

FATHER-SON INTERACTION AND CONSTRUCTION OF IDEALIZED
MASCULINITIES IN TURKEY

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

BY

RUMEYSA CEYLAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF GENDER AND WOMEN STUDIES

JANUARY 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

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

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Saktanber
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.

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ceylan Tokluoğlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör	(METU, SOC)	_____
Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ceylan Tokluoğlu	(METU, SOC)	_____
Asisst. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Bozok	(Maltepe Uni., SOC)	_____

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, Last name : Rumeysa Ceylan

Signature :

ABSTRACT

FATHER-SON INTERACTION AND CONSTRUCTION OF IDEALIZED MASCULINITIES IN TURKEY

Ceylan, Rumeysa

M.S. Department of Gender and Women Studies

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ceylan Tokluoğlu

January 2019, 172 pages

Construction of various masculinities is a new area of interest in comparison to other topics within gender studies. Characteristics of hegemonic masculinity are always in flux which brings about the never-ending need for analyzing the changing dynamics of gender relations which is mostly examined through the social constructionist view. The aim of this thesis is to analyze the dynamics of the father-son interaction and the construction of idealized masculinities of young Turkish adult men. The socio-cultural parameters of being a man in Turkish society will also be examined since it is through these parameters that father-son relationship and ideal masculinities become interrelated. In this familial dyad, transmission of ideas and tenets about manhood rest on idealized masculinities, revealing the importance of the interaction between fathers and sons in the construction of idealized masculinities in Turkey. In-depth interviews were conducted with twenty-four men (between the ages of 21 and 27), each lasted about an hour or more. Based on the qualitative data collected through the interviews, I mainly argue that father-son interaction is an influential source for constructing common masculine ideals among contemporary young

Turkish adult men. I also argue that the nature of this relationship is changing, moving away from more traditional forms towards a more complex and flexible one.

Keywords: Masculinities, Hegemonic Masculinity, Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities, Social Constructionism, Fatherhood

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE’DE BABA OĞUL ETKİLEŞİMİ VE İDEALİZE ERKEKLİK OLUŞUMU

Ceylan, Rumeysa

Yüksek Lisans, Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ceylan Tokluoğlu

Ocak 2019, 172 sayfa

Çeşitli maskülinite tiplerinin oluşumu, toplumsal cinsiyet çalışmalarında diğer konulara nazaran daha yeni bir alandır. Hegemonik maskülinitenin özellikleri, değişken dinamiklere sahip olması sebebiyle analiz ihtiyacı asla bitmeyen cinsiyet ilişkileri konseptinde, çoğunlukla sosyal inşacı bir bakış açısıyla incelenmektedir. Bu tezin amacı, genç yetişkin Türk erkeklerinin baba oğul ilişkisi dinamiklerini ve idealize maskülinite kurulumlarını analiz etmektir. Aralarındaki bağlantıdan ötürü, Türk toplumunda erkek olmanın sosyokültürel parametreleri konusu, baba oğul ilişkileri parametreleri ve ideal maskülinite konularıyla beraber incelenecektir. Bu ailesel ikilide, idealize edilmiş maskülinitelerin temelinde yatan fikirler ve prensiplerin aktarımı konusu, Türkiye’deki idealize edilmiş maskülinitelerin kurulumunda baba oğul ilişkisinin önemini ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Yaşları 21 ve 27 arasında değişen, 24 erkekle, her biri bir saat veya daha fazla olmak üzere derinlemesine görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Görüşmelerden elde edilen nitel verilere bağlı olarak, baba oğul ilişkisinin, genç yetişkin Türk erkeklerinin ortak maskülen ideallerinin kurulumunda etkin bir kaynak olduğu savunulmaktadır. Buna ek olarak,

söz konusu ilişkinin yapısının deęiřtięi, geleneksel formlardan, daha kompleks ve esnek bir duruma evrildięi öne sürölmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Maskülniteler, Hegemonik Maskülnite, Erkeklik ve Maskülnite Çalıřmaları, Sosyal İnřacılık, Babalık

To Mehmet and Fatih Ceylan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To begin with, I want to express my very profound gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ceylan Tokluođlu for her great support and dedication to her work. I would not be able to finish this thesis without her disciplined and calming attitude. I would like to thank the Examining Committee Members Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör and Assist. Prof. Mehmet Bozok for their precious suggestions and comments.

Mehmet Ceylan, I cannot thank you enough for raising me like that. You showed me that men also have feelings and they are not necessarily evil beings. Halil İbrahim Uzun, thanks for all of your kindness and financial support. If you weren't there, I wouldn't be able to survive.

Dad, I know that we do not have a classical father-daughter relationship. I always think that we actually have a father-son bond, and after this thesis, I'm definitely sure about that. I like the way we are though.

Ceyda, Damla, Sıla, Dilek, Demet, Öykü, Ahmet and Ömer, I would like to express all my sincere feelings to you for "keeping me sane in those years".

Mom and other women in my family, I will thank you in my other theses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	1
1.1. General Introduction.....	1
1.2. Theoretical Background.....	13
1.3. Social Construction as a Theoretical Framework	13
1.4. Social Construction of Gender	20
1.4.1. Social Construction of Masculinities	22
1.5. Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities	24
1.5.1. The Main Approaches to Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities	25
1.5.2. The Conception of Hegemonic Masculinity.....	29
1.5.3. The Main Approaches to Fatherhood.....	31
2. THEORETICAL DISCUSSIONS IN TURKEY	37
2.1. Introduction.....	37
2.2. Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities in Turkey	38
2.2.1. Social Construction of Masculinities in Turkey	39
2.2.2. Hegemonic Masculinity in Turkey	41
2.2.3. Fatherhood Studies in Turkey.....	48
3. SOCIO-CULTURAL PARAMETERS OF BEING A MAN IN TURKISH SOCIETY	52
3.1. Introduction.....	52
3.2. Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Participants and their	

Parents.....	52
3.3. Level of Education.....	53
3.4. Employment	54
3.5. Mobility.....	54
3.6. Gender Perception	55
4. PERCEPTION OF IDEAL MASCULINITIES OF YOUNG TURKISH ADULT MEN.....	63
4.1. Introduction	63
4.2. Characteristics of Perceived Ideal Masculinities.....	64
4.3. Perceived Expectations from Young Turkish Adult Men.....	70
4.4. The Sources of Knowledge of Masculinities	78
4.5. Idealized Father – Son Relationship	79
4.6. The Actual Dynamics of Father – Son Relationship	83
4.7. The Father and Ideal Man	93
4.7.1. Criticisms and Appreciations of Fathers.....	94
4.7.2. Fathers as Role Models.....	99
4.8. Approval and Admiration from the Fathers	101
4.9. Criticisms and Appreciations from the Fathers.....	104
4.10. The Effect of the Fathers on the Personality of Sons.....	107
4.11. Similarities between Fathers and Sons.....	109
5. CONCLUSION.....	111
REFERENCES	117
APPENDICES	
A: İNSAN ARAŞTIRMALARI ETİK KURULU BELGESİ/ HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL.....	148
B: ARAŞTIRMAYA GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU/ INFORMED CONSENT FORM	149
C: KATILIM SONRASI BİLGİLENDİRME FORMU/ DEBRIEFING FORM	151
D: SORU LİSTESİ/QUESTIONNAIRE	153
E: THE SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS	155

F: THE SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FATHERS OF THE PARTICIPANTS	157
G: THE SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MOTHERS OF THE PARTICIPANTS	159
H: TÜRKÇE ÖZET/TURKISH SUMMARY	161
I: TEZ İZİN FORMU/THESIS PERMISSION FORM	172

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

“In a world so vast, so fraught...

The father who does not lie is no father at all.”

Bakker, *The Aspect-Emperor Trilogy*

1.1 General Introduction

Gender is the state of being female or male. However, different from sex, gender is not related to biology; it is socially constructed. Women and men are gendered beings who operate along a masculine-feminine continuum. Masculinities are socially constructed concepts located in this continuum with different versions. To argue that femininity and masculinity are socially constructed means that society defines these roles and to address their changing nature one should analyze social structures and dynamics which vary across different cultures. Social structures, norms, and rules are complex and changing concepts in different socio-cultural contexts; they are not universal. Within all these dynamic interactions, the formation of gender cannot be assumed as a stable and unitary process. As social constructionism accepted, gender is a spectrum with its most inclusive version. Five specific features are used to examine the formation process of gender as a spectrum. These features are gender identity, gender ideals, gender roles, gender displays and gender stratification (Cohen, 2001). All of these elements and their dynamics have been studied extensively in the literature. Masculinities studies is a relatively new area compared to other areas in gender studies, such as feminist movements, sexual liberation, gender inequality in the workplace or motherhood.

Various disciplines such as psychology, sociology, philosophy, history, anthropology, biology, and literature have examined masculinities by different methodological approaches (Brod, 1987; Kimmel & Messner, 1992; Messerschmidt, 1993; Connell, 1993, 1995; Brod, & Kaufman, 1994; Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994; Sussman & Sussman, 1995; Mangan, 2003; Ratele, 2006; Messerschmidt, 2007). Critical studies on men and masculinities have been taught by academicians of women's studies or gender studies since the 1970s.

Critical studies on men and masculinities are required to define and acknowledge alternative masculinities aside the hegemonic ones. Characteristics of masculinities are determined and taught by societal norms, values, and expectations. Thus, they have various attributions in different societies. Men are forced to conform to these attributions and expectations from the moment that they began to socialize. This situation creates certain stereotypical assumptions about being a man in proper ways. These assumptions, stereotypes, and prejudices intensify gender inequality and support the hegemony of certain types of masculinities. This exclusionist attitude of gender norms defined by society makes life harder for every member of it. It does not restrict only women; it restrains men's lives by rejecting alternative ways for being a man. Gender studies need to acknowledge and examine these specific dynamics in the construction of masculinities to analyze gender spectrum and process of gender formation as a whole. Research on critical studies on men and masculinities are about hegemonic and alternative masculinities, crises of masculinities, constructions of masculinities within the structures like military or politics, fatherhood, representations of masculinities in media and literature, the politics of masculinities, physical, mental, social and occupational health of men, sexuality, and LGBTI. This thesis intends to contribute to the critical studies on men and masculinities in the Turkish context. The research is about the socio-cultural parameters of being a man in Turkey and perception of ideal masculinities of young adult Turkish men by analyzing the narratives of a group of men in Ankara. Perception of ideal masculinities and sources that shape the construction of these masculinities in the Turkish context are examined within the social constructionist

approach. In these contexts, concepts like social construction of masculinities, hegemonic masculinity and fatherhood are also analyzed. Their interpretations in current Turkish society and societal results of these practices and perceptions are evaluated. Although there have been many studies about the construction of masculinities and fatherhood in separate dimensions, only few of them focused on the specific relationship between them (Duran, 2010; Tecik, 2012; Boratav, Fişek, & Ziya, 2012). This study maintains social constructionist approach within the framework of critical studies on men and masculinities. The selected methodological approach makes it different from other studies in the same topic.

The specific findings of this thesis are not claimed to represent Turkey as a whole. The analyses and conclusions cannot be generalized for all Turkish men. There is still a need for more studies and research about critical studies on men and masculinities in Turkish academic literature. We do not have enough data about idealized masculinities and fatherhood to make comparisons between past and current tendencies in Turkey. The perception of ideal masculinities and its relation with father-son interaction has not been mentioned much in the current literature. For instance, perception about the responsibilities of fatherhood has changed from the 1960s to 2000s; it now has different interpretations in rural areas and cities (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2002). This specific example shows that even if it was studied earlier, the changeable structures of masculinities and fatherhood demands to be analyzed over and over again. Participants were selected according to some specific characteristics. They were between twenty-one and twenty-seven years of age. None of them had any children. Also, none of them were married. These characteristics of them were critical since their perception of fathering roles or fatherhood in general was the perception of childless young men. This selection criterion was necessary to understand the role of fathers as positive or negative male role models of masculinity idealization; the apprehensions of my participants were not blurred since they did not yet experience parenting.

Based on critical studies on men and masculinities, social constructionism was chosen as the methodological approach. Social constructionism was selected due

to four main characteristics (Burr, 2006). It is anti-essentialist, anti-realist, specific about historical and cultural aspects of knowledge, and focuses on social practices, processes, and interactions (2006, pp. 4-5). The underlying idea of all these aspects is that relationships between people are socially constructed, and this construction cannot be attributed to biological or innate determinants. It is a process shaped by social structures, practices, limitations, and interactions. Because of the dynamics of historically and culturally specified knowledge, we cannot talk about a direct perception of reality (2006, p. 4). Thus, we cannot argue about a single type of masculinity or a single definition of fatherhood.

At the end of the 1970s, men's studies focused on the idea of singular idealized masculinity (Tolson, 1977; Mellen, 1977; Hantover, 1978). According to this idealization process, a specific type of masculinity was highlighted, and masculinity was reduced to a limited role model. From the mid-1980s, this tendency has diminished. The concept of dominant masculinity and assumptions about its unchangeable core were questioned and challenged. Consequently, masculinity has been started to be viewed as a social construct. Different masculinity definitions and practices became the focus (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985; Kimmel, 1987; Brod, 1987) in response to the concept of hegemonic masculinity built at the beginning of the 1980s. The concept of hegemonic masculinity was first mentioned in a report written about the field studies carried out in high schools in Australia (Connell, Ashenden & Kessler, 1982). These studies aimed to affect teacher union policy, teacher education, the sociology of education, and educational policy in general. After this, Connell developed the concept of hegemonic masculinity together with his researches. Connell built this concept on Gramsci's (1971) notion of hegemony.

Hegemonic masculinity is defined by Connell (1995) as:

At any given time, one form of masculinity rather than others is culturally exalted. Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women (Connell, 1995, 77).

In the 1990s, masculinity was not seen as a universal and transhistorical category anymore. On the contrary, it was seen as a social construct that should be studied by focusing on the narratives and experiences of subjects in specific contexts. In 1993, the name of the journal *Men's Studies Review* was changed as *Masculinities*. This specific example shows us the changing academic tendencies and approaches in masculinities concept. We can also see the changes among topics of critical studies on men and masculinities since the 1990s. The focus was along different dimensions such as socio-economic status, race, religion, age, and education level within the frame of masculinities (Gilmore, 1990; Messner, 1992; Donaldson, 1993; Rotundo, 1993). As Clatterbaugh (1998) wrote, this change shows us that the meaning of masculinity has changed considerably. It was basically seen as a universal concept that has particular limits. After the 1990s, masculinities were conceptualized as a more complex phenomenon with changing dynamics.

The resources and limitations of the notion of hegemonic masculinity have shaped the history of critical studies on men and masculinities (Türk, 2007). There are different definitions about the notion of masculinity. From essentialist approaches to positivist perspectives, there are many different approaches to define the traits and characteristics of masculinities. As Clatterbaugh (1998) asserted, masculinity is not countable and cannot be categorized easily. Thus, there are many different descriptions and interpretations of masculinities.

Fatherhood is also a concept that has been studied by many different disciplines by different approaches. Fatherhood, the interaction between fathers and their children, and effects of being a father on the psychology of men are still popular topics in areas such as developmental psychology and social psychology. It has also

been studied through different sociological approaches within the framework of masculinities studies.

According to the data from Levtov and her colleagues (2015), nearly 80 percent of men will become biological fathers at some point through their lives. The rest of them also will have interaction with children in different social roles as members of society. Interpretation and practice of fatherhood have a prominent effect not only on children and mothers but also on the lives of the men and fathers themselves (Johansson, & Andreasson, 2017). Involvement of fathers in family life has changed in recent years. Prominent social and political changes in the global area such as new family structures, altered sexual politics, and alteration of the labor markets had remarkable effects on the transition of fathering practices (Johansson, & Andreasson, 2017). In different cultures, new parenthood styles that involve increased father involvement have been developed. In these new parenting styles, equitable caregiving has been aimed. With the rise of new family interactions and systems, traditional family patterns disappear. Within this context, also parenting practices and fatherhood beliefs are changing. These socio-cultural transformations should be evaluated by including individual experiences and practices of fatherhood. Plural masculinities concept should also be included at this point. There are different ideas about how to be a good father. Fatherhood shapes in an area that gathers personal experiences, socio-cultural and socio-economic values. These social dynamics affect the construction of personalities within their interrelated structures. In the social construction of personality context, masculinities and fatherhood are the notions that are connected to each other. Practices, limitations and possibilities of masculinities and fatherhood are specific to cultures. Fatherhood is shaped by experiences, practices, requirements, and expectations of societies. In most of the societies, fathers are expected to take breadwinner role in families, and they involve with their children in indirect ways. In industrialized societies, a father may not be able to see his child for months because of his job (Levai, Kaplan, Ackermann, & Hammock, 1995). On the other hand, in preindustrial societies like

the Aka, father's involvement with his child has been demonstrated as direct care by spending approximately eight hours a day with his offspring (Hewlett, 1991).

Fatherhood may have a great effect on a man's life. On the other side, some fathers may refuse to take responsibilities of their children and deny the duties of parenting. It is also known that there are single fathers who bring up their children alone without a maternal figure or a partner. Also, there are divorced fathers who choose to stay connected with their children or cut off communication with them. It is understood that fatherhood is more than having a biological offspring. It should not be evaluated as a homogenous entity. Fatherhood has attributions such as direct paternal care, indirect paternal care (Gray & Anderson, 2010), interaction with other family members, domestic work (Johansson, & Andreasson, 2017), and providing economic stability and security (Seccombe, 1986) within the conception of masculinities. The notions of masculinities and fatherhood are not identical. Still, fatherhood cannot be explained without including the dynamics of masculinities (Johansson, & Andreasson, 2017). In some situations, fatherhood defines and shapes significant elements of the masculine subject formation. For some men, fatherhood may be the essential way to express their masculinities in its entirety (Pittman, 1993). Still, the notion of masculinity has a broad area that includes many other aspects of the lives of men.

Qualitative research method was used for collecting information about the socio-cultural parameters of being a man, perception of ideal masculinities and fatherhood. For the field study, in-depth interview method was chosen. Forty-six questions were asked. Fourteen questions were structured and aimed to get the sociodemographic characteristics of participants. Rest of the questions were open-ended. For providing mutual understanding, trust and empathy, the interviews were made in comfortable, silent atmospheres. Each of the interviews lasted about an hour or more. The structure of open-ended questions affected the length of interviews. Each participant focused on a different aspect of masculinity or fatherhood. All researchers experience different conditions in the field. As a woman researcher in the field of critical men and masculinities studies, my experience is also different from

others. There are some points that I want to state here to help future women researchers in the same field. As a woman researcher studying the characteristics of masculinities and fatherhood, some participants were suspicious about my attitude towards men in general. Some admitted that they thought I would act in an unfriendly manner. Most of the participants claimed that they thought I would criticize them. After a while, they started to talk comfortably and share their ideas, thought, emotions and experiences with me. It is important to build the trust relationship between participants and researcher at these kinds of studies. Some of the participants were more eager to talk than other participants. These factors were also effective in terms of providing different types of contents. Still, I cannot claim that the thoughts, emotions, and experiences of the participants are objective and straight. In the end, it should not be forgotten that these kinds of studies are based on personal experiences. While sharing those experiences and thoughts, factors such as gender, ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds of the participants and the researcher are important. Gender of the researcher is especially important as it can affect the way participants explain themselves and their experiences based on their gender. I can easily claim that if I would be a man researcher, arguments and ideas of the participants would change. Still, I do not think that their arguments would be totally opposite. For instance, while describing the characteristics of a bad man, all of the participants started with domestic violence and told me that a bad man beats his wife and children. If I were a man researcher, maybe they would mention that characteristic later. In addition to these, I believe that semi-structured interviews are very useful for these kinds of study areas. Giving the space to the participants is very important for getting accurate data. Although the sample size might be considered as small, comprehensive information about the socio-cultural parameters of masculinities in the Turkish society, the changing perception of ideal masculinities and the transformation of fatherhood were acquired parallel to the previous studies in the literature on masculinities.

The field research of this study was done in Ankara which is the capital of Turkey. Ankara is one of the biggest cities in Turkey with a crowded population and

an advanced economy. The literacy level of the city is high. There are sixteen universities in Ankara. Since all of the essential state structures such as the Grand National Assembly of Turkey and ministries are located in Ankara, the city is known as the capital of politics and bureaucracy of Turkey. According to the 2017 Turkish Statistical Institute data, the total population of the capital is 5,445,026. Ankara is a diverse city in terms of its socio-cultural values, socio-economic statuses and different levels of education of its population. The interviews were carried out in February 2018. Twenty-four men participated in the research. Snowball sampling was used to contact them. All of the participants were young adults whose ages ranged from 21 to 27. They were single and never got married. None of the participants were parents. Sound recording was used in all of the interviews with the participants' permission. The first interviewee was reached through the social media. He guided me to his friends and provided me with new contacts. All of the participants lived in different districts of Ankara. Thirteen participants were undergraduate students and two were graduate students at the time. Nine participants held Bachelor's degree. Nicknames used in this study to preserve anonymity and confidentiality were picked by the participants themselves.

In the first chapter social constructionism within gender studies will be introduced. Social constructionism is the basis of this thesis since it supplies an extensive framework for theoretical explanations and discussions. Social constructionist theory has a critical approach to accepted ways of perceiving the world. It challenges conventional knowledge that is accepted as unbiased and objective (Burr, 2006). Basic methodological approaches of traditional science such as empiricism or positivism are not used as reference points in the methodology of social constructionism. Social constructionism does not accept the assumption that observing people is enough for accurate data. So, it denies using observation as a method in gender studies and rejects the dichotomous gender system. Critical studies on men and masculinities are the second foundation of the theoretical background of this thesis. The historical progress of critical studies on men and masculinities and primary approaches to masculinities will also be outlined. Connell's concept of

hegemonic masculinity and the development of this notion in critical studies on men and masculinities literature will be analyzed accordingly. Lastly, the main approaches to fatherhood will be introduced in this chapter. Related to plural masculinities framework, diverse perceptions of fatherhood will be presented and evaluated.

Chapter Two will focus on the theoretical discussions in Turkey. Critical studies on men and masculinities in Turkey will be outlined and summarized. There has been a considerable increase in the critical studies on men and masculinities after the 2000s. In the Turkish academic literature, studies of critical studies on men and masculinities mostly focus on the military, the psychology of men, employment and masculinity, LGBTI, and the media representations of men and domestic violence (Dalkanat, 2001; Türkmen, 2004; Akça, 2006; Ovacık, 2008; Özbay, 2010; Koçer, 2012). There are also studies about the relationship between fatherhood and masculinities (Sever, 2002; Duran, 2010; Tecik, 2012). All of these studies focused on different aspects of fatherhood by using different scientific approaches. Still, there are unexamined issues and relationships in the field of critical studies on men and masculinities in the Turkish context. Adaptations and usage of Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity with reference to Turkish men will also be introduced. Lastly, main approaches to fatherhood and some of the major studies about the father-son relationship in the Turkish context will be outlined in this chapter.

Chapter Three begins with the sociodemographic characteristics of the participants and their parents including their age, place of birth, marital status, level of education, and their occupations. This section is about the socio-cultural parameters of being a man in Turkish society. These parameters are analyzed under five subtitles. These subtitles are level of education, employment, mobility, lifestyle habits and gender perception. Gender perception will be discussed under three subsections. These are perceived gender differences, advantages of being a man and disadvantages of being a man.

An introductory discussion about the above mentioned themes is important to sketch the line of reasoning in this study. To begin with, level of education is one of

the factors that shape masculine traits. Connell (1989) claimed that education has indirect impacts on the construction of masculinities for men from different socio-economic backgrounds. According to this study, the process of constructing masculinities can be provided by different ways such as conflicting with the authorities of educational institutions or preferring rational and responsible ways of projecting mobility. For this reason, perceived role and importance of education should be taken into account in the construction process of masculinities. Similarly, employment is another prominent theme in the lives of young Turkish adult men. It is seen as a requirement for a man to prove himself to his family and society. Parallel to previous findings, a recent report on the crisis of masculinity (Welford & Powell, 2014) presented the relationship between employment situation and general well-being of men. According to this report, loss of a job is mostly perceived as a threat to one's masculinity. Most of the men in the study admitted that they feel responsible for financial matters and they should be the main breadwinner in the family. These findings are parallel to the previous studies in the Turkish academic literature (Imamoğlu, 1992; Braun, 2001; Açıksöz, 2016) which is also supported by the findings of this thesis. Connected to level of education and employment, mobility was one of the most mentioned topics in the interviews. According to the feminist theory, gender and mobility cannot be separated, and they impact each other in indirect ways (Hanson, 2010). As Hanson mentioned in the same article, complex social problems such as sustainability should be examined by considering the interaction between gender and mobility. Also, in the Turkish society, mobility is one of the issues where gender difference is still salient (Secor, 2002; Healy, Özbilgin, & Aliefendioğlu, 2005; Rankin & Aytaç, 2006). Especially from the participants' narratives about their family lives, it can be said that gender difference shows itself in various areas such as occupation, education and urban mobility.

Chapter Four focuses on the perception of ideal masculinities of young Turkish adult men. Firstly, characteristics of perceived ideal masculinities will be introduced. Since the definition of ideal masculinities has always changed, their defining characteristics will also be in a constant state of flux. Parallel to the notion

of multiple masculinities, we cannot talk about a fixed masculinity type that has been validated all over the world. Also, we cannot argue that there is a fixed masculinity type for Turkey. The masculine ideals have been affected by different dynamics such as the political and economic situation of the country, social transformations, and perceived internal and external threats throughout the history of Turkey. Within this context, the current perception of idealized masculinities will be analyzed in detail. Then, perceived expectations from young Turkish adult men will be presented. Before analyzing societal expectations, duties and perceived status of men will be briefly outlined to get a clear picture. The sources of knowledge of masculinities will be analyzed in this context. The role of family and paternal figures in the families will also be mentioned. Idealized father and son relationship will be analyzed in the following section. The definition and dynamics of an ideal relationship between fathers and sons will be discussed in the same section. Then I will introduce the actual dynamics of father and son relationship, and based on the answers of the participants, I will categorize various forms of relationship between fathers and sons. This categorization is based on specific concepts such as hierarchy, respect, friendship or affection. After presenting the ideas about an ideal relationship, a comparison between fathers and the ideal man will be made. Criticisms and appreciations of fathers will be analyzed in this context. Positive and negative personality characteristics of fathers will be analyzed under the title of Fathers as Role Models. Approval and admiration from fathers, topics that fathers approve or admire about their sons, and the importance of these approvals and admirations for sons will be analyzed in this section. Following these topics, criticisms and appreciations from fathers will be discussed. The effect of these criticisms on the construction of masculinities of the participants will be evaluated. Lastly, I will discuss the effect of fathers on the personality of their sons based on the perceptions of the participants. To see the overall effect of all of the factors introduced above, similarities between fathers and sons will also be analyzed. Although the similarity of personality traits does not mean that there is a direct causality, this discussion will provide important clues about the actual interaction between fathers and sons.

The conclusion chapter will summarize the results and arguments of this thesis. Contributions and limitations of the study will be mentioned. Finally, some suggestions will be made about future research on this specific topic.

1.2. Theoretical Background

A discussion of social constructionism will be provided in this chapter. Gender and masculinities studies use the social constructionist approach as the basis of their analysis. The nature of social constructionism allows social disciplines to evaluate the process of construction of gender from a different perspective; questioning reality and truth is the central focus of this approach. In this context, the dynamics of the social construction of reality and gender will be evaluated, followed by a discussion of social construction of masculinities. Then, the main arguments of critical studies on men and masculinities will be outlined and summarized. In this context, the conceptualization of hegemonic masculinity and fatherhood will be provided. These specific concepts are evaluated as the central concept in the construction of diverse masculinity types. In the reproduction process of these masculinities, fatherhood is assumed to play an essential role. The socialization process in the construction of masculinities will be discussed in this specific context with reference to the main approaches to fatherhood.

1.3. Social Construction as a Theoretical Framework

There is no single description of social constructionism. According to Burr (2003), the theory is based on four main qualifications. Firstly, social constructionism challenges conventional knowledge. Knowledge is defined as conventional when it is based on neutral observation of the world with an objective approach. Other approaches used in traditional science such as empiricism and positivism assume that the world can be observed and the truth about it can be revealed. According to this assumption, existence requires perception. However, social constructionism supports the idea that people should act cautiously about their assumptions on the appearance of the world. What people perceive may not equal to the existing real divisions. Secondly, social constructionism has historical,

geographical and cultural specificity (Burr, 2003, p. 3). People understand the world through concepts and categories. These notions which people use to interpret the reality are culturally, geographically and historically specific. They depend on the place and time that people live. People's understandings are evaluated as outputs of geography, history, and culture where specific economic and social adjustments dominate a given culture at a certain time period. One's way of understanding cannot be considered any better than other ways of interpreting the reality. Thirdly, social constructionism accepts that knowledge is produced by social processes. Knowledge cannot be acquired from the essence of the world; it is socially constructed by people. An accepted comprehension of the world is not derived directly from the objective observation of the world. On the contrary, it is practiced by sharing different types of knowledge among people in daily life. Lastly, knowledge and social processes complement each other. These shared understanding of the world can show itself in various forms. Thus, we cannot claim that there is a fixed, singular form of social construction. Multiple social constructions lead to different types of activities. In sum, definitions and productions of the social world maintain specific types of social activities and eliminate marginalized others (Burr, 2003).

Social constructionism is anti-essentialist (Burr, 2003). Since it accepts that the social world is simply a product of social processes, it rejects the idea of fixed, given nature of people. People are not born as who they are; rather, they become who they are.

Social constructionism is also anti-realist. It denies the equation of knowledge is perception. The theory accepts that people construct their unique versions of reality within their own societies and cultures. If relativism of knowledge is accepted, the concept of truth becomes questionable. Because of its anti-realist approach, constructionism does not accept the existence of the objective fact. Knowledge is produced through different approaches and perspectives and it serves some activities more than others. Social constructionism can be evaluated as radically different from other approaches in social sciences and humanities. Social constructionism rejects the idea of one and only truth derived by direct observation.

In this sense, it holds a radically different approach when compared with other mainstream perspectives in social sciences and humanities (Burr, 2003).

Social constructionism acknowledges the historical, geographical and cultural specificity of knowledge. The descriptions, explanations, and theories within social sciences are also culturally bounded. The assumption of a universal fact that can be applied to all cultures throughout history is not acceptable for social constructionism. According to the social constructionist approach, searching for the truth of people or social life is not an achievable target. Rather, the historical developments of contemporary types of social practices should be examined. Thus, social constructionism prefers to concentrate on social interactions and practices. The focus of sociology has been on the social structures such as the economy or the family shaping the nature of interactions between people. Moreover, social structures have been seen as the sources of the social phenomena that people perceive. Social constructionism refuses this approach and claims that the social interactions and social practices should be the source of information. Since the source of inquiry is those interactions, they should be the center of attraction. Social constructionism explains the notions within the dynamics of social interactions and practices. Since knowledge is seen as the product of these specific processes, it is accepted as an action rather than a property (Burr, 2003, p. 4).

The social constructionist framework has been used in different disciplines of social sciences and humanities such as sociology, social psychology, anthropology, history, sociolinguistics, and literary theory (Burr, 1995; Brickell, 2006). Thus, there are various different approaches to social constructionism. In psychology, Gergen and Gergen (1984, 1986), Sarbin (1986) and Shotter (1993) made essential contributions to the field of social constructionism. While Shotter focused on the interpersonal dynamics of construction, others examined the construction of personalities in the form of stories or narratives (Burr, 2003). In contemporary social psychology, social constructionism is used to define the social dynamics that create individuality or to denote a type of linguistic determinism (Brickell, 2006).

In sociology, the influence of Berger and Luckmann's (1966) and Holzner's (1972) works are seen in the formation of the constructionist approach. According to this approach, whole social and cultural reality is seen as related to social activities and experiences that are carried out unitedly (Segre, 2016). Its validity and reliability are not questioned since this reality is taken for granted. By this way, objective existence occurs. The common point of Berger, Luckmann, and Holzner is their theoretical references to symbolic interactionism concept of Mead (Stryker, 1980), and phenomenological sociology of Schutz (Segre, 2016). Berger and Luckmann focus on the structure of meanings in both objective and subjective terms, while Holzner concentrates on the situational and directional sides of society (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Holzner, 1972). In this thesis, Berger and Luckmann's (1966) approach is used as the theoretical base.

The social constructionist approach can be evaluated as both nonpsychologicistic and nonsociologicistic. According to Berger and Luckmann (1966), the advantage of this approach is its applicability to the issues of social action and institutions in the context of institutionalization, legitimation, and objectivation. The specific reasoning about knowledge of this approach in relation to individual identity and social construction supplies an essential filling view for disciplines such as sociology and psychology.

According to Berger and Luckmann's (1966) social constructionist approach, the reality is a structure that is demonstrated, interpreted and shared by common members of society. This reality has been produced in the thoughts and activities of people and provided as actual by them. By this way, the realistic world has built up intersubjectively. In sociological analyses, this personally significant and consistent reality is taken as the focus point. Additionally, the social constructionist approach accepts the biological aspect of human behavior and claims that people are biologically coded to create and occupy the world with other people. This world that has been created and occupied defines, shapes and limits the reality. According to Berger and Luckmann (1966), social reality is also effective in shaping functions of organisms. Society decides the manner of activities and expressiveness of organisms.

It can be seen in the functioning of nutrition and sexuality. Although these activities are based on biological urges, they also have plasticity (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, pp. 202-203). Limitations and directions of these activities are constructed by societal rules and norms. One cannot eat everything s/he wants to appease or cannot have the sexual release with anyone s/he wants since there is a bilateral limitation between society and organism (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 203).

According to the social constructionist approach, the existence of people is acknowledged by communication and interaction with other people (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Although people share a common world, their perception and attributions are different from each other. Thus, the multiplicity of reality has been accepted by the social constructionist approach. Still, this difference does not change the fact that there is a common sense of reality. The reality of daily life is assumed as reality. No further verification is needed for this assumption since the presence of the reality of everyday life is considered as enough. The reality of daily life is apprehended as an arranged reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, pp. 27-36).

Until an interruption occurs, the reality of daily life is accepted as unproblematic. This interruption is combined with the unproblematic sectors of everyday life by the instructions of rational knowledge. Rational knowledge used in everyday life, on the other hand, is constructed in spatial and temporal terms. Berger and Luckmann (1966) define this spatial and temporal structures as peripheral and intersubjectively available (p. 40). Related to this definition, common knowledge and shared reality is possible. Social relations are also included in this shared knowledge and reality. These shared concepts are evaluated as sources providing detailed information to people about how to act in certain spheres in everyday life. Again, Berger and Luckmann (1966, p. 89) claim that schemes, roles, and typifications are all created and maintained in the reality that is socially constructed. These typifications include all types of natural and social actions and experiences. Until a disruption or an error occurs, the validity and reliability of personal knowledge, thus common knowledge, is not challenged. Relevance defined by pragmatic benefits of people is used to construct and empower this knowledge.

Another point that Berger and Luckmann (1966) focused on is the social distribution of knowledge. According to this concept, knowledge is distributed differently and possessed by different types of people in various ways. This distribution is also claimed to create different spheres in the social construction of typifications, roles, and thus, society. It divides people into groups as insiders and outsiders in the concept of reality. The distributed knowledge is assumed as objective and valid truth while it is internalized by members of a certain groups. This same knowledge is transferred to the next generations in the form of objective and certain truth. It is used in the formation of the personality of an individual. In this way, certain types of identities, thus, certain types of people are created.

Social processes construct identity. Identity is defined, shaped, distorted and maintained within the context of social relations. Identity formation and maintenance that are created through social processes are also defined by social structures. There are social constructions that can specify some gender identity variations historically (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, pp. 194-200). These variations can be recognized in cases individually. These “typifications” that society created are used in “orientation and conduct” in everyday life. Observation and assertion of these identity variations verify or “refute” themselves. According to the social constructionist approach of Berger and Luckmann, identity is a product of the relationship between the individual and society. Still, they assert that identity types are comparatively fixed social constructs that are defined within social reality (1966, pp. 194-196).

