http://dx.doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v23.6417

# AN ANALYSIS OF THE "CINDERELLA" FAIRY TALE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE CULTURE OF POVERTY: A CRITICAL EVALUATION FROM A SOCIAL POLICY PERSPECTIVE

## *UMA ANÁLISE DO CONTO DE FADAS "CINDERELA" DA PERSPECTIVA DA CULTURA DA POBREZA: UMA AVALIAÇÃO CRÍTICA DO PONTO DE VISTA DAS POLÍTICAS SOCIAIS*

Article received on: 9/1/2026
Article accepted on: 7/4/2026

**Seda Tekeli***
***Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Türkiye
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1839-8291
sakyalcin@anadolu.edu.tr

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

**Abstract**
This study aims to reveal the mechanisms of the cultural reproduction of poverty by analyzing the narrative of the classic fairy tale *Cinderella* within the framework of the culture of poverty approach. The culture of poverty approach argues that poverty is not merely a matter of economic deprivation; rather, it is reproduced across generations through individuals' values, attitudes, and behavioral patterns. In this context, fairy tales are regarded as important tools for transmitting social norms and ideological structures. In this study, the Cinderella fairy tale is examined through the themes of passivity, fatalism, dependence on an external savior, and social mobility. The findings reveal that the fairy tale presents a narrative that glorifies external intervention over individual effort and renders structural inequalities invisible. This situation creates an ideological foundation that could contribute to the legitimization of aid-based approaches over rights-based approaches in the realm of social policy.

**Keywords:** Culture of Poverty. Social Policy. Fairy Tales. İdeology. Social Mobility.

***Resumo***
*Este estudo tem como objetivo revelar os mecanismos de reprodução cultural da pobreza por meio da análise da narrativa do conto de fadas clássico *Cinderela*, dentro da perspectiva da "cultura da pobreza". Essa perspectiva defende que a pobreza não é meramente uma questão de privação econômica; ao contrário, ela se reproduz de geração em geração por meio dos valores, atitudes e padrões comportamentais dos indivíduos. Nesse contexto, os contos de fadas são considerados ferramentas importantes para a transmissão de normas sociais e estruturas ideológicas. Neste estudo, o conto de fadas *Cinderela* é examinado por meio dos temas da passividade, do fatalismo, da dependência de um salvador externo e da mobilidade social. Os resultados revelam que o conto de fadas apresenta uma narrativa que glorifica a intervenção externa em detrimento do esforço individual e torna invisíveis as desigualdades estruturais. Essa situação cria uma base ideológica que poderia contribuir para a legitimação de abordagens baseadas na assistência em detrimento de abordagens baseadas em direitos no âmbito da política social.*

***Palavras-chave:*** *Cultura da Pobreza. Política Social. Contos de Fadas. Ideologia. Mobilidade Social.*

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In the modern social sciences literature, poverty is treated as a multidimensional and complex social phenomenon that cannot be explained solely through income inadequacy. In this context, approaches that emphasize the cultural dimension of poverty draw attention to the importance of the value systems that individuals develop together with the socio-economic conditions in which they find themselves. The culture of poverty approach in particular argues that behavioral and cultural patterns play a determining role in the intergenerational transmission of poverty. At this point, the question of how poverty is defined becomes a fundamental component of this multidimensional approach.

There is no single definition that fully explains the concept of the poor. Differences in approach also diversify definitions of "the poor" (World Bank, 2000). Within the nutritional sustenance approach, individuals deprived of the products necessary to sustain their biological life are defined as poor; this state of deprivation is sometimes characterized as a lack of the income required to purchase the needed products (OECD, 2019). However, meeting nutritional needs alone is not sufficient for a person to lead a humane life. The fulfillment of social and cultural needs, as much as nutritional needs, is necessary for the continuity of human existence (Townsend, 1979). Adopting a broader approach, Sen (1999) defines as poor those who are deprived of the material and non-material assets required to lead a life worthy of a human being, and defines this state of deprivation as poverty. In this context, the geography in which one lives, the surrounding environment, socio-cultural opportunities, traditions, and social values are also determinative in definitions of the poor and of poverty.

This definitional diversity provides the basis for the phenomenon of poverty being addressed from different perspectives by various disciplines. The discipline of sociology characterizes poverty as an underclass concept that persists in every society, while also emphasizing that poverty has deepened further with globalization (Bauman, 2005; Wacquant, 2008). The discipline of social policy treats poverty as a social problem and focuses on developing policies against its consequences (Ilo, 2021). The discipline of economics, which focuses on the causes of poverty, on the one hand analyzes the economic problems that lead to poverty and, on the other hand, deals with its economic consequences (Sen, 1999; World Bank, 2020). The discipline of social security, drawing

on these economic consequences, aims to provide income security to poor individuals (Ilo, 2017). In this context, poverty has, over time, gone beyond the vital necessity of nutrition and become a phenomenon encompassing the whole of human life; the causes that give rise to poverty and the ways of combating it have also undergone transformation (UNDP, 2020). In this regard, the culture of poverty approach addresses the causes of poverty on the basis of individual behaviors and cultural patterns rather than structural factors (Lewis, 1966).

Although the recognition of poverty as a social problem dates back to the 17th century, poverty has existed since the very first days when humans began living collectively and engaging in relations of production. In this regard, poverty continues to exist today by affecting people's lives (Aksan, 2012). In the historical development of societies, poverty has at times been explained through individual inadequacies and behavioral patterns, and at other times through economic structure, class inequalities, and relations of production. In addition, external factors such as natural disasters, wars, and crises can also be effective in the emergence of poverty (Aydin & Türgay, 2011). In this respect, poverty bears the character of a complex phenomenon in which both individual and structural dynamics are intertwined. In particular, the increase in income distribution inequalities and the strengthening of social exclusion mechanisms together with the process of globalization have caused poverty to become a more visible and deepened problem (World Bank, 2020).

At this point, it becomes clear that explaining poverty solely through economic indicators is insufficient; the cultural and social environment in which individuals are embedded must also be taken into account. Cultural tools that play an important role in the intergenerational transmission of social values, norms, and behavioral patterns also influence the ways in which poverty is perceived and reproduced. Among these tools, fairy tales stand out as powerful narrative forms that transmit certain values, social roles, and life practices to individuals from an early age. For this reason, fairy tales should not be regarded merely as texts for entertainment but as narratives that also carry ideological and cultural codes (Zipes, 2018).

