



# Researcher: Social Science Studies

(2017) Cilt 5, Sayı IV, s. 53-67

**RSSS**  
ISSN:2148-2691

## Toplumsal Cinsiyet Eğitiminin Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rol Tutumları Üzerine Etkisi\*

Ayşegül ÖZCAN<sup>1</sup>, Nimet KARATAŞ<sup>2</sup>, E.Ümit SEVİĞ<sup>3</sup>

### Özet

Çalışma, üniversite öğrencilerine uygulanan toplumsal cinsiyete ilişkin geliştirilmiş eğitim programının öğrencilerin toplumsal cinsiyet tutumlarına etkisini incelemek amacıyla yapılmıştır. Çalışma ön test-son test tek gruplu model ilkelerine uygun deneysel bir çalışmadır. Çalışmaya, Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi birinci sınıf öğrencilerinden, çalışma kriterlerine uyan ve çalışmaya katılmayı kabul eden basit rasgele örneklem yöntemi ile seçilen 40 öğrenci alınmıştır. Çalışma grubuna araştırmacı tarafından 12 hafta boyunca haftada 2 saat "toplumsal cinsiyet eğitimi" verilmiştir. Veriler, Tanıtıcı Bilgi Formu, Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rol Tutum Ölçeği (TCRTÖ) ve Cinsiyet Eşitliği Ölçeği (CEÖ) kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Çalışma öncesi etik kurul onayı ile sözel ve yazılı onamları alınmıştır. Verilerin normal dağılıma uygunluğu Tek Örneklem Kolmogorov- Smirnov Testi ile belirlenmiştir. Veriler tanımlayıcı istatistikler, Cronbach's Alpha, paired sample t testi, one way anova, independent t testi kullanılmıştır.

Çalışmada, TCRTÖ ölçeği geleneksel alt boyut puan ortalaması eğitim öncesi 19.50±4.3 iken, eğitim sonrası 23.22±5.16, eşitlikçi alt boyut puan ortalaması eğitim öncesi 26.65±4.47 iken, eğitim sonrası 33.97±4.50 yükselmiştir. Aralarındaki fark, istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bulunmuştur (p<0.001). CE ölçeği geleneksel alt boyut puan ortalaması eğitim öncesi 27.35±3.79, eğitim sonrası 38.17±3.65, eşitlikçi alt boyut puan ortalaması eğitim öncesi 11.40±2.87, eğitim sonrası 17.85±3.65'dir. Eğitim öncesi ve sonrası, CE ölçek puan ortalamaları arasındaki fark anlamlı bulunmuştur (p<0.05). Öğrencilere toplumsal cinsiyete yönelik verilen eğitimin öğrencilerin toplumsal cinsiyet tutumlarında geleneksel tutumdan eşitlikçi tutuma doğru olumlu yönde değişime neden olmuştur. Toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı eğitimde öğrencilerin aile özelliklerinin etkili olmadığı belirlenmiştir. Çalışma, hemşirelerin cinsiyet eşitliğinin sağlayabilme konusunda eğitim sorumluluğunu etkin kullanabilmesi açısından katkı sağlayacaktır.

### Anahtar Kelimeler

Cinsiyet eşitliği  
Cinsiyet eğitimi  
Toplumsal cinsiyet  
tutumları  
Üniversite öğrencileri

<sup>1</sup> Asst. Prof., Nursing Department, University of Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli, aysegulozcan.77@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Nursing Department, University of Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli, nkaratas@nevsehir.edu.tr

<sup>3</sup> Professor, Nursing Department, University of Erciyes, [usevig@erciyes.edu.tr](mailto:usevig@erciyes.edu.tr)

\*Çalışma, Erciyes Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırma Projeleri Birimi tarafından TSB-10-3072 Kodlu proje ile desteklenmiştir. 17 Th International Congress Of The International Society Of Psychosomatic Obstetrics And Gynaecology (ISPOG). 22-24 May 2013, Berlin. Sözel Bildiri.

