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ABSTRACT

In many countries, including Turkey, agriculture is a major component of the rural population income, and in these rural areas women are the cornerstones of the agricultural production. Resources, especially water, land, livestock, crops, and knowledge about agricultural production are crucial for preserving the livelihoods of most of the world's rural families. Access to, control over, and management of these resources determines which farming activities are pursued, what goods may be produced, and whether the lives of rural households are enhanced or diminished. Yet, gender influences who has access to these resources and what level of access they have. Although women work in the fields, the homes, outside the farm, and at the markets, their male counterparts often maintain control of the decision making over the household and its economy. Thus, women, more than men, bear the burdens - physical, psychological, social, moral, economic, and legal- of these gender inequalities. Previous studies focused on the women farmers’ unpaid work in agriculture and household duties, their access to technical information, credit, extension services, critical inputs such as fertilizers and water, and marketing around the world including Turkey. However, there are not many studies addressing the Turkish women farmers’ gender inequality positions from a feminist standpoint lens. Drawing on the feminist standpoint theory, the purpose of this study was to explore the gender inequality experiences of women farmers on small farm practices in Turkey. Utilizing qualitative methods through the lens of feminist inquiry as a methodological approach, this study explored several aspects addressed by research questions associated with social positions: gender division labor; women’s work in
agriculture and household; decision making dynamics of rural families; accessing resources and knowledge; agrarian change; and effect of gender on small farm practices from Turkish women farmers’ standpoints. Feminist standpoint data were collected through 23 individual in-depth interviews, and five focus group sessions with women farmers in their villages, located in southern region of Konya province, in Turkey. Data were analyzed thoroughly following the constant comparative method by using the computer software, Atlas.ti. Initial codes used in data analysis were based on concepts and themes drawn from both the literature and theoretical framework. The results demonstrated that there are gendered roles and responsibilities on small farm practices; women participants carry out both farm and household tasks, and in this sense bearing a heavier workload burden than men. Moreover, women’s work in agricultural production, subsistence production, providing care for family members, or work in the extended family house, is invisible. The results also highlighted that these rural women’s formal education level is low and they lack access to extension education services. Further, they lacked decision making power, compared to their husbands, on household resources and income on these small farm practices. Additionally, this study pointed out that there is an ongoing depeasantization in these rural villages and the migrating rural women hold unemployable positions in the cities due to their limited skills and poor education background. This study concludes with recommendations for individuals, community organizations, Turkish government agricultural policy makers, and extension education systems to better assist these women in their work.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In the 1960’s, a peasant man from a village on the outskirts of the Taurus Mountain chain in Turkey stepped up and sent the first girl to middle school in a nearby town. Rumors spread out all over the village and neighboring villages: how could a girl go to school? She is going to be a bad girl. She will bring shame to the community. Luckily, that man happened to be my father, and the girl was my older sister. My father never considered the opinions of other people and stood by his own decisions. Slowly, the village people got used to the idea of my sister going to school and even praised my sister’s name by attaching the honoring adjective, “hanım”, equivalent to ma’am, to her name. To this day they still call her by this honorary name. My sister became a respected science teacher in the community.

My father’s vision of gender equality in education led me to where I am now, and gave me the opportunity to study the life experiences of my fellow village women. Though our paths in life separated long ago, I never forgot my roots in the village, and how women are subordinated from opportunities and marginalized within the gender roles that have been embedded. I recognized that feminism often sees gender as a means of distributing power and benefits. Being a rural woman implies less opportunity, less infrastructure, and more work in Turkey. These women are hardworking, fascinating human beings and play significant roles in the nation’s agricultural food system. However, they have no voice to represent themselves.

In the rural villages throughout Turkey including the southern region of Konya province, the area this study took place, rural women make critical contributions to agricultural production. I know from personal accounts that these women work from sunrise to sunset. Away from the field, they carry out housework at home until bedtime. They work the entire day without complaint, and can live with little income while they retain a very unique position in traditional
food systems and local food security. Women carry out unpaid work in agriculture by growing food in a household garden, collecting water and fuel, caring for children and the elderly, assisting other family members who are ill or disabled, cooking and cleaning, and working on the family farm without remuneration (Beneria, 1999; Daniels, 1987; FAO, 2006; Gulcubuk, 2010). Women, as unpaid family workers or agricultural workers on their own land, are very vulnerable to social risks because they are not covered by any insurance system (Akkaraca Kose, 2012). Rural women are deprived of many opportunities, but they do not have a deep awareness of their wellbeing for many reasons including their level of education. The opportunity to be educated means the opportunity to find a good quality job, to emancipate oneself and develop a better life (Gündüz-Hosgör & Smith, 2006). Through education, rural women could discontinue the dependence on their own husbands, on their own family, or on a social security system.

This study is about the rural women who do not leave the rural areas, who do not get an education and job, and who do not migrate to cities by following their husbands. They are village women who are born and live in historically agricultural small communities. In these communities, agriculture is still an important part of daily work and life for women. They are traditional subsistence or semi-subsistence producers to traditional nomadic producers or small-scale agricultural holders. They plant, tend to crops and animals, fertilize and weed, harvest and process (Budak, Darcan, & Kantar, 2005; Ilcan, 1994; Ozcatalbas & Akcaoz, 2010). In short, they do all it takes to produce a crop or livestock. However, they do not get much in return. Social norms and practices dictate their lives (Kandiyoti, 1988). Moreover, these women have no voice to represent their work and rights from their own experiences and perspectives. We do not know their stories from firsthand accounts because they are at the bottom of society in terms of income, education level (many only at primary school level), and infrastructure (schooling,
transportation, running water, health services, etc.) (IFAD, 2011). In order for these rural communities to prosper, women’s needs and rights must be addressed, thus, strengthening women’s ability to challenge social and political gender inequalities. The intent of this study is to give a voice to these rural women, and to relate their experiences on gender inequality from their social positions as food producers in Turkey.

**Background of Study**

In rural Turkey, there are a diverse range of social, structural and economic constraints that vary by local context affecting women’s lives. Relative to men, women tend to own less land, have limited ability to hire labor, and have impeded access to credit and market, extension, and other services (FAO. 2011). Above all, women farmers lack access to, and decision-making power over productive resources as well as control over income. In addition, rural women are under a heavy work burden of multiple responsibilities including farm work, household chores, and earning cash (wage work). This often adds up to long workday hours that are much longer than that of their male counterparts. However, women continue to lack access to important infrastructure services and appropriate technologies to ease their workloads (FAO, 2011).

Even though the first girl in my village who made it to college was in the 1970s, there have not been many girls following in her footsteps because rural people live in a vicious circle of low education, structured social roles, deteriorating infrastructure, and poor economy. First, inequalities between men and women are often exacerbated by the education gap (FAO. 2011). Rural families tend to be keener on investing effort and resources in the education of boys than girls. Families with limited resources often keep girls home (Rankin & Aytac, 2006). In the rural villages, when considering a girl’s future, the biggest concern is not skill development or education. Rather the first priority is preparing them for traditional gender roles such as mothers,
caregivers, and wives (Dedeoglu, 2012). Another setback to be considered is the level of education attained by the head of the household. In rural areas, the children of parents who have low educational levels are more likely to inherit low educational levels themselves (IFAD, 2011). A household whose head is poorly educated is prone to a higher risk of poverty, because low skilled people tend to be more vulnerable to unemployment or to have low paid jobs. This may have a strong negative impact on their family’s well-being. Above all, the limited resources available are generally used for boys and not for girls (Quisumbing et al., 2014).

Rural women face social restrictions in public participation and mobility because of existing sociocultural orders around them (Kandiyoti, 1988). Turkish rural social culture continues to enforce the traditional gender roles of a mother, a caregiver, and a wife in the obedient position within the patriarchal family order. This often leaves women and girls economically and socially dependent (Dedeoglu, 2012). As young girls women mostly depend on their families. When they get married, their dependence is passed on to their husbands. In their marriage relationships, women are kept in silence and accept the culturally defined roles of women. They blindly embrace their culturally defined role in rural society as wife, caretaker, and mother. Generally a young woman moves to her husband’s household after she gets married in a rural village (Kandiyoti, 1987). In her husband’s family house, young wives are not only at the bottom of the social order (Hart, 2010), but also shoulder the tiring farm work and household chores (Karkiner, 2009). Many women live in the extended family household for a certain time period, or until their in-laws pass on.

During this period, a young couple generally does not have ownership of land and control of income. Senior men are the head of households and hold the decision making power as patriarchal relationships are central to daily life in rural villages (Kandiyoti, 1987). Today,
although some of this sentiment has changed, much has remained the same. All these social structures still cause the marginalization of many women.

In the rural villages, availability of decent infrastructure is another setback for villagers including women and girls. All rural residents are severely underserved by basic infrastructure services (e.g. roads, transportation, health services, and schooling) (Gunduz, Hosgor, & Smits, 2006). The quality and accessibility of education are the major concerns in rural schools (Rankin & Aytac, 2006). Moreover, in some rural villages, there is an ongoing diminishing of existing schools. Every village is not provided with a school, which means that students have to go to another village to get an education. There is still a problem of illiteracy and low education attainment among adults that affects mainly rural areas in Turkey (Jomo & Baudot, 2007).

It should also be noted that low infrastructure and low income lead to migration to urban areas causing low population density in rural areas, or “depeasantization” (Gurel, 2011). Almost all villages are in some way deteriorated by migration. Empty houses and empty lands are the new reality of many rural villages including the study region. However, migration to cities having low skills brings more constrains to rural women. They not only lose subsistence activities in the village, but do not work outside the home. The women then become full time housewives in their apartment homes or shanty houses (Erman, 2001). Through this, families lose important food sources.

In rural villages, women play a key role in managing households and make major contributions to agricultural production, but their roles are largely unrecognized (Beneria, 1999; Gulcubuk, 2010)). Compared to men, women farmers have less access to productive resources, opportunities and information. Such constrains limit their access to land ownership, credit, inputs, and extension services, all of which are needed to be economically successful. (FAO,
Yet the gender inequalities that exist between women and men make it difficult for women to achieve their potential and restrict women’s contribution in household decisions and decisions over agricultural production. All these barriers ultimately inhibit women’s ability to produce, and can make it difficult for them to escape poverty or provide food for their families (FAO, 2011). This imposes costs on the agricultural sector, the broader economy and society, as well as on women themselves.

Since agriculture is such an important component of the livelihood strategies of rural villages in Turkey, and women are major players in small farm practices, it is essential to address the details of gender inequalities in agricultural practices on small farms. The feminist standpoint is connected to the unique position of women as the most marginalized group in society due to the gender division of labor, the specificity of women’s contribution to production (labor) and reproduction (i.e., giving birth, caregiving, household labor, food provisioning etc.), and the cultural values and power dynamics surrounding them (Harding, 1987). To date, the gender inequalities in small farm practices in Turkey is not well studied. Drawing on feminist standpoint theory, this study aims to specifically study women farmers’ gender equality experiences from a women farmers’ standpoint in small farm practices in Turkey.

**Problem Statement**

In the rural areas of the developing world, including Turkey, agriculture is a major component of rural income, and women are the backbone of agricultural production (Ozturk, 2012). Resources, especially water, land, livestock, crops, and knowledge about agricultural production are crucial for the livelihoods of most of the world's rural families (FAO, 2011). Access to, control over, and management of these resources determines which activities are pursued, which goods may be produced, and whether the lives of rural households are enhanced
or diminished. More importantly, gender determines who has access to these resources and what kind of access they have. Although women work in the fields, the homes, outside of the farm, and at the markets, their male counterparts often control decisions over the household and its economy (FAO, 2011). Significant gender inequalities can be found in unrecognized women’s work in agricultural production along with their household chores (Quisumbing et al., 2014). Moreover, they are held back by a number of constraints stemming from gender inequality including limited access to farm inputs and technology, information, training, formal education, marketing, credit, and training services, all of which adversely affect their productivity (FAO, 2011; Fletschner & Kenney, 2014). Therefore, women face considerable gender-related constraints and vulnerabilities compared to men because of existing structures in households and societies.

In the Turkish rural villages, farms are family-owned, typically small, and fragmented, because of inheritance laws which allow the land to be equally divided among siblings after the parents are deceased (Ozturk, 2012). Farming in Turkey is a family-based business which involves many members of the household including women and children (Ozturk, 2012). According to Klaver and Kamphis’s (2006) report, the 2001 agricultural census documented 3 million farms with an average cultivated area per holding of about 6 hectares (ha). About 65% of agricultural holdings are smaller than 5 ha. The majority of these holdings are vegetable producers, which typically cultivate an area of less than 1 ha. Only 15% of the farms in 2001 were larger than 10 ha, but they account for almost 70% of the total cultivated land in Turkey (Klaver & Kamphis, 2006). On the small farms, household labor is essential and women are the primary laborers. Husbands are the heads of the farms, have decision making power, and control resources. These patriarchal relationships are central in keeping up farming (Ilcan, 1994). This
culture presents unique challenges for women in terms of gender equality on small farm practices.

Many scholars have focused on the role that women play in agricultural production around the world. Their discussions about the importance of women’s role in food production in developing countries stress women’s important role in growing, participating in post-harvesting, processing, carrying out sustenance activities, and care giving to family (FAO, 2011; Doss, 2014). Similarly, women’s work is often integral to the functioning of smallholder farms in Turkey. Thus, women farmers perform many tasks in agricultural production including planting, hoeing, weeding, tending animals, harvesting and threshing of the crops, post-harvest food processing, milking and making dairy products, marketing, and provision of food to their families (Budak et al., 2005; Ilcan, 1994; Ozcatalbas & Akcaoz, 2010; Ozkan, Ediz, Ceyhan, & Goldey, 2000). Despite women’s substantial work on the farm, many scholars also stress women farmers’ invisible and unpaid work on the farm (Beneria, 1999; Sachs, 1983). Their work is not remunerated. It is labeled as unpaid family work and is not even recognized in an official statistic (Alston, 1998; Beneria, 1999; Gulcubuk, 2010; Mackintosh, 2000). But like so much of women’s work, much of women’s agricultural work is rendered invisible or devalued. As a consequence, this non-remunerated or unpaid labor goes overlooked and is not echoed in the design of agricultural policies (FAO, 2006). This neglect of women’s “invisible labor” contributes to the marginalization of women in the economy.

Women farmers’ lower socioeconomic status and increased vulnerability to poverty and economic insecurity is hampered by the transformation of agriculture in Turkey as well. Turkey has committed to a free market system even if losing small farmers and family farms is the price to be paid (Aydin, 2010; Kayder & Yenal, 2011; Ozturk, 2012). Turkish agriculture is in
transition from traditional semi-subsistence to more commodified farm enterprise with a focus on more export-oriented farming (Kayder & Yenal, 2011). With government policy strengthening the dominance of the market, “prices and demand patterns fluctuate widely leaving small producers vulnerable to market forces and raising the level of risk and insecurity” (Kayder & Yenal, 2011 p.60). Thus, small producers (subsistence and semi-subsistence) are vulnerable in the free market economy. Turkey is in rapid “depeasantization,” which implies that rural populations, especially peasant farmers, are migrating to cities and establishing urban slums (Gurel, 2011; Kayder & Yenal, 2011; Ozturk, 2012). In fact, according to a 1980 Turkish Statistic Institute (TUIK, 2014) report, the rural population rate was 56.1 percent compared to the urban rate of 43.9 percent. In 2012, rural population spiked up to 77.3 percent compared to the rural rate of 22.7 percent. Rural people who do not make sufficient livelihood out of their small piece of land (low income) in the free market arena have to migrate to cities. The sad part of the story does not stop at the “waste land” left behind, as typically urban slums do not provide the sought after opportunities for those migrant rural peasants. The nonagricultural employment generation capacity of export-led growth falls short of absorbing the labor surplus emerging from rural to urban migrations (Gurel, 2011; Ilkkaracan, 2012). Overall, women are the most affected from these circumstances because they play such a central role in peasant and subsistence farming (Ozturk, 2012). Thus, not only is subsistence farming disappearing, the food security of immigrant families is in danger.

To date, many studies have indicated that there are well-documented gender inequalities in women farmers’ unpaid work in agriculture and household duties, access to technical information, credit, extension services, critical inputs such as fertilizers and water, and marketing around the world including Turkey (FAO, 2011). However, there are not many studies
addressing Turkish women farmer’s gender inequality experiences from a feminist standpoint lens. Turkish rural women, most of whom are actively involved in agricultural production are generally marginalized and silenced in society due to their gender roles, social status, economic status, low education, and the prevailing patriarchal social order (Rad et al, 2012). Through studying women farmers’ daily lives, this study gives voice to them. This research focused on Turkish women farmers’ lives by drawing on feminist standpoint theory as a base to understand the nature of gender inequality. It explores women’s social roles (gender division of labor), work experiences through farming and household, and roles in the food system and small farm communities from women’s standpoints. This study provides an opportunity to hear women’s voices in order to understand the heart of rural women gender inequality experiences on small farm practices in Turkey. Through examining the outcome of this study, a variety of diverse individuals including women farmers, organizations (e.g. extension services, women gender related organizations), and policy makers can develop better understanding of the nature of gender inequality and women’s social roles, work experiences, and interests on small family farm holdings. Above all this study will assist rural women to build a deep awareness about their deprivations and difficulties on small farm practices.

**Purpose and Research Questions**

The guiding question for this feminist standpoint inquiry of qualitative study is “What gender inequalities exist on small farming practices in Turkey?” In order to explore this question, the study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the gender division of labor on small farm practices?
2. What gender inequalities exist in the workload of women farmers on small farm practices?
3. What gender inequalities exist in decision making on small farm practices?

4. What gender inequalities exist in acquiring knowledge about farming practices?

5. How does the way small farming is changing in Turkey affect women farmers?

**Conceptual Framework and Methodological Approach**

In this study, the conceptual framework draws on the feminist standpoint theory base to explore women farmer gender inequalities on small farm practices in Turkey (Aptheker, 1989; Harding, 1993; Hartsock, 1983; Hill Collins, 1986; Smith, 1987). This theory-base allows for this study to explore the unique position of rural women as the most marginalized group in society due to the gender division of labor (Bryson, 1996; Mackintosh, 1984), the specificity of women’s “invisible” contribution to agricultural production (labor) (Beneria, 1999; Sachs, 1983) and reproductive work (i.e., giving birth, caregiving, household labor, agricultural subsistence work, food provisioning etc.) (Daniels, 1987; Mackintosh, 2000), and the socio-cultural patterns that are the distinct roles and norms assigned to women and men in a society (Mackintosh, 1984).

The methodological approach for this study is a feminist standpoint inquiry of qualitative methods. Feminist standpoint epistemology (the nature of knowledge) recognizes women’s lived experiences as legitimate sources of knowledge (Aptheker, 1989; Harding, 1993; Hartsock, 1987; Smith 1987), lending to the need of the study to explore the daily experiences of women farmers. To proceed with this research, I placed myself on the participant’s side to eliminate or at least to minimize the power differences between myself as a researcher and women farmers as researched (collaboration, and caring) (Harding & Norberg, 2005). I shared my reflexivity statement with readers to disclose of my social position (Campbell &Wasco, 2000). To start this research, I used a “bottom up” approach to develop an epistemology for constructing knowledge.
I adopted this approach because feminist standpoint theory calls attention to the knowledge that arises from conditions and experiences that are common to girls and women (e.g. women’s life experiences as source of knowledge) (Wood, 2005). This “bottom up” approach informs my research to develop an epistemology for constructing knowledge, based on insights arising from marginalized women farmers’ social positions. To collect data, I used qualitative research methods including semi-structured interviews and focus groups to allow rural women to speak about their daily life experiences in the farm and household in their home environment. The interview has been used frequently by feminist research as a way for researchers and participants to work together to illuminate experience. There is also an emphasis on using group level data collection throughout the feminist research body (Cambell & Wasco, 2000).

**Significance of Study**

This research is significant for several reasons. These reasons relate to the focus of the study, and the feminist conceptual framework employed. First, this study is significant because the results from the study will help in the understanding of gender relations, the division of labor between men and women (who does what work), and who has access to, and control over, resources in rural small-scale farming communities in Turkey. It is especially important to know the ways that women and men work and contribute to agricultural production, economy, their family and society. In agriculture, gendered roles imply that women perform almost all aspects of farming and post-harvest activities but receive little recognition for their efforts (Gulcubuk, 2010). Indeed, women provide unpaid labor in almost all agriculture-related activities (crop production, postharvest and livestock management activities), but men largely control the market and income in Turkey. The study results may emphasize that women who are unpaid family
workers or agricultural workers on their own land are vulnerable to social risks because they are not covered by an insurance program.

Second, this study can benefit rural women and other women, particularly women extension agents, to create a deep awareness about women’s deprivations and difficulties on small farm practices. Gender inequalities erode women’s ability to access and manage land and other productive resources (e.g. inputs, credits), and pose a significant barrier to promoting their economic security and self-reliance. These women may realize that they play an important role in their family’s food security as well as their nation’s food security. Women in power may recognize that women and men have different needs and power, and that these differences should be identified and addressed in a manner that rectifies the imbalances between the sexes. Gender equality can benefit rural women and others in the following ways: gender equality can increase women’s independence socially and financially, facilitate women’s access to decision-making processes, encourage men to share household duties, and ensure women have a right to social security and other entitlements.

Third, the findings of this study may also be used in guiding policy makers and development planners who are concerned about gender issues while designing agricultural projects within the region and elsewhere in the country. These results may inform policies, programs and projects that improve rural women’s access to and control over productive resources, inputs and services. Policies that are gender-sensitive, in other words, that consider the particular needs and capacities of both women and men, are more likely to be effective.

This study may provide critical information to educators and practitioners, particularly extension agents working with women farmers in Turkey and other developing countries. This may help to address gender equality in the access to and control of productive resources, labor
and time-saving technologies, and practices that contribute to reducing women’s workload saving them time. Rural women also need assistance to develop the capacity necessary in order to increase their incomes. For this, a vital first step is to provide them with training as well as agricultural inputs and credit so that they can produce more, aggregate their crops, and market. Hence, women farmers take on different and often overlapping roles such as contributing their labor as unpaid family workers and taking on farm work as regular agricultural laborers and sometimes as the principal producers of crops. Women in the different roles will have different needs and interests, and it is important to target support accordingly.

Fourth, this study’s findings may also cast light on severe agrarian change with the unfavorable demographic situation in rural villages in Turkey. Particularly in the mountain villages, very few of the younger generations stay in the village to take over their parents’ farm work. Because, cultivated lands are very small and fragmented in rural areas in Turkey as a result of inheritance law, they are not adequate to produce income for the whole family in the free market. Thus, these small farming communities are deteriorated by large migrations, and it contributes to the problems of low and aging as well as low infrastructure and public services (e.g. schools, health care and social services) in the rural areas. This study may bring to attention the condition of women in these migration-deteriorated communities and how migration affects their lives. Women are the most affected from these circumstances, because they play such a central role to peasant and subsistence farming. Thus, they are not only losing important food sources from subsistence production, but they also become increasingly inactive as housewives in the cities. The Turkish economy did not create enough jobs, and patriarchal social orders placed constraints on women’s mobility by limiting their movement into the labor market (Dedeoglu, 2012).
Fifth, this research also provides a significant contribution to the application of the feminist standpoint theory to explore women farmers’ gender inequality experiences in rural communities. There was a lack of research using the feminist conceptual framework to explore the everyday life experiences of Turkish rural women who are historically silenced and marginalized. According to Haraway (1991) and Longino (1999), we can learn more by paying close attention to the unique perspectives, or standpoints, on social reality that women who have different positions in society may experience. By exploring gender inequality experiences of rural women farmers, policy makers, development planners, and organizations concerned with gender equality may have a better understanding of marginalization, gender roles, low schooling, migrations and gender, women’s access to resources and knowledge, and the lack of decision-making power in Turkey.

Finally, the results of this study cannot be transferred to either all women farmers in Turkey or women in different parts of the world. However, this study has contributed to the literature in identifying a range of standpoints from women farmers in the Konya province of Turkey, about how women interpret their gender inequality experiences from their position as producers working on small farms and in their households. The study results are only representative of those women who agreed to participate in interviews and focus groups.

**Clarification of Terms**

This section includes descriptions of frequently used terms in order to provide transparency concerning the use of terminology within this study. The intent of this section is to help clarify the use of these key concepts and terms throughout this research. **Women farmers and rural women** are used interchangeably for the purpose of this study, because nearly all rural women somehow engage in agricultural practices. Thus, these women include wives or girls in
households that provide most of the agricultural labor on the farm. Their work is generally defined as unpaid family work. **Unpaid work** refers to activities such as childcare, home cleaning and maintenance, agricultural work, subsistence production, volunteer work, and delivery of food (Beneria, 1999). This is an important labor area where the market does not have significant control (Mackintosh, 2000). These works are not remunerated as economic activity in national or international statistics on the work force, GNP, and national income (Beneria, 1999). In rural areas in Turkey, women are working on their own family farms, which is counted as unpaid work in the agricultural sector as an extension of their domestic work (Gulcubuk, 2010).

To define **sex, gender and gender roles**, gender term definitions from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), a specialized agency of the United Nations, were adopted for this study. **Sex** refers to the innate biological categories of male or female. **Gender** identifies the social roles and identities associated with what it means to be a man or a woman (FAO, 2011 p.4). It refers to the relationship between men and women, boys and girls, and how this is socially constructed. **Gender roles** are dynamic and change over time. **Gender roles** are learned behaviors in a given society/community, or other special group, that condition which activities, tasks and responsibilities are perceived as male and female. **Gender equity** entails the provision of fairness and justice in the distribution of benefits and responsibilities between women and men. The concept recognizes that women and men have different needs and power and that these differences should be identified and addressed in a manner that rectifies the imbalances between the sexes. **Gender equality** is the result of the absence of discrimination on the basis of a person's sex in opportunities and the allocation of resources or benefits or in access to services (IFAD, n/d.). **The gender division of labor** refers to different work that women and men generally do within the community or inside the home. It means men’s and women’s
activities in any society that are directly tied to socio-cultural patterns, that is, the distinct roles and norms assigned to women and men in a society (FAO, 2004; Mackintosh, 1984). In most farming systems there is a division of labor, which determines the different and complementary tasks for which men and women are responsible (FAO, 2004; Karl, 2008).

The patriarchy is an ideology of inferiority and subordination of women and gender inequalities in households and society at large. There are a range of patriarchal ideologies and gender constraints throughout societies. Patriarchy is not only men subordinating women but many other factors such as states, workplaces, cultural gender norms, religion, and women against women and girls. Although patriarchy has been previously defined in many ways, for the purposes of this research, I adopted the Hunnicutt (2009) definition which is, “it [patriarchy] means social arrangements that privilege males, where men as a group dominate women as a group, both structurally and ideologically—hierarchical arrangements that manifest in varieties across history and social space” (p. 557).

In Turkey, subsistence, semi-subsistence, and small-scale farming are important characteristics of traditional agricultural production and have always dominated agricultural food systems, because Turkish farms are historically small and fragmented in rural villages (Ozturk, 2012). A subsistence farm is one that produces food mainly to feed the farm family, with very limited surplus (if any) for sale on local informal markets or for barter. A semi-subsistence farm is one which produces enough surplus, beyond the family’s own needs, to sell for regular income. In simple terms, governments tend to regard farms of less than 1 hectare as subsistence, and 1 to 5 hectares as semi-subsistence. (Klaver & Kamphis, 2006). Small-scale farms are farms which operate less than 6 hectares (ha) of land in Turkey. According to a report by Klaver and Kamphis (2006), the 2001 agricultural census documented 3 million farms with an average
cultivated area per holding of about 6 ha. About 65 percent of agricultural holdings are smaller than 5 ha. The majority of these holdings are vegetable producers, which typically cultivate an area of less than 1 ha. **Family-owned farms** are owned by families (both men and women inherit land from their parents), but are operated by men (if present). Man, wife, and unmarried kids or married kids (if they live with parents) work all together and pool the income. The head of household is generally a senior man, and he controls income and resources.

The term **peasant** is defined here as rural dwellers who live off the land as farmers and/or semi-nomadic pastoralists combining subsistence and commodity production. **Depeasantization** and **deagrarianization** concepts were used as associated terminology in this study (Aydin, 2010; Kayder & Yenal, 2011; Ozturk, 2012). **Deagrarianization** is the process of moving the societal structure away from an agrarian mode toward something else (Kayder & Yenal, 2011). **Depeasantization** comprises the erosion of peasant practices and the substitution of market rationality in agriculture (McMichael, 2001). **Depeasantisation** can be seen as a specific form of **deagrarianisation** in which peasantries lose their economic capacity and social coherence, and shrink in size. The terminology of this phenomenon, called “**depeasantization**” implies that rural villagers, especially peasant farmers, are migrating to urban cities by leaving their lands and homes in rural areas in Turkey (Ozturk, 2012). Most of subsistence and semi-subsistence farmers’ children do not want to stay in the villages and take over their parents’ farms. Because cultivated lands are very small and fragmented in rural areas in Turkey, they are not adequate to produce income for the whole family.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study possesses several limitations. The first concern is related to time limitations for conducting the study. To do this study, I had travelled from the USA to Turkey for 3 months
to conduct all interviews and focus groups. Because of time restrictions, some of the interviews were conducted during the holy month of Ramadan in Turkey. Interviewees were fasting in long summer days. This may have been problematic in obtaining in-depth knowledge from them. This may have particularly affected interviews taking place in the afternoons.

In addition to this, there were other women present during some of the interviews used to collect data in this study. This may have caused women to provide some politically correct answers instead of speaking honestly. For example, the interview questionnaire has some questions related to how much land and livestock a family owns, or how much income was earned. Some of the participants avoided answering these questions. This may cause problems in describing the farming background of some participants in the study.

The second concern is related to power imbalance between a researcher and the participant. In this study, the target population is marginalized women farmers. Therefore, it is very hard to eliminate the power imbalance between the researcher and the participants. While I come from the same culture and grew up in a similar household, positioning myself among the participants (an insider), I could not necessarily eliminate power differences. I recognized that there were power imbalances, and that some were uninterested in participating in interviews with a researcher from an American University (outsider position). I tried to eliminate the power difference as much as I could to reach out to the women participants at their social level to obtain knowledge from them. To do this, I used my older sister’s (farmer like them) help as an informant to speak with participants in order to build relationships in some interviews. I started conversations with them talking about my village, or I tried to make a point of talking about my kids, telling them I am a mother and a wife etc. As a researcher, I placed myself on the participants’ side as an insider to encourage them to relate their experiences. In this sense, I am
in the outsider-within epistemological position in feminist standpoint theory (Harding, 1991). Being from the same culture, and especially growing up in a similar household gave me an advantage in grasping the reality of women farmers’ experiences.

The third concern is related to focus group process. According to Carey (1994) there are some disadvantages to using focus group interviews such as that the researcher has less control over the data generated; and data may be difficult to analyze (Carey, 1994). Even though women farmers talked more when in a group setting, and were encouraged by each other in the focus group sessions, there was a problem staying focused on the topics. They started talking about unrelated subjects or their health problems during sessions. Thus, I got some unrelated data, and also sometimes felt like I was losing control of the discussions. However, I managed to return participants to the topics by using my cultural competency. I really believe that the focus group methods can be useful for studying marginalized participants, particularly those with minimal education.

The fourth concern is related to the IRB process. The cross-cultural studies can be problematic sometimes for fulfilling IRB requirements. This research was carried out in Turkey, and participants were women farmers with limited educational levels and virtually no decision-making power. This presented a real challenge in securing informed consent forms signed by the participants. Women farmers do not want to sign the consent forms for a variety of reasons ranging from the fear of getting in trouble with their husbands to the fear of their personal information being used in scams. Some of the potential participants declined to participate in the research, merely because they did not want to sign a piece of paper. Although I was able to get a signed consent form from each participant, I spent quite some time explaining what IRB is and why I needed the consent forms to be signed for their benefit.
The fifth concern is related to the feminist nature of this research. Some principles drawn from the feminist theory might be viewed as taboo by village women because of the difference in culture, values, and low educational level. For example, some participants avoided talking about gender inequalities, gender division of labor and decision-making participation in households. They most likely felt that others may view them as breaking their cultural norms and values or their religious norms as well. They live in a certain family order; and cannot be isolated from their culture, their husband and family. There are several patriarchal relationships in the village social structure. They are born into that patriarchal structure and they only view life through this structure.

The final concern is related to some things being “lost in translation,” because the study was originally conducted and analyzed in Turkish, with results translated to English. This may be a matter of concern as some culturally-specific impressions and meanings can be lost in the translation to another language. Consequently, translation into another language may lose richness of data due to misinterpretation.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This study explores gender inequalities on small farming practices in Turkey. To better understand the context of this study, I have provided background information on: 1) gender division of labor (defining gender, gender roles, and gender division of labor) and the gender division of labor in agriculture and domestic work, 2) gendered aspects of small farming (e.g. women farmers’ workloads, unpaid (invisible works) and wage work, access to and control over resources, knowledge and decision making power on farming and household), (3) social culture around women farmers and their social class, 4) background information about small farming in Turkey and the study region, and 5) the agrarian change and effect on gender in Turkey since the 1980s (e.g. globalization, neoliberal policies on agricultural food system).

Gender Division of Labor

Defining Gender, Gender Roles and the Gender Division of Labor

Gender refers to the socially constructed roles and responsibilities of women and men (Boserup, 1970). The concept of gender also includes the expectations held about the characteristics, aptitudes, and likely behavior of both women and men (femininity and masculinity). The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), a specialized agency of the United Nations, defined gender as:

“The term gender refers to culturally based expectations of the roles and behaviors of men and women. The term distinguishes the socially constructed from the biologically determined aspects of being male and female. Unlike the biology of sex, gender roles and behaviors and the relations between women and men (gender relations) can change over time, even if aspects of these roles originated in the biological differences between sexes” (IFAD. n.d).

Thus, there are distinctions between gender and sex. Gender refers to a social construction, while sex refers to biological differences (Mackintosh, 1984). Gender roles are learned behaviors in a given society or community. They condition which activities, tasks, and
responsibilities are perceived as male and female (FAO, 2011; Mackintosh, 1984). These roles and expectations are learned, changeable over time, and vary within and between cultures (Boserup, 1970; FAO, 2011). In general, societies use the different gendered roles that stem from biological differences between women and men as the basis to divide their tasks both in the home and in the public sphere (Mackintosh, 1984; Quisumbing et al., 2014).

The gender division of labor refers to the different types of work that women and men generally do within the community or inside the home. It means men’s and women’s activities in any society that are directly tied to socio-cultural patterns, or the distinct roles and norms assigned to women and men in a society (Boserup, 1970; FAO, 2004; Mackintosh, 1984). Hence, in public spheres, male domination is well recognized, while women perform tasks in the household economy and in the domestic sphere (Bryson, 1996). It is necessary to analyze the division of labor and power relations of women and men in order to understand their dynamics. Every society is affected by gender differences, but these vary widely by culture and can change dramatically over time (Boserup, 1970; FAO, 2011). Factors such as education, technology, economic change, and sudden crises cause gender roles and the gender division of labor to change (Moser, 1989). By examining the gender division of labor it becomes evident that women’s and men’s tasks are interdependent, and that women generally carry the greater burden of unpaid work in the home and community (Beneria, 1999). Hence, the relations between women and men matter when investigating their access to, and control over resources, benefits, and decision-making processes (FAO, 2011).

**Gender Division of Labor in Agricultural Practices**

In most farming systems there is a division of labor, which determines the different and complementary tasks for which men and women are responsible (FAO, 2004; Karl, 2008). The
role of men and women in agricultural production vary from one place to another. Yet often, men and women share or divide tasks in agricultural production. Sometimes men and women have distinct tasks or responsibilities for different crops or livestock (Karl, 2008). Studies often identify some tasks as men's tasks and others as women's tasks around the world even though men and women both have important roles to produce food (FAO, 2011). Concerning division of labor, within Sub-Saharan Africa, males are often responsible for the physically intensive tasks such as initially clearing the land, tilling the soil, and marketing larger amounts of farm produce, whereas women are more involved in farming activities such as planting, weeding, harvesting, agro-processing, and marketing of small amounts of farm produce at the local market (Guyer, 1991). In Asian farming systems, men typically provide the labor in land preparation, and women provide labor in planting, cultivation, and crop care such as weeding (Quisumbing & McClafferty, 2006). In Turkey, women carry out planting, weeding, harvesting, postharvest processing, and selling small amount of produce (especially vegetable, egg, dairy products) at the local market on the farm. Men perform more physically intensive tasks such as mechanized work, soil preparation, spraying, irrigating, and selling large amounts of agricultural products (farm animals, cereal crops etc.) (Ilcan, 1994; Ozcatalbas & Akcaoz, 2010; Ozkan, et al., 2000; Savran Al-Haik, Friedel, & Niewolny, 2013). In fact, gender division of labor is essential in farming practices all over the world including Turkey. Nonetheless, gender division of labor in farming tasks results in differences in the priorities, motivations, opportunities, barriers, and knowledge of women and men. These differences in the gender division of labor have implications for the nature of poverty, marginalization, and vulnerability.

As in most developing countries, agriculture is the main occupation of nearly everybody in rural villages and is also the source of livelihood. Here, there is a division of farm labor by sex
and by type of crops or livestock to sustain agricultural production. Women are often marginalized in the agricultural food system to access assets. According to Kristjanson, et al. (2014) livestock are important assets for rural households because it is often easier for people in developing countries to acquire livestock assets. Men and women often manage different types of animals and are responsible for different aspects of animal care. However, even though women own livestock, it does not necessarily mean that women have the right to control or use products, or that they can participate in decision-making regarding management or sales (Kristjanson et al., 2014). Other setbacks associated with livestock assets owned by women include a lack of access to resources and to services for livestock health, production and marketing, and increased commercialization, particularly of milk and dairy enterprises (Kristjanson et al., 2014). Budak, et al. (2005) studied the role of women raising small ruminants in southern Turkey. They pointed out that households carry out farm works by themselves (they do not hire help), and that gender division of farm works are essential in their practices. Although tending animals involves both men and women, milking and making dairy products is always the task of women on small traditional farms in Turkey (Budak et al, 2005).

In Africa, for instance, women and men may have separate fields and crops, as well as some joint household plots and enterprises. Thus, cash and export crops are frequently regarded as men's crops and subsistence crops as women's crops (Hill & Vigneri, 2014). Given that women’s subsistence work is generally undervalued, Urdy (1996) pointed out that development agencies assumed that men were the sole farmers, and provided input and knowledge to men. They did not recognize that in some areas of Africa there is division of labor by crop, and that men and women may grow different crops. Therefore, women farmers were not given input and knowledge as farmers, which made women farmers seem less productive. With regard to
agricultural development, women’s access to appropriate information, given and received on a
timely basis, is critical to the development and use of technological innovations and
improvements. However, women frequently cannot obtain such information. Agricultural
research and development, including extension services, have been dominated by men and have
largely ignored women's role in crop production and women's needs for technology and
information (Durutan, 1994). Gender-responsive actions should enable women farmers to take
greater advantage of extension systems and increase the accessibility of new agricultural
technologies and innovations.