In this context, the themes contained in classical fairy tales offer an important field of analysis for revealing how social inequalities, class positions, and the experience of poverty are made meaningful. Narratives such as Cinderella in particular contain implicit

messages suggesting that escape from poverty is possible through individual effort, patience, and external intervention. This may be linked to the "culture of poverty" approach, which grounds the causes of poverty in individual characteristics rather than structural factors (Lewis, 1966).

This study analyzes the Cinderella tale from the perspective of the culture of poverty in order to reveal the meanings the narrative carries for the reproduction of poverty, the legitimation of social inequalities, and social policy. Accordingly, the study also aims to evaluate how cultural narratives may contribute to social policy discussions. In this study, the Cinderella narrative is examined through three principal narrative forms: Charles Perrault's 1697 Cendrillon version, the Brothers Grimm's 1812/1857 Aschenputtel version, and Walt Disney's 1950 animated film. Examining these three versions together provides an analytical advantage in showing that the same narrative structure is reproduced not only across different geographies but also across different historical periods and media forms. The Disney version in particular differs qualitatively from the other two written narratives in terms of mass visual media's capacity for ideological reproduction, and therefore requires distinct analytical attention. The study adopts critical discourse analysis as its method. Developed by Fairclough (1992) and Van Dijk (1993), this approach aims to systematically reveal the connection between language and narrative structures and relations of power and ideological patterns. Within this framework, fairy tales are addressed not merely as literary texts but as discursive fields through which social values and class norms are transmitted. The analysis is conducted through six thematic categories: passivity, fatalism, external intervention, social mobility, spatial segregation, and gender. The scope of the study is limited to narrative structure; dimensions related to how reader/viewer audiences perceive the text have been left outside the scope.

## 2 CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

When the poverty literature is examined, it is observed that this phenomenon has, for many years, been addressed predominantly on an economic basis. However, particularly from the 1960s onwards, intense debates have emerged regarding whether poverty is individual or structural, and whether cultural factors or capitalist relations of

production are determinative. These debates have led to poverty being evaluated not only as income inadequacy but also within the framework of multidimensional elements such as social exclusion, cultural non-integration, class position, gender, and spatial segregation (Gül & Sallan GÜL, 2008).

While the multidimensional, composite, and complex structure of poverty makes it difficult to define the concept, it also produces diversity in definitions and contributes to the multifaceted nature of research (Çabuk, 2003). The United Nations (UN) and the World Bank (WB), through the studies they have conducted, attempt to describe and define poverty from different perspectives. The World Bank defines poverty through the "income poverty" approach (World Bank, 2000). The UN, on the other hand, addresses poverty in the context of "deprivation" and "human development" (UNDP, 2020), and grounds poverty in Amartya Sen's "capability approach." According to this approach, poverty is expressed through non-monetary indicators such as the literacy rate, average life expectancy, and infant and child mortality, and is characterized as "human poverty." The World Bank, however, addresses poverty within the Bretton Woods approach and expresses it through monetary indicators such as the real wage, the unemployment rate, and the poverty line (Kabaş, 2009). The European Union (EU), another international institution, defines poverty as the state of having incomes and resources so insufficient as to prevent people from having a standard of living considered acceptable in the society in which they live. According to this definition, owing to their poverty people may experience multiple disadvantages such as unemployment, poor housing, and inadequate health services. Accordingly, by the end of the day, the poor become excluded from social life, are marginalized, and their access to fundamental rights may be restricted (EU, 2016). Bilton *et al*. (2002) count those working in low-paid and insecure jobs as poor and characterize this group as the first group constituting poverty. According to this study, the elderly who must subsist on low pensions constitute the second group, while the other poor group consists of single-parent families in which the mother or father is not present due to divorce or death. Just as in single-parent families, poverty also arises as a problem within extended families when the nutritional and care needs of household members cannot be sufficiently met.

When the contemporary literature on poverty is examined, it is seen that the phenomenon of poverty is addressed within the framework of concepts such as individual

welfare and responsibility, social and cultural non-integration, social exclusion, culture of poverty, discrimination, social pathology, gender, race, ethnicity, spatial segregation, and workfare. This demonstrates that, in the diagnosis of poverty, the phenomenon of culture is an important element alongside economic factors (Gül & Sallan Gül, 2008). For this reason, while understanding the relationship between poverty and culture requires evaluating both economic and social dimensions together, it also brings with it the responsibility of analyzing individuals without labeling or prejudice. Indeed, the emphasis placed on the cultural dimension of poverty can, in some cases, prepare the ground for the behaviors of the poor to be evaluated as "pathological" and for welfare policies to acquire a punitive character (Wacquant, 2009).

Two fundamental approaches stand out in the poverty literature. The first approach is one that seeks the causes of poverty in individuals' behaviors and cultural characteristics. In parallel with neoliberal and neoconservative thought, this perspective explains poverty through a lack of individual responsibility, laziness, or wrong choices (Murray, 1984; Mead, 1992). The second approach explains poverty through structural factors. According to this perspective, poverty arises as a result of multilayered processes such as capitalist relations of production, class inequalities, gender roles, and discrimination. Indeed, Karl Marx's analyses of the capitalist mode of production reveal that the process of capital accumulation, by its very nature, produces inequality and structurally places working classes in a disadvantaged position (Marx, 1867). This framework has been developed in subsequent works as well; Galbraith (1996) drew attention to the systemic origins of poverty by emphasizing the negative effects of market mechanisms and distortions in income distribution on social welfare. Similarly, Castells (1989) shows that processes of economic restructuring, technological transformation, and urbanization have transformed labor markets, creating new forms of inequality, and that these processes have deepened poverty. Today, however, many researchers adopt a more holistic perspective, arguing that explaining poverty solely through structural or solely through cultural factors is inadequate (Wilson, 2010; Small *et al*., 2010; Erhard, 2022). In this direction, Small *et al*. (2010) argue that poverty must be understood through both structural constraints and the cultural practices shaped within these constraints. Rather than reducing poverty to one-dimensional explanations, this approach offers the possibility of a more comprehensive analysis by centering the interaction between the

structural conditions in which individuals are situated and the cultural responses they give to these conditions.

