

Violence against women in Turkey

A Nationwide Survey

Ayşe Gül Altınay | Yeşim Arat



VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN TURKEY
A Nationwide Survey

Ayşe Gül Altınay
Yeşim Arat

Punto
İstanbul
2009

Published in 2009 by Punto Publishing Solutions / Punto Baskı Çözümleri
Halaskargazi Cad. Sait Kuran İş Merkezi No. 301, Kat 5
Şişli 34381 İstanbul – Turkey

© 2009 by Ayşe Gül Altınay and Yeşim Arat

All rights reserved. The pdf version of this report can be reproduced, shared, and printed online without permission as long as no changes are made to the original document and due credit is given.

ISBN: 978-975-01103-7-5

Translated by Amy Spangler

Cover and page design by Savaş Yıldırım

Visual material in the front and back cover used with permission from the respective organizations:

Front cover:

- Kırk Örük: Kadına Yönelik Şiddetle Mücadele Kooperatifi/Kırk Örük: Cooperative for the Struggle Against Violence Against Women, 2007
- “10. YIL: Kadınların şiddetten kurtulmak için geliştirdikleri yöntemlerin yeni bir dünya hayal etmeyi mümkün kılaacağına inanıyoruz” (10th Anniversary: We believe that the methods women have designed to seek liberation from violence will enable the imagination of a new world) – KAMER Foundation, 2007
- “Anadolu’nun orta yerinde şiddete karşı kadınlar elele” (In the middle of Anatolia: Women hand-in-hand against violence) – Kadın Dayanışma Vakfı/Women’s Solidarity Foundation, 2007
- “Kadına yönelik şiddete son” (End to violence against women) – Amnesty International, 2007
- “Geceleri de sokakları da istiyoruz” (We want both the nights and the streets) – Ankaralı Feministler/Feminists of Ankara, 2007
- “Bağır herkes duysun! Erkek şiddeti son bulsun!” (Shout so that everyone can hear! Make male violence stop!) – “Dayağa Karşı Kadın Dayanışması” 20. Yılında/20th Anniversary of “Women’s Solidarity Against Beating,” 2007
- “Kadınların şiddete bakışı” (Women’s view of violence) – 4. Uluslararası Gezici Filmmor Kadın Filmleri Festivali/4th International Filmmor Women’s Film Festival on Wheels, 2006
- “Şiddetin ötesine yolculuk” (Journey beyond violence) – Filmmor Kadın Kooperatifi/Filmmor Women’s Cooperative, 2006

Back cover:

- “Aile İçi Şiddete Son!” (End to Domestic Violence!) – Hürriyet, 2004
- “Namus” (Honour) – 5. Uluslararası Gezici Filmmor Kadın Filmleri Festivali/5th International Filmmor Women’s Film Festival on Wheels, 2007
- “Her kadının içinde bir mucize saklı” (There is a miracle hidden in every woman) – KAMER Foundation, 2006
- “Kadına karşı şiddeti durdur” (Stop violence against women) – Amnesty International Turkey, 2004

The (longer) Turkish version of this report, *Türkiye’de Kadına Yönelik Şiddet* (Ayşe Gül Altınay and Yeşim Arat, İstanbul: Punto, 2007), received the 2008 PEN Duygu Asena Award.

For more information on the survey and to access the Turkish version:

<http://www.kadinayoneliksidet.org/>

kadinayoneliksidet@gmail.com

Table of Contents

Tables	v
Preface to the English Edition	vii
Acknowledgements	xvi
Introduction	1
1 Survey Methodology	5
A Short History of Research on Violence Against Women	7
Our Methodology	11
Sampling and Implementation	15
Basic Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	20
2 Survey Findings	33
Women's Views on Violence and Gender Equality	34
Women's Experiences of Violence	37
Women's Views on the Struggle against Violence	53
3 Discussion and Suggestions	63
Preliminary Conclusions	64
Policy Implications	68
Appendix: Questionnaire	71
Bibliography	91
About the Authors	104

Tables

Table 1	Distribution of Interviews According to Provinces	18
Table 2	Comparison of National Census Data and Survey Sample Data	19
Table 3	Whether This Was the Woman's First Marriage	20
Table 4	Form of Marriage	20
Table 5	How Couples Met and Married	21
Table 6	Birth Place – Type of Settlement	22
Table 7	Net Household Income (Monthly)	22
Table 8	Income-Generating Work by Women	23
Table 9	Place of Income-Generating Work by Women	23
Table 10	Type of Income-Generating Work by Women	24
Table 11	Languages Known and Languages Spoken With Family Members (Turkey)	25
Table 12	Languages Known and Languages Spoken With Family Members (East)	26
Table 13	Ethnic Identification	27
Table 14	Belief in a Religion	27
Table 15	Religious Identification of Believers	28
Table 16	Religious Denominations of Believers	28
Table 17	Level of Education	30
Table 18	Views on Justification of Beating	35
Table 19	Gender Relations in the Home	37
Table 20	Getting Permission	38
Table 21	Slapping, Shoving and Beating by the Husband (Physical Violence)	39
Table 22	Whether Women Have Told Others about the Experience of Physical Violence	41
Table 23	Physical Violence and Marital Status	41
Table 24	Physical Violence and How Couples Met and Married	42
Table 25	Physical Violence and Women's Education	43
Table 26	Physical Violence and Spouse's Education	44
Table 27	Physical Violence and Income	45
Table 28	Physical Violence and Relative Contribution to Household Income	46
Table 29	Physical Violence and Type of Settlement – Turkey	46
Table 30	Physical Violence and Type of Settlement – East	47
Table 31	Sexual Violence	48
Table 32	Spousal Prevention of Income-Generating Work	49
Table 33	Women's Knowledge of the Civil Code on Property Regime	50
Chart 1	Multivariate Analysis of Physical Violence via Discriminant Analysis	51-52
Table 34	What Would You Do If Your Husband Were to Beat You Today?	55
Table 35	What Would You Do If You Heard Your Neighbor Being Beaten By Her Spouse?	56
Table 36	Have You Heard of the Family Protection Law?	57
Table 37	Do You Know Anyone Who Has Benefited from the Family Protection Law?	57
Table 38	Knowledge of the Property Regime and of the Family Protection Law	58

Table 39 Knowledge of the Property Regime and of the Family Protection Law, and Education	59
Table 40 Do Institutions Carry out Their Responsibilities Concerning the Prevention of Violence against Women?	60
Table 41 Can the State Prevent Men's Violence Against Their Spouses?	61
Table 42 Are There Enough Women's Shelters in Turkey?	61
Table 43 Do You Approve of Your Taxes Being Used to Establish Women's Shelters?	62
Table 44 Should the Courts Penalize Men Who Beat Their Wives?	62

Preface to the English Edition

January 2009

There she was, a beautiful woman, a really beautiful woman who is attractive and carries herself with confidence. I mean, will she even talk to me? I had such a low opinion of myself that I believed she would not even talk to me. And then she began. She told us her name and then she asked my name. I was shocked. I mean, of course, people give names even to their dogs and cats, right? And I as a 44 year old woman should also have a name. Only that I had forgotten my name [sigh]. I was seriously shocked. I shook for a moment and then told my name. She asked me its meaning and who had given it to me. I had never been asked such questions before. That was my first shock. I could not stop shaking as I told her about my name that day.

Kardelen's story¹ about her name resonates strongly with the bestselling feminist novel *Kadının Adı Yok* (The Woman Has No Name) by Duygu Asena. Sometimes referred to as the "first feminist manifesto in Turkey,"² *Kadının Adı Yok* first came out in 1987 and reached a record high of 40 editions in one year. In July 2006, when her author Duygu Asena died, it was a large group of feminist women who carried her coffin out of the mosque where her funeral prayer had taken place. This was against established religious practice. One large banner said, "The woman has a name. And we will not forget."

Kardelen was not at this funeral. She was busy changing her life and the lives of the women around her as one of the very few self-identified feminists in her small town at the Eastern borderlands of Turkey. And it had all begun, quite literally, with remembering and (re)claiming her name.

When we interviewed Kardelen in April 2006, she regarded what she had accomplished in the past two years of her life as nothing short of a "revolution." She had recently told "the beautiful woman" who had initiated this revolution by asking her name, that if it hadn't been for her, she would probably be lying in a grave. "Because of the violence I was experiencing, I had already attempted suicide. And now I am here, talking to you with self-confidence."

Gender-based violence constitutes one of the major mechanisms through which women, gays and transsexuals/transgenders are excluded from social, economic and political life in Turkey. Since 1987, gender-based violence has

¹ Self-chosen pseudonym.

² Şirin Tekeli, "Şirin Tekeli'den Duygu İçin," *Bianet*, August 1, 2006 (retrieved October 12, 2008): <http://www.bianet.org/bianet/kategori/kadin/83240/sirin-tekeliden-duygu-icin>.

been one of the key issues within the feminist movement. 1987 marks not only the publication of the groundbreaking novel on gender and sexual politics by Duygu Asena, *Kadının Adı Yok*, but also the organization of the Women's Solidarity March Against Violence, the first major feminist rally of the second wave women's movement and the first mass political demonstration of post coup d'état Turkey. Since then, feminists have established women's centers and other organizations addressing violence against women in more than 30 provinces.³ Lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transsexual/transgender activists (LGBT) have also formed institutions and platforms that problematize violence on the basis of sexual orientation and identity.⁴ In recent years, gender-based violence has occupied the national agenda, particularly in the context of reforms in basic laws such as the Civil Code and the Turkish Penal Code.

To trace women's experience of and the feminist struggle against domestic violence by male spouses (the major form of gender-based violence addressed by second-wave feminism in Turkey) from the late 1980s till today, we conducted an 18-month research project titled "Domestic Violence and the Struggle against It," supported by TÜBİTAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey). The project had two legs. First, based on in-depth interviews and focus group discussions, our research aimed at analyzing the mechanisms of empowerment, support, and awareness-raising developed by women's organizations at both the national and the local level, and to discuss the factors that contribute to the success, as well as the challenges and limitations of this organizing. Between February 2006 and June 2007, we interviewed more than 150 feminist activists from close to 50 organizations in 27 cities.

Second, we conducted a nationwide representative survey in spring 2007. Based on face-to-face interviews with 1,800 ever-married women from a total of 56 provinces⁵, this survey was the second nationwide study on domestic violence (first being a 1993 survey). The questionnaire for the survey was developed after a year of in-depth interviews with activists in women's or-

³ For a detailed analysis of this short history, see Arat 2008.

⁴ As of 2008, there are more than 10 LGBT organizations and initiatives in İstanbul, Ankara, Antalya, İzmir, Eskişehir and Diyarbakır. Lambdaistanbul (www.lambdaistanbul.org) in İstanbul and Kaos GL (www.kaosgl.com) in Ankara are the oldest and the most active of these organizations. For a pioneering study on the different forms of discrimination experienced by gays, lesbians and bisexuals, see Lambdaistanbul 2006.

⁵ 1,520 of these interviews were part of the representative national sample, and the remaining 280 were drawn from the Eastern and Southeastern regions in order to enable a close analysis of results from these regions.

ganizations and with the feedback of more than a dozen academics and activists specializing in this field. Besides this participatory process of survey preparation, an indispensable component of the feminist methodology we tried to adopt was approaching the women to be interviewed for the survey as “subjects” in the debate on domestic violence. This required a move away from a focus on women’s “experience” of violence towards a questionnaire design that would help bring out their views on the background, legitimacy, prevention, and penalization of spousal violence. As we discuss in greater detail in the coming pages, the survey ended up having three parts: 1) what women think about domestic violence by their spouses (background and legitimacy), 2) women’s experience of domestic violence by their spouse, and 3) women’s views on prevention and penalization (with a particular emphasis on the role of the state).

We are currently in the process of writing articles on both the qualitative and quantitative legs of the research project. In the meantime, the demand from activists, policy makers and other researchers outside of Turkey has motivated us to share the preliminary findings of the national survey with the English-reading public. The rest of this report discusses these findings.

A longer version of this report was published in Turkish as a book in November 2007 and was circulated (in print form and as a pdf document) to more than 2,500 individuals, organizations, and universities. The results of the survey were reported widely in national and local media: 18 daily national newspapers ran more than 30 articles, interviews and news stories in the two weeks that followed the publication of the report; 10 TV stations broadcasted interviews and short documentaries, as well as reporting the results in prime time news programs; and close to 100 internet sites carried news and opinion pieces on the survey. Many politicians showed interest in the report and the main national agency on gender issues, the General Directorate on the Status of Women (KSGM) has been using it in its policy statements, as well as in educational seminars and talks. In November 2008, the book was awarded the 2008 PEN Duygu Asena Award, together with Handan Çağlayan’s (2007) pioneering work *Analar, Yoldaşlar, Tanrıçalar*. The second edition came out in November 2008 and is now available in bookstores.

In the Turkish debates, four key findings of our research have received particular attention. First, the combined outcome of two of the questions in the survey have revealed a growing awareness of and decreasing tolerance towards domestic violence by women. Nine out of ten women agreed with the statement that “wife-beating” was never justifiable (as opposed to the statement that under certain circumstances beating could be justified)

and nine out of ten women said “yes” to the question of whether the courts should “penalize” the men who exercise violence against their wives. These results (reinforced by responses to other questions) suggested that women did not regard domestic violence as a “private affair” that needs to be solved “within the family.” Since this goes against the findings of earlier surveys and against popular assumptions of women’s response to violence, there was special interest expressed in the media, as well as by activists, lawyers, psychologists, doctors, and politicians in this finding. Many people, including us, interpreted this as an encouraging outcome of 20 years of successful struggle by feminists. This finding revealed that the feminist struggle against domestic violence has not only been successful at changing the terms of the debate in the media or introducing new laws and state policies, but that the main message had reached, and had been internalized by the great majority of the women in Turkey.

The second key finding that attracted particular attention has been the increasing risk of physical violence for women who make more money than their husbands. Whereas the national percentage of women participating in the survey who have ever experienced physical violence from their husbands turned out to be 35 %, this percentage climbed up to 63 % for the women who contributed more income to the household economy than their husbands. Those who had equal incomes seemed to bear the lowest risk (20 %). This finding challenged the popular assumption that women endured domestic violence because of economic dependency and reinforced the feminist emphasis on the need to understand the gendered power relations behind domestic violence.

Thirdly, there was significant attention paid in the debates to the “silence” of the women experiencing male partner violence. The survey results suggested that as many as 49 % of the women who had been physically abused by their male partners nationwide had *not* shared this experience with anyone else before sharing it with our interviewers. While this finding was a positive indication of the rapport established between our interviewers and the women participating in the survey (since they were able to share their experience of violence with the interviewers), it was a striking sign of women’s solitude when faced with violence.

Finally, the finding about the lack of significant statistical difference between the East and the rest of the country regarding both the rates of violence and women’s attitudes towards violence (despite a huge gap in terms of

income and education levels)⁶ attracted media and scholarly attention. Combined with the finding about the increased risk of violence among women with higher income than their husbands, this lack of significant statistical difference between the East and the rest of the country challenged the popular understanding that “it is the Eastern women who are abused; the women in Western Turkey are more liberated.” While the scope of this national survey is not enough to engage in a detailed analysis of all aspects of gender-based violence experienced by women across regions, nevertheless, our limited findings are enough to question the myth about gender-based violence being “an Eastern issue” in Turkey.

There were a number of other significant findings that have received little or no attention in the Turkish debates so far. We discuss some of them in the coming pages. As Sally Engle Merry suggests, survey research has been an important mechanism in the struggle against gender-based violence globally (Merry 2006, 139). The widespread interest and extensive coverage of our survey further reinforces the need for research in this area. In an effort to aid future research and increase the transparency of this project, we have included the full questionnaire as an appendix to our book (and this report). We hope that our survey will encourage others to engage in research on gender-based violence and we look forward to seeing our findings be refuted, rethought or developed.

A feminist revolution in the making

Before we move on to “numbers,” though, let us go back to Kardelen’s story about her self-declared “revolution”: Self-identified as a Kurdish Sunni woman, Kardelen has experienced various forms of gender-based violence in her 44 years spent entirely in a small border town in Eastern Turkey. Her dream was to become a teacher, but she had to quit school after grade 8. Her education was interrupted because of what she calls “civil war” in the 1970s: “In those years, our town was divided into two: the leftists on one end of the street, the rightists on the other.” Another interruption in her life, the death of her father, was the result of a more subtle and internalized form of militarized violence: Her father had become paralyzed during military service and had died soon afterwards. For Kardelen, life with four brothers who regularly abused her physically became so unbearable that at age 17 she eloped with a young man she hardly knew:

He told me that with him I would be living like a princess. Only Allah knows and I know how I lived... He was alcoholic and that intensified the violence. There was physical violence, psychological violence, economic violence, all of it. I could

⁶ This does not mean there were no differences. We discuss this issue in detail in the next sections.

hardly step outside the house. My life in that house was like life in an F type [high security] prison cell. I told my husband that he was like Saddam. Not then, I told him this only recently.

The following 25 years were shaped by intense violence. Confined to home, Kardelen was responsible for the care of her mother-in-law, father-in-law, aunt-in-law, and her three children. One legitimate reason she could find to leave the house was to go to a neighborhood Qur'an course, as a result of which she started wearing the religious headcover (and still does).

In Kardelen's life-story narrative, the first moment of rupture in her married life is the death of her last surviving in-law: "After the death of my father-in-law, there was emptiness. Suddenly, I had nothing do for half of the day. That is when I started the depression treatment." The violence at home continued with great intensity. Kardelen remembers seeking refuge in the police and the governor's office on different occasions. She had learned from the TV that there was a new law that she could use to file a complaint⁷, but the police officer she talked to would not let her. "He told me to reconcile because we were a family. I was very angry with him. I said to him, 'You men are all the same... If I were a man who had experienced violence, you would have taken me in to file a complaint.' I wanted to file a complaint; I wanted him punished, even if for one night. I wanted him to know that there were new laws." At another occasion, when the violence became unbearable, Kardelen called the governor's office to ask for his support. They told her that the governor was hardly in town and that there was nothing they could do to help her. In Kardelen's terms, all doors were closed on her face.

Kardelen had voiced her complaint not only to the police or the governor's assistants, but also to the Imam of her mosque. On one of the special occasions when men and women pray in the mosque together, she refused to say "*helal olsun*" ("I give you my blessings") for her husband, when asked by the Imam to do so.

During the prayer, the Imam called on to women three times, asking, 'Do you give your blessings to your husbands?' And I said 'No'. Only I said no, everyone else said yes. All of the women turned towards me. Why should I give my blessings to him? The Imam did not turn to the men to ask them for their blessings for their wives. Why should women give their blessings? Why should I? I was aware of my rights, those that relate to religious matters, so I did not give my blessing. Why should I forget all those things he did to me? I won't forget... That was my last visit to the mosque. I have not gone back in the past 12 years.

⁷ The Law for the Protection of the Family was passed in 1998, after years of feminist lobbying and criticism, allowing women to seek a "protection order" against abusive partners or other members of the family.

When we asked Kardelen how she explained the violence she was experiencing back then to herself, she said the following: “I thought and thought about this. I thought about it a thousand days and a thousand nights. I had heard about Allah testing his believers through such hardships. I thought I was being tested, I saw it as my fate.”

After 25 years of intense violence, and after all the doors had closed on her, a neighbor invited Kardelen to a women’s meeting in the neighborhood. Kardelen used a striking metaphor to describe her situation at the time of her meeting with “the beautiful” Hayriye, a longtime feminist activist from Diyarbakır KAMER: “Life was like a swamp, all my body, except my hands, was buried in mud. My hands asking for a hand.” With KAMER women holding her hand, Kardelen would start her slow, painful, but very rewarding transformation from a life in the swamp to one empowered by women.

During that first [awareness raising] group, I went through intense self-questioning. It was intense and painful, but I became fully aware of everything. I started saying, ‘I exist, I can do anything I want, I am strong.’ They say women are weak... I looked into my past and realized that I must have been very strong to have gone through all that hardship. I was not *nothing*, I was *everything*.

This realization would have significant consequences, for her, for her children, and for her husband. Very briefly (and not doing justice to Kardelen’s amazing story): In the middle of the second awareness-raising group she attended, Kardelen left her husband, moving into a rental apartment with her three children, disregarding the threats coming from her husband. After a while, having gone through alcohol therapy, her husband wanted to get together. Kardelen laid down her rules, including the freedom to work at KAMER and to travel to other cities if necessary. For her husband, the sleep-over in other cities was unthinkable. Yet, Kardelen did not give in and made her husband accept her terms. She told her husband that she had lived her whole life for other people – for him, for his parents, for her children – and that now she was living her life for herself.

Now, when she comes late from KAMER work, her husband greets her with “Welcome home, my dear husband,” (referring to their changing gender roles) to which she replies “Thank you, my dear wife.” The day we had the interview, she had just come back from a two-week training in Diyarbakır KAMER, stopping at home for a quick shower and then coming to the women’s center. She told her husband, who had been waiting for her, that she had to leave right away to meet her guests from Istanbul. “He just looked at me in awe,” she told us with a satisfied smile. Kardelen defines this situation as the “dethroning” of her husband as a result of her “revolution.” This dethroning has opened new channels of communication in their 26 year long relation-

ship. “We have come a long way,” says Kardelen, “this is a man who had never told me that he loved me. The other day, there were some romantic songs on TV and he asked me for a dance. This is why I value this [women’s] work so much. In my 25 years of marriage [before KAMER], I had not looked in the mirror even once.” In her post-KAMER life, Kardelen became an enthusiastic reader of literature and feminist works and learned how to use the computer. She has since become active in nationwide feminist listserves.

An acronym for Women’s Center, *Kadın Merkezi* in Turkish, KAMER was established in the predominantly Kurdish province Diyarbakır in 1997 and now has women’s centers in 23 provinces in Eastern Turkey.⁸ The group defines itself as an independent feminist organization and insists on its independence from any political group or party in the region. It is founded and continues to spread out in a part of Turkey where there is more illiteracy, more unemployment and lower levels of income compared to regions in the West.⁹ The war that has gone on since the 1980s in response to PKK (Kurdistan Workers’ Party) insurgency led to the outburst and spread of violence in the region and disrupted civil life. The confrontation between the Kurdish nationalists and the state continues to disrupt civil life. Civil life and civic association in such a context are, needless to say, much more difficult to nurture. It is under these particular conditions that KAMER has reached more than 20 thousand women in the 23 provinces of the region since 1997, initiating a feminist transformation encompassing Kirmanci Kurds, Zazas, Turks, Arabs, Azeris, Assyrians, Sunnis, Alevis, Islamists, secularists and many other women with conflicting worldviews and ethno-religious belongings.

Kardelen is one among approximately 20 thousand women who have become empowered by KAMER’s grassroots feminism to initiate their own “revolutions,” and one of the many more thousands of women around Turkey to have been a part of the feminist effort to end domestic violence and to support women who have experienced such violence. The first feminist rally against domestic violence in 1987 had resulted in the establishment of *Mor Çatı*, the Purple Roof Women’s Shelter Foundation in Istanbul in 1990 and the Women’s Solidarity Foundation in Ankara in 1991.¹⁰ Since then, these

⁸ See www.kamer.org.tr

⁹ In our sample, only 10 percent of the women in the East were engaged in an income-generating activity (14 percent of them working at home), as opposed to 20 percent in the rest of the country. More strikingly, the illiteracy rate among women in the East was 42 percent, as opposed to 15,5 percent in the rest of the country.

