

Responses to Anonymous Comment

We thank very much to the anonymous reader for his/her valuable comments and suggestions.

I read this paper with interest. Although I believe the analyses are somewhat "old school" and the study comprises too few attempts to link it to the international literature on gender discrimination, I believe the results are insightful. I believe the following things should be done in a revision.

1. The manuscript is not well-written at all. Therefore, I would advise the editor to accept it only conditional on professional language editing. **The language of the paper will be edited.**

2. The manuscript is, both with respect to the literature review and with respect to the discussion of the results, too much focused on Turkey. The authors should stress why this study is also relevant with respect to an international audience. In addition, they should compare their results more thoroughly with findings from other countries. **Wage discrimination is an important and relevant issue for both developed and developing economies. This will be briefly emphasized in the paper. We will compare our results more thoroughly with findings from other countries.**

3. The golden standard to measure discrimination in the labour market are nowadays field experiments (Azmat and Petrongolo, 2014; Riach and Rich, 2004). In contrast to "old school" decomposition methods, they allow to disentangle employer discrimination from all supply-side determinants of labour market outcomes. While the authors measures might be biased due to selection (e.g. due to unobserved differences in behaviour and preferences between men and women), this is not an issue when analyzing data from randomised experiments. It is strange that this literature is not even mentioned, given that Economics E-journal recently published Baert (2015), a study contributing to this literature. **We will acknowledge and mention the existence of a newer methodology based on field experiments. We will also cite Baert (2015) as well as other important studies in this line of research.**

3a. I believe the authors should at least mention the limitations of their method compared with the golden standard. **We will acknowledge the limitations of our methods in our paper.**

3b. The authors should at least cite some recent contributions to this reference literature with respect to gender discrimination (e.g., Albert et al. 2011; Baert et al., Forthcoming; Petit, 2007; Riach and Rich, 2006). **We will cite in our paper the recent studies of field experiments.**

(Note that following the suggestion of an anonymous reader, we will reestimate all models for each year between 2004 and 2014 by using a different data source, the Labor Force Survey.)

References

Albert, R., L. Escot, and J. Fernández-Cornejo (2011). A field experiment to study sex and age discrimination in the Madrid labour market. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 22 (2): 351–375.

Azmat, G., and B. Petrongolo (2014). Gender and the Labor Market: What Have We Learned from Field and Lab Experiments? *Labour Economics* 30 (Special Issue on "What determined the dynamics of labour economics research in the past 25 years?"): 32–40.

Baert, S., A. De Pauw, and N. Deschacht (Forthcoming). Do Employer Preferences Contribute to Sticky Floors? *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*.

Petit, P. (2007). The effects of age and family constraints on gender hiring discrimination: A field experiment in the French financial sector. *Labour Economics* 14 (3): 371–391.

Riach, P.A., and J. Rich (2002). Field experiments of discrimination in the market place. *Economic Journal* 112 (November): F480–F518.

Riach, P.A., and J. Rich (2006). An Experimental Investigation of Sexual Discrimination in Hiring in the English Labor Market. *B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy (Advances)* 5 (2): 1.