

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESOURCES AND
PHYSICAL ABUSE AGAINST WOMEN BY THEIR HUSBANDS

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

BY

NİLÜFER HACIOĞLU

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
SOCIOLOGY

DECEMBER 2006

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof.Dr.Sencer AYATA
Director

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

Asoc.Prof.Sibel KALAYCIOĞLU
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 Arts.

Prof.Dr.Mehmet ECEVİT
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Asoc.Prof.Sibel KALAYCIOĞLU (METU, SOC) _____
Prof.Dr.Mehmet ECEVİT (METU, SOC) _____
Ass.Prof.Nilay ÇABUK KAYA (A.U., 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:

Signature :

ABSTRACT

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESOURCES AND PHYSICAL ABUSE AGAINST WOMEN BY THEIR HUSBANDS

Hacıođlu, Nilüfer

M.A, Department of Sociology

Supervisor : Prof. Dr. Mehmet ECEVİT

December 2006, 109 pages

This study was undertaken with the objective of analysis of domestic violence against women by their husbands in terms of resource theory and its concepts. Domestic violence against women is a widespread social problem that can be observed in all societies. Studies on domestic violence in the past ten years were an important mechanism for bringing many women's experiences of discrimination and vulnerability to public attention.

According to resource theory, major sets of resources like economic variables, prestige, force, and kinship are significant factors to explain domestic violence against women. These resources are indicators of power and the lack of ability of men to reach these resources or women's ability to get these resources can affect power relations in the family and cause conflict.

Key words: violence, domestic violence against women, resource theory

ÖZ

SOSYAL VE EKONOMİK KAYNAKLAR VE EŞLERİ TARAFINDAN KADINLARA UYGULANAN FİZİKSEL ŞİDDET

Hacıođlu, Nilüfer

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi : Prof. Dr. Mehmet ECEVİT

Aralık 2006, 109 sayfa

Bu çalışma, eşleri tarafından kadına yöneltilen şiddeti, kaynak teorisi ve onun kavramlarıyla incelemiştir. Kadına yönelik şiddet yaygın ve tüm toplumlarda görülen sosyal bir problemdir. Son yıllarda aile içi şiddet üzerinde yapılan çalışmalar kadınlara yönelik ayrımcılığa ve kadınların savunmasızlığına kamu oyu dikkatini çekmiştir.

Kaynak teorisine göre ekonomik değişkenler, prestij, güç ve akrabalık gibi temel kaynaklar aile içi şiddeti açıklamak için önemli faktörlerdir. Bu kaynaklar gücün göstergesidir ve erkeğin bu kaynaklara ulaşamaması ya da kadının bu kaynaklara ulaşması aile içindeki güç dengelerini etkileyebilir ve çatışmaya neden olabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler : Şiddet, kadına yönelik aile içi şiddet, kaynak teorisi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ecevit for his valuable supervision, guidance, encouragement and constant support in preparing this thesis. Thanks go to the other examining committee members, Sibel Kalaycıođlu and Nilay abuk Kaya and these students of Mr.Ecevit who made contributions during my study.

I express my sincere appreciation to Muhammet Can, the Director of Institution of Forensic Medicine in Bađcılar.

I would like to thank my family who always support me to complete this thesis, especially my sister Mnevver, her husband Ejder and to my husband.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THEORETICAL APPROACHES.....	6
2.1. Definition of violence.....	6
2.2. Violence theories.....	9
2.3. Domestic violence against women.....	13
2.3.1. Liberal Perspective.....	15
2.3.2. Class Perspective.....	20
2.3.2.1. General Model.....	20
2.3.2.2. Subculture Model.....	24
2.3.3. Feminist Perspective.....	27
2.3.4. Resource Theory.....	31
3. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN TURKEY	35

3.1. Researches in Turkey.....	36
3.2. Struggle with Domestic Violence in Turkey.....	39
3.3. Legal Dimension of Domestic Violence in Turkey.....	42
4. METHODOLOGY.....	46
4.1. Experience of the survey.....	47
4.2. Data Collection and Sampling.....	51
4.3. The Questionnaire.....	52
4.4. Limitation of the study.....	54
5. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....	57
5.1. Demographic Profile of Respondents.....	57
5.2. Family Patterns as Resource.....	58
5.3. Economic Resources.....	63
5.4. Education as a Resource.....	67
5.5. Age as a Resource.....	68
5.6. Effects of Physical Abuse on Women.....	70
5.7. Reason of Physical Abuse from the Women’s Point of View.....	72
5.8. Women’s Place of Birth and Physical Abuse.....	74
6. CONCLUSION.....	75
REFERENCES.....	80
APPENDICES.....	90
A. Demographic Profile of Respondents.....	90
B. Questionnaire in English.....	92
C. Questionnaire in Turkish.....	101

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

FMIDB: Forensic Medicine Institute Directorate of Bağcılar Branch

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Duluth Model power and control wheel.....	14
---	----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographic profiles of respondents.....	79
Table 2: The relation between family type and the number of consultation to the police and district attorney.....	60
Table 3: Family type and first physical abuse against women by their Husbands.....	61
Table 4: Reported Frequency of Physical Abuse Directed by Husband against Women.....	69

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to focus on physical abuse against married women by their husbands in terms of resource theory. Domestic violence against women is a widespread social problem that can be observed in all societies. The severity and frequency of violence changes according to the structure of the society and it also changes within the same society over time. This change is related to the social change process of human beings and societies. Although there is some differentiation about usage of violence, violent acts and their causes, violence exists in all age groups and in all societies.

Domestic violence is studied by different disciplines. Sociologists came late to the study of domestic violence. Gelles (1985:349) explains that:

Family violence is seen as a private matter. The private nature of family violence not only hides the problem from public and scientific view, it also makes the victims and offenders nearly inaccessible to many social researchers. While social workers, psychiatrists, and physicians have access to participants in family violence, sociologists' access to cases and subjects is frequently limited to public instances of violence-homicides, assaults, or officially reported cases of child abuse. Social service personnel and hospital personnel frequently have denied sociologists' access to subjects on the grounds of ity.

In addition to Gelles' explanation, since violence was a private and an individual problem, sociologists arrived late to the study of wife abuse. Violence was thought of as a psychological problem, therefore sociologists were affected by this perception of violence so they did not study the social dimensions of it.

There are some variables which are emphasized in sociological literature as determination of violence that age, sex, income level, job, religious beliefs, unemployment, and honor (Rittersberger-Tılıç, 1997). On the other hand, housekeeping, child care, money, sex, and social activities are emphasized as reasons for violence (Straus, Gelles, Steinmetz, 1988).

There are many negative effects of violence against women. Violence causes permanent physical and psychological indisposition and with repeated male violence, death sometimes occurs. Women who suffer domestic abuse were twice as likely to suffer health problems which persisted after the abuse had stopped, according to a survey in ten countries by the World Health Organization (2005). The problems included pain, dizziness, gynecological, and mental health problems. They are also as more likely to have had a miscarriage or an induced abortion.

Domestic violence is not only against women but also against men, children, and elderly people. However, violence against women is more widespread. Violence against women is not the same as the other forms of violence because it is specifically linked to the politics of sexism and male supremacy, the tendency of men to dominate women. Men have society's implied permission to hit their wives. Most people believe that men should not hit the women they love, but most people believe that men should be able to control their wives by whatever

means necessary (NiCarthy, 1990). This idea supports and legitimizes male violence against females.

About one out of twenty-six American wives get abused by their husbands every year, or a total of almost 1.8 million per year. One out of three women in the United States is exposed to physical violence at least once by their husbands during their marriage (Strauss, Gelles, Steinmetz; 1988). In France, 95% of violence victims are women, and 55% of these women are victims by their own husbands. In a family research study in Kenya, of the 733 participating women, 42% stated that their husbands periodically beat them. In Bangladesh, women killed by their husbands constitute 50% of all homicides in the country (Heise, 1992). In Russia, a formal declaration by the government stated that in 1994, 15,000 women died as a result of their spouses' violent behavior (Clarke, 1995). In Turkey, it is found that 75 percent of women reported having been physically abused by their husbands (PIAR, 1988 cited in Gülçür; 1999;6).

There are many opinions about domestic violence and some of them are nonscientific or myths. One of these myths is that family violence is rare. However the fact that it is rarely seen should not be taken to mean that it rarely occurs. The rate of violence against women is found high: a woman is abused every 18 minutes in USA, in Peru 70 per cent of all crimes reported to the police involve women abused by their husbands, in Pakistan in 400 cases of domestic violence reported in 1993 in the province of Punjab, nearly half ended with the death of the wife. These estimates suggest that maltreatment is not rare (Barnett, Miller-Perrin, Perrin, 1997). The other myth is that only poor people are violent. According to Kantor and Straus (1994) more blue-collar husbands (13.4%) were violent the previous year than were white-collar husbands (10.4%). Poor families are more likely to be violent

but it should not be taken to mean that only poor families are violent. Another myth is that abused children or children who witness abuse always become abusive spouses. Research indicates somewhere around 60% percent of men who batter grew up in homes where they were beaten or they witnessed one parent battering another. However this is not an explanation because there is the other 40 % percent. This means that if the children have seen their father batter they can be batterers, but it does not mean that they always become abusive spouses (NiCarthy, 1990). There are some other thoughts which are not proved by the researches: alcohol and drugs are real causes of domestic violence, women who were exposed to violence by their fathers are more likely to marry a man who is prone to use violence (Gelles, 1987), and women who stay after repeated beatings are masochistic, plain foolish or provoke men into violence (Hoff, 1990).

The struggle with domestic violence is a struggle with inequality. Living without violence is a woman's human right like all individuals.

There are seven chapters in this study including the introduction. In the second chapter violence and domestic violence as subtopics of violence will be defined and theories about them are argued. Violence will be explained in terms of psychological, political and sociological aspects. In addition, domestic violence will be explained by three different perspectives: liberal, class, and feminist perspective. The chapter will also include the discussion of resource theory.

In the next chapter, Turkish researchers' studies and legal applications related with domestic violence against women will be discussed. The chapter will also include the struggles of women's organizations with domestic violence.

In the fourth chapter, I will describe Forensic Medicine Institute, my survey experiences and the method of this study. In addition to this, the questionnaire of the study will be explained in this chapter. This chapter will be an important part of the study because the chapter will include how this study was conducted.

The fifth chapters will constitute the main part of this study and will analyze findings. Findings will be discussed according to resource theory and its concepts. The sixth and the last chapter will be the conclusion.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL APPROACHES

Classification of the literature about violence against women is difficult because violence against women cannot be understood in terms of a single factor. Most of the researchers focus on a few different reasons and not on a single one to explain why men use violence against women. Their arguments are sometimes so similar that even their approach is defined in different perspectives. For example, approaches by Gelles and Straus, who have many essays and research on violence against women, sometimes support the class analysis perspective and sometimes the liberal perspective. Thus, classification of the literature about male violence to females and the definition of the researchers are difficult for the reader.

2.1. Definition of violence

Violence has been a popular subject for the last few years. There are different types, causes, definitions, and forms that occur at the interpersonal, collective, and global levels. It is a problem for all human relations. Therefore it should be thought of as a human rights problem because it undermines the overall quality of life for the victims. Human rights violations in the private and public spheres are interrelated, and only a new integrated approach to both violence and human rights can lead to realistic solutions to problems that otherwise seem unsolvable (Eisler, 1995:163).

Violence has been pervasive throughout human history, but a few researchers (Collins 1975; Elias 1994) note that the increasing technological and bureaucratic nature of violence has made contemporary violence quite different from than in the past. A definition of violence includes relativity: What counts as violence and to whom? Which perspective should we use? Should we use the perspectives of the victims or of those who perpetrate these acts? Of researchers? Of law? They include the subjective definitions of women who experience violence, of men who perpetrate violence, and of researchers who interpret information provided by concerned individuals (Dobash and Dobash, 1998).

Elizabeth Stanko (2003) states that there is no set and agreed upon definition among researchers of what violence is, yet she defines four elements that are crucial in grappling with the meaning of violence: first is the act itself; second is the relationship of the participants to each other; third is the location of the act; and fourth is the outcome or the resultant damage. She said that all these elements combine to create a message about the meaning of violence.

The narrowest meaning of violence indicates physical violence in which a victim is physically injured. In addition to acts causing serious physical harm, the concept of violence also refers to various everyday infringements of bodily and even mental integrity that can be regarded as normal or even acceptable behavior (Stanko, 2003). An extensive definition of violence includes psychological, economical, sexual, verbal forms. One of the peace studies researchers, Johan Galtung (1964), suggests an extended definition of violence when he divides it into two different forms: direct and structural violence. The actor of direct violence is obvious, but in structural violence there is not an actor and it occurs when people are harmed because of inequitable

social arrangements rather than by overt physical violence. According to Galtung, direct violence is an event; structural violence is a process.

Galtung (1964) states that violence is the cause of the difference between the potential and the actual. He explains this with a tuberculosis example: in the past, people died because of tuberculosis but it was not understood as violence. However, a vaccination is possible today for tuberculosis. So, if people die because of this illness today, this can be understood as structural violence because there is a potential to continue the human's life.

Turkish studies on violence concentrate mainly either on political violence/terror or murder. We can see the general definition in the Turkish Dictionary. The word “Şiddet” (violence) comes from the Arabic Language to Turkish Language and according to the Turkish Dictionary of the Institution of Turkish Language, violence means: 1. The grade of an action or force, intensity, hardness, 2. Speed: Violence of the wind, 3. Use of brute force against opposite thinking persons, instead of persuading or settling, and 4. *Metaphor*. Extremeness about emotions or behavior.

According to another definition in Turkish literature, violence arises from social relations among sides who have conflicting interests (Ergil, 2001). Violence is a physical violence as a narrow sense and hard and painful action against the wholeness of the human body from outside (Ünsal, 1996:29).

A basic assumption regarding violence is that it is only possible where there are the powerful and the powerless. An important point to consider is which factors create the powerful and the powerless.

Turpin and Kurtz (1996) define a number of problems with the current theories on violence. First, the traditional disciplinary approaches obscure the problem of violence even as they have also clarified part of it. Interdisciplinary work is the most creative approach to this issue, but it is discouraged in the academy. Second, scholars neglect the micro/macro issue, tending to focus on one particular level of violence. Third, conventional social science methodologies encourage narrow approaches to the study of violence, prompting a focus on one specific form of violence that is often limited in spatial and temporal terms. Fourth, there is lack a diversity of approaches to the study of violence in part because society disregards work by women, non-Westerners, and people of color.

Another problem about the theorizing of violence is explained by User, Kümbetoğlu and Kolankaya (2002), they state that a definition of violence becomes independent from real phenomenon over time. Violence is defined and standardized and the situation which does not fit this definition is ignored. However there are special forms of violence to be studied. Violence is misunderstood with the standardized definitions.

2.2. Violence theories

Violence has been investigated by different disciplines such as psychology, anthropology, political science, sociology, and criminology. They all have focused on different reasons and different explanations to answer why people inflict violence.

The first perspective is physiological. For the physiological theories humans behave violently because of some innate tendency or as a consequence of a genetic or physiological abnormality and they

emphasize individualistic sources of violence, particularly those resulting from abnormal psychological development. They focus on the relationship between violence and brain lesions, brain dysfunction, endocrinology, premenstrual syndrome, hypoglycemia, genetic composition, and hormones. Sigmund Freud's opinions are the most well-known opinion on this issue. The work of Sigmund Freud (1950) contends that conflicting influences within an individual's unconscious shape human behavior, particularly conflicts between drives and instincts (the id) and the internalized social values (superego). The ego as a third aspect of the personality, mediates these two internal forces. Therefore, violent behavior can then be explained by an overdeveloped id (which contains the aggressive drive) or a weak superego that fails to counter the id (Turpin, and Kurtz, 1996).

Social psychological researches have theorized that violence is learned. Albert Bandura (1973) demonstrated that children imitate or model violent behavior in a laboratory setting. Humans may behave violently, according to social learning theory, because they learn this behavior during childhood.

According to Stanko (2003), a psychological theorist, the differential impact of anxieties or aggression fuelled by inconsistent, harsh or neglectful parenting, loss of significant adults or childhood experiences of physical or sexual abuse are in the personal histories of identified violent perpetrators.

Another explanation is asserted by political theories. They argue that people form states to provide security, particularly against violence. Once a state is organized, then it competes with other states for power, often using violent means. Violence among states will be checked only to the extent that power, or violence, is balanced. Political scientists

thought that violence is the inevitable price of modernization (Turpin, and Kurtz, 1996). Political theories view violence as a political tool.

The other explanation is made by sociologists and cultural anthropologists. According to them aggressiveness as a cause of violence is not instinct, but the causes of it are life experiences and disappointments. It is a social phenomenon and its root is not biological. Sociologists and cultural anthropologists (like Coser, Mead, Etzioni and Levi-Strauss) have focused on social structure and culture to explain the violence (Turpin, and Kurtz, 1996).

According to social science researchers, violence is understood to be organized around social cleavages or categories, such as the tribe in pre-industrial societies, and race, class, ethnicity, and gender in industrial societies. Violence is often used by those who have power, while the powerless often see violence as the most efficacious way to improve their situation (Weber 1968).

In sociology literature, violence as a concept is not widely used but conflict is an important issue in sociology theories. Theodore Caplow (1971) defined social conflict like this:

Social conflict are two or more antagonists (either individuals or groups) on two opposing “sides”, at least one scarce things for which they contend, and some means whereby they can interact and influence each other’s behavior.

Karl Marx is an important name for conflict theory. For Marx, conflict was inherent in the nature of social arrangements under capitalism. Capitalism generated the vast differences in interests and capitalism

that gave the few at the top so much power over the many at the bottom (Lilly, Cullen and Ball, 2002).

For Marx, social relationships are rife with conflicting interest. As a result of conflicting interests, social systems systematically generate conflict. Conflict is an inevitable and pervasive feature of social systems and it occurs over the distribution of scarce resources most notably power. Moreover conflict is the major source of change in social systems (Turner, 1974).

According to Marx conflict is activated under certain conditions and one of these conditions is the polarization of society into two classes. The distribution of resources is viewed as the source of conflict and the conflicts of interest adhering to unequal distribution (Turner, 1974).

Another German Sociologist, Georg Simmel, developed a different approach to the analysis of conflict phenomena. Simmel, like Marx, viewed conflict as ubiquitous and inevitable in society, but unlike Marx, social structure was seen not so much composed of domination and subjugation. Simmel postulated an innate “hostile impulse” or a “need for hating and fighting” among the units of organic wholes, although this instinct was mixed with others for love and affection and was circumscribed by the force of social relationships. Simmel viewed conflict as a reflection of more than just conflicts of interest, but also of those arising from hostile instincts. He viewed one of the ultimate sources of conflict to lie in the innate biological makeup of human actors (Turner, 1974).