¹⁰ The official establishment of the Women’s Solidarity Foundation is 1993. Between 1991 and 1993, the feminists who founded this initiative operated a Women’s Center under the auspices of a local (Altındağ) municipality.

pioneering foundations have given direct support to a number of new women's initiatives around Turkey, sharing their experiences and learnings, acting together in national coalitions, and encouraging women to become active in the struggle against violence. More than 60 women's organizations in 34 cities, including the KAMERs in 23 cities, have joined the feminist effort to make violence visible, to develop mechanisms of solidarity and support for women experiencing violence, to raise awareness of the public and the state, and to encourage men and women to imagine a world without violence.

From Duygu Asena writing her "feminist manifesto" *Kadının Adı Yok* (Woman Has No Name) in the 1980s to Kardelen becoming a feminist in an Eastern border town, reclaiming her name, "dethroning" her husband, and engaging in a "revolution" in the 2000s, women from very different walks of life are re-writing the present and the future of gender relations in Turkey. We hope that this survey will help all of us reflect on and better understand this moment of tremendous change, and to develop new tools and terms to make violence visible in its many forms.

Acknowledgements

Conducted over a period of 18 months in 2006-2007, this study was funded by The Scientific and Technological Research Institute of Turkey's (TÜBİTAK) Social and Human Sciences Research Group.¹¹ We would like to express our deepest gratitude to TÜBİTAK for their invaluable support.

This study was realized thanks to the efforts of an amazing research team. We owe a special debt of gratitude to Aslı Erdem, Setenay Nil Doğan, Betül Demirkaya, Fulya Kama, Sude Bahar Beltan, Duygu Gül, and Merve Kasarcı for their contributions during every stage of the study. If it hadn't been for their hard work and meticulous efforts, it would have been impossible to produce such a thorough, comprehensive study in such a short amount of time.

The survey was realized under the guidance of Yılmaz Esmer, a pioneering scholar in survey research. We are grateful to him for his valuable guidance and support.

If it had not been for the selfless contributions of Yönelim Research Company¹² at every stage, from preparation of questions and special training for interviewers, to codification of numerous open-ended questions and multi-analysis of the data we gathered, there is no way we could have realized such a comprehensive survey on such a limited budget. We would therefore like to express our sincere gratitude to Ali Eşref Turan, Çimen Turan, Sevil Bostancı, Sevgi Adak Turan, and Ömer Turan. We also thank all the people who conducted the surveys, whose names we list on the following page. Following their training under the guidance of Çimen Turan, they took to the field, where they completed their surveys in spite of all the difficulties they faced, and took the time to write down in meticulous detail their observations regarding each interview.

We furthermore wish to express our deepest gratitude to Binnaz Toprak, Ersin Kalaycıoğlu, Belgin Tekçe, and Ali Çarkoğlu, who provided invaluable advice during the preparation of questions and assessment of findings, and to Ayşe Öncü, Dicle Koğacıoğlu, Fatma Nevin Vargün, Fatmagül Bertkay, Ferda Ülker, Handan Çağlayan, Hülya Adak, İlknur Üstün, Jülide Aral, Melt-em Ahıska, Nebahat Akkoç, Nükhet Sirman, and Ufuk Sezgin, who helped to

¹¹ None of the views, findings, or opinions expressed in this publication are necessarily espoused by TÜBİTAK.

¹² The official name is Yönelim Research Co, Inc. / Yönelim Araştırma Danışmanlık Hizmetleri A.Ş. www.yonelimarastirma.com.tr

enrich the study through their participation in meetings held in December 2006 and October 2007. KAMER Diyarbakır also deserves a special thank you for enabling us to carry out a pilot survey in Diyarbakır and for sharing with us their own experiences in conducting similar studies.

Moral and financial support provided by the Department of Political Science and International Relations at Boğaziçi University helped us to overcome obstacles encountered during the research process. We would like to express our sincerest gratitude to everyone in the department who lent us a helping hand, especially Yılmaz Esmer and Department Chair Binnaz Toprak. We thank the Boğaziçi University Scientific Research Projects Coordination Office for their support. We offer our sincere gratitude to Sabancı University for the generous support it provided from the very beginning of the study, most especially to University President Tosun Terzioğlu as well as Ahmet Alkan, Cemil Arıkan, and Mehmet Baç. The English translation was supported by the Directorate of Research and Graduate Policy and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. We thank Nilay Papila and Selay Biltekin for their support during the survey process; Elif Gülez, Nesrin Balkan, Mariam Öcal, İnci Ceydeli, Viket Galimidi, Sumru Şatır, and Tuğcan Başara for their dedicated efforts towards ensuring that the book reach as many people as possible; and Ahmet Türkoğlu for working extra hard to design a fabulous website for us in a very short amount of time.

Punto Printing Solutions were meticulous in preparing the first Turkish printing in October 2007, the second Turkish printing in November 2008, as well as this English report. We are extremely grateful to Taner Koçak for his dedication to the book and for being the ultimate problem-solver and thus making its publication possible, and to Savaş Yıldırım for fastidious design and application. We are also grateful to Amy Spangler (from AnatoliaLit) for her thorough and skillful translation of the report.

Finally, to all of the women who have shared with us their experiences, views, and lives—we have learned and continue to learn so much from their struggles—and to all of the women's organizations who opened their doors to us, we would like to express our eternal gratitude!

Survey interviews were conducted by:

Atiye İnce, Aybike Özbay, Aycan Demir, Aysel Topçu, Aysun Kıtık, Ayşe Vayni, Ayşe Çelik, Ayten Demir, Belgin Korkmaz, Beyhan Diren, Burcu Arıca, Canan Kuşkon, Çiğdem Aktürk, Damla Yücebaş, Derya Yücebaş, Dilan Tan, Dilek Çelik, Ebru Değdaş, Eda Kurnaz, Elif Peksöz, Elif Sebahattinoğlu, Emine Kardeş, Emine Bingöl, Esra Aşkın, Ezgi Dikdere, Fatma Toprak, Funda Genç, Gözde Karataş, Gülsüm Demirel, Hafize Yılmaz, Hatice Boyraz, Hatice Urhan, Hülya Uslu, İclal Doğan, İrem Şener, Mahmude Kaymak, Mehmetap İri, Melike Öztekin, Melisa Sabuncu, Meral Çelik, Müge Hancıer, Nimet Cordan, Nur Karataş, Pınar Acımış, Rabia Yıldırım, Rukiye İclal Doğan, Seçil Abdişler, Seda Akpınar, Seda Yalçın, Selma Türkoğlu, Serpil Uslu, Serpil Özkır, Sevgi Özkır, Sinem Şakar, Songül İskender, Suzan Demirci, Şefika Baykara, Tuğba Dünder, Yasemin Çatal, Zeynep Demir, Züleyha Tunar.

Introduction

Violence shapes gender relations in multiple ways. Killings carried out in the name of honor are one of the most visible and lethal forms of gender-based violence. In its less visible, more subtle forms, gender-based violence threatens the physical and emotional integrity of millions of women living in Turkey, and billions globally. Domestic violence, especially that carried out by husbands, comprises a “constitutive dimension” of women’s life (Bora and Üstün 2005, 18).

Despite the importance and prevalence of violence against women in Turkey, extremely few studies have been conducted on the topic (Işık 2002, 66; Kerestecioğlu 2004, 52). Since the 1980s, one can talk about a dynamic feminist research agenda, which has transformed and enriched the humanities and social sciences as well as social and political perceptions on gender. Such areas as women’s history, literature, labor, women in the workplace, Islam and the headscarf, women’s participation in the political process, nationalism, and the contributions of the women’s movement to democracy have attracted a significant number of researchers.¹ Surprisingly, very few studies have taken on the issue of gender-based violence.

The limited data that we have regarding women’s subjection to violence consists of small-scale studies of particular organizations, localities, or regions,² or studies conducted by women’s organizations themselves.³ The sole comprehensive quantitative study in this field is *Aile İçi Şiddetin Sebep ve*

¹ For studies regarding feminist history and historiography see Demirdirek 1993, Çakır 1994, Kandıyoti 1996, Tekeli 1998, Altınay 2000 and 2004, Berktaş 2003, Zihnioğlu 2003; for literature see Parla ve Irzık 2004; for the history and contributions of the women’s movement see Tekeli 1986, Sirman 1989, Güneş-Ayata 1993, Arat 1994, 1997, 2008; for women in the work place, labor, and politics, see Ecevit 1993, Özbay 1993, Kümbetoğlu 1995, Tan, Ecevit and Uşur 2000, Acar-Savran 2004, Toprak and Kalaycıoğlu 2004, Bora 2005, Çağlayan 2007; for Islam and the headscarf see Acar 1993, Göle 1993, Özyürek 2000, Çakır 2000, Arat, 1993, 2001b, 2005.

² For a comparative discussion of two small-scale studies conducted in Ankara and in Germany see İlkaracan, Gülçür and Arın 1996. For a study on the perception of “honor” in Southeastern Anatolia see Sır 2006. Several questions about violence were also posed as part of a study conducted in Eastern and Southeastern Turkey; see İlkaracan 1998. The Ankara Chamber of Physicians (2003) and the Istanbul Bar Association Women’s Rights Center (2002) have each published a book based upon symposia they held on physical and sexual violence against women. For a general discussion of the issue see Arın 1998, Bora and Üstün 2005; for the women’s movement and the struggle against violence see Işık 2002, Kerestecioğlu 2004. For honor killings see Kardam 2005, Pervizat 2005, Ertürk 2006, Belge, 2006, Koğacıoğlu 2007, and Yirmibeşoğlu 2007. For women and suicide see Halis 2001. For sexual violence see Altınay 2002, Amnesty International 2003, Keskin and Yurtsever 2006.

³ Some of these publications are as follows: Dayağa Karşı Dayanışma Kampanyası [Campaign Against Battering] 1988; Mor Çatı Women’s Shelter Foundation 1996, 1998, 2000, and 2003; Şahmaran 2003; KAMER 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c; Women’s Solidarity Foundation 2005; Amargi 2005, EPİDEM 2006, DİKASUM 2007, Kırk Örük 2007.

Sonuçları (Causes and Effects of Domestic Violence), a survey published by the Family Research Institution (operating under the office of the Prime Ministry) in 1993-94, based on a representative sample covering all regions of Turkey (*Aile İçi Şiddetin Sebep ve Sonuçları*, 1995). Apart from the few (but growing number of) publications of women's organizations themselves, qualitative studies on individual experiences of domestic violence hardly exist.⁴

Our intention with this research project, which places a clear emphasis upon women's actual experience of and struggle against violence, has been to take a step towards filling this void. In the longer (Turkish) version of this report, we analyze how violence against women is defined and perceived in Turkey, and what kinds of methods have been developed in the struggle against domestic violence at both the non-governmental and the state levels. For the qualitative section of our study, not wholly covered in this report, we interviewed nearly 150 women from approximately 50 women's organizations in 27 different provinces to gather insight into how the state and women's organizations problematize violence against women, how methods to stop such violence have developed over time, and the results of their struggle. These interviews showed that by raising awareness about domestic violence and empowering women and improving their status, significant advances can be made in the struggle against gender-based violence.

The quantitative leg of this study was a nationwide survey conducted with a representative sample of ever-married women (married, divorced/separated or widowed). Based on face-to-face interviews with 1,800 ever-married women from a total of 56 provinces⁵, we aimed to identify the views and experiences of women with respect to spousal abuse and the struggle against it. One of the most important findings of this study is that while one out of every three women experiences physical violence at the hands of her spouse, nine out of every ten women do not think there is any valid justification for physical abuse. We also found that the large majority of women did not perceive of "domestic violence" as something that needed to be resolved within the domestic sphere. Our survey reveals that women consider the government, local administrations, state institutions, laws, and the courts bearers of significant responsibility when it comes to intervening in this sphere and preventing violence. One can thus say that the demands of the women who participated in

⁴ Aksu Bora and İlknur Üstün's "*Sıcak Aile Ortamı*": *Demokratikleşme Sürecinde Kadın ve Erkekler* ("Home Sweet Home": Women and Men in the Democratization Process [TESEV Yayınları, 2005]) is an important exception.

⁵ 1,520 of these interviews were part of the representative national sample, and the remaining 280 were drawn from the Eastern and Southeastern regions in order to enable a close analysis of results from these regions.

the survey overlap to a large extent with the demands of the women's organizations that are engaged in the struggle against violence against women.

When feminists first uttered the term "domestic violence" in 1987, they were treated as a group of marginal women. 20 years later, important steps have been taken in the struggle against domestic violence. Since 1998, the Law for the Protection of the Family enables women to seek a "protection order" against abusive husbands. The new Civil Code, effective as of 2002, makes it possible for women to claim half of all family earnings and property in the case of a divorce, and formally ends the identification of men as "heads of households." Since 2005, the new Penal Code defines acts of sexual violence as acts committed against the integrity of individuals, rather than against "general morality and family order," and increases the terms of punishment for crimes committed in the name of "honor."

The Prime Ministry's Circular No. 26218, issued in July 2006, marks another turning point. The Circular borrows from the language and demands of feminist organizations and lists in detail the responsibilities of and the measures that need to be taken by state institutions such as the Ministries of Justice, National Education, Health, Interior Affairs, Work and Social Security, Culture and Tourism, as well as the Directorate of the Social Services and Child Protection Agency, the General Directorate for the Status of Women, the Turkish Grand National Assembly, Governor's Offices, and municipalities. These measures include adopting prevention of violence against women as a state policy; instituting a permanent Commission for the Equality of Men and Women at the Turkish Grand National Assembly; establishing a Violence Against Women Watch Committee under the leadership of the General Directorate for the Status of Women; creating a special fund for women to set up a new life after leaving shelters; instituting a national 24/7 hotline; providing financial support for independent shelters established by civil society organizations; and gender mainstreaming in decision-making processes. However, in the absence of sanctions to actively enforce its measures and a budget for its implementation, the circular mostly remains on paper.

A similar state of affairs is true for the municipalities as well. Although Article 14 of Municipal Code No. 5293 obligates all metropolitan municipalities and all municipalities with a population exceeding 50,000 persons to open "homes for the protection of women and children," no progress has been achieved on this front. As of September 2007, the Social Services and Child Protection Agency (SHÇEK) has 19 women's shelters, while the Governorship and Special Provincial Administrations have 12, and the municipalities just four women's shelters.

Among the most urgent demands of women's organizations in Turkey are that the Prime Ministry's Circular and the Municipality Law be actively enforced without fail, that the number of women's shelters be increased, and that the shelters be run in cooperation with independent women's organizations. Recent developments have not been very promising. As of December 2008, the *Purple Roof* staff running their joint shelter with the Governorship of Beyoğlu (in Istanbul) were told that they would no longer be paid by the state. This decision had come after the two-year funding provided of by the World Bank had expired. One of the few "good examples" of state-civil society collaborations in running shelters is now a dead project.⁶

In what follows, we present the results of our nationwide survey, which, among other things, points to the need for the state of Turkey to take the demands of women's organizations regarding the struggle against violence seriously. Our findings suggest that many of these demands are shared by a great majority of women in Turkey.

The report is composed of three parts. In Chapter 1, we discuss our methodology, including its sources of inspiration, and present the demographic characteristics of our sample. In Chapter 2, the main findings of the survey are presented in three subheadings: women's views on domestic violence, their experience of violence in the home, and their views on the struggle against violence. In Chapter 3, we discuss our preliminary conclusions and assess the policy implications of the survey findings. The questionnaire used in the survey follows the main text as an appendix.

6 Emine Özcan, "Kaymakamlık Mor Çatı'ya Ödeneği Kesti" *Bianet*, November 20, 2008 (retrieved December 14, 2008): <http://bianet.org/bianet/kategori/bianet/110967/kaymakamlık-mor-catiya-odene-gi-kesti>

Chapter 1

Survey Methodology

Methodology is never an easy issue. For two feminist researchers experienced in qualitative, ethnographic research, survey methodology presents additional challenges. We were drawn to the study of violence against women in Turkey because we were curious about two things: the dynamics behind the recent upsurge in the grassroots struggle against gender-based violence and the views and experiences of “ordinary women” regarding this constitutive aspect of our lives. We tried to design the research project so that each of these curiosities would feed one another. And they did – in ways that were both expected and surprising. Almost one year of qualitative research which involved travel to more than 20 cities and interviews with close to 150 women in more than 50 organizations (most of them independent women’s organizations, but also women’s commissions in bar associations, women’s centers run by municipalities, state agencies, and UN agencies) shaped our thinking on gender-based violence and the struggle against it in new ways.

Our approach to the survey, which we conducted in the second year of our research, matured as a result of this process of learning, as well as through the direct input of a significant number of researchers and activists. We were able to work through the alienating and potentially harmful (for the women interviewed) aspects of survey research on a sensitive issue such as violence through a very rewarding participatory process of survey design, implementation and analysis. We agree with Holly Johnson that “these two forms of acquiring knowledge – statistical surveys and qualitative studies – are complementary, and both are necessary for our understanding of these events. Women’s accounts of their own experiences and richness and texture to purely statistical descriptions of prevalence and incidence, and detailed statistical information adds complexity in other ways. When combined, they can have enormous benefits to battered women and those at risk of violence” (Johnson 1998, 50-51). In future publications, we hope to discuss in greater detail the ways in which such combined research can deepen our understanding of gender-based violence and the struggle against it.

In what follows, we first present a brief overview of the history of research on violence against women, focusing on debates and contributions that have inspired our approach to this survey. Second, we discuss the ways in which we tried to translate feminist methodologies, questions, and curiosities (to borrow from Cynthia Enloe) into a participatory research process involving a significant number of women and men. Third, we discuss sampling and its implementation. And finally, we present the basic demographic characteristics of our sample that provide the background to the main findings discussed in Chapter 2.

A Short History of Research on Violence Against Women

It is only relatively recently that violence against women has attracted political and academic attention. With the simultaneous development of second wave feminism in North America, Western Europe, and other parts of the world in the 1960s, “violence against women” entered the world stage as a dynamic area of research, activist organizing, legal reform, and political debate. So how did academic curiosity regarding this type of violence, which “had no name” until the 1970s, develop and lead to the culmination of a research field in its own right?

Quantitative research is the most prevalent form of research in the larger field of violence against women. Until the late 1960s, domestic violence was believed to be a rare phenomenon, frequently associated with psychological issues and poverty (Gelles 1980, 873). For example, while not a single article with the word “violence” in the title was published in the first 30 years of *The Journal of Marriage and the Family* (1939-1969), we find that, in the second 30 years of the journal (1970-present), domestic violence has been one of its most featured topics (O’Brien 1971, Gelles 1980, Gelles and Conte 1990). More importantly, during this time, new journals, such as *Violence Against Women*, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, and *Journal of Family Violence*, have emerged, all of which publish studies on this topic alone. According to sociologists Richard Gelles and Jon Conte, the expansion of research on the topic of domestic violence in the 1980s “has been substantial, perhaps greater than in any other substantive area in the social sciences” (Gelles and Conte 1990, 1045).

Domestic violence research conducted since the 1970s has been shaped by two different but interconnected paradigms:

- 1) The “family violence” paradigm,
- 2) The feminist “male violence” paradigm.

Though there may be significant differences (which we shall discuss below) between the two paradigms, both share the same point of departure and primary emphasis: the “family,” most frequently described with the help of such adjectives as “safe,” “warm,” and “loving,” is actually one of the most violent institutions in our societies.

Carried out in the United States of America in 1975, the National Family Violence Survey was one of the first studies to implement the “family violence” paradigm, and it was pivotal in revealing that the American family was actually an institution fraught with violence, thus “shattering the myth” (Gelles 1980, 878) that violence in the family was a rare phenomenon. In this

survey, which would become a reference point for future studies, violence practiced by family members against one another is analyzed by means of detailed questions. With its analysis concentrated upon the unit of “the family,” the underlying idea of the survey is that conflict is an inherent part of family relations, just as it is of all spheres of social life. However, the fact that conflict is “natural” does not mean that it is “natural” for violence to be part of conflict resolution, it is argued. The problem lies in family members’ failure to implement “rational,” “non-violent” means to resolve conflicts. The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) developed by sociologist Murray Straus based upon this analytical framework has been the point of departure for surveys conducted on this topic since the mid-1970s (Straus 1979).

Analyzing domestic conflict in four basic dimensions—conflict between children, that directed at the child by the parents, that directed at the wife by the husband, and that directed at the husband by the wife—first generation studies based upon CTS focused on “behavior.” In the CTS surveys, family members were asked with what frequency 18 different forms of behavior had been used to resolve conflicts experienced during the preceding year; for example, with what frequency “calm discussion” had taken place, or with what frequency one had “yelled and cursed” or “thrown something” at the other, had “beaten,” “threatened using a gun or knife,” or “used a gun or knife.” CTS surveys aimed to then evaluate these behaviors on a scale of violence in order to measure the extent and forms of verbal and physical violence experienced within the family (Straus 1979).

While the CTS-based family violence research carried out in the 1970s did reveal the family to be a violence-ridden institution, some aspects of the research came under question by feminist researchers, who presented three important criticisms:

- 1) Failure to evaluate the background (context) in which domestic violence occurs,
- 2) Failure to measure the effects of violence,
- 3) Failure to include questions regarding sexual and economic forms of violence.

According to feminist researchers, underlying these deficiencies is a disregard for the power relations that exist between men and women (Dobash&Dobash 1979, Kurz 1989, Anderson 1997). Such critics maintain that it is impossible to determine the characteristics, underlying reasons, and effects of domestic violence without taking the power relations defined through such concepts as “patriarchy” or “male hegemony” seriously.

As Lisa Brush (1990, 58) underlines, feminist researchers who write from within this paradigm “focus on relationships of domination rather than acts of violence.”

The point most heatedly debated by the advocates of these two different paradigms is the suggestion that women too practice domestic violence against men. Referring in her controversial article of 1978 to this situation as “The Battered Husband Syndrome,” Suzanne K. Steinmetz was criticized by feminist researchers for equating violence practiced by men with that practiced by women, failing to take into consideration who initiates violence (and therefore characterizing violence used by women in self-defense as assault), ignoring the power relationship underlying the violence, and failing to consider the damage caused by violence (Dobash&Dobash 1979). Drawing from their experiences in women’s centers and shelters established in the 1970s, and evaluating violence statistics in conjunction with interviews with female victims/survivors of violence, feminist researchers approached domestic violence as being predominantly “male violence,” arguing that men tended towards violence as a means to assert their dominance and control over women. According to feminist researchers advancing the “male violence” paradigm as a critique of the gender-blind “family violence” paradigm, physical violence could only properly be understood within the framework of this power relationship (see Dobash&Dobash 1979, Kurz 1989, Brush 1990, Anderson 1997).

Moving on to the 1980s, we find that those conducting research within the framework of the “family violence” paradigm took some aspects of this criticism seriously and shaped their research methods accordingly. In the 1990s, the 18-question CTS was replaced by the 39-question CTS2 (Straus et al. 1996). The CTS2 not only included new questions regarding sexual violence and the physical effects of violence (injuries, etc.), but the manner and order in which the questions were asked were also changed.

