

## A CONCEPTIONAL EXAMINATION OF URBAN POVERTY: UNDER-CLASS OR GHETTO POVERTY?

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Doğan BIÇKI\*  
Arş. Gör. Serhat ÖZGÖKÇELER\*\*

### ABSTRACT

In this paper, the basic concepts commonly used in the discussions of urban poverty are briefly examined. As a result of this examination, the main aim of this study is to provide guidance to the general reader with no mastery of the literature of the concepts used in the analysis related to the problem of urban poverty; on the other hand, to provide introductory information for those researchers recently interested in the literature. It is because the arbitrary usage of some of the concepts related to poverty such as the interchangeable use of underclass and lower-class, similar to all other conceptualizations, invalidates the efforts trying to understand and explain them.

Therefore, there certainly is a need to decide whether foreign concepts borrowed from different cultural contexts are usable to describe domestic facts and cases.

**Key Words:** Absolute Poverty, Relative Poverty, Social Exclusion, Underclass, Ghetto [Neighborhood] Poverty

### ÖZET

#### KENTSEL YOKSULLAR ÜZERİNE KAVRAMSAL BİR İRDELEME: “SINIF-ALTI” ya da “GETTO YOKSULLUĞU”

Bu yazıda, kentsel yoksulluk tartışmalarında sıklıkla kullanılan temel kavramlar kısaca gözden geçirilmektedir. Bu gözden geçirme

çalışması neticesinde, bir yandan kentsel yoksulluk sorunuyla ilgili analizlerde kullanılan kavramlar konusunda literatüre vukufu olmayan genel okuyucuya rehberlik edilmesi; diğer yandan, literatüre yeni ilgi duyan araştırmacılar için giriş mahiyetinde bir ön bilgi oluşturulması hedeflenmektedir. Zira diğer tüm kavramlaştırmalarda olduğu gibi, yoksullukla ilgili bazı kavramların gelişi güzel kullanımı, örneğin, “sınıf-altı” ile “alt-sınıf”ın bir birinin yerine ikâmesi gibi, anlamak ve açıklamak yönünde sürdürülen çabaları boşa çıkarmaktadır.

Dolayısıyla, farklı kültürel bağlamlardan tevarüs edilmiş yabancı kavramların, yerli olgu ve olayları tanımlamaya elverişli olup olmadığının tartışılmasına ihtiyaç bulunmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Mutlak Yoksulluk, Göreli Yoksulluk, Sosyal Dışlanma, Sınıf-altı, Getto Yoksulluğu

### 1. Introduction

The regime of national welfare state in force after the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War has turned out to be the fundamental mechanism dissolving socio-spatial disparity through long-term transfer of resources across regions. *The cleansing of the inter-city slums and the relative reduction of the cross-regional developmental differences* seem to be the result of a systematic socio-spatial redistribution. In this connection, thanks to the changing role of the state, efforts in order to reduce the costs of social security have increased the socio-spatial disparity. The economic field under the new circumstances has been given a new shape opening itself for international competition. The increasing competition on the inter-regional and cross-regional scales has resulted in the deepening of *unemployment, poverty and social polarization*<sup>1</sup>.

The concept of *urban poverty* describes the tendency for the concentration of poverty in certain urban areas under the influence of globalization processes<sup>2</sup>. This concept that has such usages as *the new*

<sup>1</sup> Erik Swyngedouw, “Excluding the Other: The Production of Scale and Scaled Politics”, **Geographies of Economies**, eds. Roger Lee & Jane Wills, London: Arnold, 1997, p. 174.

<sup>2</sup> Karen Macours & Johan F.M. Swinnen, “Rural – Urban Poverty Differences in Transition Countries”, **LICOS Centre for Institutions and Economic Performance**, Discussion Papers, No. 169, 2007, pp. 1–3.

\* Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Sciences & Arts, Sociology Department.

\*\* Uludag University, Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences, Labour Economics & Industrial Relations Department.

*poor* and *underclass poverty* in the relevant literature describes a *different* type of poverty from the commonly accepted concept of poverty.

