

The Social Architecture of Violence: Mechanisms of Patriarchal Status Protection and Reproduction in Şanlıurfa

Gıyasettin YILDIZ
Harran Üniversitesi
gyildiz@harran.edu.tr
0000-0001-5191-509X

Selime KÜÇÜK
Harran Üniversitesi
kucukselime47@gmail.com
0009-0003-9900-4369

Araştırma Makalesi

DOI: 10.31592/aeusbed.1757926

Geliş Tarihi: 04.08.2025

Revize Tarihi: 25.01.2026

Kabul Tarihi: 17.03.2026

Atf Bilgisi

Yıldız, G. ve Küçük, S. (2026). The social architecture of violence: Mechanisms of patriarchal status protection and reproduction in Şanlıurfa. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12 (1), 280-299.

ABSTRACT

The present study examines domestic violence against women in the highly patriarchal and traditional context of Şanlıurfa, Turkey, from the perspectives of both women and men. In the initial phase of the study, a sequential exploratory qualitative design was employed, with a phenomenological approach being utilised to facilitate a profound comprehension of the violence experiences of 21 participants and the meanings they ascribed to these experiences. In the second phase, grounded theory methodology was employed to analytically process the emerging themes and patterns of experience, thereby developing a comprehensive conceptual model of how violence operates in this context. The findings reveal that domestic violence is not merely a random act or an individual pathology, but rather a cyclical social mechanism that functions as a “Patriarchal Status Preservation and Reproduction Mechanism.” This process is initiated in response to perceived threats to male authority, the breadwinner role, or honour. It is facilitated by a rigid gender role structure and the normalisation of violence, and implemented through rationalisation strategies (e.g. victim blaming). The outcome of this process is the re-establishment of the patriarchal order and the intergenerational transmission of a culture of violence. The model demonstrates that violence is a deeply embedded manifestation of gender ideologies and power relations, explained through feminist theories, symbolic interactionism, and Bourdieu's concept of symbolic violence.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Domestic Violence, Gender, Patriarchy, Grounded Theory, Şanlıurfa.

Şiddetin Sosyal Mimarisi: Şanlıurfa'da Ataerkil Statüyü Koruma ve Yeniden Üretme Mekanizmaları

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'nin Şanlıurfa kentinin son derece ataerkil ve geleneksel bağlamında kadınlara yönelik aile içi şiddeti, hem kadınların hem de erkeklerin bakış açılarından incelemektedir. Sıralı keşifsel nitel bir desenle yürütülen çalışmanın ilk aşamasında, 21 katılımcının şiddet deneyimlerini ve bu deneyimlere yükledikleri anlamları derinlemesine anlamak için fenomenolojik bir yaklaşım kullanılmıştır. İkinci aşamada ise ortaya çıkan temaları ve deneyim kalıplarını analitik olarak işlemek için temellendirilmiş teori metodolojisi kullanılmış ve nihayetinde bu bağlamda şiddetin nasıl işlediğine dair kapsamlı bir kavramsal model geliştirilmiştir. Bulgular, aile içi şiddetin sadece rastgele bir eylem veya bireysel bir patoloji değil “ataerkil statü koruma ve yeniden üretim mekanizması” olarak işleyen döngüsel bir sosyal mekanizma olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Bu süreç, erkek otoritesine, geçim sağlayıcı rolüne veya onura yönelik algılanan tehditler tarafından tetiklenir, katı bir cinsiyet rolü yapısı ve şiddetin normalleşmesi tarafından mümkün kılınır, rasyonalizasyon stratejileri yoluyla uygulanır ve ataerkil düzenin yeniden kurulması ve şiddet kültürünün nesiller arası aktarımıyla sonuçlanır. Model, feminist teoriler, sembolik etkileşimcilik ve Bourdieu'nun sembolik şiddet kavramıyla açıklanan, şiddetin cinsiyet ideolojilerinin ve iktidar ilişkilerinin derinlemesine yerleşmiş bir tezahürü olduğunu göstermektedir.

Keywords: Aile İçi Şiddet, Toplumsal Cinsiyet, Ataerkillik, Gömülü Teori, Şanlıurfa.

Introduction

Violence against women, especially when perpetrated by partners or family members within the family, constitutes one of the most common human rights violations and one of the most serious public health problems globally (Alves, Manita, Caldas, Fernández-Martínez, Silva and Magalhães,

2019; Dhungel, Dhungel, Dhital and Stock 2017; Ellsberg et al., 2020; Wirtz et al., 2018). World Health Organization (WHO) data show that one in three women worldwide have experienced physical or sexual violence in their lifetime, with rates as high as 50% in some regions (Keyvanlo and Mikaili, 2023; Mannell et al., 2022; Sardinha, Maheu-Giroux, Stöckl, Meyer and Garcia-Moreno, 2022). This shows that violence encompasses not only physical attacks but also a wide range of psychological, sexual and economic abuse, with devastating effects on women's health, autonomy and well-being (Yuan, Kadetz, Shen and Hesketh, 2024). Therefore, the consequences of violence do not remain at the individual level, but also negatively affect families, communities and national development with effects such as increased health costs, loss of labor force and social disintegration (Mannell et al., 2022; Wirtz et al., 2018).

In parallel with this global picture, violence against women continues to be an important social problem in Turkey. National studies and reports of civil society organizations reveal the prevalence of violence and its occurrence among different socio-economic groups (Ağyel and Türk, 2024; Başar and Demirci, 2018; Şen and Bolsoy, 2017). Social and political debates, especially around international agreements such as the Istanbul Convention, show the sensitivity of the issue on the national agenda and the existence of different approaches to its solution. These debates reveal that violence is not only an individual crime but also a political issue with deep cultural and structural roots (Alkan, Serçemeli and Özmen, 2022; Eralp and Gökmen, 2022; Hamzaoğlu, 2024).

In order to understand this complex social dynamic, Şanlıurfa was deliberately chosen as the focal point of this study. This is because Şanlıurfa has a socio-cultural texture in which traditional patriarchal norms, strong kinship ties and partly feudal structure traces are clearly visible (Ökten, 2009; Ökten, 2010; Yıldız, 2019; Yıldız, 2023). These characteristics make it a “critical case” where the social mechanisms that legitimize violence operate most clearly. The logic of critical case selection in qualitative research is based on testing a theory in the most salient sample: If violence is a mechanism for maintaining patriarchal status, it is expected to be observable in the strongest patriarchal context (Şanlıurfa). Therefore, the findings of the study will not only provide a local description, but also a rich empirical ground for the construction of a general theory of the social architecture of violence.

The socio-economic indicators of the region also support this critical context. A rigid gendered division of labor is evidenced by key regional indicators: women's labor force participation and educational attainment rates fall well below the national average, while their social roles remain largely confined to the domestic sphere (Acar and Kekeçoğlu, 2020, Aksöz and Arslan, 2023; Cunningham, 2008; Chesney-Lind and Chagnon, 2016; Ersoy and Yıldız, 2011; Sariaslan, 2023). This structure, combined with cultural codes such as “honor” and “reputation” and “loyalty”, reinforces control over women's lives and creates a fertile ground for the legitimization of violence (Cihangir, 2012; Doğan, 2014; Sev'er and Yurdakul, 2001). With these qualities, Şanlıurfa functions as an ideal laboratory for analyzing how violence is made sense of and perpetuated within gender regimes.

Studies on domestic violence against women generally focus on quantitative studies that measure the prevalence of violence or qualitative studies that reveal the experiences and traumas of women (Afrouz, Crisp and Taket, 2021; Yuan et al., 2024). Scholars have also emphasized that domestic violence is not a uniform phenomenon but may take different structural forms depending on the dynamics of power and control within relationships. Johnson (2008) conceptualizes this diversity through a typology distinguishing between patterns such as situational couple violence and coercive controlling violence, highlighting how some forms of violence operate as systematic strategies of domination rather than isolated interpersonal conflicts. While these studies are extremely valuable, there is a significant gap in the comparative analysis of the processes of making sense of and legitimizing violence by individuals who share the same ideological-cultural ground (Döker and Koçer, 2024; Grembi, Rosso and Barili, 2024; Ross et al., 2025).

