Social Indicators Research (2006) 75: 463–501
DOI 10.1007/s11205-005-1096-7

KEMAL AYDIN

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND CONSUMPTION PATTERNS IN TURKEY

(Accepted 24 January 2005)

ABSTRACT. In this article, by analyzing consumption practices of Turkish households, I attempted to identify whether there are distinctions between different social classes in Turkey. Stated another way, I assessed and explored the impact of socio-economic forces on consumption patterns, taste and lifestyle. In doing so, I tested emprically, two theoretical approaches, Bourdieu's "reproduction theory" and Giddens "class Structuration thesis". A total of eight dependent variables are analyzed in terms of the linkages between those selected consumption items and social structure. In general, the emprical findings indicated that the intersection and reinforcement of social class variables, such as income, education, occupation, sector, and neighborhood differentiation, determined consumption patterns and lifestyle differences in Turkey.

KEY WORDS: consumption patterns, lifestyle, social stratification, Turkey

INTRODUCTION

The economic, social and cultural transformations occurring on a global scale in the last quarter of the 20th century have resulted in the proliferation of a multiplicity of new discourses within the social sciences, as various scholars have tried to theoretically grapple with these transformations. As many theorists, including Offe (1985), Melucci (1996) and Castells (1997) among others, have pointed out, these changes have necessitated theoretical shifts within the social sciences, from discourse of modernism to postmodernism, for example, capitalism to post-capitalism, or from Fordism to post-Fordism. In the economic sphere, such transformations, particularly the information technology revolution, have led to an embryonic change in the ways and means of the production, distribution and consumption of goods (Castells, 1997).

In the social sphere, similarly, these transformations have led to significant reconfigurations and reformulations of class structures, especially within the societies of economically advanced nation-states, resulting in the emergence of "new class" and "new social movements" (Eyerman, 1992). Accordingly, what may be observed, scholars point out, are various social shifts from class-based politics to identity politics, ideology to lifestyles, and mass production to consumption, and so on, that become the primary forces fuelling social change. One consequence of such change has been the birth of a "new-middle-class", with its new "leisure lifestyle", and consumption, which has been the site of much analysis by many sociologists (Featherstone, 1991; Slatter, 1997). While such inquiry has tended to be limited to the context of developed nations, I would argue that the increasing globality of ongoing economic and socio-cultural transformations serves to make this debate globally relevant.

In contemporary Turkey, which is the subject of this article, there has been a parallel transformation within the last 25 years (Bali, 2002; Gole, 1991; Gurbilek, 1992; Kozanoglu, 2001; Ozcan et al., 2002; Pinarcioglu and Isik, 2001; Sozen, 1999; Yenal, 2000, Unpublished dissertation). There has also been a change in the discourse of the social sciences that is very similar to that in advanced nations. The emergence of identity politics, gender, and religious revivalism, for instance, are as relevant in Turkey as they are in the United States. In my research, first, by analyzing consumption practices of Turkish households, I will attempt to identify whether there are distinctions between the different social classes. Stated another way, I will assess and explore the impact of social classes on consumption patterns, tastes and lifestyles, by analyzing how different social classes spend their income. Finally, I will attempt to determine how contemporary Turkish society is stratified in terms of lifestyle and consumption patterns.

In doing so, I will test empirically two theoretical approaches, Bourdieu's (1977) "reproduction theory" and Giddens' (1973) "class structuration theory". The primary research question here is how consumption and lifestyle patterns are distributed among the different social classes in Turkey. Are there social classes and class cultures, in terms of consumption and lifestyle practices? How are these lifestyle and consumption practices associated with social,

economic, demographic, and cultural factors? By drawing insights from both Bourdieu and Giddens, I will attempt to answer these questions, while at the same time determining whether reproduction theory and class structuration theory are useful in interpreting the data. These two theories in sociology are the primary theoretical approaches that seek to conceptualize the relationship between class, status and lifestyle (Grusky, 1994). Although at first glance Bourdieu and Giddens appear to outline significantly different theories, both draw their ideas from Marx, Weber, and Durkheim. Marx and Weber, especially, provided these two contemporary sociologists with their essential views on social class, consumption, status and lifestyle.

Second, although, the data seem relatively old, since 1994, there has been no other large-scale survey conducted in the area consumption patterns so this survey contains the latest available data for the researchers. The survey is carried out every 10–12 years by the SIS of Turkey to gather information about employment, housing, consumption habits and types, and to make policy based on this information. In the present study, the survey data will be used to analyze the effect of socio-economic and demographic factors on consumption patterns, in an effort to contribute to the understanding of the social inequality in Turkey. In doing so, I will attempt to theorize the contemporary social stratification of Turkey' society, using Bourdieu's and Giddens' theories as my conceptual framework and guide. In summary, the effect of socio-economic and demographic factors will be analyzed on consumption patterns, and this will help us to contribute to an understanding of the shape of social inequality in modern Turkey related to lifestyle and consumption patterns.

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION CULTURAL STUDIES AND SOCIOLOGY OF CONSUMPTION

Within the concurrently evolving debate on social sciences (Douglas and Isherwood, 1979; Featherstone, 1991; Slater, 1997), the emphasis has been on identifying the linkages between the economic concept of consumption as an exchange of goods, and the parallel transference of meanings that constitute culture.

Considering consumption to be a founding feature of contemporary cultures, such debates viewed consumption as the social paradigm within which human relations to material culture were established. Featherstone (1991), for example, points to consumption's considerable impact on the shaping of postmodern culture. These critics, and others, including Slater, Douglas, Isherwood and Warde, have all based their arguments around common, pervasive themes. These include an examination of the process of advertising and ways in which it serves to fetishize the object or material good. The inadequacy of the notion of "free choice" in the contemporary advertising-led environment, wherein identity is measured in terms of brand loyalties, shape not only the ways in which goods purchased define the individuals' own identity, but also inflect in crucial ways upon the consumers' admittance into specific social groups or communities, and indeed reorganize his/her very relationship to the existing social and physical environment. It is evident that the new literature emerging within the social sciences emphasizes the cultural aspect of consumption. Within this literature, it becomes clear that comprehending material culture merely in terms of monetary transactions conducted between producers and consumers is inadequate (Warde, 1992).

However, researchers appear to be divided over the qualitative character of consumption and fragmentation. Some have argued that the emerging empirical results point to social fragmentation as being a consequence of the individualization and stylization of consumption (Davis, 1982; Eyerman, 1992; Gartman, 1991; Pakulsky and Waters, 1996). Others suggest that what emerges as fragmentation emerges along the social class lines (Bihagen, 1999; Bourdieu, 1984; Manza and Brooks, 1998; Wright, 1996). While the first perspective suggests that consumption can more usefully be considered as uncoupling from socio-economic hierarchy, the latter treats consumption as a function of the individuals' social location in production-based social relationship. Within this context, two sociologists, Bourdieu (1984) and Giddens (1973), are crucial within the study of consumption, social class and status distinctions. In following pages, I discuss Bourdieu and Giddens' approaches to "consequences of social stratification" consumption and class analysis.

BOURDIEU

Bourdieu may be the most important scholar to bring the issue of lifestyle and consumption to the forefront of sociological analysis within the last 20 years. By synthesizing Marx, Weber and Durkheim, he offered a theory of social reproduction. In Bourdieu's theory, although class is a universal explanatory principle, he does not define class in terms of the means of production but social relationships. Instead, class is defined as "similar position in social space... similar conditions of existence and similar dispositions". His view of society as "a system of relatively autonomous but structurally homologous fields of production, circulation and consumption of various forms of cultural and material sources" (Brubaker, 1985, p. 748).

"Taste serves to unify those with similar preferences and to differentiate them from those different tastes. Taste implies distaste and taste is a matchmaker. People pursue distinctions in a range of cultural fields" (Bourdieu, 1984). For example, educational institutions and marriage patterns are two exclusionary fields. According to Bourdieu, "there is a strong correlation between social position and dispositions of the agents who occupy them" (Bourdieu, 1984).

Consumption in Bourdieu' theory is not analyzed in terms of supply and demand. Producers do not dictate tastes to consumers. On the other hand, consumers do not simply tell producers what to produce. Consumers select from the products available to them. These selections are determined by their position in the struggle among the social classes for distinction (Swartz, 1997, p. 131).