The possibility of everyday life is seen as related to this shared, common knowledge. This common knowledge is socially distributed in terms of its relevance to people and social groups. The possibility of everyday life as related to shared, common knowledge is socially distributed in terms of its relevance to people and social groups. Thus, acquired knowledge is usually seen as the knowledge that is the subject of interest. Common knowledge exists with subjective and objective reality. The questioning of reality directs sociologists to social constructionist approach. When theories of identity are integrated into a wider theory of reality, we need to

understand the logic behind the theory of reality. The social construction of reality has been provided by institutionalization. The core of this institutionalization is the social guidance of activity. Generally, institutionalized actions that society assumes habitual and purposeful are exemplified as objective reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 77). The institutional world is seen as legitimate, and this legitimation has its sources in the typification process (Berger & Luckman, 1966). This institutionalization does not include all common knowledge. There are different types of knowledge that people produce between themselves or transmit to the next generations. These differences of the common knowledge divide institutionalization into segments; thus, into sub-universes of meaning (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 102). Each type of knowledge has its legitimacy and boundaries that reject outsiders (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 104). According to Berger and Luckmann (1966), symbolic universes can be defined as an integrated structure that is created with diverse parts of meaning and contains the institutional order in a symbolic entirety. On the other hand, symbolic processes are defined as the processes that refer to other realities than individuals' daily experiences.

Symbolic universes produce meanings after they objectify and accumulate knowledge (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 115). This symbolic universe concept is important since it produces cognitive construction in historical and social contexts (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 110). Its affirmation is maintained by dominant groups which have specific types of ideologies and activities. This situation creates a hierarchy among realities. The possibility of hierarchy among different types of masculinities and the concept of hegemonic masculinity is produced within this specific context of the hierarchy of realities. The symbolic universe is self-sustaining until it becomes problematic. This problematic situation usually occurs with a challenge of a deviant or marginalized group that confirm other or alternative perceptions and conceptions of the symbolic and social orders. As a result of this challenge, a different symbolic universe may occur. This new symbolic universe has a unique style for institutionalizing the common knowledge. These new conceptions of meanings may be integrated into the main order. Therefore, pluralistic concepts

and multiplicity are seen in most of the modern societies. There are diverse interpretations of objective reality. Still, society is considered as a subjective reality (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 149). This subjective reality of society is produced and maintained by the processes of primary and secondary socialization.

Primary socialization is a process that harmonizes individuals to perceive the world. By this way, the reality that is constructed subjectively is assumed as a consisted and valid one. In this socialization process, individuals learn by imitating and adopting the roles and actions of significant others by various emotional and cognitive mechanisms. Secondary socialization includes a wider adoption and imitation process. In this socialization type, individuals internalize the institutional world and its subsegments. Also, the function of secondary socialization is to create a self-maintaining and meaningful identity. A consolidated reality concept can be internalized and maintained in this way (Berger & Luckman, 1966).

There are various institutions which demonstrate that the reality is rooted in consciousness in very different ways (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 194). The social distribution of knowledge steps in and make individuals regulate their individual needs to sustain a united explanation for reality. If there are some kinds of conflicts between primary and secondary socialization processes, re-socialization may be unsuccessful. Availability of diverse subjective identities cause these conflicts mentioned above. Although there are many different explanations available for the concept of identity crisis, social constructionism theory defends the idea that these conflicts are simply results of extreme or radical transformations of social structures (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, pp. 194-198).

1.4. Social Construction of Gender

To understand the social construction of gender, one should start with the definitions of sex and gender. Sex is defined as a system of biological reproduction whereas gender is accepted to be culturally constructed (Hurley, 2007, p. 98). Sex is considered as related to nature while gender is evaluated to be connected with nurture. None of them can be evaluated as the only responsible agent in the construction of individualistic characteristics. Rather, sex-related inclinations based

on biological features and genetics should be examined through the concepts of gender norms and cultural expectations (Fausto-Sterling, 2015, p. 3). Biological evidence may be helpful to describe the universality of gender differences or gender inequalities, but evidence in social scientific disciplines alters this universality (Aronson & Kimmel, 2014, p. 27). Although the effect of genes, hormones and other biological factors cannot be ignored, these elements cannot provide sufficient explanations about social mechanisms and processes that lead to specific individual preferences in terms of gender relations (Fausto-Sterling, 2015). As Fausto-Sterling (2015) found in her research that cultural expectations may have some biological consequences. Cultural and social factors may affect the physiological development of children. If girls and boys are raised in specific ways to meet the gender norms of society properly, their physiological growth will also be coherent. As Fausto-Sterling (2015, p. 4) claimed in her article, this is the point where nature and nurture are no longer distinct. They can be evaluated as a developmental unit.

Other perspectives such as radical feminism, sex-role theory, Marxist and socialist feminism are claimed to ignore the apparent demonstrations of agency (Messerschmidt, 2009). They were unable to combine micro and macro levels in the context of gender construction. Messerschmidt explains that gender is not a possession. Rather, it is a way of interaction. According to Messerschmidt, specific social situations connect with distinct types of gender constructions. He accepts that sex categories provide a source for individuals to act in specific masculine or feminine manners; thus, gender and sex are considered as equivalent most of the time. Perception and validation of being male or female are also affected by these interpretations of gender and sex categories. These perceptions and validation of gender influences the practices of individuals and lead them to act in certain manners. Still, these practices may not always be conscious (Martin, 2003). As Messerschmidt adds, accountability may encourage them to perform in particular gendered ways in specific contexts (2009, p. 87).

As also Chodorow (1995) claimed, gender cannot be evaluated only as linguistically, politically, psychologically or culturally constructed. Rather it is a

combination of all of these factors within the context of power relations. Chodorow (1995) evaluates gender in feminist theory, thus gives importance to the culture concept and supports the idea that gender cannot be evaluated without including cultural factors. Chodorow criticizes contemporary and classical theories as they examine masculinity and femininity as the essence. She claims that this situation leads universalized and essentialized assumptions about gender and gender roles.

Social constructionist approach to gender allows us to leave nature versus nurture dichotomy and provides a different and more proper understanding. Concepts such as hegemonic masculinity or the multiplicity of masculinities should be examined within the frameworks that provide an anti-essentialist point of view.

1.4.1. Social Construction of Masculinities

Social constructionism defines gender in its very specific ways. Masculinities are included and examined within gender concept. Just as gender, also masculinities are more fluid, more variable and diverse than biological theories would have asserted (Connell, 1995; Aronson, & Kimmel, 2014). Before examining the social construction of masculinities, biological explanations for masculinities, thus, the function of testosterone should be given.

Testosterone is a sex hormone that is assumed to be connected with masculinity as it boosts the growth of male sexual features and found to be responsible for changing brain functions and producing aggression (Archer, 1991; Van Anders, 2013). Usually, males are found to have higher rates of testosterone in their blood circulation (Zitzmann & Nieschlag, 2001). Also, they are found to be more aggressive than females (Persky, Smith, & Basu, 1971). Still, the cause-effect relationship between aggression and testosterone was not clear. Sapolsky (1997), found that testosterone does not cause aggression. It just boosts the existing aggression. Rather than hormone itself, the social conditioning is the more important factor in the expression of aggression (p. 24). In the same article, Sapolsky claims that the tendency to hold hormones and genes responsible for certain actions is simply reductive. This reduction is dangerous as they can be used as excuses for the behaviors of individuals. It supports the idea of boys will be boys (p. 25). Another

point that Sapolsky made is that the genetics or biological factors of actions are meaningless without a social context. At the very moment, the social construction of masculinities comes into play.

Gender and masculinities cannot be examined separately as one of the concepts is the source of another and vice versa. Rather, they are in a continuum that affects each other with the diverse interpretations of cultures, history, ideals, power relations and cumulative knowledge (Herz, 2018). Thus, the relationship between them is far more than stable and peaceful. Tension and conflicts between the constructions of these two concepts are inevitable.

There are various explanations for discussing gender differences from different scientific disciplines. For instance, anthropology has a tendency to explain gender differences based on the sex-based division of labor (Aronson, & Kimmel, 2014). Anthropologists focused on the hunter role of men throughout history while sociologists studied the breadwinner role and its defining quality in the construction of masculinities. All of these approaches can be evaluated through the broader concept of social constructionism as all of them accept the fact that masculinities are not innate. They are constructed throughout history, under different socio-economic and cultural situations. As Herz (2018) explained in his article, masculinity is not a stable concept that can be inherited or somehow transferred from one generation to the next (p. 1). As Archer (2003) asserted, masculinities should be examined as relational identities that are shaped and constructed in daily life. Although boys and men actively perform these specific masculinities, they have a tendency to consult already available contexts of masculinities (Mac an Ghail, 1994). By this way, there are multiple types of masculinities. Some of them have universal counterparts in diverse cultures at different times throughout history. Economic provider role of men can be given as an example to this particular situation. On the other hand, as the dynamics that affect the construction phase of masculinities are always changing, constructions themselves are also always in a fluidity. Thus, a stable and constant masculinity type is not possible. As Berger and Luckmann (1991) also claimed, a stable notion of masculinity is problematic since individuals are active agents who

continuously socialize in their lifetimes. The learning process is also continuous. In addition to the learning process, there is a gendered position of questioning masculinities. This questioning makes individuals to constantly defend their behaviors, emotions, and thoughts within the context of masculinities (Wernesjö, 2014). It also creates a perception of threat to the one's reflection of his own masculinity. The situation itself is one of the main reasons for continuing change of masculine traits.

To sum up, masculinities is a concept that is open to change and cannot be pinned down (Johansson and Haywood, 2017; Herz, 2018).

1.5. Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities

Critical studies on men and masculinities have an essential role in feminist theory and gender studies. Gender justice cannot be provided without studying this specific issue (Gardiner, 2004). The importance of critical studies on men and masculinities can be described as quoted:

In masculinities studies, it can be claimed that paradigm exists that a project aiming to improve the well-being of “women” by targeting “men” (Doyle, 2002, p. 192).

By rejecting some needs of basic human nature such as showing and accepting one's emotions or being vulnerable, hegemonic masculinity has been aiming to create strong, thus insensitive tyrants who would try to dominate and humiliate the rest of the gender spectrum. As well as feminine side, other types of masculinities are also targeted of this act of domination and humiliation. Hegemonic masculinity has been marketed as an idealized form of a man. The characteristics of the ideal man have been changed along years, among countries and different cultures. It does not have a fixed nature. There are a lot of different dynamics behind its changing structure. The common point of all these hegemonic masculinity throughout the human history is its oppressive and restrictive qualities. Hegemonic masculinity is mainly extolled since it has monopolized the economic provider role in the society. From prehistoric times to the 21st century, the most basic expectation from men has been providing food and shelter for the other members of the clan or

society. Men have been accepted as the dominant and controlling side with such power they have been attributed.

One of the main aims of gender and women's studies is to raise women's awareness of oppression by societal norms and rules and to educate them to resist oppression or change those so-called ideal conceptions of gender. Even if this goal is achieved, gender equality cannot be attained only by focusing on one side of the coin. The whole spectrum of gender should be included for this ideal. Thus, to raise awareness of men about the hegemony of specific kinds of masculinities and to show them the oppressive elements that limit their lives are also as important as other aims of gender and women's studies.

1.5.1. The Main Approaches to Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities

There are four main approaches to critical studies on men and masculinities. Firstly, biological theories and models examined the "innate" distinctions caused by the biological features of women and men. These instinctive differences were thought to be the reason for different social acts related to sex. The main problem about biological assumptions is their essentialist core. These can be easily interpreted as political prescriptions. In other words, what is normative may be defined as what is normal (Kimmel & Messner, 1992).

Secondly, anthropological theories and models analyzed the concepts such as masculinity and femininity in a cross-cultural context. They focused on the different attributions about masculinity and being a man in different countries, at different times. Gender distinctions have been claimed to be originated from cultural adaptations to the surroundings. Another argument is that culture precedes the demonstration of the fluidity of gender (Kimmel, 2000).

Thirdly, psychological theories and models studied gender and its specific roles attributed to women and men. This group of people argued that there are different development stages for women and men. Still, their attributions were parallel with gender stereotypes and criticized by some psychologists like Gilligan (1982). Also, Chodorow (1978) claimed that these distinctions that were thought to be "innately developed" were socially constructed; thus, they were able to change.

Fourthly and up to now, sociological theories and models emphasized the dynamics behind how girls and boys had been socialized according to sex-appropriate behaviors (sex roles) that were related to biological sex. Sociologists had attempted to collect attributes, acts, and attitudes proper for women and men. While femininity was seen to be related to emotional expressiveness, nurturance, passivity, and relatedness, masculinity was associated with characteristics such as aggressiveness, competitiveness, and bravery.

Though each of these fields made an enormous contribution to concepts of masculinity and femininity, analyzes of them are restricted and cannot explain how gender performs in various cultures at different times. The biggest criticism against all these fields was made by feminist scholars. In different social science disciplines, feminist scholars made studies to disclose ignored ideological beliefs behind the findings of the researches in gender studies.

Women's studies programs started to develop a different approach for the study of gender in the early 1970s. They did not make any assumptions about gender beforehand. Also, they did not compare women and men in terms of intelligence or development. First researches that were straightly affected by feminist criticism were presented in the mid-1970's (Kimmel & Messner, 1992). The book *Men and Masculinity* (Pleck & Sawyer, 1974) introduces psychological and sociological research that reveal how performance anxiety and hiding emotions limit men's capacity in terms of working and loving freely. *The Male Machine* (Fasteau, 1974) is a book that analyzes the myths about masculinity and their destructive effect on the societal level. *The Liberated Man* (Farrell, 1974) evaluates men's liberation within the frame of feminism. It focuses on the advantages of feminism for men. *The Forty-Nine Percent Majority* (David & Brannon, 1976) is one of the first books that discusses hegemonic masculinity without using the term. *A Man's Place* (Dubbert, 1979) examines identity-formation. By outlining the changing dynamics of male roles, Dubbert introduces the idea of multiple masculinities indirectly. *The American Man* (Pleck & Pleck, 1980) added an evolutionary dimension to the existing arguments on masculinities by adopting a historical perspective. In *The Myth of*

Masculinity (Pleck, 1981), there is a literature review on male roles since the 1930s. Pleck suggests that the sex role strain paradigm can be described as a reevaluation of sex role stereotyping. He also defines hegemonic masculinity by asserting the problematic and unreachable nature of idealized male sex roles.

Masculinity was seen as dominant compared to femininity. Old-fashioned gender norms created and maintained the dominance of masculine characteristics over feminine characteristics (Schippers, 2007). First studies on masculinities that were mentioned above challenged the existing gender ideology. They recognized the relativity of the definitions related to gender traits and identities.

The contemporary approach to critical studies on men and masculinities is shaped around hegemonic masculinity and multiple masculinities. The diversity of critical studies on men and masculinities should be acknowledged to understand the dynamics of men's lives. Rather than comprehending masculinity as a singular identity, we need to see the variations among different masculinities from different socio-economic statuses, from different cultures, and at different time periods. Previous research focused on the only version of masculinity, which was considered as hegemonic masculinity for a while. Subjects of the previous research were white, heterosexual and middle-aged men. They were also members of the middle-class (Kimmel & Messner, 1992). These characteristics had been idealized. Men of color, gay men, and working-class men, disabled men, older and younger men were separated from the definition of the ideal man. They were seen as divergent and problematic (Pyke, 1996; Schippers, 2007). Thus, they were evaluated as representing subordinated or marginalized types of masculinities. These theoretical claims recreated the power relations. As a result, different types of masculinities were kept at subordinate levels. The dominant version of masculinity became the normative definition of masculinity (Kimmel, 2000). However, the dominant and hegemonic description of masculinity was challenged by members of subordinated and marginalized masculinities, by men from different ethnic origins, men of color and gay men. As a result of these challenges, now we can argue that we cannot talk

about a singular type of masculinity. Various men produce various types of masculinity.

This notion of multiple masculinities was internalized in the 1980s. *Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity* (Carrigan, Connell & Lee, 1985) was written to analyze the politics of masculinity in realistic terms. They argued that masculinity cannot be understood without including disciplines like psychoanalysis, history, sociology, and movements such as feminism, contemporary socialism, and gay liberation. *Gender and Power* (Connell, 1987) is the first structured framework for the social analysis of gender and sexuality. In addition to Connell's (1987) work, *The Gender of Oppression* (Hearn, 1987), *The Making of Masculinities* (Brod, 1987) and *Changing Men* (Kimmel, 1987) were accepted as the four main works that helped the development of theoretical approaches to masculinities (Townsend, 2010). *Studying Men and Masculinity* (Ford & Hearn, 1988), *Masculinity and Power* (Brittan, 1989) and *Sexism, Racism, and Oppression* (Brittan & Maynard, 1984) are the other studies that analyze masculinities within the frame of social theory. They contributed to the masculinities studies by examining its relations with other structures such as racism.

Recent critical studies on men and masculinities have focused on the social construction of masculinity. Masculinities are socially constructed; thus, meanings of them are not created in an isolated space according to this approach. It is related to a larger social system and it is learned through socialization: "Men are not born; they are made" (Kimmel & Aronson, 2003, p. 17).

In general, the definition of masculinity cannot be universal or transhistorical, and it is not determined by biology. On the contrary, it is constructed actively in a social, cultural and historical framework. As it can differ between various cultures, it can also change within one culture by time. The definition of manhood in the 1920s and the definition of manhood in the 2010s in Turkey have many different elements; we cannot talk about a singular Turkish man. Also, it is not possible to claim that Turkish men are born with specific genes that make them a certain kind of people. They have been socialized in various ways, under different economic, social and cultural conditions, at different time periods.

1.5.2. The Conception of Hegemonic Masculinity

Although a singular and universal masculinity type does not exist, the definition of the predominant qualities for a hegemonic masculinity style is possible. The characteristics of hegemonic masculinity is also not fixed; it can also change. Still, there is a given pattern in the context of gender relations (Türkoğlu, 2013).

From the end of the 1970s, the focus of critical studies on men and masculinities was to study the idealized masculinities and define the dynamics behind these idealizations. According to this approach, a specific perceived type of masculinity was put forward. In this way, various other types of masculinities were reduced to a particular role model (Türk, 2007). According to Türk, the problematic side of this tendency of critical studies on men and masculinities was the emphasis on a de facto type of masculinity that ignores the notion of power in general. From the mid-1980s, the tendency in the critical studies on men and masculinities has changed. The idea of a fixed and unchangeable definition of masculinity has been converted to the acknowledgment of multiplicity of masculinities. The social constructionist approach to masculinities had an essential role in this change. By this way, alternative and different ways of becoming a man have been examined in detail. In the 1990s, subjectivity and specific factors behind the construction of masculinities have been accepted. The concept of masculinities has been saved from generalizations, and the attributions of universality have been left by the academic community. As Clatterbaugh (1998) claimed, masculinities are so complex that they cannot be reduced to a singular role model. As a result of this change in critical studies on men and masculinities studies, other factors that affect the construction of masculinities came to the forefront. The concept of masculinities has been started to be examined within the context of larger power relations. At the very moment, the concept of hegemonic masculinity was formulated on firm ground. In the literature, hegemonic masculinity was firstly mentioned by Connell (1982) in a report about the young people in a high school in Australia. The hegemony concept was taken from Gramsci's notion. Hegemonic masculinity is defined by Connell (1995) as:

At any given time, one form of masculinity rather than others is culturally exalted. Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women. (Connell, 1995, p. 77)

Hegemonic masculinity concept has affected most of the theoretical work circulating presently in the critical studies on men and masculinities. Connell (1995) emphasizes the idea of fluidity of hegemonic masculinity and the elements that mobilize and dignify this structure. Although it is not the most typical type of practiced masculinities, the majority of men support hegemonic masculinity as it provides the subordination of others, mostly of women. Connell defines this term as the patriarchal dividend (p. 82). According to her, the patriarchal dividend is the essential factor that mobilizes a specific type of masculinity and acknowledges its hegemony. According to Hearn (2007), hegemonic masculinity is a successful theoretical tool since it can define the categories of multiple masculinities in a structure and examine their relations and interactions with each other. This situation reveals the fluidity of gender identities and power relations. According to Coles (2009), justification of hegemonic masculinity concept is provided by gender relations and challenges. Gender relations and challenges include the positions of femininities and alternative types of masculinities to hegemonic masculinity. Within the context of power relations, these elements are arranged in a hierarchy. While defining the alternative types of masculinities, reductionism must be avoided (Beynon, 2001). As Connell emphasizes, the relations between the various types of masculinities should be studied. Other factors such as socio-economic status, race, age, ethnic background et cetera should also be included in the examining of these relations. Similarly, Coles (2009) argues that the relations between the different types of masculinities include patterns of subordination and dominance. Personal backgrounds such as race, age or economic status may be effective in the construction of this hierarchy (Connell, 1995). However, as Coles mentioned in the same article, the borders of this hierarchy is not rigid, and they are open to challenge by subordinated layers.

In addition to all these, it should be known that not all men experience hegemonic masculinity in the same way. The term is used to define male power on a structural level. Still, power relations should be clarified in these specific contexts. Also, the variety of masculinities should be acknowledged. Understanding, perception, and experience of masculinity are different for all men.

1.5.3. The Main Approaches to Fatherhood

Family is the first social institution that individuals meet with social norms, ideals, and expectations. Cultural values and societal rules are transmitted through language to children. Family can be described as a basic prototype that imitates the social hierarchy within the society. It has two essential organizational functions. Firstly, a family creates a structure that gives power and authority to the oldest member. Secondly, a family constructs a division of household labor based on sex. Usually, husbands are older than wives, and they take the breadwinner role. On the other hand, women are younger, and they take the housekeeper role. By this way, authority is automatically given to men. In a family, the father represents the authority and state. He decides for the family and represents the family in public.

As a sociological concept, fatherhood has been studied over the past twenty years. It is rather a new topic when compared to motherhood. While the main theoretical approaches to fatherhood will be summarized in this section, a brief history of fatherhood will also be provided.

In the 17th and 18th centuries, the economy of Europe and America was mainly based on agriculture. Households were structured according to this economic condition. In this family-based production pattern, all members of family worked together (Coltrane, 2004). Both parents took the responsibility for the care and education of their children (Coltrane & Galt, 2000). Fatherhood in the 18th and 19th centuries has been studied by historians such as Stearns (1979), Griswold (1993) and Gillis (1997). According to their studies, fathers were more intimate with their children than formerly thought. As Gillis (1997) found, before the 19th century, fathers showed great interest in the daily care of their children and participated actively in childbirth. The ideal and common father model was a nurturing and

present one. This model was also related to the economic conditions of the time. Boundaries between work and home were blurred; thus, the parent had more chance to spend time with their children in daily life. With the industrial revolution, boundaries between work and home were made clear and distinct. Thus, the structure of the family and the roles of parents also changed dramatically. Before the 19th century, father figure was as related as mother figure with the concepts of family and home. They were not assumed to be absent or strangers in their own houses. Even though the direct care for infants were still provided by mothers, fathers were also active in the education and training of their children (Coltrane, 2004). According to Pleck and Pleck (1997), fathers were held responsible for the acts of their children in the public sphere, as they were seen as the head of the family and a moral supervisor. The distinction between mothers and fathers in terms of emotional availability and nurturance was different then (Johansson & Andreasson, 2017).

In the 19th and 20th centuries, home-based production disappeared. Market economies replaced them. The main role of the father was transformed to be the only economic provider of the family. The direct relationship and interaction between the father and the family decreased. Rather than emotional involvement, financial support was seen as the primary duty of a good father (Coltrane, 2004). It was especially valid for middle-class families. The influence of other factors such as race was observable during this transformation period. Many of the African American, Asian American, and Latino men were unable to take the economic provider role. Contrary to white, middle-class women, the women from these various ethnic backgrounds had to work to contribute to the economy of the family (Dill, 1988).

When it comes to fatherhood, one of the major topics that have been examined was the dual role of fathers in the family context. Fathers have been seen as economic providers and as intimate members of the family (Johansson & Andreasson, 2017). Although there are studies that categorize the roles of fathers according to different time periods (LaRossa, 1997; Lorentzen, 2013), it is not possible to talk about a general pattern. The economic conditions of the period were seen as the cause determining the primary role of the father in the family. Still, this

periodization approach is useful to emphasize disruptions or apparent changes in the dynamics between families and fathers. Influence of class, nationality, ethnic background, welfare state systems and other determinants should also be considered when examining fatherhood (Griswold, 1993; McDaniel, 1994). There were various styles of fatherhood throughout history. Most of the historical studies about fatherhood practices have focused on the families in North America and Europe (Coltrane, 2004). These studies emphasized the behavior of men in families, their ideas, and actual fathering practices (Griswold, 1993; Kimmel, 1996; LaRossa, 1997; Pleck & Pleck, 1997). Coltrane and Parke (1998) claim that fatherhood concept was assumed to be linear and continuous in the previous studies. This understanding of fatherhood caused over-generalization of the concept based on the experiences and practices of the white and middle-class fathers (Coltrane, 2004).

In the construction of masculinities, family and fathers take essential roles. Nearly 90 percent of men marry, and approximately 90 percent of them become fathers (Snarey, 1993). This ratio includes alternative ways to be a father such as using reproductive technologies or adoption. Also, all fathers are not married. Most of the first-time fathers are in their twenties or thirties (Lerman, 2009). To sum up, being a father is a frequent experience. Fatherhood is a fixed status. Once a man is a father, he will always be a father. Thus, being a father is a self-defining concept for men. Being divorced or being physically distant from his child does not change the fact that he is a father. Still, there is a distinct difference between the construction of fatherhood and motherhood. As Benson (1968) claimed, woman constructs their perception of gender and most of their personalities based on motherhood. On the other hand, men learn how to be a father later. The knowledge and instructions about fatherhood usually come from other women or children.

According to Marsiglio and Pleck (2005), there is an intersection between fatherhood and masculinities in various ways. The definition and functions of fatherhood should be known to examine the intersection. Usually, fathers are not seen as the primary caregiver. The nurturer role is generally seen as related to mothers. Still, some fathers may be the only or primary caregiver. For the larger

proportion of fathers, it can be said that they are secondary parents (Dowd, 2000). A considerable number of fathers are absent and do not take the economic provider role as well. Another point that should be added is the lifestyle patterns of fathers. Unlike mothers, most of the fathers are not full-time parents. Usually, their daily live routines do not change after they become parents. For instance, they do not feel obligated to leave their jobs to take care of their children. Nurturing children is not a common practice among fathers (Mackey, 2012). Fatherhood can be categorized in two dimensions in terms of nurturance. The common and dominant style is the father who does not involve in the caretaking process of his children (Gerson, 1993). The second style is the father who involves in the nurturance of his children. The second style of fatherhood is rather a new one, and growing recently.

Four main classifications of fatherhood will be summarized to analyze the recent changes. Firstly, Rotundo (2006) claims that there are two main periods for fatherhood in the United States. The first period is described as patriarchal fatherhood that existed between the years 1620 and 1800. The second period continued from 1800 until the present day. While differentiating these two periods, Rotundo analyzed the socio-economic and socio-cultural factors of both periods. A new category that is named as androgynous fatherhood period was added by Rotundo following economic growth and increasing divorce rates. Fathers in the latest category are more involved than others in the nurturing process. They are also more included in the socialization of their children. Androgynous fathers are mostly members of the upper class. They have a more egalitarian attitude in the context of gender equality (Tecik, 2012).

Secondly, Lamb (1987) divides fatherhood into four main periods. In the first period, the primary role of the father was seen as being the moral supervisor. Especially in religious education, fathers were seen as responsible parents. The second period starts with the industrial revolution. The primary role of fathers was seen as economic providers. Breadwinner role was constructed during this period. In the third period, sex-role model and construction of specific gender perceptions were produced. Fathers were seen to be responsible for transmitting masculinity

characteristics to their sons and teaching them manners. Lastly, in the fourth period, nurturing father role was constructed in the late 1970s. This was seen as an evolutionary step by Lamb (Tecik, 2012). Fathers are now active agents in the children involvement processes.

Thirdly, Pleck (1987) divides fatherhood into three main periods. According to Pleck, fathers are categorized as moral overseers, distant breadwinner and sex-role model (pp. 83-93). The first period lasted from the 18th century to the earlier periods of the 19th century. Fathers were held responsible for moral tutoring. The perception of women was also effective in this type of responsibility of fathers. Women were seen as more irrational, emotional and weak than men. Thus, men were seen as capable of childcare. The second period lasted from the earlier periods of the 19th century to the mid-20th century. Major economic changes in the world have shaped this period; capitalism has grown globally. Men were seen as economic providers. By this way, distant breadwinner type emerged. With the effect of decreasing involvement of fathers, mothers became the more active parent in the child care processes. Still, final decisions were made by fathers (Tecik, 2012). The third period was between 1940 and 1965. Sex role father model was constructed in this period. Because of the World War II, most of the fathers were absent. This situation led to significant changes in the family structure. Gender roles of parents in terms of paternity and maternity were made definite.

Fourthly and lastly, LaRossa (1988) divided fatherhood into two main categories. LaRossa did not focus on the stereotypical definitions of fatherhood as Lamb, Pleck, and Rotundo did. He claimed that fatherhood should be analyzed under two topics: the culture of fatherhood and conduct of fatherhood (pp. 451 – 452). The culture of fatherhood includes general principles and perception of fatherhood. Conduct of fatherhood includes the behavior of fathers toward their children. The culture of fatherhood can be influenced by socio-economic changes and has a flexible structure. On the contrary, the conduct of fatherhood resists social changes and has a rigid structure (p. 452).

Fatherhood has been classified into different categories by different approaches as discussed above. Usually, the economic conditions have been the most influential factor in shaping the primary roles of fathers in the family. Perception of gender roles and gender equality, other socio-cultural elements such as religious beliefs are also influential in determining the duties of a father.

Now, I will provide the theoretical discussions in the Turkish context of critical studies on men and masculinities.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL DISCUSSIONS IN TURKEY

2.1. Introduction

Following the discussions on the theoretical background of social constructionism, critical studies on men and masculinities, and fatherhood, I will provide a summary of the major theoretical debates in Turkey about similar issues. In the Turkish literature on critical studies on men and masculinities, there is a gap in terms of using or adopting the social constructionist approach. However, it is still possible to introduce some works inspired by social constructionism, which I will refer to after discussing the history of the critical studies on men and masculinities studies in Turkey.

Even though the critical studies on men and masculinities have not been studied intensely until the 1990s in Turkey, the topic has now become an essential area for attention in gender studies. In Turkey, there are many academic pieces of research about critical studies on men and masculinities. The critical studies on men and masculinities in the Turkish context mostly focus on topics like hegemonic masculinity, fatherhood, military, the psychology of men, employment and masculinity, LGBTI, and the media representations of men and domestic violence. Here, I will limit the scope of my discussion to main studies on hegemonic masculinity and fatherhood.

In the process of social construction of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey, the ways masculinities and fatherhood intersect is essential. In the Turkish family structure, fathers are seen as the head of household. With the changing dynamics of economic conditions and alterations in the Turkish Civil Code, privileges of men in the family structure have been abolished legally (Sancar, 2009). Responsibilities and

rights were equally distributed between the spouses to provide gender equality in marriage. Still, men are seen to have the right for gaining and spending money in Turkish society (Sancar, 2009). Thus, economic provider role is still primal and valid for most of the Turkish fathers. Fathers are seen as the authorities of families related to this situation. They make most of the important decisions. In general, Turkish fathers are the representatives of authority and hegemony. When considered from this point of view, construction of hegemonic masculinity related to fatherhood concept is understandable.

Below, I will first outline some of the major works in the critical studies on men and masculinities based on the social constructionist approach in the Turkish academic literature. Then, I will summarize the major publications on hegemonic masculinity and fatherhood.

2.2. Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities in Turkey

Although the critical studies on men and masculinities have been a compelling field of study in Europe and North America since the 1980s, the development of gender studies followed a slower pace in Turkey. Compared to women's studies, critical studies on men and masculinities have been developing recently. Critical studies on men and masculinities in the Western literature have been affecting the Turkish scholars since the 1990s. Globalization and post-modernization were effective in this development. Firstly, some of the main works on critical studies on men and masculinities were translated into Turkish. Segal's (1990) book about the changing dynamics of masculinity, Connell's (1990) book about gender and sexual politics in relation to the state, Zarit, Schmitt and Sofer's (1991) book about sexuality among Muslim men, Lloyd's (1996) book about the gender dynamics in the philosophical approach, Zilbergeld's (1999) book about the sexuality of men, and Cohen's (1990) book about manhood were some of the major pieces translated into Turkish at that time. A few books were written about the issue by some writers such as Atabek (1989), Parla (1990), Işık (1998), Şenlikoğlu (1999), and Mater (1998). One of the major pieces *Cariyeler, Bacılar, Yurttaşlar* was written by Kandiyoti and Bora in 1997. Also, a field study on gender roles and attitudes of

men was conducted in Eskişehir (Onaran, Bükler & Bir, 1998). Although there was little interest in the society and academy toward masculinity studies, publications about critical studies on men and masculinities continued to grow. Since the late 2000s, books about domestic violence (Kudat, 2007), media and masculinity (Sezgin, 2007; Erdoğan, 2011), social construction of masculinities (Saraçgil, 2004; Düzkan, 2006; Sancar, 2007; Kuruoğlu, 2009; Boratav, Fişek & Ziya, 2012; Tekelioğlu, 2012), the military (Yamak Ateş, 2012), sexuality and sexual health of men (Eker & Şimşek, 2006; Hattat, 2010; Eroğlu, 2011) were written. Besides these publications, there are many theses about critical studies on men and masculinities in the Turkish academic literature. These studies will be examined further in the following sections.

2.2.1. Social Construction of Masculinities in Turkey

As I mentioned in the introduction of this section, it is hard to tell when social constructionism has been adopted by Turkish scholars. I will now introduce some of the major works that use the social constructionist approach in the field of critical studies on men and masculinities. Although some of them did not mention social constructionism as their main approach, all studies will be included. Feminist theory is the theoretical background in most of the publications mentioned here. In the context of gender studies, most of the feminist approaches also adopted social constructionism using its basic principles. Although many scholars and graduate student studied gender issues, works of Sancar (2007; 2009; 2013; 2014), Beşpınar (2014; 2016), and Bozok (2009; 2011; 2012; 2013; 2018) appear as the major publications specifically on critical studies on men and masculinities. However, there are other important contributions in the field. For example, the master thesis of Barutçu (2013) is about the social construction process of manhood in Turkey. Çayırılı's (2012) thesis is also about the perception of manhood in Turkey within the contexts of circumcision, military service, and marriage. The social construction of masculinities has especially been studied in relation to the military (Sinclair-Webb, 2000; Altınay, 2004; Biricik, 2008; Kuloğlu, 2011; Açıksöz, 2012; 2017; Sünbuloğlu, 2013; Yüksel, 2013; Aktaş, 2014a; 2014b; Öztan, 2014). Other contexts

such as violence (Şentürk, 2013), social media and internet (Alemdaroğlu & Demirtaş, 2004; Akbaş, 2012), LGBTI (Ertan, 2008; 2009), circumcision (Barutçu, 2015), religion (Tuksal, 2004), and politics (Okan, 2003; Özbay, 2010) were also examined by academicians and graduate students. Among these studies, I especially want to focus on two works that are closely connected to the subject of my thesis: Sancar's (2009) book, *Erkeklik: İmkansız İktidar (Masculinity: Impossible Power/ Men in Family, Market and Street)* and Bozok's (2013) doctoral thesis, *Constructing Local Masculinities: A Case Study from Trabzon, Turkey*.

