



Gender and the Wage Gap in Turkish Academia

Meltem Ucal, Mary Lou O'Neil & Sule Toktas

To cite this article: Meltem Ucal, Mary Lou O'Neil & Sule Toktas (2015) Gender and the Wage Gap in Turkish Academia, *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 17:4, 447-464, DOI: [10.1080/19448953.2015.1063309](https://doi.org/10.1080/19448953.2015.1063309)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19448953.2015.1063309>



Published online: 14 Aug 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 291



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 9 View citing articles [↗](#)

Gender and the Wage Gap in Turkish Academia

Meltem Ucal, Mary Lou O’Neil and Sule Toktas

Turkey maintains one of the lowest female labour force participation rates in Europe, but also boasts an above average number of female professors. Turkey is well above the European average (15 per cent) with approximately 28 per cent of full professorships being occupied by women. Despite these seemingly positive indications, do men and women in Turkish academia earn the same wages? This study explores whether or not there exists a gendered pay gap in Turkish academia. Using data collected from a survey of more than 700 Turkish academics, we observed that there is a gendered wage gap that disadvantages women, but only at the highest pay levels found at private universities indicating the existence of intra-class inequality, where men and women despite occupying the same class position are compensated differently.

Introduction

The global gender gap remains a stubborn problem. According to the World Economic Forum’s Global Gender Gap Index,¹ the worldwide gap has narrowed considerably in both education and health and survival, but the gaps in both politics and economics remain wide.² In terms of political empowerment, 60 per cent of the gap has been closed but just 21 per cent in economics. While the Global Gender Gap Index is not based solely on economics, it is one of the main factors. In the *Global Gender Gap Report 2013*, Turkey ranked 120th out of 134 countries.³ In economic participation and opportunity, the country finds itself in 127th place. Turkey has an abysmal rate of female labour force participation and women are regularly paid less than men. While Turkey maintains one of the lowest female labour force participation rates in Europe, it also boasts an above average number of female professors.⁴ Turkey is well above the European average (15 per cent) with approximately 28 per cent of full professorships being occupied by women.⁵ Moreover, Turkey has a Glass Ceiling Index of 1.25 indicating a relatively thin glass ceiling.⁶ Despite these seemingly positive indications, do men and women in Turkish academia earn the same wages? This study explores whether or not there exists a gendered pay gap in Turkish academia. We found that there is a gendered wage gap that disadvantages women but only at the highest pay levels found at private universities. This paper begins with a review of the literature on the gendered wage

gap and then progresses to Turkey specifically. Finally, we present the findings from our own survey of 700 Turkish academics.⁷

The Gendered Wage Gap

There is ample evidence that a gendered wage gap exists in multiple countries and in various sectors.⁸ Moreover, this is an issue that is not limited solely to underdeveloped or developing countries, but also exists in advanced economies as well. Grey-Bowen and McFarlane argue that gender discrimination in wages is, in part, cultural, stemming from the belief that men and women are not equal, and specifically that men are superior to women in terms of skills, leadership and managerial abilities.⁹ These perceptions stem from a historical and unchanged understanding of the roles and responsibilities of women, and can sometimes be linked to cultural, social or religious beliefs that are unchanging. Women still spend more time in household activities than men and thus, often have fewer opportunities for work and assuming responsibilities in organizations and positions where they would earn larger salaries than men.¹⁰

Discrimination against women in terms of pay is well documented.¹¹ Research demonstrates that this is a worldwide phenomenon covering industrial and non-industrial countries alike. In a study of eight industrialized countries, Blau and Kahn found that women earn between 25 and 40 per cent less than men, while in the USA the gap was 30 per cent.¹² In Latin American and Caribbean countries, the wage gap ranged between next to nothing to 45 per cent.¹³ In examining non-industrial nations, Gupta found that the concentration of women in low-paying clerical and service sector jobs contributed to the gender pay gap.¹⁴ In examining European Union (EU) countries, Arulampalam *et al.* found that women were paid less in both the public and private sectors.¹⁵ Weichselbaumer and Winter-Ebmer performed a meta-analysis of more than 260 studies on the international wage gap finding that in samples consisting of low-wage jobs the wage gap was higher than that found in samples comprised of university graduates and academics.¹⁶ They also found that the wage gap is much larger for married women than for those who are single, which follows Becker's finding that after marriage men focus on work and women on the household.¹⁷ There is also a difference between the public and private sectors. Weichselbaumer and Winter-Ebmer¹⁸ found that the gap between male and female wages was smaller in the private sector and in studies that concentrated on a single economic sector. Durnel explains that there is more parity in the public sector due to lifetime employment contracts and the determination of wage increases by state policy.¹⁹ Since the 1960s, the differential in pay for men and women has fallen steadily, but this is due mainly to improvements in women's education and training.²⁰ In fact, when one focuses on the aspect of the wage gap that is not attributable to human capital variables, namely, discrimination, there appears to be no decrease.²¹ Despite the improvement of women's position generally in societies, they are still too often confined to low-paying jobs with men taking high-paying jobs.²²