What differentiates the *new urban poverty* from commonly accepted definition is the fact that groups of people with no history of any financial problems before have started to suffer from poverty as a result of transformations in the global economic field, that this poverty has turned out to be a relatively *persistent* one and that these groups have been excluded from socio-spatial processes. Urban poverty in some cases is described and dealt with as underclass poverty. The underclass is described as *those with no regular jobs or with no job at all, are dependent on financial state support, with a high potential to commit a crime and with no or very poor quality of accommodation*<sup>3</sup>. What is described as the underclass is generally found in the cities in the United States and in metropolises known as *World City/Global City*. Though not as widespread, it has been observed that similar groups of people have started to emerge in the biggest cities of the developing countries. Surviving their lives on the cardboards under the skyscrapers and in suburban metro stations reveals the social and spatial “**displacement**” of those groups. The fact that skyscrapers and metro stations seen as icons of wealth and development have turned out to be the stages of the cardboard lives of those groups reveals the extent of the inequality of this wealth.

In this study, some basic concepts frequently used in the discussions of urban poverty will be briefly examined. As result of this examination, this study aims, on the one hand, to guide a general reader

<sup>3</sup> The term underclass translated as ‘**sinif-alti**’ into Turkish has a different emphasis from the term lower-class [**alt-sinif**]. Sometimes without paying attention to this difference, “underclass” is observed to have been <able to be> translated as *alt-sinif* [lower-class]. One factor that may tolerate not being careful about this difference is that the concept of “underclass” that is heavily referred to in *American* and *Anglo-Saxon* literature does not have definitive/clear meaning. Within the context of other countries, it is quite hard to characterize a group that can be comparably defined by the concept “underclass”. It is because the qualities assumed to define the group in question have some heavy ethnic/cultural specifications. The fact that this concept does not have a corresponding equal word in Turkish just like in many other cultures, is a happy indication that there does not exist such a group that this term describes.

with no proficiency of the concepts used in the analysis of urban poverty issues; and on the other hand, to provide basic introductory information for the young researchers interested in the relevant literature. It is because, similar to all other conceptualizations, the non-uniform and casual usage of the certain concepts about poverty such as replacing *underclass* with *lower-class*, invalidates the principle aim of the social sciences, which is to explain and understand. Therefore, there is a definite need to argue and challenge whether foreign concepts emerging from different cultural contexts are relevantly capable of describing local phenomenon.

## 2. Some Basic Concepts Related with Poverty:

### *Absolute Poverty, Relative Poverty and Social Exclusion*

Defining the concept of poverty comprises of many difficulties due to the inherently dynamic and relative characteristics. The difficulty in defining and the resulting difficulty in quantifying the concept have been appeased by a method of analysis focusing on separation of the different dimensions of poverty. In other words, it has become relevant and necessary to establish what kind of deprivations the concept of poverty has included. In this connection, there basically appear two kinds of poverty: *Absolute Poverty* and *Relative Poverty*.

*Absolute poverty* is characterized by the economical strength of the individual based on an individual’s income and spending. The estimation made according to consumption expenditure are made in relation to the expenditure needed for an individual to biologically procreate him/herself taking the calories and other nutrition constituents that are the basic nourishment needed daily. Accordingly, the financial cost of the least expensive food expenditure constitutes a threshold; those who are under this threshold due to lack of sufficient income are characterized as “**absolute poor**”<sup>4</sup>. The notion of absolute poverty, despite containing many problems, seems to be a convenient one to describe the poverty of under developed countries facing

<sup>4</sup> Ravi Kanbur & Diganta Mukherjee, “Poverty, relative to the ability to eradicate it: An index of poverty reduction failure”, *Economics Letters*, No. 97, 2007, pp. 52 – 3.

*undernourishment* that also includes *starvation*<sup>5</sup>. The World Bank [WB] characterizes people with an income unable to afford nutrition constituents of minimum 2.400 calories as absolute poor. Based on this criterion, one dollar a day is the limit of absolute poverty. However, the measure of one dollar a day of absolute poverty has been redefined according to the level of “development” of the countries. This limit is *four dollars* for the group of *Eastern European* countries into which *Turkey* has also been added<sup>6</sup>.