A major leap forward in surveys on domestic violence was realized with the Violence Against Women Survey carried out by Statistics Canada in 1993. The survey, comprised of telephone interviews with 12,300 women, presented an approach different from the CTS and CTS2-based surveys in several respects (Johnson 1998):

- The framework of the survey was defined as “violence against women,” rather than “family/domestic violence.”
- In the words of its primary researcher, Holly Johnson, violence in this survey was neither presented nor evaluated as “a means to resolving conflict within the family” (Johnson 1998, 36).

- Before proceeding on to questions about husband/partner violence, which is a topic not easily addressed, other questions were asked to respondents as a kind of warm-up to ease them in to the topic. For example, questions about experiences and fear of violence outside the home, harassment outside the family, and the ways in which husbands limit and control their spouses' lives and behavior preceded questions about physical violence (Johnson 1998, 36).
- The context in which physical violence takes place and the ways in which the power relationship between men and women impacts daily life were incorporated into the study by means of detailed questions measuring husbands' control over their spouses (Piispa 2003, 189).
- The survey included an evaluation of the aftermath of acts of violence with detailed questions addressing women's responses to violence as well as the physical and emotional effects of violence (Johnson 1998, 36).
- The interviewers were comprised solely of women, so that the women being interviewed would feel comfortable and safe (Johnson 1998, 32).
- Taking into consideration the fact that talking about violence and recalling experiences of violence could have a traumatic effect upon the women being interviewed (and keeping in mind the ethical principle that surveys should not harm the person being interviewed), those conducting the interviews underwent intensive training and, when necessary, the women being interviewed were immediately provided with information about women's centers to which they could apply for assistance (Johnson 1998, 32).

After Canada, similar surveys were conducted in other countries such as Finland, Australia, Iceland, Sweden, and Germany, as well. With this new phase ushered in by the Canadian survey, the scope of studies on violence against women has expanded; the context in which violence occurs, its effects, women's responses to violence, experiences of violence outside the home, sexual violence, and degrees and forms of control have become the foci of surveys conducted in this field (Lundgren et al. 2002, Piispa 2003). In recent years, international organizations have also taken a keen interest in the subject. One outcome of this burgeoning interest is the survey *Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women*, published in 2005 (Garcia-Moreno et al. 2005 and 2006). Conducted by the World Health Organization in 2000-2003 in 10 different countries, it is arguably the most comprehen-

sive survey of its kinds. Providing data from 10 different countries, the survey makes a major contribution to the multifaceted, multilayered analyses of violence which have begun to take hold following the pioneering survey by Statistics Canada.

To summarize, research on violence against women has undergone swift development over the past 30 years. Following the feminist critique of the first “family violence” surveys conducted in the 1970s, feminist conceptions of gendered power relations have significantly shaped the development of this dynamic field of research. On the other hand, the scope of feminist analysis itself has broadened in the same period (see Anderson 1997).

Our Methodology

“Feminist methodology” has been a dynamic field of debate within women’s and gender studies since the 1970s. Attributing as much importance to the research process as to the research results, striving for optimum participation, taking precautions to ensure that women participating in surveys suffer no harm, approaching each woman as a “subject” rather than an “object,” taking women’s personal experiences and opinions seriously, and benefiting from the experiences of and collaboration with women’s organizations are some of the focal points of this debate. We too sought to subscribe to a feminist methodology when developing and implementing this survey. The methodology that we followed can be broadly outlined as follows:

Participatory process: During the process of preparing the questions, we came together with women’s organizations and academics working in this field and brainstormed with them about what the survey should contain and what kind of measures might be taken to ensure that the women interviewed were not harmed by this process:

- We had one-to-one meetings on survey design with representatives of women’s organizations and academics with experience in this field (October-December 2006, Istanbul).
- A workshop was held with 11 academics, psychologists, and representatives of women’s organizations from Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, and Diyarbakır (December 2006, Istanbul).
- A workshop and pilot survey, in which Çimen Turan and Sevgi Adak Turan from Yönelim Research participated, were held at Diyarbakır KAMER (April 2007, Diyarbakır). In the same month, a pilot survey was conducted in Adana as well.

Special training for interviewers: In studies on violence against women conducted in recent years, special care has been taken to ensure that interviews

with women are conducted by women interviewers (Garcia-Moreno et. al. 2005, Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). We too worked with specially trained women interviewers, so that the women being interviewed would feel comfortable sharing with us their experiences regarding violence, and so that we might reduce insofar as possible any problems that might arise as a result of discussing this difficult and often painful issue.

Following the workshop and pilot survey held in Diyarbakır together with Çimen Turan of Yönelim Research and Diyarbakır KAMER, we identified the topics to be stressed during interviewer training and Çimen Turan carried out the training program with the interviewers gathered for this purpose in Istanbul, Adana, and Diyarbakır.

Çimen Turan summarizes the points stressed during interviewer training as follows:

“The first part of the interviewer training took place as a discussion between the female trainer and the interviewers, all of who were women, in which women’s issues in general and psychological, economic, and physical violence against women were addressed. During the discussion, the following points were stressed:

- Violence against women is not a phenomenon particular to Turkey; it is a universal problem. A large number of surveys like this have been conducted in European and North American countries; however, this would be the first nationwide survey of its kind to be conducted in Turkey.
- This survey is being conducted for Yeşim Arat and Ayşe Gül Altınay, two academics who work on women’s issues. (A letter written by the researchers and addressing the interviewers was read and handed out to the interviewers at the meetings. It was observed that the letter had a positive impact upon the interviewers.)
- As the women participating in this meeting, some of us may have experienced violence to some degree or in some form during certain parts of our lives, or we might already know of women close to us who have been victims of violence. (During this part of the meeting, some of the participants gave examples of women close to them who had experienced violence.)
- Violence against women is a topic that is difficult to share and talk about, and the interviewers would have to make an effort to ensure that the women felt comfortable and safe while taking the survey.
- The interviewers should be in no way prejudiced or judgmental in their approach to the women.
- Interviewers should try to understand the women with whom they conduct the surveys by imagining themselves in their shoes.
- It is important that the interview be held without the presence of a third party and someplace where no one else can hear the answers provided.
- Interviewers need to assure the women that neither their answers nor their names will be shared with any other person or institution.

After we had stressed all of these points, the interviewers were then told that should they believe that, despite all of their best efforts, the respondent was not being honest, they should note this on the last page of the survey.

In the second part of the interviewer training, we focused upon the rules to which interviewers must adhere and rules that are common to interviewer training for all fields of research, as well as rules for becoming a successful interviewer.

In the third part, the Violence Against Women Survey was distributed to the participants and all were asked to read the survey from beginning to end. Later, each question was read out loud one by one; the interviewers were alerted to those points to pay attention to while recording answers and any remaining questions they had were answered.”

It was extremely important for us that the interviewers feel themselves to be part of the study. To this end, we sent each of the women who would be conducting the survey interviews a letter, and in that letter we explained that one of the most important parts of the study would be the interviews that they would be conducting; that the secret to a good interview lay not just in the preparation of the questions themselves, but in making sure that the questions were posed in an appropriate manner and to the right people, and that the questionnaire was filled out in a correct and meticulous manner; and that the interviewers’ labor, efforts, and diligence would be a decisive factor in producing reliable information and data that we could use for years to come. The fact that many interviewers included detailed notes on the surveys to share their observations with us, and that they persistently told Çimen Turan that they wanted to see the survey results were encouraging signs that the interviewers indeed felt a part of this study.

The fact that the respondents did not hesitate to give the interviewers their telephone numbers is an important indicator of the level of trust established between the interviewers and respondents. The women interviewed were explicitly told that their telephone numbers would be used only by *women* controllers who would be following up with them after the interview. Indeed, the telephone numbers were later used for control purposes to confirm that the surveys had gone smoothly.

Survey design and formulation of the questions (avoiding normalization): How questions are asked is of critical importance in conducting surveys. It is of utmost importance that questions not be leading and that they be clear. Questions must be posed in a delicate manner, especially when dealing with a sensitive topic like violence against women, which can evoke strong emotions, including shame and guilt. The order in which questions are asked and the manner in which they are posed is just as important as the contents of the questions themselves. Feminist researchers who conduct surveys are particularly mindful of how the survey begins and how the survey topic is introduced, as this phase is essential to ensuring that the women feel comfortable responding to the questions, and to emphasizing and assuring the women that the information they provide will remain confidential (see

Ellsberg 2001, Walby and Myhill 2001, Piispa 2003). We too undertook a lengthy, multifaceted effort to ensure that our survey contained appropriate questions formulated in line with feminist principles. While finalizing the questions:

- We avoided questions that might make the women feel “ignorant.” The only “knowledge” question in the survey was that referring to the new property regime in the Civil Code.
- We were careful not to ask questions about violence too early, so that the women would have a chance to feel comfortable and warm up to the survey.
- For the section of the questionnaire dealing with violence, we began with topics that we thought would be easier for the women to talk about. Before asking them whether their husbands were physically violent towards them, we asked them when and wherefore they asked their spouses for “permission,” their views on domestic violence, the violence they experienced as children, and the violence their own mothers had been subjected to by their husbands and parents-in-law.
- Keeping in mind that going into details in the questions about violence might have negative effects upon the women’s psychology, and that recalling traumatic experiences of violence from the past (such as incest) could cause problems for the women later, we limited the scope of such questions.
- When asking them their own views about violence, we emphasized that society holds many different and varied views about the issue, so that they would feel comfortable expressing their own views.
- While trying to ensure that the women were comfortable answering the questions, we also took particular care to avoid expressions that would “normalize” violence.

Giving women the opportunity to express themselves by means of open-ended questions: One of the most serious points of criticism brought by feminist scholars against survey researchers is that women, who are, as it is, already silenced and unable to make their voices heard within society, are then restricted by certain routine expressions employed in the surveys, which are previously composed by others. Though the feminist approach to surveys has made great strides with regard to the order of questions and manner of asking them, the matter of women being able to have their own personal expressions reflected in the surveys remains an issue. We saw two ways to minimize this problem while conducting our research on violence against women:

- To enrich the survey by means of in-depth interviews (qualitative research) with fewer women; and to ensure that the language emerging from those in-depth interviews is reflected in the survey, insofar as possible.
- To try and capture women's own original expressions by adding to the survey open-ended questions about certain topics.

During our research, we did our best to implement both of these methods. On the one hand, in the process of preparing the survey questionnaire, we strove to gather ideas and opinions of women's organizations as well as individual women who had become aware of the violence they were experiencing and had begun to struggle against it, so that we might shape the language used in the survey in collaboration with them. On the other hand, we tried to make sure that the women being interviewed would have the opportunity to express themselves freely by means of open-ended questions.⁷

Not only was the research process, which took shape on the basis of the aforementioned principles and experiences, enriching and educational from our perspective, but we also saw that it had a positive impact upon the research results. One of the most fundamental problems encountered in surveys on violence against women is underreporting of actual violence. While reasons for this might include the way in which questions are posed, use of male interviewers, interviewers' failure to gain respondents' trust, or the presence of others while the survey is being conducted, other possible reasons are that the women might want to forget about their experiences or that they are too ashamed to share them (see Johnson 1998, Smith 1994). One of the most striking results of our survey was that nearly half (49%) of the women who said they had experienced physical violence stated that they had never before spoken of it to anyone. For Eastern Turkey, this figure rises to 63%. These women stated that they had previously told very few people or no one at all about their experiences of violence, yet they were able to share these experiences with our interviewers. We can reasonably assume that this was due in part to the manner in which the questions were posed as well as the interviewers' ability to establish a relationship of trust with the individual respondents.

Sampling and Implementation

Because the scope of our research was limited to domestic violence by male spouses, the population of the survey was ever-married women (currently married, divorced/separated or widowed).

⁷ We were able to ask a number of open-ended questions, the classification and codification of which are extremely time consuming, thanks to the tireless efforts and understanding of Yönelim Research.

A total of 1,800 interviews were conducted. 1,520 of the total interviews comprise a representative sample for the whole of Turkey, as those respondents were chosen randomly using the 12-unit Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS-1). An additional sample of 280 women was drawn to represent the Northeastern Anatolia, Central Eastern Anatolia, and Southeastern Anatolia Regions. Therefore, throughout this report, reference will be made to three separate samples:

- The findings presented under the heading “Turkey” are those for the 1,520 interviews as explained above.
- Findings presented under the heading “East” are based upon the answers of 226 respondents of the general Turkey sample living in the Northeastern Anatolia, Central Eastern Anatolia, and Southeastern Anatolia Regions together with the additional sample of 280 (for a total of 506 respondents).
- Findings described as “Central/West” are the results of 1,294 interviews out of the aforementioned 1,520 interviews, conducted in those regions outside of Northeastern Anatolia, Central Eastern Anatolia, and Southeastern Anatolia.

The sampling was multistaged. In the first stage, the country was divided according to geographical region into subpopulations called strata. The stratification of geographical regions was based upon the first level of The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS-1), the geocode standard which the Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI) recently began using as part of Turkey’s European Union accession process. The number of interviews to be conducted in each region was calculated according to the proportion of the region’s population in the national population. In this stage, election statistics were used, since those statistics are the most recent for the overall adult population.

In the second stage, settlements in each region were divided into three strata: province centers (*il merkezi*), county centers (*ilçe merkezi*), and villages (*köy*). The number of interviews to be conducted in each stratum was determined according to the data for that region. Systematic sampling was used to identify the settlements of each type where interviews would be conducted. The list used in the systematic sampling was weighted according to the number of voters in each settlement.

In the third stage, the neighborhoods in the province and county centers where the interviews would be conducted were also identified by means of systematic sampling. The above list was also used during this process.

In the fourth stage, in the case of province and county centers, streets were identified in the neighborhoods where the survey would be conducted. The streets were identified using lists that indicated land value. The street with median value in each neighborhood was then selected.

The interviewers were provided with instructions showing them the system whereby they would find the residences on the chosen streets and in the chosen villages. Whenever more than one woman in a single residence met the interview criteria, the "Kish Grid" was used to randomly select which woman would be interviewed.

If the Turkey sampling could have been arranged as a simple random sampling, then in the case of a binomial distribution, that is, when the possible number of answers to a question is two, the survey would have had a confidence level of 95 %, and a margin of error of ± 2.5 . Because the sampling methods used were not just simple random sampling, the margin of error is different from that indicated above. The number of households on each street is unknown, which inhibits us from being able to calculate the margin of error.

In the Turkey sample, the survey was carried out in 10 province centers (*cities*), 15 county centers (*small towns*), and 51 villages. These 75 settlements were distributed over 48 different provinces. In the additional East sample, the survey was carried out in 4 province centers (*cities*), 3 county centers (*small towns*), and 12 villages. The total settlements of various types which were included in the sampling of Turkey and the East were distributed over 56 provinces (see Table 1).

The interviews were conducted with the residents of households. Hence, the survey does not cover women staying in women's shelters, nursing homes, or prisons. While surveys carried out on a residence-basis can cause sampling biases in some other countries (Walby and Myhill 2001, 510-1), the small number of shelters (35 in 2007) and the low numbers of women in prisons (around 3,000 in 2007) and nursing homes significantly reduces this risk in the case of Turkey.

Table 1
Distribution of Interviews According to Provinces

Provinces	Number of Interviews	Provinces	Number of Interviews	Provinces	Number of Interviews
Adana	80	Erzurum	40	Muğla	10
Adıyaman	20	Eskişehir	30	Muş	10
Afyon	10	Gaziantep	10	Nevşehir	10
Ağrı	40	Giresun	10	Niğde	10
Ankara	110	Hatay	40	Ordu	30
Antalya	10	Isparta	10	Rize	10
Ardahan	10	İçel	40	Sakarya	10
Aydın	30	İstanbul	250	Samsun	60
Balıkesir	40	İzmir	90	Siirt	30
Bingöl	30	K.Maraş	10	Sinop	10
Bitlis	10	Kastamonu	10	Sivas	10
Bursa	70	Kayseri	80	Ş.Urfa	90
Çorum	10	Kilis	40	Şırnak	10
Denizli	20	Kocaeli	30	Tokat	10
Diyarbakır	40	Konya	40	Trabzon	10
Düzce	10	Kütahya	10	Tunceli	10
Edirne	10	Malatya	10	Van	30
Elazığ	70	Manisa	30	Zonguldak	10
Erzincan	10	Mardin	20	Total	1800

The interviews were conducted face-to-face with individuals who qualified to be part of the sample. All of the interviews were conducted between May 23 and June 27, 2007.

The age range, educational background, and marital status of the sample compared to all women of Turkey belonging to the same age group can be found in Table 2.

One reason for the comparatively high percentage of middle school, high school, and university graduates interviewed (that is, compared to percentages for the overall population) may be the progress realized in the area of education in the seven years since the last census. Another reason could be that the women overstated their actual level of education.

Table 2
Comparison of National Census Data and Survey Sample Data

	Census: Women in Tur- key *	Survey: Turkey Sample
Age		
17 – 20	3.5	1.4
21 – 24	7.7	6.6
25 – 34	25.9	25.7
35 – 44	23.6	27.3
45 – 54	16.6	20.8
55 – 64	11.1	11.3
65 and over	11.7	6.8
Total	100.0	99.9
Education		
Illiterate	26.2	19.1
Literate but no formal education	7.2	8.5
Primary School	47.7	45.7
Middle School	5.6	7.8
High School	9.1	11.6
University	4.2	7.2
Total	100.0	99.9
Marital Status		
Married	87.1	87.8
Divorced	2.0	2.6
Widowed	10.9	8.9
Separated	-	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0
n		1,520

* Source: DİE, *2000 Genel Nüfus Sayımı: Nüfusun Sosyal ve Ekonomik Nitelikleri* [Turkish Statistical Institute, *2000 Census: The Social and Economic Characteristics of the Population*], Ankara: 2003: 156, 160-2.

Basic Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The tables below show the data for the demographic questions asked at the beginning and end of the survey.

Marriage: In the Turkey sample, 88% of women interviewed were married, 3% were divorced, and 9% were widowed. The number of women who were separated but not divorced accounted for less than 1%. Women who had been married only once in their lives accounted for 97% of the sample (Table 3).

Table 3
Whether This Was the Woman's First Marriage
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/West
Yes, the first	96.9	96.4	97.1
No, not the first	3.1	3.6	2.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	1,520	506	1,294

In the Turkey sample, 82% of the women were married both civilly and religiously. 15% were only married civilly, while 2% were married only religiously. For the Eastern Turkey sample, the figure for those civilly married only falls to just 3% (Table 4).

Table 4
Form of Marriage
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/West
Civil marriage only	15.1	3.4	16.5
Religious marriage only	2.2	6.5	2.0
Both civil and religious marriage	82.4	90.1	81.2
Not married in either way	0.3	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

When looking at the figures for how women met and came to marry their future husbands, we find that arranged marriages account for half of them. This figure rises to 66% in the East (Table 5).

Table 5
How Couples Met and Married
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/ West
We met on our own, decided to marry, and our families approved	40.6	28.9	42.7
We met on our own, decided to marry and married despite our families' disapproval	2.1	0.2	2.4
I eloped of my own free will	5.5	3.2	6.0
I was abducted against my will	0.5	-	0.5
By arranged marriage	50.6	65.6	47.7
In exchange for a female from my husband's family (Berdel)	0.6	1.8	0.5
By arranged marriage agreed upon by my family when I was still an infant (Beşik kertmesi)	0.1	0.2	0.2
Other	0.1	0.2	0.1
Total	100.1	100.1	100.1

Location of settlement: 33% of the interviews were carried out in villages, 18% in county centers (small towns), and 48% in province centers (cities). Of the women interviewed, 50% stated that they were born in a village, 26% in a small town, and 23% in a city. For the East, the figure for women born in villages rises to 60%, while those born in small towns account for only 16%.

Table 6
Birth Place – Type of Settlement
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/West
Village	49.8	60.1	48.2
Small town (County center)	25.9	16.2	28.0
City (Province center)	22.6	22.7	22.2
Abroad	1.1	1.0	1.0
No answer	0.6	-	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Income: Of the women interviewed, 4% said that they had a monthly household income of over 2,500 NTL, while 35% declared less than 500 NTL net monthly household income (Table 7). 20% of women in the Central/West sample stated that they worked at an income-generating job, compared to just 10% in the East sample (Tables 8, 9, and 10).

Table 7
Net Household Income (Monthly)
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/West
No income	2.9	4.9	2.6
250 NTL or less	7.1	16.4	6.1
250 – 499	24.9	31.2	23.6
500 – 999	36.6	29.4	37.4
1,000 – 2,499	19.3	10.9	21.2
2,500 or more	3.9	1.6	4.3
Don't know	4.1	5.5	3.6
No answer	1.1	-	1.2
Total	99.9	99.9	100.0
Average*	938 NTL	680 NTL	982 NTL

* 5,000 NTL was considered the upper limit for the “2,500 or more” category when calculating the average.

Table 8
Income-Generating Work by Women
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/West
Yes	19.2	10.1	20.1
No	80.8	89.9	79.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 9
Place of Income-Generating Work by Women
In percent

	Turkey		East		Central/West	
	of those w/jobs	of total women	of those w/jobs	of total women	of those w/jobs	of total women
At home	11.3	2.2	13.7	1.4	10.4	2.1
Outside the home	88.7	17.0	86.3	8.7	89.6	18.0
No income-generating job		80.8		89.9		79.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	292	1,520	51	506	260	1,294

Table 10
Type of Income-Generating Work by Women
In percent

	Turkey		East		Central/West	
	Of those w/jobs	Of total women	Of those w/jobs	Of total women	Of those w/jobs	Of total women
Business woman – Merchant	0.3	0.1	-	-	0.4	0.1
Freelance Worker – Specialist	6.8	1.3	2.0	0.2	7.7	1.5
Shopkeeper– Artisan	11.3	2.2	5.9	0.6	11.5	2.3
Office worker in the private sector	6.5	1.3	3.9	0.4	6.5	1.3
Public Servant	15.8	3.0	43.1	4.3	13.1	2.6
Manufacturing/ Service Worker	23.3	4.5	3.9	0.4	25.8	5.2
Farmer (land owner)	9.2	1.8	7.8	0.8	8.8	1.8
Other	2.1	0.4	2.0	0.2	1.9	0.4
Agricultural Worker (wageworker)	2.4	0.5	7.8	0.8	2.3	0.5
Work from Home	11.3	2.2	13.7	1.4	10.4	2.1
Work in Others' Homes	11.0	2.1	9.8	1.0	11.5	2.3
No income-generating job		80.8		89.9		79.9
Total	100.0	100.2	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0
n	292	1 520	51	506	260	1 294

Languages known and spoken with family members: When looking at which languages are known and which languages are spoken with family members, we find that Turkish is known by nearly everyone, while the most widespread languages outside of Turkish are Kurdish and Arabic (Table 11).

Table 11
Languages Known and Languages Spoken With Family Members
(Turkey)
In percent

	Language known	Language spoken with mother	Language spoken with father	Language spoken with spouse
Turkish	98.1	91.7	91.8	94.8
Kurdish (Kurmanji)	12.6	10.0	9.9	8.1
Zazaki	2.4	2.0	2.0	1.4
English	5.7	0.1	2.6	0.1
Arabic	3.6	2.8	0.1	2.2
German	1.3	-	0.5	-
Dutch	0.1	-	-	-
Circassian	0.8	0.4	0.1	0.5
Cypriot-Greek-Pontic Greek	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1
French	0.5	-	-	-
Bulgarian	0.3	0.1	0.1	-
Other	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.1
Mother/father no longer living by the time she began speaking		0.1	0.2	
Total	*	*	*	*
n	1,520	1,520	1,520	1,520

* The total of these columns is greater than 100, because some women knew/spoke more than one language.