In her valuable work *Erkeklik: İmkansız İktidar*, Sancar (2009) gives detailed information about various masculinities and manhood experiences of men in Turkey in the context of power relations. Sancar acknowledges the diversity and multiplicity of masculinities in the Turkish context. She claims that this diversity has been constructed in relation to socio-economic status, ethnic background, religious sect, age, occupation, and physical characteristics (p. 301). According to these factors, men are categorized into different segments of masculinities hierarchy. Despite diverse features and different kinds of masculinities, one specific type of masculinity identity may demonstrate itself as the natural and only type of masculinity (Sancar, p. 301). Sancar claims that to understand the dynamics of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey, strategies of its production and practices of masculine dominance should be understood. According to Sancar, Turkey is a country that has been transformed from geriatric patriarchy to a model that supports the breadwinner role for men (p. 301). This transformation process, which is related to changing economic dynamics, alters power relations between different types of masculinities. In Turkish culture, there has been unquestionable respect for elders, especially for the oldest man in the family. As Sancar explains, this situation has been transformed due to shifting subjects about economic power. Being the main economic provider has made younger men the authority of families (p. 302). Industrial capitalism affects the hegemonic relationship of masculinities and changes the dominance and subordination relations between them (p. 302). On the other hand, Sancar describes the frictions of paternities within the context of responsibilities required by the pre-modern

paternalistic authority type. These frictions create chaotic and blurred situations that leave younger men unprotected when they are confronted by new or threatening situations. All of these dynamics construct different types of masculinities; thus, the hegemonic structure of masculinities has been continuing to change throughout history.

Bozok's (2013) doctoral thesis is about the social construction of masculinities in Trabzon. He used the pro-feminist approach in this thesis. His theoretical background was also based on the acknowledgment that masculinities are contextually and socially constructed within the complex socio-cultural and economic dynamics. These dynamics which constructs and shapes masculinities in the Trabzon case is described as expressiveness of emotions. These emotions can be evaluated as follows: manly, authority of men in the family as the leader of household, men's relations with sex workers named 'Natashas' in that specific local area, exclusionist attitude towards LGBTI people, rightist political attitude, fanaticism of *Trabzonspor* (a football club) within the contexts of Turkish nationalism, Islamism, and conservatism (p. 218). Besides these factors, Bozok mentions the changes in the historical characteristics of the Eastern Black Sea region to explain the socio-economic and cultural dynamics from a wider frame. Although Bozok specified some elements in the construction of masculinities in Trabzon, he does not generalize his findings to include all of the male members of the whole city. In the most general sense, Bozok describes the form of masculinities in Trabzon as patriarchal and conservative. In accordance with the principles of social constructionism theory, he notes that these factors are related to that specific geographical area at that specific time period.

2.2.2. Hegemonic Masculinity in Turkey

Construction of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey has been studied by many scholars and graduate students (Yüksel, 1999; Çiftçi, 2001; Atay, 2004; Süreya, 2004; Barutçu, 2013; Erdoğan, 2013; Özbay, 2013; Çelik, 2016; Hünler, 2016). The concept has especially drawn attention in academic circles in the 2010s. Hegemonic masculinity in Turkey has been studied from different perspectives within different

contexts. These contexts were combined in an article by Özbay (2013). Özbay (2013) defines hegemonic masculinity in Turkey by describing it in nine different contexts. These contexts are militarism and army, body and age, place, class, popular culture, religion and sect, politics, sports, and heterosexuality. In this section, these nine contexts will be summarized while describing the construction process of hegemonic masculinity in Turkish culture.

The military has been a very essential and defining institution for the construction of masculinities in the Turkish culture (Sinclair-Webb, 2000; Altınay, 2004; Biricik, 2008; Kuloğlu, 2011; Açıksöz, 2012; 2017; Sünbülüoğlu, 2013; Yüksel, 2013; Aktaş, 2014a; 2014b; Öztan, 2014). From primary school to the compulsory courses in the universities, the military victories of Turkic states are the main focus of history classes. Most of the important leaders of Turkish history are men and have a militarist background. Another point that should be emphasized is the military service in Turkey. It is obligatory for every Turkish man when they turn 21 years old. Military service in Turkey is described as ‘national service’. Soldiers are called Mehmetçik (which literary means in Turkish Little Mehmet). It is a loving and a warm way of referring to Turkish soldiers (Kilford, 2014). From statements such as “Every Turkish man is born as a soldier”, it is possible to infer the importance of military service in the construction of masculinities in Turkey (Altınay, 2004). In the 1980s and 1990s, military academies were administered by high scores in the exams (Özbay, 2013). As Sinclair-Webb (2000) claimed, when it comes to gender or masculinities in Turkey, the Turkish army is seen as the most effective institution in the construction process of masculinities.

Body and age is another essential factor in the construction of hegemonic masculinity. Healthy, middle-aged men are always favored in Turkey. Younger, economically dependent men and older, sick men are mostly excluded by the hegemony of the favored ones. As Özbay (2013) claimed, for hegemonic masculinity to be hegemonic, men must be effective enough to look powerful and authoritative. They should not be dependent on others in physical, emotional or economic terms. Middle-aged men are usually the most suitable ones to fulfill these characteristics.

According to Thompson (1994), authority and most of the societal instructions are attributed to the old men in underdeveloped and small countries. In these kinds of societies all kinds of potency and authority are held by old men (Özbay, 2013). As I mentioned earlier, Sancar (2009) talks about a transformation from geriatric patriarchy to a model that supports the breadwinner role for men. In transnational, post-industrial and knowledge-based societies, authority was taken from wise old men and given to healthy, fit, self-sufficient, younger men who are adaptive to the technological developments (Özbay, 2013). When older men lost their hegemony in the hierarchy of masculinities, they become marginalized. To reinforce their authoritative status, members of hegemonic masculinity ridicule these older men by referring to their impotence (Walsh, 2010). In response to this, old men have been trying to prove themselves and created a medical sector especially for andropause (Erol & Özbay, 2013; Kampf, Marshall, & Petersen, 2013).

The place can be described as the concept referring to where masculinities are constructed and shaped. Hegemonic masculinity sets some standards and limits that let their members to exist, work, and contact with others at specific places. There are three main types when it comes to the concept of place. Firstly, there are places that exclude women or accept them only as guests (Özbay, 2013). Football stadiums, mosques, mines, and barracks are examples to such places (Beattie, 1996; King, 1997; Magubane, 2002; Brown, 2008). Although women may be accepted to some of these places to a certain degree, these places are accepted as men's places. Secondly, there are places that women and men share. These places may be divided according to a division of labor. The borders between men and women are clear and not blurred. Social codes of actions are predetermined. Strip clubs are one of the examples for this category (Price-Glynn, 2010). Except for these two categories, there are four main places where everyday life is constructed: home, workplace, means of transport, and streets. These places are shared by men and women (Massey, 2013). Hegemonic masculinity set the rules for men and even for women about what to do at home, and which actions are acceptable at specific places. Home is usually seen as feminine and a closed place while other external places are seen as

masculine, dominated by men. Thus, social mobility works on behalf of men in Turkey. Especially in small towns, this kind of discrimination can be seen apparently (Kıray, 1964). There are still some other places where women are not allowed to go out without a male company especially in the small towns of Turkey. Gender inequality in education is also another result of this segregation (Rankin & Aytaç, 2006). When this situation is challenged by women in bigger cities, they may face sexual harassment (DeSouza, & Solberg, 2003).

Before describing the dynamics of hegemonic masculinity in the context of class, Özbay (2013) questions the definition of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey. While Bozok (2013) defines hegemonic masculinity through conservatism, fanaticism, and nationalism in Trabzon, Tecik (2012) analyzes the construction of hegemonic masculinity within the frame of fatherhood in Eskişehir. Sungur (2011), on the other hand, focuses on the construction of hegemonic masculinity through perception of honor in Adana. All of the examples are evidence for the argument that there is no singular definition of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey. Even during the same time period, different geographical regions and different cultures demand different qualities for a masculinity style to be hegemonic. Özbay claims that hegemonic class does not define hegemonic masculinity in Turkey. The highest economic class and richest men in Turkey do not define the characteristics of hegemonic masculinity. If class would be the only factor that shapes the construction of hegemonic masculinity, it can be claimed that white-collar masculinities have been idealized and became normative (Özbay, 2013, p. 194). Still, this is an issue that must be investigated extensively by including other socio-cultural factors such as religious belief, perception of gender equality and marriage, attitude toward politics and state, sexual experiences, and consumption patterns.

The relationship between hegemonic masculinity and popular culture has been studied broadly (Mort, 1988; Horrocks, 1995; Newkirk, 2002; Jung, 2010). Özbay (2013) claimed that popular culture has a temporary effect on the construction of hegemonic masculinity. To illustrate the influential masculinity figure in the media, he gives the example of Acun Ilıcalı (p. 195). Ilıcalı is still an influential

character in the Turkish media. Besides, TV serials and movies are also claimed to be influential on this process. TV serials are preferred over movies in Turkey. The dominant characters in these serials certainly shape the behaviors of young Turkish adult men. Özbay refers to *Kurtlar Vadisi*, *Ezel*, and *Kuzey / Güney* to illustrate some of the influential characters at the time he was conducting his research (p. 195). The masculine themes in those TV serials mostly influenced a specific group of men. Nowadays, the same applies to serials like *Diriliş: Ertuğrul*, *Söz*, *İsimsizler*, *Savaşçı* and *Börü*. However, we need to explain the difference between the earlier TV serials and the recent ones. In the recent serials, the emphasis on Turkish nationalism and militarism is very apparent. Although *Kurtlar Vadisi* had nationalist themes, subjects of the serial were the mafia who tried to secure justice illegally. The themes in the serials such as *Söz*, *İsimsizler*, *Savaşçı* and *Börü*, rest on the recent past of Turkey where nationalist and militarist themes are emphasized. However, this time all acts done legally under the control of the state. Subjects are all connected to the army or to state institutions. This difference between the two kinds of serials can be seen as the consequence of the traumatizing political events in Turkey's recent past. Increased terror attacks and the perception of threat from both inside and outside the country have affected and shaped the representation style of the media. Thus, lawless ways to construct masculinities are no longer supported in the media. Still, hegemonic masculinity is still being constructed through popular culture, this time by promoting legal and controlled ways.

In Turkey, the effect of religion and sects in the daily lives of people has increased in the recent past. Religion has always been an essential factor in Turkish culture in terms of identity. In Minor Asia, Turkic states believed in Tengrism. As a consequence of trade and wars with Arabs, most of the former Turkish states have converted to Islam. In both religions, men were seen as the regulators in the society, and they were held responsible for the protection of their families and societies. By this way, they became the authorities and made the final say. As the hegemonic masculinity concept, a singular definition for all Muslim men in the world is also not possible (Gerami, 2005; Lahoucine, 2006; Ouzgane, 2006; De Soudy, 2015). It is not

even possible to describe a unity about the perception of Islam in Turkey. There are different sects in Islam; most of the Turkish citizens are Hanafi (Subaşı, 2014). The second widespread sect is Shafiism (Subaşı, 2014). However, most of the religious debates take place between Hanafis and Alevis which has silent reflections in politics. There are no studies about Hanefism and Alevism as being sources for different types of masculinities.

Politics is defined as the most effective factor in the construction of hegemonic masculinity by Özbay (2013). Özbay claims that Atatürk formed the idea of a new and proper male citizenship and portrayed himself as a role model to promote this ideal. Thus, he laid the foundation of an ideal style of Turkish hegemonic masculinity. Atatürk was also a leader with a military background, and was accepted as the founding father of the new republic. However, he mostly affected educated urban men. Men in small villages of Anatolia remained uninfluenced in terms of their masculine identities. (p. 197). After all, the mechanism of hegemonic masculinity does not include all members of the society. For a specific type of masculinity to become the hegemonic one, other types of masculinities should be degraded or marginalized. Other types of masculinities such as complicit or marginalized ones are expected to obey the rules of idealized hegemonic masculinity. In the example of Atatürk, male members of the new republic were expected to adopt the new manners and rules to be good citizens. To illustrate, the wearing of the fez and turban (*sarık*) were officially banned in 1925. At the same year, the parliament passed a law that made wearing Western-style hats mandatory for all male citizens, including the civil servants. Although these kinds of interventions did not aim to construct a new and modern type of Turkish hegemonic masculinity, they did have an indirect effect on its construction. By marrying and supporting gender equality in his marriage, Atatürk promoted this idealized masculinity style which he symbolized as the modern Turkish leader. After Atatürk, other political leaders such as B. Ecevit, A. Menderes and T. Özal became effective in the construction of other specific types of masculinities. As Özbay also claims, R. T. Erdoğan has been the most effective model of masculinity among the others.

Politics and hegemonic masculinity in Turkey are now mostly studied with reference to President R. T. Erdoğan who symbolizes a more conservative-traditional and nationalist type of hegemonic masculinity (Korkman & Açiksöz, 2013; Sünbülüoğlu, 2013; Turam, 2014; White, 2014; Keskin 2016; Arjomand, 2017). This trend is also related to the fact that studying masculinities recently have been popularized in the Turkish academic literature.

Sports have not been studied extensively in relation to gender relations and masculinity in Turkey. When it comes to the relationship between sports and hegemonic masculinity in Turkey, football comes to mind first (Biricik, 2011; Alpan 2013; Nuhurat, 2013; Çakmak & Çelik, 2016; Nuhurat, 2017; McManus, 2018). Most of the schools in Turkey do not have official teams. They also do not have the required capacity for forming sports teams. Some upper high class and privileged schools pay more attention to sports. Thus, football or other sports are usually seen as informal activities to have fun among homogenous male groups. Fanaticism is an important element of the issue although other dynamics are involved; fanaticism cannot be attributed only to a special group of men. Also, fanaticism is not special to a specific socio-economic status or to a specific age range. Interest in football might be seen as an undeniable factor in the construction of hegemonic masculinity. However, this has become less important since other sports such as basketball or martial arts such as kick-box or taekwondo have gained much popularity recently.

Lastly and most importantly, heterosexuality is the core element in the construction of hegemonic masculinity. This situation is mainly caused by the marginalized circumstance of gay men. Connell (1995) explained that hegemonic masculinity does not have a stable or unchanged essence. It has a dynamic and fluid structure. In other words, hegemonic masculinity is not intercultural. Their construction depends on the characteristics of specific time periods, geographical areas and culture. According to the hierarchy that Connell described, every other masculinity style can be hegemonic if the necessary conditions are provided, except for gay men. In the heteronormative societies, heterosexuality is seen as the healthy, normal and actual sexual preference. Other sexual preferences are assumed as

unhealthy and abnormal. Thus, they are treated as if they are illnesses that should be treated. The dominance of hegemonic masculinity is mainly based on and supported by this heteronormative social structure. On the other hand, all other sexual preferences are marginalized and weakened by the same structure. When it is compared to the all other personal factors such as age, race, ethnic background, religious belief or socio-economic status, heterosexuality is accepted as the normative element for a man to be a man within the hegemonic masculinity structure. All other factors may be tolerated by the system, but having another sexual preference rather than heterosexuality is not accepted. Also, heterosexual men should always prove themselves about their heterosexuality. This situation causes exaggerated masculinity (Kimmel, 2004). It is a way to construct hegemonic masculinity by defining oneself by differing oneself from the others. Another function of exaggerated masculinity is to compensate internalized inferiority by using this defense mechanism. It is not rare to see exaggerated masculinity profiles in gay or bisexual men (Zinn, 1982). By demonstrating macho or violent presentations of masculinity, they try to prove their manhood and suppress their inferiority complex.

2.2.3. Fatherhood Studies in Turkey

The family structure in Turkey can be described as patriarchal. Sancar (2009) claims that the most prevalent type of fatherhood in Turkey is the modernized one. According to this description, modernized fathers take all the responsibilities of the family. The function of female members of family is limited to doing housework. Daughters and sons are not accepted as equal members of the family. In the hegemonic masculinity construction, hierarchical gender order is mainly provided by having a son for a modernized father. The importance of father – son interaction in terms of construction of hegemonic masculinity can be seen in this specific process.

Turkish society was generally agricultural until the 1950s. Thus, extended family type was common. After 1950s, due to mechanization of agriculture and changing economic dynamics, migration from rural areas to urban centers started. Due to changing socio-economic conditions, extended families were transformed

into nuclear families. Hofstede (1980) described Turkey as a collectivistic country. In Turkish society, kinship relationships have always been very important. Family members still have strong relationships and interactions with each other. Family types may change; still, traditional rules, norms and values within the patriarchal constructs are very important and efficient. Because of the fixed nature of patriarchal constructs, the father figure is essential for Turkish families. Father figure is assumed to play a vital role in the transference of socio-cultural values between the generations since fathers symbolize authority. Especially within the first years, children are taught those hegemonic norms and rules by their fathers in the family (Sancar, 2009; Bozok, 2011).

Another important period was the 1980s when Turkey went through a rapid transformation. The education level of women and divorce rates had increased immensely. The number of children and the rate of arranged marriage had decreased (Tecik, 2012). These developments were also influential in changing the dynamics of fatherhood. Since the old patriarchal patterns have been challenged by different social constructs such as family and marriage, traditional and hegemonic types of masculinities were also under threat. This kind of change has also been seen in other countries such as Sweden and Norway (Johansson & Andreasson, 2017). Since the 1970s, Swedish government has been trying to construct the gender-equal Swedish man and father model (Johansson, 2009; Klinth & Johansson, 2010). Also Nordic family model has been changing in terms of encouraging men to provide help to mothers in childcare (Johansson, & Andreasson, 2017). In the literature, the importance and influence of fathers on the development of children was studied immensely by disciplines such as social psychology, developmental psychology and sociology (Radin, 1972; DeKlyen, Biernbaum, Speltz, & Greenberg, 1998; Floyd & Morman, 2003; Morman & Floyd, 2006; Keizer, Dykstra, & Poortman, 2009). The meaning of fatherhood, the description of paternal care and the primary role of fatherhood in the construction of masculinities have been examined. Still, they do not share a unitary definition. Moreover, there is no parallelism between cultures in terms of the systematic changes associated with fatherhood. The literature on

fatherhood is limited in Turkey. There are some reports about father support programs (Koçak, 2004). Since the 1990s, especially in the different sub-disciplines of social science fields of study, we see many academic publications and research about father-son relationship and its influences (Kudret, 1960; Levend, 1966; Parla, 1990; Gürbilek, 2002; Tezgör, 2006; Çetin, 2007; Uğurlu, 2007; Bayat, 2009; Buran, 2009; Çitçi, 2009; Demir, 2009; Tüzer, 2010; Çetin, 2010, Perşembe, 2010). Especially in the fields of psychoanalysis and developmental psychology, fatherhood has been examined by scholars in Turkey (Karadayı, 2001; Parman, 2001; 2002; 2007; Sunat, 2002; Dindar, 2004; Özdal & Aral, 2005; Akbaş, Böke & Karabekiroğlu, 2008; Böke, Turla & Akbaş, 2008; Özenen, 2009). There are also theses written about fatherhood in Turkey. They were usually written by several sub-disciplines of social science fields of study. (İnci, 1992; Yardımcı, 2007), cinema (Yılmaz, 2008; Ormanlı, 2010), law (Sezen, 2000; Yazgı, 2002; Akın, 2006; Duran, 2007; Akalın, 2008), education (Sever, 2002; Meral, 2006; Poyraz, 2007; Şahin & Demiriz, 2014), psychology (Kuzucu, 1999; Düşgör, 2007; Arslan Kocaman, 2008; Duran, 2010; Tabakoğlu, 2010) and sociology (Tecik, 2012; Güloğlu, 2017; Sümer Tanyeri, 2017).

All of these academic and nonacademic publications mentioned in this chapter are significant to understand the effects of fatherhood in the construction of masculinities. In general, these studies provide valuable information about the dynamics of fatherhood and masculinities regarding different time periods. Many of the studies did not use the feminist or critical men and masculinities studies approach. Most relied on qualitative data rather than quantitative data. In this respect, the operational definition of fatherhood becomes problematic. To define fatherhood only in biological terms would be inaccurate. Excluding social dynamics such as gender relations would limit the understanding of fatherhood with respect to the construction of hegemonic masculinity.

Below I will discuss the socio-cultural parameters of being a man in Turkish society and perception of ideal masculinities of young Turkish adult men. To explain the socio-cultural parameters of being a man in Turkish society, I will first present

the sociodemographic characteristics of the participants of the study. Level of education, employment, mobility and gender perception of the participants will be analyzed under separate headings. Gender perception of participants will be examined in three sections. These are perceived gender differences, advantages of being man, and disadvantages of being a man. To analyze the perception of the ideal masculinities of young Turkish adult men, I will first discuss the characteristics of perceived ideal masculinities. Perceived expectations from participants will also be provided. Family man role will be examined as the idealized masculinity style in Turkish society. Sources for the construction of idealized masculinities will be provided in two sections. Fatherhood will be the focus analyzed under seven headings. These are the primary role of the father in the family, father's socio-economic status, education level, paternal perception, perceived masculine characteristics, father-son interaction, and the generation gap between father and son. The discussion of these topics will be based on the field research carried out in Ankara. My analysis will also include a brief comparison of hegemonic masculinity and fatherhood in the Western and Turkish contexts to highlight the collectivistic and traditionalist components of the Turkish case.

CHAPTER 3

SOCIO-CULTURAL PARAMETERS OF BEING A MAN IN TURKISH SOCIETY

3.1. Introduction

Sancar (2009) claimed that, although there are rapid changes in the styles of popular masculinities, social constructions that feed hegemonic masculinity have not changed much. Economic provider and breadwinner role of Turkish men continue within the rules and frames of heterosexuality. However, Sancar divided the power source of the hegemonic masculinity into two. The first power source for Turkish hegemonic masculinity is provided by state sanctions. This level includes the institutions of law, state, military, and family. The second power source includes individual preferences (p. 307). Sancar writes that personal masculinity performances in the second level gained strategical importance over time. In the sections below, I will discuss the state-related and individualistic preferences of young Turkish adult men with reference to levels of education, employment, mobility and gender perception. Before this discussion, the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants, their fathers and mothers will be given. Age, birthplace, education level, and the occupation of the participants and their parents are important to see the commonalities that contribute to the construction of hegemonic masculinity pointing at unity in diversity.

3.2. Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Participants and their Parents

Twenty four men participated in the field research. None of the men were married, and none of them had yet experienced fatherhood. Their ages ranged from twenty-one to twenty-seven. The first few participants were contacted through the social media; the rest were accessed by snowball sampling. Birthplace of most of the

participants is big cities of Turkey. Eight of the participants were born in Ankara and eight in other big cities of Turkey such as İstanbul, Antalya, Bursa, Eskişehir, Edirne, and Gaziantep. Others were born in rather small cities such as Yozgat, Uşak, Sivas, Ordu, Osmaniye, Kırşehir, Kırıkkale and Tokat. However, all of the participants now live in different districts of Ankara.

The age of fathers of the participants ranged from forty-six to sixty-two. Birthplace of fathers are somehow parallel to the birth place of their sons. Three fathers were born in Ankara and six in other big cities of Turkey such as İstanbul, Antalya, Eskişehir, Edirne and Gaziantep. Others were born in small cities such as Yozgat, Uşak, Sivas, Ordu, Amasya, Kırşehir, Kırıkkale, Burdur, Elazığ, Rize and Karaman. Half of the fathers live in big cities while others stayed mostly in their birthplaces.

The age of mothers of the participants ranged from thirty-nine to sixty-two. Birthplace of mothers are also parallel to the birth place of fathers and their sons. Three mothers were also born in Ankara and six in other big cities such as Antalya, Eskişehir, Edirne, Kayseri and Gaziantep. Others were born in Yozgat, Sivas, Kırşehir, Amasya, Rize, Elazığ, Ordu, Amasya, Konya, Uşak, Burdur and Kırıkkale. Except for two participants, all of the fathers and mothers were still married and living together at the time of writing.

3.3. Level of Education

When agriculture has been replaced by industry and service sectors, level of education has gained crucial importance especially in big cities. In this study, all of the participants were either university students or university graduates. Thirteen participants were undergraduate students, two were graduate students, and nine held a Bachelor's degree. The education levels of fathers are different from their sons. Nine fathers were university graduates. Three fathers held a Bachelor's degree. One father held an associate's degree. Four fathers were high school graduates. Three fathers were secondary school graduates and four fathers were primary school graduates. This data suggests that level of education of the younger generation has

increased compared to the 1990s since the majority of the participants had a higher level of education than their fathers.

The education levels of mothers are also different from both their husbands and their sons. Nine mothers were primary school graduates. Six mothers were university graduates. Only one mother held a Bachelor's degree. Seven mothers were high school graduates. One mother was a secondary school graduate. We see that men were more advantageous in continuing their education when the education levels are compared to women.

3.4. Employment

Employment is one of the essential elements that play a role in the construction of one's masculinity. Thirteen participants were undergraduate university students who did not have an occupation or regular wages at the time. Two of the participants were legal practitioners and two were engineers. One participant was a medical secretary. Although five of the participants were graduates of the Military Academy, only one of them was a military officer. The other four, one a staff manager, another a tradesman and the remaining three independent businessman, as defined by them. Some of the participants were professing different jobs than their education area.

3.5. Mobility

Since half of the participants were still students at the time, it is not easy to compare the occupations of sons and fathers. However, to make a broad comparison between the occupations of sons and fathers, it can be claimed that the second generation has experienced a significant upward mobility, which is called inter-generational mobility. When we look at the occupations of fathers, twelve were civil servants, five were workers, four were freelancers, two were engineers, and one was a tradesman. Although all of the participants had higher levels of education than their fathers, we cannot claim that their wages will necessarily be higher than the first generation. We can only assume that the sons will work in jobs with higher salaries than their fathers. More than half of the participants' mothers (fourteen) were

housewives. Six of them were civil servants, two were workers, one was an engineer, and one was a physiotherapist. In general, when the financial income of fathers and mothers are compared, mothers are more disadvantaged, which affects the total income of the family. One can assume that the sons I have interviewed will have better standards of living when they form their own families.

3.6. Gender Perception

Gender perception is used to describe the factors and dynamics within the identification process of individuals. At first sight, human beings recognize and identify each other based on their sex. Other living beings, for example a cat does not live with the information of its biological sex; it only has instincts to survive and breed. Unlike cats, human beings are aware or made aware of their biological sexes in the socialization process. Gender is constructed in this specific process. Thus, gender is not an available concept for other living beings except for humans.

Gender perception of my participants will be analyzed under three main parts through the social constructionist approach. Firstly, perceived gender differences of the participants will be provided and discussed. The concept of gender and the meanings they attribute to it will be examined briefly. These concepts will be discussed further in Chapter Three, Section 5.2 where I discuss masculinities in detail. Secondly, the advantages of being a man according to the participants' perception will be provided. How they perceive the advantages of being a man in Turkish society and the reasons behind it will be examined. Thirdly and lastly, the disadvantages of being a man as presented by the participants will be given. The factors they identify as disadvantages and the dynamics that create this perception will be analyzed through the concept of masculinities.

To understand the perceived gender differences, we need to know the difference between gender and sex. Biological sex differences between men and women are caused by the differences between hormones and anatomical variants. These are natural facts; thus, they are universal. On the other hand, gender differences are constructed through various social dynamics. For example, breadwinner role for a man or nurturer role for a woman are socially imposed upon

men and women (Hurley, 2007). Although they may also be seen in various different cultures at different time periods, gender differences are always specific to cultures. Hurley explains this dynamic with social conditioning. She claims that this conditioning contributes to gender roles that are accepted as normative or traditional. Consequently, gender inequality is profoundly installed in social structures. Unless they are radically challenged, this unjust situation of gender roles is maintained and accepted as they are. All behaviors, thoughts and emotions are categorized as proper or improper in accordance with the social norms of societies. Appropriateness of behaviors, ideas or emotions may change throughout time. It may also change among various cultures. Once slavery was seen as normal and maintained by some cultures for a very long time. At the present time, it is evaluated as a crime against humanity and certainly unacceptable. Also, attitudes and behaviors about gender have been changing throughout time. Women used to live under restricted conditions while men were seen as superior. Still, this sexist attitude continues to exist under different mechanisms such as ambivalent sexism. Inequality, too, still exists. The only change is the ways it becomes visible.

Examining the perceived gender differences of the participants is important to assess their views about gender norms and their acceptance of the behaviors and attitudes of individuals shaped through the frame of their gender perception.

There were three types of answers given by the interviewees when the differences between women and men were asked. Only four participants claimed that they saw no difference between women and men. They claim that the two sexes are sisters. Men see women as human beings and argue that the differences between the two sexes are imposed upon them by their families and by the larger society.

Others listed various reasons arguing that the two sexes are different and that they should exist. Eight interviewees claimed that there were only biological differences between the two sexes such as hormones, physical strength, being able to give birth, and tone of voice. Men's characteristics such as "being braver" is attributed to their biology. The 'duty' of protecting women was also seen as part of men's protective instinct. However, this specific need for protection of women was

attributed to the social conditions in Turkey (e.g. increasing rates of sexual violence against women), which is seen as a threat against women's security. In other words, it was not attributed to pure biological reasons. In the literature, sciences like biology and genetics seem to have a more essentialist approach toward differences among women and men (Shields, 1975; Deaux, 1976; DeLamater & Hyde, 1998; Geary, 1998). However, in the more recent literature, we see an opposite view which is followed by increasing number of scholars. This trend began with the reappraisals of biological theories on gender and human sexual orientation (Fausto-Sterling, 1985; Byne & Parsons, 1993) and continued with the contributions of social sciences, such as many anthropological rediscovers (Vance, 2007) or psychoanalytic theories (Person & Ovesey, 1983).

The other eight interviewees emphasized the mental differences between men and women. Among this group, it was believed that there are sharp differences between men and women stemming from different ways of acting. The most mentioned theme was that men are freer in their acts than women, while women are being held responsible for their acts. Women were taught to pay for their mistakes more than men. In other words, men feel more comfortable when they break the rules, but women are more careful about not crossing the line. Women are also seen as more well-groomed while men are pictured as poorly groomed. Another clear distinction was made about the ways of thinking. Women's way of thinking is seen as more detailed and planned than the way men thinks, which is explained with reference to the mentality of men. Men are described as having a solution-oriented mindset and as being pragmatic, while women are seen to be suffocated with unnecessary details considering all possibilities simultaneously. Moreover, women are usually seen as more anxious than men. Men are ascribed to be calm and coldblooded. Still, women are defined as being more mature while planning their future, unlike men who are prone to see life through rose-tinted glasses. Men are defined as gullible when compared with women. The participants claimed that these differences were derived from societal expectations and the way people were raised. Usually, women are seen as more emotional than men. These characteristics of

women are attributed to their mothering instinct or just them being women. In situations like death, women are seen to be more emotional; thus, “weaker” than men. On the contrary, men are attributed characteristics like being insensitive, which makes them stronger. Some of the participants argued that men are untalented about emotional issues and they are not able to analyze the emotions of other people like women can. Expressiveness about one’s emotions is seen as an indicator of weakness, posing a threat to one’s masculinity (O’Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986). Since being expressive is seen as a feminine attribute, these ideas about masculinity were not surprising. However, while stating the most difficult aspect of being a man, two of the participants said that:

Men are emotional beings. It is not well known, but we are emotional. We are more fragile beings, we act without thinking about the consequences. We cannot show this sensuality. You are a man, you need to look strong. Think it as it is something unconscious. No one can admit it to you baldly. (Kylorap, 26)

Men are more emotional. They make self-sacrifices for their loved ones, unlike women. (Oğuz, 26)

Besides these three main ideas about the differences between men and women, other factors like social status, friendship styles, traditional family structures, as well as duties like providing for your family, doing housework, and babysitting were also mentioned. In general, the participants usually think that the lives of women are more difficult than their lives. As worded by an interviewee:

I think that women have to deal with so many things. Men face this challenge when they plan to build their own life. When both are economically dependent on their family, a boy can be raised more comfortably than a girl. But daughters start to challenge this situation in their families when they start school. They have to prove themselves at least fifteen, twenty years before men. While society easily accepts men, women have to make themselves accepted. Women’s struggle for life is longer and harder than men’s. (Utku, 22)

Definition of manhood was mostly made by comparing men to women. Most of the participants admitted that they feel lucky to be a man, especially in this country. They evaluate the responsibilities of women as heavier and more than the duties assigned to men. Women are seen as over-controlled by their families and

society. All of the participants were aware that they would not be that free to go out at night or to go to a university in another city if they were women. The participants who have sisters had the chance to observe this discrimination. Others observed it through their girlfriends or women around them. Freedom was the most important theme that the participants emphasized as the main difference between men and women. The most important aspects of freedom they referred to range from minor issues like being allowed to wear what they want to being able to have an active sexual life before marriage and not being judged by the society. Women's submissiveness to social norms was not seen as a result of their passive nature or because of being less brave than men. They were also clearly aware of the societal pressure on women. They considered societal pressure as an indicator of being an undeveloped country. In comparing women and men, the participants mentioned the country-specific conditions referring to violence and sexual harassment against women, and increasing numbers of rape. Some of the participants also claimed that "the protector role" of men is necessary due to this worsening situation in Turkey.

Patriarchy is a system that supports men's superiority over all other individuals. It is embedded in almost every social construct. Thus, men are seemed to be more advantaged than women in the context of power relations. According to the claims of the participants, the advantages of being a man can be categorized into two main sections. The first section includes biological, physical and anatomical advantages while the second section includes the social advantages of being a man. For the first section, most of the participants mentioned physical power as the primary advantage of men. Physical power is seen as related to protect and defend oneself more easily. The participants expressed that they felt more secure than women as their physical power would help them in a situation such as harassment, rape or a physical attack. Physical power is seen as a disincentive for possible dangerous situations. In a biological meaning, men are also seen as more comfortable than women. Pregnancy and menstruation are seen as uncomfortable situations according to the participants. Most of them express that they felt lucky as they did not have to experience these biological incidents.

Except for the physical or anatomical advantages, the participants usually focused on the social aspects when it comes to advantages of being a man in the Turkish society. All of the participants claimed that men are freer than women. This freedom is usually defined by actions such as being able to go outside comfortably at night. The participants claim that they can live by their own standards without explaining all of their actions or plans to their families. They also claimed that they were criticized less by the society and the societal norms. They feel like they are less likely to be subject of any questioning when it is compared to women. Also, they mentioned that they are less likely to be blamed because of their sexual history and experiences. Aside from all these aspects, some of the participants mentioned that men are more comfortable than women as they do not have to be well-groomed all the time. Another interesting point is that most of the participants mentioned that friendship among men is more intimate than the relationships between women.

Men are better at friendship. When they need each other, they meet. For the rest of their relations, they act shallow. (Tona23, 25)

All of the participants accept that being a man is more advantageous than being a woman. Many of them explained this situation in relation to the gender inequality.

There is no positive side to it. There may be some advantages being a man in Turkey by its accepted ways. Your words may be seen as more valuable in family or business life. This may seem like an advantage personally, but we live in the 21st century. There is no need to argue about gender equality. Still, we discuss it in Turkey. Unavoidably, manhood brings you some advantages. It is caused by the difference of status, and understanding of the society. (Utku, 22)

The disadvantages of being a man are seen as mainly based on the social aspects of Turkish society. No biological or physical aspect is mentioned as a disadvantage. Some of the participants mention the circumcision as a drawback. Still, it is not seen as a major problem related to being a man. Circumcision can be described as a socialization phase that is legalized in religious terms (Bozok, 2011). As Bozok (2011) claimed:

Circumcision basically signifies the symbolic attendance of male children to the “world of men” by separating from their mother –and the “feminine” features and relations associated with the mother. (Bozok, 2011, p. 61)

All of the participants claimed that the freedom they were given makes them responsible for many things. Social and economic responsibilities were focused on nearly all of the interviews. Although they accepted that women and men are equal, most of the participants claimed that husbands should gain more than wives. They thought that women are not under economic pressure just like men. According to the participants, men should work and gain their economic independence no matter what. Unemployment is seen as more acceptable for women. In relation to the responsibility, all of the participants also mentioned the societal expectations. They thought that Turkish society expects too much from them. These expectations include acts such as being able to build, maintain, shape and direct a family. Perceived societal expectations are mainly based on family. Men who are not able to meet these expectations are seen to be more likely to be isolated from society. Thus, they are seen as more vulnerable to depression. Most of the participants claimed that they feel like they have to hide their problems and try to solve them on their own. They mentioned their hesitancy about revealing their insecurities even to their family members or close friends. Emotional expressiveness has been studied by different social science disciplines such as psychology and sociology. It also has been focused on the framework of gender (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 2010). The explanations of participants about their hesitancy to express their emotions or problems are parallel to the results of previous studies (Blier & Blier-Wilson, 1989; Simon & Nath, 2004). Some participants also claimed that men are worse at emotional intelligence than women. Women are seen as better at emotional empathy. Participants complained they have to hide their emotions to confirm societal standards of being a man. They were not pleased to be perceived as weak when they reveal their emotions.

