Men and Masculinities
http://jmm.sagepub.com/

Unpacking Masculinities in the Context of Social Change: Internal Complexities of the Identities of Married Men in Turkey

Hale Bolak Boratav, Güler Okman Fisek and Hande Eslen Ziya

Men and Masculinities published online 13 June 2014
DOI: 10.1177/1097184X14539511

The online version of this article can be found at:
http://jmm.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/06/12/1097184X14539511

Published by:
SAGE
http://www.sagepublications.com

Additional services and information for *Men and Masculinities* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://jmm.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://jmm.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://jmm.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/06/12/1097184X14539511.refs.html

>> OnlineFirst Version of Record - Jun 13, 2014

What is This?

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

Article

Men and Masculinities
1-26
© The Author(s) 2014
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1097184X14539511
jmm.sagepub.com

Unpacking Masculinities in the Context of Social Change: Internal Complexities of the Identities of Married Men in Turkey

Hale Bolak Boratav[1], Güler Okman Fişek[2], and Hande Eslen Ziya[3]

Abstract

Through analysis of fifty in-depth interviews with married men from different socio-economic backgrounds and ages in seven provinces in Turkey, this article examines the internal dilemmas and contradictions in the construction of masculine identities in the context of social change in the country. The focus is on men's experiences of most salient relational contexts with their parents, their children, and their spouses, and the possible implications of these relational experiences as well as prevailing social discourses for how these men negotiate masculinity. Overall, the men's narratives indicate that both the relationship with the children and with the wife are relationships in transition, reflected in the dilemmas and contradictions at the discursive level, as well as between discourse and lived reality, resulting from the juxtaposition of relatively traditional backgrounds and the prevailing discourse of traditionalism with the

[1] Department of Psychology, Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey
[2] Department of Psychology, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey
[3] Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, UK

Corresponding Author:
Hale Bolak Boratav, Department of Psychology, Istanbul Bilgi University, Kazim Karabekir Caddesi. No. 1, Istanbul 34040, Turkey.
Email: hale.boratav@bilgi.edu.tr

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

emerging modernist discourse of egalitarianism. Findings are discussed in the context of the relevant literature and the socio-cultural context.

Keywords
fatherhood, gender equality, identity, marriage, psychology, Europe

Introduction

The area of men's studies has been rapidly growing since the 1980s (Kimmel and Messner 2007). Following Connell's (1987, 1995) groundbreaking theoretical and empirical work that problematized the construct of masculinity, scholarly work on the plurality of masculinities has burgeoned in the last three decades. More recently, there has been increased emphasis on the need to investigate the interdependencies between structural, individual, and cultural factors in relation to masculinities (Lusher and Robbins 2009), a call for an intersectionality perspective on how class, race and ethnicity, age, sexualities and nation impact masculinities (Messerschmidt 2012), a recognition of the value of life-history research for unpacking the dynamics or internal complexity of masculinities, and attention to how masculinities are subject to change (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). It is in the context of these discussions that our project on masculinities in Turkey was conceived.

Connell and Messerchmidt's (2005, 852) important paper on rethinking the concept of "hegemonic masculinity" called for an emphasis on the "layering, the potential internal contradiction, within all practices that construct masculinities." Although their call is in reference specifically to hegemonic masculinity, one can argue that for the majority of men, their experiences of relational contexts with their parents, their children, and their spouses are likely to engender tension, especially in the context of social change. This article is about the internal dilemmas and contradictions in the identities of married men in the context of social change in Turkey, with a particular focus on the relational practices within which masculinities are constructed. In the following overview, we aim to set a context for our study, first by looking at the international literature and then by examining the situation in Turkey.

Research in different parts of the world has brought into focus the gradual changes in men's constructions of what it means to be a man, as they negotiate different masculinity discourses that range from more traditional to more democratic, shifting gender relations, and the discrepancies between gender ideologies and lived realities. The questions of what it means to be a man, a father, and a husband seem to constitute an increasingly contested terrain that might invoke uncertainty, confusion, or contradictions. Sullivan (2004, 211) has argued for the importance of developing "theoretical frameworks of change that incorporate the complexity of the intersection between ideology, attitudes and practices in situated, located contexts." Studies

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

in Europe, North America (Sullivan 2004) and non-Western contexts point to local and situated processes of change, often inscribing tension.

For example, Vigoya's (2001) review of life history research on the construction of masculine identities in different Latin American countries such as Brazil, Chile, and Mexico suggests that social and economic shifts have prompted changes in male attitudes and behaviors that were historically tied to concepts of authority and tradition, while Fuller's (2001) research on the constitution of male gender identities in the context of change in Peru reveals how the coexistence of parallel and opposing discourses about masculinity (such as the domestic discourse, the discourse of virility, and the public discourse) offers men with spaces to reaffirm their masculine identities. Aboim (2009) points to a similar dynamic in post-colonial urban Maputo in Mozambique, where men, caught between tradition and male dominance, and legal changes that valorize and legitimize gender equality, reconstruct mixed or hybrid masculinities.

Attitudes and practices related to gender-based-hierarchy and the traditional division of labor in the marital relationship appear to be the most resistant to change (Steil 2000; Thebaud 2010; Wyrod 2008). For most men, marital equality may mean a loss of certain privileges (Steil 2000); compared to women, endorsing traditional gender roles is less likely to influence men's relationship satisfaction (Burn and Ward 2005), and life transitions such as geting married or having a child do not necessarily affect men's participation in household responsibilities (Baxter, Hewitt, and Haynes 2008; Dribe and Stanfors 2009).

Data on changes in the meaning and practice of fatherhood over the last thirty years suggest that in most places, this is where men may be able to stretch more (Coltrane 1996; Hearn and Morgan 1990; Lamb 1986; Larossa 1988; Townsend 2002). The traditional father role has been questioned since the 1970s (Pleck 2004), bringing with it inevitable tensions and conflicts. Signs of change have included an increasing emphasis on sharing childcare, household chores, and closer relationships with children (Craig 2006; Lamb and Tamis-LeMonda 2004). However, while norms might change, behaviors can be more resistant (Cooper 2000; Lamb and Tamis-LeMonda 2004; Williams 2008). During this transition (Cooper 2000) fathers appear to be helpers of mothers more than primary caretakers, with breadwinning being still more important (Haas and O'Brien 2010). Fathers' caretaking mostly takes the form of doing fun things outside the home (Craig 2006; Lamb and Tamis-LeMonda 2004), and middle-class fathers tend to be more democratic than others (Larossa 2007; Marsiglio et al. 2000).

The conflicted side of parenting has to do with traditional gender role beliefs that still persist in many parts of the world, such as the notion that childcare is "feminine," challenging men's masculine identity (Blazina and Watkins 2000; Maurer and Pleck 2006); an awareness by men of their "limitations and inadequacies" (Palkowitz, Copes, and Woolfolk, 2001, 59); that mens' "machismo" conflicts with other aspects of their cultural self (Glass and Owen 2010). Finally, men who are developing more relational forms of masculinities connected with caregiving and

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

family participation can also face obstacles to work and family reconciliation due to traditional organizational gender in their jobs (Holter 2007). All this results in a "gender role conflict" (Blazina and Watkins 2000; Maurer and Pleck 2006).

The Cultural Context: Family and Gender Dynamics in the Context of Change in Turkey

Any generalizations about gender and family are difficult to make given the heterogeneity of geographies, ethnicities, and the urban/rural cleavage in Turkey. That said, it is safe to suggest that in the traditional family structure, men are superior to women and children. The traditional structure also draws legitimacy from the religious discourse endorsed by the majority of the Muslim population. This hierarchy creates clear boundaries in the relationship between the father and children, jeapordizes closeness and emotional exchange, and results in a relationship defined by respect and fear (Fişek 1991, 2002; Kıray 1976). The position of fatherhood requires keeping a certain physical and emotional distance, avoiding open sharing, and is sustained by providing, maintaining authority, discipline and protection for the home, and representing the family (Ayçiçeği-Dinn and Kağıtçıbaşı 2010; Fişek 1991; Kıray 1976; Sancar 2009; Sefer 2007; Sunar 2002, 2009; Sunar and Fişek 2005).

