

The Role of Ambivalent Sexism and Some Demographic Variables in Perpetuating Honor-Based Inequalities

Gülçin Akbaş¹

Suzan Ceylan-Batur²

Abstract

This study investigates the role of ambivalent sexism and demographic variables in shaping attitudes towards honor among participants in Turkey, a country where honor cultures persist. Understanding the factors that influence favorable attitudes towards honor is crucial for addressing this issue. The findings reveal significant gender differences, with men exhibiting more favorable attitudes towards honor than women. Male participants also displayed higher levels of hostile and benevolent sexism, suggesting that they contribute to the perpetuation of sexism. Correlation and regression analyses demonstrated that both hostile and benevolent sexism were associated with favorable attitudes towards honor in both genders. Hostile sexism played a significant role in predicting attitudes towards honor in both men and women, while benevolent sexism was significant only for men. Other demographic variables also played a significant role. Higher education levels, particularly for participants and their mothers, were associated with more negative attitudes towards honor. The income of female participants was negatively correlated with favorable attitudes towards honor. Moreover, religiosity and right-wing political orientation were associated with more positive attitudes towards honor. In conclusion, this research sheds light on the complex dynamics of attitudes towards honor in Turkey. It highlights the need for education and the promotion of gender equality, especially among women. Additionally, religious teachings, political orientation, and socioeconomic factors should be considered when

1 Assist. Prof., Atılım University, gulcin.akbasuslu@atilim.edu.tr,
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6932-2022

2 Assist. Prof., TOBB University of Economy and Technology, scbatur@etu.edu.tr,
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6932-2022

addressing and preventing honor-based violence. Further research is needed to explore these factors in greater depth.

1. Introduction

In honor-based cultures, including Turkey, an individual's social status and reputation within the community hold significant importance (for more detailed information, see Sakallı-Uğurlu & Akbaş, 2013). Within these cultures, there exist cultural codes that dictate the expected behaviors for both women and men (Baker et al., 1999, pp. 167-168), with these codes differing between the genders. In accordance with traditional gender roles, honor-based cultures expect men to wield power and assume a leadership role within the family (Sever and Yurdakul, 2001, p. 970). To attain this power, men are anticipated to exhibit toughness, embrace masculinity, attain a certain status, and establish authority within the family (Sever and Yurdakul, 2001, p. 973; Vandello & Cohen, 2003, p. 998). They are also expected to safeguard and exert control over the honor of their families and the women they perceive as dependent on them within the family structure (Rodriguez-Mosquera et al., 2002, p. 159). Men who deviate from these standards risk diminishing their own self-worth and societal standing (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996, p. 2).

In contrast, for women in honor cultures, regardless of age, socio-economic status, or marital status, the primary expectation revolves around maintaining sexual purity and fidelity (Sever & Yurdakul, 2001, p. 973). Women who fail to meet these expectations can suffer a loss of both their self-esteem and their family's standing within society (Vandello & Cohen, 2003, p. 998). According to honor cultural codes, the family's honor is largely influenced by the sexual behaviors of women (Arın, 2001, p. 823; Baker et al., 1999, p. 165), while male sexuality is unrelated to honor (Cihangir, 2013, p. 330).

In honor cultures, it is believed that any behavior by women can tarnish the family's reputation. Consequently, women are expected to submit to male authority and control in all aspects of life, while men are anticipated to take on the role of rule-makers and controllers (Baker et al., 1999, p. 168; Sakallı-Uğurlu & Akbaş, 2013, p. 79). In this context, the allocation of different responsibilities to women and men in honor cultures restricts women and curtails their freedoms, while providing men with an environment in which they can freely express their power and will (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Akbaş, 2013, p. 87).

Both men and women are considered honorable as long as they adhere to these societal expectations. However, women's sexual behaviors are perceived as highly vulnerable and, thus, easily susceptible to harm (Arın, 2001, p. 823; Sever & Yurdakul, 2001, p. 965). In traditional honor cultures, honor is considered of paramount importance, and any means can be employed to protect and, when necessary, restore it (Brown et al., 2018, p. 539). Violence is often used as a means to protect honor in honor cultures. Honor-based violence against women is prevalent (see Sakallı-Uğurlu & Akbaş, 2013, p. 84) and is generally more socially acceptable compared to other forms of violence unrelated to honor (Ceylan et al., 2021, p. 6; Cohen & Nispett, 1994, p. 565). The traditional concept of honor, which places a high value on societal reputation, justifies controlling behaviors that may be seen as tarnishing honor, with violence against women being justified in this context (see Akbaş et al., 2020). Honor-based violence is typically perpetrated by men within the family, and men who engage in violence are often perceived as more masculine (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Akbaş, 2013, p. 80). In society, men who engage in honor-based violence can be perceived as strong, courageous, and protective of their families (Ceylan et al., 2016, p. 54). In contrast, a man who fails to restore his honor carries a sense of shame (Vandello & Cohen, 2003, p. 1002).