This study aims to fill this gap by focusing on ‘how’ violence is made sense of by both women and men, thereby deciphering common cognitive and cultural schemas that enable violence. Moving

beyond the prevailing approach in the literature which often treats perpetrator motivations and victim experiences in isolation, this research situates violence within the contemporary dynamics of the 2020s. In this context, economic instability and shifting gender regimes have deepened the “crisis of masculinity,” positioning violence as a dynamic “status restoration mechanism”. A key scarcity in the literature is the examination of how this perceived status threat interactionally triggers women’s survival strategies, conceptually defined as “patriarchal bargaining” (Kandiyoti, 1988), and how this dyadic process perpetuates the violence loop. Consequently, the unique contribution of this research is its modelling of violence not as an isolated phenomenon, but as a social process reproduced in interactions. This approach transcends the simplistic binary of “men legitimize, women internalize,” revealing instead a complex social transaction where men’s efforts to re-establish hegemonic masculinity in the face of perceived status loss are met with women’s forced consent or strategic silence (Dugan, 2022; Döker and Koçer, 2024). The ultimate aim is to develop a data-based, integrated social process theory that explains the mechanisms through which domestic violence against women is experienced, interpreted, legitimized and perpetuated in Şanlıurfa.

The Theoretical Architecture of Patriarchal Violence

This study adopts a multi-layered theoretical framework that combines macro, meso and micro levels to analyze the complex nature of domestic violence against women. This framework positions violence not as an individual aberration but as a product of broader social structures, cultural norms and interpersonal interactions. This approach enables findings to be not only described but also analyzed in depth and placed in a broader sociological context. In this sense, the framework integrates structural feminist theories of patriarchy with interactionist perspectives on gender and power, allowing domestic violence to be interpreted as a socially produced and reproduced mechanism embedded in gendered hierarchies and everyday practices.

Macro Foundations: Patriarchal Order, Gender And Honor Regimes

The social architecture of violence is underpinned by macro-level structures that permeate society at large. Patriarchy is at the forefront of these structures. Feminist theory defines patriarchy not only as the individual dominance of men, but also as a set of interrelated social structures that keep women in a subordinate position (Allen, 2022; Ferguson, 2016). Sylvia Walby (1990) examines these structures under six headings: household production, wage labor, the state, male violence, sexuality and cultural institutions. In this framework, violence emerges as one of the main mechanisms used to establish and maintain the patriarchal order. Women's confinement to their domestic roles (“domestic production”) and men's resort to violence to ensure their authority (“male violence”) are the basic modes of functioning of the patriarchal system (Potter, 2006). Classical feminist scholarship has long emphasized that violence against wives functions as a structural mechanism through which patriarchal authority is enforced and reproduced within the family (Dobash & Dobash, 1979).

In societies like Turkey, this macro structure is embodied through cultural codes such as “honor”, “honor” and “loyalty” (Doğan, 2014). These concepts are powerful cultural tools to control women's bodies, sexuality and behavior in the social sphere. Honor is generally defined through women's fidelity and sexual purity, while the protection of this honor is seen as the honor of the man and the social prestige of the family (Ashokkumar and Swann, 2022; Vandello and Cohen, 2003). The perception that these cultural codes are violated is interpreted as a serious threat to the social identity of the man and turns violence into a “legitimate” and even “necessary” sanction (Çalık, 2017; Doğan, 2014; Gül and Schuster, 2020; Hamzaoğlu, 2024). Therefore, violence committed in the name of honor is framed as a restorative act that aims to repair damaged collective honor and restore the patriarchal order, rather than a personal outburst of anger. Furthermore, in the contemporary context of economic instability and shifting gender regimes, these patriarchal structures are often intensified. Economic pressures challenge traditional masculine roles, positioning violence not merely as a customary practice but as a strategic “status restoration mechanism” employed to reclaim perceived lost authority in both public and private spheres.

Meso Channels: Socialization of Violence And Internalization of Norms

Patriarchal norms at the macro level are learned and internalized by individuals through meso-level socialization processes and transmitted across generations. Through processes of social learning, habitus formation, and symbolic power, individuals come to perceive gender hierarchies not as socially constructed arrangements but as natural and inevitable aspects of social life. Two theoretical approaches stand out in understanding this process. The first is Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1973, 1977). This theory argues that individuals learn behaviors by observing and imitating important people around them (parents, relatives), especially during childhood (Stith, Rosen, Middleton, Busch, Lundeberg and Carlton, 2000). When an individual sees that a behavior has positive consequences or is not punished, they are more likely to adopt that behavior (reinforcement) (Cochran, Jones, Jones and Sellers, 2016; Rahman and Sakib, 2023).

Secondly, and more profoundly, Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of habitus and symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1995). Habitus is a system of deeply ingrained tendencies that individuals acquire from the social environment in which they grow up, accept without questioning, and guide their actions. Individuals socialized in a patriarchal habitus perceive the hierarchy between the sexes and the superiority of men as “natural” and “inevitable”. Symbolic violence explains the most complex dimension of this process. According to Bourdieu, symbolic violence is a “gentle” and “invisible” form of violence perpetrated by relations of domination with the consent and complicity of those under domination (Bourdieu, 2000; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2003; Çeğin and Özpolat, 2016). This occurs when the dominant group's (men's) ways of perceiving and classifying the world (e.g. that women are “emotional”, “weak” or “need to obey” beings) are adopted and internalized by the oppressed group (women).

This process of normalization is reinforced through everyday cultural channels. Media narratives and family discourses can frame aggression as a legitimate, even necessary, tool for problem-solving and discipline, thereby embedding violence within the very language of care and authority (Döker and Koçer, 2024). This learned silence and justification create a powerful cultural barrier, making external interventions appear as violations of family privacy rather than acts of protection.

Micro Triggers: Interactional Meaning and Legitimization of Violence

Structures and norms at the macro- and meso-level are transformed into concrete actions in everyday interactions at the micro-level. From an interactionist perspective, gender itself is continuously produced and reproduced through everyday practices, a process conceptualized as “doing gender” (West & Zimmerman, 1987). In such contexts, acts of violence may function as extreme performances through which individuals attempt to restore disrupted gender identities and hierarchical expectations. Two theoretical tools will be used to understand the dynamics of this transformation. Symbolic Interactionism provides an ideal framework for analyzing how violence acquires “meaning” and is legitimized in immediate interactions. According to this approach, the meaning of actions is not spontaneous; it is defined and interpreted by social actors in interaction. When an act of violence is endowed with symbolic labels such as “decency”, “discipline”, “disciplining”, “taming” or “cleaning up honor”, it ceases to be a morally reprehensible attack and becomes a “necessary” or “understandable” act in a given social context (Batista, Barreto, Gomes, Prado, Padoin, Godoy and Marcon, 2023).

The Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis focuses on the psychological mechanisms that trigger violence (Berkowitz, 1989). According to this hypothesis, an individual who is prevented from achieving his/her goals (experiencing frustration) feels an urge to aggression. Especially in patriarchal societies, men's role as “breadwinner” is of central importance. When factors such as economic difficulties or failures at work prevent men from fulfilling this role, it creates a serious sense of frustration and loss of status. When the aggression generated by this frustration cannot be directed at powerless or risky targets (e.g. the boss), it is directed at “safer” and “weaker” targets, namely women

and children within the family (displacement) (Rees, Hawkes, Williams, Williams and O'Meara, 2023). This is a mechanism by which powerlessness in the public sphere is compensated for by violence in the private sphere. This three-layered theoretical framework reveals that violence is not just an individual act; on the contrary, it is a complex social architecture that is fed by the macrostructures of patriarchal society, transmitted through socialization and triggered and reproduced in everyday interactions.

