

THE PREDICTORS OF UNDERSTANDING OF HONOR AND ATTITUDES
TOWARD HONOR RELATED VIOLENCE: AMBIVALENT SEXISM AND
SYSTEM JUSTIFICATION

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

BY

RUŞEN İŞİK

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

JULY 2008

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

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

Prof. Dr. Nebi Sümer
Head of Department

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

Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı-Uğurlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı-Uğurlu (METU, PSY) _____

Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan (METU, PSY) _____

Dr. Derya Hasta (Ankara University, PSY) _____

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

Name, Last name : Ruşen Işık

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE PREDICTORS OF UNDERSTANDING OF HONOR AND ATTITUDES TOWARD VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN FOR PROTECTING HONOR: AMBIVALENT SEXISM AND SYSTEM JUSTIFICATION

Işık, Ruşen

M. S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı-Uğurlu

July, 2008, 68 pages

The aim of this thesis was to investigate the relationship of ambivalent sexism toward women and men and system justification with understanding of honor and attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor. 351 undergraduate students from METU, Ankara and Gazi University participated in the study (180 females and 166 males). Participants' ages ranged from 17 to 30 ($M=21.56$). Data was collected by a questionnaire consisting of Understanding of Honor Scale; Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor Scale; Ambivalent Sexism Inventory which has two subscales of Hostile Sexism (HS) and Benevolent Sexism (BS); and Ambivalence toward Men Inventory which has two subscales of Hostility toward Men and Benevolence toward Men (BM); and Economic System Justification Scale and demographic information. Separate linear regression analyses for males and females were performed in order to compare their responses. Results showed that among males, higher levels of HS and BM; and lower levels of HM; and among females, higher levels of BM and system justification predicted higher tendency to relate honor with women's virginity and holding men responsible for protecting it. Regarding attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor, males' scores were positively associated with BM, whereas females' scores were positively associated with BM and ESJ scores.

The thesis aims to contribute to the literature by (1) investigating the concept of “honor” which has not been dealt with in psychology literature; (2) introducing two newly developed scales: Understanding of Honor Scale and Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor Scale; and (3) making use of ambivalence toward men and women, and system justification theory while investigating the topic.

Keywords: Honor, Violence against Women, Ambivalent Sexism, Ambivalence toward Men, System Justification.

ÖZ

NAMUS ALGISININ VE NAMUSU KORUMAK ADINA KADINA UYGULANAN ŞİDDETE YÖNELİK TUTUMLARIN YORDAYICILARI: ÇELİŞİK DUYGULU CİNSİYETÇİLİK VE SİSTEMİ MEŞRULAŞTIRMA

Işık, Ruşen

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı-Uğurlu

Temmuz, 2008, 68 sayfa

Bu tezin amacı, kadınlara yönelik çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik, erkeklere yönelik çelişik tutumlar ve sistemi meşrulaştırma ile namus algısı ve namus adına kadına uygulanan şiddete yönelik tutumlar arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Çalışmaya, ODTÜ, Ankara Üniversitesi ve Gazi Üniversitesinde okuyan 351 lisans öğrencisi katılmıştır (180 kadın ve 166 erkek). Katılımcıların yaşları 17 ile 30 arasında değişmektedir. Data toplama aracı olarak Namus Algısı Ölçeği; Namusu Korumak adına Kadınlara Uygulanan Şiddete Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği; Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği (ÇDCÖ); Erkeklere ilişkin Çelişik Duygular Ölçeği (EÇDÖ); Ekonomik Sistemi Meşrulaştırma Ölçeği (ESM) ve demografik bilgilerden oluşan bir anket uygulanmıştır. Kadınlarla erkeklerin sonuçlarını karşılaştırabilmek amacıyla ayrı ayrı regresyon analizleri yapılmıştır. Sonuçlar, erkeklerde, yüksek Düşmanca Cinsiyetçilik (DC) ve Erkeklere ilişkin Korumacı Tutumlar (EKT) puanlarının ve düşük Erkeklere ilişkin Düşmanca Tutumlar (EDT) puanlarının; ve kadınlarda yüksek Erkeklere ilişkin Korumacı Tutumlar (EKT) ve ESM puanlarının namusu kadının bekaretiyle ilişkilendirme ve erkekleri namusu korumaktan sorumlu tutma eğiliminde artışla ilişkili olduğunu göstermiştir. Bunun yanında, namusu korumak adına kadınlara uygulanan şiddete yönelik tutumlar konusunda, erkeklerin EKT puanları bu tutumlarla pozitif yönde ilişkili bulunurken kadınların hem EKT hem de ESM puanları bu tutumlarla pozitif yönde ilişkili bulunmuştur.

Bu tez, psikoloji literatüründe çalışılmamış olan “namus” olgusunu araştırarak; literatüre iki yeni ölçek kazandırarak - Namus Algısı Ölçeği ve Namusu Korumak adına Kadınlara Uygulanan Şiddete Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği; ve konunun araştırılmasında kadınlara ve erkeklere yönelik çelişik duyguları ve sistemi meşrulaştırma teorisini kullanarak katkı sağlamayı amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Namus, Kadına yönelik Şiddet, Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik, Erkeklere ilişkin Çelişik Duygular, Sistemi Meşrulaştırma.

Aileme...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank to my advisor, Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı-Uğurlu, without whom it wouldn't be possible to accomplish this thesis. I am very grateful for her crucial criticisms and comments; her patience; and her psychological support which forced me to finish this thesis in a short time.

I wish to thank to my examining committee members, Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner-Özkan and Dr. Derya Hasta for allowing their time for my thesis, their very constructive comments and contributions.

I owe special thanks to my roommates, Pınar Bıçaksız, Elçin Gündoğdu, Elif Körpe, Canan Büyükaşık Çolak, Dilek Sarıtaş and Bahar Köse, for their friendship and the atmosphere they formed in 203B “hammam”. I am also very grateful for their patience in answering my endless questions☺. I would like to thank to Pınar Bıçaksız also for her statistically significant contributions to this thesis☺. And also I must express my gratitude to Gaye Zeynep Çenesiz for her help in the writing process of this thesis...

I would like express my gratefulness to my friend and colleague Ayça Özen for her contributions in the process of the development of scales and her sincere help whenever I need.

Thanks to all the instructors from Ankara University, Gazi University and METU, who allowed their time for me to collect data in their courses. And also I would like to express my gratitude to all the participants for their participation to our study, without who this study wouldn't be possible.

Special thanks to Mehmet Güzel, who I know would never withhold his support on me, for his emotional support and endless patience. It would be really hard to overcome this thesis process without his assistance and tolerance. Thanks for your sincere existence...

And lastly, I dedicate this thesis to my dear family. I would like to express my pride for being a member of this family and my love to my dad Selahattin, my mum Mukaddes, and my sisters Şule Şilan and Berivan Işık. Thank you for your unconditioned love and support for whatever I decide to do or be...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 The Concept of Honor.....	4
1.2 Honor Killings.....	7
1.3 Ambivalent Sexism Theory.....	10
1.4 Ambivalent Sexism toward Men.....	15
1.5 System Justification Theory.....	16
1.6 The Aims and Hypotheses of the Study of the Study.....	21
2. METHOD.....	25
2.1 Participants.....	25
2.2 Measures.....	26
2.2.1 Demographic Variables.....	27
2.2.2 Scales on Honor and Honor Killings.....	27
2.2.2.1 Understanding of Honor Scale (UH).....	27
2.2.2.1.1 Development of UH.....	27
2.2.2.1.2 Validity of UH.....	28
2.2.2.1.3 Reliability of UH.....	30
2.2.2.2 Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor Scale (AVWPH).....	30
2.2.2.2.1 Development of AVWPH.....	30
2.2.2.2.2 Validity of AVWPH.....	30
2.2.2.2.3 Reliability of AVWPH.....	32
2.2.3 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI).....	32
2.2.4 Ambivalence toward Men Inventory (AMI).....	33
2.2.5 Economic System Justification Scale (ESJ).....	34

2.3 Procedure.....	35
3. RESULTS.....	36
3.1 Descriptive Information about the Study Variables.....	36
3.2 Gender Differences among Study Variables.....	36
3.3 Correlations among Study Variables.....	39
3.4 Regression Analyses Regarding Research Questions.....	41
3.4.1 Predicting Understanding of Honor and Attitudes toward Honor Related Violence toward Women by HS, BS, BM and System Justification.....	41
3.4.1.1 Predicting Understanding of Honor (UH) by HS, BS, HM, BM, and System Justification (ESJ).....	41
3.4.1.2 Predicting Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor Scale (AVWPH) by HS, BS, HM, BM and ESJ.....	43
4. DISCUSSION.....	44
4.1 General Evaluations of the Study Findings.....	44
4.1.1 Gender Differences among Study Variables.....	44
4.1.2 Predictive Power of HS, BS, HM, BM, and System Justification on Understanding of Honor and Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor.....	47
4.1.2.1 Predictive Power of HS, BS, HM, BM and System Justification on Understanding Honor.....	47
4.1.2.2 Predictive Power of HS, BS, HM, BM and System Justification on Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor.....	50
4.2 Conclusions of the Thesis.....	51
4.3. Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research.....	53
REFERENCES.....	54
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A.....	62
APPENDIX B.....	64
APPENDIX C.....	66
APPENDIX D.....	68
APPENDIX E.....	70

APPENDIX F.....	71
-----------------	----

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 2.1 Sample Characteristics.....	26
Table 2.2 Cronbach Alpha, Eigenvalue, Explained Variance, Factor loadings, Item-Total Correlations for UH Items.....	29
Table 2.3 Cronbach Alpha, Eigenvalue, Explained Variance, Factor loadings, Item-Total Correlations for AVWPH Items.....	31
Table 3.1 Gender differences among Study Variables.....	38
Table 3.2 Correlations between Study Variables.....	40
Table 3.3 Summary of Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Understanding of Honor and Violence against Women for Protecting Honor.....	42

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Honor Killing of 14-year-old Groom: 14-year-old V. Y. took up a knife when he saw his 15-year-old wife –in terms of religious rules- A. O. arm in arm with another man. His mother said: “my son cleansed his honor”... (“14’lük Damadın”, 2003).

Güldünya Faded Deliberately: Güldünya was raped by her cousin and became pregnant. Tribe council decided her to be a fellow wife of her cousin. When she refused to do so, she was sent to a relative’s house in İstanbul. She gave birth to her son named Umut (in English hope) there. Her brothers came to İstanbul and forced her to commit suicide, she ran away, but she was found and wounded in the street with a gun. While she was treated at hospital, her brothers shot her in the head...

Advocate of Güldünya’s brothers said that:

“According to Turkish laws the concept of honor is a sacred thing... Sexuality can even be a reason of divorce. Sexual life concerns both the family and the society...Güldünya has stained the family honor...” (“Güldünya’nın Ölümünden”, 2004).

The examples of honor killings can be multiplied. As the examples suggest, “honor” has a vital role in the community life in Turkey (e.g., Ergil, 1980; Koçtürk, 1992; Sev’er & Yurdakul, 2001). However, Turkey is not the only country in which honor culture constitutes an important part of the dominant culture; many societies in the Mediterranean like Italy and Greece (Herzfeld, 1980; Pitt-Rivers, 1977); in the Balkans such as Yugoslavia (Gah, 2000), in many Middle Eastern countries like Egypt (Baron, 2006), Pakistan (Anonymous, 1999) and in Arab world like Israel, Palestine, Suudi Arabia (Hasan, 2003) and Jordan (Anonymous, 1999) are of those countries which attribute peculiar significance to honor.

Many scholars of sociology, anthropology, women studies, health and law have long been investigating the concept of honor and violence –especially against women- associated with honor related issues in order to understand the antecedents of these

phenomena; take steps for improvement of the societies regarding the issue of honor and prevent the ongoing violence related to honor. Many of the studies conducted on honor and honor killings are composed of statistical information about victims of honor killings (e.g., UNPFA, 2000) on the world and in any specific country. Other studies are sociological (e.g., Baron, 2006; Okyay, 2007) and anthropological analyses (e.g., Pina-Cabral, 1989; Pitt-Rivers, 1977); theoretical comparisons (e.g., Sev'er & Yurdakul, 2001; Pervizat, 2005) and critical approaches (e.g., Parla, 2001) from feminist point of view and critical evaluations of laws (Arın, 2001; Şahin, 1999). Most of the scientific studies depend on qualitative methods like interviews and field studies (e.g., Bora & Üstün, 2005; İlkaracan, 1998) in which a profound understanding of people's view of honor and honor killings is aimed to be examined. However, despite its significance in many cultures, there is no study in citation index on the concept of honor in psychology literature.

In such countries mentioned above, honor is usually viewed as women's sexual purity (e.g., Hasan, 2003). This understanding is a product of patriarchal system in which women are viewed as weaker than, and owned and protected by men and are restricted by male-dominated rules (Koçtürk, 1998). This definition of honor further displays a double standard between expectations of the society from men and women by ascribing the responsibility of remaining "chaste" to women, but not to men and giving men the role of "cleaning" the contaminated honor by punishing the "unchaste" women –usually with death penalty.

Maintenance of this perception of honor reflects embracement of traditional societal rules and gender roles. That is, those who perceive honor as women's sexual chastity and hold favorable attitudes toward violence against women for reasons of honor, are likely to be against social change and take side for the maintenance of the existing order which is discriminatory and sexist in nature. Here come very important questions: how does it happen that men, who are potential murderers of their sisters, wives and mothers, view this order as legitimate and resist to the change of the system? And more strikingly, how does it happen that women, who are the subjects of this restriction and discrimination and are potential victims of honor killings, advocate this way of living?

In the attempt to answer these critical questions I will apply to the system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994) which suggests that people may engage in system justification –“the process by which existing social arrangements are legitimized- even at the expense of personal and group interests” (p.2).

Moreover, in the patriarchal system, whereas men are expected and perceived to be powerful, dominant and courageous, women are viewed as passive, obedient and subordinate. Thus, from the perspective of group relations women are in the disadvantaged; and men are in the advantaged position. However, the relationship between men and women is different from other group relations in that although men have an authority over women, both groups are dependent on each other for sexual reproduction and romantic relationships. Women are viewed as weak and needing protection of men, but also glorified as mothers and lovers and women who bear against traditional gender roles are viewed as challenging male domination and treated negatively (Glick & Fiske, 1996). On the other side, whereas men are viewed as using power over women and women resent them for this inequality; they are also respected by women because of the positive characteristics attributed to men (like courageousness, strength, protectiveness). In order to understand the views of and attitudes toward honor accurately I will further apply to the ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) which conceptualizes the relationships between men and women as mentioned above.

This thesis aims to make a contribution to the psychology literature by investigating the understanding of and attitudes toward honor in the light of system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994) and ambivalent sexism theory with its dimensions of ambivalence toward women (Glick & Fiske, 1996) and men (Glick & Fiske, 1999).