Levis Coser is another sociologist who studied conflict theory. He studied Simmel’s theory and viewed conflict as a process that can, under certain conditions, “function” to maintain the “body social” or

some of its vital parts. For Coser, violence, dissent, deviance and conflict, which are typically viewed as disruptive to the system, can also be viewed, under specifiable conditions, as strengthening the system's basis of integration as well as its "adaptability" to the environment. He focuses on conflict in terms of its function for the society as Simmel.

As a result of the theories of these sociologists, the basic themes of conflict theory are following: first, stratification is a central feature of the organizations. Second, interest groups and individuals struggle to maintain their positions of domination or evade domination by others. Third, who wins what in these struggles depends on the resources controlled by the different factions, including material resources for violence and for economic exchange, but also resources for social organization and for shaping emotions and ideas. Fourth, conflict drives social change (Collins, 1990).

Micro/macro linkages and interdisciplinary approach are needed for the effective resolution of the problem of violence. Violence is caused not simply by individual psychological factors, biological impulses, or social-structural factors alone but by a web of causal connections between the personal-level and the global-level structure, processes and behaviors.

2.3. Domestic violence against women

One of the subtopics of violence is domestic violence. Domestic violence means that violence occurs between family members. Domestic violence has different forms such as wife abuse, child abuse, elderly abuse and different types such as physical, economical,

emotional, sexual and verbal. In most situations, different violence types are applied together.

Domestic violence is not only for women but also for men, children, and elderly people. All forms of violence are problems and should be challenged. However, violence against women is more widespread.

Violence against women is defined by the Pekin+5 Political Declaration and Outcome Document (2001): “violence against women are all types of behavior which depend on sex, resulting in or possibly resulting in physical, sexual and psychological harm and suffering, including force and arbitrary restrictions of freedom, and can occur in private life or in the public area”.

Domestic violence has various dimensions and the Power and Control Wheel was developed to show all dimensions of it in a domestic abuse intervention project in Duluth.



Source: Pence, Duprey, Paymar and McDonell, 1985

Figure 1: Duluth Model power and control wheel

In this study, three main theoretical approaches will be summarized: liberalism, class analysis and feminism. Liberal approach explains the violence in terms of the psychological problems of men and it does not accept violence as a social problem. Class analysis focuses on the frustrations of men in a class society, and the other approach, feminism, focuses on power relations as a result of a patriarchal society (Walby, 1990).

2.3.1. Liberal Perspective

The liberal perspective includes psychological and social psychological explanations of the violent behavior of men. Liberal perspective researchers believe family violence is a rare occurrence that would manifest itself only in circumstances in which an individual family member has a mental illness or some psychopathology. Overall, this theory focuses on the personality characteristics of the offender and includes personality disorders, character disorders, mental illnesses, and alcohol and substance abuse. They attempt to identify abusers based on specific traits, temperament, personality, histories and physiologies that are different from those of average people. They describe the abusers' personality characteristics such as immaturity, impulsiveness, dependency, narcissism, egocentrism, and sadomasochism (Pagelow, 1984 cited in Kurst-Swanger, 2003; 33).

This perspective suggests that “violence is a product of bad childhood experiences and a disrupted family background. As a result of their problematic childhoods these men were not able to acquire the normal form of masculinity; family disturbances left them unprepared to deal with stresses of life, oversensitive and diffident” (Walby, 1990:130).

As a result of problematic family interaction, male children become men who abuse their wives.

Moreover, boys and girls learn the appropriate behavior for their sex during childhood in which femininity is constructed as the opposite of masculinity. Often little girls are raised as very emotional, easily influenced, submissive, excitable, passive, home oriented, unworldly, indecisive and dependent and not competitive, adventurous, aggressive, independent or self-confident. Whereas boys are raised as assertive, active, boisterous, lively and quick to take initiative. The socialization process includes a set of rewards and punishments for children like these:

...Parents are proud when their male toddler holds back his tears and picks himself up from a fall, and they're pleased when their son persists in sticking out a game without tears or complaint, even though he's hurt by a ball or another player. He's rewarded for his bravery and physical toughness and punished if he acts "like a sissy" or "like a girl" or a coward....Boys dream of being famous race car drivers, boxers or football heroes but as they grow older it becomes more and more difficult to live up to the image of the dominant, worldly, self-confident, aggressive, decisive male. How does a person pull that off if he's sixteen years old -or twenty three or forty five- and he's rarely left the town where he grew up, he's never had a permanent job, or if he knows he's stuck in the tedious job he's held for twenty years? (NiCarthy, 1990:6)

For NiCarthy (1990), many men are faced with a threat to their masculine image when they cannot perform up to society's standards of masculinity. Therefore they may lash out verbally or physically, blaming whoever is handy in order to save face.

Albert Bandura (1973) from Stanford University is another scholar who claims that children learn violent acts during their childhood. He tried to explain his theory with his most famous experiment-the Bobo doll. In this experiment, he had children witness a model aggressively attacking a plastic clown called the Bobo doll. Children would watch a video where a model would aggressively hit the doll. The model pummels it on the head with a mallet, hurls it down, sits on it and punches it on the nose repeatedly, kicks it across the room, flings it in the air, and bombards it with balls. After the video, the children were placed in a room with attractive toys, but they could not touch them. The process of retention had occurred. Therefore, the children became angry and frustrated. Then the children were led to another room where there were identical toys used in the Bobo video. The motivation phase was in occurrence. Eighty-eight percent of the children imitated the aggressive behavior. Eight months later, 40% of the same children still reproduced the violent behavior observed in the Bobo doll experiment. According to Bandura, role playing has an important role for men who abuse their wives.

In addition to Bandura's theory about role playing and violence, Hart (1995) explains the role of childhood on violence:

The majority of children from violent families actually witness their fathers battering their mothers. In fact, some fathers deliberately arrange for children to witness the violence. Studies show that such role models perpetuate violence into the next generation. Boys who witness their fathers battering their mothers are three times more likely, as adults, to hit their own wives. And sons of the most violent fathers have a rate of wife-beating 1,000 times greater than sons of non-violent fathers.

According to Bandura and Hart's theory, boys learn that violence is a way to solve the problems and get rid of the stress around men.

On the other hand, role-playing is also important for females in childhood. Gelles (1987) said that girls who observed spousal violence in their family were more likely to be victimized as adults. The more experience with violence a woman has, the more she inclines to approve of the use of violence in the family. There are two explanations for this situation: women who have more experience with violence are inclined to approve of the use of violence, and a father's violence provides a role model for the women in mate selection.

Another cause for male's psychopathology is a dependency on their family members. Excessive dependency of boys on their mothers and subsequently other women entails the defensive establishment of ego boundaries as an overlay on fundamental emotional insecurity (Chodorow, 1978). In turn, these defenses may develop to become forms of compensatory hypermasculinity, and forms of violence occur when they cannot or do not satisfy their dependency needs.

Gelles (1987) shows that not all men who had battered women came from violent homes, that not all men who came from a violent family went on to abuse their wives, and thirty percent of violent spouses had never witnessed violence between their parents while fifty percent had. In addition, R.Emerson and Russell Dobash found in their study in Scotland that only twenty percent of the siblings of batterers were violent to anyone (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). In childhood, not only family but also friends, experiences, social groups at school, and television are important factors for socialization of children. Role models are important to define children's behaviors, but they also

interpret what they see and connect it with other events, ideas and feelings.

The liberal point of view is criticized in terms of their public-private dichotomy. The liberal approach investigates the violence against women as an individual problem and they believe it is a private matter for families. They think that because of the sensitive nature of this issue, a state cannot take men to court easily, and, also, that the government should stay out of the private affairs of its citizens. Namely, they leave women alone with their private problem. Additionally, they do not suggest any solution to eliminate violence because the psychopathology of men cannot be eliminated.

Hearn (1978) states male violence is not the product of psychological traits - all men can be violent. It is certain that men expose violence to women, and it is possible that these men like other men, can be assessed and understood psychodynamically. In other words, the behavior of men can be understood psychologically and it does not mean that the reason for violence is psychological. All men can be violent, so violence cannot be seen as just a psychological problem.

Another criticism of the Liberal viewpoint is that they ignore social and economic dimensions of male violence. Male violence against women cannot be explained primarily as a result of the psychological derangement of a few men. As results of many researches (Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz, 1980; Hochschild, 1989; McCloskey, 1996; Conger, 1990; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Lockart, 1987 and Staples, 1971), social factors like education level, income level, and unemployment were found important.

Next criticism regarding the liberal analysis is the lack of attention to culturally specific factors that may adversely affect women's resistance to abuse from male partners. Women suffer greater abuse from male partners within cultural units in which they have less social, legal and economic power (Straus, 1994; Levinson, 1989).

Implicit in this perspective is the assumption that violence against women is rather rare because they believe that mental illness and psychopathology is rare in societies. However, statistics show that male violence against women is widespread (Strauss, Gelles, Steinmetz; 1988).

2.3.2. Class Perspective

Class analysis is another point of view which some scholars focus on to understand male violence. The focus of this perspective is the men's frustration at being in a lower class and lower position in the social hierarchy. There are two different perspectives in the class analysis approach: first the general model and the second is the subculture model. The basis of the two approaches is that male violence against women is most common during situations of economic stress.

2.3.2.1. General Model

The studies of Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz (1980), Hochschild (1989), Liem and Liem (1988) McCloskey (1996), Petersen (1980), Gordon (1988), Conger (1990), Liker and Elder (1983), Lindsey, (1990) and Staples (1971) support the general model. The general model is based on the assumption that society is at a stage where struggles for power and dominance are acted out. Marx says that these struggles occur among social classes which compete for control over the means of

production and the distribution of resources. Modern conflict theorists such as Dahrendorf (1959) and Collins (1975) have refined the original Marxian assertions to reflect contemporary patterns. Conflict is not simply based on class struggle and the tensions between owner and worker or employer and employee, but occurs among many other groups as well. These can include parents and children, husbands and wives, males and females, and any other groups that can be defined as a minority or majority - the list is infinite (Lindsey, 1990).

According to class theory, there are two different explanations of men's violent acts towards women. First is that men expose violence to their wives because of their unemployment, stress at work and economic strain. Second is that men expose violence to their wives because of perceived failures in fulfilling traditional gender roles. Lindsey (1990) states that to apply the contemporary conflict framework to gender stratification, class can be redefined to mean groups who have access to and differential control over scarce resources such as authority and political power, in addition to economic power. Men's ability to contribute resources to the family relative to their wives' is the central organizing principle in American marriages. When men lose advantages, either by their own job loss or the wives' acquisition of income, marital tension can increase as a result of perceived failures in fulfilling traditional gender roles in which men earn money for the household and women are responsible for housework.

Gelles (1974), Petersen (1980), and Staples (1971) state that a larger proportion of lower-class couples engage in marital violence than couples from higher-socio economic positions. The rate of violence between husbands and wives is twice as high in blue-collar families as it is in white-collar families.

Although men's economic vulnerability often emerges as a risk factor for domestic violence, why being poor would incite more men to harm their wives and children is not obvious. Gordon (1988) contends that it is the overall stress of poverty, especially chronic poverty that contributes to men's feelings of frustration, unleashing their abusive behavior within the family. This model would predict that a lower overall family income engendering economic strain and hardship would lead to heightened feelings of frustration and ultimately to acts of aggression.

A number of studies have indicated a link between men's job loss and marital discord (Conger 1990, Liem and Liem 1988, Liker and Elder 1983). Conger (1990), in a study of Iowa farm families facing agrarian restructuring and decline in the last decade, found that the husbands' unemployment diminished marital quality as a result of economic strain, indicated by problems such as an inability to pay bills, the postponement of major purchases or medical care, and the borrowing of money from friends or family. These economic strains cause aggression of men and they are more likely than their employed counterparts to become hostile and depressed soon after losing their jobs (Liem and Liem, 1988).

Several possible explanations are stated for men's increased hostility as a result of decreased earnings. The first, suggested by Conger's (1990) research, is that since men typically contribute a larger portion of the family income, the economic strain –or frustration- ensuing their job loss fans conjugal tensions. On the other hand, if the wives of these men were able to work and to bring in enough money so debts could be paid and accounts restored, their husbands would relax. However, there is an alternative view that it is not the frustration caused by an overall

loss of economic control that attends men's unemployment but the concomitant erosion of masculine domestic power that engenders their hostility (McCloskey, 1996). Men believe that their control over their wives is diminished by lost earnings. Both of these views are partly true to explain domestic violence against women by their husbands.

Some studies by Dobash and Dobash (1979), Straus (1976), Walker (1978) provide a basis for expecting dependency in terms of economic and social resources to be associated with high levels of abuse while other studies by Allen and Straus (1980), Goode (1971), yield the opposite expectation. Kalmuss and Straus (1982) said that women's social status as well as their access to various systems of resources is determined largely by their relationships with men through marriage. The result of their study indicate that women whose dependency on marriage is high tend to experience more physical abuse from their husbands than women whose dependency is low.

According to Laura Ann McCloskey (1996), shifts in income between partners might be less responsible for domestic violence than social class, and the complex set of beliefs and gender relations attending it. Findings indicate that income might make a difference within the context of deprivation or class:

Studies that trace paths between men's unemployment and wife or child abuse (Gelles 1989; Kantor and Straus 1990; Steinberg, Catalano, and Dooley 1981) typically fail to separate income motility from social class indicators. There is some evidence that domestic violence is more frequent in lower than in middle-class American families. Kantor and Straus (1990), in one summary of Straus and Gelles' (1985) national telephone survey, reported that lower-class men sanctioned slapping wives more than did middle-class men (18.5 vs. 14.4 percent) and were more likely to

admit hitting their wives (13.4 vs. 10.4 percent)
(McCloskey, 1996; p 451).

According to class theory, lower income level, economical strains at home, and unemployment are important factors of domestic violence against women. The researchers of class theory are criticized in terms of their economic based approaches by feminists.

One criticism of class theory is that a male partner's lack of income or other economic resources is insufficient to explain abuse against women and that women's socioeconomic dependence on the partnership may better explain this abuse (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Kalmuss and Straus, 1982).

2.3.2.2. Subculture Model

In this perspective, researchers focus on the race and social hierarchy to understand male violence and they mostly investigate black men and women to support their theory. Their preferences seem to be determined not only by social but by their own ethnic/class related values, needs, and circumstances. Because men's use of violence and women's perceptions and responses to domestic violence are influenced by racial and ethnic cultural norms (Woods and Campbell, 1993, Landenburger, 1989).

The reasons of high rate of violence among black men to their wives is explained that black men do not have the usual resources with which to earn or prove their masculinity in normatively prescribed ways. These kinds of men would display a great deal of hostility in interactions with women (Cazenave, 1983). On the other hand, black men are frustrated

socially because of their subordinate position in comparison with white men.

Although marital violence is considered a universal problem, previous investigations have suggested that it is primarily a lower-class phenomenon and that minority women, especially black women, are abused at a disproportionately higher rate than white women. Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980) reported that eleven percent of black women, as compared to three percent of white women, were victims of wife abuse. They further concluded that wife abuse was four hundred percent greater among black couples than among white couples. Cazenave and Straus (1979) analyzed the data collected by Straus and his colleagues (1980) and reported that eight percent more of the black husbands as compared to white husbands had inflicted severe violence on their wives. According to their study, black husbands were less likely than white husbands to have slapped their wives at nearly every income level. They state that black husbands who were blue-collar workers had a higher rate of severe husband-to-wife violence and wife slapping than their white counterparts. In the study of Fagen, Stewart, and Hansen (1983), the results of their racial comparisons of spouse abuse revealed that whites were more violent both in and outside the home. They concluded that the issue of race remains enigmatic and warrants further investigation.

Subculture theory is criticized by Lockhart (1985) and Staples (1976) and they state that official statistics and clinical populations do not provide an adequate basis for racial comparisons because of overrepresentation of black and lower-class individuals in these populations. The overrepresentation of black and lower-class persons in official statistics regarding spousal violence could be more related to their socioeconomic and colonized status than to their race. All too

often, investigators who have made use of this data have failed to control for social class differences, which may be related to abuse among these populations. They have hastily concluded that black husbands are more violent toward their wives than are white husbands, regardless of their social class background.

Although Straus and associates (1980) considered several indicators of social class (e.g., family income, educational level, and occupational status), they failed to heed their own warning: they conducted post hoc racial analyses without controlling for class differences. Consequently, it appears that their analyses allowed conclusions of simple racial differences to go unchallenged. Because this study by Straus and his colleagues (1980) is considered the most current, comprehensive, and representative data available, their results and conclusions are often cited as established facts. Although the study is comprehensive, failure to control for social class (which seems to be related to the low number of blacks in their sample) has resulted in misleading conclusions regarding racial similarities and differences in the incidence of husband-to-wife violence.

Lockhart (1987) reports that there is no significant difference in the proportion of black and white women who reported they were victims of husband-to-wife violence during the year prior to this investigation. She wrote that several previous studies (Cazenave and Straus, 1979; Straus et al., 1980) have suggested that black couples are more violent in their marital relationships than white couples. However, she found only one class-linked racial difference: a larger proportion of middle-class black women than middle-class white women reported they were victims of violence from their marital partners.

Another criticism is that many of the studies that include African American women have used clinical samples or data from criminal justice or social service sources (Koss et al., 1994; Lockhart, 1985), calling into question the generalization of the results of such work because persons who are involved or known through such institutions are not representative of the larger population (Frieze and Browne, 1989; Straus and Gelles, 1990). Actually, this is a general problem for all violence researches.

2.3.3. Feminist Perspective

The feminist approach is the third common perspective regarding wife abuse and researchers place male-female relations at the center of their analysis and view inequality between men and women as a key factor in violence. Inequality is used differently from the inequality concept in the class analysis because the feminist perspective emphasizes inequality-rooted gender roles in society instead of economical based inequality.

Feminist researchers believe that men use violence as a way to control female partners (Yllo, 1993), and institutions have permitted and condoned the use of physical abuse by husbands. The focus of their study is the patriarchal structure of society, construction of masculinity and femininity, and difficulties which make women stay in spite of systematic violence.

Power and control are central concepts for the feminist perspective in explaining violence. For the perspective, domestic violence is primarily a problem of men using violence to maintain control over women, a control to which they feel they are entitled and that is supported by a patriarchal culture. According to feminist perspective,

women have been subjugated by the greater patriarchal society that has placed limits on their opportunities and leave them vulnerable to a number of abuses (Johnson and Ferraro, 2000; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; 1998).