Mapping Theory to the Analytical Model: The multi-layered theoretical framework adopted here is functionally mapped onto the analytical model of violence as a social mechanism. By linking structural patriarchy, processes of socialization, and interactional meaning-making, the model conceptualizes violence not as an isolated act but as a socially organized practice through which gender hierarchies are reproduced and stabilized. The macro-level structures (patriarchal order, honor regimes) establish the legitimacy ground and define what constitutes a status threat. The meso-level processes (social learning, habitus, symbolic violence) explain how these structures are internalized and transmitted across generations, creating a normalized cultural backdrop. Finally, the micro-level dynamics (symbolic interactionism, frustration-aggression) elucidate the immediate triggers and interactional strategies through which threats are perceived, violence is enacted, and subsequently justified. This stratified approach ensures that each theoretical component addresses a distinct dimension of the phenomenon, moving beyond eclecticism to provide a comprehensive, multi-level explanation of how violence is architecturally sustained in the Şanlıurfa context.

Method

Research Design

In order to analyze a complex social phenomenon such as the experience and meaning of domestic violence against women both in-depth and holistically, this study adopted a two-stage research design defined as sequential exploratory qualitative design in the literature (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2017). The main rationale for choosing this design is that complex social phenomena make it possible both to capture the authenticity and depth of lived experiences (authentic-human dimension) and to develop an abstract and conceptual model based on these experiences (abstract-conceptual dimension). This approach is in line with the recommendations of theorists such as Creswell and Plano Clark (2017), who are leading names in mixed methods research, and Morse (2010) and Sandelowski (2000), who emphasize the importance of combining depth and abstraction in qualitative research.

The first phase of this research is based on a phenomenological approach that aims to reveal in depth the subjective worlds of meaning, experiences, and perceptions related to experiences of violence (Ciocan, 2024; Pérez-Gatica, 2024). The second stage of the research was based on the grounded theory approach, which aims to construct a data-based theory about the functioning of violence by using the themes and patterns of experience that emerged in the first stage (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). This two-stage process ensured that the research findings were both faithful to the reality of the participants and that a broader theoretical understanding was derived from this reality.

Research Group

The participants of the study were determined by purposive sampling method among individuals living in Şanlıurfa city center who could offer different perspectives in accordance with the purpose of the study. In order to understand the phenomenon of violence comparatively from the perspectives of both women and men, the sample consisted of a total of 21 participants, 11 women and 10 men with different ages, education levels, occupations, marital status and socio-economic backgrounds. Demographic characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Participant Code	Gender	Age	Education Level	Profession	Marital Status
M1	Male	22	Undergraduate (Continued)	Student	Single
W1	Woman	36	High School	Housewife	Married
M2	Male	38	License	Nurse	Married
M3	Male	21	Undergraduate (Continued)	Student	Single
W2	Woman	22	Primary School	Housewife	Married
M4	Male	24	Undergraduate (Continued)	Student	Single
M5	Male	23	Associate Degree	Paramedic	Single
W3	Woman	22	Undergraduate (Continued)	Student	Single
K4	Woman	25	High School	Private Sector	Single
K5	Woman	26	Undergraduate (Continued)	Student	Single
M6	Male	35	High School	Municipality Personnel	Married
W6	Woman	38	Primary School	Housewife	Married
W7	Woman	20	High School	Not working	Single
M7	Male	40	High School	Teacher	Married
M8	Male	40	Primary education	Public Personnel	Married
W8	Woman	28	Primary School	Housewife	Married
M9	Male	50	License	Teacher	Married
W9	Woman	26	High School	Housewife	Married
W10	Woman	42	High School	Housewife	Married
M10	Male	22	Undergraduate (Continued)	Student	Single
W11	Woman	46	High School Dropout	Housewife	Married

Ethical Positioning and Participant Profiles

In line with the approved ethical protocol, participants were not directly asked to self-identify with labels such as “perpetrator” or “victim,” nor was selection based on judicial records. This approach prioritized psychological safety and voluntary, open narration. The interview guide invited reflections on experiences, witnessing, and societal perceptions of violence. Consequently, the sample encompasses a spectrum of positions within the social architecture of violence. While not categorically pre-classified, the in-depth dialogues revealed that participants' narratives included first-hand accounts of victimization, childhood exposure to inter-parental violence, and perspectives that rationalize or legitimize violence within specific contexts. This methodological choice allowed us to capture the shared cultural schemas and meaning-making processes about violence, rather than pre-defining individual roles.

Data Collection Tools

Semi-structured, in-depth interviews covering topics such as the definition of violence, its causes, women's perception and situations where violence is legitimized were used as data collection tools. The interviews were conducted in environments where the participants could express themselves comfortably, all interviews were audio-recorded with the permission of the participants and lasted an average of 25-40 minutes.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data analysis was conducted in parallel with the two-stage design of the research. This process ensured that the findings were both faithful to the subjective reality of the participants and that a systematic theory was reached based on this reality.

Phase 1 (Phenomenological Exploration): In the first stage, the texts obtained after the audio recordings were transcribed were subjected to phenomenological analysis. The aim of this analysis was to determine how the phenomenon of violence was manifested in the “lifeworld” of the participants, what meanings were attributed to it and the basic themes that formed the essence of the experience. In this process, the researcher aimed to look at the data through the eyes of the participant by bracketing his/her own prejudices. This phase provided a basis for a deeper understanding of the human dimension and complexity of violence.

Phase 2 (Grounded Theory Construction): In the second stage, the themes and rich descriptions that emerged from the phenomenological analysis were subjected to the systematic coding processes of the grounded theory approach developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). This process consisted of three basic steps:

1. **Open Coding:** By analyzing the transcribed interview texts line by line, meaningful units (concepts) in the data were identified and named. Dozens of codes were revealed at this stage.
2. **Axial Coding:** The relationships between the codes that emerged through open coding were examined and similar codes were combined under broader categories. At this stage, connections were established between categories around a paradigmatic model such as “the causes of a phenomenon (causal conditions)”, “the specific conditions in which it occurs (context)”, “the action/interaction strategies that govern the phenomenon” and “the consequences of these strategies”.
3. **Selective Coding:** The categories developed through axial coding were integrated around a central “core category” that could explain the entire data set. In this study, at the end of the entire analysis process, the core category was identified as “Violence as a Mechanism of Protecting and Reproducing Patriarchal Status”. This core category formed the basis of the final theory of the research.

Ethical Protocol

The research was conducted in accordance with the approval obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences at * University on March 17, 2025, under decision number 2025/84. Considering the sensitive nature of the research, all participants were provided with detailed information about the purpose of the research, the principle of voluntariness, their right to withdraw from the research at any time, and how the confidentiality of their data would be ensured, and their written informed consent was obtained. To protect the anonymity of participants, codes such as M1 (Male 1) and W1 (Female 1) have been used throughout the text.

Findings

The two-stage analysis of the data revealed that domestic violence in the Şanlıurfa context is not individual outbursts of anger or simple interpersonal disagreements, but rather a cyclical social mechanism triggered by specific circumstances, implemented through specific strategies and ultimately reproducing the patriarchal order. At the center of this mechanism, i.e. as the core category of the research, is the phenomenon of “Violence as a Mechanism to Protect and Reproduce Patriarchal Status”. According to this model, violence emerges as a functional tool that men resort to when their hierarchical status defined by gender roles is threatened, in order to protect this status, re-establish authority and “repair” the disrupted order. This process consists of four main interrelated components: (1) Causal Conditions, (2) Contextual Conditions, (3) Action/Interaction Strategies and (4) Outcomes.

Causal Conditions: Threats To Patriarchal Status

The analysis shows that the main triggers that initiate the process of violence are perceived threats to the idealized position of the man within the patriarchal system, that is, his status. These threats are situations that undermine the man's hierarchical superiority in the family, his role as an economic provider and his social honor.

Questioning the Authority of Men: “Disobedience” and “Stubbornness”

Questioning the absolute authority and authority of the man as the head of the family is the most frequently cited causal condition for violence. The woman's failure to comply with the man's expectations, orders or advice is coded as a direct challenge to the man's status and triggers violence. A 22-year-old married woman (W2) clearly formulates this situation when she directly attributes the cause of violence to the man's disobedience: *“She probably did what men told her not to do. That's why she committed violence... Because men are not listened to? Exactly.”* “This perception was echoed by other female participants, who linked their partners' violence directly to moments when they were perceived as being disobedient or stubborn (W9).

