Gender Based Wage Differentials in Turkey

Mehtap Hisarcıklılar[1]
Hakan Ercan[2]

Abstract: Although undesirable, different labour market outcomes for men and women are still being observed in many places. One of the most important consequences of different treatment in the labour market is lower wages for women. Using 1988 Household Labour Force Survey data, this study aims to examine the gender wage differentials and its possible causes in the Turkish Labour Market. Results from Neumark's modification of Oaxaca decomposition suggest that the human capital characteristics of females have a narrowing effect on the wage gap and the difference is mainly due to discrimination.
Keywords: Gender, Wage Discrimination, Decomposition

1. Introduction

Treatment of women differently in the labour market is widely observed in the world, even in developed countries: Many women are allocated into certain kinds of occupations, paid less than their male counterparts and face problems in promotion (Anker, 1997; ILO, 2003; World Bank, 2001 and 2003). This unequal treatment of men and women in the labour market is not only socially unfair but also has negative effects on the economy as it is an inefficient use of human resources.

Following the neoclassical theory, reasons behind the gender wage differ-

---

[1] İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi, İşletme Mühendisliği Bölümü

[2] Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, İktisat Bölümü

ences are mainly examined by decomposing the mean wage differential into portions that could be explained by human capital characteristics and an unexplained part, which is attributed to discrimination. Oaxaca's (1973) decomposition method and its modifications have been widely used in this area.

As in many parts of the world, women in the Turkish Labour Market are also segregated into occupations, which are considered to be more convenient for females and on average, receive fewer wages than men. Kabasakal, Boyacigiller and Erden (1994) conclude in their study that women working in banking and insurance sectors in Turkey are not represented sufficiently in top and middle managerial positions compared to their contribution to the work force in these sectors. The authors also mention that Ozbasar and Aksan (1976), Dilber (1981), and Tabak (1989) find similar results in their studies where they examine women's position in manufacturing companies (see Kabasakal, Boyacigiller, Erden 1994: 46).

Using 1987 Household Income and Consumption Expenditures survey data, Dayioglu and Kasnakoglu (1997) apply the Oaxaca decomposition technique to examine the male-female wage differential in urban Turkey and conclude that depending on the model employed, 64 % to 100 % of the gender wage gap could not be explained by the human capital or job characteristics. In her study on the wage differentials between public and private sectors in Turkey, Tansel (1999) concludes that men working in the public sector earn less than those in the private sector whereas for women, wages are at par or higher in public sector compared to the private sector. Also, although male and female wages are at parity in public sector, there is a large gender gap in the private sector. In another study where she examines the wage differentials in the sectors covered and uncovered by a social security program, Tansel (2001) finds that men earn about two times higher wages than women in the occupations covered by a social security program whereas for the uncovered wage earners, males' wages are near parity with those for the females.

Applying Neumark's (1988) modification of the Oaxaca decomposition, this study attempts to analyse the gender wage discrimination in the Turkish Labour Market. The data set used in the analysis belongs to 1988 Household Labour Force Survey by the State Institute of Statistics (SIS) of Turkey.

The rest of this study is organised as follows: The next section summarises different theories on discrimination. Section 3 explains the decomposition technique used in this study. Section 4 gives information on data and Section 5 presents results for the wage regressions and decomposition analysis. Section 6 concludes.

2. Theories on Labour Market Discrimination:

There are various theories on the differences in labour market outcomes for men and women, which could be classified in three main categories: neoclassical theories, institutional and labour market segmentation theories, and feminist (or gender) theories.