In addition, the one-dollar-standard as a limit of poverty as determined by the WB has been criticized with the argument that “*the global scale of the poverty is being disguised*”. Accordingly, the number of the poor in the world is being manipulated and exposed less than what it already is. Thus, should the one-dollar-a-day threshold be accepted the limit of poverty, it can then be concluded that it is only the 1/5 [1,2 billion] of the world’s population are poor. Based on this estimation, the WB contends that poverty is in decline in under developed countries, and calls attention to the fact that poverty is a problem unique to Third World Countries<sup>7</sup>. Given the criterion of one-dollar-a-day, the poor in developed countries suddenly *disappear*. Therefore, in order to make up for the existing insufficiency in the definition of absolute power, a new term referred to as “relative poverty” has been introduced.

**Relative poverty**, given the fact that an individual is a social being, recommends the designation of the level of consumption and living in order to be able to actively reproduce him/herself<sup>8</sup>. Therefore, this index of poverty commonly used in developed countries covers those with an

<sup>5</sup> Fikret Senses, **Kuresellesmenin Oteki Yuzu: Yoksulluk** [The Other Face of Globalisation: Poverty], Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari, 2001, p. 63.

<sup>6</sup> Ali Seyyar, “Sosyal Siyaset Acisindan Yoksullukla Mucadele” [Fighting with Poverty from the Perspective of Social Policy], **Yoksulluk, Vol. I**, eds. Ahmet Emre Bilgili & Ibrahim Altan, Istanbul: Deniz Feneri Yayinlari, 2003, p. 39.

<sup>7</sup> Yasemin Ozdek, “Kuresel Yoksulluk ve Kuresel Siddet Kiskacinda Insan Haklari” [Human Rights Under the Pressure of Global Poverty and Global Violence], **Yoksulluk, Siddet ve Insan Haklari** ed. Y. Ozdek, Ankara: Türkiye ve Ortadoğu Amme Idaresi Enstitusu [TODAIE] Insan Haklari Arastirma ve Derleme Merkezi Yayini, May, 2002, p. 3.

<sup>8</sup> Lutfi Sunar, “Yoksullugun Onlenmesinde Sivil Toplumun Rolu ve Gonul Kusagi Projesi” [The Role of Civil Society and Project of *Gonul Kusagi*], **Yoksulluk, Vol. III**, eds. Ahmet Emre Bilgili & Ibrahim Altan, Istanbul: Deniz Feneri Yayinlari, 2003, p. 133.

income well below the average income in that country. In the *EU* countries today, the level of relative poverty covers those with a *middle income* under the *fifty percent*<sup>9</sup>. The level of relative poverty used in developed countries is directly related with “the structure of income distribution”. For instance, the rate of relative poverty in *France* is higher than the one in *Slovakia*; it is because, though the average income in *Slovakia* is *not lower* than the one in *France*, the income distribution is simply better. However, an average poor in *Slovakia* is absolutely *poorer*<sup>10</sup> than an average poor in *France*. Accordingly, while the notion of relative poverty is usable to determine the conditions of the poor in a society in comparison to the other members, it is inappropriate to make cross national comparisons.

Within the framework of this comparison, while absolute poverty can be eliminated through *economic growth* and *development*; we seem to have accepted that relative poverty will always be with us<sup>11</sup>. The disadvantages inherent in both notions have drifted the direction of the poverty analysis from economic deprivation to social one. In this connection, **social exclusion** as the source of social deprivations and the concept of “spatial cleavage”<sup>12</sup> as its spatial expression has become a part of the debate of poverty.

<sup>9</sup> **Median income**, in a population of 100 people, when individuals are put in order of the lowest zero to the highest 100, this term signifies the income of the 50<sup>th</sup> person as a reference. In other words, it represents the “median income”. In addition, it is necessary to differentiate “median income” from the “average income”. The average income is obtained by dividing the income of 100 persons by the number 100. However, in a community in which one person earns 100 liras and the rest of the 99 persons earn only 1 lira, the resulting average income may be very different from the middle income distributed between 0 and 100. In determining the relative poverty, the income under the 50% level in *European* and *OECD* standards and also the middle income used in *Turkey*, the income under the 40% in the *USA* and the one under 60% in *Sweden* are taken into account. Ahmet Insel, “Yoksulluk, Dislanma ve STK’lar” [Poverty, Exclusion and NGOs], **Sivil Toplum ve Demokrasi Konferans Yazilari-6**, ed. Arzu Karamani, Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Sivil Toplum Kuruluslari Egitim ve Arastirma Birimi Yayinlari, 2005, p. 8.