The socio-cultural and economic changes taking place especially over the last quarter of the past century have undoubtedly had an effect on traditional family life. This change has been especially evident in child rearing practices (Ayçiçeği-Dinn and Kağıtçıbaşı 2010; Kağıtçıbaşı and Ataca 2005). According to the new family model described by Kağıtçıbaşı (1996, 2002), child rearing methods have become less authoritarian and restrictive, and the importance of emotional ties and connection between parents and children have become more important as a result of these changes (Fişek 1982; İmamoğlu 1991; Pehlivanoğlu 1998). In the new generation of upper-middle-class families, formality-based connection between the father and children is seen to be decreasing and is being partly replaced by less formal emotional ties. In Sunar's (2002) study of three generations of middle-class families, the younger generation of parents were found to be perceived as being more emotionally open and close to their children than the previous generation; authoritarian control by the parents was found to be decreasing while the autonomy allowed the child increased.

In contrast, the traditional mother–child relationship can be described as trusting and close. Children are more securely attached to their mothers who are more involved in ensuring their children's physical, economic, and psychological needs (Bolak 1999; Halfon 2007; Sefer 2007). The mother–son relationship is especially close due to the social expectation that giving birth to a son increases the woman's hierarchical status (Kıray 1976), as well as ensuring old age security (Delaney 1991; Kandiyoti 1994). The relative lack of emphasis on the spousal relationship also increases the salience of the mother–son relationship.

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

As elsewhere, the most resistant aspect of gender involves relations between men and women (Bolak 1997b; Kıray 1976; Sancar 2009; Sunar 2002; Sunar and Fişek 2005). Traditionally, marriage is accepted as a given marker of adulthood and is characterized by separate spheres of activity and mutual respect rather than emotional closeness and communication. Patriarchal hierarchy and duo-focal family structure (Olson 1982) emphasizes the separation of lives, as woman's work is inside the home and man's work outside (Sunar and Fişek 2005). In line with this, Fişek (1994) indicates that traditionally, emotional closeness is lived in same-sex relationships prior to and after marriage. This traditional picture is changing toward a more egalitarian and emotionally close spousal relationship through urbanization, increases in educational level, and partly women's participation in the labor force (Bolak 1997a; Hortaçsu 1995; Sunar and Fişek 2005; Tolan 1991). In one study of working-class couples, the position of the woman as the primary and stable provider in the household posed an ideological challenge to the traditional basis of male authority through a discourse that included intra as well as extra household roles in the definition of "male responsibility" (Bolak 1997b).

Empirical investigation of masculinity has been rare. Much research indicates that male hierarchy is rationalized and women's behavior is controlled under the guise of honor and protection (Sunar and Fişek 2005). The "father of the family" model means financial provision as well as representing the family in the public world, thus inhering the hegemonic masculinity discourse within it. The traditional model has seen some change since the Republican reforms of the last century (Durakbaşa 1998). However, modernization has also led to inner contradictions in the hegemonic masculinity discourse such that while the traditional model is seen as underdeveloped, the popular discourse still valorizes it (Alemdaroğlu and Demirtaş 2004).

In her study of the construction of masculinity by men from a variety of sectors, Sancar (2009) found that when men lose their social and economic means, their only way to secure a sense of success is to maintain their status as head of the household. Lower socioeconomic status (SES) men want obedient, respectful, and hardworking wives. The study of working-class households by Bolak (1990, 1995, 1997b, 1999) showed that the situation with the woman as the primary breadwinner and the husband lacking stable employment was much more threatening to the male identity than to the female; women coped with this reversal of status much better than their husbands.

In this project, we aimed to do an in-depth exploration of the negotiation of masculine subjectivities by married men in Turkey. In the last decade and a half, scholars have drawn attention to a focus on the "masculinity crisis" particularly in the literature in the West (Frosh 2002), where men are argued to experience uncertainties in their masculine identities associated with social roles, sexualities, work and family relations, as a result of material and discursive shifts in gender relations. It is debatable whether such a crisis exists in Turkey. Rather, internal contradictions in the construction of masculinities in the context of social change and the ambivalences

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

and conflicts produced in the process are more typical dynamics in Turkey, and constitute a major focus of exploration in our study.

Method

Sample

Since marriage is considered as the most significant marker of adult status in Turkey, it was decided to include only married men in the study. Participants were selected using the strategy of purposive sampling. Turkey is a very large country with considerable geographic and sociocultural diversity. For example, the Western coastal region tends to be relatively more liberal in comparison to the central and eastern regions. The central Anatolian region is more inward looking and is associated with a more conservative and religious cultural climate. The eastern and southeastern regions are the most economically disadvantaged and tend to suffer from a more feudal social structure. The southeast is also the region where ethnic Kurds constitute the majority.

The services of a research company that specialized in social research were recruited. Based on our selection criteria, fifty married men were recruited from seven provinces in different regions of Turkey that were expected to reflect this geographic and socio-cultural diversity. Istanbul was selected as the major metropolis of the country, located in the northwest Marmara region. Edirne was included as another city of a much smaller scale from the same region. Konya and Diyarbakır were selected as major representatives of the central and southeastern regions, respectively. Trabzon was chosen as a representative of the Blacksea coastal region where the ethnic Laz constitute the majority. The final two provinces were selected to represent the Mediterranean region. Adana, the fifth largest city in Turkey, was chosen for representing a mix of a more provincial cultural background with major industrial development; Antalya was chosen as a more outward looking coastal province that is also the heart of the tourism sector.

Other selection criteria included being at an age that enabled the recollection of experiences with their own parents (range 23–52, mean = 38.38), and representing socioeconomic diversity. The research company reached potential candidates from their database. Participants who gave their consent to participate and fulfilled the eligibility criteria based on the information they provided in a screening form were contacted for the interview. Based on various indices such as educational and occupational status and level of income, each participant was categorized as low, middle or high SES, resulting in a sample of twenty low SES, fourteen middle SES, and sixteen high SES men.

Data Collection

Because the project team was all female, it was decided that an experienced male social science researcher, also the head of the research company, should carry out

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

the interviews in the field. The project team came up with the topics of interest and drafts of questions to guide the interviews. Following a small pilot study, the interview protocol was finalized by the research team. Interviews started with a general question that asked the participant to talk about himself, and followed a life history format, with appropriate probes when necessary. The project team received verbatim transcriptions of the interviews. Based on the transcripts as well as the interviewer's self-report, it is safe to suggest that he was able to establish very good rapport with the participants.

Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis was informed by the method of grounded theory (Charmaz 2006; Strauss and Corbin 1990), an inductive process where the aim is to start from the existing data, to reach new categories and themes, and to interpret them within a contextual framework. In this process, meaning categories are determined and integrated in different stages of increasing abstraction, so that both commonalities and differences are established using the constant comparative method. The computer software package Atlas.ti 6 was used to systematically code and analyze the raw data and to develop and integrate the emerging analytic categories and themes.

The first stage of open coding or line-by-line coding was used to generate descriptive and summaritive codes for men's experiences and perceptions, staying as close as possible to participants' original words. This was followed by focused coding whereby the most frequent initial codes were organized under "code families." Memo-writing during the coding helped move the analysis from *content reflection* to *content interpretation* and facilitated the process of raising focused codes to conceptual categories.

The project team sought to reach consensus during the process of coding and conducted the coding according to the relevant literature (Hill et al. 2005; Hill, Thompson, and Williams 1997). Initially, each team member coded a number of interviews on their own and came together to develop a common code book. The next step was to combine the codes under code families. Once the code list was shortened, the project team coded a few interviews together. During this process, researchers evaluated the appropriateness of the coded segments of the data and aimed to reach consensus.