Poverty and the culture of poverty express distinct conceptual frameworks. While the concept of poverty generally refers to the situation in which individuals are deprived of the material means necessary to sustain their lives, the culture of poverty is regarded as a multifaceted phenomenon with social and cultural dimensions, emerging when this state of deprivation gradually transforms into a way of life (Lewis, 1966). In this regard, the culture of poverty occupies an important place in the poverty literature in both theoretical and empirical studies. Defined in general terms, the culture of poverty refers to a cultural pattern, characterized by the dominance of attitudes such as fatalism, resignation, and passivity—positioned against values such as success, hard work, and individual effort—and showing a tendency toward intergenerational transmission (Marshall, 1999). Within this framework, the culture of poverty addresses poverty not merely as an economic inadequacy but as a totality of behaviors and attitudes shaped by the conditions in which one finds oneself (Lewis, 1966; Sen, 1999).

The culture of poverty approach was first systematically articulated by Oscar Lewis (1961). According to Lewis, poverty produces a distinctive way of life, particularly among individuals living under long-term conditions of deprivation; this leads to the emergence of similar behavioral patterns despite differences in spatial and national contexts. Thus poverty does not remain limited to material deficiencies but is transformed into a cultural structure that is reproduced through its own system of norms and values. In connection with this approach, Keith Joseph (1972) developed the concept of the "cycle of deprivation." This concept argues that elements such as a disadvantaged family environment, low expectations, and limited opportunities reproduce poverty through intergenerational transmission (Welshman, 2005). In this process, the limited life expectations and perceptions of opportunity held by individuals prepare the ground for the acceptance of poverty and its acquisition of continuity (Atkinson, 1997). At the same time, the culture of poverty and cycle of deprivation approaches have been criticized from various angles (Wilson, 2010; Ryan, 1971; Small *et al*., 2010). In particular, Alcock (1997) notes that these approaches carry the risk of reducing poverty to the cultural characteristics of individuals and may overlook structural factors. Ryan (1971), criticizing the reduction of poverty to individual characteristics, defines the disregard of structural

conditions as the "blaming the victim" approach (Ryan, 1971). According to these criticisms, the reproduction of poverty must be explained not only through individual behaviors but also through the influence of economic, social, and political structures.

Drawing on his fieldwork on the urban poor in Mexico and Puerto Rico in the 1950s and 1960s, Lewis argued that poverty is not merely an economic condition but also constitutes a way of life transmitted from generation to generation. According to this approach, the culture of poverty is characterized by features such as fatalism, passivity, short-term thinking, low levels of education and organization, distance from institutional structures, and limited social participation. Individuals living in poverty develop certain behavioral patterns by adapting to the conditions in which they find themselves; over time, these patterns transform into a subculture. This subculture, internalized from childhood onward, facilitates the intergenerational transmission of poverty. According to Lewis, the culture of poverty is explained within the framework of three fundamental theses: (i) the basic dynamics that produce and sustain poverty are located within the cultural structure; (ii) the culture of poverty bears the character of a way of life transmitted from generation to generation; and (iii) this culture differs distinctly from dominant social values (Gül & Sallan Gül, 2008). Within this framework, the culture of poverty is regarded not merely as a result of economic inadequacies but also as the institutionalization of cultural and behavioral responses to these inadequacies.

The culture of poverty exhibits a multilayered structure with economic, social, and psychological dimensions. At the economic level, elements such as irregular income, unemployment, low wages, and chronic indebtedness come to the fore; at the social level, lack of organization, limited political participation, and exclusion from institutional structures attract attention. At the psychological level, features such as helplessness, a sense of worthlessness, low self-esteem, and fatalism become prominent. This multidimensional structure shows that poverty is not merely a problem of access to material resources but is also a process that shapes individuals' perceptions of life and their social relations (Townsend, 1979; Sen, 1999). Nevertheless, the culture of poverty approach is criticized for explaining the causes of poverty predominantly through individuals' values and behaviors. In this context, Wacquant (2009) argues that limiting poverty to cultural explanations may render structural inequalities and the role of state policies invisible. Similarly, Pierre Bourdieu's concept of *habitus* emphasizes that

individuals' behaviors are shaped by the social structure in which they are situated, thereby revealing that the culture of poverty cannot be explained solely through individual choices. Accordingly, structural factors such as class position, economic capital, cultural capital, and social capital are influential upon the culture of poverty. Consequently, rather than evaluating the behaviors of individuals living in poverty merely as "choices" or "cultural characteristics," these behaviors must be addressed within a context in which they are constrained and reproduced by the social structure (Bourdieu, 1984).

Lewis (1961) defines the culture of poverty as a subculture shaped within the Western capitalist social order, addressing this phenomenon not only as a "way of life" but also as a multilayered response to structural inequalities. Accordingly, the culture of poverty is the way in which marginally positioned individuals and groups, in class-stratified and highly individualized capitalist societies, both adapt to (adaptation) and develop an implicit response against the disadvantaged structure in which they find themselves. In this context, the culture of poverty includes strategies for managing the feelings of hopelessness, exclusion, and helplessness that arise when individuals realize that their possibilities for upward mobility within dominant social values, ideals of success, and opportunity structures are extremely limited. Accordingly, cultural patterns cannot be considered independently of structural conditions. Indeed, many features of the culture of poverty are related to alternative practices of solidarity and survival that emerge as a result of the obstacles poor individuals face in accessing formal institutional structures (such as income inadequacy, bureaucratic exclusion, stigmatization, and insecurity). Within this framework, neighborhood-based solidarity networks, informal economy practices, and reciprocity relations may be regarded not merely as cultural choices but also as "necessary" strategies aimed at filling institutional gaps. This perspective deepens further when considered together with William Julius Wilson's analyses of urban poverty and Pierre Bourdieu's conceptualization of *habitus*. While Wilson (1987) demonstrates that structural unemployment and spatial segregation feed the culture of poverty (Gracia & Delclós, 2012), Bourdieu (1984), by emphasizing that individuals' practices are shaped by the social field and the types of capital in which they are situated, shows that the culture of poverty is a product of social reproduction processes rather than of individual deficiencies. This theoretical framework makes it possible to understand how the culture of poverty is reproduced not only in individual practices but

also through fundamental social institutions such as the family. From the standpoint of family structure, in environments where the culture of poverty is dominant, fragmented family structures, early adulthood, neglect of children, and male-dominated relations are widely observed. This situation is associated not only with economic deprivation but also with cultural and social reproduction mechanisms. According to Bourdieu (1984), the dominant class imposes values that attribute worth to thrift and the accumulation of wealth and property, that emphasize the possibility of upward mobilization, and that explain low economic status through individual inadequacy and lack of quality. Consequently, the Cinderella tale provides an appropriate ground for critical analysis to reveal how this ideological framework is internalized through cultural narratives.