<sup>10</sup> Ahmet Insel, “İki Yoksulluk Tanimi ve Bir Oneri” [Two Definitions of Poverty and One Suggestion], **Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi**, No. 89, 2001, pp. 64–6.

<sup>11</sup> Michael Pachione [ed.], “Urban Restructuring and the Reproduction of Inequality in Britain’s Cities”, **Britain’s Cities**, London: Routledge, 1997, p. 42.

<sup>12</sup> “*Spatial Cleavage*”, characterizes various disadvantages that some parts of the urban group have [for instance, *being poor; unemployed; subjected to social exclusion; unorganized in terms of utilizing social resources; lack of education and unable to receive sufficient public*

Atkinson and Davoudi<sup>13</sup> characterize the concept of social exclusion as “processes” and “models” that generalize the disadvantages related to *education, healthcare, accommodation and financial resources*. According to Amartya K. Sen<sup>14</sup>, the general framework of social exclusion is constituted by larger in capabilities such as *employment, social security, education, healthcare, nourishment, accommodation, skills, politics and culture*. Duffy<sup>15</sup>, on the other hand, defined the same term as a condition of incapability in participating the *political, cultural, social and economical life and alienation from the axis of the society and drifting away from it*.

Social exclusion, since 1980s, has been characterized in relation to concepts of unemployment, inequality, and poverty. The reasons of social exclusion such as *unemployment, inequality, poverty, lack of education, disadvantages in the field of labour, homelessness, illiteracy, being in risky conditions* are the facts that prevent people from integrating into the social life. However, it is difficult for every person exposed to unemployment, poverty or inequality to be accepted as socially excluded in every society and at all time periods. It is mainly because who will be accepted as poor based on which criterion and what kind of social protections s/he will benefit from changes from one country to another<sup>16</sup>.

---

*service* etc.] therefore their separation from the relatively well –off and median income groups, mingling with groups with similar social status in various urban spaces, due to their concentration in homogeneous social spaces regarding poverty and other disadvantages, and basically characterizes their deprivation of the necessary means to get rid of poverty.

<sup>13</sup> Rob Atkinson & Simin Davoudi, “The Concept of Social Exclusion in the European Union: Context, Development and Possibilities”, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 3, 2000, pp. 427–28.

<sup>14</sup> Amartya K. Sen, *Development as Freedom*, New York: Knopf Press, 1999, p. 79.

<sup>15</sup> K. Duffy, *Social Exclusion and Human Dignity in Europe*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1995, p. 18.

<sup>16</sup> Serhat Ozgokceler, “Sosyal Dislanma Sorunsali ve Engellilerin Sosyal Politikasi Baglaminda Degerlendirilmesi” [The Problematic of Social Exclusion and Examination of the Social Policy of the Disabled People], [Graduate Thesis, Uludag University, Institute of Social Sciences, 2006], pp. 21–2.

On the other hand, the relationship between *social exclusion and poverty*<sup>17</sup> can be established in this way. If a person has been exposed to the risk of social exclusion; that person has a limited capability in effectively integrating into the society<sup>18</sup>. “*Capability*” is an ability of being able to function effectively in a society and integrating into the society equally and thoroughly. Therefore, the concept of capability establishes the connection between poverty and social exclusion; social exclusion characterizes the absence of basic skills that make people poor. In this connection, poverty is not the case of being less well-off; it is the case of incapability of maintaining being well-off due to the deprivation of economic means. In other words, it is the case of being deprived of basic economic tools required to get rid of poverty<sup>19</sup>.

If poverty is considered from this perspective, it is clearly observed that the urban poor are faced with a dual disadvantage. The urban poor, on the one hand, experience a real situation of poverty; on the other hand, they lose their chance of being together with people with knowledge/skills/social connection who could support their efforts in improving their living conditions. The weakness of the social connection that helps people to realize their goals creates an environment deprived of effective community norms. In such environments of poverty, there appears an increased tendency of irregular attitudes via cultural socialization and taking people as role-models. Persons raised in such a climate internalize a negative attitude towards regular *work-family-education* institutions. On the other hand, the feeling of insecurity and threat experienced in the areas of poverty compel persons to avoid getting in touch with other people apart from their own relatives and friends. This situation has a negative impact on efforts exerted for the purposes of *social integration*<sup>20</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> Espen Dahl, Tone Fløtten & Thomas Lorentzen, “Poverty Dynamics and Social Exclusion: An Analysis of Norwegian Panel Data”, *Journal of Social Policy*, Vol. 37, No. 2, 2008, pp. 232–34.