Several studies have particularly explained that men and women have different tasks,
knowledge, and preferences for raising livestock, choosing crops, and performing such activities
as selecting seed, planting, harvesting, and processing around the world (FAO, 2011). In the
book edited by Collinson (2000), researchers talked about their field experiences in farm
communities and how they misunderstood or underestimated the local culture and knowledge as
well as the role of women in agricultural production. For example, in Rwanda, scientists learned
from on-farm trials that women were the predominant bean-growers. In studies of farmer
evaluation, women bean-growers came to research stations to discuss varieties in the final stage
of selection. In another study in Peru, work in a community revealed, unexpectedly, that women,
rather than men, were the ones caring for the livestock. Researchers learned that they did not use
chemicals to treat parasites because of their high cost. Instead they used local treatments for
parasites. Scientists helped to organize a production research group to conduct trials based on
local plant and chemical dipping. Local leaves proved to be as efficient as the synthetic chemical
treatments but the plant from which the leaves came was scarce. Thus, women started to grow
this plant (Feldstein, 2000). Understanding gender differences in local knowledge and
recognizing the contribution women can make in this field are important, because women are more frequently involved in subsistence practices. Knowledge differences can reveal important opportunities to contribute to crop improvement or crop and variety selection. Knowledge differences must also be understood to improve the effectiveness of any technology dissemination or extension process. Research and extension systems can become more effective in developing sustainable agricultural systems if they adopt a gender perspective that enhances understanding of the distinct roles, needs and opportunities of men and women.

**Gender Division of Labor on Domestic Works**

Regarding household tasks in rural communities, women and girls generally carry out all household chores unassisted from male family members around the world (FAO, 2003). Because this domestic labor is categorized as women’s work, it legitimizes its lack of valuation and perpetuates an ideological construction placing social expectations and norms on women to perform such labor (Bryson, 1996). Thus, women’s household works are correspondingly devalued, for it is either unpaid, or limited by the demands of unpaid work in the home (Daniels, 1987; Mackintosh, 2000). To assign all domestic chores to women alone is nothing more than the typical patriarchal understanding of their role in the family and in society. Hence, rural women typically work longer hours than men, when one takes into account both farm labor and unpaid reproductive or domestic responsibilities (FAO, 2011). In this sense, women are simply overburdened.

In terms of gender division of labor regarding household works such as food preparation, child rearing, and other important maintenance functions, women’s work is excluded from the category of economic activity. In this regard, Bryson (1996) indicated that the household economy is associated with women while the market economy is associated with men.
Therefore, women primarily do the tasks that traditionally have been thought of as ‘‘women’s work’’ (e.g., care work, cooking, laundry, housecleaning), whereas men primarily do ‘‘male’’ tasks (e.g., heavy work, mechanized work) (Greenstein, 2000 p.323). Women are homemakers, care givers, wives and mothers, but their work is not paid a wage and so, as her work is not for the market, it is not considered economically significant (Beneria, 1999). Hence, these household chores are regarded as less important and it does not figure in the Gross National Product (GNP) and in the records of divorce settlements (Bryson, 1996; FAO, 2006). Since women and girls most often perform this type of labor, their unpaid efforts are largely unrecognized (Rathge, 1989). As a consequence, this unpaid household labor contributes to marginalization of women in the economy.

**Gendered Aspects of Small Farming**

**Women Farmers’ Workload in Agricultural Production**

Women’s contribution to agricultural production varies from country to country, but women play important roles in the development of rural and national economies (FAO, 2006). FAO (2003) estimates have shown that women represent a substantial share of the total agricultural labor force as individual food producers or as agricultural workers, and that around two-thirds of the female labor force in the developing economies are engaged in agricultural work. According to FAO (2011), women comprise 43 percent of the world’s agricultural labor force, on average, in developing countries. In Turkey, women perform 45.5 percent of the agricultural labor. Thus, the employment ratio of women in agriculture is 2.5 times higher than that of men in Turkey (Gulcubuk, 2010).

Many scholars have focused on the role that women play in agricultural production around the world. Their discussions about the importance of women’s role in food production in
developing countries stress women’s important role in growing, processing, and providing food to feed their families as well as care giving (Doss, 2014; FAO, 2011). In line with other developing countries, rural women in Turkey carry out many tasks in every stage of agricultural production including planting, post-harvest food processing, marketing, tending animals, milking and making dairy products, and providing food to their families (Budak et al., 2005; Ilcan, 1994; Ozcatalbas & Akcao, 2010; Ozkan, et al., 2000).

In Turkey, there are several empirical studies detailing the woman farmer’s workload in agriculture. In the Budak, et al. (2005) aforementioned study, it was outlined that women worked an average of 12.8 hours per day throughout the year, and an average of 2.8 hours related to small ruminant raising activities. Women and girls participated in tending animals and cleaning barns, yet they also milked the goats (94.0 percent), made yogurt and cheese, and sold the dairy products in the local bazaar. They pointed out that 82.2 percent of women participants were involved in handicraft activities like carpet and rug waving as well. Moreover, 45.5 percent of women were involved in subsistence vegetable growing in small gardens, and provided labor towards growing wheat and barley in family owned semi-arid land. This is typical within village semi-subsistence farming practices, and women are major workers in Turkey.

In another published article, Ozkan et al, (2000) investigated the role of women in vegetable farming in the Antalya province of Turkey. Their results suggested that women mainly did planting, hoeing, and harvesting, working an average of 8 to 9 hours each day. In comparison, they spent 64.5 percent of their time on growing vegetables and 22.6 percent of their time on household work. They pointed out that women work around the year because of the sub-tropic nature of the climate region allowing them to grow vegetables in at least three different growing seasons. In my study of the same region, women farmers indicated that whenever there
is work needed to be done on the family farm, they deliver regardless of what time of the day it is (Savran Al-Haik et al., 2013). Certainly, these studies suggest that women farmers provide substantial labor in agricultural production in Turkey.

**Women’s Unpaid Work (Invisible Work)**

Despite women’s substantial work on the farm, many scholars have drawn attention to the unrecognized contribution of women in sustaining farm production (Sachs, 1983, Beneria, 1999). Women farmer’s work is not remunerated, labeled as unpaid family work, and is not even recognized in official statistics (Alston, 1998; Beneria, 1999; Daniels, 1987; Gulcubuk, 2010; Mackintosh, 2000). However, these studies are clear that in agriculture, women’s contribution is often unrecognized and unfairly rewarded. Thus, like so much of women's work, much of women's agricultural work is rendered invisible or devalued (Sachs, 1983). As a consequence, this non-economic or unpaid work goes unnoticed and is not reflected in the design of agricultural policies (FAO, 2006). This neglect of women’s “invisible labor” contributes to the marginalization of women in the economy.

To understand the paid and unpaid nature of women’s work, it is better to define what “work” is. According to Mackintosh (2000 p.122), two types of work are carried out. One type of work is paid labor, usually for wages, but including self-employment in production and trade. The other is unpaid work. The tasks often categorized as women’s work, done at home, are generally referred to as “domestic labor” or “housework” for the family or household well-being. Mackintosh described that the concept of “domestic” has been used in two distinct ways. It has been applied to all work done within the home, and more narrowly to work servicing the household. In another study, Beneria (1999) described that unpaid work includes activities such as childcare, home cleaning and maintenance, agricultural work, subsistence production,
volunteer work, and delivery of food. This is also an important labor area where market relations do not have significant control. For instance, a mother’s work in nurturing her child is considered non-work, is not economically rewarded, and is not generally acknowledged. Mothers who care for young children have their time and energy fully occupied with socially useful and necessary work, but find themselves classified as dependents within the society rather than workers or full citizens (Bryson, 1996). With regard to this definition of work, so much of the work performed by women in agriculture and households is unpaid and “invisible” in terms of market criteria or even in terms of socially dominant perceptions of what constitutes “work” (Daniels, 1987 p.405).

Nevertheless, many studies stress that the economic value of the unpaid work that women do is significant and must be acknowledged. Still, unpaid work is not remunerated as economic activity in national or international statistics on the work force, GNP, and national income (Beneria, 1999; Daniels, 1987; FAO, 2006; Gulcubuk, 2010). As Mackintosh, (2000) highlighted, it is important to be clear about the boundary between market work and the domestic economy, for it is not simply a matter of where the work is performed. Beneria (1999) also pointed out that women’s unpaid agricultural labor is highly integrated with domestic activities (e.g. household gardening, the fetching of wood and water, tending animals, and many other tasks). She stressed that the distinction between the conventional classifications of family labor (in agriculture) and domestic work is very thin, and a clear-cut line is difficult to draw (Beneria, 1999). All these market works are somehow linked to unpaid labor at home. For example, the housewife work has neither monetary value in the market nor a quantitative measure. It is work in the domestic economy, where labor is not awarded a wage. This work is undertaken to meet human needs directly rather than to supply the market (Women's Work Study Group, 1975). Therefore, housework is not carried out within the labor market, and domestic work is not
subject to market or organizational control and is not remunerated (Daniels, 1987). However, these works are very important for family wellbeing.

Society finds many ways to devalue certain kinds of work, and to deny that they are actually work at all. Just as women are stereotyped as naturally nurturing, Leonard (1994) asserted that the gendered division of labor within the household feeds an ideology based on the notion that women are naturally good at certain types of work, and paves the way for the occupational segregation of the labor market into male and female jobs.

Unpaid work puts women in a vulnerable position within the household and society. Thus, Lois Bryson (1996 p. 211) traces the development of, and critiques the “gendered yardstick” of economic value. While clearly supporting official recording and recognition of the existence of unpaid work, she draws attention to the key question, “Who benefits?” from women’s unequal responsibility for this work. The greater burden of unpaid work leads to limited career opportunities, reduced access to positions of power and authority within the society, the vulnerability of women and their children to poverty in the event of divorce, and the likelihood of very poor access to superannuation benefits on retirement (Bryson, 1996). In addition, it is the gendered nature of unpaid work that prevents women from being recognized as breadwinners, even when they are engaged in paid employment (Bryson, 1996 p. 217).

The descriptions of women’s unpaid invisible works from the literature cited above are reflective of women’s work in Turkey, and particularly women farmers. These women shoulder both agricultural work and domestic work, but their agricultural labor on family farms are unpaid and invisible because their works have not been presented in national statistics (Rad et al, 2012; Gulcubuk, 2010). As an example, Karkiner (2009 p.78) studied rural women’s workload in the Alibeyli village in the Izmir province of Turkey. She described the village women’s heavy,
unpaid workloads both in the household and the field. In her study, 59 percent of the surveyed women in Alibeyli village identified themselves as unpaid family workers compared to 29 percent who denied that they were unpaid family workers. These unpaid works include all kind of field work, growing vegetables, animal tending, and household works (Karkiner, 2009). Above all, considering rural women in Turkey generally live for a while with the husband’s extended family after marriage (Kandiyoti, 1988), rural women are under the heavy burden of unpaid work.

**Women Wage Work in Agricultural Production**

According to FAO (2006) agriculture is an important component of the economy of many developing countries including Turkey, as it significantly contributes to domestic production and employment. Women provide a large proportion of agricultural labor. As FAO noted, women represent an important share of the total agricultural labor force, as individual food producers or as agricultural workers, and around two-thirds of the female labor force in developing countries are engaged in agricultural work. Thus, women comprise 43 percent of the world’s agricultural labor force, on average, in developing countries (FAO, 2011). As Gulecubuk (2010) reported, of all the working women, 45.5 percent are in agriculture, which translates to one out of every two women working in the agricultural sector. He also emphasized that women’s employment ratio in agriculture is 2.5 times higher than that of men, and can be understood within the context that men move to non-agricultural job areas while women tend to stay in agricultural work (Ozturk, 2012).

Turkey is one of those countries with a gender gap in the employment of women. According to Ilkkaracan (2012), based on official government statistics from 2009, only 26 percent of the adult women in Turkey participated in the labor market compared to 71 percent of
men. Nevertheless agriculture is the prime source of employment for women, and the majority of those jobs (91 percent) are unpaid (Ilkkaracan, 2012). Rural women face considerable structural challenges including migration, declining agriculture employment nationwide, a lack of education, and an unsupportive legal environment for agricultural workers (Landig, 2011). Thus, these jobs in agriculture sector are seasonal, insecure, low paid, and challenging including little or no health benefits and no legal support for setting wages or securing jobs. Hence, most agricultural workers have no social and health protection (Akkaraca Kose, 2012; Gulcubuk, 2010). Furthermore, many women do not control their income when they work as wage laborers.

The relevance of agriculture is still significant in terms of employment opportunities. Here, low incomes and seasonality of work could represent important factors affecting the poverty and social marginalization of women.

**Women Farmer’s Access to and Control over Resources and Decision-Making Power**

The Food and Agriculture Organization’s State of Food and Agriculture 2010–2011 report emphasized women’s contributions to agriculture in developing countries, and highlighted the need to close the gender gap in access to agricultural resources and services (FAO, 2011). The FAO also noted that women farmers face a number of constraints stemming from gender inequality including limited access to farmland, inputs and technology, education, information, and financial and extension services, all of which adversely affect their productivity and hinder progress on broader economic and social development goals (FAO, 2011). Moreover, constraints on women’s access to resources and services is compounded by cultural norms and values resulting in lower levels of productivity, as documented in the same report on gender gaps. These include restrictions on rural women’s behavior and mobility, their reproductive work burden, and gender inequalities in education, health, and labor (FAO, 2011). All these gender inequalities
lead to unequal control of productive resources, which tend to create a barrier for women to invest in increasing productivity. Gender inequalities erode women's ability to access and manage land and other productive resources, and pose as a significant barrier to promoting their economic security and self-reliance.

Access to land is a basic requirement for farming in many areas of the world. Strengthening women’s access to and control over land is an important means of raising their status and influence within households and communities (FAO, 2011). However, women are often disadvantaged in both legal and customary land tenure systems. Women have always had less access to land even though their land rights are protected by legal systems in many countries including Turkey (Meinzen-Dick et al., 2014). Still, women get less land or infertile lands because these norms and laws are usually gendered in their application. For example, in Turkey by law, the land is equally divided among siblings after the decease of the parents, but in customary land tenure arrangements, men generally take better land than women. This is because in Turkish culture, women move to the husband’s land after marriage (Kandiyoti, 1988), and they became a member of their husband’s family. Even the husband does not have control over land until his father grants it to him or passes away. Thus, rural women remain at a severe disadvantage with respect to the ownership and control of land assets in rural areas. As a consequence of customary land tenure arrangements, women are not granted access to credit, input, and training that might result in increased productivity in agriculture (FAO, 2006). Furthermore, because women do not hold the title to their land, they are unable to obtain any monetary benefits from its sale as well (FAO, 2006).

Access to financial services is a challenge for women in rural areas. In the above-mentioned report, FAO notes that while all smallholders face constraints in their access to
financial resources, “In most countries the share of female smallholders who can access credit is 5–10 percentage points lower than for male smallholders” (FAO 2011, p. 38). In Turkey, Gulcubuk (2010) pointed out that the percentage of women who obtain credit is less than 1%. Hence, lack of access to credit constrains women as food producers, and results in lower levels of output, as documented in FAO’s report on gender gaps in agriculture (FAO, 2011). Women face gender bias in their access to credit. This contributes to economic disempowerment, migration, and social disruption in rural areas (Feltscher & Kenney, 2014).

Access to decision-making power is another setback for women farmers, even though development planners have begun to realize that gender inequality means more than which gender provides the most labor in a particular system. Gender inequality also involves an analysis of who makes decisions on resource allocation and marketing, and who receives and controls the money (Feldstein, 2000). The FAO report shows that men control resources and money, and rural women are often marginalized in decision-making on farm production, and in controlling resources and money around the world (FAO, 2011). Thus, in the rural areas, women generally have a lack access to decision-making on resources and money on the farm. In my study in Turkey, women farmers pointed out that they participated in decisions on what to produce on the farm, but that men generally managed and controlled money. They even avoided claiming to save any money for themselves when selling produce from home (Savran Al-Haik et al., 2013). Apparently, women’s decision-making power intersects with cultural norms and values including age, marital status, income status, and education level in Turkey (Kandiyoti, 1987). However, men generally manage income and resources, and have decision making power in rural areas.
Social Culture around Women Farmers in Rural Villages in Turkey

There is an examination of different forms of social institutions which constrain or otherwise affect women’s status and roles in rural communities in developing countries including Turkey. Women’s works and perceived morals are influenced by cultural norms such as religion, political ideology, type of kinship system, or other cultural norms such as the importance of fertility and purity of girls (Brydon & Chant, 1989). According to Stivachtis and Georgakis, (2008) social life in Turkey is influenced by both Mediterranean culture and Islamic morals and values. Although Turkey is a secular state, Turkish society is predominantly an Islamic society in which Islamic morals and values are applied to daily life (Hart, 2007). Hence, religion has a very important effect on both culture and the gender relations (Stivachtis & Georgakis, 2008). In Islam, men are seen in public space while women retain their roles as mothers and wives in private space. Women are seen in the context of the family, not as individuals (Arat, 2005). Thus, Islam is a sex-segregated religion, and women are bearers of the moral values. In this sense, women are perceived as vulnerable individuals who must be kept safe at all times, and their sexuality controlled. That is why strict external restrictions are placed on women, which may range from total isolation and covering to severe restrictions of their mobility and their entry into public places (Kandiyoti, 1988).

In Mediterranean culture, traditionally, women live in domestic spheres maintaining the responsibilities of wife and motherhood roles. This Mediterranean family structure is rooted in patriarchy in which the male dominates and has superior status (Stivachtis & Georgakis, 2008). In this male dominated social structure, women are perceived as “men’s honor,” and a husband is principally responsible for a woman’s honor (Kandiyoti, 1988, p.279). In this sense, women play a direct role in the social status of their husbands. Hence, women have an important role in
carrying out this patriarchic male superiority structure. As Stivachtis and Georgakis (2008, p.5) described, “This embedded concept of ‘honor,’ especially as related to women’s purity, is a strong characteristic of Mediterranean culture.” This leads to the idea that the “honor” of a family is dignified through the virginity and purity of the female family members (Stivachtis & Georgakis, 2008 p.5). Female sexual purity is connected to family, or lineage honor (Kandiyoti, 1987). In this context, men claim the right to defend their own honor by maintaining the honor of their female relatives. Thus, women are expected to be modest and sexually pure in order to preserve the honor of their families. If they shame her family through disapproved actions, they can be subject to severe violence. Since the representation of family honor is a woman’s purity, families are very protective of girls in public space and control girl’s sexuality.

The Turkish social structure is patrilineal in which the typical household comprises a segment of a patrilineage (usually a father, his sons, and grandchildren), their wives, children, and sometimes more distant kin. Kandiyoti (1988, p.282) categorized Turkish social culture as a classic patriarchic structure. In this classical patriarchy, she stated that, “The domination of younger men by older men and the shelter of women in the domestic sphere were the hallmarks of a system in which men controlled some form of viable joint patrimony in land, animals, or commercial capital” (Kandiyoti, 1988, p.282). Thus, in Turkish rural social life, there are several patriarchal relationships in the village social structure, older women to young women, men to women, and women to women. Not surprisingly, women are embedded in this patriarchal structure and they only view life through this structure. Hence, in Turkish social structure, particularly rural villages, brides are required to leave their parents’ home and join the husband’s extended family household. Within this patrilineal social structure, Kandiyoti (1987 p.331) described that a young bride comes to her husband's household at an extreme disadvantage as she
will be subordinated not only to all men in the family but also to senior women, especially the mother in-law, and sister in-laws with established seniority. In this context, the young bride is not only at the bottom of the social hierarchy (Kandiyoti, 1987), but also shoulders farm work and household chores in the household with silent acceptance (Karkiner, 2009). Women’s power is acquired through seniority and by bearing male heirs. They gain status as they give birth to children, especially boys, and gain their acceptance in their husbands’ families. Finally, when the couple separates from the extended family, or the father-in-law dies, a woman establishes her separate nuclear household and comes into her own. She gains main influence and power when her grown sons bring their brides (Kandiyoti, 1987). Thus, women play important roles in maintaining patriarchal social order, and this is passed on through the generations.

Rural women live in a certain patriarchal family order, and they have lower social status and opportunities compared to urban women. Gündüz-Hosgör and Smith (2006, p. 1) studied the status of women by comparing women living in the countryside with women living in towns within different regions of Turkey. They focused on differences in socio-economic status, gender role attitudes, and freedom or "autonomy" among the women in their research. Their results revealed that there are huge differences in these respects among women from different regions, and between women living in the countryside and women living in towns. Town women have better opportunities in education and income, but they have more dependence on their husband since very few of them have paid jobs. Village women generally have more freedom of movement and better access to public space as long as they stay within the borders of their own villages. Yet village women tend to accept the traditional gender role attitudes more often than women in the towns. Their results described that women themselves also internalized male dominance by approving (half of the countryside women and some 40 percent of the town
women) with the statements that, “important decisions should be made by men,” “men are wiser than women,” and "women should not argue with men.” However, the majority of study participants disagree with the statement that, "it is better for a male child to have education" (Gündüz-Hosgör & Smith, 2006 p.20). They attributed this to the success of educational reforms.

Turkish women were granted many rights after the establishment of the republic in 1923 such as the banning of polygamy, increased minimum age of marriage for females, required female permission for marriage, the outlawing of a husband’s one-sided right to divorce by giving both spouses the right to seek legal divorce, and allowing the mother the custody of minor children in the case of the father’s death (Kandiyoti, 1988). For example, Turkish women voted in a general election for the first time without any of the activities of suffrage movements in 1934. These rights are handed over to Turkish women without the activities of women's movements by the reformist leaders devoted to the goals of modernization and "Westernization” (Kandiyoti, 1988 p.320). However, the majority of women in Turkey did not benefit from these reforms and rights, particularly those in rural areas. This is because reforms remained limited to upper- and middle-class women in urban cities (Dedeoglu, 2012). Dedeoglu (2012) stated that the Turkish state continues to impose women’s role in society as mothers and wives. Thus, until recently, even Turkish Civil Code described women’s roles as mothers and wives generating dependent citizen roles for women. She supports this notion by listing some rules from former civil code such as: 1) a man is the head of household. 2) a woman is deprived of her rights of inheritance, 3) a woman may not work without her husband's permission, 4) if divorce happens, both parties retain the goods that they owned prior to the marriage and goods that they acquired in their name during the marriage, 5) a woman who commits adultery is subject to more severe punishments, etc. (Dedeoglu, 2012). These rules left women economically vulnerable, dependent
on the husband or father for social security, and helped to maintain the patriarchal social order in the family and in the society. Even though the Civil Code was changed in 2002, the preexisting social orders did not change easily. For example, Dedeoglu stated that the employment rate for women decreased from 30 percent to 28 percent between 1988 and 1998, and fell to 22 percent in 2008. Women are still dependent citizens, and possess low participation in the labor force (Dedeoglu, 2012). She also proposed that granting gender equality in legal scripts is not sufficient to implement gender equality without affirmative programs with a majority of women. Nevertheless, in Turkey, women are still economically vulnerable, dependent on the husband or father for social security, and live in the patriarchal social order in the family and in the society.

**Access to Basic Education and Information in Agriculture**

**Access to Education**

Education is one of the most critical areas of empowerment for women, as both the United Nations Cairo and Beijing conferences affirmed. Yet the gender gap in education is a well-known reality in developing countries. It is important to recognize that the barriers to education facing women in the developing world go far beyond simple economics. Cultural bias, tradition, infrastructure, and safety concerns often stand in the way. Unfortunately, the gender gap in education is particularly severe in rural areas because of low income, infrastructure and sociocultural values (FAO, 2011).

Sociocultural beliefs and practices, particularly for girls, play a role in educational outcomes around the world including Turkey. Women face considerable gender-related constraints and vulnerabilities compared to men because of existing structures in households and societies (World Bank, 2009). Thus, inequalities women experience in education stem from the larger problem of gender inequality in most developing societies. The patriarchal structure of
these societies sets a lower or subordinate status for women in the society (Gannon, 1998). The lower social value of women influences their well-being and access to health services, education, nutrition, and work (Paolisso & Leslie, 1995). Thus, an individual’s biological sex determines the first basic divide in all societies in terms of quality of life, position on the social hierarchy, and chance of survival (Epstein, 2007 p.2). Gender inequalities begin at childhood. In such societies, because of the differential social evaluations of sons and daughters, girls receive less care, including education and medical care, than boys (Larme, 1997; Miller, 1997). For example, women and girls in the developing world are often denied opportunities for education. Girls are not sent to school, or are taken away from school if the family needs their labor, if there are safety concerns, or if there are scarce economic sources (Rankin & Aytac, 2006). Starting from a very early age, women are subordinated form education opportunities that would benefit them in adulthood.

Rankin and Aytac (2006) studied gender inequality in schooling in Turkey. They used a nationally representative sample of Turkish youths, and assessed the effects of macrostructure, family resources, and cultural attitudes and practices on primary and postprimary school attainment. Their results indicated that locality, family resources, and family structure and culture influence the education of both genders. Girls' chances of postprimary schooling are greater if they live in metropolitan areas and in less patriarchal families. They indicated that there is gender disparity between boys and girls in education attainment in Turkey, which is particularly severe in rural areas. This is because children of rural families are expected to participate in household chores and farm work, interfering with their schooling and lowering their attainment. Also Turkish rural culture is often defined as patriarchal with a severe gender divide in which girls have lower status compared to boys. Thus, cultural norms and beliefs that
privilege males over females are associated with wide gender disparities in the educational attainment of girls (Rankin & Aytac, 2006).

The quality of education is lower in rural areas due to both educational infrastructure and the level of staff qualification. Students living in rural villages may have more difficulties accessing education because they have to travel every day. As a consequence of the decline in the number of rural schools linked to a strategy of grouping schools, the primary and secondary schools in rural areas are now less accessible in terms of distance that students have to cover, and higher costs for families. According to Rad et al., (2012), lack of family income and lack of infrastructure are the most important obstacles to girls’ education in the mountain villages of the Mersin province of Turkey. They also pointed out that rural women want their daughters to get an education for a better livelihood, but at the same time cannot afford to send them to school in the city. Besides limited resources, rural kids often take on part of the labor in agricultural practices and household tasks, which interferes with their schooling and lowers their attainment especially for the post-primary level (Rankin & Aytac, 2006).

According to the Turkish Statistic Institute, gender gaps in the primary school and lower secondary levels for 2013/2014 have closed in recent years. Also the gender gap in education has narrowed over the last decades at the upper secondary level with 94.59 percent, and at the higher education level with 89.24 percent in 2013/2014 (TUIK, 2015). Turkey passed a bill for 8-year compulsory education in 1997, and the 12 years (4+4+4) stratified compulsory education bill in 2012 (TUIK, 2015). Based on these statistics, ever since the new organizations in education systems have been implemented, the gender gap has gradually declined at all levels of education (see table at appendix M). However, it should be noted that education systems in Turkey do not assure equal opportunity to every child in terms of accessing quality education and accessing
higher education (Rankin & Aytac, 2006). Essentially, Turkey has enrollment exams for better high schools and universities. These exams are very competitive and very costly to families (Tansel & Bircan, 2006). Kids from families with limited resources and rural agricultural small holders find it hard to make it through to these special high schools and universities, because families cannot cover the expenditure of private tutoring (Tansel & Bircan, 2006). Thus, the educational attainment is significantly lower in rural than in urban areas (Rankin & Aytac, 2006). Even though the level of education is looking better among the genders in recent years, there is still a problem of illiteracy among adults that affects mainly rural areas.

**Access to Information and Training in Agriculture**

   Many developing countries have invested considerably in complex organizations (e.g. extension services, farm cooperatives, research institutions, etc.) to advance technological innovation and increase productivity in agriculture. Many of these institutions have overlooked women and have marginalized women farmers in terms of technology adoption, and training and information (FAO, 2011). Gender inclusive actions should enable women farmers to take greater advantage of extension systems and increase the accessibility of new agricultural technologies and innovations. Women farmers in Turkey and other developing countries experience a knowledge gap in farm practices relative to their male counterparts. According to FAO (2011), rural women often have less access to new agricultural technologies, education, and extension training around the world. Similarly, in Turkey, women farmers have less access to agricultural information and innovations in agriculture (Boyaci, 2010; Kizilaslan, 2007; Rad et al., 2012; Ozcatalbas & Akcaoz, 2010). However, extension services devoted very little time and resources to women farmers in Turkey (Boyaci, 2010; Kizilaslan, 2007; Ozcatalbas & Akcaoz, 2010). Women’s workloads, social and cultural constraints, and their domestic obligations made it more
difficult for them to access training as well. Thus, women’s lack of access to information and knowledge hampers their ability to participate equally with men in the agricultural sector.

Many studies, particularly FAO studies, emphasize that women are not getting enough extension education, and face constraints due to their gender that reduce their productivity in agriculture (FAO, 2003; FAO, 2011). Generally, around the world, women farmers are overlooked by extension services. Roughly 5% of the extension education is directed to women farmers (FAO, 2003). In Turkey the numbers are not much better, and extension services simply do not serve enough women farmers. As Budak et al. (2005) indicated, few extension programs were presented and only 3% women participated in their study region. Boyaci (2010) stated that 7.6% of women farmers are targeted by extension services. These statistics highlighted that women farmers are simply disregarded as producers by extension services.

Furthermore, even when extension services are directed to teach women farmers, either these programs are not useful for women’s works or women cannot attend because of their workloads in the household and on the farm. Rad et al. (2011) researched what kind of education women farmers sought from the Mersin province of Turkey. The results of their study revealed that rural women (21-36 years of age) in Mersin wanted to receive training in animal tending, plant production, carpet weaving, food processing, nutrition, and family planning. They also indicated that women’s participation in various training programs was moderately low. The majority of women who participated in extension training viewed the training as not useful, and the information given as impractical and irrelevant to their daily farm works (Rad et al., 2011). Further, women farmers wanted training that was directly related to their work on the farm. They particularly asked for extension education in technology transfer related to their work to ease
their workload, and to create more efficient use of time in their household and farm (Rad et al., 2012). The little education directed to them should be beneficial to their farm practices.

Turkey has well-established extension services across the state. Even province and district extension services have separate units for women, but these separate extension units are devoted to home economics. These generally touch on agricultural matters only insofar as they relate to nutrition and family welfare (Ozcatalbas & Akcaoz, 2010). Simply women are not targeted effectively by extension services (Klaver & Kamphis, 2006). However, women farmers also have difficulties attending (the already limited) extension education programs because of their household responsibilities (FAO, 2011). As Kizilaslan (2007) reported, there were major factors limiting the women’s access to extension education in Turkey: 1) insufficient time, 2) lack of training, 3) social structure, and 4) poverty. These constraints block women’s participation to offered extension programs. With regard to agricultural productivity and development, women’s access to appropriate information, given and received on a timely basis, is critical to the development and use of technical innovations and improvements, yet women frequently cannot obtain such information (FAO, 2003). Agricultural research and development, including extension services, have been dominated by men and have largely ignored women's role in crop production and women's needs for technology and information (Durutan, 1994). Gender-responsive actions should enable women farmers to take greater advantage of extension systems and increase the accessibility of new agricultural technologies and innovations.

Recently, according to the MFAL official website, MFAL has focused on improving rural women’s livelihood with nationwide launched projects such as the “Women Farmers Extension Education Project,” and “Rural Women Social Economic Development Project.” These projects
are supported by FAO in three provinces of Turkey (MFAL, 2014). It is rather encouraging to finally see MFAL including women farmers in farm practice extension programs.

**Agrarian Change and Gender**

**Background of agriculture in Turkey**

Turkey has 24 million hectares (ha) of agricultural land, which represents about 20 percent of the European Union’s (27 countries) (EU-27) agricultural land (Akkaraca Kose, 2012). It has a large amount of agricultural land compared to many countries in the world. Nevertheless, small-scale semi-subsistence farming has always dominated the structure of agriculture in Turkey because Turkish farms are historically small and fragmented (Akkaraca Kose, 2012; Ozturk, 2012). According to a report by Klaver and Kamphis (2006), the 2001 agricultural census documented 3 million farms with an average cultivated area per holding of about 6 ha. About 65 percent of agricultural holdings are smaller than 5 ha. The majority of these holdings are vegetable producers, which typically cultivate an area of less than 1 ha. Thus, small-scale farming is still a main characteristic of the country’s agriculture even though Turkey is categorized as a newly industrialized nation (Ozturk, 2012).

Agriculture is still a very vital component of the Turkish economy, despite the fact that its share in GDP has shrunk in recent years. It constituted 8.8% of Turkey’s GDP in 2012, 8.3% in 2013 and 8.0% in 2014 (Akkaraca Kose, 2012; World Bank, 2015). According to Aydin (2010, p.180), implementing free market policies have increased a process of “de-agrarianization” in Turkey where the share of agriculture in the GDP has declined from 24.2 percent in 1980 to 10.3 percent in 2005. He also indicated that there has been a significant drop in the percentage of people working in agriculture from 54.2 per cent in 1980 to 27.5 percent in 2006. The total number of people working in agriculture has declined from 8.08 million in 2001
to 6.08 million in 2006 (Aydin, 2010). The Turkish rural population continues to drop dramatically.

According to the Turkish government statistic institute, the urban population ratio was 77.3 percent compared to the rural ratio of 22.7 percent in 2012, but the urban population ratio was 91.3 percent compared to the rural ratio of 8.7 percent in 2013 (TUIK, 2014). It should be noted that the local governance structures were changed in Turkey in 2013. After local governance restructuring happened, rural villages were included in cities as neighborhoods. This meant that rural villages became part of urban cities on paper. That affected the urban/rural population ratio dramatically. Sudden change in the governance structure of villages brought migration-deteriorated villages nothing but more fees on infrastructure such as water, electricity, trash, housing, and so on. It is an unavoidable irony that the total population of Turkey is 77,695,904 (urban: 71,286,182 and rural: 6,409,722) in 2014 (TUIK, 2014). It is puzzling whether to treat rural villages as urban or rural. They are still the same old villages with low infrastructure.

**Background of Small Farming and Study Region**

This study focused on women farmers from the south of the Konya (il/vilayet) province in the central Anatolian region of Turkey. The central Anatolian region is a semi-arid zone with low erratic rainfall (300-600 mm) per annum. This region occupies 21% of the total area of Turkey with its 151,000 square kilometers of land. It is the second largest region out of seven geographic zones in Turkey. Regarding agricultural livelihoods systems, this region is known as the “cereal storage of Turkey,” where mostly cereal crops such as wheat and barley are produced by mechanized agricultural techniques. This region includes arid grazing areas, and animal husbandry is a common economic activity in the villages as well. Depending on the availability
of irrigation (underground or ground irrigation systems), sugar beets, and a variety of fruits (apple, pears, cherry, sour cherry, plums etc.) and vegetables (tomatoes, pepper, cucumber, melon, eggplant, bean etc.) are grown. The countryside of the Central Anatolia region has poorly developed infrastructure, and migration to the cities is common (Gunduz, Hosgor, & Smits, 2006).

The study region is located on the Mediterranean border of the Central Anatolia region surrounded by the Taurus mountain chains. Given that it is surrounded by high mountains, the agricultural land is rough and not uniform on mountainous areas, but also fertile on the plain land. That is why some villages are categorized as mountain villages. Like most of the farming community in Turkey, farmers in study region are small or semi-subsistence farmers who do mixed farming (grow a variety of crops, cereal crops, vegetables, chicken and raise livestock), mostly for home consumption and for sale at local farmer’s markets and local whole sale markets. In the mountain villages and towns, animal husbandry such as goats, sheep, and cows are raised in comparison to the prairie villages and towns where cereal crops, vegetables, and fruits are common practice. Overall, aside from animal husbandry, the major crops are cereal crops, potatoes, vegetables, sugar beet, apple, pear, strawberry, dry beans, chickpea and grape (TUIK, 2010).

Globalization of Agricultural Food System

Important changes have taken place in the agricultural food system in developing countries since the 1980’s. According to Ozturk (2012) the world’s agriculture system is changing due to neoliberal free market policies imposed on developing countries by International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB), and the rules of the World Trade Organization (WTO). The promise of neoliberal policies is to stimulate economic growth through “free
market" strategies (Brohman, 1995; Tabb, 2001). However, according to McMichael (2001), trade liberalization through elimination of all barriers to “free trade,” minimum import requirements, and tariff and producer subsidy reductions opened up competition between developing countries’ agriculture (peasant farming) and high tech West farming corporations. However, neoliberal policies favor business/ corporate goals over social goals (Brohman, 1995; Tabb, 2001). With free trade agreements in place, developing countries open up their borders and permit the promotion of big agro-industrial corporations and international trade in the agricultural food system, having disadvantageous effects on local and national food production and especially small farmers (Aydin, 2010; McMichael, 2001). Women are most affected by these transnational food corporations, because they lose most of the work from subsistence farming production and income from marketing in local markets. Hence, trade integration in the developing countries actually resulted in decreased well-being and increased the food insecurity of local population (Austin, McKinney & Thompson, 2012). Also, the ungoverned market (free market) increased the world’s inequality and poverty because the developing countries’ domestic small business and small farmers could not compete with corporate farmers and TNCs (Stiglitz, 2002). As a consequence of controlling food and agriculture systems, these corporations have dominated world food production, and small farmers and peasant farmers lose their livelihood from agricultural production (Shiva, 2000).

Globalization has increased export-oriented agriculture that can prompt investment in the production of cash crops for export, rather than local food production (Aydin, 2010). For example, according to Ferolin and Dunaway (2013), export-oriented aquaculture supported by the Philippines government diminished small-scale fishponds targeting domestic markets. Consequently, exports of commercial fishing increased dramatically, while the livelihoods of the
majority of fishing families have been worsened. This not only resulted in the local peasant
fishers’ debt bondage, but also generated “depeasantization” in local communities
(disappearance of small farmers and fishers). Export-led agriculture or aquaculture has degraded
environmental and ecological sources for local people as well (Dunaway & Macabuac, 2007;
Dunaway & Macabuac-Ferolin, 2013). Some of the consequences were increased food insecurity
and malnutrition of local people, loss of land to shrimp farming, and not enough land for rice
farming (Dunaway & Macabuac, 2007). Moreover, export-oriented development also led to
monoculture agriculture, so traditional mixed farming systems in developing countries gradually
perished (McMichael, 2001). Local people lost nourishing and culturally sound diverse foods
(Shiva, 2000).