Men are emotional beings. It is not well known, but we are emotional. We are more fragile beings, we act without thinking about the consequences. We cannot show this sensuality. You are a man, you need to look strong. Think it as it is something unconscious. No one can admit it to you baldly. (Kylorap, 26)

One participant mentioned the general prejudice caused by the wicked acts of some men in the society. He claimed that incidents including physical, verbal and sexual harassment were generalized and attributed to all men. Because of these kinds of acts, all men are seen as the potential threat. He also expressed that this situation makes the connection with women and children even harder. Another disadvantage that the participants mentioned was military service. Military service is compulsory in Turkey. This means that military service applies to all male citizens from twenty to forty-one years of age. Paid military service is another option for Turkish men. Still, it is not applicable all the time, it is under the initiative of state.

It can be claimed that there are idealized types of masculinities in Turkish society. Expectations and responsibilities are shaped in accordance with these idealized masculinities. To acknowledge and confirm these types of masculinities is supported by society. To get these idealized forms of masculinities is seen as impossible for some participants. Others also claimed that it is hard and restrictive. By definition, the characteristics of hegemonic masculinity are favored and imposed on the male members of society. In addition to that, to achieve hegemonic masculinity is impossible. The effects of the dominant structure of hegemonic masculinity in Turkish society can be seen from the statements of the participants below.

In order to confirm the attributions of society, you have to act and transform into a thing that you are not, and you don't want to be. (Utku, 22)

To be fit into a model, to a model of manhood. Furthermore, it is a limitless model. To fit into it is hard anyway. It is hard because everybody perceives you different as you are a man. It doesn't matter if you deal with a man or a woman. I think, to be a man, to think that you are generalized to other men is hard. (Tona23, 25)

CHAPTER 4

PERCEPTION OF IDEAL MASCULINITIES OF YOUNG TURKISH ADULT MEN

4.1. Introduction

Hegemonic masculinity was firstly described by Connell (1995). After Connell, the term was used in different social science disciplines and improved throughout time. Hegemonic masculinity was accepted as a mechanism that imposes its characteristics on other types of masculinities and femininities in order to maintain its power in the patriarchal structure. The existence of other types of masculinities implies that there is no singular type of masculinity; masculinity is not a singular entity. Rather, it has multiplicity.

“Masculinities” is a concept that indicates that there are different – and plural- types of masculinity rather than a single masculinity. The concept offered by Connell, refers that masculinity is not universal as it is not eternal and timeless. Different social and cultural conditions reveal different types of masculinity. (Bozok, 2011, p. 44)

As Bozok (2011) explained, masculinity can be transformed by different socio-cultural conditions. In other words, various socio-cultural conditions may require different types of masculinities. Idealized forms of masculinities are shaped in accordance with these changing requirements. Thus, it is not possible to talk about a fixed type of masculinity that has been favored all the time. Because of the same reason, perception of ideal masculinities has also been changing throughout time. Even in the same culture, idealized characteristics and requirements from masculinities may change due to the variety of socio-cultural and economic reasons. Some roles such as breadwinner role may be required for the financial security of families. As men have much more job opportunities than women, taking an economic provider role would be easier for men (Padavic & Reskin, 2002). As it can

be understood, this role attributed to ideal masculinities has been associated with economic conditions. As women join the workforce and contribute to their families economically, breadwinner role for idealized masculinities may lose its strength and validity.

In the interviews, I tried to detect the favored masculine characteristics that young Turkish adult men aspire. In addition to that, it is important to analyze the sources of this perception of idealized masculinities. When it comes to personal characteristics of one, it is hard to differentiate which elements are innate or caused by certain types of socialization processes. Masculinities are the dimensions that should be thought integrated with other personal characteristics. For instance, breadwinner role may require a certain level of responsibility for a person. Still, it is not possible to claim that he is a responsible man only because he takes the breadwinner role of his family. Thus, we cannot exclude masculinities from other aspects of personality. We also cannot evaluate masculinities only with reference to dimensions of personality. Perception of the idealized characteristics of masculinities should be evaluated by considering multiple dimensions.

In addition to all these, it can be claimed that for the participants there is an unsolved tension between the old and new ways of relating to their fathers. The recent recognition of the multiplicity of masculinities can be helpful to grasp these changing dynamics.

4.2. Characteristics of Perceived Ideal Masculinities

The multiplicity of the term masculinity has been discussed in previous chapters. The term “masculinities” is used as there is no single description and definition of the concept itself (Whitehead, 2002; Coles, 2009). Before explaining the perception of my participants and characteristic aspects of ideal masculinities, main attributions made for masculinities should be made clear. There is no single description of manhood or masculinity according to the participants. It is simply defined as a conception that can be perceived in various ways and through different dimensions of society.

It's not something so special. I can define being a human, but I can't define being a man. (Beko, 22)

Some descriptions of manhood or masculinity were made by the interviewees within the framework of culture and socialization. Manhood was seen as a result of socialization for some participants.

If people didn't socialize, there wouldn't be a definition for manhood actually. Except having a penis, we don't have any differences. Yes, we have roles but I don't think that they're realistic. (Çöp, 21)

Most of the participants mentioned the socio-cultural elements and did not exclude the factor of living in Turkey. They claimed that there is a cultural perception which makes you feel different as you are a man. They blamed the Turkish culture for the irrational acts men do just to prove their manhood. Another socio-cultural point that was emphasized during the interviews was social class. Level of education and cultural background seemed relevant to social class according to some participants. In this context they claimed that those with less education may not react to domestic violence.

Manhood may be defined as acting according to the society. In some places you must have a stronger character. This is valid for a big part of Turkey. For me there is no difference except physical characteristics. Still, you need to act differently in the society. (Mert Pazarcı, 22)

In some places, male figure is the ultimate authority. He has economic power, he has responsibility. Grandfather, father, brother and the male figures of the family are influential. Also in economic terms the family is depended on them. There is a traditional life style. In those situations, men are not questioned. (Utku, 22)

Participants mostly defined manhood by using adjectives such as warrior, protector, hunter, dominant power, authority, cold-blooded, brave, egoist, stable, assertive, strong, ethical, strong-willed, flexible (knows how to act or react to the situations), ruler, possessive, and self-sacrificing. Manhood was also defined by being a father, brother, and soldier. Few participants defined manhood by comparing men and women. They claimed that women were more complex creatures. Men were rather simple. Missions of men were also seen simpler when they compared them with the missions of women. Men were also seen as more advantageous in the

society. This was seen as an indicator of patriarchal and old-fashioned societies. These kinds of societies were defined as not being modern.

In addition to the personal and societal qualities, biological characteristics such as having XY chromosomes, anatomical features, having male genitalia and physical appearance were also mentioned as confirmation of being a man.

Eleven participants claimed that manhood cannot be proved. Some of the participants confessed that they used to think differently in the past. They use to think that manhood required some confirmation. Other participants said that they did not have the same point of view with the larger society. For the majority of society manhood can be proved in some ways, but for them, manhood is not something that can be confirmed by performing some specific acts or by having specific qualities.

Manhood can't be proved. There are some women who are even more man than a man. (Halim, 27)

No, it can't be proved. I'm against any clear definition for gender. It's more likely a spectrum. (Tona23, 25)

Participants were asked some questions about their perception of idealized masculinities and the required characteristics for these types. Idealized characteristics can be categorized into three sections. These are economic independence, physical and mental strength and characteristics related to build and maintain a family. Economic independence was very important for all of the participants. It is the most primary and idealized characteristic for a man to maintain his life. Independence was mentioned in both economic and emotional terms. Having a regular job was mentioned by twenty-one participants. Being financially wealthy was also mentioned by fifteen participants. Half of the participants emphasized the importance of financial power in marriage.

A man should be like an ATM. He should have a house and a car. He should be able to give his unlimited credit card to his wife. He should be able to afford to buy the white appliances she sees in her friends' houses. For instance, the refrigerator should be renewed every five years or else she can never be happy. If a man can't keep up to a specific standard, she can't raise a child comfortably. If things get worse, his wife will abandon him. (Erendibi, 25)

Strength is another essential characteristic that nearly all of the participants mentioned. Strength was evaluated both in physical and mental terms. For most of the participants, the ideal man should be strong or should look tough. Although most of the participants claimed that physical appearance is not important, four participants mentioned being at least 180 cm tall and muscular as idealized characteristics of men. It is important to note that these participants were also 180 cm or more tall. Five participants mentioned being sportive as idealized characteristics of men. Mental strength was usually defined with reference to the social responsibilities of the ideal man. Personal characteristics such as being responsible and compassionate can be evaluated in the category mental strength. Two of the participants claimed that the ideal man should know how to express his emotions. Knowing how to talk or act in the society were seen as necessary to be respected in the society by nineteen participants. These acts were also mentioned among the ideal characteristics of men. Being educated, especially being a university graduate was emphasized by most of the participants. Qualities such as being cultured and knowing foreign languages were stated in addition to high level of education. Only one participant mentioned that the ideal man should be nationalist and he should know what he must do for his country.

If a person understands Turkishness and defines himself/herself as Turkish, s/he should be an honest, right, nationalist, perfectionist, and well-supported in socio-cultural terms. (Piyaniş, 22)

Nineteen participants claimed that the ideal man would want to build a family. It is not enough to build a family; he should make time for his family too. The ideal man should not cheat on his wife and he should be loyal always. For most of the participants, being able to support his family financially is one of the essential characteristics of the ideal man. According to them, the ideal man is the one who is loved as a father by his family members. Moreover, all of the participants claimed that the ideal man should not use violence against women and children. Some of them added that the ideal man should not have bad habits such as consuming alcohol or gambling. Few mentioned that these actions did not necessarily make them bad men. Answers of the participants were usually parallel to their own habits. The

participants consuming alcohol were hesitant to describe it as a "bad habit". Still, they claimed that consuming too much alcohol might be a problem as it would cause problematic situations.

In addition to the ideal characteristics of a man, participants were asked to define a "bad man". The most common answer given was using violence. Although the focus is on violence against women, its definition has a wider meaning. To use violence against someone or something less powerful is seen as misuse of power which is given to men. To be beaten is seen as a sign of inferiority. Other answers given in the spectrum of using violence were to commit a crime, to steal, to sexually abuse someone, to be nonconformist, to have bad habits such as consuming too much alcohol or gambling, to mess with others, to restrict people or their freedom, not being able to direct one's virility, misbehaving with women, to degrade women, and to see women as second-class human beings.

Some personal characteristics were also addressed when defining a bad man. These characteristics are being jealous, disrespectful, liar, selfish, irresponsible, obsessed, stubborn, ungenerous, vengeful, unreliable, mannered, rude, aggressive, unvirtuous, unethical, insensitive, making concessions that they do not need to make on one's personality, not having a specific attitude towards life, not being able to attain a higher social status, being dependent on others, and requiring medical care. Requiring medical care was an interesting point that many of the participants mentioned. According to their statements, being able to maintain a life on his own is very important for a man. This issue has been studied under the titles of "men and health help-seeking behavior", "men and healthcare" and "men and health risk behaviors" in the critical studies on men and masculinities. As Galdas, Cheater and Marshall (2005) claimed, men are reluctant to seek help from healthcare systems for various problems like physical disabilities or psychological problems such as depression or anxiety. In the light of such information, it is also possible to claim that requiring medical help is seen emasculating for the participants. Also, it may be seen as related to being dependent on others which was also listed under the characteristics of a bad man. Acts such as making unnecessary jokes, talking too

much, breaking one's word, swearing, and lifting up one's voice were also added to the qualities of a bad man.

Some qualities were seen as inferior rather than bad. For instance, having problems with sexual potency, acting differently than one's personality, to be disgraced, to be humiliated, and to be denigrated were seen as signs of inferior personality. Among them, sexual potency has been a subject in critical studies on men and masculinities many times. As Inhorn (2002) stated:

Sexual dysfunction is profoundly emasculating in a country where hegemonic masculinities are competitive. (Inhorn, 2002, p. 343)

In addition to sexual potency, male infertility is also seen as a shame for the subject. Both of these situations are seen related to the loss of one's masculinity and virility (Inhorn, 1994; Webb & Daniluk, 1999). Although infertility was not mentioned in any of the interviews, it is important to refer to previous studies. Sexual potency was mentioned as a problem and listed among the characteristics of a bad man.

In addition to all of these characteristics, most of the participants defined a bad man with reference to his family relations. Having problems with family members and friends, cheating on his wife, being cheated by his wife, and neglecting his children were seen as the primary qualities of a bad man. These comments highlight the importance of father role in the construction of ideal masculinities in Turkish society. They also indicate the validity of the breadwinner role to a certain extent.

To have a deeper understanding of idealized masculinities, the participants were asked if they had any male figures in their lives. Male figures were usually appreciated for their specific characteristics. These characteristics are the personal qualities such as being devoted, reliable, knowledgeable or responsible. Some of them were respected as they stand for what they believe. Political figures such as Atatürk or German revolutionists were usually mentioned as ideal masculinities because of their ideas, thoughts, ideologies and their radical acts. Five of the participants mentioned their fathers as their ideal male figure. Grandfathers, brothers

and uncles were the other examples mentioned as male figures. Two participants mentioned their commanders as ideal male figures. One participant mentioned Prophet Muhammad. Other male figures that were mentioned as the ideal male figures were sportsmen and educationalists. Nine participants claimed that they had no such ideal male figure.

Most of the participants said that they sought to become the ideal man. Four participants saw themselves far from this ideal. Three participants saw themselves as partially ideal. Four of them claimed that they are very close to being ideal. Only three participants claimed that they were the ideal man. Rest of them said that it was not important to them to be the ideal man. They argued that the definition of the ideal man was not clear and dependable.

These ideals are achievable. They aren't really about our inner self because these characteristics are important in terms of the roles you have play to others in life. (Tona23, 25)

When the ways to reach this perfection was asked, most of the participants claimed that it was possible by seeking for it. Seeking to become the ideal man was defined as being disciplined, responsible and self-sacrificing. Experience and financial wealth were also seen as essential for reaching this ideal. Support was also mentioned by most of them. Some of the participants emphasized that especially support from fathers was important. Few of the participants claimed that it was not possible to achieve this ideal.

4.3. Perceived Expectations from Young Turkish Adult Men

Perceived expectations from men in Turkish society were also discussed with the participants. Before discussing societal expectations, questions about the duties and status of men were asked. All of the participants made a distinction between the expectations of Turkish society and themselves. All of them emphasized various differences according to their own points of view.

According to the interviewees, tasks requiring physical strength, riding the car or going out in the evenings or at night when necessary were their responsibility since they were the male members of the family. Women, on the contrary, are

expected to take responsibility for domestic tasks only; they mostly remain inside the house. This discrimination is also seen in different areas of life such as education. None of the participants mentioned any problems about living away from their parents. Only few mentioned that their sisters were not allowed to attend universities in other cities. In other words, families of the participants were hesitant to let their daughters to live in other cities by themselves. Moving to another city was possible only through marriage.

They expect from me to study and take care of my business. If someone needs to be carried, I take them. If someone needs to go somewhere at night because of our business, I go. These aren't expected from my sister. She's only expected to graduate. (Coşkun, 24)

I used to go shopping. Domestic chores were the responsibility of my elder sister. I was able to move to another city to study at university but they didn't let her go. (Sentex, 26)

I used to help my father, my elder sister used to help our mother. But we don't have the same level of freedom. She was able to stay at her (female) friends' house maybe once or twice. I was way too comfortable than her. (Deniz Ali, 21)

Ten participants said that they were given responsibility for some household tasks such as cleaning the house. Half of the participants noted that there was a change in the expectations of their families in terms of their children's gender; there was a move towards gender equality.

In the past, people used to want to have a son to gain a place in society, to keep their bloodlines, to protect their status. It's different now. Now they say if I had a daughter, she would take better care of me. (Oğuz, 26)

Although my family is conservative, we weren't discriminated. When my mother was doing the dishes, I helped her. She didn't stop me from doing it. My mother used to knit. When I wanted to knit like her, she again didn't stop me. Still, my sister always used to make her bed. I didn't. My mother made my bed and didn't get angry with me. (Çöp, 21)

Gender of other siblings and cousins are also effective in the construction of different hierarchical structures in the family. If the participants were raised in a family with only same-sex members, their perceptions would be different. In families where all siblings are male, there is a need for extra caution since there is no difference between the duties expected from them. Age factor is more important in

these kinds of families. In families with only female siblings family dynamics naturally show variation. Participants raised with sisters or female cousins had more chances to observe differences between gender roles easily. Still, it is important to note that all of the participants were aware of the gender factor that impacted their self-perceptions of opposite sex.

I don't know if the situation would be different if I had a sister. I have a brother. Otherwise my observations would be different. We may look like a modern family but I'm not sure if it would be the same if I had a sister. (Halim, 27)

As we have a traditional family structure, girls were warned to be careful about their behavior. Me and my older brother weren't expected to do house cleaning. Nobody told us to do things in the house but my mom or dad did tell our sisters. My sister may question why I don't do anything while she does. (Akbabuş, 23)

Participants gave explanations by comparing themselves to their sisters or female cousins. In these comparisons it was revealed that gender was not the only factor when assigning tasks to children in the family. Age factor is as important as gender.

There was no extra burden in terms of responsibility. I was always more comfortable. Even when I did something wrong, my elder sister was blamed. She was only two years older than me though. (Tona23, 25)

In our family there wasn't any difference in responsibilities according to gender. Age was more important. (Erendibi, 25)

I am the eldest of three brothers. They sent me for every task. Although my middle brother was one and a half years younger than me, protecting my brothers was my duty. As we grew up, we became friends. There is a seven year gap between me and my youngest brother. In other words, there is a hierarchy between us. Now he is sent for every task. (Eren, 26)

I'm the youngest brother. We are all males. As I'm the youngest one, I do most of the shopping. My father gave the control of our household budget to our eldest brother. He used to arrange everything. I helped my mother, carried out little tasks. I grew up comfortably compared to my older brothers. They focused on our education. Two of my brothers (older brothers) worked and got into business at an early age. (Çay, 26)

In situations where gender differences are not relevant birth order of siblings becomes important in addition to age of siblings. The first child of the family is usually seen as unlucky as the parents are not experienced enough according to the participants. In my sample the financial wealth of the families usually increased over time. However, at the time of the birth of the first child, families were usually not able to provide for him or her as they could for their second or third children. For example, firstborn children were not able to attend hobby classes. Few participants mentioned that their parents were not patient with their older siblings as they were with the young ones.

Of course, there were some differences between me and my sister who is older than me as my family moved away from our traditional culture. Still, my parents were inexperienced when they had my elder sister. She was their first child. When I was studying at the university, I was more comfortable than she was. There was no serious discrimination at home. Now, things are more equal. If you ask my sister, she tells so many things about discrimination though. Our parents had economic difficulties so they weren't able to give her enough pocket-money. I was more comfortable in terms of money too. Their economic condition got better when I grew up. I was appreciated more by my parents, but they didn't appreciate my sister the same way. (Kırıkçatal, 24)

I have nine cousins. The youngest is a girl, rest are men. We've been treated the same. Still, I'm the first grandson. Their expectations of me were very high. They expected me to get higher positions. My cousin, who is three years younger than me, got engaged recently. Now he is the favorite one, the most appreciated. (Hank, 26)

Although the participants mentioned their hometowns indirectly in their answers, only one participant openly linked his situation to his hometown. According to him, expectations, duties and the position of men are closely related to one's birthplace.

As my origin is Eastern Anatolia, my family had certain expectations and rules. There is still feudalism in the East. They told me that the fields and sheep of my grandfather will be mine. We need to go beyond these. I was born and raised in a different culture, but I didn't adopt it. (Modernhood, 21)

The position of men in Turkish society was also asked to the participants. In general, Turkish men are attributed huge power and authority. All of the participants clearly stated that this was due to the patriarchal structure in Turkey. Related to this

patriarchal structure, they all mentioned the provider and protector role assigned to men by the society.

Since we have a rigid patriarchal structure, men are important. Our society gives the protector role to men as they have the physical strength. (Akbabuş, 23)

In addition to the provider and protector role, one participant referred to the warrior role associated with Turkish men.

Man's position in Turkish society is a one-down position of God. Khagan, Khan, Emperor, Sultan, Padishah. He is expected to do all the things that people expect from God but can't get it. Such kind of power and authority is attributed to men. He is born, becomes a man, grows up, be circumcised, studies, be a man, be a lion, be a martyr, be a ghazi; if not, returns to his hometown, marries and have sons. This is the expectation. (Kırıkçatal, 24)

Only one participant stated that the status of men in Turkish society is a false representation. According to him, women manipulate and control men in accordance with their own desires and goals.

Although men seem to remain in the forefront, actually they are the ones who are controlled and prompted by their wives. It looks like they make their own decisions, but that's not the reality. (Erendibi, 25)

The perceived expectations of Turkish society from men were surprisingly the same for all of the participants. They were able to make a certain list for these expectations throughout their lives. Socio-economic status, ethnic background and other socio-cultural factors made no difference. The functions of these societal expectations as perceived by men shape the role of men being the provider and protector of their own future families. In other words, men are raised to be breadwinners of their families. Except for one participant, the rest claimed that they were expected to marry.

Men are expected to deal with things like finding a job, etc. Usually economic things. Marriage isn't expected though. (Beko, 22)

Most of the participants listed the expectations of Turkish society from men in a certain order. Firstly, men are expected to complete their education successfully.

Graduating from university is seen as an important step to getting a job with a good salary. Even though not all of the participants were expected to graduate from a university, they were all expected to have a job to be financially independent. After finishing their studies, men are expected to do military service. This is seen as a requirement to find a job since most of the workplaces hire applicants who completed their military service (Yılmaz, 2005; Öztan, 2014). Military service is seen as a phase related to economic conditions rather than nationalist motives. While describing manhood and masculinities, nearly all of the participants used adjectives such as warrior, hunter, protector, and provider. It was interesting to see that military service was not perceived in that way. Although only few of the participants thought that protecting the country was among the duties of men, the rest did not evaluate military service as a duty. This can be regarded as a radical move away from the traditional values attached to military service which has been a deep-seated component of manhood in Turkish society. What follows completing military service are finding a job and gaining financial independence. These are the primary features of perceived ideal masculinities for the participants. These were also evaluated as the most important foundations of being a man in Turkish society. Overall, economic independence is seen as a primary requirement for a man to build and maintain his own life properly. There is an undeniable mental effect of financial independence in addition to improved economic and material living standards which are seen as basic requirements to be respected in the society. This situation is also evaluated as one of the most concrete ways to prove one's manhood. In addition to all these, financial independence is seen as a necessity for a man to be able to marry in Turkish society. In other words, marriage was seen as the next step following getting a job nearly for all of the participants.

A man must have a job. He shouldn't have any bad habits. These affect families both in financial and social terms. If you don't have a job, nobody lets their daughters marry you. It's the first question they ask. What does he do for a living? In almost every family, man is the head of the household. (Topçu, 25)

A man should be able to provide for his family financially. He should be able to protect his wife. In-laws look for these traits in their sons-in-law. (Halim, 27)

Comments of the participants show that marriage was not enough to build a family. According to their perception, maintaining a family life is as important as starting one. Maintaining a family life is mostly associated with having children. Still, couples are expected to obey specific rules. Providing financial stability, avoiding bad habits such as consuming alcohol or gambling, and being a good father and husband are expected from men. Few participants added that maintaining family bonds with one's first family is also important since keeping the role of good son is provided through this relationship. Only one participant said that having a good relationship with one's wife's family is important for a good family life. However, it should not be thought that gaining financial independence is seen only related to building and maintaining a family. Although to build and maintain a family is seen as one of the major prerequisites for an ideal man in Turkish society, financial independence is also perceived necessary for gaining one's life control in total. It can be claimed that financial independence is both necessary for a son to gain control over his life and to build his own family. Thus, most of the participants built their masculine perception on the basis of economic independence.

In addition to these general patterns of perceived expectations, there were some other personal comments made by the participants. One participant claimed that Turkish society expects men to be a protector in a more restricting way.

He should be strong. You shouldn't fail. You'll provide money for your family. You'll protect your wife and kids. You should even restrict them a little. Like putting a collar on them. Man takes the role of a restrictor both in the family and society. I don't know if he wants it at all. As he takes the role, I guess he wants it too. (Beko, 22)

One participant claimed that marriage means to a woman to fulfill her desire to have children. He claimed that women use men for their specific motives, and marriage is the formal way of doing it.

He should build a family. Everybody wants it. As we live in a Muslim country, we call it marriage of course. Having kids is also important. Our women use men only to become mothers. Then they ignore the men they married. Their children become the center of their lives. (Chucky, 25)

In terms of being the only financial provider of the household, there were different comments made by the interviewees. Most of the participants said that it would not be a problem if their wives also had a job. A few of them believed that it would be difficult to live on one income. This group also noted that it would be even better if their wives earned money too. Four of the participants said that it would be a problem for them if their wives earn more than them; this would make them feel emasculated. Only one participant commented that it would not be a problem if his wife would earn more than him.

Being responsible and earning money are expected from men. But I don't think that men should earn more. (Chucky, 25)

Men are expected to be financial providers. He is expected to have the gift of the gab. Also, women should earn less than men. He should have a higher status. He should have a car. Mainly, expectations are economic. (Hank, 26)

After discussing marriage and then having children, the participants added to the list of perceived expectations from men in Turkish society. Most of the participants said that men were not allowed to live their lives to the fullest. Few of them even believed that men were expected to die at a certain age after their retirement.

5-6 years after retirement, he is expected to die. Yes, his death is also expected. Look at Turkish men. They die five years after retirement. When you look at the Europeans, you see that they still do things like hiking and trekking when they are 85 years old. You can't see this in Turkey. (Gökhan, 26)

After marriage you're expected to have kids. Then you're expected to take care of them. After all these, you should die. (Deniz Ali, 21)

4.4. The Sources of Knowledge of Masculinities

Family was mentioned as a source of knowledge of masculinities by most of the participants. Usually, paternal and male figures in the families were picked as examples. Their attitudes, actions, the way they create their personalities and relationships were observed by the younger male members in the families.

Basically, it starts with the relationship between the father and son. My father also lives in the same society with me. Maybe he lives under harder conditions. We are not living in a gender-equal society right now. Still, things are better now if we compare it with the times 30 or 40 years before. As generations get older, the dosage of discipline increases. A son gets first things from his father, from his father's relationship with his family members and his social circle. As a result, the son may not be the same as his father. He can be the opposite of his father. Again, the source is his father. It starts with him. Father is the first and the strongest male figure one ever sees. Later on, as he gets older, after high school, sons try to create things he sees in himself. Because of puberty, he tries to prove himself. He is shaped by the things he got from his father during his childhood, from the social environment that he was part of, and the developmental stages that he gets through. (Utku, 22)

Imitation and adaptation of specific personality traits in terms of creating masculinities were discussed throughout Chapter 5. Idealized characteristics of masculinities and idealized male figures were discussed with reference to different contexts. In addition to the male figures in the family, there were two cases where the principles of masculinities were taught by female figures. Seven participants referred to personal experiences and to their own efforts as sources of knowledge of masculinities.

I'll directly quote my mother: A man should be able to take his woman under his wings. (Tona23, 25)

Especially my grandmother gave me advice. Usually, old people, old women give advice. I didn't get any information from a young woman about how to be a man. (Gökhan, 26)

It is important to note that these seven participants did not exclude the impact of their families or traditions on shaping their masculinities.

After mentioning their families, most of the participants added their friends and schoolmates since the education system is considered as an important source for

creating masculinities traits. Being part of a different kind of hierarchy as well as recognition of the opposite biological sex are important factors in the development process of different masculinities characteristics. The education system is also seen as a tool for self-development. Few participants stated that they could develop themselves in a specific way after they finished school. The effect of reading was seen as essential in this phase of self-development. In addition to education and reading, the impact of media was also mentioned by fifteen participants. In contrast with education, the effect of media was seen as manipulative in an unwanted way. Media was seen as a tool for creating specific types of masculinities. According to most of the participants, the media attempts to shape men in a certain way. Manipulation strategies of the media change throughout time. These comments of the participants also support the arguments about the mechanism of hegemonic masculinity and confirm the multiplicity of masculinity concept.

Most people, especially in Turkish society, learn about hegemonic masculinity from mafia and gangsters TV shows. School children imitate the actors in the TV shows when interacting with each other and with the opposite sex. Especially, uneducated people adopt these kinds of acts. (Erendibi, 25)

When you turn on the TV, you see that they impose a classical male figure on you. The media forces you to fit into this model, things like men should definitely be a warrior. When you look at the political conditions of the country, the media tells you to stay strong, be ready to die if needed, and get ready to leave your family behind. (Gökhan, 26)

Only three participants referred to biological attributions mentioning the role of genetics. Although they did not exclude the impact of socialization, they believed that a part of masculinities is innate.

4.5. Idealized Father – Son Relationship

The definition and dynamics of an ideal relationship between parents and children were examined by different scientific disciplines. These definitions and dynamics have changed throughout time and naturally it shows variation across different cultures. Other important factors such as socio-economic status, ethnic background and religious beliefs are also effective in this process. Familial dyads

such as mother and daughter, mother and son or father and son are also studied by different approaches. Among them, father and son relationship has been examined by developmental psychology, social psychology, sociology, gender studies, and critical studies on men and masculinities.

The ideal relationship between fathers and sons was described by the participants. Their answers can be grouped into two categories. Half of the participants claimed that an ideal relationship should be hierarchical, while the other half claimed that an ideal relationship should be a friendly one.

A hierarchical relationship between the father and son was described based on the authority of the father. In this relationship, the father figure is seen as a guidance mechanism. This guidance is expected to be both in material and mental terms. Most of the comments describe fathers as morally instructive and as trainers with reference to the advice they give about political and financial issues. Important life decisions such as choosing an occupation, marriage decision or moving out of home are mostly asked to fathers. Their ideas about these kinds of issues are valued by them who idealize a hierarchical father-son relationship. Fathers are expected to have personality traits which are attributed to idealized man. In addition to their personality traits, fathers are also expected to be a respected person in society. Habits such as alcohol consumption are seen as a threat to the authority of the father. Thus, these were mostly not approved by the participants. For some of the participants these kinds of habits were acceptable only when they do not interfere with the autonomy of the father. Affection and compassion were also seen as essential for a healthy relationship between father and son. However, respect is assumed as the base for these emotions to foster. Most of the participants claimed that other aspects of the relationship would not be possible without a certain degree of respect. The hierarchy between fathers and sons is seen as more flexible than the hierarchy between fathers and grandfathers. All of the participants agreed that their fathers were more affectionate and compassionate compared to their fathers' relationship with their own fathers. This hierarchy does not apply to the relationship between grandfathers and grandsons. In most cases, grandfathers are seen like elder

parents, compassionate towards their grandsons. Still, the hierarchy between grandfathers and fathers is maintained lifelong; their relationship is seen as a familial dyad that lack understanding. Nearly all of the participants stated that they felt sorry for their fathers in these terms. They think that their fathers were not born and raised in families where they could have felt more love and compassion. Because of the same reason, some distant attitudes or harsh behavior of their fathers were accepted as normal. Mostly, participants tended to feel compassion for their fathers while they were criticizing them. They also tended to explain the motives of their fathers with reference to the nature of their relationship with their fathers.

I would say it should be full of love and compassion but I'm not sure if they're needed that much. I think they should get on well with each other. They shouldn't argue too much. It won't help anyone. You are his father, he is your son. What can you earn or lose by arguing with him? Fatherhood is something learned. You shouldn't push them too hard, they also learn. My father was with me during the learning process, he is now better with my sibling. (Beko, 22)

It should be noted that acts including affection or compassion are usually expected from mothers. Too much affection and compassion were also evaluated as a problem in an idealized hierarchical father-son relationship. In this kind of a relationship, the father is the authority figure and a source of a certain kind of stress for sons. This kind of a stress was seen as a requirement for most of the participants. They thought that mothers were too compassionate and that they could not force their children to do certain things. However, authority and harshness of a father were expected to motivate the participants to achieve their goals and objectives. . In addition to affection and compassion based on respect, trust and generosity were also expected from this kind of a relationship. These characteristics were listed as secondary. Affection, compassion and respect were seen as the primary traits for building a strong bond between fathers and sons. After all these elements are achieved, trust and generosity would follow necessarily. Trust and generosity were seen as essential to maintain a healthy father-son relationship. In this second phase of the relationship, sons expect their fathers to give them some space so they can prove themselves physically, emotionally, psychologically, mentally and financially. For a

man to create a healthy masculine characteristic, this phase was seen as essential. In general, fathers are expected to be more sympathetic towards their sons during this phase. In other words, sons expect their fathers to soften their authoritarian and harsh attitude. Sons want their fathers to remember that they were young once too, and that they also made many mistakes. Too much criticism in this phase of the idealized hierarchical relationship between fathers and sons is seen as a reason for low self-esteem for men.

Fathers should understand that the person he deals with is very young. He's only at the beginning of his life. He tries to create his own personality. If a father doesn't understand this, he expects too much from his son. He shouldn't think that they are equally strong. His son can't meet his expectations yet. When this situation is reflected on the son, he feels like he has an inability to meet any expectation throughout his life. It's a psychological burden. It can depress you. A father should accept his son as he is. He should approach accordingly. (Utku, 22)

The second idealized type of father-son relationship is the one defined as friendly. In this friendly type affection and compassion were emphasized more than respect. For this group of participants, the authority of the father is considered as harmful if it causes a distance between fathers and sons. Also for these participants mothers are more available to provide love, affection, compassion and devotion in comparison to fathers. Fathers are known to express their loving feeling towards their sons in their own ways. In this kind of a relationship, the most emphasized element is communication between fathers and sons. Sons want to be able to talk about everything with their fathers including sexuality, drugs, romantic relationships, religion, and politics.

They should definitely be friends. If I wasn't friends with my father in high school, I was now a heroin addict. A father should talk about everything with his son. Drugs, sexuality, everything. Only by this way, a son doesn't go astray. (Coşkun, 24)

Societal norms and taboos were also criticized in this second type of relationship. Expressing emotions was not seen as feminine; actually, it was supported by these participants. A hierarchical, distant relationship is seen as a societal norm by those in the second group. For a healthy masculine characteristic,

clear and comfortable communication between fathers and sons is seen as essential. Spending time together was emphasized following good communication with fathers. Spending time together was generally defined as doing sports, going to football matches, to movies, theatres or fishing.

I think it shouldn't be harsh. Because of the perception of masculinities, there's an assumption that men should stay strong. I don't agree with that. Communication (with fathers) should be strong. They should spend time together. When a child asks for something, his father shouldn't say not now. I don't say that they should spend all days together. Still, a father should spend time with his son when he gets a chance. (Deniz Ali, 21)

Trust was listed after affection, compassion and communication. Trust relationship is rather seen as a natural outcome of the stages discussed above. Fathers are expected to guide their sons by being compassionate role-models to their sons. Then, they are expected to trust their sons and help them to develop their personality. Sons expect their fathers to be smooth and unrestrictive. When they make mistakes, fathers are expected to be tolerating and not to criticize them harshly. Fathers are also expected not to set limits for their sons. They are mostly expected to let their sons grow up in their own ways and be there for them when they fail.

It should be noted that there were no distinct differences between the participants who idealize the hierarchical and friendly types of relationship between fathers and sons. Socio-economic status, geographical background, age or level of education of the participants did not make any difference in their comments. This situation may be explained by the changing dynamics of this specific relationship. We can assume that the respondents gave us the general idea about their relationship with their fathers. Still, a hierarchical relationship may not indicate that all aspects of this relationship are strict and harsh. Also, a friendly relationship does not mean that there are no rules or limitations in the construction of friendliness between fathers and sons.

