PERCEIVED PARENTAL ATTITUDES OF TURKISH COLLEGE STUDENTS
TOWARDS DATING AND PREMARITAL SEXUAL BEHAVIORS:
THE ROLE OF STUDENTS' GENDER & PARENTAL MARITAL STATUS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

BAŞAK ŞAHİN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

JULY 2005

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____
Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nebi Sümer
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Deniz Şahin	(HÜ, PSY)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yeşim Yasak	(GÜ, PSY)	_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner- Özkan	(METU, PSY)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Surname: Başak Şahin

Signature:

ABSTRACT

PERCEIVED PARENTAL ATTITUDES OF TURKISH COLLEGE
STUDENTS TOWARDS DATING AND PREMARITAL SEXUAL
BEHAVIORS:
THE ROLE OF STUDENTS' GENDER & PARENTAL MARITAL STATUS

Şahin, Başak

M. A., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Bengi Öner Özkan

July 2005, 113 pages

The aim of this study is to measure the perceived parental attitudes of Turkish college students towards dating and premarital sexual behavior and to examine how these attitudes differ with respect to gender of the students and parental marital status. The participants of the present study were 160 college students. Participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire, with two scales, which were measuring perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior and perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior.

Results indicated that, both gender of students and parental divorce affect students' perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior; with the use of Wilk's criterion, both of the DVs were significantly affected both by gender $F(2,155) = 14.85$, $p < .01$ and parental divorce $F(2,155) = 23.42$, $p < .01$, and by their interaction $F(2,155) = 10.84$, $p < .01$. There was a significant

gender difference about perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior; male students perceived their parents' attitudes as more permissive toward premarital sexual behavior, but female students perceived their parents' attitudes as less permissive toward premarital sexual behavior. However, in terms of parental attitudes toward dating, there was no significant difference due to gender. There was also a significant difference in perceived parental attitudes in terms of parental marital status with respect to dating and premarital sexual behavior. Children of divorced parents perceived their parents' attitudes in a more permissive way, however children whose parents are still married perceived their parents' attitudes as less permissive, toward both dating and premarital sexual behaviors.

The interaction of gender and parental marital status were both significant due to perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior $F(1,155)= 12.41$, $p<.01$ and due to perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior $F(1,155)= 19.80$, $p<.01$. In terms of perceived parental attitudes toward dating, females whose parents are divorced tend to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females whose parents are married, whereas males whose parents are divorced did not significantly differ from the males whose parents are married. Moreover, males whose parents are married tended to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females whose parents are married toward dating behavior, whereas females and males whose parents are divorced did not significantly differ. In terms of perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexuality, both females and males whose parents are divorced tend to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females and males whose parents are married, however the difference between

females whose parents are divorced vs. married is significantly larger than the difference among the males whose parents are divorced vs. married. Moreover, males whose parents are married tended to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females whose parents are married toward premarital sexual behavior, whereas females and males whose parents are divorced did not significantly differ.

Department of the student, city mostly lived in, father education, mother education, and number of siblings of the student were not found to be correlated with the perceived parental attitudes of college students toward dating and premarital sexual behavior. The results of the present study are discussed in the light of the literature, and limitations and future suggestions are presented.

Keywords: Dating behavior, premarital sexuality, perceived parental attitudes, parental divorce, and cultural context.

ÖZ

TÜRK ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN ÇIKMA VE EVLİLİK ÖNCESİ CİNSEL DAVRANIŞLARLA İLGİLİ ALGILADIKLARI EBEVEYN TUTUMLARI: ÖĞRENCİLERİN CİNSİYETLERİNİN & EBEVEYNLERİN EVLİ OLUP OLMAMASININ ROLÜ

Şahin, Başak

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Bengi Öner Özkan

Temmuz 2005, 113 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türk üniversite öğrencilerinin çıkma ve evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili algıladıkları ebeveyn tutumlarını ölçmek ve bu tutumların öğrencilerin cinsiyetine ve ebeveynlerin evli olup olmamasına göre nasıl değiştiğini incelemektir. Çalışmanın katılımcıları 160 üniversite öğrencisidir. Katılımcılardan, çıkma ve evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili algıladıkları ebeveyn tutumlarını ölçen iki anketi doldurmaları istenmiştir.

Sonuçlar, hem öğrencilerin cinsiyetinin hem de ebeveynlerin evli olup olmamasının öğrencilerin çıkma ve evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili algıladıkları ebeveyn tutumlarını etkilediğini göstermiştir; Wilk kriterinin kullanılmasıyla, her iki bağımlı değişkenin de hem öğrencilerin cinsiyetinin $F(2,155) = 14.85$, $p < .01$ hem ebeveynlerin boşanmış olmasının

F(2,155) = 23.42, p < .01, hem de bunların ortak ilişkisinden F(2,155)= 10.84, p<.01, etkilendiği gösterilmiştir. Öğrencilerin cinsiyetinin evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili algıladıkları ebeveyn tutumları üzerinde etkili olduğu görülmüştür. Erkek öğrenciler evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili ebeveyn tutumlarını daha izin verici algılarken, kız öğrenciler evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili ebeveyn tutumlarını daha az izin verici algılamaktadır. Ancak, çıkma davranışıyla ilgili ebeveyn tutumları açısından öğrencilerin cinsiyeti anlamlı bir fark göstermez. Ayrıca, ebeveynlerin evli olup olmaması; çıkma ve evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili algıladıkları ebeveyn tutumları açısından anlamlı olarak farklıdır. Boşanmış ebeveynlerin çocukları çıkma ve evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili ebeveyn tutumlarını daha izin verici algılarken, evli ebeveynlerin çocukları çıkma ve evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili ebeveyn tutumlarını daha az izin verici algılamaktadır.

Öğrencilerin cinsiyetinin ve ebeveynlerin evli olup olmamasının ortak ilişkisi, çıkma F(1,155)= 12.41, p<.01 ve evlilik öncesi cinsel F(1,155)= 19.80, p<.01 davranışlarla ilgili algılanan ebeveyn tutumları açısından anlamlı bulunmuştur. Boşanmış ebeveynlerin kız çocukları evli ebeveynlerin kız çocuklarına göre çıkma davranışıyla ilgili ebeveyn tutumlarını daha izin verici algılamaktadır, ancak boşanmış ebeveynlerin erkek çocuklarıyla, evli ebeveynlerin erkek çocukları çıkma davranışıyla ilgili algılanan ebeveyn tutumlarında anlamlı bir fark göstermez. Dahası, evli ebeveynlerin erkek çocukları evli ebeveynlerin kız çocuklarına göre çıkma ve evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili ebeveyn tutumlarını daha izin verici algılar, ancak boşanmış ebeveynlerin kız ve erkek çocukları, çıkma ve evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili algılanan ebeveyn tutumlarında anlamlı bir fark göstermez. Boşanmış

ebeveynlerin kız ve erkek çocukları, evli ebeveynlerin kız ve erkek çocuklarına göre, çıkma ve evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili ebeveyn tutumlarını daha izin verici algılamaktadır, ancak evli ya da boşanmış ebeveynlerin kız çocukları arasındaki fark, evli ya da boşanmış ebeveynlerin erkek çocukları arasındaki farktan daha anlamlıdır. Evli ebeveynlerin erkek çocuklarının evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili anne baba tutumları, evli ebeveynlerin kız çocuklarına göre daha izin verici algılamaktadır, ancak boşanmış ebeveynlerin kız ve erkek çocukları evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili algılanan anne baba tutumlarıyla ilgili anlamlı bir fark göstermez.

Öğrencinin okuduğu bölüm, yaşamının çoğunu geçirdiği şehir, anne eğitimi, baba eğitimi ve kardeş sayısı, çıkma ve evlilik öncesi cinsel davranışlarla ilgili algılanan ebeveyn tutumlarıyla bağlantılı bulunmamıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçları literatür ışığında tartışılmış ve çalışmanın sınırlılıklarına değinilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çıkma davranışı, evlilik öncesi cinsellik, algılanan ebeveyn tutumları, ebeveynlerin boşanmış olması, ve kültür yapısı.

To my Parents Mine & Turhan Şahin,

and the Loved Ones

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xiii

LIST OF TABLES

xiv

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

When we talk to a friend, or read a magazine; probably the topic of romantic relationships will be a part of the conversation or the theme. Relationships are always interesting for people of all ages, races and nations; but if sexuality is a part of these relationships and it is not institutionalized, it is even far more interesting. However the content of these conversations will vary due to familial and cultural background. Cultural values and familial structure have such effects upon our cognitions that, within time our socially derived world knowledge affect how we perceive the thoughts and attitudes of important others, e.i. the parents (Lewin, 1951; Gergen, 1985; Bem, 1987; Beall, 1993). Moreover, what do lead perceived attitudes of important others –parents in this case- and what do influence and make a difference in individuals' perceived parental attitudes vary due to familial and cultural backgrounds. Turkish society, which is a collectivist culture, is in a transition stage with respect to dating values through westernization (Göregenli 1995; Anamur 1998; Kılıç, 2000; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1985; cited in Sunar, 2002). Female vs. male students and students with divorced parents vs. married parents, may have different perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behavior. Therefore, the difference due to perceived parental attitudes toward certain topics should be understood. In order to understand the significance of perceived parental attitudes towards dating and premarital sexual behavior within cultural context, one needs to consider how gender of the child and familial context affect this process. We need to

1

examine what are the perceived parental attitudes upon dating and premarital sexuality, and how they differ with respect to gender of the child and family context, e.i. marital status of the parents.

After defining the concepts of dating, premarital sexuality, gender schematization and gender differences in these relationships, salience of culture, structure of Turkish culture and presence of parental divorce, and perceived parental attitudes will be described in the following part.

1.1. Definition of Dating Behavior

Several authors described dating behavior in different ways; dating is seen as a means of socialization leading to personal and social growth, as an opportunity for companionship with members of the opposite sex (Erikson, 1968), as recreation or an opportunity to have fun (McDaniel, 1969), as a means of status grading (Skipper and Nass, 1966) and as a means of mate sorting and selection (McDaniel, 1969). The literature on dating attitude and behavior is large and abundant, and definitions of attitude and behavior in these terms vary. Attitude, for instance, was often defined to be preferences of dating partner's characteristics (Hansen, 1977; Roscoe, Diana & Brooks, 1987), attitudes toward premarital sex (Roche and Rampsey, 1993), date aggression (Stets, 1992), and date rape (Mills and Granoff, 1992).

In order to define the concept of "dating", the historical development of the concept is needed to be given in the first place. Waller (1937) observed a new pattern of interaction between the sexes. He described dating as interaction, which had as its prime goal for any of the functions identified by Skipper and Nass as dating as a form of recreation, socialization, status grading & achievement, except courtship or mate selection. People tended to date at

2

their own level of the hierarchy: students who are members of particular nations predominantly tended to date students from same nations, dorm residents predominantly date to dorm residents. Dating is an interaction reserved for people who have no responsibility of marrying one another and as primarily aiming at status grading and status achievement, according to Waller's data from Penn State College during 1929- 1930 academic year.

Krain, Cannon & Bagford (1977) stated that, the behavior pattern of interaction between the sexes with the prime goal being something other than mate selection emerged by about the 1920's and has come to be known as "dating". This phenomenon was described as a sharp break from traditional patterns of interaction between the sexes. However, they stated that it had also definite mate selection possibility in the sense that if one finds the right person, it is free to negotiate carrying the relationship to a more serious level.

According to Burgess & Locke (1945), dating is "a social engagement" between two young people with no commitment beyond the expectation that it will be a pleasurable event for both. McCabe (1984), in his theory of adolescent dating, defined dating as interplay among maturation, social influences, and opportunities can best explain the particular practice. Dating is described as a social institution, which is regulated and constrained by several social forces and by several authors and clearly, it is a social behavior that is affected by societal expectations at each age level (Dornbusch, Carlsmith, Gross, Martin, Jennings, Rosenberg & Duke, 1981). Coleman (1961) noted that dating is the typical interaction pattern between the sexes in high school.

Skipper & Nass (1966) described dating as a behavior, which most people experience during adolescence and early adulthood and stated that:

When one thinks of dating, he usually refers to the time span of the teens and early twenties. Usually dating is stereotyped as a romantic, exciting, interesting and valuable experience in and of itself. Moreover, it is felt that it makes a salient contribution to the individual's socialization into the adult roles of the society, eventual marriage and establishment of home and family.

They stated as functions of dating for the individual as following:

1. Dating may be a form of recreation. It provides entertainment for the individuals involved and is a source of immediate enjoyment.
2. Dating maybe a form of socialization. It provides an opportunity for individuals of opposite sex to get to know each other, learn to adjust to each other, and to develop appropriate techniques of interaction.
3. Dating may be a means of status grading and status achievement. By dating and being seen with persons who are rated "highly desirable" by one's peer group, an individual may raise his status and prestige within his group.
4. Dating may be a form of courtship. It provides an opportunity for unmarried individuals to associate with each other for the purpose of selecting a mate whom they may eventually marry.

Lowrie (1951) designed a study to find out why students date. Three reasons were identified: 1) Mate selection 2) recreation 3) anticipatory socialization. Mate selection is the conscious searching for compatible dating and/or marriage partners. Recreation is dating solely for the purpose of enjoying heterosexual interaction. Anticipatory socialization is learning, through dating, the knowledge and skills, which are prerequisite to assuming specific marital roles.

According to McDaniel (1969), dating is known to manifest itself in at least three stages: random dating, going steady and pinned/ engaged. Random dating occurs when the female is dating but not with any special person; going steady occurs when she is dating a special person but has not made any commitment to marry; and being pinned/ engaged occurs when she is

4

dating a special person and has made a commitment to marry.

Most of the literature about dating attitudes was depended upon values of American college students. Dating in its current form developed in the urban United States after World War I. While dating tends to accompany courtship, it typically precedes it chronologically. It is the major form of heterosexual relationship during adolescence (Husbands, 1970; Lambert, Rothschild & Altland, 1978; Broderick, 1968). At American high schools, ability to have dates is an indicator of "popularity" (Williamson, 1965; McCabe, 1984). Skipper & Nass (1966) stated that, the general American view of dating is positive and optimistic.

Furmann (2002) in the article of "The Emerging Field of Adolescent Romantic Relationships" stated about dating behavior the following:

> Dating and romantic relationships are always the most important parts of adolescents' social lives. Adolescents interact more frequently with romantic partners than with parents, siblings, or friends. Adolescent romantic relationships are more significant than they are frequently considered to be. We can easily discount these relationships, but they are quite central in adolescents' lives. Not surprisingly, romantic relationships are the context of much the sexual behavior. Some sexual activities occur with casual partners or friends, but most occurs within a dating or romantic relationship. The strongest single factor for sexual intercourse in 7th through 12th grades is involvement in a romantic relationship during the previous 18 months. More work is needed in integrating the field of adolescent romantic relationships and sexual behavior.

It is for sure that romantic relationships and sexual behavior are considered to be important in adolescents', late-adolescents' and early-adults' lives. In order to find out the perceived parental attitudes towards dating behavior, it is necessary to state an operational definition for the certain "dating" concept. Within the context of this study, dating is described (within the light of

literature) as "expression of heterosexual and romantic interest, which constitutes a form of recreation and socialization for daters and may or may not include sexuality."

Within the light of literature, we can conclude that dating relationships is a current value of adolescents and young adults. One should also consider the place of sexuality within romantic relationships. But, where does the sexuality stands within the dating period? What were the values and what are the current values about premarital sexuality? We will shed light onto these and several other questions within the definition of premarital sexuality within dating behavior.

1.2. Definition of Premarital Sexuality within Dating Behavior

As dating may or may not include sexuality, it is necessary to explain the role of premarital sexuality as a part of dating behavior within the literature. The literature on dating attitudes and behaviors from 1970s to 1990s seemed to be consistent in terms of an increasing permissiveness in premarital sexual attitudes, common occurrences of sexual behaviors among daters, and a relationship between dating stage and intercourse (Bell & Chaskes, 1970; Ferrel, Tolone & Walsh, 1977; King, Balswick & Robinson, 1977; Mahoney, 1978; Glenn & Weaver, 1979; Bell & Coughey, 1980; Earle & Perricone, 1986). According to Burgess & Locke (1945), dating is not synonymous with either sexual intercourse or courtship. Regan and Berscheid (1999) argued that, sexual desire is a component of romantic love and sexual desire is commonly perceived to be part of the experience of being in love. Reiss (1960) stated that, permissiveness with affection is supposedly the emerging norm in college society.

In terms of developmental period of sexuality, DeLamater (1981)

stated that with the occurrence of puberty, and development of secondary sex characteristics, importance of sexual meanings and behaviors for the individual is increased. These changes make the person aware of sexual activity, reproduction, and dating and mate selection, which are socially integral aspects of these physical/ biological processes. When the person enters adolescence, it is expected from him/ her to begin the transition from childhood roles, which emphasize submissiveness, non-responsibility and asexuality, to adult roles, which emphasize dominance, responsibility, and sexuality (Feldman, 1972). Therefore, there have been both biological and social pressures toward sexual development. Sexual identity includes knowledge in terms of one's body and sexual functioning, a sense of one's attractiveness to others, and the image of oneself as sexual. The young person comes to accept his/her involvement in these activities and s/he develops a sense of sexual adequacy.

The article of Pope & Knudsen (1965) aimed to make a systematic investigation of changes in American family institutions by consideration of the so-called "sexual revolution" against traditional standards- premarital chastity for the woman, the double standard for the man. The so-called double-standard in social learning terms, means that women are punished for sexual activities such as having numerous partners or engaging in causal sex, whereas men are not likely to be punished, or perhaps are even rewarded (through admiration or increased social status), for such behaviors (Oliver & Hyde, 1993). Likewise, Reiss (1960) identified four specific premarital standards: abstinence. the double standard (premarital coitus is more acceptable for men than for women), permissiveness (acceptance of coitus) with affection, and permissiveness without affection.

7

The association between dating stages and sexual relationship is also studied. Using a college student sample, Roche & Rambsey (1993) divided dating process into stages and related these stages to the students' concept of reported dating behaviors, ranging from light petting, heavy petting, to intercourse. The results suggest that a higher percentage of students reported intercourse as dating moved from preceding stages to later stages. It is also stated that young adults' sexual permissiveness for dating varies with the commitment level; higher levels of dating commitment predicts greater approval for engaging in sexual intercourse. Sprecher & Hatfield (1996) found similar results. Peplau, Rubin & Hill (1977) stated that, "Sexually-traditional" couples believed in and practiced abstinence until marriage. "Sexual moderates" believed intercourse was acceptable when each loved the other. "Sexual liberals" believed that sexual activity could be engaged in for its own sake, that it was not necessary for the couple to be in love nor sexual intimacy to lead to emotional intimacy. Pope & Knudsen (1965) also stated that, there are social arrangements, in terms of premarital intercourse. One of the social arrangements is that, premarital intercourse may be permitted, but only between those partners who will later marry. Through their comparison of reported attitudes toward premarital sexuality in four universities, DeLamater & MacCorquodale (1979) found that, an increasing percentage of people accept intercourse before marriage; between 1959 and 1973. The data showed a substantial trend toward "permissiveness with affection" and the results showed an increase in premarital experience, particularly in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Moreover, more coitally experienced men and women had more liberal attitudes, suggesting that premarital standards are not static, but changing within time (DeLamater & McCorquodale, 1979).

