

©Copyright 2015

Kader Tekkas

The influence of masculinity and gender equality on violence against women in young male  
university students in Turkey

Kader Tekkas

A dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

Requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2015

Reading Committee:

Patricia A. Betrus, Chair

Nancy F. Woods

Shawn K. Elmore

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Nursing Science

University of Washington

**Abstract**

The influence of masculinity and gender equality on violence against women in young male university students in Turkey

Kader Tekkas

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:  
Associate Professor, Patricia A. Betrus  
Psychosocial and Community Health Nursing

**Background:** Gender inequalities increase the risk of male violence against women (VAW). The roles and behaviors of women and men, children as well as adults, are constructed and reinforced by gender norms in the community and society. For this reason, constructions and conceptualizations of masculinities and femininities, gender roles for men and women need to be understood well to develop programs to prevent VAW. This dissertation is composed of three papers. The purpose of first paper is to review literature on VAW in Turkey for determining influencing factors on VAW and proposing potential interventions based on social ecological framework. The purpose of second paper is to explore perspectives of young Turkish men, aged 18-25, about meanings and conceptualizations of masculinity. The purpose of third paper is to explore views of Turkish male university students about men's gender roles in family life.

**Method:** First paper critically examined VAW in Turkey based on social ecological framework. Organized into four sections; (1) Family structure and cultural practices related to women's rights in Turkey; (2) VAW in Turkey: magnitude of the problem; (3) Determinants of VAW

based on social ecological framework; (4) Future recommendations to prevent VAW in Turkey based on social ecological framework. Second and third papers are qualitative research. . For this study five focus group interviews were conducted with 46 participants from two universities in Istanbul. The content analysis approach was used. Data were analyzed inductively by using Atlas.ti software program version Mac OS X.

**Results:** First paper suggest that paternalistic culture and attitudes, gender inequality, lack of legal protections, and limited community assistance have an important influence on women's experience of violence. Young age at marriage, personal abuse history, lower level of education, alcohol and substance abuse, men's having multiple partners, low relationship satisfaction, arranged and forced marriage, poverty, lack of family and social support, lack of economic opportunities for women, social norms, laws and policies about VAW were the risk factors span the individual, relationship, community, and societal levels.

The participants for the second and third papers had a mean age of 21.54 years. All students were single and seventeen of the forty-six participants were in a relationship. The two domains that characterize young men's thoughts, beliefs, and behaviors related to masculinity were: (1) conceptualizations of masculinity, (2) masculine performativity. Young men identified "authority", "toughness", "self-sufficiency", and "high achievement and success" concepts as the masculine identities of their perceived "real man". Additionally, two concepts that characterize the young men's hypermasculine performance were "being homophobic" and "having an active sex life". Moreover, three major categories emerged about men's gender roles in family life; (1) male breadwinner identity, (2) female breadwinner identity, and (3) doing or avoiding housework. Earning income to provide for the family and protecting the family were accepted as men's major duties. Most of these young men had negative attitudes towards women's

employment. Men avoided housework due to masculine pride, feeling entitled, lack of time at home, parenting style, and tolerance to mess.

**Conclusion:** VAW is one of the most pervasive, yet underestimated, social and public health problems in Turkey. In order to prevent VAW in Turkey, prevention policies and programs should involve a continuum of activities that address multiple levels of the social ecological framework. Gender norms are one of the most crucial factors influencing all these levels. Young Turkish men still hold traditional gender roles and masculinity concepts. Healthy gender identity among college-aged Turkish men needs to be supported. There are no programs involving adult or adolescent men in the promoting gender equality and prevention of VAW. There is a need to design to implement an intervention program to engage men and boys to develop new beliefs and attitudes about gender equality with the long-term goal of preventing VAW.

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b>DEDICATION</b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Purpose</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Content of the Dissertation</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>References:</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>PAPER ONE</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Investigating Violence against Women in Turkey: A Social Ecological Framework</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Family Structure and Cultural Practices Related to Women’s Rights in Turkey</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Violence against women in Turkey: Magnitude of the problem</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Determinants of Violence Against Women Based on Social Ecological     Framework</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>Future Recommendations to Prevent Violence Against Women in Turkey     Based on Social Ecological Framework</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>PAPER TWO</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>Young Turkish Men’s Conceptualizations of Masculinity</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Conceptual Framework</b> .....	<b>43</b>
<b>Method</b> .....	<b>46</b>
<b>Results</b> .....	<b>52</b>
<b>Discussion</b> .....	<b>61</b>
<b>Implications for further research and practice</b> .....	<b>64</b>

References .....	67
<b>PAPER THREE .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Men’s Gender Roles in Family Life: Views of Turkish Male University Students.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Abstract .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Method .....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Results.....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Discussion and Conclusions.....</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Consent Form.....</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Turkish Version of the Consent Form .....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Demographic Survey .....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>Turkish Version of the Demographic Survey.....</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>Ground Rules .....</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>Focus Group Interview Questions .....</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>Flyer .....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Turkish Version of the Flyer.....</b>	<b>112</b>

## **List of Tables**

**Table 1.** World Health Organization's recommendations to prevent violence against women....**3**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This thesis is a culmination of combined efforts, inputs, and support from many people that I owe many thanks. First and foremost, I would like to thank to my thesis advisor, Dr. Patricia Betrus, for the continuous support of my Ph.D study and research. Her expertise, understanding, and patience, added considerably to my graduate experience. Dr. Betrus provided both advice and freedom to pursue different projects without objection. I appreciate her knowledge and skills in many areas and assistance in writing this thesis, grant proposals and scholarship applications. I also would like to thank to members of my committee, Dr. Nancy Woods, Dr. Shawn Elmore and Dr. Jon Conte for the assistance they provided at all levels of this research project. I am very grateful to them for their scientific advice and knowledge and many insightful discussions and suggestions. In particular, I thank to Dr. Woods for reading my thesis carefully and letting me think each part of this research more broadly.

I will forever be thankful to my former advisor, Dr. Yoriko Kozuki, who helped me to narrow down my research interest to figure out what I wanted to do in my graduate experience. Also, I would like to thank her for introducing Dr. Betrus to me and helping me to find the best chair ever. A very special thanks goes out to Dr. Elizabeth Herdman, former director of Koc University School of Nursing, without whose motivation and encouragement I would not have considered a graduate career in the United States. I doubt I will ever be able to convey my

appreciation fully, but I owe her my eternal gratitude.

I would like express my gratitude to Semahat Arsel, Chairman of the Vehbi Koc Foundation and Semahat Arsel Nursing Education and Research Center (SANERC), who awarded me scholarship to study at University of Washington. Without her financial support pursuing a Ph.D degree in the United States would not be possible for me. Also, I would like to acknowledge and thank, The Hester McLaws Nursing Scholarship Fund of the University of Washington, School of Nursing for the extra funding they provided to further this thesis.

I would like to thank all men who participated in this study. They generously shared their thoughts and beliefs with me, a complete stranger. Also, I would like to thank to Ecem Misir and Ozge Conak who helped with obtaining permission from and connecting me with collaborators in the universities where I conducted this study. Additionally, I would like to thank to Shih-Yin Lin for her assistance in data analysis process.

I met many great people throughout my years in University of Washington and am lucky to share their friendship. I learned a lot from my cohort, 2011 PhD in Nursing Program. In particular, I would like to thank to Musetta Fu, Weichao Yuwen, Grace Tu, Jungeun Lee, Meg Lagunas and Rita Ismail for providing support and friendship that I needed. We survived together in this difficult Ph.D journey.

I especially thank my parents, sister, brother and Duygu Boran for the support they

provided me through my entire life. My parents, Saziye and Ismail Tekkas, sacrificed their lives so that my siblings and myself can have better lives and education. They were a source of infinite unconditional love and care. My sister, Tulay Misir, has been my best friend all my life and always supported me. I thank her for her advices and support.

Finally, I would like to thank to my fiancé, Bilal Kerman. Without his love, encouragement and editing assistance, I would not have finished this thesis. He has been a true and great supporter. He has always been the first person reading and editing my papers, and helping me to write grant, scholarship and award applications. He has faith in my intellect and me, even when I did not have faith in myself. Last two years of the graduate school were not easy, both academically and personally. There were times that I felt depressed and anxious. He was the one helping me to deal with all difficulties and always made me feel better. I truly thank Bilal for always being there for me.

## **DEDICATION**

*I dedicate this thesis to*

*my family and fiancé, Bilal*

*for their constant support and unconditional love.*

## INTRODUCTION

Violence against women (VAW) is accepted as one of the most pervasive, yet underestimated, social and public health problems worldwide (Ellsberg, Jansen, Heise, Watts, & Garcia-Moreno, 2008; Krug, Mercy, Dahlberg, & Zwi, 2002). It affects all and ranges from 15% to 71% in all countries of the world, including Turkey. The rate of physical or sexual violence by their husbands or partners at some point in their lives is 42% for women aged 15–60 in Turkey (Turkish Republic Prime Ministry Directorate General on the Status of Women, 2009). Violence against women is a violation of human rights and embedded in all sections of society including education, justice and the health system.

In addition to being a violation of human rights, VAW also severely damages the physical, sexual, reproductive, emotional, mental, and social well-being of individuals and families (WHO, 2010). There are many short and long-term health outcomes associated with violence, including physical injury, unwanted pregnancy, abortion, gynecological complications, sexually transmitted infections (including HIV/AIDS), posttraumatic stress disorder, anxiety and depression. Additionally, exposure to violence during pregnancy is associated with miscarriage, premature labor, and low birth weight. The victims of violence against women are more likely to engage in high-risk behaviors such as smoking, substance abuse, and unsafe sex (WHO, 2010). The effect of VAW on family members can be considerable, for example, children living in families where domestic violence occurs can have behavioral, emotional and schooling problems and don't receive health care (Almeida, 2013). When the violence ends, the effects of witnessing domestic violence diminish in time but the impact can continue through adulthood. The children

may develop depression, anxiety, and trauma related symptoms (Straus, Gelles, & Smith, 1990). As adults there is an increased risk of these children perpetrating or experiencing violence.

World Health Organization's message is "Violence against women is preventable" (Almeida, 2013). In the literature, different approaches and perspectives have been adopted to understand and prevent VAW. The "human rights approach" is based on recognizing the discrimination that underlies VAW. In this approach governments are required to respect, protect, and fulfill human rights by adopting preventative and protective measures and prosecuting and punishing perpetrators (Craven & Clearinghouse, 2003; WHO, 2010). Further, this approach accepts VAW as a violation of many human rights, including the right to equality and non-discrimination; the rights of life, liberty, autonomy, and security of the person; the right to privacy; and the right to an accessible standard of health. According to The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), countries party to the CEDAW should be responsible for taking actions to eradicate VAW, including developing policies or programs that promote or protect human rights, or establishing national institutions to monitor and prevent human rights violations (Baldez, 2011).

A second and commonly accepted approach to understanding violence against women is the "gender perspective". This approach emphasizes the power differences and hierarchical constructions of masculinity and femininity as the predominant and pervasive causes of VAW (WHO, 2010). These constructions are predicated on the control of women, and thus result in structural gender inequality as explained by feminist theory. According to feminist theory, VAW emphasizes the gender and power inequality in opposite gender relationships and feminist researchers claim that violence is part of a system of coercive control through which men maintain societal dominance over women (Anderson, 1997). Men secure masculine identities

through prestige and authority (Hunnicut, 2009). Systems of male domination allow men to demonstrate that they are different from, and better than, women. In such societies, generally, the most prestigious jobs are assigned to men and there is greater incentive to reject or break with femininity. If male domination is blocked for any reason, men may respond with violent behavior (Hunnicut, 2009). Based on feminist theories WHO suggest that VAW is rooted in gender inequality and it is associated with cultural norms of male ownership of women, and that the lack of equality between men and women within homes is the primary cause of violence (Almeida, 2013; Humphreys & Campbell, 2010). For this reason, preventing violence against women is possible with promoting gender equality and health sector plays a key role on this by collaborating with other stakeholders such as local government, social services, media, and education. WHO recommends programs to reduce VAW need to address risk factors at multiple levels (Almeida, 2013) (Table 1).

Table 1. World Health Organization’s recommendations to prevent violence against women

<b>Level</b>	<b>Risk Factor</b>	<b>Intervention</b>
Individual	History of violence in Childhood	Parenting programs to prevent child maltreatment
Relationship	Male control over women	Programs targeting men and boys to promote gender equitable attitudes and behaviors
Community	Unequal gender norms that condone violence against women	Programs promoting equitable gender norms through media, community mobilization, schools, and religious institutions
Societal	Male partners’ use of alcohol Women’s lack of access education and employment	Reducing availability and access to alcohol Laws and policies and programs that promote women’s access to employment and microcredit, girls’ access to education, and that ban or prohibit violence against women

Consequently, the relationship between gender and violence is complex. The roles and behaviors of women and men, children as well as adults are constructed and reinforced by gender norms in society (WHO, 2009). For this reason, constructions and conceptualizations of masculinities and femininities, gender roles for men and women need to be understood well to develop programs to prevent violence against women.

### **Purpose**

The purposes of this dissertation were to; review literature about violence against women in Turkey; explore perspectives of young Turkish men, aged 18-25, about their meanings and conceptualizations of masculinity; explore young men's attitudes and beliefs towards men's gender roles in family life.

### **Content of the Dissertation**

This dissertation consists of three papers. The first paper is the literature review about violence against women in Turkey based on social ecological framework. Family structure and cultural practices related to women's rights, the prevalence of violence against women in Turkey are presented. Determinants of violence against women and future recommendations to prevent violence against women in Turkey are provided based on social ecological framework.

The second and third papers include the analysis of qualitative data we collected through focus group interviews with young men in Istanbul, Turkey. The second paper presents the results about young men's conceptualizations of masculinity. The third paper presents the results about the views of young men's about men's gender roles in family life.

## References:

- Almeida, T. (2013). Violence against women, the health sector responds. Retrieved from <http://seedstheatre.org/violence-against-women-the-health-sector-responds/>
- Anderson, K. L. (1997). Gender, Status, and Domestic Violence: An Integration of Feminist and Family Violence Approaches. [Article]. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 59(3), 655-669.
- Baldez, L. (2011). The UN Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW): A New Way to Measure Women's Interests. *Politics & Gender*, 7(03), 419-423.
- Craven, Z., & Clearinghouse, F. V. (2003). *Human Rights and Domestic Violence: Australian Domestic & Family Violence Clearinghouse*.
- Ellsberg, M., Jansen, H. A., Heise, L., Watts, C. H., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2008). Intimate partner violence and women's physical and mental health in the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: an observational study. *Lancet*, 371(9619), 1165-1172. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(08)60522-x
- Humphreys, J., & Campbell, J. C. (2010). *Family violence and nursing practice*: Springer Publishing Company.
- Hunnicut, G. (2009). Varieties of Patriarchy and Violence Against Women: Resurrecting "Patriarchy" as a Theoretical Tool. [Article]. *Violence Against Women*, 15(5), 553-573.
- Krug, E. G., Mercy, J. A., Dahlberg, L. L., & Zwi, A. B. (2002). [World report on violence and health]. *Biomedica*, 22 Suppl 2, 327-336.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Smith, C. (1990). *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*: Transaction Publishers New Brunswick, NJ.
- Turkish Republic Prime Ministry Directorate General on the Status of Women, H. U. I. o. P. S., ICON-Institute Public Sector GmbH, and BNB Consulting. (2009). *National research on domestic violence against women in Turkey*. Ankara: Retrieved from [http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/eng/dokumanlar/2008-TDVAW\\_Main\\_Report.pdf](http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/eng/dokumanlar/2008-TDVAW_Main_Report.pdf).
- WHO, W. H. O. (2009). Violence Prevention the Evidence: Promoting gender equality to prevent violence against women.
- WHO, W. H. O. (2010). *Preventing intimate partner and sexual violence against women: Taking action and generating evidence*. Geneva, World Health Organization.

## **PAPER ONE**

### **Investigating Violence against Women in Turkey: A Social Ecological Framework**

#### **Abstract**

This paper reviews current research and reports on violence against women in Turkey. It is organized into four sections; (1) Family structure and cultural practices related to women's rights in Turkey; (2) Violence against women in Turkey: magnitude of the problem; (3) Determinants of violence against women based on social ecological framework; (4) Future recommendations to prevent violence against women in Turkey based on social ecological framework.

Pertinent studies suggest that violence against women is a significant public health problem in Turkey with femicide which is endemic. Paternalistic culture and attitudes, gender inequality, lack of legal protections, and limited community assistance have an important influence on women's experience of violence. The risk factors which span the individual, relationship, community, and societal levels are young age at marriage, personal abuse history, lower level of education, alcohol/substance abuse, men's having multiple partners, low relationship satisfaction, arranged and forced marriage, poverty, lack of family and social support, lack of economic opportunities for women, social norms, laws and policies about violence against women.

Careful consideration of understanding the factors that influence violence against women based multiple levels of social ecological framework is necessary. This understanding will lead

to the creation of effective prevention strategies for violence against women in Turkey. Inclusion of cultural practices that violate women's right, programs involving young or adult men in the prevention of violence against women are necessary. These programs should be school based to reach larger groups and influence peer relationships. The programs should engage men and boys to develop new beliefs and attitudes about gender equality. Additionally, economic opportunities should be created for women, and Turkish government must "effectively enforce" the law on violence against women.

## **Introduction**

Turkey is a rising power among Middle Eastern countries bridging Europe and Asia. It has been going through revolutions to establish itself as a modern nation with a strong secular and democratic constitution. With a population of about 75 million people Turkey is a predominantly Muslim country. Turkey achieved candidate status for full membership in the European Union (EU) in 2000 and since then the country has been in transformation. Virtually all areas of the governing structure and the interactions between state, society, and individuals are in the process of a change (Keyman, 2010). Despite this transformation, the movement in women's rights and gender equality necessary for Turkey's adoption to EU norms is lagging behind. Laws, and policies against violence to women, honor killings, and hidden forms of discrimination still remain widespread.

The issue of gender equality and women's status in Turkey goes back to the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1920s. The founder and the leader of the modern Turkish Republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk realized the vital role of women in transforming Turkey into a modern nation and launched intensive reforms for gender equality in society. This provided equal rights and opportunities for both women and men. Turkish women were able to exercise political rights, to vote, and to be elected to public office many years before some European countries. Turkish women got equal rights in divorce, custody, and inheritance. Polygamy was abolished during these times. Entire educational systems became mixed gender, from primary to higher education (Bozkurt, 2013). In the 1980s, with the strengthening of the women's movement, both at the international level and Turkey itself, public awareness of women rights has increased.

Until recently, Turkey had made significant progress in gender equality in the

democratization process. Turkey almost achieved eliminating gender inequality in primary education with the equal ratio of girls to boys in primary education reached to 98.9%. (Alata, Arslan, Baran, & Duman, 2010). However, the proportion of girls in secondary and tertiary education was still low. A new law, known as the “employment package”, was passed to encourage female employment. As part of this package the Government started to pay the employer’s share of the social security premium if the employee was a woman (Alata et al., 2010).

Turkish legislation on women’s rights has improved with the modernization of the Turkish penal code, civil code, labor code, family law, and Municipality law (Bozkurt, 2013). Despite all the extensive legal reforms realized in the past to ensure gender equality, Turkey started to rank very low in international indexes on gender equality in recent years. According to The Global Gender Gap Report 2014 published by the World Economic Forum, Turkey ranks 125 out of 142 countries. The 125th place ranking places, Turkey in the lowest position among the European and Central Asian countries ("The Global Gender Gap Report 2014," 2014). The latest governmental report about gender equality in Turkey (Muftuler-Bac, 2012) reveals, only 22.8 % of Turkish women currently work outside the home. 57.2% of these women work in the agricultural sector and half of those are working as unpaid family workers. Women employed outside the home, excluding the family farm, only represent 15.5% of the population. Currently representation of women in politics is also relatively low. Only 14.3% of the Turkish Parliament are woman and Turkey ranks 88<sup>th</sup> among 143 countries for women in politics. (Sevinc, 2012).

While institutions in Turkey acknowledge the need for gender equality, the change must also incorporate the social, cultural and community norms to bring real change. Many of these changes take generations and until then women will continue to experience the results of the

inequality. Violence against women is one of the unfortunate results of the inequality.

### **Family Structure and Cultural Practices Related to Women's Rights in Turkey**

Violence against women (VAW) does not only affect individuals but also affects the whole family, community and society. In order to understand determinants and consequences of VAW in Turkey it is important to take into consideration several factors, Turkish family structures and cultural practices. Many of these factors either separately or together violate the human rights of women and need to be addressed comprehensively.

Turkish society is highly patriarchal, with clear-cut gender role differences which influence the institutions of marriage and family life (Sakalli, 2001). In the Turkish family men are the dominant gender and are expected to have control of the home. The husband is culturally accepted as the ruler of the family and is regarded as the formal authority to which the wife and children must ultimately obey and respond (Sakalli, 2001). Men believe it is their responsibility to control how women dress, how they live, and how they behave in public. Not only do men control 'their' wives, sisters, or female children, they also believe it is alright to control all woman. Men believe that they have the right to control and comment on women's behavior in public. While there are no written or legal rules about where women can go or visit, most women implicitly know that some places of the city are closed to women. While written rules do not exist, unwritten rules contain women's behavior. It is the unwritten cultural rules about their personal lives and behavior that can cost them their lives. Even something as simple as wearing the wrong dress, or talking with someone not viewed as appropriate can be cause enough to exact punishment, often leading to violence. As a result, a woman's freedom is under the control of all of men in Turkey, starting with the men in their own family.