Neoclassical (human capital) theories assume that workers and employers are rational and that labour markets function efficiently. According to this theory, workers seek out the best paying jobs after taking into consideration their own personal endowments, constraints, and preferences. Employers, on the other hand, try to maximise profits by maximising productivity and minimising costs to the extent possible. Thus the differences in the labour market payments results from the equilibrium forces of supply and demand. Wage differences are viewed as a consequence of the quality of the different 'offerings' of men and women in the labour market. It is stressed that females have lower human capital in terms of what they bring to the labour market (e.g. they have less education, less relevant fields of study) and what they acquire after joining to the labour market (e.g. they have less experience than men as a result of intermittent or truncated labour market participation because of marriage or household/child-care responsibilities) (Altonji and Blank, 1999; Becker, 1964 and 1968; Cain, 2001; Polachek and Siebert, 1999).

Neo-classical theories have been elaborated by the 'new home economics', where the division of labour in the family is emphasised (Mincer and Polachek, 1974; Becker, 1965 and 1981). It is argued that the division of labour between men and women, where the women takes the responsibility for domestic tasks and therefore acquires negligible 'human capital', is an outcome of rational decision-taking by individuals within the family unit. Since the sexual division of labour, with the male as the `bread-winner` and

the female as the `housekeeper`, is assumed to be consistent with maximising economic utilities and since women are deemed to be less productive in employment as a result of accumulating less human capital, sex discrimination is seen to be economically rational. (Collinson et al., 1990; Crompton and Sanderson, 1990).

Another model based on neo-classical theory is the 'compensating differentials model'. This model focuses on women's preference for certain types of occupations as well as on the lower pay in typical female occupations. According to this model, women prefer to work in occupations with lower wages, but which have better working conditions and good fringe benefits like health insurance and crèches.

According to the institutional and labour market segmentation theories, labour market is divided into segments such as primary and secondary sectors, static and progressive jobs, formal and informal sectors (Collinson et al., 1990; Walby, 1986). These theories have three propositions (Tunali and Ercan, 1998): Identical individuals are rewarded differently depending on the segment they are in; access to better paying jobs is not equal; and the segment that the worker is in influences the worker's cognitive abilities and imposes additional limits to mobility. The best known of these theories is the dual labour market theory, which divides the market as primary and secondary sectors. Jobs in the primary sector are defined to be relatively better in terms of payment, security, promotion, and working conditions whereas secondary sector jobs tend to be poorly paid with few promotion prospects and worse working conditions. It is stated that for the most part, the primary market is predominantly male, whereas the secondary market is predominantly female.

A supply side argument for women's employment in the secondary sector jobs comes from the 'Cambridge Group' (Crompton et al., 1990; Walby, 1986). The economists in this group argue that women are not expected to earn a primary wage because of their position in the family. Hence they are more prepared than men to accept a secondary wage, which lowers their supply price.

Feminist theories, on the other hand, are mainly concerned with non-market variables. These theories often stress that the disadvantaged position

of women in the labour market and the processes that maintain this structure is caused by the patriarchy and women's subordinate position in the society and the family.[3]

3. Measuring Labour Market Discrimination

Following neoclassical theory, many empirical studies on wage differentials decompose the mean wage differential into justified and justified parts. The justified part is the portion that could be explained by the human capital characteristics of the individuals and the unjustified part is the remaining part that cannot be explained and thus attributed to discrimination. The decomposition method introduced by Oaxaca (1973) and its modifications are widely applied in the labour market discrimination literature.

Baldwin and Johnson (1996), for example, apply Cotton's (1988) modification of the Oaxaca decomposition to estimate the wage discrimination against black men in the US. With a similar approach, Neuman and Silber (1996) examine the differences in salaries of male workers of Eastern and Western origin in Israel. Kidd and Shannon (1996a and 1996b) estimate gender based wage discrimination in Australia and Canada, Meng (1998) in rural China, Neuman and Weisberg (1999) in Israel, Paternostro and Sahn, (1999) in Romania and Dayioglu and Kasnakoglu (1997) in Turkey.

Stating that the main reason of the wage differential between male and female workers is not unequal pay for equal work, but the concentration of women into lower paying jobs, Oaxaca (1973) introduced a method to decompose the wage gap of male-female workers which estimates the effects of discrimination as the residual left after subtracting the effects of differences in individual characteristics from the overall wage differential.

