higher than both Türkiye average (70%) and urban average (66%) (Table 212).

In scenes of violence, Ankara and Izmir react more

compared to Istanbul. In such scenes, the rate of feeling disturbed and changing the channel is 65% in Ankara and 68% in Izmir, and this rate declines to 58% in Istanbul.

Those who live in Southeast Anatolia, Northeast Anatolia and Central Anatolia are the ones who are disturbed the most about scenes of violence. In these regions, the rate of those who are not disturbed by the scenes of violence and continue to watch is 7% in Southeast Anatolia, 6% in Northeast Anatolia and 6% in Central Anatolia. West Anatolia is the region with the highest rate, 19% of those who are not disturbed by such scenes.

Table 212. Reactions to Scenes of Violence throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	I would not be disturbed, I would continue to watch	I would feel disturbed and try to distract the younger members of the family	I would feel disturbed and change the channel
Türkiye	12,7	17,2	70,1
RESIDENCE AREA			
Urban	13,9	19,8	66,4
Rural	9,8	10,9	79,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES			
Istanbul	13,3	28,4	58,3
Ankara	18,6	16,1	65,3
Izmir	14,6	17,5	67,9
NUTS			
Istanbul	13,3	28,4	58,3
West Marmara	11,5	9,7	78,8
East Marmara	10,2	11,5	78,3
Aegean	15,0	15,7	69,3
Mediterranean	15,0	15,4	69,7
West Anatolia	18,8	16,7	64,5
Central Anatolia	6,2	11,2	82,6
West Black Sea	10,6	10,6	78,8
East Black Sea	13,2	10,9	75,9
Northeast Anatolia	5,9	26,0	68,1
Mideast Anatolia	15,1	15,1	69,8
Southeast Anatolia	6,7	19,4	73,9

Based on gender, there are only minor differences between males and females. The rate of those who are not disturbed and who continue to watch is slightly higher in males with 15%. 73% of females is disturbed and changes the channel, this rate is 68% in males (Table 213).

Based on age groups, similar to the sexually explicit scenes, 18-24 age group is the least disturbed group with a rate of 25%. Again, just like in sexually explicit scenes, older people prefer to change channels (in 55-64 age range 81%, and in 65+ 84%), and those from 25-44 age group are disturbed and try to distract kids and youngsters.

The rate of those who are not disturbed by scenes of violence and continue to watch is higher in widowed individuals (26%). The rate of those who are disturbed and prefer to change the channel is higher amongst those whose spouses passed away (81%).

In terms of educational status, the rate of those who are not disturbed by the scenes and continue to watch sharply increases, as the educational level increases. For instance, 7% is not disturbed among those who received no schooling, this rate is 20% for those from high school and above educational levels. Amongst those who are disturbed, people who have not graduated from a school prefer to change the channel (80%), and amongst those from high education level the rate of those who prefer to distract kids and youngsters is higher compared to other groups. For example, 20% of high school graduates and 24% of university gradutes try to distract kids and youngsters, instead of changing the channel (Table 213).

Table 213. Reactions to Scenes of Violence by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	I would not be disturbed, I would continue to watch	I would feel disturbed and try to distract the younger members of the family	I would feel disturbed and change the channel
GENDER			
Male	15,0	17,4	67,6
Female	10,3	17,1	72,6
AGE			
18-24	25,2	16,8	58,0
25-34	13,2	21,2	65,6
35-44	8,7	22,0	69,3
45-54	10,6	14,0	75,3
55-64	9,1	10,4	80,5
65+	7,5	8,4	84,0
EDUCATIONAL STATUS			
No schooling	6,8	13,2	80,0
Primary school	7,8	15,6	76,6
Elementary/secondary school	14,7	15,7	69,7
High school	19,9	20,0	60,1
Undergraduate/graduate studies	18,8	23,6	57,6
MARITAL STATUS			
Single	26,4	17,5	56,0
Married	10,1	17,3	72,7
Separated/ live apart	12,4	26,4	61,2
Widowed	6,5	12,2	81,4
Divorced	12,0	19,2	68,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE			
Nuclear	12,4	17,9	69,7
Extended	10,7	15,3	74,0
Broken	22,2	15,0	62,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS			
High upper class	23,1	29,9	47,0
Upper class	16,4	22,9	60,6
Upper middle class	15,1	17,3	67,6
Lower middle class	10,1	15,8	74,1
Lower class	5,6	17,3	77,1

Evaluation based on household types shows that broken household is the household type with the highest rate of those, 22%, who are not disturbed by scenes of violence, just like in sexually explicit scenes. Majority of individuals from nuclear and extended households (70% of nuclear households, 74% of extended households) are disturbed and change the channel (Table 213).

A similar tendency can be found in the data based on socioeconomic status levels. In high upper class, 23% is not disturbed by scenes of violence and continues to watch. This rate is only 6% in lower class. (Table 214).

Table 214 indicates the rates of responses "yes" and

"no" to the question "Have you ever filed a complaint to an official institution regarding the disturbing content in a TV program?" Across Türkiye only 3% reports filing a complaint.

There is not a sharp differentiation in the responses to this question based on rural/urban, gender, three major cities, region, age and household type. (Table 214 & 215).

However, marital status, educational status and socioeconomic status groups differentiate. 7% of individuals who lives apart, 7% of university graduates, 7% of individuals from high upper and upper middle classes says that they file an official complaint about the TV content.

Table 214.Filing a Complaint to an Official Institution Regarding TV Content throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Yes	No
Türkiye	2,6	97,4
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	3,0	97,0
Rural	1,6	98,4
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	4,5	95,5
Ankara	3,9	96,1
Izmir	3,6	96,4
NUTS		
Istanbul	4,5	95,5
West Marmara	0,9	99,1
East Marmara	2,5	97,5
Aegean	2,8	97,2
Mediterranean	1,3	98,7
West Anatolia	3,2	96,8
Central Anatolia	1,7	98,3
West Black Sea	1,3	98,7
East Black Sea	4,4	95,6
Northeast Anatolia	4,5	95,5
Mideast Anatolia	2,0	98,0
Southeast Anatolia	1,4	98,6

Table 215. Filing a Complaint to an Official Institution Regarding TV Content by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Yes	No
GENDER		
Male	3,1	96,9
Female	2,2	97,8
AGE		
18-24	2,3	97,7
25-34	3,5	96,5
35-44	3,5	96,5
45-54	2,3	97,7
55-64	1,7	98,3
65+	0,9	99,1
EDUCATIONAL STATUS		
No schooling	0,6	99,4
Primary school	1,5	98,5
Elementary/secondary school	2,0	98,0
High school	3,5	96,5
Undergraduate/graduate studies	7,2	92,8
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	2,9	97,1
Married	2,7	97,3
Separated/ live apart	6,9	93,1
Widowed	0,7	99,3
Divorced	3,1	96,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	2,8	97,2
Extended	2,2	97,8
Broken	2,5	97,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
High upper class	7,0	93,0
Upper class	7,1	92,9
Upper middle class	2,9	97,1
Lower middle class	1,6	98,4
Lower class	0,7	99,3

Within the scope of research, individuals were asked what disturbs them most in TV programs and the options were "sexuality", "violence", "Tv ads", "biased news and comments", "disrespectful, slangy, abusive conversations" and "other". According to data gathered, 46% of individuals said they were disturbed by TV programs with sexual content. As the table indicates, in second place, at a rate of 15%, "violence" and "disrespectful, slangy, abusive conversations" follow.

There is a similar distribution in urban and rural breakdown. The rate of individuals in rural areas who are disturbed by sexual content is higher than Türkiye average and urban areas (52%). Individuals living in rural areas are disturbed by biased news and comments at a rate of 7%, this rate is 12% in urban areas. Sexuality was reported as the the most disturbing program content in all three major cities. The rate of individuals who are disturbed by violent content is slightly higher in Izmir (19%). The rate of those who find disrespectful, slangy, abusive conversations disturbing is higher in Istanbul (19%) (Table 216).

Based on the regions, Central Anatolia (67%) and Mideast Anatolia (60%) are the regions which are the most disturbed by sexual content, and Istanbul (39%) and East Marmara (39%) are the regions which are the least disturbed. Programs with violent content disturb at most those living in East Black Sea (21%), and the least those who live in Central Anatolia (8%). People who live in Istanbul are disturbed by biased news coverages (14%) and programs with disrespectful, slangy, abusive conversations (19%), and they report higher disturbance rates in these contents compared to other regions. TV ads are the most problematic content for those living in the Mediterranean, with a rate of 17% (Table 216).

Table 216. Contents Found Disturbing on TV throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Sexuality	Violence	Disrespectful/slangy/ abusive conversations	Biased News and Comments	TV Ads	Other
Türkiye	45,7	15,4	14,6	10,3	9,2	4,9
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	43,3	15,6	15,5	11,7	9,2	4,6
Rural	51,9	14,7	12,1	6,5	9,1	5,7
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
İstanbul	39,4	14,8	19,4	13,8	9,3	3,4
Ankara	38,1	15,0	14,9	16,9	9,6	5,5
İzmir	37,1	19,0	13,7	16,4	11,1	2,7
NUTS						
Istanbul	39,4	14,8	19,4	13,8	9,3	3,4
West Marmara	42,3	19,4	15,5	10,3	10,6	2,1
East Marmara	39,3	15,7	17,1	9,6	11,0	7,3
Aegean	43,5	16,7	12,9	11,9	11,1	3,9
Mediterranean	41,3	12,4	7,5	5,7	16,9	16,2
West Anatolia	46,6	13,2	14,2	12,9	9,0	4,1
Central Anatolia	66,7	8,2	6,1	4,7	5,6	8,7
West Black Sea	51,7	17,0	12,2	7,8	7,4	3,9
East Black Sea	46,1	21,3	12,3	7,1	5,0	8,2
Northeast Anatolia	41,3	20,2	22,4	4,1	9,2	2,8
Mideast Anatolia	59,6	12,7	11,5	6,9	4,7	4,6
Southeast Anatolia	49,2	15,2	11,5	7,9	10,0	6,2

Evaluation based on gender shows minor differences, stil the distribution of rates are similar. The rate of females (48%) who are disturbed by sexual content on TV is higher than males (43%). Males are less disturbed by violent content (12%) compared to females. Likewise, females are less disturbed by biased news, comments and TV ads compared to males. For example, the rate of females who are disturbed by biased news and comments is 6%, whereas this rate is 14% for males (Table 217).

Distibution in terms of age groups resembles more or less the distribution across Türkiye. Sexuality is the content which disturbs all subgroups at most.

18-24 age group, with a rate of 40% is the group which is the least disturbed by sexuality, and as age goes up, the rate of those who are disturbed by sexual content also increases. The second ranking content which causes the most disturbance based on age groups is violence. Similarly, as age progresses, the rate of those who are disturbed by this content also increases. 18–24 age group individuals, with a rate of 15%, are disturbed at most by ads. 65+ individuals are the least disturbed by biased news and comments with a rate of 5%, and the ones who are disturbed at most are 18-24 individuals with a rate of 14% and 25-34 individuals with a rate of 13%.

The highest differentiation areas based on marital status are sexuality and biased news and comments. The rate of those who are disturbed by sexuality is higher in married individuals (49%), and lower in those living apart (32%). 19% of singles is disturbed by biased news and comments, this rate is quite low in widowed individuals (4%) (Table 217).

According to educational status, the distribution is again similar however it is observed that the differ-ences in rates become sharper. Programs with sexual content again are the most disturbing. The rate of those who are disturbed is 56% amongst those who have not graduated from a school and this rate drops to 31% in university graduates. The second content which the university graduates find the most dis-turbing is biased news and comments (25%). Dis-turbance of biased news and comments is the least in individuals who have not received any schooling (3%).

Table 217. Contents Found Disturbing on TV by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	Sexuality	Violence	Disrespectful/slangy/abusive conversations	Biased News and Comments	TV Ads	Other
GENDER						
Male	43,0	11,6	14,0	14,4	11,8	5,2
Female	48,4	19,2	15,2	6,2	6,6	4,5
AGE						
18-24	40,2	11,5	14,2	14,0	15,4	4,7
25-34	43,1	15,5	14,9	12,3	9,4	4,8
35-44	47,9	15,9	15,7	8,7	7,4	4,4
45-54	47,6	15,5	15,0	9,0	7,2	5,7
55-64	48,1	18,0	13,1	9,4	7,1	4,3
65+	50,6	17,4	13,2	5,3	7,7	5,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	55,5	16,0	13,4	3,2	6,2	5,8
Primary school	51,8	16,4	14,1	5,3	7,5	4,9
Elementary/secondary school	45,3	13,8	15,6	8,9	11,1	5,3
High school	38,6	14,1	14,8	15,5	12,3	4,6
Undergraduate/graduate studies	30,8	15,9	15,5	24,9	9,2	3,8
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	34,9	12,2	13,7	18,9	15,6	4,8
Married	49,0	15,6	14,7	8,4	7,6	4,7
Separated/ live apart	32,2	21,9	15,8	10,3	13,1	6,8
Widowed	45,7	20,9	15,8	3,6	8,3	5,7
Divorced	32,1	20,6	15,1	13,8	9,5	8,9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	45,9	15,3	15,0	10,3	8,9	4,6
Extended	53,2	13,9	12,6	6,7	8,7	4,9
Broken	32,8	18,0	15,4	15,7	11,7	6,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	26,1	16,9	20,1	24,5	10,1	2,4
Upper class	34,3	16,8	15,1	21,2	8,8	3,8
Upper middle class	43,8	14,3	15,1	12,2	9,8	4,8
Lower middle class	50,2	15,0	14,3	6,9	9,0	4,5
Lower class	52,4	17,3	12,5	4,3	6,7	6,7

Individuals from extended households are more disturbed by sexual content (53%), and individuals from broken households are more disturbed by biased news and comments (16%) compared to other household types (Table 217).