These statements show that violence is often framed as a “reaction” to an action or inaction of the woman. At this point, violence comes into play as a means of re-establishing the disrupted hierarchy and “letting the woman know her place”. The expectation expressed by a 28-year-old married woman (W8) that women *should “know how to keep quiet when the time comes”* and *“act accordingly”* reveals the basis and fragility of this patriarchal authority.

Men's Inadequacy in The Provider Role: Economic Pressure and Stress

The inability of men to fulfill one of the most basic traditionally defined roles of “breadwinner” creates a serious loss of status and a sense of inadequacy, which paves the way for violence. A 23-year-old male paramedic (M5) expresses this displacement mechanism very clearly: *“The economy... gets depressed. Exactly like that. Difficulty of making a living... he can't take it out on his boss, he comes home and takes it out on his child or his wife. He can't say anything to his boss, for example... It is easier to inflict violence on his child or wife when he comes home.”* This narrative shows that men who lose their authority and power in the public sphere try to compensate for this loss of power in the private sphere by using their physical superiority. In this context, violence becomes a tool to suppress the feelings of inadequacy and shame caused by economic failure and to regain control in the family.

The Dishonor of the Man: “Honor” and “Cheating”

A man's dignity and social respectability is largely defined by the fidelity of the women in his family, especially his wife, and their behavior in accordance with social norms. A violation or suspected violation in this area is perceived as the most serious threat to a man's social identity and status, turning violence into an “inevitable” and even “obligatory” action. A 22-year-old male student (M1) draws this red line clearly: *“Can we call it honor? when a woman cheats on her husband, he can kill or beat her.”* This view is shared not only by men but also by women. A 22-year-old married woman (W2) unquestioningly accepts the legitimacy of violence in cases of infidelity: *“It's like getting up and cheating when your husband is with you. If that happens, I mean, this is not only for me, but also for many people, they turn to violence. In case of cheating. Yes.”* In this case, violence is framed not as a simple outpouring of anger, but as a ritualistic act to “repair” the man's damaged honor and social respectability.

Contextual Conditions: The Ground That Makes Violence Possible

The transformation of the aforementioned causal conditions (threats) into violence is only possible within a specific social context. This context provides a cultural and ideological backdrop that positions violence as an understandable, normal and in some cases even “necessary” behavior. The analysis shows that there are two main conditions that constitute this ground. The first is a “patriarchal

social contract” that imposes rigid gender roles. The second is a “culture of violence” where violence is learned and normalized.

Patriarchal Social Contract: Defined Roles and Denied Equality

In the narratives of the participants, the existence of an unwritten “contract” that determines the roles, duties, rights and hierarchical positions of men and women is clearly visible. This contract prepares an ideological ground for violence by accepting the superiority of men and the subordinate position of women as natural and unquestionable. A 50 year old male teacher (M9) clearly reveals the terms of this contract: *“If a woman cannot fulfill her responsibilities, if a woman cannot be a woman... if she is a housewife, if she cannot be a housewife, she will inevitably be subjected to this kind of violence”*. According to this statement, a woman's value and security depend on her fulfillment of the roles assigned to her (motherhood, homemaking).

The consequence of violating this contract gives men the right to punish women. A 22-year-old male student (M1) described the fate of a woman who does not fulfill her responsibilities at home: *“She goes back to her father's house... Of course they are right... Yes, she would be condemned.”* Underlying this hierarchical structure is the categorical rejection of the equality of men and women. The same participant (M1) argues that women and men cannot be equal because “the responsibility of women is heavier” and legitimizes inequality through the “sacred” but heavy roles attributed to women. This “contract” constitutes the ideological infrastructure that makes violence possible. When a woman breaks this contract, it is seen as a “justified” and “natural” consequence that she is subjected to sanctions (violence).

Learned and Normalized Culture of Violence

Violence is not only a spontaneous reaction, but also a pattern of behavior that is learned through observation in the family and society and normalized over time. The narratives of the participants show that they grew up in a culture where violence is seen as a means of “manners” and “discipline” and even believed to be beneficial. A 38-year-old male nurse (M2) points to this learning process when describing the cycle of violence in his own family: *“In my own family, I saw it from my father, the deceased. He was a good person but that was all he saw. As a result, did he inflict violence on my mother? Yes.”* This statement reflects a belief that violence does not stem from malicious intentions, but from a behavioral model that is passed down between generations.

The legitimization of violence as a means of education is clearly expressed by some participants. A 22-year-old male student (M1) was quite clear on this issue: *“Violence is necessary both when raising children and when working, to discipline or to guide people... Violence is useful for development”*. Violence is useful for development”.

The intergenerational transmission of violence and its normalization as a means of “upbringing” cleanses the act of violence of its moral burden. It is no longer an act of harm, but is redefined as an act of “healing”, “guidance” and “development”. This cultural backdrop provides a ready-made scenario for the perpetrator to rationalize his/her action and frames violence even as a responsible behavior in certain circumstances.

Action/Interaction Strategies: Practicing and Making Sense of Violence

Under the described causal and contextual conditions, individuals develop certain strategies of action and interpretation when they encounter the phenomenon of violence. These strategies are cognitive and behavioral maneuvers that both enable and subsequently interpret the act of violence. They range from the perpetrator's rationalization of his/her action to the victim's internalization of the situation and witnesses' avoidance of intervention.

Perpetrator's Legitimization Strategies: Avoiding Responsibility and Diverting the Crime

Perpetrators use various cognitive maneuvers to make the act of violence morally acceptable. The most common strategy is to claim that the victim “deserved” or “provoked” the violence. A 40-year-old madrasa teacher (M7), after stating that he had witnessed his father's violence against his mother, justifies violence even years later by saying, “It's not like my mother didn't deserve it too” and blames the victim for the violence. Denial of responsibility is another common strategy. Rather than accepting blame, the perpetrator reframes the narrative to position themselves as a “victim” of external or internal pressures, attributing their violence to these forces. A 35-year-old man (M6) explains the inevitability of violence in case of infidelity with the words “*one cannot control oneself inevitably*”. Therefore, these strategies absolve the perpetrator from the moral responsibility for his/her action. Violence is presented as an inevitable consequence of an act of the victim or an uncontrollable impulse, rather than a proactive choice on the part of the perpetrator. In this way, the perpetrator is able to maintain his or her self-image as a “good person” while the cycle of violence gains legitimacy.

Response Strategies of the Victim and Witness: Internalization and Withdrawal

In the process, victims or witnesses of violence often develop various strategies that reinforce the cycle of violence. One of the most powerful manifestations of symbolic violence is when victims believe that the violence is caused by their own mistakes or shortcomings. A 28-year-old woman (W8) formulates this situation with a proverb: “*If you don't give a man a stick, he won't get up and beat you.*” This statement is a complete internalization of the patriarchal ideology that the ultimate source of violence is the behavior of women. On the other hand, third parties who witness the violence refrain from intervening due to cultural norms such as “*you cannot come between husband and wife*” and fear of legal consequences. A 24-year-old male student (M4) explains this by referring to the “Kadir Şeker incident” that has been widely publicized in Turkey: “*I wanted to prevent it but... The Kadir Şekerci incident, for example... Inevitably the woman there could have said. Why are you coming between husband and wife? He's my husband. If she said that, I would be guilty.*” This is a powerful social mechanism that confines violence to the private sphere and isolates the victim.

Conclusions: Completion and Reproduction of the Cycle

When these causal conditions, contextual background and interaction strategies come together, the cycle of violence is completed and creates the conditions to reproduce itself. As a result of this process, two main outcomes emerge: the re-establishment of patriarchal order in the short term and the transmission of the culture of violence across generations in the long term.