Men dominate, oppress and exploit women in the patriarchal system and the patriarchal system can be seen in institutions, state, and mode of production. Namely, it penetrates all structures in society. Dobash and Dobash (1998) say that in patriarchal societies the marital relationship is one in which women carry out scores of domestic duties deemed to be “their” responsibility, and men have the right to oversee, direct, and judge this work. Men think that they have a right to punish ‘their’ women for perceived wrongdoing about housework, preparation of meals, child care, and using income for home expenses.

“Personal is political” is the radical feminist motto. From this perspective, women’s problems are not only personal complaints. Personal lives are not the result of individual choices of women, it is socially structured (Cliff, 1984). Separation of the public and the private is understood as a patriarchal construction (Walby, 1990). Moreover, this separation rationalizes violence against women (Richardson and May, 1999). The tradition of domination and violence in the private sphere provides the foundations for domination and violence in the more visible political or public sphere (Eisler, 1995). Violence against women in the family has its root in the patriarchal structure of the family. The central motivating factor behind the violence is a man’s desire to exercise general control over his woman. Men intend to control their partners and satisfy their needs to display that control. There are multiple control tactics and men usually use a combination. Using coercion and threats, limiting her relations with others, forcing sex and many other types of violence accompany the

physical violence, and all of them create a “violence circle” (Pence, Duprey, Paymar and McDonell, 1985).

Feminist researchers criticize the belief that violence is mutual between husband and wives. Violence inflicted by females does not elicit fear or cause injury as much as that inflicted by males. Motives of male and female violence are different because when women engage in acts of violence, they do so primarily in self-defense (Wekerle and Wolfe, 1999). The National Crime Survey reported that ninety-one percent of all violent crimes between spouses were directed at women by husbands or ex-husbands (Kurz, 1989).

In addition to that, for Dobash and Dobash (1998) men’s use of violence against their female partners is different from those in which men inflict violence against other men. When men fight each other they projected a sense of heroic achievement, stressing prowess and masculine identity. Dobash and Dobash stated that:

By comparison, accounts of acts of violence against women were impoverished and abbreviated, containing no blow-by-blow descriptions with heroic flourishes and reaffirmations of masculine identity. Instead, they were morality tales of a different order, in that women had “done something wrong” and deserved violent treatment, and they confirmed masculine identity to the extent that a man is not “subordinated” to a woman and certainly not a husband to his wife. (Dobash and Dobash, 1998; 167)

Stark and Flitcraft (1996) describe contemporary United States society as a system with weakening male dominance. Within intimate relationships, women’s struggles against traditional sex role constraints cause conflict, and male partners may attempt to establish control through coercion, with or without physical violence. Stark and Flitcraft

(1996) argue that wife battering is a strategy used to suppress conflict and is not an escalation of marital conflict. Therefore, interventions that ignore power relations in favor of a focus on the stormy relationship and conflict-management techniques inadvertently reinforce women's subordination.

The feminist theory states that because males historically had greater access to resources, including property, employment opportunities, education, material possessions, community groups and services, and status, they have maintained power over women. Male social power and the complementary legal system enable men to use abusive tactics to maintain the status quo and violently resolve conflicts without consequences (Berry, 1995; Browne and Herbert, 1997; Carderelli, 1997).

According to feminist theory, men's desire to control women, power relations in favor of men and patriarchal society are important factors to understand domestic violence against women.

Feminist theory is criticized because it does not explain why some men abuse their wives while others do not. The feminist approach does not focus on the interpersonal dynamics involved in attempts to resolve incompatibilities. Therefore, it fails to look at specific intervening psychological variables, as well as other variables that are important in the study of domestic violence (Kurst-Swanger, 2003).

The second point to be criticized is that society is changing and women have gained greater access to resources including education, employment opportunities and therefore to material possessions, self-esteem and power (Kurst-Swanger, 2003). But some wives who have gained greater access to resources are still abused by their husbands.

So we cannot explain the violence as a lack of accessibility to resources.

Another criticism regarding the feminist perspective is that it neglects the fact that females also inflict violence in relationship.

2.3.4. Resource theory

In this study, domestic violence against women is focused in terms of resource theory. Resource theory is a sociological theory which focuses on domestic violence against women in terms of men's and women's social and economical resources. Resource theory supports the explanations about domestic violence against women by class and feminist researchers because the theory defines income level and power as resources of spouses.

Goode (1971) is an important scholar for the resource theory of power to explain a husband's use of physical force against his wife. Goode maintained that violence is a resource similar to money that can be used to deter unwanted actions or to induce desired behaviors (Hoffman, Demo, Edwards, 1994). He argued that the greater the resources available to an individual, the more force he or she can use, but the less likely violence actually will be employed. Violence is viewed as the "ultimate" resource in that it is used when other resources are perceived to be insufficient or have failed to obtain the desired response. The use of violence thus can be seen as the most overt and effective means of husbands' social control over their wives (Yllo and Bogard, 1988) in that it is used when other and more subtle methods of control do not elicit submission.

Resource theory is also supported by Dobash and Dobash, and they state that:

Parents and children as well as husbands and wives obviously share common goals within the context of the family but are also in competition for the resources of the domestic arena, including time, physical space, freedom of movement, and the fruits of domestic labor. Conflicts of interest between men and women as well as those between parents and children are a part of the social construction of the family and underpin the negotiations between its members. While the specific sources of conflict between marital partners are writ large in the arenas of domestic labor and personal possessiveness, they are played out against a background of the differing interests and responsibilities of men and women in their respective positions as “husbands” and “wives” and “fathers” and “mothers” (Dobash and Dobash, 1998: 144).

One of the important principles of this theory addresses the notion of exchange. Within the family structure, people are bound to each other through ongoing transactions or exchanges (Goode, 1971). Violence is seen as an outcome of the inequity of exchange. Goode (1971), Makepeace (1987) and Peterson (1991) suggested that families from the lower social strata are particularly vulnerable to abuse because they have fewer alternative resources. For example, they have less prestige, money, and power. As a result, they experience greater frustration and bitterness. In addition to these, Peterson (1991) also found that women seeking divorces described their husbands as having meager psychological resources. For many, having limited social and psychological resources can also translate into violent behavior.

Specifically, they argue that married men who have few resources to offer, or fewer resources than their wives, are more likely than their resource-rich counterparts to use violence. Husbands with the most material resources are least likely to use violence because their material resources assure obedience and compliance (Goode, 1971). Resource theory is supported by many studies which indicate that men with lower levels of income, prestige, and education are more likely to abuse their wives (Hoffman, Demo, and Edwards, 1994; Hotaling and Sugarman, 1986; McCall and Shields, 1986).

Disparity in either occupational status or income favoring women, with the wife having a higher occupation or making more money than the husband, precipitated escalating forms of wife abuse (Hornung, McCullough, and Sugimoto, 1981). The husband's occupation, when viewed independently from the wife's, was unrelated to his use of violence. Status disparity in conflict with traditional gender roles outweighs social class as a risk factor. Violence, therefore, becomes an equalizer for men, a coercive tactic when women gain more resources after men lose resources (Allen and Straus 1980, Figueredo and McCloskey 1993, Goode 1971).

McCloskey (1996) states that women who have resources that approach or exceed their partners' are more likely to be victimized. According to her theory, overall family occupational level, combining the job ranking of both women and their partners, was negatively related to wife abuse over and above income disparity. The lower the social status of the family, the more frequent and escalated the wife abuse. This result from that low occupational standing indexes a number of other descriptors, including low educational attainment, possibly lower social skills and even drinking or drug problems.

When men lose power over women in their relationships, when as a class they have economic and political supremacy, they feel entitled to revert to physical threats to augment their control. Under analysis, violent behavior was found to be most common in families where the husband was not achieving well in the work/earner role and where the husband demonstrated certain status characteristics lower than those of his wife. This was viewed as a special form of status inconsistency. One interpretation for that violent behavior was that it represented the use of coercive, physical force by the husband in an effort to reaffirm his superiority vis-à-vis the other family members (O'Brien, 1971).

Resource theory is criticized by Atkinson, Greenstein, and Monahan Lang (2005) in terms of ignoring the cultural variables. They say that rather than accurately reflecting the variability in men's gender ideologies, such arguments assume all men to be traditional. But the social theories have arguments about all social issues and it is not necessary to think that a theory should explain the entire situation on certain issues. On the other hand, explanation about the majority, like resource theory, is needed to understand the structure of the society.

CHAPTER 3

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN TURKEY

This study focuses on domestic violence in Turkey. Therefore Turkish literature, the Turkish feminist movement and the legal perspective of violence in Turkey should be discussed to understand the situation and developments.

Theories of Western researchers cannot explain all dimensions of violence against women in Turkey. Turkey has its own originality rooted in its structure of society. Religious beliefs, understanding of honor, and the relations between daughter-in-law and mother-in-law should be analyzed to understand violence against women in Turkey.

Women's lives are hard in Turkey and they are shaped by a multiplicity of traditional practices which abuse women in different ways including: early and forced marriages, polygamous marriages, and restrictions on women's freedom of movement in Turkey. The women's situation in the Eastern and South-Eastern regions of Turkey is even more difficult. There are many important issues which should be studied by social scientists and they are directly related to violence and women such as honour crimes, rape and marital rape, suicides of women as different forms of honour crimes, and sexual abuse of girls in the household.

Domestic violence in Turkey began to be focused on after the 80s and was accepted as a social problem and a human right issue (Pekin+5

Political Declaration and Outcome Document, 2001). The feminist movement in Turkey has had an important contribution to this development. Studies of violence against women in the past ten years were an important mechanism for bringing many women's experiences of discrimination and vulnerability to public attention. However there are only a few academic studies on domestic violence in Turkey. This issue has become popular in the last ten years as we see more articles in the newspapers everyday related to battered women and many television programs put it on their agenda. However, there are only a few studies on it, especially in the social sciences. In Turkey, there is a lack of statistics relevant to violence to reach any conclusive assertions.

3.1. Researches in Turkey

In Turkey, there are a few studies about the violence against women. Two of them were conducted by PIAR (1988 and 1992 cited in Gülçür, 1996:6) which found different results in two different studies that 75 and 22 percent of women reported having been physically abused by their husbands.

Another study was conducted by Şahika Yüksel in 1990 in İstanbul¹ and she interviewed 140 married women who had applied for consulting or medical treatment to the Psychiatry Department of Istanbul University. According to Yüksel's study, 57 percent of women reported that they were abused by their husbands at least for a year. In a research on violence against women in Turkey, it is proven that early marriages and marriages without parental permission are correlated with resorting to violence. In this study, all that women

¹ İstanbul is the biggest city in Turkey.

married without parental permission reported that they were exposed to physical abuse. According to this study, the idea of domestic violence was belonging to a lower class was proved. Although there was not found a strong relationship between education and violence, it was reported that the severity of violence is lower in the families with high educational level. 62% of respondents in this study stated that their husbands began to abuse them during the first year of their marriage.

The other study was conducted by Esmer (1991) with 116 couples in Istanbul. His study was about the perception and the narration of the violence by couples. According to his study, 46 percent of men reported that they did not abuse their wife before the marriage. Meaning of this result is that 54 percent of women who were wives of these men were abused.

The wider study about the violence against women was conducted by the Family Research Institution in 1994 with 2479 women and 1147 men. This study covered 12 provinces and 30 percent of the women interviewed indicated they had been physically abused by their husbands, while 34 percent of the men questioned admitted that they had physically abused their wives (Nielson-Family Research Institute, 1994).

Another study was conducted by Helga Rittersberger Tılıç, Kayhan Mutlu and Sibel Kalaycıoğlu in Ankara² between 1994 and 1995 with 160 men and 213 women. The subject of this study was the definition of violence and its perception especially by families. In this study, violence was defined as not only damage practiced by a person to another physically and consciously, but also psychological and verbal

² Ankara is the capital city in Turkey.

constraint unconsciously. Women, in their study, reported that disrespectfulness and heeding what their husband is told are the reasons of domestic violence. In this study, education level was found important on the severity of violence.

The other study was conducted by Leyla Gülçür and Pınar İlkkaracan in 1993-94 in Ankara with 155 women. The issues of their study were the family life of women in Ankara and the different types of domestic violence that they experienced; the strategies women use against domestic violence and the institutional recourses offered to them; and the impact of domestic violence on women's psychological health. As a result of their study, eighty-nine percent of the respondents had been subjected to one or more forms of psychological violence, while thirty-nine percent had experienced physical violence. Fifteen percent of their respondents reported that they had been forced to have sex by their husbands. While five percent had been threatened with economic restrictions, two percent had been locked inside the home, six percent had been forced to remain at home due to threats involving the children, and three percent had been subjected to other categories of violence (e.g. battered by in-laws, set on fire) (Gülçür, 1999). In this study it is found that five percent of married women were exposed to physical violence by a male who is in her husband's family, two percent of women were exposed by a female who is her husband's family or relatives.

Another research was conducted by the Purple Roof Foundation with 550 women who applied to the foundation during three years. Ninety percent of these women were from the city center. According to this research, seventy-three percent of respondents reported that they were exposed to at least one kind of violence and eighty-seven percent of

these respondents reported that they were abused physically (Family Research Institution, 1994).

There are some other studies that were conducted by the Foundation for Women's Solidarity, KAMAR, which have added to the limited body of knowledge concerning domestic violence in Turkey.

3.2. Struggle with Domestic Violence in Turkey

In the first half of the 1980's, the women's movement in Turkey began to question the violence against women seriously. This is because, in 1987, a judge declared: "No woman should be without a child in her womb and a stick on her back" for rejecting a woman's divorce case in Çankırı, and this sparked the growing reaction towards the subject of violence against women. Women soon began a campaign named "No beating!". There were more than 1000 women participating in the demonstration in Istanbul according to a researcher (Yüksel, 1995), and according to another report (Işık, 2002), there were almost 2500 people. The women's movement was accelerated by this campaign and has begun to get its institutional identification by building shelters and consulting centers independently from political actions. These were the new steps in the written history of the women's movement in Turkey (Işık, 2002; Purple Roof Foundation, 1988).

Conferences, studies and panel discussions about male violence drew attention to this issue. All of the publicity increased the interest about violence as an important issue. However, the tendency to accept male violence as a natural act is still high in Turkey.

The 1990's were spent with the women's fight about violence against women. The same period of time also had an important role in the

institutionalization of the women's movement. Women's Commission of Turkish Bar Association (TÜBAKKOM) is an example of this institutionalization, which was formed by women's law commissions in Purple Roof (Mor Çatı), Ankara Women's Solidarity Foundation, Aegean Women's Solidarity Foundation (EGDAV), Women Center (KAMER) and Bar Association of Turkey (Işık, 2002; Gülçür, 1999).

In the 1990's, the foundations and associations helped and supported women who were exposed to violence. The Women's Solidarity Foundation was founded in 1991. It opened the Women's Solidarity Center which was the first center founded with cooperation between the local government and a non-governmental organization. The center supported women in terms of psychological and forensic consultancy services and opened the first independent shelter in Turkey in 1993 (Turkish Republic Prime Ministry Directorate General on the Status and the Problems of Women, 1998). In the same period of time, one more independent shelter had been built by Purple Roof, one of which had existed for seven and the other for five years. Unfortunately, in 1999, both of these independent shelters had to be closed because of economic distresses, and years of heavy work made the women serving in these shelters tired (Işık, 2002).

The İstanbul Women's Right Commission and the Turk Lawyer Women's Association gives consulting services to women who are exposed to violence. In 1996, three shelters were opened related to the municipality in İstanbul Küçükçekmece, in Aydın and in Adana. Also, the Prime Ministry Directorate General on the Status and the Problems of Women trained people in police departments, forensic institutions and health centers where women apply to get assistance. The Social Services and Child Protection Agency (SHÇEK) has six women retreat in different regions. In addition to these, the Gender and

Women's Studies Programs conducted research about violence against women. In 1998, there were eleven women shelters and six women consultancy and solidarity centers (Turkish Republic Prime Ministry Directorate General on the Status and the Problems of Women, 1998).

The Women's Shelters General Assemblies, the first of which was held in 1998, has become a permanent yearly meeting platform for the women's organizations fighting violence against women. The assemblies make the information transfer easier between the organizations and have a serious effect in building common walkways and strategies. Furthermore, the works conducted by the assembly has had an effective role during the decision to make changes in the Family Protection Law and Civil Law (Işık, 2002).

The establishment of the Prime Ministry Directorate General on the Status and the Problems of Women in Turkey, are giving a place for the violence against women subject in the country reports that are constituted by the studies held collectively with the attorneys from the women's movement, building women research centers in the universities that educates at the graduate level, giving a special place to the violence against women subject in the 7th and 8th five-year development plans of the State Planning Agency, being represented in Human Rights Coordinator Supreme Council of Prime Ministry as women institutions, establishing The Status of Women units in thirteen provinces working in the governor's office structure, training the police departments about how to treat violence aggrieved by women in the name of developing police station services, and other operations held by local authorities are the other progresses in the women's movement of the 1990's (Işık, 2002).

In 1995, a feminist popular magazine, “Pazartesi”, had begun publishing. In this magazine, the subjects of physical violence against women, sexual harassment, honor killings were important because they increased the public sensitivity to these issues (Koçali, 2002).

In 1996, a women’s communication institution, “Flying Broom”, was established. Flying Broom has provided a communication between the women’s institutions by making radio programs about women, organizing film festivals, publishing magazines and conducting projects about women’s problems and violence (Kardam and Ecevit, 2002).

The differences between the 1990’s and the 1980’s include the ideological status, the organization and the wide range of study area groups that were interested in the issues of women, which were not comparable with any previous years. Besides, in the 1990’s the women’s movement had been focused on organizational efforts rather than massive acts and protests which characterized the 1980’s (Kardam and Ecevit, 2002).

All these institutions and studies are important steps to resist violence, to make women conscious and to eliminate violence. A number of benefits produced as a result of these studies. Social dimensions of the issue were acknowledged and violence against women was accepted as a serious problem by local and national government agencies. In addition, local shelters were created for women.

3.3. Legal Dimensions of Domestic Violence in Turkey

A growing intensification of the women’s movement since the 1980s has strongly challenged the patriarchal values in society. Women’s

non-governmental organizations' struggle against all kinds of violence, especially domestic violence, and they try to raise awareness in the public about women's issues. As a result of successful campaigning, lobbying, and advocacy, there have been remarkable achievements in the legal system.