4.6. The Actual Dynamics of Father – Son Relationship

The participants described traditional and distant father-son relationship mostly with reference to the patriarchal rules in Turkish society. These unspoken

rules were claimed to create a hierarchy between them. Respect and love were differentiated in this specific relationship. Only few participants claimed that their relationships with their fathers were based on friendship. In these cases, the love between parent and child is apparent. All of these participants said there was respect in their relationship with their fathers. Rather than love, respect seems to create a hierarchy and shape the status of the father in this relationship. It can be claimed that the love demand of sons is rather modernist when compared with the respect demand of fathers. Respect is one of the core values in the Turkish society caused by both traditions and religion. Although love is also given importance at the societal level, the expression of love is rather problematic. It is easy to show respect only. Still, it is hard to equilibrate love and respect in the same relationship. Somehow, love seems like a weakness against the authority of the father. This can be explained by the perception of emasculating acts in Turkish society. The expression of love is one of the acts that weaken the masculinity of a man. It is important to add that fear was not mentioned as a current element in the dynamics of father and son relationship. It is seen as related to the childhood phase. After a while, respect is more emphasized than fear and love. At this point, it should be mentioned that there was no significant difference between the levels of education of fathers in terms of the dynamics of this relationship. In general, conflict between traditions and modern values may be the core explanation since the necessity of love was underlined by all of the participants related to the issues discussed above. In addition to love and respect, there is also an assumed support from fathers. Most of the participants were sure that their fathers would support them when needed. These participants also added trust to their list as an element defining the nature of their relationship with their fathers.

If I face a big obstacle in my life, I would want to take my father's advice. I don't do it. I prefer to go through it alone. For example, I've never hugged my father before. My father is a cold person, he doesn't express his love. I don't see my family as money. I'm almost financially independent in that respect. Our relationship is simple. I don't miss him so much when he's gone. Still, I feel happy when I see him. I feel happy when we spend time together. We don't talk too much, still, he's a good person. He doesn't get angry with us too much. (Çöp, 21)

Problems are shared more comfortably with mothers. Issues such as romantic relationships are mostly shared with mothers. These kinds of issues are seen as private. Most of the participants said that it was unnecessary to discuss these issues with their fathers. Fathers are seen as authority figures whom they can discuss more serious issues such as work, economics, politics, religion, and et cetera. Nearly all of the participants mentioned their hesitation about sharing their personal problems in general. At the same time, they said that they wished they could share these problems with their fathers and ask for help. Still, they noted that they did not tell anything to their fathers about their personal problems not to worry them. Most of the participants also openly said that they expected financial assistance from their fathers. However, they do not discuss this last issue with their mothers.

The nature of the relationship between fathers and sons can change under different socio-cultural or socio-economic conditions. Few participants believed that being the first-born child is also effective in their relationship with their fathers.

Because I was his first child, he cherished me. Still, we didn't spend much time together, even during my childhood. (Gökhan, 26)

In the past years in Kırşehir, showing affection to kids in front of elder members of the family was considered as shame. He didn't show his love and affection because of this. He refrained from showing emotion. (Oğuz, 26)

Three participants claimed that things would be different if they were born as girls. They believed that fathers in general were harder on their sons.

A father can easily argue with his son. He can't with his daughter. (Kylorap, 26)

Age gap between fathers and sons is also effective in this relationship.

I didn't experience a strong father-son relationship. My father married late. I have an older dad. I'm his latest child. We have a 40-year age gap. We have two generations between us. When I grew up, my father looked like my grandfather. I admired the relationship between my father and my oldest brother. Although they didn't talk much, they could understand each other. My father loved him in a different way. I didn't spend time with my father. (Çay, 26)

One participant was working with his father in his workplace. He claimed that this situation changed the dynamics of their relationship.

Our relationship is mostly based on respect. We're like colleagues rather than a father and son. We work together for hours. My father gets bored when I'm not at home. He cares for my thoughts and consults me. If I get into trouble, I expect help from him. But it depends on what kind of trouble I'm in. (Coşkun, 24)

Three participants defined the relationships between them and their fathers as vague and nonstandard. For them, a standard relationship between a father and son should be more affectionate. They described their fathers as silent and indifferent. Communication with fathers in these cases was described as limited. Work routines of fathers appear to be effective in poor communication.

My father was working. When he came home, he watched TV and slept. We didn't go to matches together. I can't tell if a relationship with one's father should be like that or not. I had much fun with my mother. I always spend time with her when I was a child. While my father was working, we used to go to the village for three months. We couldn't spend time with our father. (Kırıkçatal, 24)

My father was a worker. He was at home less than a month during the whole year. I didn't know him well until I was 15-16 years old. I wanted to surround myself by male figures to fill the gap. I spend time with my uncles. My mother didn't want me to do this but I did to fill the gap. When I was in high school, especially during adolescence, we didn't talk much as if we were enemies. It was because of my father's attitude though. He doesn't like to talk too much. When I was a child, my parents argued a lot. I got distant from my father. When I got into the military school, when I was 19, he was proud of me. He became more like a loving father. He didn't call me 'son' though. He always says "her (mother's) son". (Oğuz, 26)

Two participants claimed that other male figures in their family such as their uncles and grandfathers tried to fill the father gap. In these cases, fathers were mostly working. When they were at home, they did not spend much time with their sons. In these cases, the characteristics related to masculinities were transferred to various male figures in the family and to other sources.

We have an indifferent relationship with my father. We didn't have a clear relationship. This is because of his personality. He doesn't really care about anything. If he's asked to do something, he does it. He doesn't escape from his responsibilities. But he doesn't do things without being told. I guess my grandfather felt that gap and spent time with me during my childhood. He talked to me, asked questions, took me to the mosque, coffeehouse or downtown. My grandfather tried to do these things spontaneously. We lived in the same building until I was eight. I had a strong bond with my grandfather. (Tona23, 25)

Most of the participants said that they do not communicate with their fathers in a daily routine. Actually, only four participants mentioned that they talk with their fathers' everyday as they live in the same house. Even in that situation they do not talk about serious issues. Most of their conversation is about their everyday lives and duties. Other participants who live apart from their fathers claimed that it was better for them to be far away and communicate less. Physical distance is seen as a healthy condition for their relationship with their parents. Living with a father was mostly seen as a problematic and tense relationship for most of the participants.

Problems between fathers and sons usually start during the puberty period. Mostly, problems in school or problems with other children are the most common reasons causing tension between fathers and sons during the adolescence period. Most of the participants mentioned that they had no problems with their fathers when they were younger. Still, most of them noted that they did not spend much time with their fathers during their childhood. In many cases, long working hours of fathers was responsible for that.

I remember having so much fun with my father when I was 6-8 years old. Even if weren't able to do things together, he slept with me. We used to go fishing. In adolescence, we had so many problems. I couldn't talk about the things I wanted to. These things were about politics or any other ideas I had. He tried to change my mind, he wanted me to think like him. Sometimes he was like a very good friend, but we always argued. (Tövbestein, 26)

It should be noted that only three participants said that their communication with their fathers was very good and that they could easily share their problems with their fathers. They also noted that they like to spend time together.

There is a strong correlation between masculinity on the one hand and gender and marriage on the other. Gender perception is a term used to define how people are

placed on a masculine-feminine continuum. It is crucial when analyzing the perception of people about their own gender identity, gender ideals, gender roles, gender displays, and gender stratification in general (Cohen, 2001). All of these aspects of gender perception construct masculinities and femininities in various ways. Thus, gender perception of my participants is one of the socio-cultural parameters that determine what kind of masculinity they choose to adopt. Perception of marriage was also included in the study since marriage is evaluated as a transition phase in becoming a man in Turkish society (Sancar, 2009). As Sobal (2005) claimed in his article, we can interpret all features of life as gendered including marriage. Marriage has been attributed different definitions and meanings throughout history (Golod, 1998). As marriage practices change over time, roles and expectations from spouses also change. These roles and expectations are constructed by the social norms and values of society through a gender-specific normative perception. For instance, breadwinner role has been idealized for men during the twentieth century (Haywood, & Mac an Ghail, 2003). According to this role, the essential expectation from husbands and fathers is to provide economic security and stability for their families. Motivations and masculine ideals of married men have been shaped to adjust to these expectations. Communities support masculinities that attune specific criteria to sustain certain types of family structures. Thus, marriage plays a very significant role in shaping masculinities.

One of the most striking aspects of father-son interaction in my sample was the absolute lack of communication between fathers and sons about their personal lives, especially about their romantic relationships, sexuality, marriage, and about women in general. Except two of my participants, none of the sons talk about their intimate relationships with their fathers. Even if they have talked, their fathers gave indirect advice and mostly joked about it. Choosing a humorous style for communication is an indicator of the overall relational satisfaction between fathers and sons (Neuendorf, Rudd, Palisin, & Pask, 2015). There were some warnings from their fathers about not jumping into a relationship and not to be thoughtless since this is a serious issue. When there is an attempt to marry or when there is an ongoing

serious romantic relationship, there is a limited conversation with fathers. Only one participant said that his father warned and advised him about choosing a lifetime partner, and talked to him about what kind of manners a wife should have. Fathers of other participants did not guide their sons at all. The general attitude of fathers was letting their sons choose whomever they want for romantic relationships or for marriage. In other words, there were no restrictions about the qualities of a partner. On the contrary, they encouraged their sons with some emancipatory comments about their future partners which most can be considered as unconventional. Two of these comments are as follows:

My father told me to find an orphan girl. He said we can be her family. He also said that she could be a foreigner since foreigners don't care much about kinship relationships. (Tövbestein, 26)

I remember my father telling me that he wouldn't come to my house after I marry. He has the American mentality. He said that I have no responsibilities which would restrict or limit me. He also claimed that foreign girls are good too. My parents wouldn't judge me if I choose a foreign partner. (Erendibi, 25)

Since Darwin (1859) race is assumed to be an important element in partner selection. Different disciplines such as anthropology, sociology and social psychology claimed in the past that people tend to choose their partners from the same racial background and most of the marriages occur within a group (Jensen, 1978; Buss & Barnes, 1986). As it was claimed by Halwani (2018), racial preference may function as some kind of an election process to exclude people who are not identified as members of an approved group. However, recent studies suggest that racial stratification has been declining and the dynamics of racial differences has lost its importance when compared to the tendencies in the past (Torche & Rich, 2017). There are very limited studies about the racial preferences of Turkish people in the context of marriage (Hoşgör, 2016). Most of the existing studies focus on the marriage patterns of the Turks who live in Europe as immigrants and on the dynamics of marriage with Europeans (Lievens, 1999; Reniers, 2001; Timmerman, 2006; Timmerman Lodewyckx, & Wets, 2009). Race of prospective brides was not mentioned in my study.

As Kağıtçıbaşı (2002) argued in her article, the dominant family model in Turkey can be described with the term “emotional interdependence”. This means that the level of material dependency on children is declining. In other words, children are no longer evaluated by their "economic/utilitarian" values. In addition to this development, there is an increasing psychological value attributed to children. Rather than their possible economic contribution to the family, seeing children as a source of joy and as friends gained a momentum (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). This trend indicates that the dynamics of parenting in Turkey is changing, especially with respect to the understanding of fatherhood and its practices. In Kıray’s (1964) study, which was conducted in Ereğli, one of the main roles of fathers was to find the proper girl when the time comes to marry off his son (p. 115). Fathers are involved in choosing their son's partners and they also have the final say. Kıray also argues that in Ereğli the most mentioned conflict between fathers and sons was about whom their sons should marry and about where they should live after marriage. Patrilocality was not mentioned in the interviews of this study. Fathers also seemed to be uninterested, even emancipatory about the place where their sons should live when they marry. The difference between the conclusions of Kıray’s study and this study may be due to social transformation that is linked to “urbanization” as claimed by Kağıtçıbaşı (2002). Still, not all of the fathers lived in the cities. Most of the fathers who lived in rural areas also had an emancipatory attitude towards their sons in this specific context. Also, the education level of fathers did not make a difference in this attitude.

When the topic is marriage, the involvement of fathers was usually limited to financial matters in my study. As a parental role, fathers provide resources to assist their children when they are getting married (Anderson & Gray, 2010). From wedding ceremony expenses to giving money for their new home, fathers were seen as economic providers. This is a type of indirect paternal care. It can be claimed that the area of interpersonal relationships is seen as “feminine” so fathers may not want to be included in this sphere. Talking about romantic relationships and how to choose a partner appears like the duty of mothers or other women in the family. Three of my participants said that they talked about these kinds of issues with their mothers and/or

sisters. The rest said that they usually talk about these issues with their friends.

In the literature, Turkey is pointed out as a country which experiences rapid changes in terms of marriage dynamics (Beşpınar, 2014). According to Beşpınar's data, there is an increase in the number of divorced people in Turkey. There is also an increase in the number of people who never married. Similar socio-demographic characteristics appear to be the most effective factor when choosing a marriage partner. Similarity in terms of economic conditions, social status and religious sect was also emphasized as important by the interviewees. These kinds of characteristics of a family were more important than individualistic characteristics like one's physical appearance or level of education when choosing a marriage partner. Kin marriage is the most favored type. These findings show that to obey traditional marriage behavior is still a norm in Turkish society. Other important factors that were mentioned were the effects of education, socio-economic status and regional differences on marriage practices. These three factors affect not only marriage practices, but also the relationship between the partners and their ideas about marriage.

Age at first marriage for men was mostly between 18 and 24, according to the surveys conducted by the Turkish Family and Social Policies Ministry in 2006 and 2011. My participants' ages ranged between 21 and 27 however, none of them were married. Their levels of education appear to be a factor in explaining this situation. The findings of Beşpınar's (2014) study also suggest that as level of education increases, age at first marriage decreases. Supporting this finding, all of my participants were either university students or university graduates. Their fathers' level of education did not make a difference in their attitude to marry later.

According to Beşpınar (2014), age at first marriage increased in the western part of Turkey. Additionally, spouses usually meet with each other at secondary social environments (mostly colleagues, friends). In the eastern part of Turkey, age at first marriage is younger than the western part where spouses meet with each other at rather limited social circles (mostly neighbors, family members like cousins). The decision to marry and the approval of the family were found to be more important

than one's own judgment. Actually, the case of one of my participants is parallel with these results. His family lived in Gaziantep (a city in eastern Turkey) and had a more conservative attitude in general. His father was clear and directive while he gave advice to his son about marriage. He pointed out the important characteristics of an ideal wife and expected him to obey his norms when choosing a wife. This was the only case where a father forced his son to meet his expectations. There were other fathers who were born or still living in eastern rural areas such as in a village of Elâzığ, but they had a more libertarian attitude towards their son's life partner.

Lastly, the economic conditions of the participants must be considered as an essential factor in this specific topic. Since men are still perceived as the "economic providers" to families, the income of the male partner is of vital importance in Turkey. Although nearly half of the participants had a job and a regular income, they did not yet feel ready to marry and start a family. Their comments were mostly about financial difficulties stemming from the current economic situation in Turkey. The rest of the participants were university students in Ankara, and they received economic support from their families for their education and daily expenses. In their current economic situation, they did not even think about having a serious romantic relationship. Not being able to provide for their economic needs including simple activities like joining a social event was considered as something that would negatively affect the masculinity of a man:

When you go on a date with your girlfriend, you have to insist that you have to pay for the bill. This is a norm of masculinity in Turkey. But I don't agree with this. If you always have to insist on paying all the expenses, it's devastating both personally and economically. (Deniz Ali, 21).

Discussing sexuality with fathers is a taboo according to my interviewees. Only two of the fathers discussed sexuality with their sons. One of the fathers warned his son to be careful about sexual matters. The participant told me that he felt shy, so he did not want to continue talking about it. Another participant's father explained to him that sexual desires were all about hormones and warned him about excessive sexual activity. He also added that it was his libido causing changes in his body. Rest

of the participants gave short and clear answers and said that they did not communicate with their fathers about sexuality. Most commented that it would be “inappropriate” to talk about such things with their fathers. Some of them also added that they did not want to start this kind of a conversation since they did not want to know about their fathers’ past sexual experiences. In addition to these, most of the answers implied a difference between their understanding of sexuality and their fathers’. In general, they were afraid to be criticized or condemned by their fathers since they did not have a “stable” sexual relationship with a single partner. In this respect, they all considered their fathers as “more conservative” than they are.

4.7. The Father and Ideal Man

Most of the participants claimed that their fathers are very close to being the ideal father figure. This was mostly because their fathers were the first male figure in their lives, as explained by the respondents. Personal characteristics such as being good, compassionate, helpful, and nice were also listed when discussing the qualities of an idealized father.

A father is always the ideal model for a man. He is the first man you’ve ever met. He is the one. (Modernhood, 21)

My father is very close to the ideal model. He is almost the same. People always choose someone as a role-model when they’re 3-4 years old. Men choose their fathers as a role-model. It may be the same with me too. My father also looks to his own father as a role-model. (Kylorap, 26)

Some of the participants criticized their fathers in terms of not being able to adapt to the current technology and social developments. They mentioned the different socio-cultural factors at the time they were born and raised. These factors were seen as important for one’s self-development and personality. Consequently, these same factors were also seen as contributing to becoming the ideal man.

An ideal man should be able to adapt. If my father had lived 20 years ago, it would be better for him. He’s so patient. I’m not like him. You understand things as you grow up. He’s very close to the ideal man. Still, he can’t adapt to today’s technology. I would say he’s 95% ideal man. (Topçu, 25)

I'm my father's son. But our perspectives about life may be different. The place where he was born and raised, the time period he has lived... If I'm 100% ideal man, he's 80%. (Chucky, 25)

My father is a very good father, he is a very good person. But he lived in a different place. The culture he has lived in is different than mine. They argue a lot with my sister. He created a routine for himself. He was able to leave his village all by himself. He studied all by himself. When I think about his progress until this day, I can still say he is the ideal man. (Akbabuş, 23)

Some participants mentioned the differences between the ideal man and their fathers. Most important reasons for these differences were lifestyles and expectations from life.

My father is close to his own ideal man, not close to mine. (Fearor, 25)

He's far from being the ideal man. Still, most women would want to marry him. He is stable. He doesn't drink or gamble. He has a stable salary. He goes to work then comes back home. He always brings bread when he's coming home. He fixes breakfasts at weekends. (Çöp, 21)

Although most of the participants claimed that their fathers were close to the ideal man, they criticized them for minor things. These criticisms were mostly explained as a result of generation gap. Sociality and technology adaptation of the fathers were criticized. These criticisms were attributed to the era that the fathers were born and raised. The personality of the fathers was not pointed as not being adaptable to changing circumstances.

4.7.1. Criticisms and Appreciations of Fathers

Although most of the participants described their fathers as the ideal man or very close to the ideal model, few participants said the opposite. Socio-cultural factors and the level of education of fathers were usually held responsible for their personalities. Lack of a proper role model was also listed among the reasons. Mostly, families and the traditional norms in the places where their fathers were born and raised were the points of reference when describing the characteristics of their fathers. Traditional rules were seen as strict norms that restrict people's freedoms.

Same rules were also seen as responsible for preventing one's personal development. Two participants added that they appreciated the efforts of their fathers to adapt to the current technology or social situations.

He isn't so close to the ideal man. His level of education, the cultural atmosphere of the place where he lived, lack of a role model... These are the things that influenced his personality. (Oğuz, 26)

He isn't close to the ideal man only because he's graduated from primary school. If things were different, he would be the ideal man. (Coşkun, 24)

He isn't close to the ideal man as he was raised in a village according to strict rules. He tries break free now. I really admire his effort. They treated my elder sister differently. Now they try to be closer to her. He tries to be more understanding and nice. (Kırıkçatal, 24)

It should be noted that the participants made a very clear distinction between the ideals of the society and their own. In general, following social norms does not equal to their own perception of the ideal man. Fathers are defined as the ideal man when the issue is being a responsible father and a husband. However, when discussing matters like sharing thoughts, feelings or emotions, fathers appear to move away from classical perception of an ideal father figure. Respect for their fathers (traditional norms) versus their understanding of freedom as educated urbanites (modern) seems to contradict. In other words, there appears to be an unsolved tension between the old and new ways of relating to their fathers. Although most of the fathers were described as 'obeying people' to the ideals of the society, most of the participants claimed that their fathers were also close to the ideal figure. It is important to add that some of the characteristics were seen as ideal by both the participants and the society. For instance, taking the breadwinner role of the family is seen as ideal by the society according to the perceptions of the participants. To some extent, most of the participants also shared the same idea. Still, they added that the breadwinner status should not be attributed only to men. Women should also contribute financially. These kinds of variations in the ideas of the participants seem to make them think that they are radically different from the rest of the society.

My father hides his feelings, he doesn't express himself. He is cold-blooded unlike my mom. I saw him crying only a few times. When he's sad, he hides it. He complies with social norms. He can't be defined as the ideal man. (Mert Pazarıcı, 22)

All of the participants compared their fathers with their grandfathers. They consider their fathers as more developed than their grandfathers referring to their level of education and their perception of gender equality

When I compare him with his father, I can tell that he's more developed than him. They are the opposite of each other, just like us. (Gökhan, 26)

Only five participants said that there was no reason to criticize their fathers. They argued that the things they do wrong were due to external factors. Place of birth, time period and the cultures in which the fathers were born and raised were held responsible for the mistakes they make. They mostly appreciated their fathers for their personal traits and social skills. If a father is described as a family man, he is respected. Other factors appreciated were discussed in the sections above. Overall, most of the participants did not criticize their fathers harshly.

Personal traits such as not being emotionally expressive, caring too much about what others think, not being able to seek one's right, being not much talkative, being impatient, having improper expectations, inadaptability to the changing social conditions, stubbornness, lying, and extravagance were the criticized traits in fathers. Fathers are expected to be mentally strong who can be criticized if not. In the family context, not spending time with one's family and the desire to be the only authority in the family were criticized by most of the participants. Although the participants respect the ideas and decisions of their fathers, they want to be a part of the decision-making process. They also do not want to accept their fathers as an unquestionable authority figure. They want to be able to talk with them both about personal and familial matters. Participants who do not smoke also criticized smoking fathers.

He doesn't express his emotions or ideas. He cares too much about what others think. He doesn't talk much, he doesn't seek his right. He gets mentally tired easily. On the other hand, he stays calm. He doesn't lie. He doesn't have any money coming from ill-gotten gains. He can do no wrong. When he talks, he talks reasonably. (Oğuz, 26)

He doesn't like small talk. He can tell when he meets someone smart. The people he likes, he likes them sincerely. I appreciate him. Still, he isn't the role model I expected to have. He doesn't talk, we don't do anything together. We share nothing with him. He had his own room, cigarettes, and tea. I never understand why my mother married him. Other than his salary, he gave me nothing. (Hank, 26)

He doesn't want us to be a part of the decision-making process in the family. I criticize him. He never tells something negative to us. Just tell it, why don't you do that? I realized this much later. That's a problem in itself. Even when he gets sick, he doesn't go to the hospital. This is a common trait of Turkish fathers. (Gökhan, 26)

When participants were asked if they would want to be like their fathers, they gave both positive and negative answers. However, none of them really wanted to be just like their fathers. Although they appreciated their fathers, they provided details about why they were criticizing them. The participants evaluated the personality of their fathers through socio-cultural and economic factors.

I want to be a father. But I'm not sure if I want to be just like my father. I think it's very satisfying to raise a human being. Still, it's hard to do under the current conditions of the country and the world. (Feanor, 25)

Self-sacrifice and generosity of fathers are the key characteristics that the participants wanted to adopt. These qualities were most appreciated and respected by all of the participants. In a few cases, fathers were claimed to be irresponsible in terms of good parenting. These fathers were criticized for not spending time with their children and for not treating their wives with respect.

I definitely want to be like my father, but I can't. He's so self-sacrificing. It should be the paternal instinct. After twelve hours of ride, he took my sister out for dinner just because she wanted. I can't do that, I don't think so. (Coşkun, 24)

If we add being open to new things, I would want to be like my father. I appreciate the way he raises children. It's a very difficult thing to do. (Topçu, 25)

He always earns from what is *Halal*. I want to be like him about earning money. But I don't want to be like him when it's about spending time with his children. He doesn't show love or respect to his wife. He killed his inner child. I don't want to do that. (Oğuz, 26)

Although the characteristics of fathers are mostly defined through the personal relationships between sons and fathers, the participants evaluated their fathers also with reference to their social position and their social interaction and relationships with others.

People around my father liked him so much. There were so many people at his funeral. He could easily make a positive impact on other people. I saw it at the funeral. Even people who talked to him only once were there for him. I want to be like him. I've never seen a bad side of him. I don't know if it's because I didn't want to see it or not. (Çay, 26)

Few participants criticized their fathers for not being social.

I've already said that I want to be like him. The family he has built is there for him. You come to a certain age, have children, what more can you expect? He's happy with his life. The things I don't like about him are more though. I expect him to be more social. (Erendibi, 25)

Authority and autonomy are among the most valued characteristics of idealized masculinities. Financial, emotional and mental independence are considered as the requirements for having a strong personality, and these qualities are highly respected. As the existence of these personal characteristics was highlighted and valued, their absence counts for the negative qualities of fathers. Being directed and manipulated by other people are seen as a man's weakness.

I don't think I can be like my father. I care so much about my freedom, my own will. I don't want people to direct me. I don't let them into my life easily. So it's not possible for me to be just like my father. Maybe I feel this way as a reaction to my father. He is very controlled in his social relationships. (Tona23, 25)

I like my father's compassion, he can't hurt anyone. Even if he's right, he can't defend himself. Sometimes I want him to raise his voice, but he doesn't adopt a particular attitude. I would want him to be tough in some situations. I want him to seek his right, especially about family issues. You can take his money from his hand, he won't chase you. I don't want to be like him, but my mother tells me that I behave like him too. (Halim, 27)

Based on the ideas about ideal father figures, I now discuss fathers being role models for their sons.

4.7.2. Fathers as Role Models

For further information, participants were also asked if they take their fathers as role models. Positive and negative personality characteristics of their fathers were described in detail in their answers. Fathers were usually appreciated for their interest in family life. Personal qualities of fathers such as being patient, compassionate, helpful, honest, responsible, educated, cultured, and cold-blooded were mentioned in a positive way. Personal traits such as aggressiveness, coerciveness, stubbornness, jealousy, conservativeness, and passiveness were described with a negative connotation. Fathers were criticized if they had some of these negative personality traits listed above.

I see him as a role model in terms of his education, his involvement with his children, his knowledge about other cultures. But he doesn't like to travel. If I were him, I would travel with my family. I would read much more, watch more movies. (Sentex, 26)

He cares for all family members. He's always there for us when we need him. Still, he's restrictive in terms of religious rules. He's weak in planning things, he's stubborn. (Feanor, 25)

My father improved himself when compared to his father. My grandfather helps other people so much, but he doesn't help his own children at all. He gave him a hard life. My father doesn't raise his voice. Only rarely. It's a nice thing. (Beko, 22)

I see my father as a role model. He's an honest man, he never lies. He's responsible. He takes care of his children. He has many friends. He spends time with his wife. I'm more modern than him though. My father doesn't let my mother wear anything she wants. He tries to control her relationships with her male friends. It must be jealousy. I'm not jealous. I must have more self-confidence. I don't get jealous. (Chucky, 25)

His is very successful in crisis management under stressful conditions. He's an optimist. He always believes that things will get better. This makes me stronger. I get my strength from him. Not only a father is important. A mother is also important. Still, the paternal figure is far more important. I have no support but he's my father. It's enough. It's a good feeling. Turkish society feeds this feeling too much. (Gökhan, 26)

One participant mentioned domestic violence. However, he excused his father saying that he was young and inexperienced at the time.

He was violent with me and my sister when we were a child. It happened because of his youthfulness and inexperience. He's different now with my other siblings. His perspective has changed. I want to be different with my own children. Education is so important in these matters. (Coşkun, 24)

Below I provide more details about the basis of seeing fathers as a role model with reference to three different groups of positive traits.

When it comes to the most important ideals that are assumed to be adopted from fathers, participants mostly talked about ethical values and human characteristics that are valued by society.

Most emphasis was on traits like being honest, being loyal to the loved ones and standing behind them always, being true and ethical, and being a trustworthy person that everyone believes in. There is a lexical bundle in Turkish, "*sözünün eri*", which means "a man of his word". In general, all of the traits listed above are perceived as the characteristics of the ideal man. Being patient, giving your maximum effort to achieve your goals, being determined, acting responsible, being an idealist, and being charitable are the other personal traits that were extolled and thought to sons by their fathers. These are the characteristics that conform to norms and rules to provide and maintain the general well-being of societies.

The second emphasis was more on individualistic qualities. These were being free and independent, not overestimating other people, lying if necessary, not caring too much about trivial matters, and not feeling obligated to conform to social traditions.

The third emphasis was on family. These include acts like being able to take hard decisions for the family, having a job for protecting the family from pauperizing

(also not complaining about work when he comes home), allowing children to decide for themselves, and trusting them under all conditions.

There was only one respondent who argued that sons should turn a blind eye to the negative qualities of a father.

Not repeating the things that I criticize about him was the most important lesson that I drove from our relationship. (Utku, 22)

It is important to note that most of the participants seem to evaluate and perceive their fathers both in negative and positive ways. Although they are aware of the negative attitudes and some of the personality traits of their fathers, they mostly tried to understand the reasons behind these negative traits. They did not accuse their fathers of having negative personality characteristics. They also did not sublimate their fathers. Overall, their attitudes were more positive than negative.

4.8. Approval and Admiration from the Fathers

Three participants said that approval and admiration from their fathers were important until they got into university. University admission is seen as one of the primary phases in participants' lives. Other than its importance in terms of education and occupation, the university is seen as a place that directs and shapes one's personality. As all of the participants were either university students or graduates of university, they all mentioned the impact of university education on their personalities and lives. Most of the participants lived with their parents until they got into university. Becoming a university student provided them a physical and mental space since most of them moved to other cities. Apart from being away from their families, they got the chance to meet other people from various other cultures and from different socio-economic classes. By this way, they got the chance to compare their family lives with others. They encountered alternative styles in social and familial relationships. Although most of the participants admire the fatherhood and masculinities styles of their fathers, they said that they wanted to be better people than their parents. The effect of social norms seems to decrease specifically in situations like this. Thus, all of the participants believed that university education changed their lives in a positive way. The participants' self-esteem strengthened as

their level of education increased. To sum up, students who attend university in big cities appear to question their family dynamics and become sensitive about gender segregation.

It was important until I started university. After that, you want to be free. You don't want your parents to interfere with your life. For instance, I drink and smoke. I don't want them to question me about it. Until a certain age, you have to gain admiration from your father. He has to trust you. You'll take his car, he should be able to give it without hesitation. When you want to go out at 3 a.m., he should let you. I still drive slowly when he's with me, to maintain his trust. (Kylorap, 26)

Still, being graduated from the university does not necessarily parallel to a decrease of the importance of approval and admiration from fathers. Sixteen participants said that approval and admiration from their fathers are still important for them. However, this does not mean that these participants act in accordance to please their fathers. Although three participants explained that they made big life decisions parallel to the approval and appreciation of their fathers, most of them did not mention such a huge impact.

It's so important (father's approval). My job, my education. If he didn't care about my education, I wouldn't go to school. I would drop out. I planned so many things according to him. I didn't have any plans for the future. My father created it all by himself. (Coşkun, 24)

It's important, but it's not necessary. I don't do a thing just to gain his admiration. I care about my own feelings and thoughts. If my father admires something I do, I feel like I'm on the right track. (Çöp, 21)

One participant especially mentioned that approval and admiration from his father is more important than his mother's. He explained that his mother appreciated even the little things he did, so her approval and admiration didn't excite him anymore.

It's even more important than my mother's approval and admiration. My mother supports me even about my little acts, she is glad for me. Approval and appreciation from my father is harder. I feel more pleased when I get his admiration. He didn't approve or appreciate me except for my choice of military academy though. (Halim, 27)

Few participants commented on the importance of their father's approval and admiration based on the personal characteristics of fathers.

It's important as my father is a very honest man. He is nationalist, he knows the recent history of this country. He has these values. I want to reach these aims. So I want his approval and admiration. Still, I don't especially do what I do to get his approval and admiration. I've already adopted these values. I try to become a good person. (Piyanist, 22)

Four participants claimed that approval or admiration from their fathers did not matter for them. Three of them said that they wanted to make their own decisions. In other words, they do not want their fathers to interfere with the process of decision-making. So, they do not seek extra approval or admiration from anyone else including their fathers.

I do what I do only for myself. I don't care about his admiration. (Modernhood, 21)

Only one respondent explained that this situation was caused by his ideological perspective.

To care about one's admiration or approval is contrary to me ideologically. I don't stop myself if I think some action is right. I don't care if anyone including my father appreciates me when I do that. If I want to do it, I just do it. I take the consequences. (Deniz Ali, 21)

Although other participants mentioned indirectly, two of them clearly stated that they were not sure if their fathers approved or admired them. Only five participants said that their fathers admired them verbally. Other participants did not say that they felt unapproved or unappreciated. Still, the communication between them and their fathers was vague rather than being clear. This was attributed to the values and norms of Turkish culture by three of the participants. On the other hand, one participant claimed that he was far more appreciated than his elder sister as he was the only male child of his family. This situation was also attributed to the cultural elements of Turkey society. Still, this is seen as an indicator of gender inequality in the society by the participants. They did not seem to be pleased because of the privilege they had.

I'm not sure how I gain his approval or admiration. I can understand my mother, but it's hard to understand my father. I don't know what his expectations about me are. I don't even know if he cares about me. When we are together, I try to do something to please him. Or I try to talk about the topics that I think he likes. He doesn't talk if I don't ask questions to him. I don't try to please him by my big life decisions. (Tona23, 25)

It seems like fathers mostly care about the educational situation of their sons. This specific focus on education is mostly described by financial worries. For most of the fathers of the participants, education is the most secure way to get a job. Getting a job is associated with a man's personality in the Turkish society. It is seen as one of the essential variables in Turkish masculine characteristics. All of these factors seem to lead fathers to appreciate and admire their sons mostly about issues like education and occupation.

4.9. Criticisms and Appreciations from the Fathers

The points that fathers appreciate and criticize were asked to the participants. Only four participants stated that their fathers did not criticize them. Two of them described their fathers as careless. Other two stated that the thoughts and acts of them were parallel to the actions and ideas of their fathers. In addition to the criticisms, these participants did not mention any apparent appreciation. These and other statements of these participants indicated that the communication between them and their fathers was not strong and clear.

For the other twenty participants, most of the appreciations and criticisms were related to the responsibility theme. Nearly all of these participants stated that their fathers appreciated them if they took responsibility for their education or occupation. Irresponsible or incautious acts were criticized harshly by the fathers. Responsibility was expected from the participants in all areas of their lives. Some participants' opinions about these criticisms were already discussed in the sections above. In the sections about the ideal relationship between fathers and sons, only a few participants claimed that the expectations of fathers about their sons were high. This situation was assumed to cause harsh criticisms by fathers.

I'm not that much hard working. He criticizes me about that issue. My brother develops himself more than me, he reads more than me. I'm lazy. My father usually interferes about that. Except that, he supports me. According to him, my laziness is my only flaw. (Halim, 27)

He appreciates me because of my diligence. He doesn't appreciate me verbally, but he expresses his appreciation in his way. (Eren, 26)

The second theme is political and religious beliefs. Although political and religious beliefs of the participants and their fathers were not asked, there was some indirect information in the interviews. Most of the participants mentioned a difference between them and their fathers in terms of their political and religious beliefs. Although not all of the fathers were conservative, most of them were described as more normative than the participants. Fathers were usually seen as traditional. Education level or social background of fathers seemed to be ineffective in this traditional attitude. University graduate fathers were also seen as more normative and conservative by their sons. Birthplace of the fathers was also seen as irrelevant for this situation. This condition of fathers was mostly attributed to the period that they were born and raised in. The approach and relationship style of grandparents were seen as the primary reasons for the traditionalist and conservative attitude of their fathers. Economic conditions and challenges in their lives were also mentioned.