For many years, domestic violence was viewed as a family matter. A man was expected to keep what happened in his household within the family. Many of the women experiencing domestic partner abuse accepted their partners' assaults. They expressed their feelings with statements such as "He is my husband, so he can both love me and hit me" or "Beating comes from heaven." (Dinc & Sahin, 2009; Tas, Uyanik, & Karakaya, 1997). Such beliefs and acceptance facilitated and even perpetuated the violence.

In recent time, however, women's perspectives and beliefs have started to change. In 2009, Altinay and Arat (2009) reported that nine out of ten women agreed with the statement that "wife-beating" was never justifiable. When asked if the courts should penalize men who exercise violence against their wives the same percentage responded "yes".

There are cultural and social traditions that place Turkish women at risk of being viewed as "owned" by men. When viewed as property such honor traditions as bride price, arranged and forced marriages are common practices, even though these activities violate the human rights of women and girls. According to the Turkey Demographic and Health Survey (Studies, 2008) the median age at first marriage is 20.8 years with 39.7 percent of women marrying prior to age 18. Although legal marriage age is 17, adolescents in age 15-17 can 'admit' to court to get legal permission to get married (Güler & Küçüker, 2010). Added to the complexity of understanding marital traditions in Turkey, is that many young women marry only within a religious ceremony, and do not go through any legal marriage ceremony. The marriage is not recorded legally since these illegal marriages are off the record they are not included in the statistics (Cakmak, 2009).

It's difficult to determine the exact number of childhood marriages in Turkey. There are many reasons why women marry at an early age; father's death, a large number of daughters and/or children, poor financial circumstances or lack of other opportunities. The decision to

marry is not only the women's, but rather it is a family decision. When the family is in need it is often the father and family who make the decision to marry their daughters off at an early age. Where young girls are perceived as an economic liability, their marriage may form part of a family's survival strategy. Families negotiate the bride price and the husband's family must pay. In this centuries old tradition, the family of the bride states a price and asks groom or groom's family to pay a certain sum amount in order to complete the marriage. According to a child-bride study conducted in 2012 in Diyarbakir, a city located in southeastern Anatolia region in Turkey, 91% of 300 women (273) had 9 or more siblings when they got married. Nearly half of the women (45.7%) in this study were sold in an arranged marriage because of the need to get money from the groom's family to support bride's family (Oto, 2012). The tradition of arranged marriage limits any possibility of women having any choice or decision about their personal freedom. Further, buying a wife enables the husband to think of her as property and under his total control. This potentiates the possibility of domestic violence. If the woman does not absolutely obey him the consequences may be very harsh including death.

Honor killings are another cultural practice violating women's rights and life. This is the most serious form of violence against women in Turkey. Honor killings occur when a woman steps outside of her socially prescribed role of wife or of daughter (e.g., by engaging in extra marital sexual relationship, having interactions with men outside the family, or, any activity which brings shame and dishonor to the family). The honor killing is generally committed by a male member(s) of the family. In a culturally traditional society honor means everything, and loss of honor affects not only a person, but the whole family or community. In Turkish society, a man's honor is defined by two words: *seref* (*sharaf* in Arabic), which is a man's reputation as a member of community; and *namus*, which describes the chastity of his female family members.

When *namus* has been lost by suspicion of or unchaste conduct, the only way to restore *seref* is killing the guilty woman (van Osch, Breugelmans, Zeelenberg, & Bölük, 2013; *Violence against women in Turkey: A report to the committee against torture*, 2003). By committing honor killing the man restores his reputation within the community, as well as that of his family. In Turkey, it is not possible to obtain accurate statistics on the number of honor crimes. Authorities do not systematically prosecute these crimes. In 2009, the Ministry of Justice stated that the number of murders of women increased 1400% between 2002 and 2009. According to “We Will Stop Women Murders Platform”, a non-governmental organization keeping records of women murders, 294 women were murdered in 2014. The reasons for these killings included: woman’s willingness to make a decision about her life (47%), separation or divorce (25%), financial reasons (10%) and unknown (18%). Thus, whatever the reason, the rate of honor killing is increasing and the cultural practices in the family still continue to violate the human rights of women (Platform, 2015)

In some regions of Turkey, the maintenance of female virginity has been equated with family honor. Thus a practice of testing virginity via vaginal exams was implemented. The government issued a decree to clarify the differences between testing of virginity and the medically necessary vaginal and anal exams required by law. The government banned the practice of forced virginity testing on women, however it still continues to be widespread in regions in Turkey and unfortunately, it is endorsed by some government officials in parts of Turkey (Zeyneloğlu, Kısa, & Yılmaz, 2013) Despite the new national laws on prohibition of virginity testing, the government has been slow to implement the law, or to enforce the law. Young women are forcefully taken to hospitals by their families who suspect their daughters have had premarital sex. If the young women’s hymen is ruptured, regardless of the reason, the

family has it surgically repaired, thus re-establishing her ‘virginity’. In Turkey, the laws do not prohibit hymen repair for family honor. Because of the pressure from family and community young women are now requesting a virginity test, so that they can assure they are intact to prospective men. There is an increasing trend of women requesting hymen repair. The women pay for surgery to reconstruct their hymens in secret prior to marriage, because of the fear that if it is ruptured they will be honor killed by their husband or her family (Zeyneloğlu et al., 2013).

Cultural practices like bride’s price, forced marriages, honor killings and virginity testing still continue to violate women’s rights in many areas of Turkey and those practices place women at increased risk of violence and support the belief that a woman is “owned” by her husband. Although violence against women (VAW) is a widespread concern, prevention programs are few and far between in Turkey. Current studies explored the role of culture, laws, or prevention programs separately. Yet, in order to take action to prevent VAW, all aspects of the problem should be considered systematically and comprehensively in the studies.

The purpose of this paper is to; (a) Review literature in violence against women in Turkey, (b) determine influencing factors on VAW by using a social ecological framework, (c) propose potential interventions and areas of future research based on social ecological framework.

### **Violence against women in Turkey: Magnitude of the problem**

The prevalence of violence against women raises concerns in Turkey. The frequency of domestic violence varies considerably among provinces. The rate of violence against women, experienced at some point of their lives, ranges from 14.4% to 93% (Karaçam, Çalışır, Dündar, Altuntaş, & Avcı, 2006; Mayda & Akkuş, 2005; Burcu Tokuç, Ekuklu, & Avcioğlu, 2010). The first-ever comprehensive Turkish nationwide survey on the prevalence of domestic violence

against women was completed in 2009. This study included interviews with over 12,000 women from all regions of Turkey. It indicated that 42% of women aged 15–60 had suffered some physical or sexual violence by their husbands or partners at some point in their lives (Turkish Republic Prime Ministry Directorate General on the Status of Women, 2009). In the same study, the rate of sexual violence was 18% in rural and 14% in urban areas. This translates to at least 11 million women who have experienced physical or sexual violence in Turkey. Women in Turkey, like their counterparts in Western nations, find it hard to report sexual violence and victims of the most serious sexual offences often never tell anyone about it. For this reason, it is assumed that sexual violence rates are actually higher than reported in this survey (Altınay & Arat, 2009).

Similarly, a study in 2003 (*Violence against women in Turkey: A report to the committee against torture*, 2003), reported that 90% of Turkish women had experienced some type of violence from their husbands or boyfriends and many women reported that their husbands had starting beating them on their wedding night. Thus, women can experience violence at any point in their lives.

In a different nationwide survey, (Altınay & Arat, 2009) 34% of women throughout Turkey had been subjected to physical violence by their husbands in their lifetime and this number increased to 40% for women from the Eastern part of Turkey, (note bene: Eastern Turkey is a more rural section of the county). Beside domestic violence rates, femicide in Turkey is endemic. In 2009, the Republic of Turkey Ministry of Justice stated that the rate of murdered women increased by 1400% between 2002 and 2009 (Karal & Aydemir, 2012). After this report, the Turkish government stopped releasing violence against women statistics and non-government organizations started to keep records of male violence against women. According to Independent Communication Network statistics, men killed at least 281 women in 2014; one out of five

women were killed for seeking a divorce or breaking up a partner; 46 percent of women's murderers were their husbands and 10 percent were partners; and killing of women increased 31 percent in 2014 compared to 2013 (Talhaoglu, 2015).

### **Determinants of Violence Against Women Based on Social Ecological Framework**

A number of risk and protective factors have been identified with regard to violence against women, and these factors span the individual, relationship, community, and societal levels (Mamdouh et al., 2012). The risk factors are not direct causes of violence against women, but rather are correlated with a greater likelihood of violence, victimization or perpetration. In addition, these factors work in combination at the individual, relationship, community, and societal levels to increase the risk of experiencing violence. Understanding the factors associated with violence against women is essential for critiquing and creating primary prevention and designing interventions. The salient factors, social conditions, and characteristics related to violence against women will be described using a social ecological model. The social ecological approach states that no single factor can explain why some women are at higher risk of experiencing violence than are others (L. L. Heise, 1998; Rachel Jewkes, Levin, & Penn-Kekana, 2002); instead, risk of violence against women is influenced by the interaction of individual, relationship, community, and societal factors (CDC, 2009).

**Individual Level:** The individual level consists of biological and personal history factors that may increase a person's risk of being a victim or perpetrator of violence. Salient factors include age, education, and personal abuse history (CDC, 2009; García-Moreno, Jansen, Ellsberg, Heise, & Watts, 2005; Mamdouh et al., 2012).

*Age:* Young age has been identified as a risk factor for women to experience intimate

partner violence and for a man to commit physical violence against a partner (Rachel Jewkes et al., 2002; Romans, Forte, Cohen, Du Mont, & Hyman, 2007; Vest, Catlin, Chen, & Brownson, 2002). However, other researchers have found little relationship between age of either partner and violence (R. Jewkes, 2002; Rachel Jewkes et al., 2002; Koenig, Stephenson, Ahmed, Jejeebhoy, & Campbell, 2006; Martin, Tsui, Maitra, & Marinshaw, 1999). In Turkey, 39.7 percent of women marry before turning 18 (Ministry of Family and Social Policies, 2006). Moreover, arranged marriages take place at an early ages based on the decisions of the family, mostly due to poverty or economic problems. Although bride price is illegal, it is still a common practice in some regions of Turkey. Families sell daughters who are young to support their families' economy (UNFPA, 2014). Additionally, some families accept their daughters as a socioeconomic burden and marrying off them as early as possible means "one less mouth to feed" (UNFPA, 2014). Thus, young age at marriage is associated with power dynamics in the family and leads to an increased exposure to violence due to husband's perceived superiority over women and increased authority (Yuksel-Kaptanoglu, Turkyilmaz, & Heise, 2012).

*Personal Abuse History:* Childhood history of abuse increases the likelihood of children experiencing or perpetrating violence in the future. In a nationwide study in Turkey, women who witness their own mothers physically abused by their fathers are 1.59 times more likely being abused by current spouse. Husbands witnessed their mother physically abused in their childhood were 1.71 times more likely to abuse their wives (Yuksel-Kaptanoglu et al., 2012).

*Education:* Research has indicated that women with a lower level of education are at greater risk for experiencing violence (Abramsky et al., 2011; Ackerson, Kawachi, Barbeau, & Subramanian, 2008; Boyle, Georgiades, Cullen, & Racine, 2009; Johnson & Das, 2009).

Education is a gateway to other opportunities, including greater access to resources in society,

higher self-confidence, better employment, and higher income. A higher level of education may act as a protective factor. Research shows that women with a higher level of education and married couples with relatively equivalent education levels are less likely to experience IPV (Abramsky et al., 2011; Dalal, Rahman, & Jansson, 2009; Ellsberg et al., 2008). In Turkey, women have equal to or lower educational level than their husbands in a typical family. Women who were more educated than their husband were less likely to experience violence (Yuksel-Kaptanoglu et al., 2012). A study of child marriages in Turkey (2012), indicated that 25 percent of women stated they were already victims of violence before they got married and after marriage their exposure to violence by their husband doubled (Sol, 2012)

*Alcohol and substance use:* There is strong evidence that alcohol use is both a risk factor for and an outcome of IPV (Duailibi et al., 2007; Gil-Gonzalez, Vives-Cases, Alvarez-Dardet, & Latour-Pérez, 2006; Stuart et al., 2003). The European Union (EU) report on domestic violence against women (2010), reviewed 12 of the possible causes of domestic violence against women. Alcoholism was the most frequently indicated cause by individuals surveyed across the EU. Indeed, 95% of respondents indicated alcoholism as a cause of domestic violence, while an additional 92% regarded drug addiction as a cause (TNS & Directorate-General for Justice, 2010). According to the National Epidemiologic Survey on alcohol and related conditions, alcohol and cocaine abuse were most strongly associated with IPV perpetration, while cannabis and opioid abuse were most strongly associated with IPV victimization (Smith, Homish, Leonard, & Cornelius, 2012). Similar results were found in a study in Turkey that interviewed women with a history of being assaulted by their spouses. Eighty percent of women's husbands had at least one 'bad habit' such as alcohol use or gambling (Balci & Ayranci, 2005). In a study conducted to determine the prevalence of domestic violence among of women in Ankara, the

capital of Turkey, alcohol use was one of the reasons cited for the use of violence by husbands against their wives. (Akar, Aksakal, Demirel, Durukan, & Özkan, 2010)

**Relationship Level:** Personal relationships with family, friends, and intimate partners can also be studied for risk factors to domestic violence. At this level, a person's closest friends, partners, and family members, and marital household issues influence their behavior and contribute to their range of experiences. Factors associated with victimization/perpetration of domestic violence include the man having multiple partners and conflict or dissatisfaction in the relationship (CDC, 2009; Mamdouh et al., 2012).

*Multiple Partners:* There is a strong association between having multiple partners and the perpetration or victimization of intimate partner violence (IPV) (Abrahams, Jewkes, Hoffman, & Laubsher, 2004; Chan, 2009; Dalal et al., 2009; Koenig et al., 2006; Vung & Krantz, 2009). Studies from India, South Africa, Uganda, Vietnam, and the United States have demonstrated that if a person has multiple sexual partners, the likelihood of either experiencing or perpetrating IPV increases to a 1.5- to 2-fold greater risk. The Turkish Legislation and Regulations sets the standards for marriage in Turkey, which is civil marriage. Couples can have a religious ceremony, if they wish, in addition to the civil one, but the religious marriage has no legal standing.

In Turkey, some men marry a woman in a civil marriage and then take several other wives, but only in a religious marriage. The belief held by these men is that if they marry the women they are having an affair with in a religious ceremony then they have legitimized the relationship, and they are not committing adultery. The wife who was married in the legal ceremony, has little or no say in this arrangement. However, this is for men only, women cannot do the same. It would be unacceptable for a woman to have an affair or multiple religious

marriages. If a woman were to have multiple partners, she would be killed in the name of honor (Yuksel-Kaptanoglu et al., 2012).

*Relationship Satisfaction:* Low relationship satisfaction is a risk factor for IPV for both men and women (Slep, Foran, Heyman, & Snarr, 2010) In relationships, violence is used as an expression of frustration and anger during a conflict (R. Jewkes, 2002). Ackerman and Field (2011) examined the association between IPV and relationship satisfaction among victims. They found a negative association between victimization and relationship satisfaction was substantially stronger for women than for men. Similarly, in a meta-analysis examining the relationship between marital satisfaction/discord and IPV in heterosexual relationships, Stith, Green, Smith, and Ward (2008) found that decreased marital satisfaction was associated with increased marital conflict and physical aggression in intimate relationships. There was with no difference in the magnitude of the effect size between marital satisfaction and IPV and marital discord and IPV.

In Turkey, there are several marriage traditions that may also influence the risk of male violence against women in marital relationships. The traditional involvement of in-laws in the marital life of young couples increase marital conflicts and the risk of violence. Increased urbanization in Turkey led to an increasing number of couples living in nuclear families, however the couple is expected to involve the whole family in their decision making process (Karaoglu et al., 2006). The parents, in-laws and other relatives may intervene in child-care, housework, business decisions and social life. Some couples are put in situations where they have to share the most intimate details of their lives with their parents and in-laws. The customs dictate obeying parents and in-laws. Such interference by the family may lead to conflict among partners (Karaoglu et al., 2006).

*Type of marriage:* Arranged and forced marriages are still important concerns that need to be

addressed legally, and culturally in Turkey to reduce IPV. According to Sahin et al. (2010) women who were married in arranged or forced marriages have a 1.6 times higher likelihood of experiencing violence during the marriage,.

**Community Level:** Community describes the settings in which social relationships occur (e.g., schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods), researchers focusing on this level attempt to identify the contextual characteristics related to someone becoming a victim or perpetrator of IPV. Characteristics that have been examined include location (e.g., rural vs. urban), poverty level, and geographic mobility (CDC, 2009; Mamdouh et al., 2012).

*Poverty:* Although there is evidence that IPV occurs in all socioeconomic groups, women living in poverty are at a greater risk for experiencing violence (L. Heise, Ellsberg, & Gottmoeller, 2002; Rachel Jewkes et al., 2002). The literature does not provide a definitive explanation for why poverty increases the risk of IPV. One hypothesis is that the relationship between violence and poverty is mediated by masculine identity. According to this theory, men living in poverty have difficulty living up to their culturally expected role as providers, which causes them extreme stress and can lead them to become perpetrators (R. Jewkes, 2002). Other explanations have suggested that various factors accompanying poverty (e.g., overcrowding or hopelessness) contribute to IPV. Whatever the explanation, the association between poverty and IPV has been demonstrated in several studies (Cunradi, Caetano, Clark, & Schafer, 2000; Tsai, 2013; Uthman, Moradi, & Lawoko, 2009) and according to European Commission Domestic Violence against Women report, poverty is the third most commonly cited cause (77%) of the 12 included in the report (TNS & Directorate-General for Justice, 2010). In Turkey, women from poorer households are in greater risk of experiencing husband violence than did women from better-off households (Yuksel-Kaptanoglu et al., 2012). Similarly, Akar, et al (2010) (Akar et al.,

2010) found that Turkish women whose monthly household income is about \$250 were 3.16 times higher risk of being exposed to violence than women whose monthly income is \$500.

*Lack of family and social support:* The transition to marriage or married status for adolescent girls often is associated with limited access to knowledge, lack of autonomy, removal from previous social networks, entering into hierarchical family pattern, and sometimes-abusive relationships (Haberland, Chong, & Bracken, 2003; Mathur, Greene, & Malhotra, 2003). In some families, a woman goes to live in her husband's family's home after getting married. Contact with the woman's old friends and natal family is limited by her marital family (Nauck & Klaus, 2004). This transition after marriage especially at a young age reduce access to social support from her family and friends, education, labor force options and power in decision making (Jensen & Thornton, 2003; Mathur et al., 2003). All of these factors are threats to women's empowerment and disadvantage for likelihood to experience domestic violence. Even though traditional family relationships in Turkey are believed as strong, women get less support after getting married. Living in a hierarchical family pattern makes women more vulnerable to violence.

*Lack of economic opportunities for women:* Employment status and occupational status of women are polarized in Turkey. Only one in third of married women declare themselves to be employed and many of these women work as family workers. While there is increased female employment in urban areas of Turkey, principally due to new policies which include mass schooling, there is less chance for women who live in rural areas, especially in the Eastern regions of Turkey. In this region, few women have economic freedom. About a quarter of the Kurdish and Arabic women in Eastern regions of Turkey, or one in every 25 women in Turkey, cannot speak Turkish and thus have difficulties getting economic opportunities (Ozbay, 1995).

Consequently, these women are still under the influence and control of their families and patriarchal traditions and values. These values limit the power that women need to manage their own lives. Their husband or their families control them and they live under the pressure of obeying their husbands or their parents. Such lack of power makes women vulnerable to violence.

**Societal Level:** The societal level refers to the social and cultural norms and policies that may contribute to or protect against the perpetration and victimization of domestic violence. These factors include gender-inequitable social norms, IPV acceptability, and weak legal sanctions against domestic violence (CDC, 2009; Mamdouh et al., 2012).

*Social norms:* Beliefs, attitudes, and social norms affect the acceptance or approval of violence (Witte & Mulla, 2012). Neighbors et al. (2010) examined descriptive norms regarding IPV held by men who were IPV perpetrators. These men consistently overestimated the percentage of men who engaged in IPV, and furthermore, their estimates were associated with violence toward their partner over the past 90 days. Women's attitudes and thoughts about IPV are an important indicator of social norms (Linos, Khawaja, & Kaplan, 2012). Studies examining violence within marriage in India, Turkey, Iraq, and Ethiopia have found that women in these cultures have a broad acceptance of spousal abuse (Abeya, Afework, & Yalew, 2011; Altinay & Arat, 2009; Linos et al., 2012; Rani, Bonu, & Diop-Sidibe, 2004).