Following Oaxaca and Ransom (1994), define G_{mf} as the gross wage differential between male and females:

$$G_{mf} = (w_m / w_f) - 1 \qquad (1)$$

---

[3] See Collinson et al. (1990), Crompton and Sanderson (1990), Hartman (1976), Kemp (1994), Walby (1986) for a detailed discussion on these theories.

where w denotes the wage and subscripts m and f refer, respectively, to male and females. This wage differential in the absence of discrimination would only reflect the productivity differences between the two groups:

$$Q_{mf} = (w_m^o / w_f^o) - 1 \qquad (2)$$

where "o" denotes the absence of labour market discrimination.

Oaxaca (1973) defines Becker's (1971) competitive labour market discrimination coefficient, which is the difference between the observed wage ratio and the wage ratio that would prevail in the absence of discrimination, in percentage terms (see Cotton 1988, p.236). The market discrimination coefficient (D_{mf}) in the Oaxaca decomposition is defined as the proportionate difference between $G_{mf} + 1$ and $Q_{mf} + 1$ (Oaxaca and Ransom, 1994).

$$D_{mf} = \left(w_m / w_f - w_m^o / w_f^o \right) / \left(w_m^o / w_f^o \right) \qquad (3)$$

A logarithmic decomposition of the gross wage differential is obtained using the expressions in Eqs. (1) to (3):

$$\ln(G_{mf} + 1) = \ln(D_{mf} + 1) + \ln(Q_{mf} + 1) \qquad (4)$$

Considering that the wage differential in the labour market occurs as a combination of underpayment of the disadvantaged and overpayment of the advantaged group, the wage differential is further decomposed into components representing the underpayment of females and overpayment of males

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(D_{mf} + 1) &= \ln\left(w_m / w_f \right) - \ln\left(w_m^o / w_f^o \right) \\ &= \ln\left(w_m / w_m^o \right) + \ln\left(w_f / w_f^o \right) \end{aligned} \qquad (5)$$

Denoting $\varphi_{mo} = (w_m / w_m^o) - 1$ as the differential between males' wages and the wages that they would have received in the absence of discrimination and $\varphi_{of} = (w_f^o / w_f) - 1$ as the differential between the wages that females would have received in the absence of discrimination and their cur-

rent wages, and substituting Eq. (5) into Eq. (4), the gross wage differential is re-written as

$$\ln(G_{mf} + 1) = \ln(\varphi_{mo} + 1) + \ln(\varphi_{of} + 1) + \ln(Q_{mf} + 1) \qquad (6)$$

For the case where wage functions are estimated in a semi-logarithmic format by OLS, and considering that those fitted regressions pass through the means of the data, decomposition of the wage differential in Eq. (6) takes the form

$$\overline{\ln w_m} - \overline{\ln w_f} = \bar{x}'_m(\hat{\beta}_m - \beta^*) + \bar{x}'_f(\beta^* - \hat{\beta}_f) + (\bar{x}_m - \bar{x}_f)'\beta^* \qquad (7)$$

where $\overline{\ln w}$ denote the mean log wage, $\bar{x}'$'s are vectors of mean values of the explanatory variables in the wage regressions, $\hat{\beta}$'s are the estimated co-efficients, and β^* is the estimated non-discriminatory wage structure. The first term on the right-hand-side of Eq. (7) is an estimate of male wage advantage, the second term is an estimate of female wage disadvantage, and the last term is an estimate of the productivity differential between the two groups.

Oaxaca (1973) suggests the adoption of either the current male wage structure or the current female wage structure as the non-discriminatory wage structure (i.e. β^*) for the decomposition.