Globalization of Turkish Agriculture Systems

Turkey was amongst the league of countries that can produce enough food to feed its own
population. In fact, Turkey was one of the fortunate countries in terms of agricultural fertile land,
climate, and rich flora. Historically, the Turkish economy was dependant on agriculture, and the
majority of the population was living in the countryside. Government policies have shaped
agriculture from the very early years of the republic up until the 1980s (Ozturk, 2012). This era
is called “the national–developmentalist era.” The commodification of inputs and outputs, and
the integration of agriculture into the national economy, had been largely shaped by state policy
during this period (Keyder & Yenal, 2011, p.82). In this period the government controlled
organizations and cooperatives.

In the recent period starting from the 1980s, the state focused on industrial development
with dismantling and privatization of most of the state owned agricultural organizations. Turkey
is committed to the free market and globalization of its agro-food system with various trade
agreements and regulations (Ozturk, 2012). The chronological order of free trade agreements from organizations such as WB, IMF, the European Union (EU) and WTO can be found in Murat Ozturk’s book titled “Agriculture, peasantry and poverty in Turkey in the neo-liberal age.” According to Ozturk (2012), Turkish agriculture’s route to free trade was paved by neoliberal policies such as abolishing subsidies, taking steps to lower interest rates, and reducing the role of the state in the economy (including privatization). These regulations were imposed on Turkey in the 1980s, but progressed slowly during the 1990s with rapid neo-liberal restructuring happening during the first decade of the millennium (Ozturk, 2012). Nevertheless, these policies changed many aspects of the Turkish agricultural sector, including commodification of agricultural systems, access of large multinational corporations, increases in imported products, export-oriented farming, and decaying rural populations (de-agrarianization) (Aydin, 2010; Kayder & Yenal, 2011). Thus, in recent years, the small farm land share has been in constant decline, and that of larger scale farming enterprises has been rising due to free market policies (Ozturk, 2012).

The neo-liberal policies applied in Turkey, particularly after 1999, have had intense effects on its farming economy and village life (Ozturk, 2012). In small village communities deteriorated by migration to cities, empty houses and abandoned land have become the new reality. I know this personally as well, because my village is one of them. As Kayder and Yenal (2011, p.60) explained, “Global circuits have swept away the accustomed networks of information, production, and marketing which had been largely established and maintained by comprehensive governmental support policies.” Simply, these small traditional rural farmers are left unprotected in the market with the elimination of government support and protection to sustain agricultural production. They further summarized:
“Neoliberal globalization have swept away the accustomed networks of information, production and marketing which had been largely established and maintained by comprehensive governmental support policies. New institutions (merchants, brokers, food corporations, komisyoncus) have come into the picture establishing the links between small producers and larger markets. With state policy strengthening the domination of the market, prices and demand patterns fluctuate widely leaving small producers vulnerable to market forces and raising the level of risk and insecurity. This situation brings about a rapid de-ruralization of the population in most regions of the country.” (p. 83)

It is hard for these small-scale farmers to survive in the global market without government support. Hence, in recent years, the small farm land share has been in constant decline and that of larger scale farm enterprises rising because of all the free market policies (Ozturk, 2012). Turkey committed to the free market system even if "losing" small farmers and family farms was the price to be paid (Aydin, 2010; Ozturk, 2012). Consequently, Turkey is in rapid “depeasantization,” which implies that rural populations, especially peasant farmers, are migrating to cities and establishing urban slums (Gurel, 2011; Ozturk, 2012). Rural people who do not make sufficient livelihood from their small piece of land (low income) in their home villages (limited land resources) have to migrate to cities. The sad part of the story does not stop at the “waste land” left behind, as typically urban slums do not provide the sought after opportunities for those migrant rural peasants as well, because they become unskilled and cheap wage workers (Aydin, 2010; Gurel, 2011). This can be counted as lose-lose situation for Turkey on both the migration to cities and decaying agricultural production. Women are the most affected from these circumstances because they play such a central role to peasant and subsistence farming. According to Ozturk (2012) two and a half times more women than men are employed in agriculture, and women are more directly impacted by the structural changes on agriculture. Not only is subsistence farming disappearing, but the immigrant family’s food security is in danger.
Despite an upgraded new status as urban dwellers, rural women become housewives and become inactive due to the strict patriarchal social boundaries around them. According to Gunduz-Hosgor and Smits (2006), women living in the small villages have more autonomy and greater access to public space as long as they stay within the borders of their own villages or neighboring villages. In the cities, however, the autonomy of women is more constrained, because these migrants are generally marginalized from economic activity (e.g. low skill, education). In another study, Dedeoglu (2012) emphasized that after leaving agricultural activities as unpaid family workers, women became increasingly inactive in cities as the Turkish economy does not provide enough jobs. In addition to this, the patriarchal social norms place constraints on women’s mobility by limiting their movement into the labor market. Thus, most of them become full housewives and their access to the public space is much more limited under the patriarchal social order. These arguments are also relevant to young women, however, it should be noted that compared to older women, living in a town may have major advantages for younger women. The educational facilities, and hence the opportunities to become economically independent are generally much better in the towns (Gunduz- Hosgor & Smits, 2006). As much as cities can offer more opportunities in terms of education and finding jobs for young girls, cities are also seen as more dangerous places for women and girls to be in public space as well. One can only wonder how these women’s lives are changed and their food security affected in the cities. This may be an attractive follow up research topic in the future – the study of the perspectives of immigrant women and girls.

**Summary**

In summary, in most farming systems there is a division of farm labor by sex and by type of crops or livestock to sustain agricultural production. Yet often men and women share or divide
tasks in agricultural production. Some studies have specifically explored the idea that men and women have different tasks, knowledge and preferences for raising livestock, choosing crops, and performing such activities as selecting seed, planting, harvesting, and processing around the world. By examining the gender division of labor it becomes evident that women’s and men’s tasks are interdependent, and that women generally carry the greater burden of unpaid work in agricultural production, in the home, and in the community. Research on women’s invisible work suggests that the economic value of the unpaid work that women do is significant and must be acknowledged, but unpaid work is not remunerated as economic activity in national or international statistics on the work force, GNP, and national income. Thus, unpaid work puts women in a vulnerable position within the household and society.

I have offered a discussion on women farmers’ access to and control over resources and decision-making power, and information and training in agriculture. FAO studies have particularly stressed the need to close the gender gap in access to agricultural resources and services. Gender inclusive actions should enable women farmers to take greater advantage of extension systems and increase the accessibility of new agricultural technologies and innovations. I have also provided discussion on social culture around women farmers in rural villages in Turkey. Women face considerable gender-related constraints and vulnerabilities compared to men because of existing structures in households and societies.

In addition, I offered insights into agrarian change and gender including the background of small farming in Turkey and the study region, globalization of agricultural food systems, and globalization of the Turkish agricultural system that were meant to provide an understanding of the context in which this study is taking place. The neo-liberal policies applied in Turkey have had particularly intense effects on its farming economy and village life. Turkish agriculture is in
transition from traditional subsistence and semi-subsistence to more commercialized farm enterprises with more export-oriented farming. Women are the most affected with transformations in food systems because they have an important role in subsistence production, and they provide a large proportion of agricultural labor in Turkey.
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

The feminist standpoint theory provides the theoretical framework to explore women farmers’ gender inequalities on small farm practices in Turkey from women farmers’ standpoints. The feminist standpoint theory offers insights into how research on power relations should begin with the lives of the marginalized, how knowledge is socially situated, the social values and power dynamics that account for the subordination of girls and women, and the distinct knowledge fostered by activities that are typically assigned to females (Aptheker, 1989; Harding, 1987; Hartsock, 1983; Hill Collins, 1986; Smith, 1987; Wood, 2005). Drawing on the feminist standpoint theory base allows this study to explore the unique position of rural women as the most marginalized group in society due to the gender division of labor (Mackintosh, 1984, Bryson, 1996) and the specificity of women’s “invisible” contribution to agricultural production (labor) (Beneria, 1999; Sachs, 1983), reproductive work (i.e., giving birth, caregiving, household labor, food provisioning etc.) (Daniels, 1987; Mackintosh, 2000), and socio-cultural patterns or the distinct roles and norms assigned to women and men in a society (FAO, 2014; Mackintosh, 1984). In the following sections, I will offer an overview of the feminist standpoint theory, key claims of feminist standpoint theory, key feminist standpoint constructs that are explored in this study, and limitations of the feminist standpoint. I will also offer discussion on the conceptual framework of feminist standpoint theory guiding this study and provide operationalized definitions of the concepts.

Feminist Standpoint Theory

Feminist standpoint theories emerged in the 1970s. The first came from the Marxist argument that people from an oppressed class have special access to knowledge that is not available to those from a privileged class, and feminist critical theoretical approaches can be
found within a range of social scientific disciplines (e.g. postpositivist critical theory, radical and socialist feminism, womanism) (Campbell & Wasco, 2000). They propose epistemological and methodological approaches that are specific to a range of disciplinary frameworks, but share a commitment to acknowledging, analyzing, and drawing on power/knowledge relationships, and on bringing about change resulting in more just societies (Harding, 1987). In the 1970s, feminist scholars influenced by Marxist insight began to examine how inequalities between men and women influence knowledge production. Feminist standpoint theory is, “an epistemological theory that focuses on the ways that social locations shape knowledge” (Wood, 2005 p.64). Therefore, this theory offers a critique of existing power relations and the inequalities they produce in the lives of women and men (Wood, 2005).

Feminist standpoint theory, theorized by Dorothy Smith (1981) and Nancy Hartsock (1983), and described through the works of other scholars such as Patricia Hill Collins (1986), Donna Haraway (1988), Sandra Harding (1991) and Hilary Rose (1983), has two original assumptions: “that all knowledge is located and situated, and that one location, that of the standpoint of women, is privileged because it provides a vantage point that reveals the truth of social reality” (Hekman, 1997 p.349). Thus, feminist standpoint theory calls attention to the knowledge that arises from conditions and experiences that are common to girls and women (e.g. women’s lived experiences as source of knowledge (Wood, 2005). Camphell and Wasco (2000 p.775) stated that, “the ordinary or extraordinary events of women’s lives are worthy of critical reflection as they can inform our understanding of social world.” Thus, this theory proposes that an individual's own perspectives are shaped by her or his experiences in social locations and social groups (Harding, 1993). However, according to Wood (2005 p.62), standpoints are not only formed from location or experiences, “they are earned through political struggles that create
oppositional stances based on recognition of and resistance to dominant worldview.” Hence, feminist standpoint theory is activist, requiring the examination of “power relationships, institutions, policies, and technologies that perpetuate oppression from the perspective of the oppressed, so that they may be changed, undermined, or abolished” (Intemann, 2010, p. 785). Feminist standpoint research seeks to respect, understand, and empower women. Therefore, feminist standpoint research proposes that at the epistemological level, women’s lived experiences are used as a source of knowledge instead of men's, and at the ontological level, there is no single objective truth. This theory claims that class, gender, race, and sexual orientation structure a person’s understanding of reality. At the methodological level, the process of examining those experiences must reflect ethics of respect, collaboration, and caring (Aptheker, 1989; Campbell & Wasco, 2000; Harding, 1993; Smith, 1987). Hence, Henwood and Pidgeon (1995) also highlighted the importance of the researcher reflexivity statement revealing personal and social impacts which inevitably play a role in shaping the form that knowledge takes. The feminist standpoint can be achieved through “critical reflection and power relations and their consequences” (Wood, 2005 p.62). Although women's voices were the original source of standpoint theory, the concept has been successfully used both by women and men of diverse classes, racial ethnic groups, and cultures to make their values and accomplishments visible to the male dominant society (Lorber, 2010).

Another key argument is the outsider-within epistemological position in feminist standpoint theory (Harding, 1991). According to Henwood and Pidgeon (1995 p.17), feminist standpoint theory opposes the discussion of relativism which claims the researcher can produce “less partial” and “less distorted beliefs” by starting from the perspective of marginalized groups. They stressed that, “marginalized groups can have special insight, as outsider to dominant
patriarchal frameworks of thoughts, since they can see what invisible from within that order” (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1995 p. 17). Moreover, Wood (2005 p. 62) referred to this position in saying that, “the outsider-within is a privileged epistemological position” since it requires double consciousness, being at once outside of the dominant group and intimately within that group in ways that allow observation and understanding of that group.

The feminist standpoint theory has specific key claims that revolve around marginalized groups. These claims are that a) research on power relations should begin with the lives of the marginalized (values the lives and the knowledge of subordinated groups), b) knowledge is socially situated (knowledge arises from subordinate locations) c) identifying social values and power dynamics can account for the subordination of girls and women (society structured by power relations which results in unequal social locations for men and women), and d) it is important to underline the distinct knowledge fostered by activities that are typically assigned to females (knowledge arises from gender division of labor) (Hartsock, 1983; Hill Collins, 1986; Smith, 1987; Aptheker, 1989; Harding, 1993; Wood, 2005). In the following section, I will discuss these key claims of the feminist standpoint theory.

**Research on Power Relations Should Begin with the Lives of the Marginalized**

Feminist standpoint theory is essential to probing systemic oppression in a society that devalues women's knowledge (Harding, 2004). In this sense, standpoint feminism makes the case that, because women's lives and roles in almost all societies are significantly different from men's, women hold a different type of knowledge (Hartsock, 1996). Thus, women experience their oppression, struggles, and strengths in various ways because of their diverse realities and their identities as women. Within this context of diversity, their position as a subordinated group allows women to see and understand the world in ways that are different and challenging to the
existing male-biased (male standpoint) conventional knowledge (Smith, 1987). Thus, standpoint feminism argues that feminist social science should be practiced from the standpoint of women or particular groups of women (Hill Collins, 2000) as some scholars (e.g., Patricia Hill Collins and Dorothy Smith, Bettina Aptheker) claim that they are better equipped to understand certain aspects of the world.

Aptheker (1989 p.39) called upon researchers to approach study from the “bottom up” starting from the everyday lives and experiences of people in marginalized groups to understand the perspective of the marginalized society, particularly the women. The experiences and activities of those at the bottom of such social hierarchies can provide meaningful starting points for identifying noteworthy questions and problems to be explored, as well as offering a standpoint for viewing the reality of human relations with each other and the natural world (Harding, 1993 p.54). From standpoint theory perspective, researchers find that research problems emerge from the everyday life of marginalized groups in relation to the social locations (Smith, 1987), which are imposed on less powerful groups and act as the root of many problems.

In this book, Aptheker (1989 p.39) proposes a “bottom-up” approach, a search for the meanings that can be found in the activities of women’s lives and represented in stories, song, and rituals. Learning and relating these meanings, she contends, will help feminists develop what she calls a “map” of women’s reality from women’s way of seeing. She refers to this view as “women’s standpoint” (p.39). Aptheker argues that women’s lives are fragmented, dispersed, and episodic. They are often determined by events outside of women’s control. She focuses on the “dailiness of women’s lives,” or the patterns women create and the meanings women invent each day and over time as a result of their labors and in the context of their subordinated status to men (p.38). To start research from women’s experiences, Aptheker especially values women’s
life stories. She allows women to speak about their daily lives through their poems, their art, and their stories. Thus, research from a standpoint position tries to capture how the social structure contributes to the problems found in daily life, and seeks the emancipatory transformation of the social structure (Swigonski, 1993).

**Knowledge is Socially Situated (Knowledge Arises from Subordinate Locations)**

Feminist standpoint theories involve a commitment to the view that all attempts to know are socially situated. Standpoint theory asserts that one’s standpoint emerges from one’s particular social locations (e.g. the view of the world from where you are located physically, mentally, emotionally, and socially) (Hartsock, 1996). However, social location is not standpoint. A standpoint arises from an individual’s social position with regard to gender, culture, race, ethnicity, class, physical capacities, and sexual orientation, and is affected by how these factors interact and affect his/her everyday world (Hill Collins, 1989; Harding, 1992). Thus, the social situation of an epistemic agent plays a role in forming what we know and limiting what we are able to know. Hence, Hartsock’s (1996) claim that any individual can have multiple standpoints underlines the importance of fully recognizing plurality and the intersections of these various positions (sex, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, economic class etc.) in informing a range of standpoints. Emphasis is placed on recognizing commonalities that can be theorized and used to inform standpoint positioning (Fawcett & Hearn, 2004).

Standpoint feminism focuses on the way women are represented, and the way in which knowledge is constructed (Griffiths, 1995). Standpoint theory builds on the assertion that the less powerful members of society experience a different reality as a consequence of their oppression (Hill Collins, 1989; Harding, 1991). Subordinated groups interpret reality differently from the dominant group. To survive, they must have knowledge, awareness, and sensitivity of both the
dominant group’s view of society and their own (Hill Collins, 1989). Thus, subordinated social locations are more likely than privileged social locations to generate more accurate knowledge (Wood, 2005). According to Henwood and Pigeon (1995), standpoint theory builds on analysis of power relationships, describing dominant conceptual schemes as outcomes of knowledge produced exclusively from social activities of the powerful in society (typically men). It is argued that a more complete basis for knowledge can only be found within the perspectives and experiences of women and the lives of other social groups ordinarily excluded from the dominant social order (Aptheker, 1989). Wylie (2003) stated that social location systematically influences our experiences, shaping and limiting what we know, such that knowledge is achieved from a particular standpoint. Therefore, the situated-knowledge notion has been interpreted as the claim that women have a distinct way of knowing that is different from that of men because of their marginalized position in society (Aptheker, 1989; Haraway, 1988; Henwood & Pigeon, 1995). The situated-knowledge principle stresses that knowledge is achieved from a particular standpoint. Thus, the different social locations that women and men occupy cultivate distinct kinds of knowledge (Hartsock, 1998).

**Identifying Social Values and Power Dynamics that Account for the Subordination of Girls and women**

Feminist research recognizes that most women face some form of oppression and exploitation because of power dynamics in a society. For example, Harding (2004, p.31) stated that, “a standpoint is a distinctive insight about how hierarchical social structures work”. Feminist standpoint theory rejects the notion that knowledge is a straightforward outcome of essential characteristics of group members (e.g. male or female) (Harding, 1993). Instead, feminist standpoint theory recognizes sociocultural ideologies (e.g., gender roles, gender division
of labor) that explain why women are assigned to certain activities and why those activities are less valued than activities typically assigned to men (Bryson, 1996; Mackintosh, 1984). Feminist standpoint centers on realizing that the conditions and experiences common to girls and women are not natural, but are a result of social and political power dynamics (Harding, 1993). Standpoint theory aims to understand the knowledge that arises from women’s social locations. However, standpoint theory underlines the importance of the politics of location and positioning and how this might intersect with the complexities of more or less conscious social identifications (Fawcett & Hearn, 2004).

**Underlining the Distinct Knowledge Fostered by Activities that are Typically Assigned to Females**

The premise of feminist standpoint theory is that society is organized by power relations that generate unequal social positions. One location is occupied by members of the dominant group (typically men), and other location is inhabited by members of subordinate groups (typically women) (Wood, 2005). The different social locations that women and men occupy foster distinct kinds of knowledge. According to feminist standpoint theory, women's lives, in general, differ systematically and structurally from men's lives (Harding, 1992). Women and men are expected to engage in distinctive activities, and the two groups are rendered different rights and opportunities. For instance, females are expected to take primary responsibility for homemaking, nurturing, and caregiving, and females are supposed to obey and please others (Harding, 1992). Thus, the experiences that are available to women and men shape what they know and how they understand cultural life (Wood, 2005).

Feminist standpoint theory calls attention to the knowledge that arises from conditions and experiences that are common to girls and women (Harding, 1992). Thus, feminist standpoint
theory is interested in skills and knowledge that are cultivated by typically female activities such as reproductive work, domestic work, and caregiving. Feminist standpoint theorists claim that caring for others allows girls and women to develop knowledge of what others need and how to meet those needs (Wood, 2005). For instance, Smith (1989) claimed that because women have historically been the caregivers of society, men have been able to dedicate their energy to thinking about abstract concepts that are viewed as more valuable and important. Women’s activities are thus made invisible and seen as “natural,” rather than as part of human culture and history. Thus, Bryson (1996) indicated that the household economy is associated with women, while the market economy is associated with men. That is why in public spheres, male domination is well recognized while women remain in the household economy and in the domestic sphere (Bryson, 1996).

**Limitations of Feminist Standpoint Theory**

The primary limitation most commonly leveled against standpoint theory revolves around universalizing all women as the same, a phenomenon called essentialism. Essentialism refers to the practice of generalizing all women (or any group) as though they were essentially the same. Too often, feminist frameworks have presented a view of women and their subjectivities as universally homogeneous. The situated-knowledge thesis has been interpreted as the claim that women have a distinct way of knowing, which is different from that of men. As a result, standpoint feminists have been charged with emphasizing gender stereotypes and falsely assuming that all women or oppressed groups have some sort of universal shared experience or interest in lieu of being oppressed (Intemsnn, 2010; Hekman, 1997). According to Mohanty (1988) gender relations cannot be universalized. Without cultural and historic specificity, women become an already constituted, homogeneous group with similar needs and interests regardless
of their class and racial location, and despite the particular historic contexts forming the backdrop to their lives (Mohanty, 1988). In particular, Mohanty criticizes the universality of the theories of western feminists and the categorization of the “third world woman” as a unitary category in their writing (p. 61). Mohanty feels that the assumption that third world women are a coherent group, ignoring the social factors, is false. Syed and Ali (2011) argued that expecting western middle class women’s experiences and perspectives to be the norm for women worldwide is unwise. Lorde (1984) argued that the feminist movement as a whole, and mainly white privileged women, disregards lesbians, black women, poor women, and third world women as legitimate feminists. She addressed the sad status of the feminist movement, given that minority experiences were rarely, if ever, taken into account. Standpoint theory has been helpful in reclaiming women's experiences as suitable research topics, but it contains a problematic emphasis on the universality of this experience at the expense of recognizing the differences among women's experiences.

A Conceptual Framework to Explore Women Farmers’ Gender Inequalities

A conceptual framework for this study draws on the feminist standpoint theory-base to explore women farmer gender inequalities on small farm practices. This theory-base allows for the study to explore factors related to the research questions: gender division of labor, women’s work in agriculture and the household (invisible, unpaid nature of women’s works), decision making dynamics of rural families, accessing resources and knowledge, agrarian change, and the effect of gender on small farm practices from women farmers’ standpoints. In this research, I used a “bottom up” approach to develop an epistemology for constructing knowledge, which is based on insights arising from women farmers’ daily experiences (Aptheker, 1989; Smith, 1987). This is because feminist standpoint theory uses the knowledge that arises from conditions and
experiences that are common to girls and women (e.g. women’s life experiences as source of knowledge) (Wood, 2005). In starting this study by examining women farmers’ daily experiences, I focused on identifying key constructs from feminist standpoint theory which guide a broad framework for my analysis. These key constructs were: 1) inequitable gender division of labor, 2) subordinated social locations, and 3) social cultural power dynamics. In the following section, I will explore the conceptual model for this study, including the interaction between the women farmer’s marginalized positions and feminist standpoint constructs, and gender inequality outcomes for women farmers. I will also discuss the key constructs explored in this study, and provide operationalized definitions for these feminist standpoint constructs.

Conceptual Model

Figure 1 provides a conceptual model of how women farmers’ daily life experiences contribute to marginalized positions, resulting in gender inequalities on small farm practices. Women farmers’ marginalized positions on gendered roles and responsibilities in agricultural work and household work results in inequitable gender division of labor. Women farmers’ marginalized positions on unrecognized, unremunerated, and unpaid farm work and domestic work results in inequitable gender division of labor. Women farmers’ marginalized positions on accessing resources (input) and knowledge including minimal schooling, low infrastructure, lack of access to extension education, and low economic class results in subordinated social locations. Women farmers’ marginalized positions relative to the social cultural structure around them including lack of access to decision making, lack of access to control money, and patriarchal social order results in social cultural power dynamics. Women farmers’ marginalized positions on changes in agricultural practices and communities including immigrant position, losing subsistence production, food insecurity, and lack of access to public space results in subordinated
social locations. The feminist standpoint constructs of inequitable gender division of labor, subordinated social locations, and social cultural power dynamics result in gender inequality outcomes for women farmers on small farm practices. These gender inequality outcomes include women’s farmers’ invisible work, economic deprivation, heavy work burden, dependent position (economically dependent citizen), unemployable position, and patriarchal social control.
Women Farmers’ Daily Life Experiences

Women agricultural tasks
- subsistence production
- hoeing, planting, harvesting
- tending to livestock / making dairy product
- post harvest processing

Women agricultural tasks
- subsistence production
- hoeing, planting, harvesting
- tending to livestock / making dairy product
- post harvest processing

Access to resources and knowledge
- formal education
- infrastructure
- access to extension education & training
- access to input (fertilizer & pesticides)
- economic class

Changes in agricultural practices & communities
- migration
- commodification of agriculture

Social cultural structure
- access to decision making
- access to public space
- live within a certain family hierarchy

Women Farmers’ Marginalized Positions

- gendered roles and responsibilities (farm & household)
- gender division of labor
- unpaid / unrecognized work

- minimal schooling
- low infrastructure
- lack access to extension education
- lack access to input
- low economic class

- losing subsistence production
- food insecurity
- immigrant position
- lack access to public space

- lack access to decision making
- lack access to control money
- patriarchic social order

Feminist Standpoint Theory Constructs

Inequitable gender division of labor

Subordinated social locations

Invisible work
Patriarchic social control
Dependent position
Deprivation
Unemployable position
Heavy work burden

Social cultural power dynamics

Women Framers’ gender inequality standpoints

Figure 1: Conceptual Model
Operationalized Definition of the Concepts

Concept 1: Gender Inequality Standpoints (Outcomes)

Gender inequalities involve women’s invisible work in agriculture and the household, women’s heavy work burden, lack of access to productive resources, limited access to knowledge and decision making power, and social restriction on mobility and public participation (FAO, 2011; Fletschner & Kenney, 2014). Beneria (1999) stated that unpaid work includes activities such as childcare, home cleaning and maintenance, agricultural work, subsistence production, volunteer work, and delivery of food. This is also an important labor area where market relations do not have significant control. Hence, women farmers’ work is not remunerated, labeled as unpaid family work, and is not even recognized in official statistics (Alston, 1998; Beneria, 1999; Daniels, 1987; Gulcubuk, 2010; Mackintosh, 2000). Thus, like so much of women's household work, much of women's agricultural work is rendered invisible or devalued (Sachs, 1983). As a consequence, this non-economic or unpaid work goes unnoticed and is not reflected in the design of agricultural policies (FAO, 2006). This neglect of women’s “invisible labor” contributes to the marginalization of women in the economy.

FAO (2011) noted that women farmers face a number of constraints stemming from gender inequality, including limited access to farm land, inputs, technology, education, information, and financial and extension services, all of which adversely affect their productivity and hinder progress towards broader economic and social development goals. Thus, constraints on women’s access to resources and services are compounded by cultural norms and values resulting in lower levels of productivity as documented in the 2010-2011 FAO report on gender gaps. Constraints included restrictions on rural women’s behavior and mobility, their reproductive work burden, and gender inequalities in education, health and labor (FAO, 2011).
All these barriers ultimately inhibit women’s ability to produce, and can make it difficult for them to escape poverty or provide food for their families.

Within this study, women farmers’ gender inequality outcomes include invisible work, patriarchal social control, dependent position (economically dependent citizen), deprivation, unemployable position, and heavy work burden. Invisible work outcomes include unrecognized and unremunerated women’s work in the household and on the family farm. Patriarchal social control outcomes include lack of mobility, and lack of access to public space. Dependent position outcomes include women’s dependence on men for social security and income. Deprivation outcomes include lack of access to control money and resources. Unemployable position (specifically a lack of skill for employment opportunity) outcomes include lack access to formal education, and extension education and training in agricultural production.

**Concept 2: Inequitable Gender Division of Labor**

Gender division of labor means men's and women's activities in any society that are directly tied to socio-cultural patterns, or the distinct roles and norms assigned to women and men in a society (Boserup, 1970; FAO, 2004; Mackintosh, 1984). In general, societies use the different gendered roles that stem from biological differences between women and men as the basis to divide their tasks both in the home and in the public sphere (Mackintosh, 1984; Quisumbing et al., 2014). By examining the gender division of labor it becomes evident that women’s and men’s tasks are interdependent, and that women generally carry the greater burden of unpaid work in the home and community (Beneria, 1999). For instance, a mother’s work in nurturing her child is considered non-work, is not economically rewarded, and is not generally acknowledged. Mothers who care for young children have their time and energy fully occupied
with socially useful and necessary work, but find themselves classified as dependents within the society rather than workers or full citizens (Bryson, 1996).

Gender division of labor in farming tasks results in differences in the priorities, motivations, opportunities and barriers, and knowledge of women and men. These differences in the gender division of labor have implications for the nature of poverty, marginalization and vulnerability (FAO, 2011). Thus, in many developing countries, agriculture is the main occupation of nearly everybody in rural villages and the main source of livelihood. Here, there is a division of farm labor by sex and by type of crops or livestock to sustain agricultural production. For example, women are often marginalized in the agricultural food system in terms of access to assets. According to Kristjanson, et al. (2014), livestock are important assets for rural households because it is often easier for people in developing countries to acquire livestock assets. Men and women often manage different types of animals, and are responsible for different aspects of animal care. However, even though women own livestock, it does not necessarily mean women have control over the use of products or decision-making regarding management or sales (Kristjanson, et al., 2014).

Regarding the domestic work of women farmers in many cultures including Turkey, household related tasks are generally seen as women’s responsibility. Thus, many societies find ways to devalue certain kinds of work, and deny that they are really work at all. Just as women are stereotyped as naturally nurturing, Leonard (1994) highlighted that the gendered division of labor within the household feeds an ideology based on the notion that women are naturally good at certain types of work (e.g., caring work or house work), and paves the way for the occupational segregation of the labor market into male and female jobs. Thus, women are given lower paid jobs and house work related jobs (service jobs).
In this study, inequitable gender division of labor in agricultural production and household work is explored with respect to gendered roles and responsibilities in agricultural work and domestic work. Gender division of labor included women’s gendered roles and responsibilities in farm work and domestic work compared to male counterparts.

**Concept 3: Subordinated Social Locations**

The concept of subordinated social locations defined that the different social locations that women and men occupy cultivate distinct kinds of knowledge (Hartsock, 1998). Wylie (2003) stated that social location systematically influences our experiences, shaping and limiting what we know, such that knowledge is achieved from a particular standpoint. Women farmers have lack of access to and control over resources and decision-making power. Many studies, and particularly FAO studies emphasized that women farmers face a number of constraints stemming from gender inequality including limited access to farm land, inputs, and technology, education, information, financial, and extension services, all of which adversely affect their productivity and hinder progress on broader economic and social development goals (FAO, 2011). By studying gender inequalities, rural women’s subordinated locations, and the knowledge rural women foster, it not only provides insight into the lives of these marginalized rural women, but also casts light on dominant group practices (male privilege), especially those that create and reproduce inequality (Wood, 2005).

Subordination of women to men stems from the larger gender inequalities in most developing societies. The patriarchal structure of these societies sets a lower or subordinate status for women in the society (Gannon, 1998). The lower social value of women influences their well-being and access to health services, education, and work (Paolisso & Leslie, 1995). Thus, an individual’s biological sex determines the first basic divide in all societies in terms of
quality of life, position in the social hierarchy, and chance of survival (Epstein, 2007 p.2). The male sex is always privileged over the female across the globe. Sometimes the gender gap is big, sometimes narrow, but females are always categorized as subordinated. Thus, girls receive less care, including education and medical care, than boys. Women and girls in the developing world are often denied opportunities for education. Girls are taken away from school if the family needs their labor or have scarce economic sources (Larme, 1997; Miller, 1997).

Recently, in Turkey, rural people have experienced social change due to heavy migration from villages to cities. As a consequence, they have experienced living in migration deteriorated communities, or migration burden in cities (immigrant position). Because Turkey has adopted the free market economy and opened up agricultural practices to the global neoliberal market (Aydin, 2010; Ozturk, 2012), Turkish agriculture is in transition from traditional subsistence, semi-subsistence to more commercialized farm enterprises with more export-oriented farming (Aydin, 2010; Ozturk, 2012). Consequently, Turkey is in rapid “depeasantization” which implies that rural populations, especially peasant farmers, are migrating to cities and establishing urban slums (Gurel, 2011; Ozturk, 2012). Women are the most affected from these circumstances because they are losing subsistence production, their families’ food security are in danger, and they have become housewives in cities. Dedeoglu (2012) emphasized that after leaving traditional agricultural production in villages, women become increasingly inactive in cities as the Turkish economy has not created enough jobs, and patriarchal social norms place constraints on women’s mobility by limiting their movement into the labor market.

This study focuses on subordinated social locations, and access to resources and knowledge due to changes in agricultural practices and communities. These subordinated locations of access to resources and knowledge include minimal schooling, low infrastructure,
lack of access to input and extension education, and lower economic class status. The subordinated social locations of the changes in agricultural practices and communities included immigrant position, losing subsistence production, lack of access to public space, and food insecurity.

Concept 4: Social Cultural Power Dynamics

Social cultural power dynamics between women and men pertain to their access to, and control over resources, benefits, and decision-making processes. Although women work in the fields, the homes, outside of the farm, and at the markets, their male counterparts often control decisions over the household and its economy (FAO, 2011). Thus, Bryson (1996) indicated that the household economy is associated with women while the market economy is associated with men. That is why, in public spheres, male domination is well recognized while women are expected to remain in the household economy and in the domestic sphere (Bryson, 1996). Women have lack of access to, and control over resources and decision-making power.

Feminist research recognizes that most women face some form of oppression and exploitation because of power dynamics in any society. Women and men are expected to engage in distinctive activities, and the two groups are rendered different rights and opportunities. For example, Harding (2004, p.31) stated that, “a standpoint is a distinctive insight about how hierarchical social structures work.” Thus, females are expected to take primary responsibility for homemaking, nurturing, and caregiving, and females are supposed to obey and please others (Harding, 1992). Gender research from a standpoint position tries to capture how the social structure contributes to the problems found in daily life, and seeks the emancipatory transformation of the social structure (Swigonski, 1993).
This study focuses on social cultural power dynamics and the social cultural structure around women farmers. Social cultural structure includes lack of access to, and control over money, lack of access to decision-making in farms and households, and the patriarchal social order.

Conclusion

Feminist standpoint theory provides a conceptual framework for this study through which gender inequality experiences of women farmers on small farm practices in Turkey are explored. In this section, I first discussed feminist standpoint theory and key claims of this theory. In addition to this, I examined the limitations of feminist standpoint theory. Next, I identified key constructs from feminist standpoint theory and explored the conceptual model of this study, as well as provided operationalized definitions for these constructs. In the following chapter, I will discuss the methodology of this study.
Chapter 4: Methodology

In previous chapters, I have provided the background on the phenomenon of interest within this study, as well as the theoretical framework. In this chapter, I will examine the research methodology used to explore this phenomenon. I will also provide an overview of my personal epistemological, ontological, and methodological positioning, the problem statement, research questions, unit of analysis, and the research design.

Methodological Approach

A methodology involves a systematic research design, the underlying assumptions to research design, and data collection (Bailey, 2007). Thus, methodology is a theory and analysis of how research should proceed, while methods are data collection techniques (Harding, 1987). Feminist research employs a variety of methodologies including qualitative and quantitative methods to engage research participants (typically members of marginalized groups) in reflection on how their social conditions: gender, race, social class, ethnicity, and sexual orientation shape their experiences in the social world (Campbell & Wasco, 2000). To do this, feminist methodologies attempt to eliminate sexist bias in research, and find ways to capture women’s voices that are consistent with feminist ideals. Feminist standpoint researchers must also share their reflectivity statement with their readers, showing how their own social location affects their interpretation of their data (Campbell & Wasco, 2000).

To proceed with this research, and drawing on the feminist standpoint theory base, I started this research from women farmers’ daily life experiences (Aptheker, 1989; Smith, 1987). I placed myself on the participant’s side to eliminate or at least to minimize the power differences between myself as a researcher and women farmers as researched (collaboration, and caring) (Harding & Norberg, 2005). I shared my reflexivity statement with readers to disclose of
my social position (Campbell & Wasco, 2000). To start this research from daily life experiences of women farmers, I used Apteker’s (1989) approach from her book “Tapestries of Life” as a model to explore women farmers’ gender inequality experiences on the small farm practices. In this book, Aptheker (1989 p.39) proposes a “bottom-up” approach, a search for the meanings that can be explored within the activities of women’s lives, and represented in stories, song, and rituals. “Learning and relating these meanings”, she contends, will help feminists develop what she calls a “map” of a woman’s reality from a woman’s way of seeing, a view that she refers to as a “woman’s standpoint” (p.39). This “bottom up” approach informs my research to develop an epistemology for constructing knowledge, which is based on insights arising from women farmers’ marginalized social positions. Certainly, the ways that social location shapes experience are not homogeneous among rural women in study villages (Intemann, 2010). Rural women have different experiences in virtue of their other differences such as, being young or old, class, being married, unmarried or widow, being poor or rich, education level, and so on (Intemann, 2010). Hence, I interviewed women farmers with diverse social positions in this research.

To collect data, I used qualitative research methods (e.g., interviewing, focus groups) to allow rural women in their home settings to speak about their daily life on the farm and in the household. I aimed to grasp the arbitrary and unfair nature of power relations that structure their village social life. I conducted my research with women farmers “where they are” in order to understand how social location influences their daily life experiences. This allowed me to grasp the “gender inequalities” in small agricultural practices from women farmers’ standpoints in Turkey.
Personal Epistemology and Ontology Positioning

I have embraced a critical paradigm that will guide this research, articulated through the feminist standpoint theory and my field research design. Researchers who are guided by “a critical paradigm want to document, understand, and change the way powerful groups oppress powerless groups” (Bailey, 2007, p.55). Hence, I chose this paradigm to guide my research, because my study participants were marginalized Turkish women farmers from small rural communities. This paradigm articulates feminist standpoint theory, which proposes a critique of existing power relations between men and women and the inequality they produce (power/knowledge relationships) (Wood, 2005). This brings about change, which results in more just societies (Harding, 1987). The goal of this study, is to understand how the values of both the researcher and the participants determine perceptions of the social world. Within the critical paradigm, the axiological belief is that values are important to the research, and should be clearly articulated in the work and by the participant (Bailey, 2007). As a researcher, I am consciously and explicitly positioned on the participants’ side (insider), because I can speak the same language, I grew up in an identical village household, I know the culture through personal practice, and I worked with villagers before through a previous job. Unquestionably, all these experiences gave me great advantages in the field. I also believe that these rural women are marginalized in terms of getting education, accessing resources and information, and having poor infrastructure. Furthermore, they are embedded in patriarchal social orders, and do not have a voice to represent themselves. Nevertheless, I also hold an “outsider” position by affiliating with American University and recognizing that my experiences have changed over my adult life (I am no longer one of them). However, with positioning myself as their researcher, I can understand
their social locations better with my education, my advocacy for gender equality, and life experiences as an extension agent and a researcher of agricultural food systems in Turkey.