Although often overlooked, there has also been exploration of the role of class position on the gendered wage gap. Studies by Blau and Kahn found that due to the

placement of women in primarily low-paying jobs, the resulting gender gaps are supported by underlying class inequalities that disadvantage women.²³ Research demonstrates, however, that even as women move into more male-dominated occupations, the extent of wage inequality has not necessarily decreased.²⁴ This points to the phenomenon of intra-class inequality understood as ‘differences in earnings between men and women located within the same class’.²⁵ Intra-class inequality seems to arise as a result of two primary factors: sex segregation which relegates men and women to different sectors of the economy that have differing pay scales²⁶ and outright discrimination against women.²⁷

The literature on the pay gap in academia is extensive. Okpara *et al.* report that female academics in the USA earn less and are less satisfied with their pay than their male colleagues.²⁸ The researchers discovered that women were concentrated in lower academic ranks and that the wage gap was due to biases against pay increases for promotions of women since the senior members responsible for the promotions, in the universities, were male.²⁹ Benjamin discovered that the wage gap is so pervasive that men are paid more than women of similar rank at all levels within universities.³⁰ In a study on gender earnings differentials among college administrators, Monks and McGoldrick analysed the gender pay gap among the top five salary individuals at private higher education institutions and identified a 13 per cent average pay disadvantage for women.³¹ In a review of salaries of those in the American Association of University Professors, full-time male professors earned 11.4 per cent more than women at the same level.³² Those professors who earn tenure also report higher salaries. Despite data which points to relatively high rates of gender equality in Scandinavian countries, Seirestad and Healy found that in universities in Sweden, Norway and Denmark, there is vertical segregation of women and that women overall experience discrimination.³³ Overall, European universities are marked by strong vertical segregation, or a glass ceiling, which prevents women from advancing to the highest ranks.³⁴

The Wage Gap in Turkey

Turkey has one of the lowest female labour force participation rates of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) member countries and at 28 per cent is far below the OECD average of 58 per cent.³⁵ Rising urbanization and the decline in agricultural work have left the vast majority of women in Turkey outside the labour market. Besides low female labour force participation, the rates of paid employment for women are also low. Just 54 per cent of total female employment in 2012 was in paid labour activities.³⁶ Moreover, in 2012, 33.7 per cent of all women were employed as unpaid family workers.³⁷ Women also experience higher rates of unemployment than men.³⁸ Those women who do find work are largely still confined to the agricultural sector while their urban sisters are relegated to low-paid, low-skill employment.³⁹

There have been numerous explanations offered for the lack of women participating in the labour force in Turkey. Perhaps more than anything the transition from an economy dominated by agriculture to one dominated by markets

has eliminated many jobs that women once performed.⁴⁰ Moreover, low rates of education for women in Turkey further hinder their search for jobs.⁴¹ In her exploration of married women's decisions to work, Kızılırmak found that women enter paid employment primarily to compensate for their husband's unemployment.⁴² At the same time, she observed that fertility decreases married women's likelihood of working when children are young. Additionally, Acar⁴³ points to the lack of childcare as an obstacle for women returning to work while İlkkaracan⁴⁴ and Moghadam⁴⁵ emphasize the unequal division of labour in the home as preventing women from entering the labour market. Moreover, Kardam and Toksöz assert that women are prevented from entering the labour force by prevailing cultural attitudes which continue to define women in terms of their domestic role.⁴⁶ When women are able to enter the labour force they face gender-based discrimination in the workplace.⁴⁷ Women are also often confined to low-wage jobs in manufacturing which continues to reproduce class and social inequalities.⁴⁸

Despite extensive legislation that outlaws discrimination in pay, there is wide agreement in the literature that women in Turkey face wage discrimination and as a result earn less than men. However, there is little consensus on how much less women actually earn. In a 2006 study, Kara observed that women in Turkey earned 16 per cent less than men per hour.⁴⁹ Cudeville and Gurbuzer, on the other hand, claim that the gender wage gap is approximately 25 per cent for salaried workers and more than half of this difference can be attributed to discrimination.⁵⁰ Kasnakoğlu and Dayıoğlu used data from the Household Income and Expenditures Survey to explore the extent of the wage gap by level of schooling, education, region, occupation and job status. The average female-to-male earnings difference they found was 47.5 per cent, which rose to 60 per cent when corrected for hours worked.⁵¹ They located the largest earnings gap among those with less education, agricultural, factory workers and the self-employed. The gap closes as education increases.⁵² Selim and İlkkaracan present similar findings in that the wage gap is, in part, explained by the fact that women tend to have less education than men.⁵³ However, this only explains half of the gendered wage gap and productivity levels cannot explain the rest. Thus, roughly 20 per cent of the pay differential between men and women is from 'outright discrimination' in the labour market; a pay differential that occurs neither as a result of different productivity levels, nor as a result of the type of job or workplace, but merely due to the sex of the worker.⁵⁴ Meulders *et al.* observed that for researchers in Turkey (defined as those who spend more than 50 per cent of their time on research) the pay gap was 28 per cent.⁵⁵ The gap increases with years of experience as men earn more as they gain more experience. Interestingly, Tansel reported that women in public sector jobs earn the same or more than in the private sector, while the opposite is true for men.⁵⁶ At the same time, there is a gender gap in the private sector with women earning less.⁵⁷ Tansel attributes the gap, in part, to discrimination but also to the fact that the return on schooling is less in the private sector than the public.⁵⁸