Following Oaxaca (1973), various studies seek to find the appropriate representation for the wage structure in the absence of discrimination. Reimers (1983), for example, uses the arithmetic mean of the structures for the two groups as the non-discriminatory wage structure. Since many theories suggest that labour market discrimination not only lowers the wages of the disadvantaged group but also results in higher pay for the advantaged group, Cotton (1988) reformulates the Oaxaca decomposition allowing for the estimation of the 'cost' imposed on the disadvantaged group and the 'benefit' gained by the advantaged group. He suggests that the wage structure in the absence of discrimination is a simple weighted average of the observed structures for the two groups where the weights are proportions of the groups in the labour market. Neumark (1988), on the other hand, suggests using the wage structure obtained from the pooled sample of male and females.

Oaxaca and Ransom (1994) compare four alternative non-discriminatory wage structures: current female wage structure, current male wage structure, Cotton's (1988) weighted average of the observed structures, and Neumark's (1988) approach of using the pooled sample of male and females. They obtain that the pooled method yields the smallest estimated standard errors for every estimated differential.

4. Data

The data set used in this study belongs to the Household Labour Force Survey that is conducted by SIS in October 1988. This is the only nation-wide survey which includes information about labour market earnings. Recently, SIS has started to ask the wage question again, but the results are not made available to researchers, citing 'control' purposes. The sampling unit in labour force surveys is the household. Households are chosen on the basis of proportional probability sampling applied to population clusters that are obtained by a three-stage stratification scheme on region, rural/urban location, and size of the settlement, respectively (SIS, 1990).

The survey was conducted to 22,320 households – 14,880 households from 59 urban locations and 7,440 households from 225 rural locations. The whole data set has information about 102,062 individuals, 51,361 of whom are females and 50,701 are males. For the aim of the study, observations on 13,931 individuals who are aged between 15 and 60, and who are regular or causal employees were used in the analysis. Self-employed, employers, and unpaid family workers are excluded from the sample. The reason to exclude these groups is that their labour is not marketed.

Females comprise 16.47 percent of the wage and salary earners sample. 79.17 percent of the females and 77.48 percent of the males are working in urban areas. Females constitute 16.77 percent, and males constitute 83.23 percent of the urban working population. These percentages for rural areas are 15.43 and 84.57 respectively. These figures show that the distribution of males and females in rural and urban areas have similar patterns.

The percentage distribution of males and females among occupations are reported in Table 1. The majority of females are working in scientific, technical, and professional or clerical occupations, while the majority of

males are working as operatives. Both sexes have the lowest proportions in managerial positions.

According to the SIS definition, firms that are employing 10 or more workers are labelled as large, and the ones, which are employing less than 10 workers, are labelled as small. When the wage levels of large and small firms are compared, it is seen that on average, large firms pay 52.92 percent higher than the small firms. 76.25 percent of the wage and salary earner female workers are working in large firms whereas the percentage is 65.05 for males.

Table 1. Distribution of Labour Force among Occupations

Occupation	Female	Male
Scientific, technical, and professional workers	24.49	10.97
Managers and proprietors	1.74	2.55
Clerical workers	23.70	8.89
Sales workers	3.40	4.20
Foremen, craftsmen	9.24	22.06
Operatives	5.93	21.95
Service workers	10.46	15.37
Labourers	7.93	9.68
Agricultural workers	13.12	4.31

5. Methodology

This study applies Neumark's modification of the Oaxaca decomposition to the Turkish data. Because our aim is to measure labour market discrimination, only people working in the labour market are included in the decompositions. Following Neumark (1988) and Oaxaca and Ransom (1994), the non-discriminatory wage structure is chosen to be the pooled sample of male and females. Mincer type wage regressions for males, females and the pooled sample are run as a first step and then Neumark's modification of the Oaxaca decomposition is applied to decompose the mean gender wage differential into explained and unexplained parts.

5.1. Wage Regressions:

Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) is applied to estimate semi-logarithmic wage regressions controlling for the basic human capital and job characteristics. The logarithm of the hourly wage is regressed on five educational dummies, potential experience, potential experience squared, five regional dummies, tenure, and dummy variables for the place of residence, working part- versus full time, vocational education, firm size and being the head of the household. The dummy variable for vocational education takes the value 1 if the person has received any vocational training, and 0 if not. Firm size dummy takes the value 1 if the person is working in a place with more than 10 employees. Tenure shows the amount of time the individual has worked in their last job measured in months. Considering that the wage of a person is closely related with the occupation they are working in, nine occupational categories are also included in the wage regressions. Summary statistics for the explanatory variables are given in Table 2.