<sup>18</sup> David Brady, “Rethinking the Sociological Measurement of Poverty”, *Social Forces*, Vol. 81, No. 3, 2003, pp. 723–24.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, p. 725.

<sup>20</sup> Bruce H. Rankin & James M. Quane, “Neighborhood Poverty and the Social Isolation of Inner-City African American Families”, *Social Forces*, Vol. 79, No. 1, September 2000, pp. 142–43.

On the other hand, the characterization of “*who*” will be regarded as poor and “*under which criterion*” automatically reveals the dimension related to the analysis of the urban poor. The problem related to the analysis of the urban poor has been overcome by efforts trying to discriminate the various dimensions related to the poverty experiences of the masses in question. Within those dimensions, ways of description based on “*time*”, “*space*” and “*behavior*” are foregrounded.

### 3. The Basic Dimensions Used in the Analysis of Poverty:

#### “Time”, “Space” and “Behavior”

In the definition of poverty in respect of time, the fact that persons and families have been poor for a long time is used as data. Since it lasts for a “long time”, this type of poverty is characterized as *persistent poverty*. The type of poverty defined in respect of “space”; is characterized as *ghetto poverty* due to high unemployment rate and inadequate accommodation and it is also referred to as *neighborhood poverty* due to its concentration in the certain areas of the city. The characterization of poverty in respect of “behavior” describes *underclass poverty* in which there is a tendency to be different from the rest of the community in terms of participation in the work life and in ethical issues<sup>21</sup>. Despite a conceptual difference between *underclass* and *ghetto poverty*, those two concepts are used interchangeably.

### 4. The Difference Between Under-class and Ghetto Poverty

The concept of underclass<sup>22</sup>, as the term itself suggests does not characterize a group that are lower-class; but instead characterizes a section that does not belong to one of the social or economical classes due to their behavior characteristics, that has no ethical norms compatible with the rest of the community at large and that has no chance of vertical improvement because of being mostly unemployed,

<sup>21</sup> Paul A. Jargowsky & Mary Jo Bane, “Ghetto Poverty in the United States, 1970–1980”, **The Urban Underclass**, eds. Christopher Jencks & Paul E. Peterson, Washington D.C: The Brookings Institution, 1991, pp. 235–36.

<sup>22</sup> Christopher T. Whelan, “Marginalization, deprivation, and fatalism in the Republic of Ireland: class and underclass perspectives”, **European Sociological Review**, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1996, pp. 33 – 7.

dependant on financial aid and lack of education accompanied by some ethnic disadvantages.

According to *Bauman*<sup>23</sup>; one of the most significant services offered by underclass for the society today is now to attract fears and concerns not consumed by a powerful external enemy. In this connection, underclass, being an important remedy for the common mental health, seems to be an internal enemy ready to replace the external one. Another conspicuous aspect in Bauman’s underclass analysis is his approach to relationship between *consumer society* and *poverty*. According to Bauman; since there is no longer any need for mass labour work in mass production in a consumer society, the poor once view as a peripheral work force have now been converted into defective consumers. In this connection, if being poor in the past came to mean “*being unemployed*”; it now actually means “*not consuming enough*”.

Bauman’s approach is important in that it reminds us of the lack of concentration on insufficient consumption capacity in the characterization of poverty. It is because the significance of the capacity of production that is one of the most important tools of a poor to participate in the community seems to have been overlooked. The reorganization of economy with the framework of globalization, by restricting the capacity of this mass in order to become producers, gives rise to the exclusion of the poor both from the employment processes and from social decision-making processes.