Despite Turkey's dismal rate of female labour force participation, it ranks just above the EU average overall for female researchers in higher education with 41 per cent.⁵⁹ At the same time, Turkey boasts the highest number of women professors in Europe with

28 per cent of full professors being women.⁶⁰ Furthermore, Öncü made clear 30 years ago that women in Turkey were making their presence felt in academia as high numbers of women enter academia professionally.⁶¹ While the relatively large number of women achieving full professorship represents a kind of success, these same women report continued discrimination.⁶² This exists against a deeply held belief that the universities in Turkey are a place of gender equity free from discrimination.⁶³ Yet, Mischau makes clear 'there is no university where the percentage of female professors corresponds with the percentage of female academic staff or students'.⁶⁴

In a recent comparative study of the salaries of academics, Turkish faculty members earned less than their counterparts in many other countries even when controlling for purchasing power and national income.⁶⁵ Turkey ranked 20th out of 28 countries⁶⁶ in the study when considering average wages but rose to 14th when national income levels were added to the calculations. Akgeyik found wage discrepancies at every rank, but Turkey lagged the farthest behind at the level of full professor.⁶⁷ Perhaps more importantly here, the study revealed a number of differences belonging to the Turkish university market. Despite a belief in the general sameness of salaries at state universities in Turkey, there are differences and these are attributable primarily to performance-based pay systems.⁶⁸ Furthermore, all academic positions at private universities command higher salaries and those employed at private institutions can earn as much as twice as state employees.⁶⁹

As a means to explore the issue of the gender wage gap, this paper focuses specifically on Turkish academia and attempts to establish whether or not a wage gap between men and women exists. Turkish academia is an interesting site for exploration of this issue because although overall female labour participation is low, women's presence in academia is particularly high. Given that the lack of women's education is an oft-cited source of the wage gap, placing highly educated individuals at the centre of the study helps to bring to light the potential sources of difference, including that of discrimination.

The Method and the Sample

This paper relies on data gathered in an online survey that was completed by 741 Turkish academics employed at various public and private universities. We chose to use an online survey in part for ease and with the hope of gathering a diverse sample. Surveys were e-mailed to both men and women at all ranks (instructor, assistant, associate and full professor). We received 741 responses of which 719 were valid.

The questionnaire was designed at nominal, ordinal and interval levels. The questions asked were current employment status (state/private university), academic title, length and duration of promotion in academia, wage level, gender, year of degree received, year of appointment to a position of the reception of the last educational degree, marital status and number of children. We used random sampling to obtain our sample group and then performed Pearson's chi-square tests to determine the validity of our hypotheses. The demographics of the sample can be seen in [Table 1](#).

We received responses from all ranks at both state and private institutions although the sample includes more individuals at the rank of assistant professor. A

Table 1 Demographics of the Respondents

Wage	Percentage	Faculty	Percentage
2000 TL and less	3.4	Dentistry	2.4
2001–3000 TL	30.2	Pharmaceutics	1.2
3001–4000 TL	21.2	Education	3.6
4001–5000 TL	21.7	Art and Sciences	17.7
5000 TL and above	23.5	Fine Arts	5.8
		Law	2.3
Type	Percentage	Economics and Administrative Sciences	22.3
Public	39.7	Theology	1.5
Private	60.3	Communication	5.9
		Engineering	22.4
Age	Percentage	Health Sciences	1.2
25–35	24.2	Medicine	9.6
36–45	34.8	Veterinary Medicine	3.2
46–55	25.6	Other	0.7
56 and above	15.4		
Gender	Percentage		
Male	42.2		
Female	57.8		
Title	Percentage		
Instructor	16.2		
Assistant Professor	38.1		
Associate Professor	20.9		
Professor	24.8		

total of 60.3 per cent were employed at private universities while 39.7 per cent were employed at public institutions. The sample includes more women than men with 57.8 per cent of the group consisting of female and 42.2 per cent male scholars. The respondents occupied positions in a wide variety of disciplines, but most of the respondents were from the faculties of Arts and Sciences, Economics and Administrative Sciences and Engineering. The distribution by academic title shows that the largest group consists of assistant professors with a 38.1 per cent share. Professors constitute 24.8 per cent and associate professors represent 20.9 per cent of the sample. Instructors are the smallest group at 16.2 per cent. Regarding age, 24.2 per cent of the respondents were between 25 and 35, 34.8 per cent between 36 and 45, 25.6 per cent between 46 and 55, and 15.4 per cent over 56 years of age. The salaries of respondents ranged from below 2000 TL/month to more than 5000 TL/month although there were more individuals who earned between 2000 and 3000 TL/month.⁷⁰ The single largest determinant of salary is academic rank. This is particularly the case for those employed at state institutions where salaries are largely determined by grade and salary increases follow increases in rank. However, Akgeyik has made clear that this is also beginning to change with the introduction of performance-based pay incentives.⁷¹ The distribution of the sample by gender, rank and type of institution can be seen in [Table 2](#).