Women who ordinarily accept male superiority are more likely to conform to patriarchal demands and suffer violence from men (Marshall & Furr, 2010). Women growing up in the Turkish culture that normalizes men's superiority over women put themselves at greater risk of violence from their husbands. In a study conducted in Edirne Turkey, women were asked to provide their opinions about gender discrimination in various scenarios. The results indicated

that 22% of women accepted as standard behavior that men make important familial decisions, 15% accepted that men were more clever than women, and 24% accepted that a woman must not discuss anything with her husband if she does not have the same opinion (B. Tokuç, Ekuklu, & Avcioglu, 2010). One explanation of women's acceptance of their husbands' superiority in decision-making can be found in the Turkish patriarchal structure. Women grow up in a society saturated in male-dominant ideas, attitudes, and policies, which teach them to normalize men's superiority. Another explanation is that women are scared to discuss things with their husbands if they do not have the same opinion because they know that there is the possibility of violence. For this reason, they let men make the important decisions. In a study of 24,647 people in Turkey as part of the (Ministry of Family and Social Policies, 2006) women were asked to answer "How does your spouse respond when you have a disagreement?". Eight percent of women said that their spouses used force. Thus, fear may motivate women to defer to men with regard to decision-making processes and to avoid disagreements with their husbands.

*Laws and policies:* At a societal level, laws and policies related to gender equality and IPV greatly influence the presence of and protection from violence. Laws and policies about IPV and violence prevention vary between countries (WHO, 2010). Policies which may be of help to women victims of IPV are those that inform women about accessible resources, help them leave abusive environments, and provide them with services to treat physical and psychological trauma (e.g., community awareness and advocacy, crisis services, and medium and long-term psychological consultation services (Ofstehage, Gandhi, Sholk, Radday, & Stanzler, 2011). Important legal reforms include: strengthening women's civil rights, sensitizing and training police and judges about partner violence, and strengthening and expanding laws defining rape and sexual assault within marriage (WHO, 2010). In Turkey, in order to protect women rights

and fight violence against women, a new law draft was presented, “Law for the Protection of the Family and Prevention of Violence against Women-Law No:6248”. This law passed in assembly in March 8, 2012 on World Women’s Day. This new law seeks to protect women as well as all family members who are victims of domestic violence and offers financial aid, psychological and legal guidance and support services. Additionally, the law requests violence prevention and monitoring centers to act as shelters for victims, since there are only 103 women’s shelters in all of Turkey for a population of 77.6 million (Women Against Violence Europe Network, 2012). Women can now obtain protection orders and according to new law, if the perpetrator violates the protection order, he will be jailed for the first offense for three days. The previous law-(Law No. 4320) also called for a jail sentence in the event of violation of the protection order, there were no immediate consequences, it took a long time to send the abuser to jail. While the laws are in place to protect women, and the positive developments in the legal framework, acceptance and implementation of the laws are lagging. Turkey is still failing to protect women from male violence.

### **Future Recommendations to Prevent Violence Against Women in Turkey Based on Social Ecological Framework**

In order to prevent violence against women in Turkey, prevention policies and programs should involve a continuum of activities that address multiple levels of the social ecological framework and these policies and programs should be implemented across the lifespan. A holistic approach including all four (individual, relationship, community and societal) levels of the social ecological model is more likely to sustain prevention efforts over time compared to any single intervention.

**Individual Level:** Prevention strategies at the individual level should be based on promoting attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors towards gender equality and prevent violence. In recent years, there has been a growing international consensus regarding the key role that men and boys play in empowering women and girls in achieving gender equality. This is reflected in a series of milestone international meetings and documents. There is not currently a men's or young boy's gender engagement program created or implemented in Turkey While there are programs designed in other countries to use as a foundation, it is important to create a specially designed and programmatic interventions using knowledge of the individual factors for young men in Turkey to education and discuss gender equality.

**Relationship Level:** Individuals' attitudes and behaviors are influenced by their closest social circle. Peers, family members and partners contribute to their experiences. Prevention strategies at this level should include school-based programs focusing on peer relationships, gender equality, prevention of violence against women, and promoting healthy relationships. A school is a particularly appropriate setting for violence prevention programs because it is the place, in which social interaction and development occur (Farrell, Meyer, Kung, & Sullivan, 2001). Although aggressive behaviors through interactions with perverse peers may develop, schools also provide opportunities to develop positive behaviors (Foshee et al., 2013). According to Foshee et al. (2013), adolescents with friends who experience dating violence are more likely to perpetrate violence against their dating partner. Moreover, in order to be accepted by their peers, young men may use violence in school settings. A study by Noonan and Charles (2009) found that eight grade males use emotional abuse (name calling, spreading sexual rumors) to increase their reputations among peers and to save face in front of their peers. On the flip side school setting can be used for positive reinforcement. Peers also can influence the adolescents positively

(Foshee et al., 2013). Social control has a key role in positively influencing other individuals' behaviors in a way promoting social order. For this reason schools provide an environment for using strategies to promote gender equality and nonviolent approach against women. Turkey has increasingly moved towards co-gender education, with about equal ratios of girls and boys in primary school. However, the proportion of girls in secondary and tertiary education was still low, and efforts to directed to increasing the number of girls attending higher schools. Further, Turkey, has no systematic school based programs promoting gender equality. There is a need to establish school-based programs to prevent violence against women by promoting gender equality and non-violent behaviors.

**Community Level:** Prevention strategies at this level should focus on creating economic opportunities for women. Many women in rural areas of Turkey still do not have opportunity to work in paid jobs. While many of the women work in agriculture (many of which are family related and non-paying jobs), nonagricultural female activities are lacking. Limited number of companies, lack of education and social norms are the main obstacles for women. In Turkey the community level will have to have separate community strategies for urban and rural settings. In the rural setting, women do not have opportunity to work; lack of educational opportunities and social norms limit their empowerment. For the rural areas 1 in 25 women do not speak Turkish and for these women finding employment is extremely limited. Interventions would be to increase the educational attainment of women, language outreach, increase employment opportunities outside of the family, and work on gender equality. In cities the establishment of a business improvement district to increase employment opportunities for women should be created. Other improvements in the community especially for rural settings should reflect the need to increase women's employment.

Although there are more job opportunities, economic growth and higher female education attainment in urban settings in Turkey, women's participation in labor force is low and decreasing. According to national statistics, women's participation decreased from 34.3 percent in 1988 to 29.5 percent in 2012 (Gedikli, 2014; TSI, 2012). In urban places, the majority of the women (71%) are housewives (Ozbay, 1995). An important cause of the low level of participation in the labor force is lack of support and options for women to combine working outside of the home with the additional obligations of housework and childcare (Ozbay, 1995). Women with low incomes and little education do not have access to childcare support. Preschool enrollment and childcare centers for children under the age of 5 are privatized and only high-income and high-education families can take advantage of these services. Workplaces, having fewer than 150 women employees, do not provide childcare options. This is a strong incentive for employers not hire more than 150 women to avoid the obligation (İlkkaracan, 2012). This type of bias should be eliminated and there should be monitoring system to determine those workplaces. Additionally, there is an urgent need for child care centers in the communities for women with low education and income.

Creating social networks for victimized women is another strategy. Being in a violent relationship limits women' participation in social networks and makes them more vulnerable and socially isolated (Choi, Cheung, & Cheung, 2012). Thus, there is a need recreational opportunities and social networks for victimized women or for women at risk of exposure to violence. These recreational activities may assist the women to increase their familiarity with the surrounding community, and local resources by interacting with peers.

**Societal Level:** Prevention strategies should be based on transforming social norms and policies.

Social marketing campaigns and public education focusing on violence against women can be

effective in changing social norms. In a society where honor and shame shape societal norms, the social campaigns should be directed at emphasizing the dishonor and shame of a man who “beats”. They must be targeted for changing the societal acceptance of violence against women. In Turkey, there is an increased interest using media to reach larger groups, but ‘social marketing’ should not only involve media. It is important to not only have programs and advertisements but to have individuals involved in the movement. Unfortunately, there are limited numbers of protest or promoting awareness about domestic violence walks and they are led by predominantly women or action oriented groups of women.

In Turkey, the few studies on these issues mostly focus on women empowerment or intervening with victims of violence and there is little research on changing batterers’ cognitions, ideologies and/or behaviors. There are no laws in Turkey to mandate men who have committed violence against women to participate in an intervention program, The current law for the Protection of the Family and Prevention of Violence against Women only includes putting men in prison if they violate the protection order. Violence against women and the legal consequences of arrest and conviction should be accepted as a serious crime Government must “effectively enforce” the law on violence against women.

### **Conclusion**

Violence against women is one of the most pervasive, yet underestimated, social and public health problems in Turkey. The culture of Turkey plays a key role influencing social norms and accepting violence against women. For this reason, cultural practices that violate women’s rights should be considered in violence prevention strategies. Additionally, the number of risk factors span the individual, relationship, community, and societal levels. Understanding the risk and

protective factors associated with VAW is essential for creating the interventions needed for primary prevention. In recent years, national programs are focused on women victims to determine causes and effects of violence, interventions for women to prevent violence or creating programs for coping with violence. Yet, there are limited number of legal support services and shelters for women victimized by domestic violence.

There are no programs involving adult or adolescent men in the prevention of violence against women. There is a need to design to implement an intervention program to engage men and boys to develop new beliefs and attitudes about gender equality with the long-term goal of preventing violence against women. Lastly, school based programs may be useful to reach larger groups and influence peer relationships to prevent violence against women. Consequently, a careful consideration of understanding the factors that influence violence against women based multiple levels of social ecological framework is necessary and it might help to create and sustain effective prevention strategies for violence against women in Turkey.

## References

- Abeya, S. G., Afework, M. F., & Yalew, A. W. (2011). Intimate partner violence against women in western Ethiopia: prevalence, patterns, and associated factors. *BMC Public Health*, *11*(1), 913.
- Abrahams, N., Jewkes, R., Hoffman, M., & Laubsher, R. (2004). Sexual violence against intimate partners in Cape Town: prevalence and risk factors reported by men. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, *82*(5), 330-337.
- Abramsky, T., Watts, C. H., Garcia-Moreno, C., Devries, K., Kiss, L., Ellsberg, M., . . . Heise, L. (2011). What factors are associated with recent intimate partner violence? findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *BMC Public Health*, *11*(1), 109.
- Ackerman, J., & Field, L. (2011). The gender asymmetric effect of intimate partner violence on relationship satisfaction. *Violence Vict*, *26*(6), 703-724.
- Ackerson, L. K., Kawachi, I., Barbeau, E. M., & Subramanian, S. (2008). Effects of individual and proximate educational context on intimate partner violence: a population-based study of women in India. *American Journal of Public Health*, *98*(3), 507-514.
- Akar, T., Aksakal, F., Demirel, B., Durukan, E., & Özkan, S. (2010). The Prevalence of Domestic Violence Against Women Among a Group Woman: Ankara, Turkey. [Article]. *Journal of Family Violence*, *25*(5), 449-460. doi: 10.1007/s10896-010-9306-8
- Alata, S., Arslan, H. M., Baran, B. B., & Duman, N. (2010). Millennium Development Goals Report Turkey 2010. In S. Alata, H. M. Arslan, B. B. Baran & N. Duman (Eds.), (pp. 27-31). Ankara: T.R. Prime Ministry Undersecretariat of State Planning Organization and United Nations Resident Coordinator.
- Altınay, A. G., & Arat, Y. (2009). Violence Against Women in Turkey, A Nationwide Study. Retrieved from [http://www.kadinayoneliksiddet.org/KYS\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.kadinayoneliksiddet.org/KYS_ENG.pdf)
- Balci, Y. G., & Ayranci, U. (2005). Physical violence against women: evaluation of women assaulted by spouses. *Journal Of Clinical Forensic Medicine*, *12*(5), 258-263.
- Boyle, M. H., Georgiades, K., Cullen, J., & Racine, Y. (2009). Community influences on intimate partner violence in India: Women's education, attitudes towards mistreatment and standards of living. *Social science & medicine*, *69*(5), 691-697.
- Bozkurt, E. (2013). Gender Equality and Turkey's 2023 Goals. *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, *12*(2), 27-36.
- Cakmak, D. (2009). Turkiye'de cocuk gelinler (Child brides in Turkey). Retrieved from <http://www.umut.org.tr/HukukunGencleri/TamMetinlerSunular/DirenCakmak.pdf>
- CDC, C. f. D. C. a. P. (2009). The Social-Ecological Model: A Framework for Prevention Retrieved 07/20/2013, from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/overview/social-ecologicalmodel.html>
- Chan, K. L. (2009). Sexual violence against women and children in Chinese societies. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *10*(1), 69-85.

- Choi, S. Y., Cheung, Y.-W., & Cheung, A. K. (2012). Social isolation and spousal violence: Comparing female marriage migrants with local women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(3), 444-461.
- Cunradi, C. B., Caetano, R., Clark, C., & Schafer, J. (2000). Neighborhood poverty as a predictor of intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States: a multilevel analysis. *Annals of epidemiology*, 10(5), 297-308.
- Dalal, K., Rahman, F., & Jansson, B. (2009). Wife abuse in rural Bangladesh. *Journal of biosocial science*, 41(5), 561.
- Dinc, H., & Sahin, N. H. (2009). Bir Kadın Sağlığı Sorunu: Tore ve Namus Cinayetleri [A Women Health Problem: Custom and Honor Killings]. *Istanbul Universitesi Hemsirelik Dergisi* 17(2), 123-132.
- Duailibi, S., Ponicki, W., Grube, J., Pinsky, I., Laranjeira, R., & Raw, M. (2007). The effect of restricting opening hours on alcohol-related violence. *Journal Information*, 97(12).
- Ellsberg, M., Jansen, H. A., Heise, L., Watts, C. H., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2008). Intimate partner violence and women's physical and mental health in the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: an observational study. *Lancet*, 371(9619), 1165-1172. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(08)60522-x
- Foshee, V. A., Benefield, T. S., Reyes, H. L. M., Ennett, S. T., Faris, R., Chang, L.-Y., . . . Suchindran, C. M. (2013). The peer context and the development of the perpetration of adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 1-16.
- García-Moreno, C., Jansen, H., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., & Watts, C. (2005). *WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women*: World Health Organization Geneva.
- Gedikli, C. (2014). Female Labour Supply in Turkey: Do Traditional Gender Roles Matter? Netherlands, Rotterdam: IARIW 33rd General Conference.
- Gil-Gonzalez, D., Vives-Cases, C., Alvarez-Dardet, C., & Latour-Pérez, J. (2006). Alcohol and intimate partner violence: do we have enough information to act? *The European Journal of Public Health*, 16(3), 278-284.
- . The Global Gender Gap Report 2014. (2014). In R. Hausmann, L. D. Tyson, Y. Bekhouche & S. Zahidi (Eds.). Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum.
- Güler, Ö., & Küçüker, H. (2010). Early Marriages Among Adolescent Girls in Afyonkarahisar, Turkey. *Eur J Gen Med*, 7(4), 365-371.
- Haberland, N., Chong, E., & Bracken, H. (2003). *Married Adolescents: An Overview*. Geneva.
- Heise, L., Ellsberg, M., & Gottmoeller, M. (2002). A global overview of gender-based violence. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*, 78 Suppl 1, S5-S14.
- Heise, L. L. (1998). Violence against women an integrated, ecological framework. *Violence Against Women*, 4(3), 262-290.
- İlkkaracan, İ. (2012). Why so few women in the labor market in Turkey? *Feminist Economics*, 18(1), 1-37.

- Jensen, R., & Thornton, R. (2003). Early female marriage in the developing world. [Article]. *Gender & Development, 11*(2), 9-19.
- Jewkes, R. (2002). Intimate partner violence: causes and prevention. *Lancet, 359*(9315), 1423-1429. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(02)08357-5
- Jewkes, R., Levin, J., & Penn-Kekana, L. (2002). Risk factors for domestic violence: findings from a South African cross-sectional study. *Social science & medicine, 55*(9), 1603-1617.
- Johnson, K. B., & Das, M. B. (2009). Spousal Violence in Bangladesh as Reported by Men Prevalence and Risk Factors. *J Interpers Violence, 24*(6), 977-995.
- Karaçam, Z., Çalışır, H., DüNDAR, E., Altuntaş, F., & Avcı, H. C. (2006). Evli kadınların aile içi şiddet görmelerini etkileyen faktörler ve kadınların şiddete ilişkin bazı özellikleri [Factors affecting domestic violence against married women and women's some characteristics related to violence]. *Ege Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksek Okulu Dergisi, 22*, 71-88.
- Karal, D., & Aydemir, E. (2012). *Türkiye'de Kadına Yönelik Şiddet [Violence against women in Turkey]*. Ankara: International Strategic Research Organization.
- Karaoglu, L., Celbis, O., Ercan, C., Ilgar, M., Pehlivan, E., Gunes, G., . . . Egri, M. (2006). Physical, emotional and sexual violence during pregnancy in Malatya, Turkey. *European Journal of Public Health, 16*(2), 149-156. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/cki161
- Keyman, E. F. (2010). Modernization, globalization and democratization in Turkey: the AKP experience and its limits. *Constellations, 17*(2), 312-327.
- Koenig, M. A., Stephenson, R., Ahmed, S., Jejeebhoy, S. J., & Campbell, J. (2006). Individual and contextual determinants of domestic violence in North India. *American Journal of Public Health, 96*(1), 132-138.
- Linos, N., Khawaja, M., & Kaplan, R. L. (2012). Women's Acceptance of Spousal Abuse in Iraq: Prevalence Rates and the Role of Female Empowerment Characteristics. *Journal of Family Violence, 27*(7), 625-633.
- Mamdouh, H. M., Ismail, H. M., Kharboush, I. F., Tawfik, M. M., El Sharkawy, O. G., Abdel-Baky, M., & Sallam, H. N. (2012). Prevalence and risk factors for spousal violence among women attending health care centres in Alexandria, Egypt. *East Mediterr Health J, 18*(11), 1118-1126.
- Marshall, G. A., & Furr, L. A. (2010). Factors that affect women's attitudes toward domestic violence in Turkey. *Violence Vict, 25*(2), 265-277.
- Martin, S. L., Tsui, A. O., Maitra, K., & Marinshaw, R. (1999). Domestic violence in northern India. *Am J Epidemiol, 150*(4), 417-426.
- Mathur, S., Greene, H., & Malhotra, A. (2003). *Too Young to Wed; The Lives, Rights, and Health of Young Married Girls*.
- Mayda, A. S., & Akkuş, D. (2005). Domestic violence against 116 Turkish housewives: a field study. *Women & health, 40*(3), 95-108.
- Ministry of Family and Social Policies, D. o. R. a. P. (2006). *Family Structure Study [Aile Yapısı Araştırması]*. Retrieved from [http://www.tuik.gov.tr/Kitap.do?metod=KitapDetay&KT\\_ID=11&KITAP\\_ID=16](http://www.tuik.gov.tr/Kitap.do?metod=KitapDetay&KT_ID=11&KITAP_ID=16).