The approach towards women in the Turkish Criminal Code supports the priority of men. The code was arranged in such a way that restricts married women. This sexist structure of the code is proof for the secondary position of women not only at home but also by other official organizations. Arrangements, involving violence against women and punishments are insufficient in the Turkish Criminal Code, because people can be quickly released.

It is reported that only one percent of the women in the world is referred to forensic solutions when subjected to violence. "Domestic violence that is accepted as natural even by the women, who are subjected to it, makes the court decision much more important" (Kalan, 1998:105).

As a result of the women's movement and pressure the sixth chapter of the New Turkish Criminal Code; items 102, 103, 104 and 105 which are listed under the heading of "Crimes Breaking Sexual Immunity", has been evaluated as the acts pointed to a woman as an individual, and moved under the main heading of "Crimes Against Individuals". These items were listed under the heading of "Crimes against Public" in the old Turkish Criminal Code because they were evaluated as injuring the public's morality and policy. Besides, according to the Turkish Criminal Code, sexual assault is a crime in a marriage when it is reported. With the last legal arrangements, married and single women are protected in the equal degree when subjected to sexual assault. In

the previous code, married women were protected more compared to single women, because of the privilege that founding a family brings.

In the code, many acts of violence are crimes. Being a family member is not an excuse for practicing violence to another member of the family. In the second part of the Turkish Criminal Code, item 86, under the “Crimes of Body Immunity” heading it is stated that: “Physical damage and impairment of health or perception deliberately are penalized by one to three years of imprisonment”. The degree of penalty doubles when violence is practiced on lineal ancestors, younger ancestors, and marital partners or siblings.

In 1998, a new law code, entitled “The Law to Protect the Family” was approved by Turkish parliament and this law helped to diminish the violence against women. According to the law, people can report to police if they see a violent act and the police cannot say “it is related to family and I cannot interfere”. Under the new law, any member of a family subjected to domestic violence can file a court case for what is known as a “protection order” against the perpetrator of the violence. Husbands who commit violence against their wives are punished by being banished from their homes in which the wife lives. If they do not obey this rule, they can be imprisoned. This rule is valid for the husband’s family members and relatives who are exposed to violence. The importance of this law lies in the fact that it provides women with an easy-to-implement legal recourse to struggle against domestic violence (Arın, 1998; Gülçür, 1999).

Another legal dimension is about the divorcing procedure and maintenance allowance. Women cannot divorce despite being physically abused because they cannot support themselves and their children. Women have the right for maintenance allowance, but the

maintenance system is not operated properly and it is not enough to let women live alone or with children. According to Turkish Civil Code, item 330, the amount of maintenance allowance is defined by the needs of the children, the parents' life conditions and the parent's ability to pay. Generally, men's ability which is defined by the court, to pay maintenance allowance is not realistic because of wrong declaration or documentation of men.

In addition to the insufficiency of the law system, many women are not aware of the rights granted to them by the legal system of the country. However, being aware of legal rights does not mean that women can use these rights. There are some difficulties like family issues and difficult environments for women to use their legal rights. Furthermore, one of the first things violence "teaches" women is not to seek their rights and total obedience.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

This study defines domestic violence against women as violence which is limited to physical violence (e.g. beating, slapping, and stabbing) and does not include other forms such as psychological, verbal and sexual violence perpetrated by the husband against the wife. This study includes spouses who have marriage act or religious act.

This study is different from the other studies in Turkey in terms of the survey place (Forensic Medicine Institute) and the characteristics of women who had recourse to the police or an attorney. Another research in Turkey by Gülçür and İlkkaracan (1999) reported that a very small percentage of women called the police or went to a doctor, a women's shelter or other social service institutions. None of their respondents (a hundred and fifty-five women) filed a legal complaint, which would have meant petitioning the judicial system. Gülçür and İlkkaracan (1999) stated that there are three factors which may play a role in limiting the range of women's responses: a) a lack of awareness on the woman's part that she has the right to apply to judicial, law enforcement and other social service institutions to stop the violence; b) a perception that applying to these institutions would not be of any help; and c) internalized social norms which sanction domestic violence and lead the woman to believe she "somehow deserved it".

4.1. Experience of the survey

I am a woman and have experienced different forms of violence including psychological and verbal forms. This was a reason to study this issue. Another reason was that violence against women is a popular issue, but as a result of the literature search only a few articles can be found in Turkey. Inadequate data on violence against women further impedes analysis and understanding the origin of the problem. So, this issue should be surveyed by different approaches and with a different group of women.

At the beginning of this study there were a few alternative places to study abused women: shelters, psychiatry hospitals, forensic science institutes, police stations, and courts. All of the places could contribute to the study and they had advantages and disadvantages for research. I started to research as soon as possible because of having little time to finish. Shelters were confidential and finding them could be difficult. I had to find a shelter first if I wanted to study in a shelter and it could take much time. Psychiatry hospitals were one of the strong candidates to have research in because many women who were abused physically applied to psychiatrists. However, studying with women in hospitals as patients could cause problems because they could have psychiatric problems. Moreover, there was not a certain place which abused women apply. Thus, it would be difficult to find women who were abused physically. I didn't want to study in a police station or a court because I supported the idea that state institutions abuse women in a different way. The police are generally unresponsive to cases of domestic violence and due to internalized cultural norms, they side with the man who is acting violently rather than with the woman suffering from physical violence. They try to reconcile partners and ignore women's bad situations as a victim. Police often encourage

abused women to go back home and resolve this “private” problem within the family; there are even cases where they ask the abused women what they have done “to deserve it” (Gülçür, 1999). In addition to my biases, they might not be able to help me to research male physical violence against women. Finally, I decided to research this issue with the women who apply to Forensic Medicine Institutes because I have an acquaintance doctor, who works as a director of Bağcılar³ Branch of Forensic Medicine Institute, and he said that he could help me. I could not go to Forensic Medicine Institute Directorate of Bağcılar Branch (FMIDB) every day because of my work, however he talked about my research with women and give questionnaires to them when I was not there. Another reason for my decision was that the doctor told me that the average number of women who apply for FMIDB was six per week. I thought that I could find many women as respondents, but I did not realize that there would be a legal holiday when the courts and attorney generalship closed at one period of my study. The other reason for my decision was that I would not hesitate about the women’s answers to my questionnaire, whether they are real or a cause of a woman’s psychological problems - like women who apply to a psychiatry clinic.

About six or seven women apply to FMIDB in a week because of being physically abused, and the number of applicants depends on the season, holidays and periods when the courts are closed. Women can come to FMIDB by two different ways. Women can apply to the police station or to a district attorney to complain about their husbands or other people can complain about the husband’s physical violence to his wife. If women apply to the police station first, they send the woman to the district attorney and the district attorney sends woman to FMIDB

³ Bağcılar is the fifth biggest district of Istanbul.

to take a health report during weekdays and working hours. If the event occurs during the weekend or out of working hours women are sent to the hospital or another health clinic. The doctor at FMIDB said that applications during weekends or out of working hours have a higher rate. Meanwhile the police take the husband's testimony and if the woman's injury is important and she has a risk of losing her life, the police put the husband under house surveillance and the situation goes to court. The doctor of FMIDB said that there are certain reasons a husband can be placed under house surveillance: such as a vessel cut or a thorax injury with knife which is defined by law. Thus, the husband is put under house surveillance because of the mortal risk to the woman's life and it is not because of beating. If a woman's injury is not important in the health report, the district attorney calls partners and tries to reconcile them or decide to quash a charge. The doctor of FMIDB said that generally ninety percent of violent events have no mortal risk. If women or men want to divorce they have to apply at another family court. On the other hand, if women do not complain about the husband, and she risks losing her life, then the district attorney goes to court because of life-risk.

The doctor of FMIDB stated that these bureaucratic processes continue for three or four days and meanwhile women forgive their husbands and recover from their injuries. It is difficult to give health reports three or four days after being exposed to physical violence. Furthermore, women have to complete bureaucratic processes, but she needs support, psychological counseling, and she might be injured. The process can cause women to decide not to go to the court, the police or an attorney after her husband's violent acts. Unjust treatment continues for women during the bureaucratic process at the district attorney, police station, court, and forensic medicine institute. In addition to that, there is not any psychological or counseling support during the period.

Women don't know what to do, where can she go? what is the process? The doctor of FMIDB said that women have to pay to get a health report from FMIDB or a hospital, however if women are found right, as a result of a court decision, the husband pays the money back to the women. But if the court makes a decision in favor of the husband, women are not paid back. Women feel fear again and again and live the same situation again and again. The process debilitates women.

FMIDB gives reports only about physical injuries and narratives of situations given by women. There are no psychiatrists at FMIDB. If women say that they were psychologically injured, the doctor at FMIDB can send women to a psychiatry clinic to have them report and then submit it to FMIDB. Thus, physical injuries are important for district attorneys or courts while psychological dimensions of violence are ignored. On the other hand, the doctor of FMIDB stated that they sometimes take photos of women's injuries to attach to the report. Reports sometimes cannot explain women's injuries and convince judges about the husband's physical violence. Judges might not read all of the report line by line, but photos can show the women's injuries and can convince the judge. However FMIDB is not able to take all women's photos, they only take photos of women who have fatal injuries. The doctor at FMIDB said a total of fifty events go to FMIDB every day and they cannot take photos of each of the victims. On the other hand, they cannot take photos of psychological harm.

FMIDB is an institute of Ministry of Justice and it is difficult to have permission to hold a research at FMIDB. When I started to study, I didn't know about the bureaucratic process of a research at FMIDB. First of all, my supervisor wrote a letter which is also signed by our department head. The letter was sent to Istanbul Forensic Medicine Institution and I started my study without written permission because I

did not have enough time to wait for the director of FMIDB to say that I could start. Another letter came in reply after a month, and it stated that I have to submit a written ethic committee consent because of my sensitive issue. I met with officers at Istanbul Forensic Medicine Institution and I applied to my university to get a written ethic committee consent, but the process was not completed.

4.2. Data Collection and Sampling

Fifty-eight women living in Bağcılar, İstanbul responded to the survey during April to October 2006. The samples were selected via convenience-sampling from women who applied to FMIDB and agreed to respond to the questionnaire.

The sampling selection criterions were that women, who were married with civil marriage act or religious act which is accepted as marriage by partners, women who were exposed to physical violence by their husbands and women who were convenient to participate in this study in terms of health and psychological situation. For example, women who were crying or had fatal injuries were not asked to participate in the survey. Divorced women were asked to answer the questionnaire. The other selection criteria could be that of being literate, but I did not want to narrow my study with women who were literate. Four women were illiterate and their questionnaires were filled out by me.

The sampling in this study is non-probability, purposive sampling and it is needed for this most sensitive research issue on the family. The study focused on a group who consisted of women who applied to FMIDB. Group sampling is the technique for reaching potential subjects.

The nature of purposive sampling methods means that it is impossible to generalize from one sample to a large population. My study was done using a limited female population in a limited geographic area. This sampling type limits my ability to generalize the findings.

Women were informed about the aim of the study, researcher, and questionnaire before they started to respond and it was stated that the information supplied by the women would not be shared with any other person including their family members, and they would not write their name on the questionnaire, thus, it is anonymous. In addition, they were told that this study was interested in their opinion and that there were no right or wrong answers.

4.3. The Questionnaire

Wife abuse is a sensitive issue and it is difficult for women to share the experience verbally with other people. They are terrified about the possibility that their husband might find out that they had talked with another person about their husband's violent acts. Women feel fear and shame because of being abused by their husbands. As a result of these thoughts, in this study, data was collected by the questionnaire because women can fill out questionnaires by themselves and can be relaxed. Maybe they would answer my questions less truthfully, and they would defend their actions if asked my questions face to face because of being ashamed. For example, women mostly answered negative to the question of whether they had been exposed to physical violence in their childhood or not. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç says that: "Today's parents who had been exposed to domestic violence in their childhood tend to perceive their past in a very positive manner. They tend to keep the good memories and try to forget bad ones apart from the extreme violence they had been forced by their parents" (Rittersberger Tılıç,

1998; 122). I think one of the results of this is that being face to face with a stranger makes people defensive about their family and their life.

The questionnaire included 98 questions and it is a self-completion questionnaire. It took about between 1.5-2 hours to take. There were two different types of questions in the questionnaire: multiple choice and open-ended. Most of the questions were multiple choice.

In addition to determining the demographic characteristics of the women and their husbands, the questionnaire was designed to measure the types of marriage and family, the effects of physical violence on women, the frequency of violent acts against women by their husbands, the women's responses and strategies for coping with the physical violence, the childhood violent experiences of women, drug and alcohol usage of husbands, husbands' attitudes to others, women's definitions about violence and attitudes of the others such as families of spouses. In this study, many questions were asked to discover differentiations among women and situations.

At the beginning of the study, I thought that it would be difficult to get people to give information about their husbands' and their family lives which is seen as very private and an intimate institution in society, but there were only two people who refused to be respondents in this study. Besides, most of the women declared that the questionnaire expressed their problems well, and they felt good themselves after they responded to the questionnaire. I think there are some reasons for this, and one is that women have to explain and defend themselves in all processes at the police department and district attorney because it is known that they usually do not help or support women in these processes. Only after these women came to FMIDB and the doctors

were interested in their injuries and listened to their narration about their bad experiences, women relaxed and felt better. I observed this when I was there. On the other hand, there was a table and chair only for women who responded to the questionnaire in the doctor's room and in another room and they might have preferred the place where the questionnaire was. This might have made women feel important. In addition to that, women got an opportunity to express themselves against all men who inflicted violence while responding to our questionnaire. It is known that settling old scores can diminish trauma. Another reason might be that the FMIDB is an institution and although we informed women about the study, the application of the questionnaire in this institution is perceived seriously by women so they did not refuse to respond to it. The doctor is a reliable authority for women and being with the doctor is important to persuade women to be in the research.

4.4. Limitation of the study

There are a number of limitations of this study. This study was based on small numbers of participants. The use of small numbers of participants in the study made it difficult to generalize to a larger population. In addition, there were some missing values in the data, especially in the last part of questionnaire. Missing values were excluded from the analysis and this made the sample size smaller so it was harder to find significant relationships from the data.

Second, the questionnaire was prepared at the beginning of survey and only small changes were done on it during the practice. However, when I started to analyze the data I realized that some important questions were lack for example, How many times did respondents come to the FMIDB? How did they consult the police or district

attorney? Was it their own choice or some other people call the police to interfere the abusive situation? Why did they consult the police or district attorney? What did they expect? These questions were important but I couldn't see that at the beginning of the study.

Third, responses to the questions concerning what respondents understood from different words or actions give answers and these answers were important to make data reliable. Because of the questionnaire technique there was no chance to make clear all the questions for the respondents. Therefore, I saw that when I analyzed the data, some women misunderstood some questions. On the other hand, the questionnaire was so long and it took 1,5-2 hours of respondents. There were more blank questions at the last part of questionnaire than the first part of it. It was possible that respondents were bored and did not answer the last part of questionnaire carefully.

Fourth, the study was conducted over a six month period and the season was summer when people consult the legal institutions occasionally and goes to their native region because of the legal and school holiday. It is possible that abused women population may have differed depending on the period of the year.

Fifth, this issue was a sensitive issue for women and they may have been angry about their husband's violent acts. This may have been a cause for exxageration. On the other hand, FMIDB was an legal institution and women may think that if she exaggerated the problem their husbands could be punished. In addition, the women were out of their private sphere when they came to FMIDB and this may have made women hesitate to give true answers to the questions. They may have minimized the problem when they were asked to report violent

acts within their own marriage because of being ashamed of their situation and social desirability.

CHAPTER 5

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

5.1. Demographic profile of spouses

A demographic profile is important to provide a picture of the personal and family life of the spouses. Moreover, a demographic profile is needed to interpret the results of the survey to understand which kind of women is being abused and which kind of men abuse their wives. Demographic profiles of the respondents can be seen in Table 1⁴.

The demographic profile of the fifty-eight respondents, aged between eighteen and fifty-eight, are living in Bağcılar district of Istanbul. The average reported age was thirty-one. In some other studies, the average reported age was 34,6 in Gülçür's (1999) study, 34 in İlkaracan's (1996) study, 30 in Purple Roof Foundation' study. Therefore, the finding of this study about age of abused women was consistent with the other studies. The respondents' husband's age was between eighteen and fifty-nine and the average reported age was thirty-five. Ten women had no children and the average number of children was about two.

Most of the women (thirty-nine women) and their husbands (thirty-seven husbands) graduated from primary school or have no formal education. In Yüksel's(1995) study, 41% and in Gülçür's (1999) study

⁴ Table 1 is in appendix.

59% of abused women were a graduate of high school or university. Education level of abused women in this study was lower than the education level of women in the other studies which was conducted in Turkey.

More than half of the women (thirty-five women) and a number of their husbands (ten husbands) did not work. Household income average was between 500,00-1.000,00 YTL per month (approximately between U.S. \$340-680). This mean most of spouses live at the starvation level.⁵

The average of age of marriage among respondents was twenty-one and it was twenty-four for their husbands. A few women (four women) reported that they and a few of their husbands (three husbands) got married more than once. A majority of the respondents (fifty-four women) reported having had a registered civil marriage. Half of the women (twenty-four women) had undergone an arranged marriage. The average reported marriage year was over five years.

5.2. Family patterns as social resources

Family is a unity of interacting personalities. Interaction can be seen as the indicator of how families organize themselves to carry on the activities that give them their characteristics. In a Turkish family, strong interaction between parents and children is continued after marriage of the children and interaction is especially in the men's family's favor. In traditional Turkish families, men keep their dependence position on their parents even after marriage because men are seen as a guarantee of future and continuity for their families.

⁵ Minimum wage was 531,00 YTL in 2006 in Turkey.

Where the extended families are common, several features of family organization may precipitate or impede such violent acts (Hoffman, Demo and Edwards, 1994; Warner, Lee, and Lee, 1986). Women come to the new house after marriage and this may reduce the woman's power because she must share authority over her action with her husband and her husband's family members who live there in an extended family.

In this study, the number of nuclear families was thirty-six. Thirteen women lived in an extended family which includes one or more family members on their husband's side. Moreover, four women lived in an extended family which includes one or more family members on the woman's side. Nearly half of the women (seventeen) who have a nuclear family, four of women who have an extended family including one or more family members on the husband's side, and two of women who have an extended family including one or more family members on the women's side reported that they were frequently abused by their husbands. Therefore, the proportion of the frequent abuse was high among the women who had nuclear family. This was not consistent with the theory about violent acts as a result of being extended family.

However, when women were asked about their use of legal ways such as calling police or filing a complaint, the most of the women who were living with husband's family members reported that they did not consult the police or district attorney before (Table 2). According to the findings, having an extended family which includes one or more family members on the husband's side makes it more difficult to use of legal ways.