## The Effect of Gender Education on Gender Role Attitudes of University Students

### Abstract

### Keywords

**Purpose:** The study was conducted to investigate the effect of education program that was improved related to gender on gender attitudes of university students. **Methods:** The study is a pre-post test with single group, experimental study. Total 40 students who met criterias at 1th class of Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University and accepted to participate to the study were chosen by randomized sample method and taken to the study. "Gender education" was given to the study group as 2 hours in a day during 12 weeks by the researcher. Data was collected by using Informative Form, Gender Role Attitudes Scale (GRAS) and Gender Equality Scale (GES). Before the study, ethical committee with written and verbal consents were taken. Normal distribution relevance of data was determined with Single Sample Kolmogorov- Smirnov Test. Data was evaluated by using descriptive statistics, Cronbach's Alpha, paired sample t test, one way anova and independent t test. **Results:** In the study, GRAS traditional sub dimension score mean was  $19.50 \pm 4.3$  before the education and it was  $23.22 \pm 5.16$  after the education; while equalitarian sub dimension score mean was  $26.65 \pm 4.47$  before education, it increased as  $33.97 \pm 4.50$  after the education. The difference between them was significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). Again, traditional sub dimension score mean of GES was  $27.35 \pm 3.79$  before the education, after education it was  $38.17 \pm 3.65$ ; equalitarian sub dimension score mean was  $11.40 \pm 2.87$  before the education and after education it was  $17.85 \pm 3.65$ . Also, before and after the education, difference between GES score means was significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). **Conclusions:** The education related to gender caused that traditional attitudes of the students changed direct to equality attitude as positively. It is determined that familial characteristics of them were not effective on this education based on gender. The study could contribute to nurses about using education responsibilities for supplying gender equality.

Gender equality  
Gender education  
Gender attitudes  
University student

## INTRODUCTION

In some developing countries as our country that paternalistic structure is effective in; discrimination should be done in using opportunities, sharing and using of sources and reaching to services because of gender of person. Gender Discrimination Report of World Economic Forum (2013) exhibits the men-women inequality in the world as dramatically. Türkiye is one of the countries in the world that gender gap is very deep and it is in the 120<sup>th</sup> order within 136 countries (Özer ve Biçerli, 2003). Because of this discrimination, women who have disadvantage according to men and low social statute could be affected more negatively ([http://kizlarinegitimi.meb.gov.tr/files/img/toplum\\_cinsiyet\\_ve\\_egitim.pdf](http://kizlarinegitimi.meb.gov.tr/files/img/toplum_cinsiyet_ve_egitim.pdf)).

Inequalities in education, law, social and political areas could affect the health of women in society, especially in their families (Çayır, 2012; <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/Gosterge>). One of the most important factors that expose this inequality is traditional overview of men, related to gender role. The studies show that men internalised some expresses and traditional roles related to gender as 'the basic task of women is that looking after house and

family”, “head of household must be man”, “supplying family income must be responsibility of man” (Yılmaz vd.,2009; Rosenkrantz et al.,1968; Trommsdorf and Iwawaki, 1989; Burt and Scott, 2002; Mahaffyetal.,2002). It is the most thought-provoking thing that women accepted these traditional roles. According to TPHR 2003 and 2008 data, it is suggested that women education is more important than men education (<http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/TNSA2008-AnaRapor.pdf>, <http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/pdf/TNSA2003AnaRapor.pdf>). In the studies it is found that 39-63% of the women 15-49 aged found their husband’s beating them justified (Özçatal, 2011; Kadın statüsü genel müdürlüğü,2009; Yaman ve Ayaz,2010).

According to literature, the basic dimension of accepting gender role is to perceive themselves as a woman or man, namely gender identity. Regardless of contributions of biologic, hormonal effects on gender differences, basic tool is learning for gender roles. Gender role is learned from parents, siblings, school, peers and mass communication (Dönmezer,1999; Ataman,2009; Seçgin ve Turhal,2011). Conventionality process related to gender lasts during childhood, adolescent and adulthood years. This process is included in expectations about how long the people will depend on their behaviors are brought by their own gender (Çınar,2005; Kulaksızıoğlu 2002).

Besides changing in traditional roles is a process that could occur in time, it is certain that education activities should be maintained for consciousness raising process (Sağ, 2003; Özçelik vd.,2006; Turan vd., 2001; Verdonk et al.,2009; Dielisen et al.,2014; Verloo,2006). So; it is needed that education studies as raising consciousness should be that emphasize network based on gender in every step, girls and boys should be in with equal conditions. It is more true that education activities should be direct to youths. Young people in puberty (15-24 years old) stage internalize a variety of norm, value and attitude and reflect these to behaviours; so their future life could shape. Thus, gender role teaching that is transferred to next generation could take shape as more equitable. Although a lot of studies were conducted direct to women about gender equality in our country, the studies related to men are very little, scarcely any. For coping with gender inequalities, men also should be informed about this subject. While nurse is performing these roles and responsibilities it is especially needed to conduct some studies about gender equality. This study will contribute to nurse for using her education role in being able to supply gender equality, effectively.

## METHODOLOGY

### Objective

This study was conducted to investigate the effects of education program that is improved related to social gender on gender attitudes of the university students.

### Design of the study

The study was conducted at Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University in Capadocia region of Turkey by using experimental design with pre-post test, single group.

### Participants

The first class students attending to 2010-2011 education session, haven’t got any communication problem, got low and middle level gender equality score (1-47 points) were included in the study [27]. Sample was consisted of 40 certain and 40 substitute students who accepted to participate to the study and met the criterias from 100 students who got low and

middle level gender equality score (1-47 points) by simple randomized method. (Number of girl and boy students were equated. With this sample large, when the post power analysis of gender equality scores before and after the study as alpha 0.05, power was obtained exactly (1.00). Thus, the sample large was considered as enough.