Literature indicated that premarital sexual attitudes are primarily related to many sociological and psychological factors (Hardy, 1964; Billy, Tanfer, Grady & Klepinger, 1993). Having friends who are sexually permissive, gender, being a member of low socio economic status, poor relationships with parents, going steady in dating, and low educational aspirations are some of the predictors of premarital sexuality. Most of the literature about sexual attitudes was depended upon values of American college students. Thorton (1990) examined relationships among dating, courtship and sexuality in Detroit metropolitan area. According to his sample, approximately %90 of the male and %88 of females had first dating experience at the age of 16. 3/4 of males and 2/3 of the females approved premarital sex. 63% of males and 54% of females developed sexual relationship. Whereas, only 27.1% of males and 37.9% of females planned to marry. Those who had never had sexual intercourse demonstrated significantly less approval of premarital sex than those who had. Moreover, a steady relationship played a key role in terms of leading to first intercourse.

Likewise, Oliver & Hyde (1993) found supportive results. With respect to attitudes, males reported greater approval of premarital intercourse than did females, and particularly large gender difference was revealed for attitudes toward premarital intercourse due to casual circumstances. A large gender difference was also revealed in terms of sexual permissiveness: males reported more permissive attitudes than females did. Males reported greater acceptance of extramarital intercourse and lower levels of anxiety, fear, or guilt than females did.

Tanga & Zuo (2000) had given information about dating attitudes of American college students in their study. They stated that, American college students generally adopt a liberal attitude toward dating and are more likely to develop sexual relationship. Females have had significantly less dating partners than males did. American students tend to describe their dating relationship as "steady". Dating is almost synonymous to having sex: approximately 86% of daters developed sexual relationships; sex emerges as a major dimension of dating behavior in American culture. Additionally, a steady relationship played a key role in terms of leading the first intercourse. Liberal attitude towards dating exists as a major predictor of sexual relationship. The American college students are on the liberal side in dating attitude. They are more liberal-minded regarding date- initiation, date- cost, commitment, and development of sex relationship. The majority of them have had dating experiences. They tend to date young and frequently. They are more likely to describe their relationship as "going steady" and more likely to develop a sexual relationship in dating. Their liberal dating attitude, their identification of dating stage, and numbers of their dates, are good predictors of their likelihood of developing a sexual relationship.

Scott (2000) reviewed the major researches, which took place during the 1990s about sexuality in marriage, dating and other close relationships. It is stated that, sexuality is mostly a part of many close relationships; it is sanctioned in marriage, it is often experienced in dating and it is an important part of other committed romantic relationships.

Analysis of the "National Survey of Men" with an age range of 20 to39 indicated that 88% of never-married men were coitally experienced (Billy et. al., 1993). Comparable study was made for women. Tanfer & Cubbins (1992)

study of "National Survey of Unwed Women" (NSUW) with an age range of 20 to29 demonstrated that, 80.75% of the women were non-virgins. When these studies were summed up, they suggested that young, single, adult men and women were generally sexually active and demonstrated high rates of approval of premarital sexuality.

Smith's study (1994a) due to the sexual attitudes between 1972-1991, he noted that fewer respondents rated sexual relations before marriage as always wrong, majority rated them as not wrong at all compared to earlier years. Smith interpreted these changes as being morally neutral about engaging in premarital sexual behavior. He demonstrated that societal approval of premarital sexual relationships has generally remained stable since 1982. Since 1982, 38% of the respondents have rated sex before marriage as not wrong at all, with an approximate 23% seeing it as only sometimes wrong. Predictors of such sexual permissiveness were stated as having characteristics such as; low religiosity, being young, being politically liberal, Black, male, single. According to the model of premarital sexual permissiveness developed by Reiss (1960) it is assumed that, as a result of socialization, the individual develops a sexual standard, with respect to the acceptability of various sexual activities. This standard is relatively stable over time, and it is a major determinant of the person's sexual behavior.

After paraphrasing the previous research about dating and premarital sexual behavior, we will discuss the Turkish literature with respect to dating and premarital sexual behavior in the following pages. The studies about dating as a form of romantic relationships and premarital sexuality have been mostly taken place in Western cultures. The literature about dating and romantic relationships and premarital sexuality in Turkey has been limited. However, there has

been studies about the mate preferences of university students in terms of gender (Durmazkul, 1991), gender issues and romantic relationships exploring association between gender-stereotype and attraction (Akgün, 1993), the effects of sexism and sex role orientation on romantic relationship satisfaction (Curun, 2001), predictors of adolescent sexual attitudes and behavior as the role of parents and best friends (Akgün, 2000), the concept of virginity as a cultural value among students of Middle East Technical University (METU) and Ankara University (Vargün, 2002), and the relationship between future time orientation and relationship satisfaction (Öner, 2000).

Akgün (1993) examined the effects of sexism and sex role orientation on romantic relationship satisfaction and stated that individuals perceived the ones behaving consistent in terms of gender stereotypes as more attractive than ones not behaving consistent with the certain stereotype. Curun (2001) had examined the relationship between sexism, sex-role orientation and relationship satisfaction in Turkish dating couples. He stated that both of the two gender-related concepts had a role in explaining relationship satisfaction in dating couples. In Akgün's study (2000) the adolescent sexual attitudes and behavior and the role of parents and best friends as predictors of those attitudes, were examined. She stated that, positive communication with parents, perceived approval of premarital sexual permissiveness from parents and best friends were found to predict adolescents' sexual attitudes and behavior and male adolescents were found to have more sexually permissive attitudes toward premarital sexuality than female adolescents were.

Vargün (2002) examined the attitudes of university students in Ankara toward dating and premarital sexuality. She stated that, all students of

12

METU had a dating experience, 30% had first dating experience at secondary school and 37% at high school, 37% had never experienced sexual intercourse, 48.1% had first sexual experience with a date, 96.3% thought that men and women can be friends without sex, 25.9% thought dating should be with limitations toward premarital sexuality, 74.1% thought that it is normal for a woman to experience premarital sexuality, 11% thought that his/her family should choose the person they will marry, 3.7% thought that a virgin girl is honorable. However, in Ankara University, 78% of the students had a dating experience, 6% had first dating experience at secondary school and 30% at high school, 62% had never experienced sexual intercourse, 32% had first sexual experience with a date, 82% thought that men and women can be friends without sex, 62% thought dating should be with limitations toward premarital sexuality, 58% thought that it is normal for a woman to experience premarital sexuality, 22% thought that his/her family should choose the person they will marry, 26% thought that a virgin girl is honorable. It is clear that, students of Ankara University hold more traditional values toward dating and premarital sexuality than students of METU did. The ambiguity and doubt about the concept of "being honorable", was stated by the students as ambiguous during the interviews with the frequently asked question of "How can we call a girl as honorable who had sexual experiences even she never experienced sexual intercourse". This quotation demonstrated the ambiguity, which takes place within the transition stage of Turkey through Westernization with respect to changes especially in attitudes toward premarital sexuality.

After paraphrasing the previous research about dating and premarital sexual behavior, one of the most important points to emphasize is, up to

what degree these behaviors vary according to gender schematization and differences? We will discuss the salience of gender schematization and differences with respect to dating and premarital sexual behavior in the following pages.

1.3. Gender Schematization & Gender Differences and Social Constructionism in Dating and Premarital Sexual Behaviors

It is necessary to state the salience of how gender is constructed by cultures in the first place. Beall (1993) stated that, as the social constructionist approach about gender stated, gender is a socially constructed category, which influences perceptions of women and men. Social constructionism is concerned with how people come to understand the world around them and with how they come to define "reality". It differs from other approaches in terms of the belief that people and culture is used as a guide to define the reality.

Gergen (1985) identified the four assumptions that most social constructionists have been using. Most constructionists share at least one of the following assumptions.

1. There are many different ways that the world can be understood. A particular culture's experience of the world is not the only experience that a person can have of the world. One's understanding of the world does not reflect an absolute reality that is simultaneously experienced by all people. There can be little doubt that, different views of the world lead to different experiences of reality, which are equally "real" to the people who believe in them.
2. One's understanding of the world is a social product. Understanding involves a group of active, cooperative people, who determine what constitutes reality. These understandings of the world are different across time and cultures.
3. An understanding or conceptualization of the world may be particularly popular or persistent only because it is useful. Stereotypes may be retained because they rationalize the differential treatment of groups or the current social order.

14

4. Understandings of the world are related to all kinds of social actions. Descriptions and explanations of the world influence the way that society is structured and the way that people interact.

The social constructionist perspective argues that human beings are not passive agents of a set of particular events, which are happening in the environment. Instead, constructionists believe that humans are actively engaged in their perceptions and that's why they construct the view of the world. Human society is actively involved in determining what is "right" and "wrong", what is "moral" and "immoral", what is "real" and what is "illusory". Thus, cultures are actively constructing social information. Cultures provide people with a set of lenses through which they can observe and understand their environment (Bem, 1987). One's sense of world is determined by the set of lenses, one uses them to see the world. The point of socialization is to teach children how to "see" the world or how to use the lenses the rest of the culture is using. The lenses are important because they provide people with similar understanding of the world and because they provide people with a way to interpret ambiguous information around them (Beall, 1993). As cultures were stated to provide people a set of lenses through which they can observe and understand their environment, it is essential to emphasize that one of the most important of these lenses are about gender. But then one should ask, what do lenses about gender lead to in terms of social life organizations?

Social constructionists in the field of gender argued that gender is a socially constructed category and the relations between the two genders are basically social relations (Lorber, 1986). Constructionists have noted that ideas about gender differ across cultures. Therefore, across cultures one's biological sex has

not necessarily implied that one will engage in certain activities or people will believe that one possesses certain attributes. There are cognitive and cultural forces, which maintain gender distinctions. Culture obviously affects one's beliefs and social practices, and there is evidence that people actively use gender-based cultural ideas to perceive and understand the social categories of male and female. According to Mischel (1966), gender differences are shaped by positive reinforcements for gender-role-consistent behavior, however role-inconsistent behavior is generally ignored or perhaps even punished, therefore becoming less frequent. Children differentially imitate same-gender adults, so that the gender role behavior of the previous generation perpetuates itself in the next generation. On the other hand, parents are not the only adults to whom developing children are exposed. The media and other sources present many other models for imitation and observational learning. Thus, social learning theory can readily account for change over time in patterns of gender differences in sexuality (Oliver & Hyde, 1993).

Gender is an important social category that we learn to identify at an early age because it is useful in society. Categorization is quickly learned because one should learn which public rest room to use, which activities to engage in, and which clothes are appropriate to wear. People also learn to categorize others because they are intensely socialized by their same-gender peers (Maccoby, 1990). The contents of gender schema may be different across cultures, but gender is a salient social category that is reinforced by cultural forces and by various human cognitive mechanisms (Beall, 1993). Within the light of literature, cultures have a certain gender categorization, which reinforces or punishes certain behaviors for male and female members of the society and dating and premarital

sexuality can be said to be involved in those certain behaviors.

Gender distinctions are maintained by differential socialization of male and female children, which may cause males and females to engage in different behavior causing to have different aspirations. In addition, gender distinctions may be maintained through the use of different verbal and nonverbal behavior by women and by men and ideas & expectations about gender can influence people to confirm their gender stereotype. Therefore, one's expectation that a man will be unemotional may lead to confirmation of this expectation, because people will treat the man in an unemotional way. Expectations about people do influence the way individuals are treated and their response to this treatment may confirm the initial expectation. This process has been called the self-fulfilling prophecy (Basow, 1992). Relatedly, an expectation that a women is less permissive with respect to dating and premarital sexual behaviors that a man is, may lead to the confirmation of this expectation, as people will treat the woman in a certain way, which will lead her through certain behaviors.

Likewise to previous research, Beall (1993) stated that, individuals with the help of cultural gender schema socially construct gender. The schema is learned at an early age because gender is a salient social category in the society. The schema is reinforced and maintained through various perceptual biases, through cultural mechanisms, which may produce differences between the genders and through the self-fulfilling prophecy.

Gilligan's theory about moral development is also an example of the emphasis on differences between men and women (Gilligan, 1982). She proposed that women and men's morality concepts are different because the two genders are concerned with different things. Women are concerned with preserving relationships

17

and caring for other people. Men, in contrast, are concerned with following rules of fairness. Their morality is not concerned with the preservation of relationships. That's why gender differences can reflect other processes that have little to do with biological sex. Oliver & Hyde (1993) stated that, social learning theory predicts a lower average number of sexual partners for women than for men. It also predicts that women will hold more negative attitudes about casual sex than men will. At the same time, sexuality is an important component of gender roles and heterosexuality is assumed to be part of both the male role and the female role (Oliver & Hyde, 1993). People who are described as male but having feminine qualities are assessed as having a higher probability of being gay than are men described as having masculine qualities. However, a person described as female but having masculine qualities is given a lower probability of being a lesbian than is a man with non-stereotyped qualities (Oliver & Hyde, 1993).

How is gender as a social category applied to dating and premarital sexuality within literature? When we come to the effect of gender schematization upon dating and premarital sexual attitudes, previous literature suggests the existence of gender differences in dating attitude and behavior (Hansen, 1977; Roscoe et al., 1987; Roche & Rambsey, 1993). Basow (1992) stated that, heterosexual dating, marriage and cohabitation, all reflect society's messages about appropriate male- female behavior, and heterosexual dating relationships are heavily structured by gender role norms and stereotypes. Women and men are supposed to be naturally sexually attracted to each other, although sexual feeling are supposed to be more important for males than for females; and women are supposed to be more interested than men in love and in relationships. Reiss (1976) has found   similar results, as women would be far

more oriented with respect to the quality of the relationship and emotional intimacy, whereas men would be more oriented toward body-centered sexuality that denies attachment and intimacy. These messages all are part of a cultural heterosexual "script". In fact, the heterosexual dating script is so well known that when college students were asked to list the content of actions that would occur on a first date, agreement was strikingly gender stereotyped. Women's dating script focuses on enhancing their appearance, making conversation and controlling sexual behavior. Whereas men's dating script focuses on planning and paying for the date as well initiating sexual behavior (Gagnon & Simon, 1973; Basow, 1992).

The sexual double standard, which is described as society's permissive attitudes toward male promiscuity and intolerance for female promiscuity, is critical in defining male and female roles in the process of premarital sexuality. Reiss (1960) indicated that the old double standard of several decades ago, in which sexual intercourse outside marriage was acceptable for men but not for women, has largely been replaced by a new, conditional double standard, in which sex outside of marriage is tolerated for both men and women, but under more restrictive circumstances—such as love or engagement—for women. However, DeLamater & MacCorquodale (1979) stated that, as the concern for equal educational and occupational opportunity grew, as sex discrimination was declared illegal in various contexts, it became illogical to have differing standards of sexual behavior for men and women.

Male and female schemas of the society, which leads to the construction of gender concept in the light of societal and cultural values and norms, are learned. Scott (2000) reviewed the major research made during the 1990s in

the study of sexuality in marriage, dating and other close relationships and stated that men initiated sexual activity more frequently than women. Tanga & Zuo (2000) also stated that, females have had significantly less dating partners than males. Oliver and Hyde (1993) stated that, women were less accepting causal sex than men. Regan (1997) stated that single women's sexual desire is keyed by professing love and that women's sexuality is strongly related to their relationship experience. McDaniel (1969) stated that, society does not, in fact, prefer females who are assertive with respect to dating behavior. Oliver & Hyde (1993) stated that, moderately large gender differences were revealed for incidence of intercourse, age of first intercourse, number of sexual partners, and frequency of intercourse. Males reported a higher incidence of intercourse, a younger age at which they first experienced intercourse, more frequent intercourse, and a large number of sexual partners than did females.

According to Earle and Perricone's (1986) survey about premarital sexuality among college students, a significant increase in rates of premarital intercourse, decreases in average age of first experience and increase in average number of partners were indicated, although differences between men and women still existed and these differences were much more evident in attitudes than in behavior. With respect to attitudes, men were much more likely to approve premarital intercourse in the absence of a commitment between partners. For instance, 1/3 of the men, but less than 1/20 of women, approved casual sex. Moreover, women with more permissive attitudes were from relatively lower socio economic status. The relationship between attitudes and behavior toward intercourse was significant for both men and women. Shelley (1981) stated that liberal respondents, consisting of college students, reject the double

standard and they believe that women should be free to initiate sexual activity and they did not agree that a woman should pretend to be sexually naive at the time of marriage if she is actually not.

In Laner's study of permissive attitudes toward sexual behaviors (Laner, Laner & Palmer, 1978) theory and research regarding permissive and non-permissive attitudes toward sexual behaviors contain apparent contradictions. Female and male college students share a common level of permissiveness, which has been held to vary by degree of involvement in familial or courtship processes. A comparison of students who saw their parents' marriage happy with those who believed their parents were unhappily married revealed that the latter group contained a significantly higher proportion with permissive attitudes toward premarital sexuality and cohabitation. Laner's study is an excellent example of how children of unhappily married couples held more permissive attitudes toward premarital sexuality.

Edwards & Booth (1976) stated that consistent differences between men and women in sexual behaviors have been found. Reiss (1976) proposed that, there is a relationship between less permissive attitudes toward sex and high degree of responsibility for other family values. He explained these differences by connecting the socialization of women to the family and marriage institutions, suggesting that attitudes and behaviors of women conformed, more than men did, to parentally held marriage and family values. He also noted that, because of the rise of a new set of values among the young, women are no longer less permissive than men. And it is also essential to note that this rise of new set of values among young took place in western cultures.

Luckey & Nass (1969) studied the sexual practices and attitudes

in an international sample. In terms of finding out the attitudes toward the double standard sex code, the following question was asked: "do you think it is reasonable for a man who has experienced coitus elsewhere to expect that the girl he hopes to marry be chaste at the time of marriage?" a "yes" response was interpreted as potential support for the double standard. American and Canadian females most strongly supported the double standard position. Only %13.2 of the men and %18.9 of the women supported the double standard position. 2/3 of the men and slightly more than the half of the women believed that both partners should have premarital experience. In all countries, except England, women more frequently than men supported the double standard.

In the chapter of "social constructivist view of gender" of Gergen's book (1985), it was demonstrated how gender is constructed by culture and individuals, and how it affects individuals' perception. In terms of social constructivism, people understand the world according to how they define reality. Due to the one of Gergen's related assumptions about social constructivism, reality construction is depending upon people who experience them, as those experiences are real for people who believe in them. According to the second assumption, one's understanding of the world is taken as a social product, as understanding involves active and cooperative group of people and reality is constructed by their cooperative understanding. That's why gender is very important in terms of explaining dating behavior and sexuality within dating behavior, and gender constitutes as a difference with respect to how college students perceive parental attitudes toward certain behavior.

1.4. The Salience of Culture: Individualism- Collectivism and Honor Cultures

In order to understand what influences perceived parental attitudes about dating and premarital sexuality, it is impossible to avoid the salience of culture. Moreover, as the culture we live in, which is in a transition stage from collectivistic values to individualistic ones, through industrialization and modernization (İmamoğlu, 2003; Sunar, 2002) especially within the urban population, and is found to be an honor culture (Sunar, 2002), the features of individualism, collectivism and honor cultures should be emphasized in the first place, in terms of defining cultural context.