Re-Establishment of Patriarchal Order

As its most immediate and tangible consequence, the act of violence re-establishes the questioned authority of the man, returns the woman to her designated role and reinforces the hierarchy within the family. Violence, in this sense, functions to “repair” and “restore” the disrupted or shaken patriarchal order. A 46-year-old woman (W11) clearly observes this result when describing her neighbor's fight: “*The woman shouted so insistently. The man got up and beat her. The woman calmed down.*”. This statement implies that violence restores “peace” and hierarchical order within the family by silencing, pacifying and subjugating women. Violence removes the threat to men's status and completes the cycle in the short term, creating a temporary state of equilibrium until the next perception of threat.

Intergenerational Transmission and Ideological Legitimization of the Cycle of Violence

Each cycle of violence not only maintains momentary order, but also reinforces the message that violence is acceptable, normal and even necessary behavior. This norm is learned by children who witness the violence and sets the stage for the cycle to be passed on to future generations. The most

sophisticated and insidious outcome of this process is the creation of a paradoxical ideological framework in which the ultimate responsibility for violence is placed on women.

A 38-year-old male nurse (M2) reveals this cyclical logic in the most explicit and shocking way. Attributing her own violent tendency to her mother who raised her, she develops an argument that absolves the perpetrator of all responsibility and places the blame on the victim from the very beginning: *“Violence is not inflicted on women, that violence is actually directed by the woman. The upbringing of the child in the family starts from the woman... Now what will be the main reason for me to be prone to violence? It will be my mother.”*

This argument is the most striking result showing how the patriarchal system justifies and perpetuates itself. This paradoxical perspective, which seeks the source of violence in the victim of violence, reproduces the cycle of violence not only at the behavioral but also at the ideological level. Thus, violence ceases to be merely an interpersonal act; it becomes a social mechanism deeply rooted in gender roles that constantly legitimizes and reproduces itself.

Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

Status Threat and the Fragility of Masculine Authority

The findings reveal that violence is primarily triggered by perceived threats to masculine authority, whether through disobedience, economic inadequacy, or honor violations. This aligns with Connell's (1995) concept of hegemonic masculinity, which must be continually asserted and defended. Later developments of this framework emphasize that hegemonic masculinity operates as a dynamic system of gender hierarchy in which men are compelled to continually reproduce authority and dominance in order to maintain social legitimacy (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Within this perspective, violence can be interpreted as one of the performative practices through which threatened masculine status is symbolically restored. However, our study specifies the mechanisms in the Şanlıurfa context: the erosion of the traditional breadwinner role due to economic pressures transforms violence into a “status restoration mechanism”. This extends the frustration-aggression hypothesis by embedding it within specific socio-economic realities where men's public sphere failures are compensated through private sphere domination. The data show that violence is not merely an outburst of anger but a calculated performance to re-establish a threatened hierarchical order.

Honor Regimes and Everyday Control

Honor operates not as an abstract value but as a pervasive technology of everyday control over women's bodies and behaviors. Participants' narratives confirm that honor is deeply tied to male social identity and family prestige (Doğan, 2014). A suspected violation turns violence into an “inevitable” sanction. The participants' reluctance to seek legal help (viewing protection orders as “shameful”) confirms Dugan's (2022) argument that moral maturity in patriarchal contexts is often conflated with preserving family secrets. This extends honor-regime discussions by showing how “honor talk” is mobilized to silence women's legal claims. Our contribution lies in demonstrating how honor is inextricably linked to the economic provider role in Şanlıurfa. Failure in either domain constitutes a fundamental threat to the patriarchal contract, making violence a dual-purpose tool for restoring both economic and moral authority. This intersection creates a particularly potent justification for violence in this cultural context.

Legitimization Repertoires: Neutralization and Symbolic Violence

A key finding is the sophisticated repertoire of justifications employed by perpetrators. Participants utilized classic neutralization techniques (Sykes and Matza, 1957), such as the “denial of injury” (conceptually framing violence as “pedagogical violence” beating as a tool for education/discipline). This supports Döker and Koçer's (2024) phenomenological analysis of how violence is normalized as a “problem-solving” tool in media and family narratives. The most powerful

mechanism observed, however, was the attribution of the violence's root cause to mothers-exemplified by statements such as, “She is the main reason for my tendency toward violence” (M2). This represents a profound manifestation of Bourdieu's (2000) symbolic violence, wherein the dominated internalize and reproduce the logic of their own domination. Furthermore, the tendency to blame mothers for their sons' violence illustrates the “Patriarchal Bargaining” mechanism, where women are manipulated into policing each other to survive within the hierarchy. The patriarchal system thus achieves ideological self-exoneration by shifting blame onto women, particularly the primary socializing agent. This moves beyond simple victim-blaming to a cyclical logic in which violence is presented as a consequence of women's failure to socialize men into non-violence.

Bystander Norms and the Social Reproduction of Violence

The study uncovers a strong norm of non-intervention among witnesses, encapsulated in the maxim “you cannot come between husband and wife.” This culturally specific bystander effect (Latané and Darley, 1970) is reinforced by fear of legal repercussions and social shaming. The result is a collective complicity that confines violence to the private sphere and isolates victims. This social reinforcement is crucial for the intergenerational transmission of violence, as children learn that violence is a normal, unchallengeable part of family life. The community thus functions not as a protective network but as a silent enabler, ensuring the social reproduction of violent norms across generations.

Conclusion of the Discussion Section

In summary, this study conceptualizes domestic violence in Şanlıurfa as a cyclical social mechanism for protecting and reproducing patriarchal status. The model integrates macro-structural pressures (economic insecurity, honor codes), meso-level transmission (family socialization, symbolic violence), and micro-level interactions (neutralization techniques, bystander inaction). The findings empirically substantiate Bourdieu's concept of symbolic violence while extending feminist theories of patriarchal maintenance (Walby, 1990) by specifying the interactive processes through which this maintenance occurs. The research thus provides a comprehensive, multi-layered framework that explains not only why violence occurs but how it is sustained and legitimized within a specific socio-cultural context.

The findings of this study are of particular significance as they extend beyond theoretical discussions and offer a concrete roadmap for the formulation of policies and practices aimed at combating violence. Given the established role of violence as a mechanism for the maintenance of status, it is imperative that interventions shift their focus from the management of individual anger to the examination of systemic cultural codes that define male status through the subordination of women. In this regard, the following recommendations are presented:

Firstly, the focus of intervention should be broadened from the individual to the system. Merely directing individual efforts towards anger management for perpetrators or the empowerment of victims is inadequate. The actual intervention should target the cultural codes that legitimise violence and link male identity to the pressure of being the “breadwinner” and the concept of “honour”. Education programmes and public service announcements should directly interrogate rigid gender roles and the pressures they engender.

Secondly, it is imperative to confront symbolic violence. One of the most challenging areas of combating violence is the victim's internalisation of guilt. Consequently, the implementation of educational and awareness initiatives must encompass the targeting of linguistic and discursive elements that perpetuate a culture of violence and hold the victim responsible, including terms such as “provocation,” “deserving,” and “disobedience.” The objective of this initiative is to eliminate the utilisation of this language from social discourse and to cultivate a comprehensive understanding that the responsibility for violence is unequivocally that of the perpetrator.

Furthermore, it is imperative that men and boys play an active role in the prevention process. Patriarchal norms have been shown to engender a sense of entrapment for both men and women, constraining their freedom to pursue alternative roles and expectations. Consequently, prevention programmes ought to address conventional conceptions of masculinity, the pressures engendered by these conceptions, and non-violent methods of conflict resolution. Such programmes should be disseminated in educational institutions and local communities.

Finally, the promotion of social responsibility and the encouragement of witness intervention are recommended. It is imperative to challenge the prevailing social norm that dictates the principle of non-interference in the marital relationship between spouses. In order to combat this, it is essential to provide legal safeguards to protect intervening witnesses, as well as to instil a strong public opinion that witnessing violence and remaining silent is a violation of social responsibility. It is recommended that local leaders, opinion leaders and religious leaders be encouraged to play an active role in this process.