Distribution at socioeconomic status level shows similarities with overall Türkiye. High upper class individuals feel the least disturbed by sexual content (26%) and individuals from lower class feel the most disturbed (52%). The rates of those who are disturbed by biased news and comments is 25% in high upper class and 21% in upper class and these rates are high compared to other SES groups. Individuals from lower class feel the least disturbed by biased news and comments, with a rate of 4%.

8.19. Going on Holiday

The research aimed at indicating how the individuals spend their holiday. Therefore, individuals were asked where they generally spend their holidays longer than one week. The data shows that throughout Türkiye people mostly rest at the place where they live (35%). As indicated in the table, the second option where responses concentrate on with a rate of 31% is "I do not have such holidays ". 26% of individuals says they go to their hometown or village. The rate of those who go to places such as hotels, lodging houses is 12% (Table 218).

There are areas of differentiation between urban and rural dwellers. 44% of rural dwellers reports not finding the time for holiday, this rate is 26% in urban areas. As expected, the rate of those who go

to their hometown/village is higher in urban areas (32%). The rate of those who go to places such as hotels, lodging houses and to summer cottages for holiday is higher than in rural areas. For example, the rate of those who go to places such as hotels, lodging houses is 15% in urban areas and 5% in rural areas.

Differences can be observed amongst three major cities. In general terms, for individuals who live in Izmir, not having such holidays (23%) and the habit to rest in the place where they live (40%) are higher than the other two cities. On the other hand, the rates of going to hometown/village are higher in Ankara (40%) and in Istanbul (41%). In addition, the rate of those who say "I go to a hotel, lodging house" is 24% in Ankara and it is higher than the other two cities.

In terms of regional differences, Northeast Anatolia (62%) and Southeast Anatolia (58%) have the highest rates of those who do not have time for holiday. West Marmara (45%) and West Black Sea (45%) are the regions where highest rates of resting at the place where they live can be observed. Istanbul (41%) has the highest rate of those who go to their hometown/village, and the Mediterranean differentiates itself from other regions with the highest rate of people who go to summer range (11%). Going to summer cottage is mostly a holiday preference for those who live in Istanbul (10%) and in West Marmara (9%), and spending holidays in places such as hotels and lodging houses is a holiday preference for those who live in West Anatolia (21%).

Table 218. Going on Holiday throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	I do not have such holidays	I rest at the place where I live	I go to my home-town/ village	I go to a hotel & to a lodging house	I go to my summer cottage	I go to summer range	I go abroad	I go to my vineyard house	Other
Türkiye	30,9	35,4	26,0	12,0	5,4	2,8	1,3	0,8	3,1
RESIDENCE AREA									
Urban	25,7	34,4	31,5	14,6	6,8	2,7	1,7	0,9	2,9
Rural	44,3	37,8	11,7	5,3	1,8	3,1	0,5	0,6	3,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES									
Istanbul	19,4	34,4	41,4	17,7	10,1	1,8	2,6	0,7	2,4
Ankara	14,0	32,5	40,2	24,4	8,9	2,0	1,6	1,0	2,5
Izmir	23,4	39,6	22,8	17,4	9,6	1,8	1,6	0,9	3,2
NUTS									
Istanbul	19,4	34,4	41,4	17,7	10,1	1,8	2,6	0,7	2,4
West Marmara	22,4	44,9	15,7	16,3	9,3	1,2	1,0	1,2	2,8
East Marmara	22,5	41,1	30,5	13,6	4,7	1,9	1,9	0,6	3,0
Aegean	29,7	38,0	20,5	13,1	6,9	1,9	1,1	0,6	3,5
Mediterranean	30,8	33,7	25,1	6,8	4,0	10,8	1,4	0,6	2,2
West Anatolia	19,1	32,2	35,9	21,0	7,0	2,5	1,4	0,9	3,1
Central Anatolia	42,3	30,2	18,1	7,4	1,8	0,9	1,1	2,0	3,5
West Black Sea	35,5	44,7	19,1	7,7	1,6	1,9	0,5	1,3	5,8
East Black Sea	34,5	37,7	18,9	4,1	1,1	3,7	0,6	0,3	4,8
Northeast Anatolia	61,8	20,5	10,7	6,4	2,0	0,3	0,4	0,2	2,0
Mideast Anatolia	45,2	37,0	17,1	3,5	0,8	0,4	0,1	1,5	4,0
Southeast Anatolia	58,0	25,8	12,9	5,9	1,2	0,7	0,4	0,8	1,9

Based on gender, it is observed that males and females have similar tendencies about holiday (Table 219).

In terms of age groups, in all subgroups holiday preferences are similar, with few exceptions. One of the exceptions is that for individuals who are 65+, the tendency to go to their hometown or village for holiday (12%) declines sharply however "I rest at the place where I live" option (46%) is on the rise. 18% of 25-34 age group spend their holiday in places such as hotels and lodging houses. This rate is higher than other age groups.

According to marital status, the rate of those who report not having time for holiday is higher in widowed individuals (36%). Consistently, the rate of those who rest at the place where they live is also higher in this group (43%). It is noted that the rate of those who spend their holiday in places such as hotels, lodging houses is higher in single individuals, with a ratio of 18%.

Distribution in educational status differentiation appears to be relatively quite instable. The rate of those who say they do not have time for holiday decreases as the educational status increases. 46% of those who have not graduated from a school says they do not have time for holiday tatil, and this rate drops to 13% in university graduates. Another important point is that the rates of those who chose "I go to a hotel or to a lodging house" and "I go to my summer cottage" options increase, as the educational status increases. For example, 2% of those who have not graduated from a school go to places such as hotels and lodging houses and this rate is 19% in high school graduates, 35% in university graduates. 15% of university graduates go to summer cottages. This rate is 1% in those who have not graduated from a school.

In terms of going on holiday, extended households differ from nuclear and broken households. 40% of individuals from extended households reports not having such holidays. This rate is 29% and 28%, in

nuclear and broken households. 13% of nuclear and broken households spends their holidays in places such as hotels and lodging houses and this rate is 8% in extended households (Table 219).

According to socioeconomic status, more than half (53%) of individuals in lower SES group reports not having time for holiday. This rate drops as socioeconomic status improves, and it drops to 7%

in high upper class. As socioeconomic status improves, the rate of those who go to hotels, lodging houses and the rate of those who go to summer cottage increase. For example, 1% of individuals from lower class spends their holiday in places such as hotels and lodging houses, this rate is 17% in upper middle class, 33% in upper class, 53% in high upper class. The rate of those who go to their summer cottage is 14% in upper class, 27% in high upper class.

Table 219. Going on Holiday by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	I do not have such holidays	I rest at the place where I live	I go to my home-town/ village	I go to a hotel & to a lodging house	I go to my summer cottage	I go to summer range	I go abroad	I go to my vineyard house	Other
GENDER									
Male	30,1	35,5	26,1	13,4	5,3	3,1	1,6	1,1	3,0
Female	31,6	35,3	25,8	10,7	5,5	2,6	1,1	0,6	3,2
AGE									
18-24	29,2	35,8	26,5	12,9	5,3	2,8	1,6	0,9	4,1
25-34	29,2	31,9	30,9	17,6	5,6	3,2	1,6	0,9	2,0
35-44	31,7	31,5	29,9	13,4	5,3	2,7	1,1	0,8	2,0
45-54	33,0	34,6	25,6	10,0	5,0	2,2	1,3	0,8	2,7
55-64	30,9	39,9	20,7	6,3	5,8	3,0	1,1	1,3	4,7
65+	32,6	46,4	12,1	4,1	5,2	2,8	1,0	0,3	4,7
EDUCATIONAL STATUS									
No schooling	46,3	39,6	14,3	1,6	0,6	1,7	0,1	0,5	2,6
Primary school	35,1	37,4	25,5	4,9	2,8	2,7	0,6	0,7	2,9
Elem./second. school	34,4	34,9	26,6	9,4	3,5	2,5	0,9	0,8	2,8
High school	22,1	33,4	29,1	19,1	8,6	4,0	1,8	1,2	3,7
Undergraduate/graduate studies	12,5	29,1	33,4	34,8	14,8	2,9	4,4	1,2	3,4
MARITAL STATUS									
Single	25,9	36,3	24,0	17,7	7,2	2,9	2,8	1,1	4,4
Married	31,7	34,4	27,8	11,1	4,8	2,9	1,0	0,8	2,6
Separated/ live apart	32,0	37,8	21,6	6,1	5,8	3,2	2,2	0,5	1,7
Widowed	36,3	43,1	14,6	4,3	4,7	2,0	0,3	0,3	4,5
Divorced	32,7	35,2	16,4	14,5	9,1	2,1	3,0	0,6	3,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE									
Nuclear	29,0	35,1	28,0	12,9	5,6	3,3	1,3	0,9	2,9
Extended	40,3	35,3	20,1	8,0	2,6	1,8	0,7	0,8	3,0
Broken	27,9	37,0	22,9	12,9	8,0	1,9	2,4	0,7	3,9
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS									
High upper class	7,3	24,0	29,3	52,6	26,8	2,2	9,8	1,8	1,9
Upper class	11,8	30,0	34,7	33,1	14,3	2,7	2,2	1,3	3,3
Upper middle class	21,3	33,4	34,2	17,4	7,1	3,4	1,6	1,2	3,6
Lower middle class	37,3	38,5	22,6	4,5	1,8	2,7	0,5	0,5	3,2
Lower class	52,8	35,4	13,7	0,6	0,6	1,8	0,1	0,3	1,1

Chapter 9

ELDERLINESS

In this part, findings were presented such as if there are elderly in need of care in households, who takes care of the elderly in households, what sort of life preferences individuals under 60 have regarding their seniority, reasons of the elderly for living together with their children or in a separate house and who visit the elderly.

9.1. Households with Elderly in Need of Constant Care

The table below shows the rates of households with elderly individuals in need of care in Türkiye. According to the research data, 6% of all households in Türkiye have an elderly in need of care. The rate of households with elderly in need of care is 5% in urban areas. This rate is 9% in rural areas (Table 220).

Table 220. Households with Elderly in Need of Care throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, NUTS, Household Type, and SES

	No, there isn't	Yes, there is
Türkiye	94,1	5,9
RESIDENCE AREA		
Urban	95,1	4,9
Rural	91,4	8,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES		
Istanbul	96,2	3,8
Ankara	96,4	3,6
Izmir	95,2	4,8
NUTS		
Istanbul	96,2	3,8
West Marmara	95,3	4,7
East Marmara	94,0	6,0
Aegean	94,1	5,9
Mediterranean	94,4	5,6
West Anatolia	96,2	3,8
Central Anatolia	91,1	8,9
West Black Sea	92,9	7,1
East Black Sea	90,6	9,4
Northeast Anatolia	91,3	8,7
Mideast Anatolia	93,6	6,4
Southeast Anatolia	90,6	9,4
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		
Nuclear	97,8	2,2
Extended	76,0	24,0
Broken	92,3	7,7
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS		
High upper class	99,0	1,0
Upper class	98,8	1,2
Upper middle class	96,3	3,7
Lower middle class	93,5	6,5
Lower class	89,9	10,1

This rate is in 4-5% range in the three major cities of Türkiye, i.e. Ankara, Izmir and Istanbul. In terms of regions, it is noted that Southeast Anatolia (9%), East Black Sea (9%) and Central Anatolia (9%) are the regions with the highest rates of households with elderly individuals who need care. The lowest rates are, in order, Istanbul (4%), West Anatolia (4%) and West Marmara (5%). In lower class, the rate of households with elderly in need of care is 10%. This rate declines to 1% in high upper class.

In households with elderly in need of care, individuals were asked who takes/take care of these elderly. According to the research data, care work for elderly in households is conducted primarily by daughters-in-law (32%). The rate of households where care is given by the "spouse" is 27%. The rate of households where care is given by the son is 22%, the rate of households where care is given by the daughter is 20%. The rate of households with caretakers is only 2%. When the research data is evaluated in terms of urban and rural areas, it is observed that the rate of households where care is taken by the daughter is higher in urban areas (26%) than in rural areas (10%). In households in rural areas, care work is conducted primarily by the daughters-in-law (37%). The rate of households with caretakers is 3% in urban areas, and there are not any elderly in need of care, who is taken care of by a caregiver in rural areas (Table 221).

Table 221. Individuals who Take Care of the Elderly in Need of Care throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area

	Türkiye	Urban	Rural
Daughter-in-law	31,6	28,2	37,0
Spouse	27,3	27,3	27,5
Son	22,0	20,4	24,6
Daughter	19,5	25,7	9,5
Grandchild	4,1	4,6	3,3
Other female relatives	3,1	3,3	2,6
Caretaker	1,9	2,9	0,4
Sibling	1,6	1,1	2,4
Son-in-law	1,2	0,9	1,6
Other male relatives	1,1	1,3	0,7
Neighbor	1,0	1,0	1,0
Other	0,3	0,0	0,7

9.2. Life Preferences regarding Elderliness

In the table below, individuals under 60 in the research were asked what they would do once they are too old to take care of themselves. According to these results, across Türkiye more than one thirds of participants over 18 and below 60 (39%) has said they have no idea. The majority of individuals who answered the question in various forms report that they would like to live with their children when they are old. 22% of individuals says they can live with their son, and 9% says they can stay with their daughters. 10% says they would like to move to seniors center when they are old, and 10% would like to get care service in their own house (Table 222).