### **Measurements and Data Collection Tools**

Data was collected with informative form prepared by researcher Gender Role Attitude Scale related to determination gender role attitudes and Gender Equality Scale in Adolescent (Zeyneloğlu ve Terzioğlu, 2011; Çeber vd.,2009).

*Informative Form*; It is a form that was prepared in order to determine sociodemographic data of the students and their parent. In this form, there are 13 questions related to determination some characteristics of the students as age, marital status, birth place etc, and seven questions about characteristics of parents (education statute, occupation, marriage type etc).

*Gender Role Attitude Scale (GRAS)*; It is improved by Zeyneloğlu in 2008 and used for evaluating gender role attitudes of university students. Scale consists of 38 items that determine gender role attitudes. It is a 5-likert type scale and choices are as followings; "I certainly don't agree", "I don't agree", "I am unstable", "I agree" and "I exactly agree". Score of the scale is calculated for every item as for traditional attitudes, "I certainly don't agree" 5 points, "I don't agree" 4 points, "I am unstable" 3 points, "I agree" 2 points and "I exactly agree" 1 point. However, for equitable attitudes, it is graded as acrimoniously. The highest score is "190", as the lowest score is "38". The high score that got from scale shows the equitable attitude, but low score shows they have traditional attitudes. Cronbach Alpha reliability co-efficient of GRAS was found as 0.92. It is determined that Cronbach Alpha reliability co-efficient for subscales were as following; 0.80 for women gender role; 0.78 for equalitarian role, gender in marriage and traditional gender role; 0.72 for men gender role (Zeyneloğlu ve Terzioğlu, 2011). In this study, Cronbach Alpha Reliability coefficient was 0.86.

*Gender Equality Scale in Adolescent (GES)*; Validity and reliability study of the scale that improved by Pulerwitz and Barker in Brazil was conducted by Çeber and colleagues (2009) in Turkey. The scale consists of 24 items and two sub-dimensions High score shows that gender equality norms are supported highly. Again, scores are evaluated as high, middle and low; 1-23 points are low equality, 24-47 points are middle, 48-72 points are high equality. Also, internal consistency co-efficients for subscales were calculated as 0.79 for 'Traditional Gender Norms' and 0.61 for 'Equalitarian Gender Norms' (Çeber vd.,2009). Cronbach alpha value was 0.78, in the study.

### **Education Guidance/Program for Social Gender**

It is aimed to raise the awareness of the students by education program improved related to gender roles, improve recognition related to gender roles, and make them get equalitarian attitude and. A planned education context was prepared by using techniques of model preparing with adult teaching principles. Again, education was prepared by considering similar and current studies (TC. Başbakanlık Kadın Statüsü Genel Müdürlüğü,1994; Yüksel vd.,2007). Study group (n:40) was divided in 4 groups as 10 people for performing education as interactive, supplying group interaction. Education program was performed in nine sessions as one time in a week for every group during three months

(Table 1). A class of university was used as education class. In this study, *Gender Role Attitude Scale (GRAS)* was used by reducing in two subscales as as traditional and equalitarian.

**Table 1. Gender Education Program**

Sessions	Education context	Duration education	Methods
1. Session	Introduction- orientation	45-60 min	Question-answer
2. Session	Studying of interlanguage	45-60 min	Question-answer,telling, presentation
3. Session	About Roles of Woman and Man	45-60 min	Question-answer, discussion
4. Session	Brain- gymnastic regarding social gender	45-60 min	Telling, presentation, homework
5. Session	Watch activity	45-60 min	Small group discussion
6. Session	Learning Social Gender Roles	45-60 min	Case
7. Session	Position of Women in Turkey	45-60 min	Telling, presentation
8. Session	Women and Men in our Society	45-60 min	Brain storming
9. Session	Action Plan	45-60 min	Brain storming

The participants were wanted to write their plan for increasing social gender awareness in university by distributing study material. After the education, feelings and thinkings of the students were asked as written by some questions as followings;

- Was the education helpful? Why?
- What are your changed or unchanged views after education?

After 3 months completing social gender education program, the students were again performed “Gender Role Attitudes Scale” and “Gender Equality Scale in Adolescent”.

### Data analysis

Data were evaluated by using IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0 (Chicago, ILL, USA) package program. Normal distribution of data was determined by using single sample, Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. Because of all data shows normal distribution, parametric tests were used. For statistical analysis, Cronbach’s Alpha, paired sample t test, one way anova, and independent t tests were used.