**Epistemological Positioning**

My epistemology is guided by the critical paradigm. Epistemology refers to the relationship between the knower, and that which would be known (researcher/participant relationship) (Bailey, 2007). The Greek root of the word describes the philosophy concerned with the nature and scope of knowledge. This definition was adopted by social scientists where epistemology constitutes the study of social knowledge (“how social phenomena can be known”), and often offers much of the justification for the adoption of particular methodologies (“how knowledge can be demonstrated”) (Mason, 2003 p.16). In short, epistemology is the study of knowledge and justified belief. Much of the discussion in this field is motivated by the philosophical analysis of the nature of knowledge and how it relates to connected notions such as truth, belief, and justification (Blaikie, 2000). The critical paradigm expresses that the researcher is not independent from what is researched, and that the findings of research are mediated though his/her values (Bailey, 2007). This paradigm articulates feminist standpoint epistemology, and suggests (Campbell &Wasco, 2000 p.773) “reducing the hierarchical relationship between researchers and their participants to facilitate trust and disclosure.” Thus, as previously stated, I am able to relate to my participants and have positioned myself on their side as their researcher. However, I also realize that there are existing power imbalances, and they are uninterested in giving interviews to a researcher from an American University in the field. I tried to eliminate the power differences as much as I could in order to reach out to the women participants at their social level and obtain knowledge. To do this, I used my older sister’s (farmer like them) help as an informant to speak with participants and build relationships for
some interviews. I started conversations through talking about my village, or I tried to make a point of talking about my kids, telling them that I am a mother and a wife etc. In fact, being from the same culture and having a similar background gave me an advantage for grasping knowledge of women farmers’ daily experiences.

**Ontology Positioning**

My study ontology is also guided by critical theory. Ontology is the study of the nature of reality (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). It is derived from the Greek onto (being) and logia (written or spoken discourse). It is a branch of metaphysics, the study of first principles or the essence of things. Ontology is concerned with questions such as, “what is the nature of reality” (Bailey, 2007 p.50), what entities exist or can be said to exist, and how can such entities be grouped, related within a hierarchy, and subdivided according to similarities and differences (Mason, 2003)? Critical theorists embrace that there is no single “reality” out there (Bailey, 2007 p.55). Researchers who work within this paradigm stress that social reality is interpreted through social, historical, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gendered structures, and therefore there is no single objective reality (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Thus, “what we consider to be knowledge is not ‘pure fact’ because it is filtered through these various lenses” (Campbell & Wasco, 2000 p.780). The critical paradigms consider that there is no single objective truth, and this philosophy claims that class, race, gender, and sexual orientation structure a person’s understanding of reality. Thus, what is taken to be real needs to be critically examined using an ideological critique of its role in perpetuating oppressive social structures and policies.

In this study, I have embraced that there is no single objective truth, and that women farmers’ realities are diverse and changing through social cultural structures of village life, religion, political (women rights), economic status, and gendered structures (patriarchy) (Guba &
Lincoln, 1994). Therefore, I focus on exploring diverse realities related to women farmers’ gender inequality experiences from the diverse societal positions that they are holding (e.g. young, middle age, old; poor, middle class; commercial (traditional) or subsistence grower). For example, I recognized that variation in gender inequalities in decision-making power vary from one woman to another based on their social locations (e.g. being widowed or married, young or old, being in a good relationship vs. bad relationship with the husband, husband fully present, or husband disabled).

**Unit of Analysis**

For the purpose of this research, the unit of analysis is women farmers’ standpoints, which make up the data set. Using women farmers’ marginalized position standpoints as the unit of analysis allows this study to explore gender inequalities in small farm practices from women farmers’ subordinated social positions. Feminist standpoint research recognizes that subordinated social locations are more likely than privileged social locations to generate more accurate knowledge within feminist research (Wood, 2005). It is argued that a more complete basis for knowledge can only be found within the perspectives and experiences of women living in social groups ordinarily excluded from the dominant social order (Aptheker, 1989). Therefore, data were collected and analyzed for women farmers’ daily life experiences from their marginalized positions on the small farm practices in Turkey.

**Problem Statement**

In the rural areas of the developing world including Turkey, agriculture is a major component of rural income, and women are the backbone of agricultural production (Ozturk, 2012). Resources, especially water, land, livestock, crops, and knowledge about agricultural production are crucial for the livelihoods of most of the world's rural families (FAO, 2011).
Access to, control over, and management of these resources determines which activities are pursued, which goods may be produced, and whether the lives of rural households are enhanced or diminished. More importantly, gender determines who has access to these resources and what kind of access they have. Although women work in the fields, the homes, outside of the farm, and at the markets, their male counterparts often control decisions over the household and its economy (FAO, 2011). Significant gender inequalities can be found in unrecognized women’s work in agricultural production along with their household chores (Quisumbing et al., 2014). Moreover, they are held back by a number of constraints stemming from gender inequality, including limited access to farm inputs and technology, information, formal education, marketing, credit, and training services, all of which adversely affect their productivity (FAO, 2011; Fletschner & Kenney, 2014). Hence, women face considerable gender-related constraints and vulnerabilities compared to men because of existing structures in households and societies.

In the Turkish rural villages, farms are family-owned and generally small and fragmented because of inheritance laws which allow the land to be equally divided among siblings after the decease of the parents (Ozturk, 2012). Farming in Turkey is a family-based business which involves many members of the household including women and children. According to Klaver and Kamphis’s (2006) report, the 2001 agricultural census documented 3 million farms with an average cultivated area per holding of about 6 hectares (ha). About 65% of agricultural holdings are smaller than 5 ha. The majority of these holdings are vegetable producers, which typically cultivate an area of less than 1 ha. Only 15% of the farms in 2001 were larger than 10 ha, but they account for almost 70% of the total cultivated land in Turkey (Klaver & Kamphis, 2006). On the small farms, household labor is essential and women are the primary laborers. Husbands are heads of the farms, have decision-making power, and control
resources. Patriarchal relationships are central in keeping up farming as well. This culture presents unique challenges for women in terms of gender equality on small farm practices.

Many scholars have focused on the role that women play in agricultural production around the world. Their discussions about the importance of women’s role in food production in developing countries stress women’s important role in growing, participating in post-harvesting, processing, carrying out sustenance activities, and caregiving (FAO, 2011; Doss, 2014). Similarly, women’s work is often integral to the functioning of smallholder farms in Turkey. Thus, women farmers perform many tasks in agricultural production including planting, hoeing, weeding, tending animals, harvesting and threshing of the crops, post-harvest food processing, milking and making dairy products, marketing, and providing food to their families (Budak et al., 2005; Ilcan, 1994; Ozcatalbas & Akcaoz, 2010; Ozkan et al., 2000). Despite women’s substantial work on the farm, many scholars also stress women farmers’ invisible and unpaid work on the farm (Beneria, 1999; Sachs, 1983). Their work is not remunerated, labeled as unpaid family work, and is not even recognized in official statistics (Alston, 1998; Beneria, 1999; Gulcubuk, 2010; Mackintosh, 2000). Like so much of women's work, much of women's agricultural work is rendered invisible or devalued. As a consequence, this non-remunerated or unpaid labor goes unnoticed and is not reflected in the design of agricultural policies (FAO, 2006). This neglect of women’s “invisible labor” contributes to the marginalization of women in the economy.

Women farmers’ lower socioeconomic status and increased vulnerability to poverty and economic insecurity is hampered by the transition of agriculture in Turkey as well. Turkey has committed to the free market system even if losing small farmers and family farms is the price to be paid (Aydin, 2010; Kayder & Yenal, 2011; Ozturk, 2012;). Turkish agriculture is in transition from traditional semi-subsistence to more commodified farm enterprises with more export-
oriented farming (Kayder & Yenal, 2011). With state policy strengthening the dominance of the market, “prices and demand patterns fluctuate widely leaving small producers vulnerable to market forces and raising the level of risk and insecurity” (Kayder & Yenal, 2011 p.60). Thus, Turkey is in rapid “depeasantization” which implies that the rural population, especially peasant farmers, are migrating to cities and establishing urban slums (Gurel, 2011; Kayder & Yenal, 2011; Ozturk, 2012). In fact, according to the Turkish Statistic Institute (TUIK, 2014) report, in 1980, the rural population rate was 56.1 percent compared to the urban rate of 43.9 percent. In 2012, the rural population spiked up to 77.3 percent compared to the rural rate of 22.7 percent. Rural people who do not make sufficient livelihood out of their small piece of land at home (low income) in the free market arena have to migrate to cities. The sad part of the story does not stop at the “waste land” left behind, as typically urban slums do not provide the sought after opportunities for those migrant rural peasants as well. The nonagricultural employment generation capacity of export-led growth fell short of absorbing the labor surplus emerging from rural to urban migrations (Gurel, 2011; Ilkkaracan, 2012). Overall, women are the most affected from these circumstances because they play such a central role to peasant and subsistence farming. Thus, not only is subsistence farming disappearing, the immigrant families’ food security is in danger.

To date, many studies have indicated that there are well-documented gender inequalities in women farmers’ unpaid work in agricultural and household duties, access to technical information, credit, extension services, critical inputs such as fertilizers and water, and marketing around the world including Turkey (FAO, 2011). However, there is a lack of research on Turkish women farmers’ gender inequality experiences from a feminist standpoint lens. Turkish rural women, most of whom are actively involved in agricultural production, are generally
marginalized and silenced in society due to their low education, and the patriarchal social orders around them (Rad et al., 2012). By studying women farmers’ daily lives, this study gave them a voice. This research focused on Turkish women farmers’ lives by drawing on the feminist standpoint theory to understand the nature of gender inequality, and explores women's social roles (gender division of labor), work experiences in farming and in the household, and roles in food systems in small farm communities. Said differently, this study provides an opportunity to hear women’s voices, and to understand the heart of rural women’s gender inequality experiences on small farm practices in Turkey. Through understanding this study, a variety of diverse individuals including women farmers, organizations (e.g. extension services, women gender related organizations), and policy makers can develop a better understanding of the nature of gender inequality and women's social roles, work experiences, and interests on small family farm holdings. Above all this study will assist rural women to build a deep awareness about their deprivations and difficulties on small farm practices.

**Purpose and Research Questions**

The guiding question for this phenomenological qualitative study is, “*What gender inequalities exist in small farming practices in Turkey?*” In order to explore this question, the study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the gender division of labor on small farm practices?
2. What gender inequalities exist in the workload of women farmers on small farm practices?
3. What gender inequalities exist in decision-making on small farm practices?
4. What gender inequalities exist in acquiring knowledge about farming practices?
5. How does the way small farming is changing in Turkey affect women farmers?
Preliminary Work

The research questions are based on *a priori* justifications. The *a priori* propositions in this study were established before data was collected based on previous literature and feminist standpoint theory positions that guided me in the planning and development of the interview guides. A list of *a priori* propositions is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. A Priori Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propositions</th>
<th>Supporting Literature</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is an inequitable gender division of labor for women in terms of farm work and domestic work.</td>
<td>By examining the gender division of labor, it becomes evident that women’s and men’s tasks are interdependent, and that women generally carry the greater burden of unpaid work in the home and community (Beneria, 1999). Concerning gender division of labor in agriculture in Turkey, women carry out planting, weeding, harvesting, postharvest processing, and selling small amounts of produce (especially vegetable, egg, dairy products) at the local market on the farm compared to men performing more physically intensive tasks such as mechanized jobs, soil preparation, spraying, irrigating, and selling large amounts of agricultural products (farm animals, cereal crops, etc.) (Ilcan, 1994; Ozcatalbas &amp; Akcaoz, 2010; Ozkan et al., 2000; Savran Al-Haik et al., 2013). Regarding household tasks in the rural communities, women and girls generally carry out all household chores unassisted from male family members around the world (FAO, 2003).</td>
<td>1. What is the gender division of labor on small farm practices in Turkey?</td>
<td>Interviews Focus groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Household work is categorized as women’s work, legitimizing its lack of valuation and perpetuating an ideological construction placing social expectations and norms on women to perform such labor (Bryson, 1996).

Feminist standpoint theory recognizes sociocultural ideologies (e.g., gender roles, gender division of labor) that explain why women are assigned to certain activities, and why those activities are less valued than activities typically assigned to men (Harding, 1993; Smith, 1987).

| Women’s work in agriculture is invisible and labeled as unpaid on small farm practices. | Despite women’s substantial work on farms, many studies have drawn attention to the unrecognized contribution of women in sustaining farm production (Sachs, 1983; Beneria, 1999).
Women farmers’ work is not remunerated, labeled as unpaid family work, and is not even recognized in official statistics (Alston, 1998; Beneria, 1999; Daniels, 1987; Gulcubuk, 2010; Mackintosh, 2000). These studies are clear that in agriculture women’s contribution is often unrecognized and unfairly rewarded.
Women are homemakers, care givers, wives and mothers, but their work is not paid a wage and so, as her work is not contributing to the market, it is not considered economically significant (Beneria, 1999). | 2. What gender inequalities exist in the workload of women farmers on small farm practices in Turkey? |
| Interview Focus groups |

<p>| Women farmers have less access to decision-making power on small farm practices. | The FAO report states that men control resources and money, and that rural women are often marginalized in decision-making regarding farm production and controlling resources and money around the world (FAO, 2011). | 3. What gender inequalities exist in decision making on small farm practices in Turkey? |
| Interviews Focus groups |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women farmers have less access to resources and information on small farm practices.</th>
<th>Worldwide, women have less access to education and training in agriculture. Women farmers are marginalized in terms of technology adoption, training, and information (FAO, 2011). In Turkey, women farmers have less access to agricultural information and innovations in agriculture (Rad et al, 2012; Boyaci, 2010; Ozctalbas &amp; Akcaoz, 2010; Kizilaslan, 2007).</th>
<th>4. What gender inequalities exist in acquiring knowledge about farming practices in Turkey?</th>
<th>Interviews Focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women lost subsistence farm production in villages because of out-migrations.</td>
<td>With free trade agreements in place, developing countries open up their borders and permit the promotion of big agro-industrial corporations and international trade in the agricultural food system. This has disadvantageous effects on local and national food production, and especially on small farmers (Aydin. 2010; McMichael, 2001). Women are most affected by these transnational food corporations, because they lose most of the work from subsistence farming production and income from marketing in local markets.</td>
<td>5. How does the way small farming is changing in Turkey affect women farmers?</td>
<td>Interviews Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are subject to more patriarchal restrictions on their behaviors after migrating to cities.</td>
<td>The autonomy of women is more constrained, because immigrants are generally marginalized from economic activity (e.g. low skill, education) in the cities (Gunduz- Hosgor &amp; Smits, 2006). Dedeoglu, (2012) emphasized that leaving agricultural activities as unpaid family workers, women became increasingly inactive in cities as the Turkish economy has not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Design

Type of Study

In this study, I used the feminist standpoint inquiry of qualitative research methods to explore women farmers’ gender inequality experiences on the small farm practices in Turkey. The process of feminist research is categorized by Campbell and Wasco, (2000) as four key features: 1) “expanding methodologies to include both quantitative and qualitative methods,” 2) “connecting women for group-level data collection,” 3) “reducing the hierarchical relationship between researchers and their participants to facilitate trust and disclosure,” and 4) “recognizing and reflecting upon the emotionality of women’s lives” (Campbell & Wasco, 2000 p.773).

Drawing on the feminist standpoint theory base, I used qualitative research methods, semi-structured interviews, and focus groups to collect data. For a timeline of the research phases and procedures see Appendix A. The interview has been used frequently by feminist research as a way for researchers and participants to work together to illuminate experience. There is also an emphasis on using group level data collection in the feminist research (Cambell & Wasco (2000). To better explain how this study was carried out, I will provide an overview of the research design including the rationale for using the feminist standpoint approach and qualitative methods to collect data, and the protection of human subjects in the study.

Rationale for a Feminist Standpoint Approach

There are several reasons why the feminist standpoint approach is appropriate to explore women farmers’ gender inequality experiences on small farm practices in Turkey. In particular, feminist standpoint epistemology (the nature of knowledge) recognizes women’s lived
experiences as legitimate sources of knowledge (Hartsock, 1987; Harding, 1993). This lends to the need of the study to explore the daily experiences of women farmers. With the standpoint approach, the researcher finds that research problems arise from conditions and experiences that are common to girls and women in relation to social structure (e.g. women’s life experiences as a source of knowledge) (Smith, 1987). Thus, research from a standpoint approach attempts to understand how the social structure contributes to problems in daily life, and seeks ways to link the results of social inquiry to the emancipatory transformation of the social structure (Wood, 2005). In this sense, the feminist standpoint approach is different from a positivist approach in which problems are often defined in terms of personal differences rather than in the broader context of the situation (Swigonski, 1993).

Feminist standpoint approach also embraces “strong objectivity” in the research process. Strong objectivity builds on the insights of feminist standpoint theory, which argues for the importance of starting from the experiences of those who have been marginalized (typically women and girls) throughout the production of knowledge. It is in this sense, Harding (1991) proposes, that starting research from the life experiences of women actually strengthens standards of objectivity. Employing a feminist standpoint approach allows for this study to capture women’s marginalized social locations, thus, I used the “bottom up” approach to study women farmers’ experiences as described by Apteker (1989). In her book, Aptheker (1989 p.39) called upon researchers to approach studies from the “bottom up,” starting from the everyday lives and experiences of people in marginalized groups to understand the perspective of the marginalized, and particularly the women. Hence, the experiences and activities of those at “the bottom of such social hierarchies” can provide meaningful starting points for identifying noteworthy questions and problems to be explained, as well as offering a standpoint for viewing
the reality of human relations with each other and the natural world (Harding, 1993 p.54). That is why it is important to start this research from women farmers’ daily experiences on the small farm practices in Turkey.

Additionally, using the feminist standpoint approach in this study guides how the research is carried out and ensures that the researcher’s values and attitudes do not enter into this process (Campbell & Wasco, 2000). The main goal of feminist research is to capture women’s lived experiences in a respectful manner that legitimates women’s voices as sources of knowledge (incorporating women’s lived experiences, emotions, and feelings into the knowledge-building process) (Campbell & Wasco, 2000). In this study, I am placing myself as the researcher and also as a woman on the participant’s side. I will share my reflectivity statement to reveal how my own social location affects my interpretation of the research data. In contrast, positivist approach embraces objectivity in the sense that researchers do not allow their personal biases to influence the outcomes. In that case, the researcher should remain neutral to prevent values or biases from influencing the work by following prescribed procedures rigorously (Bailey, 2007). I believe I am holding an “outsider within” position in this research, since I am affiliated with American University, but grew up in same environment as the participants. I also have experience working with villagers before in my previous job in Turkey (Harding 1991). Thus, by using qualitative methods to collect data for this research, I reach out to participants and reduce the hierarchical relationship between myself (as their researcher) and women farmers to build trust in a respectful manner. This is different from the positivist approach in which the researcher and the participants in the study were assumed to be independent. In other words, they did not influence each other (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). In the
positivistic approach, the role of the researcher is limited to data collection and interpretation through objective approach, and the research findings are usually observable and quantifiable.

**Rationale for Qualitative Research Methods**

The primary benefits of using qualitative methods to collect data in this research are that these methods offer more flexibility, and are participant-centered and experience-based. Hence, qualitative research methods are shaped by researchers to, “explore a problem, honor the voices of participants, map the complexity of the situation, and convey multiple perspectives of participants” (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 7). Qualitative research is interested in meaning, and more particularly, how people deal with and make sense of life experiences. This is an area that requires the researcher to interview those involved in the experience (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). For this reason, the interview has been used frequently by feminist research as a way for researchers and participants to work together to illuminate experience. That is why I used semi-structured interviews for my research. I had a pre-prepared questionnaire in my hand, which still allowed me the flexibility to ask more questions or change questions in the field.

Considering the feminist standpoint nature of this research, it is more appropriate to use qualitative methods to collect data for the purpose of this study when compared to quantitative methods. This is because qualitative methods are structured to capture women’s stories, and to legitimate those experiences as sources of knowledge (Jayaratne & Stewart, 1991). The feminist approach is that interviews reflect a conversation in which the participants and researcher share and discuss ideas and issues. I decided to use qualitative methods for the purpose of this research, because women farmers’ are marginalized in terms of low education level, living in a patriarchal social structure, and are embedded in the social structures around them. To obtain
rich data, I recognized that it is better to build relationships and have conversations rather than employing quantitative methods such as surveys with many questions.

This study is designed to collect data under time constraints and with limited resources in the target country (travelling required). Under these circumstances, I used qualitative methods to collect data, because I needed to employ research methods that produced in-depth data in a short time. By contrast, quantitative methods involve many participants. According to Creswell & Plano Clark, (2011) qualitative research is commonly used to provide an in-depth or detailed understanding of the problem, and frequently collects data from studying a few individuals while exploring their perspectives and experiences in greater depth. Thus, the qualitative methods gave me flexibility to collect in-depth data from fewer participants in a short time period.

While there is strong rationale for using a feminist standpoint inquiry and qualitative method approach (Fawcett, & Hearn, 2004), this design also has a few weaknesses. Weaknesses of this approach include how the research is carried out, and making sure that the researcher’s values and attitudes do not enter into this process (Campbell & Wasco, 2000). Because the women-centered results are more easily influenced by the researcher’s personal biases and idiosyncrasies, objectivity of research is more difficult to maintain, assess, and demonstrate (Harding, 1991). Also, because of the qualitative nature of data, the results of this study cannot be transferred to all women farmers in Turkey or women in different parts of the world. In this sense, the study results are only representative of those women who participated in the interviews and focus groups. Furthermore, completing qualitative data analysis can be challenging because the volume of data makes analysis and interpretation time consuming. It may demand more time, resources, and effort compared to quantitative approaches (Creswell,
Thus, I took the necessary steps to ensure that I could complete this study in bias-free and timely fashion.

**Protection of Human Subjects**

Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board (IRB) policies were followed throughout this study. Procedures for the protection of subjects and their rights were followed according to Creswell (2012). I valued following the IRB process for this study. My understanding of ethics in research means doing what is right, treating people fairly, and avoiding harming anyone. As Bailey (2007, p. 25) highlighted, “any individual participating in a research study has a reasonable expectation that information provided to the researcher will be treated in a confidential manner.” Consequently, the participant is entitled to expect that such information will not be given to anyone else. This was very critical for my research, since I was working with women participants from small villages. If I revealed village names, it would be very easy to trace who the participants were. I removed all village names and I used codes for participant names in my study. My study was also designed to avoid harm to any participants. During my interviews, one participant walked away after a few questions, and did not feel comfortable talking. Another participant got emotional and cried. My question about schooling caused her to remember how she lost her mother, grew up with a step mother, and how her parents did not send her to school. Appendix L includes the IRB approval letter for this study (IRB #14-642).

**Background of Study Region**

This study focused on women farmers from the southern part of the Konya (il/vilayet) province in the central Anatolian region of Turkey. The central Anatolian region is a semi-arid zone with low, erratic rainfall (300-600 mm) per annum. This region occupies 21% of the total area of Turkey with its 151,000 square kilometers of land. It is the second largest region out of
the seven geographic zones of Turkey. Regarding agricultural livelihood systems, this region is
known as the “cereal storage of Turkey,” where mostly cereal crops such as wheat and barley are
produced by mechanized agricultural techniques. This region includes arid grazing areas, so
animal husbandry is a common economic activity in the villages as well. Depending on the
availability of irrigation (underground or ground irrigation systems), sugar beets, a variety of
fruits (apple, pear, cherry, sour cherry, plum etc.), and vegetables (tomato, pepper, cucumber,
melon, eggplant, bean etc.) are grown. The countryside of the Central Anatolian region does not
have well-developed infrastructure, and there is more migration to the cities (Gunduz Hosgor &
Smits, 2006).

The study region is located on the Mediterranean border of the Central Anatolia region
surrounded by the Taurus mountain chains. Given the fact that it is surrounded by high
mountains, the region agricultural land are rough and not uniform in mountainous areas, but is
fertile in the plain land with around 500 mm of average rainfall annually. That is why some
villages are categorized as mountain villages (dağ köyleri), and some as plain villages (ova köyleri). Like most of the farming community in Turkey, farmers in study region are small or
semi-subsistence farmers who grow a variety of crops and raise animals, mostly for home
consumption or for sale at local wholesale and farmer’s markets. In the mountain villages and
towns, animal husbandry such as goats, sheep, and cows are raised in comparison to the prairie
villages and towns where cereal crops, vegetables, and fruits are common practice. Overall,
besides animal husbandry, the major regional crops are cereal crops, sugar beets, opium, apples,
pears and grapes (TUIK, 2010). I selected this region because the region typifies small family
farming in Turkey, and the districts’ economy mainly depends on agricultural production (see
below for targeted region map).
Participant Selection

In this study, all participants were selected according to a purposeful sampling strategy as outlined by Creswell (2011). Women farmers were selected based on the following criteria: 1) living in villages the south of the Konya province of Turkey, 2) being a farmer, farmer’s wife, or
adult daughter in a farm household, 3) taking part in production on a farm, and 4) willing to give interviews or participate in focus group sessions.

**Qualitative Protocol Development**

For this research, I developed a series of documents including interview guides, consent forms (for the individual interviewee and focus group participants), and recruitment scripts (for participants and local leaders) in English and Turkish. I developed two interview guides, one for semi-structured interviews, and the other for focus groups. See Appendix B and C to review the interview guide and focus group guide respectively. I also developed two consent forms for women participants (for individual interviewee and focus group participant). See Appendix D and E to review consent forms.

**Data Collection Methods**

For the purpose of this study, I collected data to answer research questions 1 through 5 through in-depth semi-structured interviews and focus groups with women farmers in the six different villages in the southern part of Konya. Prior to interviews, I visited all these villages to give recruitment scripts to potential participants. One focus group session, and two interviews took place with women participants who migrated to city. However, they still do farming either on their land, in their village, or have rented land around city. The site visits occurred from May to August in 2014. During the site visits, I conducted interviews with women farmers and held focus group sessions. It should be noted that the photovoice method was originally proposed as another data collection method, but I dropped this method with the agreement of my adviser. This was because of unexpected circumstances in the field, such as participants being uninterested in taking photographs, giving interviews, and having time limitations. I gave three digital cameras to three women, and taught them how to use the camera. One week later, when I
visited them, they had not even touched the cameras. I took the cameras back and gave them to another three women, but they did not take pictures either. Due to this, I lost 15 days from my already limited time. It was hard to make up for lost time in the field continuing with photovoice data collection.

**Interview Process**

I conducted 23 in-depth, semi-structured individual interviews in locations selected by participants, and whole interview audio was recorded with permission from the interviewee (for the sample interview questions for women farmers, see Appendix B). The in-depth interview took place for 30 to 40 minutes in Turkish, and all in-depth interviews were audio recorded.

The interviews were a pivotal part of my research process. In general, interviews can be unstructured, semi-structured, or structured for qualitative studies (Fontana & Frey, 2000). Thus, Bailey (2007) suggests that we consider our research paradigm, research questions, and analytical strategy while deciding what kind of interviews to use in our research. I used semi-structured interviews for my research, because I had a pre-prepared questionnaire in my hand (I knew what to ask participants), while still having the flexibility to ask more questions or change questions in the field. This was very convenient for me in the field, because even though my participants are all rural women farmers, their realities were changing from one to another. The in-depth interview questions were designed as more open-ended questions so that the participants could provide their own experiences and answers to the questions (Bailey, 2007). Following completion of the in-depth interviews, the audio recorded data was transcribed verbatim in Turkish by using computer software, and was then written up into Microsoft Word (for the time line of interviews, see the table-1 for details in Appendix A). I gave pseudonym names to
participants to mask their identity before analyzing process. I chose these names from common rural names in Turkey.

**Focus Groups Sessions**

I held five focus group sessions with five or more participants from the same village. Only one focus group session took place in city with immigrant women. I used semi-structured questionnaires, and audio recorded in participants’ preferred locations (for the time line of focus groups see the table-1 in Appendix A, and see Appendix C for guiding questions). According to Carey (1994), focus groups have advantages over the individual interviews because the researcher can use the group interactions. Feminist scholars have also argued that the task of understanding women’s lives may be best achieved in group settings (Campbell & Wasco, 2000, p. 784). Bringing rural women together to discuss their lives in the rural villages brings attention to the many ways gender inequalities touch the daily experiences of being female. In fact, for many women, it is only through their discussions with other women that they are able to find ways to describe the events of their own lives. Thus, feminist researchers state that group settings help individuals find language for talking about existing, not “created,” issues (Campbell & Wasco, 2000, p.784). However, a particular disadvantage of focus groups is the possibility that the members may not express their honest and personal opinions about the topic at hand (Carey, 1994). Nevertheless, the focus group approach worked very well in my research. Women farmers talked more and were encouraged by each other at focus group sessions. I felt like they were more talkative in a group setting. The only problem was that it was hard to keep them focused on my questions. I really believe focus groups methods can be useful in studying marginalized, and particularly low educated people.
During the data collection process, I came to realize how important electronic devices are to research keep going. During my interviews, I used two recorders. One of my recorders has a connection to a computer, which is important for uploading data. In the field, I had some issues regarding recorders (sometimes the battery ran out, sometimes one of them failed during interviews). Fortunately, I used two devices, and at least one of them was working each time. I can tell from my experience that having multiple devices is very important, as well as having a recorder with a computer connection to upload files for transcribing. Thus, researchers should be well prepared before heading to the field.

Data Analysis

In this study, two forms of data were used for analysis including in-depth interview data and focus group data. Data analysis began with transcribing all interviews and focus group data in Turkish. I used Express Scribe transcription software when transcribing the in-depth interviews and focus group data. During the transcription process, I created memos to capture my thoughts while engaged in the process of data analysis (Rossman & Rallis, 2011). I did analysis both manually and computer-assisted, since the obligation to stay closely connected with the data is fundamental (Mason, 2002). However, I mainly used the computer software Atlas.ti to analyze the transcripts. To analyze data, I used the constant comparative method (Glaser, 1965). This method requires the researcher to take one piece of data (contracts from theory, one interview, one statement, or one theme) and compare it to all other pieces of data that are either similar or different. During this process, the researcher begins to look at what makes this piece of data different and/or similar to other pieces of data (Glaser, 1965). I used an initial code list, which I developed from a list of feminist standpoint constructs to code all the transcripts. These
constructs are: inequitable gender division of labor, subordinated social locations, and social cultural power dynamics.

To begin the coding process, I first performed open coding (initial coding) by identifying and organizing my data around constructs from feminist standpoint theory. According to Bailey (2007, p. 140), “coding is the process of identifying and organizing portions of data that are potentially useful for further analysis.” I organized my data around concepts from feminist standpoint theory. During initial coding, I read my data repeatedly, coding as much as possible.

Secondly, I did focused coding (axial coding), which involves sorting my concepts and categories while re-reading the text in order to confirm that my concepts and categories accurately represent interview responses, and explore how my concepts and categories are related. During axial coding, I focused on reducing the data by identifying and combining the initial coded data into larger categories that incorporate multiple codes (Bailey, 2007).

Finally, following focused coding, I created code families (codes related to each other), and used the code families to compile themes related to research questions one through five. In this way, I generated themes from the data. The coding was completed in an iterative process designed to identify common and recurring themes and outlying trends by using the qualitative statistic software Atlas.ti (Rossman & Rallis, 2011). All analyses were done in Turkish, and I then translated the results to English.

**Trustworthiness of Research**

In qualitative research, data interpretation is based on a process of inductive inference (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2009), which refers to a process of creating meaningful and consistent explanations, understanding, conceptual frameworks, and/or theories drawing on a systematic observation of phenomena. In qualitative study, establishing the trustworthiness of research
increases the reader’s confidence that the results are worthy of attention (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Similar to the standards of validity and reliability within quantitative research, trustworthiness criteria are used within qualitative research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed a series of four terms to help establish the trustworthiness of qualitative inquiry which include, “credibility,” “transferability,” “dependability,” and “confirmability” (p. 300). They admit that these standards correspond with traditional ones in some ways, comparing credibility with internal validity, confirmability with objectivity, and transferability with generalizability.

To guarantee trustworthiness of the data, researchers employ many strategies in conducting qualitative inquiry and presenting findings to establish the trustworthiness of their research (Creswell, 2012). I focused on the trustworthiness criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability as suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985) in this study.

**Credibility**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) compared internal validity to the qualitative evaluation criterion of credibility. They argued that ensuring credibility is one of the most important factors in establishing trustworthiness. Credibility measures how well the multiple factors that interact with each other are portrayed in the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Credibility involves representing, “the realities of the research participants as accurately as possible” (Ary et al., 2006, p. 504). Credibility can be accomplished through member checks, data triangulation, and peer debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this research, I used triangulation of data to accomplish credibility by using different data sources such as interviews and focus groups. I also provided gender inequality statistics in terms of formal education, women’s work participation, and migration (rural and urban population ratios etc.) based on statistics from the Turkish Statistic Institutes. Furthermore, I collected data from the different social locations that
participants hold, such as young, middle aged, old or different income levels. In addition to this, I participated in a community of practice with my research committee members to discuss every step of this research process (Patton, 2002). Finally, I generated an audit trail to provide documentation throughout the research process (Rossman & Rallis, 2011).

**Confirmability**

Confirmability questions how the research findings are supported by the data collected. This is a process to establish whether the researcher has been biased during the study. The concept of confirmability is the qualitative researcher’s comparable concern to objectivity. Here, steps must be taken to help to ensure that the work’s findings are the result of the experiences and ideas of the participants, rather than the characteristics and preferences of the researcher (Rossman & Rallis, 2011). Confirmability can be addressed by including excerpts from the raw data that will support interpretations and conclusions drawn by the researcher (Rossman & Rallis, 2011). To ensure confirmability of this research, I incorporated direct quotes from raw data (excerpts from transcripts) to support my interpretation and conclusions. I also completed an audit trail throughout the study to demonstrate how each decision was made. I positioned myself on the participant’s side as their researcher because of the feminist nature of this research. However, I am mindful about my position as a researcher (i.e., research instrument), and have worked to eliminate my personal biases while conducting this study.

**Dependability**

Dependability ensures that the research findings are consistent and could be repeated. This is measured by the standard by which the research is conducted, analyzed and presented. In this study, I addressed dependability by keeping detailed records and reporting the research process in detail. (i.e. providing the reader with information that documents how the study was
conducted) (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I reported each step of the methodological approach, including detailed data collection and analysis procedures, to enable other researchers to repeat the inquiry and achieve similar results.

**Transferability**

Transferability refers to the degree to which the research can be transferred to other contexts. This section is defined by readers of the research. According to Rossman and Rallis (2011), the findings of a qualitative project are specific to a small number of environments and individuals. Therefore, it is impossible to demonstrate that the findings and conclusions are applicable to other situations and populations. I achieved transferability by providing rich, detailed descriptions of my research process and my methods to allow other researchers to determine if the findings are applicable to other cases. In addition, I provided background data to establish the context of the study, and detailed description of the phenomenon in question to allow comparisons to be made.

In the following section, I will share my personal reflexivity in order to share with readers how my own social location affects my interpretation of the data (Campbell & Wasco, 2000). As a researcher, I worked to ensure that the findings are reflective of women’s lived experiences, rather than my own perspective. I also worked with women participants in a respectful manner that legitimated women’s voices as sources of knowledge during this research process (Campbell & Wasco, 2000).

**Personal Reflexivity**

My position as an immigrant woman, married with kids, and working on my PhD relates me to the phenomenon of gender inequalities of women regarding education, job, gender roles and responsibilities, and household responsibilities in a specific way. While I have been in the
USA for a long time, I have a subordinate position as an immigrant woman. Back home, I was in the dominant culture as a Turkish ethnic. I had a good job, and good status as a professional woman, even though I started from the bottom. After I married, I quit my job to live in the USA with my husband. I went down to the status of having no job, and became a full time housewife and mother juggling kids and household work. That transferred me from an income-earning position to a dependent position. These experiences help me to distinguish the diverse marginalized positions of women in society from my own perspective. Immigrant status is not as beneficial as some might think. I can tell that many opportunities are not for immigrant women because people still affiliate you with your native country, and exclude you easily from opportunities. This taught me about the presence of marginalization in every society.

My interest in rural women’s life in Turkey, especially farmer’s wives or daughters evolved from my early experiences and academic interests. I grew up in a similar village household in Turkey. Our village is located in a mountainous area surrounded by beautiful forests, but harsh living conditions. People in the village perform subsistence and semi-subsistence farming including growing cereal crops, small vegetable gardens, raising chickens, cows, goats, and sheep. I could have been one of these rural women if I did not have a father who believed in education as the most powerful thing you can give your kids. I am here today at Virginia Tech, doing my PhD because of that peasant farmer’s vision. However, my heart never left the village people, and especially women who do not have the same opportunities I had. These village people were the hardest working people, but also the most neglected people in terms of schooling, infrastructure, paved roads, and public services. My family worked as a household, including kids, to produce our food. My father generally worked in forest-related work, but planting field crops and bringing harvests home was the main male job in the village. I
remembered that we always had plenty of food, but not much money, because of this multi-
sourcing production in the village. Recently, I have seen how my village changed from a viable
community to a deserted community in my visits to my country. All these small, scattered lands
are left bare without cultivating. Houses in the village have been closed one by one after
hardworking farmers get old or pass away. The next generation did not carry out their parents’
tradition. Of course, newcomers have come to the village, establishing new neighborhoods with
better looking summer homes, but no agricultural production.

I have also come into contact with villagers including small farmers through my work
experience as an agricultural extension agent in three different regions of Turkey. I worked with
small farmers and semi-subsistence farmers growing field crops and forage crops. However,
during my job I never worked with women producers. There were no programs to target women
producers with the exception of some home economics courses. Ironically, I never thought about
why we were not teaching them anything. I was a part of a system. This research allowed me to
work with those women farmers who are marginalized and ignored by institutions like extension
services, and to bring their experiences and voices to the forefront from women’s marginalized
standpoint.