Table 12
Languages Known and Languages Spoken With Family Members
(East)

In percent

	Language known	Language spoken with mother	Language spoken with father	Language spoken with spouse
Turkish	84.8	54.9	57.5	68.2
Kurdish (Kurmanji)	55.7	48.8	48.4	42.1
Zazaki	8.3	6.7	6.9	5.1
English	1.0	-	-	-
Arabic	4.7	4.2	4.2	4.2
Circassian	0.2	0.2	0.2	
French	0.4	-	-	
Bulgarian	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Other	0.2	-	-	
Mother/father no longer living by the time she began speaking		0.2	0.2	
Total	*	*	*	*
n	506	506	506	506

* The total for these columns is greater than 100, because some of the women knew/spoke more than one language.

Ethnic and religious identity: The question that was used to ask women how they identified themselves (ethnically) was as follows:

“As in every country in the world, in our country too various different ethnic groups exist. People can describe themselves as having different ethnic identities. Which of the following identities shown on this card would you say primarily describes you?”

In the sample for all of Turkey, 81% of the women described themselves as Turkish, 11% as Kurdish-Zaza, 3% as Arab, and 1% as Circassian. For the East sample, 46% of respondents described themselves as Turkish, 47% as Kurdish-Zaza, and 6% as Arab.

Table 13
Ethnic Identification
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/West
Arab	2.8	5.9	2.3
Albanian	0.1	-	0.2
Azeri	0.4	0.4	0.4
Bosnian	0.2	0.2	0.2
Circassian	1.1	0.2	1.2
Kurdish-Zaza	10.3	47.0	5.2
Laz	1.4	-	16
Roma/Gypsy	0.3	-	0.4
Turkish	80.6	46.0	85.5
Other	1.4	-	1.7
Muslim	0.1	-	0.2
No answer	1.2	0.2	1.3
Total	99.9	99.9	100.2

Religion: Nearly all of the women interviewed identified themselves as believers of Islam (Tables 14, 15, and 16).

Table 14
Belief in a Religion
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/West
Yes, she does	99.7	99.8	99.7
No, she does not	0.3	0.2	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 15
Religious Identification of Believers
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/West
Muslim	99.9	100.0	99.9
No answer	0.1	-	0.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	1,515	505	1,290

When asked which school of Islam they belonged to, some women simply answered Sunni, without stating whether or not they were Hanefi or Shafi (“Sunni” category in Table 16), while others more specifically stated whether they belonged to the Hanefi or the Shafi school of Sunni Islam. If we combine these three categories, then we find that 82% of the women interviewed identify as “Sunni.” The second most common religious identity claimed by respondents was that of Alevi with 9%.

Table 16
Religious Denominations of Believers
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/West
Sunni	20.5	10.3	22.6
Hanefi	56.2	52.1	55.7
Shafi	5.2	29.9	2.8
Alevi	8.6	4.0	8.6
Shiite	0.3	0.2	0.3
I don't know	6.6	3.0	7.2
No answer	2.6	0.6	2.8
Total	100.0	100.1	100.0
n	1,515	505	1,290

“East” and “Central/West” Samples: When originally designing the survey, we aimed to conduct at least 500 interviews in the East in order to produce regional data for that particular part of the country. Our budget allowed us to concentrate upon a single region for purposes of generating regional data, and we chose to concentrate upon the East. Our reason for this is twofold:

1) *The fact that the most comprehensive grassroots organization (KAMER) active in the struggle against violence against women exists in this region:* Because KAMER's activities were of critical significance for the qualitative leg of our research, we thought it particularly important to gather quantitative data about the East, where KAMER is primarily active.

2) *The widespread belief that women from the East are the most oppressed in Turkey:* Over the past few years, the belief that “women from the East are more oppressed” than women in other parts of Turkey has become an extremely popular assumption. The dichotomy between “backward rural regions” and “modern, developed cities,” which developed as part of the discourse of modernism, has gradually been replaced by a new dichotomy: that of “East versus West” or “Kurdish versus Turkish,” with the contradistinctions in question being primarily defined in terms of gender and violence. Debate surrounding the issue of “honor killings” is undoubtedly one of the most prominent examples of this trend.

We shall share the findings for both the Turkey and the East samples throughout the report and take up the two points summarized above once again in our concluding section.

Looking at the survey findings on the East and the rest of the country, the most conspicuous interregional disparity⁸ is to be found in the category of level of education: While illiterate women account for 16% of all women in Turkey's Central and Western regions, this figure is nearly triple for the East, where 42% of women are illiterate. In the East, the percentage of women who have received education at the middle school, high school, or higher education level is just over one third of that for the rest of Turkey (11% in the East and 29% in Central/West). The closest figures are those for primary education, but even then, women in the East lag behind women in the rest of the country by nearly one fourth (35% for the East, 48% for Central/West).

Thanks to campaigns carried out in recent years, there has been a notable increase in the percentage of children, especially of girls, attending school. However, while the issue of families not sending their children to school con-

⁸ Throughout this report, the terms “regional disparities” and “regional differences” refer to disparities and differences between the two main geographical clusters designated for the purposes of this report as “East” and “Central/West.” “East” consists of Northeastern Anatolia, Central Eastern Anatolia, and Southeastern Anatolia as designated in the new 12-region classification (NUT1).

tinues to be voiced and debated as a serious problem, the question as to whether the government is doing its part to reduce regional disparities has yet to be addressed with the same fervor. A study conducted by the World Bank in 2005 shows that the amount of money expended per student in Ağrı, Batman, Diyarbakır, Gaziantep, İstanbul⁹, Mardin, Şanlıurfa, Siirt, Şırnak, and Van was only around half of the national average. The annual expenditure per student in these 10 provinces varied between 614 NTL and 813 NTL, compared to the national average of 1,250 NTL (*Turkey – Education Sector Study*, 2005, 33). The glaring interregional disparities in access to education as revealed by our study, combined with the aforementioned data indicating that state expenditures for education contribute not to the reduction but rather to the exacerbation of interregional disparities, certainly do not bode well for the future.

Table 17
Level of Education
In percent

	Turkey		East		Central/West	
	The woman	Her spouse	The woman	Her spouse	The woman	Her spouse
Illiterate	19.1	3.9	41.9	12.5	15.5	3.2
Literate but has never attended school	4.0	3.7	5.5	4.3	3.6	3.5
Some primary schooling	4.5	2.6	6.9	3.6	4.3	2.2
Primary school graduate	45.7	44.6	35.2	42.7	47.9	44.7
Middle school graduate	7.8	14.6	3.4	12.6	8.3	14.9
High school graduate	11.6	185	4.0	16.0	12.6	18.6
Higher education/university	7.2	12.1	3.2	8.3	7.9	12.8
Total	99.9	100	100.1	100	100.1	99.9
n	1,520	1,520	506	506	1,294	1,294

⁹ The situation in those neighborhoods in İstanbul which have received the greatest influx of immigrants is particularly striking. Seven of the 10 settlement areas with the most crowded classrooms in Turkey are located in İstanbul: Gaziosmanpaşa, Esenler, Bağcılar, Küçükçekmece, Zeytinburnu, Güngören, and Sultanbeyli. The other three are Siirt's Pervari district, Şırnak's Cizre district, and Ağrı's Patnos district (*Turkey – Education Sector Study*, 2005, 33).

As indicated before, a similar disparity exists with regard to household income: In the sample for the East, 21% of women said their monthly household income was less than 250 NTL, while 53% declared a monthly household income of less than 500 NTL; the figures for Central/West, however, were 9% and 32% respectively (Table 7). In the East sample, only 13% of women declared a monthly household income of over 1,000 NTL, while for Central/West, the figure is 26%. According to these figures, the average household income in the East is approximately 30% lower than it is in Central/West. As we will discuss later, when weighing interregional disparities in the data on violence against women, it is important that interregional disparities in education and income be kept in mind as well.

Chapter 2

Survey Findings

We shall evaluate the findings of our survey under the following headings:

- a) Women's views on violence and gender equality
- b) Women's experiences of violence
- c) Women's views on the struggle against violence

Women's views on violence and gender equality

Nine out of every ten women say "there is never a valid justification for beating"

Ever since women's experiences of domestic violence first began to be discussed in Turkey, one particular bone of contention has been survey findings indicating that women *themselves* find the violence practiced against them to be justified. In a study conducted by Yılmaz Esmer and his students in 1991, in which they surveyed a representative sample of 572 women in Istanbul, nearly half of the women responded "Yes" to the question, "Do you think there are situations in which a woman deserves to be beaten by her husband?" (Esmer 1993, 116). In a *non-representative* sample conducted in Ankara in 1993-94, Leyla Gülçür interviewed 155 women and got a similar result; 43% of women always, often, or sometimes thought violence was "justified" (Gülçür 1996, 49). In the *Aile İçi Şiddetin Sebep ve Sonuçları* (Causes and Effects of Domestic Violence) survey, which was carried out by the Family Research Institution around the same time and was based upon a nationwide representative sample, it was concluded that "the majority of women who have been subjected to violence have a tendency to 'normalize' violence as a concept" (*Aile İçi Şiddetin Sebep ve Sonuçları*, p. 158).

The finding that women, and especially women who have been subjected to violence, consider violence to be "justified" in certain circumstances is supported by surveys conducted in various other parts of the world. In the National Family Health Survey conducted with a representative sample of approximately 90,000 households in India in 1998-1999, 56% of women who had been married at least once in their lives said that they thought it legitimate for their husbands to beat them (Merry 2006, 159). 80% of women in rural Egypt (Heise and Garcia-Moreno 2002, 95) and approximately 70% of women interviewed in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Peru, Samoa, Thailand, and Tanzania expressed the belief that beating was justified in certain circumstances (Garcia-Moreno et al. 2005, 39).

Perhaps the most striking finding to emerge from the Violence Against Women in Turkey survey that we have conducted is the fact that nine out of every ten women interviewed stated that “there is never a valid justification for beating.” The question was posed as follows:

“There are different opinions concerning violence and beating in the family. According to some, under no circumstances should husbands and wives act violently toward one another; in other words, according to such people, there is never a valid justification for beating. Others, however, think that in some circumstances, men can beat their wives. What are your thoughts on this matter?”

There does not appear to be any significant interregional disparity regarding whether beating is ever justified. In the sample for all of Turkey, the percentage of women who think “men can justifiably beat their wives under certain circumstances” was 11%, while the same figure for the sample of women in the East was 14%.

Table 18
Views on Justification of Beating
In percent

	Turkey	East
There is no justification for beating.	89.4	86.4
In some circumstances, men can beat their wives.	10.6	13.6
Total	100.0	100.0

This table reveals a situation that is very different from the one indicated by the results of the aforementioned surveys from the 1990s. The Family Research Institution’s survey (*Aile İçi Şiddetin Sebep ve Sonuçları*, 1995), the most comprehensive, domestic violence-focused survey of a representative sample in Turkey, did not pose this question to all the women surveyed; instead, it was observed in the in-depth interviews with women who had been subjected to violence that those women “considered violence against women to be for the large part justifiable.” However, as we discussed earlier, since the early 1990s there have been significant changes in the ways in which domestic violence has been addressed in the public arena. Whereas 20 years ago, being opposed to domestic violence would have been considered a strictly radical feminist stance to take, today such violence is commonly condemned and those who practice it are punished by law. It is therefore not surpris-

ing that women's views on the legitimacy of domestic violence have changed over the course of these 20 years.

The very limited amount of data we possess regarding views that were valid 15 or 20 years ago makes it difficult to conduct a temporal analysis. Yet, the findings of this survey clearly reveal where the women of Turkey stand in this regard *today*: An overwhelming majority of women agree that "there is never a valid justification for beating."

Why do men act violently?

In order to learn what the women thought about the cause of the violence they experienced, we asked them the following question: "Domestic violence generally consists of men acting violently towards women, of men beating women. Why do you think men act violently towards or beat their wives?" While some responses to this open ended question stressed factors such as disobedience (13%)¹⁰, economic difficulties (14%), marital conflict (6%), and psychological problems (9%), some stated very different reasons, saying that men beat women "out of weakness or powerlessness" (13%), that they practice violence because they consider themselves to be superior (10%), or that they use violence as a means "to gain superiority" (4%). In other words, when identifying the reasons behind male violence, over one fourth of the responses provided by women made diagnoses very much in line with feminist analyses of the relationship between physical violence, power, and the dominant constructs of "masculinity."

Equality between men and women in the home, ensuring women's access to education, and women's freedom to work outside the home:

Another striking finding of the survey is that when it comes to topics like division of labor in the home, working outside the home, making financial decisions, and education for girls, the large majority of women demand equality. 80% of the women believed that housework should be equally divided between the two spouses, while 87% agreed that women should be able to work outside the home, and 84% maintained that women should be able to spend their money according to their own wishes. Nearly all of the women (97%) said they agreed that "Girls should be sent to school for at least eight years," with less than 2% disagreeing.

¹⁰ As we were coding the answers to this open-ended question, we considered all statements such as "making mistakes, doing wrong, not getting permission, not listening, disobeying the husband" to fall under the heading "disobedience."

Table 19
Gender Relations in the Home
In percent

	I agree	I don't agree	I don't know	Sometimes, it depends	Total
Housework should be divided equally between the spouses	80.2	17.9	1.9	-	100.0
Women should be able to work outside of the home at the job of their choice	86.5	10.0	3.5	-	100.0
Women should be able to spend their money according to their wishes	83.8	12.6	3.1	0.5	100.0
Girls should be sent to school for at least eight years.	97.1	1.6	1.3	-	100.0

These findings exhibit strong parallels with the findings of the survey *İş Yaşamı, Üst Yönetim ve Siyasette Kadın* (Women at Work, in Upper Management, and in Politics) conducted in 2003 by Ersin Kalaycıoğlu and Binnaz Toprak. Of the 1,557 women interviewed for Kalaycıoğlu and Toprak's survey, 97% responded to the statement "every woman who wants to work should be able to" to be either "correct" or "very correct" (Kalaycıoğlu and Toprak 2004, 56); 98% said they would support "encouraging both boys and girls in primary school to continue their education" (p. 101); 98% said they would support "explaining in primary school the importance of women's equal participation in society with men" (p. 101); and 97% stated said they would support "teaching that men should also share responsibility for housework and childcare" (p. 102).

Both surveys show that women desire a life of greater equality and sharing at home, at work, and in social life.

Women's Experiences of Violence

Husbands' Control Over Women's Daily Life

A close look at the dynamics of husband-wife relations reveals that, despite women's desire for equality in domestic relations, they are strictly monitored and controlled by their husbands. We posed our question about spousal control as follows:

"In many families, getting permissions can be an important issue. Do you/Did you ask your husband for permission before doing the following things? What I mean here is not 'informing' but actually 'getting permission.' Please answer with 'always,' 'sometimes,' or 'never.'"

The women's responses to this question indicate that a great number of women's daily activities are subject to "permission" from their husbands (Table 20). Only four out of every ten women are able to visit their neighbors/friends without their husbands' permission; three out of ten can visit their families or go shopping without needing to get permission from their husbands; and only one out of ten is able to go out of town without getting permission from her husband. In short, we can say that women's every movement, from going shopping to visiting relatives, is dependent upon their husbands' permission. The survey shows that married women are extremely restricted when it comes to making their own decisions and conducting their own lives.

Table 20
Getting Permission

In percent

	I always ask(ed) for permission	I sometimes ask(ed) for permission	I never ask(ed) for permission	I don't/didn't go	We go/went together	No answer	Total
Visiting a neighbor/friend during the day	41.3	17.5	39.5	1.4	0.3	-	100.0
Visiting my family	55.1	12.8	29.0	1.8	1.1	0.1	99.9
Going shopping	49.7	11.7	31.0	5.9	1.7	0.1	100.1
Going to the cinema/theater	26.9	4.9	17.0	49.8	1.1	0.3	100.0
Going out of town	75.1	5.8	11.3	5.1	2.6	0.1	100.0

Physical violence

We asked women the following question about their experiences of violence at the hands of their spouses: "Does your husband ever slap, shove, or beat you, or has he ever done so in the past?" followed up by "If this does happen or has happened, how frequently does it occur or has it occurred?" While 66% of the women stated that they had never encountered such a sit-

uation, 34% said that they had been subjected to physical violence at least once. The figures for the East sample meanwhile were 61% and 39% respectively (Table 21).

Table 21
Slapping, Shoving and Beating by the Husband
(Physical Violence)
In percent

	Turkey	East
Never	65.5	60.5
Only once	6.7	3.6
Several times	8.2	9.7
Occasionally	6.1	11.1
Frequently	4.1	4.5
Used to happen in the past	9.1	10.5
No answer	0.3	0.2
Total	100	100.1
n	1,5	506

The rate of women who experienced physical violence from husbands in previous marriages, but not from their current husband, is nine in 1,000. Adding that figure on to the 34.2% shown above, we get a total of 35.1%. Since the same figure for the East is four in 1,000, adding it to the figure above brings the total for that region to 39.7%. In that case, the percentage of women who have been subject to physical violence (in the form of slapping, shoving or beating) by their husbands at least once “in their lifetime” is 35% for the Turkey sample and 40% for the East sample.

The survey conducted by the Family Research Institution in the early 1990s came up with similar figures, with 30% of women stating that “their husbands beat them,” and 34% of men stating that “they beat their wives” (*Aile İçi Şiddetin Sebep ve Sonuçları*, 1995, 136-137). Unfortunately, because this study was not repeated on a regular basis or developed further, the amount of information produced about this fundamental violation affecting the lives of six to eight million women in Turkey has remained extremely limited.

In a survey conducted with 24,647 people as part of the *Aile Yapısı Araştırması 2006* (Family Structure Survey 2006) conducted jointly by the

Turkish General Directorate of Family and Social Research together with the Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI), the only question regarding domestic violence was posed within the framework of “how your spouse responds when you have a disagreement”; 8% of women said their spouses “used force” during disagreements (*Aile Yapısı Araştırması 2006*, 2006, 14). It is not surprising that the percentage for “use of force (physical violence)” turned out to be so low within the framework of this particular study. Studies conducted in North America and Europe show that there is a clear discrepancy between figures regarding violence against women between surveys that explicitly focus on violence against women and those that inquire about it as part of a larger context (as in the case of “general crime surveys”), with figures generally being higher in the former than they are in the latter. Thus, many researchers have stressed the need to conduct special surveys focused upon the issue of violence against women in order to produce meaningful data and information about it (Johnson 1998, Walby and Myhill 2001, Piispa 2003, Hearn and Pringle 2006).

The solitude of victims of violence

Another striking result of our survey is that, of the women who said that they had experienced physical violence at least once in their lives, 49% in the Turkey sample and 63% in the East sample said that they had never before spoken to anyone about it (Table 22). In other words, one out of every two (and in the East, approximately two out of every three) women who are subjected to violence do not share their experience with anyone else but instead have to deal and struggle with domestic violence on their own. As for those women who said that they had spoken of their experience to others, we see that the majority told their neighbors or friends (54%), mothers (38%), or sisters (29%), and rarely their fathers (17%), brothers (10%), or children (12%).¹¹ The total number of women who have told the muhtar (elected village or neighborhood official), police, gendarme, a lawyer, or public prosecutor accounts for a mere 3%. The solitude of victims of violence therefore reveals itself to be a pressing issue.

¹¹ Because some women shared their experiences with more than one person, the total percentage exceeds 100.

Table 22
Whether Women Have Told Others About the
Experience of Physical Violence

As percentage of the women who report having experienced physical violence

	Turkey	East
Yes	51.3	37.2
No	48.7	62.8
Total	100.0	100.0
n	520	199

Some of the striking findings regarding women who say they have experienced physical violence are as follows:

Marriage

Among women who are divorced or separated, reported experience of physical violence is as high as 78% (Table 23).¹² The first conclusion one might draw is that women who have been subjected to violence have distanced themselves from that violence by means of divorce or separation. However, it is possible to come up with a different interpretation: One reason behind this difference could be the relative difficulty of speaking about ongoing violence. In other words, women may find it more difficult to speak with interviewers about violence in an ongoing marriage than about violence in a terminated relationship.

Table 23
Physical Violence and Marital Status

In percent

Physical Violence	Marital Status			Total
	Married	Divorced/ Separated	Widowed	
Never	67.0	22.0	65.9	65.5
At least once	32.7	78.0	33.3	34.2
No answer	0.3	-	0.7	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0
n	1,335	50	135	1,520

Chi-Square 44.8
Degree of freedom 4
Significance 0.000

¹² This observation is based upon 50 people, as the percentage of women who are divorced/separated is extremely low within the general population.

Another striking finding with regard to marriage and physical violence is that the circumstances under which spouses meet and get married have a significant effect on the experience of physical violence: while 28% of women who met their future spouses on their own and married with their families' approval, and 37% of women who were married by arranged marriage have experienced physical violence at least once, the figure for those who met their future spouses themselves but got married without their families' approval rises to 49% (Table 24). Surveys conducted in other countries have shown that there is a strong connection between women's isolation, especially their isolation from their families and close friends, and domestic violence; physical violence is generally accompanied by physical and social isolation (UNICEF 2000, 8; Johnson 1998, 43). We find in Turkey too that in cases where women have gotten married without family approval, being deprived of the support of family and close friends increases the likelihood of women becoming victims of domestic violence.

Table 24
Physical Violence and How Couples Met and Married

In percent

Physical Violence	How couples met and married				Total
	Met themselves, married with families' approval	Met themselves, married without approval/by eloping	Arranged marriage	Other	
Never	72.0	51.3	62.7	52.6	65.5
At least once	28.0	48.7	36.7	47.4	34.2
No answer	-	-	0.7	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0
n	617	115	769	19	1,520

Chi-Square 30.0
Degree of Freedom 6
Significance 0.000

Education

There is a meaningful statistical relationship between both the woman's and her spouse's educational status and the rate of physical violence (Table 25). The table below shows that there is a general tendency for the percentage

of women who say that they have experienced physical violence to decrease in reverse proportion to level of education. While 43% of illiterate women say they have been subjected to physical violence at least once, the figure for women who are university educated falls to 12%. However, when interpreting these data, we must keep the following in mind: The higher the woman's educational level and socioeconomic status, the more difficult it becomes for her to admit to having experienced violence. On the other hand, the fact that at least one out of every ten college/university graduates has been or is being battered by her spouse should be enough to give us pause.

When we look at the relationship between spouses' educational levels and rates of violence against women, again the results are striking: While half of the women whose spouses are illiterate say they have been physically abused at least once, the figure for those whose spouses have a college/university education is 18%. The finding that one out of every six men who have received a college/university education has beaten his wife is every bit as important as the discrepancy between the figures for illiterate spouses versus those with high education (Table 26).