As with any research study, this one is not without its limitations. The findings are specific to the context of Şanlıurfa, and the theory developed needs to be tested in different cultural and socio-economic settings. However, the methodological approach of this study, which combines phenomenology and grounded theory, provides a solid template for examining complex social phenomena in similar patriarchal societies. Furthermore, while the sample included variation in marital status (as shown in Table 1), the study's primary aim was not to conduct a systematic comparative analysis between married and single participants. The phenomenological and grounded theory approach prioritized understanding the depth and shared patterns of meaning-making around violence, rather than demographic comparisons. Future studies could employ purposive sampling strategies to specifically examine how marital status or life stage influences these perceptions and experiences.

This research demonstrates that domestic violence against women is not merely a matter of individual actions, but is deeply intertwined with patriarchal social structures. Consequently, efficacious intervention necessitates not solely addressing acts of violence but also dismantling the intricate social mechanisms that perpetuate them.

Contribution of Researchers

The two authors contributed equally to the work, each contributing 50%.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest in this article.

References

- Afrouz, R., Crisp, B., and Taket, A. (2021). Understandings and perceptions of domestic violence among newly arrived Afghan women in Australia. *Violence Against Women*, 27(14), 2511-2529. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801220985937>
- Ağyel, M., and Türk, R. (2024). Investigating attitudes toward early marriage and the prevalence of domestic violence among women married as children and adults. *Yaşam Boyu Hemşirelik Dergisi*, 1(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.29228/Inursing.71205>
- Aksöz, F., ve Arslan, B. (2023). Toplumsal cinsiyet sarmalında Güneydoğu Anadolu Bölgesi'nde kadın olmak: Şanlıurfa ilindeki kadınların toplumsal tükenmişlik düzeyleri. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 12(3), 1520-1545. <https://doi.org/10.15869/itobiad.1297267>

- Alkan, Ö., Serçemeli, C., and Özmen, K. (2022). Verbal and psychological violence against women in Turkey and its determinants. *PLOS ONE*, 17(10), e0275950. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0275950>
- Allen, K. (2022). Feminist theory, method, and praxis: Toward a critical consciousness for family and close relationship scholars. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 40(3), 899-936. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075211065779>
- Alves, M. J., Manita, C., Caldas, I., Fernández-Martínez, E., da Silva, A. G., and Magalhães, T. (2019). Evolution and analysis of cultural and cognitive factors related with domestic violence against women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34(3), 621-641. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516645570>
- Ashokkumar, A., and Swann, W. B., Jr. (2022). Restoring honor by slapping or disowning the daughter. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 49(6), 823-836. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672221079106>
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Başar, F., and Demirci, N. (2018). Domestic violence against women in Turkey. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 34(3), 660-665. <https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.343.15139>
- Batista, V., Barreto, M., Gomes, N., Prado, E., Padoin, S., Godoy, F., and Marcon, S. (2023). Unveiling family relationships based on the context of domestic violence: A grounded theory. *Revista Da Escola De Enfermagem Da Usp*, 57. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-220x-reeusp-2023-0009en>
- Berkowitz, L. (1989). Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106(1), 59-73. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.106.1.59>
- Bourdieu, P. (1995). *Pratik nedenler*. (H. Tufan, Çev.). Kesit Yayıncılık.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian Meditations*. Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., and Wacquant, L. J. (2003). *Düşünümsel bir antropoloji için cevaplar*. (N. Ökten, Çev.). İletişim Yayınları.
- Chesney-Lind, M., and Chagnon, N. (2016). Criminology, gender, and race. *Feminist Criminology*, 11(4), 311-333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085116633749>
- Cihangir, S. (2012). Gender specific honor codes and cultural change. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 16(3), 319-333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430212463453>
- Ciocan, C. (2024). Violence and the limits of experience. *Human Studies*, 48, 197-214. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10746-024-09753-2>
- Cochran, J. C., Jones, S., Jones, A. M., and Sellers, C. S. (2016). Does criminal propensity moderate the effects of social learning theory variables on intimate partner violence? *Deviant Behavior*, 37(9), 965-976. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2015.1060793>
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. University of California Press.

- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829-859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639>
- Creswell, J. W., and Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Cunningham, M. (2008). Influences of gender ideology and housework allocation on women's employment over the life course. *Social Science Research*, 37(1), 254-267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2007.01.003>
- Çalık, K. (2017). Attitudes of Turkish academics regarding violence against women in the name of honor. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(20), 3232-3254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517739288>
- Çeğin, G. and Özpolat, G. (2016). Tabiyet ve Simgesel Şiddet Kavramları Üzerinden Foucault ve Bourdieu'yu Birlikte Okumak. *Praksis*. 683-695.
- Dhungel, S., Dhungel, P., Dhital, S., and Stock, C. (2017). Is economic dependence on the husband a risk factor for intimate partner violence against female factory workers in Nepal? *BMC Women's Health*, 17(1), Article 82. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-017-0441-8>
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.
- Doğan, R. (2014). The dynamics of honor killings and the perpetrators' experiences. *Homicide Studies*, 20(1), 53-79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088767914563389>
- Döker, G. and Koçer, M. (2024). Perception of television content in the context of violence against women by women victims: A phenomenological research. *Erciyes Akademi*, 38(4), 766-789. <https://doi.org/10.48070/erciyesakademi.1545128>
- Dugan, M. (2022). Ahlaki olgunluk bağlamında kadına yönelik şiddet: Nitel bir araştırma. *KADEM Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8(2), 367-394. <https://doi.org/10.21798/kadem.2022.122>
- Ellsberg, M., Ovince, J., Murphy, M., Blackwell, A., Reddy, D., Stennes, J., and Contreras, M. (2020). No safe place: Prevalence and correlates of violence against conflict-affected women and girls in South Sudan. *PLOS ONE*, 15(10), e0237965. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0237965>
- Eralp, A., and Gökmen, Ş. (2022). The impact of poverty on partner violence against women under regional effects: The case of Turkey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 38(5-6), 4906-4924. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605221119515>
- Ersoy, O., and Yıldız, H. (2011). Reproductive health problems and depression levels of women living in sanctuary houses as a result of husband violence. *Health Care for Women International*, 32(9), 795-810. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07399332.2011.565528>
- Ferguson, M. (2016). Vulnerability by marriage: Okin's radical feminist critique of structural gender inequality. *Hypatia*, 31(3), 687-703. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hypa.12263>
- Glaser, B. G., and Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine.
- Grembi, V., Rosso, A., and Barili, E. (2024). Domestic violence perception and gender stereotypes. *Journal of Population Economics*, 37(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-024-00986-0>

- Gül, P., and Schuster, I. (2020). Judgments of marital rape as a function of honor culture, masculine reputation threat, and observer gender: A cross-cultural comparison between turkey, germany, and the uk. *Aggressive Behavior*, 46(4), 341-353. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21893>
- Hamzaoğlu, M. (2024). Honor killings in traditional societies: revisiting the case of Türkiye after İstanbul convention withdrawal. *Lectio Socialis*, 8(2), 73-98. <https://doi.org/10.47478/lectio.1454452>
- Johnson, M. P. (2008). *A typology of domestic violence: Intimate terrorism, violent resistance, and situational couple violence*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & Society*, 2(3), 274-290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124388002003004>
- Keyvanlo, S., and Mikaili, N. (2023). The effectiveness of integration of emotion regulation therapy and compassion therapy on the mental well-being of women with domestic violence experience. *PWJ*, 4(1), 72-80. <https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.pwj.4.1.8>
- Latané, B., and Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Mannell, J., Lowe, H., Brown, L., Mukerji, R., Devakumar, D., Gram, L., Jansen, H., Minckas, N., Osrin, D., Prost, A., Shannon, G. and Vyas, S. (2022). Risk factors for violence against women in high-prevalence settings: A mixed-methods systematic review and meta-synthesis. *BMJ Global Health*, 7, e007704. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2021-007704>
- Morse, J. M. (2010). Simultaneous and sequential qualitative mixed method designs. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(6), 483-491. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410364741>
- Ökten, Ş. (2009). Toplumsal cinsiyet ve iktidar: Güneydoğu anadolu bölgesi'nin toplumsal cinsiyet düzeni. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(8), 302-312.
- Ökten, Ş. (2010). İktidarın sosyolojik kimliği: Aşiretlerde iktidarın biçimi ve kaynakları. *Sosyoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 13(2), 182-215. <https://dergipark.org.tr/pub/sosars/issue/11402/136137>.
- Pérez-Gatica, S. (2024). Is violence a limit phenomenon? A critical approach from the perspective of transcendental phenomenology and public health studies. *Human Studies*, 48, 215-231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10746-024-09750-5>
- Potter, J. (2006). Cognition and conversation. *Discourse Studies*, 8(1), 131-140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059562>
- Rees, N., Hawkes, C., Williams, L., Williams, J., and O'Meara, P. (2023). Emergency medical systemic frustration of aggression and violence in conflict encounters: An evolved grounded theory. *medRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.24.23293095>
- Ross, C., Smith, J., Washington, J., Oppong, A., Maphula, A., and Ingersoll, K. (2025). "Most men think they should have some sort of power and control over women": South African women's perspectives on violence against women in the community. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2025.2495745>
- Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing and Health*, 23(4), 334-340. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240x\(200008\)23:4<334::aid-nur9>3.0.co;2-g](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240x(200008)23:4<334::aid-nur9>3.0.co;2-g)