Collectivist and individualistic cultures can be generally described in the following terms (Kim, Triandis, Kağıtçıbaşı, Choi & Yoon, 1994; Triandis, Botempo, Villareal, Asai & Lucca, 1988). Collectivist cultures are characterized by intense emotional attachment that individuals have for their ingroup. This leads to a subordination of personal goals to the collectivist goals of the ingroup and self-definition in terms of its relationship with the ingroup. This interdependence and strong bonds among ingroup members leads to a greater differentiation between ingroup and outgroup in collectivist cultures compared to individualistic cultures. Individualistic cultures, in contrast, emphasize the goals, desires and expectations of the individual, which are above the ingroup's goals, desires and expectations. The self is defined as an entity independent of the ingroup and mainly defined in terms of rights, capacities, and needs of the individual in the individualistic cultures than in collectivist cultures. Moreover, in individualistic cultures, group membership is less demanding in terms of obligations and duties than it is in collectivist cultures. To summarize,

23

collectivist cultures promote a view of the self, within which the relationship with others and interdependence is more central than it is in individualistic cultures. In contrast, individualistic cultures promote a view of the self within which independence and one's internal capacities and personal attributes are central. These cultural views of how the self related to others have also been referred to as interdependent and independent construal of the self, respectively (Markus & Kitiyama, 1991). The typical characteristics of collectivism such as relatedness, closeness among family members and favorism of the ingroup, the dynamics of the familial and parental relationships will be supportive in terms of enlightenment of perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexuality.

While individualism-collectivism is generally regarded as a cultural dimension, it is also defined in terms of psychological tendencies, such as emotions, perceptions, values, and self-construals, that in turn are seen both as sourcing from participation in the culture and as constituting certain aspects of culture (Sunar, 2002). This has implications for childrearing too, which is assumed to have the dual aspects of leading to perpetuate the culture's values and practices and at the same time resulting from them. In other words, parents raise their children under the influence of their values, emotions, and self-construal (derived from their own upbringing in the culture) in such a way as to evoke similar values, emotions, and self-construals in the children. Likewise, parents in a collectivistic culture encourage and approve the child's interdependence, with the rest of the family, criticize or otherwise discourage its independent tendencies and blur any boundaries which might reduce awareness of salient connectedness of each family member with all the   rest (Sunar, 2002). And in these terms, it

can be concluded that perceived parental attitudes are derived from being up brought in the culture.

Where does Turkish culture lie on the individualism-collectivism continuum? Earlier research (Hofstede, 1980) suggested that it could be placed near the collectivistic end of the spectrum. However, Sunar (2002) stated that, the Turkish research carried out in the 1990s, mainly with urban samples, suggested that it might be more properly regarded as lying about midway between the two extremes (Göregenli, 1995; Anamur, 1998; Kılıç, 2000; cited in Sunar, 2002). Turkish childrearing practices are expected to be a mixture of individualistic and collectivistic practices and relatedly; urban population and industrial economy, predict a combination, or coexistence of individual and group (family) loyalties (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1985; cited in Sunar, 2002). A supportive, flexible, low-pressure family style is observed within Turkish culture, as described above.

Beyond individualism-collectivism, one should consider the structural features of the honor concept and honor cultures in order to be able to understand the salience of gender script and familial relationships within the cultural code of honor, as Turkish culture is described as a honor culture (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1985; cited in Sunar, 2002). Herzfeld (1980) stated that Mediterranean value-systems have been presented as classifications of "honor" and "shame". However, in this study solely the honor concept and its related values will be presented. In terms of explanation of honor concept, since the beginning of systematic anthropological research in the Mediterranean region, the term "honor" has been used to represent a large variety of social, sexual, economic and other standards. Honor is one's worth in one's own eyes and in the eyes of others (Stewart, 1994). Honor is described as having two

aspects: inner and outer honor (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Stewart, 1994). Inner honor is defined as "inner quality that indicates an attachment to a culturally defined honor code and that is based on the individual's willingness and sense of responsibility to behave in honorable ways and to avoid dishonor (Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999). Outer honor refers to the social esteem in which an individual is held, his or her reputation. (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965a; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Stewart, 1994). It is the social recognition of the inner quality of sense of honor and its expression in honorable behavior; the social recognition that one's behavior is in accordance with honor norms and values establishes an individual's reputation. (Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999).

The maintenance of a positive reputation is a core value in honor culture. Honor cultures therefore promote a construal of the self-based on the maintenance of a good reputation and the seeking of social approval. Moreover, honor cultures promote a subordination of individual needs and desires to those of the family due to the importance of protecting and defending the family honor. Finally, honor cultures emphasize the importance of values that maintain interpersonal harmony and strengthen social bond, such as hospitality and humility (Gilmore, 1987; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Stewart, 1994).

It is stated that, honor values are defined by four major domains on the basis of the common theme each group of values share. These value domains are social interdependence, collective honor, feminine honor and masculine honor (Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999; Gilmore, 1987; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany,

1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Stewart, 1994). Interdependence is highly valued between family members in honor cultures due to the importance of a collective family honor. The status of family honor is expressed in terms of the reputation or the standing of the family in the community. Further, one's own and one's family honor are strongly interdependent: each family member has the potential to stain family's honor. One's own honor is therefore highly depended on the behavior of the other family members. To summarize, an individual bears three responsibilities in relation to his or her own honor; to avoid dishonor for her/his own sake, to protect the family's reputation and thus to avoid dishonorable behavior that could hurt family honor, to take care that other family members do not bring dishonor on the family and so on the individual. In these terms, it is essential to emphasize that one can bring dishonor to family's name and reputation –especially females-, if s/he has engaged in premarital sexuality or culturally inappropriate forms of dating behavior.

However the pattern in which the family honor is maintained and protected is in some respects different for male and female members of the family. Specifically in Mediterranean honor cultures, women and men's roles are defined differently within the family to protect family honor (Pitt-Rivers, 1977). The division of roles is based on different moral qualities for females and males. The masculine honor code defines the means by which male honor can be maintained and enhanced. Masculine honor is a type of honor that calls for action. The masculine honor code emphasizes the protection of the family, virility, precedence, and the ability to display toughness and strength in situations in which one's manhood, one's honor or one's family honor are undermined. The

27

feminine honor code is focused on patterns of decorum and restraint. The core pattern in feminine honor is referred to as sexual shame or the female chastity code (Gilmore, 1987; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Stewart, 1994). The female chastity code involves beliefs about the importance of decorum and purity in relation to female sexuality; decorum (wearing discreet clothes), virginity prior to marriage and chastity are core values in the maintenance of female honor in honor cultures. The importance of restraint in the sexual domain is also followed by an emphasis on general behavioral pattern of discretion in relation to feminine honor, which emphasizes a value such as modesty. Further, the feminine honor code involves beliefs about the importance of conforming to authority within the family context. In these terms, feminine code of honor expects females members of honor cultures not to engage in premarital sexual behavior due to salience of virginity, and this also explains the gender schematization within Turkish culture: females are expected to conform the feminine code of honor in terms of behaving appropriately in dating and not engaging in premarital sexuality in order to avoid dishonor. Moreover, it is not limited with the particular individual as the family honor is risked and in these terms individuals are expected to conform the authority within family context.

The mentioned double standards in terms of sexuality, is similar to Turkish example, which is both an honor culture (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1985; cited in Sunar, 2002) and a collectivist culture (Hofstede, 1980). But, what is the relationship between individualism-collectivism and honor cultures? In terms of stating the place of honor code within individualism-collectivism, Rodriguez

Mosquera (1999) presented well-defined explanation. Rodriguez Mosquera (1999) stated that, aspects of both collectivism and individualism are present in honor cultures due to the bipartite nature of honor. Inner honor or one's sense of honor is described as the individualistic aspect of honor as it refers to a personal concern with honor and emphasizes personal qualities such having personal integrity, and willingness and responsibility to behave in accordance to honor values. Outer honor in contrast, is described as the collectivist aspect of honor because it refers to the importance of social judgments and recognition. Thus, it might be concluded that honor cultures can best be characterized as a mixture between individualistic and collectivist cultures. However, honor cultures are mainly characterized as a variety of collectivist culture because the individualistic aspect of honor, or inner honor, becomes relational in honor cultures as one's sense of honor, one's concern with and attachment to honor values, has to be expressed in honorable behavior and to be recognized by others in order to be validated. The individualistic aspect of honor is therefore highly relational or interdependent (Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999; Gilmore, 1987; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Stewart, 1994).

Sunar (2002) stated that, the honor tradition not only underlies male dominance but contributes to the closely-knit relationships of the traditional family as well, because honor belongs not only to individuals, but to the members of families as well. Therefore, each person is dependent on the behavior of all members of the family for his or her status as an honorable member of the community. This feature of the traditional Turkish family suggests that it should be classified as a "collectivistic" institution (Hofstede 1980; Triandis, Botempo,

29

Villereal, Asai & Lucca, 1988) and it is one of the bases for Kağıtçıbaşı's conceptualization of Turkish culture as a culture of relatedness (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1985; cited in Sunar, 2002).

How do these societal and cultural differences reflect on to dating and premarital sexual attitudes and behaviors? How do these domains differ from culture to culture? According to McCabe's (1984) theory of adolescent dating, although all the individuals undergo the same maturation changes, dating practices change from one society to another. In these terms, another major force is observed as social influences, which largely come from peer group, socialization during childhood, and current social pressures outside the influence of family and peers, and religion. Gilmore (1987) stated that, as long as fathers are viewed as distant authority figures and boys are raised close to their mothers, the salience of sexuality for defining honor would remain strong. As it is emphasized that collectivist cultures can be characterized as honor cultures, and furthermore, as the maintenance of a positive reputation is a core value in honor cultures, honor cultures can be said to promote a construal of the self, which is based on the maintenance of a good reputation and the seeking of social approval (Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999). Due to the feminine code of honor and salience of reputation, especially female premarital sexual behaviors are not acceptable within honor cultures.

Tanga & Zuo (2000) indicated the abundance of the literature on dating behavior in the western societies. They stated that, although the literature on dating is abundant in the Western society, the understanding of dating in the other parts of the world, particularly that of the far-east region, is not as profound.

Cross-cultural studies comparing dating practices in the Western and Eastern societies are even less, leaving a blank in the dating literature that requires urgent attention from social scientists. They also stated that, because social influences are inseparable from cultural norms and values, it is reasonable to suggest that different cultural orientations have played a role in shaping the observed differences in dating attitudes and behaviors

Hinde (1997) emphasized that every human relationship is influenced in fundamental ways by the culture in which it develops. In so far as individuals in a relationship share cultural norms, the basic structure of their relationship will be influenced by those norms of the particular culture. Relationships influence and are influenced by the socio-cultural structure. Culture affects emotional and psychological functioning, and cultural values affect relationships. Behavior in relationships is influenced both by culture and by individual experience, and it is often difficult to separate the two.

Finally, Allan (2001) emphasized the salience of change in personal relationships through modernization. She stated that, the moral climate has been changing significantly during the last 25 years. The domestic, sexual, and familial arrangements are perceived much more as a personal matter for the ones who are involved and not as issues on which others have strong rights to influence. There are, variations in this change, particularly involving some religious and ethnic differences. However even individuals have far greater freedom and choice over how they construct their sexual, domestic, and familial lives. Patterns of sexuality have also been changing as a result of the changes occurring with late modernity and, in particular, with the process of

individualization. Moreover, people are no longer too much constrained to con-form to traditional gender and family roles. Women especially are able to choose the ways in which they build their personal lives and the relationships in which they are involved. However, one should consider, through modernization and globalization, where does the Turkish culture stand, in the first place. Therefore, it is necessary to look at the structure of Turkish culture and family.

1.5. Turkish Culture and Family

It is salient to emphasize the role of culture and family within the scope of perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual attitudes of college students. As DeLamater (1981) argued that, social institutions, primarily the family and religion, are the sources of both general perspectives and specific norms that govern sexual expression. These influence the individual through processes of socialization, and social influence throughout his/her life. During adolescence the young person also learns many of the norms governing physical intimacy, and some of this learning is incidental. The daily observation of dating and married couples, in life and in the media, reinforces the sense that appropriate partners are persons of about the same age, of the opposite gender, who are not family members. These norms are reinforced by reactions of others to couples, which violate these norms (DeLamater, 1981). Likewise, Reiss (1976) emphasizes the role of the family in influencing the individual. He argues that "the greater the responsibility for other family members, the greater the likelihood that the individual will be low on permissiveness". This makes the individual both more conservative in his/her sexual standards and more likely to attempt to control the behavior of others.

It is difficult to explain the structure of the Turkish culture and family, as Turkish culture is in a transition period in terms of romantic relationships through westernization (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1985; cited in Sunar, 2002). One the one hand, Turkish culture is in a transition stage through westernization, and is no more a typical sexist culture; women are more free in terms of participating in division of labor which brings economic freedom, both men and women seem to adopt westernized values in terms of clothing, music, life style. However college students have not perceived some deeply seated values, such as the sexual part of dating behavior, as acceptable by their parents or by the society they live in. Women are still perceived as the symbol of honor in a way. There is a code for feminine honor in honor cultures (Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999; Gilmore, 1987; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Stewart, 1994) and although Turkish culture is in a transition period in terms of romantic relationships, premarital sexuality is not sensed as acceptable by the parents, and perceived as a source of bad reputation in society.

What kind of a change was Turkish culture exposed to within 50 years? Hortaçsu (2000) studied the generational changes in lives of families through cultural change. She aimed to draw parallels between societal change in Turkey and change in lives of families over a span of time covering two generations. Starting with 1950's, a number of important changes have taken placed within Turkish society. Population growth rate has doubled between 1945-50 reaching a maximum between the years 1950-1960. Migration from rural areas to urban centers and population growth in cities increased after 1950s, Policies adopted by Democratic Party in the early 50s endorsed increased openness to western influence and goods. This trend continued and gained impetus especially

after the Özal years, increased TV ownership contributing to consumerism and exposure to western modes of life. Increased numbers of immigrant workers in European countries as well as higher literacy rates and levels of education also contributed to increased familiarity with western values and lifestyles. Consequently, endorsement of individualistic values emphasizing achievement, individual goals and independence from primary groups increased especially among the educated. Within the study, both parents and children were interviewed and in terms of parental attitudes, especially fathers were described as distant and strict as well as loving. Expression of affection was reported as indirect rather than direct and physical by children. Parent-child relations at present were described as involving more communication, more expression of affection but more respect for children's private life and decision-making than formerly (Hortaçsu, 2000).

Kağıtçıbaşı (1986), in her study of status of women in Turkey, stated that, the formal structural changes and the legal and institutional reforms have had much to do with enabling women to the upper levels, when the life-styles and intra-family status are concerned. They have provided the mechanisms for change. On the other hand, the baseline from which such change has arisen, the Middle Eastern-Eastern Mediterranean family culture, is characterized by subordination of women. When these examples are combined with the view of changing Turkish culture through westernization within the scope of collectivism & honor cultures (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1985; cited in Sunar, 2002), more light is shed onto certain societal change.

Sunar (2002) stated that, although Turkey appears to be undergoing a process of transformation particularly among the urban population, the features

of traditional Turkish family seem to have remained relatively stable over long years. She added that, present-day Turkish society is marked by great geographical and social mobility. In addition to rural-to-urban migration, there is rapid growth and change in indicators such as literacy, income, and consumption patterns. Sunar (2002) stated that, the overall picture is consistent with that of a culture moving from a more collectivistic orientation towards a more individualistic one. In many respects, the Turkish middle class family would seem to have made, at least for the time being, a rather remarkable synthesis of some of the more positive aspects of both collectivistic and individualistic cultures (such as close relationships combined with strong encouragement of the child's achievements) while avoiding some of the most negative aspects of both (such as authoritarian discipline and interpersonal alienation).

Sunar (2002) stated that, the dominant value in the Turkish cultural system is namus or honor, which is maintained through the men in the family controlling the sexual behavior (chastity) of the women. As Peristiany (1965) defined honor far from being a feature unique to Moslem societies, and as a common value to most southern European and Mediterranean cultures. The power of honor as a value that has declined with industrialization and urbanization, constitutes a strong bond of family relationships and relationships between the sexes, particularly in rural areas. Turkish society, which entered the industrialization and urbanization processes at a relatively later time than most of the other southern European cultures, has continued to be governed by honor norms and male dominance in the family. Moreover, Akgün (2000) stated that, Turkey, as compared with the Western countries, is described as conservative and sexually restrictive. However, as a developing middle-east country through

35

modernization, these cultural and industrial relations with Western countries affected the structure of Turkish culture.

Ataca (1989; cited in Sunar, 2002) stated that there is differential treatment of sons and daughters in many areas of family life, even in urban middle class families. Males and females are separated both physically and symbolically and maintenance of family honor requires considerable restriction of female behavior, and compared to boys, girls are much more closely supervised and limited in their permissible activities, particularly in adolescence.

Due to the development of sex-role identification within Turkish culture, Sunar (2002) stated that, masculine sex-role identification is facilitated by a father who encourages autonomy and uses reasoning rather than punishment; whereas feminine sex-role identification for females are quite different in content. Parental practices appeared to have high impact on masculine sex-role identification by males, although feminine sex-role identification in females was closely related to the father's controlling behavior towards his daughter, such as control of romantic relationships and premarital sexuality.

In these terms, the structure of Turkish family is salient to discuss with respect to adolescent sexuality. Sexuality is one of the taboo concerns for Turkish society and traditional family structure still exist (İmamoğlu & Aygün; 1999). Akgün (2000) stated that, in the Turkish family structure, fathers are usually the authority figure and they have a formal relationship with their children. Mothers, as major caregivers, have an affectionate and warm relationship with their children and are usually more supportive than fathers. Sunar (2002) similarly stated that,

traditional rules for mothers and fathers can described as mothers being highly involved in care and supervision of their children and fathers taking a more distant but authoritative role. Likewise emphasized in Rodriguez Mosquera's study (1999), as a result of masculine code of honor, fathers are responsible for females and thus for family's honor, they feel the need to protect their own honor –in the name of females' honor- by being authoritarian and controlling over daughters' behavior due to dating and premarital sexuality.

1.6. Perceived Parental Attitudes

Parental influence upon their offspring's premarital sexual and dating attitudes is generally taken place in the literature (Devereux, Bronfenbrenner & Rogers, 1967; Hertoft, 1969; Sorenson, 1973; Lewis, 1973; McNab, 1976). Hertoft (1969) stated that while parents showed little influence over many kinds of sex guidance to youths, they somehow influenced the sexual attitudes and behavior of their children. Moreover, social learning theory (Bandura & Walters, 1963) also supported this conclusion. Fox (1979) in the research of family's influence on adolescents' sexual behavior, reported that half of the adolescents communicate with their parents about sexual matters & concerns and she cited about the need for study of indirect communication about certain topics. Lewis (1973) also stated that there is a need for future research on nonverbal techniques utilized in transmitting parental values, which takes place under the topic of perceived parental attitudes and affecting the sexual attitudes and behavior of the children. Fishbein & Ajzen (1975) in their theory of reasoned action, argued that the perceived attitudes and values of significant others had an important shaping effect on the individual's intention to perform the particular action. Noller &

Patton (1990) argued that perceived parental attitudes play a significant role on the decision making of adolescents, although their relative influence will depend on the type of decision being made.