12% of urban dwellers reply as "I would move to seniors center", whereas only 6% of rural dwellers agree with that. The rate of those who say they would like to live in urban areas with their children is 28% in total. This rate is 43% in rural areas. 33% of rural dwellers says they would like to live with their son when they get old, and 19% says they

would like to live with their daughter. Amongst urban dwellers, 20% would live with their son, 8% with their daughter.

There are quite significant differences amongst three major cities. The rate of those who say "I would move to seniors center" in Istanbul (10%) is parallel with overall Türkiye, however those who live in Ankara (20%) and in Izmir (17%) have a higher tendency to move to seniors center. 21% of those who live in Istanbul says they would like to live with their son when they are too old, at a higher rate than the other two cities.

When life preferences regarding seniority are evaluated according to regions, it is observed that West Anatolia (16%) and West Marmara (15%) are the regions with highest rates of those who say "I would move to seniors center." This rate declines to 6% in Northeast Anatolia. In West Black Sea, Southeast Anatolia, East Black Sea and Northeast Anatolia, the rates of those who would like to stay with their children in their seniority is 40% and above. Indi-

Table 222. Life Preferences regarding Elderliness throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	I would live with my son	I would get care service at my own house	I would live with my daughter	I would move to seniors center	Other	No idea
Türkiye	22,7	19,6	8,7	10,3	2,5	38,8
RESIDENCE AREA						
Urban	19,4	20,2	8,2	11,9	2,5	39,8
Rural	32,7	17,8	10,3	5,5	2,3	35,6
THREE MAJOR CITIES						
Istanbul	21,3	20,9	8,5	9,8	2,8	38,4
Ankara	12,6	22,2	7,2	19,6	2,8	38,4
Izmir	15,1	17,1	10,5	16,5	1,4	42,2
NUTS						
Istanbul	21,3	20,9	8,5	9,8	2,8	38,4
West Marmara	22,3	19,0	15,3	14,9	0,9	30,0
East Marmara	19,3	21,0	11,0	7,0	1,6	43,7
Aegean	16,9	20,4	10,2	11,0	1,1	44,8
Mediterranean	17,8	18,6	7,3	10,6	3,7	43,3
West Anatolia	16,4	19,9	6,6	16,2	2,6	40,4
Central Anatolia	27,1	16,0	8,2	10,3	1,6	39,3
West Black Sea	28,5	24,6	15,2	8,6	1,9	29,5
East Black Sea	31,5	19,1	9,5	6,8	1,5	34,8
Northeast Anatolia	35,7	19,0	4,3	5,5	2,3	33,3
Mideast Anatolia	33,0	14,0	5,3	9,8	5,5	33,4
Southeast Anatolia	37,2	16,5	3,7	8,3	3,7	30,8

viduals in these regions say that they would like to live particularly with their sons when they are old. In Southeast Anatolia, 37% says they would live with their son. The highest rates of those who would like to get care service at their own house can be found in West Black Sea (25%), East Marmara (21%), Istanbul (21%) and Aegean (20%). The lowest rate on that is in Mideast Anatolia, with 14%.

There is not a high differentiation based on gender, nonetheless females say at higher rates that they would live with their daughters (10%), that they would move to seniors center (11%) or that they would get care service at their own house (21%) (Table 223).

In terms of age groups, the rates of those who would move to seniors center when they are old do not differ too much, only 18-24 age group have given this answer relatively at a higher rate (13%). Young, middle and higher age groups have preferred the seniors center at similar rates. The rate of those who say they have no idea regarding this question exceeds 40% in young age groups (18-24 and 25-34 age groups). In higher age groups, the answer to this question primarily is living with their children. The rate of those who think of living with their daughters or sons is 46% in 45-54 and 55-64 age groups.

The rate of those who would live with their children when they are old is higher in widowed individuals (54%), and it is lower in divorced individuals (20%). However, the rate of those who would move to seniors center is higher amongst divorced individuals (23%). Married individuals prefer the seniors center at the lowest rate (9%).

As the educational level increases, so does the rate of those who say they would go to seniors center when they are old. This rate is 5% in those who have not graduated from a school. This goes up to 19% in university graduates. The rate for option "I would live with my son/daughter" is 55% amongst those who received no schooling, and it drops to 14% in university graduates. As the educational status improves, so does the rate of those who would like to get care service at their own house. This rate reaches 27% in university graduates, and it is 21% in high school graduates. It drops to 10% in those who have not graduated from a school.

Life preferences of individuals regarding seniority from broken households are different than those from nuclear and extended households. For example, 30% of nuclear households, and 39% of extended households prefer to live with their children when they are old, and this rate is 14% in broken households. However, the rate of those who would like to move to seniors center when they are old is higher in broken households. 19% of individuals from these households says they would move to seniors center, and this rate is 10% in nuclear households, 8% in extended households.

In terms of life preferences of different SES groups regarding seniority, it is observed that the seniors center preference is low in lower class (5%). This rate goes up to 22% in high upper class. As the socioeconomic status improves the rate of those who prefer to live with their children declines, and the rate of those who prefer to get care service at their own house increases. For instance, the rate of those who prefer to live with their children is 47% in lower class, 28% in upper middle class, and 11% in high upper class. The rate of those who prefer to get care service at their own house is 10% in lower class, and this rate goes up to 34% in high upper class.

Table 223. Life Preferences regarding Elderliness by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	I would live with my son	I would get care service at my own house	I would live with my daughter	I would move to seniors center	Other	No idea
GENDER						
Male	22,8	18,2	7,9	9,3	3,0	41,5
Female	22,7	21,0	9,6	11,3	2,0	36,1
AGE						
18-24	5,0	19,0	1,9	13,2	3,0	58,1
25-34	17,5	19,2	8,1	10,1	2,3	44,3
35-44	28,2	19,3	11,0	9,8	2,4	32,9
45-54	33,2	20,6	11,5	8,9	2,2	27,7
55-64	34,8	20,5	11,5	10,4	2,6	24,8
EDUCATIONAL STATUS						
No schooling	45,6	10,4	9,1	4,9	1,8	31,1
Primary school	31,7	18,0	11,9	6,7	1,9	34,0
Elementary/secondary school	18,7	18,8	8,0	9,0	2,1	45,1
High school	11,1	21,3	6,5	14,1	3,0	45,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	9,3	27,2	4,5	18,7	3,9	37,7
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	0,0	21,9	0,0	15,2	3,2	59,8
Married	28,6	19,3	10,7	8,6	2,3	33,7
Separated/ live apart	16,5	14,1	13,0	13,6	2,2	40,6
Widowed	39,0	13,7	14,9	10,3	0,6	24,3
Divorced	10,4	15,9	9,5	23,4	3,1	38,5
HOUSEHOLD TYPE						
Nuclear	22,8	20,4	9,3	9,8	2,5	37,9
Extended	30,5	15,5	8,0	7,6	2,1	38,8
Broken	8,7	20,4	5,4	18,8	2,6	44,8
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS						
High upper class	6,1	33,8	4,7	21,9	3,7	30,4
Upper class	11,5	29,6	8,1	16,4	3,2	33,3
Upper middle class	19,4	21,6	8,1	12,4	2,6	38,3
Lower middle class	26,2	16,8	9,9	7,4	2,2	40,6
Lower class	38,8	9,9	8,9	4,8	1,8	38,6

9.3. Reasons of Preference to Go to Seniors Center

Within the scope of research, individuals who said they would move to seniors center when they are old as part of their life preferences were asked for the reasons. The table that indicates the reasons why people would move to seniors center shows that the most importat reason is noted as "I do not want to be a burden to my kids", with 47%. This is the highest given reason in all breakdown groups. 13% responds, as the rason for living in seniors center, as "Since there would be no one to take care of me". The rates of those who think their children might not want to live with them and of those who prefer to be with their peers are 12%, and 10% thinks the facilities in seniors center are more convenient.

I do not want to be a burden to my kids reply is the higher given reason both in rural and urban areas. The rate of those who say my kids might not want to live with me, is higher in rural areas (16%), compared to urban areas (11%) (Table 224).

I do not want to be a burden to my kids reply is the most highly given reason not only in all breakdowns, but also in three major cities. However, the rate of those who think like that is higher in Ankara (60%). Another reason where there is highest differentiation between three major cities is "My children might not like to live with me". The rates of those indicating this reason is lower in Ankara (9%) compared to Istanbul (15%) and Izmir (18%).

The rate of those who prefer the seniors center because they do not want to be a burden to their kids is higher in West Marmara with 63%, and it is lower in Northeast Anatolia with 23%. East Black Sea has the highest rate of people saying my children might not want to live with me (32%). The rate of those who say they would go to seniors center because there would be no one to take care of them is higher in Southeast Anatolia (26%).

Table 224. Reasons of Preference to Go to Seniors Center throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	I do not want to be a burden to my kids	Since there would be no one to take care of me	Rather than being alone, I prefer to be with my peers	My children might not like to live with me	The facilities in seniors center are more convenient	My daughter-in-law/son-in-law might not like to live with me	Other
Türkiye	47,2	12,9	12,0	11,7	9,7	2,9	3,7
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	47,2	12,5	12,4	11,0	10,5	2,5	3,9
Rural	47,7	15,1	9,3	15,8	4,7	5,3	2,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	48,5	7,3	15,7	9,2	10,5	2,8	6,0
Ankara	53,6	9,6	14,0	8,9	9,5	1,2	3,3
Izmir	49,9	7,2	8,6	17,2	13,0	1,4	2,6
NUTS							
Istanbul	48,5	7,3	15,7	9,2	10,5	2,8	6,0
West Marmara	50,6	8,3	15,9	8,5	14,3	2,4	0,0
East Marmara	51,7	13,1	6,3	14,7	12,2	0,0	2,0
Aegean	46,4	11,5	8,6	18,0	8,7	5,2	1,6
Mediterranean	43,5	17,4	15,0	11,8	5,2	2,9	4,3
West Anatolia	53,6	11,3	12,3	9,3	8,6	2,2	2,8
Central Anatolia	48,5	10,9	12,4	15,9	5,3	4,0	3,0
West Black Sea	48,0	8,8	17,5	6,8	9,5	3,5	6,0
East Black Sea	46,3	20,7	4,9	15,3	9,0	1,7	2,1
Northeast Anatolia	19,2	22,9	18,8	10,0	24,5	1,4	3,1
Mideast Anatolia	45,5	10,0	3,7	13,2	9,0	4,6	14,1
Southeast Anatolia	32,3	34,6	5,9	6,6	16,0	1,5	3,1

Females give the answer "I do not want to be a burden to my kids" at a higher rate than males (52%); still, this rate is also quite high in males (41%). Males have given the answers "My children might not want to live with me", "There would be no one to take care of me", "I prefer to be with my peers" at higher rates than females (Table 225).

In all age groups, those who say they would go to seniors center in order not to be a burden to their kids ranks the highest. In 18-24 age group the reason that seniors center will have more convenient facilities (28%) is higher compared to other age groups. In this age group, there are also higher rates of "I would prefer to be with my peers" and "There would be no one to take care of me".

The rates of those who prefer the seniors center because they do not want to be a burden to their kids are higher among married individuals (56%), divorced individuals (55%) and widowed individuals (53%). The reason "My children might not want to live with me" is given at higher rates by married people (15%), by separated individuals (8%), and by divorced individuals (15%). Those who say that facilities at seniors center are more convenient are higher among single (27%) and widowed individuals (11%) (Table 225).

Based on household type, it is observed that the reasons are at similar rates. In individuals from broken households the rate of those who say they do not want to be a burden to their kids is lower, and the rate of those who say they would like to live with their peers is higher.

Table 225. Reasons of Preference to Go to Seniors Center by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	I do not want to be a burden to my kids	Since there would be no one to take care of me	Rather than being alone, I prefer to be with my peers	My children might not like to live with me	The facilities in seniors center are more convenient	My daughter-in-law/son-in-law might not like to live with me	Other
GENDER							
Male	40,9	15,1	14,0	14,1	10,3	1,8	3,8
Female	52,2	11,1	10,4	9,8	9,2	3,8	3,6
AGE							
18-24	10,6	23,4	23,6	1,7	27,7	0,2	12,9
25-34	45,9	12,6	13,1	13,2	9,7	2,2	3,3
35-44	58,1	8,6	6,9	15,5	5,2	3,8	1,9
45-54	51,4	15,0	11,3	9,2	6,9	3,4	2,7
55-64	51,3	9,2	11,8	13,5	8,4	4,2	1,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
No schooling	40,1	19,0	3,0	16,0	13,0	4,3	4,5
Primary school	47,6	14,8	7,4	17,0	6,2	5,9	1,1
Elementary/secondary school	42,3	19,6	11,3	11,5	6,8	1,0	7,6
High school	51,1	8,8	15,6	5,9	13,5	1,4	3,7
Undergraduate/graduate studies	46,6	9,9	15,6	11,2	10,5	1,9	4,3
MARITAL STATUS							
Single	0,0	31,0	30,2	0,0	26,8	0,0	12,0
Married	56,3	8,5	8,1	14,8	6,5	3,7	2,1
Separated/ live apart	38,6	21,7	24,1	8,1	4,4	3,0	0,0
Widowed	52,7	15,4	11,2	1,8	10,9	4,6	3,4
Divorced	54,9	17,6	11,3	8,1	5,0	0,0	3,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	51,5	10,0	9,4	13,9	8,9	3,3	3,1
Extended	42,1	16,5	13,5	10,3	9,7	3,5	4,4
Broken	31,2	23,4	22,8	2,6	13,5	0,7	6,0
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
High upper class	58,7	0,9	13,3	13,8	6,0	3,4	3,9
Upper class	60,2	7,2	12,8	8,2	9,1	0,8	1,6
Upper middle class	48,2	11,1	15,1	10,3	9,6	2,2	3,5
Lower middle class	39,1	18,7	9,5	14,5	9,2	4,7	4,3
Lower class	42,8	26,4	2,4	16,0	7,1	4,8	0,3

In all educational groups the overwhelming reason is not being a burden to their kids (Table 225).