The distribution of economic capital is his "dominant principle of hierarchy"; the "second principle of hierarchy" is the distribution of cultural capital. Lifestyles arise from these two types of capital. For example, the middle and upper classes are divided in terms of cultural and economic capital. One faction in the middle and upper classes is rich in cultural capital and poor in economic capital, while for another faction it is just the opposite. According to Bourdieu, cultural capital is becoming more important.

For Bourdieu, statistical analysis on class distinctions is not enough. His method of class analysis is an imaginative combination of statistical analysis, ethnographic description, interviews, photography and media clips (Swartz, 1997). However, according to Brubaker (1985), it is impossible to ask in Bourdieu's model if social

class has an impact on consumption, because these two concepts cannot be separated from each other. Within the following pages, I will briefly discuss Giddens' structuration theory and its connection with lifestyle, consumption and social classes.

GIDDENS

An important debate within this context is provided by Giddens, in his influential treatise *Class Structure in Advanced Societies* (1973). According to Giddens, whether classes become social classes is dependent on various forms of structuration and mediation. Structuration of classes is contingent and the overlap between class and status is a matter of empirical inquiry rather than a theoretical construct.

Based on Marx and Weber, Giddens suggests that three fundamental social elements – property, education or professional skills, and manual labor-lead to a three-part model of class structuring that may be commonly observed within modern capitalist societies. These three elements lead to the formation of three power points in the economic sphere, the social corollary of which becomes the establishment of an upper class, who own productive property and thereby control the means of production; a middle class comprised of individuals who do not own property but nevertheless create a power position for themselves in the social hierarchy by virtue of the special education or skills they possess that they can use as currency in the market; and finally, a lower or working class who occupy the last rung in such a socio-economic ladder, and who can only offer manual labor in exchange for subsistence wages.

On the other hand, Giddens acknowledges that a tripartite system of class structuration and theoretical class boundaries that aim to explain real world social functioning can never claim to be absolute lines. In reality, ambiguously coalesced social collectivities, be they the old petty bourgeoisie, independently employed white collar workers, or other groups of educated professionals, and such like, are located along extremely fluid and porous boundaries of class and frequently exhibit partial access to the three elements I have outlined above (property, education and manual labor). Giddens suggests that any social stratification that is predicated on these three elements

exhibits varying degrees of closure or exclusion and need not necessarily lead to complete and inflexible categories. As a matter of fact, it becomes impossible to construct a theoretical model which can explain every detail of the different relationships that are observed within the interactions of various classes, across various societies, or even within the various segments of a single social unit at different historical points.

It is in this context, in order to theorize around such anomalies occurring in, and around, the interactions between real worlds class systems, that Giddens introduces the concept of structuration. Instead of viewing class as a discrete, explicitly differentiated unit of social stratification, Giddens proposes that class structure, as a social system of stratification, may be more usefully understood as a collection of variable processes generally occurring around a three-class system, but specifically comprehended as comprised of class groupings that differ from each other in their degree of structuration, that is, in the extent to which each is produced, and replicated, historically and geographically, as a unique social cluster.

Additionally, Giddens describes several other proximate factors one of which is specifically related to my discussion: as another proximate factor, Giddens outlines as what he calls "distributive groupings". By this, he refers to the interactions between social groups who coalesce because of commonality of lifestyle or material consumption habits. To illustrate his point, Giddens gestures towards the pattern of purchasing of houses, and to the functioning of the class clusters that result from such patterns. Giddens argues that the consumption patterns of housing can be seen as clearly strengthening social stratification based on a three-class model in societies where the upper, middle and lower classes can be observed as living in visibly distinct areas that do not overlap. Contrarily, patterns of housing that lead to a heterogeneous coexistence of people irrespective of their differential locations in the economic hierarchies, Giddens suggests are indicative of societies wherein class structuration is less pronounced, and class boundaries further blurred. In summary, Giddens' discussion allows the possibility of different social classes in different societies may interact differently because of being differently structurated, depending on the ways in which several factors synchronize or diverge in the formation of visible class cleavages.

The State Institute of Statistics' original occupational categories are used in this analysis, and are compatible with Giddens' Weberian view of class categories (1994). The occupational conceptualization is based on four assumptions: namely, that there are differences between employer and employed; between those who have educational skills and those who do not; between manual and skilled labor; and lastly, between those who possess organizational power, i.e. managers, and those who do not (DIE, 1994). Thus, the State Institute of Statistics' occupational categorizations which used here are: 1-Employers, 2-Self-employed, 3-Casual Workers, 4-Professionals, 5-Managers, 6-Clericals, 7-Trade and Sale, 8-Service workers, 9-Blue Collar Workers, 10-Farmers, 11-Residual Category (unemployed, undetermined occupations, retired and students, etc.).

Although in the employer category, most sociological analyses divide employers further in terms of the number of employed persons (Wright, 1996), in the Household Consumption Survey, there is no such distinction. The State Institute of Statistics of Turkey defined an employer as a person who employs at least one person in his/her field of activity. Second, independently working white-collar individuals, such as doctors, lawyers and dentists, are categorized under the self-employed category in many studies. However, through the cross tabs I have separated those self-employed white collar workers from other self-employed people and put them under professionals.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESIS

In this study, an effort is made determine the effect of social class, sectoral location, and income and education on ownership of appliances, consumption patterns, and lifestyle, then explore whether there is mediation by education or income and if there is an effect that is not mediated by income or education. The following hypotheses will be tested.

> *Hypothesis 1.* Regional factors involve comparative advantages. In Turkey, some regions are more developed than others are. Therefore, there will be significant differences among the regions, especially Southeastern Anatolia. It is

the least developed region and will be significantly different from the rest.

Hypothesis 2. For cities with a population over 200 001, neighborhoods are further stratified as undeveloped, middle and developed streets, in accordance with the infrastructure, such as cost of rents and transportation in the cities. Therefore, there will be differences in consumption patterns between developed, middle and undeveloped streets. Within this context, this hypothesis focuses on the issue of whether there is class structuration in terms of housing patterns. These demographic and neighborhood variables are important since they closely correlate with social class. The following hypotheses involve testing Giddens and Bourdieu's theories:

Hypothesis 3. Consumption and lifestyle differences are influenced by income, cultural capital (education) and occupations of the household head. More specifically, consumption patterns are determined by income, more education, occupation, neighborhood and sector, and demographic factors will be mediating factors (i.e., those who have more income, more educated, whose occupations for example as a managers, employers, professionals or clericals and live in developed or middle level developed neighborhood will be different in their consumption patterns, than those who had less income and education, lived in a less developed neighborhood, work for example as a casual employees, blue-collar workers, self-employed and farmers). Between these two poles (i.e., between the "taste of necessity" and "taste of freedom") the rest of the occupational categories will be ranked in accordance to combination and correspondence of their class position. Put another way, all those variables have a cumulative effect, with each contributing in the same direction to the consumption patterns. In Bourdieu's model, "taste is as a sign of group affiliation- of horizontal connections as well as vertical distinctions" (p. 458, DiMaggio in Grusky (1994)).

Hypothesis 4. Though education and occupation are closely related to habitus, more income will result in more

spending on all selected consumption items. Consumption is constrained by income. Although Bourdieu gives great importance to cultural dimensions of social class inequality, he admits that economic capital is finally the most important basis for all sorts of other inequalities.

Hypothesis 5. According to many studies (Bourdieu, 1984; DiMaggio, 1987), level of education is one of the most important factors that distinguish people's tastes from each other. According to Bourdieu, educational level or cultural capital is more important than income in predicting taste.

Hypothesis 6. Within Turkey's context, two important sectors exist side by side: the state sector and the private sector. In this data, there are three variables about the sectors: public or state sector, private sector and other. Therefore, there will be significant differences between the three sectors for ownership, leisure and consumption patterns. In short, the effect of income, social class, educational, sectoral and other demographic factors will be explored to see whether there is mediation by education, income and demographic variables and if there is an effect that is not mediated by income and education.