When the distribution of the sample is examined with a focus on title, gender and type of university (public or private), female assistant professors working in private

Table 2 Sample by Gender, Rank and Type of Institution

Title	State university employee		Private university employee		TOTAL
	Men	Women	Men	Women	
Instructor	1%	1%	5%	9%	16%
Assistant Professor	6%	7%	8%	17%	38%
Associate Professor	5%	7%	4%	5%	21%
Full Professor	6%	7%	7%	5%	25%
TOTAL	18%	22%	24%	36%	100%

universities comprise the largest share among the respondents with 17 per cent. The second largest group at 9 per cent belongs to female instructors at private universities. It is a potential weakness of this sample that public university academics are not represented in equal numbers as those employed in private universities. The final piece of our puzzle is, of course, salary. We added the variable of salary to gender, rank and type of institution. This is reflected in [Table 3](#).

Table 3 Sample by Salary, Rank, Gender and Type of Institution

Title	Wage	Public		Private		TOTAL (%)
		Male (%)	Female (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)	
Instructor	TOTAL	5.0	8.3	29.2	57.5	100.0
	2000 TL and less	1.7	1.7	3.3	8.3	15.0
	2001–3000 TL	2.5	6.7	16.7	35.0	60.8
	3001–4000 TL	0.8	0.0	5.8	12.5	19.2
	4001–5000 TL	0.0	0.0	2.5	1.7	4.2
	5001 TL and above	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.8
Assistant Professor	TOTAL	16.7	17.0	23.0	43.3	100.0
	2000 TL and less	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.4	1.1
	2001–3000 TL	16.0	16.3	2.1	4.6	39.0
	3001–4000 TL	0.4	0.0	6.0	14.9	21.3
	4001–5000 TL	0.0	0.0	8.5	13.1	21.6
	5001 TL and above	0.4	0.0	6.4	10.3	17.0
Associate Professor	TOTAL	24.5	31.6	20.6	23.2	100.0
	2000 TL and less	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	1.3
	2001–3000 TL	11.0	14.8	0.0	0.0	25.8
	3001–4000 TL	12.3	15.5	2.6	5.8	36.1
	4001–5000 TL	0.6	0.0	3.9	3.9	8.4
	5001 TL and above	0.0	0.6	14.2	13.5	28.4
Professor	TOTAL	22.3	29.9	26.6	21.2	100.0
	2000 TL and less	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1
	2001–3000 TL	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5
	3001–4000 TL	2.7	6.0	0.5	0.5	9.8
	4001–5000 TL	17.9	21.7	1.6	3.3	44.6
	5001 TL and above	1.6	2.2	23.9	16.3	44.0

Overall, the table makes clear that those academics employed at state universities earn less than their colleagues at private institutions even when they hold the same rank. However, the wage gaps that appear here are not homogenous. The disparity between salaries at public and private institutions is felt most at the entry rank of assistant professor. Those assistant professors at state universities are concentrated in the 2000–3000 TL range whereas those at private schools are nearly evenly distributed at higher levels. While this establishes a clear contrast between public and private schools in Turkey, it does not settle the question of whether there is a gender gap. In order to determine whether or not there is indeed a gendered wage gap, we tested for a gendered wage gap at each rank at both public and private universities.

Firstly, we tested the entire sample regardless of rank and institution to establish whether or not there was a relationship between gender and wages. We tested two hypotheses:

- (1) H_0 : there is no relation between income level and gender.
- (2) H_1 : there is a relation between income level and gender.

We found a gender-related wage gap albeit the correlation for the whole sample was weak. This can be seen in [Table 4](#).

The level of significance from the analysis is 0.023. Thus, the analysis confirms a relation between income level and gender with 0.05 level of significance. The phi coefficient is 0.124 for Cramer's V and 0.123 for the contingency coefficient which indicates that while there is a correlation, it is weak (12.4 per cent). In order to further test the hypothesis that there is a relation between gender and wages in Turkish universities, we performed a Pearson correlation analysis where 1 = men and 2 = women and we found a negative value of (0.096 meaning that male scholars are paid more than their female colleagues. The level of significance was 0.009, therefore the results are 99 per cent significant, at a level of 0.01.

We then conducted the same analysis for both state and private universities separately, to determine if there is an overall relationship between gender and wages at public, private or both types of institutions. The results for private universities can be seen in [Table 5](#).

The significance value is 0.002 therefore there is a correlation between wage and gender in private universities based on 0.01 significance level and 99 per cent reliability. The phi coefficient is 0.192 for Cramer's V and 0.189 for the contingency coefficient which demonstrates that there is a weak correlation between gender and wages at private institutions (19.2 per cent) but it is stronger than the correlation found in the overall sample. The analysis demonstrates that there is a relationship between gender and wages in private universities and when the Pearson correlation test was further applied, the results show that it is men who are paid more than their female colleagues. Similar results cannot be stated for public institutions. At state schools, we found no relation between gender and wages. The results can be seen in [Table 6](#).