Based on the analysis of code families, the research team came up with the most salient categories in the different domains of interest. For example, the categories that emerged as significant in the relationship with the mother were communication, sharing/intimacy, nurturance and care, monitoring and control, conflict, guidance and support, and expectations. In the relationship with the father, hierarchy, emotions defining the father–son relationship, and emotionality emerged as additional categories. Memos helped interpret both what was said and the subtext or what was not said, and served to guide the "naming" of categories. For example, the statements participants used in describing their relationships with their parents such as affection, intimacy, and sharing helped to consolidate the category of "intimacy,"

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

whereas respect, distance, and fear helped to consolidate the category of "hierarchy." These categories formed the basis for the organization of the results section.

Results

The results of the qualitative analysis are presented in the subsequent sections in terms of the men's narratives of their experiences. Quotes from the narratives, selected on the basis of representativeness and level of articulation, are given where appropriate.

Men's Relationship with Their Fathers

The present findings indicate that change in the traditional discourse on fatherhood shows only a partial trend. Men from all sectors stated that change lies in their difference from their own fathers in the area of emotional ties with their own offspring, in that they are more invested in closer relationships. However, despite complaints about their own fathers' authoritarianism, a move toward a more egalitarian, less protective parenting was less evident. This section will report on the men's narratives of their relationship with their own fathers, in contrast to their mothers, and will end with men's reports on their relationship with their own children.

The participants were unified in stating that their fathers were the dominant figure in their families of origin, reminiscent of the "male family headship" notion stated earlier. They used identical keywords such as, "Respect, fear, distance, and restriction" in describing their relationship, with respect being by far the main descriptor. However, the degree of comfort or lack of it with father shows some variability. A low SES man from Diyarbakır reported: "It is respect (. . .) I have two children and I have not yet sat down in my father's presence or smoked, have not spread out my legs. That is where he talks, we cannot; not me, not my older brothers (. . .) It is from respect, not fear, only respect" (DiSG). Another low SES man from Trabzon did not report a very different experience: "There was no fear, respect was dominant (. . .) We could not be relaxed around him. If we had been, he would not have been angry with us, but that is the way we were raised" (TrGY). Besides discomfort, there were also stories of active restriction. A high SES man from Istanbul noted: "He would be angry if we talked at the table (. . .) he wanted us to watch TV at certain hours and then go to bed. He wanted me to study. I don't know, he would be mad if I wore blue jeans since he always wore suits (. . .) He raised me in a way close to military discipline" (IstOS).

Words such as "hesitation and embarrassment" describe the consequence of this hierarchic distance, raising questions regarding difficulties with intimacy in these men's future lives. Thus, a middle SES man from Antalya reported: "He talked to me once but I did not pay attention (. . .) when he said 'Son you seem to have such and such problems', I got embarrassed, felt constricted, shy. Can one be shy with

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

one's father? I am" (AnEC). Another from Konya said: "As I say, I cannot easily open up, as in sharing problems, maybe not even with my wife" (KoIY).

While the descriptions of emotional deprivation, lack of intimacy, and communication were numerous, most men showed a strong inclination to find excuses for their fathers. A high SES man from Istanbul said: "I don't think we had much of a relationship with our father. But I should admit, I was never angry at him because of it" (IstLA). The excuses involved reasonable ideas like work conditions, poverty, tradition, and social pressure. Further, there was a strong emphasis on father's teaching, primarily of "honesty," thus providing an avenue for gratitude and empathy in constructing a positive cast to their feelings about their fathers. A low SES man from Diyarbakır noted: "I don't remember him buying us toys or anything. He did not have them (. . .) actually there was also a family culture, he could not show his love (. . .) this was considered bad form (. . .) he could not show us his love in front of the elders" (DiKiM). Alternatively, fatherly love was reported as an implicit communication as seen in the report of a university-educated Istanbulite: "My father really loved me. I know he loved me. I felt it, but he would not show it clearly (. . .) sometimes he would rub my head but my mother used to hug me. He did not show it like she did" (IstKU).

The majority reported the time spent with the father as engagement in functional work activities. A high SES man from Istanbul reported: "I used to help him during school holidays. Sometimes I sold water, sometimes gum (. . .) My father thought it would be good for me to see how trade works. A father trying to raise his son . . . " (IstMK). A middle SES man from Antalya said: "I used to spend time with my father in the garden where we had olives, onions, peppers etc." (AnCO). A low SES man from Diyarbakır reported: "We used to go in to the city with my father. He took us with him when he was going to town to get his paycheck every month. Whether it be on the road or in the town, we would share a moment" (DiYO). Only a minority mentioned open communication: "It was perfect. We were more like friends than father and son. Regular friends. I could talk about anything with my father without hesitation. I was never slapped by my dad but I did get beating from my mother" (TrYH).

In short, for the majority, a state of hierarchic noncommunication emerged, that devolved in part from both sides. While this was accepted as a given in more traditional sectors, it was described as "patriarchy" by some educated men. It is arguable whether these men really knew their fathers or were known by them as individuals. Possibly, their attempts to empathize with their fathers was a way of trying to get to know them. So, a high SES man reported: "I did not really understand my father until I got to know him, and just as I was getting to know him (. . .) I lost him. I did not fully experience my father (. . .) there is not one whole day that we spent together" (IstKU).

These narratives raise questions about how these men learned to be men. Narratives reported later in this review show them clinging to traditional male roles in their current relationships, possibly in part, as a compensation for a deeper lack.

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

However, there are two mitigating factors. Most importantly, the fact that their fathers' nurturant activities were mentioned as positive, that their fathers' protection and efforts on their behalf registered as positive made the distance more palatable. A low SES man from Diyarbakır pointed out: "For example, during the month of fasting, he would leave breakfast for me after his early morning meal (. . .) so that I could eat before going to school (. . .) there are few fathers like that in the area. If the father fasts during the fasting month, the kids cannot eat" (DiYO).

Another possibility is that men's close relationship with their mothers may have served to help them develop an empathic evaluation of their fathers. The vast majority narrated their relationship with their mothers as being opposite of the one with their fathers. "Respect" was now mentioned in the context of "we used to love each other" and "we used to share our worries." These statements did not show any demographic differences. Possibly, this closeness fostered the men's self-esteem and helped them be more understanding of their fathers. Following is a report from a high SES man from Istanbul: "If I have a problem about anything, I can easily talk to my mother about it. No hesitation. I would hesitate if it was my father but never with my mother. I'm still like that with my mother. If I have a problem I go ahead and tell her; she will listen to me, do something if she can to help me" (IstYK).

Men's Relationships with Their Own Children

Most men took their experience with their own fathers as a negative point of reference in talking about their children. They stated that they are less authoritarian, more loving and involved. Fathers with older adolescents, living in Istanbul emphasized democracy and freedom, while the younger fathers and those living in less developed areas stressed their wishes for their children not to experience the deprivations they suffered, while worrying about their limitations. Following are the reports by two high SES man from Istanbul, demonstrating the democracy and connectedness of the father–child relationship: "There is no father's authority (. . .) everyone is free; free to do what they want, because we taught them the right thing to do (. . .) We tried to communicate to them universal truths, so there was no 'this is the way to do this'" (IstAH). "There is a great difference (. . .) I show the love I did not see from my father to (my son) (. . .) I feel a great love for him. I always want to be with him" (IstYK). In giving their children the love they sought from their father, they seemed to be making up for earlier deprivations: "I did not have a childhood; so I began to feel a need for some things (. . .) now I live my childhood again with my daughter (. . .) I always say 'talk to your child, even before birth'" (AdCSM).

The narratives of those with older children hinted at a conflict, between giving freedom and protecting, being different from their own fathers and not knowing where to draw the line. Such dilemmas were sometimes compounded by disappointment over their children's failure to live up to their expectations. Thus, a high SES man from Istanbul reported: "It's as he wishes, I can't tell him 'come work with me' . . . he is after other things; he says 'let me start my own business dad'" (IstBZ).