In the study related to urban poverty, a clear distinction has not been drawn between ghetto poverty defined by a *high concentration of poverty in urban spaces* and underclass poverty defined by *behavioral features*. One reason for this is that it is thought that the analysis of the problem through moral factors gives rise to a perception of “holding the victim responsible” and thus legitimizing political attitudes that ignore the problem of poverty. For instance, *Fainstein, Gordon and Harloe*<sup>24</sup>, who regard the moral distinction between underclass and other types of

<sup>23</sup> Zygmunt Bauman, **Calisma, Tuketicilik ve Yeni Yoksullar** [Work, Consumerism and the New Poor], Istanbul: Sarmal Yayinevi, February 1999, p.10; 108.

<sup>24</sup> Susan S. Fainstein, Ian Gordon & Michael Harloe [eds.], **Divided Cities: New York & London in the Contemporary World** [Studies in Urban and Social Change], London: Blackwell Publishers, 2000, p. 10.

poverty as efforts by the right-wing governments to legitimize the national urban policies, claim in *Divided Cities*, in which underclass phenomenon of 'New York' and 'London' are comparatively analyzed, that while the underclass, until early 1980s, was limited to immigrant workers who were low paid, non-white and at the "bottom" of the American labour market; but they now claim that it has started to include all types of poor with weak ties to the formal labour market due to the deepening problem of unemployment and thus the spatial focus has expanded.

According to *Wilson*, who supports the same view; what differentiates the underclass from other economically disadvantaged groups is their marginal economic situation or weak connections with the labourforce; which is further intensified by social environment and accommodation<sup>25</sup>. From this point of view, it is not possible to analyze poverty by moral or behavioral factors. The fact that one belongs to the formal labor market or not, if taken one of the basic variables, spatial focus expands and becomes uncertain. Based on this, while preserving the possibility of revealing cultural differences between various types of the poor, it is commonly accepted that there will be no one poverty culture that will unify all the underclasses<sup>26</sup>.

The other reason why there is no "clear" distinction between underclass poverty and ghetto poverty is that some authors implicitly or explicitly regard the aspect of poverty related to behavior more "problematic" than economic deprivation and in this connection, what is meant by poverty as a problem is the underclass type of poverty<sup>27</sup>. The

<sup>25</sup> William Julius Wilson, "Another Look at the -Truly- Disadvantaged", *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 106, Issue 4, Winter '91-'92, p. 653.

<sup>26</sup> For instance, in a research in which an underclass group was studied to see whether they had an attitude and behavior different from the rest of the community, it was concluded that the underclass people were not in a position to "not to have a work ethic". According to *Leonard*; the problem of underclass in 'Belfast' is not defined in respect of individuals' different behaviors/ethical attitudes, but it is dependant on informal labour demand or insufficiency of the formal sector. Madeleine Leonard, "The Long-Term Unemployed, informal economic activity and the underclass in Belfast: rejecting or reinstating the work ethic", *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research [IJURR]*, Vol. 22, No. 1, 1998, p. 56.

<sup>27</sup> As an example of these types of attitudes, the opinions explained in *Murray's* study titled "*Losing Ground*" that is frequently referred to in studies on the analysis of poverty through

authors, who adopt this view, claim that underclass type of poverty generates a negative ethical view against working. There seems to be the impact of encouragement of immeasurable social support in the development of this new ethic. To put it in another way, since the income the unemployed persons acquire without working [*state support*] will be sufficient enough to get by with basic living standard, though not as much as what they would get while working, some seem to think that there is tendency to choose not to work<sup>28</sup>.

In addition, with *American cities* clearly leading the way, some of the characteristics such as the fact that there is a high rate of crime related to underclass settlements; that contribution of poverty as a culture to production and that there is an inherent ethnical discrimination provide support to the tendency in question. According to this perspective, while it is not ignored that some structural factors have a role to play in the creation of underclass, it is not regarded as appropriate to reduce its creation solely to these factors.

## 5. Conclusion

As a consequence, in the contexts where *behavioral dimensions* of the urban poverty are emphasized, the concept of "underclass poverty" is foregrounded; on the other hand, in contexts where *spatial factors* and *structural reasons* are emphasized, "the concept of ghetto poverty" is foregrounded. It is because some characteristics such as *unemployment*, *lack of education* and sometimes *ethnic disadvantages* that combine both categories make it unnecessary to rigidly differentiate between the two categories in question. Therefore, the concept "the urban poor"<sup>29</sup> turns

---

cultural elements, can be used. Charles Murray, *Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950-1980*, USA: Basic Books, 1994.