Having determined that there is a gendered wage gap in favour of men at private universities, we proceeded to try to ascertain at which rank the gap appears. Thus, we tested each rank and found that it is only at the level of full professor that a wage gap

Table 4 Relationship between Gender and Wages Overall

			Wage					Total
			2000 TL and less	2001– 3000 TL	3001– 4000 TL	4001– 5000 TL	5001 TL and above	
Gender * Wage cross-tabulation								
Gender	Male	Count	7	92	55	70	89	313
		% within gender	2.2%	29.4%	17.6%	22.4%	28.4%	100.0%
	Female	Count	18	132	102	91	85	428
		% within gender	4.2%	30.8%	23.8%	21.3%	19.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	25	224	157	161	174	741
		% within gender	3.4%	30.2%	21.2%	21.7%	23.5%	100.0%
Chi-square tests								
	Value	df	Asymp. sig. (2-sided)					
Pearson chi-square	11.309 ^a	4	0.023					
Likelihood ratio	11.398	4	0.022					
Linear-by-linear association	6.756	1	0.009					
N of valid cases	741							
			Value	Approx. sig.				
Nominal by nominal	Phi	0.124	0.023					
	Cramer's V	0.124	0.023					
	Contingency coefficient	0.123	0.023					
N of valid cases	741							
			Gender	Wage				
Gender	Pearson correlation	1	-0.096**					
	Sig. (2- tailed)		0.009					
	N	741	741					
Wage	Pearson correlation	-0.096**	1					
	Sig. (2- tailed)	0.009	1					
	N	741	741					
			**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					

presents itself. At no other level did we find evidence of a significant gendered wage gap. The results can be seen in [Table 7](#).

Table 5 Relationship between Gender and Wages at Private Universities

Gender	*Wage	*Private universities	Wage					Total
			2000 TL and below	2001–3000 TL	3001–4000 TL	4001–5000 TL	5001 TL and above	
Gender	Male	Count	4	27	29	36	85	181
		% within gender	2.2%	14.9%	16.0%	19.9%	47.0%	100.0%
	Female	Count	13	55	67	51	80	266
		% within gender	4.9%	20.7%	25.2%	19.2%	30.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	17	82	96	87	165	447
		% within gender	3.8%	18.3%	21.5%	19.5%	36.9%	100.0%
Chi-square tests								
			Value	df	Asymp. sig. (2-sided)			
Pearson chi-square			16.540 ^a	4	0.002			
Likelihood ratio			16.723	4	0.002			
Linear-by-linear association			14.389	1	0.000			
N of valid cases			447					
Symmetric measures								
			Value	Approx. sig.				
Nominal by nominal	Phi	0.192		0.002				
	Cramer's V	0.192		0.002				
	Contingency coefficient	0.189		0.002				
N of valid cases			447					
Pearson correlation			Gender					
Gender	Pearson correlation	1		-0.083				
	Sig. (2-tailed)			0.259				
	N	187		187				
Wage	Pearson correlation	-0.083		1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.259						
	N	187		187				

^aNo cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.88.

The significance value is 0.002. Therefore, there is a correlation between wage and gender in private universities at the rank of full professor based on 0.01 level of significance and 90 per cent reliability. The phi coefficient is 0.174 for Cramer's V and 0.171 for the contingency coefficient. While the correlation is weak (19.2 per cent), it is stronger than that found in the total sample.

The analysis demonstrates that male scholars are paid more than their female colleagues at the professor level which is distinct from the results found at other

Table 6 Relationship between Gender and Wages at Public Universities

Gender * Wage * Public universities	Wage					Total
	2000 TL and below	2001–3000 TL	3001–4000 TL	4001–5000 TL	5001 TL and above	
Gender Male	Count 3	65	26	34	4	132
% within gender	2.3%	49.2%	19.7%	25.8%	3.0%	100.0%
Gender Female	Count 5	77	35	40	5	162
% within gender	3.1%	47.5%	21.6%	24.7%	3.1%	100.0%
Total	Count 8	142	61	74	9	294
% within gender	2.7%	48.3%	20.7%	25.2%	3.1%	100.0%

Chi-square tests		Value	df	Asymp. sig. (2-sided)
Pearson chi-square		0.382 ^a	4	0.984
Likelihood ratio		0.385	4	0.984
Linear-by-linear association		0.006	1	0.938
N of valid cases		294		

^a4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.59.

Table 7 Relationship between Gender and Wages for Professors at Private Universities

			Wage			Total
			4000 TL and below	4001–5000 TL	5001 TL and above	
Gender * Wage * Professor * Private universities						
Gender	Male	Count	7	36	47	90
		% within gender	7.8%	40.0%	52.2%	100.0%
	Female	Count	14	46	34	94
		% within gender	14.9%	48.9%	36.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	21	82	81	184
		% within gender	11.4%	44.6%	44.0%	100.0%

Chi-square tests

	Value	df	Asymp. sig. (2-sided)
Pearson chi-square	5.555 ^a	2	0.062
Likelihood ratio	5.610	2	0.061
Linear-by-linear association	5.479	1	0.019
N of valid cases	184		

^aNo cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.27.

Symmetric measures

		Value	Approx. sig.
Nominal by nominal	Phi	0.174	0.062
	Cramer's V	0.174	0.062
	Contingency coefficient	0.171	0.062
N of valid cases		184	

Correlations

		Gender	Wage
Gender	Pearson correlation	1	-0.173*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.019
	N	184	184
Wage	Pearson correlation	-0.173*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.019	
	N	184	184

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

ranks. While it is clear that women professors are paid less than their male counterparts at private universities, we also found that this is most evident at the salary range of 5000 TL and above. This can be seen in [Table 8](#).