- Muftuler-Bac, M. (2012). *Gender Equality in Turkey*. Policy Department C: Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201204/20120424ATT43808/20120424ATT43808EN.pdf>.
- Nauck, B., & Klaus, D. (2004). Families in Turkey. In B. N. Adams & J. Trost (Eds.), *Handbook of World Families* (pp. 364-372): SAGE Publications. Retrieved from [https://books.google.com/books?id=Zxl1AwAAQBAJ&dq=after+marriage+extended+family+turkey&lr=&source=gbs\\_navlinks\\_s](https://books.google.com/books?id=Zxl1AwAAQBAJ&dq=after+marriage+extended+family+turkey&lr=&source=gbs_navlinks_s).
- Neighbors, C., LaBrie, J. W., Hummer, J. F., Lewis, M. A., Lee, C. M., Desai, S., . . . Larimer, M. E. (2010). Group identification as a moderator of the relationship between perceived social norms and alcohol consumption. *Psychology of addictive behaviors, 24*(3), 522.
- Ofstehage, A., Gandhi, A., Sholk, J., Radday, A., & Stanzler, C. (2011). Empowering victims of domestic violence (S. I. Research, Trans.).
- Ozbay, F. (1995). Women's labor in rural and urban settings. *Bogazici Journal: Review of Social, Economic and Administrative Studies, 8*, 1-2.
- Platform, W. W. S. W. M. (2015). 2014 Yili Kadin Cinayeti Gercekleri [2014 Women Murders Facts]. Istanbul: We Will Stop Women Murders.
- Rani, M., Bonu, S., & Diop-Sidibe, N. (2004). An empirical investigation of attitudes towards wife-beating among men and women in seven sub-Saharan African countries. *African journal of reproductive health, 116*-136.
- Romans, S., Forte, T., Cohen, M. M., Du Mont, J., & Hyman, I. (2007). Who is most at risk for intimate partner violence? A Canadian population-based study. *J Interpers Violence, 22*(12), 1495-1514.
- Sahin, N., Timur, S., Ergin, A., Taspinar, A., Balkaya, N., & Cubukcu, S. (2010). Childhood Trauma, Type of Marriage and Self-Esteem as Correlates of Domestic Violence in Married Women in Turkey. [Article]. *Journal of Family Violence, 25*(7), 661-668. doi: 10.1007/s10896-010-9325-5
- Sakalli, N. (2001). Beliefs about wife beating among Turkish college students: the effects of patriarchy, sexism, and sex differences. [Article]. *Sex Roles, 44*(9/10), 599-610.
- Sevinc, K. (2012). Gender Equality and the EU's Transformational Power in Turkey. Retrieved from <http://www.social-europe.eu/2012/11/gender-equality-and-the-eus-transformational-power-in-turkey/>
- Slep, A. M. S., Foran, H. M., Heyman, R. E., & Snarr, J. D. (2010). Unique risk and protective factors for partner aggression in a large scale Air Force survey. *Journal of community health, 35*(4), 375-383.
- Smith, P. H., Homish, G. G., Leonard, K. E., & Cornelius, J. R. (2012). Intimate partner violence and specific substance use disorders: Findings from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *Psychology of addictive behaviors, 26*(2), 236.
- Sol, H. (2012). Diyarbakır'da çocuk gelin raporu: '13 yaşımıydım, kocama baba diyordum'- [child brides report in Diyarbakir: "When I was 13 years old, I was calling my husband as

- 'dad"', *Haber Sol*. Retrieved from <http://haber.sol.org.tr/kadinin-gunlugu/diyarbakirda-cocuk-gelin-raporu-13-yasimdaydim-kocama-baba-diyordum-haberi-63339>
- Stith, S. M., Green, N. M., Smith, D. B., & Ward, D. B. (2008). Marital satisfaction and marital discord as risk markers for intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*(3), 149-160.
- Stuart, G. L., Ramsey, S. E., Moore, T. M., Kahler, C. W., Farrell, L. E., Recupero, P. R., & Brown, R. A. (2003). Reductions in marital violence following treatment for alcohol dependence. *J Interpers Violence, 18*(10), 1113-1131.
- Studies, H. U. I. o. P. (2008). *Turkey Demographic and Health Survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/eng/tdhs08/>.
- Talhaoglu, C. (2015). Male Violence 2014 Infographic. Retrieved from <http://www.bianet.org/english/women/161679-male-violence-2014-infographic>
- Tas, A. K., Uyanik, D., & Karakaya, Z. (1997). Siddeti icselestiren kadin profili: Turkiye icin nicel bir yaklasim [A woman profile of internalization of violence: A quantitative approach for Turkey]: Network of Women&Children. State Institute of Statistics of Turkey.
- TNS, O. S., & Directorate-General for Justice, F. a. S. (2010). Domestic Violence Against Women Report 2010. Belgium.
- Tokuç, B., Ekuklu, G., & Avcioglu, S. (2010). Domestic violence against married women in Edirne. *J Interpers Violence, 25*(5), 832-847. doi: 10.1177/0886260509336960
- Tokuç, B., Ekuklu, G., & Avcioglu, S. (2010). Domestic Violence against married women in Edirne. *J Interpers Violence, 25*(5), 832-847.
- Tsai, A. C. (2013). Intimate Partner Violence and Population Mental Health: Why Poverty and Gender Inequities Matter. *PLoS Med, 10*(5), e1001440.
- TSI, T. S. I. (2012). Household Labor Survey.
- Turkish Republic Prime Ministry Directorate General on the Status of Women, H. U. I. o. P. S., ICON-Institute Public Sector GmbH, and BNB Consulting. (2009). *National research on domestic violence against women in Turkey*. Ankara: Retrieved from [http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/eng/dokumanlar/2008-TDVAW\\_Main\\_Report.pdf](http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/eng/dokumanlar/2008-TDVAW_Main_Report.pdf).
- UNFPA, U. N. P. F. (2014). Child Marriages in Turkey (Overview). Ankara: UNFPA, United Nations Population Fund.
- Uthman, O. A., Moradi, T., & Lawoko, S. (2009). The independent contribution of individual-, neighbourhood-, and country-level socioeconomic position on attitudes towards intimate partner violence against women in sub-Saharan Africa: a multilevel model of direct and moderating effects. *Social science & medicine, 68*(10), 1801-1809.
- van Osch, Y., Breugelmans, S. M., Zeelenberg, M., & Bölük, P. (2013). A different kind of honor culture: Family honor and aggression in Turks. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 16*(3), 334-344.
- Vest, J. R., Catlin, T. K., Chen, J. J., & Brownson, R. C. (2002). Multistate analysis of factors associated with intimate partner violence. *Am J Prev Med, 22*(3), 156-164.

- Violence against women in Turkey: A report to the committee against torture.* (2003). Retrieved from [http://www.omct.org/files/2004/07/2409/eng\\_2003\\_09\\_turkey.pdf](http://www.omct.org/files/2004/07/2409/eng_2003_09_turkey.pdf)
- Vung, N. D., & Krantz, G. (2009). Childhood experiences of interparental violence as a risk factor for intimate partner violence: a population-based study from northern Vietnam. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health, 63*(9), 708-714. doi: 10.1136/jech.2008.076968
- WHO, W. H. O. (2010). *Preventing intimate partner and sexual violence against women: Taking action and generating evidence.* Geneva, World Health Organization.
- Witte, T. H., & Mulla, M. M. (2012). Social norms for intimate partner violence in situations involving victim infidelity. *J Interpers Violence, 27*(17), 3389-3404. doi: 10.1177/0886260512445381
- Women Against Violence Europe Network, W. (2012). Turkey Country Report: Violence against women and migrant and minority women.
- Yuksel-Kaptanoglu, I., Turkyilmaz, A. S., & Heise, L. (2012). What Puts Women at Risk of Violence from Their Husbands? Findings from a Large, Nationally Representative Survey in Turkey. *J Interpers Violence, 27*(14), 2743-2769.
- Zeyneloğlu, S., Kısa, S., & Yılmaz, D. (2013). Turkish nursing students' knowledge and perceptions regarding virginity. *Nurse Education Today, 33*(2), 110-115. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2012.01.016>

## PAPER TWO

### Young Turkish Men's Conceptualizations of Masculinity

#### Abstract

**Background:** Exploring young men's perspectives on masculinities is important to understand risky health behaviors, physically violent altercations or physical/sexual violence towards women. Interest on men's studies in Turkey that focus on issues of gender, patriarchy and masculinities has increased. However, questions about how young Turkish men conceptualize and express masculinities in their personal lives remain unanswered. The research on masculinities in Turkey is spread over different political, economic and social contexts, all age groups, and both genders but neither focused on college-aged men nor on conceptual expressions.

**Purpose:** To explore perspectives of young Turkish men, aged 18-25, about meanings and conceptualizations of masculinity.

**Method:** Total of five focus group interviews were conducted with 46 participants from two universities in Istanbul, Turkey in March 2014. The content analysis approach was used in this study. Data were analyzed inductively by using Atlas.ti version Mac OS X.

**Results:** The mean age of the participants was 21.54 years. All students were single and seventeen of the forty-six participants were in a relationship. Two categories that characterize young men's thoughts, beliefs, and behaviors related to masculinity, emerged from this study; (1) conceptualizations of masculinity, (2) masculine performativity. Young men identified

“authority”, “toughness”, “self-sufficiency”, and “high achievement and success” concepts as the masculine identities of their perceived “real man”. Additionally, two concepts that characterize the young men’s hypermasculine performance were “being homophobic” and “having an active sex life”.

**Conclusion:** Young Turkish men still hold many traditional masculinity concepts. To reformulate healthy gender identity college-aged Turkish men need to be supported in individual, community, and societal levels. First, a supportive environment that empowers young men and provides them opportunities to speak about gender roles and expectations of men in daily life is needed. Second, university faculty should include topics related to gender issues, including homophobia and sexism in their course content. Third, well-designed school based men engagement programs to promote gender equality and build healthy gender identities for preventing violence against women are critically needed. We believe that this research provides the foundation for the long-term goal of designing a programmatic intervention to promote gender equality.

## Introduction

The discipline of gender studies has historically addressed questions about women and their roles. The discipline was primarily developed and influenced by women (M. S. Kimmel, Hearn, & Connell, 2005) Until recently, understanding men's perceptions and behaviors were seldom discussed or had been neglected in the gender debate. The best way to understand a society and to find solutions for gender related public health problems should include men and masculinities, along with women and femininities examining and exploring in different social and cultural contexts. To understand the complexities of masculinities it is important to understand that they are socially constructed, produced and reproduced and influenced by the culture and society. They are shaped and expressed differently across time and space, within societies, and through life courses, and biographies (Beynon, 2002; M. S. Kimmel et al., 2005). Thus, men and masculinities need to be analyzed in different cultures, contexts and societies. Despite this need, most of the studies of men have focused on American, Australian and northern European men and cultures over the past four decades.

In Australian society, 'being a man' has been idealized as hegemonic form of masculinity that has been characterized by dominance of men over women (Connell, 1995). Similarly masculinity in United States has been characterized with hierarchy and embodied in heterosexual, white, physically and mentally abled American men with middle/upper-class status (M. S. Kimmel et al., 2005). According to M. S. Kimmel (2004), the American cultural definition of manhood is homophobic, which is the bedrock of hegemonic masculinity, as a fear of being emasculated. However, there is a decline in homophobic attitudes in the United States with liberalization and legalization of same-sex marriages (Baunach, 2012; McCormack & Anderson, 2014). Additionally, engaging in extra risky behaviors and not seeking help are the

way of constructing masculinity as a display of toughness, self-reliance, and being independent (Alex, Hammarström, Norberg, & Lundman, 2008; Courtenay, 2000).

Masculinities and men's gender roles have been discussed in different national, regional and local context (Alex et al., 2008; Connell, 1995; Harris III, Palmer, & Struve, 2011; M. S. Kimmel et al., 2005; Martino, 1999; Stern, Cooper, & Greenbaum, 2015). While there are some studies which focus on young men's beliefs about gender roles, there is a dearth of published studies focusing on specifically young men's experiences, challenges, gender performance, and development with respect to masculinities in the Western literature, and even fewer studies in Turkey. In recent years, studies focusing on construction of masculinities have been increasing. Current investigations focus on the construction of masculinities and the perspectives of men, including their perceived superiority over women. The focus is on socioeconomic development, cultural change, modernization and politics (Akyuz, 2012; Bilgin, 2004; Sakalli-Ugurlu & Beydogan, 2002; Sancar, 2009). In a major contribution to Turkish men's studies are scholars who explore masculine rituals and gender-related experiences in daily life. These studies reveal the influence of cultural background and masculinized power relations. For example, Sancar's groundbreaking book 'Domination and Masculinities: men in families, market and streets' (2009), is a fundamental study of masculinities and power relations in Turkey who investigated the construction of masculinity in daily life from an economic perspective by drawing data from fifty-four in-depth interviews and one focus group interview with a diverse group consisting of young, old, wealthy, poor, heterosexual, and gay men.

Two dissertations by Turkish authors focus on political culture and masculinities. Akyuz (2012), in her dissertation 'Political Manhood in 2000's Turkey: Representations of Different Masculinities in Politics, questioned the constructions of different masculinities in Turkish

political culture and political parties by deconstructing arguments about the relationship between politics and masculinity. While Bilgin (2004) analyzed the Turkish experience of modernity through the discourses of masculinities by discussing Islamist and secularist political dichotomy. In a series of studies, Sakalli-Ugurlu examined the effects of patriarchy, sexism, and gender differences on men's attitudes towards homosexuality (Sakalli, 2002), sexual harassment (Sakalli-Uğurlu, Salman, & Turgut, 2010), women managers (Sakalli-Ugurlu & Beydogan, 2002), gender inequality (Glick et al., 2004), wife abuse (Sakalli, 2001), men's atypical educational choices (Sakalli-Uğurlu, 2010) and relationship satisfaction (Sakalli-Ugurlu, 2003) among Turkish college students. All of her studies collected data on young men and women, and used the quantitative scale: Ambivalent (Hostile/Benevolent) Sexism Inventory.

Sancar (2009), Akyuz (2012), Bilgin (2004) and Sakalli (2001, 2002); Sakalli-Ugurlu (2003); Sakalli-Uğurlu (2010); Sakalli-Ugurlu and Beydogan (2002); Sakalli-Uğurlu et al. (2010) helped to expand men's studies in Turkey by focusing their analysis on issues of gender, patriarchy and masculinities. While these are valuable studies, questions remain about how young Turkish men conceptualize masculinities and express masculinities in their personal lives. The research conducted on masculinities has been gathered in different political, economic and social contexts, with all age groups, and some with both genders, rather than college-aged men. The focus of these studies was not on conceptual expressions.

Exploring college-aged young men's perspectives on masculinities is important to understand risky health behaviors, physically violent altercations or physical/sexual violence towards women. According to United States Department of Justice statistics ("Rape and Sexual Assault Victimization Among College-Age Females, 1995–2013," 2014), one in five female college students are sexually assaulted. Similarly, in United States, Foubert, Newberry, and

Tatum (2007) claimed that one in four college women experienced a sexual assault or attempted sexual assault and 98% of these acts are perpetrated by men. The majority of men committing sexual assault were not strangers, rather the men known to their victims (Garrity, 2011). In recent years, Turkish Researchers have become interested in determining the rates of sexual violence/harassment on all campuses in Turkey, so that programs can be designed to prevent sexual harassment, assault and rape on campuses. There is a lack of any national database concerning sexual assault/harassment on college campuses perpetrated by college-aged men. There is only some limited data from single campuses. One research study conducted in a public Turkish university in 2009 attempted to determine if sexual harassment occurred on campus and if so, how often (Aytac, 2009). Five hundred and ninety-one female students were surveyed, and 86.9 per cent of them reported they had experienced sexual harassment by men on campus (Aytac, 2009; Sozer & Clevenger, 2010).0810

Young people go to college, where for most of them, it is the first time they are on their own. They leave their parental home and values, and are involved in a world which they test new ways of thinking and believing. Peer pressure is extremely important during this period. Male peer support for aggression, development of myths about sexuality, rape, women, and violence can lead to hypermasculinity (Carr & VanDeusen, 2004). The role of peer support on campus should be studied within a framework of a patriarchal society in which young men in Turkey are raised. Additionally, young men's beliefs about sexuality, conception of masculinity, and negative attitudes towards women should be explored prior to development of an effective sexual assault prevention programs for men.

To fill the gaps in knowledge discussed previously, young men in college in Istanbul, Turkey, were recruited for the present study. These young men were brought together in a group

and asked to discuss their views, beliefs and conceptualizations about masculinities. This discussion included the social and cultural expectations they have encountered in their lives as a result of these meanings and conceptualizations.

The aim of the present qualitative study is to explore perspectives of young Turkish men, aged 18-25, about their meaning and conceptualizations of masculinity. There were two research questions:

- (1) How do young Turkish men conceptualize masculinity?
- (2) What factors influence young men's conceptualizations of masculinity?

### **Conceptual Framework**

Two theoretical constructs related to gender and constructions of masculinities comprised the conceptual framework of this study: (a) Social constructionist perspective of gender identity, (b) Hegemonic masculinity

#### **Social Constructionist Perspective of Gender Identity:**

The social constructionist perspective of gender identity considers masculinity as “a culturally based ideology scripting gender relations, attitudes, and beliefs” (Thompson & Pleck, 1995). Similar to constructionist epistemology, this perspective prioritizes the influences of social interactions in the construction of meanings and experiences. According to this perspective, any given cultural setting can provide a version or multiple versions of appropriate behaviors for men and women. For men these gender norms are passed on to boys and young men by their families, schools, media, peer groups, and social institutions among others. They are interpreted and internalized individually by the men (Barker, 2001; M. S. Kimmel et al., 2005; Pulerwitz &

Barker, 2008). For example, boys learn and perform masculine values of competitiveness, toughness and aggressiveness through participating in sports (Messner & Sabo, 1990), if the family, community or society values these traits. This conceptual framework explains how men and masculinities can be created, shaped, and promoted in communities and societies. The degree of the value placed on adherence to the gender norms of family, community or society defines how individuals reconstruct these norms throughout their lives (Pulerwitz & Barker, 2008). Furthermore, this conceptual framework highlights men's constructed superior social position and power relations created and perpetuated through ongoing interactions between men and women. Young men raised in an environment, which places a man's social position and power higher than a woman's most likely will continue to perform dominant masculinities according to prevailing societal norms. However, gender is a performed social identity and young men can change the conceptualizations and expression of masculinities if the traditional masculinity norms change or if men learn, live, and internalize the gender equitable attitudes.

M. Kimmel and Messner (2007) suggested several assumptions inherent in the social construction of masculinity. First, gender and masculinities are socially learned rather than being natural or biologically determined. Second, masculinities are performed and experienced differently by different men, and there is no absolute way of experiencing masculinity. According to M. Kimmel and Messner (2007), some masculinities are privileged (e.g., white, heterosexual, able-bodied) and are more dominant over others (e.g. gay, feminine, racial/ethnic minority, physically disabled, working class). Lastly and most importantly, since masculinity is a socially constructed identity, men and boys have an opportunity to transform the way of expressing masculinity as they "grow and mature" during their lifetime (M. Kimmel & Messner, 2007, p. xxii).

## **Hegemonic Masculinity**

The concept of hegemonic masculinity, introduced by Connell (1995), is one of the most important frameworks for understanding men and masculinities and has been used in many disciplines besides gender studies. Connell define hegemonic masculinity as

“Configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women”

(Connell, 2005, p. 77).

According to this framework, the ruling class and institutional power network establishes hegemony and maintains domination, not individuals. The power framework dominates the individual’s life and position. Feminist women or dissenting men increasingly challenge and fight hegemony, however, still top levels of business, military and the government consist of men who emulate what is masculinity. Connell (2005, p. 77) emphasized that hegemonic masculinity is objectified as a ‘currently accepted’ strategy. He believed that unless the conditions for the defense of patriarchy are altered, the bases for the dominance of a particular masculinity will not be eliminated.

Hegemonic masculinity was separated from subordinated masculinities, which is the non-dominant form of masculinity. While Connell (1995)’s definition focused on subordination of women to men, it also applied to power dynamics among other men (Shefer, 2007, p. 96). Gay masculinity was the most conspicuous subordinated masculinity (Connell, 1995). Rather than describing a character typology, she introduced multiple masculinities conceptually based on how men position themselves in relation to hegemonic standards (Connell, 1995, p. 76).

Hegemonic masculinity does not have to be enacted by a larger groups of men and may not be

normal in statistical sense because it does not represent all the men in specific society but it is certainly normative. In other words, while hegemonic masculinity is held up as an ideal form of masculinity, few men can live up to it but a majority of men still benefit from hegemonic masculinity's dominant position in the patriarchal order (Giddens & Griffiths, 2006).

### **Method**

Focus groups were used in this qualitative study to understand and describe perceptions, interpretations, and attitudes of a select population of college aged men. This approach was used to gain understanding of a particular issue from the perspective of a group of young men (Khan & Manderson, 1992, p. 57; Liamputtong & Ezzy, 2005, p. 76). In this context, focus group interviews were conducted to explore young Turkish men's thoughts, impressions and perspectives about men, gender inequalities and masculinities. The emphasis of the focus groups was on encouraging interaction between participants to discuss a 'focused issue of concern', rather than just a group interview. The term young men is defined by World Health Organization (World Health Organization, 2001) as men between ages of 15-24. For the present study the term "young men" refers to college-aged men between ages of 18-25.

Concern in the use of focus groups is whether should be constituted of familiar or stranger participants. Some researches argue that familiarity impairs free dialogue especially on sensitive topics while strangers facilitate open discussion. Conversely, familiar faces in a group may enhance the quality of the discussion (Kitzinger, 1994; Liamputtong & Ezzy, 2005; Wilkinson, 1998). Rather than investigating participants' personal histories and experiences on a certain phenomenon, our aim was to explore their generalized perceptions and conceptualizations of masculinity. Hence, our interviews included a mix of both strangers and familiar participants,

such as friends.

In this qualitative study a content analysis approach was used. There are several ways to perform a qualitative content analysis. In one type, categories are developed prior to searching the data, then the data are fit to the pre-determined categories, and a count or systematic record of the number of times the data occurs in the categories. This is often used in media research. In another qualitative approach, categories are not determined prior to the data analysis. The data determines how the categories are developed from the data. This method is often used in nursing and education field as an empirical, methodological controlled analysis of texts within their context of communication (Mayring, 2000). Krippendorff and Bock (2004) define qualitative content analysis as “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (and other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use” (p. 18). In the current study, qualitative content analysis is used as the method to identify and describe the meaning of information in an objective and systematic way to make inferences on the text within context of communication.

## **Recruitment**

Recruitment took place via flyers (appendix 1) in two universities in Istanbul, Turkey. An authorized person from each school’s administration placed flyers on announcement boards at the colleges. In addition, to the flyers in one college, a faculty member made an announcement in her class about the date and time of the study was announced. The flyers included information on the purpose of the research, inclusion criteria, the venue for and duration of the focus group, and contact information of the principle investigator. Young men who were willing to participate contacted the study personal via emails. Once a group of viable recruits was established,

potential participants were asked to confirm their interest and availability via e-mail. Several young men learned about the study from their colleagues who previously participated in the study and volunteered for subsequent groups. These young men were informed that their participation was strictly voluntary.

### **Setting and Procedure:**

Four of the five focus interviews were conducted in a conference room of the university. Meeting rooms were reserved by university administrators and the location of the room printed on the flyers. The interview room had a door, which could close for privacy. Furniture was provided to create a circle of seats for up to 12 people (10 young men, the moderator and note-taker). A coffee table was placed in the middle of the circle for a tape-recorder. One focus group interview occurred was conducted in a classroom setting. All desks were arranged as a circle to allow participants to see each other and engage and interact easily.

