

**T.C.**  
**BAŞKENT UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY**  
**MASTER'S IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY**

**THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF GENDER: HOW DO WE PERCEIVE  
DIFFERENT GENDER EXPRESSIONS?**

**MASTER'S THESIS**

**BY**  
**ZEYNEP KARA**

**ADVISOR**  
**DR. LEMAN KORKMAZ**

**ANKARA - 2019**



**BAŞKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ**  
**SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ**  
**YÜKSEK LİSANS / DOKTORA TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORJİNALLİK RAPORU**

Tarih: 16 / 09 / 2019

Öğrencinin Adı, Soyadı: Zeynep Kara

Öğrencinin Numarası: 21810013

Anabilim Dalı: Psikoloji Anabilim Dalı

Programı: Sosyal Psikoloji Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı

Danışmanın Unvanı/Adı, Soyadı: Dr. Leman Korkmaz

Tez Başlığı: The Social Construction of Gender: How Do We Perceive Different Gender Expressions?

Yukarıda başlığı belirtilen Yüksek Lisans/Doktora tez çalışmamın; Giriş, Ana Bölümler ve Sonuç Bölümünden oluşan, toplam 55 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 15 / 09 / 2019 tarihinde şahsım/tez danışmanım tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı %8'dir.

Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

1. Kaynakça hariç
2. Alıntılar hariç
3. Beş (5) kelimedenden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

"Başkent Üniversitesi Enstitüleri Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Usul ve Esaslarını" inceledim ve bu uygulama esaslarında belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Öğrenci İmzası:

Onay

16 / 09 / 2019

Öğrenci Danışmanı Unvan, Ad, Soyad,  
Dr. Leman Korkmaz

## KABUL VE ONAY SAYFASI

Zeynep Kara tarafından hazırlanan “The Social Construction of Gender: How Do We Perceive Different Types of Gender Expressions” adlı bu çalışma jürimizce Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Kabul (sınav) Tarihi: 19/08/2019

(Jüri Üyesinin Unvanı, Adı-Soyadı ve Kurumu):

Jüri Üyesi: Öğr. Gör. Dr. Leman Korkmaz, Başkent Üniversitesi

Jüri Üyesi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Canay Doğulu, Başkent Üniversitesi

Jüri Üyesi: Dr. Suzan Ceylan Batur, TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi

İmzası



Onay

Yukarıdaki imzaların, adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

.../.../20....

Prof. Dr. İpek KALEMCİ TÜZÜN

Enstitü Müdürü

## **ABSTRACT**

Gender, and related issues are intertwined with each other as they are with biological sex. Although the number of studies on gender related topics has been increasing; the issue is still maintaining its importance. The aim of this study is to investigate how women and men react to gender-matched expressions (e.g., masculine males), cross-gender expressions (e.g., masculine females), and androgynous males and females. Most of the studies in the literature focused on negative attitudes towards feminine men. However, this study aims to broaden the literature on reactions toward different gender expressions and how people perceive these different expressions in regard to biological sex of a person. It is hypothesized that (1) women and men will evaluate masculine women more negatively than women expressing feminine and androgynous characteristics, (2) men and women will evaluate feminine men more negatively than men expressing masculine and androgynous characteristics, (3) men evaluate feminine men more negatively compared to women. However, according to the results of the first study, the characteristics of the masculine gender expressions were perceived more negatively than the characteristics of the feminine gender expressions by participants. Accordingly, results of the second study revealed that individuals with masculine gender expression regardless of gender were evaluated more negatively than individuals with feminine and androgen gender expressions.