<sup>28</sup> According to *Hoffman* and *Duncan*; these types of opinions expressed by researchers such as *Mead*, *Murray* and *Ellwood*, do not enable to explain the relationship between not working and financial state support. It is because, despite the fact that the welfare support of the state has been recently **diminishing**; the fact that working rate **has not been increasing**; invalidates the opinion that the state's supports in question encourage people not to work. Saul D. Hoffman & Greg J. Duncan, "Teenage Underclass Behavior and Subsequent Poverty: Have The Rules Changed?", *The Urban Underclass*, eds. Paul E. Peterson & Christopher Jencks, Washington D.C: The Brookings Institution, 1991, p. 166.

<sup>29</sup> Concern about urban poverty has resurfaced recently because globalization and the subsequent reorientation of public policy towards market competitiveness are creating concentrated poverty in urban areas. The United Nations Centre for Human Settlements states that *today*,

out to be a higher framework encompassing both the spatial and behavioral dimensions of poverty.

While the dimensions of poverty in respect of “time” and “behavior” are emphasized more when the fact of urban poverty is subjected to theoretical analysis, the dimensions related to “spatial” concentration are emphasized more in empirical analyses. There are two reasons for this: *The first one*, is the fact that the definition of poverty in respect of time does not have a “specific” spatial reference. In other words, neither ghetto poverty nor underclass poverty inherently accommodates the dimension of time. *The second one*, the underclass poverty defined in respect of behavior is an exceptional situation for many geographies including *Turkey* and is lacking a spatial focus similar to the time dimension. For instance, apart from a group of children who are homeless and addicted to paint thinner or glue or other similar groups, a more common phenomenon *has not been observed* in Turkey. Moreover; in Turkey the availability of means such as unemployment salary, that help individuals to get by without having to work, is *too limited* to play a significant role.

On the other hand, cases such child-bearing out of wedlock and teenage pregnancy that are supposed to encourage the underclass, are both limited and are not usable ways of qualifying for financial state support. However, this is not an obstacle in order to analyze to understand whether the ghetto poor are encouraged by a kind of behavior divergent of the general social values of the society.

---

*poverty is more central than ever to the human settlements discourse, for the plain fact that decent housing and basic services are no more provided by the public sector, but have increasingly become a commodity to be accessed in the marketplace.* Hamnett, C.; “Social segregation and social polarization”, **Handbook of urban studies**, ed. R. Paddison London: Sage Publ., 2001

## References

- Atkinson, Rob & Simin Davoudi; “The Concept of Social Exclusion in the European Union: Context, Development and Possibilities”, **Journal of Common Market Studies**, Vol. 38, No. 3, 2000, pp. 427-28.
- Bauman, Zygmunt; **Calisma, Tuketicilik ve Yeni Yoksullar** [Work, Consumerism and the New Poor], Istanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi, February 1999.
- Brady, David; “Rethinking the Sociological Measurement of Poverty”, **Social Forces**, Vol. 81, No. 3, 2003, pp. 723-24.
- Dahl, Espen, Fløtten, Tone & Thomas Lorentzen; “Poverty Dynamics and Social Exclusion: An Analysis of Norwegian Panel Data”, **Journal of Social Policy**, Vol. 37, No. 2, 2008, pp. 232-34.
- Duffy, Katherine; **Social Exclusion and Human Dignity in Europe**, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1995, p. 18.
- Fainstein, Susan S., Gordon, Ian & Michael Harloe [eds.]; **Divided Cities: New York & London in the Contemporary World [Studies in Urban and Social Change]**, London: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- Hamnett, C.; “Social Segregation and Social Polarization”, **Handbook of Urban Studies**, ed. R. Paddison, London: Sage Publ., 2001.
- Hoffman, Saul D. & Greg J. Duncan, “Teenage Underclass Behavior and Subsequent Poverty: Have The Rules Changed?”, **The Urban Underclass**, eds. Paul E. Peterson & Christopher Jencks, Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1991, p. 166.
- Insel, Ahmet; “İki Yoksulluk Tanımı ve Bir Oneri” [Two Definitions of Poverty and One Suggestion], **Toplum ve Bilim Dergisi**, No. 89, 2001, pp. 64-6.
- Insel, Ahmet; “Yoksulluk, Dislanma ve STK’lar” [Poverty, Exclusion and NGOs], **Sivil Toplum ve Demokrasi Konferans Yazıları-6**, ed. Arzu Karamani, Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları Eğitim ve Araştırma Birimi Yayınları, 2005, p. 8.
- Jargowsky, Paul A. & Mary Jo Bane; “Ghetto Poverty in the United States, 1970-1980”, **The Urban Underclass**, eds. Christopher Jencks & Paul E. Peterson, Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1991, pp. 235-36.
- Kanbur, Ravi & Diganta Mukherjee; “Poverty, Relative to the Ability to Eradicate It: An Index of Poverty Reduction Failure”, **Economics Letters**, No. 97, 2007, pp. 52-3.
- Leonard, Madeleine; “The Long-Term Unemployed, Informal Economic Activity and the Underclass in Belfast: Rejecting or Reinstating the Work Ethic”, **International Journal of Urban and Regional Research [IJURR]**, Vol. 22, No. 1, 1998, p. 56.
- Macours, Karen & Johan F.M. Swinnen; “Rural-Urban Poverty Differences in Transition Countries”, **LICOS Centre for Institutions and Economic Performance**, Discussion Papers, No. 169, 2007, pp. 1-3.
- Murray, Charles; **Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950-1980**, USA: Basic Books, 1994.