Moderator and note-taker welcomed young men arriving to the meeting room. Young men were free to choose any seat within the circle. Young men were told to choose and write a nickname on nametags provided. They were informed that they would be called by this nickname during focus session. They were free to choose any name or word they want. Examples of some of the nicknames chosen by young men were 'Black', 'President', 'Wind' and some Turkish names such as Tarik, Gokhan, Cahit. An informal setting, a free and relaxed atmosphere, and the open-ended nature of the questions freed the young men from the normal constraints of the typical one-to one interview. After the interactive focus group, snacks, finger food and light refreshments were provided.

The IRB approval for the study was acquired from the Human Subjects Committee at the University of Washington and permission to conduct the study was obtained after review from the administration of two Turkish universities. Prior to focus group implementation, written consent was obtained from the young men. Simple demographic data were gathered through a one-page demographic survey that required no more than three minutes to complete. The survey included; age, year of study, income, number of siblings, and young men's current relationship status. No identifying information was attached to the demographic survey. Once consent forms and demographic surveys were collected and reviewed by note-taker (co-moderator) for completeness, focus group began.

Each focus group was conducted by a female moderator who had previous training and experience conducting focus groups and one male note-taker. The moderator used a semi-structured interview guide derived from the literature, the aims of the study and from proficient reviewers. A colleague of the moderator's, who had a graduate level education in social sciences, but no experience in focus groups was the note taker. Prior to the study the moderator provided training for the note taker in aspects of observing and recording non-verbal responses from focus group members. Training also consisted of preparing the note taker in the background of the study, the aims and how to look for the factors emerging in the session that may be important in the analysis and interpretation of the results. Non-verbal responses included facial expressions and body postures such as approval, disapproval, interest, impatience, or anger.

Focus groups consisted of seven to ten participants. The duration of the focus groups ranged from 80 to 100 minutes. During the interviews the young men were asked to reflect on and to discuss experiences and observations that had significant influences on their conceptualizations of masculinities and the way they viewed themselves as men. Following

questions were asked on focus group interviews;

1. What defining characteristics would you use to describe what it means to be a man?
2. What does masculinity mean to you?
3. What are the social expectations and pressures you face as a man?
4. Do you think it is different for women?

Each focus group interview was audiotaped. All tape recordings were transcribed in Turkish by the first author precisely as recorded; no changes were made in the young men's statements. The Turkish written transcriptions were translated from Turkish to English by a professional translator. The accuracy of the translated transcriptions was verified by a bilingual researcher. The coding was done in English.

### **Data Analysis**

Following transcription and verification for accuracy, transcripts were read and downloaded into Atlas.ti version Mac OS X. Data were analyzed by using inductive content analysis inspired by Graneheim and Lundman (2004) and (Krippendorff, 1980). Interview text was read line by line multiple times to obtain the sense of the whole and identify any concepts stated by young men. Next, text was divided into meaning units, and these they were given codes. The codes were examined for connections or relations and grouped. Preliminary categories and subcategories were developed. During the entire process of coding, categories were refined and examined to ensure they are mutually exclusive. For example, no data fell between two categories or fit into more than one category. In practice, it is hard to create orthogonal categories when data were about experiences (Krippendorff, 1980). For this reason, the researchers made sure that each

category answered uniquely and exclusively the question “What?” and was identified as a thread throughout the codes (Krippendorff, 1980). Thus, categories in this study referred to mainly descriptive levels of content.

Trustworthiness of the data analysis was tracked through formal peer debriefing and consistency check described by Thomas (2006). For formal debriefing, the peer de-briefer and primary coder maintained an audit trail and the peer de-briefer reviewed initial codes and related verbatim statements from young men. During frequent, regular meetings the primary coder shared the process used for data collection and analysis while the de-briefer examined the methods that were used to conduct the study in order to both challenge and confirm primary coder’s interpretations of the data. The process of inspection and dialogue continued until there was 100% consensus between de-briefer and primary coder. Any potential biases by the primary coder’s were explored and working hypotheses were discussed.

To investigate consistency, a consistency check, was completed. An independent experienced researcher received the research objectives, and category descriptions of each category, in a table called codebook, without the raw data. They were then provided with a sample of the raw text, which was previously coded by the primary coder. The independent coder assigned sections of the text to the categories that were developed. Primary coder and independent researcher achieved 93.4 % consensus on assigning categories to text.

Lastly, throughout the data collection and data analysis process, we tried our best to be mindful of our own biases and assumptions about young men and masculinity and tried to not to interpret data while presenting results. We recognized that our identity and experiences as researchers with an interest in young men’s masculine identity development inform these biases and assumptions.

## **Results**

### **Participants**

A total of five focus group interviews were conducted with 46 participants. Twenty-six participants in three focus groups were from a private university and two focus groups with 20 participants from the private vocational college. The mean age of the participants was 21.54 years (SD: 1.51 years; range: 6). The sample included ten first years, twenty-nine sophomores, six juniors and one senior. Marital statuses of all students were single. Seventeen of the 46 participants were in a current interpersonal relationship. The mean number of siblings of the participants was 3.61 (SD: 2.59; range: 10). Comparing monthly income ten participants with \$250 or below; eighteen participants had \$250-500; twelve participants had \$500-750 and six participants had over \$750 dollars. The average monthly income in Istanbul is \$608 (Eurostat, 2014).

### **Findings:**

Two categories characterize young men's thoughts, beliefs, and behaviors related to masculinity, emerged from this current study; (1) conceptualizations of masculinity, (2) masculine performativity. Each category is discussed and supported with representative quotes and reflections from the focus group interviews.

### **Conceptualizations of masculinity**

The first category that emerged is the conceptualization of masculinity. The young men were asked to share some defining characteristics of what makes a man and describe what "being a

man” meant to them. They shared that their concept of being man was shaped based on their life experiences, cultural beliefs, and social norms. They noted the people and their relationships, who influenced the development of their perspectives. Four subcategories emanated from the data that provide important contextual information regarding the young men’s perspectives on masculinities. The subcategories were defined and identified as a) being authoritarian, b) toughness, c) self-sufficiency and d) high achievement and success. These subcategories were consistently offered as requisite characteristics of masculinities.

Being authoritarian. Being authoritarian refers to men’s control and dominance over women due to perceived superiority by men. In this context making the rules, having the final word at home, being the head of the family and expecting women to get permission from a man is characterized as being authoritarian.

Participants expressed manifestations of men’s control and dominance over women and defined a man as ‘a person who always has the final word’ and as ‘the ruler of his home’. *“The things said by a man are kinda law”* and *“The men have the final word on anything”* are the examples of reflections supporting the concept of men’s control and dominance, which were offered by men in every focus group.

Many participants stated that they were raised in a family with traditional values and beliefs and in these families the authority rested on the father. As children they were expected to listen and obey; and they believed that they should continue the authoritarian role in their lives as they had learned from their families. *“In respect of raising healthier individuals for the environment, for instance his children, if he is not authoritarian, then the children may surpass him. A family may raise individuals who are harmful for the society, if he is unable to influence the woman and the children”* noted one of the men in the study. The man who has grown up

under authority learns to rule and expect others to obey him. Participants described this controlling mechanism by saying that men restrict women from having power in social life. A woman has to ask a husband's permission before going out of the house. The following two quotes illustrate how men think of impossibility of women's independent activities and the necessity of letting the man know before leaving the house: *"When she goes somewhere, she cannot go without telling me. I cannot accept it."* and *"If she does everything she wants how can I be her beloved?"*

The majority of the participants believe that men are superior to women because this is what they are taught by their religion. For example *"a man is definitely and always one step ahead of women."* They think that their superiority is a part of their nature and comes from creation. *"That's a part of man's nature. He always tries to be on top"* noted one of the men. *"Women are at the second class since human creation."* Another participant said, *"For ages, this topic comes from creation of Adam. God created the man as powerful. God assigned man to protect woman and the universe. For this reason, according to Quran and religion, I mean according to our belief, and that can change according to (other) religions, man is a superior creature, and he is more powerful and has some qualifications like protection instinct and being powerful."* The belief that man was created as superior to women and protectors of women was cited by several young men, as to why they needed to be authoritarian in their lives.

Toughness. Toughness refers to being physically strong as well as being capable of overcoming difficult situations or environments. The concept of toughness underscored the participant's perspectives on masculinities. "Being a man" has been identified with strength and physical skill. Participants believe that men are physically more powerful than women, thus giving the natural supremacy. : *"Due to all physical factors, as the man has more muscles, has higher muscle ratio,*

*women tend to need more protection from men. Women require a man to perform heavy duty stuff and to protect them.”*

The young men believed that part of masculinity is that men should handle the difficult tasks. These tasks they believed are ones that women are not able to do at home. As one of the participants described, *“There are things, which a woman cannot do because they are not strong enough. Man has no limits in respect of strength... Woman cannot make gardening. She cannot chop woods. She cannot haul wood and coal into the stove! She cannot turn on the central heating!”*

Self-sufficiency. Self-sufficiency is related to a man’s self-esteem, self-worth and honor. The participants embraced the self-sufficiency concept of masculinities and assumed it was necessary for a man to be self-confidant. One participant identified a ‘man’ as *“The individual feeling confident and who can overcome everything.”*

The young men described that from their early lives they were trained to be self-sufficient men. Within the family system, the young men were discouraged from asking for help to solve problems or for work that could be done on their own: *“Our style of raising since childhood is to handle our own problems without expecting the assistance of others. We are expected to deal with our problems by ourselves.”* However, some young men describe that self-sufficient behaviors may lead to underestimating some big problems: *“...but the women may exaggerate their problems more compared to men. And we, the men, may understate the big problems.”*

High achievement and success. One reason that young men feel the need for self-sufficiency is the role “high achievement and success” play in Turkish Society. Part of the concept of being a man is that he should be viewed by his contemporaries as successful and important. A man’s goal is to have a good job and to be successful at every aspect of life such as work, school and social life. To be so men must work and study hard. Accomplishments were seen as a way of augmenting masculinity and personal values.

For the majority of participants, earning high amount of money fulfills the men’s views for self-efficiency and sufficient confidence *“Money brings manhood. Money is power and a man wants to be powerful in every way. A person can come to the forefront with his personality but if a person doesn’t have money to earn his keep, he could struggle to overcome many things.”*

This need for money as a sign of self-esteem can create chaos in the workplace as men challenge each other creating significant aggressive competitiveness. However, the competition among men is not limited to workplace; they also express competition in many areas of life. Not only did the young men talk about competitiveness in school and among his friends, but he talked about using girl friends as a way to become successful and increasing self-esteem. *“The high school in which I studied was a small one, and there was competition among men.... Who has the most money? Who has the most prestigious job? Who has the best car? Who has the biggest house? Which one of the girls is more beautiful, which one is my lover? For instance, I encountered this a lot during high school. This girl is the most beautiful one, the most beautiful girl of the school. Who becomes the lover of that girl, becomes the most popular man of the school. This is the issue among men.”*

Men's desire for status as defined by having a good job and being successful at work was influenced by families and society's expectations of them. The following quote illustrates how men encounter difficulties related to society's expectations for having a generous income and being successful in their lives:

*"For instance, we are going to ask for a girl's hand in marriage, right? What does the other party ask first? "What is your job?" And the man says "I'm working in the farm". The other party is saying "No". Why? Because he won't have sufficient income from the farm work. You're unable to cover your own requirements. He says "I'm a doctor", then, they say "OK". "Do you have a car? Do you have goods?" "Yes". Then they say, "ok, it can be". As I said ideal man is the one with money. You are going to ask for a girl's hand in marriage, they do not allow if you don't have money. He is the ideal man as long as he has money."*

### **Masculine Performativity**

The second category ascertained by analysis of data was conceptualized as masculine performativity. This grouping defines participants' behaviors and acts to express themselves as "stereotypical men". This characterization is consistent with the conventional expectations and allows them to obtain hypermasculine performance. Two subcategories that characterize the young men's hypermasculine performance were; (1) Being homophobic, (2) Having an active sex life.

Being homophobic. This subcategory identifies men's knowledge and attitudes about homosexuality. Their knowledge about homosexuality, negative attitudes and feelings about

homosexuals, and the reasons of their attitudes were included in this subcategory. Not a single young man in this study held the view that homosexuality was masculine or acceptable for a masculine man.

The young men have contradictory explanations as to why men are homosexuals. According to some homosexuality is caused by “illness”, “genetic disorders”, “psychological problems”, or “hormonal problems”. For example, one young man shared *“I accept homosexuality as an illness or a genetic disorder. Because, there is no homosexuality in human nature.”* Another young man shared his thoughts on how and why homosexuality is constructed *“I believe that men started to be gay by watching it on TV, seeing on the Internet or witnessing to other gay people. I don’t think they are in fact gay. Maybe they become gay to seek more pleasure from life or due to a desire to try something different. I don’t think they choose it due to biological reasons.”*

Many young men shared their negative attitudes and feelings toward homosexuality or people who are identified or perceived as gay men. They perceived being gay as “odd” or “disgusting”. They stated that just seeing a gay person or hearing the word homosexuality makes them “feel sick”. While a few men suggested that they might have an acceptance of homosexuality, they negated these statements by suggesting homosexuals should not be in the open but should live in secluded communities and should hide their gender identities while in “decent” society. *“I’m not denigrating; I respect them but I don’t want my kids or family to see them. I think it is disgusting.”* More, they shared their fear and zero-tolerance of gayness. Whenever they pronounce the word of “gay” they expressed *“Perish the thought!”* and *“God forbid, we could have been at the same situation”*

According to the young men, a rejection of homosexuality was rooted in faith and religion. They stated that being gay was “*against the nature of mankind*” and “*against religion*”. One young man noted, “*In our culture, beliefs and faith has priority. People live based on their beliefs and faith. And faith has certain limits and sharp borders. Beliefs prohibit homosexuality*” Another young man referred homosexuality as “*a sign of doomsday*”.

Having an active Sex life. This subcategory refers to beliefs men hold around typical male sexuality, such as having an active sex life and perceiving sex as a necessity. According to several of the young men, sex has an important role in the lives of men. Having an active sex life and sexual promiscuity were attainments to be proud of. Since their high school years, the men participated in an “*invisible*” or unspoken sexual competition with their peers. Being sexually active was the essential parameter in this “*invisible*” competition and the higher the number of female sexual partners a young man had was associated the his higher status among his peers. One young man shared what he experienced during high school “*We, the men, had the chat of it [having sex] very much during high school with how many girls did you sleep? I did this, you did that. [We said] Wow! Great! etc.*”. Another young man noted, “*There is something in the circle of friends. For example, I have experienced a lot, for example, if I’m with a girlfriend, they (my friends) ask whether I slept with her or what I did last night.*”

For some men, sexual accomplishments bring respect from other men. They were encouraged by family and friends to be hypersexual and thus accomplished as a consequence of social and cultural expectations of the peer and family group. One young man stated, “*In our societal structure, men are supported and encouraged about sex like that ‘You-go-boy!’ ‘Come on, you are a lion! [Meaning you are very powerful]’*”

The views shared by the young men during the group was that intimate relationships were associated with, and virtually equal to having sexual relationship. The following statement is a demonstration of this association by a young man: *“We are talking about sexual relationship because the only thing we understand when we hear the word relationship for a man aged 18-25 is sexual relationship.”*

Emotional intensity, romance, and attachment in a relationship were not desirable characteristics to young men. Rather than having long time commitments with a single girlfriend they preferred to have short-term relationships in which having sex was the main goal, *“...in men of this age group, a friendship only based on sexuality is developing. It is a fact called ‘fuck buddy’ in foreign languages. I don’t think many people have romantic relationships. Only a few men. Besides the romantic relationship, there are people with whom we see only for sexuality. A man living a long relationship is not being contented with only one person, I don’t think the number of people being contented with a single person is much in Turkey.”* (note bene: *“fuck buddy is equivalent to ‘friends with benefit’s among young men in the US.)*

Another young man shared his thoughts on why men did not commit to a long-term relationship and avoided emotional attachment: *“It’s generally ‘use and throw!’. For instance, as men, we hang out for 2-3 months, and then someone else. What is the reason of it? At first, we experience a bad relationship, and then as we don’t trust the girls or I don’t know. As they don’t trust us... We’re generally afraid of long relationships. As a man it makes me afraid, because we had a bad experience at the beginning. But short-term relationships don’t make me scared because you don’t attach and you feel comfortable.”*

## Discussion

This study aimed at illuminating various discourses among young Turkish men regarding their perspectives on masculinity. Descriptors emerged from the conceptualization of masculinity. These were “authority”, “toughness”, “self-sufficiency”, and “high achievement and success”. Young men identified those expressed concepts and embraced these characteristics as the masculine identities they perceived as a “real man”. To benefit from hegemonic masculinity demonstrating and maintaining those characteristics was important for majority of the young men. However, individuals can embody different concepts in different contexts to some extent and still maintain masculine hegemony. It is important to note that, our findings did not define a typology for Turkish men but provided different conceptualizations for masculinity to expand the understanding what men do to create, maintain, and claim membership in a dominant male group.

Several key concepts from Harris III et al. (2011), Edwards and Jones (2009), and Harper (2004)’s studies of college men’s gender identities in the United States were reflected in the current studies conceptualization of masculinity. Young men in those studies embraced similar conceptualizations of men; being self-sufficient, tough and being successful. It appears that men in this study held beliefs and expressed roles that are consistent with traditional Western definitions of masculinity. Western literature has discussed power and dominance relationships between men and women, in the studies conducted with male college students, men’s superiority and dominance over women did not emerged as a concept. In contrast, young men in our study brought up men’s superiority and dominance over women consistently.

The men in the present study expressed concepts related to masculinities that were aligned with culturally defined notion of masculinities in Turkey. According to Sakalli (2001),

men as the dominant sex are expected to have control of the home. As she explained, the males are viewed by the family network as the accepted as the ruler of the family. Similarly, the young men in this study sought to express masculinity through dominance over women. Their expectations from their girlfriends or future wives were obedience. The women were expected to get men's consent before performing a given activity or going out of the house.

As discussed in the conceptual framework of this paper, masculinity is being continually reproduced. The reproduction process is informed by several social institutions and functions. Exposure to religious, economic, and political ideas and views have an impact on reproducing men's perceived power and superiority over women. If the dominant religious, economic and political forces in a region conform to male dominance and women subjugation then it is what should be expected in the narrative of young men. Accordingly, men in this study emphasized the Quran and God to justify men's superiority and tied this inequality to creation of humans.

In recent years the political leader of Turkey, President Erdogan made several public statements emphasizing these beliefs. One such statement from Erdogan's speech at a Women's summit –no less- in 2010 and 2014, highlights his views: *“You cannot put women and men on an equal footing. It is against the nature. They were created differently. Their nature is different. Their constitution is different.”* (Grossman, 2014). Unfortunately, many of the other Turkish politicians also convey similar views. These views are publicized over the media exposing young Turkish men, as well as the rest of the public to gender inequitable beliefs and attitudes as a vision throughout their lives.

The findings of this study support the argument that to assert themselves as men and to uphold their stature among male friends, men execute hypermasculine performance. Young men's report of homophobia coincides with American feminist scholar M. S. Kimmel (2004)

claims that homophobia is a fear of being perceived feminine by others and in fact a fear of homosexual people, themselves. Even using the word “gay” in the conversation led men to say “perish the thought” and their fear of being perceived as homosexuals was observed in their expressions. Australian sociologist Connell (1995) claimed that homophobia is the most important form of subordinated masculinity and defined homophobia as a feature of hegemonic masculinity. In this context, it is important to consider the negative attitudes and actions, like discrimination and humiliation that these young men use to protect their own masculinity. This need is a consequence of the relationship between homophobia and hegemonic masculinity. The young men in our study described homosexuals as “disgusting” or “odd” and ostracized them. In general homosexuality in Turkey is constructed as a phenomenon, which is “not normal”. Because it is not part of the society nor accepted as “normal”, the construct becomes irrelevant to masculinity and is mostly linked with “gay hating” (Ertan, 2008). Negative attitudes, hostility and hatred towards homosexuals emerged as a theme in Sancar’s (2009) study in Turkey. Some of the men in Sancar’s study showed a willingness to kill or exterminate homosexuals (Sancar, 2009).

The discussions in our focus groups revealed the young men’s interest was on discussing their relationships and gendered experiences with women. They began to prioritize sexual experience a primary reason for entering into relationship with women/girls. Such prioritization of sexual intercourse in their relationships with women is in accordance with previous studies (Edwards & Jones, 2009; Harper, 2004; Harris III et al., 2011). The young men emphasized “*use and throw*” as a mindset and described how they are pursuing multiple sexual relationships with many of different women. This emphasis of sexual prowess may be a manifestation of rivalry among peers to establish a hierarchical order. This is consistent with the writings of Connell

(1995) who theorized the “existence of specific gender relations of dominance and subordination between groups of men” (Connell, 1995, p. 78). Of note, the young men specifically discussed how they engaged in a competition among themselves to prove their sexual prowess. The higher the number of sexual partners the higher the man was in the pecking order whereas men without an active sex life were ranked lowest (Jonason & Fisher, 2009).