**Keywords:** Social constructivism, Gender, Biological Sex, Gender Expressions, Androgyny

## ÖZET

Toplumsal cinsiyet ve toplumsal cinsiyetle ilgili konular biyolojik cinsiyetle olduğu gibi birbirleriyle de karıştırılmaktalar. Toplumsal cinsiyetle ilgili konularda yapılan çalışma sayısı artsa da bu konu hala önemini korumaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, kadınların ve erkeklerin cinsiyet uyumlu (maskülen/erkeksi erkek), cinsiyet uyumsuz (maskülen/erkeksi kadın) ve androjen erkeklere ve kadınları nasıl algıladığını araştırmaktır. Alan yazındaki birçok çalışma, feminen/kadınsı erkeklere karşı olan olumsuz tutumlar üzerine odaklanmaktadır. Ancak bu çalışma, farklı cinsiyet ifadelerine olan tepkileri ve insanların biyolojik cinsiyetleri göz önünde bulundurarak farklı cinsiyet ifadelerini nasıl algılayacaklarını araştırarak alan yazına katkı sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Buna göre, (1) kadınlar ve erkekler maskülen/erkeksi kadınları feminen/kadınsı kadınlara ve androjen kadınlara göre daha olumsuz olarak değerlendirileceği; (2) erkekler ve kadınlar, feminen/kadınsı erkekleri maskülen/erkeksi erkeklere ve androjen erkeklere göre daha olumsuz olarak değerlendirileceği; (3) erkekler feminen/kadınsı erkekleri kadınlara göre daha olumsuz olarak değerlendirileceği beklenmiştir. Ancak birinci çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre, maskülen/erkeksi cinsiyet ifadelerine ait özellikler, feminen/kadınsı cinsiyet ifadelerine ait özelliklere göre katılımcılar tarafından daha olumsuz olarak algılanmıştır. Buna bağlı olarak da ikinci çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre ise; cinsiyet fark etmeksizin maskülen/erkeksi cinsiyet ifadesine sahip bireyler feminen/kadınsı ve androjen cinsiyet ifadelerine sahip bireylerine göre daha olumsuz değerlendirilmişlerdir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Sosyal İnşa, Toplumsal Cinsiyet, Biyolojik Cinsiyet, Cinsiyet İfadeleri, Androjen

*“One Person can Make a Difference”*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to express my sincere and infinite gratitude to my advisor Leman Korkmaz for her support, endless patient, sympathy and understanding during the thesis process. She is the one who gives me motivation and hopes to write and finish this study. Without her, this study would never come to an end and I am still struggling through articles.

I would also like to thanks to Canay Doğulu, for her positiveness and supportive expressions throughout my postgraduate education. She made me see life with different angles.

I would like to thank to Suzan Ceylan for being a member of the examining committee and for her valuable contributions and her sincere course of actions.

My endless thanks are for my family for their support and handling my stress during the dissertation process. I want to thank my mother Zülfiye Kara and my father Resul Kara for always be there for me. I want to thank my sisters Tuba, Tuğçe, and Ayşe and my brother in law Gazmir Hoxha for their help and encouragement. Also, I want to thank my dearest nephew Burim Tahir and my sweetest niece Aulona Esra to show me what love is and to bring joy and hope to my life.

*“Happiness can be found in the darkest of times. If one only remembers to turn on the light.”*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	III
ÖZET .....	IV
DEDICATION .....	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	VI
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	VII
LIST OF TABLES .....	X
CHAPTER 1 .....	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1.1 General Introduction .....	1
1.1.2 Social Construction of Gender and Gender Expressions .....	2
1.1.3 Measuring Gender Expressions .....	6
1.1.4 Women’s Movements .....	7
1.1.5 Men’s Movements .....	9
1.1.6 The Overview of the Current Study .....	12
CHAPTER 2 (THE FIRST STUDY) .....	15
2.1 METHOD .....	15
2.1.1 Participants .....	15
2.1.2 Instruments .....	15
2.1.2.1 Demographic Form .....	15
2.1.2.2 Gender Expression Survey .....	15
2.1.3 Procedure .....	16
2.1.4 Data Analysis .....	17
2.2 RESULTS .....	17
2.2.1 Frequency Analyses .....	17
2.2.2 Content Analysis .....	23
2.2.2.1 Codes and Themes of Masculine Gender Expression .....	23
2.2.2.1.1 Personality Traits .....	23



2.2.2.1.2 Physical Appearance.....	24
2.2.2.1.3 Cognitive Traits .....	28
2.2.2.1.4 Interests.....	28
2.2.2.1.5 Social Traits.....	28
2.2.2.2 Codes and Themes of Feminine Gender Expressions .....	28
2.2.2.2.1 Personality Traits.....	28
2.2.2.2.2 Physical Appearance.....	29
2.2.2.2.3 Cognitive Traits .....	30
2.2.2.2.4 Interests.....	30
2.2.2.2.5 Social Traits.....	30
2.3 DISCUSSION.....	34
2.3.1 Overview of Findings on Gender Expressions .....	35
2.3.1.1 Masculine Gender Expression.....	35
2.3.1.2 Feminine Gender Expression .....	37
CHAPTER 3 (THE SECOND STUDY).....	40
3.1 METHOD .....	40
3.1.1 Participants.....	40
3.1.2 Instruments.....	40
3.1.2.1 Gender Expression Manipulation.....	40
3.1.2.1.1 Masculine Gender Expression .....	41
3.1.2.1.2 Feminine Gender Expression.....	41
3.1.2.1.3 Androgynous Gender Expression.....	41
3.1.2.2 Semantic Differential Task.....	42
3.1.2.3 Social Distance Scale .....	42
3.1.2.4 Demographic Information Form .....	43
3.1.3 Procedure .....	43
3.1.4 Data Analysis .....	43
3.2 RESULTS .....	43
3.2.1 Descriptive Statistics for the Research Variables .....	44
3.2.2 MANCOVA Analysis.....	47
3.3 DISCUSSION.....	51