Using feminist standpoint epistemology in this research gave me opportunities to closely
look at women’s gender inequality realities (e.g., women’s subordinate locations, social cultural
power dynamics, and inequitable gender division of labor power) from marginalized rural
women’s positions, and provided me with experiences that are very exciting for me. During my
study, women farmers sometimes laughed at my questions regarding farm work or housework.
Sometimes, they said ironic things about their workload in the household by saying, “we cannot
let our men work too much!” Some of them even became emotional when describing how they
could not make it to school. These women are so embedded in the patriarchal social culture around them, and view the world from this perspective. By studying the everyday lives of rural women in Turkey, I looked at the society from the location of the women who provide labor on the farm, give care inside the household, and possess no voice to represent themselves.

**Exploring Feminist Standpoint Constructs**

I employed three constructs, which were critical to explore gender inequality experiences of women farmers. These concepts include: 1) inequitable gender division of labor, 2) subordinated social locations, and 3) social cultural power dynamics. I will discuss specific variables that were used to explore these constructs.

**Exploring Gender Inequality Standpoints (outcomes)**

Gender inequality standpoints outcomes were explored through invisible labor, heavy work burden, dependent position, poverty, and patriarchal social control. Invisible labor was explored by the unpaid, unrecognized labor of women farmers in terms of domestic work and agricultural work. Low productivity was explored through access to farm resources and extension services. Dependent position was explored though lack of access to decision-making power, lack of access to control money, and patriarchal social orders. Patriarchal social control was explored through immigrant position, patriarchal social control, and lack of access to public space.

**Exploring Inequitable Gender Division of Labor**

Inequitable gender division of labor was explored through gendered roles and responsibilities in the farm work and household work. Gendered roles and responsibilities were explored through women farmers’ farm tasks concerning planting, harvesting, tending livestock, making dairy products, and marketing as well as household tasks concerning managing the home
(cooking, cleaning), caring for children and the elderly, and food provisioning. Inequitable gender division of labor was also explored through the unpaid and unrecognized nature of women’s agricultural and domestic tasks.

Exploring Subordinated Social Locations

Subordinated social locations were explored through women farmers’ lack of access to resources and knowledge, and changes in agricultural practices and communities. Access to knowledge was explored through access to extension services (extension outreach and women farmers’ participation). Access to resources was explored through access to inputs (fertilizer, seeds, pesticides, and farm equipment) and markets (where they sell their products). Changes in agricultural practices and communities were explored through immigrant positions, losing subsistence production, food insecurity, and lack of access to public space.

Exploring Social Cultural Power Dynamics

Social cultural power dynamics were explored through women farmers’ access to decision-making power and control over money, and the patriarchal social order. Access to decision-making power was explored through how they decide to hire workers, how they market agricultural products, what to produce in the farm, and the buying of farm equipment, household goods, and children’s’ needs. Control over money was explored through who borrows money (credit), who buys what the family needs, and who sells agricultural products (livestock or produce). Patriarchal social order was explored by women’s access to public space, women’s mobility, and family hierarchy (living with extended family).

Summary

I employed a feminist standpoint approach with a qualitative research design to explore women farmers’ gender inequality experiences on the small farm practices in Turkey. Building
on Cambell & Wasco’s (2000) feminist research model, I used qualitative research methods (e.g., semi-structured interviews, focus groups) to collect data. The interview has been used frequently by feminist research as a way for researchers and participants to work together to illuminate experience. There is also an emphasis on using a group-based data approach in feminist research as well (Cambell & Wasco, 2000). I analyzed data based on concepts drawn from feminist standpoint theory principles. In the following chapter, I will present the findings of this study.
Chapter 5: Results

In this chapter, I will offer a discussion of the collective findings from the in-depth semi-structured interviews and the focus group data. I will present information about the demographics of the participants and their farming backgrounds. I will also offer background information about the villages in which the participants reside. After the initial foundation is laid for the research results, I will discuss the findings of the study as they pertain to each of the five research questions.

Introduction

The overarching purpose of this study is to explore the women farmers’ gender inequality experiences on small farm practices in Turkey. Gender equality does not necessarily imply that women become identical to men. Rather, equality means that one’s rights or access to opportunities are not contingent on being male or female, and entails promoting a more equal relationship between men and women in the process of agricultural food production. Through examining the gender division of labor on small farming practices, it became evident that women do not usually produce food separately from men in Turkish rural villages. On small family farms, most food is produced with labor contributions from both men and women in a collaborative fashion. Nevertheless, men generally manage income and resources and retain decision-making power in these small agricultural communities. Women and men have different perspectives, needs, interests, roles, and resources in the agricultural production process. These different roles usually result in women having less access and control than men over resources and the decision-making process. Hence, gender inequalities erode the women's ability to access and manage land and other productive resources such as knowledge and input, and pose a significant barrier to promoting women’s economic security and self-reliance. The social
situation of women farmers plays a role in informing what we know and limiting what we are able to know in feminist standpoint research. It is important to point out that the inequality these rural women experience does not only arise from relations between men and women. It extends beyond gender to other types of inequalities such as social status, class (being rural women), economic class, low income, poor infrastructure in villages, practicing semi-subsistence agriculture (low income), and geographical location (villager) (Hartsock, 1996). The various positions of women farmers play a role in forming a range of standpoints. Thus, I strove to explore the women farmers’ gender inequality experiences on small farm practices from women farmers’ various standpoints. I collected feminist standpoint data through in-depth interviews and focus groups with women farmers in their home setting in the villages of southern part of the Konya province in Turkey. Specifically, the following five research questions were used to guide the study:

6. What is the gender division of labor on small farm practices?
7. What gender inequalities exist in the workload of women farmers on small farm practices?
8. What gender inequalities exist in decision-making on small farm practices?
9. What gender inequalities exist in acquiring knowledge about farming practices?
10. How does the way small farming is changing in Turkey affect women farmers?

In May 2014, I travelled to Konya province (il) of Turkey to conduct interviews and focus group sessions with women participants. In total, I carried out 23 interviews and 5 focus groups with women farmers from six different villages in the southern region of Konya. All interviews took place face-to-face, by myself in Turkish. All of the focus group sessions were moderated by myself, and were conducted in Turkish as well. Some of the interviewed women...
also participated in the focus groups, although this was not always the case. During the analysis process, the guiding research question adopted the feminist standpoint lens, and was addressed through five research questions. Each individual research question drew upon a specific conceptual framework (specific construct of feminist standpoint theory), and the collective responses to the five questions answer the overall research question. I analyzed the transcribed interviews and focus groups to establish which feminist standpoint concepts were associated with gender inequality outcomes.

**Context for the Results**

In Turkey, a village (köy) is defined as any settlement with a population of less than 2,000. All villages are integrated into the hierarchy of the national governmental system as the smallest political and administrative unit (bottom layer), and are officially headed by an elected person called the “muhtar,” equivalent to a town mayor, and a council of elders (ihtiyar meclisi) (Ozturk, 2012 p.133). In a typical village, houses with their courtyards are built around a central place. Land used for agriculture surrounds the village. In each village, there is usually a mosque, a school, a coffeehouse, guest rooms and some small shops. In terms of infrastructure, all villages participating in this study have electricity, running water, and roads to connect them to urban cities and nearby villages. These roads are not in perfect condition. Some of the villagers own a car that others use, on a daily or weekly basis, as public transportation to commute to the district (kaza/ilçe). As I discussed in chapter 2, all of these villages have been transformed from remote village status to district’s neighborhood status upon the implementation of the new government districting system in 2013. While I was conducting this study, some of the villages were recently subjected to the new re-districting. The women of the village were worried that
these new structures might result in increased electricity fees, additional water fees (identical to the city fees), trash fees (new regulation), and other new construction regulations.

The family (aile) is the basic structure of the village society. Close family ties (kinship) and close relationships with neighbors are very important. Ideally, household members are expected to work together on the household's land cooperatively and pool the income. They are bound to networks of family, kin, neighbors, and others. In the villages, residents are related to each other by bloodline. Thus, the entire village is established by a few family lineages. Generally, social status is defined by different criteria such as age, sex, the position of a person in his or her own household (birth order), lineage, and kinship network. Economic status is indicated by landholding, occupation, income, and moral stature as demonstrated by self-righteousness, religiousness, and moral decency. In the family, there is a hierarchical social structure, and the oldest man is the head of the household with the decision-making power. Older women enjoy great influence on decision-making in family matters. Young girls and brides hold low subordinate positions compared to boys, because Turkish families are patrilineal. This means that sons carry out the family heritage, and are supposed to take care of the parents when they are older. Female members of the family embody the honor of the family, wherein sexual purity is important. For this reason, it is monitored and controlled by the family. In this sense, females are restricted from public space.

In these villages, the social class of the rural people is “villager” (peasant, köylü). They are all connected to farming and producing food. Some of them have big practices (land owner or livestock owners), and some of them are peasants (small land owner with few livestock). In villages, the focus of this study, economic status is more or less identical for the majority of the
villagers. There is not a huge income gap among the different families in the village. If they own more livestock or land, they enjoy better income, and they own a vehicle and farm equipment.

In these villages, people are Sunni Muslim with Turkish ethnic identity. There are variations in the practice of Islam depending on peoples’ choices. Some of them are strictly religious, while some practice moderately, and others do not practice at all. Nevertheless, everyone identifies as a Muslim. There is a mosque in the village, and it is open for prayer every day, and for special weekly prayer every Friday at noon. The leader (religious scholar) of the mosque is appointed by the government. Generally, this leader is a graduate from Islamic high school, and typically lives in the village with residents. The majority of adults observe other religious traditions such as fasting during Ramadan if they do not have health problems. They celebrate Muslim holidays, both the first day after Ramadan when they break the fasting, and the day when pilgrims gather in Mecca (Eid ul Addha) each year. The villagers give zekat (charity), one of the five pillars of Islam, after earning above what is needed to maintain oneself. Zekat is 2.5 percent of individual annual income and assets. They give good deeds (hayir; in-kind contributions) to the less fortunate. Hayir can be expressed by offers of assistance and expressions of care. There are always close relationships among the villagers in terms of helping neighbors and relatives.

In these villages, farming is the family business, most of which are family-owned and employ family labor. Farm work is shared by everyone currently living in the family home. Subsistence and semi-subsistence farming is an important characteristic of the village lifestyle. These farms are typically characterized by low production, and only a small fraction of products are marketed. Generally, village farmers practice a variety of production techniques (mixed farming) such as raising livestock and chicken, subsistence gardening, and growing cereal crops.
Women play a central role in these traditional rural farming systems by providing labor and managing the household.

Two kinds of village residents participated in this study. Out of the study villages, three are located in mountainous areas called mountain villages (dağ köyleri), and are perched on the side of mountains where land is rocky, arid and hilly. Three of them are located in the plains areas of Konya where land is more fertile, flat, and more valuable, and are called plain villages (ova köyleri). All villages have communal areas (generally not suitable for planting) in which residents can graze their animals. The majority of villagers own some land, generally inherited from their parents, and some of them are landless. Agricultural land are fragmented and divided. The percentage of the total population living in villages has declined dramatically as a result of rural-to-urban migration in recent years.

**Description of Study Villages**

In the mountain villages, farming is very traditional - subsistence or semi-subsistence farming. Those practicing commercialized farming practice raising livestock or small ruminants (like goats and sheep), but maintain traditional ways (semi-nomadic way). Village residents’ economic statuses are more or less identical since most of them practice subsistence production such as growing small vegetable and fruit gardens, raising chickens, and tending a few cows. Yet some of them practice a nomadic, traditional way of raising cows, goats or sheep (traditional, but more commercial practices). Although many of them are former "yörük" nomads, people still identify themselves as "yörük," which is applied to nomadic lifestyles in these villages (e.g., it is fitting for a nomadic people moving seasonally with their flocks of sheep and goats). However, the life of these people is becoming less nomadic (settled in villages), and they are departing from many of their traditions in recent years.
In these villages, agricultural practices depend mainly on animal husbandry. They produce dairy products including cheese, yogurt, and butter and sell them directly from home or at the local market. Raising and selling livestock constitute a significant portion of their income. Consequently, they quit subsistence production of cereal crops. In these villages, land that used to be cereal crop production baskets (small scattered plots), are all empty, because there is not enough labor to keep up subsistence farming. Moreover there is not enough income generated from agricultural practices to support the whole family. They do not want to employ mechanized work such as hiring a tractor or combine harvester to maintain cereal crop farming due to the small area of the land itself, the cost of mechanized work generally exceeds what can be earned from the land. That is why almost nobody grows cereal crops anymore if they own small pieces of land. Current residents consider the abandoned land an advantage as land for their animals to graze, at the same time, they are concerned about the lack of community viability.

All three villages are undergoing severe migration, and most of the houses are empty. Therefore, remaining residents are either elderly people who choose to stay in their homes (or they could not go to cities following their kids) or a few younger families that want to continue living in the villages. There is also public transportation available once a week to allow the residents to go to the city on the day of the local bazaar (farmers-market). Some villagers have their own car. In two of these villages, primary schools (often the only school) were closed, but the government provides transportation services to carry students to schools in neighboring villages. Few kids use this service as most of the parents with school-age children have already moved to other towns with schools, or even to other cities.

In the plains villages, farming is semi-subsistence. Farmers grow crops such as wheat, barley, chickpea, sugar beet, and opium for wholesale to local traders. They also raise cows,
sheep, or chickens, and produce vegetables and fruits. Some of the farmers own a tractor, a sowing machine, fertilizer, and pesticide spraying machines. They also hire a combine harvester to harvest their produce. These villagers identify themselves as real farmers. These villages are doing better in agricultural practices, because their lands are far more suitable to mechanized agriculture. That is why villagers are still growing cereal crops such as wheat and barley. They sell their milk to merchants who collect milk and animals to sell to local traders. They also sell their vegetable and fruit surplus at local markets in cities. They sell their cereal crops to wholesale traders. Even though some residents have moved to cities, they still enjoy revenue from the land either by renting their land to other producers, or by returning to the village at certain times to plant and harvest their cereal crops to sell wholesale. Even though these villages are also under migration threat, it is not as severe as that experienced by the mountain villages. Women in these villages sell egg, vegetable, and fruit surplus at the local market as well as milk and dairy products in city bazaar.

**Demographics of the Participants**

Participants in this study come from three mountain villages (dağ köyleri) and three plains villages (ova köyleri). All participants were born in these rural villages, and grew up in these environments. Their parents were also farmers living in these villages. Most of the participants had lived with their in-laws for some time (at least several years), or had lived with them until they passed away. Two of the youngest participants in this study are still living with their in-laws. Two of the older participants have their daughter-in-law still living with them. Thus, although most of the villagers have probably lived part of their lives in such a household, most village households at any given time are comprised of only parents and their children, with perhaps other scattered relatives. Out of all these participants, only one woman claimed that she
could drive a tractor, a car, and a truck in the village without possessing a driver’s license. Her husband had had an accident, and he could no longer drive a tractor or a car.

The participants’ ages fell between 25 and 72 years of age. Four participants were 67-72 years old. Most of the participants’ ages fell between 40-60 years. Two of the youngest participants were 25 and 34 years old. All participants were married except for one participant who was a widow. Most of the participant’s kids had already left home. Only the two youngest participants still had young kids at home.

Most of the participants had an elementary school education (13 participants), seven participants were illiterate, one of them can read, one of them dropped out from middle school, and one graduated from middle school. When considering their husbands’ education levels, twelve husbands received elementary school level education, three of them had high school level education (one drop out), two of them had middle school level education, two of them attained college level education (one drop out), two of them had out-of-school elementary school diplomas, one of them can read, and one of them was illiterate. Thus, compared to their spouses, only one husband was illiterate (and older than 70 years old), while almost half of the women participants were illiterate (as young as 47, 54, and 58 years old), even though compulsory five-year education was in place during their school age time.

**Farming Background of Participants**

In the mountain villages, two of the participant families owned goat herds with more than 200 head of goats. Their practices are nomadic traditional, but more commercialized in that they get subsidies from the animal union (government). They own some agricultural land, but they do not grow cereal crops anymore. They use these lands for harvesting hay (grown wildly). One of these participants owned a tractor and a small truck. Another owned a tractor and hay harvesting
machine. One participant who is a widow owns a sheep herd (took credit from a bank to buy sheep six years ago by herself). She also gets subsidies from an animal union (government). One participant’s family owns more than 50 cows, and practices semi-nomadic traditional farming. They get subsidies from the animal union. The remaining eight participants; farm practices are subsistence production (more or less the same) including a few cows, chickens (egg), small vegetable gardens (family consumption, surplus goes their relatives), and dairy products (cheese, yogurt, butter) to sell from home or at the local markets in town and cities. All participants sell their animal to local traders (generally male members of the family do the selling). They can also sell to individuals who want to buy an animal for special occasions such as holidays.

In the plains villages, farmers practice traditional forms of production as well. They produce vegetables, fruits, chickens, cereal crops, cows, goats, and sheep. They refer to themselves as real farmers in comparison to mountain village farmers. One participant’s family owned 2 tractors, sowing equipment, fertilizer and pesticide equipment, more than 30 decares (a tenth of an acre) of land, cows, and a vegetable garden. They sold milk and excess cereal crops to local traders. They sold egg, vegetable, and fruits surplus at the local markets in city. One participant’s husband has an off-farm job. They raised young beef (commercial) and produced cereal crops, and maintained a small vegetable and fruit garden. One participant’s family grew cereal crops on their village land, but they did not live in the village.

Remaining participants had similar farm practices with a few livestock such as chickens (meat and egg), vegetable and fruit gardens (surplus sold in bazaar), chickpeas, and cereal crops. They sold milk, animals, and cereal crops to local traders. Generally, all these jobs are carried out by men. Small amounts of the products such as vegetables, eggs, milk, fruit, and dairy products are sold by women directly from their homes or at the local bazaar in city.
Research Question 1: Gender Division of Labor on Small Farming Practices in Turkey

I analyzed the interviews and focus group transcripts to develop an understanding of the gender relations, the division of labor between men and women (who does what work), and who has access to and control over resources. In order to describe the specialized tasks of men and women in agricultural practices and household work, I asked the participants to describe each of the gender roles and responsibilities for both household work and farm tasks (i.e. what type of work are women typically responsible for, what kind of work are men typically responsible for, what kind of work are both women and men responsible for, and how do they organize/divide these tasks among the family members). I also questioned them about who has access to, and control over the resources in the family. I asked the participants to elucidate the gender division of labor in marketing the agricultural products and buying goods for the family. To answer this research question, I analyzed transcripts generated from both in-depth interviews and focus groups with participants through using the inequitable gender division of labor concept derived from feminist standpoint theory. I identified several themes among passages within the transcripts. These themes are: a) gendered patterns within agricultural production in Turkey: 1) women have an important role in subsistence and semi-subsistence production, 2) men perform mechanized work in agricultural production, 3) women take more responsibility in the absence of men’s physical capacity; b) presence of gendered pattern in marketing: 1) women market a small quantity of agricultural products, 2) men market high value farm products; c) gendered pattern exists within household work: 1) women take primary responsibility for homemaking, nurturing, and caregiving, 2) internalization of housework as women’s responsibility, 3) women are exposed to heavy work burden (housework and agricultural production).
Gendered Patterns within Agricultural Production in Turkey

Theme # 1: Women Have an Important Role in Subsistence and semi-subsistence Production

*Women play an important role in subsistence gardening:* On the small subsistence and semi-subsistence farms, women are responsible for the more time-consuming and labor-intensive tasks of crop production: planting, hoeing, harvesting and post-harvest processing, and livestock production: milking, and making cheese and butter. All the study participants claimed that they grew vegetables and fruit in the small gardens, and their husbands generally helped in preparing the soil and sometimes in watering. Asiye said “women work on the small garden including planting, weeding, and harvesting.” She does all the work in the garden. Participant Feza’s husband is a retired school teacher, but he is still performing some mechanized tasks in farming. She explained “men prepare soil for planting in the garden, but I do the planting, hoeing, spraying pesticides and fertilizer, watering, and I also harvest the fruit and vegetables.” She does almost all of the required work, except for the soil preparation, in the small garden by herself. Thus, women bear most of the responsibility for growing vegetables and fruits in the small subsistence garden.

*Women’s important role in milking farm animals and making dairy products:* Women often have an important role in milking and making dairy products in these rural villages. They use machines to separate butter from the milk, or to make yogurt. Some of them even use machines to milk the cows, but not many of them have such leverage. Feza said, “I take care of the cows, milk them, and make dairy products such as yogurt, cheese and butter.” Similarly, Hatice added, “I milk goats, and I make cheese, yogurt and butter.” Kezban stated that, “I milk the cows and make cheese, yogurt, and butter.” The rest of the participants mentioned doing
similar tasks. Access to milking machines did not change the fact that women are still responsible for these tasks. This observation was supported when participant Vildan said, “We use machines for milking cows, but, I am still the one who runs that machine.” All participants who own livestock performed the animal milking tasks and made dairy products. In this study, Senem shared with me that, “when I am not here, my husband cannot milk the cows. If he cannot find any woman to perform this job, he just lets the calves drink the milk.” Thus, women often are irreplaceable in milking the farm animals and making dairy products. For families that do not possess milking machines, men do not milk the animals manually, as such tasks are generally associated with household work. Therefore, women are responsible for such tasks.

The results of this study highlighted that all participants, except for one, grew vegetables in their small garden for family consumption. Particularly, participants from the plains villages grow vegetables for family consumption, and sold the surplus vegetables in a local bazaar in town and city. Moreover, participants who owned livestock claimed that they were responsible for milking the animals and making dairy products. All of these participants make important contributions to agricultural production in these villages. They are crucial to crop production, livestock rearing, milking and making dairy products, marketing, and agro-processing in the subsistence and semi-subsistence farming. While women carry out tasks that are labor intensive, and are responsible for the household food security, they do not generate much income.

**Theme# 2: Men Perform Mechanized Work in Agricultural Production**

*Men's mechanized jobs:* Men carry out mechanized jobs that take place in public space and require interactions with strangers, outsiders, and other men. All participants with a background in cereal crop production, including Asiye, Cemile, Cennet, Emine, Feza, Zehra, Vildan, Sevgi, and Solmaz, claimed that men are responsible for planting cereal crops such as
wheat and barley, applying fertilizers, and harvesting and selling the crop wholesale. Cennet stated that the, “…harvest crews are scheduled by men.” Asiye claimed that, “men do the mechanized work on the farm such as planting cereal crops and arranging and combining the harvester crew and hiring crew for the straw harvest.” Both participants’ husbands were responsible for growing cereal crops. Sevgi said, “my father in-law plants, harvests, and sells cereal crops, and my husband helps him.” Her father-in-law manages the cereal crops because he is head of the household. Emine claimed that, “my husband controls the cereal crop production, I do not interfere with his job.” Thus, if the men are present in the home, they typically limit their contributions to doing mechanized work.

*Rural women cannot drive:* All participants, except for one, stated that they do not know how to drive a car or a tractor. Kader, the only participant claiming to be able to drive a vehicle, said, “I have been driving a tractor for more than 10 years now. I drove a truck in the past, but now I have a taxi [laugh]. I drive the taxi to the bazaar without having a driver’s license, but I am afraid of getting stopped by police. However, there are no police in the village, so I drive freely.” Her husband was involved in a car accident and he cannot drive anymore. She took over the driving of farm vehicles, but she does not have a driver’s license. Thus, it is not common that village women drive vehicles, even without a license.

The study results highlighted that men are in control of cereal crop production, mainly because growing cereal crops is very ideal for using farm machines. Subsequently, women’s work in cereal crop production has been eliminated or limited in recent years. Men took over the commercialized part of traditional farming including growing and trading cereal crops, using machines, including planting with a tractor, spraying pesticides and fertilizer, and hiring a
combine harvester. In contrast to women in this study, men are responsible for agricultural activities that create income.

**Theme #3: Women Take More Responsibility in the Absence of Men’s Physical Capacity**

Women take more responsibility when men are not present or are not in full strength, deceased or working at off-farm jobs on these small farm practices. Hacer’s husband passed away and she said, “I took credit and bought sheep. I herd sheep by myself.” If her husband was alive, he would be herding sheep. Generally, herding is a man or boy’s job. This woman is the head of the household, and she is doing both men’s and women’s jobs. She said, “I am acting as both man and woman in my family.” She does all of the farm jobs with the help of her kids. She explained, “…my daughter helps me in gardening and house work, my son lends a hand in harvesting, planting, cleaning the barn, and stacking hay in the barn.” Her son helps more in masculine jobs and her daughter assists more in women’s work. Asiye, who lives alone (her husband left her), said, “If I have extra cows I sell them by myself. I also call the veterinarian by myself when needed.” She carries out all the cow-raising work by herself. Kader said. “I do all farm work by myself including planting, hoeing, and harvesting. I have one cow to take care of, and I also harvest hay and bring it to the barn.” She does all these tasks because her husband had an accident and he is not able to do much physical work. Another woman, Cemile, claimed that her husband was very lazy. She said, “I am the one who does all the work in my household. I buy groceries, I buy household goods, and I can tell I am living by the labor of my hands. I do both men’s jobs and women’s jobs. My husband is not much into work.” She shoulders her typical work responsibility and supposedly her husband’s work responsibility as well. Meral’s husband is disabled. She said, “I do almost all the work by myself, because my husband had an accident
and he cannot work much. I even go to the bazaar to sell our products by myself.” She does all the work including tending animals, making dairy products, and selling them at the bazaar.

Thus, the research results indicated that all these participants take more responsibility in agricultural production and marketing because their husbands’ work ability is limited or, in some instances absent. In the absence of men’s work power, they end up taking over the men’s responsibilities in addition to their own responsibilities in these traditional small farming practices.

**Gendered Patterns in Marketing**

**Theme #4: Women Market Small Quantity Agricultural Products**

*Women sell small quantity products:* Women sell small quantity products either locally out of their homes or at the local bazaar in city. Emine said, “I sell vegetables, eggs, fruits, and dairy products at the local bazaar, or sometimes I just sell directly from home to local customers or visitors to the village.” Basically, she sells “surplus” vegetables, dairy products, and eggs at the bazaar or from home. Cemile mentioned, “I sell my vegetables and eggs at the bazaar in city. I also sell fish. All my earnings come from farming.” She claimed that her income depends solely on what she sells at the bazaar. These participants often have control over marketing (in the local market) of surplus vegetables, dairy products, and eggs. Thus, the influence of women is clear in selling eggs, dairy products and vegetables from home and at the nearby bazaar.

*Marketing from home:* Women sell eggs, milk, cheese, butter, yogurt, vegetables and fruits. Cennet said, “We sell egg and milk from home a lot. People call to order and pick up.” Her family markets some of their products right from home. Naciye said, “I sell from home, but my husband sells at the bazaar.” She also added, “I decided to sell milk and dairy products, since I am the one who produces it. I give the sales money to my husband.” She produces and allocates
how much to sell, but the husband sells it at the bazaar and keeps the revenue. In particular, traditional nomadic producers from mountain villages claimed that their dairy products were sought by city people. They sell almost all their dairy products from home. Meryem raises goats in the nomadic way, and said, “we both [husband and her] sell from home to whoever wants to buy our products.” Meral, who produces cheese and butter, said, “I sell at the bazaar or here at home. Our cheese and butter are preferred because they are natural and have good taste and quality.” Thus, if there is a customer to buy from home, they sell their products from home.

This study result indicates that these participants have important influence in selling small quantities of products such as dairy products, eggs, and vegetable surplus either from home or at the bazaar.

Theme #5: Men Sell High Value Agricultural Products

Men control cereal crop sales: When product is marketed as wholesale, men perform these sales. Cennet claimed, “my husband sells grains and milk to wholesales.” Sevgi, who is a young bride who lives with her in-laws, said that, “my father in-law sells the cereal crops.” All other cereal crop producers including Emine and Feza stated that, “My husband sells grains produce.” Thus, men are in charge of cereal crop sales in these villages because such sales involve more money, usually take place in public space (rather than from home), and involve dealings with male traders.

Men control livestock sales: Men also control livestock sales. Cennet, Emine, Zeliha, Fadime, Hatice, Kezban, Leyla, Melek, Naciye, Meryem, Nuran, Zehra, and Vildan indicated collectively that, “My husband sells livestock.” If the husband is not the head of the household, such as in the case of Sevgi, she said, “my father-in-law sells livestock.” Hacer, a widowed women who took credit to buy sheep and also claimed that she makes all decisions in her house,
said “…my son sells the sheep.” Men are in charge of livestock sales in these village households. Livestock is an important asset in these villages. Whenever they need a lump sum of money, e.g. for a wedding or buying furniture, or sending kids to school, they sell some of their livestock. Usually men do these tasks.

Results indicated that men sell cereal crops, cows, goats, and sheep in these villages. These products, including cereal crop and livestock sales, are important assets and generate money in these villages. Thus, men sell animals because it involves negotiation with traders who are generally men.

**Gendered Patterns in Household Work**

**Theme #6: Women Take Primary Responsibility in Household Work (Homemaking, Nurturing, and Caregiving)**

*Women’s household tasks*: Household tasks including daily management of the house (cooking, cleaning and doing laundry, etc.), and caring for children and the elderly are all designated as women’s responsibilities in these villages. All these women are responsible for the care of children, their houses, and for the preparation and cooking of food in their household. Asiye said, “women take care of the children and elderly,” and Hacer clearly articulated the gender division in the household works in saying, “my daughter does the housework most of the time. My son does not do any housework.” Similarly, Meral answered, “my daughter helps in the housework such as cleaning, doing dishes, and laundry.” Both shared the fact that while their daughters help with the housework, their sons do not do any housework. Cennet claimed that, “my husband and my sons do not do any housework.” Meryem stated that, “my husband never does any work inside the house. If I ask him to do some work outside the house, he does it. If I do not ask, he does not do that either.” Her husband, like many others in the village, does not do
any housework. Hatice said, “I do the cooking, cleaning, and serving the food.” Leyla lives with her in-laws, and stated that, “my husband does not know how to do any housework. He just knows how to ask for more tea [laugh].” She is implying that he does not do any housework including minute tasks like serving himself a cup of tea. Zehra said, “women do housework (ev işlerini kadınlar yapar).” She claimed that the housework is the women’s responsibility in the village. Collectively, all the participants agreed that household work is all women’s and girls’ responsibility in these villages.

-Men’s household tasks: Men’s household work responsibility involves repairs around the house and buying the family’s daily needs from the nearby city grocery stores or the bazaar, either alone or with their wives. Cennet mentioned that, “my husband and my sons repair things in the house, if needed.” Meryem said that, “I am very busy with milking the goats at noon time each day. That is why I cannot go to the bazaar to buy stuff. My husband buys what we need. He even buys my clothes for me. He has better taste than me [laugh].” Her husband buys what they need, including her clothes, because she is so busy each noon time with milking the goats. Her daughter is married, and she does not have any help. Leyla said, “I do not go to the bazaar generally, but I ask him (her husband) to bring what we need from the bazaar.” She is a very busy woman with young kids, and does not go to the bazaar to buy anything. Meryem said that, “My husband does all the outside work (she referring to all work outside the house).” She does milking, makes yogurt, cheese, and butter, and takes care of the goat kids. She referred to these tasks as housework.

As a result of this study, all the participants claimed that their husbands or their sons do not do any housework except for buying groceries or performing repairs around the house. All participants claimed that women do all household tasks including cleaning, cooking, laundry,
taking care of kids and the elderly, and that these kinds of tasks are women’s responsibilities. They take primary responsibility for homemaking, nurturing, and caregiving. Men’s household responsibilities involve repairs around the house, and buying what the family needs from city grocery stores or the bazaar either alone or with their wives.

**Theme #7: Internalization of Housework as Women’s Responsibility**

All participants internalized the housework described above as their own responsibilities, and have no expectation for men taking responsibility for the housework. Melek said, “I do not know what he can do. My husband does not do any housework, and here in our village men do not do any housework.” Kezban said, “My husband cannot take even his water to drink. He asks us [her and kids] to serve him, and he cannot pour himself a cup of tea.” She is implying men do not do simple tasks such as serving themselves a drink in these villages. Asiye agreed, “our men do not do any housework [laugh].” Vildan claimed “men do not do any housework here, my husband sometimes cooks, but he does not do dishes, and my son cannot even cook an egg for himself.” She also added, “My daughter cooks, cleans, and does other housework,” She proudly announced that her daughter was a good house worker. From the fourth focus group, Ayse said, “My son cannot do any housework. He only knows how to go to a picnic, and he likes picnics!” Her son does not do any housework, but likes to enjoy himself in the outdoors. Thus, women already internalized all housework as their responsibility. Somehow, there is a mutual acceptance and embeddedness in this regard. Hence, women do all household work and caregiving work and have no expectations for men taking responsibility of any of these tasks.

Generally, during my interviews and focus group sessions, women laughed when I asked about the men participating in housework. It seemed “odd” to them that men might do housework in their village social culture. All the participants claimed that men do not do any
housework regarding cooking, cleaning, laundry, etc. Some of participants felt that this was very natural announcing that their sons, as well, cannot do housework. Conversely, they proudly declared that their daughters are good at housework. She is the one who raised that son, and she is completely fine with the fact that he is not participating in any housework. In their social culture, it is odd if the man or son are doing any housework, because if men do such work, then they can be labeled as not masculine enough.

**Theme #8: Heavy Work Burden (Housework and Agricultural Work)**

*Women’s agricultural work and housework:* Women are responsible for a high proportion of the agricultural work in addition to their domestic duties. This creates multiple sources of work and extended work hours for them. Asiye said, “every day I do some work such as hoeing, harvesting, and milking cows. Our work generally starts in March or April, and continues through the harvest season in October. I work every day, oftentimes 8 hours, and sometimes 12 hours, but generally I start at sunrise and work until sunset. When we come home from the field, I milk the cows, prepare dinner, and do dishes. Village women’s life is really hard.” She puts a lot of effort into agricultural production and housework each day. Senem mentioned, “I raise cows, I milk them and make yogurt, cheese, and butter, and I also do work in the house.” Cennet said, “We come home from the field, and continue to do housework. I have my daughter-in-law living with us, she and I do the housework.” She and her daughter in-law take full responsibility of household work. These women’s work does not stop in the field. They come home to continue housework.

*Rural women’s typical day:* To make the point more clearly, some participants described one day’s workload in the rural villages. Kader said,

“I take care of a cow, I grow vegetables in a small garden, I do hoeing, I prepare winter food (bulgur or cracked wheat, yogurt soup starter, etc.), I go to the garden
at 7 o’clock, I come back in the evening. Sometimes I come around noon time. Actually, depending on our strength, we cannot stay long in the field because of the hot weather.”
She is working as much as she can each day. She puts extensive hours into farming practices. Hacer described her day as:

“I wake up at 5 o’clock to take the sheep to pasture. I bring them back home at 12 o’clock noon. They only stay 3-5 hours, than we take them to pasture until midnight. I think raising sheep is hard, because you need to herd the sheep. Milking the sheep is hard also.”

She puts more than 15 hours a day into work just for herding and milking sheep. Still, she has difficulty in paying back the credit she took from the bank to get this sheep herd. Melek described her day as:

“I wake-up at 5:30. First, I tend animals, and milk the cows, and put the milk at home. Then I take them to the mountain (grazing). If some of them stay home, I leave some hay for them. Then I take the calves to grazing areas, I come back home, I do the dishes and clean the house, and I prepare lunch. In the afternoon, animals are brought back home, I water them, I clean the barn, I feed the chickens, and I feed the dog. There is a lot of work. There is plenty of work for women in each day.”

She described how much effort she put in each day to keep up with both agricultural work and housework in the village life. She did not even mention making dairy products. From the first focus group, Rukiye described her typical workday as:

“I wake up around 4-5 am in the morning. I do all the work including milking, tending animals, herding calves, as well as all housework including cooking 3 times and cleaning the house. You know there is a lot on my shoulders. I go to bed at 12 midnight, sleep 4-5 hours, and then start all over again.”

She puts more than 15 hours each day into both farm work and household work. She puts in tremendous working hours even though this does not generate enough income or comfort in her life. Another woman, Cevriye, from the same focus group stated that:

“…village women live a difficult life. We work all day, but we cannot afford to go see a doctor. We get sick from all these tough working conditions. We cannot
afford to go to see a doctor unless we are critically sick, because doctor visits are expensive, and we do not have social security or medicaid coverage for that.”

She is afraid to go to the doctor, because they do not have health care coverage, and out of pocket health care is expensive. She puts a lot of hours into working each day, but she cannot afford to see a doctor.

The results indicate that all these participants carry out both farm and household tasks. As I described above in theme #6, they raise children and take care of the elderly and sick relatives. There are no defined times or hours for their work responsibilities. They definitely do not follow the typical 8-5 work schedule. They do not have regular working hours for farm work. Generally, it depends on what work needs to be finished that day. When women and men both work in the field, the men’s work finishes at the home doorstep, but the women’s household work starts. Thus, these rural women juggle multiple types of work each day, and do not earn much income. In this sense, they are under heavy work burden from agricultural work and household work.

Overall, research question one addressed the gender division of labor on small farm practices. With respect to the inequitable gender division of labor construct of feminist standpoint theory, participants indicated that women generally take primary responsibility for subsistence production, caregiving, and homemaking, and they often have control over marketing small amounts of agricultural products such as eggs, milk, and vegetables. Men took over the commercialized part of traditional farming including growing and trading cereal crops, using machines including planting with a tractor, spraying pesticides and fertilizer, and hiring combine harvesters. The results also indicated that women take primary responsibility for homemaking, nurturing, and caregiving, while the men’s household responsibilities involve repairs around the house and buying what the family needs from the city grocery stores or the bazaar either alone or with their wives. In addition, the results pointed out that some participants
take more responsibility in agricultural production and marketing because their husband’s work
ability is limited or, in some instances absent. In the absence of men’s work power, they end up
taking over the men’s responsibilities in addition to their own responsibilities in these traditional
small farming practices. While participants carry out tasks that are labor intensive, and they are
responsible for the household food security, they do not generate much income. In contrast to
women in this study, men are responsible for agricultural activities that generate income.
Drawing on the “inequitable gender division of labor” construct of feminist standpoint theory,
the results of this research question indicated that there are gendered roles and responsibilities on
small farm practices. Participants carry out both farm and household tasks. For this reason, they
bear a heavy work burden. Thus, rural women’s heavy work burden creates gender inequality
standpoints for participants of this study.