The highest differentiation amongst socioeconomic status groups is about the rate of those who say they would prefer the seniors center since there would be no one to take care of them. The rate of those who say they would prefer the seniors center because of this is only 1% in high upper class and this goes up to 26% in lower class.

9.4. Reasons of the Elderly to Live with Their Children at the Same House

In the research, elderly individuals who are 60+ and who live at the same house with their children and/or daughter-in-law/son-in-law were asked the reason for that and answers to the question "Why do you live with your children at the same house?" are indicated below. Table 226 shows that the highest rates concentrate on "because I am happy to live with my children" (30%), "to support each other" (22%) and "because our traditions are customs require us" (13%).

There is not a sharp differentiation between rural/urban areas, however the rate of those who say they are in need of care is higher in rural areas (13%).

This rate is 8% in urban areas.

In the breakdown based on three major cities, it is understood that those who live in Istanbul show different reasons than the ones living in Ankara and Izmir. In Ankara and Izmir, those who say to support each other with my children and because I am happy to live with my children are more prominent, however these reasons are at lower rates in Istanbul and other reasons are more prominent. The rate of elderly who live with their children to support them is over 20% in Ankara and Izmir, and this rate is 9% in Istanbul. The rate of those who say they are happy to live with their children is over 30% in Izmir and Ankara. This rate drops to 26% in Istanbul.

Depending on regional differentiation, the rate of those who say my children do not want me to live alone is higher in Central Anatolia with 23%, the rate of those who say our customs are traditions require us is higher in Northeast and Mideast Anatolia with 26%, the rate of those who say because I am happy to live with my children is higher in East Black Sea with 42% and in West Marmara with 41%; and the rate of those who say to support each other with my children is higher in the Mediterranean with 36%.

Table 226. Reasons of the Elderly to Live with Their Children at the Same House throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	Because I am happy to live with my children	To support each other	Because our traditions and customs require us	Because I require special care	Because I do not have any other chances	Because my children do not want me to live alone	Because I do not have the means to live in seniors center	Other
Türkiye	30,5	22,2	12,9	9,6	7,1	6,6	0,9	11,5
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	31,2	22,8	12,7	7,6	7,9	6,7	1,1	11,8
Rural	29,0	21,2	13,4	13,4	5,8	6,5	0,4	11,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	26,1	8,7	16,1	5,1	7,1	7,7	0,5	29,5
Ankara	34,2	29,0	14,7	4,5	7,6	5,9	0,9	9,2
Izmir	39,4	22,0	10,6	4,5	4,5	8,4	0,5	10,7
NUTS								
Istanbul	26,1	8,7	16,1	5,1	7,1	7,7	0,5	29,5
West Marmara	41,8	15,9	9,7	11,0	6,6	4,7	1,9	12,6
East Marmara	22,1	28,6	14,4	16,3	5,8	5,3	0,0	10,3
Aegean	40,2	27,3	8,2	6,7	3,2	4,1	0,2	10,3
Mediterranean	24,5	36,2	5,0	11,2	7,7	4,3	1,3	10,8
West Anatolia	36,6	30,4	13,0	8,2	5,1	4,0	0,6	7,7
Central Anatolia	32,5	21,3	8,4	3,8	6,2	23,3	4,0	0,5
West Black Sea	30,3	23,7	7,8	7,0	6,2	3,1	0,0	24,0
East Black Sea	41,6	15,5	7,5	13,7	11,0	3,7	1,0	7,0
Northeast Anatolia	33,8	10,2	25,6	12,2	10,5	5,9	0,6	1,2
Mideast Anatolia	27,4	18,4	24,8	10,6	8,3	6,8	0,6	4,4
Southeast Anatolia	27,0	15,2	20,0	14,0	12,3	8,4	1,1	2,1

There is not a sharp differentiation in terms of gender breakdown, but still, the rate of those who say "Because I am happy to live with my children" is slightly higher in males (33%). In females, this rate is 28% (Table 227).

Evaluation based on marital status shows that the rate of those who say "Because I am happy to live with my children" is higher among married individuals (33%), of those who say "to support each other" is higher among divorced individuals (31%), of those who say "Customs and traditions require us" (19%), "I need care" (24%) and "I do not have another chance" (26%) is higher among those who live apart with their spouse.

According to the differentiation in educational level, 14% of those who have not graduated from a school says they live with their children because

they need care. This rate is 7% and below in other educational levels. Among university graduates, the rate 12% of those who say "My children do not want me to live alone" is higher compared to other educational levels.

The rate of those who say "My children do not want me to live alone" is higher among individuals from extended households (10%) and the rate of those who say "to support each other" is higher among individuals from broken households (28%) compared to other household types.

26% of individuals from high upper class say "My children do not want me to live alone". This rate is 8% and below in other SES groups. Almost half of individuals in upper class (45%) say they live with their children because they are happy to do so. This rate is 32% and below in other SES groups.

Table 227. Reasons of the Elderly to Live with Their Children at the Same House by Gender, Age, 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 us	Because I require special care	Because I do not have any other chances	Because my children do not want me to live alone	Because I do not have the means to live in seniors center	Other
GENDER								
Male	32,8	21,6	13,8	7,9	7,3	4,3	1,3	12,6
Female	28,5	22,8	12,2	11,0	7,0	8,6	0,5	10,7
AGE								
55-64	34,2	25,4	14,9	4,1	5,7	5,2	1,6	10,6
65+	28,0	20,1	11,6	13,3	8,1	7,6	0,4	12,2
EDUCATIONAL STATUS								
No schooling	26,7	17,9	14,9	13,7	8,8	7,9	0,3	11,0
Primary school	33,3	26,7	11,2	7,1	5,9	5,8	0,7	10,7
Element./secondary school	35,1	21,7	10,3	5,7	9,0	2,0	2,3	16,6
High school	34,2	26,8	16,3	4,9	3,9	5,5	0,7	11,7
Undergraduate/graduate studies	31,2	19,5	9,5	0,0	0,0	11,7	8,5	19,6
MARITAL STATUS								
Married	32,9	23,0	13,7	6,7	6,4	3,7	1,3	13,5
Separated/ live apart	0,0	0,0	19,4	24,4	25,6	0,0	0,0	30,6
Widowed	26,9	20,5	12,2	15,3	8,0	11,9	0,2	7,1
Divorced	18,8	31,2	2,6	2,5	14,7	9,1	0,0	21,1
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	32,7	18,5	15,3	5,0	6,2	2,6	1,9	18,6
Extended	29,8	22,9	12,7	12,5	8,0	10,0	0,3	5,4
Broken	27,3	28,8	8,3	11,3	6,4	5,6	0,2	14,4
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
High upper class	26,4	14,7	6,5	8,8	7,3	25,8	0,0	17,1
Upper class	44,7	24,7	13,6	2,5	1,2	6,5	4,3	7,5
Upper middle class	32,0	20,0	14,2	7,2	6,3	7,9	0,4	13,3
Lower middle class	29,8	23,0	12,0	9,0	8,1	6,9	0,6	11,5
Lower class	29,9	20,5	14,7	16,3	6,4	4,2	1,8	6,1

9.5. Reasons of the Elderly to Live in Separate Houses with Their Children and How Often They are Visited

60+ individuals who do not live with their children were asked why they do not live with their children. My spouse and I are self-sufficient (41%), I do not want to leave where I live, they cannot come here either (17%) and I do not want to live with my children (16%) are the replies indicated mostly. (Table 228).

In rural and urban breakdown, the most important three reasons are mainly these options. However, we do not want to change where we live, they do not want to come here either option is at 12% in urban areas, and reaches 22% in rural areas.

In three major cities breakdown, the answer "my spouse and I are self-sufficient" is the most frequently indicated reason for not living with their children. However, this reason is reported at 53% rate by those who live in Izmir and it is lower in Ankara (39%) and in Istanbul (37%). The answer "I do not want to leave where I live, they do not want to come here either" is the highest in Ankara, with a rate of 20%. Another prominent reason in Ankara is "I do not want to live with my children" (23%). This reason is indicated as one of the important reasons by those who live in Izmir, too. (17%).

In terms of regional breakdown, the reasons are generally and mostly similar. However, the rate for the option "My children do not want me" is higher in Southeast Anatolia with 16% and in Northeast Anatolia 13%, compared to other regions. 15% of those who live in Northeast Anatolia region does not live with their children because their children's financial means are limited. Mideast Anatolia is higher than other regions in terms of the rates for "Their houses are too small to inhabit me" with 9%, "There is no one in my children's house to take care of me" with 10%, and "I do not want to leave where I live, they do not want to come here either" with 30%. East Black Sea, at a rate of 32%, is the other region with the highest rate of people who say "I do not want to leave where I live, they do not want to come here either". Mediterranean and East Marmara regions are places where the rate for "I do not want to live with my children" is high, 25% and 24% respectively (Table 228).

The rate for "My spouse and I are self-sufficient" is higher in males, with a rate of 46%. This rate is 36% in females. On the other hand, the rate of females who say do not live with their children because they do not want to live with them is higher (18%) than males (12%) (Table 229).

According to marital status, more than half of married individuals (55%) say "My spouse and I are self-sufficient". The rate of those who say "I do not want to leave where I live, they do not want to come here

either" is higher in widowed indiviudals with 22%, and the rate of those who say "I do not want to live with my children" is higher in widowed (37%) and divorced individuals (34%). The individuals who live apart for their spouses give the answers "My children do not want me" (27%) and "My children's financial means are limited" (10%) at higher rates compared to those from other marital status.

In terms of educational status, among university graduates particularly the rate for "My spouse and I are self-sufficient" option increases (62%). In people who have not graduated from a school the rate of "I do not want to leave where I live, they do not want to come here either" answer (21%) is higher. "I do not want to leave where I live, they do not want to come here either" reply is a highly stated reason in nuclear households with 15%, and in broken households with 22%; the reply "I do not want to live with my children" is higher in broken households with 37%, and the reply "My spouse and I are self-sufficient" has higher rates in nuclear households with 55% and in extended households with 47%.

A similar differentiation with educational status was observed in SES groups. Vast majority (71%) of high upper class reports the option "My spouse and I are self-sufficient." In the lower class, the rate for "I do not want to leave where I live, they do not want to come here either" (28%) is higher.

Table 228. Reasons for the Elderly to Live in Separate Houses with Their Children throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	My spouse and I are self-sufficient	I do not want to leave where I live, they cannot come here either	I do not want to live with my children	My children's financial means are limited	My children's houses are not convenient	My children do not want me	My daughter-in-law/ my son-in-law/ my grandchildren do/does not want me	Their houses are too small to inhabit me	There is no one in my children's house to take care of me	Other
Türkiye	40,4	16,8	15,6	3,9	3,8	3,4	2,5	2,5	1,8	11,3
RESIDENCE AREA										
Urban	41,1	12,1	15,0	3,4	3,7	3,1	2,5	2,7	2,1	16,2
Rural	39,7	21,9	16,4	4,4	4,0	3,7	2,4	2,3	1,5	5,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES										
Istanbul	36,6	7,3	6,7	3,8	2,1	1,8	1,2	4,2	1,3	34,9
Ankara	39,0	19,8	22,8	2,5	4,2	4,3	1,5	1,3	0,3	9,3
Izmir	53,0	6,1	16,9	2,2	2,8	3,9	1,4	1,2	2,1	12,9
NUTS										
Istanbul	36,6	7,3	6,7	3,8	2,1	1,8	1,2	4,2	1,3	34,9
West Marmara	31,1	18,6	15,5	4,5	8,7	0,3	1,2	4,1	1,4	14,6
East Marmara	39,2	8,3	23,5	2,3	6,9	0,8	6,0	1,8	3,0	11,7
Aegean	52,9	15,1	9,7	3,3	2,7	2,9	0,7	1,4	1,4	11,3
Mediterranean	51,4	8,3	25,2	1,7	0,8	1,4	3,3	2,8	1,4	4,7
West Anatolia	44,3	17,7	18,8	3,2	2,9	4,1	1,0	0,9	0,2	10,4
Central Anatolia	29,5	24,0	10,3	5,1	7,4	5,6	6,2	1,0	2,1	9,2
West Black Sea	42,4	26,7	9,6	3,8	3,1	3,0	1,0	1,5	2,2	9,3
East Black Sea	24,3	31,8	21,1	6,1	3,3	4,2	2,1	1,8	0,9	6,5
Northeast Anatolia	31,9	9,3	16,2	14,5	9,5	12,9	2,6	2,2	0,0	1,0
Mideast Anatolia	33,5	29,7	5,7	4,1	0,0	8,8	6,0	9,2	10,0	4,4
Southeast Anatolia	22,1	19,6	21,5	7,3	0,9	16,0	0,8	6,9	2,7	5,5