Table 25
Physical Violence and Women's Education
In percent

Physical Violence	Women's Education							Total
	Illiterate	Literate	Some primary schooling	Primary school graduate	Middle school graduate	High school graduate	College/university educated	
Never	56.7	65.6	52.9	65.9	62.2	71.0	88.2	65.5
At least once	43.3	34.4	45.6	33.5	37.8	29.0	11.8	34.2
No response	-	-	1.5	0.6	-	-	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	291	61	68	695	119	176	110	1 520

Chi-Square 48.9
Degree of Freedom 12
Significance 0.000

Table 26
Physical Violence and Spouse's Education
In percent

Physical Violence	Spouse's Education							Total
	Illiterate	Literate	Some primary schooling	Primary school graduate	Middle school graduate	High school graduate	College/university educated	
Never	50.0	62.5	59.0	63.3	62.2	67.6	81.5	65.5
At least once	50.0	37.5	41.0	36.4	36.9	32.4	17.9	34.2
No response	-	-	-	0.3	0.9	-	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	291	61	68	695	119	176	110	1 520

Chi-Square 35,8
Degree of Freedom 12
Significance 0,000

Income and Work

The relationship between income and physical violence is inversely proportionate: The percentage of women who say they have been subjected to physical violence decreases in proportion to rise in income (Table 27). While approximately 43% of women who say they have no income or an income of less than 250 NTL have been physically abused at least once by their husbands, the figure falls to 23% for those households with an income of over 2,500 NTL. Yet, again, the latter figure is not insignificant, for it shows that violence is experienced (or has been experienced) in one out of every four families with a household income of over 2,500 NTL. However, when interpreting these data, we need to keep in mind that, as in the case of educational level, women from high income levels may be less likely to admit that they have been or currently are abused (because they are ashamed, or out of concern that it will have a negative impact upon their reputations). One of the most striking datum from Table 27, which provides figures for the relationship between household income and experience of physical violence, is that approximately 43% of women who say that they "do not know their household income" have experienced domestic violence at least once.

Table 27
Physical Violence and Income
In percent

Physical Violence	Monthly Income							No answer	Total
	No in-come	< 250 NTL	250-499 NTL	500-999 NTL	1000-2499 NTL	> 2500 NTL	I don't know		
Never	54.5	56.5	62.3	64.8	75.4	76.7	57.1	62.5	65.5
At least once	43.2	43.5	37.2	34.8	24.6	23.3	42.9	37.5	34.2
No response	2.3	-	0.5	0.4	-	-	-	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	44	108	379	557	293	60	63	16	1 520

Chi-Square 32.6
Degree of Freedom 14
Significance 0.000

Whether or not women have an income-generating job does not appear to explain women's likelihood of experiencing violence at the hands of their spouses. However, when women earn more than their spouse, the likelihood of violence appears to increase significantly. 63% of the women who said they generated more income for their families than their spouse, reported having been subjected to physical violence by their spouse at least once. Thus, when women generate more family income than their spouses, it increases their risk of physical violence by at least twofold; in such cases, two out of every three women are subjected to physical violence. The lowest rate of physical violence is for those couples in which the woman and her spouse have equal income (Table 28).

Table 28
Physical Violence and Relative Contribution to Household Income
In percent

Physical Violence	Who Generates Higher Income			Total
	The woman herself	Her spouse	Equal income	
Never	37.0	66.7	79.7	65.5
At least once	63.0	32.9	20.3	34.2
No response	-	0.4	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	73	1 289	79	1 520

Chi-Square 46.4
Degree of Freedom 16
Significance 0.000

Rural versus Urban

Looking at results for the Turkey sample, the percentage of women living in cities who are or have been subjected to physical violence is approximately 42% greater than those living in small towns. We find that beating is at its lowest in the small towns and at its highest in the cities, with the villages falling in between (Table 29). (The relationship between the rate of beating and type of settlement for the East is statistically insignificant.)

Table 29
Physical Violence and Type of Settlement – Turkey
In percent

Physical Violence	Type of settlement			Total
	City (Province center)	Small town (County center)	Village	
Never	62.8	73.1	65.1	65.5
At least once	37.1	26.2	34.5	34.2
No response	0.1	0.7	0.4	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	736	279	505	1 520

Chi-Square 12.6
Degree of Freedom 4
Significance 0.014

Table 30
Physical Violence and Type of Settlement – East
In percent

Physical Violence	Type of settlement			Total
	City (Province center)	Small town (County center)	Village	
Never	65.4	59.1	57.1	60.5
At least once	34.6	40.0	42.9	39.3
No response	-	0.9	-	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	179	115	212	506

Chi-Square 6.3*

Degree of Freedom 4

Significance 0.181

* Chi-Square is statistically insignificant.

Sexual Violence

Asking questions about sexual violence as part of surveys has a rather short history and how to define sexual violence is still a matter of debate (Heise and Garcia-Moreno 2002, Piispa 2003). In some studies, the same definitions as those employed in the law are used, while in others, researchers come up with their own definitions. We chose to express the question as part of a series of questions on the frequency of certain behaviors by the respondent's spouse: "With what frequency have you experienced the following?.... Your husband forcing you into sexual relations against your will." 14% of the women we interviewed said that they had been forced into sexual relations against their will at least once (Table 31). This result is higher than the 9% result of the Family Research Institute's survey of 1993-94 (*Aile İçi Şiddetin Sebep ve Sonuçları* 1995, 140). As is obvious from the percentage of women who did not respond to the question (4%), domestic sexual violence is a topic not easily talked about. We can reasonably assume that this figure does not reflect all cases.

Table 31
Sexual Violence
In percent

	With what frequency have you been forced into sexual relations against your will?
Never	81.9
Once	0.6
Several times	3.0
Occasionally	5.9
Often	3.2
Only in the past	1.4
No response	3.9
Total	99.9
n	1,520

67% of those who said that they had been victims of sexual violence also stated that they had been subjected to physical violence as well. The continuum between these two types of violence points to the need to situate sexual violence within the larger relationship of domination between the spouses.

Economic Violence

Women's right to work outside the home without their husbands' consent has been one of the most enduring sites of feminist struggle in Turkey. On November 29, 1990, Article 159 of the Civil Code, which made it mandatory for women to have their husbands' permission in order to work outside the home, was abolished by the Constitutional Court. However, we find that this change has had a limited impact upon the reality of domestic relations: 36% of women who were asked, "If you wanted to engage in income-generating work, would your spouse prevent you?" answered, "Yes, he would." The percentage of women for the East sample who responded affirmatively to this question was even higher, at 52% (Table 32).

Table 32
Spousal Prevention of Income-Generating Work
In percent

If you wanted to engage in income-generating work, would your spouse prevent you?	Turkey		East		Central/West	
	Of those without a job	All respondents	Of those without a job	All respondents	Of those without a job	All respondents
Yes, he would	36.0	29.1	52.1	46.8	33.3	26.6
No, he wouldn't	54.1	43.7	36.0	32.4	57.2	45.7
I don't know	9.9	8.0	11.9	10.7	9.6	7.7
Of those who generate income		19.2		10.1		20.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1
n	1 228	1 520	455	506	1 034	1 294

Another important legislative change for women's status within marriage was made to the article of the Civil Code governing the property regime in the family, whereby spouses are now accorded equal share in property and assets acquired during marriage. We wanted to see how aware women were of this change, which went into effect on January 1, 2002, and so we asked the respondents the following question: "There have been some changes to Turkey's Civil Code in recent years. According to the current law, how do spouses divide their property, possessions, and savings in case of divorce?" As seen in the table below, while 56% of women in the Turkey sample expressed accurate knowledge of the law, 5% answered with inaccurate information (such as "everything goes to the man" or "it is left to the children"), while 38% said they didn't know what the new law was. The percentage of those in the East sample who were aware of the current property regime in the law was much lower at 40% (Table 33). In short, four out of ten women in Turkey, and six out of ten women in Eastern Turkey, are unaware of a significant economic right they have possessed since 2002.

Table 33
Women's Knowledge of the Civil Code on Property Regime
In percent

According to the reformed Civil Code, how do spouses divide property, possessions, and savings in case of divorce?	Turkey	East	Central/ West
Regardless of whose name they are registered in, property, possessions and savings are divided equally	55.9	39.5	58.4
Other (misinformed)	4.9	8.3	4.5
I don't know	38.4	51.4	36.2
No response	0.8	0.8	0.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	1 520	506	1 294

The Cycle of Violence

Our survey shows that the relationship between experiencing violence and having experienced or witnessed violence as a child is not an insignificant one. Of women who were subjected to physical violence by their fathers as children or youth, 48% have been or are also subjected to physical violence by their husbands, while the percentage of women who have been physically abused by their husbands but who were not physically abused by their fathers is 28%. The same figures relating to physical violence at the hands of mothers is 41% and 29% respectively.

A similar figure is true of male spouses as well. While 47% of women who said that their spouses had been beaten by their mothers or fathers as children were subjected to violence by their husbands, 24% of women who said that their husbands were not beaten as children were subjected to violence by their husbands.

52% of women who said their mothers were beaten by their fathers are subjected to violence by their own husbands (24% of those who said their mothers were not beaten by their fathers are subjected to violence by their own husbands), while 48% of those who stated that their mother-in-law was beaten by their father-in-law are also beaten by their husbands (the figure is 25% for those who stated that their mother-in-law was not beaten). When we evaluate these numbers altogether, the factor that most significantly increases a wom-

an's risk of physical violence at the hands of her spouse is her own mother's subjection to physical violence at the hands of her father. These women run twice as much risk for being subjected to physical violence than women whose mothers were not physically abused. In short, our survey suggests that violence witnessed during childhood doubles the likelihood of men acting violently towards their spouses, or women being subjected to violence. The significance of this finding was reinforced with our multivariate analysis (below).

*Multivariate Analysis*¹³

In order to look at the degree to which the factors considered in this study explain violence not on an individual basis, but as composites, we have conducted a multivariate analysis. Since our aim has been to differentiate between those women who are physically abused by their spouses versus those who are not, the most appropriate means of analysis would be Discriminant Analysis.

The 15 independent factors in the following tables have been subjected to Discriminant Analysis. The analysis shows that the factor with the greatest power to explain the physical abuse of a woman by her spouse is her mother's experience of physical abuse by her father. That is to say, if a woman witnesses her mother's abuse, then the likelihood of her being abused by her husband increases significantly. Furthermore, though not to the same degree, the likelihood of a woman being abused by her spouse also increases if her spouse has been abused by his father and/or mother. Though to a yet lesser degree, if a woman's mother-in-law is physically abused by her father-in-law, this also increases the likelihood that a woman will be abused by her spouse.

Chart 1
Multivariate Analysis of Physical Violence
Via Discriminant Analysis
Eigen Values

Function	Eigen Value	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical Correlation
1	.242 ^a	100.0	100.0	.441

^a The first canonical discriminant function was used in the analysis.

Wilks' Lambda

Function Test	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-Square	Degrees of Freedom	Significance
1	.805	129.067	15	.000

¹³ We thank Ali Eşref Turan for conducting the multivariate analysis.

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients		Structure Matrix *	
	Function		Function
	1		1
Marital status	-.292	Mother battered by father	,709
Type of marriage (civil/religious)	-.161	Spouse battered by father/mother	,575
How couple met and married	-.026	Mother-in-law battered by father-in-law	,482
Women's education	.327	Battered by father	,380
Spouse's education	-.159	Women's education	,343
Place of birth	-.029	Income	,307
Job	.105	Battered by mother	,302
Relative contribution to income	.122	Marital status	-,227
Woman battered by father	.107	Spouse's education	,193
Woman battered by mother	-.012	Type of marriage (civil/religious)	-,175
Spouse battered by father/mother	.393	Relative contribution to income	,164
Mother-in-law battered by father-in-law	.193	Ownership of Real estate	,088
Mother battered by father	.549	How couple met and married	-,076
Income	.167	Place of birth	,076
Ownership of Real estate	.136	Job	-,044

* Within-group correlations of each predictor variable with the canonical variable. Variables are listed according to the absolute sizes of the correlation values.

The first four factors with the greatest values in the structure matrix constitute what is known in the international literature as “the cycle of violence.” Our findings regarding the cycle of violence are analogous to findings of surveys conducted in other countries (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000, 40; UNICEF 2000, 8; Heise and Garcia-Moreno 2002, 89). However, when assessing these data, feminist researchers stress several points that should be taken into consideration:

1) A methodological aberration may underlie the strong relationship between women who are subjected to physical violence by their husbands and those who have been subjected to or witnessed violence during childhood: Women who have no reservations about discussing the former may be more comfortable speaking about the latter as well (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000, 40). In order to try and eliminate, insofar as possible, this bias, in our survey we also asked questions about violence experienced by husbands as children,

and about violence experienced by mother-in-laws at the hands of father-in-laws. We assumed that women would not be as disturbed, embarrassed, etc. in answering these questions as they would in answering questions about their own experiences. Looking at the results, we find a strong relationship between these percentages and the percentages of women who have been subjected to violence by their husbands.

2) Although there is a significant increase in the likelihood of men to act violently if they have experienced or witnessed violence as children, the existence of those who act violently towards their spouses despite not having been subjected to or witnessed violence in their own family, as well as the existence of those who have experienced or witnessed violence as children and yet do not act violently towards their spouses, should make one skeptical of “cycle of violence” analyses (Price 2005, 81). According to Lori Heise and Claudia Garcia-Moreno, the following is an important theoretical question: “What distinguishes those men who are able to form healthy, nonviolent relationships despite childhood adversity from those who become abusive?” (Heise and Garcia-Moreno 2002, 89). In-depth interviews with the men themselves is the only way whereby we can hope to answer this question.

3) Foregrounding men’s own childhood experiences of violence when trying to explain their physical violence towards their spouses means risking underestimation of other violence-related factors (education, income, legal status, discourse and practices that serve to validate men’s violence, etc.).

What these three points have in common is a caution against undermining the multi-dimensional nature of domestic violence and reducing it to a single dimension or cause. We believe that the results of the multivariate analysis should be interpreted with this caution in mind.

Women’s Views on the Struggle Against Violence

Up until recently, women have had to struggle against domestic violence on their own. As evidenced by the fact that half of the women who experienced physical violence stated that they had not spoken of it to anyone before, “solitude” in the struggle against domestic violence remains the reality for many women. On the other hand, we can say that the fact that the great majority of the public opinion has come to denounce the mentality expressed by the proverb, “You have to keep a heavy hand on the wife and a baby in her womb at all times,” the proliferation of women’s organizations involved in the struggle against violence against women, and the positive changes to Turkish laws since 1987 have created a new field of struggle to end violence against women. We devoted part of the questions of our survey to women’s views about the ongoing struggle against male spouse violence.

The Struggle on an Individual Level

In order to understand the methods of struggle that women use on an individual level, we asked the following open-ended questions: “What would you do, how would you react if your spouse were to beat you today?” and “What would you do if you heard your neighbor being beaten by her spouse?”

Although the overwhelming majority of women interviewed said that “there is no justification for beating,” this does not necessarily indicate that they are equipped to deal with real-life present or future domestic violence. In response to the question, “if your spouse were to beat your today, what would you do, how would you react?”, 24% of women said that they would do or could do nothing for various reasons. The same figure for the East sample is even higher, at 46% (Table 34). The percentage of women who said that they would or could do nothing if their neighbors were to be beaten by their spouses was 45% (for the East, it was 51%) (Table 35). While 5% of women said that they would go to the police if they were to be beaten themselves, the percentage of women in the Turkey sample who said that they would call the police if their neighbor were to be beaten was 13%.

Table 34
What Would You Do If Your Spouse Were to Beat You Today?
In percent

	Turkey	East
I wouldn't do anything. I wouldn't respond at all. I would suck it up. I would put up with it for the sake of my children. I have nowhere to go, so I would just lie down and take it.	23.6	46.1
I'd yell back at him, get angry. I wouldn't just suck it up. I wouldn't just put up with it. I'd oppose him. I'd do to him exactly what he'd done to me.	22.3	13.3
I'd get a divorce. I'd leave him. I'd go to the courts. Our relationship would officially end.	11.1	4.9
I don't know what I would do. It depends on the circumstances. I don't know.	9.3	7.7
I'd leave the house. I'd leave. I'd run away. I'd slam the door shut and go.	7.3	5.2
I'd cry, I'd get upset, I'd be hurt, I'd be sad.	5.5	7.1
I'd refuse to speak to him. I'd refuse to speak to him until he apologized. I wouldn't speak to him for a few days.	5.2	11.5
I'd go to the police. I'd file a complaint to the police station. I'd apply to wherever I needed to apply and file a complaint.	4.5	3.2
I'd talk with him. I'd ask him why. I'd try to calm him down.	4.3	3.4
I'd defend myself. I'd defend my rights. I'd act out against him.	3.3	1.4
If he went too far, I'd leave him. If he went too far, I'd call the police; I'd go to the courts. If he continued, I'd go to the Association for the Protection of Women.	2.1	0.8
I'd kick him out of the house, keep him restrained from the house.	2.1	0.8
I'd get away from him. I'd run away to a different room.	1.7	1.2
I'd go to my parents' house, and if he apologized, I'd come back.	1.2	2.0
If it happened just once, I wouldn't do anything. If it happened again, I wouldn't forgive him.	1.0	0.4
I'd complain to his mother.	0.6	0.4
I'd throw him out of the house. I'd get a restraining order, so he couldn't come near the house again.	0.4	0.2
Other	1.2	1.0
It wouldn't happen. He couldn't do it. I wouldn't let anyone beat me. I wouldn't let it happen, not at my age.	8.4	5.3
No response.	0.8	1.0
n	1520	506

* The total of this column is greater than 100, because some women provided more than one answer. Because this was an open ended-question, we grouped the answers at the coding stage. The sentences in the above (and below) tables are examples of the answers that were grouped together.

Table 35
What Would You Do If You Heard Your Neighbor Being Beaten By Her Spouse?
In percent

	Turkey	East
I wouldn't do anything. There's nothing I could do. I wouldn't intervene.	44.6	51.2
I would try to stop the man. I would try to save the woman. I would go to them and try to help.	18.7	20.0
I would be sad. I would feel as if I'd been beaten myself. I would feel sad for her, I would feel hurt. I would be angry.	16.0	16.0
I would call the police.	13.3	4.4
I would talk with the man. I would stand up to the man.	7.5	9.1
I would offer psychological support. I would talk with her. I would console her. I would support my neighbor.	6.0	6.2
I would try to help them make peace.	4.8	6.5
I would remind the woman of her rights. I would help the woman to file a complaint, I would advise her to go to the courts.	3.3	1.0
I would take the neighbor in to my own home. I would protect the neighbor in my own home. I could take care of her in my own home.	2.6	2.8
I don't know what I would do. It depends on the circumstances.	2.3	3.2
I would swear at the man. I would curse at him. I would yell at him.	0.8	1.2
I would tell the woman to leave him. I would pressure them to separate. I would encourage them to separate.	0.7	0.2
I would go and rip the man to pieces. I would beat him up. If I could, I would kill him.	0.3	-
I would direct her to a women's shelter.	0.3	-
I would call the neighbor's friends or relatives.	0.1	0.2
Other	0.3	0.4
No response	0.7	0.4
n	1520	506

* The total of this column is greater than 100, because some women provided more than one answer.

In addition to the questions about individual struggle, we also asked a few questions about Law No. 4320 (also known as the Protection Order). First, we provided the following information: "Within the past few years, a new law has passed: The Law for the Protection of the Family. According to this law, if one spouse acts violently towards the other or towards the children, the judge can keep the abusive spouse away from the home by issuing a "restraining order"

to protect the abused spouse and children.” The respondents were then asked the following questions: a) “Have you heard of this law before?” b) “Have you or any woman you know benefitted from this law?” c) “If ‘yes,’ who?”

57% of the women interviewed said they were aware of the law, while 4% (a total of 65 women) said they knew of someone who had benefitted from it (Tables 36 and 37). A total of 5 women said they had benefitted from the law themselves, while 26 women said their neighbors had benefitted from the law, 20 women said their relatives had benefitted from the law, 13 women said a friend had benefitted from the law, and 4 women said someone else they knew had benefitted from the law. This study reveals once again that the implementation of Law No. 4320 remains extremely limited.

Table 36
Have You Heard of the Family Protection Law?
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/West
Yes	57.2	35.0	60.6
No	42.8	65.0	39.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	1,520	506	1,294

Table 37
Do You Know Anyone Who Has Benefitted from This Law?
In percent

	Of those who have heard of the law	Of all women
Yes, I do	7.5	4.3
No, I don't	92.5	52.9
Those who haven't heard of the law		42.8
Total	100.0	100.0
n	869	1520

Our survey findings suggest a strong correlation between unawareness of Law No. 4320 and unawareness of the changes in the property regime in the Civil Code. 73% of women who said they were aware of the new property law

said that they were aware of Law No. 4320 as well. 63% of those who were unaware of the change to the Civil Code were likewise unaware of Law No. 4320. There is also a strong correlation between women's responses to these questions and their educational levels, as well. 54% of illiterate women were *unaware* of both laws, while the percentage of such women *aware* of both laws was 14%; percentages for women who were college/university educated meanwhile was 3% and 77% respectively. Women's knowledge of the laws therefore increased considerably in correlation with their level of education.

One of the most striking findings of Table 36 is the regional disparity between those who had heard of the law and those who hadn't. While 61% of women living in the Central and Western regions of the country had heard of Law No. 4320, only 35% of women in the East had heard of the law. One might maintain that the main reason underlying this difference is "education." As we have shown earlier on (see Table 17), while the percentage of illiterate women in Turkey's Central and Western regions is 16%, the figure for the East is nearly triple that, rising to 42%. The percentage of women in the East who have studied at the middle school-high school level is only one third of the figure for the rest of Turkey (11% in the East versus 29% in Central/West). The closest figures are those between women who have completed primary school, and even in that case, the figures for the East are lower than those for the rest of Turkey (East 35%, Central/West 48%).

Taking into consideration the strong correlation between awareness of the law and women's education level, we can say that differences in education level are what underlie the striking discrepancy in percentages for the different regions.

Table 38

Knowledge of the Property Regime and of the Family Protection Law

In percent

Family Protection Law	New Property Regime			Total
	Knows	Doesn't know/ misinformed	No response	
Has heard about it	73.3	36.6	41.7	57.2
Hasn't heard about it	26.7	63.4	58.3	42.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	850	658	12	1 520

Chi Square 204.8
Degree of Freedom 2
Significance 0.000

Table 39
Knowledge of the Property Regime and of the Family Protection Law, and Education
In percent

	Knows the property regime only	Knows the Family Protection Law only	Knows both	Doesn't know either	No response	Total
Illiterate	8.9	22.0	13.7	54.0	1.4	100
Literate (but no schooling)	8.2	14.8	26.2	50.8	-	100
Some primary school education	16.2	16.2	29.4	38.2	-	100
Primary school graduate	18.7	16.8	37.6	26.2	0.7	100
Middle school graduate	13.4	18.5	58.8	9.2	-	100
High school graduate	14.8	5.1	74.4	4.0	1.7	100
University or other school of higher education	22.8	8.2	77.3	2.7	-	100

Expectations from the State in the Struggle Against Violence

We evaluated women's expectations of the state in the struggle against violence by asking respondents about their views on four issues: whether institutions and organizations are carrying out their responsibilities, what the state can do to prevent male violence, status of women's shelters, and the need for penal measures.

The striking results derived from respondents' answers to the question, "Do the following institutions carry out their responsibilities concerning the prevention of violence against women?" indicate that for most women, state institutions fail at their responsibilities – either in the form of total or partial failure. Institutions thought to do the best job at fulfilling their responsibilities are women's organizations (34%) and the courts (28%). Only 20% or less of respondents stated that they thought other institutions (Parliament, Municipalities, the police, the gendarme, and bar associations) carried out their responsibilities (Table 40).