Table 8 Relationship between Gender and Wages above 5000 TL at Private Universities

Gender * Wage cross-tabulation			Wage		
			5000 TL and below	5001 TL and above	Total
Gender	Male	Count	5	44	49
		% within gender	10.2%	89.8%	100.0%
	Female	Count	9	30	39
		% within gender	23.1%	76.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	14	74	88
		% within gender	15.9%	84.1%	100.0%
Chi-square tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (1-sided)
Pearson chi-square	2.690 ^a	1	0.101		
Continuity correction ^b	1.814	1	0.178		
Likelihood ratio	2.685	1	0.101		
Fisher's exact test				0.143	0.089
Linear-by-linear association	2.659	1	0.103		
N of valid cases	88				

^aNo cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.20.

^bComputed only for a 2 × 2 table.

According to a chi-square test, we obtained a significance value for the correlation between gender and wage gap for professors working in private universities. Since this value is 0.101, there is no significant correlation at a 0.1 significance level and 90 per cent reliability. However, the overall significance is higher than this result.

Conclusion

Since the 1990s, Turkey has witnessed an enormous expansion in higher education. In 1982, there were 27 universities in Turkey while today there are 179 of which 109 are public and 70 are private.⁷² Alongside this development, the number of academics has more than doubled to just over 60,000.⁷³ Roughly a third of all academics in Turkey are women. Although Turkey boasts a higher than average number of women who achieve the rank of full professor, our research indicates that despite their achievements these women are paid less than their male counterparts. Having surveyed more than 700 academics at public and private universities across Turkey, we are able to conclude that there is a gendered wage gap in favour of men. However, the wage gap does not appear evenly across the entire sample. Our data demonstrated a wage gap at private universities where salaries are less regulated and more subject to the forces of the market and an individual's bargaining ability. This falls in line with the literature for both Turkey and elsewhere which reports less wage equality for women in the private sector.⁷⁴ This research also adds to the growing literature which

demonstrates that there is a persistent disadvantage faced by women in the paid labour force even when those women possess the highest levels of education. Similar to the USA and Europe there appears to be a continued gendered wage gap in academia and our study demonstrates that that trend extends to Turkish private institutions as well. Moreover, our findings also demonstrate the existence of intra-class inequality where men and women occupying the same class position are compensated differently. Perhaps not surprisingly it is women who find themselves disadvantaged which calls into question the hope of some reward on the other side of the glass ceiling.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance and contributions of Nazan An and Uğur Kaplan.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by the Kadir Has University Scientific Research Fund Programme [2012-BAP-03].

Notes

- [1] The Glass Ceiling Index (GCI) measures the opportunities for women to reach top positions in universities. A GCI of 1 indicates there is no difference in the opportunities between men and women.
- [2] World Economic Forum, *The Global Gender Gap Report 2013*, World Economic Forum, Geneva, 2013, <<http://www.weforum.org/reports/global-gender-gap-report-2013>> (accessed 11 September 2014).
- [3] Ibid.
- [4] OECD, *OECD StatsExtracts*, 2014, <http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=LFS_SEXAGE_I_R> (accessed 11 September 2014).
- [5] European Commission, *She Figures 2012: Gender in Research and Innovation*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2012.
- [6] Ibid.
- [7] For our purposes here we have defined academic to mean those who hold the title assistant professor, associate professor or professor.
- [8] O. Kara, 'Occupational gender wage discrimination in Turkey', *Journal of Economic Studies*, 33 (2), 2006, pp. 130–143; B. F. Reskin and P. A. Roos, *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads into Male Occupations*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1990.
- [9] J. Grey-Bowen and D. McFarlane, 'Gender compensation discrimination: an exploration of gender compensation gap and the higher education connection', *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 2(1), 2010, pp. 65–82.
- [10] Ibid., p. 66.
- [11] R. Anker, 'Theories of occupational segregation by sex: an overview', *International Labour Review*, 136(3), 1997, pp. 315–339; J. Ashraf and B. Ashraf, 'Earnings in Karachi: does gender make a difference', *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 36(1), 1988, pp. 33–46; J. Ermisch, H. Josh and R. Wright, 'Women's wages in Great Britain', Birkbeck College Discussion Papers

