Review Of The Opinions Of The College Students On Social Gender Roles According To The Geographical Regions In Turkey

Besra TAŞ
Fatih University, Faculty of Education, İstanbul, Turkey
besra.tas@gmx.de

Betül KILINÇ
Fatih University, Faculty of Education, İstanbul, Turkey
betul_klnc34@hotmail.com

Hilal BAĞCI
Fatih University, Faculty of Education, İstanbul, Turkey
hilal_didem5@hotmail.com

Adem TATAR
Fatih University, Faculty of Education, İstanbul, Turkey
ademtatar@outlook.com

Kübra ZORLU
Fatih University, Faculty of Education, İstanbul/TURKEY
kubrazorlu60@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Perspective towards men and women in the culture the people brought up in is different. Therefore, expectations from men and women differ. People are born as women or men, but the culture they are brought up in raise them with certain gender roles. As in some cultures, there are limits in certain situations towards women in several regions in Turkey such as business life or education life. This situation creates taboos in thoughts and perspectives towards life of women. Contrary to these thoughts, men are given more extensive and discriminatory social roles.

This study is realized to determine the opinions of senior students who receive education in Turkey on the effect of specified cultural differences on social gender roles. This study includes the comparison of the opinions of senior students on social gender roles with different dimensions. These dimensions are egalitarian gender role, female gender role, male gender role, gender role in marriage and traditional gender role. Also there is an evaluation according to the departments the students study in. College students in different regions in Turkey are included in the study.

Keywords: Geographical Region, Gender, Gender Roles, Rural Region, Urban Region

INTRODUCTION

Even though gender and social gender concepts are used for one another, there needs to be a differentiation between gender and social gender concepts. Gender is defined as genetic, biological and physiological qualities the individual present as man and woman (Vefikuluçay, Zeyneloğlu, Eroğlu, Taşkın, 2007, p. 27). Social gender is at the foundation of the categories that effects the social life (Taylor, Peplau, Sears, 2003, p. 375). We try to differentiate them when we first meet them in accordance with their male or female identities. This is almost inevitable. The reason for this is that social gender is one of the principal categories (Taylor, Peplau, Sears, 2003, p. 375). The process of classifying people as men or women is called "social gender stamping". This process happens automatically without any initial thoughts and it is a natural process. Social gender stamping includes expectations about how people should behave in accordance with their social gender (Zastrow ve Ashman, 2014, p.574).

Our initial thoughts about gender consist of observable clues such as dressing style, physical qualities of people. Individuals reflect their social genders as one of the part of their presentation of self Taylor, Peplau, Sears, 2003, p. 375).

PERSPECTIVE ON SOCIAL GENDER ROLES IN ACCORDANCE WITH FEMINISM PERSPECTIVE

Towards the end of 1970s, feminist movement brought forward that biological difference is not a coincidence and defended that what is personal is also political, thus it started to criticize the ideological discourses towards the gender role attitude (Sullivan, 2003). Feminists thought that traditional gender roles forced on women and men cause gender discrimination and violence towards women during socialization process without noticing the gender and that women are victimized, pushed around; thus they presented gender roles as a problem. What this movement is in opposition to is that power, material wellbeing and the distribution of property and prestige are realized not according to individual skills, but according to the basis of gender through sexism which is an ideology that is based on the belief that one gender is superior to the other especially in terms of traditional gender roles (Sullivan, 2003).

SOCIAL GENDER ROLES ACCORDING TO THE CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Social gender is a cultural concept and it is different than biological gender concept. It expresses and presents the meanings and expectations of being men and women and that are attributed to us through society and culture. It also includes psychological qualities in parallel with the biological structure of an individual. Social gender is about psychosocial qualities that differentiate the individual as being womanly or manly (Dökmen,2004,p.4). Culture is one of the main factors which determine gender stereotypes and attitudes. Roles and stereotypes created for women and men by culture change over time. Therefore, these roles and stereotypes determined for women and men have significantly changed because of reasons such as women being active in business life and the increase in the level of education of women. During this process, the distances between these stereotypes determined for women and men in traditional societies have been reduced or even these stereotypes and roles have started to share similarities (Öngen, Aktaç, 2013, p.13).