It is also entirely possible that the young men exaggerate their expression of sexual prowess and dominance in order to be ranked higher in the hegemonic masculinity order. This exaggeration is further evidence of the power of hegemony for the men. Whether they are actually sexually active or just bragging, they feel the pressure to be seen by their peers as part of the norm defined for them. Not only do young men express that having multiple sexual partners is essential to being a man, but previous studies show that college-aged men over-report number of lifetime sexual partners (Brown & Sinclair, 1999; Jonason & Fisher, 2009; Pedersen, Miller, Putchu-Bhagavatula, & Yang, 2002). In other words, men could exaggerate reported sexual success in order to appear to have dominance over other men.

### **Implications for further research and practice**

The findings of this study raise many questions to be explored in future studies of young men and masculinities. Meanings, which the young men ascribed to masculinity from the current study, were influenced by their upbringing, experiences within their social network and observations within of their peers. Rather than focusing on “How” and “Why” questions to learn men’s perceptions towards masculinity, this study sought to find answers to “What” questions. Future inquiry into how men’s views about masculinities are constructed throughout their early lives and why some men prioritize concepts related to hegemonic masculinity whereas some men

don't should be pursued.

The purpose of this study was to explore young, college-aged Turkish men's perceptions towards what it means to be a man and their view of masculinity. The study did not investigate the influence of the college setting to their conceptualizations. Further research should focus on searching what influences the campus environment, academic interests, campus involvement and male peer group interactions have on Turkish men's insights about masculinity. These findings might yield information to develop a conceptual framework about constructing masculinities within the campus context.

Several recommendations can be proposed, based on our findings to support healthy gender identity among college-aged Turkish men. First, young men need to be provided with opportunities to speak about gender roles and expectations of men in daily life in a supportive environment that can empower men. As it is evident in our results, beginning from childhood, men are expected and encouraged to be tough, sexually active, and competitive. The ability to discuss gender roles among themselves can help young men deconstruct and reconstruct masculinities and avoid vulnerabilities related to gender roles expectations.

Second, faculty in universities should include topics related to gender issues, including homophobia and sexism in their course content. First, however, they should be encouraged to examine their own biases, which may be conscious and unconscious. Young men in universities should be able to discuss and critique their own thoughts about gender identity in different platforms under the supervision of knowledgeable and insightful faculty. We believe that those discussions will encourage young men to re-shape their views on daily gender identity issues, as well as, on sexism or homophobia, which will lead to building a healthier gender identity.

Third, replicating this study in high schools may allow us to learn about young adolescents' beliefs about masculinities. In our study, men recalled their high school years and their experiences while ascribing the meanings towards masculinities. Adolescence is a time for transition and where young men increase their autonomy, begin to set a more independent life course, interact with different people and consolidate many of the ideas and social norms that will guide them throughout their lives (Gunnar & Collins, 2013). During adolescence most young men experience their first romantic and intimate relationships (Connolly & McIsaac, 2011). It is during this time in their lives, that young men consolidate their beliefs and attitudes about relationship dynamics. Their beliefs are influenced by observing relationships they see at home and around them in the community as models. Thus, it is important to learn their perceptions towards masculinity to understand what factors shape, reinforce and challenge their gender related beliefs, attitudes and assumptions.

Lastly, well-designed school based men engagement programs to promote gender equality and to build healthy gender identities are critically needed. There are no programs specifically designed to involve young Turkish men to promote attitude change on gender roles, sexual health and gender equality. This research will provide the foundation for a long-term goal of designing a programmatic intervention to promote gender equality and enhance choices for men to change traditional gender roles.

## References

- Akyuz, S. (2012). Political manhood in 2000s Turkey: Representations of different masculinities in politics. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Ankara: İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences.*
- Alex, L., Hammarström, A., Norberg, A., & Lundman, B. (2008). Construction of masculinities among men aged 85 and older in the north of Sweden. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 17*(4), 451-459.
- Aytac, S. (2009). Kampuste Taciz Arastirmasi [Sexual Harassement on Campus], *Hurriyet*. Retrieved from <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/11151012.asp>
- Barker, G. (2001). 'Cool Your Head, Man': Preventing gender based violence in favelas. [Article]. *Development, 44*(3), 94.
- Baunach, D. M. (2012). Changing Same-Sex Marriage Attitudes in America from 1988 Through 2010. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 76*(2), 364-378. doi: 10.1093/poq/nfs022
- Beynon, J. (2002). *Masculinities and Culture*. Great Britain: Biddles Limited, Guildford and Kings Lynn.
- Bilgin, E. (2004). *An analysis of Turkish modernity through discourses of masculinities*. Middle East Technical University.
- Brown, N. R., & Sinclair, R. C. (1999). Estimating number of lifetime sexual partners: Men and women do it differently. *Journal of Sex Research, 36*(3), 292-297.
- Carr, J. L., & VanDeusen, K. M. (2004). Risk factors for male sexual aggression on college campuses. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*(5), 279-289.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*: Univ of California Press.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (Second Edition ed.): Univ of California Press.
- Connolly, J., & McIsaac, C. (2011). Romantic relationships in adolescence. *Social Development: Relationships in Infancy, Childhood, and Adolescence*.
- Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: a theory of gender and health. *Social science & medicine, 50*(10), 1385-1401.
- Edwards, K. E., & Jones, S. R. (2009). " Putting My Man Face On": A Grounded Theory of College Men's Gender Identity Development. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(2), 210-228.
- Ertan, C. (2008). Hegemonic Masculinity And Homosexuality: Some Reflections On Turkey. *ETHOS, 1*, 4.
- Eurostat. (2014). *European Statistics-Labour Market Database*. Retrieved from: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/labour-market/earnings/database>
- Foubert, J. D., Newberry, J. T., & Tatum, J. (2007). Behavior differences seven months later: Effects of a rape prevention program. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 44*(4), 1125-1146.

- Garrity, S. E. (2011). Sexual assault prevention programs for college-aged men: A critical evaluation. *Journal of forensic nursing*, 7(1), 40-48.
- Giddens, A., & Griffiths, S. (2006). *Sociology*. Malden: Polity Press.
- Glick, P., Lameiras, M., Fiske, S. T., Eckes, T., Masser, B., Volpato, C., . . . Sakalli-Uğurlu, N. (2004). Bad but bold: Ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender inequality in 16 nations. *J Pers Soc Psychol*, 86(5), 713.
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24(2), 105-112.
- Grossman, A. (2014). 'Women are not equal to men... it is against nature to put them on an equal footing': Turkish president stuns crowd at women's rights conference, *Daily Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2847397/Erdogan-women-not-equal-men.html> - ixzz3ZF6ciXHD
- Gunnar, M. R., & Collins, W. A. (2013). *Development During the Transition to Adolescence: The Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology*: Psychology Press.
- Harper, S. R. (2004). The measure of a man: Conceptualizations of masculinity among high-achieving African American male college students. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 89-107.
- Harris III, F., Palmer, R. T., & Struve, L. E. (2011). "Cool Posing" on Campus: A Qualitative Study of Masculinities and Gender Expression among Black Men at a Private Research Institution. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 47-62.
- Jonason, P. K., & Fisher, T. D. (2009). The power of prestige: Why young men report having more sex partners than young women. *Sex Roles*, 60(3-4), 151-159.
- Khan, M., & Manderson, L. (1992). Focus groups in tropical diseases research. *Health policy and planning*, 7(1), 56-66.
- Kimmel, M., & Messner, M. (2007). *Men as gendered beings. Men's lives*. New York: Pearson.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2004). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States: An Integrated Study*. Ed. Paula S. Rothenberg. New York: Worth, 81-93.
- Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J., & Connell, R. (2005). *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities*: Sage.
- Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of focus groups: the importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of health & illness*, 16(1), 103-121.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*: Sage.
- Krippendorff, K., & Bock, M. A. (2004). *The content analysis reader*: Sage.
- Liamputtong, P., & Ezzy, D. (2005). *Qualitative research methods*.
- Martino, W. (1999). 'Cool boys', 'party animals', 'squids' and 'poofers': interrogating the dynamics and politics of adolescent masculinities in school. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 239-263.

- Mayring, P. (2000). *Qualitative Content Analysis* (Vol. 1).
- McCormack, M., & Anderson, E. (2014). The Influence of Declining Homophobia on Men's Gender in the United States: An Argument for the Study of Homophobia. *Sex Roles, 71*(3-4), 109-120. doi: 10.1007/s11199-014-0358-8
- Messner, M. A., & Sabo, D. F. (1990). *Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives*: Human Kinetics Publishers.
- Pedersen, W. C., Miller, L. C., Putha-Bhagavatula, A. D., & Yang, Y. (2002). Evolved sex differences in the number of partners desired? The long and the short of it. *Psychological Science, 13*(2), 157-161.
- Pulerwitz, J., & Barker, G. (2008). Measuring Attitudes toward Gender Norms among Young Men in Brazil. [Article]. *Men & Masculinities, 10*(3), 322-338.
- . Rape and Sexual Assault Victimization Among College-Age Females, 1995–2013. (2014): US Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Sakalli, N. (2001). Beliefs about wife beating among Turkish college students: the effects of patriarchy, sexism, and sex differences. [Article]. *Sex Roles, 44*(9/10), 599-610.
- Sakalli, N. (2002). The relationship between sexism and attitudes toward homosexuality in a sample of Turkish college students. *Journal of Homosexuality, 42*(3), 53-64.
- Sakalli-Ugurlu, N. (2003). How do romantic relationship satisfaction, gender stereotypes, and gender relate to future time orientation in romantic relationships? *The Journal of Psychology, 137*(3), 294-303.
- Sakalli-Uğurlu, N. (2010). Ambivalent sexism, gender, and major as predictors of Turkish college students' attitudes toward women and men's atypical educational choices. *Sex Roles, 62*(7-8), 427-437.
- Sakalli-Ugurlu, N., & Beydogan, B. (2002). Turkish college students' attitudes toward women managers: The effects of patriarchy, sexism, and gender differences. *The Journal of Psychology, 136*(6), 647-656.
- Sakalli-Uğurlu, N., Salman, S., & Turgut, S. (2010). Predictors of Turkish women's and men's attitudes toward sexual harassment: Ambivalent sexism, and ambivalence toward men. *Sex Roles, 63*(11-12), 871-881.
- Sancar, S. (2009). *Erkeklik: imkânsız iktidar: ailede, piyasada ve sokakta erkekler [Domination and Masculinities: men in families, market and streets]*: Metis Yayınları.
- Shefer, T. (2007). *From boys to men: Social constructions of masculinity in contemporary society*: Juta and Company Ltd.
- Sozer, M. A., & Clevenger, S. (2010). Üniversite Kampüslerinde Uygulanan Tecavüz ve Cinsel Tacizi Önleme Eğitim Programlarının Etkililiği [The Effectiveness of College Based Rape and Sexual Assault Education Programs] *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 11*(1).
- Stern, E., Cooper, D., & Greenbaum, B. (2015). The Relationship Between Hegemonic Norms of Masculinity and Men's Conceptualization of Sexually Coercive Acts by Women in South Africa. *J Interpers Violence, 30*(5), 796-817. doi: 10.1177/0886260514536275

- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American journal of evaluation*, 27(2), 237-246.
- Thompson, E., & Pleck, J. H. (1995). Masculinity ideologies: A review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities. *A new psychology of men*, 129-163.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998). *Focus groups in feminist research: Power, interaction, and the co-construction of meaning*. Paper presented at the Women's Studies International Forum.

## PAPER THREE

### Men's Gender Roles in Family Life: Views of Turkish Male University Students

#### Abstract

**Background:** Standard stereotypes suggest that public and political positions are associated with men; housework and family affairs are associated with women. However, recently in Western countries both men and women's substantial household obligations and major work responsibilities have changed, however there is limited research in different cultural contexts. Family and work issues are directly associated with cultural beliefs, norms, and values, especially with respect to gender roles. So, it is crucial to explore men's attitudes and beliefs towards gender roles, because they signify the internalization of role-responsibility.

**Aim:** To explore views of Turkish male university students about men's gender roles in family life.

**Method:** Five focus group interviews were conducted with 46 participants from two universities in Istanbul, Turkey in March 2014. The content analysis approach was used in this study. Data were analyzed inductively by using Atlas.ti version Mac OS X.

**Results:** Three major categories emerged from this study; (1) male breadwinner identity, (2) female breadwinner identity, and (3) doing or avoiding housework. Earning income to provide for the family and protecting the family were accepted as men's major duties. Most of men had negative attitudes towards women's employment. Men avoided housework due to masculine

pride, feeling entitled, lack of time at home, parenting style, and tolerance to mess. Men agreed to help doing housework if they worked equally.

**Conclusion:** This study contributes to literature how young men define a man's responsibilities at home and how their attitudes and beliefs are shaped in the context of cultural norms in Turkey. The results show a continuation of the dominance of traditional views about gender roles. A well-designed program for young men to help them change their responses and behaviors towards gender equality may change these intransitive views and may promote more equitable attitudes and behaviors toward men's caring roles and housework. These programs can prepare young men for their future roles as parents and partners as not only protectors but also care providers.

## **Introduction**

The nature of families and the workforce has been changing in all around the world. Women's employment is on the rise. There is a change in both men and women's substantial household obligations as well as major work responsibilities (Aycan & Eskin, 2005; Cinamon & Rich, 2002). These fundamental changes led scholars to search the association between changing trends and gender relations because family and work issues are directly associated with cultural beliefs, norms, and values, especially with respect to gender roles (Aycan & Eskin, 2005; Treas, 2002). Although Universal Declaration of Human Rights requires all women and men have the right to benefit equally from the right to live and work without any discrimination (The United Nations, 1948), a persistent inequality valuing men over women in many areas of life exists.

Several studies on gender roles (Basow, 1992; Bhasin & Ay, 2003; Dokmen, 2004) suggested that there were significant differences between women and men in working, social, marital and family life. Standard stereotypes suggest that public and political positions have been associated with men and that housework and family affairs have been associated with women. The roles assigned to women consist of greater home life responsibilities than men, identifying her as the homemaker. The man, conversely, is stereotyped as the breadwinner, a strong working protective role (Adana et al., 2011; Akin & Demirel, 2003). Such judgments and discriminations influence women's social, economic and family lives negatively. They hold women behind men, resulting in gender inequality.

In the last three decades, a major shift of women's education and employment has challenged the male breadwinner and female homemaker family model in many countries. The changes also influenced the need for increased education levels for both men and women. This has positively

impacted the public's perspectives towards men's and women's roles. Both women's and men's roles are being redefined, with both playing a role in employment, housework and family roles (Attanapola, 2003; Cunningham, 2008; Lewis, 2001).

The recognition of the function of the culture in gender roles has been increasing in recent years, yet, there is limited research on gender roles and the impact of gendered views on daily family life. Moreover, the majority of the research on gender roles, and work and family life has been conducted in Western countries. There is a need to determine social views on gender roles in different cultural contexts.

### **The Cultural Context**

Turkey has been a democratic, secularized republic with a modern constitution since the 1920s and 99.8% of its population is Muslim (Central Intelligence Agency, 2013). Turkey is seen as a geographical and cultural bridge between East and West. This connection affects social values. Turkish culture is known as altruistic, spiritual, conservative, other centered, community oriented and favoring interdependent values. It is different than Western cultures with their rational, materialistic, pragmatic, functionalist and self-centered values (Gulerce, 1995). There are also differences in gender roles expectations in Turkey. There are laws and policies mandating the gender equality among men and women; however male dominance in many facets of life and second-class status of women still prevail in Turkey (Kagitcibasi, 1982; Öngen, 2007).

Traditionally, the institutions of marriage and family are highly patriarchal (Sakalli, 2001). Empirical research on masculinity has been rare. Culturally, the husband is accepted as the ruler of the family. He is the protector of the family's honor. He is regarded as the formal

authority to whom the wife and children must ultimately respond. The husband's role is absolute. He assumes responsibility for maintaining the family structure by whatever means he feels are justified (Kandiyoti, 1995 cited in Sakalli, 2001). Men believe that they have the authority to control how women dress, how they live, and how they behave in public. Not only do men control 'their' wives, sisters, or children they also attempt to control any woman's life and will do so in public.

Traditional family values, which stereotype men as the breadwinner and the women as the homemaker, still prevail in Turkey (Sakalli, 2001). The roles of financial provider as well as of representing the family in the public are assigned to men. He is identified as "father of the family" a connotation of hegemonic masculinity (Boratav, Fi ek, & Ziya, 2014). Women's visibility in the labor force is limited due to traditions and male dominance. According to the latest governmental report concerning gender equality in Turkey (Muftuler-Bac, 2012), only 22.8 % of women in Turkey are currently in the workforce. Of these, 57.2% of the women work in the agriculture sector and half of those working as unpaid family workers. Turkish men's attitudes about women's work outside of the family remain problematic. In a study conducted in Istanbul with 560 participants, 57.9% of the male participants responded that 'woman can work if family needs it' and 12.9% of men stated that 'woman shouldn't work even if her family needs it' (Çaha, 2010).

Gender role differentiation can also be seen in the family roles such as sharing of the household tasks and caregiving. Most men continue to hold the belief that women should be responsible for the housework. Caha's study (2010) suggest that only 19.6% of the male participants think that 'men and women should equally share the housework.' In Turkey

household tasks and childcare are labeled as “women’s work” and are responsibility of women. It is considered a shame for men to do women’s work (Öngen, 2007).

Studies have investigated men’s views towards women and their role/status, however, comprehensive research is needed to understand men’s views on their own roles to complete the picture. It is crucial to explore men’s attitudes and beliefs towards gender roles, because they signify the internalization of role-responsibility.

One period of intense role development and internalization for men occurs when they enter University. This is the first time for most young men when they are independent of their family and questioning their role in the world. Focusing on male university students is important because they are expected to be more progressive than people who don’t attend to universities. As institutes of higher education, universities aim to grow students not only in terms of knowledge but also raise their intellectual and ethical potential. Exploring university students’ perceptions of gender roles should reveal if their perceptions are mutating away from the traditional public beliefs. Investigating young men’s views on gender roles and equality may help predict the views future generations about gender roles and promoting gender equality. This study was conducted to explore views of male university students about men’s gender roles in family life. The goal is to understand the factors that shape the views of young Turkish men studying in the universities in Istanbul, Turkey.

### **Method**

This qualitative study used focus groups to understand and describe perceptions, interpretations, and beliefs of a select population. This approach was used to gain understanding of a particular issue from the perspective of the group’s participants (Khan & Manderson, 1992, p. 57;

Liamputtong & Ezzy, 2005, p. 76). In this context, focus group interviews were conducted to explore male university students' thoughts, impressions and perspectives about men's gender roles in family life. The focus group interviews emphasized encouraging interaction between participants to discuss a 'focused issue of concern', rather than group interview. In the present study the term "young men" refers to college-aged men between ages of 18-25.

The aim was to explore men's gender roles in family life. Whether a focus groups should contain familiar participants or strangers is a discussion in the literature. Some researches argue that familiarity impairs free dialogue especially on sensitive topics, while strangers facilitate open discussion. Conversely, familiar faces in a group may enhance the quality of the discussion on certain topics (Kitzinger, 1994; Liamputtong & Ezzy, 2005; Wilkinson, 1998). Rather than investigating participants' personal histories and experiences on a certain phenomenon our interviews included a mix of both strangers and familiar participants, such as friends.

Content analysis was used in this study. Using a qualitative approach, the data informs how the categories evolve. This method is often used in nursing and education field as an empirical, methodological controlled analysis of texts within their context of communication. Qualitative content analysis has been defined as "a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (and other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use" (Krippendorff & Bock, 2004, p. 18; Mayring, 2000). In the current study, qualitative content analysis is used as the method to identify and describe the meaning of information in an objective and systematic way to make inferences on the text within context of communication.

## **Recruitment**

Recruitment took place via flyers (appendix 1) in two universities in Istanbul, Turkey. An authorized person from each school's administration placed flyers on announcement boards at the schools. At one site a faculty member made an announcement in class about the date and time of the study. Flyers included information on the purpose of the research, inclusion criteria, the venue for and duration of the focus group, and contact information of the principle investigator. Participants were instructed to contact the study personal via emails for more information. Potential participants confirm their interest and availability via e-mail. After the first focus group, several participants for subsequent groups learned about the study from participants who previously participated in the study. These young men were informed that their participation was strictly voluntary.

## **Setting and Procedure**

Four of the five focus interviews were conducted in the meeting room at the university. Meeting rooms were reserved by university administrators and the information related to location was indicated in the flyers. Interview room had a door for privacy. Table and chairs were provided to create a circle of seats for up to 12 people (10 young men and the moderator and note-taker). A coffee table was placed in the middle of the circle for a tape-recorder. One focus group interview was conducted in a classroom setting. All desks were arranged as a circle to allow participants to see each other and engage and interact easily.

The young men were greeted by the moderator and note-taker and were instructed to choose any seat within the circle. The young men were asked to choose a nickname to use during

the focus group and write this on a nametag. They were free to choose any name or word they want to be called. Examples of nicknames chosen by young men were 'Punctual', 'Low', 'Pato' and Turkish names such as Ismail, Emre, Fikret. Prior to implementation of the focus group written consent was obtained from the young men.