Table 40
Do Institutions Carry Out Their Responsibilities
Concerning The Prevention of Violence Against Women?

In percent

	Yes, they do	A little but not enough	No, they do not	No opinion	Total
Police	18.6	22.6	40.3	18.5	100.0
Gendarme	20.7	18.8	32.1	28.4	100.0
Courts	28.0	29.5	23.0	19.5	100.0
Bar associations	15.5	18.3	23.8	42.4	100.0
Municipalities	13.5	17.2	39.6	29.7	100.0
Parliament	15.2	18.3	34.9	31.6	100.0
Women's organizations	33.6	28.6	15.1	22.8	100.1

Responses to our question about *what steps the state could take* to prevent male violence were also striking. The percentage of respondents who believed that the state could prevent violence by educating men was approximately 60%, while 53% said that the state could prevent male violence by establishing shelters; 45% said by supporting organizations and associations active in this field; 45% by giving heavy sentences to offenders; and 33% by educating the police on this matter. A portion of the women, percentages of which vary between 14% and 22%, think that by taking these measures, the state can prevent violence in *some* situations (Table 40, column 2). If we bring these two responses together (i.e. those who say that the state “can prevent” violence and those who say the measures described “may or may not prevent” violence, or can prevent violence in some situations), then we find that between 60 to 74% of women think that there are certain measures that the state can take to prevent male violence against their spouses, such as educating men, opening women’s shelters, supporting organizations and associations active in this field, giving heavy sentences to offenders, and educating the police.

Table 41
Can the State Prevent Men's Violence Against Their Spouses?
In percent

	Yes, they can	They can in some but not all cases	They cannot	No opinion	Total
By giving heavy sentences to offenders	44.7	15.3	30.7	9.3	100.0
By educating the police on this matter	33.2	20.3	32.2	14.3	100.0
By supporting organizations/ associations active in this field	44.7	21.8	17.5	16.0	100.0
By establishing shelters	53.1	18.8	16.2	12.0	100.1
By educating men	59.9	14.1	15.9	10.1	100.0

After we provided the information on the number of women's shelters in Turkey (as being 35), 85% of women interviewed stated that this number was insufficient and 87% approved of having their tax money used to establish women's shelters. This finding is similar to that found in Ersin Kalaycıoğlu and Binnaz Toprak's study, where 97% of the women responded either "yes" or "definitely yes" to the question, "Is it right for the state to open shelters where women battered and abused by their husbands may stay at no cost, together with their children?" (Kalaycıoğlu and Toprak 2004, 59).

Table 42
Are There Enough Women's Shelters in Turkey?
In percent

Yes, there are	6.2
No, there are not	84.8
No opinion	9.0
Total	100.0
n	1 520

Table 43
Do You Approve of Your Taxes Being Used to Establish Women's Shelters?
In percent

Yes, I definitely approve	42.6
I approve	44.3
I neither approve nor disapprove	2.9
I don't approve	1.9
I don't approve at all	0.7
No opinion	7.7
Total	100.1
n	1 520

92% of the women would like for the courts to “penalize” men who act violently; the figure for the East sample being 80%, and Central and Western Turkey sample being 94% (Table 44).

The responses to this set of questions regarding the state's responsibilities altogether suggest that when it comes to the struggle against male partner violence, women consider the government, local administrations, state institutions, the law, and the courts bearers of significant responsibility in intervening and putting a stop to such violence. This survey suggests that, according to the women in Turkey today, domestic violence is not a “domestic” affair.

Table 44
Should the Courts Penalize Men Who Beat Their Wives?
In percent

	Turkey	East	Central/ West
Yes, they should	92.2	79.8	93.7
No, they should not	6.0	16.8	4.8
I don't know, no opinion	1.8	3.4	1.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
n	1 520	506	1 294

Chapter 3

Discussion and Suggestions

Preliminary Conclusions

Perhaps the most important finding of our study is that an overwhelming majority of women in Turkey today do not believe there is any justification for domestic violence. For nine out of ten women, “There is never a valid justification for beating.” This finding points to a much different conclusion than that arrived at by small-scale studies conducted in the past, which indicated that women thought there might be valid justification for beating. The struggle against violence and the women’s movement, which has undergone swift development since the 1980s, appears to have raised awareness about there being no valid justification for violence.

Indeed, our study shows that the large majority of women demand equality in gender relations in the home. 80% of women think that housework should be divided equally between the spouses; 87% of women agree that women should be able to work outside the home at the job of their choice; 84% of women maintain that women should be able to spend their money according to their own wishes; nearly all of the women (97%) agree that girls should receive at least eight years of schooling. In other words, this survey suggests that, parallel to feminist values which advocate for women’s equality, freedom and independence, the large majority of women in Turkey demand an equal division of labor, equality in gender relations, and equal opportunity.

Yet most women appear to be unable to shape their lives according to these values. It appears that every step a woman takes, from going shopping to visiting her family, is subject to her husband’s control: Only one out of every ten women is able to go to out of town without her husband’s permission, while three out of every ten is able to visit their families or go shopping, and four out of every ten is able to visit friends/neighbors without their husbands’ permission.

Our study indicates that 35% of married women in Turkey have been subjected to physical violence by their husbands at least once in their lives. In the survey conducted by the Family Research Institution in 1995, approximately 30% of women had stated that “their husbands had beat them” while 34% of men had stated that they had beat their wives (*Aile İçi Şiddetin Sebepleri ve Sonuçları*, 1995, 136-137). Adding our findings to this survey, one can say that one out of every three women in Turkey has been physically abused by her husband and that this figure has not changed over the past decade.

Our study also provides clues as to the particular characteristics of women who are abused by their husbands. According to this survey, violence experi-

enced or witnessed during childhood doubles the likelihood of a man acting violently towards his wife, and of a woman being subjected to violence. The discriminant analysis we conducted suggested that the factor with the greatest power to explain the physical abuse of a woman is her mother's experience of physical violence at the hands of her father. Though it is necessary to avoid generalizing about this phenomenon, which is referred to as "the cycle of violence," and thus take into consideration such factors as economic status, level of education, and socialization in later life as well, this finding underscores the importance of the socialization process within the family.

Women with higher incomes than their spouses are at double the risk of beating, and two out of every three women who contribute more to the household income than their spouses are subjected to physical violence. This finding could be interpreted to mean that men, having lost economic strength, resort to physical strength as a means to assert their patriarchal authority.

There also appears to be a significant correlation between a woman's likelihood of experiencing domestic violence and how she met and married her spouse. Those couples who met themselves and got married with their families' approval suffer less violence in their marriages than those who married without their families' approval, whether after meeting themselves or being part of arranged marriages. 28% of those who met themselves and got married with their families' approval have been subjected to physical violence at least once, while the figure for those who are part of arranged marriages rises to 37%, and the percentage for those who met themselves but got married *without* their families' approval is even higher at 49%. We thus find that isolation and lack of family support is a factor which increases a woman's likelihood of experiencing domestic violence.

The number of women who say that they have experienced physical violence decreases as level of education increases. While 43% of illiterate women state that they have been subjected to physical violence at the hands of their spouses at least once, the figure for women who have received higher education (i.e., college, university or other forms of higher education) is just 12%. However, when interpreting these figures, it should be kept in mind that college/university-educated women may be more reticent to speak about the violence they have experienced. In any case, according to this survey, one out of every six college/university-educated men is physically violent towards his spouse.

Another important finding regarding the state of women who have been subjected to violence is their solitude. Half of the women who are physically

abused by their husbands said that they had never before spoken of this violence to anyone. The women belonging to this group may not have shared their experiences of violence with others before because they were ashamed to talk about it, because they blamed themselves, because they wanted to protect their husbands, or because they thought they would not be supported or taken seriously. Regardless of the reason, women who are abused appear to be bereft of individual as well as institutional support. Furthermore, about half of the women appear to be unaware of their rights in marriage: Nearly half of the women in Turkey are unaware of the revised property regime in the Civil Code and 43% are unaware of Law No. 4320 on the Protection of the Family.

Though one third of women have been subjected to physical violence and the majority live lives strictly controlled by their husbands, women who participated in this survey voice a clear demand for women's human rights. Moreover, they expect the state to play an active role in the struggle against domestic violence. Between 60 to 74% of women believe that the state can take certain measures to prevent men's violence towards their spouses, such as educating men, opening women's shelters, providing support to organizations active in this field, giving heavy sentences to offenders, and educating the police; however, most women also suggest that the state is not carrying out these responsibilities. Moreover, 85% of women think that the number of women's shelters in Turkey is insufficient and 87% approve of the use of their tax money for opening women's shelters. In short, this survey shows that the majority of women in Turkey believe that the government, local administrations, state institutions, legislation, and the courts bear significant responsibilities when it comes to carrying out the necessary measures and interventions to prevent domestic violence. 92% of women want the courts to penalize men who practice violence. These findings suggest that women in Turkey today do not consider domestic violence an issue to be resolved "domestically."

The perception that "women in the East are more oppressed"

One opinion that has gained foothold and widespread acceptance in recent years regarding violence against women is the assumption that "women in the East are more oppressed" than women in other parts of Turkey. The "backwards rural area" versus the "modern, developed cities" dichotomy that developed in conjunction with discourses of modernization has increasingly found expression in a new form, as that of a dichotomy of "West versus East," or even "Kurdish versus Turkish," with the difference between them being predominantly situated on a gender – violence axis. Discussions revolving

around the issue of “honor killings” comprise one of the most striking examples of this phenomenon.

Our study shows that there are no substantial differences in women’s views regarding violence and gender equality within the family in Turkey’s Eastern versus its Central/Western regions. The only possibly significant difference in views are those regarding domestic division of labor and working at an income-generating job: In the Central/West sample, 82% of women agreed that “housework should be divided evenly between spouses,” while the figure for the same in the East sample fell to 66%. 32% of women (who do not work outside the home) responded to the question, “If you engaged in income-generating work, would your husband prevent you?” by saying, “Yes, he would,” while the figure for the same in the East sample rose to 52%. In all other categories, percentages for the regions exhibited little variation. Women are also of the same opinion when it comes to the matter of justified beating: In the East sample, the percentage of women who said, “There is no valid justification for beating” is 86%, while the figure for Central/West is 89%.

Likewise, there are no significant differences when it comes to experiences of physical and sexual violence: 39% of women in the Eastern regions stated that they had been subjected to physical violence and 14% to sexual violence; the same figures for the Central/Western regions were 33% and 14% respectively. One difference, which we can interpret as a result of the ethnized armed conflict and of state violence in Eastern Turkey in the 1980s and 1990s, has to do with women’s trust in and expectations of state institutions. In the East, women are relatively reluctant to go to the police or apply to the courts. While 15% of women in the Central/Western regions say they would call the police if their neighbor were being beaten by their spouse, the figure for the same in the East is just 4%. Similarly, while 94% of women in the Central/Western regions say “the courts should penalize men who beat their wives,” in the East this figure is 80%.

Looking at the study findings, the most striking differences between the sample for the East versus that for the Central/Western regions are in the categories of education and income. While 16% of women in Turkey’s Central and Western regions are illiterate, this figure triples for women in the East, rising to 42%. The total percentage of women in the East who have middle school, high school, or higher education combined is only one third of that for the rest of Turkey (East 11%, Central/West 29%). The closest figures are those for women who have completed primary school, and even then figures for the East are much lower (East 35%, Central/West 48%).

We get a similar picture when it comes to the issue of household income: In the East sample, 21% of women stated that their household income was less than 250NTL, and 53% said it was less than 500 NTL; in the Central/West sample, however, the figures are 9% and 32% respectively. While 13% of women in the East sample said their household income was over 1,000 NTL, the figure for the same in the Central/West sample is 26%. According to these figures, the average household income in the East is approximately 30% lower than it is in the Central/Western regions.

Despite this vast disparity between “Eastern” versus “Western” women when it comes to education and income, there does not appear to be significant differences between them either in terms of experiences of violence or their views on the struggle against violence. Those areas in which there *are* differences need to be evaluated taking into consideration the education and income disparity, as well as Turkey’s recent history with political violence.

Policy Implications

Our study clearly shows that the majority of women in Turkey do not think violence is justifiable and that they desire equality in gender relations. It seems that feminist politics, which have focused on the struggle against violence against women since the 1980s, have reached women in Turkey, either directly or indirectly (for example, by effecting changes in the media discourse). Our findings suggest that women’s organizations are not alone in their struggles and that they are no longer “marginal” amongst the country’s women.

The qualitative study that we conducted with women’s organizations involved in the struggle against violence shows that women’s organizations have acquired a significant amount of experience and knowledge in this field over the last 20 years. Beginning with Women’s Solidarity March Against Beating in 1987, women’s organizations have been actively calling for change in women’s approaches to violence, in the public view of violence, and in the words used to describe violence. As solidarity with women who are subjected to violence has increased over time, so too have efforts to provide support become increasingly widespread and comprehensive. Some women’s organization, most prominently KAMER, have begun undertaking very successful initiatives towards empowering women as a means to transform relations of violence in the family. They have shown that by taking a firm stance against all kinds of violence and using effective communication methods, it is possible to create awareness and to put an end to violence. In other words, the feminist perspective at once transforms domestic violence, while also contributing to the transformation of relations of violence at large and

the culture of violence that pervades society. We believe that this remarkable success must be underscored and that steps should be taken to ensure the continuation and expansion of these and similar initiatives. Yet, as our study shows, many independent women's organizations are struggling with their own financial and ideological issues; these organizations, with their enormous potential to effect change, await support.

Looking at the overall picture that emerges from this study, we feel the need to stress the importance and necessity of cooperation between state institutions and women's organizations in the struggle against domestic violence. Indeed, women, who during the 1980s organized in protest actions *against* the state, have in more recent times begun to seek dialogue and cooperation *with* the state. Women's organizations have had a significant impact in achieving many of the steps which have been taken in the struggle against violence, from the drafting and passage of Law No. 4320 to the revisions of the Civil Code and the Penal Code. Passage of the new Penal Code has been a major step towards ensuring that domestic violence is no longer viewed as an acceptable, "ordinary" phenomenon but rather as a "crime." Deterrent sentences against violent offenders will prove that the state in no way approves of such violence. However, it is imperative that this new Penal Code, which was drafted with significant contributions on the part of the women's movement in Turkey, be strictly enforced, so that progress can be achieved in actuality and not just on paper.

Prime Ministry Circular 26218, issued in July 2006, is one of the most positive, concrete examples of interaction and cooperation between women's organizations and state institutions. Of critical importance, the Circular gives voice to a significant portion of women's demands. It not only prescribes various protective and deterrent measures in the struggle against violence against women, assigning duties in this regard to both the Turkish Parliament's General Directorate for the Status of Women and various service institutions, but it also describes in detail further measures to be taken in the fields of education, health, and law to this end. The measures spelled out in this Circular are yet to be enforced. Presently there are no sanctions to encourage their implementation and no funding to ensure implementation. Most of the state institutions lag behind their responsibilities as dictated in the Circular.

The most urgent of the responsibilities of the state is providing protection for women who are subjected to violence. State institutions remain woefully inadequate in this regard. As stressed by both women throughout Turkey as well as the women's organizations we interviewed, the number of wom-

en's shelters needs to be increased, and advantage must be taken of independent women's organizations' experiences in the struggle against violence in furthering the struggle. The 16th Clause of the Services Institution section of the 2006 Prime Ministry Circular states that "budget funds allocated to the Social Services and Child Protection Agency (SHÇEK) must be increased, women's shelters/guesthouses must be improved, both qualitatively and quantitatively, to meet European Standards, the personnel providing services must come to adopt a women's perspective, and the necessary care must be taken to ensure that the aforementioned centers provide their services in accordance with the principle of confidentiality."

Municipalities have been charged with similar obligations. According to the 14th Article (clause a) of Municipality Law No. 5393, all metropolitan municipalities and all municipalities with a population greater than 50,000 are obligated to open "protective shelters for women and children." Yet, no progress has yet been achieved on this front. As of September 2007, there are 19 women's shelters run by SHÇEK, 12 run by the Provincial Governorships and Special Provincial Administrations, and 4 run by the municipalities. Some independent women's organizations have expressed their desire to run shelters in cooperation with the state or municipalities and there has been one important case of cooperation in Istanbul. Recent developments have not been very promising. As of December 2008, the *Purple Roof* staff running their joint shelter with the Governorship of Beyoğlu (in Istanbul) were told that they would no longer be paid by the state. This decision had come after the two-year funding provided of by the World Bank had expired. One of the few "good examples" of state-civil society collaborations in running shelters is now a dead project.

An effective struggle against the burning issue of domestic violence will only be possible if state institutions and governments act decisively, if necessary funding is provided, and if government institutions cooperate with women's organizations that have accumulated experience in this field. Our study shows that progress above and beyond the positive steps taken in the form of legislative changes of recent years and the Prime Ministry Circular of July 2006, is demanded not only by women's organizations, but by the overwhelming majority of women in Turkey today.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN SURVEY

My name is We are conducting a survey for Boğaziçi and Sabancı Universities. Could you please help us by answering a few questions?

SCREENING QUESTIONS

A. Do you live in this house/apartment?

1.	Yes	[]	→ <i>GO TO C</i>	E1
2.	No	[]	→ <i>GO TO B</i>	

B. I have to ask the questions in this questionnaire to a woman living in this house, who is or has been married. Is there such a woman (married, widowed, or divorced) in the house at the moment?

1.	There is	[]	“Can I speak to her?”	E2
2.	There is not	[]	“Thank you.” → END OF SESSION	

C. a. How many of the women in this house are married, divorced, separated but not divorced, or widowed?

_____ persons E3

b. Could you tell us their names, one by one, in order of age, beginning with the oldest?

WRITE THE ANSWERS BELOW, IN THE ORDER IN WHICH THEY ARE TOLD

No. of Prs.	Names of people with the desired characteristics	NUMBER OF HOUSE									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
3		2	3	2	1	3	1	2	1	3	2
4		3	1	2	4	1	3	4	3	2	1
5 and		2	4	5	3	1	5	3	2	1	4

FIND THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN FOR THE HOUSE IN QUESTION; EACH DAY THAT YOU CONDUCT THE SURVEY, THE FIRST HOUSE YOU GO TO WILL BE NUMBER ONE ON THE CHART, THE SECOND HOUSE NUMBER TWO, ETC. IN THE COLUMN FOR THE CURRENT HOUSE, FIND THE ROW THAT INDICATES THE CORRECT NUMBER OF QUALIFYING SUBJECTS IN THAT HOUSE. THE NUMBER IN THE CELL AT THE POINT WHERE THE COLUMN AND ROW INTERSECT WILL INDICATE THE NUMBER OF THE PERSON TO BE INTERVIEWED IN THAT HOUSE. FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU ARE IN YOUR SIXTH HOUSE ON THAT DAY, AND IF IN THAT HOUSE THERE ARE FOUR PEOPLE WITH THE DESIRED CHARACTERISTICS, YOU WILL SEE THAT IN THE CELL WHERE THE 6TH AND 4TH ROW INTERSECT THERE IS THE NUMBER 3. THUS THE 3RD PERSON WILL BE INTERVIEWED.

D. Can I talk to Ms.? _____ (ASK THIS QUESTION AFTER HAVING WRITTEN THE NAME OF THE PERSON CHOSEN ACCORDING TO THE TABLE IN THE PREVIOUS PAGE)

E. What is your marital status?

1.	Married	[]	→ GO TO 1 st QUESTION	E4 If there are two columns in the questions, for divorced and widowed women, read the questions written in the box on the right in this font.
2.	Divorced	[]	→ GO TO 1 st QUESTION	
3.	Spouse has died (widowed)	[]	→ GO TO 1 st QUESTION	
4.	Not divorced, but living separately from spouse	[]	→ GO TO 1 st QUESTION	

THE FOLLOWING PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE SHOULD BE CONDUCTED WITH NO ONE PRESENT IN THE ROOM EXCEPT FOR THE RESPONDENT.

BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE QUESTIONS, I WOULD LIKE TO STATE A FEW POINTS.

THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS. THE MOST VALUABLE ANSWER IS THE ONE THAT TRULY REFLECTS YOUR VIEWS.

YOUR ANSWERS WILL ONLY BE USED TO CALCULATE NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES FOR OUR SURVEY. YOUR ANSWERS TOGETHER WITH YOUR NAME WILL NOT BE SENT ANYWHERE OR TO ANYBODY. THEREFORE, NOBODY WILL KNOW WHAT YOUR ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS WERE.

1. (TICK THE ANSWERS IN THE RELEVANT COLUMN OF THE BELOW TABLE)

a. How many people apart from you are permanent residents in this house?

b. How old are you, your spouse, and your children living with you?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
b. How old are you and your children living in this house with you?

a. Relationship			b. Age					
i.	You		4	Your age: ____	5			
ii.	Spouse	[]	6	Age of spouse : ____	7			
iii.	Daughters	[]	8	Age of daughters: _____	9 10 11 12 13			
iv.	Sons	[]	14	Age of sons: _____	15 16 17 18 19			
v.	Father-in-law	[]	20					
vi.	Mother-in-law	[]	21					
vii.	Brother-in-law	[]	22					
viii.	Wife of husband's brother	[]	23					
ix.	Husband's sister	[]	24					
x.	Nephews	[]	25					
xi.	Mother	[]	26					
xii.	Father	[]	27					
xiii.	Son-in-law	[]	28					
xiv.	Daughter-in-law	[]	29					
xv.	Grandsons/daughters	[]	30					
xvi.	Siblings	[]	31					
xvii.	Other	[]	32	(Specify)				

2.a. How many children have you given birth to? _____ children

33

b. How many are still alive? _____ children

34

3. What was the last school you and your spouse graduated from, and if you/your spouse left any school without graduating, what was the last grade you/your spouse attended?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
3. What was the last school you and your former / late spouse graduated from, and if you/your former or late spouse left any school without graduating, what was the last grade you/your former or late spouse attended?

INDICATE THOSE WHO LEFT SCHOOL BEFORE COMPLETION, CALCULATING THE YEAR.

		Herself	Spouse
		35	36
1.	Illiterate	[]	[]
2.	Literate, but never went to school	[]	[]
3.	Completed 1 st grade	[]	[]
4.	Completed 2 nd grade	[]	[]
5.	Completed 3 rd grade	[]	[]
6.	Completed 4 th grade	[]	[]
7.	Completed 5 th grade (Primary school)	[]	[]
8.	Completed 6 th grade	[]	[]
9.	Completed 7 th grade	[]	[]

		Herself	Spouse
10.	Completed 8 th grade (Middle school)	[]	[]
11.	Completed 9 th grade	[]	[]
12.	Completed 10 th grade	[]	[]
13.	Completed 11 th grade (High school)	[]	[]
14.	Incomplete university studies	[]	[]
15.	2 year long higher education	[]	[]
16.	University / 4 year	[]	[]
17.	Post-graduate	[]	[]
18.	Doctorate	[]	[]

4. Are you married, civilly or religiously to your spouse? If yes which of the two?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
4. Were you married, civilly or religiously To your former / late spouse? If yes, which of the two?