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

Even the best relationship with their children may not compensate for the lack they brought from their past. A high SES man noted: "I miss my son. We live in the same house, yet I miss him. I come home from work, we kiss; 'How are you?' 'Good dad, I have a test tomorrow' and off to the computer" (IstAS). The only ones content were those who kept up the traditional style that they grew up with. Thus, a middle SES man from Konya admitted: "Our job is to give tham a good training in proper demeanor, teach them the basics of our religion (. . .) I did not beat them but I instilled fear in them. Thank God, my family supported me in this (. . .) I get up when my father comes in (. . .) my kids will not see this outside, and so they should see it at home" (KoIY).

Those with small children were optimistically planning to raise their children without the pain they suffered: "My son is in grade school. If he wants something, I go and get it. For example, "we will do this and that at school, buy me something nice like a nice school uniform (. . .) why shouldn't I? He should be happy. We couldn't say 'we will do such and such at school' out of fear of him saying something (. . .). I don't want him to suffer like that (. . .). Just so he can open up, so he does not get bottled up inside" (KoCR).

In short, these fathers have a desire to grant their children more autonomy than they had. However, while hierarchic distance is negated, protective hierarchy remains, especially where daughters are concerned, as admitted by this high SES man from Istanbul: "If my daughter ends up in an out of town university, I will not stand in the way of her education. She will either live in a dormitory, or we will rent a flat; her mother will go, I will go" (IstTH). And it is here that these fathers experience the most ambivalence and conflict. This is best stated in the words of a high SES father with adolescent children, giving up hierarchy but not knowing how to father in a different way:

> I don't know if this is good or bad. So, just as my father did not know any better, I didn't either. We did not use beating to train the child, but we didn't do something else instead either. We just tried to get them to do what they should in a democratic environment. You still try to get them to (behave properly), but you don't know how. And this has to do with my lack of knowledge about childrearing. How does the one who succeeds do it? Is there a school for this? There should be, but I don't know. (IstAC)

The Couple Relationship

The couple relationship seems to be predominantly a relationship in transition, with boh traditional and contemporary aspects (Fişek 2011). It is this transitional nature of the relationship that results in the contradictions both within the discourse and between discourse and lived reality. It is apparent from the way most marriages are talked about, that there is an awareness of the expectation of a closer interaction, communication, sharing, partnership, and equality with the wife. The extent to which such expectations are met seems to be varied, particularly as a function of the

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

level of education and urbanization; but, except for a small minority, men's narratives reflect tensions and oscillations along the dimension of "traditional" to "democratic" (Bolak-Boratav 2011). Findings are summarized under two subheadings: gendered roles inside and outside the household and sharing and intimacy in the couple relationship.

Gendered Roles Inside and Outside the Household

The most general statement that can be made about the couple relationship is that it is shaped first and foremost by mutual responsibilities. For most men, the behaviors and roles they witnessed in their family of origin constitute an important frame of reference. This is particularly the case for the lower SES men from the more traditional and conservative segments of the population, reflected as a feeling of total exemption from the domestic sphere perceived as exlusively feminine, entitlement to service by women, expectation of unconditional respect for him and his family, and reticence about letting the wife work outside the home or even go out alone. A young man with a religious education background said: "Like I saw from my family, my father used to say 'A job? Keep her at home; maybe you will bring home stale bread and onions, but you have to look after her, don't let her work outside'" (KonCR). When asked what if the family and the larger community approved of his wife's work outside the home, another young man replied "I can't respond to that because I wasn't brought up that way; I was brought up this way" (DiBB). This "social expectation" to continue the status quo, combined with the difficulty of envisioning a social milieu where women have equal rights with them is reflected in a confusion of the difference between what other people think and their own inclinations.

A close reading of the narratives hints at inconsistencies between lived experience and discourse, as well as internal contradictions. For example, a common discourse is that if a man does not want his wife to "take advantage" of him, he should not indulge her too much. So, based on a contextual reading of a young man's account: "What she wants doesn't happen right away; First, I think about it, and then I may do it 3 or 4 days later (. . .) Depends on how she asks for it, if she pleads nicely for example; if she is stubborn about it, I refuse to do it" (DiBB), makes it look like posturing or putting on a tough guise. Another young man of limited means from Diyarbakır argued that his wife always did what he wanted, and when asked if this is a good thing, revealed his gratitude toward her for making it easier for him to keep up the appearances: "Of course it's good, what would I do if she was stubborn and got my words wrong? She accepts me in my poverty; what would I do if she didn't? What would I do with the children if she just left, what would I do then with my three children?" (DiCA). Some admitted to following the status quo, even while recognizing it as not right: "I say "that's my wife's job", and don't do it. It's not good that we do this, but that's just the way it has been, what we learned from our father" (KoIY). Acknowledging that one needs to change, but not knowing how to do so is another source of contradiction, particularly in relationships with the extended family: "You

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

have to get over so much stuff to be okay with this kind of relationship in our time. You just can't. When I go to my sister's house alone during the religious holiday she will say 'Where is your wife?' and I will say 'My wife went to her sister's house'. What will people say?" (AdYH).

The narratives of university-educated men in the middle SES group bring into sharper relief the contradictions between practice and discourse and between practice and internal experience. Examples include admitting to "grumbling" when his wife wants to visit her folks just so his mother doesn't bother him about it, while knowing deep down this is her right; giving his wife her space and decision-making power while expecting her to take full responsibility for the home and children and not to question his activities outside the home; reporting to be happily married while also admitting that his wife is not to call him until 2 a.m. when he is out. What differentiates the reports of university-educated men is that they admit to voicing less resistance to participating in housework, particularly when their wives do not challenge their authority. Mostly, traditional roles/patterns seem to be maintained among men in the highest SES group as well. If anything, they appear to be more apologetic about this. For example, while displaying a positive attitude toward his marriage and recognizing his wife as an individual, one man admitted to being "backward" in expecting that his wife never "touch his wallet," while also admitting that he enjoys her compliance with this, that her behavior "humors" his pride.

Only sixteen (32 percent) of the men had wives who were currently working outside the home. Four were in the lower SES group (20 percent), five in the middle SES group (36 percent), and seven in the high SES group (44 percent). Of the four lower SES men, only one admitted to not contributing to housework, giving his longer work hours as an excuse. Five university-educated men in the middle SES group with employed wives reflected more articulately on the expectation that they participate in housework. One man noted: "A good woman is one who doesn't let her husband into the kitchen, and a good man is one who helps his wife in the kitchen" (DiYO), and admitted that this was a contradiction. Another blamed mothers: "Your mother does everything for you during your school years, during the military service years, your whole life. (. . .) At a certain age, you get married, and let's say you are on the modern side; your wife says, 'Why don't you help me with the housework?' Well, I never developed the habit. My mother never made me do it" (TrGE). In a rare case of the working wife being verbally assertive about the need for equality, a man who identified as a socialist became painfully aware of the contradiction between discourse and practice: "Yes, we can say 'as man and woman we are equals,' but sometimes my wife doesn't let me forget; when I slack off from housework she always reminds me. When I see that I feel more put upon" (AdCE). As can be predicted from the low percentage of employed wives in the sample, there appeared to be an underestimation of the financial benefits of the wife's employment, which can be accompanied by an overexaggeration of the extra expenses of a working woman. An important reason for this was that the wife's work outside for pay was often seen as a factor that threatened the status quo and legitimated her

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

spending prerogatives: "One day, the woman says 'I'm going to buy a dress' (. . .) The man says 'you can't buy it, it is over the budget.' The woman says 'I'm going to buy it, I earn money too, I also have rights in this house'. What happens then? Marriages begin to crack" (EdSY).

For men with traditional expectations, the common discourse was that the wife's employment remained unproblematic as long as it did not interfere with her household responsibilities. But, it was not uncommon that these same men actually did participate in housework: "My wife has worked for years. She comes home and cooks. I do the dishes so that she doesn't get exhausted. So I take over 'women work'. She takes over 'men work'" (IstOS). Equality in the real sense of the word, arranging and practicing roles not based on principles but on situational demands, doing this consciously and not experiencing a major dilemma around it appeared to be a rarity having to do with both being highly educated and urbanized and with the experience of having grown up witnessing their own mothers working outside the home.