In the introduction section, the topics will be presented in the following sequence; firstly, an overview of the concept of honor and honor killings will be given with related literature. Secondly, system justification theory will be held followed by ambivalent sexism theory which will include both ambivalence toward women and ambivalence toward men. Then, literature on the relationship between honor, ambivalent sexism and system justification will be mentioned. And lastly aims and hypotheses of the study will be presented.

1.1 The Concept of Honor

The concept of honor has different meanings, interpretations and behavioral reflections and obligations in different societies. Its combinations with different religions and beliefs have led to different practices associated with honor. Especially in the Mediterranean and Middle Eastern cultures honor is an integral part of the society (Baron, 2006; Ergil, 1980; Pitt-Rivers, 1977) sharing many common elements with each other.

Honor in general, is associated with social reputation of an individual and a family. According to Sev'er and Yurdakul (2001), "honor" is moral integrity, the esteem accorded with talent. Pitt-Rivers (1977, p.1) defines honor as follows

"Honor is the value of a person in the eye of his society. It is his estimation of his own worth, his claim to pride, but it is also the acknowledgement of that claim, his excellence recognized by society, his right to pride. (...). Honor, therefore, provides a nexus between the ideals of a society and their reproduction in the individual through his aspiration to personify them."

Pitt-Rivers' definition of honor is a very universal and abstract meaning of honor and can be applied to many societies especially in those that social bounds are tight. Nevertheless, the concrete meaning of honor, in other words, the reflection of it as conduct; the expectations of a society from an honorable person differ for different societies though they may share common elements. Moreover, the significance attributed to honor is different in different cultures. Even within a specific society, honor has different obligations for men and women and different practices in different social classes.

In Turkey, honor has a very vital role in the community life represented in the famous saying "in Turkey, people live for their honor" (Pervizât, 2005). The richness of Turkish language in providing many words for honor is another indicator of its cultural value. Several words associated with honor in Turkish are *onur*, *şeref*, *haysiyet*, *nam*, *san*, *gurur*, *namus*. All of these words are about social reputation; nevertheless they have slightly different meanings in daily usage. For instance, *onur* is the personal worth that others' respect is based on (Türk Dil Kurumu General

Dictionary). *Haysiyet* is the internal ability to feel shame; *nam* and *san* are used for an honorable renown; and *gurur* is an honorable pride (Sev'er & Yurdakul, 2001).

On the other hand, *namus* is the most critical concept in terms of the honor culture in Turkey and is an honor associated with women's sexual purity. It is about customs related to women's sexual behavior; involves sexual forbearance (Tezcan, 1999) which is associated with the honor of women's male relatives (father, brother and husband) and the honor of the whole family. This honor ethic is based on the belief that "women cannot be trusted to protect their chastity in the best interests of patriarchal society...an honorable man is someone whose women kin remain chaste..." (Koçtürk, 1992, p. 56). Women's "purity, cleanliness" is very fragile and can be harmed as a result of a range of behaviors changing from very slight acts like "strolling alone in the town, asking for a love song on the radio, or flirting to a boy" (Arin, 2001) to being raped or making love with someone out of marriage.

The word *namus* is rooted from the ancient Greek word *nomos*. The definition of *nomos* involves (1) anything that has been gained from usage, tradition, law, etc.; (2) a rule of behavior that logic dictates; (3) in Christianity, the law that orders the ethic principles of Jesus, especially the ethical rule about love (Pervizat, 2005). In the Ottoman Turkish, *nomos* has meanings of law, order; virginity; purity, honesty and angel close to God (Gezik, 2003).

In Turkish, *namus* and *şeref* are usually used interchangeably though they emphasize different values. *Şeref* is the word which involves values about honor of especially men emphasizing qualities like keeping promises, sticking to one's word, fighting against injustice, complying with oppression, being ready to defend his own interests as well as those of the kin-group or neighbor (Hasan, 2003), having good doings for the society and belonging to a prestigious family (Pervizat, 2005). On the other hand, *namus* is a value associated with the honor of men, women and the whole family which depends on women's sexual purity. A woman has to protect her chastity before marriage; and after marriage, she has to "present" her sexuality only to her husband, any other sexual experiences mean the loss of *namus*. On the other hand, a man of honor (*namuslu*) is someone whose women kin remain chaste and

who does not touch other men's *namus* (take slant at other men's women) (Ergil, 1980).

Here, a distinction between *şeref* and *namus* must be emphasized. As represented by the definitions of the concepts, whereas *namus* is a value that every family or individual has by birth and that can be lost; *şeref* is something that a person can gain with his/her appreciated behaviors and good doings. That is, every woman is born "clean" and her future sexual experiences determine whether she will remain so or not and her and her family's *namus* will be affected by those experiences; in the case of not remaining chaste, she and her family will be *namussuz* (dishonorable) and the family will have to "clean" their *namus* in order to regain its social status in the society. Thus, *namus* is something that is either owned or not, there is no other option in between. On the other hand *şeref* can be increased or decreased depending on the person's behaviors and position in the society. Moreover, not having *şeref* or having little *şeref* is not as worthless as having no *namus* (Pervizat, 2005).

As mentioned above, male and female honor are dependent on different criteria: whereas women are to protect their sexual purity, men are to protect *their women's* sexual purity in order to stay honorable (*namuslu*) (Pervizat, 2005). Especially in the small scale societies male and female gender roles are strictly determined and behaviors contrary to these role expectations bring being pushed out of the community. In this system, women are expected to be dependent on men. They have to remain "pure", chaste, behave more passively than men in the society and be obedient. In his book "Terror and Violence in Turkey" Doğu Ergil (1980) argues that there are two reasons that force women behave according to these expectations of the society: (1) contrary behaviors degrade men of the family; (2) the division of labor approved by traditional values have put women under the men's guardianship.

On the other hand, men are socialized as "superior, masculine" in order to be a "real man". A 'man' is someone who is courageous and can conquer others with his power (Ergil, 1980). The basic property of masculinity is, not being defeated, passing others, being superior to others. If a man cannot fulfill these properties using his knowledge and talents or if they are not enough to do so, he may try to gain it with force. According to Mocher and Tomkins (1988), masculinity, represented in

“macho” man has personality characteristics composed of a) violence as manly, b) danger as interesting and c) insensitive sexual attitudes. This masculine role of men gives them the right and the duty to keep eye on women and control them for the best interests of the patriarchy, as women are not trusted to take care of themselves because they are ‘weak’ and ‘unreliable’.

According to Ergil (1980), in agricultural societies in which families are in competition with each other, *namus* and *şeref* are the criterion that determine a family’s and an individual’s social value. Hereby, in small scale societies and underdeveloped countries protecting *namus* has a vital role for survival of families and individuals, therefore, every way can be employed in order to protect *namus*. This significance attributed to honor leads to the existence of honor crimes – especially to crimes against women ranging from cutting a limb to honor killings or forced suicides of women by their families. Ergil goes on to argue that with urbanization taking place in developing countries these honor crimes are moved to the cities. Turkey is one of those countries in which honor culture comprises a large part of the dominant culture and crimes of honor (mostly honor killings) take place and these crimes are still a fundamental problem of Turkey. In the next section studies on honor killings conducted in Turkey will be mentioned.

1.2 Honor Killings

First of all, a point must be clarified in order to make accurate analyses. In Turkish, the usage of the concepts of honor and customary killings is a controversial issue. In the community these two concepts are sometimes used interchangeably (UNPFA, 2000). For the purpose of the present study it will be helpful to know the differences between these concepts, however; viewing them as two independent phenomena leads to an overlook to the antecedents of these phenomena. ‘Customary killings’, which take place especially in the rural areas where tribal relations are powerful, is a broader term than ‘honor killings’ including murders for different reasons like blood feud, murders carried out as a result of tribal struggles and for protecting honor. The Eastern and South Eastern regions of Turkey are identified with these kinds of killings. Despite the broader meaning of customary killings, honor killings constitute a large part of them and patriarchal relations, values and customs underlie both the customary and honor killings (Okyay, 2007). A wider discussion of these two

phenomena is out of the scope of the present study, but it should be noted that what is meant by *honor killings* in the present study is homicides of women for reasons of honor (*namus*); executed either as a result of a decision of a family council (or tribe) or as an individual issue.

Women are exposed to violence and killed in the name of honor in many countries. According to a research of United Nations Population Fund (UNPFA, 2000), every year, more than five thousand women are killed for reasons of honor on over the world. According to a report of General Directorate of Security on honor and customary killings in Turkey, 1091 cases were registered between 2000 and 2005 and 322 of the murders were committed for reasons of honor (“Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü,” n.d.). Ege University Women Problems Research and Practice Center Manager Prof. Dr. Nurselen Toygar (2007) reports that in last 5 years period there are 5 thousand 367 customary and honor victims and 5 thousand suicides in Turkey.

Studies on the perceptions of honor have revealed that in residents where crimes of honor are prevalent, there is a tendency in the public to associate honor with women and women’s sexual purity. For instance, in a research conducted by Sır (2005) in Diyarbakır with 433 resident participants, 32.9% of the participants replied the question of “what is honor (*namus*)?” as “women, my sister, my mother, my family”; 18.4% as “what religion orders”; 13.7% as “men’s dignity” and 10%, as “women’s chastity”. The question of “what is dishonorableness?” was answered by 48.5% as adultery, 12% as women’s adultery and 10% as women’s loss of virginity.

Additionally, in a project carried out by Population Association and United Nations Development Program which was conducted in Istanbul, Batman, Sanliurfa and Adana by making interviews with 195 participants, it was found that there was a strong tendency in all of the cities to associate honor (*namus*) with women, women’s sexuality and women’s control (Türkiye’de Namus Cinayetlerinin Dinamikleri, 2005).

On the other hand, studies conducted among university students on their perceptions of virginity and honor show that students’ views of honor are less rigid than the public despite the fact that virginity is still emphasized. According to a study conducted by Okyay (2007) at Middle East Technical University (METU), whereas

53% of the students disagreed with the idea that women should protect their virginity until marriage, 42.5% of them were in favor of the idea. Moreover, it was found that while 26% of the participants agreed with the statement that “a woman’s honor is determined by her sexual conducts”, 66.5% disagreed. In parallel, Vargün (2002), in a social anthropological study on the representation of virginity among Ankara University and METU students, found that 68 % of the respondents thought that there is no relationship between honor and virginity, whereas 32% thought virginity determines, or at least influences honorableness. Lastly, a social psychological study on the university students’ attitudes toward premarital sex concluded that males held more negative attitudes toward premarital sex than did females (Sakallı, Karakurt, & Uğurlu, 2001). Moreover, it was found that males were more negative toward women’s engagement in premarital sex than did females. Even though this study does not deal with participants’ views of honor, it gives information about how people approach to premarital sex and particularly, women’s premarital sex.

Association of honor with women’s sexuality imposes women the responsibility of staying “pure” before marriage; and after marriage they are expected to “present” their sexuality only to their husbands. Violation of these expectations requires punishment in order to “cleanse” family honor in the eye of the society. For instance, the research by Sir (2005) mentioned above revealed that 84% of the participants thought that women should be punished for honor related issues and 37.4% told that they could commit murder for honor.

Similar ideas are confirmed in a descriptive study of İlkaraçan (1998) in which interviews were made with 599 women in the East and South East regions of Turkey. One of every five women participated in the study did not have official marriages; they were married only according to the religious rules, one of ten marriages were polygynous and 61.5% of marriages were arranged by families. 65.8% of the women told that their husbands would kill them if they were accused of adultery and only 27.3% told that their husbands would divorce them in such a case. Moreover, 82.4% of the women thought that they could not get divorced if their husbands did not want to; on the other hand, 67.4% thought their husbands could get divorced even though women did not agree. These findings are an indication of unequal gender relations,

and more importantly, women's dependency on men and the pressures on women to "protect" their chastity.

On the issue of who must be responsible for women's honor; for protecting and "cleaning" it, research results are differential. In the study of Sır (2005), the question of "what is women's duty" was replied by 49.9% of the participants as "to protect their honor", whereas by 34%, as obedience. Additionally, men's duty was defined as laying claim to women by 70% of the participants. On the other hand, university students' views of who must be responsible for women's honor displayed a different scene (Okyay, 2007): 91% of the METU students participated in the study thought that a woman is responsible for her honor whereas only 7% believed her male relatives are responsible for a woman's honor.

As the studies given above exemplify, studies on honor are basically sociological and anthropological analyses aiming at introducing a general view of how honor which is perceived different segments of the society. On the other hand, there is no study available in psychology literature on honor. This is an important absence for psychology research in Turkey; and also in the world, as honor culture form integral parts of many different societies. Studies investigating the relationship between perceptions of honor and/or honor killings, and different social psychological variables will be helpful for understanding the dynamics of the issue. With this study it is intended to make a beginning for filling this gap in the social psychology literature by investigating the relationship between perceptions of and attitudes toward honor and honor killings; and ambivalence toward women, ambivalence toward men and system justification.

1.3 Ambivalent Sexism Theory

As mentioned above, honor, represented as women's sexuality is a feature of the patriarchal system, which is more or less widespread among cultures (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Patriarchy gives men the right to dominate and oppress women and whereas male dominated system assigns men to high status roles in the family, in the community, in government and business; expects men to be strong, dominating, and courageous; its pressures dictate women to be passive, obedient and having secondary roles in the family, work and societal life (e.g., Ergil, 1980).

Gender role divisions, attitudes toward and stereotypes about women and sexism are very old fields of psychological research in the U.S.A. and Europe (e.g., Franchina, Eisler, & Moore, 2001; Mocher & Tomkins, 1988; Twenge, 1997). Several measures have been used in order to measure sexist attitudes toward and beliefs about women. The oldest measure is the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1973) which aims at measuring endorsement of traditional sex roles versus egalitarianism. However, Attitudes Toward Women Scale turned out to be insufficient in measuring subtle forms of sexism as egalitarianism has become more widely embraced. For measuring more subtle forms of sexism, Modern Sexism Scale (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995) and Neosexism Scale (Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995) were developed. A shared property of these three scales is that all of them stress that sexism is a reflection of hostile attitudes toward women.

On the other hand, another approach to sexism, ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) suggests that sexism is a multidimensional construct composed of both hostile and benevolent forms of sexism. That is, the traditional relationship between men and women leads to both hostile and benevolent attitudes toward women. This dual understanding of gender relations is more illustrative than the simple theorization of sexism as hostility toward women.

According to ambivalent sexism theory, hostile sexism (HS) includes contemptuous characterization of women which serves to legitimize traditional gender roles, male power, men's social control over women and men's exploitation of women as sexual objects. HS is directed to women viewed as aiming to dominate men either through feminist ideology or using their sexuality; and it involves a group of negative attitudes toward women who are perceived as violating traditional gender roles and seeking to have control over men (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

On the other hand, benevolent sexism (BS) seems to include subjectively more positive feelings toward women; viewing them stereotypically and idealizing them in traditional gender roles in which they are viewed as weaker and needing men's protection and affection. It recognizes men's dependence on women and although it

assumes women's inferiority it characterizes women as pure, delicate and valuable whose love make men whole complete individuals.

Ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) suggests that the roots of these two facets of ambivalent sexism are founded upon three factors: (a) the patriarchy which puts women in a disadvantaged position in economic and social aspects of life and giving men the right to have control over women; (b) men and women have different social roles; and (c) unlike any other groups (like ethnic or other social groups) men and women need each other for sexual reproduction; therefore despite men's dominance over women they are dependent on them as wives, mothers and romantic objects. These three sources –paternalism, gender differentiation and heterosexuality- of ambivalence of men toward women are shared by both benevolent and hostile sexism.

Paternalism has two aspects: *dominative* and *protective paternalism*. Dominative paternalism is hostile in that it views women as inferior and needing to be controlled by men. On the other hand, the protective paternalism is the benevolent aspect paternalism as it proposes that because of men's superiority, power and physical strength they should be the protectors of women. These two aspects go hand in hand in that men are both dependent on women as mothers and sexual partners –therefore they must provide affection and protection to women- and they have an authority over women –so they dominate women.

Gender differentiation also has two aspects: *competitive* and *complementary gender differentiation*. Like dominative paternalism, competitive gender differentiation forms the hostile aspect and justifies male structural power presuming that men are better than women therefore, only men can come to high positions in the society. On the other hand, complementary gender differentiation forms the benevolent side reflecting men's dependency on women in that it says that women have many positive characteristics that complement those of men.

Lastly, *heterosexuality* involves both hostility and intimacy. *Heterosexual hostility* reflects the fear that women will gain control over men using their sexual attractiveness; and the tendency to view women as sexual objects. On the contrary,

heterosexual intimacy reflects men's dependency on women as romantic and sexual partners; the view that men need women in order to become "whole" individuals.

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) (Glick & Fiske, 1996) which was developed to investigate the assertions of ambivalent sexism theory includes items aimed at measuring BS and HS based on the three sources of BS as well as HS –paternalism, gender differentiation, heterosexuality- mentioned above. BS and HS are found to be separate but positively correlated factors consistently by many studies using ASI (e.g., Burn & Busso, 2005; Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick et al., 2000; Glick et al., 2004). Moreover, BS and HS were validated in 19 nations with over 15.000 participants by a cross-cultural study suggesting that they are prevalent across cultures (Glick et al., 2000). It was concluded that women were more likely to accept BS than HS compared to men, especially in cultures where overall sexism is high. Additionally, the study showed that both BS and HS scores of nations predicted unequal gender relations in those cultures, indicating that HS as well as BS justified and maintained the gender inequality.

There are a number of studies examining the relationships between ambivalent sexism (BS and/or HS) and several attitudinal variables related to virginity or premarital sex, and violence against women (including rape and wife abuse) (e.g., Sakallı, 2001; Sakallı-Uğurlu & Ulu, 2003; Yamawaki, 2008). These studies may guide us in the search for the antecedents of attitudes toward honor and honor killings in that they provide information about attitudes toward women who are viewed as violating traditional gender norms –in the case of honor issue, women who do not "protect" their sexual purity may be viewed in the same line. Moreover, studies investigating attitudes toward violence against women can give cues about attitudes toward honor killings.

Studies have revealed that both BS and HS play role in the concern for control over women's sexuality (e.g., Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003; Sakallı-Uğurlu & Glick 2003; Yamawaki, 2008). BS does so by idealizing women in traditional gender roles as "pure", "uncontaminated" and "honor (*namus*)"; and HS leads to the views of women as "devils" who do not have anticipated sexual lives, thus viewing them as unreliable and dangerous for male power. For instance, Sakallı-Uğurlu and Glick

(2003) found that among Turkish undergraduates, both HS and BS predicted men's preferences for marrying a virgin than a non-virgin. On the other hand, BS, but not HS predicted negative attitudes toward women who engage in premarital sex.

In rape studies, BS but not HS was found to be influential in victim blame in rape scenarios, if the victim initiated the sexual contact (Abrams et al., 2003); if it happened in a date but not by a stranger (Yamawaki, 2008); and if the victim was raped during an extramarital affair (Viki & Abrams, 2002). On the other hand, HS but not BS was associated with minimization of seriousness of rape in stranger scenarios (Yamawaki, 2008) and higher level HS of men predicted higher inclination of acquaintance rape, but not for stranger rape (Abrams et al., 2003). Lastly, in a study of Sakallı-Uğurlu, Yalçın, and Glick (2007) conducted among Turkish university students, both BS and HS predicted less positive attitudes toward rape victims.

Other studies also revealed the role of BS and HS on other kinds of violence against women like wife beating (e.g., Glick, Sakallı-Uğurlu, Ferriera, & Aguilar de Souza, 2002; Sakallı, 2001; Sakallı-Uğurlu & Ulu, 2003) and sexual harassment (e.g., Salman, 2007; Turgut, 2007). Sakallı (2001) found that HS predicted male participants' attitudes toward wife beating in that those who were high on HS viewed wife beating as more acceptable and blamed women for provoking the violence. Moreover, Sakallı-Uğurlu and Ulu (2003), in their study on violence against women in marriage, concluded that men's high HS scores predicted more favorable attitudes toward verbal and physical violence against women and more negative attitudes toward women's divorce as a result of exposure to violence. Similar results were obtained in a cross-cultural study conducted in Turkey and Brazil (Glick et al., 2002): HS, but not BS uniquely predicted attitudes that legitimized wife abuse. By implication, it is suggested that for men, high HS is related to high tendency to engage in abusive behaviors, and for women, it is associated with more tolerance to abusive behaviors.

1.4 Ambivalent Sexism toward Men

Based on the ambivalent sexism theory, Glick and Fiske (1999) propose that despite the male power and dominance over women, men are also viewed by both men and

women ambivalently. This ambivalence is originated from women's resentment to men's authority but also their respect to this authority and as in the case of ambivalence toward women, men's and women's dependence on each other for sexual reproduction.

In order to investigate ambivalence toward men, Glick and Fiske (1999) developed another tool –Ambivalence toward Men Inventory (AMI). Approaching to the gender issue from the subordinated group's –women's- point of view Glick and Fiske (1999) propose that women will resent the power and dominance of men, named *resentment of paternalism*. In terms of *compensatory gender differentiation* women can differentiate themselves positively from men despite their disadvantaged position, assuming that women have more positive traits than men do. Moreover, women may feel *heterosexual hostility* toward men as a result of men's sexual aggressiveness and their domination in close heterosexual relationships. These factors form the hostility of women toward men. On the side of benevolence, sexual reproduction and romantic relationships between men and women may lead women to hold subjectively positive attitudes toward men. Through *maternalism*, which, like protective paternalism, views the other side weak, and needing to be nurtured and cared for, women will feel that they are more powerful than men but justify the idea that they are to serve men. Additionally, *complementary gender differentiation*, that is, the idea that men are superior to women so they should have higher statuses in the society than women, may make women admire men because of their power, intelligence and abilities attributed to men. Lastly, just as men endorse the idea that men are not whole individuals without women, *heterosexual attraction* may also make women feel the same thing for themselves, that, “women are incomplete without love of men”.

In AMI, benevolence toward men (BM) and hostility toward men (HM) were also found to be separate but positively correlated factors showing that women hold ambivalent attitudes toward men (Glick & Fiske, 1999; Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2008). Moreover, according to results of several studies AMI was strongly related to ASI (Glick & Fiske, 1999; Glick et al., 2004; Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2008). Ambivalent attitudes toward men were also validated across cultures with a study conducted in 16 nations with 8.360 participants showing that like ambivalence toward women, ambivalence

toward men was also prevalent across cultures and as gender equality decreased in a particular culture, ambivalent attitudes toward men increased (Glick et al., 2004).

In this section we gave information about ambivalent sexism theory and a summary of the studies conducted using ASI and AMI. In the next section, another important theory, the system justification theory (Jost & Kay, 1994), which will be examined throughout the present study, will be covered. System justification has been shown to be associated with ambivalent sexism (e.g., Glick & Fiske, 2001; Jost & Kay, 2005; Sibley, Overall, & Duckitt, 2007) and other gender related variables (e.g., Kay, Jost, & Young, 2005; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990). Based on the literature, it is expected that system justification will be associated with both ambivalent sexism and also understanding of honor and attitudes toward honor related crimes against women.

1.5 System Justification Theory (SJT)

The concept of justification; “an idea being used to provide legitimacy of support for another idea or some form of behavior” has taken a large place in social psychology literature (Jost & Banaji, 1994, p.1). Depending on previous theorizing and work on ego-justification and group justification, Jost and Banaji (1994) have proposed another field of justification, system justification, in order to fill a gap in the literature for situations in which negative self and in-group stereotyping take place. Thus, Jost and Banaji (1994) make a distinction between these three justification motives. Ego justification is the need to develop and maintain a positive self-image and to feel legitimate as an individual (Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). Group justification is described as the need to develop and maintain not only a favorable image for the self but also for the group that the person belongs to and for the in-group members (Jost & Banaji, 1994). And finally, system justification is the process by which people adopt ideologies and beliefs—either consciously or nonconsciously—that legitimizes social, political and economic arrangements. These motives can be in opposition with each other and yet system justification motive may operate at the expense of ego and group justification especially for disadvantaged group members (Jost & Banaji, 1994).

According to the SJT a) there is a widespread ideological motive in the society to justify the status quo; b) the members of the disadvantaged groups internalize

inferiority at least partially because of the existence of this motive; c) this internalization takes place without awareness; d) and sometimes those who are harmed by the status quo the most, internalize the status quo more strongly (Jost et al., 2004).

Jost and Hunyady (2005) report that there are several system justifying ideologies like meritocracy, fair market ideology, economic system justification, belief in a just world, power distance, social dominance orientation, opposition to equality, right-wing authoritarianism, political conservatism and Protestant work ethic. SJT holds that there are both dispositional and situational factors underlying the tendency to embrace these kinds of system justifying ideologies. Some dispositional characteristics positively associated with embracement of these ideologies are: uncertainty avoidance; intolerance for ambiguity; need for order; perception of a dangerous world; and fear of death. All these characteristics are associated with needs to reduce uncertainty and threat; it is better to have an unchanging system thus viewing the existing social order as legitimate and fair than having an uncertain social change for people who avoid threat and ambiguity (Jost & Hunyady, 2005).

In regard to situational factors, research has shown that conditions of high system threat increased the endorsement of system justifying tendencies (e.g., Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003). Moreover, when the system seems inevitable; that is, when there seems to be nothing to change the order, people begin to legitimize the existing order, independent of whether the system is favorable or unfavorable; even when there is no personal responsibility and especially when motivational involvement is high (Kay, Jimenez, & Jost, 2002). Additionally, Jost, Blount, Pfeffer and Hunyady (2003) have concluded that system justifying tendency is shown when judging profitable outcomes as more ethical than unprofitable outcomes. That is, when people are to judge favorable and unfavorable outcomes; and they wish to judge favorable outcomes as more ethical than unfavorable ones, they tend to use system justifying views.

On the issue of intergroup relations, SJT suggests that members of low status groups experience a conflict between ego, group and system justification because of the tendency to legitimize the social order conflicts with the enhancement of individual

and group benefits (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost & Hunyady, 2002). Furthermore, depending on the cognitive dissonance theory, SJT argues that disadvantaged group members are more likely to engage in system justification *under certain conditions* (Jost, Pelham, Sheldon, & Sullivan, 2003). First, members of disadvantaged groups whose group identification is low or when their group interests are low in salience they are more likely to engage in system justification. Second, in democratic societies, where people perceive that they have chosen to participate in the status quo they would be more likely to endorse system justifying beliefs in order to reduce dissonance which arises from the feeling of personal responsibility for their disadvantaged position. And lastly, in a culture in which success is emphasized and there is an understanding that social and economic outcomes are fair and deserved, disadvantaged group members will be faced with a motivational pressure to support the system (Jost, Pelham, Sheldon, & Sullivan, 2003). Under especially these conditions members of disadvantaged groups show ingroup derogation and outgroup favoritism to the extent that they perceive that the ongoing system is fair and legitimate (e.g., Henry & Saul, 2006; Jost & Burgess, 2000; Jost, Pelham, & Carvallo, 2002).

Exemplarily, Jost and Burgess (2000) investigated the hypothesis that low status group members experience a psychological conflict between group and system justification tendencies among university students conducting two studies. In the first study, they manipulated the statuses of students by giving fake information about socioeconomic success of their university's and another university's graduates and making them either the high status university or the low status university. As a result, it was found that members of low status groups (whose university graduates' socioeconomic success was told to be low) exhibited less ingroup favoritism and more ingroup ambivalence than did members of high status groups (whose university graduates' socioeconomic success was told to be high). Moreover, beliefs in the legitimacy of status differences led to more outgroup favoritism among low status group members but more ingroup favoritism among high status group members. When status differences were seen as legitimate and fair, low status university students viewed their group as less in intelligence, industry, honesty, interestingness, friendliness and skillfulness in verbal reasoning.

For the purpose of understanding why people have a tendency to justify the system, Wakslak, Jost, Tyler, and Chen (2007) conducted two studies hypothesizing that system justification is associated with reduced emotional distress and lack of support for helping the disadvantaged. In the first study in which they made the participants complete questionnaires concerning endorsement of system justifying beliefs, emotional distress and support for redistribution of resources, they found that moral outrage (outward-focused distress) was positively associated with support for redistribution of resources; and endorsement of system justifying ideology was negatively linked to moral outrage and existential guilt. In the second study, in which participants were assigned to high and low system justification conditions, it was found that induction of system justification mind-set decreased moral outrage, negative affect and intentions to help the disadvantaged.

Jost and Hunyady (2002), in their review including 18 hypotheses of system justification theory, argue that people engage in system justification and other rationalizations to be able to adapt to unjust or unpleasant realities. Specifically, they suggest that system justifying plays a palliative role by reducing guilt, dissonance, anxiety, discomfort and ambiguity for both people in advantaged and disadvantaged positions.

Having briefly described the assumptions of system justification I will mention about the related literature which will be helpful in handling the aims of the present study. However, it must be noted that there is no psychological literature on the relationship between honor and system justification. This thesis will be the first study dealing with the issue and using not only system justification but combining ambivalent sexism toward women and men; and system justification theory in understanding the concept of honor.

Nevertheless, there are studies which may guide us in dealing with the issue. For instance, system justifying variables have been found by several studies to be related to ambivalent sexism (e.g., Jost & Kay, 2005; Lau, Kay, & Spencer, 2008; Sakalli-Uğurlu et al., 2007; Sibley, Overall, & Duckitt, 2007). What these studies suggest in common is that, endorsement of ambivalent sexist views (both BS and HS) can serve as a way to justify the existing inequality between the two genders or the violence

that women are exposed to. Specifically, for instance, Jost & Kay (2005) found that activation of complementary (men as agentic and women as communal; which activates both benevolent and hostile sexism) and benevolent forms of sexism increased women's support for the status quo. On the other hand, Sibley et al. (2007) examined the effect of women's benevolent sexist beliefs on system justification with two longitudinal studies. They concluded that women's long term endorsement of benevolent sexist ideology led to increased endorsement of hostile forms of sexism toward women. In other words, women's embracement of benevolent sexist ideology led to system justification in the form of increment in hostilely sexist attitudes toward their gender. Additionally, the role of complementary justice between groups or individuals in legitimizing the status quo and the unfair relations was not confirmed only for gender relations but also for other unequal group relations and socio-economic conditions (e.g., Kay, Jimenez, & Jost, 2002; Kay & Jost, 2003).