Research Question 2: Gender Inequalities in the Workload of Women Farmers on Small
Farm Practices

To address research question two, I explored the data collected through in-depth
interviews and focus group sessions with women farmer participants. I asked the participants to
elaborate on the tasks they perform in agricultural production and in the household (what type of
work women and men do at home and on the farm, what kind of work their husbands carry out,
and what kinds of work they do together). I asked participants to discuss how women’s workload
changed in recent years when compared to their parents’ times. I analyzed the data through the
inequitable gender division of labor concept of feminist standpoint theory. I identified two
themes among the different passages within the transcript. These themes were: 1) rural women’s
workload on small farming practices and 2) rural women’s invisible work.
Theme #1 Rural Women’s Workload on Small Farming Practices

Women's work in cereal crop production is reduced: In all villages, women’s hand in labor for producing cereal crops has disappeared because of either their spouse’s shift to mechanized work (e.g., planting with a tractor and using a combine harvester) or because they completely quit cereal crop production. Participant Zehra said, “our work in farming was harder in the past because we harvested cereal crops mostly by hand. We no longer touch the crops with our hands anymore. See, today, our crops are getting harvested while I am sitting here with you.” According to her, women do not provide labor on cereal crops anymore. Leyla said, “we do not plant cereal crops, because it is labor intensive, and the cost of hiring workers for planting and harvesting is high.” In her case, they quit producing grains, because of the expensive cost of hiring mechanized work. In both cases, women’s work was limited or eliminated in growing cereal crops.

Women's work in vegetable growing: Women provide important labor towards growing vegetables in the subsistence and semi-subsistence practices. In particular, they do planting, weeding, hoeing, watering, harvesting, and preparing for the local bazaar. Sevgi said:

“…we grow vegetables and sell them at the bazaar in…[city name is masked]. My father-in-law prepares the soil with the tractor, and all women and men in the family participate in planting, hoeing, and weeding. Generally, females do hoeing, harvesting, and preparing for the bazaar, but sometimes men help in harvesting. Hoeing is hard work.”

According to her, women in the family provide important labor in producing vegetables for the local bazaar. Cennet said, “we grow chickpeas and still harvest by hand, and women do it by exchanging labor most of the time.” She further clarified that, “women do all hoeing in the garden. Our men do not do hoeing.” She and other females in the family provide labor for
planting, hoeing, and harvesting the crops. Thus, women and girls in these small family farms provide hand labor on planting, hoeing, and harvesting on these small farm practices.

As I discussed earlier for research question one, women allocate a small garden to produce vegetables and fruits for household consumption or to sell at the local market. All participants, except for one (she did not plant her garden this year), in this study mentioned that they grew vegetables in their small garden for family consumption. Asiye said, “I grow vegetables including tomatoes, eggplants, peppers, beans, cucumbers, and fruits in my garden. I serve this to my kids.” Some of these participants sell vegetable and fruit surplus at the local bazaar in… [city name is masked]. Cemile said, “I grow vegetables in my small garden, sell the produce at the local market, and buy what my household needs.” She sells her products at the local market to buy other things she needs. Cennet showed her vegetables garden to me during the interview, and she also said, “I grow vegetables and sell surplus vegetables and fruits at the …[ name of city is masked] bazaar.” She grows vegetables in front of her house, and sells the surplus at the bazaar. Thus, these participants generally grow vegetables and sell the surplus at the nearby local markets.

*Women's work on livestock rearing*: All participants who own livestock provide labor towards tending animals. Senem said, “I give feed to the animals twice a day during the winter. Sometimes I also clean the barn.” Feza said, “I take care of the animals during winter and summer.” She takes care of the animals all the time. While most participants have few livestock, some of them have more than 50 head of cattle, or herds of 200 or more goats or sheep. When the practice is smaller (a few cows), women do most of the work relating to animal rearing. Asiye said, “I take care of cows.” When the practices are relatively large, such as greater than 20 cattle, a goat herd, or a sheep herd, both men and women work together with their kids (if they
are available). Both men and women provide important labor, and they use their kids’ labor if needed. For example, two participants who own goat herds have their sons, who are living with them, help in raising the goats. Nuran said, “my son herds the goats. My husband is sick. He cannot herd anymore.” Similarly, Meryem claimed, “my son herds the goats,” and she added that “… my husband and son take care of animals together during the winter time. I do not help them much.” She does not take part in tending goats during the winter. However, Meryem said, “I take care of the goats’ kids during the summer time.” Her farm work increases in the summer. All these participants provide labor towards tending animals.

*Women’s work on milking animals and making dairy products:* As I described previously for research question one, women are always responsible for milking the animals, making dairy products, and preparing them for sale at the bazaar or directly from home. Feza said, “I milk the cows and make yogurt, cheese, and butter.” She milks and makes dairy products for family consumption, and sells the surplus at the local market. Meryem said, “I milk the goats at the hot noon time each day during summer. It takes 3-4 hours each day. I have pain in my arms, and then I make cheese or butter. Compared to the neighbors who own cows, I have more work.” She milks more animals than cow owners do which tires her. However, cow owners have to milk the cows twice a day. Meral said:

“I wake at 6 o’clock, I milk the cows until 9 a.m., and then I make cheese or separate butter from the milk with machines. Of course, I do the dishes afterwards, so all these different tasks take 2-3 hours. I repeat all these tasks during the evening again.”

She does all the milking, and makes dairy products twice a day for almost six hours each day. Thus, women’s work is vital in milking and making dairy products, and is not replaceable by men’s work.
Women's work on post-harvest processing: Women have an important role in post-harvest processing in these villages. Preparing and storing food for winter is very vital for the food security of these families. Women process and preserve the fruits and vegetables produced from their home gardens. All the participants in the study stated that they process and preserve vegetables and fruits from their home gardens. Asiye said, “I prepare all can food, pickles, preserves and jams, and dry vegetables from my garden. I feed myself, and my kids as well.” She prepares a variety of food from her own garden. These participants also prepare dry beans, dry chickpeas, soup starters, cracked wheat (bulgur), cheese, and butter. All these tasks are assigned to women and girls. Cennet said, “I prepare the winter foods such as dry beans, noodles (ereşte), cracked wheat (bulgur), instant soup (tarhana), and share them with my kids.” Kader said, “I prepare bulgur, instant soup, and dry beans for winter.” Senem said, “…I make cheese, butter, bulgur, instant soup, and soup starter. I collect many herbs (oregano, thyme, etc.) from the mountains. I give what I gathered to my kids and my siblings.” Besides preparing a variety of winter foods, she collects many herbs to use for herself and for her family. Meral said, “I collect many herbs from the mountain and sell them at the bazaar.” She sells herbs at the local bazaar for added revenue. Thus, all the participants in this study prepare winter food to share with their kids, siblings, and extended family. All these women work on preparing, preserving, and storing nonperishable food as an essential way of providing food security for their families during winter.

Results of this study highlighted that the number of participants working on cereal crop production has declined in recent years. Mechanization of farm work (labor saving machinery) reduced the need for women’s manual work on some production, especially for cereal crops, However, they still play an important role in growing vegetables, livestock rearing and
producing dairy products, and post-harvest processing in these villages. In regard to vegetable growing, they are engaged in planting, hoeing, weeding, watering, harvesting, and marketing the surplus. In livestock rearing, they participate in feeding the animals, cleaning the barns, milking and making dairy products, and preparing dairy products for sale at the bazaar. In post-harvest processing, they prepare dry beans, dry chickpeas, soup starters, cracked wheat (bulgur), cheese, butter, pickles, and canned food. All these aspects of women’s work in producing food are very important for ensuring food security for their families. Thus, these participants’ work constitutes the keystone for each household’s food security.

**Theme #2: Rural Women’s Invisible Work**

*Women’s work in agricultural production is invisible:* All the different aspects of work that women farmers provide to produce food and sustain the household are invisible to their immediate families, communities, and state. There is no remuneration for women’s hard work in agricultural production and household work each day. They are basically unpaid family workers providing labor for both the farm and household without wage. Sevgi lives with her in-laws. She said, “I have a small garden to grow vegetables and fruits, and I process and store some of the produce for winter use as well.” She produces their daily vegetable needs, and dries, cans, or freezes the surplus for winter use. Another woman, Senem said, “I make cheese and butter for us to use, and I send some to my kids who live in the city.” She produces dairy products not only for herself but also to support her kids in the city. Kezban said, “I grow vegetables in the garden, and raise a few cows, but earn no money. I work all day without income.” These kinds of small farming practices consume all of the women’s time, but do not bring them any money. Thus, all the work that women carry out each day to produce food, while very important for ensuring food security for their families, has no market value.
Women's work in subsistence production is invisible: The Turkish government does not recognize most of these subsistence and semi-subsistence farmers as producers. Subsequently, the government does not subsidize very small farm practices. From the fourth focus group, Ayse expressed a strong opinion about subsidizing small farm practices when she said:

“...subsidies go to the rich, and the rich become richer. They knock the poor down to the ground. For example, if you raise 3-4 cows, there is no subsidy for that, but someone raises 15-20, he/she gets a subsidy or credit. Yet there is nothing for us. I told you, they [government officials] are just kicking and kicking us further down to poverty.”

She pointed out that the government is not recognizing her work in farming, and not giving her credit, or a subsidy, because the farm is very small. As I described above, women carry out various tasks like vegetable growing, livestock rearing, and post-harvest processing, but none of these jobs are remunerated. Because these practices are not recognized as work, they cannot be enrolled in farmer insurance systems, and cannot get health coverage while doing all of the labor-intensive farm work. From the first focus group, Rukiye pointed out, “we do not have social security coverage from raising animals. It is so hard for us to seek medical help without social security coverage.” She further explained that, “...visiting the doctor is expensive. We do not go to see the doctor unless we get severely sick.” She cannot afford to even to go to the clinic to seek health care. Thus, the state is not recognizing these very small subsistence producers’ work. They were not eligible to enroll in government insurance for their farm practices because their practices were so small.

Women’s care work is invisible: Care work is always the women’s responsibility in these villages, and there is no remuneration. Women give birth, take care of kids and the sick, and serve visitors and the elderly. All women in this study raised kids. Vildan said, “I take care of the kids, send them to school, and help with their homework while they are in elementary school.”
She provides childcare and tutoring for her kids. Kader said, “mothers take care of the kids in this village. Fathers do not participate much, but they visit the coffee house [men’s social place] in the village. They go there day and night, while the mothers stay home with the kids.” She is frustrated that, while men do not take responsibility for the kids, they still have time to socialize at the cafe. Meral said, “I am the one who takes care of the kids, the elderly, and the sick persons in my family.” These women and other participants are all responsible for the wellbeing of the kids, the elderly, and the sick in the family. All of this care work has no remuneration.

*Women’s work in the extended family’s house is invisible:* All of these participants lived with in-laws at a certain point in time. While they are with their extended family, women work in farm practices, and do all the housework. All these works are not remunerated. Senem said, “I lived with my husband’s family for seven years. I came out with nothing. I had two of my kids there. My husband and I worked full time on their land and in their house, and we left (ayrildik) with no money.” This couple lived with the extended family in one house, both working on the husband’s parents’ land and in the house. She particularly shouldered housework and farm work. Another women, Naciye, lived with her husband’s parents until they died. She said, “we lived a long time together. When they (in-laws) became old, they could not work anymore. They passed their land and practices to us. I provided care for them.” She lived with her extended family until they passed away. Kader stated that:

“I had lived with my husband’s mother and disabled sister for 7 years, and then we separated (ayrildik). During that time, I was doing all the work. Daughter in-laws (gelin) do all work without complaint. Mothers-in-law sit and order, and gelin works.”

She was describing how a typical mother-in-law and bride relationship works in these villages. Two of the youngest participants were still living with their in-laws. Sevgi, a 25 year old with three kids, said, “my father-in-law makes every major decision in the house.” Even her
husband has no decision-making power in his parents’ house. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that she will ever have a voice in anything. Thus, all these participants have lived for a certain time with their extended families, and all the work they did/do for the extended family is unpaid and invisible.

The results for the second research question have highlighted that women’s work, be it in agricultural production, subsistence production, care work, or work in the extended family’s house, is invisible. As I described earlier, most participants put extensive hours (in some instances, more than 12 hours a day) of work to produce food in these villages. However, these types of work have no market value. For example, subsistence production, while very important for the food security of these families, has no market value unless some surplus produce is available for sale at the local bazaar. In the extended family’s house, women go through even tougher times. The head of the household, typically the husband’s father, controls the money and patriarchal relationships are fully in place. There is also patriarchy of mother-in- laws over brides. Thus, none of these participants enjoyed their time living in the extended family’s house. All types of work these participants have provided in the extended family house are invisible.

Overall, research question two addressed the workload of women farmers on small farm practices. With respect to the inequitable gender division of labor construct of feminist standpoint theory, participants in this study indicated that they provide important work towards growing vegetables, livestock rearing and producing dairy products, and post-harvest processing in the study villages. In vegetable growing, they engage in planting, hoeing, weeding, watering, harvesting, and marketing. In livestock rearing, they participate in feeding the animals, cleaning barns, milking and making dairy products, and preparing dairy products for sale at the bazaar. In post-harvest processing, they prepare dry beans, dry chickpeas, soup starters, cracked wheat
(bulgur), cheese, butter, pickles, and canned food. All these women’s work towards producing food is very important to ensure the food security of their families. Drawing on feminist standpoint “inequitable gender division of labor” constructs, the results from this research question highlighted that women’s work in agricultural production, subsistence production, care work, and the extended family’s house are invisible. Thus, the invisible work of rural women creates gender inequality standpoints for participants in this study.

Research Question #3: Gender Inequalities in Decision-Making on Small Farm Practices

To address research question three, I explored the data collected through in-depth interviews and focus group sessions with women participants. I asked the participants to talk about the decision-making process for farm management (how they decide what crops to grow and livestock to raise (sell/buy) on the farm) and the decision-making process for farm budgeting (who controls the money, who decides what equipment to buy, and how they decide to spend the money on family expenses). I analyzed the data through the social power dynamics concept of feminist standpoint theory. I identified three themes among the passages within the transcript. These themes were: 1) men have major decision-making power on small farm practices, 2) women lack access/decision-making power to/over resources and household income, and 3) rural women embedded in patriarchal social culture.

Theme #1: Men Have Major Decision-Making Power on Small Farm Practices

Men sell livestock: In these villages, men are the heads of households, and they make major decisions in the household regarding buying and selling livestock. Kader said, “men decide to buy and sell livestock.” She has no voice in the process, even though she is the one who raises these livestock (as previously described). Identically, Meryem, Melek, and Fadime all said, “...my husband decides to buy and sell our livestock.” Leyla had a similar remark saying,
“…I do not interfere in selling livestock. If he needs to sell one or two, my husband sells them.” However, she explained that, “we decide which one to sell together, based on the animal’s age and milk producing capacity.” Her husband sells the livestock, but she has influence over which one to sell. Kezban said, “…if my husband decides to sell one of the cows, he sells it, even if I do not agree with him.” He decides and sells livestock without her approval. All these women declared that their husbands were solely in charge of selling and buying livestock for the family.

*Men control cereal crop production:* Men control the different tasks of cereal crop production including buying seeds, applying fertilizers, and selling the crop. Cereal crops are also important assets in some of the study villages. Emine said, “my husband decides how much grain to plant, and how much grain to sell.” He controls the cereal crop production and marketing as well as controlling the income from selling. Sevgi, lives with in-laws, said, “my father-in-law decides to sell the cereal crops.” Father-in-laws are in charge of selling grains, because they are heads of the households and the ones who have authority over the land, equipment, and money. Vildan said, “my husband manages all the cereal crop production and sales including planting, harvesting, and selling. In the past, women participated in manual harvesting, but now everything is mechanized. Women do not contribute work to cereal crop production anymore.” Men organize and control all aspects of cereal crop production, particularly wheat and barley, in these villages.

*Men control farm equipment and inputs:* Men make the decisions for buying and repairing farm equipment and other farm needs such as seeds, fertilizer, and pesticides. Emine said, “men decide on buying all farm equipment, as well as repairing and renting. They also decide on purchasing of pesticides, fertilizer, and seeds.” Men buy and decide on all farm inputs and equipment. Cennet said, “my husband makes the decision for pesticides and fertilizer use in
the field.” Sevgi said, “my father-in-law makes the decisions for buying and using seeds, fertilizer, and pesticides.” She also added, “he also decides what farm equipment to buy.” Her father-in-law is the sole decision maker on managing the farm. Thus, men control the decisions regarding inputs and farm equipment on small family farms.

The results of this study indicate that men are the primary decision makers on farm practices, specifically those generating income. They are the heads of the households, and they control resources and income. Participants claimed that men have decision-making power over selling/buying livestock, cereal crop production and marketing (marketing large quantity produce), buying and repairing farm equipment, and buying input (seeds, fertilizer, pesticides) in the villages. Basically, men are the primary decision makers in all the money-making and spending on small farm practices. For example, producing cereal crops and selling livestock are important assets in these villages. Men make the decisions for the production and marketing of cereal crops. Men also control the selling and buying of livestock, because livestock is also an important asset for rural people. They bring revenue, and the livestock trading takes place in public places. In short, men are the sole decision makers on farm practices that generate money, and they control spending of this money afterwards.

**Theme#2: Women’s Lack Access to Decision-Making on Resources and Household Income**

*Women lack access to controlling money*: Women lack decision-making power on resources and household income. As outlined in theme #1, when farm practices generate income, men control these resources. Participants in the study claimed that men buy the farm equipment and inputs such as seed, fertilizer, and pesticides. These women have less access to controlling money and resources. In terms of household needs, most of the women in this study said that they tell their spouses what the household needs, and their husbands buy it. Kezban said, “I tell
Melek mentioned, “I make a list for him about what we need. He does not know what we need in the house.” Her husband does the shopping at the bazaar, but she tells him what they need in the house. Some of them claimed that they go together to buy what they need from the city. Kader said, “we go to buy things. I tell him what to buy and what we need, he pays for it. You know, he holds the wallet [he controls the money].” Her husband controls the money, but they shop for the family needs together as he doesn’t know what his house needs for daily living. Leyla said, “I tell them [her husband and his mother] what to bring from the bazaar, and they bring it. I do not spend money much.” Meryem said, “I rarely go to the bazaar. My husband goes by himself and brings what we need.” She cannot go to the bazaar as she swamped with the milking of 50+ head of goats each day during the summer. All these women have very low decision-making on family budgeting issues. However, they hold great autonomy on deciding what the household needs.

*Women’s hold decision-making power on subsistence production:* Women enjoy great autonomy on decisions regarding what to produce for the household’s subsistence production. Every woman with a garden in this study claimed that they can decide what to produce in the garden. Zeliha said, “I have my own garden. I decide what to produce. Sometimes, my husband helps me to water and harvest.” Feza said, “I decide what to produce, and sell vegetables from my garden.” She grows and sells at the bazaar. Cennet said, “I have two gardens, and I decide what to produce in these gardens.” She also added, “I decide on the pesticide use for the garden. I even spray the pesticides by myself using a small shoulder-strapped pesticide sprayer.” She sprays pesticides by herself. Men do not interfere with the women’s decisions on growing vegetables in the home garden. Thus, women have autonomy in managing household gardens.
Women's decision-making power increases in the absence of men's power: As I discussed with research question one, some women enjoy more autonomy and decision-making power in the absence of men’s masculine power. Asiye said, “I decide how to spend the income from farming by myself, because I live alone.” Hacer, a widowed woman, said, “I decide what to buy or sell in my house.” She also said, “I decide how many animals to raise, how many animals to sell or buy, I am both the mother and father in my house,” and, “…I tell my kids what work needs to be done on the farm.” She is the head of the household, and she holds undisputed decision-making power. Like she stated, she is doing both men’s and women’s jobs. Meral’s husband is sick. She said, “we decide together how many animals to sell or buy, how many eggs and how many dairy products to sell together.” She added, “generally I go to the bazaar to sell our products because my husband is sick. I buy what we need from the bazaar.” She participates in decisions on marketing products, and also has access to money. When husbands are not available or are in poor health (socially described role), women enjoy more autonomy in decision-making power in terms of house management and farming. Thus, in the absence of men’s power, women’s work responsibility increases, but also their access to decision-making power.

The results of this study revealed that the participants lack decision-making power in regards to controlling money and resources for the household. However, they enjoy more autonomy on deciding what they need to maintain the household. They ask men to bring what they need, or they go together to buy the things they need for the household. In some families, only women go to buy what the family needs. When the husbands are not available, or are not in good physical health, women gain more autonomy in decision-making power in terms of house management and farming. In the absence of men’s physical power or presence, the women’s
access to the decision-making power is enhanced, but this comes with increased workload. Nevertheless, that does not mean they are doing better in terms of workload and income. They not only take over men’s responsibilities, but they lose men’s work, and consequently, the potential income from that work.

**Theme #3: Rural Women Embedded in Patriarchal Social Culture**

*Women’s embeddedness in patriarchal social culture:* Participants exhibited acceptance of men’s dominant position as the household heads and the holders of the decision-making power. Emine said, “when I ask [her husband] to go to see the doctor, if he says no, we do not go. Generally, men have the last word on everything in the village.” Vildan explained, regarding grain crops or chickpea production, “I suggest what to produce, but generally he decides what to produce. Actually, whatever men want, they plant.” She added, “women do not interfere with the man’s job.” She accepted the male dominance in the decision-making process on major income generating agricultural practices. Meryem said, “my husband does the man’s work. I do not interfere with his decisions on what to buy, or how to sell.” She added, “selling animals is the men’s job.” Rural women internalized men’s authority in the household and farming practices. They actually accede to the power and authority of the male decision-makers.

*Patriarchal social control living within the extended family’s house:* Generally, village women have lived with their extended family (husband’s parents and unmarried siblings in the family house, or next to the husband family home) for a certain period of time, or until their in-laws are deceased. Even with their home on a different level of the house, they work together and eat together. All participants in this research lived with the husband’s family for a certain time period. Cemile said, “in the past, I had lived with my in-laws. I suffered a lot, but they passed away. I had a lot of bad memories.” She lived with her husband’s parents for a long time.
and had bad experiences regarding their relationship. Naciye said, “my husband’s parents passed away, but we had lived together until they died.” Kader lived with her mother-in-law and sister-in-law for 8 years. She explained that:

“...I lived with my husband’s mother and his disabled sister for 8 years. In this village, when brides (gelin) come, the mother-in-law’s work finishes in the house. She sits and orders. You cannot ask the mother-in-law to do anything. If she says, ‘how can I help you,’ you should kindly reply that you do not need any help, or if she must then you ask her to do the simplest tasks like preparing simple dishes. You cannot tell your mother-in-law to work in this village.” She further explained, “...I have two daughters-in-law that live in Istanbul. They both work, and I serve them when they visit us. Before they come to visit us, I prepare all nice dishes to please them. Times have changed now.”

In this excerpt, the participant describes her relationship with her mother-in-law. At that time, mother-in-laws were positioned over the brides. Brides are marginalized in this relationship. However, she also acknowledged that she does not practices the same patriarchy against her daughters-in-law, perhaps because they live in more liberal Istanbul and they have jobs. Sevgi is the youngest bride in the study, and she lives with in-laws. She described that, “I do all work in the house regarding cleaning, cooking, and serving to guests. My mother-in-law looks after the kids, while I am working.” Living and working in the extended family’s household subordinates women, especially when they are young.

The results of this study revealed that participants are embedded in a patriarchal social culture, and they internalize their subordinate social positions in the household and farming practices. The participants claimed that they do not interfere with male authorities controlling the money. They actually accede to the power and authority of the male decision-makers. Several patriarchal relationships are cemented in the village social life, and women are born into this structure. Hence, they may only view life through this lens. All participants in this research lived
with their husbands’ families for certain periods of time. In the extended family household, these
participants hold subordinate social positions, and they shoulder housework and farm work.

Overall, research question three addressed gender inequalities in decision-making on
small farm practices. With respect to the social cultural power dynamics construct of feminist
standpoint theory, the results of this study revealed that men are the primary decision-makers on
farm practices that generate income. They are the heads of the households, and control resources
and income. Participants have a lack of decision-making power in regards to household resources
and income on these small farm practices. However, they enjoy some autonomy on deciding
what the household needs, and issues in managing the household daily affairs. In addition, the
results of this study revealed that participants are embedded in a patriarchal social culture, and
that they have internalized their subordinate social position in the household and farming
practices. Thus, these participants actually accede to the power and authority of male decision-
makers. When husbands are not available (deceased) or not in good health, women have more
autonomy in decision-making power in terms of daily household management and farming.
However, that does not mean that they are doing better in terms of workload and income.
Drawing on the “social cultural power dynamics” construct of feminist standpoint theory, the
results from this research question indicated that women’s lack of access to decision-making
power on household resources and income create patriarchal social control and a dependent
position for participants. Thus, the patriarchal social control over women, and their dependent
positions generate gender inequality standpoints for participants of this study.
Research Question # 4: Gender Inequalities in Acquiring Knowledge about Farming Practices

To address research question four, I explored the data collected through in-depth interviews and focus group sessions with women participants. I asked the participants to talk about their, and their husbands’ education attainments, experiences with extension services, and extension service outreach programs for women farmers. I also asked about how they acquired knowledge about farming practices, new techniques, and technology. I analyzed the data through the subordinated social locations of feminist standpoint theory. I identified several themes among the passages within the transcript. These themes were: 1) lack of access to information and training, 2) subordinated social position - minimal formal education, and 3) women farmers’ challenges to attending extension training and courses.

Theme #1: Lack of Access to Information and Training

Women have no experience with extension: All participants claimed that they did not get any information and training, regarding their agricultural practices, from extension services. However, some of them are responsible for spraying pesticides and fertilizers. Some of these families have large practices in the context of Turkish small farm holdings. Cennet said, “nobody comes and tells us anything about new techniques or technology regarding farming.” She also added that, “they [extension workers] go to some other villages, but they do not come to our village. Our bean crops die. Nobody comes and checks and gives us pesticides. Our chickpeas burned this year, but nobody came to give anything.” She was implying that extension education services do not serve her village. She did not receive any information regarding new techniques and technology from the extension services. Cemile said, “I did not get any information related to farming from the extension workers.” Hacer said “I get subsidies for raising sheep from the
animal union. I learned that, but I did not get any other information related to farming from the government.” Yurdanur said, “Sometimes they [extension service] come to the village but they offer no programs for women.” According to her, extension services do not provide a program for women in this village. Naciye said, “I did not get any information related to the dangers and side effects of pesticides or fertilizers.” Women participants in this study have no experiences with extension education services. As I discussed in research question one, men control commercial agriculture and income generated from this practice. It is no surprise that women farmers are abandoned by extension services.

*No experience with home economics training:* Women are responsible for preparing food for their households and thus, for the nutritional well-being of their family members. Every extension service has a home economics unit to teach rural women about the nutritional value of food, preparing healthy food, canning and pickling, and child rearing. However, participants in this study did not get any training or information related to these subjects including canning, pickling, preparing jams, and preparing/storing winter nonperishable foods as well. Asiye said, “we learned about canning food and making preserves from friends or neighbors, not from extension.” Senem said, “I learned from my siblings or other neighbors, not from extension services.” She learned all about food preparation from relatives or friends. Cennet said, “I do all canning and storing of foods by myself with knowledge I inherited from my family. I do not ask anyone else, and so far nothing has happened to us.” She does all the food preparation, including canning and pickling by herself with knowledge passed on from her family. Thus, extension services do not reach out to women farmers even regarding food preparation and preserving.

The study results revealed that all participants had no experience with extension services. They do not get any information and training regarding their agricultural practices from
extension services, even though they handle risky jobs like spraying fertilizer or pesticides in their farm practices. As I discussed in research question one, men control the money generating agricultural practices, and income generated from these practices. It is not surprising to see women farmers left behind by extension services. While there are established home economics training units within extension services in Turkey, the participants in the study did not get any training and information related to vital subjects including nutrition, taking care of children, canning, pickling, preparing jams, and preparing winter foods. There is a problem of lack of outreach from extension services toward women farmers.

**Theme #2: Subordinated Social Position - Minimal Formal Education**

In this study, seven women are illiterate and one woman can read. Accordingly, almost half of participants are illiterate as old as 47 and 54 years old. Other participants have primary school level education. Only two participants made it through secondary school, but one dropped out before finishing school. Considering that Turkey has five-year compulsory education systems for these women at school age, having almost half of the participants being illiterate is outrageous to say the least. Women did not make it to school because their families were poor (kept girls home for free labor), low educational infrastructure (no secondary schools in most villages), one parent passed away before kids were at school age, or the father’s view regarding education was that it was useless when it comes to women. Yurdanur said, “I am the oldest kid in the family. My father died and my family did not send me to school so that I could take care of my siblings and do work at home.” She could not go to school because her father died, and they needed her work in the family. Melek’s mother died when she was one year old, and she said, “I grew up under a step mother who did not want to send me school. I suffered a lot.” Emine said, “my father did not send me to school.” She was denied education because of her father’s
negative view about girls’ education. Cennet said, “my father did not send me to school after primary school. He explained that girls do not need to go school. It is better for them to stay home.” She could not continue on at secondary school, because of her father’s belief. Thus, there is still the problem of illiteracy and low education among adults, and particularly for women in the rural areas of Turkey.

This study highlighted that there is an illiteracy problem among the participants (7 participants illiterate, one can read). Considering Turkey had five-year compulsory education systems in place for when these women were at school age, having almost half of the participants illiterate at mature ages of 47 and 54 years old is disgraceful. Participants did not make it to school because of their families’ low income (kept girls home), low educational infrastructure (no secondary school in most villages), one parent passed away before the kids were at the school age, or a father’s negative view on girls’ education. Other participants possess primary school level education.

**Theme #3: Women Farmers’ Challenges to Attending Extension Training and Courses**

*Extension education is not a priority:* Women farmers’ practices are very traditional in these villages. There is no plan for what to produce or where to sell. Getting knowledge for their traditional farm practices is not a major concern for these women farmers in their small farm practices. Senem said, “farm practices are as is. Everybody knows what they are doing.” She was implying her practice was very traditional, and that they know what they are doing in these subsistence practices. Naciye said, “what more I am going to know about raising a few cows, and making cheese?” She sees her farm practice as very small, with no need for added knowledge. Cennet said, “I use fertilizers in my garden a little bit. I also spray pesticides in the garden with a small shoulder pesticide sprayer. I never think about their effects on my health.” She uses
fertilizer and pesticides in her garden, but she does not know that these products may have hazardous effects on her health. Thus, these rural women do not prioritize getting information and training for raising a few cows, or growing vegetables in the household garden.

_Time allocation to attend extension education programs:_ Rural women juggle multiple responsibilities each day. They are busy with farm work, care giving, and household work. Meral said, “I work from morning to evening, I do not have time to attend courses.” She is swamped by endless work each day. Leyla said, “I live with my in-laws, and I have two small kids. I keep busy all day. I do not have time to attend courses.” She lives with her extended family’s household and has three small kids to care for. She does not have time to pursue other activities such as extension training and education. Meryem said:

“…we have a goat herd, and I am busy with taking care of the goats’ kids, milking the goats, and making dairy products each day. I cannot go anywhere. I sometimes cry here by myself all the time with too much work. With this much work, I am not able to go visit people. If somebody dies, I go pay my condolences after I finish milking the goats. How am I going to attend courses under these conditions? It is impossible to go anywhere.”

She is very busy with farm work and she cannot even visit people or attend someone’s funeral. She has to do all the milking and make dairy products each day. There is no room for training or education in her working schedule. All these women are too busy with their daily tasks and obligations in the farm and household to attend any kind of extension education programs.

_Patriarchal control of women:_ The husband’s permission is needed for attending training and courses, particularly for younger women. As I discussed in research question three, men are the prime decision-makers and they control the money. Women live in a patriarchal social order, especially young women who have no autonomy by themselves to decide to receive training form extension services. Emine said, “generally men have the last say in the village. If my
husband says ‘don’t go,’ I don’t attend training.’” She needs her husband’s permission to attend
the extension education programs. The youngest participants, Sevgi and Leyla both agreed, “if
my husband says ‘no,’ I do not go to training or attend courses.” Kezban said, “I ask my husband
to give permission for me to attend courses. If he says ‘no,’ I cannot attend. Women do not
challenge men’s authority here.” She stated that the man holds the decision-making power over
women, and she does not dare to challenge his already established power. There are gendered
roles and responsibilities within the household regarding farm production and household work in
Turkey. Thus, women are not in a position to say, “no” to men’s authority.

The results of the study revealed that participants face several challenges to getting
extension education and training. Getting knowledge for their traditional farm practices is not of
major concern to these women farmers in their small farm practices. These participants do not
consider it a priority to get information and training for raising a few cows or growing vegetables
in the household garden. They also have a time allocation problem for attending extension
education programs because they with struggle with multiple responsibilities including farm
work, care giving and household work each day. Furthermore, for some of these participants, the
husband’s permission is needed to attend the course and training. Because women live in a
patriarchal social order, the husband is the head of the family and possesses the decision-making
power. There are gendered roles and responsibilities within the household regarding farm
production and household work in Turkey. Thus, women are not in a position to say, “no” to the
men’s authority.

Overall, research question four addressed gender inequalities in acquiring knowledge
about farming practices on small farm practices. With respect to the subordinated social locations
of feminist standpoint theory, the study results revealed that all participants have no experience
with extension services. They do not get any information and training regarding their agricultural and home management practices from extension services. This study also highlighted that there is a severe illiteracy problem among the participants with almost half of participants illiterate at ages as old as 47 and 54 years. Moreover, the participants face several challenges to attending extension education and training including not considering training a priority, time allocation (busy), and receiving the husband’s permission to attend (patriarchal social control). Drawing on “subordinated social locations” of feminist standpoint theory, the results of this research question revealed that women’s lack of access to formal education and extension education and training create patriarchal social control, and their dependent position. All of these subordinate positions for women farmers create gender inequality standpoints for participants of this study.

**Research Question # 5: Changes in Small Village Farming and Effect on Women Farmers**

To address research question five, I explored the data collected through in-depth interviews and focus group sessions with women participants. I asked all the participants to talk about how farming is changing in their communities, and how their farm practices changed over the years. I also asked about their kids’ interest in continuing farming, government subsidization processes, changes in public services, and what migrant village women do in the cities. I analyzed the transcripts including in-depth interviews and focus groups with participants using the “subordinated social locations” concept derived from feminist standpoint theory. I identified the following themes among passages within the transcript: a) Challenges to traditional farming, which include: 1) economic deprivation from subsistence farm practices and 2) challenges to traditional small farming practices in Turkey, and b) deagrarization of rural villages and women’s position which includes: 3) depeasantization of rural villages, 4) state led
deagrarization -changing the village status to neighborhoods of cities, and 5) unemployable position of rural women.

**Challenges to Traditional Farming**

**Theme #1: Economic Deprivation from Subsistence Farm Practices**

*Subsistence production does not generate income:* In these villages, traditional subsistence and semi-subsistence farming is not generating enough income to continue farming from fragmented land (little land) or with only a few livestock. From the first focus group, Cevriye explained:

“we have few livestock, but this does not count as possession. We cannot feed ourselves with this many livestock. We sell 2-3 animals each year, but they do not bring much money (para etmiyor). All our effort is a pure waste of time in farming, and we only continue to suffer from the harsh life conditions.”

She believes that raising a few cows is not really counted as farming, because it is not generating enough income. Naciye said:

“we have a few cows, we make dairy products, we give the milk and yogurt to our kids, and sell the surplus at the bazaar. Our farming is not as much for generating income, but more like keeping us occupied with something to do. What are we going to do in this village if we choose to do nothing? At least we sell some of the animals and we earn a few liras [Turkish currency] to buy what we need.”

She considers her farming practice not as an income generating practice, but more like a time-filling habit. From the first focus group, Fatma said, “we have four animals. With these few animals, we cannot feed ourselves. We only suffer from tough living conditions.” She used the “four animals” as a metaphoric expression of how small their farm practice is. She was implying that what they are doing is not bringing in enough income to live comfortably, but it is still a better choice than doing nothing. In the second focus group session, Mehpare said, “our kids do not do farming. Our kinds of practices do not feed them. When I finish [pass away], my practices are going to die. Here, on this mountain top, there is nothing. Our children are not going to return
here.” Her farming practices will end with her, because this kind of farming is not generating enough income to attract her kids to stay. In the same focus group, Elif claimed that:

“…our kids do not want to stay in the village. They do not like farming because they cannot feed themselves through farming. It is not generating enough income, so they left to find jobs in the cities. If they have school age kids they also go because schools are closed here.”

She states that since traditional subsistence farming is not bringing in much money, the younger generations do not prefer to become farmers. From the second focus group, Elif said, “there is no good income from farming. That is why kids do not want to stay here, and they move to cities.” She stated that traditional subsistence production is not appealing to the new generations.

The results of this study highlighted that traditional ways of producing food are no longer efficient for retaining and sustaining the newer generations. Participants claimed that subsistence and semi-subsistence production are not generating enough revenue to attract younger generations to stay in farming. In these villages, land is small and fragmented, and it does not bring in enough money to continue farming in these villages. Life in the city is more attractive to younger generations, because the city offers better infrastructure and better paying jobs.

Theme #2: Challenges to Traditional Small Farming Practices in Turkey

Kids do not want to take over traditional farming: In some of the villages, the participants could not pass on their farm practices to their children. Most of the participants said that their kids did not want to do subsistence farming or live in villages. Meral said:

“…times have changed, and the new generation of children do not want to be farmers like us. They do not like farming or village life. My daughter graduated from high school, and she does not have any friends here. When everybody’s kids went to ..[name of city is masked], our kids wanted to follow as well. They have no friends left here. Many of our neighbors and relatives have migrated to ...[name of city is masked]. They live a more comfortable life there in the
apartments. I do not believe they want to come back here. We try to keep up farming, but I do not know what is going to happen in the future.”

She keeps up with the farming, but her daughter graduated from high school and has no interest in farming in the village. Almost all of the grown up kids of the participants left the village. From the first focus group, Cevriye described her experience:

“I have four sons, and all of them live in city [name of city is masked]. None of them have a salaried job, and they live off of daily wage work if they find work. If not, they do not work. However, none of them want to be farmers like us, because our work does not generate enough income to support a family. It is also hard.” She also added, “…the young generations do not want to live in the village like us, but who is going to live on this mountain top? There is nothing for young people to stay here for.

This woman’s sons did not want to be farmers, and moved to the city. However, in the city, there are no secure jobs for them, and they are living with daily wage work. Still, despite their job insecurity they still prefer not to be farmers. These traditional farming systems are no longer appealing to younger generations. Nuran said, “my sons [one single and one married] have no insurance and no salary. Everything is from these animals.” Kids do not want to stay with their parents to carry on this kind of faming, because there is no social security coverage. They do not want to live in villages like their parent did. Younger generations are uninterested in pursuing farming practices, because farming is hard work with little pay.