Shelley (1981) stated that in terms of offspring's perception of parental attitudes and behavior, it is argued that perception is the most important, because it is the child's interpretation of observations. Researchers of personality development and family interaction have always used children's reports as the primary source of data (Golden, 1969; Smith & Grenier, 1975). Moreover, children's reports of earlier parent-child experiences were sensible with direct observations (Devereux, Bronfenbrenner & Rogers, 1967). Thus, to expect children's perceptions of parental attitudes and behavior as a useful measure of indirect parental communication would be appropriate. In addition, perception of parental liberality was correlated to attitudes toward a sex-role linkage. Among adolescents, %49 who perceived their parents as liberal selected parents as a source than did youths with moderate (11%) or conservative (8%) parents. Peers were selected as sources in no more that 30% of the cases. Therefore, perception of liberality consistently correlated with adolescent sexual attitudes. Parents do not influence their children in a direct way but through children's interpretations and perceptions of messages (Carlson & Iovini, 1985). Particularly, adolescents are influenced by perceived rather than actual behavior, as a major source of interpretation, which lead behavior.

In McDaniel's study (1969), with respect to the influence of the reference system, the original family orientation, which measures the extent of orientation to the original family, is examined. The participants are asked to declare how they would be affected if their parents disapproved of their

participation in the activities, which were hypothetical activities such as; becoming engaged, dating a particular person, dating, petting on dates, going to the movies with a date, attending a football or basketball game with a date, talking to strange boys, studying alone with a boy and having lunch with a boy. The results demonstrated that, as the girls make the shift from assertiveness to receptivity, they declared behaving similar to the original family oriented values. Likewise, DeLamater & McCorquodale (1979) reported parental standards are predictors of adolescents' premarital sexual attitudes. Father's standard was related with male's and mother's standard with female's premarital permissiveness. They found that, perceived parental liberality and mother's standards were associated with permissiveness for both sexes.

Silva & Ross (2002) studied the association of perceived parental attitudes towards premarital sex with initiation of sexual intercourse among high school students in Chile. Sample items in the scale were "my mother (father) would find it acceptable for me to have sex if I were involved in a committed relationship" and "she (he) would disagree with a decision to have sex at this stage of my life. The dependent variable was sexual experiences measured by a single dichotomous item: "have you ever experienced sexual intercourse?" Having experienced sexual intercourse when perceived maternal disapproval was at its lowest was 2.3 times higher than when maternal disapproval was at its highest value. In terms of the quality of the perceived general relationship with the mother, the estimated odds of having intercourse was 6.2 times higher when reported satisfaction was at its lowest level. When both maternal disapproval of sex and the perceived quality of the relationship were considered simultaneously, the predicted odds of having sexual activity increased 14.2 times. The

perception of disapproval of premarital sex by the mother in a good mother-daughter relationship appears to constitute a buffer against early initiation of sexual activity.

Moore & Rosenthal (1991) studied the adolescents' perceptions of friends' and parents' attitudes toward sex. Results indicated that, adolescents perceived their parents' attitudes as non-liberal in their sexual attitudes and relatively unlikely to discuss sex or precautions with them. They stated that, adolescent premarital sexual attitudes was related to the perceived attitudes of the significant others in ways, which varied according to gender and the type of relationship. Especially fathers were perceived, by their children, as the least likely to discuss or be available to discuss sexual matters. In terms of gender differences about perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sex, male adolescents viewed their mothers and fathers as significantly more liberal or approving of their sexual expression than did female adolescents. Females perceived that they discussed sex more with their mothers than did boys, while the opposite perception held for discussion with fathers.

Literature supported that perceived parental attitudes lead premarital sexuality and romantic relationships. Then, what do lead perceived parental attitudes? According to which criteria are parental attitudes perceived? Darling & Hicks (1982) found that parental messages were discouraging of sex for adolescents of both sexes, but that the negative consequences of sexual activity were far more strongly stressed for daughters than for sons. This implies that young men are receiving more liberal messages from their parents about sexual expression. To sum up, parental messages to adolescents about sex are perceived to be basically disapproving, and highly gender-based.

40

In terms of perceived parental attitudes within Turkish literature, one should pay attention to gender issues in parental practices: Are sons and daughters treated the same way by their parents and are parents perceived the same way by sons and daughters in Turkey? What are the similarities and differences? Sunar (2002) stated that, parental practices have been examined on two basic dimensions in childrearing: first, the emotional relationship between parent and child: and second, parental control of the child. In terms of perceived parental attitudes toward child-rearing practices, fathers were perceived as somewhat more angry than mothers were, and sons were somewhat more likely than daughters to perceive fathers as angry (Sunar, 2002). Parents were perceived as trusting the child, with fathers being rated somewhat higher than mothers in terms of perceived trust. Parents rated themselves as slightly less trusting than their children perceived them to be. In terms of parental control of the child, especially daughters perceive parental messages about premarital sexual behaviors as disapproved.

Due to the control of negative or avoided topics of discussion, Sunar (2002) presented supportive findings. Turkish culture has traditionally valued self-control and parents tend to encourage or restrict emotional and behavioral expression in children, due to certain topics of discussion such as sexuality. There are clear gender differences in the use and experience of authority and control. Daughters are kept under closer control and supervision than sons are, particularly by their mothers, while sons are more likely than daughters to be controlled in an authoritarian manner by both parents.

Fathers are perceived as more authoritarian than mothers are, while mothers are perceived as more closely controlling than fathers are (Sunar,

2002). Results demonstrated that there is differential treatment of sons and daughters, as sons being given more autonomy while daughters are more closely supervised and controlled, especially due to premarital sexuality and there is a considerable anxiety about sexual matters (Sunar, 2002).

Akgün (2002) studied the role of parents as a predictor of adolescent sexual attitudes due to perceived parental attitudes within Turkish culture. Results demonstrated that, if the adolescents perceived their mother as not approving premarital sexual behavior, they were more likely to be sexually experienced. Moreover, adolescents' permissiveness level of sexual attitudes increases if they perceive their father as approving premarital sexual behaviors.

After paraphrasing perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexuality, another independent variable: the salience and the effects of parental divorce on the formation of perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behavior of adolescents and young adults will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

1.7. Effects of Parental Divorce upon Children toward Dating & Premarital Sexual Behavior

Family dynamics rule out certain social roles for members of the family and due to the disruption of these dynamics or harmony, such as divorce, this disruption leads each member of the family to adopt gradually new values in terms of life styles. Once the family harmony is interrupted by parental divorce, it leads the offspring to adopt maybe not disrupted, but different value orientations through certain domains, such as dating or premarital sexual behavior.

Therefore, a significant difference is expected in perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors, between the students with married and divorced parents.

"How does parental divorce influence the adolescents' attitudes" has been issue to several studies. Many studies focused upon the effects of parental divorce on adolescents toward dating and premarital sexuality (Seltzer, 1994; Jacquet & Surra, 2001; Milevsky, 2004; Mullett & Stolberg, 2002; Yvonne, 2001; Kunz, 2001; Mahl, 2001; Jeynes, 2001). Parental divorce seemed to be the primary predictor of the casual dating among young adults, and suggested that the reflections of parental divorce may affect young adults' own romantic relationships. The experience of parental divorce influences multiple domains of children's lives, including economic, psychological, academic, and personal arenas (Seltzer, 1994). Parental divorce is thought to affect the romantic relationships of young adults, especially with respect to their certainty about the relationship and perceptions of problems in it. Seltzer (1994) suggested that interpersonal problems might develop in children if divorcing parents' model was poor in terms of interpersonal styles. Jacquet & Surra (2001) also stated that such problems might extend to children's own dating relationships.

Young adults who perceive parental divorce, as a fulfillment of trust may be cautious about trusting their dating partners. Young adults from divorced families may be more susceptible about passionate love because of the anxiety and fear of abandonment associated with parental divorce (Lauer & Lauer, 1991). In particular, women from divorced families reported uncertainty about and problems with commitment (Lauer & Lauer, 1991). Evans & Bloom (1998) found similar results about women from the divorced families. Men and

women reacted to parental divorce quite differently. Those differences suggested that women might be more adversely affected by their parents' divorces than men.

The instability of parents' marriages may serve as a model for romantic relationships. According to Hetherington (1972), ambivalent behaviors are observed in girls whose fathers were absent because of divorce. These girls spent more time with male peers and male adults, yet they reported less security around men than did girls from intact families (Hetherington, 1972). Children of divorced parents may learn that relationships inevitably involve conflict. Women from divorced families communicate higher levels of conflict and negative behaviors with partners (Sanders, Halford, & Behrens, 1999).

Parental divorce appeared to lower the quality of relations with parents regardless of the level of conflict before divorce. Marital conflict lowered children's closeness to parents, and divorce lowered it even further. These associations were significant for both parents but were stronger for fathers than for mothers (Booth & Amato, 2001). It is adolescents' perceptions of parents' attitudes, rather than parents' actual attitudes, that constitute the critical influence on self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1979). Bailey & Zvonkovic (2003) stated that, nonresidential parents are in an unsafe position and they are outside of the family residence after divorce; consequently often perceived as outside of the family system. Tasker (1996) stated that, adolescents from divorced backgrounds who were currently involved in a heterosexual relationship reported more emotionally distant father-child relationships. However, adolescents from divorced backgrounds, reporting emotionally distant mother-child relationships, were less likely to be involved in a heterosexual relationship, indicating that

the quality of childhood relationships with both mothers and fathers in post-divorce families are important influences in adolescent relationship involvement.

According to Jacquet & Surra (2001), young female adults from divorced families would report greater passionate love at casual dating than those from intact families. At casual dating, women from divorced families reported significantly more passionate love than did women from intact families. Casually dating men from divorced families reported greater ambivalence about becoming involved than did men from intact families. Women from divorced families reported that they valued consistency of commitments less than did women from intact families. Findings suggested that parental divorce plays a part in shaping the experiences of young adults' heterosexual relationships, but the connection is more evident for women than for men, especially with respect to feelings of love for and trust in a partner, to conflict, and to hesitancy about involvement. Men from divorced and intact families, in contrast, differentially perceive the external social structure surrounding relationships and the investments associated with relationships. Casually dating men from divorced families perceive that they invest more in their relationships than do men from intact families.

Clark & Kanoy (1998) studied the affective relationships of young adult females and their fathers, for effects on dating relationships, dating anxiety, and interpersonal trust. Females with divorced vs. married parents, and females scoring lower on the intimacy scale, regardless of family structure, reported that they experience less father-daughter intimacy, lower dating satisfaction and trust, and higher dating anxiety. Females with divorced vs. married parents experienced significantly less intimacy with their fathers but similar levels of trust, anxiety, and satisfaction.

In the Turkish literature, in terms of the effects of parental divorce upon adolescents within the context of dating and premarital sexuality, we saw similar results with international literature. Şirvanlı-Özen (2005), studied with a Turkish sample, which had a very different cultural background, on the possible adverse effects of divorce on children. While investigating into the possible effects of divorce on children, the possible interaction of divorce with the variables of age, sex, and perceived social support is taken into consideration. As a result, in the light of the research findings of studies conducted both in the Western countries and in Turkey, it is observed that divorce may have detrimental effects on the levels of behavior and adjustment problems of children, the parenting styles and attitudes they perceive and that these effects may vary depending on the children's sex, age, and the social support they perceive from their environment.

Şirvanlı-Özen (2003), previously studied adolescents coming from married and divorced families in terms of adult attachment styles and perceived parenting styles of adolescents. With respect to the perceived parenting styles, it was stated that adolescents coming from divorced families perceived their fathers as the parent showing less affection and control in comparison with those from married families. However, perception of the mother made no significant difference from the viewpoint of marital status of parents.

Burgoyne & Haines (2002) reported results of the analysis of the views of young people with divorced and still-married parents, on marriage, divorce, and future marital intentions. Respondents reported that they believed to be regarding marriage in a more serious way than did people in general, and the majority expected to get married at some point, regardless of family background. Those with married parents made greater use of a "romantic" discourse when

talking about marriage, and individuals from both groups who had experienced parental conflict or unhappiness took a more "realistic" and cautious view. Both groups regarded divorce in a negative light. In discussion part, they emphasized the "ideological dilemma" which's issue is whether the opinions depended on the individual or societal level; in other words, whether the opinions are ridden by social desirability.

Toomey & Nelson (2001) designed a study to explore the relationship between parental conflict and young adults' levels of intimacy. The results demonstrated that, the offspring from high-conflict families had less favorable attitudes toward intimacy and they reported to have more sexual partners in number than those from low-conflict families. Schaick (2001) stated that the relationship between parental divorce in childhood and difficulties in establishing intimate relationships in young adulthood might be understood by exploring the impact of extended paternal absence. He evaluated the influences of paternal involvement and parental divorce on young adult's intimate relationships and reported that young adults from divorced families suffer more negative relationship outcomes.

Lawrence (2001) studied about the gender schematization in adolescent rearing in single- parent (as a result of divorce) and intact families. The results showed that, as parental gender models in one- and two-parent families differ, the gender roles of adolescents raised in one-versus two-parent families may differ. Differences in personal and idealized gender roles were found between students raised in one- versus two-parent families (students from single-parent families valued androgyny, which means a person who has strong masculine and feminine characteristics). In my opinion and in   the light of Lawrence's study (2001), this

may lead young adults, who experienced parental divorce, to behave less regarding to their gender script (which was discussed through item 1.3) compared to the students who were from intact families. In other words, both females and males from divorced families, may be behaving in similar manners in terms of attitudes toward dating and premarital sexuality and this may be leading to perceived parental attitudes for females as permissive as males perceived.

Jeynes (2001) conducted a study about the influence of parental divorce on children's attitudes toward premarital sex. Children, whose parents were recently divorced (within the past four years), maintained different attitudes and behaviors regarding pre-marital sex than their counterparts in single-parent divorced families, whose parents had been divorced four years or more. Children from recently divorced homes did not show a tendency to have more permissive attitudes and behaviors towards pre-marital sex than their counterparts whose parents had been divorced four years or more. Nevertheless, children whose parents had been divorced showed a tendency to have more permissive attitudes and behaviors towards pre-marital sex than children of intact families.

Within the light of literature, we can conclude that, both females and males are emotionally affected by parental divorce and are expected to adopt different attitudes toward dating and premarital sexuality compared to children from intact families. Moreover, the lack of the custodial parent at home – and that would be the father as it is in most cases- would probably be causing the lack of a certain authority figure at home. In terms of evaluation in the light of the literature of Turkish and honor cultures, we can conclude that as the father is the authority figure in Turkish culture and males are the ones who are responsible of caring for the females within the family (due to the honor code- females

48

are the symbol of honor that should be protected by the males of the family), in the absence of the authority figure, both male and female children may adopt more liberal attitudes, especially toward premarital sexuality, within the light of perceived parental attitudes. Finally, in terms of gender schematization in adolescent who was reared in divorced families, the results demonstrated that as the parental- gender models differ in single-parent families compared to two-parent families, students from single-parent families adopted androgyny (a person who has strong masculine and feminine characteristics) compared to students from intact families. This may lead young adults, who experienced parental divorce, to behave less regarding to their gender script compared to the students who were from intact families. In other words, both females and males from divorced families, may be behaving in similar manners in terms of attitudes toward dating and premarital sexuality.

(The main hypothesis of this study will be declared in the following paragraphs-1.8)

1.8. Purpose of the Study

In the light of the literature, it is pretty clear that many social aspects affect perceived parental attitudes of Turkish college students towards dating and premarital sexual behaviors. The certain gender script and schematization within the Turkish culture and parental divorce factors were appeared to be the most important of these aspects (Seltzer, 1994; Jacquet & Surra, 2001; Milevsky, 2004; Mullett & Stolberg, 2002; Yvonne, 2001; Sunar, 2002; Kunz, 2001; Mahl, 2001; Jeynes, 2001; Fox, 1979; Lewis, 1973; Shelley, 1981; Golden, 1969; Smith & Grenier, 1975; Devereux, Bronfenbrenner & Rogers, 1967). Gender script as a double standard towards dating and premarital sexuality within the Turkish

culture and living in a home environment with the lack of familial harmony as a result of parental divorce, were found to be the central factors for the parental attitudes perceived by the college students (Sunar, 2002; Milevsky, 2004; Mullett & Stolberg, 2002; Yvonne, 2001; Fox, 1979; Lewis, 1973; Shelley, 1981; Golden, 1969).

Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate the role of students' gender and parental marital status on the college students' perceived parental attitudes towards dating and premarital sexual behavior. Perceived parental attitudes by the college students were expected to differ due to the gender of the student and whether the students' parents are divorced or intact. Although perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors appeared as the sole and major determinant in terms of college students' perception, leading factors exist such as gender and parental marital status. Gender schematization in terms of which gender should behave in which way towards certain behaviors within Turkish culture and the parental divorce as giving way to a home environment where mostly the familial harmony is absent, becomes more important in terms of perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexuality and these attitudes were shaped under the influence of these factors. (Sunar, 2002; Milevsky, 2004; Mullett & Stolberg, 2002; Yvonne, 2001; Fox, 1979; Lewis, 1973; Shelley, 1981; Golden, 1969).

Therefore, in this study, it is hypothesized that:

1. Perceived parental attitudes of the student towards dating behavior differ due to the gender of the student. Females are expected to perceive less permissive parental attitudes toward dating behavior.

2. Perceived parental attitudes of the student towards premarital sexual behavior differ due to the gender of the student. Females are expected to perceive less permissive parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior.

3. Perceived parental attitudes of the student towards dating behavior differ due to the parental marital status. Children of divorced parents are expected to perceive more permissive attitudes toward dating behavior.

4. Perceived parental attitudes of the student towards premarital sexual behavior differ due to the parental marital status. Children of divorced parents are expected to perceive more permissive attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1. Participants

The sample of the present study was composed of a total of 160 (93 women, 67 men) college students, who voluntarily participated in the study with a mean age of 22.81 (SD = 2.6, range = 17-28). Names were not required and participants were assured that there were no right or wrong answers and the best answer was their personal opinion. They were asked to read the instructions carefully and to answer all questions. They were given consent from before application, and after application they were debriefed (see Appendices A and B). All participants were Turkish and unmarried students. 73.8% of the participants were students at Middle East Technical University, 25.6% of them were from Çankaya, Ankara, İstanbul, Bilkent and Gazi Universities, and 0.6% of them did not stated which university they attended. 78.1% of the participants were undergraduate students, 20.6% were master students and 1.3% were doctoral students. They were currently students in various departments of the universities, 8.2% were from Social Sciences Department, 20.8% were from Administrative Sciences Faculty, 42.1% were from Engineering Faculty, 15.1% were from Natural Sciences Faculty, 4.4% were from Architecture Faculty and 9.4% were from other faculties. 81.9% of the participants mostly lived in metropolitans in Turkey (İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir), 17.5% of them were from other cities, and 0.6% of them were from a small town. Most of the participants came from highly educated families. 76.9% of the participants' mothers and 89.3% of the

participants' fathers had high school, university or graduate school degrees. 44.4% of the participants' mothers were currently working, 22.5% were retired and 33.1% were housewives. 70% of the participants' parents were still married and 30% were divorced. In terms of income level, on a scale of 1 (least) to 7 (most), %2.5 evaluated themselves at income level 2, 7.5% at level 3, 29.4% at level 4, 42.5% at level 5, 13.8% at level 6, 2.5% at level 7 and 1.9% did not stated their income level. 22.6% of the participants were the only child, 59.4% had one sibling, 13.1% had two siblings, 4.4% had three siblings, 0.6% had four siblings. 5% of the participants defined their parents as conservative and 95% of the participants defined their parents as liberal. 25% of the participants were living with their families, 45% of them were living at dorm, 18.8% of them were living with their friend at their own home, 8.1% were living at their own home alone and 3.1% were living in other residences (with a relative, or temporarily at someone's home).