### Ethical considerations

Before the study, ethical committee consent was recruited (Erciyes University Medical Faculty Ethics Committee 2010/12). Also, verbal and written consents of the students were obtained. Again, consents of authors for using scales were obtained.

### RESULTS

**Table 2. Distribution of Participants by Sociodemographic Features (n=40)**

Variables	N	%
<b>Age</b>		
19 year	25	72.5
20 years and over	15	27.5
<b>Education level</b>		
Super/Anatolian High School	11	27.5
High school and vocational high school	29	72.5
<b>Family type</b>		
Nuclear family	34	85.0
Extended family	6	15.0
<b>Number of sibling</b>		
2 siblings and less	18	45.0
3 siblings and more	22	55.0
<b>Place of Birth</b>		
City	19	72.5
Village	11	27.5
<b>Education of mother</b>		
Primary school and low degree*	33	82.5
Secondary and high school	7	17.5
<b>Education of father</b>		
Primary sch. and low degree	18	45.0
Secondary school	5	12.5
High school and university**	17	42.5
<b>Parent marriage type</b>		
Arranged marriage, not meeting before	16	40.0

Arranged marriage, by meeting and after accepting	15	37.5
By meeting and being agree	9	22.5

\*2 people are literate \*\*3 people graduated from university

Of the students; 27.5% were 20 years and over, 55.0% had 3 and more siblings and 72.5% lived in city. Also, 82.5% of their mothers graduated from primary school or literate, only 3% of the mothers who graduated from secondary and high school graduated from high school. Also, almost half of the fathers (%42.5) graduated from primary school, fathers of 35% of them graduated from high school. It is found that almost all of the mothers were house -wife (97.5%), 30% of the fathers didn't work (Table 2).

**Table 3. The mean scores of the students for GRAS and GES before and after the education (n=40)**

SCALES	Before education	After education	p*
	X	X	
	19.50±4.36	23.22±5.16	<0.001
		33.97±4.50	<0.001

\*t-test

In the study, GRAS traditional role score mean was 19.50±4.36 before the education; it was 23.22±5.16 after the education. Also, before and after the education equalitarian role was 26.65±4.47 and 33.97±4.50, respectively. Difference between them was found as significant (p<0.001). However, while GE Scale traditional sub-scale score mean was 27.35±3.79 before the education, it increased as 38.17±3.65. Besides, equalitarian sub scale score mean was 11.40±2.87, and 17.85±3.65, respectively before and after the education. The difference between GE Scale score means before and after education were significant (p <0.001).

**Table 4. Mean scores in GRAS and GES subscores of Students according to their gender before and after education and difference between mean scores (n=40)**

Scales	Woman Women		p*	Men Men		p*	p**
	Before education $\bar{X} \pm SD$	After education $\bar{X} \pm SD$		Before education $\bar{X} \pm SD$	After education $\bar{X} \pm SD$		
<b>GRAS</b>							
Traditional							
Equalitarian							
<b>GES</b>							
Traditional subscore							
	29.35±3.54	39.85±3.97	<0.001	25.35±2.94	36.50±4.12	0.001	0.377
Equalitarian							
		18.55±4.38	<0.001	10.75±3.09	18.55±2.68	0.002	0.818

\*paired test \*\*independent t test

It is given that mean scores in GRAS and GES according to gender of the students before and after education and also mean differences (Table 4). There was an increasing in mean scores in all subscales of Gender Equality Scale and Gender Role Attitude Scale in women and men with increased education and the difference was significant as statistically ( $p < 0.001$ ). It is seen that mean scores of all subscales in GRAS before and after the education in women was higher than men. However, the differences between mean scores of all subscales for GRAS and GES before and after education weren't found as significant according to gender ( $p > 0.05$ ) (Table 4).

**Table 5. Mean scores in GRAS and GES subscores of students according to some socio-demographic variables before and after education and difference between mean scores (n=40)**

Socio-Demographic Variables		GRAS		GES	
		Traditional role	Equalitarian gender role	Traditional subscore	Equalitarian subscore
		$\bar{X} \pm SD$	$\bar{X} \pm SD$	$\bar{X} \pm SD$	$\bar{X} \pm SD$
<b>Parent marriage types</b>					
Arranged marriage	Before education	19.12±2.82	24.43±5.92	26.93 ±4.23	10.87±2.47
	After education	24.43±5.92	32.06±4.62	36.37±4.66	18.06±2.79
	p*	<0.001	<0.001	0.005	0.001