## 3 AN ANALYSIS OF THE CINDERELLA FAIRY TALE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE CULTURE OF POVERTY

Discussions of the culture of poverty present a multidimensional field that must be examined not only through economic indicators but also through cultural narratives and everyday life practices. Within this framework, fairy tales, which fulfill an important function in the intergenerational transmission of social values and class norms, are among the important sources that reveal how poverty is perceived and made meaningful. In this context, the Cinderella tale draws attention by foregrounding the idea that escape from poverty is possible through individual virtues, patience, and most often through external intervention. In this respect, the narrative both contributes to the cultural reproduction of dominant values, as Bourdieu (1984) emphasizes, and may also be evaluated, in line with Lewis's (1961) approach, as an example that prepares the ground for the internalization of poverty through passivity and acceptance. Consequently, addressing the Cinderella tale from the perspective of the culture of poverty offers a meaningful analytical opportunity for both rendering visible the cultural representations of inequalities and questioning the ways in which poverty is individualized. The tale is addressed and evaluated in the study through different values.

### 3.1 The reproduction of poverty in daily life

Everyday life is not merely a neutral ground through which individuals' routines flow; it constitutes a dynamic field in which social inequalities are reproduced and sometimes also transformed. Poverty too, when addressed in this context, emerges as an experience that is both sustained and internalized within everyday practices. The survival strategies that individuals develop under conditions of poverty are most often not the product of a conscious choice but of necessities imposed by structural constraints. Over time, these strategies may transform into cultural patterns that narrow the individual's horizon of action and normalize existing conditions.

In this context, although the Cinderella tale appears on the surface to be a story of individual success and happiness, when examined in depth it presents a powerful narrative showing how poverty is reproduced within the practices of everyday life. Cinderella's constant occupation with housework in the tale shows that she is confined to a sphere of life defined by physical labor. This corresponds to the limited horizon of life, which is one of the important components of the culture of poverty. Cinderella's world is confined to the house in which she lives; she has no access to the outside world, and this restricts her capacity for social mobility from the outset. The fact that the character internalizes rather than questions this order despite the inequalities to which she is exposed at the familial and social levels concretizes how structural constraints are reproduced at the level of individual *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1984).

From this perspective, the tale also implies that poverty is not merely a material inadequacy but also a process that narrows the individual's capacity to imagine and to develop alternative life scenarios. This observation, which corresponds to Appadurai's (2004) concept of the "capacity to aspire," shows that the cultural dimension of everyday life cannot be disregarded in social policy discussions.

### 3.2 Passivity and internalized submission

In the culture of poverty literature, passivity is associated with individuals developing low expectations regarding their capacity to transform the socio-economic conditions in which they find themselves and with the intergenerational reproduction of

this situation. The founding approach to this concept within this framework was developed by Lewis. According to Lewis (1966), poverty is not limited solely to material deprivation but also produces a "subculture" characterized by certain values, attitudes, and behavioral patterns. In this context, it is emphasized that tendencies such as powerlessness, dependence, and fatalism become widespread, and that individuals progressively withdraw from individual or collective actions aimed at changing existing conditions. This leads to passivity being addressed not merely as an individual attitude but as a way of life shaped and reproduced under conditions of poverty.

In the literature, however, this approach has been the subject of significant criticism. Wilson (1987) argues that passivity is the result of structural processes such as transformations in the labor market, unemployment, and spatial segregation, rather than a cultural characteristic. The lack of opportunity that emerges particularly after deindustrialization restricts individuals' capacity for action, preparing the ground for the spread of passive behaviors. Similarly, Wacquant (2008) maintains that the culture of poverty approach produces a stigmatizing rather than an explanatory discourse, noting that such explanations render the political and structural causes of poverty invisible and place responsibility on individuals. This critical framework reveals that passivity should be evaluated not as a "cultural deficiency" but as a result of structural exclusion processes.

In the Turkish context, Pınarcıoğlu & Işık (2001) show that poverty is a dynamic process reproduced together with spatial and economic transformations, rather than a fixed cultural characteristic. Similarly, Buğra & Keyder (2003) emphasize that poverty is related less to individual characteristics than to transformations of the welfare regime, deficiencies in social policy, and the structure of the labor market. This approach is important in showing that passivity is a structural outcome that emerges with the weakening of institutional support mechanisms.

At a broader theoretical level, Bourdieu's (1984) concept of *habitus* reveals that individuals' behavioral patterns are shaped by the social structure in which they are situated and are internalized over time. From this perspective, passivity may be understood as a practical disposition developed by individuals raised under conditions of poverty within a framework of limited possibilities and low expectations. Consequently, passivity emerges neither merely as an individual weakness nor as a purely cultural feature but as an internalized result of structural conditions.

When this theoretical framework is applied to the analysis of cultural narratives, it becomes evident that fairy tales are not merely entertainment texts but are also ideological fields through which social values are reproduced. In this context, the Cinderella narrative provides an important example for examining how passivity is culturally normalized. In the tale, instead of developing active resistance against the exploitation and exclusion to which she is subjected, Cinderella accepts the existing situation with patience and silence. The fact that she does not develop any collective or individual struggle against the oppressive attitudes of her stepmother and stepsisters may be evaluated as an internalized form of passivity. Considered together with Bettelheim's (1976) evaluations of the psychological function of fairy tales, this shows that the individual is offered a solution model based on "patience and waiting."

At the same time, as emphasized above, such positionings are related to structural processes rather than to individual inadequacies. For this reason, Cinderella's passive position should be evaluated not as an individual deficiency but as a socially produced form of passivity. Indeed, studies on transformations of the welfare regime and the labor market reveal that individuals' capacity for action is largely constrained by institutional structures.

In conclusion, rather than presenting passivity as an individual characteristic, the Cinderella narrative exhibits a structure that legitimizes it through mechanisms of patience, conformity, and reward. In this respect, the tale constitutes an important example for analyzing how the phenomenon of passivity, which stands out in culture of poverty discussions, is reproduced through cultural representations.

### 3.3 Fatalism and the perception of time

Another striking element in the tale is the dominance of a fatalistic perception of time. In the Cinderella narrative, the fact that the character waits for the "right time" to come rather than developing an active and strategic intervention to transform her current situation, and that her deliverance occurs through external intervention, points to a passive experience of time. This form of waiting is associated in the poverty literature with the limitation of individuals' capacity for planning toward the future and the foregrounding of short-term life strategies. Indeed, Lewis (1966) emphasizes that within the culture of

poverty individuals struggle to develop long-term goals and that their perception of time bears a more "present-focused" character. Similarly, in their study in the Turkish context, Pınarcıoğlu & Işık (2001) demonstrate that conditions of uncertainty and insecurity restrict individuals' capacity for long-term planning and that shorter-term strategies come to the fore in everyday life.