THE DATA

The State Institute of Statistics conducted this survey from 1 January to December 1994, at 236 urban and rural settlements. Before the survey, a pre-test was administered to 100 households in 10 provinces, 2 districts and 7 towns. In addition, to get accurate answers, brochures, posters, and spot promotions were implemented. The total sample size within the 12 month period was 26 256 household; and 517 interviewers, 112 supervisors, 47 organizers, 41 drivers and 54 agricultural technicians were employed throughout the survey. Each interviewer visited six households every three days, totaling 10 times a month. The survey was applied to 62 urban and 174 rural areas. For example, in January 1994, investigators interviewed 2188 householders and in February 1994, they interviewed another 2188 householders. This alternate process continued until the end of December 1994. In settlements where the population was, 200 001 and over were taken

as urban, less than 200 000 were taken as rural, and all of the seven geographic regions in Turkey were included in the survey.

Furthermore, collected data were edited and coded by researchers and statisticians in each headquarter of the State Institute of Statistics.[1] During the editing and coding process, 45 household heads from urban locations, and 25 from rural locations were treated as missing cases due to several reasons, such as reliability, changing locations, and missing reference periods. There were three more missing cases in the available data in my analysis. I dropped those three missing cases from my analysis. The total survey applied to about 27 000 householders within the periods of 12 months.

For my analysis, however, I have selected 13 086 households from the total six months from the available data, the selected months included January, March, May, July, September and November of 1994, and unit of analysis is household heads.

GENERAL SOCIOLOGICAL MODEL

Overall, in this project, eight different consumption items, already mentioned in Table I are selected to analyze social and structural influences. Logistic regression is suitable to predict having vs. not having, or consuming vs. not consuming (Long, 1997). The equation will be: $\log p/(1-p) = a + \beta_1(\text{class}) + \beta_2(\text{income}) + \beta_3(\text{education}) + \beta_4(\text{sector}) + \beta_5(\text{gender}) + \beta_6(\text{rural vs. urban}) + \beta_7(\text{regions}) +$

TABLE I

Types of consumption expenditures

Housing standards	Central heating
Ownership of appliances	Washer, dishwasher and car
Culture	Newspaper reading
Selected consumption categories	Bread and cereals, clothing and footwear and education
Bread and cereals	Bread, flour, rice, macaroni, maize, biscuits, sausages etc.
Clothing and footwear	Garments, cloth fabric, clothing accessories, mending, dry cleaning, shoes, shoe repair and etc.
Educational expenditure	Primary, secondary, college, dormi tory and etc.

β_8(streets), where P is the probability of consuming an item, the "Bs" are vectors of coefficients for class, geography, urban location, education, and family status and "b" is the coefficient for income.

In the second part of the analysis, seven consumption categories are selected. Those selected consumption categories are: cereal and bread, meat, vegetables and fruits, education, health, entertainment. The Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression model is suitable for the items everyone consumes where: $Y = a + \beta_1(\text{class}) + \beta_2(\text{income}) + \beta_3(\text{education}) + \beta_4(\text{sector}) + \beta_5(\text{gender}) + \beta_6(\text{rural vs. urban}) + \beta_7(\text{regions}) + \beta_8(\text{streets}) + €$ where everything is the same, but Y is a continuous dependent variable measuring the amount spent on the consumption elements.

EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

The first variable is concerned with the presence or absence of a heating system, specifically radiators. Second sets of variables include ownership of appliances. In this category washer, dishwasher, and car ownership are selected. The leisure and culture includes the analysis of newspaper readings. Finally, in the actual consumption category three expenditure items namely bread and cereals, meat, clothing and educational expenditures will be analyzed. Types of all those items are also presented in Table I.

Four logit models are utilized here to test relative effect of social, economic and demographic factors. Specifically, in model one, by controlling professionals, the relative effects of occupational categories is tested. Income is added in the second model. In the third model, educational levels are added to the first two models, and secondary school is used as a control variable. In the final full model, regions, sectors, gender, street quality and urban, as independent variables, are added to the first three models. Therefore, in the full model, by controlling professionals, income, secondary education, "other" sector, male household head, the Marmara region, rural places, and developed streets, the relative effects of eight dichotomous variables and one continuous independent variable are tested to see if there is support for social class thesis.

Central Heating

In Table II, all the coefficients, except managers, were significantly less likely to have a radiator, as compared to professionals. In this model, as well as in other analysis, 1 indicates the probability of having and 2 indicates the probability of not having. For instance, probability of the log odds of being in category one (having) for managers is 0.41; while the log of the probability of being in category one (having) for casual workers is −3.43. In the second model, although income has a strong positive effect on having a radiator, it did not alter the significant effect in the first model. Managers were still significant, and were as likely to have a radiator as professionals. After education is added, only income and college degree were positively significant for having a radiator. Those with higher incomes and college degrees seemed to be the most likely to have a radiator in the dwelling.

In the full model, the likelihood of having a radiator was most positive where income and college degrees intersected with professionals, managers, employers, the residual category, developed street, and the public sector. Those employers, self-employed and residual category members who had more income, were more likely to have radiators. Also three regions, the Aegean, Mediterranean, and Black Sea, were significantly less likely to have a radiator. The negative significant effect for the Aegean and Mediterranean regions might be due to weather; even in the winter, the weather in these two regions, compared to the others, is usually warmer. The central Anatolian region was positively associated, perhaps due to fact that most of the government employees are located in that region.

The absence or presence of central heating system (radiator) is closely related to natural gas. Until very recently, using natural gas almost did not exist in Turkey's householders dwelling. Apartments where the middle class lives used different types of radiators for heat in their dwellings. On the other hand, gecekondu (shantytown, squatter) or poor section of the cities lived in gecekondu and their lifestyle were associated with using stove, coal or wood. However, within the last 10 years, there has been large infrastructure build to switch to natural gas in all cities in Turkey. Presently, about 70% of the dwellers in big cities already receive natural gas for all-purpose. It is no longer allowed in big cities to use coal in the winter except for far away peripheries in big cities.

TABLE II

Logit results: radiator

Independent variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	−0.5605	0.0001****	−1.583	0.0001****	−2.2004	0.0001****	−2.4727	0.0327*
Employers	−0.6009	0.0001****	−1.0591	0.0001****	0.1042	0.5958	1.0606	0.0054**
Self-employed	−1.6179	0.0001****	−1.4906	0.0001****	−0.1648	0.3816	0.7575	0.0413*
Casual workers	−3.4321	0.0001****	−2.8529	0.0001****	−1.3037	0.0002***	−0.5818	0.1402
Managers	0.4139	0.0947	0.2713	0.302	0.4202	0.1285	0.4974	0.1258
Clericals	−1.1328	0.0001****	−0.8026	0.0001****	−0.3782	0.0754	−0.2679	0.2724
Trade & Sale	−1.682	0.0001****	−1.3355	0.0001****	−0.6018	0.0912	−0.2774	0.502
Service workers	−1.7837	0.0001****	−1.3928	0.0001****	−0.293	0.2006	0.1495	0.5731
Blue-collars	−2.4641	0.0001****	−2.0676	0.0001****	−0.8286	0.0001****	−0.5353	0.032*
Farmers	−2.2798	0.0001****	−2.1107	0.0004***	−1.2438	0.0375*	−0.6244	0.3113
Others	−1.0982	0.0001****	−0.7024	0.0001****	0.6487	0.0001****	1.445	0.0001****
Income			5.67E-08	0.0001****	4.29E-08	0.0001****	4.43E-08	0.0001****
Illiterate					−1.6648	0.0001****	−1.1524	0.0001****
Literate/no diploma					−1.8396	0.0001****	−1.2282	0.001***
Elementary school					−0.9387	0.0001****	−0.6585	0.0001****
High School					0.3996	0.0071**	0.3235	0.0613
College					1.2429	0.0001****	1.2484	0.0001****
Graduate					0.9053	0.2154	0.613	0.4623
State sector							0.8957	0.004**
Private sector							0.5958	0.082

				0.048	0.8031
Female					
Aegean				−0.9683	0.0001****
Mediterranean				−2.3373	0.0001****
Central Anatolia				0.3467	0.0153*
Black sea				−1.7449	0.0001****
East Anatolia				0.141	0.4099
South East Anatolia				−0.0675	0.764
Rural				−0.61	0.5777
Undeveloped street				−1.6638	0.0001****
Middle street				−1.0968	0.0001****
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	
Two Log likelihood	4136	3824	3506	2696	
likelihood ratio	452	764	1082	1892	
Percent concordant	65.4	80	82.9	91.6	
Degree of freedom	1				
Number of cases	13087				

Note: *p, **p, ***p, and ****p indicate significance at the level of *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; ****$p < 0.0001$.
Probability modeled is radiator = 1; Model 1 = $\log p/(1-p) = \beta_0 + \beta_1$(occupations), professionals excluded; Model 2 = Model 1 + β_2(income); Model 3 = Model 1 + Model 2 + β_3(education), secondary school excluded; Model 4 = Model 1 + Model 2 + Model 3 + β_4(sector) + β_5(gender) + β_6(rural vs. urban) + β_7(regions) + β_8(streets); Excluded categories: professionals, secondary school, and "other" sector, male, urban, the Marmara Region and developed streets.