Arranged marriage and love marriage	Before ducation	19.60±5.81	28.46±2.58	26.88±3.44	11.26±3.04
	After education	28.46±2.58	38.11±3.05	40.13±4.01	17.06±4.55
	p*	<0.001	<0.001	0.001	0.001
Love marriage	Before ducation	20.04±4.24	27.55±1.81	28.88±3.55	12.55±3.24
	After education	27.55±1.61	32.22±3.63	38.11±3.05	18.77±3.45
	p*	0.008	0.013	0.011	0.008
	p**	0.818	0.296	0.306	0.415
<b>Living place</b>					
City	Before ducation	19.68±4.62	27.09±3.97	28.25±4.28	11.37±2.93
	After education	27.22±4.66	34.04±3.59	38.50±4.17	11.43±2.87
	p*	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Village	Before ducation	19.27±4.14	26.11±5.08	26.00±2.47	11.43±2.87
	After education	27.11±5.08	33.88±5.52	37.68±4.68	19.43±4.68
	p*	.001	0.003	0.001	0.001
	p**	0.104	0.631	0.778	<b>0.030</b>

**Table 5 (continued). Mean scores in GRAS and GES subscores of students according to some socio-demographic variables before end after education and difference between mean scores(n=40)**

Socio-Demographic Variables	GRAS		GES		
	Traditional role	Equalitarian gender role	Traditional subscore	Equalitarian subscore	
<b>Family types</b>					
Nuclear family	Before education	19.68±4.62	27.00±3.74	27.44±3.93	26.83±3.18
	After education	27.22±4.66	34.04±3.59	38.32±4.54	37.33±3.14
	p*	0.001	0.006	0.001	0.004
Extended family	Before education	19.27±4.14	24.66±5.08	11.14±2.73	12.83±3.48
	After education	27.00±2.53	31.00±2.67	18.66±3.84	17.70±2.33
	p*	0.006	0.071	0.001	0.002
	p**	0.741	0.146	0.870	0.226
<b>Education status of mother</b>					
Primary	Before education	19.45±4.58	26.93±4.85	27.71±4.03	9.25±2.05

school and low degree	After education	27.69±4.75	34.06±4.53	37.96±3.87	11.93±2.01
	p*	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.001
Secondary and high school	Before education	19.71±3.40	25.28±1.38	25.87±2.27	11.93±2.01
	After education	25.00±6.75	33.57±4.68	39.00±6.14	18.15±3.17
	p*	0.053	0.002	0.190	0.409
	p**	0.560	0.462	0.822	0.317
<b>Education status of father</b>					
Primary school and low degree	Before education	19.38±4.08	25.38±5.77	26.33±3.18	11.00±2.76
	After education	27.33±5.14	31.61±5.71	37.78±4.37	17.66±4.18
	p*	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Secondary and high school	Before education	19.39±4.66	27.68±2.78	28.18±4.12	11.73±2.97
	After education	27.13±5.30	34.27±3.32	38.50±4.07	17.66±4.18
	p*	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
	p**	0.560	0.462	0.211	0.952

In the study, it is found that difference between mean scores in GRAS and GES before and after education wasn't as significant according to their parents' education level (Table 5) ( $p>0.05$ ). When their living place was investigated, it is found that mean scores of students who lived in city center was higher than others who lived in village and town before education. The difference between mean scores of all subscales except GE scale equalitarian dimension and total scale of GRAS and GES for the students who lived city, village or town before and after education was insignificant ( $p>0.05$ ).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Gender that is shaped by traditional paternalistic culture and values determines how men or women should behave (Yeşilorman, 2002; Ridgeway and Correll, 2000; Vefikuluçay vd., 2007; Arslan, 2003; Ökten, 2009; Sündal, 2005). Nowadays, media and even if education institutes have an effective role in generalizing traditional gender by showing men as more strong in decision mechanism but women as consumer, dependent and jealous related to gender of girl and boy students were investigated, it is found that they had got traditional attitude. In the study, mothers' being housewife and the most of fathers' (70%) being working could be effective in interiorizing traditional roles. Also, this finding is accepted as an important indicator for inequality of women and men in working life. Our study is parallel with another studies related to gender that were conducted in Turkey and the World (Bhasin, 2003; Yee and Brown, 1994; Rıfat, 2016; Yılmaz vd., 2009; Karataş vd., 2011; Güzel, 2011; Khalid and Friese, 2004; Katsura end Sugihara, 1999; Zhang, 2006; Chia et al., 1994; Tu and Liao, 2005; Kahraman vd., 2015).