Fatalism, in turn, is regarded as a mode of thinking characterized by the weakening of the individual's perception of control over his or her life and the increase of dependence on external factors. At this point, the *habitus* approach offers an important framework in showing that individuals gradually internalize the social conditions in which they are situated and narrow the realm of "the possible" in accordance with these conditions (Bourdieu, 1984). This process of internalization, particularly under conditions of poverty, prepares the ground for the limitation of expectations regarding the future and for the formation of a passive perception of time. In this context, the perception of time emerges not merely as an individual preference but as an experiential field that is socially shaped and reproduced.

Poverty studies in Türkiye similarly reveal that structural insecurity and income instability weaken individuals' sense of control over their lives and that this strengthens fatalistic tendencies. While Buğra & Keyder (2003) emphasize that transformations of the welfare regime erode individuals' social security and increase uncertainties, Şenses (2001) shows that structural adjustment policies deepen insecurity through their effects on income distribution and employment. Within this framework, it is important to evaluate fatalism not merely as a cultural characteristic but also as a reproduced reflection of structural inequalities in everyday consciousness.

There are also studies that carry this discussion to a broader theoretical plane. For example, Appadurai (2004) argues that the "capacity to aspire" is socially distributed unequally and that, under conditions of poverty, this capacity remains seriously limited. This approach is important in addressing the relationship between poverty and the perception of time not only as an economic but also as a cultural and cognitive process. Similarly, Sen's (1999) "capability approach," by focusing not only on the resources available to individuals but also on their capacity to use these resources prospectively, shows how the perception of time and agency are constrained by structural conditions.

Within this framework, it may be argued that the Cinderella narrative reflects a worldview that depicts the individual's capacity to transform her own living conditions as limited and ties change largely to external interventions. Indeed, in the narrative, Cinderella's deliverance from poverty is made possible not through her own subjective efforts but through the intervention of the fairy figure and through coincidental encounters. This indicates that a fatalistic perception of time and a passive subject position are reproduced at the level of the narrative. At the same time, evaluating this representation not as a direct reflection of social reality but as the product of a particular cultural framework would offer a more cautious approach. In this context, the tale may be read as a narrative form that may be associated with the limited agency and narrowed expectations toward the future discussed in the culture of poverty literature; however, the establishment of this connection in a reductive manner should be avoided.

### 3.4 External intervention: the fairy figure and the social assistance analogy

The most critical turning point of the tale occurs with the appearance of the fairy figure in the Cinderella narrative. The fact that the transformation in Cinderella's life is made possible not as the result of her own labor, individual effort, or a collective social struggle but entirely through an external and extraordinary intervention shows that the escape from poverty is constructed not on a structural basis but through the representation of an "external savior." Such narratives may produce an ideological view according to which poverty can be solved through individual or external interventions rather than through its social causes.

In this context, the fairy figure may be evaluated as a symbolic counterpart of the charity-based welfare regime approaches discussed in the social policy literature. Esping-Andersen's (1990) classification of welfare regimes is particularly important for understanding how the state organizes social protection and the position of the individual within this system. Esping-Andersen emphasizes that, in some welfare regimes, individuals' dependence on the market remains high and that social assistance is most often limited and selective. In such structures, the individual is positioned not as a rights-bearing citizen but as a "recipient" in need of assistance. Similarly, Deacon (2007) notes

that social assistance is becoming increasingly conditional and surveillance-oriented on a global scale, which may restrict individuals' autonomy.

By contrast, the rights-based social policy approach defines the individual not as a passive recipient of assistance but as an active citizen. Marshall (1950) argues that social rights are a fundamental component of citizenship and that institutional and continuous guarantees should be provided to individuals in areas such as education, health, and income security. In the Turkish context, Buğra & Keyder (2003) emphasize that social policy should be organized not on the basis of charity or temporary assistance but on the basis of rights and citizenship. This approach aims to strengthen the individual's capacity to shape his or her own life.

In the tale, the fact that the means provided by the fairy are temporary, conditional, and entirely dependent on an external authority points, in this respect, to a charity-based and fragile model of support rather than to a rights-based welfare understanding. Indeed, the support provided lacks continuity and is restricted by a specific time limit (midnight). This carries a logic similar to systems in which social assistance is time-limited and conditional. In such systems, the individual gains access not to the means that would permanently improve her own living conditions but to forms of support that provide only short-term relief.

The possible consequences of this situation are critically discussed in the social policy literature. Lister (2004) notes that charity-based approaches may keep individuals in a passive position and may deepen social exclusion. Similarly, Sen (1999) emphasizes that poverty is not merely a lack of income but the restriction of individuals' capability to "do" or "be." Viewed from this perspective, temporary assistance may, rather than securing the long-term empowerment of the individual, lead to the perpetuation of his or her existing fragility.

Within this framework, the fairy figure may be evaluated not merely as a fairy-tale character but also as a symbolic social policy metaphor that renders the idea of "solving poverty through assistance" natural and unquestionable. In other words, while rendering structural inequalities invisible, the narrative produces a passive subject model by locating the solution outside the individual. Thus it is not the continuity of assistance but the intervention itself that becomes central, and this overshadows social policy's potential for rights-based transformation.

### 3.5 Social mobility: luck, romance, and exceptionalism

By constructing escape from poverty not through individual effort or structural transformation but through an exceptional narrative of "luck" and being chosen, the Cinderella narrative assumes an ideological function that renders the nature of social inequalities invisible. The class ascent achieved through marriage to the prince places at the center not the transformation of systematic inequalities but the individual exceptions that rarely emerge from within these inequalities. This may be associated with Michael Young's critiques of the concept of meritocracy. Young (1958) argues that, although meritocracy is presented as a seemingly fair system, it can in fact become an ideological device that reproduces social inequalities.

At this point, Bourdieu's *habitus* and forms-of-capital approach is explanatory. Bourdieu (1984) emphasizes that individuals' social positions are the result not only of their individual efforts but also of the accumulations of economic, cultural, and social capital they possess. Cinderella's ascent, however, occurs independently of these accumulation processes, through a sudden and external intervention. This contradicts the dynamics of social mobility in the real world and renders the structural character of inequalities invisible.