He criticizes my religious beliefs and personal lifestyle. He doesn't interfere with my physical choices. (Feanor, 25)

Being too engaged in political activism was also criticized in three cases.

He used to criticize my hair and beard in high school, but now I think he respects my personality. He used to criticize me for spending time on other things than my education. He used to criticize me for spending too much time for politics. (Modernhood, 21)

The third theme is lifestyle and social relationships. Criticisms towards lifestyle emerged mostly in the puberty period of the participants and continued until the ending of high school. Fathers argued with their sons about their time management, friends, music and movies they liked. Hair and beard were also issues of conflict in some cases. Accessories such as earring, tattoos, and growing hair and beard were criticized harshly by few fathers. After a while, these fathers also

accepted the style of their sons. Half of the participants said that their lifestyles were parallel to their fathers. Naturally, they did not argue about these kinds of issues. None of the participants described themselves as anti-social. Maintaining good friendship and choosing “proper” friends are appreciated by fathers. Proper friends are described as people who do not use harmful substances such as tobacco, alcohol or drugs. These friends do not violate social rules; they act according to social norms. In this sense, political or religious beliefs of these people are considered as irrelevant.

He criticizes my lifestyle, things I read, movies I watch. I adopted a metal style in high school. I styled my hair accordingly. My father didn't criticize it. We argue about our thoughts mostly. (Tövbstein, 26)

He used to criticize my hair, friends, and appearance in high school. He didn't express himself verbally, but I understood from his attitude. He is more traditional, being different is a bad thing for him. (Oğuz, 26)

It should be noted that most of the criticisms were expressed verbally by the fathers. In addition to verbal expression, attitude and mimics of fathers were considered by the participants to understand their actual reactions. Four participants explained that their fathers appreciated them verbally. Only two of them commented that their fathers appreciated them often. Other two claimed that they were verbally appreciated only once or twice. In addition to these, most of the participants emphasized that their mothers appreciated them even for the little things that they accomplished. Because of this dynamic in the family, appreciation from the fathers is seen as more valuable.

He doesn't appreciate me verbally. Maybe he said well done only a few times. (Sentex, 26)

He appreciates me for my work, he appreciates my effort. He tells me that he is proud of me, but it's so rare. It must be something really big for appreciation. (Coşkun, 24)

Although most fathers do not appreciate their sons verbally, they do criticize them openly and excessively. Most of the criticisms were about issues like responsibility and lifestyle of the participants. However, when they enter university

and after graduation, fathers' attitude mostly changes. However, as ideal father figures, they continue to control their sons through non-verbal communication.

4.10. The Effect of the Fathers on the Personality of Sons

Twenty participants expressed that their fathers have an undeniable effect on their personalities. This effect was described in both positive and negative terms. Positive effects were mostly perceived through the personality traits of the participants. In most cases, participants said that they started to understand their fathers as they grew up. Idealism, responsibility, patience, and the determination of their fathers were seen as effective on their personalities in a positive way.

I think he affected me so much. My father isn't a lazy person. I see him as a role model in terms of his diligence. He reads too much. Seeing my father reading books affected me as a child. He doesn't watch TV series. He watches documentaries, discussion programs. These also affected me. (Mert Pazarci, 22)

Not all of the personality traits or acts of fathers were seen as positive. Two participants claimed that their fathers perpetrated domestic violence towards them, their siblings and mothers. These kinds of acts were criticized and not tolerated by the participants. They do not think that this is the norm. They explained that domestic violence affected them in a very negative way.

He showed me the bad, actually. He showed me how not to be. As I witnessed domestic violence, I don't fight with anyone. I saw how not to act towards one's wife from my father. (Oğuz, 26)

Admission to the university is also considered as a transition phase. Most of the participants expressed that the effect of their fathers on their personality decreased after they got into the university. University education is seen as a factor shaping the personalities of the participants. In the interviews, there were indirect mentions of how one's self-esteem increases by university education.

He has an effect. Until I got into military academy when I was 18 years old, at least. (Sentex, 26)

Yes, he had an effect until university. After that, his effect wasn't that much. (Kylorap, 26)

Four participants indicated that their fathers barely affected their personalities. Working routines of the fathers, and spending very little time with them were seen as effective in this situation. One of them noted that this situation made him more comfortable and free in his own life. The way he perceived his father's interest in him led him to a more individualistic lifestyle. One participant claimed that this situation affected him in a negative way. He expressed the challenges he faced through his life. He thought that his life would be more comfortable if his father took better care of him. Other two participants stated that they would be more involved fathers in the future as they knew how frustrating it was to deal with indifferent fathers.

My family isn't strict that much. They set me free in so many areas. I could develop myself. Effect of my father may be that, he set me free. I made my own decisions, they didn't interfere. If they meddled, my life would be different now. (Deniz Ali, 21)

The perceived absence of fathers was usually filled by mothers. Five participants noted that the effect of their mothers on their personalities is more than the effect of their fathers. For all of the participants, it can be claimed that mothers were the primary caregivers who take care of their children both physically and mentally.

My mother is fast and comprehensive. As my father is indifferent, my mother fills the gap. (Tona23, 25)

The effect of my father is less as he was far away. We have been in the same house for only two years. Because of that, the effect of my mother is more. (Halim, 27)

Only one participant mentioned gender difference about this topic. As he has a sister, he was able to monitor the effect of gender difference in the perception of paternal influence on personality. He thought that women perceive the absence of their fathers in a different way than men. According to him, men were not affected by this gap as much as women do.

I didn't feel the absence of my father, unlike my sister. I was happy without him. I think she (the sister) creates the problem just to pose a problem. This must be because of gender difference. Your father is alive, right? What could be better? I don't think I need to be directed. I don't think things would be different if he would always be with me. (Erendibi, 25)

Although some of the participants claimed that their father did not have any effect on their personalities, it should be noted that perceived lack of a father-son relationship may also affect the development of masculinity characteristics (Mussen & Distler, 1959; Biller, 1970, 1971). In these terms, the effect of the father may seem inevitable. This effect is not necessarily described in a negative or a positive way in this specific sample. Some major life changes such as admission to the university are seen as a variable in the relationship between fathers and sons. By reaching to a higher status in the society and dedicating oneself to his family and society in societally approved ways, the effect of the father seems to lessen.

4.11. Similarities between Fathers and Sons

Similarity in terms of physical appearance was not mentioned in the interviews. On the other hand, the similarity between participants and their fathers were usually described in terms of their personality traits. Anger expression was mentioned as the most common similarity by six participants.

My anger expression is the same as him, I can't change that. It's genetics, I guess. I'm not sure if I saw him as a role model when I was a child. Even the slang words I use are the same as my father. (Gökhan, 26)

In addition to anger expression, stubbornness, calmness, pessimism, realism, being rational, obsessiveness, straightness, loyalty, stolidity, friendliness, and sense of humor were mentioned among the similarities between fathers and sons. Most of the participants claimed that they did not spend too much time together with their fathers. Still, most of them think that these similarities were caused by imitation, rather than solely genetics or biological factors.

I think I resemble him more as I grow up. He's the only person that I see as a role model. My father is very calm, so am I. He doesn't laugh too much. I'm not cheerful either. I may have taken his pessimism too. We are both realist, we can't be emotional. (Topçu, 25)

In four cases, participants claimed that they took their personality traits from their fathers whom they criticize.

We are similar in terms of our obsessions. I criticize him, but I'm like him too. I can't give my stuff to people easily. (Kylorap, 26)

Few participants claimed that they were more like other members of the family. Mothers, uncles, elder siblings, and grandfathers were mentioned as the other members in the family. Spending too much time with these family members was seen as the cause of their similarity.

I and my grandfather are alike in terms of lightheartedness. When I was a little child, I spend too much time with my grandfather. We were always together until I was 6 years old. He was staying with us. I love reading because of him. (Erendibi, 25)

Five participants claimed that they had no similarity with their fathers in any terms. The majority claimed that they were more like their fathers and explained this mostly with reference to the time spent together. It should be noted that mostly male figures of the family were taken as a reference for the participants' personality characteristics. Personality traits such as aggressiveness, stubbornness and being straight were emphasized rather than other characteristics. This suggests that above mentioned traits were accepted in the frame of accepted masculinities characteristics. Female figures were not mentioned in terms of attitudes or behaviors affecting their masculinities. Physical characteristics were also not mentioned in terms of similarity with fathers.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

After mentioning the aim and idea behind the thesis in the introduction section, Chapter Two began with the introduction of social constructionism within gender studies. Social constructionism was taken as the basis of this thesis because of its extensive framework for theoretical explanations and discussions. Critical studies on men and masculinities were mentioned as the second foundation of the theoretical background of the thesis. The historical progress of critical studies on men and masculinities and primary approaches to masculinities were also outlined. Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity and the development of this notion in critical studies on men and masculinities literature were analyzed accordingly. Chapter Two was finished by introducing the main approaches to fatherhood. Diverse perceptions of fatherhood were evaluated. Chapter Three focused on the theoretical discussions in Turkey. Critical studies on men and masculinities in Turkey were outlined and summarized. Main approaches to fatherhood and some of the major studies about the father-son relationship in the Turkish context were also mentioned in this chapter. Chapter Four began with the sociodemographic characteristics of the participants and their parents. The section was about the socio-cultural parameters of being a man in Turkish society. These parameters were analyzed under the subtitles of education, employment, mobility, lifestyle habits, and gender perception. Chapter Five focused on the perception of the ideal masculinities of young Turkish adult men. Characteristics of perceived ideal masculinities were introduced. The current perception of idealized masculinities was analyzed in depth. Then, perceived expectations from young Turkish adult men were presented. Before analyzing societal expectations, duties and perceived status of men were shortly summarized. The sources of knowledge of masculinities were analyzed in the same context. The

role of family and paternal figures in the families were mentioned. Idealized father and son relationship was analyzed in the following section. The definition and dynamics of an ideal relationship between fathers and sons were discussed in the same section. Then the actual dynamics of father and son relationship were analyzed. Various forms of relationship between fathers and sons were categorized. After presenting the ideas about an ideal relationship, a comparison between fathers and the ideal man were made. Criticisms and appreciations of fathers were analyzed in this context. Positive and negative personality characteristics of fathers were analyzed under the title of Fathers as Role Models. Approval and admiration from fathers, topics that fathers approve or admire about their sons, and the importance of these approvals and admirations for sons were analyzed in this section. Following these topics, criticisms, and appreciations from fathers were discussed. The effect of these criticisms on the construction of masculinities of the participants was evaluated. Lastly, the effect of fathers on the personality of their sons based on the perceptions of the participants was discussed. Similarities between fathers and sons were shortly analyzed to see the overall effect of all of the factors introduced above.

Stereotypes and conventional definitions of gender types and roles have been changing throughout years. The dynamics and motives behind these changes can be explained by looking at the socio-cultural and economic movements. Factors such as increasing employment rate and education level of women are given as standard examples in this context. The economic, social and cultural condition of women and girls is not the only contributing factor to the change in the gender context. With the effect of feminist movements, gender studies have been mostly studied the condition of women in different contexts, and from different socioeconomic levels. As women constitute the biggest part of the disadvantaged group in the society, most of the researches based on gender examined the lives of women. Throughout time, the interaction of women and men has been the focus to explain the dynamics of the women's lives. Just by examining the dynamics of women, social scientists understood that they would not be able to explain all of the socio-cultural and economic aspects. The "other" side of the gender spectrum has been the focus rather

recently when it is compared to the academic research about women. After the research on interaction of women and men, examinations on the lives and dynamics of men started to be studied. Feminist movement challenged the stereotypes and assumptions about women and claimed that women and men are equally capable to perform in every aspect of life. It has been possible to see the validity and reliability of this basic argument by looking at the social movements and changes in different societies throughout history. After these studies, men have been the new subjects of gender studies. Limiting assumptions and definitions about gender roles are valid for all genders. Men are also defined and limited in certain borders within the gender contexts. The existence and validity of different kinds of manhood have been studied within the academic context recently. The term “masculinities” has been used to define and acknowledge this variety. Definition of manhood and masculinity was rather restricted. Arguments such as “Boys don’t cry” create and reinforce the limited description of masculinities. This limitation in the defining phase causes certain types of problematics. Attitudes, behaviors and other cognitive and behavioral processes of individuals are affected by the societal definitions and directions. Social pressure may impact people to act in certain and defined ways to gain acceptance by the society. Personal traits such as being nurturer, compassionate, loving, and empathetic are thought to be related to the feminine side of the gender spectrum, while characteristics such as being aggressive, competent and confident are mostly seen related to the masculine side. Being expressive about one’s emotions is not an encouraged trait for men. For most of the societies, showing one’s compassion, love, sympathy and empathy is seen as a weakness for a man. Hence, emotional side of men is mostly ignored.

In parallel to the changes in the World gender context, there are slow but sure changes in the Turkish society. Still, we cannot talk about homogeneity in this change. Usually, these kinds of changes are not seen homogenously in Turkey. There are main differences between rural areas and cities. Birth places and places of residence of individuals should not be ignored while examining various forms of masculinities. These kinds of data give us important clues about the socio-cultural

and economic factors involved in this process of building masculinities. Ethnic background, religious belief, race, age, socio-economic status, education level, disability status and all other social factors should be involved in the masculinities research processes. Because of the socio-cultural nature of Turkey, the variety of ethnic backgrounds and sects should also be included in the masculinities studies.

Gender studies are rather a new area for Turkish academicians. Employment rates, education level, physical, sexual and psychological health of women and violence against women have been studied in the context of gender studies. Masculinities have not been studied extensively in the Turkish context. Mostly issues such as militarism and nationalism were examined in multidisciplinary studies based on various different theories of masculinities. Fatherhood was the focus rather in the areas of social and developmental psychology. The effect of father-child relationship was mostly evaluated in terms of the cognitive and psychological development of children. In addition to these, the positive impact of this parental relationship on fathers was also studied. There are few studies about the specific impact of masculinities in the familial dyad of father and son. In the Turkish academic literature, studies about masculinities and fatherhood are even more limited.

This thesis can be considered as a modest contribution to the critical men and masculinities studies within Turkish academic studies. Its topic has not been studied extensively in the Turkish academic literature as masculinities is rather a new area. It should be noted that the dynamic nature of masculinities requires ongoing studies in this context. Socio-cultural parameters for Turkish young adult men should be revised periodically to see the impact of social, economic, political and cultural changes on the construction of masculinities. In addition to these, the research method of this study is qualitative. Although the data taken from quantitative studies are very important and contribute to the academic literature enormously, these kinds of studies should not be limited to ‘yes’/‘no’ answers. Participants should be able to express themselves freely and add whatever they want to their answers. This aspect is very important due to the nature of masculinities studies. Especially in societies where masculinities have not been examined extensively, it is important to get into

details to see the changing patterns and possible outcomes of emergent social movements.

In addition to all of these, there are some limitations and shortcomings of this thesis. To begin with, all of the participants were heterosexual. Different sexual orientations should be included to see their possible impact on the construction of masculinities and its connection to the father-son relationship. Race, ethnic background and religious beliefs of the participant were not asked during the field study. Although some of these factors or impacts of these qualities were mentioned in some of the interviews, generalizing from limited information would be improper. None of the participants were disabled. Disability is one of the marginalizing factors in the concept of masculinities. It should be considered while evaluating different masculinities experiences. All of the participants were university students or university graduates. Men with different levels of education should be included to see the effect of education in a more detailed way. Education levels of fathers are also important and should not be ignored. In this study, most of the fathers were graduated from primary or secondary school. Change in the education levels of fathers may impact the construction of masculinities for both fathers and their sons. This situation possibly will affect the style of bonding between a father and his son. Personal traits such as emotional expressiveness may be seen as a weakness of a man rather among uneducated groups. The perception of gender equality may also change by the education level of people. To see all of the changes that were included here and others, the same kind of studies should be conducted with broader samples. Similar studies should be made with people living in different residential areas, from different ages, ethnic backgrounds, socio-economic statuses with different education levels. Moreover, men with disabilities, with different political and ethnic affiliations, race, from marginalized groups with different languages, nationality, social background, religion or religious belief, personal or social status, mental or physical disability, family or marital status, property status, health condition should also be subjects of similar studies.

It will be very useful to conduct these kinds of studies with a broader sample.

In these samples, individuals from different socio-cultural and economic backgrounds can be chosen. Factors such as sexual orientation, age, race, and socioeconomic status should be taken into account. Conducting critical studies on men and masculinities by different disciplines with their specific approaches can give productive results. Multidisciplinary studies will broaden the horizon of the topics in critical studies on men and masculinities. Both qualitative and quantitative methods can be useful for us to get various kinds of outcomes related to the changing or shifting nature of masculinities construction. Both descriptive and statistical data is needed for filling the gap in the critical studies on men and masculinities literature in Turkey. Retrospective, prospective and longitudinal studies should be conducted so that researchers can compare and contrast the existing data with their own. Cumulative data can help us to see the changing patterns in the construction of masculinities. Future research and policies may be conducted based on such a substantial database.

REFERENCES

- Açıksöz, S. C. (2012). Sacrificial limbs of sovereignty: disabled veterans, masculinity, and nationalist politics in Turkey. *Medical anthropology quarterly*, 26(1), 4-25.
- Açıksöz, S. C. (2016). In vitro nationalism: Masculinity, disability, and assisted reproduction in war-torn Turkey. In *Gender and sexuality in Muslim cultures* (pp. 35-52). Routledge.
- Açıksöz, S. C. (2017). He Is a Lynched Soldier Now: Coup, Militarism, and Masculinity in Turkey. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*, 13(1), 178-180.
- Akalın, T. (2008). *Babalık Davası*. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Akbaş, E. (2012). *Türkiye'de sosyal medyada futbol taraftarlarının erkeklik söylemleri* (Doctoral dissertation, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi).
- Akbaş S., Böke, Ö. & Karabekiroğlu, K. (2008). Alkolik Babası Olan Çocukların Yaşam Deneyimleri. *Bağımlılık Dergisi*. 9(2).
- Akın, A. (2006). *Babalık Davası*. Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Aktaş, F. O. (2014). *Türkiye'de Erkekliğin Kurgulanışında Askerliğin Yeri* (Master's thesis).
- Aktaş, F. O. (2014). *Being a conscientious objector in Turkey: Challenging hegemonic masculinity in a militaristic nation-state* (Master's thesis).
- Alemdaroğlu, A., & Demirtaş, N. (2004). Mynet'te Erkeklik Halleri. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 101, 206-225.

- Alpan, B. (2013). "What was Offside Again?": A Foucauldian Analysis of Female Fans Reconstruction in Turkish Football. In *FREE conference, 'Women's Football: Played, Watched, Talked About', Copenhagen* (pp. 20-21).
- Altınay, A. (2004). *The myth of the military-nation: Militarism, gender, and education in Turkey*. Springer.
- Archer, J. (1991). The influence of testosterone on human aggression. *British journal of psychology*, 82(1), 1-28.
- Archer, L. (2003). *Race, masculinity and schooling*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Arjomand, N. (2017). Every Turk Is Born a Soldier. *Public Culture*, 29(3 (83)), 418-432.
- Aronson, A., & Kimmel, M. S. (Eds.). (2014). *The gendered society reader*. Oxford University Press.
- Arslan Kocaman, S. (2008). *Yeni doğanı babaya benzetme eğiliminin evrimsel psikoloji açısından değerlendirilmesi* (Doctoral dissertation, Ege Üniversitesi).
- Atabek, E. (1989). *Kışkırtılmış Erkeklik Bastırılmış Kadınlık*. Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi.
- Atay, T. (2004). Erkeklik en çok erkeği ezer. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 101, 11-30.
- Ateş, S. Y. (2012). *Asker evlatlar yetiştirmek: II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi'nde beden terbiyesi, askerî talim ve paramiliter gençlik örgütleri*. İletişim.
- Barutçu, A. (2013). Türkiye'de Erkeklik İnşasının Bedensel ve Toplumsal Aşamaları. *Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*.

- Barutçu, A. (2015). Ucundan Azıcıkla Atılan Sağlam Temel: Türkiye’de Sünnet Ritüeli ve Erkeklik İlişkisi. *Masculinities: A Journal of Identity and Culture*, (3), 129-155.
- Barutçu, A. (2015). Bir erkeklik stratejisi: Özel alanda eril suskunluk/A strategy of masculinity: Masculine reticence in private sphere. *Fe Dergi*, 7(1), 131.
- Bayat, F. (2009). Mitolojik zıtlık paradigmasında baba-oğul mücadelesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(6), 63-70.
- Beattie, P. M. (1996). The house, the street, and the barracks: reform and honorable masculine social space in Brazil, 1864-1945. *The Hispanic American Historical Review*, 76(3), 439-473.
- Benson, L. G. (1968). *Fatherhood: A sociological perspective*. New York: Random House.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Garden City.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge* (No. 10). Penguin Uk.
- Beşpınar, U. (2014). Türkiye’de evlilik. *Türkiye Aile Yapısı Araştırması Tespitler, Öneriler, 1*, 112-167.
- Beşpınar, F. U. (2014). Women and gender. *Turkey and the Politics of National Identity: Social, Economic, and Cultural Transformation*, edited by Brennan Shane and Marc Herzog, 118-44.
- Beşpınar, F. U. (2016). Between Ideals and Enactments: The Experience of “New Fatherhood” among Middle-Class Men in Turkey. In *Gender and Sexuality in Muslim Cultures* (pp. 111-130). Routledge.

- Beynon, J. (2001). *Masculinities and culture*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Biller, H. B. (1970). Father absence and the personality development of the male child. *Developmental psychology*, 2(2), 181.
- Biller, H. B. (1971). The mother-child relationship and the father-absent boy's personality development. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development*, 17(3), 227-241.
- Biller, H. B., & Bahm, R. M. (1971). Father absence, perceived maternal behavior, and masculinity of self-concept among junior high school boys. *Developmental Psychology*, 4(2), 178.
- Biricik, A. (2008). *Rotten Bodies-Idealized Masculinities: Reconstructing Hegemonic Masculinity Through Militarized Discourse in Turkey*. VDM Verlag Dr. Muller Aktiengesellschaft & Co.
- Biricik, A. (2011). The 'rotten report' and the reproduction of masculinity, nation and security in Turkey. In *Making Gender, Making War* (pp. 90-103). Routledge.
- Blier, M. J., & Blier-Wilson, L. A. (1989). Gender differences in self-rated emotional expressiveness. *Sex Roles*, 21(3-4), 287-295.
- Boratav, H., Fişek, G., & Ziya, H. (2012). *Erkekliğin Toplumsal ve Gelişimsel İnşası*.
- Bozok, M. (2009). Erkeklik incelemeleri alanındaki başlıca kuram ve yaklaşımların sosyalist feminist bir eleştirisine doğru. *VI. Ulusal sosyoloji kongresi bildiriler kitabı: Toplumsal dönüşümler ve sosyolojik yaklaşımlar içinde*, 431-445.
- Bozok, M. (2011). Soru ve cevaplarla erkeklikler. *Sosyal Kalkınma ve Cinsiyet Eşitliği Politikaları*.

- Bozok, M. (2011). Masculinities: Questions and Answers. *Social Development and Gender Equality Policies Center (SOGEP)*.
- Bozok, M. (2012). Yoksullaşma, Sağlık, Trabzonspor Taraftarlığı ve Nataşaların Gölgesinde Trabzon Erkekliği. *Karardı Karadeniz*, 413-444.
- Bozok, M. (2013). Constructing Local Masculinities: A Case Study from Trabzon, Turkey. *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. (ODTÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sosyoloji Bölümü, 2013)*.
- Bozok, M. (2018). Türkiye’de Babalığı Anlamak Serisi-II.
- Böke, Ö., Turla, A. & Akbaş, S. (2008). Çocuklarını Öldüren Babalar: Bir Derleme. *Adli Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 5(1).
- Braun, F. (2001). The communication of gender in Turkish. *Gender across languages*, 1, 283-310.
- Brickell, C. (2006). The sociological construction of gender and sexuality. *The Sociological Review*, 54(1), 87-113.
- Brittan, A. (1989). *Masculinity and power*. Basil Blackwell.
- Brittan, A., & Maynard, M. (1984). *Sexism, racism, and oppression*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Brod, H. (1987). *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies*. Allen & Unwin.
- Brod, H., & Kaufman, M. (Eds.). (1994). *Theorizing masculinities* (Vol. 5). Sage.

- Brook, J. S., Whiteman, M., Gordon, A. S., & Brook, D. W. (1984). Paternal determinants of female adolescent's marijuana use. *Developmental Psychology, 20*(6), 1032.
- Brown, K. (2008). The promise and perils of women's participation in UK mosques: The impact of securitisation agendas on identity, gender and community. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations, 10*(3), 472-491.
- Buran, A. (2009). Metin-Bağlam İlgisi Bakımından " Ak Gemi" de "Babalık" Kavramı ve Baba-Çocuk İlişkisi. *Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi, 27*(27).
- Burr, V. (2006). *An introduction to social constructionism*. Routledge.
- Buss, D. M., & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 50*(3), 559.
- Byne, W., & Parsons, B. (1993). Human sexual orientation: The biologic theories reappraised. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 50*(3), 228-239.
- Carrigan, T., Connell, B., & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and society, 14*(5), 551-604.
- Chodorow, N. J. (1978). *The Reproduction of Mothering*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Chodorow, N. J. (1995). Gender as a personal and cultural construction. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 20*(3), 516-544.
- Chodorow, N. J. (1998). The enemy outside: Thoughts on the psychodynamics of extreme violence with special attention to men and masculinity. *Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society, 3*, 25-38.

- Clatterbaugh, K. (1998). What is problematic about masculinities? *Men and masculinities*, 1(1), 24-45.
- Cohen, D. (1990). *Being a man*. Routledge.
- Cohen, T. F. (2001). Just because they're men. In T.F. Cohen (Ed.), *Men and masculinity: A text reader* (pp. 1-9). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Coles, T. (2009). Negotiating the field of masculinity: The production and reproduction of multiple dominant masculinities. *Men and masculinities*, 12(1), 30-44.
- Coltrane, S. (1996). *Family man*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coltrane, S. (2004). Paradoxes, Contradictions, and Dilemmas. *Handbook of contemporary families: Considering the past, contemplating the future*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 224-243.
- Coltrane, S., & Galt, J. (2000). The history of men's caring. In M. H. Meyer (Ed.), *Care work: Gender, labor, and welfare states* (pp. 15-36). New York: Routledge.
- Coltrane, S., & Parke, R. D. (1998). Reinventing fatherhood: Toward an historical understanding of continuity and change in men's family lives. *Philadelphia, National Center on Fathers and Families*.
- Connell, R. W., Ashenden, D., & Kessler, S. (1982). Making the difference: Schools, families and social division. Allen & Unwin.
- Connell, R. W. (1982). Class, patriarchy, and Sartre's theory of practice. *Theory and Society*, 11(3), 305-320.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). Gender and power. Cambridge. *Polity*, 279-304.

- Connell, R. W. (1989). Cool guys, swots and wimps: The interplay of masculinity and education. *Oxford review of education*, 15(3), 291-203.
- Connell, R. W. (1990). The state, gender, and sexual politics. *Theory and society*, 19(5), 507-544.
- Connell, R. W. (1993). The big picture: Masculinities in recent world history. *Theory and society*, 22(5), 597-623.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Cornwall, A. & Lindisfarne, N. (1994). *Dislocating masculinity: gender, power and anthropology*.
- Çakmak, M. B., & Çelik, V. O. (2016). Football Masculinity and Violence: Case of Nefer Fan Group. *İstanbul Journal of Sociological Studies – Sosyoloji Konferansları*, (54), 299 – 331.
- Çayırılı, B. (2012). *Türkiye’de Erkeklik Olgusu: Sünnet, Askerlik, Evlilik*. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Bölümü.
- Çelik, G. (2016). "Erkekler (de) ağlar!": Toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri bağlamında erkeklik inşası ve şiddet döngüsü 1/" Men (Also) Cry!": The Construction of Masculinity and The Cycle of Violence in The Context of Gender Roles. *Fe Dergi*, 8(2), 1.
- Çetin, İ. (2007). Türk Kültüründe Bab (Baba)/Ata Geleneği. *Milli Folklor*, 19, 76.
- Çetin, A. (2010). KUTADGU BİLİG’DE TÜRK AİLE KÜLTÜRÜNDE BİR BABANIN OĞUL İMAJI YA DA SÜREGİDEN BELLEK/KÜLTÜR.
- Çiftçi, E. (2001). Türk Toplumunda Erkek. *Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans Tezi*.

- Çitçi, S. (2009). MEHMET AKİF'İN ŞİİRLERİNDE BABA OĞUL İLİŞKİSİ. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 4(3).
- Dalkanat, N. (2001). *Erkek Eşcinsellere Uygulanan Fiziksel Şiddet ve Bu Bireylerin Uyguladıkları Fiziksel Şiddetin Değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul Üniversitesi Adli Tıp Enstitüsü.
- Darwin, C. (1859). *On the origin of the species by means of natural selection, or, preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life*. London: Murray.
- David, D. S., & Brannon, R. (Eds.). (1976). *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role*. Random House.
- Deaux, K. (1976). *The behavior of women and men*. Wadsworth Pub Co.
- De Sondy, A. (2015). *The crisis of Islamic masculinities*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- DeKlyen, M., Biernbaum, M. A., Speltz, M. L., & Greenberg, M. T. (1998). Fathers and preschool behavior problems. *Developmental psychology*, 34(2), 264.
- DeLamater, J. D., & Hyde, J. S. (1998). Essentialism vs. social constructionism in the study of human sexuality. *Journal of sex research*, 35(1), 10-18.
- Demir, Ö. G. F. (2009). Orhan Pamuk'un Masumiyet Müzesi Romanında Baba oğul ilişkisi. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 18(2).
- DeSouza, E. R., & Solberg, J. (2003). Incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment across cultures. *Academic and workplace sexual harassment: A handbook of cultural, social science, management, and legal perspectives*, 3-30.
- Dill, B. T. (1988). Our mother's grief: Racial ethnic women and the maintenance of families. *Journal of Family History*, 13, 415 – 431.

- Dindar, C. (2004). Babamın Sazının Önünde Oynadım, Başkasının değil: Toplumumuzdaki Erkeklik Kimliği Üzerine Sosyopsikolojik Bir İnceleme. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 101. Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity? *Theory and society*, 22(5), 643-657.
- Dowd, N. E. (2000). *Redefining fatherhood*. NYU Press.
- Doyle, N. (2002). Why do dogs lick their balls? Gender, desire and change—a case study from Vietnam. *Masculinities matter: Men, gender and development*, 186-208.
- Dubbert, J. L. (1979). *A man's place: Masculinity in transition*. Prentice Hall.
- Duran, H. (2007). *Babalık Davası*. Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Duran, A. (2010). Erkeksi rollerin baba katılımı ile ilişkisinin araştırılması. *Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara*.
- Düşgör, B. P. (2007). *Anoreksiya Nervoza'da Babalık İşlevinin Projektif Testlerle Değerlendirilmesi. (Master's Thesis)*. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Düzkan, A. (2006). *Erkekliğin Kitabında Yazmaz Bu*. Versus Kitap Yayınları.
- Eker, E., & Şimşek, F. (2006). *Erkeklerde Cinsel Sağlık ve Üreme Sağlığı Açısından Sağlıklı Yaşlanma*. Cinsel Eğitim Tedavi ve Araştırma Derneği.
- Erdoğan, İ. (2011). Erkek dergilerinde (Men's Health-FHM-Esquire Türkiye örneğinde) hegemonik erkek (lik), beden politikaları ve yeni erkek imajı. *Medyada hegemonik erkek (lik) ve temsil*, 41-69.
- Erdoğan, İ. (2013). Erkek Dergilerinde Sağlıklı Erkek Neden İdeal Erkektir? Men's Health Dergisi'nde Hegemonik Erkeklik ve Popüler Sağlık Söylemi. *İLETİ-Ş-İM*, 133-154.

- Erođlu, E. (2011). *Erkek Snneti: İnsanlık Tarihindeki Hikâyesi*. Amerikan Hastanesi Yayınları.
- Erol, M., & Özbay, C. (2013). 'I Haven't Died Yet': Navigating Masculinity, Aging, and Andropause in Turkey. *Aging Men, Masculinities, and Modern Medicine*, edited by Antje Kampf and Barbara L. Marshall, 156-71.
- Ertan, C. (2008). *Hegemonic Masculinity and Homosexuality: Some Reflections on Turkey*: Tahakkmc Erkeklik Ve Eşcinsellik: Trkiye zerine Bazı Dşnmler.
- Ertan, C. (2009). Trkiye'de Erkeklik İmgesi ve Eşcinsel Kimliđi. *Akdeniz niversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstits Yksek Lisans Tezi*.
- Farrell, W. (1974). *The liberated man*. New York: Random House
- Fasteau, M. F. (1974). *The male machine*. McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Fausto-Sterling, A. (1985). *Myths of Gender: biological theories about man and woman*.
- Fausto-Sterling, A. (2015). Footnote: Where Does Gender Come From? Retrieved July 29, 2018, from http://www.annefaustosterling.com/footnote_gender-come/
- Floyd, K., & Morman, M. T. (2003). Human affection exchange: II. Affectionate communication in father-son relationships. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 143(5), 599-612.
- Ford, D., & Hearn, J. (1988). Studying Men and Masculinity. *Applied Social Studies: University of Bradford*.
- Galdas, P. M., Cheater, F., & Marshall, P. (2005). Men and health help-seeking behaviour: literature review. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 49(6), 616-623.

- Gardiner, J. K. (2004). Men, Masculinities. *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities*, 35.
- Geary, D. C. (1998). *Male, female: The evolution of human sex differences*. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Gerami, S. (2005). Islamist masculinity and Muslim masculinities. *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities*, 448.
- Gergen, K.J. and Gergen, M.M. (1984) 'The social construction of narrative accounts', in K. J. Gergen and M. M. Gergen (eds) *Historical Social Psychology*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gergen, K.J. and Gergen, M.M. (1986) 'Narrative form and the construction of psychological science', in T.R. Sarbin (ed.) *Narrative Psychology: The Storied Nature of Human Conduct*, New York: Praeger.
- Gerson, K. (1993). *No man's land: Men's changing commitments to family and work*. Basic Books.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Harvard University Press.
- Gillis, J. (1997). *A world of their own making. Myth, ritual and the quest for family values*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gilmore, D. D. (1990). *Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity*. Yale University Press.
- Golod, S. I. (1998). The family and marriage: historical and sociological analysis. *St. Petersburg: TOO TC «Petropolis, 272*.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Lawrence and Wishart.

- Griswold, R. L. (1993). *Fatherhood in America: A history*. Basic Books.
- Gülođlu, M. F. (2017). *Re-production of father's authority: Father Supporting Program. (Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation)*. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Gürbilek, N. (2002). Azgelişmiş Babalar. *Kötü Çocuk Türk. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları*, 52-65.
- Halwani, R. (2018). *Philosophy of love, sex, and marriage: an introduction*. Routledge.
- Hantover, J. P. (1978). The Boy Scouts and the validation of masculinity. *Journal of social issues*, 34(1), 184-195.
- Hattat, H. (2010). *Erkekliđin Yol Haritası: Bir Cinsellik Rehberi*. Dođan Kitap.
- Haywood, C., & Johansson, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Marginalized Masculinities: Contexts, Continuities and Change*. Taylor & Francis.
- Haywood, C., & Mac an Ghail, M. (2003). *Men and masculinities*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Healy, G., Özbilgin, M., & Aliefendiođlu, H. (2005). Academic employment and gender: A Turkish challenge to vertical sex segregation. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 11(2), 247-264.
- Hearn, J. (1987). *The gender of oppression: Men, masculinity and the critique of Marxism*. Wheatsheaf.
- Hearn, J. (2007). Masculinity/masculinities. In *Encyclopedia of men and masculinities*, ed. M. Flood, J. Gardiner, B. Pease, and K. Pringle. London: Routledge.