PERSPECTIVES TOWARDS SOCIAL GENDER IN TURKISH SOCIETY FROM PAST TO PRESENT

Everything changes under the sun. Everything within the wheel that constantly moves forward and that is called time exists by undergoing necessary changes in accordance with the age. Therefore, it is not right to say that societies are stagnant and static; social structures, social dynamics, social systems, social rules constantly change (Gülşen, 2014, p.77-78; Gülşen, 2015; p,373-380; Kıray, 1999). However, Kıray states that the speed of this change is not stable, it accelerates or slows down according to ages, thus there are differences. Societies change, but in parts; the attributes of the society that change goes into a chain reaction with the other attributes and they change these attributes too. Therefore, society is whole and this whole changes continuously. It changes and rearranges itself, then it becomes a whole again (Gülşen, 2014, p.77-79; Gülşen, 2015, p,373-380; Kıray, 1999).

Social gender discrimination in Turkish society is needed to be considered together with the general structure of the social cultural basis. The existence of social gender which gives different roles to men and women in Turkish society becomes significant when it is analyzed together with the identity this society has been experiencing, creating and representing for years (Bingöl, 2014, p.110). Turkish society is a unique society with so many of its aspects like other societies; it consists many contradictory areas in itself. The variety of the society, aspects of it that are not known much, but are wrong for most of the time, excitement and boldness of it, Easterner and Westerner aspects of it, gaps between these regions, multiculturalism, traditional conservatism that is almost like a reflex or complete opposite of it, surrendering to it in an unexpected way (Bingöl, 2014, p.110).

Nirun (1994) analyzed the gender roles in Turkish society within the historical process in a study in three main titles which are pre-Islamic era, post-Islamic era and Turkey in the Republic Period. First of all, Nirun stated that social lives, approaches towards family, men and women significantly differs compared to the other times in pre-Islamic era. It is explained that social gender discrimination aimed at women almost does not exist in Turkish society in the pre-Islamic era. "Women and men are equal. Women even have an authority in the administration of the country together with the Khan. Women manage the house (Nirun, 1994: 23, 24).

Normally, when Turkish people adopted Islam, every part of their lives underwent great changes. Islam did not only change the religion in the lives of Turkish people. Byzantine-Arabic-Iran cultures were also as much effective as Islam and have left significant traces in Turkish culture (Altındal, 2004: 33). By this way, going through changes became inevitable for Turkish women and men. With Islam, place and rights of women in Turkish society have been altered because of religious judgments, rules and social beliefs that are interpreted by being deviated from the aim by the society. "Actually Islam gave great rights to women, but interpretation of

some verses and hadiths in a different way than their real meanings caused women to lose the right and prestige they had had before" (Altındal, 2004: 33).

Bingöl (2014) approached to today's women in Turkey in the article as such: "In today's Turkey, women experience an inequality in many different areas in terms of men and the society in general because of the determination of social gender. Women are exposed to this inequality especially because of the lack of education and socialization in accordance with their gender. All inequalities women face in social life include other variables and they are based on a single-based 'social gender discrimination/femininity phenomenon" (Bingöl, 2014, p.112).

PERSPECTIVES OF OTHER COUNTRIES TO SOCIAL GENDER ROLES

Social gender role differentiates in accordance with the background of the existing culture. The roles determined for women and men are exaggerated in some cultures and normal in some other cultures (Zastrow and Ashman, 2014, p.577). Traditional Asian and American families are patriarchal families in which prestige is determined in accordance with age, generation and social gender role (Balgopal, 2008, p.156). Even though social gender roles differ for Mexican Americans, traditional Mexican Americans persist on the discrimination of the gender roles. According to the traditional Mexican families, men are the leaders of the family and women are in a position that requires them to obey their husbands which are responsible of taking care of the family (Aktaran, Zastrow ve Ashman, 2014, p.577). On the other hands, Afro Americans adapt more egalitarian roles (Moore 2008). Afro American women are described as such; they live their religions more actively and they present themselves as the power of the family which sacrifices itself. Their identities are more associated with motherhood. During the course of the history, especially during the unemployment period, they went out of the house as the breadwinner of the family (Aktaran, Zastrow ve Ashman, 2014, p.577).

Social gender roles in China presents some duties and privileges. Sons are valued more compared to the daughters. Continuation of the lineage depends on the man and women are adapted by the families of their husbands. First-born son is the most favored child and he takes the responsibility of the family. Traditional roles of girls are much less rewarding. Women obtain authority and respect only when they become mother-in-laws (Aktaran, Zastrow and Ashman, 2014, p.577).