Men's mandatory responsibilities as breadwinner and head of household were perceived as oppressive, anxiety provoking, and burdensome, while legitimizing their hierarchical superority at the same time. The following quote from a participant from Antalya is a perfect example of how men justified their male prerogatives:

> A car doesn't have two steering wheels. I am the head of the household (. . .) since I am the one earning the household income, and since my wife will come to me with the question 'What shall we do now Kemal?,' when there is a financial or another problem, and since I am ultimately the one to answer this question, the responsibility to prevent a problem before it arises should be mine as well. (AnKS)

Sharing and Intimacy in the Couple Relationship

For the majority of the men, the marital relationship was shaped by mutual responsibilities rather than by sharing and mutual feelings. Spending time with the wife and doing joint activities was limited. While the discourse was "I wish I could spend more time with her, but I have to work," it is not clear that this was a priority or that not being able to do so was experienced as a serious deprivation. Concrete examples of spending time with the wife even if it was just watching TV together or going out together that involved more than shopping or visiting relatives were mentioned almost exclusively by university-educated men. Reference to spending time together and enjoying intimacy as a routine phenomenon was noticeable only in the narratives of men from higher SES group living in Istanbul.

In terms of self-disclosure, some participants admitted to not sharing their worries or problems at all with their wives, whereas others noted that they shared everything. On the one hand, the wife seemed to have replaced the mother as the major confidant; yet, when it came to disclosing work and money-related problems, maybe the most salient problems for men, they had a hard time. This was true for men from

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

different SES groups. Even the man who said that he and his wife talked every evening, admitted to not being able to talk with her when it comes to work-related problems: "I have that problem, I don't talk, I live my troubles within (. . .) She asks, and I say stuff like 'too much work, stress, things' (. . .) I don't like to get into details regarding work related issues" (IstAS). The reasons cited for not engaging in such sharing with the wife included wanting to spare his home life from problems and misery, not expecting her to be helpful, and feeling the need to protect one's role as head of household. A man from Konya reported:

> I say to myself 'what if I do tell her? (. . .) There is nothing she can do, what can she do?' Also, sometimes I think that I shouldn't spoil the head of household thing. (. . .) From what I see on TV series and programs, or at the work place, the head of household should be greeted with love and respect when he comes home; should look serious, go to work in the morning and come back in the evening. (KoIY)

Fewer partipants said they could talk with their wives about anything and stated its importance. For these men, openness and honesty in communication was an important aspect of the conjugal relationship. The fact that two of the four low SES men with working wives talked about being able to share everything with their wives, and appreciating the support they got as a result suggests that maybe the woman's participation in the labor force makes her a more suitable partner for sharing problems from the outside world.

A special emphasis on the importance of giving each other time, communicating, making an effort to build mutual understanding and partnership and sharing examples of doing so was salient only in the narratives of university-educated men over forty-five from Istanbul: "It has been 27 years. We are a very good twosome, we complement each other. And, let me put it this way; after 5 years, we began to understand each other from our eyes; we can communicate what we want to say by looking at each other" (IstKA). But, it is possible to glean limits to heterosociality even from the narratives of the highest SES men. For example, one man who blamed his wife for her lack of interest in having political discussions did not appear to acknowledge the fact that making her live with his mother may be compromising the potential for an ideal mutuality to exist in the couple relationship. Overall, men's accounts of their couple relations reflect a lack of resolution in terms of the expectations they have of their wives, the amount of equality they can accept, and their ability to form an intimate partnership. Possibly, these dilemmas can be read as part of the process whereby traditional masculinity is preserved in the context of change.

Negotiating Masculine Identities

The analysis of the data indicated that masculinities in Turkey are constructed via certain judgments about what it means to be a man, customs, religious norms, as well as certain behaviors and courses of life events (like being an adult, completing the

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

military service, having an occupation etc.) (Eslen-Ziya 2011). Most men defined their masculinities within the public domain: being successful at work, earning money—being the breadwinner and the head of the household—as well as having prestige in the eyes of their friends. The following quote from a man in Trabzon illustrates these themes: "You become someone, you arrive at a point in life, you develop a life style; these are all related to what you do for a living, in fact it is in direct proportion to how much you make in a month" (TrYH). Having a job and being the main provider continues to be perceived by married men as a sine qua non of their role as the head of the household. Falling short of this ideal was threatening to manliness, even for most men from Istanbul: "There is an enormous pressure on men. A lot is expected of them (. . .) be it about occupation and work life, other skills, or things to be fixed at home . . . these are all expected from men" (IstYK).

The concern for the family's future livelihood as well as the dilemmas about one's priorities were especially evident among the low SES men: A man needs to find a house, a job . . . needs to bring bread to his family every single day (. . .) That woman is hungry, so he needs to take care of her, he needs to provide for his wife and children; if they need fruit, fruit; if they need vegetables, vegetables. It (being a man) is something that requires such a big responsibility" (KoCR). Middle-class men expressed such concern for the future somewhat differently. As they tended to have a stable job and income, their point of reference was social discourse rather than personal experience. Another man from Konya referred to a hypothetical scenario where the man was unemployed and the wife was the primary breadwinner:

> Let's assume that one fellow male citizen cannot pay his rent, or his electricity, or telephone bill . . . or cannot provide for his children or wife because what he is earning is not enough (. . .) in that house hostility will start (. . .) The man will be down emotionally when he arrives home from work, he will be depressed . . . this in return will reflect on his wife, and children; discontent will begin and eventually end in a tragedy; by tragedy, I mean divorce. (KoKA)

Majority of the men's understanding of their role in the family resulted in an oscillating acceptance of equality. Empathy for women's lot, particularly their hard work at home and societal oppression coexisted with a defense of their own prerogatives based on what they believed to be their inalienable duty as breadwinner and male head of household. The answer to the question "Whose life is more difficult?" typically started with a statement about women's more difficult lot, to be followed with a discourse in defense of men's hierarchic authority. A young university-educated man from Antalya reported:

> I come home at night, 'where is dinner, where is tea, where is this, where is that, where are my clothes?' she also takes care of our child, the house, my dinner; life seems to be harder for women, not like how it is for men. (. . .) Of course there is equality, but the man should still be in the powerful position in this equality since according to our

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

> traditional family values, the man is in charge; that's why the man should be a bit more important. (AnAI)

As reported in the previous section on the couple relationship, particularly the narratives of low SES men reflected confusion between what they perceived people in the community thought and their own inclinations. When asked if a man and woman can be equal, one young man from Trabzon replied: "It depends (. . .) I think a woman and a man are never equal. A man can do as he pleases, he can go out and wander about (. . .) but if a women tries to do the same, they won't let her be" (TrGY).

For some low SES men, not having enough education was also seen as a major loss. Such loss was expressed with regrets and "if onlys":

> You work, work, work . . . and as a result, when your expectations, your desires are not met, whether you like it or not, you get demoralized . . . as a result, at the age of 29 you get gray hair (. . .) You think of your future all the time, and when your head is tired of thinking and worrying, so will be your body. (. . .) For instance, if I had gone to a university, I may have been more successful at my job today. (KoIY)

The men from the upper SES, on the other hand, experienced such dilemmas differently. What was salient in their narratives was a psychological reflection on the events of their lives. Their regrets or "if onlys" were more about their experiences and choices as a child, rather than about their education or occupation. One man from Istanbul talked about how he wished his father had been a bit harsher on him: "If only my father had guided me differently, I would have been in a better position at work . . . he thought I would be put upon among others so he kept me to his side, this was all out of goodwill. But I wish I were put upon a bit, I wish I got to see more" (IstDO). Another was self-critical of his choice of sport—taekwondo-as a child:

> Not that I am a man who likes fighting, but it gave me self-confidence. Even my walk changed; if you do a sport like taekwondo you are always one step ahead, you are stronger. But when you start thinking rationally, you start seeing sport as a sport, and then you say 'I wish I took up swimming instead, it is a healthier sport' . . . Before, I was thinking I can beat four or five people, but now when you start to understand, you ask yourself 'why, was this necessary?' (IstKA)

Based on our analysis of the data, masculine subjectivities do not seem to reflect a strong internal tension, but rather a state of flux. The construction of a masculine identity develops in the context of negotiating between the still relatively traditional ideology existing in the public domain as well as the emerging modernist discourse, and the daily realities of the relationships with the rest of the household, namely wife and children, which were dealt with in the previous sections.