Moreover, system justifying beliefs were found to be related to legitimization of violence against women in studies investigating attitudes toward rape victims (Kleinke & Meyer, 1990; Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2007). In those studies the association between belief in a "just world" -the belief that everybody lives what he/she deserves; so, negative outcomes must have been deserved (Lerner, 1965)- which can be considered as a system justifying variable and respondents' attitudes toward rape victims was examined. They concluded that respondents with high belief in a just world hold more negative attitudes toward rape victims than respondents with low belief in a just world. Additionally, in the study of Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., (2007) ambivalent sexism also contributed to the results as both hostile and benevolent sexism scores predicted less positive attitudes toward rape victims.

However, although it was shown by several studies that the relationship between "belief in just world" and ASI predicted attitudes toward women -especially those who are victimized- there is no study directly investigating the relationship of SJT with attitudes toward women who are victims. This thesis will handle this issue by dealing with the relationship of SJT and concept of "honor" which legitimizes violence against women.

To sum up, based on the literature on system justification, ambivalent sexism and gender relations we can expect that system justification and ambivalent sexist attitudes may predict attitudes toward honor killings and understanding of honor. That is, the literature displays that having traditional views about gender roles is associated with viewing the existing system as fair and legitimate and these views are consistent with understanding of honor as women's sexuality. Moreover, the need to preserve traditional roles and existing system may legitimize women's punishment for 'not protecting honor'. In the next section the aims and hypotheses of this thesis will be mentioned more specifically.

1.6 The Aims and Hypotheses of the Study

Honor killings and violence that women are exposed to in the name of protection of honor are very hot issues of Turkey. Even though they are the products of social structure under which patriarchy lies and are mainly subjects of sociological and anthropological studies, social psychological studies dealing with these issues must be conducted in order to shed light on the psychological dynamics at individual level. This study aims at making a prelude to filling this gap in the social psychological literature. For this purpose the study investigates two conceptual and attitudinal variables: (1) understanding of honor (whether honor is associated with women's virginity or not) and (2) attitudes toward honor killings and violence against women in the name of honor. It makes use of ambivalent sexism theory with ambivalent sexism toward women (BS and HS) and men (BM and HM); and system justification theory in the attempt to understand the phenomena.

Specifically, the study aims to contribute to the social psychology literature on three areas. First of all, it is expected to fill a gap in social psychology literature by investigating 'honor', a social issue which has not dealt with in psychology literature before. Secondly, while making use of the ambivalent sexism theory in order to explore underlying factors of understanding of honor and attitudes toward honor killings, the study not only relies on ambivalent attitudes toward women but also ambivalence toward men, which is a newly area of research. Additionally, even though there are studies investigating gender related issues in association with ambivalence toward women and system justification, there is no available study

investigating the relationship between ambivalence toward men and system justification. This study will be the first one examining this association.

Lastly, another contribution of this study to the literature is that it introduces evidence for three newly developed scales on honor and honor killings. These scales aim to investigate whether people view honor as equal to women's sexual purity; whether they relate women's honor with men's and hold men responsible for protecting honor; and measure attitudes toward honor killings, violence against women in the name of honor and punishment of women for honor.

For following through the aims of the study, the following research questions are generated:

- i) Are sex, BS, HS, BM, HM and system justification tendency predictive of understanding of honor?

Hypothesis 1: Depending on the literature on attitudes toward premarital sex (e.g., Sakallı et al., 2001; Sakallı-Uğurlu & Glick, 2003) it is expected that gender will affect the understanding of honor. That is; men will have higher tendency to relate honor with women's virginity and hold men responsible for protecting honor than will women.

Hypothesis 2: Based on the ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) and ambivalent sexism toward men (Glick & Fiske, 1999) which suggest that all aspects of ambivalent sexism (namely, BS, HS, BM and HM) idealize men and women in traditional gender roles, it is expected that people who score high on BS, HS, BM will be more likely to relate honor with women's virginity and hold men responsible for protecting honor.

On the other hand, because HM reflects hostile attitudes toward men (Glick & Fiske, 1999) and HM was found to be negatively correlated with feminist attitudes (Thomas, 2002, cited in Glick et al., 2004) it is expected that the relationship between HM and understanding of honor will be in opposite direction. That is, it is

expected that participants who score higher on HM will get lower scores on relating honor with women's virginity and holding men responsible for protecting it.

Hypothesis 3: Based on the system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994) which suggests that complementary gender roles serve to legitimize the system (Jost & Kay, 2005), it is proposed that participants who get higher scores on system justification will be more likely to relate honor with women's virginity and hold men responsible for protecting honor than those who got lower on system justification.

ii) Are sex, BS, HS, BM, HM and system justification predictive of attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor?

Hypothesis 4: In parallel with the expectations about understanding of honor, based on the literature on violence against women (e.g. Glick et al., 2002; Sakallı-Uğurlu, & Ulu, 2003; Yamawaki, 2008) it is expected that men will endorse more positive attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor.

Hypothesis 5: In line with the suggestions of ambivalent sexism about violence against women (e.g. Glick et al., 2002; Sakallı-Uğurlu & Ulu, 2003) it is expected that participants who get higher scores on BS, HS, BM will be more likely to endorse positive attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor than those get low scores on these variables.

On the contrary, because HM reflects hostile attitudes toward men (Glick & Fiske, 1999) it is expected that participants who score higher on HM will be more likely to endorse negative attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor.

Hypothesis 6: Based on the system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994) and research on the relationship between system justification and violence against women (Kleinke & Meyer, 1990; Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2007), it is proposed that participants who score on system justification will be more likely to hold positive attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor than those who score lower on system justification.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

2.1 Participants

351 university undergraduate students from Middle East Technical University, Ankara University and Gazi University participated in the study. 180 were women (51.3%) and 166 were men (47.3%). 5 of the participants (1.4%) did not mention their gender. The average age of the participants was 21.46 ($SD=1.83$) ranging from 17 to 30. Regarding socio-economic status, 83.7% of the participants indicated that they belonged to middle income class; 3.7% were from lower income class; 9.4% belonged to upper income class; and 3.1% of the participants did not mention their economic status. Of all the participants 94.9% were grown up as muslims; 0.3% as christians; 2.6% did not belong to any religion and 2.3% did not give information about their religion. More than half of the participants (51.2%) spent most of their lives in metropolis followed by minor cities with 41.8%, then comes towns with 5.3% and villages, with 1.7%. 2.6% of the participants did not state where they have lived for the most part of their lives. Most of the participants (51%) reported that they hold left-wing political views, whereas 20.5% were rightists and 19.7% were neutral. Only 3.7% of the participants were radical leftists and 0.9% were radical rightists. 4.3% did not respond to this question. Lastly, to the question of whether they had sexual intercourse or not, 56.7% of the participants reported that they did not, whereas 39% reported that they did. 4.3% did not respond. Among the participants who reported that they had sexual intercourse, 35% were females; and 65% were males. On the other hand, among those who reported that they did not, 65% were females, and 35% were males. Participant characteristics are given on Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 *Sample Characteristics*

<i>Demographic Variables</i>	<i>Mean (Frequency)</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Gender		
Male	166	47.3%
Female	180	51.3%
Missing	5	1.4%
Age		
	21.46 (<i>SD</i> =1.83)	
Economic Class		
Lower Income Class	13	3.7%
Middle Income Class	294	83.7%
Upper Income Class	33	9.4%
Missing	11	3.1%
Religion		
Islam	333	94.9%
Christianity	1	0.3%
No Religion	9	2.6%
Missing	8	2.3%
Region		
Metropolis	175	51.2%
City	143	41.8%
Town	18	5.3%
Village	6	1.7%
Missing	9	2.6%
Political View		
Radical Leftist	13	3.7%
Leftist	179	51.0%
Neutral	69	19.7%
Rightist	72	20.5%
Radical Rightist	3	0.9%
Missing	15	4.3%
Sexual Experience		
Yes	137	39.0%
No	199	56.7%
Missing	15	4.3%

2.2 Measures

Participants were made to answer demographic questions and fill five scales, namely, Understanding of Honor Scale (UH) and Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor (AVWPH) developed by the author, Işık and her advisor,

Sakallı-Uğurlu for the present study; Economic System Justification Scale (ESJ) (Jost & Thompson, 2000); Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) (Glick & Fiske, 1996); and Ambivalence toward Men Inventory (AMI) (Glick & Fiske, 1999).

For all the scales included in the questionnaire participants rated items on a 6 point Likert-type scale, 1 standing for strongly disagree and 6 standing for strongly agree. There was no choice indicating “undecided”; we made the participants to choose a side, either against or for the statements given. Higher scores indicated higher tendencies to endorse each variable.

2.2.1 Demographic Variables

Participants were asked to indicate their sex, age, major, the religion they have grown up in, the place they lived in for the most part of their life, socio-economic status, political view and whether they have experienced sexual intercourse or not.

2.2.2 Scales on Honor and Honor Killings

The scales on issues about honor were developed by two researchers; the author of this thesis and her advisor. The general purpose of these scales is to capture understanding of honor and attitudes toward honor killings. As mentioned in the first chapter, studies investigating these issues are generally sociological and social anthropological, based on qualitative methods. Making use of the literature, it is aimed to fill a gap in social psychology by developing quantitative tools for measuring honor related attitudes and views. The names of these tools are as follows: Understanding of Honor Scale (UH) and Attitudes toward Honor Killings and Violence against Women Scale (AVWPH).

2.2.2.1 Understanding of Honor Scale (UH)

2.2.2.1.1 Development of UH

In line with the aim of the study a new scale was developed based on the literature. The aim of the scale is to measure the tendency to relate honor with women’s sexual purity, view women’s honor as an indication of men’s honor, and so, hold men responsible for protecting honor. The previous studies revealed that in Turkey, honor is generally understood as women’s sexual purity and men’s honor is generally viewed as very closely associated to the women’s honor; even, it is usually equated

with women's honor (e.g., Ergil, 1980). That is, there is a tendency to view women's sexual purity as an indication of men's and the family's honor and to hold men responsible for protecting women's honor. Though this widespread value (or tendency) is displayed by qualitative studies, there is no standardized measure to investigate it. In order to fill this gap in the literature a scale was developed by the author of this thesis and her advisor depending on the information gained from previous qualitative studies, newspaper news on honor related issues and especially the interviews conducted as a part of United Nations Report on Honor Killings in Turkey (UNPFA, 2000). In the first hand an item pool including 32 items was developed by the researchers. While creating the pool, clear and simple sentences were formed which did not have more than one meaning. These items involved honor related topics to ensure content validity. Then, in accordance with the aim of the scale, items related to the importance attributed to women's virginity for protecting honor and relating women's honor with men's were selected. After the elimination of other statements 20 items like "I believe that 'virginity' is not the symbol of honor", "a girl who has lost her virginity is not honorable", "I believe that honor is about a woman's sexual purity" were included in the analysis.

2.2.2.1.2 Validity of UH

Exploratory Factor Analysis. Prior to the factor analysis, data was checked for outliers and missing values. No multivariate outliers were detected and as the missing values were less than 5%, they were replaced by mean scores. To assess the structure of the scale and estimate number of factors, principal components extraction was performed.

In the first hand, two factors were extracted. The first factor explained for the 51.72%; and the second factor explained for the 6.28% of the total variance. However, the second factor comprised of only two items which also had high loadings on the first factor. Taking this result into account and also depending on the scree plot analysis and eigenvalues it seemed that one factor solution would give a more reliable factor structure. Therefore, the factor analysis was forced to one factor. When items highly correlated with each other and loading on both factors of the initial analysis were eliminated, 15 items remained for the subsequent analyses. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was .94, which refers to a perfect factorability

value; and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant at $p < .01$ which is also required for factorability. The factor obtained by performing principal component analysis without rotation explained for the 49.26% of the total variance. Items' factor loadings ranged from .34 to .87 and item-total correlations were between .31 and .83 which is higher than the minimum acceptable value of .20 (Aiken, 1994). The final UH with 15 items is presented in Table 2.2 with factor loadings and item total correlations.

Table 2.2 Cronbach Alpha, Eigenvalue, Explained Variance, Factor Loadings and Item-total Correlations of UH

($\alpha = .92$; eigenvalue = 7.39; explained variance = 49.26%)	Loadings	Item-Total
• Namusun korunması için kadınların bekaretlerinin kontrol altında tutulmasını destekliyorum.	.873	.831
• Bakire olmayan bir kız namusunu kaybetmiştir.	.836	.784
• Kadınların cinsel hayatlarının aileleri tarafından takip edilmesinin kadınların hatalar yapıp namuslarını kirletmelerini önleyebileceği kanısındayım.	.782	.722
• Bence bekâret "kadın namusu"nun simgesi değildir.*	.774	.721
• Bir kadının namusunun ailesi tarafından korunması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.	.770	.710
• Namus kavramının kadın özgürlüğünü sınırladığına inanıyorum.*	.740	.691
• Kadınlar kendi hareketlerinden sorumludur, bu nedenle ağabey ve babaların kızların namusuna karışmaması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.*	.724	.672
• Kadının namusunun erkek akrabalar tarafından korunmasının gerekli olduğuna inanıyorum.	.724	.667
• Kadını kontrol etmek için "namus"un kullanılmasının gerekli olduğunu düşünüyorum	.719	.657
• Evlilik öncesi cinsel ilişkiye girmemiş bir kız namusludur.	.711	.647
• Erkek namusunun kızlarının ve eşlerinin namusuyla ilişkili olmasını doğru buluyorum.	.665	.614
• Namusun kadının cinsel saflığıyla ilişkili olduğunu düşünüyorum.	.658	.592
• Namus adı altında kadınların sosyal ilişkilerinin kısıtlanmasını haksızlık olarak görüyorum.*	.610	.562
• Erkek akrabaların bir kadının namusuna karışmamaları gerektiğine inanıyorum.*	.376	.340
• Bekâretin sadece kadınlarla ilişkilendirilmesi beni rahatsız ediyor.*	.341	.311

* reverse items

Confirmatory Factor Analysis. After the formation of the scale with exploratory factor analysis, the model was tested for item fit by confirmatory factor analysis. The analysis was run using LISREL 8.30 program (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1989). In the

first step, the analysis was carried out without modifications. The analysis yielded the following fit values: $\chi^2(90, N = 351) = 349.69, p < .001$, RMSEA = .091, GFI = .88, AGFI = .84, CFI = .97, NNFI = .96. As the RMSEA value is over the acceptable value for a good fit -.05 or lower values are accepted as perfect fit but up to .08 values are also acceptable depending on the model (Sümer, 2000)-, in the second step the analysis was replicated by covarying the errors of the 3rd and 6th items. This modification resulted in the following goodness of fit results: $\chi^2(89, N = 351) = 288.48, p < .001$, RMSEA = .08, GFI = .90, AGFI = .87, CFI = .98, NNFI = .97]. GFI (goodness of fit) and AGFI (adjusted goodness of fit) values over .90 is accepted as satisfactory. For CFI (comparative fit index) values over .90 are considered as good fit. NNFI (non-normed fit index) over .95 is regarded as perfect fit. Even though for a good fit χ^2 should be insignificant, because χ^2/df (degrees of freedom) is lower than 5/1 ratio, the model is acceptable (Sümer, 2000). Factor loadings of items were ranging from .30 to .89.