Securing family unpaid labor is a problem in continuing family farm practices: There are issues with larger farm practices in securing enough family labor. Meryem is raising goats in a semi-nomadic way, and explained:

“…we are getting older. My kids already left home. I have one son who is not married and lives with us, and he herds goats now. But he does not like to do it anymore. When he goes to fulfill the obligatory military service, we will not have anybody to help us. Taking care of the goats is hard, because goats need herding all the time. We are thinking of selling them and buying some cows like our neighbors here.”
She stated that they cannot continue raising goats using the nomadic way because they are short on family labor. Senem said, “my kids all left, and I am keeping up raising a few cows with some help from my husband. I have to quit soon. My kids will never come back and do farming here, because it is not generating much income.” When she gets older, she is going to quit what she been doing all her life, because her kids will not stay and take over the farming practices. Most of these farmers’ practices are going to end with them. Naciye said, “our farming is going to end with us, my kids already left the village to live in the city.” She also does not have kids to carry on her farming practice.

**Government politics pose challenges for these small farmers (free market policies):** For example, Nuran’s family owns more than 200 goats, using semi nomadic practices. She explained that:

“The government put restrictions in place on slaughtering female goats for meat. That is why we cannot sell our female goats. We want to end our farming practices. We [husband and her] are getting older, and my son does not want do it. However, selling goats is not bringing in enough money right now. We were thinking of ending our practice because renting grazing land is expensive, and animal feed is also expensive, but we need to come again next year.” She also added, “government wants to increase the goat population. We cannot sell our animals, but the government imports meat, and the value of our animals goes down.” She asked me, “what kind of politics is this?” She continued that, “meat prices are high in the market, but we still sell goats at low prices.”

She and her family are puzzled by the government’s policies that devalue their animals (with the intent of increasing the goat population) by importing meat to reduce the meat prices. They cannot sell their goats. She was facing difficulties from the free market as a traditional producer. Hacer, a widowed women, said, “I bought a sheep herd by taking credit from the bank. After I bought them, the sheep prices went down. I cannot sell them now. I cannot afford to pay my debt to the bank.” She cannot pay her loan to the bank because the sheep prices went down. It is hard for these farm practices to compete in the free market arena.
Lack of subsidies from the government to subsistence production: The government focuses on commercial agriculture, and promotes high value agricultural products with an export-oriented agenda in agricultural food systems in recent years. Asiye said, “there is a subsidy for animals, but I don’t benefit from it because they offer it only to farmers who own more cows.” She pointed out that the government subsidizes only bigger farmers. From the fourth focus group, Ayse made remarks about the government politics on small agricultural practices. She said:

“the government sees only rich people. The rich become richer. They knock the poor down to the ground. For example, you raise three cows, and there is no subsidy for them, but if someone raises 15-20 cows, they give credit and subsidies. There is nothing left for us. They always hurt the poor.”

She criticized the government’s policies in supporting farm practices of a certain size, and not reaching out to the poor subsistence producer. Thus, the government is not concerned about promoting and encouraging traditional producers including women farmers.

The outcomes of this study highlight the presence of several challenges to the traditional way of farming in these villages. The participants claimed that their kids did not want to do subsistence farming or live in the villages. This is because these traditional subsistence lifestyles are not appealing to the younger generations. They do not want to work in their family’s small practice. They stated that there is also a shortage of schooling in these villages for younger couples with young kids. In addition to this, they pointed out that the government does not subsidize very small practices. On the contrary, some of the government policies on agriculture are further marginalizing them as producers. It was eye opening to hear from Nuran and Hacer both, that they were already feeling the free market challenges in their practice. The government left these traditional farming practices unprotected to survive and compete with the meat imports. When I was conducting these interviews, the red meat price was high in Turkey. While I was
analyzing the results, the prices spiked to a problematic level during the month of Ramadan in 2015, the month of fasting for Muslims. Many families could not afford to buy meat anymore. The government solution for the meat problem was to import even more meat to bring the prices down. The government should consider alternatives to keep small producers in business and transfer their practices to the next generation. This could deem importing meat unnecessary.

Deagrarization and Women’s Position

Theme #3: Depeasantization of Rural Villages

Migration: All of these villages face a heavy migration problem, particularly the mountainous villages. The majority of these populations have already migrated to the cities. The remaining residents are either old couples, or very few families that chose to stay in the village to keep up their traditional semi-subsistence practices. Senem said, “we are still here. Residents of 12 to 15 houses have left. All others are gone.” She also continued saying:

“In the past, all villages were full of people. Every piece of land was covered with crops. Generally, men were planting with oxen or horses, but all family members including women and kids were working together. We were harvesting cereal crops manually, and there was a lot of work to be done in each harvesting season. Later, people started to move to the cities one by one. They left behind empty houses. Some old people stayed in the village. We do not plant anymore, all our lands are deserted, and we are holding up with a few cows. We buy hay from other villages for animal feed. My kids left, and now they are working in the city. I do not want to go live in an apartment in the city. I want to stay here and continue farming as much as my health allows me.”

She described how the village life and farming practices have changed during her lifetime, and how many people migrated to cities leaving bare land and empty houses behind in the village. From the second focus group, Elif claimed that, “within a 10 year period, the village became almost empty. In this village, farming is going to die. Nobody is left to carry on.” She is concerned that farming practices are not going to continue. Many village residents just quit farming and migrate to cities.
In these mountainous villages, immigration has already deteriorated communities. These communities lose their viability. However, there are also women like Meral that stay in the village. She raises 50+ cows with her sick husband. She said, “I stay here and continue farming with my husband. I am going to carry on my practice until I get old.” She sent her kids, including her daughter, to schools in the city. They chose to continue the traditional way of semi nomadic farming, and they are doing just fine. Perhaps they are in even better condition compared to families that depend on wage work in cities.

In the prairie villages, migration affected communities as well, but it has not been as severe as in the mountainous villages. From the fifth focus group, a young girl said, “one out of every three persons stays in our village. The other two migrate to the cities.” She stated that out of three families, two move to cities. In these villages the land is suitable for mechanized farming. It does not require much manual labor to keep up cereal crop farming. However, these villagers also quit planting labor-intensive crops such as sugar beet. Vildan said, “we quit growing sugar beets because the labor is expensive.” They cannot plant sugar beet anymore because hoeing requires extra labor. Even though some residents live and work in the city, they can (if they choose to) keep up planting and harvesting grains on their land. Solmaz’s husband retired from a government job. They live in city [name of city is masked], She said, “my husband still grows cereal crops on our land in our village.” Vildan’s husband also works at an off-farm job. He continues to plant and harvest grain crops, but they reside in the village. She said, “my husband plants grain crops and sells from the field to traders.” She also mentioned that, “we also raise beef cattle to sell for meat during holiday times. I take care of them. We also have cows for milk (around 10 head). I milk them using machines, and I sell the milk to dairy
dealers.” She takes care of beef livestock and milks cows. In her case, this family translated their farming practices into more commercialized farming practices to generate more income. However, many of the small subsistence producers with limited resources and education could not transform their subsistence practices into commercial agriculture. Instead, they just quit and move to the cities. In these prairie villages, communities are still viable compared to the mountainous villages. However, the participants still carry great work responsibilities for growing vegetables for family consumption and the local market, and raising cows.

Aging village population: Since younger generations do not want to stay and carry on farming, the demographic of villages is shifting to older dwellers. Many of these participants’ (Naciye, Senem, Hatice, Kader, Cemile etc.) kids moved to cities, while their parents stay in their village homes. Senem said, “I do not like the city life. I cannot live in an apartment. It is not for me, and I’d rather be here than be in the city.” These older farmers keep up with raising a few cows, because it is not very labor intensive. Some just live in the village to keep up with their accustomed life styles. Fadime, a 72 year old woman, said:

“I do not like the city life. I would die if I lived in an apartment. I have two cows for milk and yogurt. If we have a calf, we sell it. Before, we had a goat herd and more cows, but we are older now. I have difficulty milking cows. I am sick. Our practices are all about the two cows to stay connected to farming.”

She does not want to live in the city. She is raising two cows to be able to get important foods into their diet, and selling calves to generate some income. In her older age she has lost strength, and keeping up with the cows becomes harder. From the first focus group, Cevriye said, “we raise 2-3 livestock to feed ourselves, we are doing this to stay out of hunger, and we can’t stay without milk and yogurt. If we do not raise these
animals, we cannot afford to buy milk and yogurt.” She talked about how they keep up with raising a few cows to be able to produce their needed dairy products. They take cows to the meadow, and they are trained to come home by themselves. In this way, the residents, especially older folks, remaining in the villages are keeping up farming by raising a few cows without much labor. These women were connected to the farming all their lives. It is not easy to quit and move to the cities following their kids. They feel more comfortable in their village environment, and if they move, they will end up living in their kids’ homes. They cannot afford to buy their own house in the city. They are going to lose the social network made up by their neighbors and relatives.

Schooling-shortage leads to migration: The schooling shortage problem has come up as one major reason for migrating to cities, especially for couples with school age kids. In both villages in this study schools were closed, and in one of these villages, the local government provided a transportation service to carry the kids to a nearby village school. From the second focus group, Kadriye said, “many young couples do not want to stay here. When their kids reach school age, they move to the city because schools are closed here.” She talked about how young couples with school age kids are driven to move to cities. Zeliha said, “in this village, there is no schooling anymore because families with school age kids are all gone already.” She again mentioned that families with small kids move to cities, seeking schooling.

In this community, the local government did not open schools to serve kids, but they provided transportation to carry kids to another nearby school in a larger neighboring village. However, these “nearby” villages only have primary level schools. They do not have secondary level schools. Also, the quality of education is poor compared to that offered by the city schools.
Newcomers to migration deteriorated villages: Some villages have new neighborhoods, primarily for summer vacationers. I saw four new neighborhoods during my research, and near three of the villages of focus in my study. From the first focus group, Cevriye pointed out a new neighborhood close to their village and told me, “… look at those houses there. They live in better houses and better conditions. Look at my house, it is not in good condition.” She feels envious of the new vacationing homes. These newcomers are commercial small farmers from the Mediterranean region of Turkey.

These study results revealed that there is depeasantization of these rural villages. Participants described how the village life and farming practices changed during their lifetimes, and how many people migrated to cities leaving behind bare land and empty houses. All villages in the study are experiencing heavy migration, particularly mountainous villages from which the majority of the population has already migrated to the cities. The remaining residents are either older couples, or a few families that chose to stay in the village to keep up their traditional semi-subsistence practices. In the prairie villages, immigration has affected the communities, but it is not as severe as the effect on the mountainous villages. Participants again pointed out that the schooling shortage is another reason that propelled migration to cities. In some of these villages, other changes are already happening. There are newcomers, and some villages have new summer neighborhoods developing within the migration-deteriorated communities.

Theme #4: State led Deagrarianization - Changing Village Status to Neighborhoods of Cities

The Turkish government restructured the governance systems in rural villages in 2013. They changed the status of many villages to rural municipalities (belediye). Basically, they included these villages as neighborhoods within the district (kaza) or city (vilayet). There was no rural population in many districts of Konya province after 2013. Suddenly, all these villages
became part of the city. However, attaching these villages to the city governance systems brought them nothing but more fees on basic utilities including water, electricity, and trash. At the first focus group, Cevriye stated that:

“The government changed our village status to a rural municipality (belediye). We did not ask for it, and everything is more expensive now including water, electricity, and trash management. We are more frugal now in using water to wash our faces, and how are we going to water the garden? There is now a trash fee on this mountain top for God’s sake, and we do not even put trash in their dumpster. They ask for money only, but they do not serve us. They see us as people who milk cows for them, they drink our milk each day. How are we going to buy pencils, erasers, notebooks for our kids? How are we going to buy them clothes or food? They are just taking from us and not giving anything in return.”

She described how the family rationalized using water in the garden, because the newly established water fees might exceed the benefits of producing vegetables in the garden. She is also concerned that after paying all the new fees, there will not be enough money left to buy clothes, food, and school supplies for her kids. She is frustrated that the government collects fees and taxes from them but that they do not provide services to them in return. Another woman in the same focus group session, Fatma added:

“…we cannot care for the garden anymore. How are we going to keep the garden with this much water fees? We pay trash fees, but we do not even have a trash bin. I do not need to put the trash in a bin on top of this mountain. They should provide us with services, not just take our money without providing services.”

She again stressed the lack of government services to the villagers, despite collecting high fees for basic services. Senem said, “soon water will be a problem for us. People are not able to plant the garden anymore with all these water fees.”

The results of the study highlighted the participants’ concerns about changes in the village status to rural municipalities (belediye). This new village status brings more regulation and increased fees on basic necessities including water, electricity, and trash collection. These rural women are particularly affected by these fees, because they cannot produce vegetables with
high fees on water. I attributed this new restructuring to the neoliberal politics of the government, which forces every resident to pay their share with no regard for how these rural people are going to produce food for themselves and the local communities.

**Theme #5: Unemployable Position of Rural Women**

*Women’s full housewife position in the cities:* After migrating to cities, rural women become full housewives in the cities. There is no work available to migrant women unless it is farm wage work or house cleaning work. In the third focus group session, Saniye said, “when they move to city [name of city is masked], they do not see going to work as appropriate anymore. They can only handle housework in the house, and there is too much work in the house including cooking, cleaning, and taking care of the kids. In that setting, kids require more work and attention.” She describes that when women moved to cities they became housewives taking care of the household and kids. To perform agricultural work in somebody else’s field is not considered appropriate for them anymore. Meryem said, “after women (hanımlar) get used to living in the city, they do not come back here. Why should they come here? Life is harsh.” She added, “over there [city] they get used to using gas and electric appliances for cooking, doing the dishes by using running water, and they have better kitchens in the apartments.” She described them as housewives in an apartment with better kitchens and better appliances. She cynically referred to them as “hanımlar,” an upgraded social position from living in the city. Most of these migrating rural women become full time housewives providing care work to their families in the cities.

Even though most of the women in small cities like districts (kaza) do some agricultural work, they refer to themselves as housewives. Sevgi got married and moved to city. She lives with her in-laws, and said, “I am a housewife. I do all the housework here. I have three little kids
and my time is all occupied, however, we still grow some vegetables in our village. I work there if there is work needed. Other than that, I deal with all housework and take care of the kids.” She carries out all care work and housework in her husband’s extended family home. She also works in her husband’s family’s agricultural work, but not on other farms. Solmaz’s husband is retired form a government job, and lives in district. She said, “I am a housewife. I do not go to work, and I only grow some vegetables in the garden. After we moved to city, my husband lent our land to other farmers to bring a little more income.” The fourth focus group of women including Sevgi all migrated to the district from different villages, but were still connected to farming by either growing in their village, or growing by renting land around a city. They all referred to themselves as housewives. In this focus group, Dudu said, “I am a housewife of course. I carry out all housework, and my husband works outside, not me.” She refers to herself as a housewife. All these women declared themselves to be housewives since they are not performing any wage work. The agricultural work they do is not counted as work, because this work is generally not paid.

*Inactive position:* After migrating to cities, these rural women became more inactive in apartments. In the third focus group session, Durdu said, “when I look at the migrant women living in city [name of city is masked], they have more health issues than me although they live in an apartment. They do not work outside. All they do is housework.” She was stating that migrant women live in apartments where they do not go to work outside anymore, and they became more inactive. This urban living creates health problems for them. In the same focus group, Zeynep said, “most of them do not go to work. How are they going to work? Even their husbands cannot find jobs. Some of them do handicrafts (such as embroidery) to sell for a trousseau (bridal goods) or to other people. Some of them are even paying their rent with these
kinds of handcrafts.” She stated that it is impossible for them to find jobs, and that even their husbands cannot find jobs easily. However, she said that they do some handicraft work to earn a little money.

The study results revealed that living in the city is viewed as an upgraded social status in the eyes of many of the rural women and girls, because most migrant women do not do agricultural work anymore. After migrating to cities, however, they become housewives because there is no work available for migrant rural women except for farm wage work, and informal work such as handicrafts or house cleaning work. As I discussed in research question four, these rural women possess minimal formal education, and fewer job skills (nothing other than agricultural work skill) to find paid jobs in the city. Jobs available to them in the city are limited to low wage agricultural work, babysitting jobs, or house cleaning work. Thus, immigrant rural women hold an unemployable position in the cities with limited skill and educational background. This creates a gender inequality outcome for them. Consequently, they became more dependent on their husbands’ wage work in the cities.

Overall, research question five addressed how changes in small farming affect women farmers in Turkey. With respect to the subordinated social locations of feminist standpoint theory, the results highlighted that subsistence and semi–subsistence production is not generating money (economic deprivation). That is why it is not attracting younger generations to stay in farming. Also, the results revealed that all villages in this study are under heavy migration (deagrarization of rural villages). Particularly, in mountainous villages, the majority of the populations have already migrated to the cities. Moreover, results indicated that migrant rural women hold unemployable positions in the cities due to their limited skills and poor educational background. Since they cannot transfer to an employment status, they became full housewives.
and are fully dependent on the husbands’ wage work in the cities. Drawing on the “subordinated social locations” construct of feminist standpoint theory, this research question indicated that these participants experience subordinated social locations from economic deprivation, deagrarianization of their villages, dependent position, and unemployable positions. Thus, all these subordinate locations of women farmers create gender inequality standpoints for participants of this study.

Summary

I analyzed the data collected through in-depth interviews and focus groups to address the five research questions. I collected data through 23 individual in-depth interviews, and five focus group sessions with women farmers in their villages, in Konya province, in Turkey. I explored the gender inequality outcomes through feminist standpoint concepts including inequitable gender division of labor, subordinated social locations, and social cultural power dynamics on small farm practices in Turkey.

Research question one addressed the gender division of labor on small farm practices. The results indicated that women generally take primary responsibility for subsistence production, providing care work for family members, and homemaking, and they often have control over marketing small amount of agricultural products such as eggs, milk, vegetables. Men took over the commercialized part of traditional farming including growing and trading cereal crops, using machines including planting with tractor, spraying pesticides and fertilizer, and hiring combine harvester. In contrast to women in this study, men are responsible for agricultural activities that create income. The results demonstrated there were gendered roles and responsibilities on small farm practices; women participants carried out both farm and household
tasks, and in this sense bearing a heavier work burden. Thus, rural women’s heavy work burden creates gender inequality standpoints for participants of this study.

Research question two addressed the workload of women farmers on small farm practices. Participants indicated that they provide important work towards growing vegetables, livestock rearing and producing dairy products, and post-harvest processing in the study villages. The results also highlighted that all these women’s work towards producing food is very important to ensure the food security of their families. Moreover, women’s work in agricultural production, subsistence production, providing care for family members, or work in the extended family house, is invisible. Thus, the invisible work of rural women creates gender inequality standpoints for participants in this study.

Research question three addressed gender inequalities in decision-making on small farm practices. The results of this study revealed that participants lacked decision making power when compared to their husbands, on household resources and income on these small farm practices. However, they enjoy some autonomy on deciding what the household needs, and issues in managing the household daily affairs. In addition, the results indicated that men are the primary decision-makers on farm practices that generate income. They are the heads of the households, and control resources and income. The results from this research question indicated that women’s lack of access to decision-making power on household resources and income create patriarchal social control and a dependent position for participants.

Research question four addressed gender inequalities in acquiring knowledge about farming practices on small farm practices. The study results revealed that all participants have no experience with extension services. They do not get any information and training regarding their agricultural and home management practices from extension services. This study also
highlighted that there is a severe illiteracy problem among the participants with almost half of participants illiterate at ages as old as 47 and 54 years. Moreover, the participants face several challenges to attending extension education and training including not considering training a priority, time allocation (busy), and receiving the husband’s permission to attend (patriarchal social control). Thus, the results provided evidence that women’s lack of access to formal education and extension education and training create patriarchal social control, and their dependent position.

Research question five addressed how changes in small farming affect women farmers in Turkey. The results found that all villages in this study are under heavy migration (deagrarization of rural villages). Particularly, in mountainous villages, the majority of the populations have already migrated to the cities. Moreover, the results revealed that the migrating rural women hold unemployable positions in the cities due to their limited skills and poor education background. This research question indicated that these participants experience subordinated social locations from economic deprivation, deagrarization of their villages, dependent position, and unemployable positions. Thus, all these subordinate locations of women farmers create gender inequality standpoints for participants of this study.

**Chapter 6: Conclusion and Recommendations**

In this chapter, I will explore the findings from this study in a discussion of the results, the limitations, recommendations for practice, and areas for future research. The discussion of the results will describe the research findings with respect to each of the five research questions. The discussion of the study limitations will explore how the findings of this study can be applied to other populations and contexts. Recommendations for practice will include suggestions for
practice in terms of developing and implementing gender inclusive agricultural programs, policies, services, and development projects. Finally, the section on future research will explore how the findings from this study could be further explored in other research studies.

**Introduction**

In the rural areas of the developing world, including Turkey, agriculture is a major component of rural income, and women are the backbone of agricultural production. Resources, especially water, land, livestock, crops, and knowledge about agricultural production are crucial for the livelihoods of most of the world's rural families. Access to, control over, and management of these resources determines which activities are pursued, which goods may be produced, and whether the lives of rural households are enhanced or diminished. More importantly, gender determines who has access to these resources and what kind of access they have. Although women work in the fields, the homes, outside of the farm, and at the markets, their male counterparts often control decisions over the household and it’s economy. Significant gender inequalities can be found in unrecognized women’s work in agricultural production along with their household chores. Moreover, they are held back by a number of constraints stemming from gender inequality including limited access to farm inputs and technology, information, training, formal education, marketing, credit, and training services, all of which adversely affect their productivity (FAO, 2011; Fletschner & Kenney, 2014). Thus, women, more than men, will bear the burden, be it physical, psychological, social, moral, economic, political, or legal, of these gender inequalities.

I used a feminist standpoint lens to explore the women farmers’ gender inequality experiences on small farm practices in Turkey. It is important to point out that the inequality these rural women experience does not only arise from men’s and women’s relations. It extends
beyond gender to other types of unequal positions, such as social status, class (being rural women), economic class, low income, poor infrastructure in villages, practicing traditional agriculture (low income), and geographical locations (villager) (Hartsock, 1996). These various positions of women farmers play a role in forming a range of standpoints. Thus, I strove to explore the women farmers’ gender inequality experiences from women farmers’ various standpoints.

In this study, the conceptual framework draws on the feminist standpoint theory base to explore women farmers’ gender inequalities on small farm practices in Turkey (Hartsock, 1983; Hill Collins, 1986; Smith, 1987; Aptheker, 1989; Harding, 1993). The feminist standpoint theory offers insights into how research on power relations should begin with the lives of the marginalized, how knowledge is socially situated, the social values and power dynamics that account for the subordination of girls and women, and the distinct knowledge fostered by activities that are typically assigned to females (Aptheker, 1989; Harding, 1987; Hartsock, 1983; Hill Collins, 1986; Smith, 1987; Wood, 2005). Drawing on this theory base allows this study to explore several aspects of the research questions such as gender division of labor, women’s work in agriculture and the household (invisible, unpaid nature of women’s work), decision-making dynamics within rural families, accessing resources and knowledge, agrarian change, and the effect of gender on small farm practices from women farmers’ standpoints.

The methodological approach for this study is a feminist standpoint inquiry of qualitative methods. Feminist standpoint epistemology (the nature of knowledge) recognizes women’s lived experiences as legitimate sources of knowledge (Aptheker, 1989; Hartsock, 1987; Harding, 1993), which is appropriate to this study exploring the daily experiences of women farmers. To start this research, I used a “bottom up” approach to develop an epistemology for constructing
knowledge, based on insights arising from marginalized women farmers (Aptheker, 1989; Smith, 1987). I adopted this approach because feminist standpoint theory calls attention to the knowledge that arises from conditions and experiences that are common to girls and women (e.g. women’s life experiences as a source of knowledge) (Wood, 2005). I collected feminist standpoint data through in-depth interviews and focus groups with women farmers in their setting in southern part of Konya province in Turkey. I utilized data to answer the five research questions.

**Discussion of Results**

**Research Question #1: What is the gender division of labor on small farm practices?**

Research question one addressed the gender division of labor on small farm practices. The results of this study established that there are gendered roles and responsibilities in agricultural food production on small farming practices in Turkey. The participants indicated that women generally take primary responsibility for subsistence production, care work, and homemaking, and they often have control over marketing small amounts of agricultural products such as eggs, milk, and vegetables. Men perform the commercialized parts of traditional farming including growing and trading cereal crops, using machines including planting with a tractor, spraying pesticides and fertilizers, and hiring combine harvesters. Previous studies described that in most farming systems, there is a division of labor which determines the different and complementary tasks for which men and women are responsible (FAO, 2004; Karl, 2008). The role of men and women in agricultural production vary from one place to another. Often, men and women have shared or divided tasks in the agricultural production. As confirmed by this study, while women carry out tasks that are labor intensive, and they are responsible for the
household food security, they do not generate much income. In contrast to women in this study, men are responsible for agricultural activities that generate income.

The results indicated that all the participants carry out both farm and household tasks. When women and men come home after a day of working in the field, the men’s work finishes at the doorstep, but the women’s household work starts. These women take primary responsibility for homemaking, nurturing, and caregiving, while the men’s household responsibilities involve repairs around the house and buying what the family needs from the city grocery stores or from the bazaar. A key finding of this study is that all the participants have internalized the housework described above as their own responsibility, and have no expectation of men taking responsibility for the housework. In previous studies, scholars described that societies use the different gendered roles that stem from biological differences between women and men as the basis to divide their tasks both at home and in the public sphere (Mackintosh, 1984; Quisumbing et al., 2014). Thus, in public spheres, male domination is well recognized, while women are prominent in the household economy and in the domestic sphere (Bryson, 1996). The results of this study confirmed that the trend in gender division of labor in Turkey is directly tied to socio-cultural patterns. This may be described best in the common aphorism, “a woman’s place is her home” (Boserup, 1970; FAO, 2004; Mackintosh, 1984). The participants carry out all household responsibilities because both in Islamic and Mediterranean culture, women live in the domestic sphere maintaining the roles and responsibilities of wives and mothers (Stivachtis & Georgakis, 2008). Thus, the results of this study confirmed that women farmers took responsibility for all housework and care work, and they internalized these tasks as their own responsibilities.

In addition to this, the results revealed that some participants took more responsibility in agricultural production and marketing because their husbands’ work ability was limited or, in
some instances, deceased. Previous studies pointed out that gender roles are learned behaviors in a given society/community that condition which activities, tasks, and responsibilities are perceived as male and female (FAO, 2011; Mackintosh, 1984). These roles and expectations are learned, change over time, and vary within and between cultures (Boserup, 1970; FAO, 2011). In this study, in the absence of men’s work power, some participants in the traditional small farming practices ended up taking over the men’s responsibilities in addition to their own responsibilities. Thus, these study results confirmed that gender roles and expectations can change under various circumstances.

The results from the first research question also provide a greater understanding of the feminist standpoint theory. Feminist standpoint scholars pointed out the different social locations that women and men occupy, fostering distinct kinds of knowledge. According to the feminist standpoint theory, women's lives, in general, differ systematically and structurally from men's lives (Harding, 1992). Women and men are expected to engage in distinctive activities, and the two groups have different rights and opportunities. For instance, females are expected to take primary responsibility for homemaking, nurturing, and caregiving, and females are supposed to obey and please others (Harding, 1992). The study results demonstrated that there are gendered roles and responsibilities on small farm practices. Participants carry out both farm and household tasks, and in this sense they bear a heavy work burden. Thus, rural women’s heavy work burden creates gender inequality standpoints for the participants of this study.

**Research Question #2: What gender inequalities exist in the workload of women farmers on small farm practices?**

Research question two addressed the scope of women’s work on small farm practices. The study results illustrated that women play an important role in growing vegetables, livestock
rearing, producing dairy products, and post-harvest processing in these villages. All these participants make important contributions to agricultural production in these villages. In regard to vegetable growing, they are engaged in planting, hoeing, weeding, watering, harvesting, and marketing the surplus. In livestock rearing, they participate in feeding the animals, cleaning the barns, milking and making dairy products, and preparing dairy products for sale in the bazaar. In post-harvest processing, they prepare dry beans, dry chickpeas, soup starters, cracked wheat (bulgur), cheese, butter, pickles, and canned food. Many studies, including Turkish studies, have already defined women’s important role in growing, processing, and provision of food to feed their families (FAO, 2011; Doss, 2014). In Turkey, women carry out many tasks at every stage of agricultural production including planting, post-harvest food processing, marketing, tending animals, milking and making dairy products, and provision of food to their families (Budak et al., 2005; Ilcan, 1994; Ozcatalbas & Akcaoz, 2010; Ozkan et al., 2000). The results from this study confirm these findings. The study results identified that all these aspects of women’s work in producing food are very important for ensuring food security for their families. Indeed, the participants’ work constitutes the keystone for their household food security.

Results also indicated that all participants who own livestock are responsible for milking the animals and making dairy products, which is in line with the findings of Budak et al. (2005) in their study of women farmers in the villages on the Taurus Mountain in Turkey. Thus, women are often irreplaceable in manually milking the farm animals and making dairy products. For families that do not possess milking machines, men do not milk the animals manually. Such tasks are generally associated with household work, and therefore, women are responsible for such tasks. The key finding of this study is that women’s manual work on milking and making dairy products is indispensable on small farm practices.
Moreover, the study results indicated that women’s work in agricultural production, subsistence production, care work, or work in the extended family house, is invisible. As described by Beneria (1999), unpaid work includes activities such as childcare, home cleaning and maintenance, agricultural work, subsistence production, volunteer work, and delivery of food. She stated that this is also an important labor area where market relations do not play a significant role. All the work these participants do in order to produce food, while very important for ensuring the food security of their families, has no market value. Findings from this study supported Beneria’s description of women’s unpaid work, and added to her description of rural women’s work in the extended family house as another source of unpaid work. The key finding of this study is that rural women’s agricultural and household work in the extended family house is unpaid and invisible. Thus, all the invisible work of rural women creates gender inequality standpoints for participants of this study.

Results from the second research question also provide a greater understanding of feminist standpoint theory. The premise of feminist standpoint theory is that society is organized by power relations that generate unequal social positions (Wood, 2005). In the extended family house, women hold subordinated social positions, and go through tough times. The head of the household, typically the oldest male (e.g., the husband’s father), controls the money and patriarchal relationships are fully in place. There is also a patriarchy of mother-in-laws over brides. Thus, none of these participants admired their time living in the extended family house. Previous studies also described that in Turkish social structure, particularly rural villages, brides are required to leave their parents’ home and join the husband’s extended family household. All participants have lived with extended family for a certain time period, or until the in-laws passed away. Kandiyoti (1987 p.331) stated that a young bride comes to her husband's household at an
extreme disadvantage, as she will be subordinated not only to all men in the family but also to senior women, especially the mother-in-law, and sister-in-laws. In this context, a young bride is not only at the bottom of the social hierarchy (Hard, 2010), but also shoulders farm work and household chores in the household with silent acceptance (Karkiner, 2009). The results of this study support previous study descriptions of women’s subordinated position, and identify the types of work these participants have provided in the extended family house as unpaid and invisible. Thus, the invisible work of rural women creates gender inequality standpoints for participants in this study.

**Research Question #3: What gender inequalities exist in decision making on small farm practices**

Research question three addressed the gender inequalities in decision-making on small farm practices. The results of this study revealed that men are the primary decision makers on farm practices that generate income. They are the heads of the households, and control resources and income. Also, results revealed that participants lack decision-making power on household resources and income on these small farm practices. However, they enjoy some autonomy on deciding what the household needs, and on issues regarding managing the household daily affairs. The FAO (2010-2011) report stated that men control resources and money, and rural women are often marginalized in decision-making on farm production and controlling resources and money around the world (FAO, 2011). Findings from this study support the FAO report in that women’s participation in the decision-making process for family budgeting issues is minimal. However, they hold greater autonomy on deciding what the household needs.

In addition, the results of this study revealed that the participants are embedded in a patriarchal social culture, and that they have internalized their subordinate social position in the
household and farming practices. Thus, these participants actually accede to the power and authority of male decision-makers. Kandiyoti (1988) categorized the Turkish social culture as a classic patriarchal structure. In this classical patriarchy, she stated that, “…the domination of younger men by older men and the shelter of women in the domestic sphere were the hallmarks of a system in which men controlled some form of viable joint patrimony in land, animals, or commercial capital” (Kandiyoti, 1988, p.282). Thus, in Turkish rural social life, there are several patriarchal relationships in the village social structure including older women to young women, men to women, and women to women. Not surprisingly, women are embedded in that patriarchal structure and they only view life through this lens. The results of this study substantiate Kandiyoti’s classification of Turkish social culture as a classical patriarchal structure.

The results from research question three also provide a better understanding of feminist standpoint theory. Standpoint theory aims to acquire knowledge that arises from women’s social locations. The feminist standpoint centers on realizing that the conditions and experiences common to girls and women are not natural, but are the result of social and political power dynamics (Harding, 1993). Feminist research recognizes that most women face some form of oppression and exploitation because of the power dynamics in any society. The results from this research question indicated that women’s lack of access to decision-making power on household resources and income creates patriarchal social control and dependant positions for the participants. Patriarchal social control over women, along with their dependant position on men, generate gender inequality standpoints for participants in this study.
Research Question #4: What gender inequalities exist in acquiring knowledge about farming practices?

Research question four addressed gender inequalities in accessing knowledge on small farm practices. The study results revealed that all participants have no experience with extension services. They do not get any information and training regarding their agricultural and home management practices from extension services. According to FAO (2011), rural women often have less access to new agricultural technologies, education, and extension training around the world. Identically in Turkey, women farmers have less access to agricultural information and innovations in agriculture (Rad et al., 2012; Boyaci, 2010; Ozcatalbas & Akcaoz, 2010; Kizilaslan, 2007). Previous studies revealed that women have less access to agricultural information and training around the world including Turkey. Findings from this study support these studies’ results.

Additionally, the results of this study found that the participants face several challenges for attending extension education and training including not considering training a priority, time allocation (busy), and receiving the husbands’ permission to attend (patriarchal social control). Previous studies emphasized that women farmers have difficulties in attending (the already limited) extension education programs because of their household responsibilities (FAO, 2011). Kizilaslan (2007) stated that there were major factors limiting the women’s access to extension education in Turkey including: 1) insufficient time, 2) lack of training, 3) social structure, and 4) poverty. These constraints block women’s participation in offered extension programs. The results added to the work of Kizilaslan (2007) by identifying two more constraints: not giving priority, and the need for the husband’s permission to attend. The key findings highlighted that participants do not give priority to extension education programs because their practices are very
small and traditional. Also the husband’s permission is needed to attend these programs due to the patriarchal social culture.

Moreover, this study highlighted that there is a severe illiteracy problem among the participants. Almost half of the participants were illiterate at ages as old as 47 and 54 years. In this study, I identified several reasons why these participants could not make it to school: 1) families were poor (kept girls home for free labor), 2) low educational infrastructure (no secondary schools exist in most villages), 3) one parent passed away before kids were at school age, and 4) father’s view that girls’ education is useless. In previous studies, Rad et al. (2012) identified that lack of family income and lack of infrastructure are the most notable obstacles to girls’ education in the mountain villages of the Mersin province of Turkey. Rankin and Aytac’s (2006) study results indicated that locality, family resources, and family structure and culture influence the education of both genders. They also stated that girls' chances of post primary schooling are greater if they live in metropolitan areas and in less patriarchal families. The findings of this study support these previous conclusions. Study results indicated that rural women’s formal education level is low. Thus, women’s lack of access to formal education and extension education and training create patriarchal social control and dependent position. In this sense, the subordinate position of women farmers creates gender inequality standpoints for participants in this study.

**Research Question #5: How does the way small farming is changing in Turkey affect women farmers?**

Research question five addressed how changes in small farming affect women farmers in Turkey. The results of this study highlighted the presence of several challenges to the traditional way of farming practices in which village women are major players. The results found that there
is economic deprivation stemming from traditional ways of producing food. In these villages, traditional farming is not generating enough income to continue farming on fragmented land (little land) or with only a few livestock. Also, the participants claimed that their kids did not want to do subsistence farming or live in the villages. These traditional subsistence lifestyles and income are not appealing to the younger generations. They do not want to work in their family’s small practice with little money. In addition, the participants stated that there is also a schooling shortage problem in these villages, especially for younger couples with young kids. They pointed out that the government does not subsidize very small practices. Drawing on previous studies by Aydin (2010); Kayder and Yenal, (2011); and Ozturk, (2012), Turkey adopted free market policies in agricultural food systems after the 1980’s. With free market policies in place, small traditional rural farmers are left unprotected in the market with the elimination of government support and protection to sustain agricultural production. Ozturk (2012) stated that the neo-liberal policies applied in Turkey, particularly after 1999, have had profound impacts on its farming economy and village life. According to Kayder and Yenal (2011), the government left these traditional farming practices unprotected to survive and compete in the free market. This study results indicated that the traditional way of farming is disappearing (communities deteriorated by migration, closed schools, empty houses, and abandoned land particularly in mountain villages). Simply, these small traditional rural farmers are left unprotected in the market with the elimination of government support and protection to sustain agricultural production. A key finding of this research is that subsistence and semi–subsistence production are not generating enough money (economic deprivation). That is why it is not attracting younger generations to stay in farming. Many participants stated that they are not going to continue farming practices after they get older.
This study’s results revealed that there is a depeasantization of these rural villages. Particularly in mountainous villages, the majority of the population has already migrated to the cities. As described by Gurel (2011) and Ozturk (2012), rural people who do not make sufficient livelihood from their small piece of land (low income) in their home villages (limited land resources) have to migrate to cities (Ozturk, 2012). Thus, Turkey is in rapid “depeasantization,” which implies that rural populations, especially peasant farmers, are migrating to cities and establishing urban slums. Patniak (2009) pointed out that rapid “depeasantiation” is occurring in the developing countries; peasant people in these countries are migrating to cities and establishing poor slum neighborhoods. These people are poor nutrition deprived, lost their livelihood, and try to survive with wage work in informal sector (Magdoff & Tokar, 2009). These study results support previous studies’ findings on depeasantization of these rural villages. This study found that all villages are under heavy migration (deagrarization of rural villages).

Finally, the results indicated that migrated rural women hold unemployable positions in the cities due to their limited skills and poor educational background. They could not transfer to an employment status and consequently, they became full housewives and are fully dependent on their husbands’ wage work in the cities. In previous studies, Dedeoglu (2012) emphasized that after leaving agricultural activities as unpaid family workers, rural women became increasingly inactive in cities, as the Turkish economy has not provided enough jobs. In addition to this, the patriarchal social norms place constraints on women’s mobility by limiting their movement into the labor market. The results of this study support Dedeoglu’s findings including the housewife position and patriarchal social control, and added the “unemployable position” of these rural women. A key finding of this study is that women hold unemployable positions in the cities due
to low educational background and limited job skills. This creates gender inequality standpoints for rural women.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of this study involve the use of qualitative methods, and the cultural interpretation of findings. The findings from this study represent only the experiences of the individuals who agreed to participate in interview and focus group sessions. The results do not represent the experiences of all women farmers across Turkey. That is why we cannot be transferred findings from this study to all women farmers in Turkey or in different parts of the world. However, this study has contributed to the literature in identifying these participants’ standpoints about how they interpret their gender inequality experiences from their social location as producers working on small farms in the southern region of Konya province of Turkey.