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

Discussion

Sullivan (2004, 211) has argued for the importance of developing "theoretical frameworks of change that incorporate the complexity of the intersection between ideology and practices in situated, located contexts." Studies in different parts of the world identified processes of renegotiating masculinities in the face of contextual pressure. In European national contexts such as Sweden with a history of public debate, research, and policy intervention regarding gender, "hegemonic structure" may change, with gender equality policy challenging male privileges and questioning hegemonic masculinity (Hearn et al. 2012). Vigoya (2001) reminds us that in Latin America, the "so-called crisis of masculinity" emerged from significant socioeconomic transformation including the large-scale incorporation of women into the urban labor force and from the feminist movements that challenged male prerogatives inside and outside the home. Legal changes that question male authority and legitimize the "modern egalitarian family" coupled with the inability of men to meet their breadwinner responsibilities have been shown to lead to inevitable tensions in family processes and to the attempts to recreate masculinities, as in Mozambique (Aboim 2009). Similarly, an expanded discourse of women's human rights in Uganda has destabilized conventional notions of masculinity, and resulted in the construction of diverse masculinities, with the most typical form incorporating some ideas of gender equity and women's outside employment, but keeping aspects of male authority, especially inside the home (Wyrod 2008).

To some extent, with the exception of the most traditional sectors and a minority from Istanbul, the main metropolis, married men's narratives in our research point to dilemmas in their experience as fathers, husbands, and citizens such that they attempt to retain male authority while taking tentative steps toward inclusive egalitarianism. This is to be expected since, patriarchal/conservative and modernist/liberalist discourses coexist in Turkey. However, the kinds of contextual and legal pressures as the ones described previously do not yet exist in the country. In fact, findings from different studies have been interpreted to suggest that the gender hierarchy, while stretching some, remains a norm in Turkey (Ataca and Sunar 1999; Fişek 1991; Sunar and Fişek 2005).

The narratives show that fatherhood is in a transitional process, especially in urban centers where fathers are more open to worldwide trends and aware of the demands of social change. The idea that paternal caregiving is a function of social expectancies (Maurer and Pleck 2006) would seem to be operative here in that almost all the men emphasized their difference from their fathers. However, rather than an awareness of "a new fatherhood", this difference is reported in terms of more close emotional relations in contrast to their own experience growing up. In fact, there is little mention of taking on more mothering roles (Cooper 2000). The emphasis on their children's welfare, a nurturant concern, is still in line with hierarchic traditional descriptions of fathering responsibilities, similar to other non-Western contexts where paternal distance is not interpreted as lack of caring (Hauari

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

and Hollingworth 2009; Rohner and Pettengill 1985). These men seem to have carried nurturant hierarchy into their own fathering, thus embodying a mixed discourse of emotional closeness moderated by limits on egalitarian freedom for their children. Highly educated urban men who were trying to change in this respect admitted to experiencing the most ambivalence and conflict.

The narratives of maternal closeness and sharing must have mitigated some of the deprivation that was clear in the narratives. Nevertheless, just as Bolak (1999) and Sancar (2009) state that men with a distant deprived relationship with their fathers tend to reproduce what they suffered with their children, some of these men admitted to problems with verbal intimacy in their own families. Open communication carries the risk of having to accept the "other" (child or wife) as a legitimate commentator on one's own behavior; and these men were very ambivalent about this prospect.

This ambivalence is especially evident in the couple relationship, thus pointing to a juxtaposition of the legacy of personal history with a modernist egalitarian discourse, brought into the home mostly by the wives, except for the marriages in Istanbul, producing conflicts over wishes for more satisfying relationships and fears of losing proper masculine identity. Based on the narratives of our participants, the couple relationship can be said to be a relationship in transition, as reflected in the contradictions at the discursive level, as well as between discourse and lived reality. Except for the most traditional men, and a small minority of high SES men from the Istanbul, men's narratives reflected a state of flux, manifesting itself as oscillations along the dimension of "traditional" to "democratic."

Sancar (2009) has argued that the lesser the social capital available to men, the more compelled they may be to assert their authority over their wives. In her study, particularly the lesser educated men were found to place more emphasis on a gendered division of labor, and justified it by referring to the fact that they were the ones earning the money and providing for the needs of the household. Ironically in her study as well as in ours, men who could benefit the most from their wives' income were most adamant against the idea. An important reason for this was that the wife's work outside for pay was seen as a threat to the status quo and as legitimizing her spending prerogatives. The social pressure they perceived from their family of origin and the community contributed to a difficulty most men experienced in differentiating between what was socially expected of them and their own inclinations.

University-educated men reflected more articulately on the contradictions between discourse and practice; highest SES men with longer urbanization histories seemed to be more able to allign their practice with their egalitarian discourse, but except for a very small minority, the legacy of tradition appeared to be alive and well. It is also possible, as argued by Pyke (1996), that power inequalities were more easily obscured in the high SES families.

Our findings also support the previous theoretical and empirical literature that suggests that traditionally, the marital relationship in Turkey is based on mutual responsibilities rather than on expectations of emotional mutuality. Most men led rather separate lives from their wives, sometimes justified by the men's long work hours. For

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

most men, it was important that the "happy housewife" and "serious male head of household" roles were not compromised and that the boundary and the distance required by these roles were maintained. Talking just for the sake of sharing did not seem to be meaningful, it was not necessary to talk about a problem a man could "fix" on his own, and it made more sense to talk with her about something he was not able to solve or decide by himself, such as their children's needs or their future. The cultural avoidance of verbal sharing as noted previously, probably further compounded this issue. Urban and more educated men diverged some from this typical pattern.

That men's lives and discourses about masculinities are culturally shaped was a major premise for this study. Rather than an individual and static project, becoming a man is a matter of forming an experiential relationship, a performative process (Demren 2008). This study makes a contribution to the literature on how male subjectivities are shaped in the context of relationships and cultural norms that are communicated in these relational processes and institutitonal contexts. In fact, Fişek (1999) has drawn attention to the contextual nature of much of the social phenomena in Turkey. This research also contributes in three directions toward a more comprehensive and diversified study of masculinities as suggested by Messerschmidt (2012): how patriarchal relations are legitimated and stabilized at the local, regional, and global levels, intersectionality, or how class, race, ethnicity, age, sexualities, and nation impact masculinities, and how masculinities are constructed in the periphery, as opposed to "metropole" (Connell 2007) countries through the theories, concepts, and data peculiar to the periphery countries themselves.

There are also certain limitations to this project. Composition of the sample is one of them. Much attempt was made to capture the diversity of masculinities, but all the high SES men ended up being recruited from the main metropolis. One reason we did not sample high SES men from other provinces was because both the pilot study and the initial focus groups suggested that the subsample of men who belonged to the highest SES and were born and raised in Istanbul constituted the major divergence from the majority pattern. This hypothesis can be further tested in future research by sampling high SES men from other provinces as well. The fact that the data were collected by someone other than the researchers themselves was a second limitation. We think that the decision to recruit a married male social scientist to do the interviews was a good one, but at times, not having one of the researchers doing the interviews meant that not all the appropriate probes were used. We tried to compensate for this by going over the interviews as soon as they were transcribed, and by guiding the interviewer to collect more data on the less well explored topics in later interviews. Nevertheless, we believe that we made a significant contribution, in that this is one of the few in-depth report on masculine experiences from a representative male sample in Turkey.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Anıl Üstünel, MA; Büşra Yalçınöz, MA; and Cansu Alözkan, MA for their valuable assistance throughout the project; the members of

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

the SAM research team for their contributions during the sampling and data collection phases, the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments, and all the anonymous participants who took part in this research and kindly shared their experiences.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: The authors received a generous fund from the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) for the larger project titled "The Social Construction and Developmental Trajectories of Masculinities in Turkey" that this article is based on.