In order to further test construct validity of UH males' and females' scores on UH were compared, as difference in scores would suggest known group difference validity. The results showed that males ($M = 2.97, SD = .99$) had higher tendency than women ($M = 2.17, SD = .71, F(344,1) = 76.202, p < .001$) to associate honor with women's virginity and hold men responsible for protecting honor. Thus, the UH was found to be significantly related to gender, providing empirical support for the constructs measured by the UH.

Additionally, construct validity was also tested by convergent validity. It was shown that UH was significantly positively correlated with the dimensions of ASI; namely HS and BS ($r = .54, p < .01$; $r = .40, p < .01$, respectively), which suggest that the participants' responses to the items of UH and ASI, which aim to measure similar constructs, are parallel to each other.

2.2.2.1.3 Reliability of UH

6 items were recoded as they were reverse items. In order to examine the scale consistency and inter-item correlations, reliability analysis was performed. Cronbach's alpha was found to be highly reliable ($\alpha = .92$) suggesting that the statements were consistently measuring the same attitude objects.

2.2.2.2 Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor Scale (AVWPH)

2.2.2.2.1 Development of AVWPH

The aim of this scale is to capture attitudes toward punishment of women for honor related issues and honor killings of women. Since there is no instrument to measure these attitudes in Turkey, a new scale was developed depending on interviews and news about honor issues. In the first hand, an item pool consisting of 30 items about honor related violence was constructed. The pool included statements both against and for honor related violence. Considering sentence structures; clarity and simplicity; and correlations between items, 18 statements were selected for factor analysis. Some examples of the items are; “I am against killing of women for ‘honor’”; “no matter what has done, a woman shouldn’t be exposed to violence for the sake of honor”; “I believe that honor killings can be functional as societal discipline tools; “a woman who hasn’t protected her honor should be punished”.

2.2.2.2.2 Validity of AVWPH

Exploratory Factor Analysis. Principle components analysis was performed in order to assess the factor structure and number of factors. The analysis displayed that correlations between components were generally higher than .30; therefore oblique rotation was used in order to decide number of factors. The scree plot suggested 2 factors and this factor structure explained 55.18% of the total variance. In order to decide the final items of the scale, item total correlations, eigenvalues and factor loadings were considered. .30 factor loading was taken as the minimum point of selecting an item as a component of a factor. Additionally, in order to purify the factor structure, items loading on two factors with loadings greater than .40 were eliminated. This process resulted in elimination of 4 items. The analysis yielded 2 factors, however, the items loaded on the second factor had higher loadings on the first factor and when the statements were examined one factor solution was decided to be theoretically more convenient. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was .91, which is a perfect factorability value; and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant at $p < .01$ which is also required for factorability. One factor solution explained for the 47.45% of the total variance. Items’ factor loadings were between .61 and .75. Additionally, item-total correlations ranged from .55 to .71. These item total

correlations are above the minimum criteria for ensuring reliability which is .20 (Aiken, 1994).

The final 14-item AVWPH scale is presented on Table 2.3 along with factor loadings and item-total correlations.

Table 2.3 Cronbach Alpha, Eigenvalue, Explained Variance, Factor Loadings and Item-total Correlations of AVWPH

($\alpha = .91$; eigenvalue = 6.64; explained variance = 47.45%)		
	Loadings	Item-Total
• Namusun korunması için gerekirse kadına sözel şiddet uygulanabilir.	.747	.696
• Namusu kirlenmiş bir kadın ailenin şerefine korunması adına öldürülmelidir.	.747	.670
• Namus cinayetlerinin toplumsal bir terbiye aracı olarak işlevsel olabileceğini düşünüyorum.	.746	.669
• Namusu neden göstererek kadınlara zarar verenleri kınıyorum.*	.743	.678
• Toplumsal kurallara aykırı davranan kadınların toplum veya ailesi tarafından cezalandırılmasını haklı buluyorum.	.736	.689
• Erkek akrabaların “namus” adına kadına şiddet uygulaması beni rahatsız eder.*	.728	.674
• Namus adına işlenmiş cinayetlerde haklılık payı olduğuna inanıyorum.	.707	.637
• Namusun temizlenmesi için kadının öldürülmesine karşı değilim.*	.688	.612
• Ne yapmış olursa olsun namus adına bir kadının şiddete maruz kalmaması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.*	.667	.606
• “Namus” adı altında kadınlara şiddet uygulanmasına karşıyım.*	.638	.584
• Akrabaların/ailenin kadın namusuyla ilgili cezalar vermelerine kızıyorum.*	.634	.579
• “Namus” uğruna kadınların öldürülmesine karşıyım.*	.618	.553
• Başına ne gelmiş olursa olsun namusunu koruyamamış olan kadınların kınanması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.	.609	.549
• Toplumsal düzenin korunması için toplumsal kurallara uymayan kadınların cezalandırılması gerektiğine inanıyorum.	.606	.547

*reverse items

As the Table 2.3 displays, the factor explained for 47.45% of the total variance. It includes statements about physical violence against women, murders of women for honor and punishment of women to protect the family honor (e.g., “I am annoyed of male relatives’ execution of violence on women in the name of ‘honor’”; “I am against killing of women for honor”; “a woman whose honor has been besmirched must be punished to protect the family honor”).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis. In order to test the factor structure obtained by exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis was run. The results gave marginally good fit of the model [$\chi^2(77, N = 351) = 471.18, p < .001, RMSEA = .12,$

GFI = .84, AGFI = .78, CFI = .94, NNFI = .93]. In order to improve the goodness of fit values of the scale the errors of item 10 and item 11; and the errors of item 8 and item 12 were covaried as these pairs of items were very similar to each other had high correlations (10 and 11, .71; and 8 and 12, .61).

These modifications improved the fit results of the scale [$\chi^2(75, N = 351) = 332.99$, $p < .001$, RMSEA = .10, GFI = .88, AGFI = .83, CFI = .96, NNFI = .95]. The factor loadings of the items were ranging between .56 and .73.

In order to obtain further information about the construct validity of the scale known group difference and convergent validity were also used. For known difference validity, it was shown that males' and females' scores on AVWPH significantly differed from each other. That is, males ($M = 2.01$, $SD = 1.02$) endorsed more positive attitudes toward honor killings and violence against women for honor than did women ($M = 1.38$, $SD = .52$, $F(344,1) = 53.56$, $p < .001$). So, the AVWPH was found to be significantly related to gender, providing empirical support for the constructs measured by the AVWPH.

For convergent validity, it was shown that AVWPH was significantly positively correlated with the dimensions of ASI; namely HS and BS ($r = .39$, $p < .01$; $r = .20$, $p < .01$, respectively), which suggest that the participants' responses to the items of AVWPH and ASI, which aim to measure similar constructs, are parallel to each other.

2.2.2.2.3 Reliability of AVWPH

In order to assess internal consistency of the AVWPH scale and Cronbach's alpha for was calculated. It was found to be at highly reliable value ($\alpha = .91$). Therefore, the overall reliability of the scale is confirmed.

2.2.3 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

ASI was originally developed by Glick and Fiske (1996) and adapted to Turkish by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002). It aims to measure ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women including benevolent and hostile forms of sexism. ASI is composed of 22 items with two subscales of Benevolent Sexism (BS) and Hostile Sexism (HS) each having 11

items. Both forms of sexism are measured in three dimensions: paternalism (for BS protective; and for HS dominative paternalism), gender differentiation (for BS complementary; and for HS competitive gender differentiation) and heterosexuality (for BS intimate; and for HS hostile heterosexuality). However, consistent with expectations of the researchers, factor analysis using findings of six studies did not extract subfactors for HS whereas it extracted three subfactors of protective paternalism, complementary gender differentiation and heterosexual intimacy for BS (Glick & Fiske, 1996). The ASI was found to be a highly reliable scale based on these studies. Results revealed Cronbach's alpha scores for ASI between .83 and .92; for HS between .80 and .92; and for BS .73 and .85.

In the Turkish version of the scale, Cronbach's alpha for the ASI was .85; for HS .87 and for BS .78 (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002). Consistent with the findings of Glick and Fiske (1996) factor analysis extracted four factors; HS and three subfactors of BS, and these factors explained 51.07% of the total variance. HS explained 25.69% of the variance and three subfactors of BS; protective paternalism, complementary gender differentiation and heterosexual intimacy, explained 13.01%, 7.22% and 5.14% of the variance respectively.

In the present study, Cronbach's alpha was found to be .89 for the ASI; for HS it was .89 and for BS it was .75. The same factors were extracted: HS and three subscales of BS (protective paternalism, complementary gender differentiation and heterosexual intimacy). They explained for the 53.79 of the variance; 31.83%, 10.69%, 6.41% and 4.86% respectively. For HS, item total correlations were ranging from .53 to .71 and for BS, they were ranging between .30 and .56.

2.2.4 Ambivalence toward Men Inventory (AMI)

AMI was also developed by Glick and Fiske (1999) and adapted to Turkish by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2008). AMI aims at distinguishing between women's benevolent and hostile prejudices and stereotypes toward men. The first version of AMI involves 20 items with two subscales of Benevolence toward Men (BM) and Hostility toward Men (HM) each having 10 items. However, in a cross-cultural study of Glick et al. (2004) one item ("men are less likely to fall apart in emergencies than women are") from BM was omitted from the scale as it did not give reliable results. Each subscale

has three subfactors applying to male power (resentment of paternalism for HM and maternalism for BM), gender differentiation (compensatory gender differentiation for HM and complementary gender differentiation for BM) and heterosexuality (heterosexual hostility for HM and heterosexual intimacy for BM). Glick and Fiske presented the AMI with three studies. Across studies results yielded reliability coefficients between .83 and .87 for AMI; and between .81 and .86 for HM and .79 and .83 for BM.

Consistent with the findings of Glick and Fiske (1999), AMI yielded high reliability scores in the Turkish version of the scale (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2008). Cronbach's alpha for AMI was found to be .82; for HM, .82, and for BM, .83. However, unlike Glick and Fiske (1999)'s suggestion, six subfactors were not found. When factor analysis was forced to two factors –as HM and BM- these factors explained for the 41.56% of the total variance; 16.98% was explained by HM and 24.58% was explained by BM. Moreover, HM and BM were positively correlated with each other ($r = .20$, $N = 836$, $p < .01$) as Glick and Fiske (1999) suggest.

For the present study AMI was also found to be reliable ($\alpha = .83$); for HM, .81 and for BM .86. Parallel with the findings of Sakallı-Uğurlu (2008) six subfactors were not found and analysis was forced to two factors. HM and BM were differentiated with this application explaining for 43.95% of the total variance; 23.69% explained by BM, and 20.26% explained by HM. Additionally, item-total correlations were ranging between .26 and .52 for HM; and .52 and .70 for BM.

2.2.5 Economic System Justification Scale (ESJ)

ESJ was developed by Jost and Thompson (2000) in order to measure ideological tendency to legitimize economic inequality. It includes 17 attitude statements like, “if people work hard, they almost always get what they want”; “it is virtually impossible to eliminate poverty”; “economic positions are legitimate reflections of people's achievements”. The alpha reliability of the scale was found to be acceptable (.73).

The scale was translated to Turkish by the author of this thesis and her advisor for the present study. In order to check the consistency of the language with its original form, back translation was done.

Factor analysis was performed in order to verify the factor structure of the scale. The unrotated factor solution yielded four factors explaining for the 50.56% of the total variance. However, the factor structure was not clearly differentiated, having 15 items loading on the first factor with higher values than the other factors. Moreover, considering the contents of the items and the original form of the scale, it was decided to use the scale with one factor, therefore it was forced to one factor. As two items did not load on this factor they were excluded from further analyses. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was .79, which is acceptable for factorability; and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant at $p < .01$. The factor solution with 15 items explained for the 25.40% of the total variance.

The Cronbach's alpha was found to be .77, which is an acceptable value for reliability. Factor loadings were ranging between .33 and .60. Item-total analysis revealed correlations ranging from .23 to .50.

2.3 Procedure

Participants filled the questionnaire in classrooms either during a course or by appointment. All participants took bonuses for the courses within which they filled the questionnaires out. The purpose of the study was briefly explained to the participants. The participation was on voluntary basis and students were told that they could leave the study whenever they wished. Also, they were assured about the confidentiality of the study; they were not asked for their names or IDs and they were assured that the information they give would be used for only academic purposes. It took approximately 30 minutes for the participants to fill the questionnaires out. Additional information about the study was given to the students after the administration of the questionnaire. For more detailed information about the study or the findings of the study, they were given the contact information of the researchers.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Prior to analyses, data was checked for missing values, normality, linearity, homoscedasticity and outliers. As missing cases were lower than 5%, they were replaced by mean scores of each case. No multivariate outliers were identified. The analysis was performed with 351 participants. In this chapter, correlations among study variables and regression analyses regarding hypotheses will be presented.

3.1 Descriptive Information about the Study Variables

Before giving the mean scores, it should be noted that minimum score on each variable was 1; and maximum score was 6; 1 indicating the lowest score and 6 indicating the highest score on every scale. Beginning with the honor related variables, it was found that participants had slightly low tendencies to view honor related to women's virginity and view men responsible for protecting honor ($M = 2.56, SD = .95$). With regard to honor killings and violence against women in the name of protecting honor, participants had very low scores ($M = 1.69, SD = .85$). In terms of ambivalent sexism toward women, participants displayed slightly high hostile sexism ($M = 3.70, SD = 1.02$) and benevolent sexism ($M = 3.61, SD = .90$). Furthermore, scores on hostility toward men ($M = 4.03, SD = .87$) and benevolence toward men ($M = 3.47, SD = 1.10$) were moderately high, indicating that participants had hostile and benevolent attitudes toward men. Lastly, mean score of system justification was 2.84 ($SD = .71$) which means that participants had slightly low tendency to justify the system.