Table 229. Reasons for the Elderly to Live in Separate Houses with Their Children by Gender, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	My spouse and I are self-sufficient	I do not want to leave where I live, they cannot come here either	I do not want to live with my children	My children's financial means are limited	My children's houses are not convenient	My children do not want me	My daughter-in-law/ my son-in-law/ my grandchildren do does not want me	Their houses are too small to inhabit me	There is no one in my children's house to take care of me	Other
GENDER										
Male	46,1	15,9	12,5	3,8	3,4	3,0	2,1	2,9	1,3	11,0
Female	35,6	17,5	18,3	3,9	4,2	3,7	2,8	2,2	2,3	11,5
EDUCATIONAL STATUS										
No schooling	29,5	20,6	19,6	6,2	4,5	5,9	3,5	2,1	2,1	8,3
Primary school	47,6	14,3	14,0	2,4	3,9	1,9	1,5	2,6	1,7	11,5
Elementary/secondary school	43,8	16,5	6,5	2,8	0,8	1,0	4,2	3,4	1,4	20,3
High school	39,5	17,2	17,5	0,0	1,0	1,5	2,0	6,6	0,9	18,4
Undergraduate/graduate studies	62,1	7,6	5,5	2,5	3,4	0,0	0,7	0,0	2,5	17,5
MARITAL STATUS										
Married	54,5	15,0	8,2	3,3	2,8	2,9	1,4	2,1	1,5	10,1
Separated/ live apart	0,0	12,9	27,1	10,0	0,0	27,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	22,8
Widowed	1,2	22,5	36,6	5,0	6,4	4,2	5,4	3,9	2,8	14,5
Divorced	0,0	6,3	34,4	14,2	13,0	9,5	8,0	1,8	4,6	12,6
HOUSEHOLD TYPE										
Nuclear	54,6	15,3	8,4	3,1	2,7	2,7	1,4	2,0	1,5	9,8
Extended	46,8	8,6	2,0	8,6	4,4	5,6	0,0	2,8	4,0	17,4
Broken	1,1	21,7	36,8	5,3	6,7	4,8	5,5	3,7	2,5	14,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS										
High upper class	70,9	17,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	11,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Upper class	59,1	2,3	12,8	2,3	0,7	0,0	0,0	3,0	0,0	19,9
Upper middle class	46,9	11,0	8,4	2,6	1,3	0,0	1,4	3,0	2,1	24,8
Lower middle class	52,9	15,3	12,1	3,0	3,6	1,3	1,1	1,8	1,2	9,5
Lower class	23,0	27,7	18,2	8,6	3,5	10,1	2,3	1,9	2,6	4,0

Elderly individuals who live separately from their children and who have daughters and sons were asked how often their children visit them.

According to the table regarding the frequency of sons' visits, 33% of sons visits their parents more than once a week. According to data, 51% of sons visits their family at least once a week. 2% of individuals who live apart from their children reports that their sons do not visit at all (Table 230).

According to rural-urban breakdown, 59% of urban dwellers is visited by their son at least once a week. This rate drops to 43% in rural areas. The rate of elderly who are visited several times a year is higher in rural areas (30%).

In the three major cities breakdown, the rate of sons visiting their parents once a week or more than once a week is higher Istanbul compared to other

two cities. This response has been stated by 69% of those living in Istanbul, and by 63% in Izmir, and 51% in Ankara. The frequency of elderly who live in Ankara being visited by their sons is generally lower. 26% of these individuals says their sons visit them once a month, 14% says their sons visit them several times a year. The rate of elderly who are visited by their children once a month is 10% in Istanbul, and 18% in Izmir. The rate of elderly who are visited several times a year is 10% in Izmir and in Istanbul.

In terms of the regions, Istanbul and the Mediterranean regions attract attention. 69% of the elderly in Istanbul and 64% of the elderly in the Mediterranean are visited at least once a week by their sons. These rates are higher compared to general Türkiye rates (51%) and also higher compared to other regions.

Table 230. Frequency of Visits by the Sons of the Elderly throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	More than once a week	Once a week	Several times a month	Once a month	Several times a year	When they need help	We have not seen each other for more than a year	They do not visit at all
Türkiye	33,0	18,2	13,8	6,1	24,1	1,8	1,6	1,4
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	35,5	23,7	13,1	5,0	18,3	1,2	1,3	1,8
Rural	30,4	12,6	14,5	7,3	30,0	2,5	1,8	1,1
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	34,6	34,4	10,0	4,3	10,3	1,5	1,6	3,3
Ankara	34,1	16,5	25,8	8,3	13,8	0,4	0,0	1,1
Izmir	39,9	22,9	18,1	4,9	10,3	1,6	2,4	0,0
NUTS								
Istanbul	34,6	34,4	10,0	4,3	10,3	1,5	1,6	3,3
West Marmara	27,6	20,5	11,6	7,5	29,3	2,1	0,5	0,9
East Marmara	47,1	17,1	13,9	5,9	15,4	0,0	0,6	0,0
Aegean	40,2	16,4	15,7	6,1	16,6	0,7	1,0	3,2
Mediterranean	39,4	24,8	5,4	2,3	25,9	1,3	0,5	0,5
West Anatolia	37,8	15,4	23,4	7,2	13,5	0,3	1,2	1,3
Central Anatolia	23,5	9,7	11,8	8,8	42,6	1,3	1,0	1,2
West Black Sea	23,4	10,0	18,5	5,0	36,2	1,9	4,6	0,3
East Black Sea	21,4	9,8	9,0	6,3	43,1	7,0	1,8	1,6
Northeast Anatolia	12,4	18,7	30,4	14,6	20,4	0,8	1,8	1,0
Mideast Anatolia	5,9	19,1	26,2	12,9	27,9	1,9	5,2	0,9
Southeast Anatolia	36,6	23,8	10,8	6,9	6,2	9,4	3,6	2,6

There is not a sharp differentiation between females and males, still, the rate of females who are visited by their sons more than once a week (36%) is higher compared to males (30%) (Table 231).

More than one thirds of the elderly who are graduates of elementary/secondary school and high school (34%) is visited by their sons several times a year. These rates are higher compared to the elderly in other educational levels. The rate of those who are visited at least once a week is lower (44%) among elderly who are graduates of elementary/secondary school (44%) and among university graduates (46%). This rate is above 50% in other educational status.

According to marital status, the rate of those who

are visited by the sons at least once a week is higher in widowed (56%) and married individuals (50%). The rate of the eldery who have not seen their sons for more than a year (11%) and the rate of those whose sons do not visit them at all (16%) are higher in elderly who are separated with their spouses. 30% of those who are divorced is visited by their sons several times a month. This rate is higher compared to individuals from other marital status.

Individuals from nuclear and broken households are visited more frequently by their sons. 56% of the parents in broken households and 50% of the parents in nuclear households are visited by their sons at least once a week. This rate is around 43% in extended households.

Table 231. Frequency of Visits by the Sons of the Elderly by Gender, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	More than once a week	Once a week	Several times a month	Once a month	Several times a year	When they need help	We have not seen each other for more than a year	They do not visit at all
GENDER								
Male	29,9	19,3	14,2	6,1	25,2	1,8	1,8	1,6
Female	35,5	17,3	13,4	6,1	23,1	1,9	1,3	1,3
EDUCATIONAL STATUS								
No schooling	35,6	16,2	12,1	6,6	22,9	2,6	2,3	1,8
Primary school	31,3	20,6	15,7	6,4	22,6	1,3	1,0	1,2
Elementary/secondary school	31,2	13,0	14,1	5,1	33,6	1,5	1,6	0,0
High school	32,6	20,3	6,8	2,7	33,5	1,3	1,6	1,2
Undergraduate/graduate studies	28,6	17,5	16,5	3,7	28,3	1,7	1,0	2,7
MARITAL STATUS								
Married	31,1	18,6	14,5	5,7	25,9	1,7	1,4	1,1
Separated/ live apart	15,3	22,7	1,4	9,0	24,5	0,0	11,2	15,9
Widowed	39,2	17,2	11,1	7,2	19,3	2,4	1,7	2,1
Divorced	27,9	13,3	30,2	9,7	10,0	0,0	5,7	3,2
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	31,2	18,8	14,2	5,4	26,2	1,7	1,4	1,1
Extended	26,7	16,0	20,0	11,3	23,0	2,1	0,9	0,0
Broken	38,5	17,1	11,8	7,4	18,4	2,2	2,1	2,5
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
High upper class	22,9	23,3	9,1	26,8	17,9	0,0	0,0	0,0
Upper class	28,0	24,1	11,8	7,1	25,8	3,2	0,0	0,0
Upper middle class	26,0	18,7	15,1	2,2	33,2	0,9	1,6	2,4
Lower middle class	33,0	19,2	14,9	6,4	23,6	1,2	0,9	0,8
Lower class	32,5	14,2	9,8	4,4	32,2	2,1	1,3	3,5

In terms of the socioeconomic status of individuals, lower middle class individuals are visited by their sons the most frequently. 52% of these individuals is visited at least once a week by their sons. It is understood that 27% of the children in high upper class visits their parents once a month. This rate is below 10% in other SES groups (Table 231).

According to the table based on the frequency of daughters' visits, 38% of daughters visits their elderly parents more than once a week. It is understood that 12% visits them at least once a week. According to the table, 50% of daughters visits their families at least once a week. 2% of these elderly individuals who live apart from their children says their daughters do not visit them at all (Table 232).

From the rural-urban perspective, 59% of urban dwellers is visited by their daughter at least once a week. This rate drops to 40% in rural dwellers. Similar to the visits by sons, the rate of the elderly who are visited by their daughters several times a year is higher in rural areas (28%).

In the breakdown according to three major cities, it is noted that the elderly in Istanbul are visited more frequently by their daughters. 68% of the elderly living in Istanbul says that their daughters visit them at least once a week, this rate drops to 59% in Izmir and to 48% in Ankara. The rate of elderly individuals whose daughters visit them several times a year is higher in Ankara (19%) and in Izmir (12%).

Similar to the rates of the elderly who are visited by their sons, it is noted that the rates of elderly visited by their daughters are higher in Istanbul and Mediterranean regions. 68% of the elderly in Istanbul and 64% of the elderly in the Mediterranean Region are visited at least once a week by their daughters (Table 232).

Table 232.Frequency of Visits by the Daughters of the Elderly throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	More than once a week	Once a week	Several times a month	Once a month	Several times a year	When they need help	We have not seen each other for more than a year	They do not visit at all
Türkiye	37,5	12,3	18,5	5,9	22,0	1,2	1,2	1,5
RESIDENCE AREA								
Urban	45,8	13,1	16,4	4,3	16,6	0,7	1,0	2,1
Rural	28,4	11,4	20,7	7,7	27,8	1,8	1,4	0,9
THREE MAJOR CITIES								
Istanbul	53,1	15,3	15,9	5,2	6,8	0,0	0,8	2,9
Ankara	34,5	13,7	21,8	8,0	18,5	2,0	0,6	0,9
Izmir	44,2	14,4	21,1	4,9	12,0	1,4	0,7	1,5
NUTS								
Istanbul	53,1	15,3	15,9	5,2	6,8	0,0	0,8	2,9
West Marmara	42,6	12,2	12,9	8,6	20,3	1,3	1,1	1,0
East Marmara	42,1	11,1	20,4	11,7	14,2	0,0	0,0	0,5
Aegean	43,9	9,7	22,6	3,3	17,3	1,0	0,3	1,9
Mediterranean	46,4	17,2	15,9	2,9	13,6	0,9	0,5	2,7
West Anatolia	35,1	16,1	21,7	8,3	14,3	1,4	1,8	1,3
Central Anatolia	17,1	9,4	14,0	6,2	46,6	1,4	2,1	3,2
West Black Sea	27,6	6,3	21,3	4,6	37,0	1,0	2,3	0,0
East Black Sea	21,5	9,7	11,4	3,6	46,7	4,0	2,8	0,3
Northeast Anatolia	13,2	18,2	35,8	8,7	18,5	2,8	1,8	1,0
Mideast Anatolia	22,2	11,8	22,6	8,0	30,4	2,3	1,9	0,8
Southeast Anatolia	33,0	17,0	20,4	8,3	15,5	2,7	3,2	0,0

There is not a differentiation in terms of gender breakdown. Parents who are visited frequently (at least once a week) by their daughters are the elementary/secondary school graduates with 64% and high school graduates with 61% (Table 233).

Based on the socioeconomic status of individuals upper middle class is the most frequently visited group by their daughters. 60% of the parents in this class is visited by their daughters at least once a week. The elderly who are visited several times a year is at a higher rate in high upper class (41%).

Elderly individuals were asked who visits them at most other than their children. According to this question, primarily their neighbours (64%), then their relatives (38%) and their grandchildren (33%) visit the elderly. No one visits 3% of the elderly (Table 234).

Based on the rural-urban breakdown, it is noted that it is again primarily neighbours, relatives and grandchildren who visit the elderly. However, in rural areas, visits by neighbours have a rate of 72%. This rate is 57% in urban areas.