- in Economics, 8/90, London, 1990; P. Francois, 'A theory of gender discrimination based on the household', Working Paper 629, Department of Economics, Queen's University, London, 1996; S. Harkness, 'The gender earnings gap: evidence from the UK', *Fiscal Studies*, 17(2), 1996, pp. 1–15; L. Nor, 'An overview of gender earning differentials in peninsular Malaysia', *Journal of Economics & Management*, 6(1), 1998, pp. 23–49; M. Schafgans, 'Gender wage differences in Malaysia: parametric and semiparametric estimation', STICERD London School of Economics Discussion Papers Services EM/97-325, London, 1997; M. Singh and D. Bhattacharjee, 'Pay discrimination by gender in corporate sector: a case study', *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 41(1), 1998, pp. 97–103; M. Stephen, 'Recent shifts in wage inequality and the wage returns to education in Britain', *National Institute Economic Review*, 166, 1998, pp. 87–95; K. Terrell, 'Female–male earning differentials and occupational structure', *International Labour Review*, 131, 1992, pp. 387–398; K. Weeder, 'Revisiting occupational sex segregation in the United States, 1910–1990: results from a log-linear approach', *Demography*, 35(4), 1998, pp. 475–487; R. E. Wright and J. F. Ermish, 'Male–female wage differentials in Great Britain', Birkbeck College Discussion Papers in Economics, 10/90, London, 1990.
- [12] F. D. Blau and L. M. Kahn, 'The gender earnings gap—learning from international comparisons', *American Economic Review*, 82(2), 1992, pp. 533–538.
- [13] Terrel, op. cit.
- [14] N. Gupta, 'Gender, pay and development: a cross-country analysis', *Labour and Management in Development Journal*, 3(2), 2002, pp. 2–18.
- [15] W. Arulampalam, A. Booth and M. Byran, 'Is there a glass ceiling over Europe? Exploring the gender pay gap across the wage distribution', *ILR Review*, 60(2), 2006, pp. 163–186.
- [16] D. Weichselbaumer and R. Winter-Ebmer, 'A meta-analysis of the international gender wage gap', *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 19(3), 2005, pp. 479–511.
- [17] G. Becker, *A Treatise on the Family*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1993.
- [18] Weichselbaumer and Winter-Ebmer, op. cit.
- [19] J. Durnel, 'Earnings inequality between genders in private–public sector: a comparison between Turkey, Sweden & cross country', 2010, <https://www.academia.edu/1529624/Earnings_Inequality_Amongst_the_OECD_countries> (accessed 11 September 2014).
- [20] Weichselbaumer and Winter-Ebmer, op. cit.
- [21] Ibid.
- [22] H. Mandel and M. Shalev, 'How welfare states shape the gender pay gap: a theoretical and comparative analysis', *Social Forces*, 87(4), 2009, pp. 1873–1911.
- [23] Blau and Kahn, op. cit.; F. D. Blau and L. M. Kahn, 'Wage structure and gender earnings differentials—an international comparison', *Economica*, 63(250), 1996, pp. S29–S62; F. D. Blau and L. M. Kahn, 'Understanding international differences in the gender pay gap', *Journal of Labour Economics*, 21(1), 2003, pp. 106–144.
- [24] Reskin and Roos, op. cit.
- [25] Mandel and Shalev, op. cit., p. 3.
- [26] T. Petersen and L. A. Morgan, 'Separate and unequal: occupation-establishment sex segregation and the gender wage gap', *American Journal of Sociology*, 101(2), 1995, pp. 329–365.
- [27] W. T. Bielby and J. N. Baron, 'Men and women at work: sex segregation and statistical discrimination', *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(4), 1986, pp. 759–799.
- [28] J. O. Okpara, M. Squillace and E. Erondu, 'Gender differences and job satisfaction: a study of university teachers in the United States', *Women in Management Review*, 20(3–4), 2005, pp. 177–190.
- [29] Ibid.
- [30] E. Benjamin, *Disparities in the Salaries and Appointments of Academic Women and Men: An Update of a 1988 Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Academic Profession*, American Association of University Professors, Washington, DC, 2004.
- [31] J. Monks and K. McGoldrick, 'Gender earnings differentials among college administrators', *Industrial Relations*, 43(4), 2004, pp. 742–758.