- Sardinha, L., Maheu-Giroux, M., Stöckl, H., Meyer, S., and Garcia-Moreno, C. (2022). Global, regional, and national prevalence estimates of physical or sexual, or both, intimate partner violence against women in 2018. *The Lancet*, 399, 803-813. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)02664-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02664-7)
- Sariaslan, K. (2023). *Empowering housewives in Southeast Turkey: Gender, state and development*. I.B. Tauris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9780755646517>
- Sev'er, A., and Yurdakul, G. (2001). Culture of honor, culture of change. *Violence Against Women*, 7(9), 964-998. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778010122182866>
- Stith, S. M., Rosen, K. H., Middleton, K. A., Busch, A. L., Lundeberg, K., and Carlton, R. P. (2000). The intergenerational transmission of spouse abuse: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(3), 640-654. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00640.x>
- Sykes, G. M., and Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22(6), 664-670. <https://doi.org/10.2307/208919>
- Şen, S., and Bolsoy, N. (2017). Violence against women: Prevalence and risk factors in Turkish sample. *BMC Women's Health*, 17(1), Article 100. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-017-0454-3>
- Vandello, J. A. and Cohen, D. (2003). Male honor and female fidelity: Implicit cultural scripts that perpetuate domestic violence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(5), 997-1010. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.997>
- Walby, S. (1990). *Theorizing patriarchy*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125-151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243287001002002>
- Wirtz, A., Perrin, N., Desgropes, A., Phipps, V., Abdi, A., Ross, B., Kaburu, F., Kajue, I., Kutto, E., Taniguchi, E. and Glass, N. (2018). Lifetime prevalence, correlates and health consequences of gender-based violence victimisation and perpetration among men and women in Somalia. *BMJ Global Health*, 3(4), e000773. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2018-000773>
- Yıldız, G. (2019). Geleneksel bağlamda erkeklerin dönüşen kadınlık algısı-Şanlıurfa ili örneği. *Toplum ve Kültür Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (3), 1-29.
- Yıldız, G. (2023). Kültür, moda ve gündelik hayat: mozaik bir kent olarak urfa'da erkeklik kimliğinin izini sürmek. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
- Yuan, W., Kadetz, P. I., Shen, X., and Hesketh, T. (2024). Women's experience of domestic violence: A qualitative study in Hangzhou, China. *Journal of Family Violence*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-024-00789-7>

Genişletilmiş Özet

Giriş

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'nin en belirgin ataerkil örüntülerinden birini barındıran Şanlıurfa'da aile içi şiddetin nasıl doğduğunu, nasıl meşrulaştırıldığını ve hangi toplumsal mekanizmalarla yeniden üretildiğini açıklamayı amaçlamaktadır. Literatürün çoğu şiddetin yaygınlığını sayısal verilerle ortaya koyarken, bu araştırma hem kadınların hem erkeklerin bakış açısını birlikte ele alarak şiddeti "bireysel patoloji"den ziyade "ataerkil statüyü koruma ve yeniden üretme mekanizması" olarak konumlandırmaktadır. Böylelikle makro (ataerkillik ve namus rejimleri), mezo (toplumsallaşma ve öğrenilmiş şiddet) ve mikro (gündelik etkileşim) düzeyler aynı modelde birleştirilir ve şiddetin görünmez ideolojik bağları görünür kılınmasını sağlar. Bu yaklaşım, yalnızca şiddetin nedenlerini tanımlamakla kalmayıp aynı zamanda şiddetin toplumsal dokuda nasıl kökleştiğini, bireylerin gündelik hayatlarına nasıl sızdığını ve hatta devlet politikaları ile kültürel kurumlar tarafından nasıl yeniden üretildiğini de açığa çıkarmaktadır. Dolayısıyla Şanlıurfa örneği, şiddetin hem yerel hem de evrensel boyutlarını anlamak için kritik bir laboratuvar işlevi görmektedir.

Yöntem

Araştırma, sıralı keşifsel nitel tasarım izlemiştir. 1. Fenomenolojik Aşama: 11'i kadın, 10'u erkek olmak üzere toplam 21 katılımcıyla yarı yapılandırılmış derinlemesine görüşmeler yapılmış; katılımcıların aile içi şiddeti nasıl deneyimlediği ve anlamlandırdığı incelenmiştir. 2. Gömülü Teori Aşaması: Fenomenolojik temalardan hareketle açık, eksenal ve seçici kodlama adımları yürütülmüş; veriden türeyen kategoriler "çekirdek kategori" etrafında bütünleştirilmiştir. Katılımcılar amaçlı örnekleme yoluyla çeşitlilik gözetilerek seçilmiş; görüşmeler 25-40 dakika sürmüş ve etik kurul onayı ile ses kaydına alınmıştır. Bu süreçte araştırmacı, kendi önyargılarını askıya alarak (bracketing) katılımcıların deneyimlerine mümkün olduğunca saf bir şekilde yaklaşmaya özen göstermiştir. Ayrıca, fenomenolojik derinlik ile gömülü teorinin soyutlama gücü bir araya getirilerek hem katılımcıların bireysel yaşantıları korunmuş hem de bu yaşantılardan evrensel düzeyde açıklayıcı bir model üretilmiştir.

Bulgular

Araştırma verilerinin ayrıntılı çözümlemesi, aile içi şiddetin Şanlıurfa bağlamında kendine özgü fakat evrensel nitelikler de barındıran, döngüsel ve çok katmanlı bir mekanizma üzerinden işlediğini göstermektedir. Şiddetin ortaya çıkışı, gelişimi ve sürdürülüşü; nedensel koşullar, bağlamsal koşullar, eylem ve etkileşim stratejileri ile sonuçların birbirini sürekli besleyen bir döngüsü içinde anlaşılabilir. Bu açıdan şiddet, yalnızca bireylerin kişisel tercihleri ya da psikolojik özellikleri ile açıklanabilecek bir olgu olmaktan ziyade, toplumsal yapının derinliklerine sinmiş ve gündelik hayatın birçok düzeyinde yeniden üretilen bir sosyal mekanizma olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır.

Nedensel koşullar incelendiğinde, kadının itaatsizliği ya da inatçılığı, ekonomik yetersizlik ve namus ya da onurun zedelenmesi gibi etkenlerin öne çıktığı görülmektedir. Erkeklerin otoritelerinin sorgulandığı her durumda şiddet devreye girmekte ve statü kaybının telafisi için işlevsel bir araç olarak konumlandırılmaktadır. Özellikle ekonomik yetersizlik, erkeklerin "eve ekmek getirememe" kaygısıyla birlikte statülerinin sarsıldığı duygusunu beslemekte, bu da şiddeti adeta bir "çıkış yolu" hâline getirmektedir. Kadının sadakatine ilişkin söylenti ya da şüphe dahi, namusun lekelenmesi algısıyla birleşerek şiddeti meşrulaştırıcı bir unsur hâline dönüşmektedir. Bu bağlamda şiddet, öfke patlaması ya da kontrolsüz bir davranış değil aksine statünün yeniden inşasının en hızlı ve etkili yolu olarak algılanmaktadır.