Table 233. Frequency of Visits by the Daughters of the Elderly by Gender, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	More than once a week	Once a week	Several times a month	Once a month	Several times a year	When they need help	We have not seen each other for more than a year	They do not visit at all
GENDER								
Male	36,7	12,4	18,5	5,6	22,8	1,5	1,0	1,5
Female	38,2	12,2	18,4	6,2	21,2	1,0	1,3	1,5
EDUCATIONAL STATUS								
No schooling	33,0	12,8	19,4	5,9	23,4	1,8	2,2	1,5
Primary school	37,7	12,9	17,9	6,8	21,6	1,0	0,5	1,6
Elementary/secondary school	55,5	8,6	13,1	2,5	18,2	0,5	0,0	1,6
High school	48,5	12,0	13,6	4,4	17,7	0,0	1,6	2,2
Undergraduate/graduate studies	40,7	6,5	27,4	3,5	21,3	0,6	0,0	0,0
MARITAL STATUS								
Married	36,8	12,1	18,4	5,1	23,8	1,2	1,3	1,3
Separated/ live apart	19,0	14,7	31,3	10,7	11,0	13,4	0,0	0,0
Widowed	40,3	13,1	17,8	8,1	16,9	1,1	0,9	1,8
Divorced	31,6	2,7	30,3	7,8	16,9	0,0	0,0	10,7
HOUSEHOLD TYPE								
Nuclear	36,4	12,1	18,2	5,1	24,3	1,2	1,3	1,4
Extended	43,7	12,7	22,0	6,3	13,2	0,0	2,0	0,0
Broken	39,7	12,6	18,6	8,2	16,5	1,4	0,9	2,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS								
High upper class	13,4	,0	25,1	20,9	40,5	0,0	0,0	0,0
Upper class	33,3	14,9	36,5	4,7	10,6	0,0	0,0	0,0
Upper middle class	54,3	5,3	15,6	3,8	18,9	0,0	0,7	1,5
Lower middle class	37,4	13,9	17,2	6,5	21,6	1,1	1,2	1,1
Lower class	29,7	12,9	16,3	3,3	33,2	1,2	0,9	2,6

In three major cities, the rate of those who are visited by their neighbours apart from their children is also higher compared to other relatives and acquaintances. However, in Izmir, the rate of those who are visited by their neighbors is higher than the two other cities, with a rate of 72%. In Istanbul (36%) and in Ankara (41%), the rate of being visited by other neighbors is higher than Izmir (28%) (Table 234).

In Aegean (25%) and Mediterranean Regions (24%) the rate of elderly who are visited by their friends, in West Marmara the rate of those who are visited by their neighbours (75%), in Mideast Anatolia the rate of those who are visited by other relatives (56%), in the Mediterranean Region the rate of those visited by their grandchildren (51%), in East Marmara the rate of those visited by their siblings (26%) are higher compared to other regions.

Table 234. People Who Visit the Elderly at Most Other than Their Children throughout Türkiye and by Residence Area, Three Major Cities, and NUTS

	My neighbours	My other relatives	My grand-children	My siblings	My friends	No one	Other
Türkiye	64,2	37,6	33,0	18,8	16,1	3,2	1,3
RESIDENCE AREA							
Urban	56,7	39,9	34,5	19,6	19,3	3,2	1,5
Rural	72,5	35,0	31,3	17,8	12,6	3,2	1,0
THREE MAJOR CITIES							
Istanbul	59,0	36,3	27,0	13,8	23,4	2,4	3,2
Ankara	62,0	40,9	34,4	15,8	17,9	5,5	0,3
Izmir	72,5	28,3	33,4	18,4	24,7	1,4	1,4
NUTS							
Istanbul	59,0	36,3	27,0	13,8	23,4	2,4	3,2
West Marmara	75,7	33,6	33,7	12,4	13,7	4,7	0,8
East Marmara	54,0	36,1	41,4	25,1	12,4	3,5	0,6
Aegean	70,8	34,1	31,6	21,3	25,5	4,5	2,8
Mediterranean	59,1	51,0	50,9	22,9	24,1	1,5	0,0
West Anatolia	56,6	39,2	37,2	14,3	15,6	4,5	0,2
Central Anatolia	69,8	38,3	22,1	22,7	7,5	3,5	0,3
West Black Sea	66,1	35,8	29,7	15,1	9,2	4,8	0,0
East Black Sea	67,1	29,0	14,0	20,8	4,6	0,0	1,6
Northeast Anatolia	61,9	29,2	22,3	11,1	3,2	2,7	0,0
Mideast Anatolia	73,3	54,7	29,1	21,7	16,8	0,3	0,0
Southeast Anatolia	56,1	28,7	21,5	8,3	1,0	1,2	5,9

The rate of males who are visited by other relatives (41%) and friends (19%) is higher than females. On the contrary, females are visited at a higher rate (67%) by their neighbours (Table 235).

In lower educational status, the rates of elderly who are visited by their neighbours is higher compared to other educational levels. 70% of those who have not graduated from a school, 65% of the elderly who are primary school graduates are visited by their neighbours. As the educational status improves, the rate of elderly who are visited by their friends increases. Almost half of (46%) university graduates are visited by their friends, and this rate drops down to 10% in those who have not graduated from a school.

Although there is not a significant differentiation in terms of household type breakdown, still the rate of elderly from extended households being visited by their relatives (50%) is higher compared to other household types. This rate is 40% in elderly from nuclear households, and 30% in elderly from broken households. It is noted once again that the rate of those who are visited by their siblings is higher amongst elderly from extended families (26%).

The rate of elderly from lower class who are visited by their neighbours (65%) and the rate of elderly from upper class who are visited by their friends (44%) is higher than other SES groups.

Table 235. People Who Visit the Elderly at Most Other than Their Children by Gender, Age, Educational Status, Marital Status, Household Type, and SES

	My neighbours	My other relatives	My grand-children	My siblings	My friends	No one	Other
GENDER							
Male	61,0	41,2	31,3	20,1	18,6	3,0	1,1
Female	66,9	34,5	34,4	17,6	14,0	3,4	1,4
AGE							
55-64	63,1	39,5	29,0	24,5	20,5	3,1	0,3
65+	64,5	36,9	34,4	16,7	14,6	3,2	1,6
EDUCATIONAL STATUS							
No schooling	69,7	34,6	31,8	14,5	10,2	4,3	1,2
Primary school	65,2	39,4	35,4	21,1	16,2	2,8	1,1
Elementary/secondary school	58,9	36,0	32,7	21,5	19,8	2,5	1,7
High school	35,4	39,6	26,7	22,5	27,3	1,5	0,0
Undergraduate/graduate studies	46,6	44,1	25,9	23,4	46,9	1,1	4,7
MARITAL STATUS							
Married	63,7	40,4	33,5	20,1	16,5	2,6	1,0
Separated/ live apart	60,8	52,2	15,6	0,0	12,3	0,0	0,0
Widowed	67,1	29,8	32,6	15,2	14,5	4,6	2,2
Divorced	35,3	22,3	16,9	22,2	31,9	12,3	0,0
HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
Nuclear	63,8	40,0	33,7	19,9	16,1	2,6	0,7
Extended	60,2	49,3	26,6	26,4	21,7	1,7	5,5
Broken	65,7	29,7	31,9	14,7	15,3	5,2	2,1
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS							
High upper class	59,0	30,7	13,3	21,1	8,7	0,0	0,0
Upper class	46,0	36,3	30,0	21,6	44,8	1,9	2,9
Upper middle class	48,7	52,4	34,3	22,4	27,1	1,5	1,7
Lower middle class	64,5	36,9	33,5	19,1	14,5	2,9	1,2
Lower class	65,7	38,0	35,8	14,4	11,2	5,5	2,6

RESULTS

The number of people living in a household in Türkiye, or in other words the size of a household is 3,6 persons on average. There is no differentiation based on rural or urban residential area. In the regions in east Türkiye, the average size of a household is larger. Southeast Anatolia (5,6 persons), Mideast Anatolia (4,7 persons) and Northeast Anatolia (4,5 persons) regions have the highest average household size, and West Marmara is the region with the lowest household size, with 2,7 persons. As the socioeconomic status improves, the average household size decreases. The average household size is 4,3 persons in lower class and it drops down to 3,1 persons in high upper class.

Across the country, 70% of the households is composed of nuclear families,   18% is composed of broken families, and 12% is composed of extended families. The rate of extended families is higher in rural areas and in lower socioeconomic status.

Detailed information about the inhabited dwelling of families in Türkiye and features have been gathered. In general, dwelling type and features differ based on the residential area. Almost half of the households in Türkiye (49%) resides in flats, 25% in detached houses and 15% resides in detached squatter houses. Vast majority of urban dwellers (62%) lives in flats, and more than half of rural dwellers resides in detached houses (53%). Detached squatter houses are the most common type of dwelling in Northeast Anatolia (46%) and in lower SES group (37%). Across Türkiye the very low rate of households who reside in gated communities (4%) is high in high upper class (19%).

26% of the households in Türkiye is tenants, and the inhabited dwelling belongs to one of the members of the family in 61%. The rate of households who own the inhabited dwelling goes up to 70% in high upper class, but still a considerable proportion of this group (25%) is tenant.

The rate of those who live in dwellings other than their main dwellings such as summer cottages, vine-yard houses, village houses and summer ranges for certain times of the year is 20% across Türkiye. The use of second dwelling is higher particularly among those who live in Istanbul (33%). As expected, as the socioeconomic status increases, so does the rate of households who use a second dwelling.

Half of the households in Türkiye (50%) heat with firewood/coal stove. This rate goes up to 83% in rural areas. For households in urban areas, central heating with natural gas/room heater (31%) is the most common heating method. There are differences among three major cities in terms of the heating system. More than half of the households in Istanbul and in Ankara use central heating with natural gas/room heater, however in Izmir, the prominent heating system is firewood/coal stove (48%) and airconditioner (20%).

Across Türkiye, the most common dwelling size, with a rate of 43%, is three-room-in-total (2+1) dwellings. Four-room in total (3+1) dwellings follow that with a rate of 41%. More than half of families with children (57%) allocate a special room to their children. A higher proportion of households with elderly in the inhabited dwelling (64%) has a special room for the elderly.

Across Türkiye, concrete is the most commonly used soil material in dwellings (23%). The rate of households with a concrete soil material reaches 39% in rural areas. Parquet is the prominent soil material in urban areas (23%). Among three major cities, there is differentiation in terms of the soil material of the inhabited dwelling. In Ankara parquet (45%) is salient, whereas in Istanbul use of parquet (31%) as well as laminated flooring (29%) is also common. In Izmir floor tile (23%), parquet (20%) and laminated flooring (20%) use is at par. As the socioeconomic status improves, the use of parquet and laminated flooring increases, and the use of wood, concrete and carpet decreases.

In the research, questions were asked to understand the economic status of the individuals and house-

holds. Almost all of the households have a refrigerator (98%), washing machine (94%), mobile phone (91%), television (89%) and iron (89%). Garbage disposal (2%), clothes dryer (4%), sports tools/equipment in the house (5%) are the goods which exist in households at the lowest rate.

In Türkiye, the rate of households who have received assistance from a person or institution in the last one year is 10%. The rate of households who have received assistance is higher in rural areas (14%), in Ankara (13%), in Northeast Anatolia (28%) and in Southeast Anatolia (22%), in broken families (15%) and in lower class (25%). The General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity ranks the first amongst individuals or person who provide assistance, with a rate of 39%. Municipalities rank second with 24%.

Across Türkiye, the rate of those who have received debt or loan from an institution or a person in the last one year is 35%. The rate of households which have received debt/loan is higher in middle socioeconomic group. In B and C1 SES groups, the rate of debt/loan recipient households exceeds 40%. Buying a house is the most highly reported reason for getting the debt/loan (17%). Some of the other highly reported reasons are "to buy a private car (13%)", "to clear commercial debts (11%)" and particularly salient in urban areas "for the payment of credit card debt (11%)". The rate of those who get a debt/loan for educational purposes is remarkable in Southeast Anatolia (15%).

A vast majority of debt/loan recipients (79%) has got the debt/loan from banks. But particularly in Southeast Anatolia the rate of those who get a debt from other relatives (30%) and in Northeast Anatolia the rate of those who get a debt from their neighbours (26%) is also quite high. Almost all of the individuals from the upper socioeconomic group who got a debt/loan received this debt/loan from banks, and the rate of individuals who get a debt/loan from the bank drops in lower class (39%), and the rates of those who get debt from other rela-

tives (26%), friends (21%), neighbours (17%), siblings (16%) increase.

Another subject which was examined in a detailed manner within the scope of the research is the marriage and divorce process. The vast majority of marriages in our country (87%) take place between 18 and 29 years of age. A siginificant part of the married individuals (57%) had their first marriages between 18 and 24 years of age. In Türkiye, the rate of those who had their first marriage before 18 years of age is 17%.

The rate of marriage before 18 is more common among females (28%) than males (6%). Southeast and Mideast Anatolia are the regions where marriage before 18 years of age is the most common in both males and females. As the educational status and socioeconomic level decreases, marriages before 18 years of age increase in both genders, and on the contrary, as the educational status and socioeconomic level improve, the rate of individuals who marry later in life (at the age of 30 and above) increases.

Despite the fact that 28% of females in Türkiye have their first marriages before they are 18, a population of only 1% says that the appropriate age of marriage for females throughout Türkiye is under 18. 64% of overall Türkiye thinks that the ideal age of marriage for females is between 18 and 24. Only 29% thinks that this age interval is the appropriate age of first marriage for males. In Türkiye, the most highly reported age interval for males is between 25 and 29 (50%).