Hourly wage is calculated using the information on total monthly earnings, individual's weekly hours of work in the first and second jobs, and the amount of days the individual works in a month. The data set has information only on the hours of work during the week prior to the survey date. Therefore, when calculating the hourly wage, it is assumed that the individual had worked the same number of hours during the whole month.

The results of the wage regressions are presented in Table 3. The basic human capital variables are found to have the expected effects on wages. People with any level of schooling earn more than the ones with no degree. Wages increases with the level of education, i.e. holding everything else constant, high school graduates earn more than the middle school graduates, and the university graduates earn more than the high school graduates. The 'return to education' is found to be higher for males than for females[4].

---

[4] Note that although the term 'return to education' is used here, it is difficult to obtain a precise estimate for the returns to education. This might be mainly due to omitting some unobservable characteristics, such as ability, that have an effect on people's productivity and hence on their wages (Griliches, 1977).

Besides general education, receiving a vocational training also increases the wages with a higher effect for males than for females.

Table 2. Mean and Standard Deviation of the Explanatory Variables

Variables	Males		Females	
	Mean	Std. deviation	Mean	Std. deviation
Primary school education	0.5685	0.4953	0.322	0.4673
Middle school education	0.0985	0.2980	0.0667	0.2495
High school education	0.134	0.3406	0.278	0.4481
University education	0.0846	0.2782	0.183	0.3868
Experience	20.0808	11.1283	15.658	11.4055
Experience squared	5.2707	5.4333	3.752	5.2271
West	0.392	0.4882	0.5041	0.5001
North	0.0632	0.2433	0.0484	0.2146
East	0.162	0.3685	0.0854	0.2795
South	0.1525	0.3596	0.1455	0.3527
Urban	0.7748	0.4178	0.7917	0.4062
Part time	0.0375	0.1899	0.1163	0.3207
Vocational education	0.5511	0.4974	0.5434	0.4982
Firm size	0.6505	0.4768	0.7625	0.4256
Tenure	101.5636	90.7672	85.7647	82.9760
Sample size	11636		2295	

Consistent with the human capital theory, people with more experience earn higher wages, but the marginal contribution of experience on wages decrease as people get older. Tenure, measuring the amount of experience people have in their job at the time of the survey, also has an increasing effect on the wages.

Supporting our expectations, holding everything else constant, people living in urban areas receive higher wages as opposed to the ones living in rural areas. Part-time work is also found to have a positive effect on wages.

There is a potential problem of sample-selection bias associated with the

estimation of the wage regressions. The problem arises from the assumption that the observed occupational distribution is determined via the forces of supply and demand. The sample of individuals observed in each occupation may not be random, thus bias may occur from this non-random sampling. However this study does not deal with this problem.

5.2. Decomposition of the Wage Differential

The mean log wage differential between male and females in the sample is 1.1089, which shows that on average men are paid approximately 11.5 % higher than women in the labour market.[5] After estimation of the wage regressions, this mean log wage differential is decomposed into three components using the expression in Eq. (7): male wage advantage, female wage disadvantage and the justified part.

The decomposition results are given in Table 4. It is quite interesting to observe from these results that the component for the productivity differential takes a negative value, implying that the human capital, job or other characteristics for the people in wage employment have a reducing effect on the male-female wage differential. These results suggest that the gender wage differential in the labour market arises not because of the differences in the human characteristics of men and women, but because of their unequal treatment. 23.8 % of the wage difference is accounted by the male advantage while the female disadvantage accounts for 120.4 %, implying that the discriminatory structure in the labour market not only lowers the wages of women, but also results in higher wages for men. However the 'cost' of discrimination imposed on women is much higher than the 'benefit' gained by men.