3.2 Gender Differences among Study Variables

One-way ANOVA was performed in order to assess main effects of gender on study variables. Results revealed that men and women significantly differed on their scores on associating honor with women's virginity and associating women's honor with that of men; violence against women for protecting honor; HS; BM; and system justification (see Table 3.1). The only scores on which gender didn't have significant effect were BS and system justification. Men ($M = 2.97, SD = .99$) had higher

tendency than women ($M = 2.17, SD = .71$) to associate honor with women's virginity and hold men responsible for protecting honor. With regard to attitudes toward honor related violence, men ($M = 2.01, SD = 1.02$) had more positive attitudes toward honor killings and violence against women for honor than did women ($M = 1.38, SD = .52$). In terms of HS, higher scores were endorsed by men ($M = 4.05, SD = 1.01$) than women ($M = 3.37, SD = .92$). Men ($M = 3.83, SD = 1.06$) also endorsed higher scores on BM than women ($M = 3.13, SD = 1.04$). Lastly, different from other significant gender effects, women ($M = 4.34, SD = .83$) endorsed higher HM tendencies than did men ($M = 3.70, SD = .79$). Gender differences among the study variables are given on Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 *Gender Differences among Study Variables*

<i>Variables</i>	<i>General</i>		<i>Males</i>		<i>Females</i>		<i>MS Error</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
UH ^a	2.55	.94	2.97	.99	2.17	.71	55.79	76.202*	.181
AVWPH ^a	1.68	.86	2.01	1.02	1.38	.52	34.166	53.555*	.135
HS ^a	3.70	1.02	4.05	1.01	3.37	.92	40.728	43.635*	.113
BS ^a	3.60	.90	3.65	.85	3.56	.95	.596	.731	.002
HM ^a	4.03	.87	3.70	.79	4.34	.83	35.350	53.466*	.135
BM ^a	3.46	1.10	3.83	1.06	3.13	1.04	42.541	38.837*	.101
ESJ ^a	2.84	.71	2.90	.80	2.78	.60	1.322	2.654	.008

* $p < .01$,

Note: ^a = (UH= Understanding of Honor, AVWPH= Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor, HS= Hostile Sexism, BS=Benevolent Sexism, HM= Hostility toward Men, BM= Benevolence toward Men, ESJ= Economic System Justification).

3.3 Correlations among Study Variables

Correlations between study variables were examined with Pearson two-tailed correlation analysis. Demographic variables included in this analysis were sex, economical class, major and sexual experience. Other study variables were, UH, AVWPH; ASI (HS and BS) and AMI (HM and BM); and ESJ.

Among demographics, economic class was significantly associated with major, AVWPH and ESJ. Economic statuses tended to be higher among the participants from natural sciences than participants from social sciences ($r = .13, p < .05$). On the other hand, as the participants' economic statuses increased, their attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor became more negative ($r = -.12, p < .05$). Additionally, as the economic class increased, participants' tendencies to justify the system also increased ($r = .11, p < .05$). For further information about demographic variables' correlations with other variables, see Table 3.2.

As expected, UH was found to be significantly positively associated with AVWPH ($r = .76, p < .01$). Additionally, it was also significantly positively correlated with HS; BS; BM; and ESJ ($r = .54, p < .01$; $r = .40, p < .01$; $r = .65, p < .01$; $r = .41, p < .01$ respectively).

In the same line, AVWPH also had significantly positive correlation with HS ($r = .39, p < .01$), BS ($r = .20, p < .01$), BM ($r = .48, p < .01$) and ESJ ($r = .30, p < .01$). On the other hand, it was negatively associated with HM ($r = -.13, p < .05$).

Consistent with the literature, HS was found to be positively correlated with BS ($r = .48, p < .01$). In addition, HM and BM were also positively correlated with each other ($r = .18, p < .01$). Moreover, both HS and BS were significantly positively related to BM ($r = .70, p < .01$; $r = .69, p < .01$, respectively); HM ($r = .16, p < .01$; $r = .39, p < .01$, respectively); and ESJ ($r = .34, p < .01$; $r = .29, p < .01$, respectively). Lastly, BM was found to be significantly positively associated with ESJ ($r = .40, p < .01$).

Table 3.2 *Correlations between Study Variables*

<i>Variables</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Sex	-										
2. Economic Status	n.s.	-									
3. Major	-.299**	.133*	-								
4. Sexual Expreience	.298**	n.s.	n.s.	-							
5. UH ^a	-.426**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	-						
6. AVWPH ^a	-.367**	-.116*	n.s.	n.s.	.764**	-					
7. HS ^a	-.336**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.542**	.390**	-				
8. BS ^a	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.109*	.400**	.201**	.479**	-			
9. HM ^a	.367**	n.s.	n.s.	.225**	n.s.	-.132*	.161**	.389**	-		
10. BM ^a	-.319**	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.650**	.480**	.697**	.685**	.179**	-	
11. ESJ ^a	n.s.	.106*	n.s.	n.s.	.407**	.296**	.335**	.292**	n.s.	.402**	-

*Correlation significant at the .05 level (2-Tailed)

**Correlations significant at the .01 level (2-Tailed)

Note: ^a= (UH= Understanding of Honor, AVWPH= Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor, HS= Hostile Sexism, BS=Benevolent Sexism, HM= Hostility toward Men, BM= Benevolence toward Men, ESJ= Economic System Justification).

3.4 Regression Analyses Regarding Research Questions

3.4.1 Predicting Understanding of Honor and Attitudes toward Honor Related Violence toward Women by HS, BS, HM, BM and System Justification

Understanding of honor and attitudes toward honor killings and honor related violence against women were examined through two scales; Understanding of Honor Scale (UH) and Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor Scale (AVWPH). The effects of the independent variable, namely; HS, BS, HM, BM and ESJ on predicting changes on these dependent variables were analyzed through linear regression analyses. Since there were significant gender differences in understanding of honor and attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor, separate analyses were conducted for male and female participants.

3.4.1.1 Predicting Understanding of Honor (UH) by HS, BS, HM, BM and System Justification (ESJ)

Two linear regression analyses were run in order to compare males' and females' results regarding the study variables. HS, BS, HM, BM and ESJ were entered to the regression equation at the same time. R was significantly different from zero for both men and women [$F(5, 160) = 27.53, p < .01$; $F(5, 174) = 20.88, p < .01$, respectively]. Adjusted R^2 was .45 for men; and .38 for women, meaning that the model explained for the 45% of the variance in the tendency to relate honor with women's virginity and hold men responsible for protecting honor among men, and that of 38% among women.

As seen on Table 3.3, among males, viewing honor as related to women's virginity and holding men responsible for it was significantly predicted by HS ($\beta = .18, t = 2.17, p < .05$), BM ($\beta = .49, t = 5.18, p < .01$), and HM ($\beta = -.14, t = -2.16, p < .05$) whereas among females, it was significantly predicted by BM ($\beta = .38, t = 3.65, p < .01$) and ESJ ($\beta = .28, t = 3.90, p < .05$).

Table 3.3 Summary of Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Understanding of Honor and Violence against Women for Protecting Honor

<i>Variables</i>	UH ^a		AVWPH ^a	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
	<i>B</i>	β	β	β
HS ^a	.18*	.01	.10	.00
BS ^a	.03	.08	-.17	-.08
HM ^a	-.17*	-.03	.14	-.04
BM ^a	.46**	.38**	.50**	.39**
ESJ ^a	.15	.28**	.10	.18*
<i>R</i> ²	.46	.38	.26	.19
<i>Adjusted R</i> ²	.45	.36	.24	.16
<i>F change</i>	27.53	20.88	11.19	8.01
<i>Significant F change</i>	.00	.00	.00	.00

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Note: ^a = (UH= Understanding of Honor, AVWPH= Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor, HS= Hostile Sexism, BS=Benevolent Sexism, HM= Hostility toward Men, BM= Benevolence toward Men, ESJ= Economic System Justification).

3.4.1.2 Predicting Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor Scale (AVWPH) by HS, BS, HM, BM and ESJ

Separate regression analyses were run for male and female participants. HS, BS, HM, BM and ESJ were included in the regression equations as predictors and AVWPH was entered as the dependent variable.

R was significantly different from zero for both men and women [$F(5, 160) = 11.19, p < .01$; $F(5, 174) = 8.00, p < .01$, respectively]. Adjusted R^2 was .26 for males and .19 for females indicating that the variables entered explained for 26% of the variance among males, and 19% of the variance among females. AVWPH was significantly predicted by BM ($\beta = .50, t = 4.46, p < .01$) among males. Among females, BM and ESJ significantly predicted AVWPH scores ($\beta = .39, t = 3.25, p < .01$; $\beta = .18, t = 2.21, p < .05$, respectively). The findings are presented on Table 3.3.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

In this section main findings of the present study will be discussed in relation to the hypotheses and literature. The main aim of the study was to explore the effects of ambivalent sexism toward women and men and system justifying beliefs on the understanding of honor and attitudes toward honor related violence against women. After evaluating the findings, limitations of the study and suggestions for future research will be presented.

4.1 General Evaluations of the Study Findings

4.1.1 Gender Differences among Study Variables

The gender effects on study variables were assessed through one-way ANOVA analysis. Gender had significant effects on understanding of honor; more specifically, relating honor with women's sexual purity; and relating women's honor with men's and thus, holding men responsible for protecting honor); attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor; HS; BM and HM. The variables on which gender did not have significant effect were BS and system justification beliefs measured by ESJ scores.

Specifically, in line with the expectations, results revealed that men were more likely than women to relate honor with women's virginity and hold men responsible for protecting honor. This finding is consistent with preliminary research on attitudes toward premarital sex among Turkish samples (e.g., Sakallı-Uğurlu & Glick, 2003; Sakallı et al., 2001). For instance, Sakallı et al. (2001) found that male participants endorsed more negative attitudes toward women's premarital sex than did women. Additionally, Sakallı-Uğurlu and Glick, (2003) concluded that men were willing to marry a virgin than a non-virgin. These results suggest that men are more likely than women to attribute significance to women's virginity as an indicator of "purity" and chastity.

In addition to viewing honor as related to women's virginity and relating it with men's honor, male participants were also found to hold more positive attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor than did women. This finding also confirms the expectations and is also consistent with research on different kinds of violence against women like studies on wife abuse (e.g., Sakallı, 2001); rape studies (e.g., Kleinke & Meyer, 1990) and sexual harassment studies (e.g., Turgut, 2007). For instance, in two wife abuse studies it was found that men exhibited more approval of wife beating than did women (Glick et al., 2002; Sakallı, 2001; Sakallı-Uğurlu & Ulu, 2003) and in addition to physical wife abuse, Sakallı-Uğurlu and Ulu (2003) also found that men approved verbal wife abuse more than women did. In rape studies, it was found that men were more likely than women to blame the victim of rape and hold more negative attitudes toward victims than do women (e.g., Kleinke & Meyer, 1990; Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2007).

Taken together these results suggest that among the present sample, men are more likely to endorse traditional view of honor than women. As mentioned in the introduction, this understanding of honor is rooted from the patriarchal society (Koçtürk, 1992). In the patriarchal system men are socialized to be superior and women are to be inferior in the society and dependent on men (Ergil, 1980). It can be speculated that the reason that makes men display approval of traditional gender roles more than women do is, not to lose their dominance in the society. The understanding that equates honor with women's sexuality and holds men responsible for protecting honor and thus, gives men the right to execute violence on women for honor related reasons; i.e. the control over women's sexuality in the name of honor ensures the legitimization of male dominance in the society. Unsurprisingly, men do not wish to lose their advantaged position.

With regard to participants' ambivalent sexism scores, whereas men got higher scores on HS than did women, men and women did not differ on their BS scores. In terms of HS, the finding is in line with the results of Glick and Fiske (1996), Glick et al. (2000), and Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002). All of these studies and the present study suggest that men are more likely than women to endorse more hostile sexist attitudes toward women. In regard to BS, the finding of the present study is also consistent with other ambivalent sexism studies conducted in Turkey (e.g., Gülçür, 2006;

Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002; Turgut, 2007) and across cultures (Glick et al., 2000). In the study of Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002), among the subfactors of BS whereas men had higher scores on protective paternalism, they got lower scores on complementary gender differentiation than women, and men and women did not differ on heterosexual intimacy scores. In a cross-cultural study among 19 nations, Glick et al. (2000) found differential results between nations in terms of BS scores of men and women. The general trend was that, compared to HS scores, the gender difference in BS scores decreased, disappeared or even reversed in different countries. Among the countries, Turkey was one of those in which men and women did not differ in BS scores. It was concluded that, in the countries where gender equality was low, women were more likely to adopt BS and reject HS compared to the countries where gender equality was high. According to the researchers, the reason of this tendency was to avoid negative effects of hostility toward women and provide protection for women in those countries by adopting benevolent sexist attitudes. This explanation is consistent with system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994) which suggests that disadvantaged group members are likely to justify the existing order in such a way that they view the inequality as natural and desirable. That is, in countries where women and men are viewed stereotypically that men are to be superior, courageous, protecting etc. and women are to be obedient and dependent but also warm and caring, adopting these stereotypes –which are benevolent sexist views- would let women perceive themselves as idealized and protected.

In terms of ambivalence toward men, men and women significantly differed in HM and BM scores. However, the tendency in these scores was in opposite directions for men and women. That is, whereas women scored higher on HM, they scored lower on BM than men. These findings are consistent with the study of Glick and Fiske (1999) through which they introduced the AMI and the validation study of the Turkish version of the scale conducted by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2008). In both of the studies it was found that while females scored higher on HM, males scored higher on BM scores. Additionally, these results were confirmed by several other studies conducted among Turkish samples (e.g., Gülçür, 2006; Turgut, 2007). Lastly, similar findings were reported in the cross-cultural study of Glick et al. (2004); women scored higher than men on HM in all samples but one sample; and men scored higher than women on BM although the difference was not significant in five nations. It was

reported that women's HM scores increased in nations where men endorsed more HS, indicating that women's HM reflects their resentment to men's HS.

Additionally, it was suggested that the reason that makes men endorse more BM than women is that BM legitimizes the ideology that glorifies men (e.g. willing to take risk more than women) and encourages the idea that women should take care of men at home.

4.1.2 Predictive Power of HS, BS, HM, BM and System Justification on Understanding of Honor and Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor

In the present study the understanding of honor was conceptualized based on the widespread understanding of honor in Turkey. That is, as it was mentioned in the introduction, there is a general understanding of honor in Turkey that suggests that honor is associated with, even it is equal to women's sexual purity and that, women's honor is associated with the honor of the extended family and the male members of the family for many people (Sir, 2005). Therefore, protecting honor –that is, claiming control on women's sexual purity- is a duty of the males of the family; either brothers', father's, or husband's (Ergil, 1980). In the case that a woman's sexual purity was not kept, she has to be punished; the punishments can be cutting a limb of the woman, killing the woman, or making her commit suicide. In this study university students' degree of viewing honor within this traditional understanding and their attitudes toward punishment of women for honor related reasons were examined making use of ambivalent sexism theory (along with ambivalence toward women and ambivalence toward men) and system justification theory.

In the following section the findings along with the hypotheses regarding ambivalent sexism toward women and men, and system justification will be presented.