In Türkiye, the rates of marriage by meeting the spouse in family (39%) and neighbour/ neighbourhood (39%) network is quite high. As the educational level and socioeconomic status improves, despite the fact that the rate of those who meet in the friend, work or school network and marry increases, the rate of those who marry from family, neighbour and neighbourhood network is high in each part of the society.

Arranged marriages in Türkiye are currently common (51%). A large part of individuals who got married this way were asked for their opinions when they got married, and the decision was left to the individual. However, it is noted that a population of 10% were not asked for their own opinions and they got married based on the decision of the family. East Black Sea (17%) is the region where this rate is the highest. The rate of individuals who were not asked for their own opinions about the arranged marriage and who got married based on the decision of their family is higher among those who did not graduate from a school (22%). Among individuals from broken families, it is noted that the rate of such marriages is high (19%).

44% of those who got married have chosen their spouses themselves. Almost all of them got the consent of their families before getting married. The rate of those who eloped or who were eloped is 4% across Türkiye. The rate of such marriages is higher in West Marmara (8%). Bride Exchange is at a very low rate across Türkiye, but it is a continuing practice in Southeast Anatolia (3%).

It was found out that in almost all of the marriages (94%) both civil and religious marriage ceremonies were performed. The rate of those who only has the civil ceremony or of those who only had the religious ceremony is low across Türkiye (3%). The rate of those who only had the civil marriage ceremony increases as the educational status and socioeconomic level improve, on the other hand the rate of those who only had the religious ceremony increases as the educational status and socioeconomic level decrease. Still, it is noted that in general in all groups, the quite common type of marriage ceremony is to have both the civil and the religious marriage ceremonies.

Bride price is practised in 16% of marriages in our country. This rate is higher in the rural area (23%), among individuals from extended families (24%). This rate reaches 40% in Northeast and Mideast Anatolia, and among those who have not graduated from a school.

According to the conclusions of the research, there is a kinship between couples in 21% of marriages in Türkiye. The rate of those who have a kinship with their spouse is higher in the rural area (25%). This rate reaches 36% in Mideast Anatolia and 44% in Southeast Anatolia. As the educational status and socioeconomic level decrease, the bride price practice increases and reaches about 30%. Marriages of kinship mostly take place with relatives from the paternal side (59%). 18% of marriages of kinship took place with "son/daughter of paternal uncle", 12% with "son/daughter of paternal aunt," and 29% with "other relatives from the father's side".

Across Türkiye, despite the fact that 51% has had their first marriage with a relative, only 13% approves of such marriage. The rate of those who approve of marriage with relatives is higher in places where such marriage is common. More than one thirds (34%) of those who live in Southeast Anatolia and 27% of those who live in Mideast Anatolia approve of marriage with relatives. In the lowest educational level and socioeconomic group, 20% thinks such marriage is appropriate. The main reason for those who approve of marriage with relatives is "information on/preservation of family roots" (37%). 22% of these individuals reported that they approve of such marriages because relative kids get along better.

The most commonly observed ceremonies in Türkiye are "wedding" with 89% and "betrothal/asking for the girl's hand in marriage" with 88%. It is noted that all ceremonies are commonly held in Türkiye. Even the engagement ceremony which has the lowest rate was conducted in 82% of first marriages. It is noted that only in Southeast and Mideast Anatolia the rate of those who had the civil marriage ceremony is lower.

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked to rank the social attributes they would like to find in the person they will marry as "important", "does not matter" and "not important". According to this assessment, the most important attribute for males is "her not being married before" (85%).

"Similarity of the family structures" (75%) and "her being religious" (73%) are the important social attributes which are rank second and third in the list. Females find all the questioned attributes more important compared to males. For females, the highest priority attribute is that the person they will marry "has a job"(92%).

A similar evaluation for the character attributes of the future spouse shows that vast majority thinks all attributes except for "physical beauty" are "important". Both females and males think that the future spouse being beautiful of handsome is significantly less important compared to other attributes. However for males (55%), physical beauty is more important than for females (48%).

A vast majority of individuals who got married (86%) has an ongoing marriage, in 8% the spouse has died, and 5% is divorced. 28% of individuals from broken families are divorced, and in 65% the spouse has died.

In the research, individuals who were divorced at least for once were asked why. For males and females the salient reason is "irresponsible and indifferent attitude". Other salient reasons of divorce for females are beating, maltreatment (21%), cheating (16%), alcoholism and gambling (14%) and failing to financially provide for the family (14%). For males "disrespectful attitude of the female towards male's family" is a salient reason for divorce (11%).

Several statements were read to all the individuals who participated in the research and they were asked if that statement alone is an absolute reason for divorce for them. It seems that cheating for even once, both the male cheating on the female (88%) and the female cheating on the male (93%) is the most important reason for divorce. Vast majority of the society does not see the spouse's suffering from a refractory disease or the spouse's failing to have a baby as reasons for divorce.

Another subject that was investigated in detail in the research is intra-familial relations. Within this scope, topics such as occasions which bring family members together, division of labor at home and problems experienced in family were asked.

It is understood that household members often gather at a relatively high rate at the weekends (80%) and for dinner (81%). On the other hand, the rate of gathering often for breakfast is at a high rate like 64%, although slightly lower than the rates above. The rate families who can gather for breakfast drops to 59% in urban areas. The city/region where this rate is the lowest is Istanbul (50%).

Evaluation of activities that the household members often do together has watching television together in the first place (60%). Vast majority of the household members (78%) say they do not go to the cinema/theater together and 61% says they do not go on holiday together. In all activities except for "going on a picnic", as the socioeconomic status increases, the rate of households who do these activites together ascends.

The data of people who do the housework shows that females do housework such as cooking, doing the laundry and the dishes, ironing and basic needlework at a high rate. The rates of females doing these housework varies between 89% and 95%. This rate declines slightly in housework such as serving tea at home, laying and cleaning the table and cleaning the house. Housework such as daily shopping, paying the monthly bills of the household, repairwork and painting the house are done by males at a higher rate.

It is understood that in households with a child between 0 and 5 ages the mother is responsible for taking care of the little child during the day (88%). Across Türkiye, the rate of children who are taken care of by the maternal grandmother is at a low rate like 4% and this rate exceeds 15% in broken households and in the high upper class. Across Türkiye the caretaker rate is 1% and exceeds 10% in these mentioned groups. Once again, throughout Türkiye the kindergarten rate is 3% and goes up to 18% in high upper class.

In Türkiye, 5% of households has a disabled person who requires care, and the rate of ill persons who require care is 8%. The rate of disabled persons requiring care is higher in Southeast Anatolia (12%), in extended households (14%) and in lower class (10%).

The rate of ill persons requring care is high in Northeast Anatolia (15%), Southeast Anatolia (11%) and East Black Sea (11%). In extended families, the rate of ill persons requiring care bakıma reaches 22%.

Disabled persons requiring care are taken care of by their spouse (28%) or by their mother (27%) at the highest rate. İll persons requiring care are generally taken care of by their spouse (36%). The most noteworthy point here is that in extended households is the daughter-in-laws are responsible for care. In 25% of extended households, daughters-in-law care for the disabled and in 41% of extended households daughters-in-law care for the elderly requiring care.

Households were asked who generally is the decision maker in matters like selection of a house, general order of the house, kids, shopping, relationship with relatives, relationship with neighbours, holidays and entertainment. According to the findings of the research, the mother/woman has a more dominant role in taking many decisions regarding the family. According to data based on decision making process in the family, family members decide together at a rate of 50% and above. In terms of general order of the house, in 44% of households women are decision makers, and in other matters in the household it is noted that men are decision makers at a higher rate. It is understood that in Türkiye, man/father and woman/mother take joint decisions in the family on some matters. It is observed that in matters such as selection of a house, holidays and entertainment the mother and the father can decide together.

Married individuals were asked how their relationships with their spouses are and if they have any problems. It is observed that the family members say their relationships with their spouses are well almost in every matter. The issues which cause problems mostly at various frequencies are responsibilities "regarding the house" and "regarding the kids children". These two problems are followed by "regarding the expenses". The least conflictual issues are "gambling problem" (2%), "differences in religious views" (3%), "sexuality" (3%) and "political views" (3%).

One of the indicators of relationships between individuals in the family is the type of their reaction when there is a conflict between individuals that cannot be resolved through dialogue. Across the country the total "generally" and "sometimes" answers show that men react by raising their voices to their spouses (65%), by remaining silent (43%) or by reprimanding (42%), and the women react mostly by remaining silent (55%),by raising their voices (44%) or by getting cross (39%). The rate of men using force/physical violence to their spouses is 5%. From the educational status perspective, although there is not a very high differentiation between the rates, it is noted that the rate of men exerting physical violence on their spouses is slightly higher among individuals from lower educational status. As the socioeconomic level decreases, the rate of women who are used force against by their spouses increases.

It is understood that throughout Türkiye, 62% of married individuals do not consider getting help from anyone when they have a serious problem with their spouse. 23% says they will get this help from the elderly family members. Only 3% says they will get help from expert institutions or individuals. It is noted that the rate of those who says they can get help from expert individuals or institutions is slightly higher in Istanbul (8%), among graduates of undergraduate/graduate studies (6%) and in high upper class (A SES group) (10%).

Regarding relationships with relatives, individuals were asked about their "relationships with family

members and close relatives". In this framework, the highest rate of "very good" answers can be found in relationships with the kids, mother and father. 62% gives the answer "very good" about their relationships with their daughters, 60% evaluates their relationships with their sons as "very good", and the rate is 54% for relationships with the mother and 50% for relationships with the father. This rare drops to the lowest levels (20%) in relatives such as paternal uncle, paternal aunt, maternal aunt, maternal uncle.

Within the scope of the research, families were asked how close they live to their relatives. 60% of the households lives in the same house with the daughter, and 65% lives in the same house with the son. For proximity to other relatives and family members mostly "in a different city" answer was given. This rate is followed by "in the same city, same town" and "in the same city, different town" answers.

The rate of those who live with their mother-in-law/father-in-law in the same house is around 3%-5% throughout Türkiye, and the rate of those who live in the same house with their mother-in-law in extended families is 32%, and the rate of those who live in the same house with their father-in-law is 21%.

Across Türkiye family members individuals meet most frequently (several times a week or everyday) are daughters and sons (82%-84%) and mothers/fathers (60%-63%). The rate of individuals who frequently meet close relatives like paternal uncle/paternal aunt/maternal aunt/maternal uncle varies between 16% and 22%. The rate of individuals who often meet all relatives other than children and neighbours is higher in rural areas.

Within the scope of the research, all individuals were asked how frequently they share their emotions and thoughts with their relatives. Individuals share their emotions and thoughts at the highest rate and the most frequently with their children. The rate of those who always share their emotions

and thoughts with their daughters is 63% and the rate of those who share them with their sons is 60%. 52% of individuals says they always share their emotions and thoughts with their mothers and 42% says they always share them with their fathers. As the educational and socioeconomic status improve, the rate of individuals who share increases.

Across Türkiye the rate of individuals with two children is higher (35%). These individuals are followed by those who have three children (22%). The number of children of urban dwellers and of people who live in the western part of the country is fewer. For example, West Marmara is the region where having an only child is the most common (25%). As the educational level and socioeconomic status improve, the number of children decreases. Among those who have not graduated from a school, 4% has an only child, whereas in university graduates this rate is 37%. 42% of individuals with children in high upper class have an only child, and this rate regresses to 11% in lower class.

On the other hand, across Türkiye, it is understood that the individuals would like to have more kids. 38% of individuals reports they would like to have two children and 32% reports they would like to have three children if they had the means to. In other words, most individuals want to have two or three children. The rate of those who would like to have an only child (4%) or six children and more (5%) is low. In rural dwellers, the rate of those who would like to have three or more children is higher (64%). It is observed that from the east to the west the number of children individuals would like to have tends to decrease. Similarly, it has been found out that the number of children desired drops in young age groups. It is observed that there is an inverse proportion between the educational and socioeconomic status and the number of children individuals would like to have. 52% of individuals between 18 and 24, 51% of university graduates and 54% of high upper class have declared that they would prefer to have two children if they had the means to.

71% of individuals reports that they do not have a preference regarding the gender of the child they would like to have. Across Türkiye, the rates of those who would like to have a son (15%) and a daughter (13%) are close. On the other hand, Southeast Anatolia Region is noted as the region where the rate of those who would like to have a son (27%) is the highest.

Adoption is not common across Türkiye. Across Türkiye, only 0,4% of individuals have adopted. On the other hand, the rate of those who think that individuals can adopt if they cannot have kids through natural methods is 83%. Following this rate, in second place, with a rate of 78% comes the test-tube baby service and in the third place with 77% ranks becoming foster parents. 16% of individuals has a positive view of "Using the sperm bank or the egg bank" idea. This rate goes up to 24%-25% in university graduates and to 28-29% in high upper class.

Within the scope of the research, individuals were asked if they agree or disagree with some statements in order to find out about the value they attribute to the child. 87% of individuals agrees with the statement "a kid brings the couple closer". Statements such as "A daughter is closer to the family" (82%) and "The child takes care of the parents when they are old" (% 80) are accepted in the society. "Only a son can assure the continuation of the bloodline" statement is the one with the lowest rate of consensus, out of all the statements questioned (47%).

Conflicts between parents and their children mostly take place because of "spending and consumption habits" (32%), "selection of friends" (31%), "clothing" (28%). Political views is the topic where the fewest conflicts are experienced (5%). Amongst the regions, Istanbul and Northeast Anatolia with 40% have the most conflicts between parents and children and West Marmara is the region with the least conflict.