3.3.1 Participants' Gender Effect.....	51
3.3.2 Gender and Gender Expression Effect.....	52
CHAPTER 4.....	55
4.1 GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION .....	55
4.1.1 Contributions and Implications of the Study .....	55
4.1.2 Limitations and Directions for Future Research.....	56
4.1.3 Concluding Remarks.....	57
REFERENCES.....	58
APPENDICES.....	66
APPENDIX A .....	67
APPENDIX A.1. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM (FOR GENDER EXPRESSION SURVEY) .....	67
APPENDIX A.2. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM .....	67
APPENDIX B. ....	68
APPENDIX B.1 GENDER EXPRESSION MANIPULATION .....	68
APPENDIX C .....	69
APPENDIX C.1. SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TASK.....	69
APPENDIX C.2. SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE.....	70
APPENDIX D. ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL .....	71
APPENDIX E.....	74
APPENDIX E.1. INFORMED CONSENT FORM (FOR GENDER EXPRESSION SURVEY) .....	74
APPENDIX E.2. INFORMED CONSENT FORM .....	76

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.2.1. Frequencies Of Feminine Gender Expression Codes ( $N = 147$ ).....	19
Table 2.2.2. Frequencies Of Masculine Gender Expression Codes ( $N = 147$ ) .....	21
Table 2.2.3. Themes Of Masculine Gender Expression.....	25
Table 2.2.4. Themes Of Feminine Gender Expression .....	31
Table 3.2.1. Descriptive Statistics For The Research Variables .....	45
Table 3.2.2. Ancova Table: Differences Between Feelings And Attitudes Based On Gender Expressions And Sexes .....	50

# CHAPTER 1

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1.1 General Introduction

The number of studies focusing on sex/gender-related issues has been increasing in the literature. However, considering the prejudices and discrimination that people still experience because of their gender identity and/or gender expression, it is clear that further studies are needed on these issues. Biological sex is assigned sex, based on the chromosomes and the genital organs whereas gender is a social interpretation of biological sex (Unger, 1979). In fact, gender includes expectations from women and men, it describes how girl and boy; women and men should act, speak and dress, and even think. Gender stereotypes dictate that women should stay at home and take care of children, and men should go outside and bring money to home (Rudman & Mescher, 2013). While these defined roles bring constraints for both men and women; it seems there is less burden of this gender dichotomy for males because men have more power than women (Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts, 2012).

Throughout history, by questioning gender-based power dynamics, gender-based discriminatory behaviors, prejudices, and traditional gender roles, meanings of being women and men have been reconstructed. During this reconstruction process, depending upon the changes in the meaning of being women and men, expectations on how women and men should express themselves have also been changing. Accordingly, the aim of this thesis, which includes two studies, is to find out contemporary perception on gender expressions and to examine people's reactions to different gender expressions (feminine, masculine, and androgynous) for both women and men. In the first chapter of the thesis, theories and the findings in the literature which provide theoretical bases for this study will be discussed. To this end, social construction theory and its implications on gender and gender expressions will be discussed. Subsequently, how gender expressions measured will be presented from a historical view. Then, women's movements in history will be elaborated. Afterward, men's movement and their role in history will be discussed. Finally, an overview of the study including aims, and hypotheses of the study will be presented.

In the second chapter, information on the method, the results, and the discussion of the first study carried out within the scope of this dissertation will be given. In the third chapter, the second study carried out within the scope of this thesis will be presented and information on the method, the results, and the discussion of the study will be given. In the fourth and final chapter, discussion of the main findings, contributions of the study to the literature, limitations of the study and the directions for future researches will be given and also the last chapter will include concluding remark emphasizing the importance of continuing the gender expressions research.