Table 2. The relation between family type and the number of consultation to the police and district attorney

		Number of consultation to the police and district attorney		Total
		None	One or more times	
Family Type	Nuclear Family	16	19	35
	Extended family including family members from husband's side	6	5	11
	Extended family including family members from women's side	0	4	4
Total		22	28	50
*8 respondents were omitted because of missing data on this item.				

Seven of women who live with husband's family reported that they were physically abused by their husbands more than once a week. As a result of findings, the frequency of being physically abused is similar between women who live in an extended family and women who live in a nuclear family. However, Table 3 shows that twelve of women who live with husband's family stated that their husband first began to inflict physical violence against them in the first days of their marriage. This was a significant differentiation between two family types because women in extended family were experienced first violent acts earlier than the women from nuclear family. Therefore, having an extended family that includes men's family members is a factor that makes husband began to expose physical violence against women earlier. On the other hand, eleven respondents reported that the reason for their husband's violent acts against them was impression of their husband's family.

Table 3. Family type and first physical abuse against women by their husbands

		First physical abuse		Total
		In the first year of marriage	After the first year of marriage	
Family Type	Nuclear Family	23	11	34
	Extended family including family members from husband's side	12	0	12
	Extended family including family members from women's side	1	3	4
Total		36	14	50
* 8 respondents were omitted because of missing data on this item.				

Moreover, twenty women said that they were abused by their husband's family members as well. Six of these women reported that they had an extended family and it includes their parents-in-law. On the other hand, two of these women stated that they had extended family including one or more member of the woman's family. The proportions of violence against women by the husband's family who did not live with their son were higher than the husband's family who stayed with their son. Most of the women who were abused by parents-in-law reported that they did not work and they graduated from primary school or have no education. As a result of another study by İlkkaracan (1998), the proportion of being abused by husband's family members was 7,8%. Therefore, when the proportion of being abused by husband's family was compared to the findings of İlkkaracan's(1998) study, significant difference was found.

On the other hand, women are in communication with their own families. Forty-three women stated that they talked with their families

about their husband's violent acts. Only three respondents declared that they did not talk with anyone about the physical violence which was inflicted upon them by their husbands. On the other hand, ten women said that they talked with other people outside of their family members such as police, doctor, attorney and their friends. Siblings have a high rate to be talked to about being physically abused, and mothers have the second highest rate. Women living with or near their natal or biological kin also may be better able to struggle in the violent marital home. Women who have closer ties with natal kins can be able to get more control over finances, decision-making power and mobility (Bloom, Wypij, and Das Gupta, 2001). Moreover, the presence of the wife's family can cause conflict in the family by the point of view of men, but this can make the women stronger to resist and negotiate conflicts at home.

Half of the women stated that they were staying at their families' home when they came to FMIDB. For most of the women the family home is a safe place to use as a shelter. Women first talk to their families about their husband's violent acts and if their families support women, they want to divorce. On the other hand, most of women who have parents stay with their families to protect themselves from their husbands. So, close relationships between women and their parents makes women stronger to struggle with the effect of their husband's violent acts.

A number of the women's families (twenty families) were pessimistic and they did not support the women in resisting physical violence. According to respondents, their families only gave empty statements: "you have children and you should stay" and "these kinds of problems happen in every family". Most of the women think that their families feel upset because they cannot do anything about the violence. Only

eleven women reported that their families advised them to divorce and suggested she consult the police and said that the women could stay with them. Family support is important to women through a difficulty. The majority of women (nine women) who supported by their families against physical violence think about divorce. On the other hand, a negative correlation between frequency of physical abuse and attempt to divorce was found. According to the findings of this study, as the frequency of physical abuse decreases, attempts to divorce increases.

Society's traditional sex roles may further contribute to a woman's belief that she cannot leave the violent relationship. Women think that they are powerless to stop the batterer and, thus, often cease making any attempts to leave or change the abusive situation. Abused women may begin to believe that they are responsible for the abuse. These feelings of powerlessness and self-blame are thought to contribute to the development of depressive symptomatology, which may further exacerbate the victims' feelings of helplessness (Walker, 1978). However, in this study, nearly all of the respondents struggle to change the abusive situation and they use the legal ways. This mean is that they risk their marriage and their husband may be harsher because of her attempt to change the situation. Thus, the findings of this study were not consistent with the Walker's (1978) theory of learned helplessness. According to this study, only fifteen women reported that they came to the FMIDB for the first time.

5.3. Economic Resources

As a result of the finding about economic resources, the relation between income and frequency of physical violence was that nineteen of thirty-nine women whose income level were between 500,00 – 2.000,00 YTL and six of twelve women whose income level was

2.000,00 YTL or over per month reported that they were physically abused once or more than once a week. The results show that there were more women who were physically abused once or more than once a week from the lower income level. On the other hand, nearly all unemployment husbands (ten husbands) abused their wives frequently. In resource theory, Goode (1971), Makepeace (1987) and Peterson (1991) stated that families from the lower social strata are particularly vulnerable to abuse because they have fewer alternative resources such as prestige, money, and power.

Power is one of the few family interaction areas. The husband's resources of occupational prestige, educational achievement, and income are positively related to their decision making power. Within the family structure, people are bound to each other through ongoing transactions or exchanges. According to resource theory, inequality of exchange is an important cause of domestic violence. Men's masculine identity are threatened by the women's psychological and economical resources and this motivates men to use violence to reinstate their dominance (Thoits, 1992; Connell, 1995). According to findings, about half of the working women (twenty-three women) who have a job and earn the same or more amount of money than their husbands: three of these women directly reported that the reason for their husband's violent acts were their husband's inferiority complex, economic disability and they were willing to take all the money of women.

Major sets of resources like economic variables, prestige, force, and kinship are significant factors to abuse or to be abused in the family because they have the impact of human action. These resources are indicators of power and the lack of ability of men to reach these resources or women's ability to get these resources can cause conflict in the family. On the other hand, this study shows that women who

work and have higher income level talk about their abusive relationship with the other people who are not a member of their families more easier than the other women who do not work and have lower income level. This means that having ability of women to reach more resources is a cause for women to struggle with their problems and take help from others.

According to this study, twenty-six of thirty-five women who want to divorce reported that they do not work. Moreover, four of eight women who have already divorced or are waiting for the courts to decide reported that they do not work. More women who work reported that they want to divorce than the other women who do not work. All of four divorced women reported that they continuously or periodically work.

In addition, four of thirty-nine women with lower income levels (between 500,00 – 2.000,00 YTL per month) and seven of twelve women with higher income levels (2.000,00 YTL or over per month) reported that they did not want to divorce. Six of these seven women were housewives. It is evident that income as a resource is important to these women to continue their life. Divorce often means becoming poorer for women, regardless of their married socio-economic status. This is particularly so in the case of women with children. Most of the women who want to get divorced due to the physical abuse, end up leaving their house and property which might have been obtained through her own labor. Fear of lack of money and lack of self-confidence to be able to continue the life alone are the reasons to stay in a violent home for women. According to this study, there is a negative correlation between demanding divorce and income levels. More women from lower income levels declared that they want to divorce than the women from higher income levels.

On the other hand, cultural values, some of which are associated with gender stereotypes, patriarchal values, and religious prescriptions and symbols converge to place the primary responsibility for keeping the family together on women. Therefore, women are expected to endure, sacrifice, and suffer silently in order to keep their family together and to even enjoy the suffering (Hortaçsu, et al., 2003).

Twenty-eight of the women reported that they felt themselves bound to their husbands economically and sixteen women reported that they did not feel themselves bound to their husbands economically. Most of the women who felt themselves bound or not to their husbands economically declared that they wanted a divorce. Four women reported that they have already divorced and all of these women declared that they did not feel themselves bound to their husbands. Therefore, findings show that economical dependence of women is not a factor to make women stay with their abusive husband. In addition, women reported that they used the legal ways such as calling police or filing a complaint even they felt themselves economically bound to their husbands. Thus, being dependant is not a difficulty for women to spread their problem to the public sphere and to consult legal institutions.

However, physical abuse is more frequent among women who feel themselves economically bound to their husbands. On the other hand, unemployed husbands abuse their wives more frequently than the other husbands who work. This is consistent with the class theory that men expose violence to their wives because of their unemployment, stress at work and economic strain because they perceive failures in fulfilling traditional gender roles. Patriarchal values and gender stereotypes

create an expectation of men as responsible to earn money to household and women as responsible for housework.

5.4. Education as a resource

About half of the women stated that they were physically abused more than once in a week. As a result of the study, there is an opposite correlation between education level of husbands and frequency of physical abuse, as education levels of the husband increases, the frequency of physical abuse decreases. On the other hand, education level was found related with the attempting to divorce, more high educated women want to divorce than the women who have lower education levels.

Seventeen of the thirty-eight women who graduated from primary school or have no education reported that they did not go to the police or attorney before, and this proportion for nineteen women who have secondary school or higher education was six. The result of the comparison between the two groups of women was that women who have higher education had higher rates of consulting the police.

These findings are consistent with resources theory, according to the theory, the greater the resources available to an individual, the more force he or she can use, but the less likely violence actually will be employed. Higher educated women can use more force and they consult the police or attorney. Moreover, the resources which are available to a woman increase while violent acts of their husband decrease. However, according to Gülçür's (1999) study in which education level of women was found higher than the women in this study only 1.2 percent of women reported that they called the police

when they abused by their husbands. Moreover, none of women said that they filed a legal complaint.

Five women reported that their husbands first began to inflict physical violence against them during their engagement period, and half of the women's husbands first began to inflict physical abuse against them during the first days of their marriage. However, eight women were different from these women and they reported that they were first exposed to physical abuse from their husbands long after they got married. Understanding why these women were first physically abused later than the others is important. The education level of these women when compared to the other women in the survey was high. Five of them were graduates of secondary school or have higher education than secondary school. However, five women's husbands were graduates of primary school. Five of these women worked and two of their husbands did not work. The husbands of these women's had occupational prestige in their occupation such as a teacher, pilot, and officer who was responsible for a section. In addition, income levels of these women were higher than the other women who were surveyed. Five of these women reported that they had consulted the police or attorney when they were physically abused by their husbands.

5.5. Age as a resource

As shown in Table 4, most of the women from all year level reported that they were frequently abused by their husbands. Fifteen of respondents stated that their husband first began to abuse them one or more years after of their marriage. Findings show that physical abuse against women who were twenty-five years old or below began earlier than the other two groups of women.

Table 4. Reported Frequency of Physical Abuse Directed by Husband against Women

		Physical abuse			Total
		Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	
Age	25 years old and below	7	3	3	13
	Between 26 and 45 years old	15	2	5	22
	46 years old and over	3	1	1	5
Total		25	6	9	40
* 18 respondents were omitted because of missing data on this item.					

Moreover, the proportion of consulting the police or attorney was found higher among the oldest group of women than other two age groups and the lower proportion was among women who were twenty-five years old or below. In Turkish family, women gain power when they become older and age defines the power hierarchy in patriarchal society. This makes older women stronger than the younger one. Another resource for older women is their children and they can take help from them when they need.

According to the study, positive correlation was found between sharing the problem with others such as the police, neighbor and friend and age. Findings show that older women spread their problem to the others easier than the younger women. On the other hand, younger women talk with their families more than older women.

5.6. Effects of physical abuse on women

The effects of the physical abuse were focused in terms of three different categories: physical, psychological and social.⁶ According to the findings of this study, it can be observed that there are positive correlation between the frequency and the effects of physical abuse. Sixteen of twenty-four women reported that they were frequently abused, two of six women reported that they were occasionally abused and three of nine women reported that they were rarely abused by their husbands stated that they were physically affected.⁷ In addition, fifteen of twenty-four women who reported that they were frequently abused and seven of fifteen women who reported that they were occasionally or rarely abused declared that they were affected by physical abuse in terms of the social aspects. All of twenty-four women who said that they were frequently abused reported that they were psychologically affected by their husbands' violent acts.

A positive correlation between consulting the police or district attorney and being affected physically was found. It can be said that when women are physically injured because of their husbands' violent acts, they spread their problem to the public sphere. On the other hand,

⁶ Women reported that they were mostly affected psychologically, and then physically and socially. Women who declared that they had physical indispositions and injuries were accepted as physically affected women. Women who declared that they felt themselves degraded, felt guilty, could not express themselves, live in fear constantly, cannot sleep, are depressed, and are anxious about their kid/kids were accepted as a psychologically affected. Women who declared that they could not meet with their family/families or friend/friends or neighbor/neighbors, and have difficulties going to their work were accepted as socially affected women.

⁷ Frequent, occasional and rare physical abuses were described as categories to explain the frequency of physical abuse. Being physically abused once or more in a couple of days was described as a frequent physical abuse, being physically abused once or more in a month was described as a occasional physical abuse and once in a year or more times was described as rare physical abuse. However, in the categories which were described occasional and rare physical abuse were also frequent.

being socially affected is not strong enough factor to make women spread their problem to the public sphere. Women who reported that they were physically injured by their husbands' violent acts declared that they consulted the police or district attorney more than the women who were psychologically and socially affected by their husbands' violent acts.

Moreover, more than half of the women who stated that they were frequently abused by their husbands reported that they talked about their husband's violent acts with their neighbor, a police or a doctor who was not a member of their families. On the other hand, less than half of the women who stated that they were occasionally or rarely abused by their husbands reported that they talked with the people who were not members of their families. The frequency of the violence is an important factor in making women tells their problems to the people who were not members of their families.

Nine women were reported that they physically abused their children when the children did something that they did not approve of. Nearly all of these nine women were less educated, seven of them were from high income level and six of them were frequently abused women. Most of them reported that they were abused by their families during the childhood. According to another study (Ari et al., 1994) in Turkey, the percentage of women who physically abused their children was high (62%) in comparison with this study. The rate of the women who physically abused their children is low in this study. This is consistent with these women's resistance to physical abuse by their husbands. On the other hand, all women in this study reported that they were physically abused but result of the study by Ari et al. (1994) showed that 20% of women who were respondents were physically abused. Therefore, being a complainant about the physical abuse may cause

women to avoid abusing their children. In addition, parent-to-child violent acts may be more acceptable than violent acts directed by husbands against wives because it is construed as an educational tool (Hortaçsu et al., 2003).

On the other hand, Hortaçsu, Kalaycıoğlu, and Rittersberger-Tılıç (2003) explained the incidence of physical abuse against children by their mothers that childrearing role of women as a result of the gender-stereotypic division of labor within the Turkish family and serving as mediators between their husbands and children may cause women to be both targets and perpetrators of violent acts.

5.7. Reason of physical abuse from the women's point of view

Most of the respondents stated that their husbands abused them because of his psychological indisposition (twenty-six women), no reason (twenty-five women), willing to prove masculinity (twenty-five women), the other people's impression on him (twenty-four women), jealousy, and his witness to violence in their family (twenty-two women). Housekeeping, unemployment and work stress were not found to be important factors by women to be abused by their husbands.

The respondent's answers showed that they did not believe in their husbands had the right to use violence against them. On the other hand, according to Gülçür and İlkaracan's (1996) research, many women (forty-three percent) reported that they believed their husbands had the 'right' to use violence against them. Moreover, none of the women said that their husbands abuse them because of the domestic works which is believed as women's obligation in patriarchal societies. Hortaçsu, Kalaycıoğlu, and Rittersberger-Tılıç (2003) found that both

the victims and perpetrators often use the gap between women's obligations and their performance to justify violence against women. As a result of their study, 30% respondents found physical aggression acceptable. This is not consistent with the findings of this study.

However, when women were asked for the excuse of their husbands for their violent acts, they reported that their husbands alleged housework, jealousy of him, women's disrespectfulness to the husband's family, lack of money, women's talking back to the him and substance use of him as a pretense. For husbands, wife's disobedience for the gender-stereotypic division of labor cause family conflict. Women's disobedience may imply that her husband is not fulfilling his role obligations, thus posing a threat to his power position (Hortaçsu et al., 2003). This threat make husband abuse their wives and husband's violent acts are justified by the society as a result of women's disobedience for gender roles. Moreover, family is a protective unit and it may be restrictive because of their protective role. Husband's desire to control wives and their aggression as the reason to keep the family together are justified by the patriarchal values dominant in Turkey (Hortaçsu et al., 2003).

Respondents found legal arrangements, education, women's economic independence on men, social services and consultancy service for the families as solution to husband's violent acts. In addition, a woman stated that cultural structure of society should be changed to eliminate violence and another woman said that women should marry with a man who women love.

5.8. Women's place of birth and physical abuse

According to the result of this study, twenty-one women were born in the Marmara Region and nineteen women were born in the Black Sea Region, eight women were born in the Central Anatolian Region, five women were born in the Eastern Anatolian Region and one each three women were born in the Aegean Region, the Mediterranean Region and the Southeastern Anatolian Region.

According to findings, the proportion of consulting the police or district attorney was higher among the women from the Black Sea Region. The characteristic of the Black Sea Region's women is known as a fighter. There is different family structure in this region because women attend their family's economic activities especially in the families that earn their living from agriculture. On the other hand, the Black Sea Region is known as the place of the Amazons, the interesting and attractive warrior women of the history. I predict that women in this region have more resources than the women in some other regions in Turkey.

All regions in Turkey have their own special social structure. For example, according to the study of Ilkkaracan (1998) in Eastern Anatolian Region, asking for help from legal institutions constituted the least-utilized type of response to the physical abuse among women in this region because they were afraid of and did not believe in government agencies because of the conflict environment. Political, economic and social problems of the region because of the conflict made difficult women to talk about their husband's violent acts.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The reasons for domestic violence against women are various and originated in the social structure. It cannot be understood by a single factor. One important factor is the patriarchal social structure and its practice in everyday life. Another important factor is the lack of ability to reach social and economic resources. The next important factor is the institutions' permission for men to use violence.

According to this study, many women who have different demographic characteristics such as age, education, income level, place of birth, job are abused and we cannot say that for example the women who are from high income level or women who are on their middle ages are not abused. However, demographic characteristics of women are important to understand what kind of women are very frequently abused or what kind of women are rarely abused by their husbands? or what kind of women are physically abused earlier than the others? Therefore, physical abuse cannot be explain only by class theory and their economical based argument, cannot be understood only by psychological explanations of liberal perspectives and cannot be explained by feminist theory and their argument about power relations in the family. Because, not only unemployed, uneducated, jealous, psychologically sick husbands abuse their wives. In addition to demographic characteristics of women and their husbands, ability of them to reach social, economical and psychological resources cause family conflict.