- [32] D. Gunther and K. Hayes, 'Gender differences in salary and promotion in the humanities', *The American Economic Review*, 89(2), 1999, pp. 397–402.
- [33] C. Seirestad and G. Healy, 'Women's equality in the Scandinavian academy: a distant dream?', *Work, Employment and Society*, 26(2), 2012, pp. 296–313.
- [34] European Commission, op. cit.
- [35] OECD, op. cit.
- [36] Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu, *İstatistiklerle Kadın 2012*, Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu Matbaası, Ankara, 2012.
- [37] Ibid.
- [38] Ibid.
- [39] C. Başlevant and Ö. Onaran, 'The effect of export-oriented growth on female labour market outcomes in Turkey', *World Development*, 32(8), 2004, pp. 1375–1398.
- [40] A. Tansel, 'Economic development and female labour force participation in Turkey: time-series evidence and cross-province estimates', ERC Working Papers in Economics 01/05, 2002, <http://www.pep-net.org/fileadmin/medias/pdf/recommended_readings/ERCWPE0105.pdf> (accessed 11 September 2014).
- [41] M. İnce and M. Demir, 'The determinants of female labour force: empirical evidence from Turkey', *Eskisehir Osmangazi University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 1(1), 2006, pp. 71–90.
- [42] B. Kızıllırmak, 'Labour market participation decisions of married women: evidence from Turkey', in A. Deshpande (ed.), *Globalization and Development: A Handbook of New Perspectives*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008, pp. 137–151.
- [43] S. Acar, 'Analysis of female labour force participation in Turkey from a gender perspective', presented at 1st PhD Conference in Economics 2008 in memory of Vassilis Patsatzis, Athens, Greece, 16 May 2008.
- [44] İ. İlkaracan, 'Why are there so few women in the urban labor market in Turkey?: a supply-side account', International Association for Feminist Economics Annual Conference, Istanbul, 2000.
- [45] V. Moghadam, 'Turkey: from housewife to worker?', in V. Moghadam (ed.), *Women, Work and Economic Reform in the Middle East and North Africa*, Lynne Rienner, Boulder, CO, 1997, pp. 101–117.
- [46] F. Kardam and G. Toksöz, 'Gender based discrimination at work in Turkey: a cross-sectoral overview', *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Political Sciences*, 59, 2004, pp. 151–172.
- [47] Ibid.
- [48] R. Selim and İ. İlkaracan, 'Gender inequalities in the labour market in Turkey: differentials in wages, industrial & occupational distribution of men and women', 2002, <<http://content.csbs.utah.edu/~ehrbare/erc2002/pdf/P405.pdf>> (accessed 11 September 2014).
- [49] Kara, op. cit.
- [50] E. Cudeville and L. Gurbuzer, 'Gender wage discrimination in the Turkish labour market', CES Working Papers, 2007.67, Documents de Travail du Centre d'Economie de la Sorbonne, Paris, 2007.
- [51] Z. Kasnakoglu and M. Dayioğlu, 'Women's labour force participation and earnings differentials between genders in Turkey', *METU Studies*, 24(3), 1997, pp. 329–361.
- [52] Ibid.; Selim and İlkaracan, op. cit.; Kara, op. cit.
- [53] Selim and İlkaracan, op. cit.
- [54] Ibid.
- [55] D. Meulders, S. O'Dorchai, R. Plasman and A. Rigo, 'Topic report on gender wage gap and funding. Meta-analysis of gender and science research', 2010, <https://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/images/TR1_Segregation.pdf> (accessed 11 September 2014).
- [56] Tansel, op. cit.
- [57] Kara, op. cit.; A. Tansel, 'Public–private employment choice, wage differentials and gender in Turkey', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 53(2), 2005, pp. 453–477.
- [58] Tansel, 'Public–private', op. cit.

- [59] European Commission, op. cit.
- [60] G. Healy, H. Alienfendioglu and M. Özbilgin, 'Academic employment and gender: a Turkish challenge to vertical sex segregation', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 11(2), 2005, pp. 247–264; European Commission, op. cit.
- [61] A. Öncü, 'Turkish women in the professions: why so many?', in N. Abadan-Unat (ed.), *Women in Turkish Society*, Brill, Leiden, 1981, pp. 181–193.
- [62] Healy *et al.*, op. cit.
- [63] Ö. Özkanlı and A. Korkmaz, *Kadın Akademisyenler*, Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayını, Ankara, 2000.
- [64] A. Mischau, 'Women in higher education in Europe: a statistical overview', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 21, 2001, pp. 20–31.
- [65] T. Akgeyik, *Ulusal ve Uluslararası Karşılaştırmalarla Öğretim Üyeliği Maaşı: Tespitler ve Bir Model Önerisi*, SETAV Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Toplum Araştırmaları Vakfı, Ankara, 2013.
- [66] The countries included in the study were: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Czech Republic, Germany, England, Ethiopia, France, Holland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mexico, Norway, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Turkey and the USA.
- [67] Ibid.
- [68] Akgeyik, op. cit.
- [69] Ibid.
- [70] The individuals we surveyed are paid in Turkish lira (TL). This, combined with the fluctuating value of the Turkish lira, led us to quote salaries in the local currency to avoid confusion.
- [71] Akgeyik, op. cit.
- [72] Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu, 2014, <<http://www.yok.gov.tr/web/guest/universitelerimiz>> (accessed 11 September 2014).
- [73] G. Çetinsaya, 'Büyüme, kalite, uluslararasılaşma: Türkiye yükseköğretimi için bir yol haritası', 2013, <<http://yolharitasi.yok.gov.tr/docs/YolHaritasi.pdf>> (accessed 11 September 2014).
- [74] Durnel, op. cit.; Tansel, 'Public–private', op. cit.

Meltem Ucal is associate professor of economics at Kadir Has University, Istanbul, Turkey. She received her BA, MA and PhD, all in Econometrics, from Istanbul University. She has published many articles in international and domestic journals such as *Journal of Business Economics and Management* and *Emerging Market Finance and Trade*. Her current research interests are model selection, non-parametric regression, bootstrap, cross-validation, statistical analysis, foreign direct investment, differential wage, income inequality and energy efficiency.

Address for correspondence: Department of Economics, Kadir Has University, Cibali, Istanbul, Turkey. E-mail: mucal@khas.edu.tr

Mary Lou O'Neil is associate professor and director of the Gender and Women's Studies Research Center at Kadir Has University, Istanbul, Turkey. Her research interests include gender, law and popular culture in Turkey.

Address for correspondence: Gender and Women's Studies Research Center, Kadir Has University, Kadir Has Caddesi, Cibali, Istanbul 34083, Turkey. E-mail: mloneil@khas.edu.tr

Sule Toktas is a professor of political science at Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Kadir Has University. Her research interests are international migration, women's studies and Turkish politics.

Address for correspondence: Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Kadir Has University, Cibali, Istanbul 34083, Turkey. E-mail: sule@khas.edu.tr