Honor-based violence against women can manifest in various forms, ranging from verbal abuse to murder (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Akbaş, 2013, p. 84). Due to the underreporting of various forms of violence, there is no concrete data available, except for honor killings. However, the lack of reported honor killings, the presentation of such killings as suicides, or their concealment within families—often due to factors like the dishonor perceived by women who are coerced into taking their own lives (Amnesty International, 2004, p. 18)—make it impossible to obtain up-to-date global data on honor killings. Nevertheless, a report by Kardam in 2007 indicated that over 5,000 women fall victim to honor killings each year (p. 1). There is no official data on honor killings in Turkey (Amnesty International, 2004, p. 18), but according to data from kadinayetleri.org (2022), between 2010 and 2022, 126 women were killed under the pretext of honor or tradition, 205 women were killed under the pretext of suspected infidelity, and 95 women were killed due to jealousy. These statistics underscore the continued prevalence of honor in Turkey.

According to Akbaş et al. (2020, p. 475), the prevalence of honor-related forms of violence can be attributed to individuals within these cultures who uphold and legitimize the concept of honor. Therefore, identifying the factors that play a role in perpetuating honor-based inequalities is

believed to be crucial for understanding the current situation and developing preventive policies. In this context, this research examines the role of ambivalent sexism and certain demographic variables, which are thought to significantly contribute to the perpetuation of honor, in sustaining honor-based inequalities.

1.1. Ambivalent Sexism

Ambivalent sexism encompasses two related yet distinct forms of sexism: Hostile sexism and benevolent sexism (see, Glick & Fiske, 1996, 2001). Hostile Sexism is defined as openly felt negative attitudes towards women who challenge male superiority and openly defy men (e.g., “A woman, once she gets a man’s commitment, will often try to put him on a tight leash.”), while benevolent sexism is characterized by positive attitudes rooted in the perception of women as pure, nurturing but weak, and in need of men’s protection (e.g., “Women should be cherished and protected by men”) (Glick & Fiske, 1996, pp. 491-492, 2001, pp. 110-111). According to Glick and Fiske (1996, p. 494), benevolent sexism serves the purpose of enabling men to maintain both their dominance and relationships with women (e.g., marital relationships). In this context, women receive protection and affection as long as they conform to traditional gender roles, whereas women who challenge male dominance and advocate for equality face hostile attitudes. These two distinct forms of sexism, perceived differently, contribute to the perpetuation of gender inequalities in society.

Ambivalent sexism has been tested in numerous studies worldwide (e.g., Glick et al., 2000; Connor et al., 2017) and in Turkey (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2010). It has been associated with various concepts representing and supporting gender inequalities and traditional gender roles (e.g., partner abuse: e.g., Glick et al., 2002; sexual harassment: e.g., Russell & Trigg, 2004; attitudes towards non-traditional women and men: e.g., Glick et al., 2015; attitudes towards rapists and rape victims: e.g., Yamawaki et al., 2007; attitudes towards breastfeeding in private and public spaces: e.g., Acker, 2009). In general, women tend to reject hostile sexism while endorsing benevolent sexism, whereas men tend to endorse hostile sexism more than women (for a detailed comparison, see Glick et al., 2000). According to Glick et al. (2000, p. 772), the extent to which men and women support benevolent and hostile sexism varies depending on the prevalence of traditional gender roles in their respective countries. In countries where gender inequality is more dominant, women tend to embrace benevolent sexism to avoid hostile attitudes, which, in turn, perpetuates gender inequality.

The role of ambivalent sexism has also been tested in honor cultures where gender inequality is prevalent (e.g., Glick et al., 2016). Using data collected from Turkey, researchers have demonstrated that hostile sexism among men and benevolent sexism among women play significant roles in perpetuating honor (Glick et al., 2016, p. 549). Recent research (Akbaş et al., 2020, p. 483) has further confirmed the positive and meaningful relationship between benevolent and hostile sexism and honor. Due to their association with various concepts, such as attitudes towards rapists and rape victims (Yamawaki et al., 2007), and their relationship with the approval of honor, benevolent and hostile sexism have been tested in a broader sample to assess their role in sustaining honor.