Within the demographic information sheet, there were personal questions, which were told to leave blank to participants, if they did not want to respond. 96.3% of the participants stated that they had ever dated someone, 3.1% stated that they had never dated someone, and 0.6% did not respond. Within this 96.3%, in terms of total number of dates until today, 57% of the participants dated number of people between 1-5, 22.6% dated number of people between 6-10, 11% dated number of people between 11-15, 5.7% dated number of people between 16-20, 1.4% dated number of people between 21-25, and 2.1% dated number of people more than 25. Within this 96.3%, in terms of age of first date, 26.5% of the participants first dated at within the age range of 10-14, 62.1% first dated at within the age range of 15- 18, and 11.4% first dated after the age of

19. 51.3% had a date currently, 46.3% were not dating with someone currently, and 2.5% did not state their current dating status. When we asked if they had ever had sexual intercourse, 62.5% stated that they had sex, 31.3% stated that they had never had sex, and 6.3% did not state if they had ever had a sexual intercourse. Within this 62.5%, in terms of total number of sexual partners until today, 18% of the participants had only one sexual partner, 34.9% of the participants had number of sexual partners between 2-5, 31.4% of the participants had number of sexual partners between 6-10, 10.1% of the participants had number of sexual partners between 11-15, and 5.6% of the participants had number of sexual partners between 16-20. Within this 62.5%, in terms of age of first sexual intercourse, 69.7% of the participants first had sex at age within the range of 14-18, 23.7% of the participants first had sex at age within the range of 19-21, and 6.5% of the participants first had sex at the age of 22 or older. When we asked them how they evaluated premarital sexuality, 75% stated that they thought premarital sexuality was acceptable, and 23.1% stated it as unacceptable, and 1.9% did not respond. In terms of one-night-stand sexual relationships, 40.6% stated one-night-stand as acceptable, and 57.5% stated it as unacceptable, and 1.9 did not respond. When it was asked if it was acceptable to date more than one person simultaneously, 21.9% stated it as acceptable, and 76.3% stated it as unacceptable, and 1.9% did not respond. Finally, when we asked them whether they planned to marry within their life times, 68.1% stated that they were going to marry one day, and 31.3% stated that they were never going to marry, and 0.6% did not respond.

Table 1. displays the details about gender, age, department, attended university, city mostly lived in, current education level, paternal

education, maternal education, mother's working status, parental marital status, income level, number of siblings, conservatism of family, residence, status of dating experience, number of dates until today, age of first date, acceptance level of one-night stands, acceptance level of premarital sexuality, marriage idea, currently dating status, status of sexual intercourse experience, number of sexual partners until today, age of first sexual intercourse, and acceptance level of dating more than one person simultaneously, of the participants.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Variable	N	Percent (%)*
Gender		
Female	93	58.1
Male	67	41.9
Age		
17-20	39	24.4
21-24	80	50.1
25-28	41	25.6
Department		
Social Sciences Faculty	13	8.2
Administrative Sciences Faculty	33	20.8
Engineering Faculty	67	42.1
Natural Sciences Faculty	24	15.1
Architecture Faculty	7	4.4
Other	15	9.4
University		
Middle East Technical Uni.	118	74.2
Other Universities	41	25.8
City mostly lived in		
Metropolitan	131	81.9
City	28	17.5
Town	1	0.6
Village	0	0
Current Education Level		
Undergraduate	125	78.1
Master	33	20.6
Doctoral	2	1.3
Paternal Education		
Primary School	7	4.4
Secondary School	3	1.9
High School	35	21.9
University	86	53.8
Master Degree	23	14.4
Phd Degree	6	3.8
Maternal Education		
Primary School	13	8.1
Secondary School	11	6.9
High School	54	33.8
University	76	47.5
Master Degree	4	2.5
Phd Degree	2	1.3
Mother's Working Status		
Working	71	44.4
Not working	53	33.1
Retired	36	22.5
Parental Marital Status		
Married	112	70
Divorced	48	30
Income Level		
Level 1	0	0
Level 2	4	2.5
Level 3	12	7.6
Level 4	47	29.9
Level 5	68	43.3
Level 6	22	14
Level 7	4	2.5

Table 1 continued

Number of Siblings		
Only Child	36	22.6
Having 1 sibling	95	73.1
Having 2 siblings	21	16.2
Having 3 siblings	7	5.4
Having 4 siblings	1	0.8
Conservative/Liberal Families		
Conservative	8	5
Having 1 sibling	152	95
Residence		
Dorm	40	25
Parents	72	45
Peer	30	18.8
Alone	13	8.1
Other	5	3.1
Ever Dated		
Yes	154	96.9
No	5	3.1
Number of Dates		
1-5	78	57
6-10	31	22.6
11-15	15	11
16-20	8	5.7
21-25	2	1.4
More than 25	3	2.1
Age of First Date		
10-14	35	26.5
15-18	82	62.1
19-…	15	11.4
One Night Stand		
Acceptable	65	41.4
Unacceptable	92	58.6
Premarital Sexuality		
Acceptable	120	76.4
Unacceptable	37	23.6
Marriage Idea		
Yes	109	68.6
No	50	31.4
Dating Currently		
Yes	82	52.6
No	74	47.4
Sexual Intercourse		
Yes	100	66.7
No	50	33.3
Number of Sexual Partners		
1	16	18
2-5	31	34.9
6-10	28	31.4
11-15	9	10.1
16-20	5	5.6
Age of First Sexual Intercourse		
14-18	53	69.7
19-21	18	23.7
22 and older	5	6.6
More than One Date		
Acceptable	35	22.3
Unacceptable	122	77.7

* Valid Percentages were given.

2.2. Instruments

A questionnaire, consisting of two scales (Perceived Parental Attitudes toward Dating Scale and Perceived Parental Attitudes toward Premarital Sexuality Scale), was used in this study.

2.2.1. Demographic Data Sheet

Demographic data sheet aimed to collect information about the participants' gender, age, department, school, current education level, paternal and maternal education level, maternal working status, SES, number and gender of siblings, residence; and private information about whether the participants ever dated, are dating with someone currently, ever had premarital sexual experiences, found one night stands, premarital sexuality, marriage, dating more than one person at the same time acceptable, the number of dates, age of first date, the number of sexual partners, age of first premarital sexual experience (see Appendix A).

2.2.2. Pilot Study

In order to determine the items under perceived parental attitudes' domains of the particular study, a pilot study was conducted. But before the pilot study, in terms of scale development, a list of 52 items, which were derived within the light of literature, were handed out in several psychology courses and students of these courses were used as judges to rate the items related to the topic of interest. After the item analysis is completed, the chosen or rewritten items were used in the pilot study on 45 participants (24 females, 19 males). The obtained data were subjected to two   separate varimax rotated factor analysis

for two scales respectively, in order to identify the items, which would be used in the main study. There were two scales, as perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior (24 items) and toward premarital sexuality (20 items). It was decided that the cross-loadings suggested a single factor solution for both scales. Therefore, principal component analysis with varimax rotation and single factor solution was performed.

Four items in the first scale (perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior) were not loaded anywhere within the scale, and deleted from the first scale. Single factor explained 31.08% variance. The factor loadings of the scale are presented in Table 2. The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) of 20-item scale was .88. The item-total correlations range of these items was Min = -.01, Max = .78.

In the second scale (perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexuality), all the items had high factor loadings and none of the items were deleted. Single factor explained 49.92% variance. The factor loadings of the scale are presented in Table 3. The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) of 20-item scale was .92. The item-total correlations range of these items was Min = -.32, Max = .84.

Table 2. Pilot Study Factor Loadings of Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Dating Behavior Scale

Item	Loading	h^{2} *
If my father learns that I have a date, he will be angry.	.82	.67
If my mother learns that I have a date, he will be angry.	.48	.23
If my father learns that I have a date, he pretends like he does not know.	.58	.33
If my mother learns that I have a date, she pretends like she does not know.	.54	.30
If I tell my father that I have a date, he will take it as normal.	.78	.61
If I tell my mother that I have a date, she will take it as normal.	.41	.17
If I date with someone who had dated with too many people, this will not please my father.	.41	.17
If I date with someone who had dated with too many people, this will not please my mother.	.44	.20
If my father does not approve my date, he will not let me to see him/her again.	.68	.47
If my mother does not approve my date, she will not let me to see him/her again.	.65	.42
My father does not approve me to date before I marry.	.68	.47
My mother does not approve me to date before I marry.	.35	.12
My father is indifferent in terms of how I behave about romantic relationships.	.37	.14
My mother is indifferent in terms of how I behave about romantic relationships.	.45	.21
My father does not want me to talk about my romantic relationships with him openly.	.53	.29
My mother does not want me to talk about my romantic relationships with him openly.	.55	.30
If I know that my father would not approve, I will not talk about my romantic relationships.	3.074E-03	
If I know that my mother would not approve, I will not talk about my romantic relationships.	1.300E-03	
My father does not want our relatives to know that I date with someone.	.77	.59
My mother does not want our relatives to know that I date with someone.	.60	.36
My father does not matter other people to learn that I date with someone.	.85	.73

Table 2. continued

My mother does not matter other people to learn that I date with someone.	.83	.70
My father does not want me to date someone without his permission.	6.924E-05	
My mother does not want me to date someone without his permission.	1.713E-02	

Eigenvalue	7.46
Explained Variance	31.08
Cumulative Percent	31.08

*h^2: Communality

61

Table 3. Pilot Study Factor Loadings of Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Premarital Sexual Behavior Scale

Item	Loading	h^2 *
If my father learns that I have sex with my date, he will be angry.	.88	.78
If my mother learns that I have sex with my date, she will be angry.	.88	.78
If my father learns that I have a date, he pretends like he does not know.	-.42	.18
If my mother learns that I have a date, she pretends like she does not know.	-.48	.23
If I tell my father that I have sex with my date, he will take it as normal.	.77	.60
If I tell my mother that I have sex with my date, she will take it as normal.	.78	.60
If I date with someone who had sex before, this will not please my father.	.69	.47
If I date with someone who had sex before, this will not please my mother.	.71	.50
If my father learns that I had sex with my date, he will not let me to see him/her again.	.83	.69
If my mother learns that I had sex with my date, she will not let me to see him/her again.	.85	.72
My father does not approve me to have sex before I marry.	.86	.73
My mother does not approve me to have sex before I marry.	.86	.74
My father is indifferent in terms of how I behave about sexual relations.	.46	.21
My mother is indifferent in terms of how I behave about sexual relations.	.45	.20
My father does not want me to talk about my sexual relationships with him openly.	.49	.24
My mother does not want me to talk about my sexual relationships with her openly.	.72	.52
My father does not want our relatives to know that I have sex with my date.	.68	.47
My mother does not want our relatives to know that I have sex with my date.	.71	.50
My father does not matter other people to learn that I have sex with my date.	.64	.41
My mother does not matter other people to learn that I have sex with my date.	.65	.43
Eigenvalue		9.98
Explained Variance		49.92
Cumulative Percent		49.92

*h^2 : Communality

62

2.2.3. Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Dating Behavior Scale

Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Dating Behavior Scale was developed by the author in the light of literature, to measure the approval level of parents about dating behaviors perceived by the student. The questions were worded so that, respondents were asked to indicate the circumstances under which dating behavior were perceived as acceptable by their parents. Twenty items were used in the particular scale. Each item was developed for both perceived maternal and paternal attitudes toward dating behavior.

All items were 5-point Likert-type scales; six items were reverse coded, ("1" – "strongly disagree", "5" – "strongly agree") (see Appendix D). Participants were expected to indicate the extent to which the items are appropriate in terms of their perception of parental attitudes on 5-point scale. The possible highest score adds up to 100 and the lowest score adds up to 20. As the total score increases, the participants' perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior become less permissive and parental permissiveness level decreases, and vice versa.

2.2.4. Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Premarital Sexual Behavior Scale

Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Premarital Sexual Behavior Scale was developed by the author in the light of literature, to measure the approval level of parents about premarital sexual behaviors perceived by the student. The questions were worded so that, respondents were asked to indicate the circumstances under which premarital intercourse were perceived as acceptable by their parents. Twenty items were used in the particular scale. Each item was

developed for both perceived maternal and paternal attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior.

All items were 5-point Likert-type scales; six items were reverse coded, ("1" – "strongly disagree", "5" – "strongly agree") (see Appendix D). Participants were expected to indicate the extent to which the items are appropriate in terms of their perception of parental attitudes on 5-point scale. The possible highest score adds up to 100 and the lowest score adds up to 20. As the total score increases, the participants' perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior become less permissive and parental permissiveness level decreases, and vice versa.

2.3. Procedure

The questionnaire was administered during the Spring Festival of Middle East Technical University to the students sitting at the tables of the food court. The participation is on voluntary basis. In order to avoid the interviewer bias, the instructions were read to the participants on a standard basis. An average administration lasted for 15 minutes. After the participants were given the scales, they were debriefed after completing the questionnaire. The Debriefing Form is presented in Appendix B.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1. Reliability and Validity of Scales

3.1.1. Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Dating Behavior Scale

Principal component analysis was performed to determine the factor structure of the scale of main study. Examination of initial solution suggested ten-factor solution. However, there were many cross-loadings among factors and six items had low factor loadings. Therefore, items were forced to two factors with varimax rotations. Again, cross-loadings and items with low loadings were observed. Finally, principal component analysis with varimax rotation and single factor solution was performed as the cross-loadings suggested a single factor solution. Two items with low factor loadings were not considered for future analysis. Single factor explained 33.24% variance. The factor loadings of the scale are presented in Table 4. The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) of 18-item scale was .89. The item-total correlations range of these items was Min = .30, Max = .71. The split-half reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) of 18-item scale was .81 for part one and .83 for part two. Scale questions were presented in Appendix C.

In terms of measuring content validity, the items were reviewed by three psychology students, two psychology professors and two lay individuals in terms of how good and related to the topic of interest. Feedbacks were used to guide revision of the items. Face validity was assessed by asking the participants, "what was intended to be measured?", almost all of the participants

told that what is intended to be measured was open (perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior).

Four questions, which were chosen from Miller's study (1986) of "Communication between the Adolescents and Parents", were used in order to measure the correlation between the perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior scale and Miller's scale. Miller's scale was translated and applied by Akgün (2000) in Turkey. In Akgün's study of Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale, for the mother version the internal consistency reliability of 20-items was .89; for the father version the internal consistency reliability of 20-items was .91. The Pearson Correlation between the Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Dating Behavior Scale and Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale was .832 (p<.01, two-tailed). Scale questions were presented in Appendix E.

Table 4. Factor Loadings of Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Dating Behavior Scale

Item	Loading	h^2 *
If my father learns that I have a date, he will be angry.	.78	.61
If my mother learns that I have a date, he will be angry.	.54	.30
If my father learns that I have a date, he pretends like he does not know.	.55	.30
If my mother learns that I have a date, she pretends like she does not know.	.49	.24
If I tell my father that I have a date, he will take it as normal.	.73	.54
If I tell my mother that I have a date, she will take it as normal.	.52	.27
If I date with someone who had dated with too many people, this will not please my father.	.50	.25
If I date with someone who had dated with too many people, this will not please my mother.	.46	.21
If my father does not approve my date, he will not let me to see him/her again.	.64	.41
If my mother does not approve my date, she will not let me to see him/her again.	.59	.35
My father does not approve me to date before I marry.	.74	.55
My mother does not approve me to date before I marry.	.47	.22
My father is indifferent in terms of how I behave about romantic relationships.		2.687E-04
My mother is indifferent in terms of how I behave about romantic relationships.		1.994E-03
My father does not want me to talk about my romantic relationships with him openly.	.51	.26
My mother does not want me to talk about my romantic relationships with him openly.	.36	.14
My father does not want our relatives to know that I date with someone.	.76	.58
My mother does not want our relatives to know that I date with someone.	.69	.48
My father does not matter other people to learn that I date with someone.	.73	.53
My mother does not matter other people to learn that I date with someone.	.68	.46

Eigenvalue	6.65
Explained Variance	33.24
Cumulative Percent	33.24

h^2: Communality

67

3.1.2. Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Premarital Sexual Behavior Scale

Principal component analysis was performed to determine the factor structure of the scale of main study. Examination of initial solution suggested ten-factor solution. However, there were many cross-loadings among factors and six items had low factor loadings. Therefore, items were forced to two factors with varimax rotations. Again, cross-loadings and items with low loadings were observed. Finally, principal component analysis with varimax rotation and single factor solution was performed as the cross-loadings suggested a single factor solution. Two items with low factor loadings were not considered for future analysis. Single factor explained 48.64% variance. The factor loadings of the scale are presented in Table 5. The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) of 18-item scale was .95. The item-total correlations range of these items was Min = .39, Max = .82. The split-half reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) of 18-item scale was .93 for part one and .88 for part two. Scale questions were presented in Appendix D.

In terms of measuring content validity, the items were reviewed by three psychology students, two psychology professors and two lay individuals in terms of how good and related to the topic of interest. Feedbacks were used to guide revision of the items. Face validity was assessed by asking the participants, "what was intended to be measured?" question, almost all of the participants told that what is intended to be measured was open (perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior).

Table 5. Factor Loadings of Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Premarital Sexual Behavior Scale

Item	Loading	h^2 *
If my father learns that I have sex with my date, he will be angry.	.86	.74
If my mother learns that I have sex with my date, she will be angry.	.82	.71
If my father learns that I have a date, he pretends like he does not know.		7.982E-02
If my mother learns that I have a date, she pretends like she does not know.	.31	9.512E-02
If I tell my father that I have sex with my date, he will take it as normal.	.82	.67
If I tell my mother that I have sex with my date, she will take it as normal.	.79	.62
If I date with someone who had sex before, this will not please my father.	.62	.39
If I date with someone who had sex before, this will not please my mother.	.71	.50
If my father learns that I had sex with my date, he will not let me to see him/her again.	.77	.59
If my mother learns that I had sex with my date, she will not let me to see him/her again.	.74	.54
My father does not approve me to have sex before I marry.	.86	.74
My mother does not approve me to have sex before I marry.	.84	.71
My father is indifferent in terms of how I behave about sexual relations.	.56	.31
My mother is indifferent in terms of how I behave about sexual relations.	.60	.37
My father does not want me to talk about my sexual relationships with him openly.	.56	.31
My mother does not want me to talk about my sexual relationships with her openly.	.40	.16
My father does not want our relatives to know that I have sex with my date.	.72	.51
My mother does not want our relatives to know that I have sex with my date.	.77	.59
My father does not matter other people to learn that I have sex with my date.	.75	.55
My mother does not matter other people to learn that I have sex with my date.	.77	.59
Eigenvalue		9.73
Explained Variance		48.64
Cumulative Percent		48.64

*h^2 : Communality

3.2. Statistical Analyses

Prior to analyses, data was screened to determine the missing cases and outliers and item frequencies were examined. Missing cases were lower than 5%, therefore they were replaced with the mean value for each item. In order to detect the outliers, Z scores of the scale were calculated; as there were no subject scores exceeding the cut-off point ($Z > \pm 3.29$), none of the subject scores were deleted. All of the participants' parents were alive; and were either still married or divorced. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 6. The correlations between variables are presented in Table 7.