### **1.1.2 Social Construction of Gender and Gender Expressions**

As mentioned in the beginning of the previous section, our biological differences create a dichotomy between men and women. From then on, the name of sex turns into gender when we refer to the social interpretation of sex (Unger & Crawford, 1993). But gender is not a fixed notion; it varies and changes through time, place, and people. For example, a few decades ago, only mothers were taking care of their children in public places, however recently fathers also take care of their children in public places. So, how these changes occur? As we know there are no written rules about these roles, or when and how to change them. According to social constructionist approach people continuously change the gender. In fact, they were the one who "do" the gender (Lorber, 1994).

"Doing the gender" is a concept suggested by social construction theory which emphasizes the interpretation of immutable things (such as biological sex) (DeLamater & Hyde, 1988). The basic assumption of social constructionism is, "reality is socially constructed" (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p.1), which means that we perceive the world by giving meaning to things happen. According to this paradigm, language makes a great difference in how we perceive things because we can classify things and people with language. As it is mentioned above, gender is the interpretation of biological sex, thus with different interpretations, gender has been re-constructed throughout different time, and places. Accordingly, social constructionist approach might provide a theoretical base when we try to understand gender and related issues. To illustrate, although in most of the cultures, women are staying at home, and taking care of children, and men are going outside for food, in some cultures, these roles constructed very differently: In one of the African tribes (called Wodaabe) men needs to pay attention to their physical appearances in order to find a wife, because in this tribe women choose their partners

according to men's beauty. In this tribe women have more sexual freedom than men, even after the marriage, women can have a second sexual partner, where men cannot<sup>1</sup>. According to these examples, we can conclude that gender is created by culture, and it changes with time, and gender experienced differently by the members of specific societies (Gagnon, 1990).

People construct gender by the way they talk, dress, walk, and so on. Although there are no manuals on gender, we still understand and know when someone acts inconsistent with gender roles. People feel uncomfortable when these roles are ambiguous and displaced, and they can be relieved when they placed people into proper gender status (Lorber, 1994). A gender status is the constructed aspect of a sex category (e.g., girl, boy, women, men); which has occurred through naming, dressing, walking, gesturing, etc.

In the 1970s when the word of gender emerged, it was defined as "nonphysiological components of sex that are culturally regarded as appropriate to males or females" (Unger, 1979, p.1086). Therefore, underlying assumption of this statement is that people are expected to express him/herself in accord with the gender assumptions: Gender assumptions lead people to have a bias that if you are a male, you must express yourself with masculine behaviors, attitudes, etc.; in parallel, if you are a female, you must have feminine behaviors, attitudes, etc. This bias occurs because most of the time people associate being male with masculinity and being female with femininity. However, while the former namely gender identity refers to defining oneself as women and/or men; the latter one namely gender expression indicates how we express our genders. The term masculine specifies the most proper traits for males, and it is associated with an instrumental orientation, and the term feminine has been used to specify the most proper traits for females and associated with an expressive orientation (Bem, 1974). Therefore, masculinity traits are described as being independent, competitive, superior, self-confident and making decisions easily (getting the job done); femininity traits are described as being compassionate, dependent, helpful to others, warm in relations with others, and kind (Bem, 1974; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). Of course, these traits are constructed in society, therefore they are not universal, and they are open to change throughout time.

---

<sup>1</sup> African Travel Page. December 2018. <<https://afktravel.com/88150/15-things-you-didnt-know-about-the-wodaabe-people/13/>>

Despite femininity and masculinity are not necessarily exist, people's expectations and social norms constructed these features. Thus, for people, it becomes necessary to comply with these constructed traits. While there are lots of people define masculinity and femininity according to males' and females' appropriate features; many researchers (Connell, 2005; Schippers, 2007; Unger, 1979) define gender expressions as "...the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender...". According to this definition, masculinity and femininity are not specific to men and women; but they are traits practiced by either of the sexes. Rather than gender identity, these traits can be seen as personal characteristics that enable people to express their "self" to others, the way that they live a life, their sense of self, etc. Hence, being masculine or feminine doesn't indicate your gender identity and/or sex; but it defines who you are as a person. When gender expression as a concept first emerged, it was seen as bipolar; in which a person is on the either masculine or feminine pole. Thereby, this bipolarization constraints people in the extent of being expressive vs. instrumental, or assertive vs. shy, etc. (Gollwitzer, 1981). But the restrictive nature of this dichotomy made researchers emphasize a new term: androgyny (Bem, 1974, 1977; Kelly & Worell, 1977; Spence & Helmreich, 1980). Androgyny indicates, "the integration of both masculinity and femininity within a single individual" (Bem, 1977, p.196) therefore psychological androgyny makes it possible that an individual can be both affectionate and assertive, both feminine and masculine depending on the situational factors. Androgyny can be defined as an equal load on both feminine and masculine traits (Bem, 1977). This new term, the multidimensional characteristic of gender expression allows individuals to become humans rather than programming machines. This doesn't mean that people cannot be masculine or feminine: Some people's masculine or feminine characteristics might be more dominant, while some other people express masculine and feminine characteristics equally (Bem,1977).