1.2. Demographic variables

In numerous studies aimed at understanding honor and honor-based violence against women, the relationship between honor and fundamental demographic variables has been examined (see Sakallı-Uğurlu & Akbaş, 2013). In this study, all major demographic variables, including gender, education, parents' education, income, religiosity, and political views, were collectively investigated to comprehend the potential role of these variables in shaping positive attitudes toward honor.

1.2.1. Gender

Significant differences between male and female participants have been observed in both honor research and many studies focusing on gender inequality. In many countries worldwide, men tend to support gender equality less than women do. For instance, in a study conducted in 42 countries, including Turkey, Kosakowska-Berezecka et al. (2020) found that men were less inclined to support the struggle for gender equality (pp. 9-12). In a study conducted in the Netherlands, examining Turks, Moroccans, and Dutch nationals with roots in honor cultures, Cihangir (2012, p. 327) revealed that Turkish and Moroccan male participants, influenced by honor culture, emphasized the importance of female sexuality for honor more than female participants did. However, they believed that male sexuality was not related to honor. In research conducted in Turkey, which is characterized as an honor culture, it has been demonstrated that men tend to maintain honor more than women do (Akbaş et al., 2020, p. 484), hold more negative attitudes towards rape victims (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2007, p. 892), women who engage in premarital sex (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Glick, 2003, p. 299), and are more supportive of husbands beating their wives (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2001, p. 605). In light of these studies, this research

also tests whether there are differences between men and women regarding the maintenance of honor.

1.2.2. Education

The relationship between education and honor has been examined in previous research (see Sakallı-Uğurlu & Akbaş, 2013), highlighting that low education levels can pose a risk for the perpetuation of honor (e.g., Kardam, 2007, pp. 16, 51-53). A recent study (Akbaş et al., 2020) also found that as participants' education increased, their motivation to maintain honor decreased. In sociological research titled "Honor and Honor Killings in Turkey," Bağlı and Özensel (2011) interviewed 190 individuals convicted of honor killings in detention centers. They found that the majority of the convicts had a high school education or lower, with only 4 convicts having university-level education. Additionally, the research explored the educational backgrounds of the participants' parents, revealing that particularly mothers had very low levels of education, with many being illiterate. Fathers, while generally more educated than mothers, mostly had education levels of middle school or lower. Based on these findings, it is suggested that parents' education can be one of the determinants of how much individuals will support honor (Sakallı & Akbaş, 2013, p. 88). Therefore, this research examines both participants' education and the education levels of their parents.

1.2.3. Income

Henry (2009) suggested that individuals with low socioeconomic status might be more prone to violence, as men may resort to violence to compensate for their lower status (pp. 451-454). Consequently, the lower the social status of a family (economic, social, or political), the higher the likelihood of supporting and perpetuating honor and honor-based violence (Cooney, 2014, pp. 411-416; Henry, 2009, pp. 451-454). Dayan (2021, p. 5), believing that these claims needed scientific investigation, collected data from participants with low, medium, and high socioeconomic status, and suggested that low socioeconomic conditions and poverty could be risk factors in honor killings (pp. 13, 15). However, Dayan (2011, p. 13) also emphasized that socioeconomic status alone might not be sufficient to explain honor-based violence. This research explores the relationship between participants' monthly income and their motivation to maintain honor.

1.2.4. Religiosity

Studies on the relationship between religiosity and honor play a significant role in understanding honor (Beller et al., 2021, p. 9973; Sakallı & Akbaş, 2013, pp. 81-82). Generally, research conducted with Muslim participants has shown positive relationships between religiosity and maintaining honor (e.g., Glick et al., 2016, p. 549), supporting honor-based killings (e.g., Beller et al., 2021, p. 9979), and tolerating honor-based violence against women (e.g., Ceylan et al., 2021, p. 6). While most of the religiosity and honor studies focus on Muslim participants, similar findings are available from studies involving Christian participants. For example, positive relationships have been found between religiosity and the perception of female honor (Pomerantz & Brown, 2020, pp. 528, 535). These findings suggest that religiosity can play a crucial role in the maintenance of honor and honor-based violence. Therefore, this research examines the role of participants' self-perceived religiosity in maintaining honor.