In a study realized with Texas University, Audra Lee (2007) applied a scale which measures the social gender roles on the people in the region. This study realized in Texas which is divided into two sections as North and South presents that women generally forced to abide by gender roles the society attributes to them and they act in accordance with these roles. Also Audra Lee asserted with the studies that women had to give priority to houseworks when they work and their priorities differentiate in this regard.

Ifechukwu (2013) reached similar conclusions in the study applied on Nigerian students with social gender roles attitude scale. As a result of the study, it is asserted that women need to be busy with houseworks by staying at home and men are busy with outdoor works as breadwinner individuals. Ifechukwu also stated with the studies that Nigerian students generally adapt to traditional social structure.

In addition to this, in the study called "Gender Roles in Pakistan" published in Essay UK, the perspective of Pakistani people towards social gender is mentioned as such: "Since Pakistan is a country directed with Islam Regime, the effect of Islam is felt intensively in social roles. However, since 1990s, women have started to become active in political fields and business life. Still, the equality between women and men is very little. Social works for women rights started in 20th and 21th centuries and more importance is placed to women rights. In this period, many marches and media-based works were realized to defend women rights. These developments created a great effect on Pakistani people and brought along a positive process in terms of women rights and right to employment. As a result of this, today Pakistani women have become employed in a wide range of works such as nursing and piloting. Also, the author stated that this situation was a big step and a source of pride for Pakistan (Essays, UK., 2013).

Lum (2000) summarized the cultural perspective towards social gender in the book written on this subject as such: "For a person who is a member of an ethnic group not to adapt to the dominant culture he/she is born into. There are many degrees of acculturation; a person can persist on traditional cultural beliefs, values and traditions of the country [or cultural heritage] he/she has come from more or less" (Lum, 2000, s.201).

RESEARCH METHOD

Since the acquired date presented numeric quality, the use of quantitative method was easy in the study. This is an important situation for measurement process. Turkey was divided into 3 regions visually on the map and patterned based on quantitative method techniques in this study to determine the facilitation of the attitude of the senior students in the college regarding gender roles according to this data (Kıncal; 2015).

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

n=746 students were included within the scope of the study and 59,1% of these were consisted of women and 40,9% were consisted of men. In the sample acquired, differences according to gender, department-section, egalitarian gender role, female gender role, gender role in marriage, traditional gender role, male gender role and geographical regions in Turkey were analyzed.

DATA COLLECTION

The study regarding social gender roles was applied on college students who continue their undergraduate studies. Turkey was divided into 3 regions visually and the study was applied to the senior students in different cities in these regions. The three regions were Western Region, Central Region and Eastern Region. According to this, the cities in the Western Region are Kocaeli, Tekirdağ, Ankara, Kırklareli, İstanbul, Zonguldak, İzmir, Bursa, Aydın, Bolu, Sakarya, Manisa, Edirne, Kastamonu, Balıkesir, Fethiye, Afyonkarahisar, Düzce, Çanakkale, Antalya, Denizli, Eskişehir, Yalova, İzmit, Muğla, Uşak, Kütahya. The cities in the Central Region are Çorum, Trabzon, Sivas, Sinop, Tokat, Samsun, Amasya, Ordu, Artvin, Kırşehir, Kayseri, Giresun, Adana, Rize, Hatay, Karabük, Mersin, Burdur, Isparta, Çankırı, Gümüşhane, Niğde, İskenderun, Aksaray, Bartın. The cities in the Eastern Region are Malatya, Adıyaman, Diyarbakır, Ağrı, Kahramanmaraş, Şanlıurfa, Elazığ, Bingöl, Gaziantep, Erzurum, Ardahan, Mardin, Bitlis, Kars, Erzincan, Bayburt, Muş, Van, Batman, Hakkari, Şırnak, Iğdır, Konya and Siirt. The following changes are made in the cities divided into 3 regions; even though Artvin is in Eastern Region, it is moved into Central Region because of the increase in development and literacy rate. Even though Ankara and Eskişehir are in the Central Region, they are moved into the Western Region. The reason of this is that Eskişehir is an active city full of students and Ankara is the capital. Even though Konya is in the Central Region, it is included in the Eastern Region because of the life standards. Apart from these, life standards of the countries of the foreign students who participated to the study are considered and determined as such: Georgia, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Afghanistan were added to the Eastern Region; Somalia was added to the Central Region and Russia, Bulgaria, Canada, Lithuania were added to the Western Region. The application of the scale was realized in the fall semester in 2015-2016 school year.