- 1. Civil marriage only [] 37
- 2. Religious marriage only []
- 3. Both civil and religious marriage []
- 4. Not married in either way []

5. Who decided that you would marry your spouse?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
5. Who decided that you would marry your former / late spouse?

- 1. I decided [] 38
- 2. My family decided []
- 3. Other (specify) [] _____
- 99. No answer []

6. Which of the below best describes the way you got married with your spouse?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
6. Which of the below best describes the way you got married with your former / late spouse?

- 1. We met on our own, decided to marry, and our families approved [] 39
- 2. We met on our own, decided to marry, and then married despite our families' disapproval []
- 3. I eloped of my own free will []
- 4. I was abducted against my will..... []
- 5. By arranged marriage []
- 6. In exchange for a female from my husband's family (*Berdel*)..... []
- 7. By arranged marriage agreed upon by my family when I was still an infant (*Beşik ertmesi*)..... []
- 8. Other (Specify) _____ []
- 99. No answer []

7.a. Are you and your spouse relatives?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
7.a. Were you and your former / late spouse relatives?

- 1. Yes [] 40
- 2. No []

b. (TO BE ANSWERED IF THE ANSWER TO 7.a IS "YES")

How is your spouse related to you?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
How was your spouse related to you?

_____ 41

8.a. How long have you been married to your spouse?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
8.a. How long were you married to your former / late spouse?

_____ years 42

b. Is this your first marriage?

- 1. Yes, first [] 43
- 2. No, not first []

c. (TO BE ANSWERED IF THE ANSWER TO 8.b IS “NO”)
How many times have you been married? _____ 44

9. Where were you born? Could you tell me the place where you were born, specifying province, district, and village?

Village	County	Province

45

10. Which language or languages do you know? 46-47

11. Which language or languages do/did you speak with your mother? 48-49

12. Which language or languages do/did you speak with your father? 50-51

13. Which language or languages do you speak at home with your spouse?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
13. Which language or languages did you speak at home with your former / late spouse?

14.a. At present, do you have an income-generating job? 1. Yes [] 52
 2. No []

b. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 14.a IS “YES”) 1. At home [] 53
Do you work at home or outside your home? 2. Outside []

c. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 14.a IS “YES”) 54

What kind of work are you doing at the moment?	What kind of place do you work in?	What is your duty and position there?	How many people are employed there?
_____	_____	_____	_____

d. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 14.a IS “YES”) 1. Yes [] 55
Do you have a second job? 2. No []

e. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 14.d IS “YES”)

56

What is your second job? _____	What kind of place do you work in? _____	What is your duty and position there? _____	How many people are employed there? _____
-----------------------------------	---	--	--

f. (TO BE ASKED TO EVERYBODY)

Do you work in your orchard or vegetable garden, or do you raise animals?

1. Yes	[]	57
2. No	[]	

g. (TO BE ASKED TO EVERYBODY)

Do you have a pension income; your own or from one of your parents?

1. Yes	[]	58
2. No	[]	

15. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 14.a IS “NO”)

If you wanted to engage in income-generating work, would your spouse prevent you?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
If you had wanted to engage in income-generating work when you were together, would your spouse have prevented you?

- | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|-----|----|
| 1. Yes, he would | he would have | [] | 59 |
| 2. No, he would not | he would not have | [] | |
| 98. I do not know | | [] | |

16.a. **Your spouse** **Your former / late spouse**

60

What is his job? What was it? _____	What kind of place does he work in? What kind of place did he work in? _____	What is his duty and position there? What was his duty and position there? _____	How many people are employed there? How many people were employed there? _____
---	--	--	--

b. (IF ANSWER TO 16.a INDICATES THAT HE WORKS)

Does your spouse have a second job? **Did your spouse have a second job?**

- | | | |
|--------|-----|----|
| 1. Yes | [] | 61 |
| 2. No | [] | |

c. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 16.b IS “YES”)

Your spouse’s second job

62

What is it? What was it? _____	What kind of place does he work in? What kind of place did he work in? _____	What is his duty and position there? What was his duty and position there? _____	How many people are employed there? How many people were employed there? _____
--------------------------------------	--	--	--

**NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT
THE RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN THE FAMILY.**

19. In many families, getting permission can be an important issue. Do you ^{did you} ask your husband for permission before doing the following things? What I mean here is not “informing”, but actually “getting permission”. Please answer with “always,” “sometimes,” or “never.”

	I always do I always did	I sometimes do I sometimes did	I never do I never did	I do not go I did not go	
	1	2	3	4	
a. Visiting a neighbour / friend during the day	[]	[]	[]	[]	65
b. Visiting my family	[]	[]	[]	[]	66
c. Going shopping	[]	[]	[]	[]	67
d. Going to the cinema / theatre	[]	[]	[]	[]	68
e. Going out of town	[]	[]	[]	[]	69

20. In every household there can be different ideas concerning the family. I would like to ask you your views on this issue. Could you tell me whether or not you agree with the following statements?

	I agree	I do not agree	No opinion	
	1	2	3	
a. Housework should be divided equally between the spouses.	[]	[]	[]	70
b. Women should be able to work outside the home at the job of their choice.	[]	[]	[]	71
c. Women should be able to spend their money according to their wishes.	[]	[]	[]	72
d. Girls should be sent to school for at least eight years.	[]	[]	[]	73

21.a. There are different opinions concerning violence and beating in the family. According to some, under no circumstances should husbands and wives act violently toward one another; in other words, according to such people, there is never a valid justification for beating. Others, however, think that in some circumstances, men can beat their wives. What are your thoughts on this matter?

1. There is no valid justification for beating. [] 74
2. In some circumstances, men can beat their wives. []

**b. (TO BE ANSWERED IF THE ANSWER TO 21.a IS THE SECOND OPTION)
In which circumstances? (THERE CAN BE MORE THAN ONE ANSWER)**

75-76

IN TURKEY, DOMESTIC BEATING IS A COMMON OCCURRENCE. WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCES AND VIEWS ON THIS MATTER.

- 22. Did your father beat you when you were a child or young woman?**
- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. Yes | [] | 77 |
| 2. No | [] | |
| 3. I do not remember | [] | |
| 4. My father did not live with us / My father was not alive | [] | |
- 23. Did your mother beat you when you were a child or young woman?**
- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. Yes | [] | 78 |
| 2. No | [] | |
| 3. I do not remember | [] | |
| 4. My mother did not live with us / My mother was not alive | [] | |
- 24. a. (TO BE ASKED IF SHE HAS A CHILD)**
Do you ever beat your children; if they are adults now, did you beat them when they were children?
- | | | |
|--------|-----|----|
| 1. Yes | [] | 79 |
| 2. No | [] | |
- b. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 24.a IS "YES")**
How often?
- | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|----|
| 1. It happened only once | [] | 80 |
| 2. It happened a few times | [] | |
| 3. It happens occasionally | [] | |
| 4. It happens frequently | [] | |
- 25. a. (TO BE ASKED IF SHE HAS A CHILD)**
Does ~~Did~~ your husband beat the children, if they are adults, did he beat them when they were children?
- | | | |
|--------|-----|----|
| 1. Yes | [] | 81 |
| 2. No | [] | |
- b. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 25.a IS "YES")**
How often?
- | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|----|
| 1. It happened only once | [] | 82 |
| 2. It happened a few times | [] | |
| 3. It happens occasionally | [] | |
| 4. It happens frequently | [] | |
- 26. Was your husband beaten by his mother or father?**
- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Yes, he was | [] | 83 |
| 2. No, he was not | [] | |
| 98. I do not know | [] | |
| 3. He did not live with his mother or father / His father died when he was very young, so he does not remember | [] | |

27. To your knowledge, was/is your mother-in-law beaten by her husband?

1. Yes, she was/is [] 84

2. No, she was/is not []

98. I do not know []

3. I never had a mother-in-law []

28. Does/Did your father beat your mother?

1. Yes [] 85

2. No []

98. I do not know []

3. My father did not live with us / My father died when I was very young, so I do not remember []

4. My mother did not live with us / My mother died when I was very young, so I do not remember []

29.a. How many women do you know who are have been beaten by their husbands? _____ 86

b. (TO BE ASKED IF NO NUMBER HAS BEEN STATED IN 29.a)
Can you state an approximate number? _____ 87

30. How often do you experience the following? Please use this card (GIVE THE FREQUENCY RECORDING CARD) to select the answer that most accurately describes your experience

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)

30. How often did you experience the following with your former / late husband? Please use this card (GIVE THE FREQUENCY RECORDING CARD) to select the answer that most accurately describes your experience

32.a. Does your spouse ever slap, shove, or beat you?
 If yes, how often? **Please use this card (GIVE THE FREQUENCY RECORDING CARD) to select the answer that most accurately describes your experience**

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
 32.a. Did your husband ever slap you, shove, or beat you? If yes how often?
Please use this card (GIVE THE FREQUENCY RECORDING CARD) to select the answer that most accurately describes your experience

has never happened	happened only once	has happened a few times	happens occasionally	happens frequently	It used to happen, but not anymore	No answer
1	2	3	4	5	6	99
[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

105

b. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 32.a IS NOT “IT NEVER HAPPENED”)
When was it the last time that your husband treated you in this way?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
THIS QUESTION NOT TO BE ASKED

106

c. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 32.a IS NOT “IT NEVER HAPPENED”)
Have you ever told anyone about the way your husband treats you?

- 1. Yes []
- 2. No []

107

d. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 32.c IS “YES”)
Who did you tell?

(THERE CAN BE MORE THAN ONE ANSWER)

- 1. My mother []
- 2. My father []
- 3. My sister(s) []
- 4. My brother(s) []
- 5. My neighbors / friends []
- 6. My children []
- 7. The *muhtar* (village head) []
- 8. The police []
- 9. The gendarme []
- 10. A lawyer or prosecutor []
- 11. A doctor []
- 12. A religious figure []
- 13. Other (Specify) []

108

33.a. **During your marriage, have you ever thought of leaving your spouse?**

(IF DIVORCED) **THIS QUESTION NOT TO BE ASKED**
 (IF WIDOWED) **Did you ever think of leaving your spouse when he was alive?**

- 1. Yes, I have/did []
- 2. No, I have not/did not []

109

b. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 33.a. IS “YES”)

Why have you thought about leaving him? What were your reasons?

(IF DIVORCED)
b. What was your main reason for divorcing him?

(IF WIDOWED)
b. Why did you think about leaving him? What were your reasons?

110-111

34.a. Does your husband drink so much that it disrupts daily life and upsets your family life?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
34.a. Did your former / late husband drink so much as that it disrupted daily life and upset your family life?

1. Yes []
2. No []

112

b. Does your husband gamble so much that it disrupts daily life and upsets your family life?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
b. Did your former / late husband gamble so much that it disrupted daily life and upset your family life?

1. Yes []
2. No []

113

**35.a. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 8.b ON THE 4TH PAGE IS “NO,” OR IN OTHER WORDS, IF THIS IS NOT THE WOMAN’S FIRST MARRIAGE)
Did your husband from your previous marriage slap you, shove you, or beat you?**

1. Yes []
2. No []

114

b. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 35.a IS “YES”)

Was this one of the main reasons for you getting separated, divorced?

1. Yes [] 115
2. No []

36. Do you think courts should penalize men for beating their wives?

1. Yes [] 116
2. No []

37. Within the past few years, a new law has passed: The Law for the Protection of the Family. According to this law, if one spouse acts violently towards the other or towards the children, the judge can keep the abusive spouse away from the home by issuing a “restraining order” to protect the abused spouse and children.

- a. Had you heard of this law?**
- | | | |
|--------|-----|-----|
| 1. Yes | [] | 117 |
| 2. No | [] | |

**b. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 37.a IS “YES”)
Have you, or have any women you know, benefitted from this law?**

- | | | |
|--------|-----|-----|
| 1. Yes | [] | 118 |
| 2. No | [] | |

**c. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 37.b IS “YES”)
Who benefitted from it? (THERE CAN BE MORE THAN ONE ANSWER)**

- | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|
| 1. I did . | [] | 119 |
| 2. A friend of mine did. | [] | 120 |
| 3. A neighbor did. | [] | 121 |
| 4. A relative of mine did. | [] | 122 |
| 5. Other (Specify) | [] | 123 |

38. If your husband were to beat you today, what would you do, how would you react?

(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)
38. If your husband were to beat you, what would you have done, how would you have reacted?

124-125

39. If you were to hear that your neighbour was being beaten by her spouse, what would you do?
 (IF YOU RECEIVE A GENERAL AND UNCLEAR ANSWER SUCH AS “I WOULD SUPPORT HER,” ASK HER FOR DETAILS BY ASKING “HOW?”)

126-127

40. Domestic violence generally consists of men acting violently towards women, of men beating women. Why do you think men act violently towards or beat their wives?
 (IF YOU RECEIVE AN ANSWER SUCH AS “BECAUSE OF GUILT,” ASK HER FOR DETAILS BY ASKING “WHO IS GUILTY?” OR “GUILTY IN WHICH WAY?”)

128-129

41. What do you think could be done to stop men from acting violently towards their spouses?

130-131

42. Do you think that the state can prevent the violence of men towards women by doing the following?

	It can	It might or might not	It cannot	No opinion	
	1	2	3	4	
a. Giving heavy sentences	[]	[]	[]	[]	132
b. Educating the police on this matter	[]	[]	[]	[]	133
c. By supporting associations and societies active in this field	[]	[]	[]	[]	134
d. By establishing shelters	[]	[]	[]	[]	135
e. By educating men	[]	[]	[]	[]	136

43.a. Do you think that the state should support women on this matter?

- 1. Yes [] 137
- 2. No []
- 3. No opinion []

b. (TO BE ASKED IF THE ANSWER TO 43.a IS “YES”)

How can the state support women?

138

44. The places where the women take refuge as a last resort are called “shelters” or “women’s shelters.” At the moment, there is a total of 35 shelters in Turkey.

- a. Do you think this number is sufficient?**
- 1. Yes, it is [] 139
 - 2. No, it is not []
 - 3. No opinion []

b. Do you approve of the your taxes being spent to establish shelters?

- 1. I definitely do [] 140
- 2. I do []
- 3. I can’t say that I do or not []
- 4. I do not []
- 5. Definitely not []
- 6. No opinion []

45. Do the following carry out their responsibilities concerning the prevention of violence towards women?

	Yes, they do	A little, but not enough	No, they do not	No opinion	
	1	2	3	4	
a. Police	[]	[]	[]	[]	141
b. Gendarmes	[]	[]	[]	[]	142
c. Courts	[]	[]	[]	[]	143
d. Bar associations	[]	[]	[]	[]	144
e. Municipalities.....	[]	[]	[]	[]	145
f. Parliament.....	[]	[]	[]	[]	146
g. Women's organizations	[]	[]	[]	[]	147

FINALLY, WE HAVE SOME GENERAL QUESTIONS THAT WE ASK EVERYBODY.

46. I am not going to ask you your exact income, but I would like to learn in which of the following income brackets you are to be included. Including all income such as wages, salaries, rents, interest, profit, income from fields, pensions, which of the following brackets describes your household's total monthly net income? Of course, by this we mean the combined income of everybody in this house.

148

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Less than 250 NTL [] | 5. 2500 or more [] |
| 2. 250 – 499 [] | 6. No income [] |
| 3. 500 – 999 [] | 98. I do not know [] |
| 4. 1000 – 2499 [] | 99. No answer [] |

<p>ATTENTION!</p> <p>Pension income may be received once every three months.</p> <p>Agricultural income may be expressed on a yearly basis.</p> <p>Please specify.</p>

47.a. Do you or your husband own real estate such as a house, land, a field, or an orchard?

<p>(IF DIVORCED / WIDOWED)</p> <p>47a. Do you, or did your former / late husband own real estate, such as a house, land, a field, or an orchard?</p>

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 1. Yes [] | |
| 2. No [] | |

149

49. As in every country in the world, in our country too various different ethnic groups exist. People can describe themselves as having different ethnic identities. Which of the following identities shown on this card would you say primarily describes you? (GIVE HER THE CARD WITH THE LIST OF IDENTITIES)?

- | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|-----|
| 1. Arab | [] | 10. Greek..... | [] | 158 |
| 2. Albanian..... | [] | 11. Syriac/Assirian | [] | |
| 3. Azeri | [] | 12. Turkish | [] | |
| 4. Bosnian | [] | 13. Jewish | [] | |
| 5. Circassian..... | [] | 14. Other | [] | |
| 6. Armenian..... | [] | (Specify) | | |
| 7. Kurdish-Zaza... | [] | | | |
| 8. Laz | [] | 99. No answer | [] | |
| 9. Roma/Gypsy | [] | | | |

50. Is there anything you would like to add?

159-160

=====

NAME AND SURNAME OF RESPONDENT : _____

ADDRESS Neighborhood : _____ Avenue : _____ Street : _____

(In case it is an apartment building or housing estate) Name : _____

No. of building : ____ No. of block : ____ No. of apartment : ____

Neighborhood: _____ County: _____ Province : _____

PHONE NUMBER : ____ - _____

“THANK YOU”

=====

INTERVIEWER : _____ 161 DATE OF INTERVIEW : __/__/2007

Comments About the Interview:

Observations concerning the respondent and the environment in which the interview took place:

Was the respondent relaxed? Did you experience any problems getting to interview her alone?

Did the respondent sound sincere? Did she comment on the questionnaire?

PHONE FOLLOW-UP					
Person answering	Situation				Result
	[] Interview took place. All follow-up questions answered accurately.				NO PROBLEM
Talked to the	[] Interview took place. There were problems regarding follow-up questions. <i>Problems:</i>				THERE ARE PROBLEMS
Respondent	[] Interview did not take place.				INTERVIEW DID NOT TAKE PLACE
	[] Someone else was interviewed, but the planned respondent's name was written. <i>Person interviewed:</i> _____				SOMEONE ELSE WAS INTERVIEWED
Talked to someone else	[] The respondent lives at that number, and the person answering was aware of the survey.				
	[] The respondent lives at that number, and the person answering confirmed the personal data of the respondent.				
	[] The respondent lives at that number, but the person answering was not aware of the survey.				
Not able to reach respondent by phone	[] The phone is of the village muhtar (head)/neighbour/grocer or other acquaintance, respondent cannot be reached.				
	[] There is no such person at that phone number.				INTERVIEW DID NOT TAKE PLACE
Phone call not answered	[] Tel./No. out of order	Number of call:	()1.	()2.	()3.
	[] No answer	Number of call:	()1.	()2.	()3.
	[] The recorded phone number does not exist				
PERSON WHO MADE FOLLOW-UP PHONE CALLS (EXCEPT FOR UNANSWERED CALLS): _____			DATE OF FOLLOW-UP: ___ / ___ / 2007		

Bibliography

Acar, Feride. 1993 [1990]. Türkiye'de İslamcı Hareket ve Kadın. In *1980'ler Türkiye'sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, ed. Şirin Tekeli, 79-100. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Acar-Savran, Gülnur. 2004. *Beden Emek Tarih: Diyalektik Bir Feminizm İçin*. Istanbul: Kanat.

Acuner, Selma. 2002. 90'lı Yıllar ve Resmi Düzeyde Kurumsallaşmanın Doğuş Aşamaları. In *90'larda Türkiye'de Feminizm*, eds. Aksu Bora and Asena Günel, 125-158. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Aile İçi Şiddetin Sebep ve Sonuçları. 1995. T.C. Başbakanlık Aile Araştırma Kurumu. Ankara: Bizim Büro.

Akkoç, Nebahat. 2002. Diyarbakır KA-MER'in Kuruluş Hikayesi ve Yürüttüğü Çalışmalar. In *90'larda Türkiye'de Feminizm*, eds. Aksu Bora and Asena Günel, 205-216. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Altınay, Ayşe Gül. 2000. *Vatan, Millet, Kadınlar*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Altınay, Ayşe Gül. 2002. Bedenimiz ve Biz: Bekâret ve Cinselliğin Siyaseti. In *90'larda Türkiye'de Feminizm*, eds. Aksu Bora and Asena Günel, 323-343. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Altınay, Ayşe Gül. 2004. *The Myth of the Military-Nation: Militarism, Gender and Education in Turkey*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Amado, Liz Ercevik. 2005. *The Human Rights Education Program for Women: Utilizing state resources to promote women's human rights in Turkey*. Minnesota: The Center for Victims of Torture.

Amargi. 2005. *Kadına Yönelik Şiddet*, eds. Gülden Bağa and Ayşe Kısımet. Istanbul: Amargi Kadın Akademisi.

Anderson, Kristin L. 1997. Gender, Status and Domestic Violence: An Integration of Feminist and Family Violence Approaches. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59(3):655-669.

Anıl, Ela, Canan Arın, Ayşe Berktaş Hacımiraçoğlu, Mehveş Bingöllü, Pınar İlkaracan and Liz Erçevik Amado. 2005. *Turkish Civil and Penal Code Reforms from a Gender Perspective: The Success of two Nationwide Campaigns*. Istanbul: Women for Women's Human Rights-New Ways.

Arat Yeşim. 1993 [1990]. Feminizm ve İslam: *Kadın ve Aile Dergisinin Düşündürdükleri*. In *1980'ler Türkiye'sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, ed. Şirin Tekeli, 101-114. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Arat, Yeşim. 1994. Toward a Democratic Society: Women's Movement in Turkey in the 1980s. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 17(2/3): 241-248.

Arat, Yeşim. 1997. The Project of Modernity and Women in Turkey. In *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*, eds. Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba, 95-112. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Arat, Yeşim. 1999. Purple Roof Women's Shelter Foundation: Democratic Aspirations and Local Constraints. In *Deconstructing Images of "The Turkish Woman"*, ed. Zehra Arat, 295-309. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Arat, Yeşim. 1999. Democracy and Women in Defense of Liberalism. *Social Politics*, 6(3): 370-387.

Arat, Yeşim. 2001a. Women's Rights as Human Rights: The Turkish Case. *Human Rights Review*, 3(1):27-34.

Arat, Yeşim. 2001b. Group Differentiated Rights and the Liberal Democratic State: Rethinking the Headscarf Controversy in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 25: 31-46.

Arat, Yeşim. 2005. *Rethinking Islam and Liberal Democracy: Islamist Women in Turkish Politics*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Arat, Yeşim. 2008. Contestation and Collaboration: Women's Struggles for Empowerment in Turkey. In *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Vol IV: Turkey in the modern world*, ed. Resat Kasaba, 388-418. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arat, Zehra Kabasakal. 2006. Feminist Proje Girişimleri: Genel Sorunlar ve Türkiye için Değerlendirmeler. *Amargi*, Winter (3): 30-31.

Arın, M. Canan, 1998. Kadına Yönelik Şiddet. In *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler*, ed. Ayşe Berktaş Hacımiraçoğlu, 201-210. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Aytaç, Şule, 2005. Türkiye’de Feminist Hareketin Oluşumu. In *Özgürlüğü Ararken: Kadın Hareketinde Mücadele Deneyimleri*, eds. Berivan Kum, Fatma Gülçiçek, Pınar Selek and Yeşim Başaran, 37-58. İstanbul: Amargi.

Belge, Ceren. 2006. Kadına Yönelik Şiddetin Cezalandırılmasında Kültürel Değerlerin ve Yöresel Geleneklerin Ağırlığı: Şanlıurfa 2. Ağır Ceza Mahkemesi’nin Kararları Üzerine bir İnceleme. *Şanlıurfa Barosu Dergisi*, 13: 39-54.