For changing of work-sharing based on dominant gender and social gender role responsibilities; it is needed to change traditional perceptive and mentality which perceived women has got primary role and responsibility in care for house, family and children. It is emphasized that an education insight that bring an equalitarian approach to women-men roles in every stage of life as beginning childhood should take place in family, nursing home, school, mass media and special education environments for adults ( Özçelik vd.,2006; Turan vd.,2001; Bora,2008; Arısoy ve Demir, 2007; Dedeoğlu, 2000; Negiz ve Tokmakçı, 2011;Subrahmanian, 2005). In a study of Biddle and colleagues (1990); university life leads differences in person's values and overviews. In a study that was conducted with young men, it is found that educative works and activities increased gender norms (Verma et all.,2006). There is only a study of Erden that as similar to our study in our country. In the study of Erden, it is determined that there was a positive change in gender attitudes of the students who took gender equality course and there wasn't any change in attitudes of the students who didn't take course (Erden, 2009). In our study, it is found that mean scores of all subscales in GRAS and GES before and after education increased and difference between mean scores was significant highly ( $p=0.001, p=0.001$ ). It could be stated that because of discussing work-sharing basen on gender, how the situations of women and men in every environment of society, students' expressing themselves in the study, their sharing experience with group at a planned education about social gender could change their attitudes to equalitarian from traditional as positively, even if their age, education statute, living place and family characteristics didn't change. It is suggested that findings of our study emphasized the importance of special education programs for adults in supplying women-men equality, changing traditional attitudes, improving equalitarian approach instead of traditional values and applications (Erden ve Akman,2001; Senemoğlu,2002). Meeting the education needs of this group is important both social and economical improvements of country and also an effect on general population politics.

It is important that reproduction of roles, investigating social gender concepts, asking the families to list the works that done within 24 hours, in educations based on social gender are important to examine traditional roles in house (Başbakanlık Kadın Statüsü Genel Müdürlüğü,1994; Özmete ve Yanar,2016). In the study, some statements in the study are as following;

"I suppose that housewives make ordinary works. I thought they were watching TV and visiting their neighbours all day. However, with our study, I recognized that they have got more work-load"

"In our society that we live, men are defined as power. I used to think that men must be in every area and see girls as honor, mostly. I think women are unique beings who complete the gender. We must show women's power to the World in order supply women-men equality."

"It was a very useful education. Because, my opinions improved, I learned the difference between social and biological gender. It made me to look to life from different viewpoints."

"I recognized the difficulties that gender brought. I saw that how our gender shaped in rigid thinkings."

"As a men, my thinkings about the importance of women in our life increased still more according to my previous opinions. I understand that I will never accept inequality."

These statements show that recognition relation the social gender role direct to equalitarian increased. In our study, it is seen that reproduction of roles based on social gender; investigating sexuality, social gender concepts; discussing the works that done within 24 hours by listing are important in changing gender role attitude as positively.

Some other factors that affect social gender are education status of parents, living place and familial characteristics. In our study it is found that differences between mean scores of GRAS and GES before and after education weren't significant according to education status of students' parents, familial characteristics (Table 5)( $p>0.05$ ). In another studies also it is found that there wasn't a significant relation between education status of parents and equalitarian gender role attitudes of the students, as similar to our study [60-62]. In the study, 82.5% of the mothers of the students were literate and 42.5% of the fathers were literate or graduated from primary school (Table 2). It is thought that the students could adopt traditional roles because of parent's education status being low, almost all of mothers's (97.5%) being housewife, being the role of woman as motherhood and thinking that responsibilities in house are women's. This is explained through 'gender role differentiation' of Parsons by giving expressive roles to women, instrumental roles to men. It is seen that the education status of fathers was higher than the mothers (Table 2). According to TPHR 2008, 18% of the women and 23% of the men had got middle degree education [11]. This result shows that education status between men and women was also not equal and men had higher education than women. These results are manifestations for woman's disadvantage and social gender inequalities in education in Turkey (Yeşilorman,2002; Ökten,2009; Karakuş, 2007; Atış,2010; Erol, 2008).

In our study, it is found that before education, total score means in GRAS and GES of the students lived in city were higher than the others lived in village and town. However, the relation between mean scores as in sub dimensions and total for GRAS and GES, except equalitarian GES score, before and after education were not significant according to living place ( $p>0.05$ )(Table 5). In a study of Zeyneloğlu, developmental level of living place until primary school finished was a factor that affects social gender attitudes of the students [27]. In our study being not any difference between mean scores from GRAS and GES according to living place is thought because of the effect of planned social gender education.

## REFERENCES

- Arısoy, E., Demir,N.B.(2007). Avrupa Birliği sosyal hukukunda ayrımcılıkla mücadele kapsamında kadın erkek eşitliği. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 7(2), 707-725
- Arslan, A.D. (2003). Eşitsizliğin teorik temelleri: Elit teorisi. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(2), 115-135.
- Ataman, H. (2009). LGTB hakları insan haklarıdır. *İnsan Hakları Gündemi Derneği Yayınları*.
- Atış, F. (2010). Ebelik/Hemşirelik 1. ve 4. sınıf öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine ilişkin tutumlarının belirlenmesi, Yüksek Lisans tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Adana.
- Bhasin, K. (2003). Toplumsal cinsiyet“bize yüklenen roller”. İstanbul: Kadınlarla Dayanışma Vakfı Yayınları.
- Burt, K. B., & Scott, J. (2002). Parent and adolescent gender role attitudes in 1990s Great Britain. *Sex roles*, 46(7), 239-245.