Table 6. Means and Standard Deviations of the Variables

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
PPA* toward Dating- Female/ Parents Intact	68	2.20	.63	1.00	3.94
PPA toward Dating- Female/ Parents Divorced	25	1.52	.50	1.00	2.39
PPA toward Dating- Male/ Parents Intact	44	1.67	.57	1.00	4.11
PPA toward Dating- Male/ Parents Divorced	23	1.71	.59	1.00	2.94
PPA toward Premarital Sex- Female/ Parents Intact	68	3.96	.75	2.17	5
PPA toward Premarital Sex- Female/ Parents Divorced	25	2.46	.92	1.22	4.11
PPA toward Premarital Sex- Male/ Parents Intact	44	2.66	.62	1.50	4.44
PPA toward Premarital Sex- Male/ Parents Divorced	23	2.34	.87	1.00	3.83

PPA* = Perceived Parental Attitudes

Table 7. Correlations Between Variables

	1	2	3	4
1. Gender (Female=1, Male=2)	1			
2. Parental Marital Status (Married=1, Divorced=2)	-.08	1		
3. PPA* toward Dating	-.26**	-.27**	1	
4. PPA toward Premarital Sex	-.48**	-.46**	.64**	1

**p<.01
*p<.05

3.2.1. Multivariate Analysis of Variance

In terms of statistical analysis, Multivariate Analysis of Variance (Manova) was decided to be run, as the research design suited its certain criteria. First of all, two independent and two dependent variables were used in this study (with respect to Manova criteria, one or more independent variables, which of each at least has 2 levels; and two or more dependent variables should exist). Second, the Pearson correlation between dependent variables was .64 (with respect to Manova criteria, Manova works best when dependent variables are correlated, and correlation should be at least .60 between dependent variables). Third, in terms of the number of the cases in each cell, the cell with the most case (68) was less than three times of the cell with the least case (23), (with respect to Manova criteria, each cell should not have more cases than five times of the cell with the least case). Fourth, multivariate normality existed when the degrees of freedom of the error term (155) were examined (with respect to Manova criteria, the degrees of freedom of the error term should be equal or higher than 20, in order to have a multivariate normality). Fifth, in terms of significance in Box's Test of Equality of Covariances Matrices, the significance level (.406) is examined (with respect to Manova criteria, if there is no significance in this test, it means that homogeneity of variance/covariance exists and the assumptions met). In order to explore the differences in perceived parental attitudes due to students' gender and parental marital status, 2 (males vs. females; females = 1, males = 2) X 2 (married parents vs. divorced parents; married = 1, divorced = 2) between subjects multivariate analysis of variance was performed on two dependent variables: perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior and perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior. With the use

of Wilk's criterion, the main effect of both of the two dependent variables were significant for both gender $F(2,155) = 14.85$, $p < .01$ and parental divorce $F(2,155) = 23.42$, $p < .01$, and for their interaction $F(2,155) = 10.84$, $p < .01$. Results are presented in Table 8.

Univariate Analysis of Variance after MANOVA indicated that, gender was significant due to the perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior $F(1, 155)= 28.34$, $p<.01$, whereas perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior was not found to be significant. The means of female students for perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior ($\underline{M}$=2.02) and perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior ($\underline{M}$=3.55) were greater than the means of male students for perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior ($\underline{M}$=1.68) and perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior ($\underline{M}$=2.55). The strength of association between students' gender and perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior was η^2= .02. The association was stronger between students' gender and perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior, η^2= .15. Female students perceived their parents' attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior less permissive than male students did, whereas perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior was not found to be significant due to gender. Results are presented in Table 9.

Univariate Analysis of Variance after MANOVA indicated that, parental marital status was both significant due to perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior $F(1,155)= 9.62$, $p< .05$ and due to perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior $F(1,155)= 46.86$, $p< .01$. The means of students with married parents, for perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior ($\underline{M}$=1.99) and perceived parental attitudes toward premarital

73

sexual behavior (M=3.45) were greater than the means of students with divorced parents, for perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior (M=1.61) and perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior (M=2.40). The strength of association between students' parents marital status and perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior was η^2= .06. The association was stronger between students' parents marital status and perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior, η^2= .23. Students with married parents perceived their parents' attitudes both toward dating and premarital sexual behavior less permissive than students with divorced parents did. Results are presented in Table 10.

Univariate Analysis of Variance after MANOVA indicated that, the interaction of gender and parental marital status were both significant due to perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior F(1,155)= 12.41, p<.01 and due to perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior F(1,155)= 19.80, p<.01.

With respect to significance of interaction effect, Manova did not run significance tests as both of the independent variables have less than three levels. Therefore, the significances of interaction effect for both dependent variables, were assessed by computing Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) Test. The results are presented in Table 11.

In terms of perceived parental attitudes toward dating, females whose parents are divorced (M=1.52) tend to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females whose parents are married (M=2.20), whereas males whose parents are divorced (M=1.71) did not significantly differ from the males whose parents are married (M=1.67). Moreover, males whose

parents are married ($\underline{M}$=1.67) tended to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females whose parents are married ($\underline{M}$=2.20) toward dating behavior, whereas females ($\underline{M}$=1.52) and males ($\underline{M}$=1.71) whose parents are divorced did not significantly differ. Means & standard deviations and post-hoc comparisons due to perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior are presented in Table 12.

In terms of perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexuality, both females ($\underline{M}$=2.46) and males ($\underline{M}$=2.34) whose parents are divorced tend to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females ($\underline{M}$=3.96) and males ($\underline{M}$=2.66) whose parents are married, however the difference between females whose parents are divorced ($\underline{M}$=2.46) vs. married ($\underline{M}$=3.96) is significantly larger than the difference among the males whose parents are divorced ($\underline{M}$=2.34) vs. married ($\underline{M}$=2.67). Moreover, males whose parents are married ($\underline{M}$=2.67) tended to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females whose parents are married ($\underline{M}$=3.96) toward premarital sexual behavior, whereas females ($\underline{M}$=2.46) and males ($\underline{M}$=2.34) whose parents are divorced did not significantly differ. Means & standard deviations and post-hoc comparisons due to perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior are presented in Table 13.

The strength of association between the interaction of students' parents marital status & gender, and perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior was η^2= .07. The association was stronger between the association between the interaction of students' parents marital status and gender, and perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior, η^2= .11. The results are presented in Table 14.

Table 8. F Values in Multivariate Tests for Perceived Parental Attitudes toward Dating and Premarital Sexual Behaviors with respect to Students' Gender, Parental Marital Status and Their Interaction

PPA* toward Dating and Premarital Sexual Behaviors	F	p	*η^2
Gender	14.85	.000***	.16
Parental Marital Status	23.42	.000***	.23
Interaction Effect	10.84	.000***	.12

*η^2= Strength
PPA*= Perceived Parental Attitudes
*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 9. Means for Perceived Parental Attitudes toward Dating and Premarital Sexual Behaviors with respect to Students' Gender Main Effects

	Female Mean	Male Mean	Overall Mean	F	p	*η^2
PPA* toward Dating Behavior	2.02	1.62	1.88	2.90	.091	.02
PPA toward Premarital Sexuality	3.55	2.55	3.13	28.34	.000***	.15

*η^2= Strength
PPA*= Perceived Parental Attitudes*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 10. Means for Perceived Parental Attitudes toward Dating and Premarital Sexual Behaviors with respect to Parental Marital Status Main Effects

	Married P.* Mean	Divorced P. Mean	Overall Mean	F	p	*η^2
PPA* toward Dating Behavior	1.99	1.61	1.88	9.62	.002*	.06
PPA toward Premarital Sexuality	3.45	2.40	3.13	35.47	.000***	.23

* P= Parents
*η^2= Strength
PPA*= Perceived Parental Attitudes
*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 11. Results of Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) Test for Significance of Interaction Effect

Interaction Groups	PPA* toward Dating	PPA toward Premarital Sexuality
Female/ Intact Parents Vs. Female/ Divorced Parents	13.225**	22.727**
Female/ Intact Parents Vs. Male/ Intact Parents	10.451**	19.667**
Male/ Intact Parents Vs. Male/ Divorced Parents	0.843	4.818**
Female/ Divorced Parents Vs. Male/ Divorced Parents	3.647	1.758

PPA*= Perceived Parental Attitudes
Standard Error of PPA toward Dating Behavior Scale = 0.051
Standard Error of PPA toward Premarital Sexual Behavior Scale = 0.066
Significance cut-off point= 4. 54, $p<.01$ (Lee, 1975; q distribution table: Experimental Design and Analysis)

Table 12. Means and Standard Deviations of Students' Gender and Parental Marital Status for Perceived Parental Attitudes toward Dating Behavior

	Female Student	Male Student
Divorced Parents	1.52 a (.50)	1.71 a (.59)
Married Parents	2.20 b (.63)	1.67 a (.57)

* Means with different subscripts are significantly different from each other at .01 significance level according to posthoc comparisons of Tukey's HSD Test.

Table 13. Means and Standard Deviations of Students' Gender and Parental Marital Status for Perceived Parental Attitudes toward Premarital Sexual Behavior

	Female Student	Male Student
Divorced Parents	2.46 a (.92)	2.34 a (.87)
Married Parents	3.96 b (.75)	2.66 c (.62)

* Means with different subscripts are significantly different from each other at .01 significance level according to posthoc comparisons of Tukey's HSD Test.

Table 14. F Values in Multivariate Tests for Perceived Parental Attitudes toward Dating and Premarital Sexual Behaviors with respect to Interaction Effects of Students' Gender and Parental Marital Status

Interaction Effects	$\underline{F}$	$\underline{p}$	$*\eta^2$
PPA* toward Dating Behavior	12.41	.001***	.07
PPA toward Premarital Sexual Behavior	19.80	.000***	.11

$*\eta^2$= Strength
PPA*= Perceived Parental Attitudes
*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

3.2.2. Correlations Between Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Dating

& Premarital Sexual Behaviors, and Background Variables

The relationships between some background variables like age, department, attended university, city mostly lived in, current education level, paternal education, maternal education, mother's working status, income level, number of siblings, conservatism of family, and perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors were also considered. As the mean score increases, perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behavior in terms of permissiveness decreases. As shown in Table 15, a significant negative correlation was found between age and perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior; with increasing age students tend to adopt more permissive values toward perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior. Also current education level showed a significant negative association both with perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors. As the current education level increases, the perceived parental attitudes toward certain behaviors become more permissive, however it can be related with increasing age, too. Furthermore, mother's working status was both correlated with perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors. If the mother is working currently, college students' perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors become more permissive compared to mother's being housewife or retired. With regard to the correlations, it can be said that if the hours that mother spent at home increases, students' perceived parental attitudes- especially toward premarital sexual behaviors as it was found significant at .001 level- decreases with respect to permissiveness. Income level of the students was found to

be negatively correlated with perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior. As the income level increases, students' perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior become more permissive. As expected, students' evaluation of their parents' being conservative or liberal showed a significant negative association with perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors. If they describe their parents as conservative, they tend to perceive parental attitudes toward premarital sexual and especially toward dating behaviors less permissively, and vice versa. Background variables such as status of dating experience, number of dates until today, age of first date, acceptance level of one-night stands, acceptance level of premarital sexuality, marriage idea, currently dating status, status of sexual intercourse experience, number of sexual partners until today, age of first sexual intercourse, and acceptance level of dating more than one person simultaneously were not evaluated even if a significant correlation was found; as these variables can not influence perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors, but perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors can influence these variables within the light of literature. Therefore, they were not taken into consideration as background variables.

Table 15. Correlations of the Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Dating & Premarital Sexual Behaviors and Background Variables

Pearson Correlations	PPA* toward Dating Behavior	PPA toward Premarital Sexual Behavior
Age	-.140	-.259**
Current Education Level	-.158*	-.162*
Mother's Working Status	.181*	.254**
Income Level	-.183*	-.055
Parents' Conservatism	-.431**	-.190*

* Correlation is significant *=at the 0.05 level, **= at the 0.01 level; (2-tailed).

81

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The present research attempted to specify the dimensions necessary to influence perceived parental attitudes of Turkish college students toward dating and premarital sexual behavior. According to the hypotheses of the study, perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors were expected to differ due to the students' gender (female vs. male) and parental marital status (married vs. divorced). Within the light of results, perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior demonstrated significant difference due to students' gender and parental marital status, whereas perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior only demonstrated significant difference due to parental marital status.

1.2. Group Differences with respect to Main and Interaction Effects in Results

Female students perceived their parents' attitudes toward premarital sexuality less permissive than male students did. It is the best example of premarital sexuality's being a taboo, especially for females, in Turkish culture. Perceived parental attitudes −indifferent of any socio-economic status or education level of parents- toward premarital sexual behavior is still not permissive, especially for daughters. It is assumed to be rooted from the gender schematization and gender differences in terms of child-rearing treatments within Turkish culture. Even Turkey has been moving from collectivistic values toward individualistic ones (Sunar, 2002), it has still been an honor culture and

82

students of different genders are expected to appreciate the feminine and masculine code of honor (Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999; Gilmore, 1987; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Stewart, 1994) and behave accordingly to these codes of honor. Moreover, premarital sexuality's being perceived as not permissive, regardless of the parents' education level, demonstrates that Turkey is a honor culture, which preserves the honor values due to premarital sexuality.

As maintenance of family honor requires considerable restriction of female behavior, and compared to boys, girls are much more closely supervised and limited in their permissible activities, particularly in adolescence (Ataca 1989; cited in Sunar, 2002), in relation to feminine code of honor and gender schematization within Turkish culture, as family honor has requirements of restriction of certain female behaviors and as females are closely supervised and limited in permissible activities beginning from adolescence, it is expected for female college students to perceive parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors, which are less permissive than males, or not permissive at all. However, daughters and sons did not differ in their perceived parental attitudes toward dating, but displayed a significant difference in perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behaviors. Within the light of present study, dating is no more seen as a behavior, which should be restricted or closely supervised and limited in terms of permissible activities for daughters; therefore dating behavior is perceived to be approving and not gender-based. Darling & Hicks (1982) stated, parental messages were discouraging of sex for adolescents of both sexes, but that the negative consequences of sexual activity were far more strongly stressed for daughters than for sons. These findings

imply that young men are receiving more liberal messages from their parents about sexual expression. Moreover, in terms of honor values, the loss of virginity avoids the maintenance of good reputation in honor cultures. Honor only concerned the sexual conduct of female members according to Herzfeld (1980). He also noted that the definition of moral-value terms requires a clear perception of linguistic and social context in community, whereas "reputation" is clearly a common theme among honor cultures. What is the salience of "reputation" aspect within honor cultures? Reputation in honor cultures is a very salient personal feature that refers to the individual's morality and his/her social and personal worth. A sense of honor implies a concern for one's reputation and sensitivity to social judgments, and a good reputation is characteristic of a person with sense of honor (Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999; Gilmore, 1987; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Stewart, 1994). Schneider (1971) stated that, all regions surrounding the Mediterranean Sea in which great emphasis is placed on the chastity and virginity of women; and honor is defined as an index of female chastity. To sum up, in Turkish culture as maintenance of family honor requires restriction of female behavior, girls are more closely supervised and limited in their permissible activities (Ataca, 1989; cited in Sunar, 2002), parental messages to adolescents –especially daughters- about premarital sexuality are perceived to be basically disapproving, highly gender-based and related with the maintenance of good reputation.

Moreover, the double – standard due to premarital sexuality within the literature, explains the gender difference in results (Reiss, 1960; Pope & Knudsen, 1965; Symons, 1979; Oliver & Hyde, 1993). They argued about the so-called double standard, which was described as society's permissive

attitudes toward male promiscuity and intolerance for female promiscuity, due to premarital sexuality. Whereas, DeLamater & McCorquodale (1979) stated that with equal educational and growing occupational opportunities, and with sex discrimination's being declared illegal in various contexts, it became illogical to have differing standards of sexual behavior for men and women. However, even within time and legal terms this double-standard changes, the picture is apparently different in Turkish culture. In eastern cultures such as Turkey, premarital sexuality is still based on a double-standard within the light of Turkish literature (Kağıçıbaşı, 1986; Sunar, 2002) and in the present study. Due to the results, there is an intolerance in perceived parental attitudes toward female premarital sexual behaviors.

Why did perceived parental attitudes toward dating behavior not demonstrate a significant difference due to students' gender? Daughters perceived their parents' attitudes –regardless of any socio-economic status or education level- as equally permissive with sons, toward dating behavior, in contrast to premarital sexual behavior. As argued before, Turkish culture is stated to be in a transition stage through Westernization (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1985; cited in Sunar, 2002; Sunar, 2002), dating is taken as a normal and probable adolescent behavior by parents, as both female and male college students stated in general terms that, their parents did not restrict or get angry if they have told their parents that they have had a date. Moreover, they stated that they thought their parents would not bother if their relatives have heard that they have had a date. These results demonstrate that, dating is not perceived by parents within the scope of honor values such as the salience of reputation, family honor and feminine code of honor, due to perceived parental   attitudes.

Whereas, premarital sexual behaviors are still and strictly perceived within the scope of honor values such as the salience of reputation, family honor and feminine & masculine code of honor, due to perceived parental attitudes. Regardless of the maternal & paternal education level, premarital sexual behaviors are perceived both by females and males as disapproving and not permissive, and it constitutes a supportive finding that Turkey is a honor culture, as it had been stated in the literature before (Sunar, 2002).

Students with married parents perceived their parents' attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behavior less permissive than students with divorced parents did. Family dynamics rule out certain social roles for each member of the family and due to the disruption of these familial dynamics or harmony, such as divorce, this disruption leads each member of the family to adopt new values in terms of life styles gradually (Seltzer, 1994; Jacquet & Surra, 2001). Once the family harmony is interrupted by parental divorce, it leads the offspring to adopt not disrupted, but maybe different value orientations through certain domains, such as dating or premarital sexual behavior. The reason that college students with divorced parents were found to perceive parental attitudes in a more permissive way, in terms of dating and premarital sexual behavior, can well be explained by adopting different values as a result of the lack or disruption of familial harmony, compared to students with married parents. As Şirvanlı-Özen (2003) stated that adolescents from divorced families perceived their father as the parent showing less affection and control in comparison with those from married families, fathers might have no longer been perceived as the authority figure in divorced families or no longer felt themselves as the authority figure, who has had the right to have control over in children's permissible activities. Therefore, children

with divorced parents perceive parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behavior significantly more permissive than children with married parents in the present study.

As a matter of fact, empirical studies supported the results in the same way. According to Jacquet & Surra (2001), young female adults from divorced families would report greater passionate love at casual dating than those from intact families and casually dating men from divorced families reported greater ambivalence about becoming involved than did men from intact families. Women from divorced families reported that they valued consistency of commitments less than did women from intact families. These findings lead to conclusion that both male and female children of divorced parents are more likely to engage in casual dating and sexual behaviors.

There was no hypothesis due to the interaction of students' gender and parental marital status, in this study. Indeed, one of the most interesting and striking findings of this study is the interaction effect between students' gender and parental marital status in terms of perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexuality. In terms of perceived parental attitudes toward dating, females whose parents are divorced tend to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females whose parents are married, whereas males whose parents are divorced did not significantly differ from the males whose parents are married. Moreover, males whose parents are married tended to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females whose parents are married toward dating behavior, whereas females and males whose parents are divorced did not significantly differ. In terms of perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexuality, both females and males whose parents

87

are divorced tend to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females and males whose parents are married, however the difference between females whose parents are divorced vs. married is significantly larger than the difference among the males whose parents are divorced vs. married. Moreover, males whose parents are married tended to perceive parental attitudes significantly more permissive than females whose parents are married toward premarital sexual behavior, whereas females and males whose parents are divorced did not significantly differ.