The investigators obtained IRB approval for the study from the Human Subjects Committee at the University of Washington and permission to conduct the study, after review, was obtained from the administration of two Turkish universities. Demographic data were gathered via a one-page survey that requires no more than three minutes to complete. The survey included; age, year of study at university, income, number of siblings, and young men's relationship status. No identifying information was attached to the demographic survey. Once consent forms and demographic surveys were collected and reviewed by note-taker (co-moderator) for completeness, focus group began.

The informal setting, free and relaxed atmosphere, and the open-ended nature of the questions encouraged young men to feel free from the normal constraints of the typical one-to-one interview. After the interactive focus group snacks, finger food and light refreshments were provided. Each focus group was conducted by an experienced female moderator with previous training and experience and one male note-taker. The moderator used a semi-structured interview guide. The note-taker had graduate level of education in social sciences but was not experienced in note taking for focus groups. Prior to the study the moderator provided training in aspects of observing and recording non-verbal responses from groups. The goals, aims and background of the study were explained to the note taker, so that potential important factors for analysis and interpretation of the results emerging in the session would be noted. Non-verbal responses

included facial expressions and body postures such as approval, disapproval, interest, impatience, or anger.

Focus groups consisted of seven to ten participants. The duration of the focus groups ranged from 80 to 100 minutes. The discussion in the focus group was in Turkish. During the interviews men were asked to reflect on and discuss experiences and observations that had significant influences on their views and beliefs about men's gender roles in family life.

Following questions were asked during focus group interviews:

1. What are the men's role and responsibilities in their relationships at home?
2. What do you think influences men's beliefs about the roles and responsibilities in the home setting?

Each focus group interview was audiotaped. All tape recordings were transcribed in Turkish by the first author precisely as recorded; no changes were made in the young men's statements. The Turkish written transcriptions were translated from Turkish to English by a professional translator. The accuracy of the translated transcriptions was verified by a bilingual researcher.

## **Data Analysis**

Following transcription from the audiotapes and verification for accuracy, the data were downloaded into Atlas.ti version Mac OS X. Data were analyzed by using inductive content analysis inspired by Graneheim and Lundman (2004) and Krippendorff (1980). Interview text was read line by line multiple times to obtain the sense of the whole and identify any concepts stated by young men. Next, text was divided into meaning units, and these they were given

codes. The codes were examined for connections or relations and grouped. Preliminary categories and subcategories were developed. During the entire process of coding, categories were refined and examined to ensure they are mutually exclusive. For example, no data fell between two categories or fit into more than one category. In practice, it is difficult to create orthogonal categories with experiential data (Krippendorff, 1980). For this reason, the researchers made sure that each category answered uniquely and exclusively the question “What?” and was identified as a thread throughout the codes (Krippendorff, 1980). Thus, categories in this study referred to mainly descriptive levels of content.

Trustworthiness of the data analysis was tracked through formal peer debriefing and consistency check described by Thomas (2006). For formal debriefing, the peer debriefer and primary coder maintained an audit trail and the peer debriefer reviewed initial codes and related verbatim statements from young men. During regular meetings, the primary coder shared the process used for data collection and analysis while the debriefer examined the methods that were used to conduct the study in order to both challenge and confirm primary coder’s interpretations of the data. Thus, 100% consensus was achieved between debriefer and primary coder and primary coder’s biases were explored and working hypotheses were discussed with peer.

To investigate consistency, a consistency check, was completed. An independent experienced researcher received the research objectives, and category descriptions of each category, in a table called codebook, without the raw data. They were then provided with a sample of the raw text, which was previously coded by the primary coder. The independent coder assigned sections of the text to the categories that were developed. Primary coder and independent researcher achieved 93.4 % consensus on assigning categories to text.

Lastly, throughout the data collection and data analysis process, we tried our best to be mindful of our own biases and assumptions about young men and masculinity and tried to not to interpret data while presenting results. We recognized that our identity and experiences as researchers with an interest in young men's masculine identity development inform these biases and assumptions.

## **Results**

### **Participants**

Five focus group interviews were conducted. A total of 46 participants completed this study. Three focus groups with 26 participants from private university and two focus groups of 20 participants from the private vocational college. The mean age was 21.54 years (SD: 1.51 years). The sample included ten (21.7%) first year, twenty-nine (63.0%) second year, six (13.0%) third year and one (2.3%) fourth year students. All students were single. Approximately one-third, (seventeen of the 46) were in a current relationship. The mean number of siblings was 3.61 (SD: 2.59; range: 10). Comparing monthly income ten students had \$250 or less; eighteen had between \$250-500; twelve had \$500-750 and six participants had over \$750 dollars. The average monthly income in Turkey is \$608 (Eurostat, 2014)

### **Findings**

Three major categories about men's gender roles in family life emerged from this current study; (1) male breadwinner identity, (2) female breadwinner identity, and (3) doing or avoiding

housework. Each category is discussed and supported with representative quotes and reflections from the focus group interviews.

### **Male breadwinner identity**

This category refers to earning a family wage and providing for the family, as well as taking responsibilities for protecting the family and its members. The majority of the young men described a man's major duties as taking care of the family and protecting family members "*We have responsibilities. I mean, like, we have to take care of our wives, we have to provide for our families. These are our major duties*" Working and "*bringing bread to home*" were seen as primary responsibility of men. The majority of the participants believed that men are the main provider. According to them, a home/shelter and anything else a family needs such as food and furniture should be provided by a man. This belief that men must work outside the home to provide for the home, then defined women's responsibilities as staying at home and taking care of the needs of the family in the house. As one participant described, "*Man is the individual bringing food and ingredients and woman has to cook*"

As the young men discussed their beliefs about men's provider role they described that this role and its obligations originated from family and societal pressure. The obligation to work and expectation to provide for were imprinted to these young men since childhood. They believed that they personally had to enact their provider role when they grow up. For example "*... They grow up with that mindset since childhood: "I have to provide for my home and family, I will get married and I will take care of my wife and kids."* Although many men had a sense of satisfaction derived from fulfilling their self-defined role, others discussed the burden of being the main provider. They perceived expectations from women and society for men to provide for

the family as pressure and burden on them. An example *“loads the men with a charge of everything.”*

In the case of the woman is the main provider; they stated their concern about being belittled by society. They believed that society perceived using the women’s earning as a shameful act *“...if a woman provides for the family, society views differently. It is said that “Look, that man is surviving with his wife’s money.” A man should take care of the family, should have a job and provide for the kids...”*

In contrast, a few men mentioned globalization, interaction with the West, and changing life conditions begun to influence their attitudes. They feel like their current beliefs as the men as the main provider is not sustainable. These men believe that women’s employment, education and socialization play an important role on society and men’s attitude change on their family roles.

*“Due to less globalization level, women were staying at home in past periods. Along with globalization, for instance the women became more socialized... Due to globalization, the opinions of men have changed more. In the current period, what is being expected of men is his assistance, listening to the opinions of his spouse, his assistance in domestic affairs rather than earning of money, and it is now being called as ‘life is a joint venture’. I believe this is now the expectation of women and society, and he is now being deemed as a figure who is more understanding, who allows more freedom to his spouse and who will assist more rather than a figure earning money.”*

## Female breadwinner identity

These young men described their beliefs of manhood in context of not only what being a man was, but also what their views of being a woman meant. Much of this view focused around women's responsibility in a home or at work. This category includes men's negative and/or positive attitudes towards women's employment. Some men believed that "*working is for men*". According to these men, women shouldn't work. They thought that women who work rose to a position of power and had more voice at home. Thus, men's authority over women weakened. For example, one participant explained this situation

*"...in west [west coast of Turkey] women are working and for instance the men are also working. Therefore, the men cannot make themselves listened to by the women. For instance, he will say something on an issue but he knows his spouse will become angry and say that "I'm also working and bringing in money, I'm also taking bread to home and you have nothing exceptional."* Another participant supported this belief with an aphorism "*The woman's money stays on the doorstep, she kicks it while coming in and going out.*"

Negative attitudes of men towards women's employment was related to women's perceived responsibilities at home. Men were concerned that a working woman would not have enough time for her responsibilities such as house chores and pleasing the husband. For example, *"...what I want is to have a hot meal. When I arrive home, to have conversation and share something. If she is at work and I'm at work, we will both be tired, and lack of communication will occur. This would be the reason for her not to work."* These were the reasons these men were opposed to woman's employment.

Gender inequality at work was one of the factors discussed by men in the focus groups. Several men shared that they did not believe that men and women could be viewed as equal at

the workplace. One participant noted *“It seems like a woman doing the same job with a man at the workplace seems like a funny thing. Because we do not deem ourselves as peers with them [women] as Turkish population.”*

A few men had positive attitudes towards women’s employment. They expressed that *‘women can work, like men do’*. They positively underlined the increasing participation of women in the workforce especially in the last three to four decades: *“In the last 30-40 years, women have started to work. Many women have jobs. I think it is beneficial.”* They associated the necessity of women to work to financial needs and changing economy. One participant noted,

*“The prices increased a lot, and the work performed by the men is unable to cover that price. And as they are unable to cover, they [men] are allowing the women to work. Actually this became a bit of an obligation. We placed it under the name of modernization along with obligation.”*

Another participant shared his willingness for his prospective wife to work. He emphasized that some men who live in the Eastern part of Turkey did not let woman work because of the ‘manhood pride’: *“I would like my spouse to work. Now, we should work together. But I have to be able to trust her [when she is out of the house]. And also the men of East have too much pride. He cannot let his wife work due to that pride.”*

### **Doing or avoiding housework**

Doing or not doing housework was brought up in all the focus groups. The young men held strong beliefs about whether a man should do any work in the home, and if so, what type of work was acceptable. Conditions and reasons why men believe they should or should not do

housework included in this category. Many of the participants stated that they avoided doing housework at home. They shared several reasons for not doing house chores. Following are the reasons of avoiding housework: “Masculine Pride”, “Feeling of entitlement ”, “Lack of time”, “Parenting style”, and “Tolerance to mess”. Men emphasized that there were some conditions to help with housework, such as sickness, asking for help, sharing the housework.

Masculine Pride. The most common reason men stated for not doing housework was their standing in society and what others would think of them. They believed that if a man did housework at home he was perceived by society as “*not manly enough*” and ridiculed by friends and family members. A man who helped the chores was called names: “*light man*”, “*henpecked man*” or “*pussy-whipped*”

One participant stated “*...if a man is cleaning the house you visit, he is pointed out and said that the management, dominance in this house belongs to the woman, and this is a shame in our culture.*” Another participant shared an experience he had with his brother “*My older brother was newlywed, it had been one-two months, when we went to visit him he was cooking, and my other older brother started to make fun of him as if like saying ‘what else I will see?’ After that he never entered the kitchen*”

In some of the interactions among the men in the group, participants brought up some specific chores like cleaning the windows. (Nota bene: It is very important in Turkish culture, be clean and to be perceived by others as being clean inside and out. Not only should the inside of houses be clean and clutter free, but the outside including windows must be clean. Generally, women cling to the window frame hanging outside the window, placing their feet on the window ledge and clean the windows until they are spotless and shiny. No matter which floor they live on, they clean the window once every three to four weeks.) Most of these young men

avoided cleaning the windows because of the possibility of being seen by other people. This was one of the participants' speculation on why men avoided cleaning the windows,

*“Why a man can wash the dishes but the same man can't clean the windows? Because cleaning the windows is seen from the outside of the house, because of the societal pressure. For example you are washing the dishes and it is only one of the housework. Cleaning windows is also one of the housework and it is a shame. But, not to be seen on the outside of a window and not to be exposed to family and society pressure, cleaning the windows is not performed by men. Society doesn't expect men to clean windows in a large part of the Turkey.”*

For these men, cleaning the window damages the “male code” and doesn't suit to a “real man”. For example, *“I think that it is because of the societal pressure. For example, a man's act of cleaning the windows could be ridiculed. Maybe I am wrong but I cannot suit to myself.”*

Feeling entitled: The young men felt they were entitled to leave the housework to their wives.

They believed that serving men was women's responsibility *“He works, and he wants the dinner ready when he arrives home”*. Another participant noted *“I would like to share my father's thought. He is a busy person. He wakes up at 5:30-6:00am and comes back to home around 9:00-10:00pm. He thinks that serving to him is not helping to a husband. Having the service of his wife is his right. It is not like he is not helping to the housework.”*

Lack of time. Another justification of avoiding housework by some of the participants was not having enough time at home and being tired after working all day. *“...as the men work in heavy works especially in rural areas, they go to home as tired, and they cannot allocate their time to domestic works...”* Participants believed that if men worked outside of the home all day, women should have had responsibilities at home in order to share life's responsibilities equally.

*“For example, if I am providing more funding for house economy and if I am working in a more labor intensive job, it doesn't matter if she works or not, I expect her to do the housework. Housework is not heavy. But if I work harder at work and if she is less tired than me at work, I expect her to feel exhausted at home for the sake of equality. I will work harder at the same time I will do housework, and then my wife will live like a sultan. If I cook and do cleaning, then nothing is left”*

Parenting Style. The attitudes and behaviors for not doing housework at home were influenced by the young men's parents' parenting style and role models (uncles, older brothers and members of the community) *“I have never seen my father in the kitchen even just having a glass of water by himself. I have two sisters and a mother and generally they serve to him...”*

Some men thought that being a role model for their own sons was an important factor on doing or avoiding the housework. One participant explained his reason of avoiding housework: *“I think it is related to parenting style of parents. For example, I never do dishes. If I get married in future, I will not do dishes again because I am not used to do it at home. My mother always did it for me. I don't wanna do it in future”* and another stated *“... may raise individuals who are harmful for the society, if he is unable to influence the woman and the children.”*

Generally, men compared themselves to their fathers. They gave examples of what they witnessed at home. According to these men, they were imitating their fathers who were imitating their father (the participants' grandfathers).

*“In family life, he [my father] is not dealing with housework, despite knowing it. Why does not he do? Because this is the raising style of him. You are a member of the family, a competent member, a patriarch member. It is not suitable for you to do. You cannot even enter the kitchen. The woman cooks and brings to you; she is a kind of maid.”*

Tolerance to mess. Men emphasized higher tolerance to mess and uncleanliness compared to women. Housework and keeping the home tidy by nature are not important for them to considering doing the housework. They mentioned “manly” laziness and claimed that men have a higher threshold of overall messiness, even dirtiness. They believed that because of women’s lower tolerance for unclean environments, they are more likely to do chores at home. One participant noted

*“For three years, my aunt is living near my building. I live far from my family for three years. I never tidy the house. Huge stacks are arising at home, and then my aunt is tidying them. In other words, they are becoming uncomfortable with it. I’m telling them not to do that. I’m telling them that “I like living in stacks and dirt” But they are saying that they would tidy them. And they do not want me to help them. They would do it in any case. It is weird. I don’t know what kind of a frame of mind they have.”*

Another participant described his tolerance threshold for some housework tasks at home:

*“For example, we have stayed in Istanbul two months at summer season. You know, our parents go to vacation. At that time, I stayed with my brother. He is one year younger than me. When we are together with my brother, we are trying to keep house clean, we are doing deep down cleaning once in a week. Dirty dishes would pile up and we are waiting for having more and more dirty dishes and we are placing them to dishwasher once in a week. Imagine how it looks when we are doing those things once in a week! Before our parents arrive home we clean the house not to make my mom mad at us.”*

Conditions to help for housework. There are certain situations men conceded that helping women for housework was justified; if she was sick or asks for help; if there was a task that a woman could not handle; or if it was a specified task inside the home, such as only doing dishes or only

ironing. For some participants, one main factor that justified helping women was her employment status. Men were willing to help their partners, if she worked outside of the home.

For example,

*“Women are also working as men, when the women arrive home at the same time with their spouse, they can be as tired as men, and this doesn’t mean that men will just work. They can cook and dine together”* Another man noted *“If my wife and I handle the financial problems together, we could be able to do housework together. I mean doing laundry or dishes. I won’t clean the windows and I won’t expect her to fix the plumbing. I could handle that kind of things.”*

### **Discussion and Conclusions**

The findings in this study revealed that young men in Turkey viewed man as the breadwinner and placed high value on men’s providing and women’s caring roles. According to men in our study, man’s primary responsibility was earning an income and providing for the family. This is in line with other studies. Men’s provider identities are still very much in evidence in Turkish culture (Boratav et al., 2014; Sancar, 2009). In contrast, studies about men’s gender roles conducted in Western countries support a decline of the breadwinner role (Crompton, 1999; Cunningham, 2008; Lewis, 2001).

In the last three decades, in Turkey women have increasingly attained higher level of education. Women’s participation in labor force has also increased. Previous research suggested that individuals who have higher level of education were the first ones to adopt new attitudes about cultural changes (Cunningham, 2008; Lesthaeghe & Surkyn, 1988; Myers & Booth, 2002; Treas, 2002). Since our interviewees were with university students, receiving higher education, we expected them to have a more modern and egalitarian approach towards men and women’s

gender roles in family life. We hoped their views on women's education and employment to be more progressive than in the past. Conversely, men in our study espoused traditional patriarchal views. They affirmed the traditional male breadwinner, female homemaker family model. While the majority of men had negative attitudes towards women's employment, encouragingly some men had positive attitudes.

Men attach meanings to manhood within the household. They felt it was their privilege as a husband to be served by their wives and expect certain responses. Demands and responses are considered to be proper expressions of masculinity and womanhood, respectively. Men base this privilege on several meanings they attached to being a husband. A husband in their eyes is the head of household, and the sole provider (Natalier, 2003). Power in the home is associated with gender enactments in a relationship. Domestic actions, such as who does housework can be investigated with a gendered significance. Findings of this study support Natalier (2003) assertions regarding irrelevance of housework to enactments of masculine identity. In our study, doing housework was recognized as not "manly". Societal pressure stemming from cultural traditions had a significant influence on gender roles of the men. Majority of young men avoided housework due to fear of being identified as enacting a feminine role and the possibility of being ridiculed by their families or peers. These findings are also consistent with claims by West and Zimmerman (1987) who argued that within a given context, gender performance ascends from dealing with others. Men "do gender" to deal with others in every day life (Natalier, 2003; West & Zimmerman, 1987). According to West and Zimmerman (1987) "Doing gender is to advance a new understanding of gender as a routine accomplishment embedded in every day interaction."

Bolak (1997) suggests that men's understandings about sharing of house chores should be based on relative importance of women's employment. Men agreed to help doing housework in

the case of working equally. However, Commuri and Gentry (2000) and DeVault (1997) suggested that husbands' behavior regarding household production, such as doing housework and making decisions related to household, were the same regardless of the wife's working status. In our study, all men were single. For this reason, it is unknown whether or not they will share housework in case of being dual earners. Some of the men indicated that even if their wife worked they still expected her to do all the housework, while others felt that shared housework was appropriate if the wife worked outside the home. Although, they did suggest this did not include the public spectacle of cleaning windows. Therefore, it is important to conduct longitudinal studies to test the change on men's attitudes and behaviors towards sharing housework in terms of working equally.

Men's both negative and positive attitudes towards women's employment and doing housework emerged in our study. This was an expected finding since patriarchal-conservative and modernist-liberalist discourses coexist in Turkey (Boratav et al., 2014). Istanbul is a metropolitan city and inhabited by very diverse communities. University students come to study from all around Turkey. The city and culture that they have experienced before joining the university might have influenced their thoughts. An in-depth exploration to understand the past-life factors influencing men's attitudes towards women's employment and doing housework is needed.

Male university students' lives and discourses about men's gender roles in family life was the major premise of this study. This study makes a contribution to literature on how young men define men's responsibilities at home and how their attitudes and beliefs are shaped in the context of cultural norms in Turkey. This study forms a baseline for further research to understand underlying factors of their attitudes. It will be important to know which of the

meanings and thoughts about gender roles are learned and are reinforced during university years and persist or change after graduation. Further studies should also compare how life experiences such as marriage or life partnership, fatherhood, or career influence men's perceptions.

The results of this study show a continuation of the dominance of traditional views about gender roles in Turkey. A well-designed programs for young men to help them change their responses and behaviors towards gender equality could help change these intransitive views. The programs should be designed to adopt more equitable attitudes and behaviors toward men's caring roles and household tasks are needed in Turkey. These programs can prepare young men for their future roles as parents and partners. Young men need to deconstruct the idea that being a man does not involve housework and childcare. That a man's role is not only protector but care provider. They should be encouraged to question the dichotomy that women care and men are careless.

This study has a few limitations. First, given the study's qualitative design, we recruited young men from two universities in Istanbul, Turkey. While the findings fit the expectations and parallel previous studies; they should not be generalized beyond the sites and the men who participated. Second, we gathered limited information about sociodemographic characteristics of the participants. Asking further questions their family life, who is the main provider in their families; geographic area they were born and/or were raised; and if they were living in a city, town, or village prior to attending university, would have been helpful in interpreting and discussing study findings. These demographic characteristics and others should be included in further research to better explore the factors that influence their views. Lastly, despite the aforementioned steps we took to establish trustworthiness, this study cannot be separated from the subjectivity of the primary author of this study as she was born and raised in Turkey.