If people behave consistently with traditional gender roles, in other words, if men express masculine gender roles and if women express feminine gender roles it is called as gender-matched expressions. But if men do not behave according to traditional male gender roles, and if women do not behave according to traditional female gender roles it is called cross-gender expressions (Blackwood, 1984; Helgeson, 1994). As a consequence of the changes throughout history, the participation of men and women in cross-gender domains become possible. For example, becoming a kindergarten teacher is seen appropriate for women, however recently men

are taking this job too. Also, while boxing is perceived suitable for men, nowadays there are lots of women boxers throughout the world (e.g., according to The Guardian's news, in England, 40% of boxing clubs run classes for women specifically 20.500 women box every week)<sup>2</sup>.

Although cross-gender expressions are prevalent in society, it does not mean that there are no biases toward people who show inconsistent behaviors with their gender. Gender and related issues such as gender identity, gender expressions, sexual orientation are intertwined when it comes to using of these terms in society; most of the time people with "atypical gender expression" are seen as homosexuals (Rieger, Linsenmeier, Gygax, Garcia, & Bailey, 2010). Because of the stereotypes, and the limited information about homosexuality; people tend to believe that homosexual women are masculine, and homosexual men are feminine (Kite & Deaux, 1987). Therefore, the negative reactions to the feminine men and masculine women could be the result of homophobia. There are also other studies showing that feminine males are perceived as homosexuals. But the literature on LGBTI individuals (e.g., Robinson, Skeen, & Flake-Hobson, 1982; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) shows that being homosexual men is not equal with being feminine men or vice versa. As mentioned above, gender expressions are not about individuals gender identity or sexual orientation, they are the characteristics of one's self.

In the current thesis, I aim to examine how people perceive gender-matched expressions (e.g., masculine males), cross-gender expressions (e.g., masculine females), and androgynous expression of women and men. There are inconsistent findings in research on gender expressions specifically, in research on how people react to inconsistent gender expressions. The inconsistent finding might stem from the constructed nature of gender: Gender and the relevant issues are as real as we constructed them. Therefore, while a few decades ago parents wanted their daughters to be obedient, shy, and yielding; nowadays, they want their daughters assertive, dominant, and independent (e.g. Brandth, 1994). In the studies carried out previously in Turkey, women were perceived as warm, emotional, delicate, and fragile (Kandiyoti, 1978; Sunar, 1982); however a recent study showed that even though women are still perceived as emotional, warm, etc. nowadays they are also seen as jealous, shrewd, independent, thrifty (Sakallı-Uğurlu, Türkoğlu, & Kuzlak, 2018).

---

<sup>2</sup> The Guardian. December 2018. <[https:// www. theguardian. com/ lifeandstyle/2010/nov/12/women-boxing-live-tv-olympics](https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2010/nov/12/women-boxing-live-tv-olympics)>



### **1.1.3 Measuring Gender Expressions**

From a historical viewpoint, it is seen that researchers make different attempts to measure masculinity and femininity. For example, Lewis and Miles (1936) measured masculinity and femininity with a 456- item scale namely, Attitude Interest Analysis Survey (AIAS, as cited in Helgeson, 1994). According to this survey, items that scored highly by women than men labeled as feminine, and items were scored highly by men than women labeled as masculine. Strong (Vocational Interest Blank, 1936) indicated that females and males' interest would vary through age. Also, there were certain vocational interests that are defined for males and females. Therefore, his questionnaire was asking the individuals' interests. Additionally, when constituting masculinity-femininity scales he used three different age groups namely, high school group, college group, and adult group. According to the results, vocational interests that were more frequently chosen by males were labeled as masculine, and vocational interests that were more frequently chosen by females were labeled as feminine. Another scale was constituted from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, and in this subscale, femininity items were validated on gay men's responses (Hathaway & McKinley, 1940). So, homosexual men equated with femininity, therefore, gender expressions and sexual orientation seemed to be intertwined. As it is seen, masculinity-femininity scales' items that developed from 1925 to 1970 were methodologically weak so that those items only give information about if the participant was men or women. Another weakness of these scales was femininity and masculinity were assumed to opposite ends of a continuum (Helgeson, 1994).