- Herz, M. (2018). 'Becoming' a possible threat: masculinity, culture and questioning among unaccompanied young men in Sweden. *Identities*, 1-19.
- Hewlett, B. S. (1991). Demography and childcare in preindustrial societies. *Journal of anthropological research*, 47(1), 1-37.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: National differences in thinking and organizing. *Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage*.
- Holzner, B. (1972). Reality construction in society.
- Horrocks, R. (1995). *Male myths and icons: Masculinity in popular culture*. Springer.
- Hoşgör, A. G. & Smits, J. (2016). Türkiye'de Türk – Kürt Kültürlerarası Evlilik Eğilimleri: 1993-2008. *Türkiye Dördüncü Nüfusbilim Konferansı: Tebliğ Metinleri Kitabı*, 147-153.
- Hurley, S. (2007). *Sex and the social construction of gender: can feminism and evolutionary psychology be reconciled?* na.
- Hünler, O. S. (2016). What does it mean to be masculine? A preliminary study. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport (IntJSCS)*, 4(1), 108-117.
- Imamoğlu, O. (1992). Evaluating his/her success/failure at breadwinning/homemaking: A case of double standards. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 12(2), 19-31.
- Işık, E. (1998). Beden ve Toplum Kuramı Öznenin Sosyolojisinden Bedenin Sosyolojisine. *Bağlam Yayıncılık*.
- Inhorn, M. C. (1994). *Quest for conception: Gender, infertility, and Egyptian medical traditions*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Inhorn, M. C. (2002). Sexuality, masculinity, and infertility in Egypt: Potent troubles in the marital and medical encounters. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 10(3), 343-359.
- İnci, H. (1992). Tanzimat Devri Türk Romanında Baba. *Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi.*
- Jensen, A. R. (1978). Genetic and behavioral effects of nonrandom mating. *Human variation: The biopsychology of age, race, and sex*, 51-105.
- Johansson, T. (2009). *Familjeliv* [Family life]. Malmö: Liber förlag
- Johansson, T., & Andreasson, J. (2017). *Fatherhood in Transition: Masculinity, Identity and Everyday Life*. Springer.
- Jung, S. (2010). *Korean masculinities and transcultural consumption: Yonsama, Rain, Oldboy, K-Pop idols* (Vol. 1). Hong Kong University Press.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1982). *Sex roles, family & community in Turkey* (Vol. 3). Indiana Univ Pr.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (2002). Cross-cultural perspectives on family change. *Autonomy and Dependence in the Family, Turkey and Sweden in critical perspective. Swedish research institute in Istanbul.*
- Kampf, A., Marshall, B. L., & Petersen, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Aging men, masculinities and modern medicine*. Routledge.
- Kandiyoti, D., & Bora, A. (1997). *Cariyeler bacılar yurttaşlar: kimlikler ve toplumsal dönüşümler*. Metis Yayınları.
- Karadayı, F. (2001). Gençlerin Babalık Rolüne İlişkin Tutumları, Kendi Babalarının Davranışı ve Sosyo-demografik Faktörlerle İlişkisi. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü*, 8(8).

- Keizer, R., Dykstra, P. A., & Poortman, A. R. (2009). Life outcomes of childless men and fathers. *European sociological review*, 26(1), 1-15.
- Keskin, D. D. F. (2016). Masculinity in Gender Relations: Hegemonic Masculinity and Masculine Power Discourse in Turkey During AKP Period.
- Kıray, M. B. (1964). *Ereğli: Ağır Sanayiden Önce bir Sahil Kasabası*. Devlet Karayolları Matbaası.
- Kilford, C. (2014). Civic training for Mehmetçik: the TSK in 21st century Turkey. *Turkish Review*, 4(6), 606.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1987). *Changing men: New directions in research on men and masculinity*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kimmel, M. (1996). *Manhood in America: A cultural history*. New York: Free Press.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2000). *The Gendered Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2004). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. *Race, class, and gender in the United States: An integrated study*, 81-93.
- Kimmel, A., & Aronson, A. (2003). *Men and Masculinities. A Social, Cultural, and Historical Encyclopedia*. ABC-CLIO.
- Kimmel, M. S., & Holler, J. Z. (2000). *The gendered society*.
- Kimmel, M. S., & Mahler, M. (2003). Adolescent masculinity, homophobia, and violence: Random school shootings, 1982-2001. *American behavioral scientist*, 46(10), 1439-1458.

Kimmel, M. S., & Messner, M. A. (1992). *Men's lives*. Macmillan Publishing Co, Inc.

King, A. (1997). The lads: Masculinity and the new consumption of football. *Sociology*, 31(2), 329-346.

Klinth, R., & Johansson, T. (2010). *Nya svenska fäder* [New Swedish fathers]. Umeå: Boréa förlag.

Koçak, A. A. (2004). *Baba Destek Programı Değerlendirme Raporu*. Anne Çocuk Eğitim Vakfı.

Koçer, Z. (2012). *1960'lar ve 1970'lerde Yılmaz Güney'in Yıldız İmgesindeki Erkeklik Kurumları* (Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation). İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent Üniversitesi Ekonomi ve Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Korkman, Z. K., & Açıksöz, S. C. (2013). Erdogan's Masculinity and the Language of the Gezi Resistance. *Jadaliyya*, June, 22.

Kudat, A. (2007). *Al Kocayı Vur Sopayı: Sevenler Arasında Şiddet*. Doğan Kitap.

Kudret, C. (1960). Babalar ve Çocuklar. *Türk Dili Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 10(109).

Kuloğlu, C. (2011). *The Military in Turkey from a Gender Perspective: Gender Related Problems that Women Face in the Turkish Military*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Publishing.

Kuruoğlu, H. (Ed.). (2009). *Erkek kimliğinin değişe (meye) n hâlleri*. Nobel Yaşam.

Kuzucu, Y. (1999). Babalarıyla çatışma düzeyi yüksek ve düşük olan ergenlerin ve babalarının babalık rolüne ilişkin algılarının karşılaştırılması. *Unpublished master's thesis*. Ankara University, Institute of Social Science, Ankara.

Lahoucine, O. (2006). Islamic masculinities.

Lamb, M. E. (1987). *Introduction: The Emergent American Father* in M.E. Lamb (ed.) *The Father Role: A Cross-cultural Perspective*, pp. 1–26, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

LaRossa, R. (1988). Fatherhood and social change. *Family relations*, 451-457.

LaRossa, R. (1997). *The modernization of fatherhood. A social and political history*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Lerman, R. I. (2009). *Young unwed fathers: Changing roles and emerging policies*. Temple University Press.

Levai, M., Kaplan, S., Ackermann, R., & Hammock, M. (1995). The effect of father absence on the psychiatric hospitalization of Navy children. *Military medicine*, 160(3), 104-106.

Levend, A. S. (1966). Baba Oğlu Neden Anlamaz? *Türk Dili Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 15(175).

Lievens, J. (1999). Family-forming migration from Turkey and Morocco to Belgium: The demand for marriage partners from the countries of origin. *International migration review*, 717-744.

Lloyd, G. (1996). The man of reason. *Women, knowledge, and reality: Explorations in feminist philosophy*, 2, 149-65.

Lorentzen, J. (2013). *The history of fatherhood in Norway 1850–2012*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mac an Ghail, M. (1994). The making of black English masculinities. *Theorizing masculinities*, 183-99.

- Mackey, W. C. (2012). *Fathering behaviors: The dynamics of the man-child bond*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Magubane, Z. (2002). Mines, minstrels, and masculinity: Race, class, gender, and the formation of the South African working class, 1870–1900. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 10(3), 271-289.
- Mangan, M. (2003). *Staging masculinities: history, gender, performance*. Palgrave.
- Marsiglio, W., & Pleck, J. H. (2005). Fatherhood and masculinities. *The handbook of studies on men and masculinities*, 249-269.
- Martin, P. Y. (2003). “Said and done” versus “saying and doing” gendering practices, practicing gender at work. *Gender & society*, 17(3), 342-366.
- Massey, D. (2013). *Space, place and gender*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Mater, N. (1998). Mehmed'in Kitabı: Güneydoğu'da Savaşmış Askerler Anlatıyor [Mehmed's Book: Soldiers Who Fought in the Southeast Talk]. *Istanbul: Metis Yayınları*.
- McDaniel, A. (1994). Historical racial differences in living arrangements of children. *Journal of Family History*, 19, 57-77.
- McManus, J. (2018). *Football in Turkey*.
- Mellen, J. (1977). *Big bad wolves: Masculinity in the American film*. Random House Inc.
- Meral, B. (2006). Babaların zihinsel engelli çocuklarının yetiştirilmesine yönelik katılım durumlarının belirlenmesi. *Unpublished master's thesis*. Anadolu University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1993). *Masculinities, Crime and*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2007). Goodbye to the sex-gender distinction, hello to embodied gender: On masculinities, bodies, and violence. *Sex, Gender, and Sexuality: The New Basics*.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2009). “Doing Gender” The Impact and Future of a Salient Sociological Concept. *Gender & Society*, 23(1), 85-88.

Messner, M. A. (1992). *Power at play: Sports and the problem of masculinity*. Beacon Press.

Morman, M. T., & Floyd, K. (2006). Good fathering: Father and son perceptions of what it means to be a good father. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers*, 4(2).

Mort, F. (1988). Boys own? Masculinity, style and popular culture. *Male order: Unwrapping masculinity*, 193-224.

Mussen, P., & Distler, L. (1959). Masculinity, identification, and father-son relationships. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59(3), 350.

Neuendorf, K. A., Rudd, J. E., Palisin, P., & Pask, E. B. (2015). Humorous communication, verbal aggressiveness, and father–son relational satisfaction. *Humor*, 28(3), 397-425.

Newkirk, T. (2002). *Misreading masculinity: Boys, literacy, and popular culture*. Heinemann, 361 Hanover Street, Portsmouth, NH 03801-3912.

Nuhrat, Y. (2013). Playing by the Book (s) The Unwritten Rules of Football in Turkey. *FairPlay, Revista de Filosofía, Ética y Derecho del Deporte*, 1(1), 89-111.

- Nuhrat, Y. (2017). Fair to Swear? Gendered Formulations of Fairness in Football in Turkey. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*, 13(1), 25-46.
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex roles*, 14(5-6), 335-350.
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (2010). Gender-role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity.
- Okan, N. (2003). *Ülkücü Kimliğin Milliyetçilik, Etnisite, Irk ve İktidar Kavramları Aracılığıyla Sosyal Antropolojik bir Değerlendirmesi*. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Onaran, O., Büker, S., & Bir, A. A. (1998). *Eskişehir'de erkek rol ve tutumlarına ilişkin alan araştırması*. Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Ormanlı, O. (2010). *1980'den Günümüze Türk Sinemasında Baba Oğul İlişkisi*. (Doktora Tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Ouzgane, L. (2006). *Islamic masculinities*. Zed Books.
- Ovacık, A. C. (2008). Aile içi şiddetin erkek çocuğun şiddet içeren suç işleme davranışına etkileri. *Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, İstanbul*.
- Özbay, C. (2010). *Retailed lives: Governing gender and work in globalizing Istanbul*. University of Southern California.
- Özbay, C. (2010). Neoliberalizm ve erkekliğin halleri. *Yeni sol, yeni sağ*, 101-132.
- Özbay, C. (2013). Türkiye'de hegemonik erkekliği aramak. *Doğu Batı*, 63, 185-204.

- Özdal, F., & Aral, N. (2005). BABA YOKSUNU OLAN VE ANNE-BABASI İLE YAŞAYAN ÇOCUKLARIN KAYGI. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2).
- Özenen, F. (2009). Babayı Öldürmek ve Yaratıcılık. *Psikanaliz Yazıları*, 18. Bağlam Yayınları.
- Öztan, G. G. (2014). *Türkiye'de militarizm: zihniyet, pratik ve propaganda*. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Padavic, I., & Reskin, B. F. (2002). *Women and men at work*. Pine Forge Press.
- Parla, J. (1990). *Babalar ve oğullar: Tanzimat romanının epistemolojik temelleri* (Vol. 25). İletişim yayınları.
- Parman, T. (2001). Babalar, Mahrem Yabancılar. *Psikanaliz Yazıları*, 3. Bağlam Yayınları.
- Parman, T. (2002). Erkek Olmak ya da Üçün Üçü Olmak: Oedipus Öncesi Dönemden Ergenliğin Sonuna Kadar Baba Oğul İlişkisi. *Psikanaliz Yazıları*, 5. Bağlam Yayınları.
- Parman, T. (2007). Babalar, Oğullar ve Büyükbabalar. *Psikanaliz Yazıları*, 15. Bağlam Yayınları.
- Persky, H., Smith, K. D., & Basu, G. K. (1971). Relation of psychologic measures of aggression and hostility to testosterone production in man. *Psychosomatic Medicine*.
- Person, E. S., & Ovesey, L. (1983). Psychoanalytic theories of gender identity. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 11(2), 203-226.

- Perşembe, N. (2010). Edebiyata Yansıyan Baba Algısı. *Mavi Melek Kültür Sanat ve Edebiyat Dergisi*.
- Pittman, F. S. (1993). *Man enough: Fathers, sons, and the search for masculinity*. Penguin.
- Pleck, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1980). *The American Man*. Prentice Hall.
- Pleck, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1997). Fatherhood ideals in the United States: Historical dimensions. *The role of the father in child development*, 3, 33-48.
- Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. MIT Press (MA).
- Pleck, J. H. (1987). The theory of male sex-role identity: Its rise and fall, 1936 to the present. *The making of masculinities: The new men's studies*, 21-38.
- Pleck, J. H., & Sawyer, J. (Eds.). (1974). *Men and masculinity*. Prentice Hall.
- Poyraz, M. (2007). Babaların babalık rolünü algılamalarıyla kendi ebeveynlerinin tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Çocuk Gelişimi ve Eğitimi Anabilim Dalında Yüksek Lisans Tezi*.
- Price-Glynn, K. (2010). *Strip club: Gender, power, and sex work*. NYU Press.
- Pyke, K. D. (1996). Class-based masculinities: The interdependence of gender, class, and interpersonal power. *Gender & Society*, 10(5), 527-549.
- Radin, N. (1972). Father-child interaction and the intellectual functioning of four-year-old boys. *Developmental Psychology*, 6(2), 353.

- Rankin, B. H., & Aytaç, I. A. (2006). Gender inequality in schooling: The case of Turkey. *Sociology of Education*, 79(1), 25-43.
- Ratele, K. (2006). Men and masculinities: Psychology and politics. The gender of psychology, 165-181.
- Reniers, G. (2001). The post-migration survival of traditional marriage patterns: Consanguineous marriages among Turks and Moroccans in Belgium. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 21-45.
- Rotundo, E. A. (1993). *American manhood: Transformations in masculinity from the revolution to the modern era*. Basic Books.
- Rotundo E. A. (2006). Patriarchs and Participants, A Historical Perspective on Fatherhood in the United States. In Whitehead, S. M. (Ed.) *Men and Masculinities Critical Concepts in Sociology Volume II, Materialising Masculinity*. (140-155). Routledge.
- Sancar, S. (2007). *Demokrasi Kültürünün Cinsiyet Boyutu: Modern Erkeklik ve Cinsiyet Farkları*. Ankara Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırma Projeleri.
- Sancar, S. (2009). *Erkeklik: İmkansız iktidar: Ailede, piyasada ve sokakta erkekler*. Metis.
- Sancar, S. (2013). Erkeklik. *Toplumsal cinsiyet çalışmaları içinde*, 168-191.
- Sancar, S. (2014). *Türk modernleşmesinin cinsiyeti: erkekler devlet, kadınlar aile kurar*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Sapolsky, R. (1997). Testosterone rules. *Discover*, 18(3), 44-48.
- Saraçgil, A., Aktaş, S., & Özgün, Ö. (2005). *Bukalemun erkek: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde ataerkil yapılar ve modern edebiyat*. İletişim.

- Sarbin, T.R. (1986) 'The narrative as root metaphor for psychology', in T. R. Sarbin (ed.) *Narrative Psychology: The Storied Nature of Human Conduct*, New York: Praeger.
- Schippers, M. (2007). Recovering the feminine other: Masculinity, femininity, and gender hegemony. *Theory and society*, 36(1), 85-102.
- Secombe, W. (1986). Patriarchy stabilized: The construction of the male breadwinner wage norm in nineteenth-century Britain*. *Social History*, 11(1), 53-76.
- Secor, A. J. (2002). The veil and urban space in Istanbul: women's dress, mobility and Islamic knowledge. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, 9(1), 5-22.
- Segal, L. (1990). Slow motion: Changing men, changing masculinities. *London: Virago*.
- Segre, S. (2016). Social constructionism as a sociological approach. *Human Studies*, 39(1), 93-99.
- Sever, M. (2002). Toplumsal, Kültürel Bağlamda Babalık Kurgu ve Pratiklerinin Çocuk Eğitimine Etkileri: Üç Kuşak Babalar Üzerinde Karşılaştırmalı Bir Araştırma. *Unpublished master's thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara*.
- Sezen, M. K. (2000). *Hukuk ve Adli Tıp Açısından Babalık Davaları*. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Sezgin, N. (2007). *Bir Popüler Kültür Örneği Olarak Kurtlar Vadisi'nde Karakterler*.
- Shields, S. (1975). Functionalism, Darwinism, and the psychology of women. *American Psychologist*, 30(7), 739.

- Shotter, J. (1993) *Conversational Realities*, London: Sage.
- Simon, R. W., & Nath, L. E. (2004). Gender and emotion in the United States: Do men and women differ in self-reports of feelings and expressive behavior? *American journal of sociology*, 109(5), 1137-1176.
- Sinclair-Webb, E. (2000). 'Our Bülent is now a commando': Military Service and Manhood in Turkey. *Imagined masculinities: Male identity and culture in the modern Middle East*, 65-91.
- Snarey, J. R. (1993). *How fathers care for the next generation: A four-decade study*. Harvard University Press.
- Sobal, J. (2005). Men, meat, and marriage: Models of masculinity. *Food and Foodways*, 13(1-2), 135-158.
- Stearns, P. (1979). *Be a man! Males in the modern history*. New York: Holmes and Meier.
- Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version*. Benjamin-Cummings Publishing Company.
- Subaşı, N. (2014). Din Sosyolojisi. *Dem Yayınları, İstanbul*.
- Sunat, H. (2002). Babalar ve Kızları ya da Kızların Yalnızlıkları. *Psikanaliz Yazıları*, 5. Bağlam Yayınları.
- Sungur, A. (2011). Masculinity and Honour Perception: A Case Study in Tepebağ District Adana Turkey. *Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ankara: Middle East Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences*.
- Sussman, H. L., & Sussman, H. (1995). *Victorian masculinities: manhood and masculine poetics in early Victorian literature and art* (Vol. 204). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sümer Tanyeri, F. (2017). Perception on fatherhood and paternal leave in Turkey. *Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ankara: Middle East Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences.*
- Sünbuloğlu, N. Y. (2013). 12 Nationalist Reactions and Masculinity Following Hrant Dink's Assassination. *Rethinking Transnational Men: Beyond, Between and Within Nations, 12, 204.*
- Sünbuloğlu, N. Y. (2013). Giriş: Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik ve Erkek (lik) lere Dair Bir Çerçeve. *Erkek Millet Asker Millet: Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek (lik) ler içinde. Der. Nurseli Yeşim Sünbuloğlu. İletişim Yayınları, 9-44.*
- Süreya, C. (2004). Hegemonik erkekliğin peşinden. *Toplum ve bilim, 101, 50.*
- Şahin, H., & Demiriz, S. (2014). Beş altı yaşında çocuğu olan babaların, babalık rolünü algılamaları ile aile katılım çalışmalarını gerçekleştirmeleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 18(1), 273- 294.*
- Şenlikoğlu, E. Ö. (1999). *İslâm'da erkek.* Mektup Yayınları.
- Şentürk, B. (2013). Şiddet ve Erkeklikler: Av Mevsimi ve Gönül Yarası Filmleri Üzerinden Türkiye'deki Erkeklik Biçimlerine Bakmak. *Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 27.*
- Tabakoğlu, S. (2010). *Babasını Öldürmüş ya da Öldürmeye Teşebbüs Etmiş Şizofrenlerin Ruhsal Yönden Değerlendirilmesi. (Master's Thesis).* İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- T. C. Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı, (2011). *Türkiye'de Aile Yapısı Araştırması 2011.* Ankara, Afşaroğlu Matbaası.
- Tecik, Z. (2012). *Fatherhood Experiences of Lower-Middle Class Men: The Case of Eskisehir* (Doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University).

- Tekeliođlu, T. (2012). *50'sinde Erkek*. Turkuvaz Yayınları.
- Tezgör, H. (2006). Ođuz Atay'ın "Babama Mektup"una Psikanalitik Bir Yaklaşım. *Pasaj Edebiyat Eleştiri Dergisi* (4-5).
- Thompson, E. H. (Ed.). (1994). *Older men's lives* (Vol. 6). Sage.
- Timmerman, C. (2006). Gender dynamics in the context of Turkish marriage migration: the case of Belgium. *Turkish Studies*, 7(1), 125-143.
- Timmerman, C., Lodewyckx, I., & Wets, J. (2009). Marriage at the intersection between tradition and globalization: Turkish marriage migration between Emirdag and Belgium from 1989 to present. *The History of the Family*, 14(2), 232-244.
- Tolson, A. (1977). *The limits of masculinity*. Tavistock Publications.
- Torche, F., & Rich, P. (2017). Declining racial stratification in marriage choices? Trends in black/white status exchange in the United States, 1980 to 2010. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 3(1), 31-49.
- Townsend, N. (2010). *Package deal: Marriage, work and fatherhood in men's lives*. Temple University Press.
- Tuksal, H. Ş. (2004). İslamcı Erkekliđin İnşası-Geleneksel Rollerin İhyası. *Constructing Islamist Masculinities—Revitalizing Traditional Roles. Toplum ve Bilim*, 101, 81-88.
- Turam, B. (2014). Gender and sexuality of the state. *Turkish Review*, 4(3), 346.
- Türk, B. (2007). Eril Tahakkümü Yeniden Düşünmek. *Pierre Bourdieu: Sosyal Bilimlerde Açılımlar Konferansı, İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi*.

- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu, 2017. Yıllara Göre İl Nüfusları. Retrieved from http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreIstatistikTablo.do?istab_id=1590
- Türkmen, M. (2004). Erbaş ve Erlerde ntihar Olasılığı ile Ruhsal Durum, Sosyal Destek ve Problem Çözme Becerileri Arasındaki İlişkiler. *Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi*, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Türkoğlu, B. (2013). Violence as a way of reconstructing manhood: The role of threatened manhood and masculine ideology on violence against women. *Yüksek Lisans tezi*, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Tüzer, İ. (2010). Oğuz Atay'dan 'Babama Mektup'ya da Bir Yazarın Ölen Babasıyla/Kendisiyle Hesaplaşması. *Turkish Studies Dergisi*, 5.
- Uğurlu, S. B. (2007). Yusuf Atılgan'da Baba İmgesi: Psikanalitik Bir Yaklaşım; *38th International Congress of Asian and North African Studies*.
- Van Anders, S. M. (2013). Beyond masculinity: testosterone, gender/sex, and human social behavior in a comparative context. *Frontiers in Neuroendocrinology*, 34(3), 198-210.
- Vance, C. S. (2007). Anthropology rediscovers sexuality: A theoretical comment. In *Culture, society and sexuality* (pp. 57-74). Routledge.
- Walsh, F. (2010). *Male trouble: Masculinity and the performance of crisis*. Springer.
- Webb, R. E., & Daniluk, J. C. (1999). The end of the line: Infertile men's experiences of being unable to produce a child. *Men and Masculinities*, 2, 6-25.
- Welford, J., & Powell, J. (2014). A crisis in modern masculinity: understanding the causes of male suicide. *London: CALM*.

- Wernesjö, U. (2014). *Conditional belonging: Listening to unaccompanied young refugees' voices* (Doctoral dissertation, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis).
- White, J. (2014). *Muslim nationalism and the new Turks*. Princeton University Press.
- Whitehead, S. M. (2002). *Men and masculinities: Key themes and new directions*. Polity.
- Yardımcı, F. (2007). Modern Türk Şiirinde Baba.
- Yazgı, B. (2002). *Medeni Usül Hukukunda Babalık Davası*. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Yılmaz, A. (2005). Türkiye'de işsiz nüfus. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15(1), 43-56.
- Yılmaz, S. (2008). *Türk sinemasında aile kavramı ve baba oğul ilişkileri* (Doctoral dissertation, DEÜ Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü).
- Yüksel, N. (1999). Toplumsal Cinsiyet Olgusu ve Türkiye'deki Toplumsal Cinsiyet Kalıplarının Televizyon Dizilerindeki Yansımaları.
- Yüksel, E. (2013). Bir Savaş Anlatısı Olarak Nefes: Vatan Sağolsun ve Hegemonik Erkekliğin Krizi. *Fe Journal: Feminist Critique/Fe Dergi: Feminist Elestiri*, 5(1).
- Zarit, J., Schmitt, A., & Sofer, J. (1991). Sexuality and Eroticism among Males in Moslem Societies.
- Zilbergeld, B. (1999). *The new male sexuality*. Bantam.
- Zinn, M. B. (1982). Chicano men and masculinity. *The Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 10(2), 29.

Zitzmann, M., & Nieschlag, E. (2001). Testosterone levels in healthy men and the relation to behavioural and physical characteristics: facts and constructs. *European Journal of Endocrinology*, 144(3), 183-197.

APPENDICES

A. İNSAN ARAŞTIRMALARI ETİK KURULU BELGESİ/HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER



ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

Sayı: 28620816 / 63
DÜMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

02 OCAK 2018

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgili: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Prof.Dr. Ayşe Ceylan TOKLUOĞLU;

Danışmanlığımı yaptığımız Rumeysa CEYLAN'ın "Baba Oğul İlişkisinin Maskülinite Karakter Oluşumuna Etkisi" başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay 2017-SOS-239 protokol numarası ile 02.01.2018-30.09.2018 tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL

Üye

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN

Başkan V

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR

Üye

Doç. Dr. Vaşar KONDAKCI

Üye

Doç. Dr. Zana ÇITAK

Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK

Üye

B. ARAŞTIRMAYA GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU/INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Bu araştırma Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Bölümü öğrencisi Rumeysa Ceylan tarafından Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ceylan Tokluoğlu danışmanlığındaki yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında yürütülmektedir. Bu form sizi araştırma koşulları hakkında bilgilendirmek için hazırlanmıştır.

Çalışmanın Amacı Nedir?

Çalışmanın amacı, baba oğul ilişkisinin, genç yetişkin erkeklerdeki maskülinite karakter oluşumuna olan etkisini araştırmaktır.

Bize Nasıl Yardımcı Olmanızı İsteyeceğiz?

Araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ederseniz, sizden beklenen, size sorulan açık uçlu soruları cevaplandırmanızdır. Bu çalışmaya katılım ortalama olarak 90 dakika sürmektedir.

Sizden Topladığımız Bilgileri Nasıl Kullanacağız?

Araştırmaya katılımınız tamamen gönüllülük temelinde olmalıdır. Ankette, sizden kimlik veya kurum belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplarınız tamamıyla gizli tutulacak, sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir. Katılımcılardan elde edilecek bilgiler toplu halde değerlendirilecek ve bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır. Sağladığımız veriler gönüllü katılım formlarında toplanan kimlik bilgileri ile eşleştirilmeyecektir.

Katılımla ilgili bilmeniz gerekenler:

Anket, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek sorular içermemektedir. Cevaplar, ses kaydı alınarak kaydedilecektir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplama

işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta serbestsiniz. Böyle bir durumda anketi uygulayan kişiye, anketi tamamlamadığınızı söylemek yeterli olacaktır.

Araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isterseniz:

Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz. Araştırma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Sosyoloji Bölümü öğretim üyelerinden Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ceylan Tokluoğlu (E-posta: ctoklu@metu.edu.tr) ya da araştırma görevlisi Rumeysa Ceylan (E-posta: rumeysa.ceylan@metu.edu.tr) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum.

(Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz).

İsim Soyad

Tarih

İmza

----/----/-----

C. KATILIM SONRASI BİLGİLENDİRME FORMU/DEBRIEFING FORM

Bu araştırma daha önce de belirtildiği gibi Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Bölümü öğrencisi Rumeysa Ceylan tarafından Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ceylan Tokluoğlu danışmanlığındaki yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında yürütülmektedir. Çalışmanın amacı, baba oğul ilişkisinin, genç yetişkin erkeklerdeki maskülinite karakter oluşumuna olan etkisini araştırmaktır.

Maskülinite, kültürel, coğrafi, tarihi koşullara göre tanımı açısından değişkenlik gösteren, farklı sosyal bilim disiplinleri tarafından çeşitli yönleriyle ele alınan bir kavramdır. Bireylerin maskülinite karakteristik özelliklerini oluşturması aşaması, dönemsel ve kültürel kodlarla değişkenlik gösteren bir süreçtir. Bu araştırmada maskülinite, Türkiye’de yaşayan genç yetişkin erkeklerin, babalarıyla olan ilişkileri çerçevesinde incelenmektedir. Söz konusu baba – oğul ilişkisinin, genç yetişkin erkek bireylerin maskülinite karakterleri oluşumu, gelişimi ve değişimi süreçlerinde, yadsınamaz bir etkisi olduğu öngörülmekte; bu etkinin, bireyin maskülinite karakterinde ne derecede ve nasıl yansıtıldığı incelenmektedir. Söz konusu etkileşimin incelenmesi, maskülinite alanında, bireysel ve toplumsal projeler, akademik araştırmalar gibi alanlar için veri elde etmek, bu araştırmanın başlıca hedefidir.

Bu çalışmadan alınacak ilk verilerin 2018 yılının Mayıs ayı sonunda elde edilmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Elde edilen bilgiler sadece bilimsel araştırma ve yazılarda kullanılacaktır. Bu araştırmaya katıldığınız için tekrar çok teşekkür ederiz.

Araştırmanın sonuçlarını öğrenmek ya da daha fazla bilgi almak için aşağıdaki isimlere başvurabilirsiniz.

Ayşe Ceylan Tokluoğlu (E-posta: ctoklu@metu.edu.tr)

Rumeysa Ceylan (E-posta: rumeysa.ceylan@metu.edu.tr)

Çalışmaya katkıda bulunan bir gönüllü olarak katılımcı haklarınızla ilgili veya etik ilkelerle ilgili soru veya görüşlerinizi ODTÜ Uygulamalı Etik Araştırma Merkezi'ne iletebilirsiniz.

e-posta: ueam@metu.edu.tr

D. SORU LİSTESİ/QUESTIONNAIRE

- 1- Doğum yeriniz:
- 2- Doğum tarihiniz:
- 3- Medeni durumunuz:
- 4- Eğitim durumunuz:
- 5- Mesleğiniz:
- 6- Babanızın doğum yeri:
- 7- Babanızın doğum tarihi:
- 8- Babanızın eğitim durumu:
- 9- Babanızın mesleği:
- 10- Annenizin doğum yeri:
- 11- Annenizin doğum tarihi:
- 12- Annenizin eğitim durumu:
- 13- Annenizin mesleği:
- 14- Anne – babanın evlilik durumu:
- 15- Erkeklik nedir? (Erkek olmayı nasıl tanımlarsınız?)
- 16- Erkeklik kanıtlanabilir mi?
- 17- Erkek olmak neleri gerektirir?
- 18- Erkek olmak sizin için ne ifade eder?
- 19- Erkek olmanın en iyi tarafı nedir?
- 20- Erkek olmanın en zor tarafı nedir?
- 21- Erkek ve kadın arasındaki farklar nelerdir? İkisini ayıran en önemli fark nedir?
- 22- Erkek olmak hakkındaki bilgileri nereden öğrendiniz?
- 23- En iyi erkek modeli sizce kimdir?
- 24- İdeal bir erkek nasıl olmalıdır? Ne özellikleri barındırmalıdır?
- 25- Siz bu ideal erkeklığe kendinizi ne kadar yakın görüyorsunuz?
- 26- Sizce bu ideale nasıl ulaşılır?
- 27- Size göre, babanız ideal erkeklik durumuna ne kadar yakındır?

- 28-** Erkek modeli olarak kendinize kimi örnek aldınız? Neden?
- 29-** Sizce erkeklik imajı nedir?
- 30-** Erkeklik imajını sarsacak ya da onu kötü yönde etkileyecek şeyler nelerdir?
- 31-** Kötü erkeği nasıl tanımlarsınız?
- 32-** Türk toplumunda erkeğin yeri nedir?
- 33-** Erkeğe düşen görevler nelerdir?
- 34-** Erkekten beklenti nedir?
- 35-** Kendi ailenizde size sadece erkek olduğunuz için biçilen roller, verilen görevler nelerdir?
- 36-** Baba - oğul arasındaki ilişki nasıl olmalıdır?
- 37-** Babanızla aranızdaki ilişkiyi nasıl tanımlarsınız?
- 38-** Şu ana kadar ki oluşan kişiliğinizin gelişim evresinde, babanızın payı ne kadardır? Katkısı olmuş mudur?
- 39-** Babanızı kendinize rol model olarak alır mısınız? Alıyorsanız, hangi konularda? Almıyorsanız, neden? Hangi konularda farklı olmak istersiniz?
- 40-** Babanızı eleştirdiğiniz ve takdir ettiğiniz şeyler neler?
- 41-** Babanızla kişilik özellikleri açısından benzetilir misiniz/benzetilir miydiniz? Benziyorsanız, hangi açılardan?
- 42-** İlerde babanız gibi olmak ister misiniz? İstiyorsanız neden, istemiyorsanız neden?
- 43-** Babanızın sizi eleştirdiği ve takdir ettiği şeyler neler? Babanız fiziksel tercihlerinize karışır mı? (küpe takmak, sakal, saç vs gibi)
- 44-** Babanızın onayını takdirini kazanmak sizin için önemli mi? Onay ya da takdir almak için yaptığınız şeyler oldu mu?
- 45-** Karşı cins konusunda babanızla konuştunuz mu? Mesela karşı cinse nasıl davranmanız gerektiği gibi? Peki cinsellik hakkında konuştunuz mu? Sevgilileriniz hakkında? Bu konularda size öğüt verdi mi ya da siz tavsiye istediniz mi, danıştınız mı? Babanız size bu konuda neler aktardı?
- 46-** Kendi babanızdan öğrendiğiniz en önemli ders nedir?