The negative value for the justified part could be explained by the fact that women in the labour market are generally those with higher human capital characteristics who work in good conditions and receive higher wages while the ones with less human capital are discouraged to work in the labour market. Further research could be directed to examining labour force participation of women in Turkey.

---

[5] The percentage figure is calculated as $(e^{0.1089}-1)*100$.

Table 3. Wage Regressions for the Oaxaca Decomposition

VARIABLES	Females	Males	Pooled
Primary school education	-0.0660	0.1288***	0.1483***
	(-1.19)	(6.59)	(7.96)
Middle school education	0.1052	0.3430***	0.3631***
	(1.25)	(13.02)	(14.22)
High school education	0.2753***	0.5800***	0.5829***
	(3.53)	(21.49)	(22.60)
University education	0.7739***	1.0433***	1.0629***
	(8.85)	(30.65)	(33.62)
Experience	0.0292***	0.0564***	0.0528***
	(6.29)	(29.95)	(30.33)
Experience squared	-0.0608***	-0.0874***	-0.0826***
	(-6.46)	(-23.63)	(-23.91)
West	0.1642***	0.1320***	0.1231***
	(4.34)	(9.45)	(9.25)
North	-0.0865	-0.1274***	-0.1177***
	(-1.21)	(-5.28)	(-5.03)
East	0.1786***	-0.0089	0.0300*
	(3.01)	(-0.51)	(1.75)
South	-0.1485***	-0.1278***	-0.1310***
	(-2.98)	(-7.25)	(-7.72)
Urban	0.0752*	0.1238***	0.1154***
	(1.85)	(9.19)	(8.85)
Part time	0.1218**	0.2182***	0.1479***
	(2.56)	(7.57)	(6.11)
Vocational education	0.0468	0.1020***	0.0960***
	(1.35)	(8.71)	(8.44)
Firm size	0.3543***	0.1912***	0.1983***
	(9.75)	(15.79)	(17.01)
Tenure	0.0009***	0.0003***	0.0004***
	(3.79)	(3.51)	(5.32)
Scientific workers	0.3743***	0.0679***	0.0759***
	(4.71)	(2.69)	(3.23)

Managers	0.5139***	0.3274***	0.3188***
	(3.98)	(8.74)	(8.67)
Clerical workers	0.2804***	0.0256	0.0176
	(3.67)	(1.11)	(0.83)
Sales workers	0.2193**	0.0303	0.0253
	(2.19)	(1.04)	(0.89)
Service workers	0.1498**	-0.0537***	-0.0622***
	(1.97)	(-2.97)	(-3.44)
Agricultural workers	-0.5215***	-0.2062***	-0.3936***
	(-6.75)	(-6.89)	(-14.91)
Craftsmen	0.0818	0.0650***	0.0562***
	(1.08)	(4.00)	(3.43)
Labourers	0.0364	-0.0703***	-0.0828***
	(0.47)	(-3.41)	(-4.07)
Constant	5.3404***	5.2427***	5.2535***
	(55.11)	(156.63)	(164.07)
Adj. R2	0.46	0.37	0.37
No of obs.	2295	11636	13931

Notes: (1) t-ratios are reported in parenthesis. (2) Not having a degree and living in the central part of Turkey are the base categories for educational and regional dummies.
*** Significant at the 1 percent level
** Significant at the 5 percent level
* Significant at the 10 percent level

Table 4. Oaxaca Decomposition of the Mean Wage Differential

	Decomposition
Unjustified	0.1571
Male advantage	0.0259
Female disadvantage	0.1312
Justified	-0.0481
Total	**0.1090**

6. Conclusion

This study has examined the gender wage differentials in Turkey. Using 1988 Household Labour Force Survey Data, it applied Neumark's (1988) modification of the Oaxaca decomposition where the parameter estimates from the pooled wage regression of male and females is assumed to be the non-discriminatory wage structure.