In the 1970s, Bem developed her sex role inventory (BSRI; 1974) and she indicated that femininity and masculinity are two independent dimensions (Bem, 1974). While developing the scale Bem did not consider the differences between responses of men and women on items, but she focused on the differences in the social desirability of characteristics attributed to men and women. After BSRI, Spence et al. (1974) developed a new scale called Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). Once more, femininity and masculinity were considered as two independent dimensions. This questionnaire measured the typical adult male and female characteristics, and typical college male and female characteristics. Unlike Bem's questionnaire, on this measure, participants rated the ideal male and female (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). However, there was some criticism for these questionnaires that they are not multidimensionally measured femininity and masculinity, instead, they were only assessing the

desirable features of femininity and masculinity (Helgeson, 1994). Accordingly, Spence, Helmreich, and Holahan (1979) developed an extended version of PAQ (Extended version of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire) by adding two alternative scales to measure undesirable aspects of femininity (e.g., whiny, gullible) and masculinity (e.g., arrogant). After distinguishing negative and positive aspects for femininity and masculinity, it was found that positive and negative ends of the gender expressions are related to some physical and psychological issues. For example, the positive end of the masculinity is related to better health, but the negative end of the masculinity is related to severe heart attacks (Helgeson, 1990; Holahan & Spence, 1980). From then on, masculinity and femininity were examined in various contents such as physical characteristics, role behaviors, personality traits (e.g., Deaux & Lewis, 1984; Myers & Gonda, 1982).

In 1982, Myers and Gonda decided to measure masculinity and femininity in a different way. They asked participants to define feminine and masculine terms in open-ended questions. On average 90% of the identified terms for masculine and feminine were different than traditional masculinity and femininity inventories. This result showed that gender expressions are continuously constructed by people. The researchers emphasized that participants have their own conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Therefore, future researches should use participants "rich source of information" for masculinity and femininity (Myers & Gonda, 1982).

The findings of the study given above provide support for the suggestions of social constructionism in gender expressions. This study indicates that the meaning of being men and women and the definition of masculinity and femininity might change in different times and contexts. Accordingly, rather than examining gender expressions by using categories that have been already defined, exploring the meaning of masculinity and femininity for a certain group of people in certain context and time might provide more accurate perspective. Besides, when we examine the historical occurrences for both women and men, we might gain a broader perspective to understand the changes that happened and the obstacles over changes. In the following section, women's movements and men's movements will be elaborated.

#### **1.1.4 Women's Movements**

People constitute and share some social tasks for per person as well as for both sexes (female and male). The repetitive and continuous implementations of certain social tasks by

women and men are transformed into social roles that had to be followed by females and males, and it is called as traditional gender roles (Basow, 1992). From then on, women have suffered from the consequences of these roles. Therefore, gender and gender expressions as socially constructed of concepts must be examined in a historical point of view in order to gain a broader perspective. For this purpose, in this section, women's movements will be elaborated.

Throughout history, especially women challenge the gender-based power dynamics by questioning the discriminatory behaviors and given roles to them. In the late 19th century the first official women's movement began for the right to vote (DuBois, 1978). But before that, there were organized movements of women. Actually, before this big movement for the right of vote, in 1789, laborer women of Paris marched to the Palace of Versailles, set the stage for the French Revolution. The women's bravery led the French people to take control over their fate and therefore it provided encouragement and support to establish a new order (Wyllie, Acton, & Goldblatt, 2018). While the known first official movement was about suffrage and legal obstacles for women, in the 1960s there was another women's movement in the USA questioning sexuality, (e.g., birth control, abortion) and roles of women in family (e.g., housework, childcare) as well as the workplace and legal inequalities such as custody and divorce law. The last women's movement started in the 1990s and it still continues (Mendes, 2011; Ryan, 1992). This time women continue to struggle for their rights and the movement expands its focus to include a diverse group of women such as women of colors, women from different ethnicities, nationalities, religions, and cultural backgrounds. In this way, this movement is also picking up the pace to resolve race and discrimination issues. To sum, while in the first movement women struggled for their legal rights; in the second and the third women's movement, women tried and still trying to reduce existing inequalities, such as unequal pays for men and women (including a diverse group of women), sexual harassment at workplace, etc. (O'Neil, 1981; Rudman et al., 2012).