In these terms, the structure of Turkish family is salient to discuss with respect to adolescent sexuality. Sexuality is one of the taboo concerns for Turkish society and traditional family structure still exist (İmamoğlu & Aygün; 1999). Akgün (2000) stated that, in the Turkish family structure, fathers are usually the authority figure and they have a formal relationship with their children. Mothers, as major caregivers, have an affectionate and warm relationship with their children and are usually more supportive than fathers. Sunar (2002) resemblingly stated that, traditional rules for mothers and fathers can described as mothers being highly involved in care and supervision of their children and fathers taking a more distant but authoritative role. However, in divorced families adolescents perceive their father as the parent showing less affection and control (Şirvanlı-Özen, 2003). Moreover, Rodriguez Mosquera (1999) stated that, a lack of sexual shame on the part of female relatives is one of the most shameful situations in honor cultures because it damages not only the woman's honor, but also the honor of the family. The fact that men are the guardians of the family's reputation in honor cultures means that responsibility for ensuring the chastity of female relatives also falls on men. This dependence of family honor on the

sexual behavior of female relatives in honor cultures results in a strong control of female relatives' social activities, and in the strengthening of male authority and female submission within the family. A man's honor and reputation is to an important extent assessed in terms of his female relatives sexual shame, because males are seen as the protectors of female sexual shame. Likewise emphasized in Rodriguez Mosquera's study (1999), as a result of masculine code of honor, fathers are responsible for females and thus for family's honor, they feel the need to protect their own honor –in the name of females' honor- by being authoritarian and controlling over daughters' behavior especially due to premarital sexuality. However, as in the case of parental divorce daughters perceive parental attitudes more permissively, it might have rooted from that, fathers are no longer perceived as the authority figure in divorced families, or/and fathers might have been feeling away from fact that men are the guardians of the family's reputation as they were not feeling themselves as the head of the family anymore.

Hetherington (1972) stated that the instability of parents' marriages might serve as a model for romantic relationships. Empirical work is indicative of ambivalent behavior for girls whose fathers were absent because of divorce. In terms of application of honor on divorced families within the need of explaining the interaction effect, even if not all but most of the divorced parents' children live out of familial harmony or without the main authority figure of father at home as a result of maternal custody, these children perceive parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexuality far more permissively compared to children of intact families; especially to daughters due to the feminine code of honor. That's why daughters in divorced families perceive parental attitudes far more different than daughters in intact families.

Marital conflict lowered children's closeness to parents, and divorce lowered it even further. These associations were significant for both parents but were stronger for fathers than for mothers (Booth & Amato, 2001). Hence, this distance might have been causing not caring too much for perceived parental messages due to dating and premarital sexuality. Bailey & Zvonkovic (2003) stated that, nonresidential parents are in an unsafe position and they are outside of the family residence after divorce; consequently often perceived as outside of the family system. Consequently, again as the fathers are the keepers of family honor due to masculine code of honor (Rodriquez Mosquera, 1999; Gilmore, 1987; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Stewart, 1994) and are responsible for controlling and supervision of female members of the family, parental divorce may be leading to a lack of control among parents in terms of dating and premarital sexual behaviors –especially for daughters- as in most cases the custody is on mothers. Furthermore, according to significance of interaction effect between female and male students with divorced parents, no significant difference was found; it shows that parental divorce may be leading to a lack of control among parents in terms of dating and premarital sexual behaviors, especially for daughters, as stated in literature (Şirvanlı-Özen, 2003).

4.3. Limitations of the Study & Suggestions for Future Studies

One of the limitations within this study can be declared as the sample size. There were 18 questions in each scale and the sample size is 160 college students; the number of the participants exceeded eight times of the highest number of questions in the scales. However, a sample composed of higher number of participants and participants from multiple universities and regions of Turkey would lead to more significant results and would avoid

possible errors within the study. Moreover, the number of participants falling into each group due to independent variables (female-married parents, male-married parents, female-divorced parents, male-divorced parents) could be equal or higher in terms of research design.

In terms of suggestions, as the participants were all university students and were late-adolescents and early-adults, the results of the present study can be evaluated within the consideration of the age of participants in a longitudinal study design. A longitudinal study with the participants who are at their early or mid-adolescence years could be more appropriate in terms of evaluating the development and formation of the perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behavior.

Due to the limitations of the study and as a further study, college students with divorced parents can be grouped due to the time that their parents had divorced. Because, there can be differences between groups of students, whose parents were divorced during childhood- adolescence and early adulthood.

As a further study, the questionnaire may be handed out both in the urban and rural regions of Turkey. In terms of values, in the rural areas of Turkey, not only the perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexuality, but also toward dating may also be declared as unacceptable by the college students. It is known that even the disruption of arranged marriages led to honor homicides in the east and south-east part of Turkey (Sunar, 2002). Therefore, perceived parental attitudes especially toward premarital sexual behavior would be expected to demonstrate quite different results compared to these results.

Moreover, as Turkish culture is changing towards individualism through westernization, this study can be suggested to be replicated through years,

due to societal change. Sunar (2002) stated the following due to the change from collectivist values to individualistic ones through westernization:

> It is highly unlikely that this synthesis will persist unchanged very far into the future. Indeed, the current situation for Turkish urban families is the product of complex and dynamic set of changes and stabilities. It is expected to see accelerating change in childrearing patterns in the direction of greater encouragement of individual autonomy. Although honor remains an important cultural ideal, in urban middle class practice, the relative autonomy afforded young people in the management of their affairs, including their marriage decisions. No one would have perceived their development as a serious breach of the family's honor, and no one would have sought to punish them for flouting authority and tradition.

Within the prospect of this societal change, the results would be different, if this study had been assessed twenty years before, and with high probability, it will be different if it is assessed twenty years later.

As a future study, perceived parental attitudes can be compared with the actual parental attitudes in terms of dating and premarital sexual behavior of college students. Even the perceived parental attitudes highly reflects the actual parental attitudes as a result indirect learning, this comparison may lead to a fruitful topic of future research, as it will be helpful in terms of understanding the degree of difference between the actual and perceived parental attitudes, and actual attitudes will give more precise information about the parental attitudes about dating and premarital sexuality.

Truthfully, it is very interesting that, perceived parental attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior were less permissive for females, regardless of paternal and maternal education level and the city mostly lived in. It means that, premarital sexual behavior is within the scope of honor values, such as feminine code of honor, maintenance of good reputation, sexual shame (Rodriguez Mosquera,

1999). Moreover, not being permissive toward premarital sexuality is a cultural characteristic of Turkish culture. Turkey preserves the honor values in terms of premarital sexuality, whereas dating is no longer seen within the scope of these honor values. As a future research, the same study can be assessed with a larger sample, which is composed of participants from several universities and cities, in order to see the impact of maternal and paternal education level and the city mostly lived in.

Akgün (2000) stated that, as positive communication with mother increased, the adolescents' sexual behavior at the university also increased. If s/he has more negative communication with his/her mother, sexual behavior at the university decreased. In addition, if the adolescents had negative communication with his/her father, the probability of sexual experience increased. In my opinion, the result of Akgün's study is a perfect example of Turkish family structure. Deriving from the presented data, one may argue that adolescents having a good communication with their mothers may feel that all their behaviors are approved by their mothers. In addition, adolescents having a bad communication with their mothers are more likely to perceive their mothers as disapproving premarital sexuality. Akgün also added that, having a bad communication with fathers might be interpreted as disapproval. This misinterpretation may lead adolescents to prove their "existence" by involving some behaviors like sexual intercourse. In terms of future studies, it is suggested that the effects of parental communication on perceived parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behavior should be studied, as it will reveal interesting findings in terms of the causes that influence the formation of perceived parental attitudes of college students.

In the name of honor cultures, Greek culture would be an illustrative one (Herzfeld, 1984), which was demonstrated as similar with respect to Hofstede's individualism-collectivism dimensions (Hofstede, 1980) to Turkish culture. Herzfeld stated:

> Take the Greek youth who prides himself on a "warm, Mediterranean" sexuality as well as on the strictness with which he upholds the "traditional rules" of chastity at home. Easily critised by a foreign observer for his "double standards" he is, in effect, replaying to the internally conflicting stereotypes that simultaneously serve his ends and appeal to the foreign audience, from whom they – along with many other trappings of an idealized modernity – partly came. The Greeks' dual self-image is refraction of this mixture of admiration for a lost past and pity for today's sad relic.

Turkish culture is currently in a similar position as described above. When the rates of sexual intercourse and frequency of dating are examined, the increasing rate of premarital sexuality and higher numbers of dates demonstrate a certain change in new generation's values, and perceived parental attitudes demonstrate the past generation's values. Despite the rates of sexual intercourse and frequency of dating, if the so-called dual self-image still exists, it will for sure disappear and lead to a greater extent of change among new generation's values in the future. Through westernization, the values due to dating and premarital sexual relationships will not resist change too long.

When the rates of premarital sexual experience for both females and males are examined, 90% of the males and 50% of females have already had premarital sexual experience among the participants of this study and these results lead us to think that, most of the females had premarital sexuality in spite of parental intolerance and lack of permissiveness. Therefore, as a future research suggestion, how does this situation affect female students' self-images,

psychological well-being and current & future parental relationship orientations can be studied.

Due to the findings of present study, parental messages were perceived as discouraging of premarital sexual behavior for daughters in relation to feminine code of honor, salience of reputation and gender-schematization. However, dating behavior is no more perceived as a behavior, which should be restricted or limited in terms of permissible activities of any sexes. Moreover, children of divorced parents perceive parental attitudes toward dating and premarital sexual behaviors significantly more permissive than the children of married parents. Children of divorced parents perceive parental attitudes less regarding of honor cultures, which was assumed to root from disruption of familial harmony and fathers' being not perceived as the authority figure in divorced families.

In conclusion, the significance and salience of this study is that, within the literature perceived parental attitudes were generally taken as independent variable, whereas in this study the attitudes were taken as dependent variable, as it was essential to find out what was leading parental attitudes to be perceived in certain ways. This study is one of the examples in terms of functioning to fill out the certain gap within the literature, due to perceived parental attitudes.

REFERENCES

Akgün, E. (2000). <u>Predictors of Adolescent Sexual Attitudes and Behavior: The Role of Parents and Best Friends</u>. Published Master Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Akgün, S. (1993). <u>Cinsiyet Rolüne İlişkin Kalıp Yargılara Uygun Davranıp Davranmamanın Çekiciliğe Etkisi</u>. Published Master Thesis, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Allan, G. (2001). Personal Relationships in Late Modernity. <u>Personal Relationships</u>, 8: 325- 339.

Bailey, S. J. & Zvonkovic, A. V. (2003). Parenting after divorce: Nonresidential parents' perceptions of social and institutional support. <u>Journal of Divorce and Remarriage</u>, 39: 59- 67.

Bandura, A. & Walters, R. H. (1963). <u>Social Learning and Personality Development</u>. New York, Holt Reinhart & Winston.

Basow, S. A. (1992). <u>Gender Stereotypes and Roles</u>. Pasific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Beall, A. E. (1993). A Social Constructivist View of Gender. <u>The Psychology of Gender</u>. New York: Guilford Press.

Bell, R. R. & Chaskes, J. B. (1970). Premarital Sexual Experience Among Coeds. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, 32: 81- 84.

Bell, R. R. & Coughey, K. (1980). Premarital Sexual Experience Among College Females, 1958, 1968, and 1978. <u>Family Relations</u>, 29: 353- 357.

Bem, S.L. (1987). <u>Gender Schema Theory and the Romantic Tradition</u>. In P. Shaver & C. Hendrick (Eds.), Sex and Gender: Review of Personality and Social Psychology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Berscheid, E. (1999). The Greening of Relationship Science. <u>American Psychologist</u>, 54: 260- 266.

Billy, J. O. G., Tanfer, G., Grady, W. R. & Klepinger, D. H. (1993). The Sexual Behavior of Men in the United States. <u>Family Planning Perspectives</u>, 25: 52-60.

Booth, A. & Amato, P. R. (2001). Parental Predivorce Relations and Offspring Postdivorce Well-being. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, 63: 197- 213.

Broderick, C. B. & Rowe, G. P. (1968). A Scale of Preadolescent Heterosexual Development. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, 30: 97- 101.

Burgess, E. & Locke, H. <u>The Family</u>. New York American Book, 1945.

Burgoyne, C. B. & Haines, R. (2002). Views of marriage and divorce: An in-depth study of young adults from intact and divorced families. <u>Journal of Divorce and Remarriage</u>, 37: 75- 82.

Carlson, J. M. & Iovini, J. (1985). The Transmission of Racial Attitudes from Fathers to Sons: A Study of Blacks and Whites. <u>Adolescence</u>, 20: 233- 237.

Clark, K. J. & Kanoy, K. (1998). Parents' Marital Status, Father-Daughter Intimacy and Young Adult Females' Dating Relationships. <u>Journal of Divorce and Remarriage</u>, 29:167- 179.

Coleman, J. S. (1961).<u>The Adolescent Society</u>. Glencoe, Illiois, The Freeman Press.

Curun, F. (2001). <u>The Effects of Sexism and Sex Role Orientation on Romantic Relationship Satisfaction</u>. Published Master Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Darling, C. A. & Hicks, M. W. (1982). Parental Influence on Adolescent Sexuality : Implications for Parents as Educators. <u>Journal of Youth and Adolescence</u>, 11 : 231- 245.

DeLamater, J. (1981). The Social Control of Sexuality. <u>Annual Review of Sociology</u>, 7: 263- 290.

DeLamater, J. & MacCorquodale, P. (1979). <u>Premarital Sexuality : Attitudes, relationships, Behavior</u>. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Devereux, E. C., Bronfenbrenner, V. & Rogers, R. R. (1967). Childbearing in Englang and the United States: A Cross- National Comparison. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 51: 247- 253.

Dornbusch, S. M., Carlsmith, J. M., Gross, R. T., Martin, J. A., Jennings, D., Rosenberg, A. & Duke, P. (1981). Sexual Development, Age and Dating: A Comparison of Biological and Social Influences upon One Set of Behaviors. <u>Child Development</u>, 52: 179- 185.

Durmazkul, D. A. (1991). Cinsiyetlerine göre Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Eş Seçimi Tercihleri. <u>Published Master Thesis</u>, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Earle, J. R. & Perricone, P. J. (1986). Premarital Sexuality : A Ten- Year Study of Attitudes and Behavior on a Small University Campus. <u>The Journal of Sex Research</u>, 22: 304- 310.

Edwards, J. N. & Booth, A. (1976). Sexual Behavior in and out of Marriage: An Assessment of Correlates. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38: 73- 81.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton.

Evans, J. J. & Bloom, B. L. (1998). Effects of Parental Divorce Among College Undergraduates. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 28: 69- 78.

Ferrel, M. Z., Tolone, W. L. & Walsh, R. H. (1977). Maturational and Societal Changes in the Sexual Double- Standard: A Panel Analysis (1967- 1971; 1970- 1974). Journal of Marriage and the Family, May: 255- 271.

Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research. Addison- Wesley, Reading, MA.

Fox, G. L. (1979). The Family's Influence on Adolescent Sexual Behavior. Children Today, 36: 21- 25.

Furmann, W. (2002). The Emerging Field of Adolescent Romantic Relationships. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 11: 177- 180.

Gagnon, J. H. & Simon, W. (1973). Sexual Conduct : The Sources of Human Sexuality. Chicago: Aldine Press.

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology. American Psychologist, 40: 266- 275.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilmore, D. D. (1987). Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean. Washington DC: American Anthropological Association.

Glenn, N. D. & Weaver, C. N. (1979). Attitudes toward Premarital, Extramarital, and Homosexual Relations in the U.S. in the 1970s. Journal of Sex Research, 15: 108- 118.

Golden, P.C. (1969). A Review of Children's Reports of Parent Behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 71: 222- 226.

Hardy, K. R. (1964). An Appetitional Theory of Sexual Motivation. Psychological Review, 71: 1-18.

Hansen, S. L. (1977). Dating Choices of High School Students. The Family Coordinator, April, 133- 138.

Hetherington, M. E. (1972). Effects of father absence on personality development in adolescent daughters. Developmental Psychology, 7, 313-362.

Hertoft, P. (1969). Sex Guidance. Danish Medical Bulletin, 16: 22- 30.

Herzfeld, M. (1980). Honour and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems. Man, 15: 339- 351.

Herzfeld, M. (1984). The Horns of the Mediterraneanist Dilemma. American Ethnologist, 11: 439- 454.

Hinde, R. A. (1997) Relationships: A Dialectical Perspective. East Sussex, Psychology Press Publishers.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequences, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hortaçsu, N. (2000). Generational Changes in Lives of Families: The Turkish Case. In Crossroads of History: Experiences, Memory, Orality. International Oral History Association (Eds) J. Wiltob, A. Ritchie, M. de Moraes Ferreira, A. Lichtblau, & A. Öztürkmen. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Printhouse.

Husbands, C. (1970). Some Social and Psychological Consequences of the American Dating System. Adolescence, 5: 451- 462.

Jacquet, S. E. & Surra, C. A. (2001). Parental Divorce and Premarital Couples: Commitment and Other Relationship Characteristics. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 63: 627- 639.

Jeynes, W. H. (2001). The Effects of Recent Parental Divorce on Their Children's Sexual Attitudes and Behavior. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 35: 115- 133.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1986) Status of Women in Turkey: Cross-Cultural Perspectives. International Journal of Middle East Studies, 18: 485-499.

King, K., Balswick, J. C. & Robinson, I. E. (1977). The Continuing Premarital Sexual Revolution among College Females. Journal of the Marriage and the Family, 39: 455- 459.

Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., Choi, S. & Yoon, G. (1994). Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method and Applications. London: Sage.

Krain, M., Cannon, D. & Bagford, J. (1977). Rating- Dating or Simply Prestige Homogamy? Data on Dating in the Greek System on a Midwestern Campus. Journal of Marriage and the Family, November, 663- 674.

Kunz, J. (2001). Parental Divorce and Children's Interpersonal Relationships: A Meta-Analysis. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 34: 19- 32.

Lambert, B. G., Rothschild, B. F. & Altland, R. (1978). Adolescence. Belmont, Calif, Wadsworth.

Laner, M. R., Laner R. H. & Palmer, C. E. (1987). Permissive Attitudes Toward Sexual Behaviors: A Clarification of Theoretical Explanations. The Journal of Sex Research, 14: 137- 144.

Lauer, R. H., & Lauer, J. C. (1991). The long-term relational consequences of problematic family backgrounds. Family Relations, 40, 286-290.

Lawrence, S. M. (2001). Gender Schematization in Adolescents: Differences Based on Rearing in Single-Parent and Intact Families. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 34: 137- 143.

Lee, W. (1975). Experimental Design and Analysis. San Francisco: Freeman.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field Theory in Social Science. New York: Harper.

Lewis, R. A. (1973). Parents and Peers: Socialization Agents in the Coital Behavior of Young Adults. The Journal of Sex Research, 9: 156- 170.

Lorber, J. (1986). Dismantling Noah's Ark. Sex Roles, 14: 567- 580.

Lowrie, S.H. (1951) Dating Theories and Student Responses. American Sociological Review, 16: 334- 340.

Luckey, E. B. & Nass, G. D. (1969). A Comparison of Sexual Attitudes and Behavior in an International Sample. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31: 364- 379.

Maccoby, E. E. (1990). Gender and Relationships: A Developmental Account. American Psychologist, 45: 513- 520

Mahl, D. (2001). The Influence of Parental Divorce on the Romantic Relationship Beliefs of Young Adults. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 34: 89- 101.