Similarly, Weber (1978) addresses social stratification not only through class but also through relations of status and power. Cinderella's marriage to the prince represents a leap in status as much as in economic terms. However, this leap occurs not through institutional processes and mechanisms of social recognition in the Weberian sense but through a fairy-tale intervention. This conceals the fact that the acquisition of status is socially constructed.

On the other hand, the capability approach developed by Sen (1999) defines poverty not merely as a lack of income but as the restriction of individuals' capacity to access fundamental life opportunities. In the Cinderella narrative, however, this increase in capability is provided not through individual or public efforts but through an entirely external and miraculous intervention. This renders the structural dimension of poverty and the role of social policies invisible.

Consequently, while reproducing a discourse similar to that of meritocracy, the Cinderella tale grounds this discourse not in realistic social processes but in an

exceptional and fairy-tale-like regime of possibility. By over-emphasizing individual success, such narratives conceal the structural causes of inequalities and present poverty as a result of individual fate. In this context, the tale may be read not merely as a cultural narrative but also as an ideological device that reinforces the legitimacy of the existing social order.

### 3.6 Spatial and symbolic segregation

In the tale, the sharp distinction between spaces emerges as a symbolic expression of class differences. While the house in which Cinderella lives is identified with oppression, labor, and poverty, the palace is represented as the space of wealth, freedom, and happiness. Such spatial oppositions reflect not only physical differences but also how social hierarchies are culturally produced. In this context, the concept of *habitus* is important for understanding how the spaces in which individuals are situated shape their perceptions, expectations, and horizons of action (Bourdieu, 1984). The space in which Cinderella lives functions as a *habitus* field in which she internalizes her social position and accepts its limits. This spatial distinction may also be explained through Lefebvre's (1991) approach to "the production of space." Lefebvre (1991) argues that space is not a neutral ground; on the contrary, it is produced by social relations and reproduces these relations. Within this framework, the palace is not merely a physical place but a social space in which power, privilege, and inaccessibility are produced. The house in which Cinderella lives, on the other hand, is the spatial counterpart of labor, domination, and exclusion. This opposition concretizes the distinction frequently emphasized in the culture of poverty between the "enclosed sphere of life" and the "inaccessible sphere of welfare."

Similarly, Wacquant (2008) emphasizes that spatial segregation, and particularly the concentration of poverty in specific areas, is a structural mechanism that restricts individuals' access to opportunities. The fact that Cinderella's access to the palace is realized not through her own effort but through external intervention shows that overcoming such spatial and class barriers through individual will is highly limited.

Giddens's (1984) theory of structuration is also important in explaining this situation. Giddens (1984) notes that individuals' actions are both constrained by structure

and reproduce these structures. However, in the Cinderella narrative the individual's transformative effect upon these structures is almost entirely absent; on the contrary, the transformation occurs entirely through external intervention. This strengthens the fatalistic perception that social mobility lies outside individuals' control.

Consequently, the spatial distinction in the tale is not merely an aesthetic element but a powerful narrative device showing how class inequalities are reproduced through spatial segregation. The fact that Cinderella's access to the palace depends upon an extraordinary intervention conceals how rigid class and spatial boundaries are in the real world and produces a misleading hope regarding their surmountability. In this respect, the tale performs an ideological function by presenting inequalities operating through space as natural and immutable.

### 3.7 The gender dimension and poverty

The tale also offers important clues with respect to gender roles. Cinderella's confinement to domestic labor and the realization of her deliverance through marriage show that women are defined not as economic subjects but through relational roles. This is directly related to the concept of "invisible labor," long discussed in the feminist economics literature. Indeed, Federici (2012) emphasizes that women's domestic labor is devalued and rendered invisible within the capitalist system. Cinderella's everyday life provides a typical example of this labor, which, although productive, is not economically recognized.

Similarly, Fraser (2016) argues that, in capitalist societies, the distinction between production (the market) and social reproduction (domestic care labor) systematically pushes women's labor into a secondary position. Cinderella's confinement to the domestic sphere is a cultural reflection of the attribution of this realm of reproduction to women. In the tale, women's access to the public sphere (the palace) is possible only through marriage, which generates the meaning that women's social mobility rests on relational ties rather than on individual capacities.

In this context, Bourdieu's (2001) conceptualization of "masculine domination" is also explanatory. Bourdieu (2001) notes that gender inequalities are reproduced not only at the economic but also at the cultural and symbolic levels. While Cinderella's passivity,

patience, and obedience are rewarded, her not being positioned as an active subject shows that this symbolic order is reproduced within a fairy-tale narrative. On the other hand, Kabeer (1999) defines women's empowerment through individuals' access to resources, capacity for action, and control over outcomes. In the Cinderella narrative, these three elements are realized not through the woman's own will but through external intervention. This reinforces ideological acceptances according to which women's escape from poverty is possible not through structural avenues such as education, employment, or economic independence but through relational mechanisms such as marriage.

Consequently, while rendering visible the intersection of the culture of poverty and gender inequalities, the tale also presents a narrative that contributes to the reproduction of these inequalities. The association of women's deliverance with marriage rather than with individual labor and structural opportunities presents the gender-based division of labor as natural and inevitable, thereby legitimating inequalities at both the economic and cultural levels. In this respect, the Cinderella tale may be evaluated not merely as a class narrative but also as an ideological vehicle of the gender regime.

## 4 EVALUATION FROM A SOCIAL POLICY PERSPECTIVE

When considered from a social policy perspective, the narrative presented by the Cinderella tale brings to the agenda several interrelated fundamental fields of discussion. At the center of these discussions lie the construction of escape from poverty as a matter of individual luck and external intervention and its ideological effects on welfare policies.

First, the model of assistance presented by the tale evokes the charity-based welfare understanding that, in the social policy literature, is positioned against the rights-based approach. Marshall's (1950) conceptualization of social citizenship requires that the individual be positioned not merely as a recipient but as an active citizen possessing rights. In the Cinderella narrative, by contrast, the support provided by the fairy is conditional, temporary, and entirely dependent on an external authority. This structure positions the individual not as a rights-bearing subject but as an object in need of benevolence, thereby strengthening the cultural ground of the charity-based welfare understanding. Viewed through the framework of Esping-Andersen's (1990) classification of welfare regimes, it is seen that this narrative corresponds to the structural

features of the liberal welfare regime: dependence on the market is high, social protection is selective and temporary, and individual responsibility is determinative.