Washer

In contrast to professionals, in Table III, with the exception of managers and clericals, the rest of the occupational categories were less likely to have a washer.[2] In model two, though those with higher incomes are more likely to have washers, employers, self-employed, casual workers, blue collars, farmers and residual category continued to be statistically less likely to have a washer. Self-employed, casual workers, services, blue-collars, and farmers, interacted with less educated household heads were less likely to have a washer, once income and education were controlled.

In the full model, those with high school or college degrees and who were located in developed streets and urban locations were significantly more likely to have washer in comparison to casual workers and farmers who had less education and lived in less developed streets. In addition, five out of six regions were less likely to own washer when the Marmara, which is the most developed region, is controlled.

Dishwasher

Except managerial groups, the rest of the occupational categories are significantly less likely to have a dishwasher (Table IV). The coefficient or log odds for casual workers was −4.21, which means that they are the least likely to own a dishwasher, compared to the rest. Although income had a significant positive impact, it still did not knock out the occupational differentiation. All of the educational variables are significant, except graduate level education. With the exception of income and graduate level of education, the rest of the variables were negatively associated with likelihood of having a dishwasher. Only graduate level education and more income had a positive impact on having a dishwasher.

In the full model, casual workers, clericals, trade-sale, service workers and blue collar workers intersected or interacted with three first three levels of education and in addition, four regions, and poor and middle level streets, were significantly less likely to have a dishwasher, in comparison to the positive significant effects of income, college degree and both public and private sector and Black Sea region.

TABLE III

Logit results: washer ownership

Independent variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	−2.4363	0.0001****	−0.8633	0.0001****	−0.6668	0.0072**	−0.3368	0.5853
Employers	0.3846	0.0973	0.6121	0.0115*	0.0241	0.9271	−0.0841	0.845
Self-employed	1.5724	0.0001****	1.2797	0.0001****	0.6072	0.0069**	0.453	0.2639
Casual workers	2.8051	0.0001****	2.0604	0.0001****	1.3129	0.0001****	0.8296	0.001**
Managers	−0.2981	0.5482	−0.0384	0.94	−0.0998	0.8484	−0.3439	0.5255
Clericals	0.3124	0.2286	−0.0755	0.7774	−0.1516	0.5939	−0.2397	0.4121
Trade & Sale	0.9992	0.0006***	0.4419	0.142	0.0411	0.8974	−0.1783	0.5982
Service workers	1.6293	0.0001****	1.1044	0.0001****	0.6067	0.0117*	0.4114	0.0974
Blue-collars	1.5164	0.0001****	1.0124	0.0001****	0.4758	0.0378*	0.2128	0.3755
Farmers	1.0318	0.0001****	0.9355	0.0001****	0.5469	0.0058**	0.4362	0.0332*
Others	1.2774	0.0001****	0.6862	0.0007***	−0.1933	0.3972	−0.0191	0.9612
Income			−1.21E-07	0.0001****	−1.00E-07	0.0001****	−7.56E-0	0.0001****
Illiterate					1.3226	0.0001****	1.055	0.0001****
Literate/no dip					0.9262	0.0001****	0.5665	0.0007***
Elementary					0.2414	0.036*	0.0787	0.5134
High school					−0.6129	0.0001****	−0.5994	0.0002***
College					−1.0006	0.0005****	−0.9037	0.0019**
Graduate					1.0688	0.3564	1.3365	0.2724
State sector							−0.154	0.6648
Private sector							0.3284	0.3579
Female							−0.2337	0.0912

TABLE III

Continued

Independent variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq
Aegean							0.5457	0.0001****
Mediterranean							0.7857	0.0001****
Central Anatolia							0.5709	0.0001****
Black sea							0.0947	0.5937
East Anatolia							0.8814	0.0001****
South East							1.3543	0.0001****
Rural							−1.1895	0.0065**
Poor street							0.615	0.0001***
Middle street							0.2998	0.013*
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
Two Log likelihood	6455		5995		5767		5416	
Likelihood ratio	569		1029		1257		1609	
Percent concordant	60.7		76.5		78.4		81.4	
Degree of freedom	1							
Number of cases	13087							

Note: *p, **p, ***p, and ****p indicate significance at the level of *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; ****$p < 0.0001$; Probability modeled is washer = 0; Model 1 = $\log p/(1-p) = \beta_0 + \beta_1$(occupations), professionals excluded; Model 2 = Model 1 + β_2(income); Model 3 = Model 1 + Model 2 + β_3(education), secondary school excluded; Model 4 = Model 1 + Model 2 + Model 3 + β_4(sector) + β_5(gender) + β_6(rural vs. urban) + β_7(regions) + β_8(streets); Excluded categories: Professionals, secondary school, "other" sector, male, urban, the Marmara Region and developed streets.

Car Ownership

Table V shows that, with the exception of employers and managers, the rest, as compared to professionals, were significantly less likely to have a car in model one. In model two, income knocked out all the occupational differences, and only income had a positive impact on the likelihood of having a car. In model three, casual and service workers and those who had below the secondary educational level had a negative significant impact on having a car. Income, high school and college degree had a strong positive effect on car ownership at 0.0001, 0.0024 and 0.0001 levels, respectively.

In the full model, car ownership is positively associated with employers, self-employed, residual category, income, college degree and both public and private sectors. Casuals, blue-collars, female household head, undeveloped street, Southeastern and Eastern regions were less likely to own a car in the full model.

Newspapers

In Table VI, after controlling professionals, self-employed, casual workers, service, blue collars, farmers and the residual category were significantly less likely to read newspapers. After income was added, it did not change the first model. Income by itself had a significant effect on the probability of having the habit of reading newspapers. When education is added in the third model, all the occupational effects are canceled. Income has a positive significant effect, and the first three levels of education have a significant negative effect. College degree as a significant positive effect remained. In the full model, employers, trade-sale, higher income and college degree had a significantly positive relationship on spending on newspapers. On the other hand, below college degree, eastern and southeastern regions, and less developed streets were less likely to spend on newspapers.

When the analyzed variables are placed in its theoretical context, a pattern begins to emerge. In the first three models, although income had a statistically strong positive impact on all the analyzed cases, after income added to occupational categories, it did not alter the first model. However, in the third model, after educational level was added, by excluding secondary school, it reduced the significance from eight or nine occupations to four or five occupations. In the

TABLE IV

Logit results: dishwasher ownership

Independent variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	−0.3938	0.0003***	−1.8062	0.0001****	−2.5086	0.0001****	−2.5435	0.0272*
Employers	−0.7559	0.0001****	−1.4242	0.0001****	0.0983	0.0001****	0.5389	0.1457
Self-employed	−2.0576	0.0001****	−2.0273	0.0001****	−0.3276	0.0001****	0.1151	0.7534
Casual workers	−4.2123	0.0001****	−3.4939	0.0001****	−0.8537	0.0001****	−1.6056	0.0008***
Managers	−0.2092	0.4127	−0.5189	0.0689	−0.1718	0.0001****	−0.4784	0.1208
Clericals	−1.3755	0.0001****	−0.9735	0.0001****	−0.1708	0.0001****	−0.5735	0.0125*
Trade & Sale	−1.5986	0.0001****	−1.1408	0.0003***	−0.0317	0.0001****	−0.4323	0.2496
Service workers	−3.1371	0.0001****	−2.8155	0.0001****	−1.0738	0.0001****	−1.5571	0.0001****
Blue-collar workers	−2.7512	0.0001****	−2.2703	0.0001****	−0.6267	0.0001****	−0.845	0.0005***
Farmers	−2.2654	0.0001****	−2.0955	0.0005***	−0.5511	0.0001****	−0.7195	0.2525
Others	−1.7831	0.0001****	−1.3405	0.0001****	0.23	0.0001****	0.5126	0.1021
Income			8.04E-08	0.0001****	6.01E-08	0.0001****	6.13E-	0.0001****
Illiterate					−1.6127	0.0001****	−1.6557	0.0001****
Literate/no diploma					−1.7094	0.0001****	−2.0035	0.0002***
Elementary school					−1.126	0.0001****	−1.1127	0.0001****
High school					0.4048	0.0001****	0.2131	0.2135
College					0.258	0.0001****	0.9248	0.0001****
Graduate					24.7888	0.9842	0.634	0.4618
State sector							0.8321	0.0074**
Private sector							0.7251	0.0348*