SOCIAL GENDER ROLES ATTITUDE SCALE

The necessary permit was received according to the use of the scale and the necessary direction for the use of it was included on the scale. The students within the scope of the study were asked to fill out the demographical information which consists of 5 questions and Social Gender Roles Attitude Scale developed by Zeyneloğlu & Terzioğlu (2011) and which consists of 38 articles and 5 subdimensions; 5 point likert scale was used in the attitude scale.

It is seen that factor load of reliability co-efficient articles differ between .35 and .79 in the original of the scale. Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability co-efficient was determined as .92 for the whole scale. Cronbach alpha reliability co-efficient of female gender role subdimension is .80 and Cronbach sub-reliability coefficient of the subdimensions of gender role in marriage and traditional gender role is .78. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of male gender role subdimension is .72. Correlation between subfactors is 0.65-0.35 (Zeyneloğlu, Terzioğlu; 2011).

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In the statistical evaluation of the data acquired, SPSS – Statistical Package for the Social Sciences – package program is used. Statistical operations are realized regarding the problem of the study and sub-problems on the data coded on the program. As statistical operation, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, one-way analysis of variance and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) are used. They are tabulated so that they can be palpable (Alper, Deryakulu; 2008). Correlations are at 0.01 significance level (double queue).

FINDINGS

In this study, Turkey was divided into 3 regions and the information below is acquired by analyzing the perspectives in these regions according to social gender roles in terms of different variations.

Table 1:*Participation Rate in relation to Social Gender Roles Attitude Scale According to Geographical Regions in Turkey*

Region	Frequency(f)	Percentage (%)	Effective Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Western Region	214	28,7	28.7	28.7
Moderate	263	35,3	35.3	63.9
Eastern Region	269	36,1	36.1	100.0
Total	**746**	**100,0**	**90**	

As is seen from the table, 746(n) people in total were included in the 3 regions. Among these, the percentage of the Western Region is n= 214, 28,7%; Central Region is n=263, 35,3% and Eastern Region is n=269, 36%. The Western Region has the less percentage; Central and Eastern Regions follow it, respectively. As is seen in the table, there is no significance difference in the participation rates between regions.

Table 2:*Participation Rate in relation to Social Gender Roles Attitude Scale According to Gender in Turkey*

Gender	Frequency(f)	Percentage (%)	Effective Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Women	441	59,1	59.1	59.1
Men	305	40,9	40.9	100.0
Total	**746**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

As is seen from the table, 746(n) people in total were included in the 3 regions. Among the participants, n=441, 59.1% of them were women and n=305, 40,9% were men. Women participants constitute the majority. The participation rate of men is lesser.

Table 3:*Participation Rate in relation to Social Gender Roles Attitude Scale According to Department in Turkey*

Department	Frequency(f)	Percentage (%)	Effective Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Numeric	350	46,9	46.9	46.9
Verbal	396	53,1	53.1	100.0
Total	**746**	**100.0**	**90**	

Students from verbal section in the study are in the rate of 53,1% with n=396 people, students from numeric section are in the rate of 46,9% with n=350 people. As is stated in the table, Verbal Section students constitute the majority of this study in which n=746 people are included. There is no significant difference in the participation rates of Numeric and Verbal Sections.

Table 4:MANOVA Results in Gender Roles According to Gender Differences

Source	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean Square	F	p
Egalitarian Gender Role	2722.156	1	2722.156	96.550	.000
Female Gender Role	5311.632	1	5311.632	129.079	.000
Gender Role in Marriage	5561.812	1	5561.812	209.549	.000
Traditional Gender Role	6698.846	1	6698.846	171.822	.000
Male Gender Role	1869.343	1	1869.343	84.372	.000

Significant differences are acquired according to the gender in all variances in the results of multivariate analysis of variance. Egalitarian Gender Role; $F(1,744)=96.55$, $p=0.000<0.05$.Female Gender Role; $F(1,744)=129.08$,$p=0.000<0.05$. Gender Role in Marriage $F(1,744)=209.55$, $p=0.000<0.05$. Traditional Gender Role; $F(1,744)=171.82$, $p=0.000<0.05$. Male Gender Role $F(1,744)=84.372$, $p=0.000<0.05$.