Berktaş, Fatmagül. 2003. *Tarihin Cinsiyeti*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Berktaş, Fatmagül, ed. 2004. *Türkiye’de ve Avrupa Birliği’nde Kadının Konumu: Kazanımlar, Sorunlar, Umutlar*. İstanbul: KADER Yayınları.

Bora, Aksu. 2002. Bir Yapabilirlik Olarak Ka-Der. In *90’larda Türkiye’de Feminizm*, eds. Aksu Bora and Asena Günel, 109-124. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bora, Aksu. 2005. *Kadınların Sınıfı: Ücretli Ev Emeği ve Kadın Öznelliğinin İnşası*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bora, Aksu and İlknur Üstün. 2005. *Sıcak Aile Ortamı, Demokratikleşme Sürecinde Kadın ve Erkekler*. İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları.

Bozkurt, Emine. 2005. On the role of women in Turkey in social, economic and political Activities, (2004/2215(INI)), European Parliament, Women’s Rights and Gender Equality Committee, unpublished report.

Brush, Lisa D. 1990. Violent Acts and Injurious Outcomes in Married Couples: Methodological Issues in the National Survey of Families and Households. *Gender and Society*, 4(1):56-67.

CEDAW Shadow Report on the 4th and 5th Combined Periodic Country Report for Turkey. 2005. *Flying News* 3, January: 52-67.

Coomaraswamy, Radhika. 2000. Combating Domestic Violence: Obligations of the State. In *Domestic Violence Against Women and Girls* (Innocenti Digest 6), 10-11. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Center.

Crowell, Nancy A. and Ann W. Burgess, eds. 1996. *Understanding Violence Against Women*. Panel on Research on Violence Against Women, Committee on Law and Justice, National Research Council. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.

Çağlayan, Handan. 2007. *Analar, Yoldaşlar, Tanrıçalar: Kürt Hareketinde Kadınlar ve Kadın Kimliğinin Oluşumu*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Çakır, Ruşen. 2000. *Direnış ve İtaat: İki İktidar Arasında Kadın*. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Çakır, Serpil. 1994. *Osmanlı Kadın Hareketi*. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Çakır, Serpil and Necla Akgökçe, eds. 1995. *Farklı Feminizmler Açısından: Kadın Araştırmalarında Yöntem*. Istanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.

Çakır, Serpil and Hülya Gülbahar. 2000. Türkiye'de Kadın Hareketinin Yüz Yılı Kronolojisi, in *2000 Ajandası*. Istanbul: Kadın Eserleri Kütüphanesi ve Bilgi Merkezi Vakfı.

Dayağa Karşı Dayanışma Kampanyası. 1988. *Bağır! Herkes Duysun*, eds. Banu Paker, Canan Arın, Gülnur Savran, Nesrin Tura, Pervin Ulusoy, Sedef Öztürk, Selma Altun and Şahika Yüksel. Istanbul: Kadın Çevresi Yayınları.

Demirdirek, Aynur. 1993. *Osmanlı Kadınlarının Hayat Hakkı Arayışlarının Bir Hikayesi*. Ankara: İmge Yayınları.

DİKASUM. 2007. *2006 Yılı Faaliyet Raporu*. Unpublished report. Diyarbakır: Diyarbakır Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kadın Sorunları Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi (DİKASUM).

Dobash, R. Emerson and Russell Dobash. 1979. *Violence Against Women*. New York: Free Press.

Ecevit, Yıldız. 1993 [1990]. Kentsel Üretim Sürecinde Kadın Emeginin Konumu ve Değişen Biçimleri. In *1980'ler Türkiye'sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, ed. Şirin Tekeli, 117-128. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Ellsberg, Mary, Lori Heise, Rodolfo Pena, Sonia Agurto and Anna Winkvist. 2001. Researching Domestic Violence Against Women: Methodological and Ethical Considerations. *Studies in Family Planning*, 32(1):1-16.

EPİDEM. 2006. *Epidem: Yenişehir Belediyesi Kadın Eğitim ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık Merkezi 3 Yıllık Değerlendirme Raporu*. Diyarbakır: EPİDEM.

Eriksson, Maria and Keith Pringle. 2005. Introduction: Nordic Issues and Dilemmas. In *Tackling Men's Violences in Families: Nordic Issues and Dilemmas*, eds. Maria Eriksson, Marianne Hester, Suvi Keskinen and Keith Pringle, 1-12. Bristol: Policy Press.

Ertürk, Yakın. 2006. Turkey's Modern Paradoxes: Identity Politics, Women's Agency and Universal Rights. In *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights*, eds. Myra Marz Ferre and Aili Mari Tripp, 79-109. New York: New York University Press.

Ertürk, Yakın. 2007. Intersection between culture and violence against women, A/HRC/4/34Add.2, Human Rights Council Report of the Rapporteur on Violence Against Women, Its Causes and Consequences, Mission to Turkey, May.

Esmer, Yılmaz. 1993. Algılama ve Anlatımda Eşlerarası Farklılıklar. In *Kadın ve Cinsellik*, ed. Necla Arat, 97-119. Istanbul: Say Yayınları.

Gambetti, Zeynep. 2005. The conflictural (trans) formation of the public sphere in urban space: The case of Diyarbakır. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, Spring: 43-71.

Garcia-Moreno, Claudia, Henrica A.F.M. Jansen, Mary Ellsberg, Lori Heise, and Charlotte H. Watts. 2005. *Who Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Garcia-Moreno, Claudia, Henrica A.F.M. Jansen, Mary Ellsberg, Lori Heise and Charlotte H. Watts. 2006. Prevalence of intimate partner violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *Lancet*, 368:1260-1269.

Gelles, Richard J. 1980. Violence in the Family: A Review of Research in the 70s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42(4):873-885.

Gelles, Richard J. and Jon R. Conte. 1990. Domestic Violence and Sexual Abuse of Children: A Review of Research in the Eighties. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52(4):1045-1058.

Göle, Nilüfer. 1993. *Modern Mahrem: Medeniyet ve Örtünme*. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Gülçür, Leyla. 1996. Ankara Araştırması. In *Sıcak Yuva Masalı: Aile İçi Şiddet ve Cinsel Taciz*, eds. Pınar İlkaracan, Leyla Gülçür and Canan Arın, 40-55. Istanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Güneş-Ayata, Ayşe. 1993 [1990]. Türkiye'de Kadının Siyasete Katılımı. In *1980'ler Türkiye'sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, ed. Şirin Tekeli, 293-312. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Halis, Müjgân. 2001. *Batman'da Kadınlar Ölüyor*. Metis Yayınları, Istanbul, (2001).

Hearn, Jeff and Keith Pringle, eds. 2006. *European Perspectives on Men and Masculinities: National and Transnational Approaches*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Heise, Lori and Claudia Garcia-Moreno. 2002. Violence by Intimate Partners. In *World Report on Violence and Health*, eds. Etienne G. Krug, Linda L. Dahlberg, James A. Mercy, Anthony B. Zwi and Rafael Lozano, 87-121. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Işık, S. Nazik. 2002. 1990'larda Kadına Yönelik Aile İçi Şiddetle Mücadele Hareketi İçinde Oluşmuş Bazı Gözlem ve Düşünceler. In *1990'larda Türkiye'de Feminizm*, eds. Aksu Bora and Asena Günel, 41-72. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

İlkkaracan, Pınar. 2001. Türkiye büyük erkek meclisine yolculuk. *Pazartesi*, 4 April.

Johnson, Holly. 1998. Rethinking Survey Research on Violence Against Women. In *Rethinking Violence Against Women*, eds. R.E. Dobash and R.P. Dobash, 23-51. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Johnson, Michael P. and Kathleen J. Ferraro. 2000. Research on Domestic Violence in the 1990s: Making Distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4):948-963.

İlkkaracan, Pınar. 1998. Doğu Anadolu'da Kadın ve Aile. In *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler*, ed. Ayşe Berktaş Hacımırzaoğlu, 173-192. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

İlkkaracan, Pınar and Leyla Gülçür, 1996. Aile İçinde Kadına Karşı Şiddet. In *Sıcak Yuva Masalı: Aile İçi Şiddet ve Cinsel Taciz*, eds. Pınar İlkkaracan, Leyla Gülçür and Canan Arın, 21-39. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

İlkkaracan, Pınar, Leyla Gülçür and Canan Arın, eds. 1996. *Sıcak Yuva Masalı: Aile İçi Şiddet ve Cinsel Taciz*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Kadın Dayanışma Vakfı. 2005. *Aile İçinde Kadına Yönelik Şiddet El Kitabı*. Ankara: Kadın Dayanışma Vakfı.

Kalaycıoğlu, Ersin and Binnaz Toprak. 2004. *İş Yaşamı, Üst Yönetim ve Siyasette Kadın*. İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları.

KA-MER. 2004. *Alışmayacağız: "Namus" Adına İşlenen Cinayetler 2003 Raporu/We will not get used to! Killings in the Name of 'Honour' 2003 Report*. Diyarbakır: KA-MER Vakfı Yayınları.

KA-MER. 2005. *"Keşke" Dememek İçin: "Namus" Adına İşlenen Cinayetler 2004 Raporu/No More "if only's": Killings in the Name of 'Honour' 2004 Report*. Diyarbakır: KA-MER Vakfı Yayınları.

KA-MER. 2006. *Suçlu Kim?: "Güneydoğu ve Doğu Anadolu Bölgelerinde 'Namus' Kisvesi Altında İşlenen Cinayetler ile Mücadelede Kalıcı Yöntemler Geliştirme Projesi / "Who is to Blame?": "Project for the Development of Permanent Methods in the Struggle Against Killings Committed Under the*

Guise of 'Honor' in the Southeast and East Anatolia Regions" 2005 report.
Diyarbakır: KA-MER Vakfı Yayınları.

KAMER. 2007a. *İstersek Biter: "Namus" Adına İşlenen Cinayetler 2006 Raporu/We can stop this: Killings in the Name of 'Honor' 2006 Repor).*
Diyarbakır: KAMER Vakfı Yayınları.

KAMER. 2007b. *ben varım.* Diyarbakır: KAMER Vakfı Yayınları.

KAMER. 2007c. *Farkederek Çoğalmak: KAMER'in Şiddet İçin Çalışma Yöntemleri.* Diyarbakır: KAMER Vakfı Yayınları.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. 1996. *Cariyeler, Bacılar, Yurttaşlar: Kimlikler ve Toplumsal Dönüşümler.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Kardam, Filiz. 2005. *Türkiye'de Namus Cinayetlerinin Dinamikleri: Eylem Programı için Öneriler Sonuç Raporu.* Birleşmiş Milletler Nüfus Fonu, Nüfus Bilim Derneği, Birleşmiş Milletler Kalkınma Programı. Ankara: Koza Yayınları.

Kardam, Nüket. 2003. *Kadının İnsan Hakları Eğitimi Programı 1995-2003: Değerlendirme Raporu.* İstanbul: Kadının İnsan Hakları – Yeni Çözümler Vakfı.

Kayır, Gülser Öztunalı. 1996. Kadınlar ve Psikolojik Şiddet. In *Evdeki Terör: Kadına Yönelik Şiddet*, 53-65. İstanbul: Mor Çatı Yayınları.

Kelly, Liz and Jill Radford. 1996. 'Nothing really happened': the invalidation of women's experiences of sexual violence. In *Women, Violence and Male Power*, eds. Marianne Hester, Liz Kelly and Jill Radford, 19-33. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Kelly, Liz. 2005. Inside Outsiders: Mainstreaming Violence Against Women Into Human Rights Discourse and Practice. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 7(4): 471-495.

Kerestecioğlu, İnci. 2004. Türkiye'de Kadının Toplumsal Konumu: Kazanımlar ve Sorunlar. In *Türkiye'de ve Avrupa Birliği'nde Kadının Konumu: Kazanımlar, Sorunlar, Umutlar*, ed. Fatmagül Bertay, 35-54. İstanbul: KADER Yayınları.

Keskin, Eren and Leman Yurtsever, eds. 2006. *Hepsi Gerçek: Devlet Kaynaklı Cinsel Şiddet*. Istanbul: Punto.

Kırk Örük. 2007. *Dünya Bankası Küçük Hibeler Programı Final Raporu*. Ankara: Kırk Örük Kadına Yönelik Şiddetle Mücadele Kooperatifi, unpublished report.

Koçali, Filiz. 2003. "TÜBAKKOM: Eşitlik Mücadelesine Devam." *bianet.org*, 19 March. (<http://www.bianet.org/2003/03/20/17420.htm>)

Koçali, Filiz. 2007. Mor İğnenin İzi Silinmez. *Amargi*, Spring(4):8-9.

Koğacıoğlu, Dicle. 2007. Gelenek Söylemleri ve İktidarın Doğallaşması. *Feminist Yaklaşımlar*, June, no. 3. www.feministyaklasimlar.org.

Kum, Berivan, Fatma Gülçiçek, Pınar Selek and Yeşim Başaran, eds. 2005. *Özgürlüğü Ararken: Kadın Hareketinde Mücadele Deneyimleri*. Istanbul: Amargi.

Kurz, Demie. 1989. Social Science Perspectives on Wife Abuse: Current Debates and Future Directions. *Gender and Society*, 3(4):489-505.

Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs. 1995. Gizli işçiler: Kadınlar ve bir alan araştırması. In *Farklı Feminizmler Açısından: Kadın Araştırmalarında Yöntem*, eds. Serpil Çakır and Necla Akgökçe, 230-238. Istanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.

Lundgren, Eva, Gun Heimer, Jenny Westerstrand, and Anne-Marie Kalliokoski. 2002. *Captured Queen*. Stockholm: Fritzes Offentliga Publikationer.

Merry, Sally Engle. 2006. *Human Rights & Gender Violence: Translating International Law into Local Justice*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Mirzaoğlu, Ayşe Berktaş, ed. 1998. *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler/Bilanço 98*. Istanbul: İş Bankası ve Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Mojab, Shahrzad and Nahla Abdo. 2006. *Namus Adına Şiddet: Kuramsal ve Siyasal Yaklaşımlar*. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

- Mor Çatı Kadın Sığınağı Vakfı. 1996. *Evdeki Terör: Kadına Yönelik Şiddet*. İstanbul: Mor Çatı Yayınları.
- Mor Çatı Kadın Sığınağı Vakfı. 1998. *Geleceğim Elimde*. İstanbul: Mor Çatı Yayınları.
- Mor Çatı Kadın Sığınağı Vakfı. 2000. *Kadın Sığınakları I. ve II. Kurultayları*. İstanbul: Mor Çatı Yayınları.
- Mor Çatı Kadın Sığınağı Vakfı. 2003. *Kadın Sığınakları III. ve IV. Kurultayları*. İstanbul: Mor Çatı Yayınları.
- Özbay, Ferhunde. 1993 [1990]. Kadınların Eviçi ve Evdışı Uğraşlarındaki Değişme. In *1980'ler Türkiye'sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, ed. Şirin Tekeli, 129-158. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Öztunalı, Nurser. 1996. Gönüllününün Not Defteri Kadınların Kendilerini Şiddetten Koruması Neden Zor? In *Evdeki Terör: Kadına Yönelik Şiddet*, 163-166. İstanbul: Mor Çatı Yayınları.
- Özyürek, Esra. 2000. Mecliste Başörtüsü Düğümü. In *Vatan, Millet, Kadınlar*, ed. Ayşe Gül Altınay, 339-357. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Parla, Ayşe. 1996. Anlatılar, Duvarlar ve Direniş Sesleri: Aykırı Bir Mekan Olarak Mor Çatı. In *Evdeki Terör: Kadına Yönelik Şiddet*, 53-65. İstanbul: Mor Çatı Yayınları.
- Parla, Jale and Sibel Irzık, eds. 2004. *Kadınlar Dile Düşünce: Edebiyat ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Pervizat, Leyla. 2005. *Uluslararası İnsan Hakları Bağlamında Namus Cinayetleri: Kavramsal ve Hukuksal Boyutu ve Türkiye Özelinin Değerlendirilmesi*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. İstanbul: Marmara University.
- Piispa, Minna. 2003. Violence against women as conveyed by surveys – the Finnish Case. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 3: 173-193.

- Price, Lisa S. 2005. *Feminist Frameworks: Building Theory on Violence Against Women*, Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Radford, Jill, Lynne Harne and Melissa Friedberg. 2000. Introduction. In *Women, violence and strategies for action: Feminist research, policy and practice*, eds. Jill Radford, Melissa Friedberg and Lynne Harne, 1-9. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Saltzman, Linda E. 2004. Definitional and Methodological Issues Related to Transnational Research on Intimate Partner Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 10(7):812-830.
- Sarıhan, Şenal. 2002. *Yeni Medeni Yasa Kadınlara Neler Getiriyor?* Ankara: İl Özel İdaresi Genel Sekreterliği.
- Sarıhan, Şenal. 2005. *Türk Ceza Kanunu Kadınlara Neler Getiriyor?* Ankara: İl Özel İdaresi Genel Sekreterliği.
- Savran, Gülnur. 2005. 80'li Yılların Kampanyaları ve Özel Alanın Politikası. In *Özgürlüğü Ararken: Kadın Hareketinde Mücadele Deneyimleri*, eds. Berivan Kum, Fatma Gülçiçek, Pınar Selek and Yeşim Başaran, 81-99. Istanbul: Amargi, Istanbul.
- Sır, Aytekin. 2006. Perceptions of honor: A Survey Research by Prof. Dr. Aytekin Sır. In *Suçlu Kim? Güneydoğu ve Doğu Anadolu Bölgelerinde 'Namus' Kisvesi Altında İşlenen Cinayetler ile Mücadelede Kalıcı Yöntemler Geliştirme Projesi 2005 Raporu*/"Who's to Blame?": "Project for the Development of Permanent Methods in the Struggle Against Killings Committed Under the Guise of 'Honor' in the Southeast and East Anatolia Regions" 2005 report, 211-251. Diyarbakır: KA-MER Vakfı Yayınları.
- Sirman, Nükhet. 1989. Feminism in Turkey: A Short History. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 3(1): 1-34.
- Smith, Michael D. 1994. Enhancing the Quality of Survey Data on Violence Against Women: A Feminist Approach. *Gender and Society*, 8(1):109-127.
- Straus, Murray A. 1979. Measuring Intrafamily Conflict and Violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41(1):75-88.

- Şahmaran. 2003. *Sempozyum: Kadına Yönelik Şiddet ve Başa Çıkma Yöntemleri/ Symposium on "Violence Against Women and The Way of Struggle*, ed. Dilşa Deniz. İstanbul: Şahmaran Kadın Da(ya)nışma ve Araştırma Merkezi.
- Şenol, Nevin, Ceren Isat, and Aysun Sayın. 2004. *Avrupa Birliğine Giriş Sürecini İzleme Programı – Kadınlar ve Erkekler için Eşit Fırsatlar: Türkiye*. İstanbul: İstanbul Politikalar Merkezi ve Açık Toplum Enstitüsü.
- Tan, Mine Göğüş, Yıldız Ecevit and Serpil Sancar Üşür. 2000. *Kadın-Erkek Eşitliğine Doğru Yürüyüş: Eğitim, Çalışma Yaşamı ve Siyaset*, İstanbul: TÜSİAD Yayınları.
- Taylı, Ülfet and Zelal Yalçın. 2007. Aile İçinde Kadına Yönelik Şiddete Karşı. *Amargi*, Güz(6): 49-50.
- Tekeli, Şirin. 1986. Emergence of the New Feminist Movement in Turkey. *The New Women's Movements*, ed. D. Dahlerup, 179-199. London: Sage.
- Tekeli, Şirin. 1998. Birinci ve İkinci Dalga Feminist Hareketlerin Karşılaştırmalı İncelemesi Üzerine Bir Deneme. In *75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler/Bilanço 98*, ed. Ayşe Berktaş Hacımırzaoğlu, 337-346. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Timisi, Nilüfer and Meltem Ağduk Gevrek. 2002. 1980'ler Türkiye'sinde Feminist Hareket: Ankara Çevresi. In *90'larda Türkiye'de Feminizm*, eds. Aksu Bora and Asena Günel, 13-40. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Tjaden, Patricia and Nancy Thoennes. 2000. *Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Turkey – Education Sector Study: Sustainable Pathways to an Effective, Equitable, and Efficient Education System for Preschool Through Secondary School Education*. 2005. Report no. 32450-TU. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.

Uçan Süpürge. 2004. *Türkiye’de Kadın Örgütleri Rehberi 2004*. Ankara: İngiltere Büyükelçiliği & Uçan Süpürge.

UNICEF. 2000. *Domestic Violence Against Women and Girls*, Innocenti Digest no.6, Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Center.

Yalçın, Zelal. 2006. Hayat Artık bir Proje mi? *Amargi*, Kış (3): 32.

Yüksel, Şahika. 1993. Eş Dayağı ve Dayağa Karşı Dayanışma Kampanyası. In *1980’ler Türkiye’sinde Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, ed. Şirin Tekeli, 341-350. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Yüksel, Şahika. 1996. Kadınların Kendilerini Şiddetten Koruması Neden Zor? In *Evdeki Terör: Kadına Yönelik Şiddet*, 96-112. İstanbul: Mor Çatı Yayınları.

Walby, Sylvia and Andrew Myhill, 2001. New Survey Methodologies in Researching Violence Against Women. *British Journal of Criminology*, 41: 502-522.

Yirmibeşoğlu, Vildan. 2007. *Töre ve Namus Gerekeşiyle İşlenen Cinayetler: Toprağa Düşen Sevdalar*. İstanbul: Hürriyet.

Zihnioğlu, Yaprak. 2003. *Kadınsız İnkılap: Nezihe Muhittin, Kadınlar Halk Fırkası, Kadın Birliği*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Ayşe Gül Altınay received her BA in Political Science and International Relations and Sociology from Boğaziçi University in 1994 and her Ph.D in Cultural Anthropology from Duke University in 2001. Since 2001, she has been teaching at Sabancı University and doing research on militarism, nationalism, violence, gender, and sexuality. She is the author of *The Myth of the Military-Nation: Militarism, Gender and Education* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), co-author of *işte böyle güzelim...* (with Hülya Adak, Esin Düzel and Nilgün Bayraktar, Sel, 2008, www.isteboyleguzelim.org); and editor of *Vatan, Millet, Kadımlar* (İletişim, 2000/2004) and *Ebru: Reflections on Cultural Diversity in Turkey*, a photography project by Attila Durak (Metis, 2007, www.ebruproject.com).

Yeşim Arat is a Professor in the Department of Political Science and International Relations at Boğaziçi University. She received her BA from Yale College in Political Science and Economics in 1978 and her Ph.D from Princeton University, Department of Politics, in 1983. She has two books: *Patriarchal Paradox: Women Politicians in Turkey* (Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1989) and *Rethinking Islam and Liberal Democracy: Islamist Women in Turkish Politics* (State University of New York Press, 2005) and is the co-editor (with Barbara Laslett and Johanna Brenner) of *Rethinking the Political: Gender, Resistance and the State* (University of Chicago Press, 1995). She has numerous articles in edited volumes and professional journals. She is interested in questions of women's political participation and democracy. Presently, she is the provost of Boğaziçi University.

Violence against women in Turkey

A Nationwide Survey

Ayşe Gül Altınay | Yeşim Arat



ISBN 978-975-011037-5