- Ozdek, Yasemin; "Kuresel Yoksulluk ve Kuresel Siddet Kiskacinda Insan Haklari" [Human Rights Under the Pressure of Global Poverty and Gobar Violence], **Yoksulluk, Siddet ve Insan Haklari**, ed. Y. Ozdek, Ankara: Türkiye ve Ortadoğu Amme Idaresi Enstitusu [TODAIE] Insan Haklari Arastirma ve Derleme Merkezi Yayini, May 2002, p. 3.
- Ozgekceler, Serhat; "Sosyal Dislanma Sorunsali ve Engellilerin Sosyal Politikasi Baglaminda Degerlendirilmesi" [The Problematic of Social Exclusion and Examination of the Social Policy of the Disabled People], [MA Thesis, Uludag University, Institute of Social Sciences, 2006].
- Pachione, Michael [ed.]; "Urban Restructuring and the Reproduction of Inequality in Britain's Cities", **Britain's Cities**, London: Routledge, 1997, p. 42.
- Rankin, Bruce H. & James M. Quane; "Neighborhood Poverty and the Social Isolation of Inner-City African American Families", **Social Forces**, Vol. 79, No. 1, September 2000, pp. 142-43.
- Sen, Amartya K.; **Development as Freedom**, New York: Knopf Press, 1999.
- Senses, Fikret; **Kuresellesmenin Oteki Yuzu: Yoksulluk** [The Other Face of Globalisation: Poverty], Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari, 2001.
- Seyyar, Ali ; "Sosyal Siyaset Acisindan Yoksullukla Mucadele" [Fighting with Poverty from the Perspective of Social Policy], **Yoksulluk, Vol. I**, eds. Ahmet Emre Bilgili & Ibrahim Altan, Istanbul: Deniz Feneri Yayinlari, 2003, p. 39.
- Sunar, Lutfi; "Yoksullugun Onlenmesinde Sivil Toplumun Rolu ve Gonul Kusagi Projesi" [The Role of Civil Society and Project of *Gonul Kusagi*], **Yoksulluk, Vol. III**, eds. Ahmet Emre Bilgili & Ibrahim Altan, Istanbul: Deniz Feneri Yayinlari, 2003, p. 133.
- Swyngedouw, Erik; "Excluding the Other: The Production of Scale and Scaled Politics", **Geographies of Economies**, eds. Roger Lee & Jane Wills, London: Arnold, 1997, p. 174.
- Whelan, Christopher T.; "Marginalization, Deprivation, and Fatalism in the Republic of Ireland: Class and Underclass Perspectives", **European Sociological Review**, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1996, pp. 33-7.
- Wilson, William Julius; "Another Look at the -Truly- Disadvantaged", **Political Science Quarterly**, Vol. 106, Issue 4, Winter '91-'92, p. 653.