Mahoney, E. R. (1978). Gender and Social Class Differences in Changes in Attitude toward Premarital Coitus. Sociology and Social Research, 62: 279- 286.

Markus, H. R. & Kitiyama, S. (1991). Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion and Motivation. Psychological Review, 98: 224- 253.

McCabe, M.P.(1984). Toward a Theory of Adolescent Dating. Adolescence, 19: 159- 170.

McDaniel, C. O. (1969). Dating Roles and Reasons for Dating. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31: 97- 107.

McNab, W. L. (1976). Sexual Attitude Development in Children and the Parents Role. Journal of School Health, 46: 337- 342.

100

Milevsky, A. (2004). Perceived parental marital satisfaction and divorce: Effects on sibling relations in emerging adults. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 41: 115- 122.

Miller, B. C., McCoy, J. K., Olson, T. D. & Wallace, C. M. (1986). Parental Dicipline and Control Attempts in Relation to Adolescent Sexual Attitudes and Behaviors. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48: 503- 512.

Mills, C. S. & Granoff, B. J. (1992). Date and Acquaintance Rape among A Sample of College Students. Social Work, 37: 504- 509.

Mischel, W. (1966). A Social Learning View of Sex Differences in Behavior. Stanford, CA: Standford University Press.

Moore, S. & Rosenthal, D. (1991). Adolescents' Perceptions of Friends' and Parents' Attitudes to Sex and Sexual Risk-Taking. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 1: 189- 200.

Mullett, E. & Stolberg, A. L. (2002). Divorce and its impact on the intimate relationships of young adults. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 38: 39- 48.

Nisbett, R. E. & Cohen, D. (1996). Culture of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Noller, P. & Patton, W. (1990). Maintaining Family Relationships at Adolescence. In Heaven, P. C. L. and Callan, V. J. (Eds.) Adolescence: An Australian Perspective, Harcourt Brace, Jovanovich, Sydney.

Oliver, M. B. & Hyde, J. S. (1993). Gender Differences in Sexuality: A Meta-Analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 114: 29- 51.

Öner, B. (2000). Relationship Satisfaction and Dating Experience: Factors Affecting Future Time Orientation in Relationships With the Opposite Sex. Journal of Psychology, 134: 527- 537.

Peplau, L. A., Rubin, Z. & Hill, C. T. (1977). Sexual Intimacy in Dating Relationships. Journal of Social Issues, 33: 86- 109.

Peristiany, J. G. (1965). Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Pitt-Rivers, J. (1977). The Fate of Schechem or the Politics of Sex: Essays on the Anhtopology of the Mediterranean. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pope, H. & Knudsen, D. D. (1965). Premarital Sexual Norms, the Family and Social Change. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27: 314- 323.

Regan, E. C. (1997). The Impact of Male Sexual Request Style on Perceptions of Sexual Interactions: The Mediational Role of Beliefs about Female Sexual Desire. <u>Basic and Applied Social Psychology</u>, 19: 519- 532.

Reiss, I. L. (1960). <u>Premarital Sexual Standards in America</u>. New York: Free Press.

Reiss, I. L. (1976). <u>Family Systems in America</u>. (2nd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Rice, F. P. (1975). <u>The Adolescent (2nd ed.)</u>. Boston, Allyn & Bacon.

Roche, J. P. & Rambsey, T. W. (1993). Premarital Sexuality: A Five-Year Follow-Up Study of Attitudes and Behavior by Dating Stage. <u>Adolescence</u>, 28: 67- 80.

Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M. (1999). <u>Honor and Emotion : The Cultural Shaping of Pride, Shame and Anger</u>. Published Doctoral Thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

Roscoe, B., Diana, M. S. & Brooks, R. H. (1987). Early, Middle and Late Adolescents' Views on Dating and Factors Influencing Partner Selection. <u>Adolescence</u>, 22: 59- 68.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). <u>Conceiving the self</u>. New York: Basic Books.

Sanders, M. R., Halford, W. K., & Behrens, B. C. (1999). Parental divorce and premarital couple communication. <u>Journal of Family Psychology</u>, 13, 6074.

Schaick, A. L. (2001). The Impact of Paternal Involvement and Parental Divorce on Young Adults' Intimate Relationships. . <u>Journal of Divorce and Remarriage</u>, 36: 99- 102.

Seltzer, J. A. (1994). Consequences of marital dissolution for children. <u>Annual Review of Sociology</u>, 20, 235-266.

Shelley, S. I. (1981). Adolescents Attitudes as Related to Perception of Parents and Sex Education. <u>The Journal of Sex Research</u>, 17: 350- 367.

Scott, C. F. (2000). Sexuality in Marriage, Dating and Other Relationships: A Decade Review. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, 62: 999- 1018.

Silva, M. & Ross, I. (2002). Association of Perceived Parental Atitudes towards Premarital Sex with Initiation of Sexual Intercourse in Adolescence. <u>Psychological Reports</u>, 91: 781- 784.

Smith, T. W. (1994a). <u>Attitudes toward Sexual Permissiveness: Trends, Correlates and Behavioral Connections</u>. Menlo Park, CA: Kaiser Family Foundation.

Smith, N. F. & Grenier, M. K. (1975). English and French-Canadian Children's View of Parents. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 7: 40- 53.

Skipper Jr. J. K. & Nass, G. (1966). Dating Behavior: A Framework for Analysis and an Illustration. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28: 412- 420.

Sorenson, R. C. (1973). Adolescent Sexuality in Contemporary America. New York, World Publishing.

Sprecher, S. & Hatfield, E. (1996). Premarital Sexual Standards among U.S. College Students: Comparison with Russian and Japanese Students. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 25: 261- 288.q0

Stets, J. E. (1992). Interactive Processes in Dating Aggression: A National Study. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54: 165- 177.

Stewart, F. H. (1994). Honor. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Sunar, D. (2002). Change and Continuity in the Turkish Middle Class Family. Autonomy and Dependence in the Family: Turkey and Sweden in Critical Perspective. İstanbul: Swedish Research Institute, 217- 237.

Symons, D. (1979). The Evolution of Human Sexuality. New York: Oxford University Press.

Şirvanlı-Özen, D. (2005). Impacts of Divorce on the Behavior and Adjustment Problems, Parenting Styles and Attachment Styles of Children: Literature Review Including Turkish Studies. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 42: 127- 135.

Şirvanlı-Özen, D. (2003). The impact of interparental divorce on adult attachment styles and perceived parenting styles of adolescents: Study in Turkey. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 40: 129- 136.

Tanfer, K. & Cubbins, L. A. (1992). Coital Frequency among Single Women: Normative Constraints and Situational Opportunities. The Journal of Sex Research, 29: 221- 250.

Tanga, S. & Zuo, J. (2000). Dating Attitudes and behaviors of American and Chinese College Students. Social Science Journal, 37: 68- 80.

Tasker, F. L. (1996). Parent-Child Relationships Postdivorce and Adolescents' Involvement in Heterosexual Relationships. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 25: 137- 145.

Thorton, A. (1990). The Courtship Processes and Adolescent Sexuality. Journal of Family Issues, 11: 239- 273.

Toomey, E. T. & Nelson, E. S. (2001). Family Conflict and Young Adults' Attitudes Toward Intimacy. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 34: 49- 58.

Triandis, H. C., Botempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M. & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and Collectivism: Cross-cultural Perspectives on Self- Ingroup Relationships. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, 54: 323- 338.

Vargün, B. (2002). <u>Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi ve Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi Öğrencileri Arasında Bir Kültür Değeri Olarak Bekaret Kavramının Sosyal Antropolojik Açıdan İncelenmesi</u>. Published Master Thesis, Ankara University, Ankara.

Waller, W. (1937). The Rating- Dating Complex. <u>American Sociological Review</u>, 2: 727- 735.

Williamson, R. C. (1965). Dating, Courtship, and the "Ideal Mate": Some Relevant Subcultural Variables. <u>The Family Life Coordinator</u>, 14: 137- 143.

Yvonne, D. (2001). "When All Is Said and Done": The Impact of Parental Divorce and Contested Custody in Childhood on Young Adults' Relationships with Their Parents and Their Attitudes to Relationships and Marriage. <u>Journal of Divorce and Remarriage</u>, 35: 23- 29.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Demographic Data Sheet

YÖNERGE: Bu çalışma, sizin kendinizle ilgili bazı duygu ve düşüncelerinizi anlamaya yöneliktir. Doğru ya da yanlış cevap söz konusu değildir. Önemli olan samimi düşüncelerinizi açıklıkla belirtmeniz ve ilk tepkilerinize en uygun olan seçenekleri işaretlemenizdir. İfadeleri okuduktan sonra, bu ifadelere ne kadar katılıp katılmadığınızı 1'den 5'e kadar bir değeri seçerek, her ifadenin altında bulunan seçenekler üzerine işaretleyiniz.

(1) Kesinlikle katılmıyorum

(2) Katılmıyorum

(3) Tarafsızım

(4) Katılıyorum

(5) Tamamen katılıyorum

"Evde yüksek sesli müzik dinlenmesi, beni rahatsız etmez." gibi bir ifadeye (5) Tamamen katılıyorum diye cevap verirseniz, bu "Beni rahatsız etmez" anlamına gelir. İsminizi yazmanız istenmemektedir. Lütfen tüm soruları içtenlikle ve boş soru bırakmamaya çalışarak cevaplayın. Anketi cevaplamaya başladıktan sonra tamamlamadan bırakmakta serbestsiniz. Bu araştırmaya katkılarınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz.

1)   Cinsiyetiniz: _____

2)   Doğum yılınız:_____

3)   Bölümünüz:_____

4)   Okulunuz:_____

5)   Yaşamınızın çoğunu geçirdiğiniz yer:
a.   Metropol (İstanbul/Ankara/İzmir)
b.   Şehir _____
c.   Kasaba _____
d.   Köy _____

6)   Şu anda ne eğitimi yapıyorsunuz? Lisans___Yüksek lisans____

Doktora____

7)   Babanızın en son bitirdiği okul:
İlkokul___   Ortaokul__   Lise___   Üniversite___   Yüksek lisans___
Doktora__

8)   Annenizin en son bitirdiği okul:
İlkokul___   Ortaokul__   Lise___   Üniversite___   Yüksek lisans___
Doktora__

9)   Anneniz çalışıyor mu? Çalışıyor_____   Çalışmıyor_____   Emekli_____

10)   Anne ve babanız halen evliler mi? Evet____   Hayır, boşandılar_____

diğer:_____

11)   Ailenizin gelir düzeyini, genel olarak, aşağıdaki 7 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde

nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?

```
            1           2           3           4           5           6           7
            I------------I------------I------------I------------I------------I------------I
        Ortalamanın                      Ortalama
Ortalamanın
        çok altında                                                              çok
üstünde
```

12)   Kardeşiniz var mı? Cevabınız evetse, kaç kardeşiniz var ve cinsiyetleri neler?

        Hayır_____   Evet:_____

13)   Ailenizi tutucu olarak tanımlar mısınız? Evet_____   Hayır_____

14)   Nerede/ kiminle yaşıyorsunuz? Yurtta_____   Ailemle_____   Ev

arkadaşımla_____   Tek başıma evde_____   diğer_____

Bundan sonraki 10 soru, özel yaşantınızla ilgilidir. Cevap vermek istemiyorsanız, boş bırakabilirsiniz. Ancak, soruları cevaplamanız bu çalışma için çok yararlı olacaktır.

15) Bugüne kadar hiç kimseyle çıktınız mı? Evet_____ Hayır_____

16) Yukarıdaki soruya cevabınız evetse
a.   kaç kişiyle çıktınız?_____
b.   İlk çıkma deneyiminizde kaç yaşındaydınız? _____

17) Tek gecelik ilişkilere sıcak bakıyor musunuz? Evet_____ Hayır_____

18) Evlilik öncesi cinsel ilişkiye sıcak bakıyor musunuz? Evet_____

Hayır_____

19) Evlilik fikrine sıcak bakıyor musunuz? Evet_____ Hayır_____

20) Şu anda çıktığınız biri var mı? Evet_____ Hayır_____

21) Bugüne kadar hiç kimseyle cinsel birlikteliğiniz oldu mu? Evet_____

Hayır_____

22) Yukarıdaki soruya cevabınız evetse
a.   kaç kişiyle cinsel birlikteliğiniz oldu?_____
b.   İlk cinsel deneyiminizde kaç yaşındaydınız? _____

23) Birkaç kişiyle aynı anda çıkmaya sıcak bakıyor musunuz? Evet_____
Hayır_____

APPENDIX B

KATILIM SONRASI BİLGİ FORMU

Bu çalışma Psikoloji Bölümü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Başak Şahin tarafından yürütülmektedir. Araştırmanın temel amacı sizlerin çıkma davranışı ve evlilik öncesi cinselliğe ilişkin algıladığınız anne ve babanızın düşünce ve tutumlarıyla ilgili bilgi toplamaktır. Elde edilen bilgiler sadece bilimsel kongre ve yayınlarda kullanılacaktır. Çalışmanın sonuçlarını öğrenmek ya da bu araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak için Odtü Psikoloji Bölümü Sosyal Psikoloji Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Başak Şahin'e başvurabilirsiniz. (e-mail: basaksahin@hotmail.com).

Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Dating Behavior Scale

By the Author (2005)

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadelerin her birine ne derece katılıp katılmadığınızı, her cümlenin sağındaki sayılardan birini daire içine alarak belirtiniz.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1	Katılmıyorum 2	Tarafsızım 3	Katılıyorum 4	Tamamen katılıyorum 5

1. Eğer babam çıktığım biri olduğunu öğrenirse, çok kızar.   **1 2 3 4 5**

2. Eğer annem çıktığım biri olduğunu öğrenirse çok kızar.   **1 2 3 4 5**

3. Eğer babam çıktığım biri olduğunu öğrenirse, bilmiyormuş gibi davranır.   **1 2 3 4 5**

4. Eğer annem çıktığım biri olduğunu öğrenirse, bilmiyormuş gibi davranır.   **1 2 3 4 5**

5. Babama çıktığım biri olduğunu söylersem, bunu normal karşılar.   **1 2 3 4 5**

6. Anneme çıktığım biri olduğunu söylersem, bunu normal karşılar.   **1 2 3 4 5**

7. Eğer benden önce çok kişiyle çıkmış biriyle çıkarsam, bu babamın hoşuna gitmez.   **1 2 3 4 5**

8. Eğer benden önce çok kişiyle çıkmış biriyle çıkarsam, bu annemin hoşuna gitmez.   **1 2 3 4 5**

9. Babam çıktığım kişiyi onaylamıyorsa, onunla bir daha görüşmeme izin vermez.   **1 2 3 4 5**

10. Annem çıktığım kişiyi onaylamıyorsa, onunla bir daha görüşmeme izin vermez.   **1 2 3 4 5**

11. Babam evlenmeden önce biriyle çıkmamı onaylamaz.   **1 2 3 4 5**

12. Annem evlenmeden önce biriyle çıkmamı onaylamaz.   **1 2 3 4 5**

13. Babam romantik ilişkilerim konusunda nasıl davrandığımla ilgilenmez.**1 2 3 4 5**

14. Annem romantik ilişkilerim konusunda nasıl davrandığımla ilgilenmez**1 2 3 4 5**

15. Babam kendisiyle romantik ilişkilerimle ilgili her şeyi açıkça konuşmamı istemez.   **1 2 3 4 5**

16. Annem kendisiyle romantik ilişkilerimle ilgili her şeyi açıkça konuşmamı istemez. **1 2 3 4 5**

17. Babam çıktığım biri olduğunu akrabalarımızın duymasını istemez. **1 2 3 4 5**

18. Annem çıktığım biri olduğunu akrabalarımızın duymasını istemez. **1 2 3 4 5**

19. Babam çıktığım biri olduğunu insanların duymasını sorun etmez. **1 2 3 4 5**

20. Annem çıktığım biri olduğunu insanların duymasını sorun etmez. **1 2 3 4 5**

Perceived Parental Attitudes Toward Premarital Sexual Behavior Scale

By the Author (2005)

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadelerin her birine ne derece katılıp katılmadığınızı, her cümlenin sağındaki sayılardan birini daire içine alarak belirtiniz.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1	Katılmıyorum 2	Tarafsızım 3	Katılıyorum 4	Tamamen katılıyorum 5

1. Eğer babam çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu öğrenirse, çok kızar.   **1 2 3 4 5**

2. Eğer annem çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu öğrenirse, çok kızar.   **1 2 3 4 5**

3. Eğer babam çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu öğrenirse, bilmiyormuş gibi davranır.   **1 2 3 4 5**

4. Eğer annem çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu öğrenirse, bilmiyormuş gibi davranır.   **1 2 3 4 5**

5. Babama çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu söylersem, bunu normal karşılar.   **1 2 3 4 5**

6. Anneme çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu söylersem, bunu normal karşılar.   **1 2 3 4 5**

7. Eğer benden önce çok kişiyle cinsel ilişkisi olmuş biriyle çıkarsam, bu babamın hoşuna gitmez.   **1 2 3 4 5**

8. Eğer benden önce çok kişiyle cinsel ilişkisi olmuş biriyle çıkarsam, bu annemin hoşuna gitmez.   **1 2 3 4 5**

9. Babam çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu öğrenirse, onunla bir daha görüşmeme izin vermez..   **1 2 3 4 5**

10. Annem çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu öğrenirse, onunla bir daha görüşmeme izin vermez..   **1 2 3 4 5**

11. Babam evlenmeden önce biriyle cinsel ilişkim olmasını onaylamaz.   **1 2 3 4 5**

12. Annem evlenmeden önce biriyle cinsel ilişkim olmasını onaylamaz.   **1 2 3 4 5**

13. Babam cinsel ilişkilerim konusunda nasıl davrandığımla ilgilenmez.   **1 2 3 4 5**

14. Annem cinsel ilişkilerim konusunda nasıl davrandığımla ilgilenmez. **1 2 3 4 5**

15. Babam kendisiyle cinsel ilişkilerimle ilgili her şeyi açıkça konuşmamı istemez. **1 2 3 4 5**

16. Annem kendisiyle cinsel ilişkilerimle ilgili her şeyi açıkça konuşmamı istemez. 1 2 3 4 5 **1 2 3 4 5**

17. Babam çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu akrabalarımızın duymasını istemez. **1 2 3 4 5**

18. Annem çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu akrabalarımızın duymasını istemez. **1 2 3 4 5**

19. Babam çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu insanların duymasını sorun etmez. **1 2 3 4 5**

20. Annem çıktığım kişiyle cinsel ilişkim olduğunu insanların duymasını sorun etmez. **1 2 3 4 5**

Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale

By Miller (1986)

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadelerin her birine ne derece katılıp katılmadığınızı, her cümlenin sağındaki sayılardan birini daire içine alarak belirtiniz.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1	Katılmıyorum 2	Tarafsızım 3	Katılıyorum 4	Tamamen katılıyorum 5

1. Babamla karşı cinsle yaşadığım romantik ilişkilerim hakkında konuşurum.   **1 2 3 4 5**

2. Annemle karşı cinsle yaşadığım romantik ilişkilerim hakkında konuşurum.   **1 2 3 4 5**

3. Babam evlilik öncesi öpüşmeyi onaylar.   **1 2 3 4 5**

4. Annem evlilik öncesi öpüşmeyi onaylar.   **1 2 3 4 5**