It is seen that women have a more significant average compared to men in all variances.

Table 5: *Definitive Statistical Results Given for Subtitles*

	Region	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Egalitarian Gender Role	Western Region	33,7523	5,73183	214
	Moderate	33,7148	5.44704	263
	Eastern Region	33,2900	5.76058	269
	Total	33,5724	5.64005	746
Female Gender Role	Western Region	27,4766	6.87152	214
	Moderate	25.9087	6.88116	263
	Eastern Region	25.1747	6.91602	269
	Total	26.0938	6.94440	746
Gender Role in Marriage	Western Region	34.3458	5.38665	214
	Moderate	33.0456	6.05113	263
	Eastern Region	33.3978	5.89916	269
	Total	33.5456	5.82853	746
Traditional Gender Role	Western Region	27.0327	6.54230	214
	Moderate	25.4639	6.84211	263
	Eastern Region	25.6208	7.22282	269
	Total	25.9705	6.92291	746
Male Gender Role	Western Region	23.0607	4.69252	214
	Moderate	22.2129	4.93317	263
	Eastern Region	22.8625	5.17958	269
	Total	22.6903	4.96342	746

When Definitive Statistics are considered, means and standard deviations for each role are given according to the regions. In this case, it is understood that the difference in averages between the regions for egalitarian gender role is not too much and general average shows it. Western Region is different than others (Mean=27.5; standard deviation=6.9), even though the other two regions are close to each other, it is seen that Central Region (mean=25.9; sd=6.8) has a higher average than the Eastern Region (mean=25.1;sd=6.8). It is seen that Western Region is distinguished than other regions in a clear way in traditional gender role (Mean=27.0; standard deviation=6.5). Even though the other two regions are very close to each other, it is seen that Eastern Region (Mean=25.6; standard deviation=7.2) is higher than Central Region. Even though there is no significant difference between regions in gender role in marriage, it is seen that Western Region is higher. Even though there is no significant difference between regions in male gender role, it is seen that Western Region is higher.

Table 6: *MANOVA Results in Gender Roles According to Regional Differences*

	Source	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Region	Egalitarian Gender Role	33,722[a]	2	16.861	.529	.589
	Female Gender Role	645,450[b]	2	322,725	6,796	.001
	Gender Role in Marriage	208,648[c]	2	104,324	3,088	.046
	Traditional Gender Role	341,850[d]	2	170,925	3,591	.028
	Male Gender Role	97,273[e]	2	48,637	1,979	.139

In the results of multivariate analysis of variance, significant differences are acquired according to regions in gender role in marriage and traditional gender role. Female gender role is significant with 2, F=6.796 degree of freedom (p=0.001<0.05). Gender role in marriage is significant with 2, F=3.088 degree of freedom (p=0.046<0.05). Traditional gender role is significant with 2, F=3.591 degree of freedom (p=0.028<0.05). There is no significant difference between regions in egalitarian gender role and male gender role. All regions are at equal level for two gender roles.

Table 7:Definitive Statistics Realized for the Faculty

Faculty	Department	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Egalitarian Gender Role	numeric	33.6943	5.67917	350
	verbal	33.4646	5.61023	396
	Total	33.5724	5.64005	746
Female Gender Role	numeric	26.1029	6.96415	350
	verbal	26.0859	6.93570	396
	Total	26.0938	6.94440	746
Gender Role in Marriage	numeric	33.3657	6.00363	350
	verbal	33.7045	5.67215	396
	Total	33.5456	5.82853	746
Traditional Gender Role	numeric	25.7200	6.84343	350
	verbal	26.1919	6.99356	396
	Total	25.9705	6.92291	746
Male Gender Role	numeric	22.5486	4.85511	350
	verbal	22.8157	5.06003	396
	Total	22.6903	4.96342	746

350 people in numeric sections and 396 people in verbal sections were asked for traditional gender role and 25.7 average in numeric and 26.2 average in verbal are obtained. 350 people in numeric sections and 396 people in verbal sections were asked for egalitarian gender role and 33.6 average in numeric and 33.4 average in verbal are obtained. It is observed that all averages are close to each other for Gender Roles.