References

Aboim, Sofia. 2009. "Men between Worlds: Changing Masculinities in Urban Maputo." *Men and Masculinities* 12:201–24.

Alemdaroğlu, Ayça, and Neslihan Demirtaş. 2004. "Biz Türk Erkeklerini Böyle Bilmezdik!: Mynet'te Erkeklik Halleri." *Toplum ve Bilim* 101:206–24.

Ataca, Bilge, and Diane Sunar. 1999. "Continuity and Change in Turkish Urban Family Life." *Psychology and Developing Societies* 11:77–90.

Ayçiçeği-Dinn, Ayşe, and Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı. 2010. "The Value of Children for Parents in the Minds of Emerging Adults." *Cross-cultural Research* 44:174–205.

Baxter, Janeen, Belinda Hewitt, and Michele Haynes. 2008. "Life Course Transitions and Housework: Marriage, Parenthood, and Time on Housework." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70:259–72.

Blazina, Christopher, and Clifton E. Watkins. 2000. "Separation/Individuation, Parental Attachment and Male Gender Role Conflict; Attitudes Toward the Feminine and the Fragile Masculine Self." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 1:126–32.

Bolak, Hale. 1990. "Women Breadwinners and the Construction of Gender: Urban Working Class Households in Turkey." Unpublished Doctorate Thesis. Santa Cruz, CA: University of California.

Bolak, Hale. 1995. "Notes towards a Multi-dimensional Conceptualization of Marital Dynamics." In *Women in Modern Turkish Society*, edited by Ş. Tekeli, 173–98. West Orange, NJ: Zed Press.

Bolak, Hale. 1997a. "When Wives are Major Providers: Culture, Gender and Family Work." *Gender and Society* 11:409–43.

Bolak, Hale. 1997b. "Marital Power Dynamics: Women Providers and Working-class Households in Turkey." In *Cities in the Developing World: Contexts and Processes*, edited by Joseph Gugler, 218–32. New York: Oxford University Press.

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

Bolak, Hale. 1999. "He Loves to Show off Even Though He Is Poor: Gendered Strategies in the Turkish Working Class Households." Unpublished Manuscript, Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Bolak-Boratav, Hale. 2011. "Construction of Masculinities in Turkey in the Context of Marriage and the Marital Relationship." Paper presented at the symposium titled "Masculinities in Turkey," XII. European Congress of Psychology, July 4–8, 2011, Istanbul.

Burn, Shawn M., and Zachary A. Ward. 2005. "Men's Conformity to Traditional Masculinity and Relationship Satisfaction." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 6:254–63.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. London, UK: Sage.

Coltrane, Scott. 1996. *Family Man*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Connell, Raewyn W. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Connell, Raewyn W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Connell, Raewyn W. 2007. *Southern Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Connell, Raewyn W., and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender and Society* 19:829–59.

Cooper, Marianne. 2000. "Being the "Go-to Guy": Fatherhood, Masculinity, and the Organization of Work in Silicon Valley." *Qualitative Sociology* 23:379–405.

Craig, Lyn. 2006. "Does Father Care Mean Fathers Share? A Comparison of How Mothers and Fathers in Intact Families Spend Time with Children." *Gender and Society* 20: 259–81.

Delaney, Carol L. 1991. *The Seed and the Soil: Gender and Cosmology in Turkish Village Society*. Los Angeles: The Regents of the University of California Press.

Demren, Çağdaş. 2008. "Kadınlık Dolayımıyla Erkeklik Özelliği." *C.Ü Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 32:73–92.

Dribe, Martin, and Maria Stanfors. 2009. "Does Parenthood Strengthen a Traditional Household Division of Labor? Evidence from Sweden." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 71: 33–45.

Durakbaşa, Ayşe N. 1998. "Cumhuriyet Döneminde Modern Kadın ve Erkek Kimliklerinin Oluşumu: Kemalist Kadın Kimliği ve "Münevver Erkekler." *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler*, edited by A. B. Hacımirzaoğlu, 29–51. Istanbul, Turkey: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Eslen-Ziya, Hande. 2011. "The Social Construction of Masculine Identity in Turkey." Paper presented at the symposium titled "Masculinities in Turkey," XII, European Congress of Psychology, July 4–8, 2011, Istanbul, Turkey.

Fişek, Güler O. 1982. "Psychopathology and the Turkish Family: A Family Systems Theory Analysis." In *Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey*, edited by C. Kağıtçıbaşı, 295–321. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Fişek, Güler O. 1991. "A Cross-cultural Examination of Proximity and Hierarchy as Dimensions of Family Structure." *Family Process* 30:121–33.

Fişek, Güler O. 1994. "Paradoxes of Intimacy: An Analysis in Terms of Gender and Culture." *Boğaziçi Journal: Review of Social, Economic and Administrative Studies* 8:177–86.

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

Fişek, Güler O. 1999. "Investigating the Context: What Theory and Research Can Contribute to Cross-cultural Therapeutic Practice." Paper presented at the symposium titled "Psychology as a science and profession," VI. European Congress of Psychology, July 4–9, 1999, Rome, Italy.

Fişek, Güler O. 2002. "Bende Bir Ben Var Ailemden İçeri: Türkiye'de Ailevi Benlik Araştırmaları." Paper presented at the XII. National Psychology Conference ODTÜ, Ankara Sept 11–13.

Fişek, Güler O. 2011. "Social and Developmental Construction of Masculinity in Turkey." Paper presented at the symposium on "Masculinities in Turkey," XII. European Congress of Psychology, July 4–8, 2011, Istanbul, Turkey.

Frosh, Stephen. 2002. "Father's Ambivalence (too)." In *After Words: The Personal in Gender, Culture and Psychotherapy*, edited by S. Frosh, 21–34. London, UK: Palgrave.

Fuller, Norma. 2001. "The Social Constitution of Gender Identity among Peruvian Men." *Men and Masculinities* 3:316–31.

Glass, Jon, and Jesse Owen. 2010. "Latino Fathers: The Relationship Among Machismo, Acculturation, Ethnic Identity and Paternal Involvement." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 11:251–61.

Haas, Linda, and Margaret O' Brien. 2010. "New Observations on How Fathers Work and Care: Introduction to the Special Issue—Men, Work and Parenting—Part I." *Fathering* 8:271–75.

Halfon, Sibel. 2007. "Attachment in a Cultural Context." Unpublished Master's Thesis. Istanbul, Turkey: Boğaziçi University.

Hauari, Hanan, and Katie Hollingworth. 2009. "Understanding Fathering, Masculinity, Diversity and Change." York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation (Retrieved from u fathering-diversity-full.pdf).

Hearn, Jeff, and David H. C. Morgan. 1990. *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory*. New York: Unwin Hyman/Routledge

Hearn, Jeff, Marie Nordberg, Kjerstin Andersson, Dag Balkmar, Lucas Gottzen, Roger Klinth, Keith Pringle, and Linn Sandberg. 2012. "Hegemonic Masculinity and Beyond: 40 Years of Research in Sweden." *Men and Masculinities* 15:31–55.

Hill, Clara E., Sarah Knox, Barbara J. Thompson, Elizabeth N. Williams, Shirley A. Hess, and Nicolas Ladany. 2005. "Consensual Qualitative Research: An Update." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 52:196–205.

Hill, Clara E., Barbara J. Thompson, and Elizabeth N. Williams. 1997. "A Guide to Conducting Consensual Qualitative Research." *The Counseling Psychologist* 25:517–72.

Holter, Oystein G. 2007. "Men's Work and Family Reconciliation in Europe." *Men and Masculinities* 9:425–56.

Hortaçsu, Nuran. 1995. "Prelude to Marriage in Ankara: Educational Level, Reasons for Marriage, Feelings for Spouse and Families." *Boğaziçi Journal* 9:185–205.