1.2.5. Political Orientation

Although there is no direct research on the relationship between honor and political views, insights can be drawn from existing studies on political orientation, suggesting that being right-leaning may be associated with honor. For instance, Dahlerup (2018, p. 194) noted that in Denmark, left-wing parties generally support gender equality policies more than right-wing parties do. Yılmaz et al. (2016; pp. 555, 559) stated that in Turkey, left-wing parties are more likely to endorse and support the idea of equality compared to right-wing parties. In line with these findings, Sakallı-Uğurlu et al. (2019, p. 27) mentioned that right-wing views are associated with conservatism regarding existing gender roles and resistance to change. In their study examining attitudes towards homosexuals, researchers found that, compared to left-leaning individuals, those with right-wing views had more negative attitudes. Based on these studies, this research investigates the role of holding right-wing or left-wing political views in maintaining honor.

1.3. Aim and Hypotheses

Honor and honor-related violence have been explored in various cultures, including Turkey, through associations with different concepts. In this research, the role of ambivalent sexism and various demographic variables in exhibiting positive attitudes toward honor has been examined. It is believed that considering both hostile and benevolent sexism, along with gender, education, economic status, religiosity, and political views, can be beneficial in understanding the existing dynamics that may influence the

positive evaluation of honor in Turkey. In this context, the hypotheses of the study are as follows:

1. It is expected that male participants will have more positive attitudes toward honor compared to female participants.

2. It is expected that there will be a positive relationship between ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward honor.

a. It is expected that hostile sexism will play a significant and positive role in the attitudes toward honor of male participants.

b. It is expected that benevolent sexism will play a significant and positive role in the attitudes toward honor of female participants.

3. It is expected that the level of education will have a negative relationship with attitudes toward honor.

a. As participants' education increases, it is expected that they will have more negative attitudes toward honor.

b. As participants' fathers' education increases, it is expected that they will have more negative attitudes toward honor.

c. As participants' mothers' education increases, it is expected that they will have more negative attitudes toward honor.

4. It is expected that as participants' income level increases, they will have more negative attitudes toward honor.

5. It is expected that as participants' religiosity increases, they will have more positive attitudes toward honor.

6. It is expected that participants with right-wing political views will have more positive attitudes toward honor.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

A total of 291 individuals participated in the study, with 165 (56.7%) being female and 126 (43.3%) being male. The average age of female participants was 28.83 (SD = 6.50), while the average age of male participants was 30.10 (SD = 6.12). The education levels of the participants and their parents are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Education Levels of Participants and Their Parents

	Participant		Mother		Father	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No schooling	-	-	21	7.2	1	.3
Primary school	6	2.1	128	44	77	26.5
Secondary school	2	.7	16	5.5	28	9.5
High school	71	24.4	57	19.6	79	27.1
University	146	50.2	58	19.9	85	29.2
Master's degree	53	18.2	9	3.1	14	4.8
Doctorate	13	4.5	2	.7	7	2.4

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Attitudes towards Honor Scale

Participants' attitudes towards honor were measured using the Attitudes towards Honor Scale developed by Sakallı and Işık (2009). The scale consists of 14 items, six of which are reverse-scored (e.g., "I believe that honor is necessary to control women"). Participants evaluated these items on a 6-point Likert scale (1 = "Strongly Disagree," 6 = "Strongly Agree"). Higher scores on the scale indicate that participants have more positive attitudes towards honor. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the scale was found to be .91.

2.2.2. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

Participants' ambivalent sexism was measured using the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory adapted into Turkish by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002), which was originally developed by Glick and Fiske (1996). The scale comprises two sub-dimensions: Hostile Sexism and Benevolent Sexism, each consisting of 11 items. There are no reverse-scored items in the scale. Participants rated these items on a 6-point Likert scale (1 = "Strongly Disagree," 6 = "Strongly Agree"). Higher scores on the scale indicate higher levels of sexism. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Hostile Sexism was .91, while for Benevolent Sexism, it was .89.

2.2.3. Demographic Information Form

The demographic information form included questions about age, gender, the highest level of education completed (ranging from 1 = “No schooling” to 7 = “Doctorate”), the highest level of education completed by the participants’ parents, the average monthly household income, and participants’ perceived level of religiosity (“How would you describe your level of religiosity?”) rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = “Not religious at all,” 5 = “Very religious”). Higher scores indicate a higher level of religiosity. Additionally, participants were asked about their political orientation on a 10-point Likert scale (1 = “Left,” 10 = “Right”). Higher scores indicate a more right-leaning political orientation, while lower scores indicate a more left-leaning political orientation.

2.3. Procedure

After obtaining ethical approval, the research was announced on online platforms. Participation in the study was entirely voluntary, and those who agreed to participate completed the questionnaires online. The completion of the scales took approximately 15 minutes. All data were collected over a period of approximately two weeks.

3. Results

Descriptive Findings for Research Variables. Differences between female and male participants in attitudes towards honor and ambivalent sexism were tested using t-test analysis (see Table 2). In all variables, male participants scored significantly higher than females.

Table 2: Gender Differences

	All participants		Women		Men		<i>t</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Benevolent Sexism	3.39	1.10	3.21	1.05	3.62	1.11	3.23*
Hostile Sexism	3.18	1.06	2.93	1.00	3.50	1.06	4.66*
Attitudes towards Honor	2.06	.95	1.88	.76	2.30	1.10	3.66*

**p* < .001

3.1. Predicting Attitudes Towards Honor

In order to test the relationship between attitudes towards honor, ambivalent sexism, demographic variables, female and male participants

underwent separate correlation analyses (see Table 3). Attitudes towards honor were significantly and positively correlated with ambivalent sexism, perceived religiosity, and right-wing political orientation for both female and male participants. Additionally, attitudes towards honor were significantly and negatively correlated with the education levels of participants and their parents. Furthermore, among female participants, attitudes towards honor were significantly and negatively correlated with monthly income.

Table 3: Correlations Separated by Participant Gender

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Attitudes towards Honor	-	.61**	.53**	.33**	-.21*	-.37**	-.18*	-.15	.63**	.51**
2. Benevolent Sexism	.53**	-	.50**	.29**	-.37**	-.30**	-.30**	-.19*	.53**	.45**
3. Hostile Sexism	.49**	.67**	-	.17	-.24**	-.23*	-.14*	-.12	.39**	.35**
4. Age	.03	.07	.10	-	.12	-.27**	-.19*	.06	.32**	.25**
5. Education	-.33**	-.29**	-.16*	.32**	-	.12	.22*	.51**	-.06	.06
6. Mother's Education	-.35**	-.27**	-.20**	-.17*	.16*	-	.68**	.28**	-.29**	-.15
7. Father's Education	-.26**	-.23**	-.19*	-.18*	.24**	.71**	-	.30**	-.15	-.00
8. Monthly Income	-.24**	-.18*	.10	.20*	.37**	.14	.21**	-	-.10	.09
9. Religiosity	.43**	.35**	.25**	.05	-.04	-.23**	-.17*	-.01	-	.57**
10. Political Orientation	.23**	.10	.10	-.06	.02	-.03	-.12	-.01	.36**	-

Note. Men's scores are displayed in the upper half of the table.

Regression analyses were conducted separately for male and female participants to predict attitudes towards honor, examining the roles of demographic variables and ambivalent sexism. In the first step, demographic variables were entered, and in the second step, benevolent and hostile sexism were included to test their predictive power for attitudes towards honor.

Tablo 4: Predicting Honor

	Female participants		Male participants	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β	β	β
Age	.12	.06	.12	.08
Education	-.28***	-.20**	-.21**	-.07
Mother's Education	-.26**	-.21*	-.23*	-.22*
Father's Education	.11	.10	.10	.15
Monthly Income	-.14*	-.11	.00	-.01
Religiosity	.33***	.23***	.39***	.28**
Political Orientation	.13*	.12	.23**	.12
Benevolent Sexism		.15		.24**
Hostile Sexism		.25**		.21**
F	12.67***	15.25***	17.71***	18.34***
R ²	.33	.44	.48	.56

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

In both female and male participants, religiosity, having a right-wing political orientation, and hostile sexism positively predicted favorable attitudes towards honor. However, benevolent sexism only predicted favorable attitudes towards honor in males. In both female and male participants, education and mother's education negatively predicted favorable attitudes towards honor. Additionally, only in female participants, monthly income negatively predicted favorable attitudes towards honor.

4. Discussion

Honor cultures are defined as ideologies that intend to control and dominate women, who are considered unable to protect personal and family honor and deemed weaker and less valuable than men (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Akbaş, 2013). In these cultures, where men are privileged and hold power, the concept of honor has various negative outcomes, including violence, for both women and men. Understanding the factors that may influence individuals' favorable attitudes towards honor is essential in this context. This research aimed to examine the role of ambivalent sexism and certain demographic variables in this context. The findings suggest that hypotheses are largely supported in both female and male participants.

Men are found to have more favorable attitudes towards honor compared to female participants. This finding is consistent with previous research (Akbaş et al., 2020; Glick et al., 2016) and suggests that in honor

cultures, men may want to maintain their privileged position by endorsing and supporting honor. Similarly, male participants exhibit higher hostile and benevolent sexism compared to female participants. In patriarchal systems that emphasize male superiority and consider women weak, male participants may display hostile sexism against women who attempt to change this system and benevolent sexism toward women who conform to it. These gender differences in the endorsement of honor and sexism indicate that men are the primary supporters of honor and sexism, but women also contribute to the perpetuation of sexism. In countries with high levels of gender inequality, it is common for women to maintain benevolent sexism (Glick et al., 2000). In Turkey, where gender inequality is prevalent, women may refrain from hostile attitudes and instead embrace benevolent sexism to fit into societal norms.

Correlation and regression analyses examined the role of demographic variables and sexism in predicting favorable attitudes towards honor. Consistent with previous research (Glick et al., 2016), both hostile and benevolent sexism were found to be associated with favorable attitudes towards honor in both female and male participants. Those who endorse benevolent sexism may believe in the need to protect and care for women, which could contribute to endorsing honor. Conversely, hostile sexism, which supports the idea of punishing women who deviate from traditional gender roles, may encourage the punishment of women who challenge honor. The results of the regression analyses also revealed that both hostile and benevolent sexism are significant predictors of favorable attitudes towards honor in male participants. However, in female participants, only hostile sexism was a significant predictor. This suggests that while hostile sexism plays a crucial role in both genders, its effect may be stronger in predicting favorable attitudes towards honor. These findings emphasize the importance of focusing on individuals' motivations to be sexist when understanding and preventing honor and honor-based violence.

The role of demographic variables in predicting attitudes towards honor was another primary objective of this research. The findings underscore the need to focus on demographic factors in combating honor. Specifically, higher levels of education, both for participants themselves and their mothers, were associated with more negative attitudes towards honor. This aligns with the findings of Bağlı and Özensel (2011) and suggests that as education levels increase, individuals tend to view honor more negatively. However, fathers' education levels did not have a significant impact. As mothers' education levels rise, their value systems may change, potentially resulting in the transmission of more egalitarian values to their children,

particularly daughters. Research shows that children with educated mothers tend to be more educated, especially daughters (Sperling et al., 2015, p. 29). Therefore, one of the most crucial steps in combating honor-based violence may be to educate girls and women. Similarly, when examining the role of economic income, male participants' income did not correlate with their attitudes towards honor, while an increase in female participants' income was associated with more negative attitudes towards honor. As the education levels of all participants increased, their incomes also rose, and as a result, female participants may be displaying more negative attitudes towards honor. This could indicate that as women's education levels increase, they are more likely to embrace more egalitarian perspectives and reject the concept of honor. However, the lack of a relationship between men's education and income suggests that low socioeconomic status may not be directly related to honor. These factors may need further examination in future studies.

In terms of religiosity, participants who considered themselves more religious tended to have more favorable attitudes towards honor, consistent with past research (Glick et al., p. 550). The strong predictive power of religiosity on favorable attitudes towards honor highlights the significant role of religious teachings and beliefs in shaping the concept of honor. Therefore, future research on honor should focus on religious beliefs and religiosity. Regarding political orientation, participants with right-wing political views were found to have more favorable attitudes towards honor, consistent with the literature and hypotheses. Given that right-wing political views are often less supportive of gender equality and aim to maintain the status quo, having right-wing political views may play an effective role in perpetuating existing honor-based inequalities. Conversely, having left-wing political views may promote gender equality and act as a protective factor against honor.

5. Conclusion

In this study, the role of ambivalent sexism and various demographic variables in predicting attitudes towards honor was examined among participants in Turkey. The findings provide essential insights for understanding and preventing attitudes towards honor. This research can contribute to future studies focusing on this complex issue. However, it is crucial to consider the limitations of this research. The data collected online through convenience sampling may not represent the entire population of Turkey. Additionally, the study employed a correlational research design, and causality cannot be inferred from the findings. Therefore, future research should delve deeper into the role of factors such as education, income, and political orientation in understanding and preventing honor-based violence.

REFERENCES

- Acker, M. (2009). Breast is best... but not everywhere: Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward private and public breastfeeding. *Sex Roles, 61*(7), 476-490. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9655-z>
- Akbaş, G., Sakallı, N., Ceylan, S., & Dođulu, C. (2020). Namus Sistemini Meşrulaştırma Ölçeđi'nin geliştirilmesi. *Nesne, 8*(18), 472-491. DOI: 10.7816/nesne-08-18-08
- Amnesty International (2004). *Turkey: Women confronting family violence*. Temmuz 15, 2022, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/eur44/013/2004/en/>
- Arın, C. (2001). Femicide in the name of honor in Turkey. *Violence against Women, 7*, 821-825.
- Bađlı, M., & Özensel, E. (2011). *Türkiye'de töre ve namus cinayetleri: Töre ve namus cinayeti işleyen kişiler üzerine sosyolojik bir araştırma*. İstanbul: Destek Yayınevi.
- Baker, N., Gregware, P., & Cassidy, M. (1999). Family killing fields: Honor rationales in the murder of women. *Violence against Women, 5*, 164-184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107780129952005>
- Beller, J., Kröger, C., & Hosser, D. (2021). Disentangling honor-based violence and religion: The differential influence of individual and social religious practices and fundamentalism on support for honor killings in a cross-national sample of Muslims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(19-20), 9770-9789. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519869071>
- Brown, R. P., Baughman, K., & Carvallo, M. (2018). Culture, masculine honor, and violence toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 44*(4), 538-549. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217744195>
- Ceylan, S., Dođulu, C., & Akbaş, G. (2016). Namus adına kadına yönelik şiddete dair temsiller: Karma yöntemli bir çalışma. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları, 19*, 50-60. <https://www.psikolog.org.tr/tr/yayinlar/dergiler/1031828/tpy1301996120160000m000046.pdf>
- Ceylan-Batur, S., Sakallı, N., & Gunaratne, S. (2021). Predictors of tolerating violence against women: honor concerns and fundamentalist religious orientation. *Current Psychology, 42*, 9720-9733. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02276-4>
- Ceylan-Batur, S., & Sakallı Uđurlu, N. (2020). Namusu onaylama endeksinin Türkçe'ye uyarlama çalışması. Yazım aşamasında.
- Cihangir, S. (2013). Gender specific honor codes and cultural change. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 16*(3), 319-333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430212463453>

- Cohen, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1994). Self-protection and the culture of honor: Explaining southern violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *20*(5), 551-567. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294205012>
- Connor, R. A., Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (2017). Ambivalent sexism in the twenty-first century. C. G. Sibley & F. K. Barlow (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the psychology of prejudice* (ss. 295–320) içinde. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316161579.013>
- Cooney, M. (2014). Death by family: Honor violence as punishment. *Punishment and Society*, *16*, 406-427. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474514539537>
- Dahlerup, D. (2018). Gender equality as a closed case: A survey among the members of the 2015 Danish parliament. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, *41*(2), 188-209. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9477.12116>
- Dayan, H. (2021). Female honor killing: The role of low socio-economic status and rapid modernization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *36*(19-20). <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626051987>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491-512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, *56*(2), 109. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109>
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ... López, W. L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(5), 763. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763>
- Glick, P., Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Akbaş, G., Metin Orta, I., & Ceylan, S. (2016). Why do women endorse honor beliefs? Ambivalent sexism and religiosity as predictors. *Sex Roles*, *75*(11), 543-554. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-015-0550-5>
- Glick, P., Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Ferreira, M. C., & Souza, M. A. D. (2002). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward wife abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *26*(4), 292-297. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00068>
- Glick, P., Wilkerson, M., & Cuffe, M. (2015). Masculine identity, ambivalent sexism, and attitudes toward gender subtypes: Favoring masculine men and feminine women. *Social Psychology*, *46*(4), 210–217. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000228>
- Henry, P. J. (2009). Low-status compensation: A theory for understanding the role of status in cultures of honor. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*, 451-466.

- Işık, R. & Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2009). Namusa ve namus adına kadına uygulanan şiddete ilişkin tutumlar ölçeğinin öğrenci örneklemiyle geliştirilmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 12(24), 1-9. <https://www.psikolog.org.tr/tr/yayinlar/dergiler/1031828/tpy1301996120090000m000135.pdf>
- Kadın Cinayetleri. <https://kadincinayetleri.org/>
- Kardam, F. (2007). The dynamics of honor killings in Turkey. *United Nations Population Fund*. Temmuz 15, 2022, <https://www.unfpa.org/publications/dynamics-honour-killings-turkiye>
- Kosakowska-Berezecka, N., Besta, T., Bosson, J. K., Jurek, P., Vandello, J. A., Best, D. L., Wlodarczyk, A., Safdar, S., Zawisza, M., Zadkowska, M., Sobiecki, J., Agyemang, C. B., Akbas, G., Ammirati, S., Anderson, J., Anjum, G., Aruta, J. J. B. R., Ashraf, M., Bakaityte, A., ... Zukauskienė, R. (2020). Country-level and individual-level predictors of men's support for gender equality in 42 countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(6), 1276-1291. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2696>
- Nisbett, R. E. & Cohen, D. (1996). *Culture of honor: The psychology of violence in the South*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Pomerantz, A. L., & Brown, R. P. (2020). The cross and the sword: A multi-dimensional investigation of the links between gendered facets of honor and Religiosity among American Christians. *Self and Identity*, 19(5), 521-545. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2019.1638826>
- Rodriguez-Mosquera, P. M., Manstead, A. S. R., & Fischer, A. H. (2002). The role of honor concerns in emotional reactions to offences. *Cognition and Emotion*, 16, 143-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930143000167>
- Russell, B. L., & Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of sexual harassment: An examination of gender differences, ambivalent sexism, social dominance, and gender roles. *Sex Roles*, 50, 565 – 573. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000023075.32252.fd>
- Sakallı, N. (2001). Beliefs about wife beating among Turkish college students: The effects of patriarchy, sexism, and sex differences. *Sex Roles*, 44(9), 599-610. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1012295109711>
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2002). Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği: Geçerlik güvenirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 17, 47-58. <https://www.psikolog.org.tr/tr/yayinlar/dergiler/1031828/tpd1300443320020000m000212.pdf>
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2010). Ambivalent sexism, gender, and major as predictors of Turkish college students' attitudes toward women and men's atypical educational choices. *Sex Roles*, 62(7), 427-437. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9673-x>
- Sakallı Uğurlu, N., & Akbaş, G. (2013). Namus kültürlerinde “namus” ve “namus adına kadına şiddet”: Sosyal psikolojik açıklamalar. *Türk Psikoloji*

Yazıları, 16(32), 76–91. <https://www.psikolog.org.tr/tr/yayinlar/dergiler/1031828/tpy1301996120130000m000089.pdf>

- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., & Glick, P. (2003). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward women who engage in premarital sex in Turkey. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40(3), 296-302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490309552194>
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Salman, S., & Turgut, S. (2010). Predictors of Turkish women's and men's attitudes toward sexual harassment: Ambivalent sexism, and ambivalence toward men. *Sex Roles*, 63(11), 871-881. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9847-6>
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Uğurlu, O., & Eryılmaz, D. (2019). The relationships among attitudes toward gay men and lesbians, system justification, social contact, political orientation and gender. *Nesne*, 7(14), 19-33. <https://www.nesnedergisi.com/makale/pdf/1548762001.pdf>
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Yalçın, Z. S., & Glick, P. (2007). Ambivalent sexism, belief in a just world, and empathy as predictors of Turkish students' attitudes toward rape victims. *Sex Roles*, 57(11), 889-895. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9313-2>
- Sever, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2001). Culture of honor, culture of change: A feminist analysis of honor killings in Turkey. *Violence against Women*, 7, 964-998. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778010122182866>
- Sperling, G. B., Winthrop, R., & Kwauk, C. (2015). *What Works in Girls' Education: Evidence for the World's Best Investment*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
- Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (2003). Male honor and female fidelity: Implicit cultural scripts that perpetuate domestic violence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 997-1010. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.997>
- Yamawaki, N., Darby, R., & Queiroz, A. (2007). The moderating role of ambivalent sexism: The influence of power status on perception of rape victim and rapist. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 147(1), 41-56. <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.147.1.41-56>
- Yılmaz, O., Sarıbay, S. A., Bahçekapılı, H. S., & Harma, M. (2016). Political orientations, ideological self categorizations, party preferences, and moral foundations of young Turkish voters. *Turkish Studies*, 17, 544-566. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2016.1221312>