Table 8:Definitive Statistics Realized for Gender

Gender		Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Egalitarian Gender Role	female	35.1610	4.91601	441
	male	31.2754	5.83289	305
	Total	33.5724	5.64005	746
Female Gender Role	female	28.3129	6.31355	441
	male	22.8852	6.55869	305
	Total	26.0938	6.94440	746
Gender Role in Marriage	female	35.8163	4.33383	441
	male	30.2623	6.14598	305
	Total	33.5456	5.82853	746
Traditional Gender Role	female	28.4626	6.23583	441
	male	22.3672	6.25575	305
	Total	25.9705	6.92291	746
Male Gender Role	female	24.0068	4.26428	441
	male	20.7869	5.28253	305
	Total	22.6903	4.96342	746

A sample group with 746 people is created for all Gender Roles. This group consists of 441 women and 305 men. For egalitarian gender role, the average for women is 35.16 (sd=4,9) and for men is 31.3 (sd=5,8). In female gender role, the average for women is 28.31 (sd=6,3) and for men is 22.88 (sd=6,55). For gender role in marriage, the average for women is 35.81 (sd=4,33) and for men is 30.26 (sd=6,14). For traditional gender role, the average for women is 28.46 (sd=6,12) and for men is 22.36 (sd=6,25). Lastly, for male gender role, the average for women is 24.00 (sd=4,26) and for men is 20.78 (sd=5,28).

It is observed that in all Gender Roles, female average values are higher than male average values and they are in compatible with each other in terms of standard deviations.

CONCLUSION / DISCUSSION / SUGGESTION

This study is divided into 3 geographical regions visually in Turkey as Eastern Region, Central Region and Western Region and the social gender roles in this regions are considered.

It is seen that female gender role, gender role in marriage and traditional gender role are significant statistically according to the regions. In the next stage, paired comparisons in each variation are realized to understand which regions have difference, homogeneous groups are created by using Tukey HSD test. In this case, regional differences for female gender role are listed as such: Western Region, Central Region and Eastern Region. Regional differences for gender role in marriage are as such: Western Region, Central Region. In this sorting, Eastern Region is not significant. If there was a significant differentiation, Eastern Region would be at the second place. Traditional gender role is the same with gender role in marriage. There is no significant difference between regions in egalitarian gender role and male gender role.

It is seen that statistical MANOVA results are significant according to the Gender Roles. It is seen that women have a more significant average compared to men in all variances. Significant differences are acquired according to the gender in all variances in the results of multivariate analysis of variance. It is seen that women have a more significant average compared to men in all variances. Even though men seem like they have more average, women having more average has disproved many thesis. It shows that even though women seem like they are at the background in Turkish society, this situation has actually changed and women play a dominant role now. Nirun (1994) analyzed the gender roles in Turkish society within the historical process in a study in three main titles which are pre-Islamic era, post-Islamic era and Turkey in the Republic Period. First of all, Nirun stated that social lives, approaches towards family, men and women significantly differs compared to the other times in pre-Islamic era. It is explained that social gender discrimination aimed at women almost does not exist in Turkish society in the pre-Islamic era. "Women and men are equal. Women even have an authority in the administration of the country together with the Khan. Women manage the house (Nirun, 1994: 23, 24). It is possible to say that Turkey has undergone a positive change in this regard as a society. Based on Bingöl (2014) study; "In today's Turkey, women experience an inequality in many different areas in terms of men and the society in general because of the determination of social gender. Women are exposed to this inequality especially because of the lack of education and socialization in accordance with their gender. All inequalities women face in social life include other variables and they are based on a single-based 'social gender discrimination/femininity phenomenon" (Bingöl, 2014, p.112). It is seen that this field can be changed through education, therefore studies in this regard should be focused on. Women especially should be supported in public spheres so that they can reach places that they deserve. In actuality, there are nice variances. It is seen that women play an active role in Turkish council and other public spheres. It is important to give them support and increase the scientific studies in this regard.