Mincerian wage regressions for males, females, and for the pooled sample are estimated in the first step. The results from these regressions confirm the importance of human capital characteristics in wage determination. Both education level and experience are found to play an important role in wage determination where the effects of these variables are estimated to higher for males. The results also support the discussion in labour market segmentation theories that workers employed in bigger firms earn more in comparison to the workers in smaller firms. Firm size is found to be particularly more important for females.

After estimation of wage regressions, the mean gender wage differential is decomposed into three components: male advantage, female disadvantage and the justified part. The results of this decomposition imply that the productivity characteristics of women tend to narrow the wage gap. However, after controlling for human capital and other characteristics, there is strong evidence for wage discrimination, which is consistent with other studies on Turkey. Gender wage differential in Turkish Labour Market arises because of unequal treatment against women rather than differences in their human capital characteristics. A part of the impact of this unequal treatment rewards men with higher payments but it mainly shows itself as lower wages for women.

The result that the human capital characteristics of women working in the labour market narrows the gender wage gap might be explained by the fact that women in the labour market are generally those with higher human capital characteristics, working in better positions while the ones with less human capital choose not to work in the labour market. This finding stresses yet again the importance of educational attainment in favourable labour market outcomes.

Özet: Arzu edilmeyen bir durum olmasına rağmen işgücü piyasasında kadın ve erkekler için farklı sonuçlar hala dünyada pek çok yerde gözlenmektedir. İşgücü piyasasındaki farklı muamelenin en önemli sonuçlarından biri kadınların erkeklere göre daha düşük ücret almalarıdır. Bu çalışmada, 1988 Hanehalkı işgücü anket verisi kullanılarak, Türk İşgücü Piyasası'ndaki cinsiyete dayalı ücret farklılaşmaları ve bunun olası nedenleri araştırılmaktadır. Neumark'ın Oaxaca ayrıştırma yönteminde önerdiği değişiklik kullanılarak bulunan sonuçlara göre, kadınların beşeri sermaye özellikleri maaş farkını azaltıcı etki yapmakta, ücretler arasındaki fark işgücü piyasasındaki ayrımcılıktan kaynaklanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Cinsiyete Dayalı Ayrımcılık, Maaş Ayrımcılığı, Ayrıştırma

References

Altonji, J. G., and Blank, R. M. (1999) "Race and gender in the labor market". In: Ashenfelter, O., and Card, D. (eds.) *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Vol. 3C. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science B. V., pp. 3143-3259.

Anker, R. (1997) "Theories of occupational segregation by sex: an overview". *International Labour Review*, 136(3), pp. 315-339.

Becker, S. G. (1964) *Human capital: a theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education*. Reprint, 1993. 3rd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Baldwin, M. L., and Johnson, W. G. (1996) "The employment effects of wage discrimination against black men". *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 49(2), pp. 302-316.

Becker, S. G. (1965) "A theory of the allocation of time". *Economic Journal*, 75(299), pp. 493-517.

Becker, S. G. (1968) "Discrimination, economic". Reprint. In: Humphries, J. (ed.) 1995. *Gender and economics*. England: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, pp. 385-387.

Becker, S. G. (1981) *A treatise on the family*. Reprint, 1998. 4th ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Cain, G. G. (2001) "The economic analysis of labor market discrimination: a survey". In: Ashenfelter, O., and Layard, R. (eds.) *Handbook of Labor Econom-*

ics, Vol. 1. 4th ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science B. V., pp. 693-785.

Collinson, L. D., Knights, D., and Collinson, M. (1990) *Managing to discriminate*. London: Routledge.

Cotton, J. (1988) "On the decomposition of wage differentials". *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 70(2), pp. 236-243.

Crompton, R., and Sanderson K. (1990) *Gendered jobs and social change*. Unwin Hyman Ltd., UK.