Despite all these movements, women and femininity still associate with weakness, and women still face with prejudices and discriminatory acts<sup>3,4</sup> (Bayeh, 2016; Butler, Winfree Jr, &

---

<sup>3</sup> United Nations Statistics Division. December 2018. <[http:// www. unstats. un. org/ unsd/demographic/products/Worldswomen/WW2010pub](http://www.unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/products/Worldswomen/WW2010pub)>

Newbold, 2003; Cho, 2014). There are some debates about why these movements did not show the expected effects; one suggested reason is that the movements didn't "fundamentally challenge" the existing gender beliefs (Bacchi, 1983); the other standpoint is that there are people who take benefit from the gender dichotomy and consequently, they want to maintain the gender hierarchy (Rudman et al., 2012; Rudman & Mescher, 2013; Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford, & Weaver, 2008). As Rudman et al. (2012), indicated, men don't want to change gender hierarchy because of the higher status of manhood; whereas women don't want to change the hierarchy because they don't want to challenge the status quo, therefore, they can stay in the comfort zone. Women's movements did not bring complete equality between women and men, however, when we look at the changes through time, it would be very clear that their influence is huge. In other words, although there is no complete equality, change occurs gradually, and women's movement has been changing women's and men's position in social life. As might be expected the changes in the status of women and men are not the only result of women's movement, but also the men's movements questioning the given roles to men and women.

### **1.1.5 Men's Movements**

While most of the psychology studies made by and for men (Lerner, 1979), it doesn't mean that there are not any sexist attitudes towards men (Levant, 2011). Studies showed that being man is associated with certain characteristics such as strength, aggressiveness, toughness, be willing to take risks (Bem, 1974); and to be accepted as a man, men need to prove their masculinity by expressing these characteristics to other people, especially to other men (Vandello, et al., 2008). These perceptions make men naturally related to the violation of rules, harassment, sex addicts, and other incidents which affect society, children, men, and women negatively (Brooks & Silverstein, 1995; Levant, 2011). Although the role of being strong that attributed to men seems to have negative impacts on women's lives in general; the role also has many negative sides for men either. From the first emergence of humankind on earth, men experienced a burden of leaving their secure places (e.g., home) to find food, or to find safer places for their family and tribe, while women stay at home and take care of offspring and the found resources (Isaac 1978; Lovejoy, 1981). The problem in this division of labor is that women and men were not asked what they could and want to do, those roles were simply given to them.

---

<sup>4</sup> United Nations Women. December 2018. <[http:// www. unifem. org/ gender\\_ issues/ violence\\_ against\\_ women/ facts\\_ figures/](http://www.unifem.org/gender_issues/violence_against_women/facts_figures/)>

Therefore, the male gender role was shaped like a fighter, brave, and strong person. However, this male gender role was not as desirable as it sounds because it brings restrictions in men's social life in many aspects. To illustrate, male gender role prevents males from seeking medical help (Addis & Mahalik, 2003) because seeking help requires relying on other people, questioning one's physical toughness, and admitting a need for others' help and the mentioned characteristics are not consistent with attributed characteristics to men (Good, Dell, & Mintz, 1989).

With the start of women's movement, some men started to question what women's movements mean to men and some workshops were organized and consciousness-raising groups emerged around colleges (Messner, 1998). The first men movement which was called "The Male Liberation Movement" occurred in the early 1970s (Sawyer, 1970). This male movement supported the feminist movement which focuses on sexism toward women and accepts feminism as a necessary social movement to ensure gender equalities. But this movement also addressed that traditional male gender roles negatively affect men's health and social life (Messner, 1998; Sawyer, 1970). But by the mid- to late 1970s, men's liberation movement split into two opposite sides. One side called the movement "Men's Rights" was defending anti-feminism and suggesting that feminist movements harmed men and "men are the real victims" (Flood, 1996). Supporters of "Men's Rights" were interested in issues like boys' and men's educations, men's health, and injustices and biases toward men in society (Maddison, 1999). The other half was called themselves "pro-feminists", their first attempt was to join women to confront patriarchy, even though they had to give up their institutionalized privileges by doing so (Flood, 1997). They had an understanding that "success for a man often involves influence over the lives of other persons" (Sawyer, 1970, p.32). In the early 1980s, there was another men's movement called "Mythopoetic Men's Movement", the aim of this movement was to reveal the true nature of males without limitations of the modern world (Bonnett, 1996). The movement includes psychological self-help gatherings to provide support men to alienate from traditional male sex roles and get in touch with their emotions (Bonnett, 1996; Maddison, 1999).