REFERENCES

Altındal, Aytunç (2004) *Türkiye'de Kadın (Woman in Turkey)*, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul

Altınova, H.H. ve Duyan,V., (2013). *Toplumsal cinsiyet algısı ölçeğinin geçerlik güvenirlik çalışması (Validity reliability study of social gender perception scale). Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet Dergisi,* 24.2: 9-22

Alper, A. ve Deryakulu, D. (2008). *Web Ortamlı Probleme Dayalı Öğrenmede Bilişsel Esneklik Düzeyinin Öğrenci Başarısı Ve Tutumları Üzerindeki Etkisi (The Effect of the Level of Cognitive Flexibility in Web Environment Problem-Based Education on Student Success and Attitude). Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi, (*33)148:49-63.

Audra Lee, B.S. (2007). *Women's Gender Role Attitudes: Association Of Demographic Characteristics, Work Related Factors, And Life Satisfaction,* Master Of Science University Of North Texas

Balgopal, P.R.(2008). *Asian Americans: Overview*. In T. Mizrahi & Davis, *Small groups: Studies in cocial interation.* New York: Knopf.

Bingöl, O. (2014). *Toplumsal cinsiyet olgusu ve Türkiye'de kadınlık (Social gender phenomenon and womanhood in Turkey)*, KMÜ sosyal ve ekonomik araştırmalar dergisi, sayı: 16, sayfa 108-114

Dökmen, Y. Z., (2004). *Toplumsal Cinsiyet 'Sosyal Psikolojik Açıklamalar' (Social Gender 'Social Psychological Explanations')*, Sistem Yayıncılık, Ankara, s.4

Essays, UK. (2013). *Gender Roles In Pakistan Sociology Essay*. Retrieved from https://www.ukessays.com/essays/sociology/gender-roles-in-pakistan-sociology-essay.php?cref=1

Glick, P. ve Fiske, S.T. (1999). *Gender, power dynamics, and social interaction. Revisioning gender*, London: Sage Publication, 365-397.

Gülşen, Celal. (2014). The readiness levels of secondary school administrators to the innovation management. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 5(2), 77-86.

Gülşen, Celal. (2015). Opinions of Provincial Executives on Readiness for Transfer of Authority in the Management of Educational Services. *Anthropologist*, *22*(2), 373-380.

Ifechukwu, V. (2013). *Gender role attitudes among Nigerian students: Egalitarian or Traditional?*, Department of social science, DBS School of Arts

Kıncal, R.M. (Ed.) (2015). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri (Scientific Research Methods)*. Ankara: Nobel

Kıray, B. M., (1999), *Toplumsal Yapı, Toplumsal Değişme (Social Structure, Social Change)*, Bağlam Yayıncılık, İstanbul.

Lum, D. (2000). *Social work practice and people of color: Aprocesccctage approach (4 th ed.)*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks\ Cole.

Nirun, Nihat (1994) *Sistematik Sosyoloji Yönünden Aile Ve Kültür (Family and Culture in terms of Systematical Sociology)*, Atatürk Kültür, Dtyk Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Yayını Sayı: 73, Ankara

Öngen, B. ve Aytaç, S.(2013). *"Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerine İlişkin Tutumları Ve Yaşam Değerleri İlişkisi" ("Attitude and Life Value Relationship Regarding Social Gender Roles of College Students")*, Sosyoloji Konferansları, 1-18.

Sullivan TJ (2003) *Introduction to Social Problems*. 6. Baskı, Boston, Pearson Education

Taylor, S.E., Peplau, L.A. ve Sears, D.O. (2010). *Sosyal psikoloji (Social psychology)* (A. Dönmez, Çev.)(Gözden geçirilmiş ikinci baskı). Ankara: İmge Kitapevi.

Vefikuluçay, D., Zeyneloğlu, S., Eroğlu, K. ve Taşkın, L. (2007). *Kafkas üniversitesi son sınıf öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine ilişkin bakış açıları (Perspective of senior students in Kafkas University towards social gender roles). Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi,* 26-38

Zastrow, C. ve Ashman, K.K. (2014). *İnsan davranışı ve sosyal çevre-1 (Human behavior and social environment-1)* (A. Aydın, Ç. Karaca, F. Çoban, M.A. Foça, S.E. Türközü, Çev.). Ankara: Nika Yayınevi.

Zeyneloğlu, S., & Terzioğlu, F. (2011). *Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rolleri Tutum Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi ve Psikometrik Özellikleri (Development and Pyschometic Characteristics of Social Gender Role Attitude Scale)*. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 40: 409-420. http://www.efdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/yonetim/icerik/makaleler/425-published.pdf