Female				0.2025	0.3367
Aegean				−0.4654	0.0209*
Mediterranean				−0.6423	0.0002***
Central Anatolia				−0.4753	0.0026**
Black sea				0.4759	0.0353*
East Anatolia				−0.9416	0.0001****
South East Anatolia				−0.5797	0.0218*
Rural				−0.1872	0.8639
Undeveloped street				−0.8048	0.0001****
Middle street				−0.6087	0.0001****
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	
Two log likelihood	3496	3002	2993	2522	
Likelihood ratio	534	1028	1073	1508	
Percent Concordant	69.6	86	88.3	90.5	
Degree of freedom	1				
Number of cases	13087				

Note: *p, **p, ***p, and ****p indicate significance at the level of *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; ****$p < 0.0001$.
Probability modeled is dishwasher = 1; Model 1 = log $p/(1-p)$ = $\beta_0 + \beta_1$(occupations), professionals excluded; Model 2 = Model 1 + β_2(income); Model 3 = Model 1+ Model 2+ β_3(education), secondary school excluded; Model 4 = Model 1 + Model 2 + Model 3 + β_4(sector) + β_5(gender) + β_6(rural vs. urban) + β_7(regions) + β_8(streets); Excluded categories: Professionals, secondary school, "other" sector, male, urban, the Marmara Region and developed streets.

TABLE V

Logit results: car ownership

Independent variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	−0.2661	0.0123*	−1.4079	0.0001****	−1.9523	0.0001****	−3.022	0.0003***
Employers	−0.1372	0.3324	−0.4607	0.0029**	0.2987	0.0893	1.1717	0.0001****
Self-employed	−1.2957	0.0001****	−1.1332	0.0001****	−0.2723	0.1009	0.6537	0.0308*
Casual workers	−2.9286	0.0001****	−2.3009	0.0001****	−1.3026	0.0001****	−1.0279	0.0002***
Managers	−0.3369	0.1852	−0.6227	0.0247*	−0.561	0.0472*	−0.4949	0.0839
Clericals	−0.8542	0.0001****	−0.5032	0.0043**	−0.1835	0.3313	−0.1757	0.3605
Trade & Sale	−1.3921	0.0001****	−0.9964	0.0003***	−0.4719	0.1062	−0.3323	0.278
Service workers	−1.7439	0.0001****	−1.3182	0.0001****	−0.6059	0.0031**	−0.5751	0.0057**
Blue-collar	−1.3763	0.0001****	−0.9289	0.0001****	−0.1586	0.3452	−0.0727	0.6772
Farmers	−1.024	0.0003***	−0.9024	0.0023**	−0.3418	0.2552	−0.42	0.1707
Others	−1.4657	0.0001****	−1.0681	0.0001****	−0.1393	0.3752	0.6957	0.0107*
Income			6.61E-08	0.0001****	5.42E-08	0.0001****	4.93E-08	0.0001****
Illiterate					−1.7697	0.0001****	−1.2546	0.0001****
Literate/no dip					−1.4835	0.0001****	−1.2316	0.0001****
Elementary school					−0.2135	0.0832	−0.1795	0.1519
High school					0.4128	0.0024****	0.2532	0.0678
College					1.0755	0.0001****	0.9015	0.0001****
Graduate					0.5099	0.4979	0.1512	0.839
State sector							1.0787	0.0001****
Private sector							0.6509	0.0184*

Female				−1.3436	0.0001****
Aegean				0.1051	0.4613
Mediterranean				0.2085	0.0934
Central Anatolia				0.2071	0.0749
Black sea				0.0432	0.8167
East Anatolia				−0.3385	0.0212*
South East Anatolia				−0.8193	0.0001****
Rural				0.4152	0.5863
Undeveloped street				−0.4228	0.0003****
Middle street				−0.2164	0.0329*
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	
Two log likelihood	5308	4895	4691	4546	
Likelihood ratio	417	830	1034	1179	
Percent concordant	60.7	79	80	81.1	
Degree of freedom	1				
Number of cases	13087				

Note: *p, **p, ***p, and ****p indicate significance at the level of *$p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; ****$p < 0.0001$; Probability modeled is car ownership = 1; Model 1 = $\log p/(1-p) = \beta_0 + \beta_1$(occupations), professionals excluded; Model 2 = Model 1 + β_2(income); Model 3 = Model 1 + Model 2 + β_3(education), secondary school excluded; Model 4 = Model 1 + Model 2 + Model 3 + β_4(sector) + β_5(gender) + β_6(rural vs. urban) + β_7(regions) + β_8(streets); Excluded Categories: Professionals, secondary school "other" sector, male, urban, the Marmara Region and developed streets.

TABLE VI

Interaction between income and education in selected variables: A: Washer, B: Car, C: Newspaper

	Estimate	Standard error	ChiSq	Pr > ChiSq
B: Washer				
ed1inc	−5.03E-08	3.14E-08	2.5666	0.1091
ed2inc	−6.36E-09	3.96E-08	0.0259	0.8723
ed3inc	−6.42E-08	2.69E-08	5.6922	0.017*
ed5inc	−1.70E-08	3.55E-08	0.2286	0.6326
ed6inc	−4.52E-08	4.57E-08	0.9795	0.3223
ed7inc	−1.31E-07	4.24E-08	9.5405	0.002**
C: Car				
ed1inc	1.38E-08	2.58E-08	0.2875	0.5919
ed2inc	2.05E-09	3.05E-08	0.0045	0.9465
ed3inc	−1.45E-08	1.21E-08	1.4398	0.2302
ed5inc	−3.50E-08	1.26E-08	7.6816	0.0056**
ed6inc	−2.51E-08	1.41E-08	3.1553	0.0757
ed7inc	−4.86E-08	2.42E-08	4.022	0.0449*
D: Newspaper				
ed1inc	3.13E-08	2.07E-08	2.2919	0.1301
ed2inc	2.53E-08	3.35E-08	0.5722	0.4494
ed3inc	2.72E-08	6.29E-09	18.6282	0.0001****
ed5inc	1.40E-08	5.85E-09	5.6929	0.017*
ed6inc	9.26E-09	6.79E-09	1.8599	0.1726
ed7inc	−1.14E-07	1.28E-07	0.7976	0.3718

Note: *p, **p, *** p, and ****p indicate significance at the level of *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; ****$p < 0.0001$.

last model, however, one to three occupations remained significant, either negatively or positively. For example, farmers and blue-collar, for washer and car ownership, were less likely to have these items after controlling all the variables. Other factors, which are essential components of class for both Bourdieu and Giddens, were decisive for the analyzed variables. Specifically, class differences appeared most clearly through the cumulative effect of those variables, with each contributing in the same direction to the consumption items. Those who had no education, or minimal education (under eight years), lived in undeveloped streets, sector, and partly with two or three occupations in the full model, and set the conditions for not having those consumption categories. Thus, class differences appeared between undeveloped streets, sector, and the first three levels

of education, vs. income, public sector, developed streets, urban, and above secondary school level of education. Class structuration in this case can be placed through the cumulative effect of income, education, occupation, sector, and neighborhood.

In addition to the additive independent effect of each structural variable in the logistic regression models, the unique combination of those variables interact, reinforce and further differentiate householders along social class lines. For example, in Table VI the interaction of education and income in selected consumption items provides further support for our hypothesis. While the interaction of income and education in the ownership of washer variables is driven by income, with the exception of elementary school and graduate degree in the washer case, other cultural items that are related to taste are more dependent on education than income. In car ownership, the results demonstrate that respondents that are more educated are less dependent on income in car ownership. At the same time, the habit of newspaper reading is more likely driven by education. Apart from elementary and high school, the rest of the educational levels were independent from income.