Dayioglu, M., and Kasnakoglu, Z. (1997) "Kentsel kesimde kadin ve erkeklerin is-gucune katilimlari ve kazanc farkliliklari". *ODTU Gelisme Dergisi*, 24(3), pp. 329-361.

Griliches, Z. (1977) "Estimating returns to schooling: some econometric problems". *Econometrica*, 45(1), pp. 1-22.

Hartmann, H. (1976) "Capitalism, patriarchy and job segregation by sex". *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 1(Spring), pp. 137-169.

Kemp, A. A. (1994) *Women's work: degraded and devalued*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

International Labor Organisation (ILO). (2003) *Time for equality at work - global report under the follow-up to the ILO declaration on fundamental principles and rights at work*. Geneva: International Labour Office. Available at:<URL:http://www.ilo.org/public/english/standards/dec1/pub1/reports/report4.htm> [20 September 2003].

Kabasakal, H., Boyacigiller, N., and Erden, D. (1994) "Organisational characteristics as correlates of women on in middle and top management". *Bogazici Journal*, 8(1-2), pp. 45-62.

Kidd, M. P., and Shannon, M. (1996a) "Does the level of occupational aggregation affect estimates of the gender wage gap?" *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, 49(2), pp. 317-329.

Kidd, M. P., and Shannon, M. (1996b) "The gender wage gap: A comparison of Australia and Canada" *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, 49(4), pp. 729-746.

Meng, X. (1998) "Male-female wage determination and gender wage discrimination in China's rural industrial sector". *Labour Economics*, 5, pp. 67-89.

Mincer, J., and Polachek, S. (1974) "Family investments in human capital: earnings of women". *Journal of Political Economy*, 82(2), pp. S76-S108.

Neuman and Weisberg (1999) "Gender wage differentials and discrimination

among Israeli managers". *International Journal of Manpower*, 19(3), 161-170.

Neumark, D. (1988) "Employers' discriminatory behaviour and the estimation of wage discrimination". *Journal of Human Resources*, 23, pp. 279-295.

Oaxaca, R. (1973) "Male-female wage differentials in urban labor market". *International Economic Review*, 14(3), pp. 693-709.

Oaxaca, R. L., and Ransom, M. R. (1994) "On discrimination and the decomposition of wage differentials". *Journal of Econometrics*, 61, pp. 5-21.

Paternostro, S., and Sahn, D. E. (1999) *Wage determination and gender discrimination in a transition economy: the case of Romania*. The World Bank policy research paper, No: 2113.

Polachek S. W., and Siebert, W. S. (1999) *The economics of earnings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Reimers, C. (1983) "Labor market discrimination against Hispanic and black men". *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 65(?), pp. 570-579.

State Institute of Statistics (SIS) (1990) *Household Labor Force Survey Results: 1988*. State Institute of Statistics Press, Ankara.

Tansel, A. (1999) *Public-private employment choice, wage differentials and gender in Turkey*. Yale University Economic Growth Center Discussion Paper, No: 797. Available at:

URL:http://www.econ.yale.edu/growth_pdf/cdp797.pdf [23 March 2001].

Tansel, A. (2001) *Wage earners, self employed and gender in the informal sector in Turkey*. Economic Research Forum for the Arab Countries, Iran and Turkey, Working Paper, No: 0102. Available at:

<URL:http://www.erf.org.eg/uploadpath/pdf/0102.pdf> [2 October 2002].

Tunali, I., and Ercan, H. (1998) Labor market segmentation in Turkey. In: Bulutay, T. (ed.) *Main characteristics and trends of the Turkish Labor Market*. Ankara: State Institute of Statistics Printing Division.

Walby, S. (1986) *Patriarchy at work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Pres.

World Bank (2001) *Engendering development – through gender equality in rights, resources and voice*. World Bank Policy Research Report. New York: Oxford University Press.

World Bank (2003a) *Gender equality and the millennium development goals*. Available at: URL:http://www.worlbank.org/gender/resources/gendermdg.pdf [20 September 2003]