İmamoğlu, Olcay. 1991. "Çocuğun Aile İçinde Yetişme Ortamı ve Toplumsallaşması." In *Türkiye Aile Ansiklopedisi*, 236–40. Ankara, Turkey: Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği Vakfı.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem. 1996. *Family and Human Development across Cultures*. Mathway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem. 2002. "Psychology and Human Competence Development," *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 51:5–22.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Çiğdem, and Bilge Ataca. 2005. "Value of Children and Family Change: A Three-decade Portrait from Turkey." *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 36: 403–22.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. 1994. "The Paradoxes of Masculinity: Some Thoughts on Segregated Societies." In *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Etnographies*, edited by A. Cornwall and N. Lindisfarne, 197–213. London, UK: Routledge.

Kimmel, Michael S., and Michael A. Messner. 2007. "Introduction." In *Men's Lives*, edited by M. S. Kimmel and M. A. Messner, 15–23. Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.

Kıray, Mübeccel. 1976. "Changing Roles of Mothers: Changing Intra-family Relations in a Turkish Town." In *Mediterranean Family Structures*, edited by J. Peristiany, 261–71. London, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lamb, Michael E. 1986. "The Changing Role of Fathers." In *The Father's Role: Applied Perspectives*, edited by M. E. Lamb, 3–28. New York: Wiley.

Lamb, Michael E., and Catherine S. Tamis-LeMonda. 2004. "The Role of Father: An Introduction." In *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, edited by M. E. Lamb, 1–31. New York: Wiley.

Larossa, Ralph. 1988. "Fatherhood and Social Change." *Family Relations* 37:451–57.

Larossa, Ralph. 2007. "The Culture and Conduct of Fatherhood in America, 1800 to 1960." *Japanese Journal of Family Sociology* 19:87–98.

Lusher, Dean, and Garry Robbins. 2009. "Hegemonic and Other Maculinities in Local Social Contexts." *Men and Masculinities* 11:387–423.

Marsiglio, William, Paul Amato, Randal D. Day, and Michael E. Lamb. 2000. "Scholarship on Fatherhood in the 1990s and Beyond." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62:1173–91.

Maurer, Trent W., and Joseph H. Pleck. 2006. "Fathers' Caregiving and Breadwinning: A Gender Congruence Analysis." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 8:101–12.

Messerschmidt, James. 2012. "Engendering Gendered Knowledge: Assessing the Academic Appropriation of Hegemonic Masculinity." *Men and Masculinities* 15:56–76.

Olson, Emelie A. 1982. "Duofocal Family Structure and an Alternative Model of Husband-wife Relationships." In *Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey*, C. Kağıtçıbaşı, 33–72. Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies.

Palkowitz, Rop, Marcella A. Copes, and Tara N. Woolfolk. 2001. "It's Like . . . You Discover a New Sense of Being: Involved Fatherhood as an Evoker of Adult Development." *Men and Masculinities* 14:49–69.

Pehlivanoğlu, Pınar. 1998. "Differences in Turkish Parenting Practices Due to Socioeconomic Status and Sex of the Child." Master's Thesis. Istanbul, Turkey: Boğaziçi University.

Pleck, Elizabeth H. 2004. "Two Dimensions of Fatherhood: A History of the Good Dad/Bad Dad Complex." In *The role of the Father in Child Development*, edited by M. E. Lamb, 32–57. New York: Wiley.

Pyke, Karen D. 1996. "Class-based Masculinities: The Interdependence of Gender, Class, and Interpersonal Power." *Gender and Society* 10:527–49.

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

Rohner, Ronald P., and Sandra M. Pettengill. 1985. "Perceived Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Parental Control among Korean Adolescents." *Child Development* 56: 524–28.

Sancar, Serpil. 2009. *Erkeklik İmkansız İktidar: Ailede, Piyasada ve Sokakta Erkekler*. İstanbul, Turkey: Metis Yayınları.

Sefer, Nihan. 2007. "Paternal Representations in Late Adolescence." Master's Thesis. Istanbul, Turkey: Boğaziçi University.

Steil, Janice M. 2000. "Contemporary Marriage: Still an Unequal Partnership." In *Close Relationships: A Sourcebook*, edited by C. Hendrick and S. S. Hendrick, 125–39. London, UK: Sage.

Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sullivan, Oriel. 2004. "Changing Gender Practices within the Household: A Theoretical Perspective." *Gender and Society* 18:207–22.

Sunar, Diane. 2002. "Change and Continuity in the Turkish Middle Class Family." In *Autonomy and Dependence in Family: Turkey and Sweden in Critical Perspective*, edited by E. Özdalga and R. Liljestrom, 137–217. İstanbul, Turkey: Swedish Research Institute.

Sunar, Diane. 2009. "Mothers' and Fathers' Child Rearing Practices and Self-esteem in Three Generations of Urban Turkish families." In *Perspectives on Human Development, Family and Culture*, edited by S. Bekman and A. Aksu-Koç, 126–39. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sunar, Diane, and Güler O. Fişek. 2005. "Contemporary Turkish Families." In *Families in Global Perspective*, edited by J. L. Roopnarine and U. Gielen, 169–83. Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Thebaud, Sarah. 2010. "Masculinity, Bargaining and Breadwinning: Understanding Men's Housework in the Cultural Context of Paid Work." *Gender and Society* 24:330–354.

Tolan, Barlas. 1991. "Aile, Cinsiyet ve Cinsel Roller." In *Türkiye Aile Ansiklopedisi*, 208–14. Ankara, Turkey: Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği Vakfı.

Townsend, Nicholas. 2002. *Package Deal: Marriage, Work and Fatherhood in Men's Lives*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Vigoya, Mara V. 2001. "Contemporary Latin American Perspectives on Masculinity." *Men and Masculinities* 3:237–60.

Williams, Stephen. 2008. "What is Fatherhood? Searching for the Reflexive Father." *Sociology* 42:487–502.

Wyrod, Robert. 2008. "Between Women's Rights and Men's Authority: Masculinity and Shifting Discourses of Gender Difference in Urban Uganda." *Gender and Society* 22: 799–824.

Author Biographies

Hale Bolak Boratav, PhD, is professor of social psychology, Department of Psychology, Istanbul Bilgi University, Turkey. Dynamics of gender, sexuality and power in cultural

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014

context, values, emotions, and health constitute major research interests. Some relevant publications include "When Wives are Major Providers: Culture, Gender and Family Work," *Gender and Society*, 1997, (11): 409–443; "Making Sense of Heterosexuality: An Exploratory Study of Young Heterosexual Identities in Turkey," *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 2006, (54): 213–225; and with A. Çavdar, "Sexual Stereotypes and Practices of University Students in Turkey," *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 2012, (41): 271–281.

Güler Okman Fişek, PhD, is Emeritus profesor of clinical psychology, Department of Psychology, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey. She uses a culturally informed approach to self-development and gender dynamics in the family, and psychoanalytic psychotherapy processes. Relevant publications include "Contemporary Turkish Families" with D. Sunar. In U. Gielen and J. Roopnarine (eds.) *Families in Global Perspective*, 2005; "Self Development, Individuation and Culture: A Psychoanalytic Search" in S. Bekman and A. Aksu-Koç, *Perspectives in human development, family and culture*, 2009; and "Relationality, Intersubjectivity and Culture: Experiences in a Therapeutic Discourse of Virtual Kinship," 2010, *Studies in Gender and Sexuality*.

Hande Eslen-Ziya, PhD, is an external visiting fellow of the Institute for Society and Social Justice at Glasgow Caledonian University. Her most recent publications are: "Social Media and Turkish Feminism: New Resources for Social Activism." From Veiling to Blogging: Women and Media in the Middle East. Special Issue of *Feminist Media Studies*, 13, no. 5 (2013) and "Domestic Work, Gender and Migration in Turkey: Legal Framework Enabling Social Reality." İn *The Discourse of Politics of Migration in Europe*, U. Korkut (eds.), Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Currently Eslen-Ziya is completing a project—*Construction of Femininity and Masculinity in Friday Prayers in Turkey*.

Downloaded from jmm.sagepub.com by guest on June 16, 2014