ORDINARY LEAST SQUARE REGRESSION RESULTS OF THREE SELECTED CONSUMPTION CATEGORIES

In this section, I examine the relative effect of each socio-economic demographic and regional factor on three selected consumption items to see how consumption patterns vary across different social classes, neighborhoods and regions. This is accomplished through OLS estimation. In this model, spending in each selected category is my continuous dependent variable, and socio-economic, demographic and regional factors are the function of spending. In other words, spending is constrained by socio-economic, demographic and regional factors. As in the case of logit analysis in the previous chapter, four models were again selected to test the relative effect of each independent variable. In model one, the effects of occupational are tested through controlling professionals. In model two, I add income, and in model three, I add educational level, with secondary school as a reference category. In the fourth full model, streets, sectors, gender, rural vs. urban and regions have been added. In the following pages, I

report the findings in Tables through IX: bread and cereals, clothing and footwear, and education, respectively.

Bread and Cereals

In Table VII, self-employed and casual workers spent significantly on bread and cereals than the rest in the first model. Income, in the second model, seemed to have a strong positive impact on bread and cereal consumption. In addition, casual workers, self-employed, service and blue-collar workers bought and consumed significantly more bread and cereals than the rest, after income was controlled. With respect to educational levels, uneducated household heads, namely, illiterate, literate without diploma and elementary school household heads, spent more on, and consumed significantly more, bread and cereals. In addition, controlling educational level, employers, trade-sale and the residual category consumed significantly less bread and cereals. In the full model, the first three levels of education continued to be significant. In addition, female household heads spent significantly less on bread and cereals. There were regional differences as well. Those who lived in the Aegean, Central Anatolia and Black Sea regions spent significantly less and consumed less bread and cereals. In short, there were clear-cut social class differences in bread and cereal consumption. Those who did not have any education or minimal education, spent more and consumed more bread and cereals. Thus, the data further proved that poor household heads mostly relied on bread and cereals in their diet. The adjusted R squares in Table VII shows that only 8% of the variance is explained by eight independent variables.

Clothing and Footwear

In model one, Table VIII, taking professionals as a reference category, managers spent the most amount of money on clothing and footwear, and were statistically significant at the 0.05 level of probability. Except employers, the rest of the occupational groups spent significantly less money. As the coefficient indicates, casual workers spent the least amount of money. After income was added, managerial groups were still positively significant and casual workers were negatively significant. Thus, except for managers and casual workers,

adding income changed the negative significance of the rest of the occupations. However, even income did not have an effect on managers and casual workers. Income as a strong positive effect continued through the fourth model. In model three, educational level did not have any effect on clothing and footwear. Income had a strong positive impact, and managers, in the last model, were statistically significant at a 0.05 level.

In the logit analyses, *R* square, that is, the explained variance, was impressively high. In all the analyzed logit variables, 80% of the variance was explained by eight independent variables. However, the *R* squares in the multiple regression results were very low. In footwear and clothing, 13% of the variance is explained by the full model.

Education

Managers in Table IX, spent significantly more on education than the professionals. Blue-collar workers, at the 0.01 level, spent significantly less money. When 0.05 was taken as a reference, self-employed, casual, blue-collars and the residual category were negatively significant. After income was added, it canceled the occupational effects, and income had a strong impact on educational spending. Even in the third and fourth models, income had a significant effect on educational spending. The adjusted R square, compared to the rest, was relatively high. Nineteen Percent of the educational spending, according to the results, can be explained by eight independent variables in the last model.

In summary, there were statistically significant sharp differences in all analyzed consumption items between the lower and upper classes, through the mediation of educational levels. The division was found between the first three levels (below eight years) vs. the second three levels (high school, college, and graduate), or between the educated and uneducated, and between undeveloped streets and developed streets. There were also statistically significant urban differences, in which urban respondents spent significantly more on bread, cereal and meat than the rural respondents.

For example, the net effect of class is detected in clothing, footwear and educational spending. After everything is controlled, managers still spent significantly more on clothing, footwear and

TABLE VII

OLS regression results for bread and cereal consumption

Independent variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Estimate	Pr > t	Estimate	Pr > t	Estimate	Pr > t	Estimate	Pr > t
Intercept	600891	0.0001****	561831	0.0001****	609032	0.0001****	446348	0.0001****
Employers	31995	0.3008	12325	0.6902	−73746	0.0276*	−57680	0.3116
Self-employed	109580	0.0001****	119402	0.0001****	14447	0.6328	15288	0.7808
Casual workers	136392	0.0001****	159989	0.0001****	35791	0.2793	86889	0.0138*
Managers	−29338	0.591	−39316	0.4698	−42827	0.4279	−22540	0.6709
Clericals	13557	0.694	27209	0.4286	−7476.61	0.8357	−13450	0.7033
Trade & Sale	−38882	0.4006	−22343	0.6282	−94418	0.0464*	−21122	0.6613
Service workers	108963	0.0005***	126289	0.0001****	35970	0.2918	31627	0.3468
Blue-collar workers	77399	0.0044**	94664	0.0005***	−3485.68	0.9103	20006	0.5217
Farmers	56211	0.1376	62705	0.0964	11844	0.7546	20540	0.5874
Others	6102.828	0.8138	23102	0.3728	−90203	0.0023**	−30514	0.5549
Income			0.00223	0.0001****	0.00272	0.0001****	0.00272	0.0001****
Illiterate					111574	0.0001****	148297	0.0001****
Literate/no diploma					167748	0.0001****	147797	0.0001****
Elementary school					64951	0.0012**	68117	0.0006***
High school					−32257	0.1728	−39526	0.0897
College					−92790	0.0022**	−92102	0.0021**
Graduate					−268500	0.0494*	−282809	0.0344*
State sector							60391	0.2153
Private sector							−69701	0.1666

Female				−205324	0.0001****
Aegean				−121819	0.0001****
Mediterranean				7291.1078	0.7036
Central Anatolia				−126299	0.0001****
Black sea				−94530	0.0006***
East Anatolia				665.60609	0.9752
South East Anatolia				31499	0.1457
Rural				166859	0.0366*
Undeveloped street				64419	0.0002****
Middle street				17454	0.2892
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	
Adjusted R square	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.08	
Number of cases	13087				

Note: *p, **p, ***p, and ****p Indicate Significance at the Level of *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; ****$p < 0.0001$.
Model 1: EXP $= \beta_0 + \beta_1$(Occupations) $+ E$, Professionals Excluded; Model 2 = Model 1 + β_2(Income) + E; Model 3 = Model 1 + Model 2 + β_3(Education) + E, Secondary School Excluded; Model 4 = Model 1 + Model 2 + Model 3 + β_4(Sector) + β_5(Gender) + β_6(Rural vs. Urban) + β_7(Regions) + β_8(Streets) + E; Excluded categories: Professionals, secondary school "Other" Sector, Male, Urban, The Marmara Region and Developed Streets.

TABLE VIII

OLS regression results for the clothing and footwear

Independent variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Estimate	Pr > t	Estimate	Pr > t	Estimate	Pr > t	Estimate	Pr > t
Intercept	1813028	0.0001****	858589	0.0001****	877283	0.0001****	500136	0.2608
Employers	48118	0.7296	−286226	0.0308*	−177129	0.224	209857	0.4069
Self-employed	−438908	0.0003***	−216803	0.0598	−95800	0.4655	274732	0.2598
Casual workers	−922789	0.0001****	−355143	0.006**	−221332	0.1272	−40991	0.7945
Managers	1067889	0.0001****	793249	0.0006***	798259	0.0005***	853952	0.0002***
Clericals	−340799	0.0304*	−24642	0.8692	18746	0.9054	45669	0.7723
Trade & Sale	−722098	0.0005***	−328599	0.0973	−246890	0.2264	−61146	0.7727
Service workers	−477895	0.0007***	−67040	0.6187	38868	0.7922	84397	0.5692
Blue-collar workers	−591421	0.0001****	−180808	0.1215	−59635	0.6543	30479	0.8235
Farmers	109596	0.5307	246609	0.1364	285380	0.0884	321555	0.0592
Others	−660719	0.0001****	−279318	0.0134*	−169768	0.185	193571	0.3943
Income			0.0537	0.0001****	0.05262	0.0001****	0.05201	0.0001****
Illiterate					−106793	0.3866	−25063	0.8441
Literate/no diploma					−179864	0.1934	−122331	0.3805
Elementary school					−169376	0.0557	−136796	0.123
High school					−56216	0.5887	−86128	0.4092
College					75325	0.5734	43924	0.7439
Graduate					−232734	0.6915	−225926	0.6995
State sector							446509	0.0384*
Private sector							193289	0.3843