E. THE SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Participant	Age of Participant	Birthplace of Participant	The Education Level of Participant	Marital Status of Participant	Occupation of Participant
Feanor	25	Yozgat	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Sentex	26	Sivas	Lisans mezunu	Bekâr	Serbest meslek
Eren	26	Gaziantep	Lisans mezunu	Bekâr	Serbest meslek
Oğuz	26	Kırşehir	Lisans mezunu	Bekâr	Depoculuk
Akbabaş	23	Tokat	Lisans mezunu	Bekâr	Stajyer avukat
Beko	22	Edirne	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Chucky	25	Ankara	Lisans mezunu	Bekâr	Jeoloji mühendisi
Coşkun	24	Ankara	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Çay	26	Ankara	Lisans mezunu	Bekâr	Esnaf
Çöp	21	Ankara	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Modernhood	21	Bursa	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Mert Pazarcı	22	İstanbul	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Deniz Ali	21	Ordu	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Halim	27	Ankara	Yüksek lisans mezunu	Bekâr	Subay

Table E: Cont'd

Participant	Age of Participant	Birthplace of Participant	The Education Level of Participant	Marital Status of Participant	Occupation of Participant
Hank	26	İstanbul	Yüksek lisans öğrencisi	Bekâr	Tıbbi sekreter
Tona23	25	Uşak	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Kırıkçatal	24	Ankara	Lisans mezunu	Bekâr	Stajyer avukat
Kylorap	26	Ankara	Yüksek lisans öğrencisi	Bekâr	Metalurji ve malzeme mühendisi
Utku	22	Antalya	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Topçu	25	Osmaniye	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Piyanist	22	Antalya	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Erendibi	25	Eskişehir	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci
Gökhan	26	Kırıkkale	Lisans mezunu	Bekâr	Personel müdürü
Tövbestein	26	Ankara	Üniversite öğrencisi	Bekâr	Öğrenci

****Nicknames were chosen by participants themselves.**

**F. THE SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FATHERS
OF THE PARTICIPANTS**

Participant	Age	Birthplace	Level of Education	Marital Status	Occupation
Feanor	61	Yozgat	Yüksek lisans mezunu	Evli	Makine mühendisi
Sentex	53	Sivas	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Memur
Eren	54	Gaziantep	Ortaokul mezunu	Evli	Mobilyacılık
Oğuz	61	Kırşehir	Ortaokul mezunu	Evli	Emekli
Akbabuş	59	Amasya	Yüksek lisans mezunu	Evli	Ziraat mühendisi
Beko	49	Edirne	Lise mezunu	Evli	Serbest meslek
Chucky	55	Rize	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Öğretmen
Coşkun	50	Ankara	İlkokul mezunu	Evli	Serbest meslek
Çay*	62	Ankara	İlkokul mezunu	Evli	Esnaf
Çöp	62	Rize	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Müfettiş
Modernhood	51	Elâzığ	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Öğretmen
Mert Pazarcı	46	Karaman	İlkokul mezunu	Evli	İşçi
Deniz Ali	51	Ordu	Lise mezunu	Evli	İşçi

Table F: Cont'd

Participant	Age	Birthplace	Level of Education	Marital Status	Occupation
Halim	59	Amasya	Yüksek lisans mezunu	Evli	Öğretmen
Hank	56	İstanbul	Ön lisans mezunu	Boşanmış	Uçak teknisyeni
Tona23	51	Uşak	Lise mezunu	Evli	Emekli işçi
Kırıkçatal	59	Sivas	Lise mezunu	Evli	Emekli memur
Kylorap	61	Elâzığ	Lisans mezunu	Evli	İşletmeci
Utku	50	Burdur	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Emekli öğretmen
Topçu	54	Antalya	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Cumhuriyet savcısı
Piyanist	51	Antalya	Ortaokul mezunu	Evli	Serbest meslek
Erendibi	53	Eskişehir	İlköğretim mezunu	Evli	İnşaat formenliği
Gökhan	52	Kırıkkale	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Memur
Tövbestein	49	Ankara	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Polis

***Father of this participant deceased shortly before this study.**

**G. THE SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE
MOTHERS OF THE PARTICIPANTS**

Participant	Age	Birthplace	Level of Education	Marital Status	Occupation
Feanor	55	Yozgat	Lise mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı
Sentex	50	Sivas	Lise mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı
Eren	52	Gaziantep	İlkokul mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı
Oğuz	54	Kırşehir	İlkokul mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı
Akbabuş	53	Amasya	İlkokul mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı
Beko	48	Edirne	Lise mezunu	Evli	Memur
Chucky	50	Rize	Yüksek lisans mezunu	Evli	Fizyoterapist
Coşkun	42	Ankara	İlkokul mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı
Çay	62	Ankara	İlkokul mezunu	Dul	Ev hanımı
Çöp	53	Rize	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı
Modernhood	48	Elâzığ	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Hemşire
Mert Pazarıcı	46	Kayseri	İlkokul mezunu	Evli	İşçi
Deniz Ali	41	Ordu	Lise mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı
Halim	53	Amasya	Lise mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı

Table G: Cont'd

Participant	Age	Birthplace	Level of Education	Marital Status	Occupation
Hank	51	Konya	İlkokul mezunu	Boşanmış	Ev hanımı
Tona23	39	Uşak	Lise mezunu	Evli	Memur
Kırıkçatal	54	Sivas	İlkokul mezunu	Evli	Hizmetli
Kylorap	58	Elâzığ	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Emekli öğretmen
Utku	50	Burdur	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Hemşire
Topçu	45	Antalya	Lise mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı
Piyanist	50	Antalya	Ortaokul mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı
Erendibi	49	Eskişehir	İlköğretim mezunu	Evli	Ev hanımı
Gökhan	50	Kırıkkale	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Öğretmen
Tövbestein	45	Ankara	Lisans mezunu	Evli	Jeoloji mühendisi

H. TÜRKÇE ÖZET/TURKISH SUMMARY

Türkiye’de Baba Oğul Etkileşimi ve İdealize Erkeklik Oluşumu

Toplumsal cinsiyet, kadın ya da erkek olmak durumu olarak tanımlanır. Ancak biyolojik cinsiyetten farklı olarak, toplumsal cinsiyet, biyolojiye bağımlı değildir; sosyal bir inşadır. Toplumsal cinsiyet olgusuna göre kadınlar ve erkekler maskülinite ve femininite spektrumunda, çeşitli noktalarda yer alır. Sosyal bir inşa olarak ele aldığımız zaman maskülinite ve femininite, kültür, tarih, coğrafi bölge, etnik köken, din, yaş ve diğer sosyoekonomik faktörlerden bağımsız olarak düşünülemeyeceği gibi, bu faktörlerle şekillenen yapılar olarak değerlendirilmelidir. Tüm bu dinamik ilişkilerin içerisinde değerlendirildiğinde cinsiyet oluşumu, durağan ve mutlak, tek bir süreç olarak ele alınmaz. Sosyal inşacılığın da kabul ettiği üzere cinsiyet, en kapsayıcı tanımıyla bir spektrumdur. Tüm bunların içerisinde maskülinite, toplumsal cinsiyet çalışmalarının diğer alanlarıyla kıyaslandığında daha yeni yeni çalışılmaya başlanmış bir alandır. Psikoloji, sosyoloji, felsefe, tarih, antropoloji, biyoloji ve edebiyat gibi farklı disiplinler tarafından da ele alınan maskülinite, 1970’lerden beri toplumsal cinsiyet veya kadın çalışmaları bölümleri akademisyenleri tarafından öğretilmektedir (Brod, 1987; Kimmel & Messner, 1992; Messerschmidt, 1993; Connell, 1993, 1995; Brod, & Kaufman, 1994; Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994; Sussman & Sussman, 1995; Mangan, 2003; Ratele, 2006; Messerschmidt, 2007). Bu çalışmalar, özellikle alternatif maskülinite şekillerini, hegemonik yapılardan ayırıştırmak için önem arz etmektedir. Maskülinitelerin karakterleri toplumsal norm, değer ve beklentilerle şekillenir. Erkekler, sosyalleşmeye başladıkları andan itibaren bu toplumsal beklentileri ve atıfları yerine getirmek, bunlara uymak için bir yönlendirme ve yer yer baskıyla karşılaşırlar. Bu durum, toplumlarda bir erkek stereotipinin oluşumuna sebep olur ve farklı erkeklik çeşitlerinin varlığını yok saymaya kadar giden bir süreci başlatır. Alternatif erkeklik tiplerinin varlığını kabullenmemek, erkeklerin hayatını tek bir idealize edilmiş erkek

karakterine kısıtlamak anlamına gelir. Toplumsal cinsiyet çalışmalarında maskülinitenin tam olarak anlaşılabilmesi için, cinsiyetin sosyal oluşum süreci ve diğer sosyokültürel faktörlerle ilişkilerinin analiz edilmesi gerekmektedir. Maskülinite çalışmaları başlıca hegemonik ve alternatif erkeklik tiplerini ele alırken, maskülinite krizlerini, oluşumlarını, bu oluşumların askeriye, babalık, politika, medya, sağlık, cinsellik ve LGBTİ gibi diğer kurum ve kavramlarla ilişkilerini de inceler.

Bu tezin amacı en genelinde, Türkiye’deki maskülinite alanındaki çalışmalara katkıda bulunmaktır. Bunu, Türkiye’deki genç yetişkin erkeklerin ideal erkekliklerle ilgili algıları ve Türkiye’de erkek olmanın sosyokültürel parametrelerini araştırarak yapmayı hedeflemektedir. İdeal erkeklik algısının, Türkiye’deki erkeklikleri ne ölçüde ve nasıl şekillendirdiği, sosyal inşacı bir anlayışla ele alınmaktadır. Bu bağlamlar çerçevesinde masküliniteler, hegemonik maskülinite ve babalık kavramları da analiz edilmektedir. Tezin spesifik bulguları, Türkiye’deki tüm erkek popülasyonuna genellenemez. Ancak akademik literatürde bu konuyla ilgili çalışmaların kısıtlılığı, bu konularla ilintili araştırmaların daha sık ve farklı bakış açılarıyla ele alınmasını gerektirmektedir. Somutlaştırmak gerekirse, babalık sorumluluklarına dair algının 1960’lardan 2000’lere kadar olan değişimini ancak literatürde daha önce yapılmış çalışmalara bakarak görebiliriz (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2002). Aynı kapsamda değerlendirdiğimizde, bu tezden önceki yıllarda yazılmış olan, Türkiye’de maskülinite ve diğer çeşitli olguların ilişkilerini farklı tarih ve coğrafi bölgelerde araştırmış olan Sungur’un (2011) Adana’da, Tecik’in (2012) Eskişehir’de ve Bozok’un (2013) Trabzon’da yapmış bulunduğu çalışmaları bilmeden, 2018 yılında Ankara’da maskülinite çalışmanın temelini atmanın zorlaşacağı belirtilmelidir. Tıpkı önceki yüksek lisans ve doktora tezleri gibi, Sancar’ın (2009) Türkiye’de erkeklik alanında yaptığı kapsamlı çalışma, Boratav, Fişek ve Ziya’nın (2012) erkekliğin hem toplumsal hem gelişimsel anlamda inşalarını incelemesi, Beşpınar’ın (2016) orta sınıfta yeni babalık deneyimlerini çalışması gibi Türk akademik literatüründe var olan araştırma ve çalışmaları bilmeden, maskülinite, toplumsal inşası, sosyokültürel parametreleri ve babalıkla ilintisini çalışan bir tez

yazmanın imkansızlığı da her şeyden önce eklenmesi gereken bir durumdur. Tüm bu örnekleri vererek belirtilmek istenilen şey, akademik literatürdeki birikimin, özellikle Türkiye’de maskülinite konusunda yapılacak olan gelecek çalışmalara bir zemin oluşturduğu, yer yer yönlendirdiği ve şekillendirdiği gerçeğidir. Toplumdaki maskülinite gibi dinamik ve diğer sosyokültürel, ekonomik değişkenlerle yakından ilintili kavramların değişimini, gelişimini veya ne yönde şekillendiğini somut bir biçimde ele alabilmek için, önceki dönemler ve farklı bölgelerde bu anlamda neler bulunduğunu, neler öngörüldüğünü ve hangi faktörlerin bu kapsamda ele alındığını bilmek büyük önem arz etmektedir.

Bu tezin katılımcı grubu, yaşları 21 ve 27 arasında değişen, babalık deneyimi edinmemiş, evli olmayan, 24 genç yetişkin Türk erkekten oluşmaktadır. Babalık deneyimi edinmemiş olmalarına özellikle dikkat edilmesinin sebebi, bu deneyimden sonra babalığa dair olan algılarının olası değişiminden etkilenmemiş veri elde etme amacının güdülmesidir. Yine de burada belirtilmesi gereken nokta, katılımcıların babalığa ve babalarına dair algılarının, yaşları ilerledikçe, fizyolojik ve psikolojik gelişimlerinin de kaçınılmaz bir sonucu olarak değiştiğidir. Her ne kadar babalık deneyimi yaşamamış olsalar bile, içinde buldukları toplum tarafından şekillenen sosyalizasyon sürecinin ilerleyen aşamalarıyla beraber, babalık algıları değişmiş, daha küçükken sahip oldukları fikirleri ya da duyguları sonradan ele aldıklarında, babalarına hak verdikleri veya onları eleştirdikleri görülmüştür. Yine de toplumsal rol anlamında henüz “baba” sıfatını edinmemiş olmalarından kaynaklı, birebir tecrübe etmemenin sağladığı bir dış bakışa sahip olmaları, tezin bu anlamdaki yargısını güçlendirmektedir. İlk katılımcıya sosyal medya üzerinden ulaşılmıştır. Diğer katılımcılara, ilk katılımcının yönlendirmesiyle erişim sağlanmıştır.

Metodolojik yaklaşım olarak sosyal inşacılık kuramı seçilmiştir. Sosyal inşacılık, özcü ve tekdüze realizm anlayışına zıt olması, bilginin kültürel ve tarihi yönlerine olan spesifik yaklaşımı ve son olarak, sosyal pratikler, süreçler ve iletişime odaklanması nedeniyle seçilmiştir (Burr, 2006). Tüm bu özelliklerin temelinde, insanlar arasındaki ilişkinin sosyal bir inşa sürecinin sonucu olduğu ve bu inşanın biyolojik ya da içgüdüsel faktörlere atfedilemeyeceği kabulü yatar. Tüm

bunlardan ötürü sosyal inşacılık kuramı, realitenin doğrudan bir algısının söz konusu olamayacağını savunur (Burr, 2006). Tam olarak aynı nedenlerden ötürü tek tip bir maskülinite tanımı ya da tek tür babalıktan bahsetmek mümkün değildir. Bunu akademik literatürde, erkeklik kavramının ele alınma şekline bakarak da görmek mümkündür. 1970'lerin sonlarına doğru yapılmış çalışmalarda erkeklik literatürü, idealize edilmiş tek tip bir erkeklığe odaklanmıştır (Tolson, 1977; Mellen, 1977; Hantover, 1978). Bu odaklanılmış, spesifik maskülinite tipinin tanımlanması, maskülinite ve daha sonralarda Connell (1995) tarafından "hegemonik maskülinite" olarak adlandırılacak olan, idealize edilerek öne çıkarılmış bir maskülinite tiplemesinin tanımsal bağlamda kısıtlanmasına neden olmuştur. 1980'lerin ortalarından itibaren, bu yaklaşım yerine daha sosyal inşacı bir bakış açısı benimsenmiştir. Dominant olan maskülinite kavramı ve onun dinamik kabul edilmeyen özü sorgulanmaya başlanmıştır. Sonuç olarak, maskülinitenin sosyal bir olgu olduğu kabulüyle, farklı maskülinite tanımları ve pratikleri odak noktası haline gelmeye başlamıştır (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985; Kimmel, 1987; Brod, 1987). 1990'larda ise maskülinite artık evrensel görülmeyen bir olgu olarak ele alınmaya başlamıştır. Daha spesifik ve kişisel tecrübelerle odaklanılması gerektiği düşünülerek, maskülinite çalışmalarında bir yaklaşım farklılığına gidilmiştir. Maskülinite çalışmalarındaki bu farklılık, kendisini, diğer disiplinler tarafından da sıklıkça çalışılmakta olan babalık kavramında da göstermiştir. Özellikle gelişim psikolojisi, sosyal psikoloji, sosyoloji, sosyal antropoloji, tarih ve edebiyat tarafından çalışılmakta olan babalık konusuna getirilen bu yeni bakış açısı da, çeşitli dönemlerde öne çıkarılan ve idealize edilen farklı farklı babalık türlerinin varlıklarını gözler önüne sermiştir.

Erkeklik ve babalık, Türkiye'de birçok farklı alanda, çeşitli disiplinler tarafından ele alınmıştır (Atabek, 1989; Parla, 1990; Işık, 1998; Şenlikoğlu, 1999; Mater, 1998; Kandiyoti, 1997; Kudat, 2007; Saraçgil, 2004; Düzkan, 2006; Sancar, 2007; Kuruoğlu, 2009; Boratav, Fişek & Ziya, 2012; Tekelioğlu, 2012; Yamak Ateş, 2012; Eker & Şimşek, 2006; Hattat, 2010; Eroğlu, 2011). Tecik'in (2012) ve Bozok'un (2013) tezlerinde de belirttikleri üzere, maskülinite çalışıldığı dönem ve

coğrafi bölgenin kendine has, spesifik sosyokültürel ve ekonomik faktörleri çerçevesinde şekillenir. Türkiye’de erkekliği bu kapsamda çalışmak, çok farklı erkeklik deneyimlerini akademik veri olarak elde etmenin önünü açmıştır. Adana’da çalışılan erkeklik ile Trabzon’da çalışılan erkeklik, Eskişehir’de araştırılan sosyoekonomik yapı ve erkeklik ilişkisi ile Ankara’da ele alınan erkekliğin sosyokültürel parametrelerle ilintileri çok farklı veriler vermektedir. Bu farklı verilerin yanı sıra, ortak örüntülerin görülmesi de beklenebilir bir durumdur.

Kişisel deneyimlerden yola çıkılarak elde edilmiş bu verilerden yola çıkarak, genç yetişkin Türk erkeklerinin babalık ve ideal maskülinite algılarıyla ilgili genelleme yapmak sağlıklı olmayacaktır. Ancak örneklemin geneline baktığımızda, tüm katılımcılar için geçerli olan bazı sosyal norm ve pratiklerden söz etmek mümkündür. Katılımcıların tamamı erkek olmanın, özellikle Türk toplumunda bir avantaj olduğunu belirtmekte, ancak bunu kadınların toplumdaki dezavantajlı konumuyla bir kıyaslama üzerinden ifade etmektedir. Yine erkeklik tanımlaması yapılırken katılımcıların çoğu daha önce bu konu üzerine hiç düşünmediğini ifade etmiştir. Sonrasında ise erkeklik tanımlamaları, yine kişilerin kadın tanımları üzerinden bir kıyaslamaya gidilerek yapılmıştır. Erkeklik tanımlamaları çoğunlukla savaşçı, koruyucu, avcı gibi genel geçer toplumsal roller, cesur, güçlü, açıksözlü, dürüst gibi sıfatlar ve son olarak baba, abi gibi ailesel bağlar üzerinden yapılmıştır. İyi bir erkek tanımlamasında finansal ve sosyal ilişkilerdeki sorumluluk tavrı vurgusu baskınken, dürüstlük, iyi kalplilik, cömertlik gibi evrensel değerlere de vurguda bulunulmuştur. Aile kurmak erkeklik için önemli bir adım olarak görülürken, aileyi devam ettirebilmek, iyi ve sorumlu bir erkeğin “yeterlilikleri” arasında değerlendirilmiştir. Aile kurabilmek için en kabul edilebilir yol olarak vurgulanan evlilik kurumu ise, ancak finansal sorumluluğu kabullenip, ekonomik sağlayıcılığı yerine getirebilmiş erkekler için geçerli olduğu düşünülen bir olgu hâline gelmiştir. Kıray’ın (1964) Ereğli’deki çalışmasında tespit edilmiş olan evlilik süreç ve ritüellerine tamamen ters bir şekilde, belli bir olgunluğa erişmemiş erkeklerin evlenmesi makul görülmemekte, aynı zamanda, erkeklerin babaları, evlilik sürecinde pasifize edilmiş konumdadır. Kıray’ın çalışmasında vurgulanan, babanın

ebeveynlik görevi olarak görülen “oğlunu evlendirmek” eylemi, bu örneklem için geçerliliğini yitirmiş durumdadır. Bu tezin örnekleminde evlilik konusunda müdahaleci olarak algılanan bir tek baba vardır. Bu durumdaki müdahale ise babanın oğlunu evleneceği kadının kişisel özellikleri konusunda dikkatli olmasını tembih etmesi şeklindedir. Diğer katılımcıların babası, evlilik gibi kadınları da içeren ilişki odaklı konularda en son karar mercii görevini üstlenmekte, bu noktada da genellikle oğluna “güvendiği” için onun kararına saygı duyması beklenen bir role bürünmektedir. Öte yandan kötü erkek tanımlamalarında ise özellikle şiddet temasının öne çıkması önemli bir bulgudur. İyi erkek özelliklerini sıralarken doğrudan yer almayan “merhametli olmak” vurgusu, kötü erkeği tanımlarken ortaya çıkmıştır. Erkekliğe, ataerkinin atfettiği toplumsal gücün kötüye, özellikle daha aciz veya savunmasız varlıklara karşı kullanılması, bir erkeği kötü yapan en başlıca etmen olarak görülmüştür. Buna bağlı olarak kıskançlık, agresiflik, saygısızlık, kabalık, zorbalık, içki, kumar ve uyuşturucuya düşkünlük, dürüst olmamak ve sorumsuzluk gibi kavramlar da kötü erkeği tanımlarken sıklıkla kullanılmıştır. Fiziksel sağlık anlamında kendi kendine yeterli olamamak da kötü erkek tanımında kullanılmakla beraber, iktidarsızlık gibi kavramlarla beraber kişiyi aşağılayan bir kategoride değerlendirilmiştir. Hegemonik masküinite dayatmalarının hem ekonomik, hem sosyal, hem de fiziksel anlamda yansımalarını bu görüşmelerde görmek de mümkündür.

Erkeklik tanımlamalarının kadınlar üzerinden bir kıyaslamayla gitmesine paralel olarak, iyi ve kötü erkeklik tanımlamaları da genellikle katılımcıların çevresindeki, özellikle ailesindeki erkek bireylerin karakterleri üzerinden yapılmıştır. Aile bireyleri arasında davranışları en çok referans alınan kişi baba olmakla beraber, çoğu durumda babaya dede, amca, abi, erkek kuzenler veya uzak akraba olup, abi olarak benimsenmiş diğer erkek aile bireyleri de sayılmaktadır. Babaya olan atıf çoğunlukla, kişilerin ilk karşılaştığı erkek bireyin babaları olmasına bağlanırken, çoğu katılımcı babalarıyla çok uzun süreli vakit geçiremediklerini de itiraf etmiştir. Bunun nedeni genellikle babanın işten dolayı çoğunlukla evde olamaması, il dışı veya yurtdışında çalışması, genel itibariyle erkeğin ailedeki istihdam rolünden

kaynaklanmaktadır. Bu durum bize, Türk ailesinde hâlâ erkeğin başlıca ekonomik sorumluluğunun bitmediğini göstermektedir. Ailelerin çoğunda anneler hâlâ ev hanımıdır ancak çalışan anneler de mevcuttur. Eğitim düzeyleri açısından kıyaslandığında eğitim düzeyi en düşük grup katılımcıların anneleri, daha sonra babaları, en yüksek grup ise katılımcılardır. Görüşmeler yapıldığı sırada görüşmecilerin tamamı ya üniversitede okumaktaydı ya da üniversiteden mezun olmuştu. Örneklemin bu yönde şekillenmesinin en büyük nedenlerinden biri, görüşmelerin Ankara’da yaşayan katılımcılarla yapılmış olmasıdır. Ankara, Türkiye’de birçok üniversiteye ev sahipliği yapan, büyük bir şehirdir. Başkent olması itibarıyla yüksek bir istihdam oranına sahip olması da Türkiye’nin başka şehirlerinden birçok insanın Ankara’da yaşamayı tercih etme sebeplerinden biridir. Aynı durum, katılımcıların ailelerinin farklı coğrafi bölgelerden ve farklı etnik yapıların içinden gelmesini açıklayan bir etmendir. Tüm bu çeşitliliğe rağmen ortak erkeklik algıları ve örüntülerinin görülmesi, maskülinitenin sosyal inşacılık kuramı içerisinde analiz edilmesini değerli kılmaktadır. Aynı anda, hegemonik maskülinite kavramının bir kez daha doğrulandığını gösterir niteliktedir. Hegemonik maskülinite, tanımıyla da belirtildiği üzere, spesifik bir coğrafyada, spesifik bir zaman diliminde, diğer maskülinite çeşitlerine baskın gelen, toplum tarafından tüm erkek bireylere dayatılan norm ve davranış çeşitleri ile oluşan bir erkeklik türüdür (Connell, 1995). Patriyarkal düzen tarafından hegemonik masküliniteye atfedilen güç, toplumdaki erkek bireylerin bu normlara yaklaşmak istemesine veya bu normları benimsemesine sebep olmaktadır. Hiyerarşik düzlemde diğer tüm erkeklik ve kadınlık türlerinin en tepesinde sayılan hegemonik maskülinite, baskıcı ve yönlendirici bir yapıya sahip olmakla beraber, ulaşılması imkânsız bir gücü temsil eder. Çoğu katılımcının görüşmelerde de belirttiği üzere bu durum, “toplumsal” bir dayatmanın “kişisel” bir sorun haline gelmesine sebep olur. Katılımcıların çoğu, doğrudan veya dolaylı olarak, Türkiye’de dayatılan hegemonik maskülinitenin kararları, duyguları, düşünceleri, hayat döngüleri, kısacası benlikleri üzerindeki etkilerinden bahsederken konuya yaklaşımları çok olumlu olmamıştır. Türkiye’de erkek olmanın avantajlarının farkında olmak, onları bu durumla barışık hâle getirmemekle beraber, duygusal

anlamda bastırılmışlığın verdiği sürüncemeden kurtarmaya da yetmemiştir. Özellikle baba – oğul ilişkisinde problematik olarak görülen duygusal bastırma tavrı, katılımcıların algısına göre duygusal gelişimlerini büyük ölçüde örseleyen, toplumdaki diğer bireylere olan yaklaşımlarını da etkileyen bir durum hâline gelmiştir. Babadan öte toplumun dayatması olarak görülen cesur, sert ve duygusuz erkek tiplemesinin, katılımcıların psikolojik durumlarının üzerindeki negatif etkisi, birçok sorunun cevabında dile getirilmiştir. Hayatı tam anlamıyla ve dolu dolu yaşamaya engel olarak görülen bu durumu çoğu katılımcının tam anlamıyla aşamadığını ifade etmesi, hegemonik maskülinite dayatmasının gücünü kaybetmediğini, aksine koruduğunu gösteren bir işarettir. Burada ifade edilmesi gereken nokta ise, katılımcıların çoğunun bu dayatmaların farkında olmasıdır. Farkındalık, değişime giden yolun ilk basamağı olarak düşünülürse, elimizdeki bilgiler yine de umut verici olarak değerlendirilebilir.

İyi ve kötü erkeğin tanımlamalarından sonra katılımcıların ideal maskülinite algısını ölçmek için bu yönde yöneltilen sorular sonucunda, tek tip bir ideal erkek türünün olmadığı görülmüştür. Katılımcıların çoğu, toplumun dayattığı ideal erkeklik algısının son derece farkında olmakla beraber, kendi ideal erkek algılarını bu dayatmadan ayrı tutmaktadır. Ancak burada belirtilmesi gereken nokta, katılımcıların yarısından fazlasının ideal erkeği tanımlarken referans aldıkları babalarını, diğer soruların cevaplarında “aslında o kadar da ideal olmadığı” yönünde analiz etmeleridir. Yine de cevaplar kendi içerisinde kendisine mazeret üretir nitelikte olup, babanın ideal erkeklikten uzak görülen özellikleri için, içine doğduğu kültür, yaşadığı yer, eğitim seviyesi, yaşadığı dönem gibi faktörlerin etkisine atıfta bulunulmuştur. Babasının hareketlerine bakarak “nasıl bir erkek olunmaması gerektiğini” belirten az sayıda katılımcının cevaplarında bile, babaların tamamen kötü veya sorumsuz olarak algılanmadığı, kendi içerisinde iyi yönlerine de vurguların olduğu görülmüştür. İdeal bir erkeklikte olmazsa olmaz olarak görülen ekonomik sağlayıcılık, erkeğin sadece aile kurabilmesi için değil, kendi hayatını tek başına idame ettirebilmesi için elzem görülmüştür. Evlilik her ne kadar toplumsal ideali yansıtan bir kurum olarak görülse de katılımcıların çoğu buna radikal bir karşı

çıkış tavrından bahsetmemiştir. Ancak eklenmesi gereken nokta, katılımcıların hiçbirinin belli bir ekonomik ve kişisel olgunluğa erişmeden evliliği yakın dönemde hayat planları içerisine dahil etmedikleridir. Buradan yola çıkarak, katılımcıların ideal erkeklik kurumlarında evliliği ekonomik sağlayıcılıktan ayırıp, sonrasında olabilecek bir aşama olarak gördükleri söylenebilir. Öte yandan evliliğin karşıdaki kişinin inisiyatifinde şekillendiği de cevapların alt metinlerinden okunabilir. Her ne kadar toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliği, kadın istihdamının artması, kadına şiddetin olmaması gerektiği tarzı konularda tüm katılımcılar hemfikir görünse de evlilik aşamasında erkeğe yüklenen finansal yükümlülük olgusu, kadının isteği ve talebi olarak görülmektedir. Bu durum, toplumsal cinsiyete dair bazı önyargıların devam ettiğini göstermekle beraber, kişilerin toplumdaki tecrübelerinden veya ailelerindeki olaylardan yola çıkarak bunları ifade ettiğini düşündüğümüz bir durumda, toplumsal cinsiyet eşitsizliğinin çeşitli şekillerde kendisini göstermeye devam ettiğine de işaret etmektedir. Katılımcıların çoğunluğunun annesinin ev hanımı olduğunu, ailedeki ekonomik sağlayıcılık rolünü babanın, kimi zaman iki işe birden giderek, kimi zaman aylarca ailesinden uzakta kalarak il dışında veya yurtdışında çalışarak üstlendiğini düşündüğümüz zaman, bu durum çok da ilgisiz görünmemektedir. Eklenmesi gereken bir başka nokta ise, ideal erkeklik tanımlamalarında kişilerin fiziksel özelliklere neredeyse hiç atıfta bulunmaması, fiziksel özelliklerden bahseden katılımcıların ise ideal erkeği kendi fiziksel özelliklerine yakın nitelikte kurmasıdır. Boy, kilo, saç, ten ve göz rengi gibi faktörler ideal erkeklik kurumunun dışında görülüp, bunlardan ziyade kişilik özellikleri, erkeğin düşünce yapısı ve toplumdaki statüsüne ilişkin açıklamalar ön plana çıkarılmıştır. Tamamen kadın katılımcılardan oluşan bir örnekleme ideal kadınlık kurgusu sorulduğu zaman ne tarz cevaplar alınacağı, toplumsal cinsiyet spektrumunun iki ucundaki ideallik algısında görülen değişim hakkında daha net bir bilgi verebilir.

İdeal baba – oğul ilişkisinin arkadaşlık üzerine kurulu olduğu algısı, katılımcıların tamamına yakınında mevcuttur. Ancak burada bahsi geçen arkadaşlık yapısı, yine de hiyerarşik bir düzlemde çıkamamakta, “saygı” kavramına vurgu yapılmadan tanımlanmamaktadır. Arkadaşlık ilişkisinden kastın, baba ile günlük

konular ve insan ilişkileri dahil olmak üzere, birçok konuda rahatça paylaşım yapabilme, birlikte eğlenmek gibi aktiviteler için zaman geçirme olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Genellikle, görüşmelerin içeriğinden çıkan sonuç, babaların ciddi durumlarda veya son karar mercii olarak rol aldığı yönündedir. Günlük sorunlar, gereksinimler veya sosyal ilişkiler gibi konularda ilk danışma rolünü annenin üstlendiği görülmektedir. Anne, genel itibarıyla, katılımcıların hayatına babadan daha müdahil ve daha hızlı bir etki mekanizması olarak rol almaktadır. Anneden beklenen ebeveyn sevgisi, babadan beklenmemektedir. Babanın bunu sağlayabileceğini çoğu katılımcı düşünmemekte, bunun gerekliliğini de sorgulamaktadır. Bu noktada annenin sağladığı sevgi, onu katılımcıyla daha yakın, daha paylaşıma açık bir konuma getirirken, aynı anda aradaki saygı hiyerarşisini zedelemekte ve onu babadan daha etkisiz bir duruma sokmaktadır. Bunda katılımcıların bazılarının da görüşmelerde ifade ettiği gibi, küçüklükten itibaren cezalandırma mekanizması olarak babanın gösterilmesi ve görevlendirilmesinin rolü olabilir.

İdeal baba – oğul ilişkisinin özelliklerini tanımlamalarından sonra katılımcılara, yaşadıkları baba – oğul ilişkilerinin yapıları sorulmuştur. Katılımcıların hepsi, kendi babalarıyla dedelerinin ilişkilerini, kendi ilişkilerinden daha soğuk, daha katı ve daha hiyerarşiye dayalı görmektedir. Kendi baba – oğul ilişkilerinin arkadaşça olduğunu ifade eden grup azınlıktadır. Çoğunluk için hâlâ hiyerarşik, saygı temelli baba oğul ilişkisi devamlılığını sürdürmektedir. Katılımcılara ileride kendi çocukları olursa onlarla nasıl bir ilişki kuracağı sorulduğunda hepsi, kendi babalarıyla olan ilişkilerinden daha yakın bir bağ kurmaya çalışacaklarını belirtmiştir. Ancak ilerleyen dönemlerde aile kurup babalık deneyimi edindiklerinde algılarının ne yönde değişeceğini şimdiden kestirmek mümkün değildir. Belli bir süre sonra aynı örneklem ile yapılacak olan başka bir çalışmanın sonucunda bir kıyaslamaya gidilebilir.

Bozok'un (2013) çalışmasında elde ettiği muhafazakarlık, milliyetçilik, fanatizm gibi etmenlerin bu örneklemde çok vurgulanmadığını söylemek mümkündür. Kendisini muhafazakâr olarak doğrudan nitelendiren katılımcı sayısı

çok azken, milliyetçi olarak ifade edenlerin oranı biraz daha yüksektir. Kendisini bu şekilde nitelendiren insanlarda da radikal ifadelere rastlanmamakla beraber, bunda içinde bulunulan siyasi konjonktürün, yaşanan şehrin büyükşehir yapısında olmasının veya kişilerin eğitim seviyesinin rolü farklı bir çalışma olarak ele alınabilir. Toplumsal cinsiyet ve ideal erkeklik algısının temel örüntülerinde, katılımcıların siyasi veya dini görüşleri fark etmeksizin birtakım ortak ifadelere sahip olmaları dikkat çekicidir. Bu durum kendisini özellikle, erkeğin ekonomik bağımsızlığını elde etmesi ve eğitim seviyesinin yüksek olmasının gerekliliğini vurgularken göstermektedir.

Katılımcıların hepsinin heteroseksüel olması, Ankara'da ikamet etmeleri, eğitim seviyelerinin üniversiteden başlaması ve hiçbirinin engelli olmaması gibi faktörler, örnekleme kısıtlayan etmenlerdir. Bu gibi faktörler, kişileri maskülinitenin kendi içerisinde kurduğu hiyerarşide farklı düzlemlerde konumlandırmakta, dolayısıyla bireylerin erkeklik deneyimlerini kökten değiştirici bir güce sahip görülmektedir. Bundan ötürü örneklemin her türlü maskülinite deneyimini kapsamaması açısından bu etmenlere dikkat edilmesi önem arz etmektedir. Siyasi görüş, dini eğilim ve etnik kökenler çalışmanın sorularında doğrudan sorulmamıştır.

Katılımcıların bazı cevaplarından edinilen bilgilerle yüzeysel bir çerçeve çizmek mümkün olmuştur. Sayısının az olmasına rağmen, farklı siyasi görüşler ve hayat tarzlarına sahip katılımcılardan oluşan bir örnekleme çalışmış olmak, bu tezin güçlü yanlarından biridir. Aynı zamanda Türkiye'deki erkeklik çalışmalarına mütevazı bir katkı niteliğinde olan bu çalışma, maskülinitenin konu itibarıyla dinamik ve sürekli değişen bir yapıya sahip olmasından ötürü kendi içinde bir değer barındırmaktadır. Erkeklik algısındaki dönemsel ve coğrafi değişimleri akademik çalışmalar üzerinden izlemenin, bu konudaki araştırmaların sayılarının artmasıyla mümkün olacağı açıktır.

I. TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : CEYLAN

Adı / Name : RUMEYSA

Bölümü / Department : TOPLUMSAL CİNSİYET VE KADIN ÇALIŞMALARI

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) : FATHER-SON INTERACTION AND CONSTRUCTION OF IDEALIZED MASCULINITIES IN TURKEY

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans / Master** **Doktora / PhD**

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.**
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two year.** *
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months.** *

** Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.
A copy of the Decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.*

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date