## References

- Adana, F., Arslantaş, H., Ergin, F., Biçer, N., Kıranşal, N., & Şahin, S. (2011). Views of Male University Students About Social Gender Roles; An Example From East of Turkey. *Journal of Family Violence, 26*(7), 519-526. doi: 10.1007/s10896-011-9385-1
- Akin, A., & Demirel, S. (2003). Concept of Social Gender and Implications on Health. *Cumhuriyet University Medicine Faculty Journal on Health, 25*(4), 73-83.
- Attanapola, C. T. (2003). Multiple voices, multiple realities: female industrial workers' health in Sri Lanka. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift, 57*(3), 154-163.
- Aycan, Z., & Eskin, M. (2005). Relative Contributions of Childcare, Spousal Support, and Organizational Support in Reducing Work–Family Conflict for Men and Women: The Case of Turkey. *Sex Roles, 53*(7-8), 453-471. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-7134-8
- Basow, S. A. (1992). *Gender: Stereotypes and roles*: Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Bhasin, K., & Ay, K. (2003). *Toplumsal cinsiyet: bize yüklenen roller*: Kadınlarla Dayanışma Vakfı.
- Bolak, H. C. (1997). WHEN WIVES ARE MAJOR PROVIDERS Culture, Gender, and Family Work. *Gender & society, 11*(4), 409-433.
- Boratav, H. B., Fi ek, G. O., & Ziya, H. E. (2014). Unpacking Masculinities in the Context of Social Change: Internal Complexities of the Identities of Married Men in Turkey. *Men and Masculinities, 17*(3), 299-324. doi: 10.1177/1097184x14539511
- Çaha, Ö. (2010). Attitudes towards the status of women in Turkish society: The case of Istanbul. *European Journal of Economic and Political Studies, 3*(2), 145-162.
- Central Intelligence Agency, C. (2013). The World Factbook: Middle East, Turkey. <https://http://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tu.html>
- Cinamon, R. G., & Rich, Y. (2002). Gender differences in the importance of work and family roles: Implications for work–family conflict. *Sex Roles, 47*(11-12), 531-541.
- Commuri, S., & Gentry, J. W. (2000). Opportunities for family research in marketing. *Marketing Department Faculty Publications, 10*.
- Crompton, R. (1999). *Restructuring gender relations and employment: the decline of the male breadwinner*: Cambridge Univ Press.
- Cunningham, M. (2008). Changing Attitudes toward the Male Breadwinner, Female Homemaker Family Model: Influences of Women's Employment and Education over the Lifecourse. *Social Forces, 87*(1), 299-323.
- DeVault, M. (1997). Conflict and Deference. In C. Counihan & P. Van Esterik (Eds.), *Food and Culture: A Reader* (pp. 180-199). New York: Routledge Press.
- Dokmen, Z. Y. (2004). *Toplumsal cinsiyet, sosyal psikolojik açıklamalar [Gender, social-psychological explanations]*: Sistem yayıncılık.
- Eurostat. (2014). *European Statistics-Labour Market Database*. Retrieved from: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/labour-market/earnings/database>

- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24(2), 105-112.
- Gulerce, A. (1995). Cultural receptiveness of psychological sciences. *Bogazici University Journal*, 16, 225-237.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1982). Changing value of children in Turkey.
- Khan, M., & Manderson, L. (1992). Focus groups in tropical diseases research. *Health policy and planning*, 7(1), 56-66.
- Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of focus groups: the importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of health & illness*, 16(1), 103-121.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*: Sage.
- Krippendorff, K., & Bock, M. A. (2004). *The content analysis reader*: Sage.
- Lesthaeghe, R., & Surkyn, J. (1988). Cultural dynamics and economic theories of fertility change. *Popul Dev Rev*, 1-45.
- Lewis, J. (2001). The decline of the male breadwinner model: implications for work and care. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 8(2), 152-169.
- Liamputtong, P., & Ezzy, D. (2005). Qualitative research methods.
- Mayring, P. (2000). *Qualitative Content Analysis* (Vol. 1).
- Muftuler-Bac, M. (2012). *Gender Equality in Turkey*. Policy Department C: Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs Retrieved from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201204/20120424ATT43808/20120424ATT43808EN.pdf>.
- Myers, S. M., & Booth, A. (2002). Forerunners of change in nontraditional gender ideology. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 18-37.
- Natalier, K. (2003). I'm not his Wife'Doing Gender and doing Housework in the Absence of Women. *Journal of Sociology*, 39(3), 253-269.
- Öngen, D. E. (2007). The relationships between sensation seeking and gender role orientations among Turkish university students. *Sex Roles*, 57(1-2), 111-118.
- Sakalli, N. (2001). Beliefs about wife beating among Turkish college students: the effects of patriarchy, sexism, and sex differences. [Article]. *Sex Roles*, 44(9/10), 599-610.
- Sancar, S. (2009). *Erkeklik: imkânsız iktidar: ailede, piyasada ve sokakta erkekler [Domination and Masculinities: men in families, market and streets]*: Metis Yayınları.
- The United Nations, U. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>.
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American journal of evaluation*, 27(2), 237-246.

- Treas, J. (2002). How cohorts, education, and ideology shaped a new sexual revolution on American attitudes toward nonmarital sex, 1972–1998. *Sociological Perspectives*, 45(3), 267-283.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & society*, 1(2), 125-151.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998). *Focus groups in feminist research: Power, interaction, and the co-construction of meaning*. Paper presented at the Women's Studies International Forum.

•

## **APPENDICES**

## Appendix A

### Consent Form

#### UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

#### School of Nursing

#### Male University Students' Perspectives on Masculinity and Gender Equality in

#### Istanbul, Turkey

	<b>Researcher (Student)</b>	<b>Faculty Advisor</b>	<b>International Supervisor</b>
Name	Kader Tekkas, RN, MSN	Patricia Betrus, RN, PhD	Aysecan Terzioglu, PhD
Academic position	PhD Student /University of Washington School of Nursing	Associate Professor Faculty Member /University of Washington School of Nursing	Assistant Professor (Faculty Member, Koc University School of Nursing)
Division/De partment	Psychosocial and Community Health Nursing	Psychosocial and Community Health Nursing	Sociology
Telephone number	001 (206) 432-6985 +90 (507) 178-7086	001 (206) 543-6065	+90 (537) 657-9307

#### **Researchers' Statement:**

We are asking you to be in a research study. The purpose of this consent form is to give you the information you will need to help you decide whether or not to be in the study. Please read the form carefully. You may ask questions about the purpose of the research, what we would ask you to do, the possible risks and benefits, your rights as a volunteer, and anything

else about the research or this form that is not clear. When we have answered all your questions, you can decide if you want to be in the study or not. This process is called “informed consent.” We will give you a copy of this form for your records.

### **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of this study is to understanding the perspectives of young men toward masculinity, gender equality, violence and sexuality and to explore the factors that shape masculine identities for young Turkish men studying in the universities in Istanbul, Turkey.

### **STUDY PROCEDURES**

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to take part in a digitally recorded group interview. You will be in a group with 6 to 9 other male university students

The interview will occur in a private room located in the TC Istanbul Kultur University and Kavram College. You will be asked to state your first name to sign this consent form and then you will receive one page length survey. Filling out the survey will take approximately three minutes. During the interview, we will not call you with your first name. After completing the survey, we will start to group interview and will ask you to share your knowledge and thoughts on masculinity, gender equality, violence, sexuality and the factors that shape masculine identities for young Turkish men.

You are free not to answer any questions you do not wish to answer or withdraw from the interview at any time. This will not affect you in any way. The Focus group interview will be conducted in 60-90 minutes.

## **RISKS, STRESS, OR DISCOMFORT**

This study is conversational only and will not pose any physical risk to you. You may experience some emotional discomfort from the interview process and the questions. You are free not to answer to the questions that you do not want to answer. If you experience signs of extreme emotional distress during the interview, I will refer you to the university counseling center, if you want to this kind of support.

In order to protect your privacy, focus group interview will be conducted in a private room at the TC Istanbul Kultur University and Kavram College. It is always possible that someone listening to the audio recording might potentially recognize your voice. This constitutes a risk to your confidentiality, but we consider a very low and unlikely risk.

## **BENEFITS OF THE STUDY**

There is no direct benefit of participation in this study. The results of this study will hopefully provide invaluable information to develop a program manual on promoting gender equality among young men in Turkey.

## **OTHER INFORMATION**

Your participation is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from this study at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled.

All information that we obtain from you will be confidential and will not be shared with anyone not on the research team. During the data collection and analysis process, all information will be secured in my laptop which is password protected. Your answers will be entered and translated by the researcher. All the information will be taken to the US after

data collection. The files will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the confines of an office within the University of Washington, School of Nursing. All audio-recordings will be transcribed in Turkish and the audio files will be destroyed no later than December 31, 2014. If the result of this study are published or presented, we will not use your real name.

Government or university staff sometimes review studies such as this one to make sure they are being done safely and legally. If a review of this study takes place, your records may be examined. The reviewers will protect your privacy. The study records will not be used to put you at legal risk of harm. One page length-survey and audio recordings (that do not contain personal identifying information) will be kept indefinitely.

---

Printed name of investigator

Signature of investigator

Date

**Participant's statement**

This study has been explained to me. I volunteer to take part in this research. I have had a chance to ask questions. If I have questions later about the research, I can ask one of the researchers listed above. If I have questions about my rights as a research subject, I can call the Human Subjects Division at (206) 543-0098. I will receive a copy of this consent form.

---

Printed name of participant

Signature of participant

Date

Copies to: Participant, Investigator's file

## Appendix B

### Turkish Version of the Consent Form

#### UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

#### Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu

İstanbul, Türkiye'deki erkek üniversite öğrencilerinin erkeklik ve cinsiyet eşitliği

üzerine görüşleri

ONAM FORMU

	<b>Araştırmacı (Öğrenci)</b>	<b>Danışman</b>	<b>Uluslararası danışman</b>
Ad-Soyad	Kader Tekkas, RN, MSN	Patricia Betrus, RN, PhD	Aysecan Terzioglu, PhD
Akademik pozisyon	Doktora Öğrencisi /Washington Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu	Doçent Doktor (Öğretim Üyesi/ Washington Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu	Yardımcı Doçent Doktor (Öğretim Uyesi, Koç Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu)
Bölüm/Dep artman	Psikososyoloji ve Toplum Sağlığı Hemşireliği	Psikososyoloji ve Toplum Sağlığı Hemşireliği	Sosyoloji
Telefon numarası	001 (206) 432-6985 0 (507) 178-7086	001 (206) 543-6065	0 (537) 657-9307

#### Araştırmacının Beyanı:

Bir araştırma çalışmasına katılımınızı rica ediyoruz. Bu onam formunun amacı araştırma hakkında bilgi vererek araştırmaya katılıp katılmama konusunda karar vermenize yardımcı olmaktır. Lütfen formu dikkatlice okuyunuz. Araştırmanın amacı, olası riskleri ve yararları,

katılımcı olarak haklarınız, varsa formda anlaşılmayan yerler ve araştırma hakkında aklınıza gelen soruları sorabilirsiniz. Tüm sorularınıza biz cevap verdikten sonra araştırmaya katılıp katılmamayacağınıza karar verebilirsiniz. Bu süreç bilgilendirilmiş onam olarak adlandırılmaktadır. Kayıtlarınız için bu formun bir kopyasını size vereceğiz.

### **ARAŞTIRMANIN AMACI**

Bu araştırmanın amacı İstanbul, Türkiye’de üniversitelerde öğrenim gören genç erkek öğrencilerin erkeklik, cinsiyet eşitliği, şiddet, ve cinsellik hakkındaki görüşlerini anlamak ve erkeksi kimliklerin oluşmasına etki eden faktörleri incelemektir.

### **ARAŞTIRMA PROSEDÜRÜ**

Bu çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ederseniz, dijital ses kaydı ile yapılacak olan bir grup görüşmesine katılmanız istenecektir. 6-9 kişiden oluşan bir grupta yer alacaksınız. Araştırma TC İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi ve Kavram Yuksekokulu’nda yer alan özel bir odada gerçekleşecektir. Onam formuna adınızı yazmanız ve imzalamanız, sonrasında da bir sayfadan oluşan bir bilgi formunu doldurmanız istenecektir. Bilgi formunu doldurmanız yaklaşık üç dakikanızı alacaktır. Bilgi formunu doldurduktan sonra grup görüşmesine başlayacağız ve size erkeklik, cinsiyet eşitliği, şiddet, ve cinsellik, erkeksi kimliklerin oluşmasına etki eden faktörler hakkındaki bilgi ve görüşlerinizi soracağız. Sorulara cevap vermemekte ve istediğiniz zaman araştırmadan çekilmekte serbestsiniz. Bu size hiçbir şekilde etkilmeyecektir. Gurup görüşmesi yaklaşık 60-90 dakika sürecektir.

## **RİSKLER, STRES YA DA HUZURSUZLUK**

Bu çalışma sadece karşılıklı konuşmadan oluşmaktadır ve size karşı herhangi bir fiziksel risk taşımamaktadır. Görüşme sürecinde ve sorulardan dolayı belki duygusal huzursuzluk yaşayabilirsiniz. Sizi rahatsız eden sorulara cevap vermemekte serbestsiniz. Eğer görüşme sırasında aşırı duygusal huzursuzluk belirtileri yaşarsanız, ve destek almayı kabul ederseniz, size TC İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi danışmanlık servisine sevk edeceğim.

Gizliliğinizi korumak için gurup görüşmesi TC İstanbul Kültür Ünivesitesi ve Kavram Yuksekokulu'nda özel bir odada yapılacaktır. Her zaman için ses kayıtlarını dinleyen kişinin sizin sesinizi tanıma olasılığı vardır, ancak biz bu olasılığı en aza indireceğiz.

## **ARAŞTIRMANIN YARARLARI**

Araştırmaya katılmanın direkt olarak bir yararı yoktur. Bu araştırmanın sonuçları Türkiye'de erkekler arasında cinsiyet eşitliğini sağlamaya yönelik bir program geliştirmek için çok değerli bilgiler sağlayacaktır.

## **DİĞER BİLGİLER**

Araştırmaya katılım tamamiyle gönüllülüğe dayanmaktadır. Araştırmadan istediğiniz zaman, herhangi bir ceza ya da kayıp yaşamadan çekilebilirsiniz.

Sizden alacağımız her türlü bilgi gizli tutulacaktır ve araştırma ekibinde yer almayan hiç kimse ile paylaşılmayacaktır. Veri toplama ve analiz sürecindeki tüm bilgiler, şifresi gizli tutulan bir dizüstü bilgisayarda saklanacaktır. Cevaplarınız bilgisayara araştırmacı tarafından aktarılacaktır. Tüm bilgiler veri toplanması sonrasında Amerika'ya götürülecektir. Tüm dosyalar Washington Üniversitesi'nde kapalı bir dolapta saklanacaktır. Tüm ses kayıtları

Türkçe olarak yazılacak ve ses kayıtları en geç 31 Aralık 2014 tarihine kadar yok edilecektir.

Bu araştırmanın sonuçlarının yayınlandığında veya sunulduğunda, gerçek isimlerinizi kullanmayacağız.

Devlet ya da üniversite çalışanları bu tür çalışmaların yasal ve güvenli bir şekilde yapıldığından emin olmak için bazen çalışmaları gözden geçirmek isteyebiliyor. Eğer bu çalışmayı da gözden geçirmek isterler ise, kayıtlarınızı inceleyebilirler. İnceleme sırasında güvenliğiniz korunacaktır. Araştırma kayıtları size yasal bir zarar vermeyecektir. Kişisel bilgilerinizi içeren bir sayfalık bilgi formu ve ses kayıtları gizli tutulacaktır.

---

Araştırmacının adı-soyadı	Araştırmacının İmzası	Tarih
---------------------------	-----------------------	-------

**Katılımcının Beyanı:**

Bu araştırma bana açıklandı. Bu araştırmaya gönüllü olarak katılıyorum. Soru sorma hakkına sahiptim. Eğer daha sonra soru sormak istersem, yukarıdaki listede isimleri yer alan araştırmacılara soarabilirim. Araştırma katılımcısı olarak haklarım ile ilgili sorum olursa İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulunu (Human Subjects Division) arayıp sorabilirim (001 206 543-0098). Bu onam formunun bir kopyasını alacağım.

---

Katılımcının adı-soyadı	Katılımcının imzası	Tarih
-------------------------	---------------------	-------

Kopyalar: Katılımcının, Araştırmacının dosyası

## Appendix C

### Demographic Survey

Survey Number:.....

Age: .....

Year of Study: .....

Income (Monthly):

- a. \$250 and below
- b. \$250-500
- c. \$500-750
- d. \$750 and above

Parents' income (Monthly):

- a. \$250 and below
- b. \$250-500
- c. \$500-750
- d. \$750 and above

Number of siblings: .....

Relationship status:

- a. In a relationship
- b. Single

## Appendix D

### Turkish Version of the Demographic Survey

#### Demografik Bilgi Formu

Anket Numarası:.....

Yaş: .....

Eğitim Yılı: .....

Aylık Gelir: a. 500 TL ve altı  
b. 500-1000 TL  
c. 1000-1500 TL  
d. 1500 TL ve üzeri

Ailenin Aylık Geliri a. 500 TL ve altı  
b. 500-1000 TL  
c. 1000-1500 TL  
d. 1500 TL ve üzeri

Kardeş Sayısı: .....

İlişki Durumu: a. İlişkisi var  
b. İlişkisi yok

## **Appendix E**

### **Ground Rules**

1. We want you to do the talking.
  - We would like everyone to participate.
  - I may call on you if I haven't heard from you in a while.
2. There are no right or wrong answers.
  - Every person's experiences and opinions are important.
  - Speak up whether you agree or disagree.
  - We want to hear a wide range of opinions.
3. What is said in this room stays here.
4. We will be tape recording the group;
  - We want to capture everything you have to say.
    - We don't identify anyone by name in our report. You will remain anonymous.

- **Appendix F**

- 

### **Focus Group Interview Questions**

1. What defining characteristics would you use to describe what it means to be a man?
2. What does masculinity mean to you?
3. What are the social expectations and pressures you face as a man?
4. Do you think it is different for women?
5. What are the men's roles and responsibilities in their relationships at home?
6. What do you think influences men's beliefs about the roles and responsibilities in the home setting?

- Appendix G

Flyer

# VOLUNTEERS NEEDED FOR RESEARCH STUDY

- Men and Manhood in Turkey Research Study
  - University of Washington

We need participants for a focus group research study. We are researching male university students' ideas and opinions about gender roles of men, men and manhood, violence and sexuality in Turkey. If you are 18-25 years old male and enrolled to the university for the 2013-2014 academic year, we would like to invite you to join into a small group. You will be in a group with 6 to 9 other male university students. Your participation will take approximately 90 minutes.

DATE:	
TIME:	
PLACE:	

- To learn more or to contact the principle investigator of the study, Kader Tekkas, at 0 507 178 7086 or [kadert@uw.edu](mailto:kadert@uw.edu)

Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Men and Manhood in Turkey Research Study	Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Men and Manhood in Turkey Research Study	Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Men and Manhood in Turkey Research Study	Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Men and Manhood in Turkey Research Study	Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Men and Manhood in Turkey Research Study	Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Men and Manhood in Turkey Research Study	Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Men and Manhood in Turkey Research Study	Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Men and Manhood in Turkey Research Study	Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Men and Manhood in Turkey Research Study	Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Men and Manhood in Turkey Research Study
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

- Appendix H

### Turkish Version of the Flyer

# ARASTIRMA ICIN GONULLU ARANIYOR

- Turkiye’de Erkekler ve Erkeklik Arastirmasi
- University of Washington

- Erkek universite ogrencilerinin, Turkiye’de erkeklerin cinsiyet rolleri, erkekler ve erkeklik, siddet ve cinsellik konularinda fikir ve goruslerini arastiriyoruz. Odak grup calismasi icin katilimcilara ihtiyacimiz bulunmaktadır. Eger 18-25 yas arasindaysaniz ve 2013-2014 akademik yilinda egitim goren erkek universite ogrencisi iseniz, sizi calisma grubumuza davet etmek istiyoruz. 6-9 erkek universite ogrencisinden olusan bir grupta yer alacaksınız. Katiliminiz yaklasik 90 dakika surecektir.

TARİH:	
SAAT:	
YER:	

- Daha fazla bilgi almak ya da katiliminizi bildirmek icin arastirma yurutucusu Kader Tekkas ile iletisime geciniz.
  - 0 507 178 7086 ya da [kadert@uw.edu](mailto:kadert@uw.edu)

Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Turkiye’de Erkekler ve Erkeklik Arastirmasi
Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Turkiye’de Erkekler ve Erkeklik Arastirmasi
Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Turkiye’de Erkekler ve Erkeklik Arastirmasi
Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Turkiye’de Erkekler ve Erkeklik Arastirmasi
Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Turkiye’de Erkekler ve Erkeklik Arastirmasi
Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Turkiye’de Erkekler ve Erkeklik Arastirmasi
Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Turkiye’de Erkekler ve Erkeklik Arastirmasi
Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Turkiye’de Erkekler ve Erkeklik Arastirmasi
Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Turkiye’de Erkekler ve Erkeklik Arastirmasi
Kader Tekkas <a href="mailto:kadert@uw.edu">kadert@uw.edu</a> Turkiye’de Erkekler ve Erkeklik Arastirmasi