Female				−114256	0.2875
Aegean				−62480	0.5229
Mediterranean				−231237	0.0076**
Central Anatolia				7383.5534	0.929
Black sea				29981	0.8094
East Anatolia				57152	0.5569
South East Anatolia				5659.3762	0.9561
Rural				137215	0.7032
Undeveloped street				−164211	0.0353*
Middle street				−106724	0.1558
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	
Adjusted R square	0.03	0.13	0.13	0.14	
Number of cases	13087				

Note: *p, **p, ***p, and ****p indicate significance at the level of *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; ****$p < 0.0001$.
Model 1: EXP = β_0 + β_1(occupations) + e, professionals excluded; Model 2 = Model 1 + β_2(income) + e; Model 3 = Model 1 + Model 2+ β_3(education) + e, secondary school excluded; Model 4 = Model 1 + Model 2 + Model 3 + β_4(sector) + β_5(gender) + β_6(rural vs. urban) + β_7(regions) + β_8(streets) + e; Excluded categories: Professionals, secondary school "other" sector, male, urban, the Marmara Region and developed streets.

TABLE IX

OLS regression results for educational spending

Independent variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Estimate	Pr > *t*	Estimate	Pr > *t*	Estimate	Pr > *t*	Estimate	Pr > *t*
Intercept	1333297	0.0001****	−603864	0.0259*	−953659	0.0133*	−561339	0.4027
Employers	537969	0.1546	276867	0.4224	481635	0.2175	585755	0.3615
Self-employed	−754032	0.0207*	−285363	0.3392	−49854	0.889	68870	0.9115
Casual workers	−972952	0.0102*	236431	0.5028	487780	0.2326	307708	0.488
Managers	1875855	0.006**	1576448	0.0113*	1511194	0.0154*	1457522	0.0199*
Clericals	−652877	0.1118	133996	0.7226	192835	0.6343	235559	0.564
Trade & Sale	−945170	0.1655	−306603	0.6225	−175032	0.7839	−326763	0.6175
Service workers	−514656	0.1828	368033	0.302	531505	0.1806	593104	0.138
Blue-collar workers	−931488	0.0039**	−107142	0.7195	139492	0.696	83814	0.817
Farmers	−239002	0.6644	−142528	0.7767	−87870	0.8638	−76575	0.8823
Others	−666763	0.0444*	141765	0.6436	326739	0.355	429027	0.4327
Income			0.09515	0.0001****	0.09385	0.0001****	0.09135	0.0001****
Illiterate					105207	0.7859	157825	0.6925
Literate/no diploma					382087	0.3521	421705	0.3101
Elementary school					74024	0.7555	63607	0.7904
High school					429829	0.1261	443254	0.1184
College					516961	0.1475	575456	0.1129
Graduate					−1692043	0.1748	−156827	0.2097
State sector							−22541	0.9661
Private sector							324885	0.5604
Female							−143192	0.6851

Aegean				−603482	0.036*
Mediterranean				−340090	0.1724
Central Anatolia				−343375	0.1477
Black sea				−415924	0.2724
East Anatolia				−323140	0.2447
South East Anatolia				−261745	0.4138
Rural				−173464	0.2651
Undeveloped street				−286761	0.1924
Middle street				−99546	0.639
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	
Adjusted R square	0.03	0.18	0.19	0.19	
Number of cases	13087				

Note: *p, **p, *** p, and ****p indicate significance at the level of *$p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$, ****$p < 0.0001$; Model 1: EXP = $\beta_0 + \beta_1$(occupations) $+ e$, professionals excluded; Model 2 = Model 1 + β_2(income) + e; Model 3 = Model 1 + Model 2 + β_3(education) + e, secondary school excluded; Model 4 = Model 1 + Model 2 + Model 3 + β_4(sector) + β_5(gender) + β_6(rural vs. urban) + β_7(regions) + β_8(streets) + e; Excluded categories: Professionals, secondary school, "other" sector, male, urban, the Marmara Region and developed streets.

education. This is the net effect of class, regardless of income, education, and other demographic variables.

With respect to gender differences, female household heads spent significantly less on all selected food categories. On the other hand, there were no gender differences in clothing and educational spending. The differences between male and female household heads in food consumption might be due to household size. Selected consumption categories were also varied in terms of region. Although the Southeastern Anatolian region, in most of the Logit analyses, was negatively significant, in five selected consumption categories, there were no differences in consumption patterns between the Southeast and the rest of the regions.

Finally, in Table X, the interaction between income and education in selected categories suggests that bread, cereal, meat, vegetables and fruit consumption within education groups is almost totally driven by income. Specifically, for bread and cereal the first five educational levels are constrained by income, on the other hand, college and graduate degree respondents were not constrained by income. For the first educational group, as income increases, so does spending on clothing. Among the rest, there is no significant interaction between education and income.

However, the interaction effect on educational spending indicates another strong support for Bourdieu's reproduction theory. Income only increases spending on education in college and graduate degree household heads. In first three levels, they do not spend on education, even if their income increases.

CONCLUSION

In the theory section, four general hypotheses are drawn from Bourdieu's reproduction theory and Giddens' class structuration thesis. The first proposition addresses the ways that consumption and lifestyle, and habitus are shaped by the influence of different form of economic, cultural and social capital. Accordingly, in general what the findings revealed is that those household heads with below eighth grade, combined with less income, neighborhood, partly by sectors, demographic locations; and regions, and together with two or three occupations (i.e., casual workers, self-employed,

TABLE X

Interaction between income and education in selected consumption spending: A: Food, B: Clothing and Footwear, C: Education

	Estimate	Standard error	t Value	Pr > t
A: Bread and Cereal				
ed1inc	0.02758	0.00256	10.77	0.0001****
ed2inc	0.03053	0.00396	7.72	0.0001****
ed3inc	0.00896	0.00086	10.42	0.0001****
ed5inc	0.00396	0.00106	3.75	0.0002***
ed6inc	0.00158	0.00121	1.31	0.1912
ed7inc	0.00166	0.00415	0.4	0.6895
B: Clothing				
ed1inc	−0.01212	0.01332	−0.91	0.3628
ed2inc	0.06851	0.02066	3.32	0.0009***
ed3inc	−0.02787	0.00707	−3.94	0.0001****
ed5inc	−0.02683	0.00776	−3.46	0.0006***
ed6inc	−0.0221	0.00844	−2.62	0.0089**
ed7inc	−0.07345	0.01937	−3.79	0.0002***
C: Education				
ed1inc	−0.01719	0.04949	−0.35	0.7284
ed2inc	0.02552	0.04427	0.58	0.5644
ed3inc	−0.01104	0.01828	−0.6	0.5459
ed5inc	0.07727	0.01884	4.1	0.0001****
ed6inc	0.14473	0.01801	8.04	0.0001****
ed7inc	−0.02667	0.0593	−0.45	0.653

Note: *p, **p, *** p, and ****p indicate significance at the level of *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; ****$p < 0.0001$.

and blue-collars workers) in the last models, placed the differentiation in consumption patterns. In addition, the relative effects of each structural variable are tested to see if there is mediation by education, income, gender, and other demographic factors. In general, social class variables had a significant effect on all of the analyzed eight basic dependent variables. Specifically, in the first three models, the relative effects of class, income and educational level are tested. Although income, in almost all the analyzed cases, had a strong positive impact at the 0.0001 level of probability, income did not alter the influence of class differences. However, after educational levels were added, the either positive or negative significance of seven to eight occupations dropped to three to four in both the third and full model. In the final analysis, for total eight variables (central

heating, washer, dishwasher, car, newspaper reading, bread and cereals, clothing and footwear consumption and educational spending) were associated with social class. More specifically, class differences for those eight dependent variables appeared as a cumulative effect, of with each variable contributing in the same direction for income, education, occupation, partly by sector, street level, and rural vs. urban. In short, those who had more income, had above a secondary school level of education (above eight grade), and lived in developed streets, significantly differed from those who had no education or minimal education (below eight grade), lived in undeveloped streets, and belonged to the casual workers, blue collars, self-employed or farmer class categories, depending on the items analyzed. Therefore, educational levels seemed to be an important mediating factor.