The results of this study indicate that women who have limited resources such as income level, education, occupational prestige and social network are high tend to experience more physical abuse from their husbands than women who have more resources. On the other hand, the women who lived in an extended family which includes family members on their husband's side are abused physically in the marriage earlier than the other women. This shows that having an extended or a nuclear family is important to be inflicted violence frequently or rarely and early or long after.

On the other hand, being supported by family members and having an extended family including family members on women's side are important to resist physical violence for women. Women who are supported by their families consult the legal institutions easier than the others. Another finding is that women who were abused rarely and who were abused later than the first year of their marriage resist to physical abuse stronger than the other women.

This study was different in term of sample group. The rate of consulting to the legal institutions is low among the abused women but in this study, nearly all women struggle to change their abusive situation. None of the women think that their husbands abuse them because of the reason related with women's behavior such as undesirable habits, disobedience, problem at housekeeping and childcare. They did not believe their husbands had the right to use violence.

Another cause can be that according to the findings, the rate of frequency of physical violence was low in this study when compared to the rate of frequency in another research in Turkey (Yüksel, 1995).

This can be explained by the Lenore Walker's (1978) conceptualization about the abused women syndrome and the notion that women who abused suffer from "learned helplessness". In this research, respondents were not hardly passive like the typical abused wife and they actively seek to help from outside because they did not learn helplessness yet.

İlkkaracan (1996) compared the findings of her study with the findings of another study by Gülçür (1995) and found that while women in Ankara rarely called the police (1 %) or filed a complaint (0 %), these were much more common responses by the immigrant women living in Berlin (20.5 % and 15.1 % respectively). For İlkkaracan, the reason of this striking difference may be that women have no faith in formal institutions in Turkey and believe that these institutions will support their violent husbands, rather than themselves. Therefore, while women in Berlin apply to a legal institution, women in Ankara do not resort to any other solution but to leave home either temporarily or permanently, or to ask for help from family and friends. However, according to my study, majority of women reported that they called police or applied to the district attorney one or more times before. Asking for help to the police or district attorney may have changed the women's life positively thus women applied again to these legal agencies.

On the other hand, this study was conducted in Bağcılar district of Istanbul. Istanbul is a metropole and Bağcılar is the fifth big district of it. In Bağcılar, women can find institutions easily to apply. In addition, violence against women is frequently discussed at the media and women learn the ways of struggle with violence. Women who participate to the TV programs because of their family problems talk about their family structure and their husband's violent acts and some

consultant give advise to the women. These programs make women feel that they are not alone and they know that there are judicial authorities where they can consult. Ilkkaracan (1996) found that When women are placed in an environment where domestic violence is acknowledged as a social problem, and where institutionalized support networks exist women do not hesitate to resist violence.

Finally, majority of women face such as pressures from their social network because women are expected to keep their family together and to continue their marriage. However, in this study many women were supported by their families to divorce and suggested to the consult the police.

According to my observations during this study, bureaucratic process is too complex and takes long time of women who consult to the police or apply to district attorney. In this process, women first apply to the police and they send women to the district attorney. District attorney takes the women's testimony. After the district attorney and police station women have to go to FMIDB to take the health report and then they have to come back to district attorney to submit the report. Women go to the court if district attorney decides to send the women to the court. Court takes long time to make a sentence. The process debilitates women. Bureaucratic process should be facilitated for women and women should be informed about the process.

The refusal of the state to intervene effectively to support women is part of the problem. The state doesn't support the women to be independent from a violent man and does not provide resources. This attitude of the state contributes to the situation in which women are exposed to violence. "Why the state does not act to protect women?" should be criticized.

A social transformation is needed to eliminate violence because it is shaped by family structure, sexist hierarchy, treatment of institutions to women, and traditional standards of judgment. One important method to eliminate violence against women is supporting women to disclose their experiences. However it is not an easy process for women. Establishing solidarity groups, forming information offices, providing abused women with medical and legal aid are all necessary steps to make the process easier for the women. Moreover, individual and marital counseling is important to help women. Counseling and special crisis centers should be established to apply treatment programs to domestic violence. Women should get help from those centers whenever needed.

REFERENCES

- Allen, C. and Straus, M.A. (1980). Resources, power and husband-wife violence. In M. Straus and G.T. Hotaling (Eds.). The Social causes of husband-wife violence (pp.188-210) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arı, M., Bayhan, P., Tuğrul, B., Üstün, E. and Akman, B. (1994). Aile İçi İlişkilerde Şiddet. In R. Karadayı et al. (Eds). Aile Kurultayı Değişim Sürecinde Aile; Toplumsal Katılım ve Demokratik Değerler (pp.300-312). Ankara, Turkey:Aile Kurumu.
- Arın, C. (1998). Kadına Yönelik Şiddet. In A.B. Hacımırzaoğlu (Eds.). 75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler (pp.201-210). Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Atkinson, M.P., Greenstein, T.N. and Monahan Lang, M. (2005). For Women, Breadwinning Can Be Dangerous: Gendered Resource Theory And Wife Abuse. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 1137–1148.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Barnett, O.W., Miller Perrin,C.L. and Perrin,R.D (1997). *Family Violence Across the Lifespan*. Sage Publication.
- Bloom, S., Wypij, D., and Das Gupta, M. (2001). Dimensions of women's autonomy and the influence on maternal health care utilization in a North Indian city. *Demography*, 38, 67-78.
- Browne, K.D. and Herbert, M. (1997). *Preventing Family Violence*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Brubaker, R. and Laitin, D.D. (1998). Ethnic and Nationalist Violence. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 423-452.
- Caplow, T. (1971). *Elementary Sociology*, N.J. Prentice Hall Inc.

- Carderelli, A. P. (1997). *Violence between Intimate Partners: Patterns, Causes, and Effects*. MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cazenave N. and Straus, M. (1979). Race, class, network embeddedness and family violence: A search for potent support systems. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 10, 3, 282-300.
- Cazenave, N.A. (1983). A Women's Place: The Attitudes of Middle-Class Black Men. Phylon, 44:1, 12-32.
- CEDAW (1992). UN Declaration on Violence against Women. Recommendation No 19, Beijing Platform for Action 1995.
- Chodorow, N. J. (1978). The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cliff, T. (1984). Class Struggle and Women's Liberation: 1980 to Today Bookmarks.
- Collins, R. (1990). Conflict Theory and the Advance of Macro-Historical Sociology. In G. Ritzer (Eds.). Frontiers of Social Theory. (pp.68-87) Columbia University Press.
- Collins, R. (1975). Conflict Sociology. New York: Academic Press.
- Conger, R.D., Elder, F.O., Lorenz, K.J., Conger, R.L., Simons, S.H., Whitbeck, S., Huck and Melby, J.N. (1990). Linking Economic Hardship to Marital Quality and Instability. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 643-56.
- Connell, R. (1995). Masculinities. Berkeley, CA.: University of California Press.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1959). Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dobash, R.E. and Dobash, R.P. (1998). Violent Men and Violent Contexts. In R.E. Dobash and R.P. Dobash (Eds.). Rethinking Violence Against Women. (pp. 141-168) London: Sage.

- Dobash, R.E. and Dobash,R. (1979). Violence Against Wives: A Case Against Patriarchy. The Free Press.
- Ergil, D. (2001). Şiddetin Kültürel Kökenleri. Bilim ve Teknik, 399, 40-41
- Esmer,Y. (1991). Algılama ve Anlatımda Eşler Arası Farklılıklar. In N. Arat (Eds.). Kadın ve Cinsellik. (pp. 97-119) Say Yayınları.
- Fagan, J.A., Stewart, D.K., and Hansen, K.V. (1983). Violent men or violent husbands? Background factors and situational correlates. In D. Finkelhor et al. (Eds.). The dark side of families (pp. 49-68). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Figueredo, A.J. and McCloskey, L.A. (1993) Sex, Money and Paternity: The Evolutionary Psychology of Domestic Violence. Ethnology and Sociobiology, 14, 353-379.
- Frieze, I., and Browne, A. (1989). Violence in marriage. In L. Ohlin and M. Tonry (Eds.). Family violence (pp.163-218). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Galtung, J. (1964). A Structural Theory of Aggression. Journal of Peace Research, 2, 15-38.
- Gelles, R. J. (1987). The violent home: A study of physical aggression between husbands and wives. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Gelles, R.J. (1985). Family Violence. Annual Review of Sociology, 11, 347-367.
- Gelles,R.J. (1974). The violent home: a study of physical aggression between husbands and wives. Beverly Hills,CA:Sage.
- Goode, W.J. (1971). Force and Violence in the Family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 624-36.
- Gordon, L. (1988). Heroes of Their Own Lives. New York:Viking.

- Gülçür, L. (1999). A Study on Domestic Violence and Sexual Abuse in Ankara, Turkey. Women for Women's Human Rights Reports. No:4.
- Hanmer, J. (1996). Women and Violence: Commonalities and Diversities. In B. Fawcett, B. Featherstone, J. Hearn, and C. Toft (Eds.). Violence and Gender Relations (pp.7-21) Sage Publications.
- Hart,B.J. (1995). Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse. <http://www.mincava.umn.edu/documents/hart/hart.html#id2304992>
- Hearn, J. (1996). Men's violence to known women: Historical, everyday and theoretical constructions by men. In B. Fawcett et al. (Eds.). Violence and Gender Relations (pp. 22-37) Sage Publications.
- Heise, L. (1992). Violence against women: The missing agenda. In M. A. Koblinsky, J. Timyan and J. Gay (Eds.), Women's health: A global perspective. (pp.171-195) Colorado: Westview Press.
- Heise, L. (1992). Fact Sheet on Gender Violence. New York: IWTC/UNIFEM Resource Center.
- Hochschild, A.R. (1989). The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Hoff, L.A. (1990). Battered women as survivors. Routledge.
- Hoffman, K.L., Demo, D.H. and Edwards, J.N. (1994). Physical Wife Abuse in a Non-Western Society: An Integrated Theoretical Approach. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56:1, 131-146.
- Hornung, C. A., McCullough, B. C., and Sugimoto, T. (1981). Status relationships in marriage, risk factors in spouse abuse. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 675-692.
- Hortaçsu, N., Kalaycıoğlu, S. and Rittersberger-Tılıç, H. (2003). Intrafamily Aggression in Turkey: Frequency, Instigation, and

- Acceptance. The Journal of Social Psychology, 143(2), 163-184.
- Hotaling, G.T. and Straus, M.A. (1980). The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence. University of Minnesota Press.
- Hotaling, G. T., and Sugarman, D. B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1, 101–123.
- Ilkcaracan, P. (1996). Domestic Violence and Family Life as Experienced by Turkish Immigrant Women in Germany. Istanbul: Women For Women's Human Rights Reports, No. 3.
- Ilkcaracan, P. (1998). Doğu Anadolu'da Kadın ve Aile. In TODAI (Eds.) 20.Yüzyılın Sonunda Kadınlar ve Gelecek Konferansı, (pp.173-192). Turkey:Tarih Vakfı.
- Ilkcaracan, P., Gülçür, L. and Arın, C. (1996). Sıcak yuva masalı: Aile İçi Şiddet ve Cinsel Taciz. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Işık,S.N. (2002). 1990'larda Kadına Yönelik Aile İçi Şiddetle Mücadele Hareketi İçinde Oluşmuş Bazı Gözlem ve Düşünceler. In A. Bora and A. Günel (Eds.) 90'larda Türkiye'de Feminizm. İletişim Yayınları.
- Johnson, M. P., and Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990's: Making Distinctions. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62(4), 948-963.
- Kalan, İ. (1998). Ailede Kadına Yönelik Şiddet ve Hukuk Düzeni. In O. Çitçi (Eds.) 20. Yüzyılın sonunda Kadınlar ve Gelecek Konferansı. (pp.103-117). TODAI, Ankara.
- Kalmuss, D.S. and Straus, M.A. (1982). Wife's Marital Dependency and Wife Abuse. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 2, 277-86.
- Kantor,G.K. and Straus, M.A. (1994). Change in spouse assault rates from 1975 to 1992: A comparison of three national surveys in the United States. Paper presented at the 13th World Congress of Sociology, Bielefeld, Germany. July 19th.

- Kardam, F. and Ecevit, Y. (2002). 1990'ların Sonunda Bir Kadın İletişim Kuruluşu:Uçan Süpürge. In A. Bora and A. Günel (Eds.) 90'larda Türkiye'de Feminizm. (pp.87-108). İletişim Yayınları.
- Koçalı, F. (2002). Kadınlara Mahsus Gazete Pazartesi. In A. Bora and A. Günel (Eds.) 90'larda Türkiye'de Feminizm. (pp.73-85). İletişim Yayınları.
- Kurst-Swanger, K. (2003). Violence in the home: multidisciplinary perspectives. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kurz, D. (1989). Social Science Perspectives on Wife Abuse: Current Debates and Future Directions. Gender and Society. 3:4, 489-505.
- Landenburger, K. (1989). A process of entrapment in and recovery from an abusive relationship. Mental Health Nursing. 3: 209–227.
- Levinson,D. (1989) Family violence in cross-cultural perspectives. Newbury Park, CA:Sage.
- Liem, R. and Liem, J.H. (1988). Psychological Effects of Unemployment on Workers and Their Families. Journal of Social Issues, 44, 87-105.
- Liker, J.K. and Elder, G.H. (1983). Economic Hardship and Marital Relations in the 1930's. American Sociological Review, 48, 343-59.
- Lilly, R.J., Cullen, F.T. and Ball, R.A. (2002). Criminological Theory. Sage Publication.
- Lindsey, L. (1990). Gender Roles: A Sociological Perspective. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Lockhart, L.L. (1987). A Reexamination of the Effects of Race and Social Class on the Incidence of Marital Violence: A Search for

- Reliable Differences. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49:3, 603-610.
- McCall, G. J., and Shields, N. M. (1986). Social and structural factors in family violence. In M. Lystad (Eds.), Violence in the home: Interdisciplinary perspectives (pp. 98–123). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- McCloskey, L.A. (1996). Socioeconomic and Coercive Power within the Family. Gender and Society, 10:4, 449-463.
- Makepeace, J. (1987). Social factor and victim-offender differences in courtship violence. Family Relations, 36, 87-91.
- NiCarthy, G. (1990). Getting Free: You Can End Abuse and Take Back Your Life. Seal Press.
- Nielsen Business Information Inc. – Family Research Institute (T.C. Başbakanlık, Aile Araştırma Kurumu) (1994). Aile içi şiddetin boyutları, nedenleri, sonuçları ve oluşum sürecinin analizi. Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Aile Araştırma Kurumu.
- O'Brien, J.E. (1971). Violence in Divorce Prone Families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33:4, 692-698.
- Pekin+5 Siyasi Deklerasyonu ve Sonuç Belgesi (2003). Pekin Deklerasyonu ve Eylem Platformu, Kadının Sttaüsü ve Sorunları Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara.
- Pence, E., Duprey, M., Paymar, M., and McDonell, C. (1985). The Justice System's Response to Domestic Assault Cases: A Guide for Policy Development. Duluth, Minnesota: Domestic Abuse Intervention Project. <http://www.duluth-model.org/>
- Petersen, R. (1980). Social Class, Social Learning, and Wife Abuse. Social Service Review, 54:3, 390.
- Peterson, D. (1991). Physically violent husbands of the 1890's and their resources. Journal of Family Violence, 6 (1), 1-15.

- Pizzey, E. (1974) Scream Quietly or the Neighbors Will Hear. Penguin Publication.
- Richardson, D. and May, H. (1999). Deserving Victims?: Sexual status and the social construction of violence. Sociological Review, 47 (2): 308-331.
- Rittersberger Tılıç, H. (1998). Aile İçi Şiddet: Bir Soyolojik Yaklaşım. In TODAI (Eds.) 20.Yüzyılın Sonunda Kadınlar ve Gelecek Konferansı, (pp.119-129). Turkey: Tarih Vakfı.
- Stanko, E.A. (2006). Theorizing about violence. Violence against women, 12:6, Sage Publication, 543-555.
- Staples, R. (1971) Toward a Sociology of the Black Family: A Decade of Theory and Research. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 119-138.
- Stark, E. And Flitcraft, A. (1996). Domestic violence and women's health. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Steinberg, L., Catalano, R. and Dooley, D. (1981). Economic antecedents of child abuse and neglect. Child Development, 52, 260-267.
- Straus, M.A. (1976). Sexual inequality, cultural norms, and wife-beating. In E. C. Viano (Eds.) Victims and Society. (pp.543-559) Washington, DC: Visage Press.
- Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J., and Steinmetz, S.K (1988). Behind Closed Doors. Sage Publications.
- T.C. Başbakanlık Kadının Statüsü ve Sorunları Genel Müdürlüğü (1998). Cumhuriyet'in 75. Yılında Türkiye'de Kadının Durumu. Takav Matbaacılık.
- Thoits, P. (1992). Identity structures and psychological well-being: Gender and marital status comparisons. Social Psychology Quarterly, 55, 236-256.

- Turner, J.H. (1974). The Structure of Sociological Theory. The Dorsey Press.
- Turpin, J. and Kurtz, L.R. (1996). The Web of Violence: From Interpersonal to Global. University of Illinois Press.
- Umberson, D., Anderson, K., Glick, J. and Shapiro, A. (1998). Domestic Violence, Personal Control, and Gender. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60, 442-452.
- Ünsal, A. (1996). Genişletilmiş bir şiddet Tipolojisi. Cogito, 6.
- User, İ., Kümbetoğlu, B. and Kolankaya, T. (2002). Şiddete İlişkin Bir Bilinç Yükseltme Çalışması. In Y. Özdek (Eds.), Yoksulluk, Şiddet ve İnsan Hakları. (pp.157-174) TODAİE.
- Viano, E. C. and Bograd, M. (1994). Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. How Battered Women and Abusive Men Account for Domestic Violence: Excuses, Justifications, or Explanations?. In D. F. Gerald, T. Hotaling, J. T. Kirkpatrick and M. A. Straus (Eds.) Coping with Family Violence: Research and Policy Perspectives (pp. 60–77). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Walby, S. (1990). Theorizing Patriarchy. Basil Blackwell.
- Walker, L.E. (1978). The Battered Woman. New York: Harper and Row.
- Warner, R.L., Lee, G.R., and Lee, J. (1986). Social organization, spousal resources, and marital power: A cross-cultural study. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 121–128.
- Weber, M. (1968). Economy and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wekerle, C., and Wolfe, D. A. (1999). Dating violence in mid-adolescence: Theory, significance, and emerging prevention initiatives. Clinical Psychology Review, 19:4, 435-456.