Şiddetin işleyişine zemin hazırlayan bağlamsal koşullar ise ataerkil toplumsal sözleşme ve öğrenilmiş şiddet kültürüdür. Erkek üstünlüğünü doğal ve değişmez bir kural olarak kabul eden bu sözleşme, kadını ikincil ve bağımlı bir konuma sabitlemektedir. Çocukluk döneminde aile içinde gözlemlenen şiddetin disiplin ya da terbiye yöntemi olarak içselleştirilmesi, bireylerin

yetişkinliklerinde şiddetle kurdukları ilişkiyi belirgin bir şekilde şekillendirmektedir. Kadın katılımcıların bir kısmının “bazen susmalıydım” ya da “hata bende” gibi ifadeleri, simgesel şiddetin görünür yansımaları olarak öne çıkmakta ve mağdurların da bu toplumsal sözleşmeyi içselleştirdiklerini ortaya koymaktadır. Böylelikle şiddet yalnızca erkekler tarafından uygulanmakla kalmamakta aynı zamanda kadınların rızaları ya da kabulleriyle de yeniden üretilmektedir.

Eylem ve etkileşim stratejileri incelendiğinde failerin şiddeti çoğunlukla bir terbiye yöntemi veya zorunluluk olarak tanımlayarak sorumluluklarını reddettikleri görülmektedir. Mağdurların ise çoğunlukla sessizlik, uyum sağlama ve içselleştirme yolunu tercih ettikleri anlaşılmaktadır. Tanık konumundaki bireyler ise genellikle “karı koca arasına girilmez” anlayışıyla müdahaleden kaçınmaktadır. Bu karşılıklı stratejiler şiddeti bireysel bir davranışın ötesine taşımakta ve toplumsal bir işbirliği şeklinde sürdürülmesine aracılık etmektedir. Failin sorumluluk reddi, mağdurun sessizliği ve tanıkların kayıtsızlığı, birlikte şiddeti sürekli kılan görünmez bir toplumsal ağ yaratmaktadır.

Tüm bu süreçlerin sonucunda ataerkil düzen yeniden tesis edilmekte, erkek otoritesi pekiştirilmekte ve kadınlar toplumsal açıdan daha pasif bir konuma itilmektedir. Bunun yanı sıra, şiddetin kuşaklar arası aktarımı da belirginleşmektedir. Çocuklar aile içinde tanık oldukları şiddeti bir norm olarak öğrenmekte; erkek çocuklar için şiddet uygulamak “erkekliğin kanıtı”, kız çocuklar içinse şiddete katlanmak “kadınlığın gereği” olarak kabul edilmektedir. Bu durum, şiddetin yalnızca tekrar edilmesine değil aynı zamanda kültürel bir miras olarak gelecek kuşaklara aktarılmasına yol açmaktadır. Dolayısıyla aile içi şiddet, sadece bir neslin değil gelecek kuşakların toplumsal ilişkilerini de şekillendiren bir miras niteliği taşımaktadır.

Bu bulgular, literatürde Bourdieu'nün “simgesel şiddet” kavramıyla yakından ilişkilendirilebilir. Erkeklerin şiddeti “meşru” nedenlerle açıklama çabası ile kadınların yaşadıkları şiddeti içselleştirmeleri arasındaki paralellik, tahakkümün rıza yoluyla sürdüğünü göstermektedir. Benzer şekilde Connell'in “hegemonik erkeklik” kavramsallaştırması da erkeklerin ekonomik, kültürel ve ahlaki sermaye kaybını telafi etmek için şiddeti bir araç olarak kullanmalarını açıklamaktadır. Araştırmanın ortaya koyduğu bu çok katmanlı yapı, literatürdeki kuramsal çerçeveleri somutlaştırarak şiddetin bireysel değil toplumsal ve yapısal bir olgu olduğunu bir kez daha kanıtlamaktadır.

Öte yandan bulgular, şiddetin yalnızca kadın ve erkek arasındaki ikili ilişkilerde değil tanıkların sessizliği, komşuların ve akrabaların müdahalesizliği, hatta yerel toplulukların değer yargıları aracılığıyla da yeniden üretildiğini göstermektedir. Bu açıdan bakıldığında aile içi şiddet, toplumsal bütünün farklı katmanlarında işleyen kolektif bir süreçtir. Dolayısıyla çözüm arayışlarının da yalnızca bireysel öfke kontrolü ya da hukuki yaptırımlarla sınırlı kalamayacağı, kültürel kodların dönüştürülmesini ve toplumsal normların yeniden inşa edilmesini gerektirdiği açıktır. Bu nokta, araştırmanın öneriler bölümüne doğrudan bağlanarak, toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliğini odağına alan kapsamlı politikaların geliştirilmesinin gerekliliğini vurgulamaktadır.

Tartışma, Sonuç ve Öneriler

Bu araştırma, aile içi şiddetin bireysel öfke patlaması ya da patolojik bir eğilimle açıklanamayacağını; erkeğin sarsılan ataerkil statüsünü korumak için başvurduğu toplumsal bir mekanizma olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Katılımcı ifadeleri bu işleyişi açıkça göstermektedir: Erkekler şiddeti “kadını yola getirme” ya da “evin düzenini sağlama” olarak tanımlarken, kadınlar “susmak zorundaydım” veya “hata bendeydi” diyerek içselleştirmiştir. Bu durum, Bourdieu'nun (2001) simgesel şiddet kavramıyla uyumludur. Zira tahakküm yalnızca zorla değil rızayla da sürmektedir.

Bulgular, erkeklerin otorite, geçindirme rolü ve namus gibi toplumsal sermayelerini kaybetme korkusuyla şiddete yöneldiğini göstermektedir. Ekonomik yetersizlik yaşayan erkekler, eve ekmek getirememenin “erkekliği eksilttiğini” belirtmiş, şiddeti statü onarımı için kullanmıştır. Bu gözlem, Connell'in (1995) hegemonik erkeklik teorisinin öngördüğü gibi erkeklerin iktidar kaybını şiddetle telafi etme stratejisini doğrulamaktadır.

Şiddetin sürekliliğini sağlayan yalnızca fail değildir. Kadınların “aile içinde kavga normaldir” veya “çocuklar için katlandım” sözleri, ataerkil toplumsal sözleşmenin mağdurlarca da içselleştirildiğini göstermektedir. Tanıkların “karı koca arasına girilmez” söylemiyle müdahaleden kaçınmaları ise şiddeti toplumsal bir işbirliğine dönüştürmektedir. Bu bulgular, Latané ve Darley’in (1970) “seyirci etkisi” kavramını desteklemektedir. Araştırmanın öne çıkan sonuçlarından biri de şiddetin kuşaklar arası aktarımıdır. Erkek çocukların “babam da anneme vururdu” diyerek şiddeti erkekliğin parçası, kız çocukların ise “annem de katlandı” diyerek tahammülü kadınlığın gereği olarak görmesi, şiddetin kültürel bir miras hâline geldiğini göstermektedir.

Bulgular, yalnızca öfke kontrolü ya da hukuki yaptırımların yeterli olmadığını ortaya koymaktadır. Şiddetin kökeni kültürel kodlarda aranmalı, “namus” ve “tahrik” gibi söylemler toplumsal dilden çıkarılmalıdır. Erkeklerin ve özellikle çocukların eşitlikçi toplumsal cinsiyet eğitimleri hedeflenmeli; tanıkların müdahalesini kolaylaştıracak hukuki güvenceler ve farkındalık kampanyaları güçlendirilmelidir. Sonuç olarak çalışma, aile içi şiddeti çok katmanlı bir çerçevede ele almakta, ataerkil düzenin şiddet aracılığıyla nasıl yeniden üretildiğini göstermekte ve çözümün kültürel dönüşümden geçtiğini vurgulamaktadır. Araştırmadan elde edilen model hem yerel bağlamda hem de evrensel düzeyde şiddetle mücadeleye katkı sunabilecek niteliktedir.