- Bora, A. (2008). Sivil toplum kuruluşları için toplumsal cinsiyet rehberi. Ankara: Odak Ofset.
- Chia, R. J., Moore, L., Lam K.N. and et al. (1994). Culture differences in gender role attitudes between Chinese and American students. *Sex Roles*, 31, 23-30.
- Çayır, K. (2012). Yaşlılık/Yaşa Dayalı Ayrımcılık. *Ayrımcılık: Çok Boyutlu Yaklaşımlar*. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları,163-74
- Çeber, E., Demirelöz, M., Nazlı, A., Ekşioşlu, A., Mermer, G., Aslan, G., Yücel, U. (2009). Ergenlerde Cinsiyet Eşitliği Ölçeğinin Türkçeye Uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Turkish Journal of Research & Development in Nursing*, 11(2).
- Çınar, P. (2005). Hangimiz daha saldırgan?, *Türk Psikoloji Bülteni*, 11(36), 76-80.
- Kulaksızoğlu, A. (2002). Ergenlik psikolojisi. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Dedeoğlu, S. (2000). Toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri açısından Türkiye’de aile ve kadın emeği. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 86, 139-167
- Dielissen, P., Verdonk, P., Wieringa-de Waard, M., Bottema, B., Lagro-Janssen, T. (2014). The effect of gender medicine education in GP training: a prospective cohort study. *Perspectives on medical education*, 3(5), 343-356.
- Dönmezer, S. (1999). *Toplumbilim*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayınları.
- Erden, T.F. (2009). A course on gender equity in education : Does it affect gender role attitudes of preservice teachers?. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 409-414.
- Erden, M., Akman, Y. (2001). *Gelişim ve öğrenme*. Ankara: Özkan Matbaacılık.
- N. Senemoğlu, (2002). *Gelişim öğrenme ve öğretim*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi, 598.
- Erol, M. (2008). Toplumsal cinsiyetin tutumlar üzerindeki etkisi. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 32(2), 199-219.
- Esin, M.N, Öztürk, N. (2005). Çalışma yaşamı ve kadın sağlığı. *Türk Tabipleri Birliği Mesleki Sağlık ve Güvenlik Dergisi*, 6(23), 38-42.
- Güzel E, N. (2011)., Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyete ilişkin düşünceleri, 1.Ulusal Kültürlerarası Hemşirelik Ve Ebelik Kongresi, İzmir, 220-222.
- [http://kizlarinegitimi.meb.gov.tr/files/img/toplum\\_cinsiyet\\_ve\\_egitim.pdf](http://kizlarinegitimi.meb.gov.tr/files/img/toplum_cinsiyet_ve_egitim.pdf) (Erişim: 01.07.2015)
- [http://kizlarinegitimi.meb.gov.tr/files/img/toplum\\_cinsiyet\\_ve\\_egitim.pdf](http://kizlarinegitimi.meb.gov.tr/files/img/toplum_cinsiyet_ve_egitim.pdf)(Erişim:tarihi 01.07.2015)
- <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/Gosterge> (Erişim: 02.03.2015)
- <http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/TNSA2008-AnaRapor.pdf> (Erişim: 10.02.2009)
- <http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/pdf/TNSA2003AnaRapor.pdf>(Erişim:01.05.2009)
- Kadının Statüsü Genel Müdürlüğü, (2009). Türkiye’de kadına yönelik aile içi şiddet. Ankara: Başbakanlık Kadının Statüsü Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları.
- Kahraman, B.A., Tunçdemir, N.O., Kekillioğlu, A., Özcan, A., Kahraman, L. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet algıları. *The Journal of Social Science*, 2(4), 304-322.