Punishments given to the child in the last one year were explored. 60% of the mothers and 51% of the fathers reprimand their children. 38% of mothers and 33% of fathers ban their children from watching TV. In the third place comes banning the children from playing games. The rate of those who say they beat their children is 21% in mothers, and 12% in fathers. Central Anatolia and Mediterranean are the regions where the rate is the highest; and West Marmara and East Black Sea regions are where it is the lowest. Parents from upper class apply methods like locking them in a room, banning them from watching TV, reprimanding, not talking to them for a while, not buying what they like for a while, banning the internet and mobile phone, more than others. Beating and slapping are the punishment methods which are less applied as the socioeconomic status increases. Similarly, these two methods decrease as the educational status increases. Parents punish their children mostly because of being negligent towards their education (40%). Lying (15%), disrespectful attitude towards the elders (12%) and failing to perform duties such as personal care, ordering their room etc. (11%) are the other reasons mentioned.

When parents experience a conflict with their children, they mostly get support from their spouses (72%). On the other hand, 15% does not get any support from anyone. Only 7% gets support from expert individuals or institutions. The rate of those who get support from experts is higher in high upper class (16%) and in university graduates (12%).

Most individuals disapprove of couples living out of wedlock and having children out of wedlock. The rate of those who approve of these is higher in urban areas, in males in western regions; in upper socioeconomic status, among single and divorced individuals, in high educational levels and in young age groups. In terms of marrying someone from a different ethnicity or religion, individuals are relatively more approving. Judgements with the highest rates of indecision are found in "One can marry someone whom they met online" with 12% and "Being from the same religious sect is not important for marriage" with 11%.

Women working at a paid job is generally accepted

in the society (82%). Northeast Anatolia with a rate of 61% and Southeast Anatolia with a rate of 64% are the regions which approve of this the least. It is observed that women (91%) support the issue of working at a paid job more than men (74%). Populations with lower support are found among the lower class (66%) and those who have not graduated from a school (73%). The reason for this thought is the perception that the primary duty of woman is childcare and housework (56%). Mideast Anatolia, with 70%, is the region where this rate is the highest. One out of every five people thinks that work environment is dangerous for women (20%). The rate of those who think that women should not work because it is contrary to our customs and traditions is is 9% throughout Türkiye, and goes up to 30% in Northeast Anatolia region.

18% of individuals thinks that their families are very happy and 59% thinks that they are happy. Only 3% reports that their families are unhappy. Individuals have a similar perception of happiness about themselves. 16% of individuals define themselves as very happy and 57% as happy. 4% defines themselves as unhappy or very unhappy. Southeast Anatolia is the region where both rates are the lowest. 35% of individuals in Southeast Anatolia region does not think that their families are happy and 40% does not feel happy.

Individuals learn about religious information mostly from family and relatives (55%). Clergyman are the second source for religious information with 13%, Quran courses are the third source for information with 11%. The rate of school and religious books is 9%.

Almost all of the individuals define themselves as religious. Half of these people (49%) say they try to perform all religious requirements and almost the other half (43%) say they perform some religious requirements. The rate of those who say they try to perform all religious requirements is higher in rural areas (60%), in Northeast Anatolia and East Black Sea (68%), in women (53%), in those who have not graduated from a school (66%), in widowed indi-

viduals (68%) and in lower SES group. (56%).

In all subject titles explored, selection of spouse is the area where religion has the most determinant role (76%). Selection of food and beverages is in second place (69%). Other two areas where religion is influential are selection of friends (56%) and selection of clothing (57%). Selection of profession is the area where religion is the least determinant (42%). It has been found out that religion is more determinant in the rural areas, in Northeast Anatolia and in East Black Sea, among women, in high age group, in widowed individuals, in extended households, in individuals with low educational status and in low SES groups.

It is observed that individuals mostly visit their relatives, friends and acquaintances for "giving condolences" (97%) and for "extending greetings in religious holidays" (97%). The rate of those who visit their acquaintances "to celebrate the newly purchased house" (89%) ve "upon their return from pilgrimage" (89%) is relatively lower.

It is understood that individuals mostly give presents to their acquaintances "upon visit of patients" (89%) and "going to see the newly born baby" (87%). It is observed that giving presents "on new year's eve" (32%) and "On Valentine's Day" (42%) are not common yet.

Within the scope of the research, individuals were explored in terms of doing social activities such as reading books and newspaper, watching TV, going to the cinema and theater, going to local, club, bar, night club, coffeehouse etc. Across Türkiye, 41% of individuals never reads books and 30% never reads the newspaper. The rate of those who never go to the cinema or theater is 70%. In terms of social locations for food and drinks, it is understood that 50% of individuals never goes to places such as restaurants, cafes, patisseries, 79% never goes to places such as coffeehouses, 88% never goes to places such as locals, clubs and associations and 92% never goes to places such as bars and night clubs. In all topics except for coffeehouses, the rate of

those who conduct these social activities is higher in younger age groups, among individuals from higher educational status and individuals from upper socioeconomic status.

Across Türkiye, 65% of individuals never work out. In males (43%) and in younger age groups (53%) the rate of those who work out is higher. One of the subjects which was questioned in the research is how frequently individuals go to watch sports games. 76% of individuals do not watch sports games. The rate of those who say they never go to watch sports games is 60% in males, whereas in females this rate goes up to 92%. As the age group decreases, so does the rate of those who say they never go to watch sports games. 37% of 18-24 age group watches sports games. This rate is quite high compared to other age groups.

Another issue which was examined within the scope of the research is smoking. 43% of individuals smokes. One out of every four individuals smokes every day (26%). This rate is higher in men (40%). The rate of those who used to smoke, but quitted is 11%. A clear correlation between the rise and fall of the educational status and the rise and fall of smoking levels cannot be observed.

Across Türkiye, 81% of individuals reports never using alcohol. 8% says they use alcohol only on special days, and 4% says they use alcohol several times a month. The rate of those who use alcohol increases as the educational status improves. The rate of university graduates who say they use alcohol at various frequencies and occasions is 37%, and this rate is 14% in primary school graduates. Similarly, from the low SES group to the high SES group, rate of alcohol use increases. 49% of high upper class use alcohol and this rate is 9% in lower class.

Within the scope of research, households were asked if they have internet connection at home. 36% of households in Türkiye have internet conenction. This rate is higher in urban areas (42%). Everyone who participated in the research were asked fre-

quency of their internet use. Across Türkiye, 40% of 18+ individuals use the internet. As the educational status and SES increase, the frequency of internet use also increases. 58% of individuals who use the internet uses it at home. 21% of individuals uses the internet at work and 13% at the internet cafe. 38% of individuals uses the internet for research and informaton purposes. The rate of those who use the internet for accessing social networking sites is 26% across Türkiye. Another purpose for internet use, with a rate of 22%, is for job or for keeping up with the business.

Within the scope of research, individuals were asked how frequently they watch TV/VCD/DVD. 51% of individuals says they often watch TV/VCD/DVD. The rate of those who say they never watch TV/VCD/DVD is 8%. According to the rates of watching television, it has been found out that only 7% never watches television. Across Türkiye, the durations of watching television show that more than half of individuals (56%) watch 2-3 hours television a day. The rate of those who watch television for 1 hour and shorter is 18%, and 22% watches it between 4 to 6 hours. A large majority of individuals who watch television (79%) watch it in the evening. The rate of those who watch television all day long is 6%. 77% of individuals watches television with household members. Vast majority (76%) of individuals have already stated that they do not want to watch television alone. It has been revealed that it is mostly the father who decides on the channel to be watched on TV (57%). The rate of mother/woman who decide on the TV channel and/or program to be watched is 19%. 91% of individuals says that they do not have discussions due to channel or program selection. 81% of individuals across Türkiye is disturbed by the sexually explicit scenes on TV, and 70% is disturbed by the scenes of violence on TV and changes the channel. Across Türkiye, only 3% files a complaint to an official institution about the programs on TV.

In the research, individuals were asked how they spend their holidays. Across Türkiye people mostly

spend their holidays by resting at the place where they live (35%). It is understood that one out of every three people cannot go on holiday because they do not have such a time. 26% of individuals spends their holidays by going to their hometowns or villages. 12% goes to places such as hotels and lodging houses.

In the research, there is various data about the seniority of individuals. The rates of families with elderly individuals requiring care in Türkiye is 6%. In rural areas, this rate is higher (9%). Southeast Anatolia (9%), East Black Sea (9%) and Central Anatolia (9%) are the regions with the highest rates of households with elderly in need of care. In lower class, the rate of households with elderly in need of care is also higher (10%). Daughters-in-law are primarily responsible for the care of elderly in need of care in household (32%). In rural areas, this rate rises even further (37%). The rate of households where elderly care is being provided for by the "spouse" is 27%. Care is taken by the son in 22% of the households, and it is undertaken by the daughter in 20% of the households. Only 2% of the households has a caretaker.

More than one thirds of individuals under 60 (39%) do not have an idea about how they will live when they get old. 22% of individuals says they can live with the son and 9% says they can live with their daughters. The rate of those would like to live in the seniors center when they get old and the rate of those who would like to get care at home is the same (10%). West Anatolia (16%) and West Marmara (15%) are the regions where the answer seniors center is the highest. In West Black Sea,

Southeast Anatolia, East Black Sea and Northeast Anatolia, the rate of those who would like to live with their children, especially with their sons when they are old is 40% and above. As the educational status and socioeconomic status improve, the rate of those who prefer to live with their children declines, and the rate of those who would like to get care at their home increases. The reason for seniors center preference has showed the option "I would not like to be a burden to my kids" saliently, with 47%.

In the research, the reasons for 60+ individuals to live with their children in the same house were examined. The elderly feeling happy to live with their children (30%), wanting to support each other with their children (22%) and because the customs and traditions require them to (13%) are more prominent reasons. On the other hand, the elderly who do not live with their children were asked about their reason. Accordingly, the elderly have stated that they and their spouse are self-sufficient (41%), that they do not want to leave where they live and the children do not want to go there either (17%) and that they do not want to live with their children (16%). In terms of education and SES, it was found out that the rate for the option "My spouse and I are self-sufficient" increases.

Half of the elderly state that their sons (51%) and their daughters (50%) visit them at least once a week. The rate of those who say that their children visit them only several times a year is around 20%-22%. Other than their children, it is mostly the neighbours who visit the elderly (64%). The neighbours are followed by relatives (38%) and by grandchildren (33%). No one visits 3% of the elderly.

REFERENCES

Aile Araştırma Kurumu (1991). *Türk Aile Ansiklopedisi*. AAK; vol.72. Bilim Serisi; 11, Ankara : Aile Araştırma Kurumu

Aile Araştırma Kurumu (1992). *Sosyokültürel Değişme Sürecinde Türk Ailesi* - Ankara : Aile Araştırma Kurumu

Aile ve Toplum Hizmetleri Genel Müdürlüğü. (2014). *Türkiye Aile Yapısı Araştırması 2006* (TAYA 2006). Ankara: Araştırma ve Sosyal Politika Serisi 01 İkinci Basım.

DPT. (1992). *Türkiye Aile Yapısı Araştırması*. Ankara: Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı.

HÜNEE (1983). *Türkiye Doğurganlık ve Aile Sağlığı Araştırması* (TDASA). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.

HÜNEE (1990) . 1990. *Nüfus Politikalarına Katkıda Bulunan Faktörlerin Belirlenmesi* (UNFPA ile). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları

HÜNEE. (1973). *Türkiye Nüfus Yapısı ve Nüfus Sorunları Araştırması* (TNNSA). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.

HÜNEE. (1978). *Türkiye Doğurganlık Araştırması* (TDA). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü.

HÜNEE. (1988). *Türkiye Doğurganlık ve Sağlık Araştırması* (TDSA). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.

HÜNEE. (1993). *Türkiye Nüfus ve Sağlık Araştırması* (TNSA). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.

HÜNEE. (1998). *Türkiye Nüfus ve Sağlık Araştırması* (TNSA). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.

HÜNEE. (2003). *Türkiye Nüfus ve Sağlık Araştırması* (TNSA). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.

HÜNEE. (2008). *Türkiye'de Nüfus Sağlığı Araştırması* (TNSA). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Kalaycıoğlu, S., Çelik, K., Çelen, Ü., Türkyılmaz, S. (2010). Temsili Bir Örneklemde Sosyoekonomik Statü (SES) Ölçüm Aracı Geliştirilmesi: Ankara Kent Merkezi Örneği. *Sosyoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi*, c.13 (1) ss.182-220.

Kıray, M. (1964). *Ereğli: Ağır Sanayiden Önce Bir Sahil Kasabası*. Ankara: Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Kongar, E. (1972). *İzmir Aile Araştırması*. Ankara: Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği Yayınları.

Office for National Statistics (2002). F*amily 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 (1997). *The Guatemalan Family Life Survey* (EGSF).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. (1994). Indonesia Family Life Survey (IFLS). Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Timur, S. (1972). T*ürkiye'de Aile Yapısı Ve Nüfus Sorunları Araştırması*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.

TÜİK. (2006). *Hanehalkı Bütçe Araştırması.* Ankara: Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu Matbaası.

Vikat, A., Spéder, Z., Beets, G., Billari, F. C., Bühler, C., Désesquelles, A., ve 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). *Ankara'da Gecekondu Mahalleleri.* Ankara: Sağlık ve Sosyal Yardım Bakanlığı.