4.1.2.1 Predictive Power of HS, BS, HM, BM and System Justification on Understanding of Honor

It was expected that participants having high scores on BS and HS, BM, and ESJ; would be more likely to get higher scores on UH than those having low scores on these variables. In contrast, it was also expected that participants having low scores on HM would get high scores on UH.

For both males and females, R was significantly different from zero meaning that the set of IVs significantly predicted males' tendency to associate honor with women's virginity and hold men responsible for protecting honor. However, when the unique contributions of IVs were examined it was observed that the unique predictive power of IVs were not all the same for men and women.

Among male participants, HS, BM and HM uniquely predicted UH. Specifically, males who got higher scores on HS and BM also got higher scores on UH than those who got low scores on these variables. In contrast, HM was negatively associated with UH, meaning that males who scored high on HM got lower scores on UH than males who got lower scores on HM. On the other hand, among females, UH was significantly predicted by BM and ESJ. Women scored high on BM and ESJ also tended to score high on UH; that is, they were more likely to associate honor with women's virginity and hold men responsible for protecting honor than those who scored low on these variables.

HS reflects contemptuous characterization of women who are viewed as aiming to dominate men either through feminist ideology or using their sexuality; and it involves negative attitudes toward women who are perceived as violating traditional gender roles and seeking to have control over men (Glick & Fiske, 1996). It serves to legitimize traditional gender roles, male power, men's social control over women and men's exploitation of women as sexual objects. The relationship between HS and UH suggested by the present study is consistent with the findings of Sakallı-Uğurlu and Glick (2003) who found that HS was predictive of males' preferences of marrying a virgin than a non-virgin among a Turkish sample.

According to ambivalent sexism toward men (Glick & Fiske, 1999), BM involves subjectively positive but still sexist attitudes toward men, which includes nurturance of men, complementary gender differentiation and heterosexual attraction. Not surprisingly BM, which justifies patriarchy (Glick et al., 2004) by supporting subservience of women, was predictive of understanding of honor in terms of traditional contention among both men and women.

With regard to HM, Glick and Fiske (1999) propose that HM reflects women's resentment to men who are the powerful group and involves hostile attitudes and feelings toward men. It is not surprising that HM is negatively associated with relating honor with women's virginity. Because, holding this traditional view of honor is a reflection of patriarchy which seeks to have control over women's sexuality (Koçtürk, 1992) and hostility toward men is in opposition to this understanding in that it reflects negative attitudes toward men.

Lastly, ESJ, which measures the tendency to legitimize the existing economic inequality, was predictive of UH among females. However, it didn't reach the significance level among males, though it had high correlation with UH and was close to the significance level ($p = .057$). According to system justification theory (Jost & Hunyady, 2002) people engage in system justification to adapt to unjust or unpleasant realities. Specifically, it suggests that system justification plays a palliative role by reducing guilt, dissonance, anxiety, discomfort and ambiguity for people both in advantaged and disadvantaged positions. From this point of view the findings are meaningful in that they suggest that participants –especially women- having high tendency to legitimize the existing order are also in favor of the traditional contention of honor. Justifying the system lets them feel better about the inequality in the society.

Additionally, the finding that women's ESJ scores significantly predicted their view of honor as related to women's virginity, whereas men's did not, is in line with the contention of system justification theory which suggests that sometimes the disadvantaged group internalize the existing order more strongly than the advantaged one (Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). That is, with regard to women's understanding of honor, though women are exposed to strict rules of the society for protecting their sexual purity, their tendencies to relate honor with virginity is explained by their system justification scores.

In short, as expected it was found that high levels of HS, BM and ESJ; and low levels of HM predict viewing honor as related to women's virginity and holding men responsible for protecting it. It is reasonable to get such a result as all of these variables are associated with seeking for the continuation of the existing order, either

in terms of gender relations or economic order. These findings confirm the second hypothesis to a large extent, with the exception that BS did not uniquely predict UH and whereas HS, BM and HM significantly predict it among males, BM and ESJ significantly predict it among females. The failure to confirm all the propositions of the hypothesis may be due to the high correlations between the IVs. That is, because the predictors were significantly correlated with one another, they might have taken the effects of each other.

4.1.2.2 Predictive Power of HS, BS, HM, BM and System Justification on Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor

The expectations on the effects of independent variables on attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor were the same with their effects on the understanding of honor. Namely, it was expected that participants getting high scores on BS and HS, BM, and ESJ; would also get higher scores on AVWPH than those having low scores on these variables. On the contrary, it was expected that lower scores on HM would predict higher scores on AVWPH.

The independent variables were entered to the regression equation at the same time and analysis revealed that R was significantly different from zero for both male and female participants. The unique predictive powers of IVs differed for men and women; whereas AVWPH was uniquely predicted by only BM among men, it was predicted by BM and ESJ among women.

Both male and female participants with higher levels of BM tended to endorse more positive attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor than participants with lower levels of BM. As mentioned above, BM includes relatively positive aspects of sexist beliefs about men (Glick & Fiske, 1999) and these positive beliefs serve to justify male dominance and traditional gender roles. From this point of view, it is reasonable to find that BM is positively associated with attitudes toward honor related violence against women. This finding is in line with the finding of the study of Chapleau, Oswald, and Russell (2007) who found that BM but not HM was positively correlated with rape myth acceptance which suggests that high BM is associated with high blaming of rape victims. Additionally, in Sakallı-Uğurlu and Gülçür (2008) BM had a strong relationship with negative attitudes toward women in

natural sciences and it predicted less positive attitudes toward men in social sciences. The finding is also consistent with the other findings among the present study which suggest that BM is also predictive of understanding of honor.

With regard to ESJ, women who got higher scores on ESJ were also more likely to hold more positive attitudes toward violence against women in the name of honor. This is in line with system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994) which suggests that the members of disadvantaged groups may be more likely than the members of advantaged groups to endorse system justifying beliefs because these beliefs would legitimize their inferior position. Even though in the present study male and female participants' ESJ scores did not differ from each other, it is interesting to find that females' but not males' ESJ scores were predictive of attitudes toward violence against women. The effect of system justification on attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor is also in line with rape studies which suggest that higher 'just world' belief was associated with higher tendency to hold rape victims responsible for the rape (e.g., Aderman, Brehm, & Katz, 1974; Kleinke & Meyer, 1990; Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2007).

Taken together, the expectations about the effects of HS, BS, HM, BM and ESJ on AVWPH were partially confirmed as the model tested by the regression equation was significantly predictive of AVWPH. However, contrary to the expectations, not all the variables uniquely predicted the variance on AVWPH with the exception of BM and ESJ. Similar to the findings about understanding of honor, the failure to find unique contributions of the predictors can be a result of high correlations of them with each other, as the correlations of all the predictors with AVWPH were significant.

4.2 Contributions of the Thesis

The concept of honor and honor related violence toward women have taken a great deal of attention in different disciplines and by many scholars around the world (e.g., Baron, 2006; Gah, 2003; Hasan, 2003; Parla, 2001; Pina-Cabral, 1989; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Sev'er & Yurdakul, 2001). Nevertheless, to our knowledge, there is no study dealing with these issues in social psychology literature. This thesis aims at making a prelude to fill this gap in the literature. For the purpose it investigates the relationship

of (1) viewing honor as related to women's virginity and holding men responsible for protecting it; and (2) attitudes toward violence against women in the name of honor with ambivalent sexism toward women and men; and system justification.

The main contribution of this thesis to the literature, as mentioned above, is that it introduced a new domain of research, the understanding of honor, which is a hot issue of Turkey and many other countries. Moreover, this thesis is –to our knowledge- the first one examining the concept of honor and honor related violence with attitudinal variables. That is, different from sociological, anthropological or other disciplinary studies, this study examined the relationship between several attitudinal variables, understanding of honor and attitudes toward honor related violence.

More specifically, the study demonstrated the relationship between domains of ambivalent sexism toward men and women and system justifying tendency; and understanding of honor and honor related violence toward women. Namely, it was shown that among males, higher levels of HS and BM; and lower levels of HM were associated with viewing honor as related to women's virginity and holding men responsible for protecting honor. Regarding attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor, it was shown that males with higher levels of BM were more likely to endorse more positive attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor. System justification was not predictive of honor related variables among males. On the other hand, women with higher levels of BM and system justification tendency were more likely to associate honor with women's virginity and hold men responsible for protecting it; and hold more positive attitudes toward violence against women for protecting honor.

Finally, the thesis contributed to the literature by introducing two new scales: Understanding of Honor Scale, which aims at measuring the tendency to relate honor with women's virginity and hold men responsible for protecting it; and Attitudes toward Violence against Women for Protecting Honor Scale; which measures attitudes toward honor killings and other kinds of violence against women for protecting honor. Additionally, the translation of Economic System Justification

Scale (Jost & Thompson, 2000) into Turkish and application of it among a Turkish sample contributed to the social psychology literature in Turkey.

4.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

There are some limitations of the thesis which should be taken into consideration.

First of all, there may be problems about the newly developed scales which might have been overlooked by the researchers. Even though the scales were tested for validity by confirmatory factor analysis, convergent validity and known group difference validity, divergent validity was not tested and test-retest reliability was not performed. Forthcoming studies should take these absences into consideration.

Additionally, this study was the first one using the Turkish version ESJ and there are some problems regarding this scale. That is, although its alpha value was at a satisfactory level (.77), its item-total correlations, factor loadings, and the explained variance were not very sufficient. Modifications on ESJ should be considered.

Moreover, in order to measure gender related system justification, gender-specific System Justification Scale (Jost & Kay, 2005) can be translated and used.

Another limitation of the study is about generalization of the findings. That is, the sample was composed of university students, most of who were from METU. This sample is problematic for generalization because they do not represent the whole population. They are highly educated, grown up mostly in big cities, belonging to generally middle to upper middle classes and more than half of them defined themselves close to leftist ideology. Moreover, the mean scores of UH and AVWPH give a cue about this limitation which are low (for UH, $M=2.56$, for AVWPH, $M=1.69$). Given these characteristics, the responses of the sample may not be representative of the large part of the population. It could be more informative to replicate the study among a sample in which honor culture constitutes a large part of the local culture and violence against women for honor takes place.

REFERENCES

- Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(1), 111-125.
- Aderman, D., Brehm, S. S., & Katz, L. B. (1974). Empathic observation of an innocent victim: The just world revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29, 342-347.
- Aiken, C. (1994). Some observations and recommendations concerning research methodology in the behavioral sciences. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 54(4), 848.
- Arin, C. (2001). Femicide in the name of honor in Turkey. *Violence Against Women*, 7(7), 821-825.
- Baron, B. (2006). Women, honour, and the state: Evidence from Egypt. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 42(1), 1-20.
- Bora, A., & Üstün, İ. (2005). *Şıcaak aile ortamı": demokratikleşme sürecinde kadın ve erkekler*. İstanbul: TESEV.
- Burn, S. M., & Busso, J. (2005). Ambivalent sexism, spiritual literalism, and religiosity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29(4), 412-418.
- Chapleau, K.M., Oswald, D.L., & Russell, B.L. (2007). How ambivalent sexism toward women and men support rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles*, 57(1/2), 131-136.
- Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü, töre cinayetlerini mercek altına aldı (n.d.). Retrieved March, 1, 2008. <http://www.tumgazeteler.com/?a=1766990>
- Ergil, D. (1980). *Türkiye'de terör ve şiddet*. Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi.
- Franchina, J. J., Eisler, R. M., & Moore, T. M. (2001). Masculine gender role stress and intimate abuse: Effects of masculine gender relevance of dating situations and female threat on men's attributions and affective responses. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2(1), 34-41.
- Gezik, E. (2003). *Şeref, kimlik ve cinayet*. Ankara-Turkey: Kalan Basım.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491-512.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1999). The ambivalence toward men inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 519-536.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (2001). An ambivalent alliance. *American Psychologist*, 56(2), 109-118.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., Adetoun, B., Osagie, J. E., Akande, A., Alao, A., Brunner, A., Willemsen, T. M., Chipeta, K., Dardenne, B., Dijksterhuis, A., Wigboldus, D., Eckes, T., Six-Materna, I.,

- Exposito, F., Moya, M., Foddy, M., Kim, H. J., Lameiras, M., Sotelo, M. J., Mucchi-Faina, A., Romani, M., Sakallı, N., Udagbe, B., Yamamoto, M., Ui, M., Ferriera, M. C., & Lopez, W. L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 763-775.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Masser, B., Manganelli, A. M., Huang, L., Castro, Y. R., Willemsen, T. M., Six-Materna, I., Lameiras, M., Eckes, T., Volpato, C., Pek, J. C. X., Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Pereira, M. L. D., Brunner, A., & Wells, R. (2004). Bad but bold: Ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender inequality in 16 Nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(5), 713-728.
- Gülçür, G. (2006). *Ambivalent sexism, ambivalence toward men and demographic variables as predictors of Turkish college students' attitudes toward men in social and women in natural sciences*. Unpublished master's thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara-Turkey.
- Güldünya'nın ölümünden polisler de sorumlu. (2001). Retrieved March 1, 2008 from http://www.bianet.org/arsiv/gecmis?rcat_id=69
- Hasan, M. (2003). The politics of honor: Patriarchy, the state and the murder of women in the name of family honor. In N. Hannah (Ed.) *Israeli family and community: Women's time* (pp. 1-36). London: Valentine Mitchell.
- Herzfeld, M. (1980). Honor and shame: Problems in the comparative analysis of moral systems. *Man*, 15, 339-351.
- Honor killings defended by Pakistan senate. (1999). *Women's International Network News*, 25(4), 36.
- İlkkaracan, P. (1998). *Doğu Anadolu'da kadın ve aile*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 1-27.
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25, 881-919.
- Jost, J. T., Blount, S., Pfeffer, J., & Hunyady, G. (2003). Fair market ideology: Its cognitive-motivational underpinnings. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 25, 53-91.
- Jost, J. T., & Burgess, D. (2000). Attitudinal ambivalence and the conflict between group and system justification motives in low status groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 293-305.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(3), 339-375.
- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2002). The psychology of system justification and the palliative function of ideology. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 13, 113-153.

- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of system justifying ideologies. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14(5), 260-265.
- Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 498-509.
- Jost, J. T., Pelham, B. W., Sheldon, O., & Sullivan, B. N. (2003). Social inequality and the reduction of ideological dissonance on behalf of the system: Evidence of enhanced system justification among the disadvantaged. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 209-232.
- Jost, J. T., & Thompson, E. P. (2000). Group-based dominance and opposition to equality as independent predictors of self-esteem, ethnocentrism, and social policy attitudes among African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36(3), 209-233.
- Kay, A. C., Jimenez, M. C., & Jost, J. T. (2002). Sour grapes, sweet lemons, and the anticipatory rationalization of the status quo. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1300-1312.
- Kay, A. C., & Jost, J. T. (2003). Complementary justice: Effects of “poor but happy” and “poor but honest” stereotype exemplars on system justification and implicit activation of the justice motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 823-837.
- Kay, A. C., Jost, J. T., & Young, S. (2005). Victim derogation and victim enhancement as alternate routes to system justification. *Psychological Science*, 16(3), 240-246.
- Kleinke, C. L., & Meyer, C. (1990). Evaluation of rape victim by men and women with high and low belief in a just world. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 14(3), 343-354.
- Koçtürk, T. (1992). *A matter of honor: Experience of Turkish women immigrants*. London: Atlantic Highlands.
- Lerner, M. J. (1965). Evaluation of performance as a function of performer's reward and attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 355-360.
- Lau, G. P., Kay, A. C., & Spencer, S. J. (2008). Loving those who justify inequality: The effects of system threat on attraction to women who embody benevolent sexist ideals. *Psychological Science*, 19, 20-21.
- Not all Islamic countries practice honor killings. (2000). *Women's International Network News*, 26(1), 42.
- Okyay, G. (2007). *Women victimization : In the case of family honor in Turkey*. Unpublished master's thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara-Turkey.
- Ondörtlük damadın namus cinayeti. (2003). Retrieved on April 1, 2008 from <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/2003/09/23/yasam/yas01.html>
- Parla, A. (2001). The “honor” of the state: Virginity examinations in Turkey. *Feminist Studies*, 27(1), 65-87.
- Peristiany, J. G. (1965). Honour and shame; the values of Mediterranean society. In E. Gezik, *Şeref, kimlik ve cinayet* (pp. 13-14). Ankara-Turkey: Kalan Basım.

- Pervizat, L. (2005). *Uluslar arası insan hakları bağlamında namus cinayetleri: Kavramsal ve hukuksal boyutu ve Türkiye özelinin değerlendirmesi*. Unpublished doctorate thesis. Marmara University, Istanbul-Turkey.
- Pina-Cabral, J. (1989). The Mediterranean as a category of regional comparison: A critical view. *Current Anthropology*, 30(3), 399-406.
- Pitt-Rivers, J. A. (1977). *The fate of shechem : Or, the politics of sex : Essays in the anthropology of the Mediterranean*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salman, S. (2007). *The predictors of attitudes toward sexual harassment : Locus of control, ambivalent sexism, and gender differences*. Unpublished master's thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara-Turkey.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2002). Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ölçeği: Geçerlik-güvenirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 17(49), 47-58.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2008). Erkeklerle yönelik çelişik tutumlar ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 11(21), 1-11.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., & Glick, P. (2003) Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward women who engage in premarital sex in Turkey. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40(3), 296-302.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., & Gülçür, G. (2008). *Ambivalent sexism, gender and major as predictors of attitudes toward women in natural and men in social sciences*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Yalçın, Z. S., & Glick, P. (2007). Ambivalent sexism, belief in a just world, and empathy as predictors of Turkish students' attitudes toward rape victims. *Sex Roles*, 57(11/12), 889-895.
- Sev'er, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2001). Culture of honor, culture of change: A feminist analysis of honor killings in Turkey. *Violence Against Women*, 7(9), 964-998.
- Sibley, C. G., Overall, N. C., & Duckitt, J. (2007). When women become more hostilely sexist toward their gender: The system-justifying effect of benevolent sexism. *Sex Roles*, 57(9/10), 743-754.
- Sümer, N. (2000). Yapısal eşitlik modelleri: Temel kavramlar ve örnek uygulamalar. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 3(6), 49-74.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(2), 199-214.
- Şahin, C. (1999). Törelere etkisiyle işlenen adam öldürme suçlarının ceza hukuku açısından değerlendirilmesi. In *T.C. Başbakanlık Kadının Statüsü ve Sorunları Genel Müdürlüğü*. (pp. 35-43). Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Kadının Statüsü ve Sorunları Genel Müdürlüğü.
- Tezcan, M. (1999). Ülkemizde aile içi töre ya da namus cinayetleri. In *T.C. Başbakanlık Kadının Statüsü ve Sorunları Genel Müdürlüğü*. (pp. 21-27). Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Kadının Statüsü ve Sorunları Genel Müdürlüğü.
- The facts about 'honor crimes' in Jordan. (1999). *Women's International Network News*, 25(4), 53.

- Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & St-Pierre, L. (1999). Neo-sexism among women: The role of personally experienced social mobility attempts. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(12), 1487-1497.
- Turgut, S. (2007). *Predictors of attitudes toward sexual harrassment: Ambivalent sexism, ambivalence toward men, and gender differences*. Unpublished master's thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara-Turkey.
- Twenge, J. M. (1997). Attitudes toward women, 1970-1995. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 35-51.
- Vargün, B. (2002). *Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi ve Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi öğrencileri arasında bir kültür değeri olarak bekaret kavramının sosyal antropolojik açıdan incelenmesi*. Unpublished master's thesis. Ankara University, Ankara-Turkey.
- Viki, G. T., & Abrams, D. (2002). But she was unfaithful: Benevolent sexism and reactions to rape victims who violate traditional gender role expectations. *Sex Roles*, 47(5/6), 289-293.
- Wakslak, C. J., Jost, J. T., Tyler, T. R., & Chen, E. S. (2007). Moral outrage mediates the dampening effect of system justification on support for redistributive social policies. *Psychological Science*, 18(3), 267-274.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

UNDERSTANDING OF HONOR SCALE

NAMUS ALGISI ÖLÇEĞİ

Lütfen her bir ifade ile ne derece hemfikir olup olmadığınızı verilen ölçekteki sayılardan uygun olanı ifadenin yanındaki boşluğa yazarak belirtiniz.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Hiç					Çok
Katılmıyorum					Katılıyorum

- ___ 1. Bekâretin sadece kadınlarla ilişkilendirilmesi beni rahatsız ediyor.*
- ___ 2. Bir kadının namusunun ailesi tarafından korunması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.
- ___ 3. Namus kavramının kadın özgürlüğünü sınırladığına inanıyorum.*
- ___ 4. Bakire olmayan bir kız namusunu kaybetmiştir.
- ___ 5. Kadınların cinsel hayatlarının aileleri tarafından takip edilmesinin kadınların hatalar yapıp namuslarını kirletmelerini önleyebileceği kanısındayım.
- ___ 6. Namus adı altında kadınların sosyal ilişkilerinin kısıtlanmasını haksızlık olarak görüyorum.*
- ___ 7. Erkek akrabaların bir kadının namusuna karışmamaları gerektiğine inanıyorum.
- ___ 8. Namusun korunması için kadınların bekaretlerinin kontrol altında tutulmasını destekliyorum.
- ___ 9. Kadınlar kendi hareketlerinden sorumludur, bu nedenle ağabey ve babaların kızların namusuna karışmaması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.*
- ___ 10. Namusun kadının cinsel saflığıyla ilişkili olduğunu düşünüyorum.
- ___ 11. Erkek namusunun kızlarının ve eşlerinin namusuyla ilişkili olmasını doğru buluyorum.
- ___ 12. Bence bekâret “kadın namusu”nun simgesi değildir.*

- ___ 13. Evlilik öncesi cinsel ilişkiye girmemiş bir kız namusludur.
- ___ 14. Kadının namusunun erkek akrabalar tarafından korunmasının gerekli olduğuna inanıyorum.
- ___ 15. Kadını kontrol etmek için “namus”un kullanılmasının gerekli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

*reversed items

___ 12. Toplumsal kurallara aykırı davranan kadınların toplum veya ailesi tarafından cezalandırılmasını haklı buluyorum.

___ 13. “Namus” adı altında kadınlara şiddet uygulanmasına karşıyım.*

___ 14. Namus adına işlenmiş cinayetlerde haklılık payı olduğuna inanıyorum.

*reversed items

- ___15. Bir kadın bir erkeğin bağılılığını kazandıktan sonra genellikle o erkeğe sıkı bir yular takmaya çalışır.
- ___16. Adaletli bir yarışmada kadınlar erkeklere karşı kaybettikleri zaman tipik olarak kendilerinin ayrımcılığa maruz kaldıklarından yakınırılar.
- ___17. İyi bir kadın erkeği tarafından yüceltilmelidir.
- ___18. Erkeklere cinsel yönden yaklaşılabilir olduklarını gösterircesine şakalar yapıp daha sonra erkeklerin tekliflerini reddetmekten zevk alan birçok kadın vardır.
- ___19. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha yüksek ahlaki duyarlılığa sahip olma eğilimindedirler.
- ___20. Erkekler hayatlarındaki kadın için mali yardım sağlamak için kendi rahatlarını gönüllü olarak feda etmelidirler.
- ___21. Feministler erkeklere makul olmayan istekler sunmaktadırlar.
- ___22. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha ince bir kültür anlayışına ve zevkine sahiptirler.

APPENDIX D

AMBIVALENCE TOWARD MEN INVENTORY (GLICK & FISKE, 1999)

ERKEKLERE YÖNELİK ÇELİŞİK DUYGULAR ÖLÇEĞİ

Lütfen her bir ifade ile ne derece hemfikir olup olmadığınızı verilen ölçekteki sayılardan uygun olanı ifadenin yanındaki boşluğa yazarak belirtiniz.

- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| Hiç | | | | | Çok |
| Katılmıyorum | | | | | Katılıyorum |
- ___ 1. Çiftlerden ikisi de çalışıyor olsa bile, kadın evde erkeğine bakma konusunda daha fazla sorumluluk üstlenmelidir.
- ___ 2. Bir erkek cinsel açıdan çekici bulduğu kadını yatağa atmak için ne gerekiyorsa yapmak konusunda tipik olarak hiç bir ahlaki değere sahip değildir.
- ___ 3. Erkekler kadınlara “yardım ediyor” gibi gözükrken, çoğunlukla kendilerinin kadınlardan daha iyi olduklarını kanıtlamaya çalışırlar.
- ___ 4. Her kadının kendisini el üstünde tutacak bir erkeğe ihtiyacı vardır.
- ___ 5. Eğer kendilerine yol gösterecek kadınlar olmasaydı erkekler dünyada kaybolurlardı.
- ___ 6. Eğer kadının bir erkekle uzun süreli, bağlılık içeren bir ilişkisi yoksa bu hayatta gerçek anlamda kendini tamamlamış sayılmaz.
- ___ 7. Erkekler hasta olduklarında bebekler gibi davranırlar.
- ___ 8. Erkekler toplumda kadınlardan daha fazla kontrole sahip olmak için her zaman çabalarlar.
- ___ 9. Erkekler temelde kadınlara maddi güvence sağlamak açısından yararlıdırlar.
- ___ 10. Kadın haklarına duyarlı olduğunu iddia eden erkekler bile aslında ev işlerinin ve çocuk bakımının çoğunu kadının üstlendiği geleneksel bir ilişki isterler.
- ___ 11. Her kadının hayran olduğu bir erkeği olmalıdır.
- ___ 12. Erkekler başkalarını korumak için kendilerini tehlikeye atmaya daha gönüllüdürler.

- ___ 13. Erkekler kadınlarla konuşurken genellikle baskın olmaya çalışırlar.
- ___ 14. Çoğu erkek kadınlar için eşitliği sözde savunur ama bir kadını kendilerine eşit olarak görmeyi kaldıramazlar.
- ___ 15. Kadınlar erkeksiz eksiktirler.
- ___ 16. Özüne bakıldığında, çoğu erkek gerçekten çocuk gibidir.
- ___ 17. Erkekler kadınlara oranla risk almaya daha gönüllüdürler.
- ___ 18. Çoğu erkek, kadınlar üzerinde güç sahibi oldukları bir pozisyonda buldukları anda, üstü kapalı yolla bile olsa kadınları cinsel açıdan taciz ederler.
- ___ 19. Kadınlar evde erkeklerine bakmalıdırlar çünkü eğer erkekler kendi kendilerine bakmak zorunda kalırlarsa bunu beceremezler.

APPENDIX E

ECONOMIC SYSTEM JUSTIFICATION SCALE (JOST & THOMPSON, 2000)

EKONOMİK SİSTEMİ MEŞRULAŞTIRMA ÖLÇEĞİ

Lütfen her bir ifade ile ne derece hemfikir olup olmadığınızı verilen ölçekteki sayılardan uygun olanı ifadenin yanındaki boşluğa yazarak belirtiniz.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Hiç					Çok
Katılmıyorum					Katılıyorum

- ___ 1. Eğer insanlar çok çalışırlarsa neredeyse her istediklerini elde ederler.
- ___ 2. Toplumdaki zenginlik farklarından doğa kanunları sorumludur.
- ___ 3. Ekonomik sistemin adil olmadığını düşünmek için birçok neden vardır. *
- ___ 4. Yoksulluğu ortadan kaldırmak nerdeyse imkansızdır.
- ___ 5. Yoksul insanlar temelde zengin insanlardan farklı değillerdir.*
- ___ 6. Toplumumuzda yükselemeyen birçok insan sistemi değil kendini suçlamalıdır.
- ___ 7. Sosyal sınıf farklılıkları doğal düzendeki farklılıkları yansıtır.
- ___ 8. Toplumdaki ekonomik farklılıklar kaynakların adaletsiz dağılımını yansıtır.
- ___ 9. Her zaman yoksul insanlar olacaktır, çünkü hiçbir zaman herkese yetecek iş imkanı olmayacaktır.
- ___ 10. Ekonomik pozisyonlar insanların başarılarının adil yansımalarıdır.
- ___ 11. Eğer insanlar eşitliği sağlamak için ekonomik sistemi değiştirmek isteselerdi bunu yapabilirlerdi.*
- ___ 12. Kaynakların eşit dağılımı doğaya aykırıdır.
- ___ 13. Aşırı zenginliği ve aşırı yoksulluğu aynı anda üreten bir ekonomik sisteme sahip olmak adil değildir.*
- ___ 14. Gelirleri daha eşit dağıtmaya çalışmanın anlamı yoktur.
- ___ 15. Zenginle fakir arasında doğuştan gelen farklılıklar yoktur; bu durum sadece içinde doğduğunuz koşullardan kaynaklanır. *

*reversed items

APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Aşağıdaki demografik bilgileri lütfen eksiksiz olarak doldurunuz:

1. Cinsiyetiniz: ___ Erkek ___ Kadın
2. Yaşınız: _____
3. Bölümünüz: ___ Sosyal Bilimler ___ Fen Bilimleri
4. İçinde yetiştiğiniz din: _____
5. Yaşamınızın çoğunun geçtiği yer nedir?
A)- Metropol (İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir) B)- Şehir
C)- Kasaba D)- Köy
6. Aşağıdaki ölçekte Türkiye'deki ekonomik durumunuzu en iyi hangi seçenek yansıtıyor?
Alt sınıf 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Üst sınıf
7. Aşağıdakilerden hangisi politik görüşünüzü tanımlar?
Radikal sol Sol Sola yakın Orta Sağa yakın Sağ Radikal sağ
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Hiç cinsel ilişki yaşadınız mı? ___ Evet ___ Hayır

KATILDIĞINIZ İÇİN TEŞEKKÜRLER...