- Karakuş, G.Y. (2007). Meslek liselerinde öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin toplumsal cinsiyet algıları ve davranışları. Yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Karataş, F., Kızılateş, Z.R., Tuğlı ve ark.(2011). Üniversite öğrencilerinin cinsiyet eşitliğine ilişkin görüşleri.10. Ulusal-Uluslararası Öğrenci Hemşirelik Kongresi. Gaziantep, ss 657.
- Katsura, E., Sugihara, Y. (1999). Gender differences in gender role perceptions among Japanese college students. *Sex Roles*, 41(9/10), 775-786.
- Khalid, R., Friese, H.I.(2004). Measuring perceptions of Gender Roles: The IAWS for Pakistanis and U.S immigrant population. *Sex Roles*, 51(5/6), 293-299.
- Mahaffy, K. A., Ward, S. K. (2002). The gendering of adolescents' childbearing and educational plans: Reciprocal effects and the influence of social context. *Sex Roles*, 46(11), 403-417.
- Negiz, N., Tokmakçı, E. (2011). Çalışma yaşamında kadının tükenmişliği. *Journal of Yaşar University*, 24(6), 4041-4070.
- Ökten, Ş. (2009). Toplumsal cinsiyet ve iktidar: Güneydoğu Anadolu Bölgesinin toplumsal cinsiyet düzeni. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(8), 301-312.
- Özçatal, E. Ö. (2011). Ataerkillik, toplumsal cinsiyet ve kadının çalışma yaşamına katılımı. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(1), 21-39.
- Özçelik, Z., Karaduman, B., Bafra, K. ve ark. (2006). Hemşirelikte haklar ve sorumluluklar. Ankara: Odak Ofset Matbaacılık.
- Özer, M., Biçerli, K.(2003). Türkiye'de kadın işgücünün panel veri analizi. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(1), 55-86.
- Özmete, E., Yanar, Z.M. (2016). Erkeklerin bakış açısıyla toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri: Kadın ve erkek olmanın değeri. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 20(1), 91-107.
- Rıfat, B. (2016). Geleneksel ve modern toplumda kadın bedeni ve cinselliği, *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 26/1, 219-243.
- Ridgeway, C. L., Correll, S. J. (2000). Limiting inequality through interaction: The end (s) of gender. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(1), 110-120.
- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., Broverman, D. M. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 32(3), 287.
- Sağ, V. (2003). Toplumsal değişim ve eğitim üzerine. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 27(1), 11-25.
- Seçgin, F, Tural, A.(2011). Attitudes on gender roles of primary school teacher candidates. *Education Sciences*, 6 (4), 2446-2458.
- Sedef, Z., Varol, M., Çiçeklioğlu, Ş.T. (2016). Bir tıp fakültesi birinci sınıf öğrencilerinde toplumsal cinsiyet algı düzeyi ve ilişkili faktörlerin değerlendirilmesi. *Ege Journal of Medicine*, 55(3), 122-128.
- Subrahmanian, R.(2005). Gender equality in education: Definition and measurements. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 25, 395-407.

- Sündal, F. (2005). Görünmez kadınlar görünür İslam: Türkiye’de eğitimli islamcı kadınların toplumsal cinsiyet bakımından günlük yaşamları. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 1(1), TC. Başbakanlık Kadın Statüsü Genel Müdürlüğü,(1994). Kadın İstihdamını Geliştirme Projesi. Ankara: Başbakanlık Kadın Statüsü Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları.
- Trommsdorff, G., Iwawaki, S. (1989). Students' perceptions of socialisation and gender role in Japan and Germany. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 12(4), 485-493.
- Tu, S.H., Liao,P.S.(2005). Gender differences in gender role attitudes: a comparative analysis of Taiwan and coastal China. *Journal of comparative family studies*, 36, 545-566.
- Turan, N., Öztürk, A., Kaya, H. ve ark. (2001). Toplumsal cinsiyet ve hemşirelik. *Maltepe Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Bilim ve Sanatı Dergisi*, 4(1), 167-173.
- Vefikuluçay, D., Zeyneloğlu,S., Eroğlu K. ve ark.(2007). Kafkas üniversitesi son sınıf öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine ilişkin bakış açıları. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, 31(1), 26–38.
- Verdonk, P., Benschop,Y.W., Haes, H.C. Lagro-Janssen, T.L. (2009).From gender bias to gender awareness in medical education. *Adv Health Sci Educ Theory Pract*, 14(1), 135-52.
- Verloo, M.(2006).Multiple inequalities, intersectionality and the European Union. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3), 211-228.
- Verma, R.K., Pulerwitz, J. V., Mahendra et al. (2006). Challeng and changing gender attitudes among young men in Mumbai, India. *Reproductive Health Matters*, 14(28), 135-143.
- Yaman., E, Ayaz, S. (2010). Kadına yönelik aile içi şiddet ve kadınların aile içi şiddete bakışı. *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 11, 23-29.
- Yee, M., Brown,R.(1994). The development of gender differantion in young children. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 183-196.
- Yeşilorman, M.(2002).Toplumsal eşitlikte kör nokta: Kadın eşitsizliğine genel bir bakış. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*,11(2), 269-280.
- Yılmaz, D. V., Zeyneloğlu, S., Kocaöz, S., Kısa, S., Taşkın, L.,& Eroğlu, K. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine ilişkin görüşleri. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1), 775-792.
- Yüksel, A., Özer, O.G., Kınalı, M. (2007). *Mor Sertifika Programı*. İstanbul: Punto Baskı.
- Zhang, N. (2006). Gender role egalitarian attitudes among chinese college students. *Sex Roles*, 55, 545-553.
- Zeyneloğlu, S. ve Terzioğlu, F. (2011). Toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri tutum ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi ve psikometrik özellikleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 40,