- Wolfner, G.D., and Gelles, R.J. (1993). A profile of violence toward children: A national study. Child Abuse and Neglect, 17, 197-212.
- Woods, S. J., and Campbell, J.C. (1993). Post traumatic stress in battered women: Does the diagnosis fit?. Mental Health Nursing, 14, 173–186.
- World Health Organization (2005). World Health Organization violence prevention activities, 2000-2004. www.unesco.org
- Yllö, K.A. (1993). Through a feminist lens: Gender, power, and violence. In R.J. Gelles and D.R. Loseke (Eds.), Current controversies on family violence (pp.47-62) Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Yllö, K. and Bograd, M. (1988). Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse. Newbury Park, CA:Sage.
- Yllö, K.A. and Straus, M. (1981). Interpersonal Violence among Married and Cohabiting Couples. Family Relations, 30:3, 339-347.
- Yüksel, Ş . (1995). Eş dayacağı ve dayağa karşı dayanışma kampanyası. In Ş. Tekeli (Eds.) Kadın bakış açısından 1980'ler Türkiye'sinde kadın. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Appendix A: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 1. Demographic profiles of respondents

Ages of women	Number of respondents
18-25	17
26-35	22
36-45	14
45 üstü	5

Education level of women	Number of respondents
Illiterate	4
No formal education	10
Primary School	25
Middle School	8
High School	10
University	1

Occupations of women	Number of respondents
Housewife	34
Worked in the past but not now	5
Civil servant	1
Working at private sector	10
Has own work	2
Works periodically	1
Works without insurance	4

*One respondent was omitted because of missing data on this item.

Income level of family	Number of respondents
500,00 YTL and under	9
Between 500,00 - 1.000,00 YTL	22
Between 1.000,00-2.000,00 YTL	8
Between 2.000,00-3.000,00 YTL	4
Over 3.000,00 YTL	8

*Seven respondents were omitted because of missing data on this item.

Number of children	Number of respondents
No children	10
1 child	17
2 children	16
3 and above	13

*Two respondents were omitted because of missing data on this item.

Years of Marriage	Number of respondents
Below 1 year	11
Between 1-5 years	7
Between 5-10 years	12
Between 10-15 years	12
15 years and above	12

*Four respondents were omitted because of missing data on this item.

How respondents got married	Number of respondents
Marriage arranged by family	24
Runaway marriage	10
Met each other independently	18
Marriage by some other way (e.g.marriage by kidnapping)	6

Appendix B: Questionnaire in English

This form includes 98 questions. Please read the following questions and choices carefully and complete the form.

- 1) Date of birth?.....
 - 2) Place of birth?.....
 - 3) How long have you been living in Istanbul?
.....
 - 4) Why did you come to Istanbul? (Please don't answer the question if you were born in Istanbul)
 1. To find a job
 2. For education
 3. My relatives live here
 4. Other.....
 - 5) What is your education level?
 1. No formal education
 2. Primary School
 3. Secondary School
 4. High School
 5. Two-years university
 6. University
 7. Other.....
 - 6) Are you working? (You can choose one or more answer)
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Unemployed
 4. Retired
 5. Other.....
- You should answer question 7, 8 and 9 only if you work
- 7) How many hours are you working in a day?
 1. Less than 4 hours
 2. 4-6 hours
 3. 6-8 hours
 4. 8-10 hours
 5. 10-12 hours
 6. More than 12 hours
 - 8) What is your occupation?
 - 9) What about your earnings in comparison with your husband's?
 1. Equal with my husband's
 2. More than my husband's
 3. Less than my husband's
 - 10) Do you have social security?
 1. No
 2. Green card
 3. SSK
 4. Bağkur
 5. Retirement fund
 6. My husband's social security (SSK, Bağkur vs.)
 7. Private social security
 8. Other.....
 - 11) How many people work in your family?

- | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Nobody | 4. My husband and me |
| 2. Only my husband | 5. My husband, me and our children |
| 3. Only me | 6. Other..... |

12) Do you have extra income? (For example rental income, farming income, income from your family)

.....

13) What is your family's income level? (Total amount of all workers and extra income in the family)

- | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1. less than 500 YTL | 4. 1.000 -2.000 YTL |
| 2. 500 – 750 YTL | 5. 2.000 -3.000 YTL |
| 3. 750 - 1.000 YTL | 6. more than 3.000 YTL |

14) Do you have children?

- | | |
|---------------|---------------|
| 1. No | 4. 3 children |
| 2. 1 child | 5. 4 or more |
| 3. 2 children | |

15) Who are living in your home? (You can choose one or more answer.)

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Our child/children | 6. My mother |
| 2. My husband's mother | 7. My father |
| 3. My husband's father | 8. My sibling/siblings |
| 4. My husband's sibling/siblings | 9. My relative/relatives |
| 5. My husband's relative/relatives | 10. Other..... |

16) Where do you live?.....

17) Which kind of house do you live in?

- | | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| 1. Slum house | 3. Apartment |
| 2. Detached house | 4. Other..... |

18) Is it your own house?

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 1. Yes | 3. Apartment or house provided by employee |
| 2. Rent | 4. Other..... |

19) Do you have relatives who live near your home? (You can choose one or more answer.)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. No | 6. My father |
| 2. My husband's mother | 7. My sibling/siblings |
| 3. My husband's father | 8. Other..... |
| 4. My husband's sibling/siblings | |
| 5. My mother | |

20) Do you see these relatives?

- | | |
|---------------|-----------|
| 1. Frequently | 3. Rarely |
| 2. Sometimes | 4. No |

21) Where do you stay now?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. I stay alone | 5. In a shelter |
| 2. With my husband in our home | 6. My friend's home |
| 3. My family's home | 7. Other..... |
| 4. My relative's home | |

- 22) Your husband's date of birth?.....
- 23) Your husband's place of birth?.....
- 24) How long has your husband been living in Istanbul?.....
- 25) Why did your husband come to Istanbul? (Please don't answer the question if your husband was born in Istanbul)
- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| a) To find a job | d) Other..... |
| b) For education | . |
| c) His relatives live here | |
- 26) What is your husband's education level?
- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. No formal education | 5. Two-years university |
| 2. Primary School | 6. University |
| 3. Secondary School | 7. Other..... |
| 4. High School | |
- 27) Is your husband working? (You can choose one or more answer)
- | | |
|---------------|---------------|
| 1. Yes | 4. Retired |
| 2. No | 5. Other..... |
| 3. Unemployed | |
- You should answer questions 28 and 29 only if your husband works
- 28) What is your husband's occupation?
- 29) How many hours is your husband working in a day?
- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Less than 4 hours | 4. 8-10 hours |
| 2. 4-6 hours | 5. 10-12 hours |
| 3. 6-8 hours | 6. More than 12 hours |
- 30) Does your husband have social security?
- | | |
|---------------|----------------------------|
| 1. No | 5. Retirement fund |
| 2. Green card | 6. Private social security |
| 3. SSK | 7. Other..... |
| 4. Bağkur | |
- 31) Are your parents alive?
- | | |
|----------------|----------------|
| 1. Yes | 3. Only mother |
| 2. Only father | 4. No |
- 32) What are your parent's education level?
- | | |
|----------------|----------------|
| 1. Mother..... | 2. Father..... |
|----------------|----------------|
- 33) Are your husband's parents alive?
- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Yes | 3. Only his mother |
| 2. Only his father | 4. No |
- 34) What are your husband's parent's education level?
- | | |
|----------------|----------------|
| 1. Mother..... | 2. Father..... |
|----------------|----------------|
- 35) When did you marry?.....

- 36) How old were you when you got married?.....
- 37) How old was your husband when you got married?.....
- 38) How many times did you get married?.....
- 39) How many times did your husband get married?.....
- 40) How did you get married?
- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 1. Arranged by families | 4. Marriage by kidnapping |
| 2. Runaway marriage | 5. Other..... |
| 3. Marriage arranged by individual partner and parent's approval | |
- 41) Do you have a civil marriage act?
- | | |
|--------|-------|
| 1. Yes | 2. No |
|--------|-------|
- 42) Are you relatives with your husband?
- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. No | 3. Distant relative |
| 2. Close relative | 4. Families know each other |
- 43) Is there any marriage between your siblings and your husband's siblings?
- | | |
|--------|-------|
| 1. Yes | 2. No |
|--------|-------|
- 44) If there is, please explain.....
- 45) Were you exposed to violence in your childhood?
- | | |
|---------------|----------------|
| 1. No | 4. Rarely |
| 2. Frequently | 5. Very rarely |
| 3. Sometimes | |
- 46) If you were exposed to violence in your childhood, who did it? (You can choose one or more answer)
- | | |
|---------------|-----------------|
| 1. My father | 4. My sister |
| 2. My mother | 5. My relatives |
| 3. My brother | 6. Other..... |
- 47) Which of the following do you consider as violence? (You can choose one or more answer.)
- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Using abusive language | 10. Jolting |
| 2. Throwing something at someone | 11. Biting |
| 3. Slapping | 12. Throttling |
| 4. Kicking | 13. Threatening with gun or knife |
| 5. Pulling hair | 14. Jogging |
| 6. Forcing sex | 15. Expelling |
| 7. Shouting | 16. Seizing money |
| 8. To intimidate | 17. Other..... |
| 9. Harming with a tool | . |
- 48) Does your father use violence against your mother?
- | | |
|--------|-------|
| 1. Yes | 2. No |
|--------|-------|
- 49) Is there violence between your husband's family member?
- | | |
|--------|-------|
| 1. Yes | 2. No |
|--------|-------|

50) If there is, please specify.....

51) Does your husband's family expose violence against you? (You can choose one or more answer.)

- | | |
|-------------------|------------------|
| 1. No | 5. His sister(s) |
| 2. His father | 6. His relatives |
| 3. His mother | 7. Other..... |
| 4. His brother(s) | |

52) Who else does your husband expose to violence other than you? (You can choose one or more answer)

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| 1. No | 8. Against strangers |
| 2. Against his mother | 9. Against our children |
| 3. Against his father | 10. Against himself (i.e to strike to a wall, to cut himself with knife) |
| 4. Against his relatives | 11. Other..... |
| 5. Against his friends | |
| 6. Against his colleagues | |
| 7. Against acquaintances | |

53) Did you tell anyone about the violence that your husband inflicted against you? (You can choose one or more answer.)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. No | 7. I told to my neighbor(s) |
| 2. I told to my mother | 8. I told to Police |
| 3. I told to my father | 9. I told to doctor |
| 4. I told to my brother/sister | 10. Other..... |
| 5. I told to my relative(s) | |
| 6. I told to my friend(s) | |

54) What did they advise you to do? (You can choose one or more answer.)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. They talked with my husband | 6. Suggested I consult police |
| 2. Advised me to divorce | 7. They said I could stay in their homes |
| 3. Reminded me that I have children | 8. Other..... |
| 4. Upset, but could not do anything | |
| 5. Said these kind of things happen in every family | |

55) How does your husband's violence affect you? (You can choose one or more answer)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. I have a physical indisposition | 7. I cannot express myself |
| 2. I cannot meet with my family | 8. I live in fear constantly |
| 3. I cannot meet with my friend(s) | 9. I cannot pay attention to my children |
| 4. I have difficulties to go to my work | 10. I am depressed |
| 5. I cannot meet with my neighbour(s) | 11. I cannot sleep |
| 6. I feel myself degraded | 12. I am anxious about my kid(s) |
| | 13. I feel guilty |

56) According to you, why does he inflict violence against you? (You can choose one or more answer.)

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 1. Without any reason | 6. Because, he is adversely affected by others |
| 2. Because he is depressed. | 7. Because of his witness to violence in the family |
| 3. Because of housekeeping | 8. To prove masculinity |
| 4. Because of unemployment | |
| 5. Because of alcohol | |

- | | |
|--|---|
| 9. Because of my attitudes | 14. Because of my relations with his family |
| 10. Because of his anger to others | 15. Because of different religion |
| 11. Because of jealousy | 16. Other..... |
| 12. Because of work stress | |
| 13. Because of another woman in his life | |

57) What is his excuse in order to inflict violence against you?

.....

58) When did your husband first begin to inflict violence against you?

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Before marriage (i.e. when we were engaged) | 4. Between the first year and fifth year of marriage |
| 2. In the first days of marriage | 5. 5 years after we got married |
| 3. In the first year of marriage | |

59) Did your husband's attitudes change after you had a baby?

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Become more severe | 4. Other..... |
| 2. Become more positive | . |
| 3. No, they did not change | |

60) How often does your husband inflict violence against you?

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Every day | 5. Once in a month |
| 2. More than once in a week | 6. More than once in a year |
| 3. Once in a week | 7. Once in a year. |
| 4. More than once in a month | 8. More rarely |

61) What is your response when your husband inflicts violence against you? (You can choose one or more answer.)

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. I do nothing | 5. I go to my family |
| 2. I go to a women's shelter | 6. I go to my relatives/friends |
| 3. I consult the Police | 7. Other..... |
| 4. I consult the district attorney | .. |

62) How many times did you consult the police or district attorney before?

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. I never consulted | 5. Four times |
| 2. Once | 6. Five to ten times |
| 3. Two times | 7. Other..... |
| 4. Three times | |

63) Did you think to divorce in the past?

- | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Yes I did | together again |
| 2. No I did not | 4. I was divorced |
| 3. We went to court but came | |

64) Do you think to divorce now?

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| 1. Yes I think | 3. We are waiting for the courts to decide |
| 2. No I do not | 4. I was divorced |

65) Was it necessary to go to the hospital because of the violence against you?

- | | |
|--------|-------|
| 1. Yes | 2. No |
|--------|-------|

66) How is your husband's behavior against you after he inflicted violence?

.....
.....

67) Does your husband use abusive language at you?

- | | |
|--------------|-----------|
| 1. Often | 3. Seldom |
| 2. Sometimes | 4. No |

68) Does your husband threaten you?

- | | |
|--------------|-----------|
| 1. Often | 3. Seldom |
| 2. Sometimes | 4. No |

69) Under which circumstances your husband does not inflict violence against you?

.....
.....

70) According to you, what should be done to eliminate the violence against women?

.....
.....

71) Do you feel yourself secure when you are with your husband?

- | | |
|--------|-------|
| 1. Yes | 2. No |
|--------|-------|

72) Does your husband use drug, alcohol, medicine or any other substance?(You can choose one or more answer)

- | | |
|------------|---------------|
| 1. No | 4. Thinner |
| 2. Alcohol | 5. Other..... |
| 3. Drug | |

73) Which frequency?

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Everyday | 4. Once in a month |
| 2. Once in a couple of days | 5. Seldom |
| 3. Once in a week | 6. Other..... |

74) Does your husband inflict violence against you outside the house? (You can choose one or more answer.)

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Yes, in my family's house | 4. Yes, in my work place |
| 2. Yes, in his family's house | 5. No |
| 3. Yes, in the street. | 6. Other..... |

75) Did you consult/receive any help from the followings because of the violence against you? (You can choose one or more answer.)

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Family | 6. Psychologist |
| 2. Friends | 7. Women's shelter |
| 3. Police | 8. No, I did not consult anywhere |
| 4. District attorney-lawyer | 9. Other..... |
| 5. Doctor | |

76) If you did not consult anyone until now, what is the reason for it? (You can choose one or more answer)

1. I don't know where they are
2. They are far away
3. I am ashamed
4. I am afraid of my husband

5. I am afraid of losing my children/child
6. I am afraid of losing my husbands' economic support
7. I feel that they do not consider me seriously
8. I think that they can not solve my problem
9. I do not want to leave my husband
10. I do not want to take help
11. Other.....

77) How do you respond to your child (or future child) if he/she does something that you do not approve of? (You can choose one or more answer.)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. I tell him/her not to do it | 6. I throw something |
| 2. I complain to his/her father | 7. I beat |
| 3. I close him/her to room | 8. I cut his/her pocket money |
| 4. I shout | 9. Other..... |
| 5. I slap | |

78) What is your religion?

- | | |
|--------------|---------------|
| 1. Muslim | 3. Jew |
| 2. Christian | 4. Other..... |

Answer the followings by choosing only one answer please

79) My husband is jealous of me

- 1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

80) My husband does not like my meetings with my family

- 1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

81) My husband does not like my meetings with my friends

- 1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

82) My husband does not like my going outside

- 1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

83) My husband wants to know where I am and who am I with

- 1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

84) At home, my husband makes decisions

- 1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

85) My husband's job is stressful

- 1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

86) My husband frequently changes his job

- 1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

87) My husband has economic distress

- 1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

88) My husband has psychiatric problems

- 1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

89) My husband despises me

- 1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

90) I am bound to my husband economically
1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

91) My husband harms the people around me
1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

92) At home my husband is the authority
1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

93) At home I am the authority
1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

94) I love my husband
1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

95) My husband is religious
1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

96) I am religious
1)Very() 2)Fairly() 3)Little() 4)Never()

97) What do you advise the women who are in the same position as you?

.....
.....
.....

98) Is there anything else you want to add?

.....
.....

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS.

Appendix C: Questionnaire in Turkish

Bu anket formu 98 sorudan oluşmaktadır. Lütfen soruları ve şıklarını dikkatli bir şekilde okuyup size uygun olan cevabı yada cevapları işaretleyiniz.

- 1) Doğum tarihiniz?.....
- 2) Doğum yeriniz?.....
- 3) Eğer İstanbul dışında doğduysanız İstanbul'a ne zaman geldiniz?
.....
- 4) İstanbul'a gelme nedeniniz nedir? (Doğum yeriniz İstanbul ise bu soruyu cevaplamayın)
 1. İş bulmak amacıyla
 2. Eğitim amacıyla
 3. Akrabalarımız burada olduğu için
 4. Diğer.....
- 5) Eğitim durumunuz?
 1. Okuma Yazma bilmiyorum
 2. İlkokul mezunuyum
 3. Ortaokul mezunuyum
 4. Lise mezunuyum
 5. Meslek Yüksek okulu mezunuyum
 6. Üniversite mezunuyum
 7. Diğer
- 6) Çalışıyor musunuz? (Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)
 1. Evet çalışıyorum
 2. Hayır çalışmıyorum
 3. İşsizim
 4. Emekliyim
 5. Diğer.....
- 7, 8 ve 9. soruları çalışanların cevaplama gerektirir.
- 7) Günde kaç saat çalışıyorsunuz?
 1. Günde 4 saatten az çalışıyorum
 2. 4-6 saat arası çalışıyorum
 3. 6-8 saat arası çalışıyorum
 4. 8-10 saat arası çalışıyorum
 5. 10-12 saat arası çalışıyorum
 6. 12 saatten fazla çalışıyorum
- 8) Mesleğiniz nedir?
- 9) Kazancınız eşinizin kazancıyla kıyaslandığında nasıldır?
 1. Eşimle aynı
 2. Eşimden çok kazanıyorum
 3. Eşimden az kazanıyorum
- 10) Sosyal güvenceniz var mı?
 1. Hayır yok
 2. Yeşil kart
 3. SSK
 4. Bağkur
 5. Emekli Sandığı
 6. Eşimden dolayı sosyal güvencem var (SSK, Bağkur vs.)
 7. Özel Sigorta
 8. Diğer.....
- 11) Ailede kimler çalışıyor?
 1. Ailede çalışan yok
 2. Sadece eşim çalışıyor
 3. Sadece ben çalışıyorum

4. Eşim ve ben çalışıyorum
5. Eşim, ben ve kızımız/oğlumuz çalışıyor
6. Diğer.....

12) Ek geliriniz var mı?(Örneğin kira geliriniz, tarladan geliriniz, annenizden-babanızdan size bağlanan maaş gibi)

.....