Second, the savior function represented by the fairy figure renders visible the risk of paternalism in social policy. The paternalist policy understanding, proceeding from the assumption that individuals cannot determine their own interests, legitimates the intervention of an external authority. The Cinderella narrative presents this intervention as not only legitimate but also necessary and salvific. As Lister (2004) emphasizes in her discussion of poverty and citizenship, such approaches may suppress individuals' capacity for independent action and thereby deepen social exclusion. Indeed, the fact that Cinderella in the tale undertakes no attempt to make a demand of the system, to seek her rights, or to wage a collective struggle may be interpreted as a typical example of the cultural normalization of the passive recipient position.

Third, by reproducing the model of passive recipiency in place of active citizenship, the narrative overshadows the transformative potential of social policy. In the Turkish context, Buğra & Keyder (2003) demonstrate that social policy has been built largely on family solidarity and charity, and that an institutional, universal, and rights-based welfare system has not yet been fully established. The cultural circulation of narratives such as Cinderella may function as an ideological ground that reinforces the legitimacy of this structure. This situation becomes particularly pronounced in systems in which social assistance policies operate not on the basis of objective needs assessment but on a discretionary basis grounded in personal relationships.

Fourth, the gender dimension of the tale stands out as an intersectional issue in social policy discussions. Cinderella's confinement to the domestic sphere and her access to the public sphere only through marriage reproduce the "invisible labor" and "dependent woman" models that have long been criticized in the feminist economics literature. Evaluated within the framework of Fraser's (2016) analysis of the distinction between production and social reproduction, it is seen that this narrative reinforces, in social policies addressing women's poverty, understandings that foreground relational mechanisms in place of education, employment, and economic independence.

Within this framework, it is understood that cultural narratives influence social policy design not only at the symbolic but also at the practical level. Cultural patterns shape individuals' expectations regarding what they can demand, and these expectations,

in turn, directly affect policy demands and the legitimating ground of welfare regimes. For this reason, the critical social policy perspective must take as objects of analysis not only institutional structures but also the cultural narratives that nourish these structures. On the basis of these observations, certain policy orientations may be proposed. First and foremost, the adoption of a rights-based framework in social policy design requires that individuals be positioned not as passive recipients but as active citizens. In this regard, overcoming the conditional and discretionary character of social assistance programs constitutes a priority objective for transformation toward universal and institutional guarantees. On the other hand, evaluating with a critical perspective the cultural tools used in social policy communication and social awareness work, and opening space for alternative narratives that recount poverty not through individual fate and external salvation but through structural inequalities and collective rights, may strengthen the transformative capacity of social policy.

## 5 CONCLUSION

This study has examined the Cinderella tale through the method of critical discourse analysis within the framework of the culture of poverty approach and has revealed how the narrative performs an ideological function through six thematic axes: passivity, fatalism, dependence on an external savior, social mobility, spatial segregation, and gender. Each of these axes produces distinct yet interrelated implications for social policy design.

With respect to the passivity dimension, the tale renders invisible the individual's capacity to transform structural conditions and presents patience and waiting as virtues. This narrative constitutes an ideological ground that obstructs empowerment-based approaches in social policy. Policy designs that position the individual not as a passive recipient but as an active citizen can play a decisive role in transforming this ground.

With respect to the fatalism dimension, the narrative weakens the individual's sense of control over her future and reinforces the impression that change is external and coincidental. From a social policy perspective, this finding points to the importance of education, vocational development, and lifelong learning policies that support future-oriented planning. As Appadurai (2004) emphasizes, when the capacity to aspire is

socially distributed unequally, the reconstruction of this capacity by social policy becomes a functional necessity.

With respect to the external savior dimension, the temporary and conditional model of assistance represented by the fairy figure strengthens the cultural legitimacy of the charity-based understanding in social policy. Proceeding from Marshall's (1950) framework of social citizenship, organizing social assistance not as individual benevolence but on the basis of universal right, and the continuity, institutional guarantee, and unconditionality of programs, constitute the policy correlate of this axis.

With respect to the social mobility dimension, the exceptional ascent narrative presented by the tale, by reinforcing the ideology of meritocracy, brings with it the risk of reducing structural inequalities to individual failure. Corresponding to Young's (1958) critique of meritocracy, this finding shows that social policy must realize equality of opportunity not only in discourse but also through institutional mechanisms that actually enable access to education, income security, and social mobility.

With respect to the spatial segregation dimension, the house–palace opposition in the tale shows that poverty is spatially fixed and that these boundaries can only be overcome through an extraordinary intervention. In parallel with Wacquant's (2008) analysis of spatial exclusion, this finding reveals the necessity, in urban social policy, of structural interventions that prioritize spatial justice, render access to quality public services independent of region, and prevent the concentration of poverty in specific areas.

With respect to the gender dimension, Cinderella's confinement to domestic labor and the realization of her deliverance through marriage show that women's poverty is reproduced through relational mechanisms. Viewed through the framework of Fraser's (2016) production–reproduction distinction, this finding indicates that social policies addressing women's poverty must rest not on marriage and family ties but on structural instruments such as access to education, employment security, and the socialization of care services.

When these six axes are evaluated as a whole, it becomes clear that cultural narratives carry an ideological weight that cannot be disregarded in social policy discussions. In the Turkish context, under conditions in which social assistance is organized largely through a logic based on charity and discretion (Buğra & Keyder, 2003), the cultural circulation of narratives such as Cinderella nourishes the legitimating

ground of this structure. The critical interrogation, in social policy design, not only of institutional structures but also of the cultural codes that nourish these structures, and the opening of space in the public sphere for alternative narratives that recount poverty through structural inequalities rather than individual fate, carries the potential to strengthen the social base of rights-based welfare policies.

The principal limitation of the study is that the analysis has been restricted to the narrative structure. Reader and viewer reception, the comparative examination of adaptations in different cultural contexts, and the empirical measurement of ideological effects remain open fields for future research.

## REFERENCES

AKSAN, G. (2012). Yoksulluk ve yoksulluk kültürünün toplumsal görünümleri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 27*, 9–19. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/susbed/article/924468.

ALCOCK, P. (1997). *Understanding poverty* (2nd ed.). Macmillan.

APPADURAI, A. (2004). The capacity to aspire: Culture and the terms of recognition. İçinde V. Rao & M. Walton (Ed.), *Culture and Public Action* (ss. 59–84). Stanford University Press. https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1370580232434129026.