In fact, according to Bourdieu, education is the most important factor in predicting consumption, taste and lifestyle. The analysis shows that class structuration occurs through the interaction of income, educational levels, residential locations, sector, and rural vs. urban, and two or three class variables already mentioned casual workers, blue-collars, and farmers. This, according to Bourdieu's approach, can be interpreted as the vertical distinctions and horizontal connections of social class in consumption, lifestyle and habitus.

Further, Aydin (2003, Unpublished dissertation) in another study cross-tabbed a total 27 variables, which were related to consumption patterns and lifestyle differences in Turkey. As the empirical findings showed that salaried high and middle level bureaucrats in public sector, professionals, clericals and employers, respectively, appeared at the top of the social structure in terms of having or owing those analyzed variables. On the other hand, in terms of average monthly income in 1994, employers' average monthly income was $1100, managers earned an average of $818, professionals' monthly income was $667, and finally, clericals earned a monthly average of $474.

However, for most of the items that I analyzed, employers end up in the highest third or, in some cases, in fourth category. This difference can be explained by Bourdieu's cultural capital and economic capital divisions, and habitus. Managers, professionals and clericals are salaried, educated, and mostly work in the public sector. Even though they earned much less than employers, organizational context, work conditions and educational capital within this context

shape the habitus. Therefore, as Bourdieu argued, social class not only relates to economic matters, but to a great extent, cultural capital (habitus) as well. Second, the business class or employers, as compared to professionals and managerial groups, had less bourgeois consumption patterns (Aydin, 2003, Unpublished dissertation).

This, in Turkey' peculiar political structure, is not surprising because the economy in the final analysis is largely still controlled by them and even if employers/owners earn more than managers/bureaucrats do. This is so, because within the last 200 years even though actors changed, the "neo-patrimonial" bureaucratic sovereign social structure more or less continues (Aydin, 2003, Unpublished dissertation). In summary, the legacy of modern Turkey is still the political structure, continuation and reproduction of Ottoman pattern of two ideal social (ruler/and ruled) classes which fits more into a Weberian framework than a Marxian one (Mardin, 1980).

Second, gender differences between heads of households, in terms of ownership of appliances, there were no statistically significant differences between male and female, except for car ownership and newspaper reading. However, female household heads spent significantly less money on bread and cereals. This effect may be due to household size. However, again there were no differences found in education, clothing and footwear spending.

Selected consumption categories were also varied in terms of regions. Although, the Southern Anatolian Region, in most of the logit analyses, was negatively significant, there were no differences in consumption patterns between the Southeast and the rest of the regions.

In this study, the data contained information from whole country. Therefore, in addition to income, education and occupation, there were also other intervening and mediating factors, such as region, sector and rural vs. urban. On the other hand, social class differences are observable in the cities than in other parts of the country. This data is very heterogeneous. For example, even the farmers differ a great deal among themselves in terms of income. The next study should focus on three big cities in Turkey, and analyze the data for those cities. Reducing 11 occupations to four to five may yield results that are more significant. The next step should be to conduct a time series analysis to record the changes and make comparisons.

NOTES.

[1] Detailed information on the technical structure, method and implementation of the survey can be found in two books published by the State Institute of Statistics: "Household Consumption Expenditure Survey Results 1994" and "Hanehalki Tuketim Harcamalari Yontem ve Kavramlari 1994".

[2] In the original data, there were two kinds of washer recorded differently. In logit analyses, I have combined them and assigned as 0: not having; 1: having. Therefore negative sign in the washer case indicate probability of not having, positive sign indicate probability of having i.e., the log odds for the probability of not having washer for managers is −0.29, on the other hand, the probability of being zero (not having) washer for self-employed is 2.80.

REFERENCES

Bali, R.: 2002, Tarz-i Hayat'tan Life Style'a: Yeni Seckinler, Yeni Mekanlar, Yeni Yasamlar. Bali, Rifat. Iletisim Yayinlari, Istanbul (From Tarz-i Hayat to Lifestyle: New Elites, New Social Spaces and New Lives).

Bihagen, E.: 1999, 'How do classes make use of their incomes?', Social Indicators Research 47, pp. 119–151.

Bourdieu, P.: 1977, Outline of a Theory of Practice. Translated by Richard Nice (Cambridge University Press, New York).

Bourdieu, P.: 1984, Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement and Taste. Translated by Richard Nice (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London).

Brubaker, R.: 1985, 'Rethinking classical theory: the sociological vision of pierre bourdieu', Theory and Society (14), p. 748.

Campbell, C.: 1995, The Sociology of Consumption: Acknowledging Consumption, in D. Miller (ed.) (Routledge, London and New York).

Castells, M.: 1997, The Power of Identity (Blackwell, Malden, Mass).

Davis, J.: 1982, 'Achievement variables and class cultures: family, schooling, job, and forty-nine dependent variables in cumulative GSS', American Sociological Review 47, pp. 569–586.

Devlet Istatistik Enstitusu (State Institute of Statistics): 1994. Hanehalki Tuketim Harcamalri Sonuclari (Household Consumption Expenditure Survey Results 1994). Devlet Istatistik Enstitusu Matbaasi. Ankara.

Devlet Istatistik Enstitusu (State Institute of Statistics): 1994. Hanehalki Tuketim Harcamalari Yontem ve Kavramlari. T.C. Basbakanlik (Devlet Istatistik Enstitusu, Ankara).

DiMaggio, P.: 1987, 'Classification in Art', American Sociological Review 52 pp. 440–455.

Douglas, M. and B. Isherwood: 1979. The World of Goods: Towards and Anthropology of Consumption (Routledge, London).

Eyerman, R.: 1992, 'Modernity and social movements', in Hans Haferkamp and Neil J. Smelser (eds.), Social Change and Modernity (University of California Press, Berkeley).

Featherstone, M.: 1991, Consumer Culture and Postmodernism (Sage, London).

Gartman, D.: 1991, 'Culture as class symbolization or mass reification? A critique of Bourdieu's distinction', American Journal of Sociology 97, pp. 421–447.
Giddens, A.: 1973, The Class Structure of Advanced Societies (Hutchinson, England).
Gole, N.: 1991, Modern Mahrem: Medeniyet ve Ortunme (Istanbul, Metis).
Grusky, B.D.: 1994, Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective (Westview Press, Boulder).
Gurbilek, N.: 1992, Vitrinde Yasamak: 1980'lerin Kulturel Iklimi (Istanbul, Metis Yayinlari).
Kozanoglu, C.: 2001, Yeni Sehir Notlari (Istanbul, Iletisim Yayinlari).
Long, S.J.: 1997, Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables (Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks).
Manza, J. and Brooks, C.: 1998, Social Cleavages and Political Change (Oxford University Press, Oxford).
Mardin S.: 1980, 'Turkey: the transformation of an economic code' in Ergun Ozbudun and Aydin Ulusan (eds.), The Political Economy of Income Distribution in Turkey (Holmes and Meier Publishers, New York).
Melucci, A.: 1996, Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York).
Offe, C.: 1985, 'New social movements: challenging the boundaries of institutional politics', Social Research 52 (Winter), p. 4.
Ozcan, K., T. Sibel and D. Ilkay: 2002, 'Basic food consumption in Turkey: effects of income, price and family size in urban areas', www.bilkent .edu.tr/kivilcim
Pakulsky, J. and M. Waters: 1996, Death of Class (Sage, London).
Pinarcioglu, M. and O. Isik: 2001, 'Kent Yoksullarinin Ag Iliskileri' Toplum ve Bilim. Yaz 2001, p. 89.
Slater, D.: 1997, Consumer Culture and Modernity (Polity Press, Cambridge).
Sozen, E.: 1999, Kimliklerimiz (Istanbul, Birey Yayincilik).
Swartz, D.: 1997, Culture and Power (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago).
Warde, A., L. Martens and W. Olsen: 1999, 'Consumption and the problem of variety: cultural omnivorousness, social distinction and dining out', Sociology 33, p. 1–105–127.
Wright, E.O.: 1996, Class Counts (Cambridge University Press, New York).

Uludag University
Sociology
Gorukle Kampusu
Niluber Hatun Ogrenci Yurdu
Bursa 16059
Turkey
E-mail: kemalaydin709@yahoo.com