The findings of this study are limited by the cultural interpretation that took place during the data collection and analysis phases. During the translation process, the concern is that some meaning will be, “lost in translation” as the interviews were conducted using the Turkish language, analyzed, and then translated to English. I felt some concern as some culture-specific impressions and meaning are lost in the translation to another language. Thus, translation into another language may decrease the richness of data due to misinterpretation. During the analysis phase, I also filtered the comments of the participants through my cultural lens.

**Recommendations for Practice**

I have derived a number of recommendations from the results of this study that can guide practice. These recommendations are geared toward individuals and community organizations, as well as Turkish government policy makers regarding agricultural policy, formal education, the
public education system, and extension education systems involved in working with women farmers.

**Recommendations for Individuals and Community Organizations**

The first set of recommendations is geared towards individuals including women farmers themselves, other women and men, and community organizations. The results of this study indicated that there is a gender division of labor and that participants carry out farm tasks that are labor intensive. Even though they are responsible for the household food security, they do not generate much income. In contrast to women in this study, men are responsible for agricultural activities that are mechanized and generate income. Moreover, the results highlighted that participants bear a heavy work burden because they carry out both farm and household tasks. Women should recognize that they are not just housewives, and that they play an important role in agricultural food production systems and household management. Men should also recognize women’s labor in farm production and the household. They should realize that even their wage work is dependant on women’s work in the household since they do not participate in any work in the house. If women’s work is recognized, this would facilitate women’s access to decision-making processes, and encourage men to share household duties.

Additionally, community organizations including banks, cooperatives, and farm unions should also recognize women’s work. If women’s work is recognized, these organizations would value women’s labor so that women may have access to productive resources, inputs, services, and credit. This may increase women’s independence socially and financially, and ensure women have a right to social security and other entitlements.

**Recommendations for Governments Policy Makers**
Agricultural Policy Makers: First, the results from this study indicated that there are gendered roles and responsibilities on small farm practices. Participants carry out both farm and household tasks, and they bear a heavy work burden. Thus, the ministry of agriculture in Turkey should make gender-aware agricultural policy decisions. Gender inclusive actions should enable women farmers to take greater advantage of extension systems and increase the accessibility of new agricultural technologies and innovations. Women need techniques and technologies to ease their work burden in both farm and household tasks. Rural women also need assistance to develop the capacity necessary in order to increase their income. For this, a vital first step is to provide them with training as well as agricultural inputs and credit so that they can produce more, and access the market.

Second, I would encourage policy makers and development planners to design gender inclusive agricultural development projects and programs within the region and elsewhere in the country. Findings of this study suggested that women have a lack of decision-making power and lack of access to household resources and income. Policy makers should make development programs and projects that improve rural women’s access to and control over productive resources, inputs, and services. Policies that are gender-sensitive, and that consider the particular needs and capacities of both women and men, are more likely to be effective.

Third, the study findings highlighted severe agrarian change with the unfavorable demographic situation in rural villages in Turkey. Particularly in the mountain villages, very few of the younger generation are remaining in the village to take over their parents’ farm work. Cultivated lands are very small and fragmented in rural areas of Turkey as a result of inheritance law. Thus, they are not adequate to produce income for the whole family in the free market. The government should create more regulations to prevent dividing land. I also recommend social
security coverage for rural families that live and continue agricultural practices in these rural
villages.

Finally, I would also encourage policy makers to take action in assisting the transition of
small family farms to more efficient production systems. Recently, Turkish agriculture is in
transition from traditional subsistence and semi-subsistence to more commercialized farm
enterprises with export-oriented farming. Many producers could not adjust to this transition, and
many of them have quit farming, and moved to cities. These results already confirmed the
depesantization within the study villages. The results also highlighted that the government
changed the status of the study villages to rural municipalities (belediye), and added more fees
for water, electricity, and trash. It is hard for village residents to pay these city fees. I would
suggest that the government keep subsidizing these small producers, and reduce fees on
electricity, water, and trash in these villages. Also, the government should encourage remaining
farmers to stay in the villages, and encourage farmers who want to come back to the villages and
keep producing food. If we lose all these small producers, who will produce healthy and
culturally sound food for local communities?

Education Policy Maker: My recommendations are also geared toward formal education
policy makers. This study highlighted that there is an illiteracy problem among the participants
(8 participants illiterate, one can read). Considering that Turkey has had a five-year compulsory
education system in place from when these women were at school age, the fact that almost half
of the participants are illiterate is outrageous. Simply, some participants did not make it to
school, and others possess only primary school education. Thus, there is illiteracy and low
education among adults in the rural areas of Turkey, particularly for women. The ministry of
education should take action to increase rural girls’ educational attainment at the primary school
level and other school levels. I would suggest that they give scholarships that specifically target rural girls so that they can continue into higher education.

**Recommendations for Extension Education Systems**

The second set of recommendations are geared toward Extension Education Systems. This study highlighted that there is an illiteracy problem among the participants (7 participants illiterate, one can read) and other participants’ have primary school level education. Extension education have substantial significance, as many of women farmers and girls have limited education or as many women farmers never had the chance to go to school to start with. Extension education may represent the only formalized education that an individual will receive her lifetime. Thus, extension education is very important for women and girls in rural society to improve knowledge and skill development. To be successful to reach out to women farmers, I offered several suggestions for extension services such as:

First, the study results revealed that all participants have no experience with extension services. They do not get any information and training regarding their agricultural practices from extension services even though they handle risky jobs like spraying fertilizer or pesticides in their farm practices. Extension education services should make gender-inclusive education programs to reach out to women farmers. Gender-inclusive training and education should enable women farmers to take greater advantage of extension systems and increase the accessibility of new agricultural information, technologies, and innovations.

Second, extension services should design training and education programs that target women in more structured ways. Results of this study found that women do not give priority to extension because they are busy with other responsibilities and also live in a patriarchal social environment. Thus, women farmers face challenges to joining training and courses. They do not
have time for the random visits that extension agents make to villages. They need more structured “gender inclusive” programs that allow for building relationships. If they want to reach out to women, they should consider women farmer’s challenges while designing programs. The extension workers thus should shape the extension program such that it will not interfere with the women farmer other responsibility. Extension agents should organize extension activities in such a way that women can attend these activities regularly and activities related to their work in farm.

Third, the study results pointed out that women farmers embedded in patriarch social culture. Some of them need husband’s permission to attend extension programs. Extension professionals should be aware of the culture at which the women farmers are embedded. Hence, they should avoid to interfere with women family life as much as possible. There are several patriarchy relationships in the village social structure. They born in that patriarchy structure and they only view life through this structure. Thus, extension workers should possess “cultural competency” to better serve them. If they want to teach them they should search a suitable method to reach them while considering the social constraints.

I would suggest to use help of women extension agents. Women farmers may prefer to get information from women extension agents in Turkey. They can interrelate better, they feel more comfortable and are more willing to work together. With male extension agents, they might have less confidence and are less likely to open up. Extension services should hire women extension agents in their establishment. I would also suggest that extension professionals, particularly women extension agents, work with women farmers to design agricultural education and training programs by considering what rural women need in their farm practices. This can promote women’s economic security and self-reliance.
Finally, the study results indicated that women farmers hold unemployable positions in cities after migration. This is because they possess minimal formal education and fewer job skills (nothing other than agricultural work skill) to find a paid job in the city. It is hard for them to transfer to paid jobs. Extension services should collaborate with other organizations such as public non-formal education centers and None Governmental Organizations (NGOs) concerned with women’s education, and focus on training and capacity building for these rural immigrant women in cities. In this way, women may find paid jobs in the cities. This would increase their self-reliance and independence.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The purpose of this study was to explore women farmers’ gender inequality experiences on small farm practices in Turkey. Future research could explore a number of different areas related to gender inequality experiences of women farmers. After examining research question one, we learned that there are gendered roles and responsibilities on small farm practices, and that participants carry out both farm and household tasks. In this sense, they bear a heavy work burden. Given these findings, the researchers should examine questions such as: what is the gender division of labor on larger farm practices, how is gender division of labor different in different regions of Turkey, and how can we ease women farmers’ work burden? By studying these research questions, we can develop a better understanding of marginalization, gender roles, and gender division of labor in Turkish society. This may also help to address gender equality in access to labor and time-saving technologies, and practices that contribute to reducing women’s workload.

After exploring research question two, we learned that women provide important labor through growing vegetables, livestock rearing, producing dairy products, post-harvest
processing, household management, and care work in the villages. Yet this study indicated that women’s work in agricultural production, subsistence production, care work, or work in the extended family house, is invisible. Given these findings, the next research questions should examine how to make rural women’s invisible work visible in these rural villages, and the consequences of invisible work to rural women. By exploring these research questions, we may create a deep awareness about women’s challenges and difficulties from invisible work on small farm practices.

Through exploring research question three, we learned that men are the primary decision makers on farm practices that generate income, and that women hold a lack of decision-making power on household resources and income on these small farm practices. Given these findings, the next research questions should focus on how to improve women’s participation in the decision-making process for these small farm practices. Through examining this research question, we may understand women’s barriers to the decision-making process. This may facilitate women’s access to decision-making processes on small farm practices.

Through exploring research question four, we learned that women farmers have no experience with extension education programs. Women farmers also face several challenges to attending extension education and training including: not considering training a priority, time allocation (busy), and receiving the husband’s permission to attend (patriarchal social control). Given these findings, additional research can be conducted to provide further clarification. Additional research should explore why women farmers are overlooked by extension services. Secondly, additional research can be conducted on “studying up” by exploring the perception of extension professionals, and the principles, practices, and cultures of extension education services. This may clarify why women farmers are excluded from extension services. These
additional topic may provide critical information to educators and practitioners, particularly extension agents working with women farmers in Turkey. They may also help practitioners to understand how gender inclusive agricultural projects and programs can be implemented to improve women farmers’ livelihood.

Finally, by exploring research question five, we learned that there is a depeasantization of study villages. Particularly in mountainous villages, the majority of the population has already migrated to the cities. Migrated rural women hold unemployable positions in the cities due to their limited skills and poor educational background. Given these findings, the next research questions should examine how these immigrant women’s social lives change in cities (do they become housewives, are they exposed to more patriarchal social control or are they more liberated, do they find paid jobs or informal jobs?), and how these rural women and their families’ food security are affected? Through examining these research questions, we may develop a better understanding of immigrant women’s social and living conditions and difficulties in the cities. All these rural women became urban dwellers living in apartments with low educational level and job skill in the cities.

Conclusion

This study provided a significant contribution to the applications of feminist standpoint theory in exploring gender inequality experiences of Muslim women farmers in rural villages in Turkey. There was a lack of research using the feminist conceptual framework to explore the daily experiences of Turkish rural women who are historically silenced and marginalized. This research demonstrated that women farmer’s experiences, and the knowledge garnered from these experiences, can be used as a means to draw attention to the inequalities and injustices in society as a whole. In fact, as we come to understand the society through the lens of women’s
experiences (for example, through women farmers’ heavy work burden, gender division of labor, unpaid work, lack of decision-making power, agrarian change, and gender), we take the first step to constructing a feminist standpoint. A feminist standpoint is a way of understanding the world. It is a point of view of social reality that begins with, and is developed directly from, women’s experiences. The next step is to draw on what we have learned from women’s experiences, and to apply that feminist standpoint toward enhancing the condition of rural women and creating social change. Women’s experiences not only point out the flaws in larger economic and political systems, but also offer potential solutions to these flaws. By exploring gender inequality experiences of rural women farmers, the results of this study can be instrumental in guiding policy makers, development planners, and organizations concerned with gender equality. Thus, they would have a better understanding of marginalization, gender roles and gender division of labor, lack of schooling, women farmers’ access to resources and knowledge and decision-making power, and deagrarization and effect on gender in Turkey.

Particularly, this study’s results can benefit rural women and extension professionals, specifically women extension agents, to create a deeper awareness about women’s deprivations and difficulties on small farm practices. Gender inequalities erode women’s ability to access and manage land and other productive resources (e.g. inputs, credits), and pose a significant barrier to promoting their economic security and self-reliance. From the results of this study, my hope is that government and societal agencies may realize that these women play a crucial role in agricultural food production processes as well as their families’ food security. Extension professionals working with women farmers, or wanting to work with women farmers, may recognize that women and men have different needs and power, and that these differences should be identified and addressed in a manner that rectifies the imbalances between the sexes. Indeed,
the results indicated that rural women provide unpaid labor in almost all agriculture-related activities (crop production, subsistence production, postharvest and livestock management activities), but men largely control the market and income in Turkey. Thus, the invisible work of rural women creates gender inequality standpoints for participants in this study.

Finally, the study results also shed light on severe agrarian change with the unfavorable demographic situation in rural villages in Turkey. Particularly, mountainous villages are under heavy migration (deagrarization of rural villages) in which the majority of the population has already left since subsistence and semi-subsistence production is not generating income (economic deprivation). These small farming communities are deteriorated by large migrations driven by the problems of insufficient public services (e.g. schools, health care, and social services) and aging infrastructure in the rural areas. Moreover, the results indicated that migrated rural women hold unemployable positions in the cities due to their limited skills and poor educational background. They could not transfer to an employment status, and consequently, they became full housewives fully dependent on their husbands’ wage work in the cities. My hope is that Turkish government officials read these research results and recognize the severity of this problem. I hope that they do something about it. Additionally, I suggest that organizations concerned with gender inequality take a closer look at the results of this study capturing rural women’s gender inequality experiences, and that they seek the emancipatory transformation of the social structure.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Timeline of Research Procedures

Table 2. Timeline of Research Phases and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Research Phase</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January- June 2014</td>
<td>Qualitative research protocol development</td>
<td>• Interview guides and consent forms developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• IRB approved protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-August 2014</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>• Interview with women farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus groups session with women farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2014- January 2015</td>
<td>Transcribing</td>
<td>• Interview data transcribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus groups data transcribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February - May 2015</td>
<td>Data analyses</td>
<td>• Coding and thematic analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June- November 2015</td>
<td>Compile final report</td>
<td>• Interpretation and explanation of results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Interviews Data Collection Guide

Location:
Date:
Name:
I am a student at Virginia Tech and I’m conducting a study of women farmers’ work experiences and gender inequality experiences on small farming practices. The purpose of this interview is to gain insight into women farmers’ workload on small farms, gender inequalities in working on farms, gender inequalities in farming and household decision making, gender division of labor and gender inequalities in the improvement of farming practices.
I learned that you and your family is a small farmer and I was hoping we could talk about your experiences on farming. I want to let you know that your answers will be confidential. I will not use your real name in my report.
This interview is voluntary and you don’t have to answer questions you don’t want to answer. The interview will take no more than 40 minutes. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Sample Interview Questions for Women Farmers

INTRODUCTION

1. Could you please tell me about the work you do on the farm?

GENDER DIVISION OF LABOR IN FARM WORK

2. Do men or women do each of the following tasks: (Provide a copy of this table to the interviewee).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Done only by women</th>
<th>Done only by men</th>
<th>Done primarily by women but men help a little</th>
<th>Done primarily by men but women help a little</th>
<th>Women &amp; men share this task equally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who prepares fields for planting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who plants seeds or seedling plants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who irrigates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who weeds?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who herds livestock?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who cleans barns?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who harvests crop?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who collects hay?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who harvests vegetables?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who gathers fruit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who feeds animals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who milks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who makes dairy products?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who shears sheep?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who collects and cleans wool?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who shears goats?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who collects and cleans goat hair?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who applies fertilizer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who sprays and handles pesticides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who processes or cleans crops before they are taken to market?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Could you list the 4 farm tasks that you spend the most time on, and tell me how much time you spend on each?

4. How many hours a day do you spend on farm tasks?

5. What farm tasks are done by your daughters?

6. What farm tasks are done by your daughters-in-law?

7. What farm tasks are done by your sons?

8. FOR YOUNG WIFE ONLY

   A. Do you live with extended family?
B. How is the farm work divided between you and the other women of the farm?

9. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about how work is organized on your farm?

GENDER INEQUALITIES IN THE WORKLOAD

1. Please estimate the amount of time you spend each week on each task.

2. How does the work you do on the farm compare with that of your husband?

3. How does your husband work on other non-farm jobs?

4. What other work do you do other than farming? (hand crafting, carpet waving etc.)

5. How do you manage household work and child care?

GENDER INEQUALITIES IN DECISION MAKING

1. How do you and your husband decide to spend money earned from the farm?

2. Tell me about how budget decisions are made for your farm?

3. How are decisions made with respect to what inputs or machines to buy for the household farm?

4. Tell me about who decides to sell products?

5. Tell me about who decides to buy agricultural equipment?

6. Which farm products does your farm sell to wholesalers? Do men or women do that selling?

7. What products do you personally sell in the local market?

8. Who makes decision about crops to be grown?

9. Who makes decision about sell/buy livestock?

10. Who makes decision about scheduling harvesting and contacts with traders and wholesalers?
11. Who buys household needs?

EXPERINCES WITH AQUIRING KNOWLEDGE TO IMPROVE FARMING PRACTICES

1. How many years of schooling have you had?
2. How many years of schooling did your husband have?
3. Tell me about where you learn about new farming practices to improve your efficiency working on the farm.
4. Tell me how you prefer to learn about new farming practices to improve your efficiency working on the farm.
5. Tell me about how you and your husband decide to implement new practices you have learned.
6. Tell me about how you and your husband decides to implement new practices your husband has learned.
7. Over the last year, have you personally received any information from Ag Extension Agents or public officials?

Background Information

1. Do you own farm land?
2. How much land?
3. How much land do you rent?
4. How many livestock do you have?
5. How many small ruminants (goat/sheep) do you have?
6. Do you take credit?
7. Who makes decisions about credit?
8. How long have been married?
9. How old are you?

10. How many children do you have?

11. What do you do with your crop/ livestock/ dairy production?
   a) How much do you sell?
   b) How much do you use for at home?

12. Who takes products to market?

13. Who sells livestock?

14. Who sells cereal crops?

15. How long have you and your husband been farming?

**Wrap up Questions**

16. Is there anything else you would like to add about your experiences on farming or extension services?

17. Is there anyone else who is doing farming that I should talk to?

**THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO TALK WITH ME TODAY**

18. Do you have any questions that you would like to ask me?

19. Would you like a copy of my final report?
Appendix C: Focus Group Data Collection Guide

Location:
Date:
Names:
I am a student at Virginia Tech and I’m conducting a study of women farmers’ work experiences and gender inequality experiences on small farming practices. The purpose of this focus group is to gain insight into women farmers’ role on farming, how farming practices are changed, small farming problems and how extension services serve to women farmers in Turkey. I learned that you all are doing small farming in the village and I was hoping we could talk about your experiences on farming. I want to let you know that your answers will be confidential. I will not use your real name in my report. This focus group is voluntary and you don’t have to answer questions you don’t want to answer. The focus group session will take no more than 1 hour. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Questions for Small Informal Focus Groups

INTRODUCTION

1. How are small farms changing?
2. Are small farms becoming more commercialized?

GENDER INEQUALITIES IN THE WORKLOAD

1. Tell me about how women’s role has changed on working on a small farm.
2. How has women’s work in farming changed over your lifetime compared to that of your mother or grandmother (if you know)?
3. How does your farm workload compare with that of your husband, compared to what has traditionally been in the past?

GENDER INEQUALITIES IN DECISION MAKING

1. Tell me more about how women make decisions with husbands now is different than the past.
2. What do you decide in term of production on farm?
3. What does your husband decides in term of production on farm?
GENDER INEQUALITIES IN DIVISION OF LABOR

4. Tell me about some of the things women now do or not do on the farm that is different than the past.

5. What is women responsibilities on the farm?

6. Can you describe your husband responsibilities on the farm?

7. What is your husband responsibilities on household works?

8. What is your responsibility on household works?

9. Who take care of kids?

10. Who do housework in your family?

EXPERIENCES WITH ACQUIRING KNOWLEDGE TO IMPROVE FARMING PRACTICES

11. How do women on family farms acquire information to improve their farming practices?

12. How has this changed from the past?

13. How extension services provide information in your farm practices?

14. Do government subsidize your farm practices?

Wrap up Questions

15. Is there anything else you would like to add about your experiences on farming or gender inequalities in the improvement of farming practices?

16. Is there anyone else who is doing farming that I should talk to?

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO TALK WITH ME TODAY

17. Do you have any questions that you would like to ask me?

18. Would you like a copy of my final report?
Appendix D: Informed Consent Form for Individual Interviews

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY
Informed Consent for Participants in Research Projects Involving Human Subjects: Taped Interviews

Title of Project: Exploring Women Farmers’ Work Experiences on Small Farms and Gender Inequalities in the Improvement of Farming Practices in Turkey

Investigator(s): Prof. Curtis Robert Friedel & Havva Savran Al-Haik

I. Purpose of this Research/Project You are invited to participate in a study about women’s work and the state of small farms in Turkey. This study is part of the requirements for completion of a doctoral degree at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in the United States.

II. Procedures This study will ask you to participate in personal interviews in which you will be asked to respond to questions about the state of small Turkish farms and about women’s work. Your responses will be tape recorded, and the investigator will make written notes as you speak. You will be permitted to ask questions at any point during the interview process.

III. Risks This study will place you at very little risk, as your identity will be kept entirely confidential. The name of your village will never be identified in any reports.

IV. Benefits This study will offer you an opportunity to express your concerns about the state of Turkish small farms and about women’s work on those farms. Studies like this one might have some future impact upon local and national policy making. No promise or guarantee of benefits is made to encourage your participation.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality All interview tapes and notes will be strictly confidential. The investigators will not use descriptive details that might reveal your identity. Neither your name nor the name of your village will be used in final reporting. If you provide sensitive personal information that you do not wish us to reveal, you may inform us, and we will eliminate that information from the written transcript of your tape. It is possible that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at my university in the United States may view this study’s collected data for auditing purposes. The IRB is responsible for the oversight of the protection of human subjects involved in research.

VI. Compensation You will not receive any monetary or material compensation. However, you may receive a short synopsis of our final report, if you check here ___ and write your mailing address below your signature at the end.

VII. Freedom to Withdraw You are free to withdraw from the study at any time by informing the investigator.

VIII. Subject's Responsibilities Your only responsibilities are to respond to questions that are posed to you during interviews and to meet with the investigator during the time periods upon which we mutually agree.
IX. Subject's Permission I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent to participate.

___________________________________________________________________ Date __________

Subject signature

___________________________________________________________________ Date __________

Witness signature for Subject who must give verbal consent. The witness will print the Subject’s name before signing her/his own name.

Address to request final report summary:

If I have questions about this research or its conduct or about research subjects' rights, I may contact:

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR Prof. Curtis Robert Friedel at cfriedel@vt.edu

CHAIR, VIRGINIA TECH INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
Dr. David Moore at moored@vt.edu

[NOTE: Subjects must be given a complete copy (or duplicate original) of the signed Informed Consent.]
Appendix E: Informed Consent Form for Focus Groups

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent for Participants in Research Projects Involving Human Subjects: Focus Groups

Title of Project: Exploring Women Farmers’ Work Experiences on Small Farms and Gender Inequalities in the Improvement of Farming Practices in Turkey

Investigator(s): Prof. Curtis Robert Friedel & Havva Savran Al-Haik

I. Purpose of this Research/Project You are invited to participate in a study about women’s work and the state of small farms in Turkey. This study is part of the requirements for completion of a doctoral degree at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in the United States.

II. Procedures This study will ask you to participate in a focus group in which you will be asked to respond to questions about the state of small Turkish farms and about women’s work. Your responses will be tape recorded, and the investigator will make written notes as you speak. You will be permitted to ask questions at any point during the focus group.

III. Risks This study will place you at very little risk, as we will not know the identities of most focus group participants. The name of your village will never be identified in any reports.

IV. Benefits This study will offer you an opportunity to express your concerns about the state of Turkish small farms and about women’s work on those farms in a small group of women. Studies like this one might have some future impact upon local and national policy making. No promise or guarantee of benefits is made to encourage your participation.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality All interview tapes and notes will be strictly confidential. The investigators will not use descriptive details that might reveal the identity of any focus group participant. Neither your name nor the name of your village will be used in final reporting. It is possible that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at my university in the United States may view this study’s collected data for auditing purposes. The IRB is responsible for the oversight of the protection of human subjects involved in research.

VI. Compensation You will not receive any monetary or material compensation. However, you may receive a short synopsis of our final report, if you check here ___ and write your mailing address below your signature at the end.

VII. Freedom to Withdraw You are free to withdraw from the focus group at any time.

VIII. Subject's Responsibilities your only responsibility is to respond to questions that are posed during the focus group and/or to participate in group discussion about those questions.

IX. Subject's Permission I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent to participate.
Witness signature for Subject who must give verbal consent. The witness will print the Subject’s name before signing her/his own name.

Address to request final report summary:

If I have questions about this research or its conduct or about research subjects' rights, I may contact:

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR Prof. Curtis Robert Friedel at cfriedel@vt.edu

CHAIR, VIRGINIA TECH INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
Dr. David Moore at moored@vt.edu

[NOTE: Subjects must be given a complete copy (or duplicate original) of the signed Informed Consent.]
Appendix F: Informed Consent Form for Interviews in Turkish

Virginia Polytechnic Enstitüsü ve Eyalet Üniversitesi
Araştırma Projelerine Katılan İnsan Denekleri için Bilgilendirilmiş İzin Verme Belgesi

Araştırma Başlığı: Turkiye’deki Küçük Çiftlikle Ugraşan Kadın Çiftçilerin İş Deneyimleri ve Kadın Erkek Eşitsizliklerinin Araştırılması Projesi

Proje yürütücülerleri: Dr. Curtis Friedel, Yardımcı Doçent Havva Savran Al-Haik Doctora Öğrencisi

I. Araştırmamanın Amacı
Bu araştırma ile Turkiye’ deki küçük çiftliklerde kadın çiftçilerin iş deneyimleri ve kadın erkek eşitsizliklerinin araştırılması amaçlanmaktadır. Bu araştırma çerçevesinde küçük çiftliklerde çalışma açısından kadın erkek eşitsizlikleri, kadın erkek iş bölümü eşitsizlikleri, kadın erkek çiftlikle ilgili karar verme eşitsizlikleri, küçük çiftliklerin durumu ve kadın erkek tarımsal yayım ve eğitim eşitsizlikleri araştırılacaktır. Bu araştırma Virginia Teknik ve Eyalet Üniversitesi doktora programının bir parçasıdır.

II. Yöntemler
Sizden, röportaj yapan tarafından çiftlikte yaptığınız işler ve küçük çiftliklerin durumu ile ilgili deneyimlerinizi anlatmanız istenecektir. Röportaj bir saat civarında olacak ve önceden sizinle ortak kararlaştırılan bir yerde yapılacaktır.

III. Tehlikeler
Bu araştırmaya katılmanın katılımcı açısından bir tehlikesi yoktur veya bu araştırmaya katılmanın tehlikesi çok küçüktür. Senin kimliğin ve köyünün adı tamamen gizli tutulacak ve hicbir yayında ve raporda açıklanmayacaktır.

IV. Avantajlar

V. Anonimlik ve Gizlilik Kapsamı
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IRB (Institutional Review Board) toplanan bilgileri denetlemek amacıyla inceleyebilir. IRB araştırmaya katılan insan deneklerin koruma ve gözetiminden soruludur.

VI. Ödül
Bu araştırmaya katılmının herhangi bir avantajı veya ödülü yoktur.

I. Ayrılma Özgürlüğü
Katılımcılar, herhangi bir ceza almaksızın istediğiniz zaman araştırmaya katılmaktan vazgeçebilirler. Katılımcılar ceza almaksızın istemedikleri sorulara cevap vermeme özgürlüğünde sahiptirler.

II. Katılımcının Sorumlulukları
Ben bu çalışmaya gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul ettim ve kadın çiftçi olarak röportaj yapan araştırmacı ile çiftlikte yaptığım iş deneyimlerimi ve tarımsal yayın ve eğitim deneyimlerimi paylaşacağım.

III. Katılımcının İzni

______ EVET ______ HAYIR

______________________________  ________________
Katılımcının İmzası                 Tarih

Araştırma hakkında bir sorum olursa, aşağıdaki kişilerle temas kurabilirim:

Havva Savran Al-Haik
Asistan Doktora Öğrencisi
001.540.449.3328 (USA)
0 -332-2650920 (Türkiye)
hsavran@vt.edu

Dr. Curtis Friedel
Yardımcı Doçent
001.540.231.8177
cfriedel@vt.edu

Dr. David Moore
IRB Chair
2000 Kraft Drive Suite 2000,
Blacksburg, VA 24060. USA
001 .540.231.4991
moored@vt.edu
Appendix G: Informed Consent Form for Focus Groups in Turkish

Virginia Polytechnic Enstitüsü ve Eyalet Üniversitesi
Araştırma Projelerine Katılan İnsan Denekleri için Bilgilendirilmiş İzin Verme Belgesi:
Odak Grup Görüşmesi

Araştırma Başlığı: Türkiye’deki Küçük Çiftlikle Ugraşan Kadın Çiftçilerin İş Deneyimleri ve Kadın Erkek Eşitsizliklerinin Araştırılması Projesi

Proje yürütücülerı: Dr. Curtis Friedel, Yardımcı Doçent
Havva Savran Al-Haik Doctora Öğrencisi

VII. Araştırmanın Amacı
Bu araştırma ile Türkiye’deki küçük çiftliklerde kadın çiftçilerin iş deneyimleri ve kadın erkek eşitsizliklerinin araştırılması amaçlanmaktadır. Bu araştırma çerçevesinde küçük çiftliklerde çalışma açısından kadın erkek eşitsizlikleri, kadın erkek iş bölümünün eşitsizlikleri, kadın erkek çiftlikte ilgili karar verme eşitsizlikleri, küçük çiftliklerin durumu ve kadın erkek tarımsal yatırım ve eğitim eşitsizlikleri araştırılacaktır. Bu araştırma Virginia Teknik ve Eyalet Üniversitesi doktora programının bir parçasıdır.

VIII. Yöntemler
Sizden, röpörtaj yapan tarafından çiftlikte yaptığınız işler ve küçük çiftliklerin durumu ile ilgili deneyimlerinizi anlatmanız istenecektir. Gurup odak görüşmesi bir saat civarında olacaktır ve önceden sizinle ve öbür katılımcılarla birlikte ortak olarak kararıların bir yerde yapılacaktır.

IX. Tehlikeler
Bu araştırmaya katılmanın katılımcı açısından bir tehlikesi yoktur veya bu araştırmaya katılmanın tehlikesi çok küçüktür. Senin kimliğin ve köyünün adı tamamen gizli tutulacaktır ve hiçbir yayında ve raporda açıklanmayacaktır.

X. Avantajlar

XI. Anonimlik ve Gizlilik Kapsamı

XII.    Özül
Bu arastirmaya katilmanin herhangi bir avantaji veya ozuluyu yoktur.

IV.    Ayrılma Özgürlüğü
Katilmcilar, herhangi bir ceza alamsizin istedikleri zaman arastirmaya katilmaktan vazgecebilirler. Katilmcilar ceza alamsizin istemedikleri sorulara cevap vermeme özgürlüğine sahiptirler.

V.    Katilmcinin Sorumlulukları
Ben bu çalışımda gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul ettim ve kadın çiftçi olarak röportaj yapan arastırmacı ile ciftlikte yaptığım iş deneyimlerimi ve tarımsal yayım ve eğitim deneyimlerimi paylaşıncığım.

VI.    Katilmcinin İzni

________ EVET _______ HAYIR

______________________________  ________________
Katilmcinin İmzası                 Tarih

Araştırma hakkında bir sorum olursa, aşağıdaki kişilerle temas kurabilirim:

Havva Savran Al-Haik
Asistan Doktora Öğrencisi
001.540.449.3328 (USA)
0 -332-2650920 (Türkiye)
hsavran@vt.edu

Dr. David Moore
IRB Chair
2000 Kraft Drive Suite 2000,
Blacksburg, VA 24060. USA
001 .540.231.4991
moored@vt.edu

Dr. Curtıs Friedel
Yardımci Doçent
001.540.231.8177
cfriedel@vt.edu
Appendix H: Recruitment Script for Local Officials and Leaders

RECRUITMENT SCRIPT FOR LOCAL OFFICIALS AND LEADERS (verbal, in person)

My name is Havva Savran Al-Haik, a graduate student from the Department of Agricultural Leadership and Community Education at Virginia Tech. I would like to invite women farmers in your village/district to participate in my research study to explore Turkish women farmers’ work experiences, and gender inequalities on small farm practices in Turkey. You may inform the community about my study and to identify females on small farms who might be willing to be interviewed.

If you would like to inform the community and to suggest participants to this research study or have any questions, please email me at: hsavran@vt.edu or call me at 001-(540)-449-3328. You may contact my advisor, Dr. Curtis Friedel, at 001-(540)-231-8177.

Thank you for your consideration,
Havva Savran Al-Haik
Graduate Assistant
Appendix I: Recruitment Script for Local Officials and Leaders in Turkish

YEREL LİDERLER DAVETİYE MEKTUBU (konuşarak, karşılıklı)


Eğer bu araştırmaya yardımcı olursanız şimdiden çok teşekkür ederim.

Havva Savran Al-Haik
Doktora öğrencisi
Appendix J: Recruitment Script for Participants

RECRUITMENT SCRIPT (verbal, in person)
My name is Havva Savran Al-Haik, a graduate student from the Department of Agricultural, Leadership and Community Education at Virginia Tech. I would like to invite you to participate in my research study to explore Turkish women farmers’ work experiences on small farms, and gender inequalities in the improvement of farming practices in Turkey. You may participate if you are farming as an agricultural producer currently.
As a participant, you will be asked to sign the consent form and indicate a time on June 15 or August 15 in which you are available for a 30-40 minutes interview/ auto-photographs & interview.
If you would like to participate in this research study or have any questions, please email me at hsavran@vt.edu or call me at 001-(540)-449-3328. You may contact my advisor, Dr. Curtis Friedel, at 001-(540)-231-8177.
Thank you for your consideration,
Havva Savran Al-Haik
Graduate Assistant
Appendix K: Recruitment Script for Participants in Turkish

DAVETİYE MEKTUBU (konuşarak, karşılıklı)
İştirakçı olarak, katılımcı formunu imzalamınız ve Haziran 15 veya Ağustos 15 tarihlerinden birini seçerek bir saat civarında bir röportaj yapmak için uygun olduğunuzu belirtmeniz istenmektedir.
Eğer katılmaüstü düşünürseniz sımdiden çok teşekkür ederim.
Havva Savran Al-Haik
Doktora öğrencisi
Appendix L: IRB Approval Letter for Qualitative Protocol

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 20, 2015
TO: Curtis Robert Friedel, Havva Savran Al-Haik
FROM: Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board (FWA00000572, expires April 25, 2018)

PROTOCOL TITLE: Exploring Turkish Women Farmers' Work Experiences on Small Farms, and Gender Inequalities in the Improvement of Farming Practices in Turkey

IRB NUMBER: 14-642

Effective May 19, 2015, the Virginia Tech Institution Review Board (IRB) Chair, David M Moore, approved the Continuing Review request for the above-mentioned research protocol.

This approval provides permission to begin the human subject activities outlined in the IRB-approved protocol and supporting documents.

Plans to deviate from the approved protocol and/or supporting documents must be submitted to the IRB as an amendment request and approved by the IRB prior to the implementation of any changes, regardless of how minor, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects. Report within 5 business days to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated or adverse events involving risks or harms to human research subjects or others.

All investigators (listed above) are required to comply with the researcher requirements outlined at:

http://www.irb.vt.edu/pages/responsibilities.htm

(Please review responsibilities before the commencement of your research.)

PROTOCOL INFORMATION:

Approved As: Expedited, under 45 CFR 46.110 category(ies) 6,7
Protocol Approval Date: June 17, 2015
Protocol Expiration Date: June 16, 2016
Continuing Review Due Date*: June 2, 2016

*Date a Continuing Review application is due to the IRB office if human subject activities covered under this protocol, including data analysis, are to continue beyond the Protocol Expiration Date.

FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS:

Per federal regulations, 45 CFR 46.103(f), the IRB is required to compare all federally funded grant proposals/work statements to the IRB protocol(s) which cover the human research activities included in the proposal/work statement before funds are released. Note that this requirement does not apply to Exempt and Interim IRB protocols, or grants for which VT is not the primary awardee.

The table on the following page indicates whether grant proposals are related to this IRB protocol, and which of the listed proposals, if any, have been compared to this IRB protocol, if required.
Appendix M: Sex Ratio by Educational Year in Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>Junior High School and Equivalent</th>
<th>High School and Equivalent</th>
<th>Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994/95</td>
<td>94.85</td>
<td>67.80</td>
<td>65.60</td>
<td>65.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>94.72</td>
<td>67.91</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>67.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>93.84</td>
<td>69.34</td>
<td>70.07</td>
<td>66.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary Education</th>
<th>Secondary Education</th>
<th>Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>85.63</td>
<td>74.70</td>
<td>69.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>85.97</td>
<td>75.50</td>
<td>69.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>88.54</td>
<td>74.74</td>
<td>70.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>89.64</td>
<td>74.41</td>
<td>72.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>90.71</td>
<td>75.87</td>
<td>75.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>91.10</td>
<td>72.32</td>
<td>74.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>91.86</td>
<td>76.01</td>
<td>74.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>92.33</td>
<td>78.12</td>
<td>74.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>78.76</td>
<td>77.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>94.11</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>77.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>96.39</td>
<td>85.81</td>
<td>78.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>97.91</td>
<td>88.99</td>
<td>80.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>98.91</td>
<td>88.59</td>
<td>83.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>100.42</td>
<td>89.74</td>
<td>86.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>100.41</td>
<td>93.29</td>
<td>87.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary School</th>
<th>Lower Secondary School</th>
<th>Upper Secondary Education</th>
<th>Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>100.59</td>
<td>102.94</td>
<td>94.15</td>
<td>88.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>100.82</td>
<td>103.69</td>
<td>94.59</td>
<td>88.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>100.57</td>
<td>101.10</td>
<td>95.40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Sex ratio is computed as the number of male students divided by the number of female students.
(2) Compulsory education was expanded to 8 years of uninterrupted education for students born on or after 1 January 1993. For students born before 1 January 1993, the minimum duration of compulsory education is 7 years.

Source: Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK)