



# Examination of the students' perception of "honor" towards women at a faculty of sports sciences (Isparta example)

Hulusi Alp

\**Suleyman Demirel University, Sports Sciences Faculty, Isparta, 32100, Turkey*

---

## Abstract

The study aimed at investigating the students' perception of honor towards women at the Faculty of Sports Sciences at a public university in the province of Isparta, Turkey. The research was conducted by scanning model, one of the visual research models. The participants comprised 184 volunteer students. The data were collected via a personal information form and the Scale of Attitude Towards Women (Gürsoy, 2008), which was composed of a total of three dimensions and 25 items. Based on cronbach alpha reliability results of the three dimensions and scale sequestered, the validity and reliability of the scale was set to .93. The data were analysed via the SPSS statistical analysis program. The normality test was conducted in order to determine whether the data were normally distributed and the total scores of the sub-dimensions included in the demographic questions and the woman's attitude scale. Since the data did not show normal distribution, multiple comparisons were examined with the Kruskal Wallis and Post-Hoc test, and the binary comparisons with the Man Whitney-U test. Significance level was taken as  $p < 0.05$ . According to the findings from the data, significant difference was detected in terms of gender, family type, mother education and father education levels. No significant difference in age and place has been detected. As a result, it can be said that in the patriarchal societies, the phenomenon of honor is an obligation imposed on women. In other words, women come to mind when it comes to honor.

**Keywords:** Perception of Honor, Women, Sports Sciences, University Students, Patriachal Societies

---

© 2016 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Societies have imposed different responsibilities on men and women, according to their traditions and customs. One of the responsibilities imposed on women is a case of honor. Honor is defined as vocabulary, ar, decency, rape, cleansing, accuracy (Altunel, 2012). When it comes to honoring in many societies, women come to mind first. Looking at many cultures, women are in a difficult position as a result of the association between honor and women (Tumer Baybuğa and Birgili 2017). In Middle Eastern and Mediterranean

---

\* Corresponding author name. Tel.: +0-536-371-3378  
E-mail address: [ekim1778@gmail.com](mailto:ekim1778@gmail.com)

countries (Israel, Palestine, Morocco, Pakistan), women are seen as symbols of honor (Gursoy and Arslan Ozkan, 2014). It is believed that the woman who is under the influence of patriarchal societies is chaste, protects her virginity, pays attention to her clothing, and listens to her family and her husband, making the woman honest (Gursoy 2009; Gursoy & Arslan Ozkan, 2014). When the woman is single, the father is an object that needs protection from the spouse after marriage. On the other hand, the man is seen as free, able to do what he wants, protecting the honor of his family, who is successful, honest and reliable in his daily life, at work (Altunel 2012). It is seen as dishonest when the moral values of a society are not respected or treated honestly and fairly against the rules (Akkoç, 2007). The fact that the woman is with a foreign man, the woman walking alone and having a premarital union are also called dishonest (Gursoy, 2009). In this case, the family is believed to have been damaged because of the dignity of the family (Bilgili and Vural 2011; Mannel, 2003). In our country, it can be said that honor is generally accepted as a woman's phenomenon.

This study was carried out to examine the perceptions of honor for women by students studying at the faculty of sports sciences.

## **2. Method**

### *1.1. Purpose and Model of Research*

The purpose of the research was to examine students' perceptions of honor towards women at a Faculty of Sports Sciences at a public university in the province of Isparta in Turkey. The research was conducted via scanning model among the methods of visual research. The methods of visual research aim to describe a situation existing or present in the past (Karasar 2012).

### *1.2. Participants*

The participants of the research consisted of 184 volunteer students at the Faculty of Sport Sciences.

### *1.3. Data Collection Tools*

To collect the research data, the "Honor understanding attitude scale regarding women" was used. The validity and reliability of the scale were made by Gursoy (2008) on university students. The scale consists of three dimensions and 25 items. The validity and reliability of the scale was determined as 93 according to Cronbach Alpha reliability results belonging to three dimensions and overall scale (Gursoy, 2009).

### *1.4. Collection and the Analysis of the Data*

The data of the research were collected using the personal information form and the honor understanding attitude scale for women, which constitute the sample of the research, and contains questions about the socio-demographic characteristics of university students. Research data were evaluated with statistical analysis program. The

normality test was conducted to evaluate the distribution of the data by evaluating the total scores given to all of the demographic questions and sub-dimension questions in the honor attitude scale regarding women. Since the data did not show normal distribution, multiple comparisons were examined with the Kruskal Wallis and Post-Hoc test, and the binary comparisons with the Man Whitney-U test. Significance level was taken as  $p < 0.05$ .

### 3. Results

Table 1: Percentage distributions of research group demographic data

		f	%
Gender	Female	50	27
	Male	13	73
Age	17-19	28	15
	20-21	77	42
	22-23	57	31
	24 and over	22	12
Place of Residence	Province	12	66
	District	48	26
	Village	14	8
Mother's Status	Not literate	12	6
	Literate	9	5
	Primary school graduate	69	37
	Secondary school graduate	33	18
	High school graduate	45	25
Father's Status	Higher Education	16	9
	Literate	6	3
	Primary school graduate	45	25
	Secondary school graduate	42	22
Family Type	High school graduate	68	37
	Higher Education	23	13
	Small family	13	75
	Extended family	47	25

According to the results of the gender variable, % 73 of the participants are male and % 27 are female. It is observed that the aggregation in the age variable data is % 42 between 20-21 years old and % 31 between 22-23 years old. According to the place of residence, it is seen that % 66 of the agglomeration lives in the province and % 26 of them live in the district. It is observed that the aggregation in the data of the mother education status variable is % 37 of primary school graduates and % 25 of high school graduates. It

is seen that the accumulation in the data of father's education variable is % 37 of high school graduates, % 25 of primary school graduates and % 22 of secondary school graduates. According to the results of the family type variable, it is seen that % 75 of the participants are small families and % 25 are large families.

Table 2: Gender variable Man Whitney-U test results

Scale Sub-sizes	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
Traditional Understanding of Honor	Female	50	121,88	6094,00	1881,000	,000
	Male	13 4	81,54	10926,00		
Egalitarian Approach Size	Female	50	112,51	5625,50	2349,500	,002
	Male	13 4	85,03	11394,50		
Premarital Sexuality/Understanding of Honor	Female	50	113,72	5686,00	2289,000	,001
	Male	13 4	84,58	11334,00		

In terms of gender variable, there is statistically significant difference between traditional honor understanding, egalitarian approach dimension and pre-marital honor understanding, total scores ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 3: Age variable Kruskal Wallis test results

Scale Sub-sizes	Age	N	Mean Rank	X <sup>2</sup>	P
Traditional Understanding of Honor	17-19	28	106,23	2,398	,494
	20-21	77	89,74		
	22-23	57	91,93		
	24 and over	22	86,16		
Egalitarian Approach Size	17-19	28	111,48	4,679	,197
	20-21	77	89,36		
	22-23	57	86,46		
	24 and over	22	95,00		
Premarital Sexuality/Understanding of Honor	17-19	28	98,46	,699	,873
	20-21	77	89,42		
	22-23	57	92,46		
	24 and over	22	95,82		

In terms of age variable, it is not seen that there is no statistically significant difference between traditional honor understanding, egalitarian approach dimension and pre-marital honor understanding, total scores ( $p > 0.05$ ).

Table 4: Place of residence variable Kruskal-Wallis test results

Scale	Sub-sizes	Place of Residence	N	Mean Rank	X <sup>2</sup>	P
Traditional Understanding of Honor		Province	122	96,30	2,689	,261
		District	48	88,34		
		Village	14	73,61		
Egalitarian Approach Size		Province	122	93,80	,459	,795
		District	48	88,17		
		Village	14	96,04		
Premarital Sexuality/Understanding of Honor		Province	122	98,22	4,946	,084
		District	48	84,41		
		Village	14	70,43		

There is no statistically significant difference between traditional honor understanding, egalitarian approach dimension and pre-marital honor understanding, total scores in terms of place of residence variable ( $p > 0.05$ ).

Table 5: Family type variable Man Whitney-U test results

Scale	Sub-sizes	Family Type	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
Traditional Understanding of Honor		Small Family (Mother, Father, Sister)	13 7	100,87	13819,50	2072,500	,000
		Extended family	47	68,10	3200,50		
Egalitarian Approach Size		Small Family (Mother, Father, Sister)	13 7	98,10	13440,00	2452,000	,014
		Extended family	47	76,17	3580,00		
Premarital Sexuality/Understanding of Honor		Small Family (Mother, Father, Sister)	13 7	97,18	13313,00	2579,000	,041
		Extended family	47	78,87	3707,00		

In terms of family type variable, there is statistically significant difference between traditional honor understanding, egalitarian approach dimension and pre-marital honor understanding, total scores ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 6: Mother education status variable Kruskal Wallis test results

Scale	Sub-sizes	Mother Education	N	Mean Rank	X <sup>2</sup>	P
Traditional Understanding of Honor		Not literate	12	90,00	15,705	,008*
		Literate	9	54,61		
		Primary school graduate	69	82,37		
		Secondary school graduate	33	94,77		
		High school graduate	45	102,04		
		Higher Education	16	127,84		
Egalitarian Approach Size		Not literate	12	88,58	10,005	,075
		Literate	9	54,94		
		Primary school graduate	69	86,43		
		Secondary school graduate	33	93,12		
		High school graduate	45	101,57		
		Higher Education	16	115,97		
Premarital Sexuality/Understanding of Honor		Not literate	12	84,71	15,389	,009*
		Literate	9	43,00		
		Primary school graduate	69	88,11		
		Secondary school graduate	33	90,20		
		High school graduate	45	101,99		
		Higher Education	16	123,19		

There is no statistically significant difference between the egalitarian approach dimension total scores in terms of the mother education status variable ( $p > 0.05$ ). It is seen that there is a statistically significant difference between traditional honor and premarital honor, total scores ( $p < 0.05$ ). Post-Hoc test was carried out to determine which variables are among the differences. Analysis results are shown in detail in table 7.

Table 7: Mother education status variable Post-Hoc test results

Scale Sub-sizes	(I)Mother status	education	(J)Mother education status	(I-J) Mean Difference	S	F	P
Traditional Understanding Honor	Primary of graduate	school	Higher Education	-7,463*	1,62	3,981	,001*
Premarital Sexuality/Understanding of Honor	Literate		High school graduate	-5,889*	1,30	3,211	,005*
			Higher Education	-7,431*	1,61		,002*

In terms of the mother education status variable, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference between the primary honor graduates and higher education graduates in terms of traditional honor, total scores ( $F = 3.981$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). It is seen that there is a statistically significant difference between literacy and high school graduates, literacy and higher education graduates, understanding of honor before marriage, total scores ( $F = 3,211$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 8: Father education status variable Kruskal Wallis test results

Scale Sub sizes	Father education status	N	Mean Rank	X <sup>2</sup>	P
Traditional Understanding of Honor	Literate	6	49,58	15,352	,004*
	Primary school graduate	45	74,78		
	Secondary school graduate	42	88,67		
	High school graduate	68	103,68		
	Higher Education	23	112,33		
Egalitarian Approach Size	Literate	6	66,58	6,919	,140
	Primary school graduate	45	90,22		
	Secondary school graduate	42	80,10		
	High school graduate	68	98,38		
	Higher Education	23	108,98		
Premarital Sexuality/Understanding of Honor	Literate	6	70,58	8,949	,062
	Primary school graduate	45	77,18		
	Secondary school graduate	42	88,80		
	High school graduate	68	104,89		
	Higher Education	23	98,33		

In terms of father's educational status variable, it is not seen that there is no statistically significant difference between the egalitarian approach dimension and pre-marital honor perception, total scores ( $p > 0.05$ ). It is seen that there is a statistically significant difference between traditional honor understanding and total scores ( $X^2(4) = 15.352$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). Post-hoc test was performed to determine which variables the difference is among. Analysis results are shown in detail in table 9.

Table 9: Father education status variable Post-Hoc test results

		(I-J) Mean				
		(J) Father education status	Difference	F	S	P
Primary school graduate	Literate		5,611	4,599	5,027	,975
	Secondary school graduate		-2,532		1,998	,903
	High school graduate		-4,948		1,766	,061
	Higher Education		-6,845*		2,036	,014*

In terms of father's educational status variable, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference between primary school graduates and higher education graduates traditional honor understanding, total scores ( $F = 4,599$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ).

#### 4. Discussion

In this section, the interpretation of the results of the analysis obtained from the research data and the scientific studies that have been done before will be given.

Looking at the results of the research findings, the first table shows the percentage of distributions based on the demographics of the athletes participating in the study.

In terms of gender variable, it has been determined that there is a significant difference between traditional honor understanding, egalitarian approach dimension and pre-marital honor understanding, total scores. It can be said that female students and male students have different perspectives on the understanding of honor, male students have a more innovative and free understanding on the contrary of the honor understanding of traditional students and patriarchal societies. Aksun and Ataca (2007); Bakır et. al., (2019); Cirhinlioğlu and Şenel (2017); Caffaro et. al., (2014); Vefikuluçay et. al., (2007), it was found that men and women think differently in terms of understanding of honor.

In terms of age variable, it was determined that there was no significant difference between traditional honor understanding, egalitarian approach dimension and pre-marital honor understanding, total scores. It can be said that the age factor does not have a different effect on the perception of honor because the ages of the students participating in the research are close to each other and they are in the same development age. In the study conducted by Irmak Vural and Körpe (2018), no significant difference was found between honor perception and age. In the study conducted by Zeyneloğlu et. al., (2013), a



significant difference was found between age and perception of honor. It can be said that the older ones have a traditionalist approach compared to the younger ones.

It was determined that there was no significant difference between traditional honor understanding, egalitarian approach dimension and pre-marital honor understanding, total scores in terms of location variable. It can be said that there is no effect on the perception of honor of the participants in the study, whether the places they live are metropolitan, province or district. Erbil (2019); in the study titled gender roles conducted by Yazıcı (2016), it was found that the place of residence does not affect gender roles.

In terms of the family type variable, there was found to be a significant difference between the traditional conception of "Honor", the size of the egalitarian approach, and the conception of "Honor" before marriage, total scores. It can be said that the family structure affects the perception of "Honor", that the students who grew up in families consisting of parents and siblings, defined as the core family, have a freer and more egalitarian understanding of the understanding of "Honor", and that the students who grew up in a larger family, such as parents, grandparents, uncles, aunts, etc., are more traditionalist.

In terms of the mother education status variable, it was determined that there was no significant difference between the egalitarian approach dimension total scores. It has been determined that there is a significant difference between the traditional honor understanding total scores of the ones whose primary education level is primary school and higher education. It can be said that the students whose mother education level is primary school have a more traditional understanding than the students whose mother education level is higher education. It has been determined that there is a significant difference between the education level of mother, illiterate and high school graduate, and literate and higher education graduate students' understanding of honor before marriage and their total scores. While students whose mothers' education level is high school and higher education, they think that women and men can have a freer life right about sexual life before marriage, while those whose mothers are primary school graduates may have a more traditional view.

In terms of father's educational status variable, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the egalitarian approach dimension and the pre-marital honor perception, total scores. It was determined that there was a statistically significant difference between traditional honor understanding and total scores ( $X^2(4) = 15,352$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). The difference was found to be between the total scores of those with a primary school degree and a higher education degree ( $F = 4.599$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). It can be said that students whose father is a primary school graduate have a more traditional approach to perception of honor, while those who have a higher education graduate have a more egalitarian approach. Güneri and Şen (2018); Çaylan Çağlayan and Topatan (2020); Irmak Vural and Körpe (2018); in the study conducted by Yazıcı (2016), it was determined that parenting education was effective in the perception of honor towards women.

## **5. Conclusion**

As a result, it can be assumed that the thoughts of male students studying at the faculty of sports sciences about the perception of honor are closer to the more traditional approach, they think that a woman has a relationship and sexuality before marriage, while men have a more comfortable lifestyle. Although the thoughts of a small part of the female students towards the perception of honor are close to the thoughts of the male students, the thoughts of the female students who make up the majority are more egalitarian than the thoughts of the male students, women should also be free in their choices like men, a flirt, togetherness or relationship before the marriage of women and men. It was determined that they had the opinion that this situation would not make women dishonorable. As the ages of the students were close to each other, no relation was found between age and perception of honor. Although it is thought that the place where the place is large or small will affect the perception of honor, it has been determined that the living places of the students in the research do not affect their perception of honor. It has been determined that the levels of mother education and father education have an impact on the perception of honor, that the children of higher education graduates have a more egalitarian understanding, and the children of primary school graduates have a more traditional understanding. While a more traditionalist approach is dominant in crowded families where family type also affects the perception of honor, it is determined that a more egalitarian approach is dominant in small-built families that are considered as nuclei. To spread the issue of honor not only as a woman-specific situation to the general public, education should be given from an early age and all individuals should be given equality awareness.

## References

- Akkoç F. (2007). *Evaluation of cause and effect relationship of honor and honor killings*. Police Academy, Institute of Security Sciences, Department of Security Strategies and Management, Master Thesis, Ankara, 2007; p:4-56.
- Aksun D. and Ataca B. (2007). Sexuality Related Attitudes and Behaviors of Turkish University Students. *Arch Sex Behav* (2007) 36: p:741–752.
- Altunel M. (2012). Honor. *Ankara Bar Association Journal*, V (1), N (1), p: 215-217.
- Bakır, N., Irmak Vural, P., Demir, C. (2019). Investigation of university students' attitudes towards sexual education and gender perceptions in terms of some variables. *Life Skills Journal of Psychology*, 3(5), p:119-128.
- Bilgili N., ve Vural G., (2011). The most severe form of violence against women: Honor Killings. *Anatolia Nursing and Health Sciences Journal*, 2011; 14: p:1.
- Caffaro F., Ferraris F., and Schmidt S. (2014). Gender differences in the perception of “Honor” killing in individualist versus collectivistic cultures: comparison between Italy and Turkey. *Sex Roles* (2014) 71: p:296–318.
- Cirhinlioğlu F.G. and Şenel A.F. (2017).The relationships among honor perception attributed to women, values and sex roles. *International Journal of Social Science*, Number: 60, p: 311-324.
- Çaylan Çağlayan M. and Topatan S. (2020). Women perceptions and attitudes towards honor of male university Students. *Turkiye Clinics J Med Ethics*. 2020;28(1): p:77-89.
- Er Güneri S. and Şen S. (2018). The attitudes of the university students towards perception of honor attributed to women. *Sted*, volume 27, issue 4, p:258-266.
- Erbil N. (2019). The relationship between university students' gender roles attitudes and life values. *Ordu University Journal of Nursing Studies*, 2(1), p:33-45
- Gursoy E. (2009). *University senior students' attitudes towards “honor” understanding of women (Ankara Sample)*. Marmara University, Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology Nursing, Ph.D. Thesis, Istanbul, 2009; p:7-29.
- Gursoy E., and Arslan Ozkan H. (2014). The perception of ““Honor”” of university students in Turkey regarding women. *Journal of Psychiatric Nursing* 2014;5(3): p:149-159.
- Irmak Vural, P., Körpe, G. (2018). The attitude of university students about femininity-masculinity and women's sense of Honor. *Journal of Life Skills Psychology*, 2(3), p:155-166.
- Mannel S. (2003). “Honor” Killings amongst Turks in the Netherlands. *Amsterdam University Press*, Isbn 90 5356 491 8, p:747/761.
- Karasar, N. (2012). Scientific research methods. *Nobel Publishing House*, 24. Printing, Ankara.
- Tumer A. M. Baybug, and Birgili F. (2017). University students ' understanding of women's honor. *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology mother and Child Health*, Muğla, 0000-0002-3078-64681.
- Vefikuluçay D., Zeyneloğlu S., Eroğlu K., and Taşkın L. (2007). Perception of and views on gender roles of senior students enrolled at Kafkas University. *Journal of The School of Nursing*, (2007), p: 26–38.

Yazıcı T. (2016). The attitude of music teacher candidates to social gender roles. *Journal of Academic Outlook*, Issue: 54, p: 833-852.

Zeynelođlu S., Kısa S. and Yılmaz D. (2013). Turkish nursing students' knowledge and perceptions regarding virginity. *Nurse Education Today*, 33 (2013) p:110–115.

---

### **Copyrights**

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (**CC BY-NC-ND**) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).