ATKINSON, A. B. (1997). Bringing income distribution in from the cold. *The Economic Journal, 107*(441), 297–321. https://academic.oup.com/ej/article-abstract/107/441/297/5128415?login=false.

AYDIN, M., & TÜRGAY, T. (2011). Yoksullukla mücadelede vergi politikası ve Türkiye. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 16*(1), 249–274. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/sduiibfd/article/222974.

BAUMAN, Z. (2005). *Work, Consumerism and the New Poor*. Open University Press.

BETTELHEIM, B. (1976). *The Uses of Enchantment: The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales*. Wintage.

BILTON, T., BONNETT, K., JONES, P., LAWSON, T., SKINNER, D., STANWORTH, M. & SWIFT, A. (2002). *Introductory Sociology* (4. ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

BOURDIEU, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Harvard University Press.

BOURDIEU, P. (2001). *Masculine Domination*. Stanford University Press.

BUĞRA, A. ve KEYDER, Ç. (2003). *New Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Türkiye*. UNDP. https://www.proquest.com/docview/89180207?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Scholarly%20Journals.

CASTELLS, M. (1989). *The Informational City*. Blackwell.

DEACON, B. (2007). *Global Social Policy and Governance*. Sage.

ERHARD, F. (2022). Culture and poverty from a lifeworld stance: Rehabilitating a controversial conceptual pair. *American Journal of Cultural Sociology, 12*, 1–24. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41290-022-00170-5.

ESPING-ANDERSEN, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton University Press.

EU-EUROPIAN UNION (2016). *Poverty and social exclusion in the EU*. Brussels: European Commission. (www.europarl.europa.eu).

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press.

FEDERICI, S. (2012). *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction and Feminist Struggle*. PM Press.

FRASER, N. (2016). Contradictions of capital and care. *New Left Review, 100*, 99–117. https://philpapers.org/rec/FRACOC-6.

GALBRAITH, J. K. (1996). *The good society: The humane agenda*. Houghton Mifflin.

GIDDENS, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*. University of California Press.

GRACIA, P. ve DELCLÓS, C. (2012). Review of Wilson (1987) The Truly Disadvantaged. *Athenea Digital, 12*(1), 247–250. gbiblioteca,+GraciaDelclos%20(1).pdf.

GÜL, H. & SALLAN GÜL, S. (2008). Yoksulluk ve Yoksulluk Kültürü Tartışmaları. *Türkiye'de Yoksulluk Çalışmaları, 57-96.*

ILO. (2017). *World Social Protection Report 2017–19*. International Labour Organization. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/@dgreports/@dcomm/@publ/documents/publication/wcms_604882.pdf.

ILO. (2021). *World Social Protection Report 2020–22*. International Labour Organization. https://www.ilo.org/publications/flagship-reports/world-social-protection-report-2020-22-social-protection-crossroads-%E2%80%93.

JOSEPH, K. (1972). Speech to the Conservative Party Conference, 19 October 1972.

KABAŞ, T. (2009). *Gelişmekte olan ülkelerde yoksulluğun nedenleri ve yoksullukla mücadele yolları* (Doktora tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü). https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=fBYCXuPjXvx-lOg2aOD9Ww&no=KK3oas-gvj8gWJbpb5e53g.

KABEER, N. (1999). Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. *Development and Change, 30*(3), 435–464. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-7660.00125.

LEFEBVRE, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Blackwell.

LEWIS, O. (1961). *The children of Sánchez: Autobiography of a Mexican family*. Random House.

LEWIS, O. (1966). The culture of poverty. *Scientific American, 215*(4), 19–25.

LISTER, R. (2004). *Poverty*. Polity Press.

MARSHALL, G. (1999). *Sosyoloji Sözlüğü* (O. Akınhay ve D. Kömürcü, Çev.). Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.

MARSHALL, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge University Press.

MARX, K. (1867). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* (Cilt 1). Penguin Classics (1990 baskısı).

MEAD, L. M. (1992). *The New Politics of Poverty: The Nonworking Poor in America*. Basic Books.

MURRAY, C. (1984). *Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950–1980*. Basic Books.

OECD. (2019). *OECD Guidelines for Measuring Subjective Well-being*. OECD Publishing.

PINARCIOĞLU, M., & IŞIK, O. (2001). *Nöbetleşe yoksulluk: Gecekondu ve kent yoksulları (Sultanbeyli örneği)*. İletişim Yayınları.

RYAN, W. (1971). *Blaming the victim*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

SEN, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford University Press.

SMALL, M. L., HARDING, D. J. ve LAMONT, M. (2010). Reconsidering culture and poverty. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 629*(1), 6–27. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0002716210362077.

ŞENSES, F. (2001). *Küreselleşmenin öteki yüzü: Yoksulluk*. İletişim Yayınları.

TOWNSEND, P. (1979). *Poverty in the United Kingdom: A Survey of Household Resources and Standards of Living*. Penguin Books.

UNDP. (2020). *Human Development Report 2020*. United Nations Development Programme.

VAN DİJK, T. A. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Sage.

WACQUANT, L. (2008). *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Polity Press.

WACQUANT, L. (2009). *Punishing the poor: The neoliberal government of social insecurity*. Duke University Press.

WEBER, M. (1978). *Economy and Society* (G. Roth ve C. Wittich, Ed.). University of California Press.

WELSHMAN, J. (2013). Underclass: A history of the excluded. *Social History of Medicine, 2nd ed.*, *18*(3), 467–469. https://www.torrossa.com/it/resources/an/5216095.

WILSON, W. J. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. University of Chicago Press.

WILSON, W. J. (2010). Why both social structure and culture matter in a holistic analysis of inner-city poverty. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 629*(1), 200–219. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0002716209357403?casa_token=E-jlV1YTEcQAAAAA:NIAhFK7H1Z9KaC7Gth_4K8Sovc26lk-WrrCK2YmzZJHOAC72VUwrl5n1sgJosZYX6whxwmYAkyqI.

WORLD BANK. (2000). *World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking Poverty*. World Bank. https://opendata.uni-halle.de/bitstream/1981185920/106496/698/578680033.pdf.

WORLD BANK. (2020). *Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2020: Reversals of Fortune*. World Bank. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/poverty-and-shared-prosperity-2020.

YOUNG, M. (1958). *The Rise of the Meritocracy, 1870–2033*. Thames & Hudson.

ZIPES, J. (2018). *The Irresistible Fairy Tale: The Cultural and Social History of a Genre*. Princeton University Press.