.....

13) Ailenizin aylık gelir düzeyi nedir?(çalışanların maaşlarının ve ek gelirlerin toplamı)

1. 500 YTL'nin altında
2. 500 – 750 YTL arası
3. 750 - 1.000 YTL arası
4. 1.000 -2.000 YTL arası
5. 2.000 -3.000 YTL arası
6. 3.000 YTL'nin üstünde

14) Çocuğunuz var mı?

1. Hayır yok
2. 1 tane var
3. 2 tane var
4. 3 tane var
5. 4 ve daha çok

15) Eşinizle birlikte oturduğunuz evde sizin dışınızda kimler yaşıyor? (Kaç kişi yaşıyorsa o kadar şık işaretleyiniz)

1. Çocuğumuz/çocuklarımız
2. Eşimin annesi
3. Eşimin babası
4. Eşimin kardeşi/kardeşleri
5. Eşimin akrabası/akrabaları
6. Annem
7. Babam
8. Kardeşim/kardeşlerim
9. Akrabam/akrabalarım
10. Diğer
-

16) Hangi semtte yaşıyorsunuz?.....

17) Nasıl bir evde oturuyorsunuz?

1. Gecekonuda
2. Müstakil evde
3. Apartman dairesinde
4. Diğer.....

18) Eviniz kendinizin mi?

1. Evet
2. Hayır kira
3. Lojman
4. Diğer.....

19) Oturduğunuz apartmanda ya da yakın çevrenizde akrabanız var mı?(Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)

1. Hayır yok
2. Eşimin annesi var
3. Eşimin babası var
4. Eşimin kardeşi/kardeşleri var
5. Annem var
6. Babam var
7. Kardeşim/kardeşlerim var
8. Diğer.....

20) Bu kişilerle görüşüyor musunuz?

1. Sık sık görüşüyorum
2. Bazen görüşüyorum
3. Seyrek görüşüyorum
4. Görüşmüyorum

21) Şu anda nerede kalıyorsunuz?

1. Eşimden ayrı bir evde kalıyorum
2. Eşimle birlikte yaşadığımız evde kalıyorum
3. Ailemin yanında kalıyorum
4. Akrabalarımın yanında kalıyorum
5. Sığınma evinde kalıyorum

6. Arkadaşımda kalıyorum
7. Diğer.....
- 22) Eşinizin doğum tarihi?.....
- 23) Eşinizin doğum yeri?.....
- 24) Eşiniz İstanbul'a ne zaman gelmiş?..... (Eşiniz İstanbul doğumluysa bu soruyu cevaplamayın)
- 25) Eşinizin İstanbul'a gelme nedeni nedir? (Eşiniz İstanbul Doğumluysa bu soruyu cevaplamayın)
1. İş bulmak amacıyla
2. Eğitim amacıyla
3. Akrabaları burada olduğu için
4. Diğer.....
- 26) Eşinizin eğitim durumu?
1. Okuma Yazma bilmiyor
2. İlkokul mezunu
3. Ortaokul mezunu
4. Lise mezunu
5. Meslek Yüksek okulu mezunu
6. Üniversite mezunu
7. Diğer
- 27) Eşiniz çalışıyor mu?
1. Evet çalışıyor
2. Hayır çalışmıyor
3. İşsiz
4. Emekli
5. Diğer.....
- 28 ve 29. soruları eşleri çalışanların cevaplaması gerekmektedir.
- 28) Eşinizin mesleği nedir?
- 29) Eşiniz günde kaç saat çalışıyor?
1. Günde 4 saatten az çalışıyor
2. 4-6 saat arası çalışıyor
3. 6-8 saat arası çalışıyor
4. 8-10 saat arası çalışıyor
5. 10-12 saat arası çalışıyor
6. 12 saatten fazla çalışıyor
- 30) Eşinizin sosyal güvencesi var mı?
1. Hayır yok
2. Yeşil kart
3. SSK
4. Bağkur
5. Emekli Sandığı
6. Özel Sigorta
7. Diğer.....
- 31) Anneniz ve babanız hayattalar mı?
1. Evet her ikisi de hayattalar
2. Sadece babam hayatta
3. Sadece annem hayatta
4. Her ikisi de hayatta değil
- 32) Ailenizin eğitim durumu?
1. Annenizin.....
2. Babanızın.....
- 33) Eşinizin annesi ve babası hayatta mı?
1. Evet her ikisi de hayattalar
2. Sadece babası hayatta
3. Sadece annesi hayatta
4. Her ikisi de hayatta değil
- 34) Eşinizin ailesinin eğitim durumu?
1. Annesinin.....
2. Babasının.....
- 35) Kaç yıldır evlisiniz?.....

- 36) Kaç yaşında evlendiniz?.....
- 37) Evlendiğinizde eşiniz kaç yaşındaydı?.....
- 38) Kaçınıcı evliliğiniz?.....
- 39) Eşinizin kaçınıcı evliliği?.....
- 40) Nasıl evlendiniz?
- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| 1. Görücü usulüyle evlendim | 4. Kaçırılarak evlendim |
| 2. Kaçarak evlendim | 5. Diğer..... |
| 3. Anlaşarak ve ailemin rızasıyla evlendim | |
- 41) Resmi nikahınız var mı?
- | | |
|-------------|--------------|
| 1. Evet var | 2. Hayır yok |
|-------------|--------------|
- 42) Eşinizle akraba mısınız?
- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1. Yakın akrabayız | 4. Akraba değiliz |
| 2. Uzak akrabayız | 5. Akraba değiliz ama ailelerimiz birbirini yakından tanıyor |
| 3. Hemşeriyiz | |
- 43) Eşinizin ve sizin kardeşleriniz arasında birbiriyle evli olan var mı?
- | | |
|-------------|--------------|
| 1. Evet var | 2. Hayır yok |
|-------------|--------------|
- 44) Varsa kimler?.....
- 45) Çocukken şiddet gördünüz mü?
- | | |
|------------|---------------|
| 1. Hayır | 4. Seyrek |
| 2. Sık sık | 5. Çok seyrek |
| 3. Bazen | |
- 46) Çocukken şiddet gördüyseniz kim/kimlerden gördüğünüzü işaretleyiniz? (Birden fazla şık işaretleyebilirsiniz)
- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Babamdan | 5. Akrabam/akrabalarım |
| 2. Annemden | 6. Diğer..... |
| 3. Abim/erkek kardeşimden | |
| 4. Kız kardeşimden | |
- 47) Aşağıdakilerden hangisini/hangilerini şiddet olarak görüyorsunuz?(Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Küfür etmek | 11. Isırmak |
| 2. Karşıdakine bir şey fırlatmak | 12. Boğazını sıkmak |
| 3. Tokat atmak | 13. Silahla ya da herhangi bir aletle tehdit etmek |
| 4. Tekme atmak | 14. Dürtüklemek/Çimdiklemek |
| 5. Saçını çekmek | 15. Kovmak |
| 6. Cinsel ilişkiye zorlamak | 16. Para vermemek/parasına el koymak |
| 7. Bağırarak | 17. Diğer..... |
| 8. Tehdit etmek | |
| 9. Bir alet kullanarak zarar vermek | |
| 10. Sarsmak | |
- 48) Babanız annenize şiddet uygular mı/mıydı?

1. Evet
2. Hayır
- 49) Eşinizin ailesinde şiddet var mı?
1. Evet var
2. Hayır yok
- 50) Varsa kimler arasında?.....
- 51) Eşinizin ailesi size şiddet uyguluyor mu? (Birden fazla şık işaretleyebilirsiniz)
1. Hayır uygulamıyor
2. Babası uyguluyor
3. Annesi uyguluyor
4. Erkek kardeşi/kardeşleri uyguluyor
5. Kız kardeşi/kardeşleri uyguluyor
6. Akrabaları uyguluyor
7. Diğer.....
- 52) Eşiniz sizin dışınızda başka kimseye şiddet uyguluyor mu? (Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)
1. Hayır uygulamıyor
2. Annesine
3. Babasına
4. Akrabalarına
5. Arkadaşlarına
6. İş yerindeki arkadaşlarına
7. Tanıdık ama aileden olmayan kişilere
8. Yabancılara
9. Çocuklarınıza
10. Kendi kendine(örneğin duvara yumruk atmak, kendini jiletlemek gibi)
11. Diğer.....
- 53) Eşinizin size şiddet uyguladığından kimseye bahsettiniz mi?
1. Hayır bahsetmedim
2. Anneme bahsettim
3. Babama bahsettim
4. Kardeşime/Kardeşlerime bahsettim
5. Akrabama/Akrabalarım bahsettim
6. Arkadaşıma/arkadaşlarıma bahsettim
7. Komşularım bahsettim
8. Polise bahsettim
9. Doktora bahsettim
10. Diğer.....
- 54) Size ne gibi önerilerde bulundular? (Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)
1. Eşimle konuştular
2. Ayrılmamı söylediler
3. Çocuklarım olduğunu hatırlattılar
4. Üzüldüler ama bir şey yapmadılar
5. Böyle şeylerin her ailede olabileceğini söylediler
6. Polise gitmemi söylediler
7. Evlerinde kalabileceğimi söylediler
8. Diğer.....
- 55) Eşinizin size şiddet uygulaması sizi nasıl etkiliyor? (Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)
1. Bedensel rahatsızlıklarım var
2. Ailemle görüşemiyorum
3. Arkadaşlarımla görüşemiyorum
4. İşime gitmekte zorlanıyorum
5. Komşularım ile görüşemiyorum
6. Kendimi aşağılanmış hissediyorum
7. Kendimi ifade edemiyorum
8. Sürekli korku içinde yaşıyorum
9. Çocuklarımla ilgilenemiyorum
10. Psikolojim bozuluyor
11. Uyuyamıyorum
12. Çocuğum/Çocuklarım için endişeleniyorum
13. Kendimi suçlu hissediyorum
- 56) Sizce eşiniz neden şiddet uyguluyor? (Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)
1. Sebepsiz yere
2. Psikolojik rahatsızlığı olduğu için

3. Ev işleriyle ilgilenmediğimi düşündüğü için
4. İşsiz olduğu için
5. Alkol aldığı için
6. Başkalarının etkisinde kaldığı için
7. Ailesinden böyle gördüğü için
8. Erkek olduğunu ispatlamak için
9. Benim davranışlarım yüzünden
10. Başkalarına kızdığı için
11. Kıskanç olduğu için
12. Çalışma hayatında yaşadığı stres yüzünden
13. Hayatında başka bir kadın olduğu için
14. Ailesiyle ilişkilerimi beğenmediği için
15. Aramızdaki dinsel/mezhep farklılıklarından dolayı
16. Diğer.....

57) Eşiniz şiddet uygulamak için ne bahane gösteriyor?

.....
.....

58) Eşiniz ilk ne zaman size şiddet uyguladı?

1. Evlenmeden önce(örneğin nişanlıyken)
2. Evliliğimizin ilk günlerinde
3. Evlendikten sonraki ilk 1 sene içinde
4. Evlendikten sonraki 1. ve 5. seneler arasında
5. Evlendikten 5 sene ve daha fazla süre sonra
6. Diğer.....

59) Çocuğunuz olduktan sonra eşinizin size karşı davranışları değişti mi?

1. Davranışları daha sert oldu
2. Davranışları daha olumlu oldu
3. Hayır değişmedi
4. Diğer.....

60) Ne sıklıkta şiddete maruz kalıyorsunuz?

1. Her gün
2. Haftada birden fazla
3. Haftada bir
4. Ayda birden fazla
5. Ayda bir
6. Yılda birden fazla
7. Yılda bir
8. Daha seyrek

61) Eşiniz size şiddet uyguladığında ne tepki veriyorsunuz?(Birden fazla şık işaretleyebilirsiniz)

1. Hiçbirşey yapmıyorum
2. Sığınma evine gidiyorum
3. Polise başvuruyorum
4. Savcıya başvuruyorum
5. Ailemin yanına gidiyorum
6. Arkadaşlarıma/akrabalarımaya gidiyorum
7. Diğer.....
...

62) Daha önce polise ya da savcıya kaç kez başvurduunuz?

1. Hiç başvurmam
2. 1 kez başvurdum
3. 2 kez başvurdum
4. 3 kez başvurdum
5. 4 kez başvurdum
6. 5-10 kez başvurdum
7. Daha fazla başvurdum

63) Geçmişte eşinizden ayrılmayı düşündünüz mü?

1. Evet düşündüm
2. Hayır düşünmedim
3. Mahkemeye başvurup sonra barıştık
4. Boşandık

64) Şu anda eşinizden ayrılmayı düşünüyor musunuz?

1. Evet düşünüyorum
2. Hayır düşünmüyorum
3. Şu anda mahkememiz devam ediyor

4. Eşimden boşandım

65) Daha önce uğradığınız şiddet nedeniyle hastaneye başvurmanız gerekti mi?

1. Evet gerekti 2. Hayır gerekmedi

66) Eşiniz şiddet uyguladıktan sonra nasıl davranıyor?

.....
.....

67) Eşiniz size küfür eder mi?

1. Evet sık sık eder 3. Evet nadiren eder
2. Evet bazen eder 4. Hayır etmez

68) Eşiniz sizi tehdit eder mi?

1. Evet sık sık eder 3. Evet nadiren eder
2. Evet bazen eder 4. Hayır etmez

69) Ne olsaydı eşiniz size şiddet uygulamazdı?

.....
.....

70) Sizce kadınlara yönelik şiddeti engellemek için ne yapmak gerekir?

.....
.....

71) Eşinizin yanındayken kendinizi güvende/emniyette hissediyor musunuz?

1. Evet hissediyorum 2. Hayır hissetmiyorum

72) Eşiniz alkol, uyuşturucu, ilaç gibi herhangi bir madde kullanıyor mu? (Birden fazla şık işaretleyebilirsiniz)

1. Hayır kullanmıyor 4. Bali ve/veya tiner kullanıyor
2. Alkol kullanıyor 5. Diğer.....
3. Uyuşturucu kullanıyor

73) Hangi sıklıkta kullanıyor?

1. Hergün kullanıyor 4. Ayda bir kullanıyor
2. 2-3 günde bir kullanıyor 5. Daha seyrek kullanıyor
3. Haftada bir kullanıyor 6. Diğer.....

74) Eşiniz evin dışında size şiddet uyguluyor mu?

1. Hayır uygulamıyor 4. Sokakta uyguluyor
2. Ailemin evinde uyguluyor 5. İş yerimde uyguluyor
3. Kendi ailesinin evinde uyguluyor 6. Diğer.....

75) Eşinizden şiddet görmenez nedeniyle aşağıdaki yerlerden herhangi birinden yardım istediniz mi? /aldınız mı?

1. Ailemden istedim 5. Doktordan istedim
2. Arkadaşlarımdan istedim 6. Psikologdan istedim
3. Polisten istedim 7. Kadın sığınma evinden istedim
4. Savcılıktan – Avukattan istedim 8. Hayır istemedim
9. Diğer.....

76) Eğer şimdiye kadar hiç bir yerden yardım almadıysanız bunun nedeni nedir? (Birden fazla şık işaretleyebilirsiniz)

1. Nerede olduklarını bilmiyorum
2. Çok uzaktalar
3. Utanıyorum
4. Eşimden korkuyorum
5. Çocuğumu/çocuklarımı kaybetmekten korkuyorum
6. Eşimin sağladığı ekonomik desteği kaybetmekten korkuyorum
7. Beni ciddiye almayacaklarını düşünüyorum
8. Benim sorunumu çözemeyeceklerini düşünüyorum
9. Eşimden ayrılmak istemiyorum
10. Yardım almak istemiyorum
11. Diğer.....

77) Çocuğunuz (varsa ya da olduğunda) istemediğiniz birşey yaparsa ona nasıl tepki veririrsiniz? (Birden fazla şık işaretleyebilirsiniz)

1. Yapmaması gerektiğini söylerim
2. Babasına şikayet ederim
3. Odaya kapatırım
4. Bağırırım
5. Tokat atarım
6. Birşey fırlatırım
7. Döverim
8. Harçlığını keserim
9. Diğer.....

78) Dininiz nedir?

1. Müslümanım
2. Hristiyanım
3. Museviyim
4. Diğer.....

Lütfen aşağıdaki sorulara yalnızca bir şikkı işaretleyerek cevap veriniz

- 79) Eşim kıskançtır ve beni kıskanır 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 80) Eşim ailemle görüşmemi istemez 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 81) Eşim arkadaşlarımla görüşmemi istemez 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 82) Eşim evden dışarı çıkmamı istemez 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 83) Eşim nerede ve kiminle olduğumu bilmek ister 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 84) Evde kararları eşim alır 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 85) Eşimin işi streslidir 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 86) Eşim sık sık iş değiştirir 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 87) Eşimin ekonomik sıkıntıları vardır 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 88) Eşimin psikolojik sorunları vardır 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 89) Eşim beni küçümser 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 90) Ekonomik olarak eşime bağımlıyım 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 91) Eşim çevremdeki insanlara zarar verir 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 92) Evde eşimin sözü geçer 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()

- 93) Evde benim sözüm geçer 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 94) Eşimi seviyorum 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 95) Eşim dinine bağlı bir insandır 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()
- 96) Ben dinime bağlı bir insanım 1)Çok() 2)Oldukça() 3)Az() 4)Hiç()

97) Sizinle aynı durumdaki diğer kadınlara herhangi bir tavsiyeniz var mı?

.....

.....

.....

98) Eklemek istediğiniz birşey var mı?

.....

.....

**BU ANKETE KATILDIĞINIZ VE BİZE ZAMAN AYIRDIĞINIZ İÇİN TEŞEKKÜR
EDERİZ.**