Even though several men's movement occurred by this time, the historical events demonstrate that maintaining continuity of the movement is harder than starting the movements. Because some of these movements (e.g., men's liberation, pro-feminists) not only suggest that traditional male roles and masculinity bring harm to men's social life, physical and mental health,

and burden them by forcing them to be dominant (if they are not, they became an object of derision) (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; Berger, Levant, McMillan, Kelleher, & Sellers, 2005; Sawyer, 1970) but also they are defending women's right and feminist movements which challenge men's superiority over women. Considering the cultural and social expectations of maintaining traditional masculinity roles, men need to be strong, superior, and most importantly they need to be the provider and the defender of traditional masculinity roles (Maddison, 1999). Commitment to masculinity roles also makes men stressful in situations that require an expression of emotions (Eisler, Skidmore, & Ward, 1988; Saurer & Eisler, 1990). Men are expected to be emotionally less expressive than women. In parallel with this expectation, some research showed that men are facially less expressive than women (Cherulnik, 1979) besides, compare to women, men experience more difficulty understanding of others' nonverbal expressions (Buck, Miller, & Caul, 1974). Consequently, being emotionally less expressive could be the cause of their problems in social life such as inability to show help-seeking behavior, dissatisfaction with relationships, etc. (Saurer & Eisler, 1990).

Compared to women, it is hard to change men's commitment to masculinity roles, and ideas because there is a "power" factor within the nature of being masculine, which supposedly gives rights to men to predominate a person who is not following the masculinity "rules". Additionally, men having feminine characteristics and/or men defending femininity are also negatively evaluated by men following the masculinity "rules". Besides, the expression of feminine gender roles by men is associated with homosexuality (Kite & Deaux, 1987). Indeed, this association is also related with power dynamics in society, men generally don't want to be associated with anything related to women and femininity because femininity is associated with weakness and low status (Bayeh, 2016; Cho, 2014; McCreary, 1994). In fact, there are some studies showing that homosexual men are trying to be perceived more masculine and they are distancing themselves from other homosexual men in order not to be perceived as feminine (e.g., Hunt, Fasoli, Carnaghi, & Cadinu, 2016). Because of these reasons, for men, it might be hard to give up masculinity roles that culture and society constructed. Even though traditional masculine roles have dozens of negative effects on men's lives, as mentioned above, there are costs of giving up these roles: These men not only leave the power and social status they are given but also, they accept to be excluded from men's world.

### **1.1.6 The Overview of the Current Study**

The aim of this study is to broaden the gender expression literature by exploring the perceived characteristics of feminine and masculine gender expressions and by examining people's attitudes towards women and men with different gender expressions (masculine, feminine, androgynous). Although there are some research results on this topic; most of them out of date, and those studies are focusing on reactions of only men or women (e.g., Brandth, 1994; Hoffman & Fidell, 1979; Hunt et al., 2016; Levant, 2011; Mennesson, 2000; O'Neil, 1981). Indeed, the previous studies generally focused on how men react to feminine, and masculine men (e.g., Hunt et al., 2016; O'Neil, 1981) and we know that feminine males are perceived more negatively by men (e.g., McCreary, 1994) and these negative reactions associated with homosexuality (McCreary, 1994). However, when it concerns reactions towards different types of gender expressions of women, our knowledge is very scarce. Thus, if we analyze reactions towards gender-matched and gender-inconsistent expressions of both men and women we can gain a better understanding of the topic.

Accordingly, in this thesis, firstly the aim is to explore how people define masculine and feminine characteristics in Turkey. Considering the limited number of recent studies on how people define characteristics of masculine and feminine person, masculine and feminine men and masculine and feminine women, and insufficient number of studies on gender expressions in Turkey (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2018), this dissertation aims to contribute the literature by exploring the perceived characteristics of masculine and feminine person, men, and women. For this purpose, the first study of this thesis will be conducted to find the contemporary characteristics of different gender expressions by considering biological sex of a person. As mentioned above, gender is not fixed, it changes through time and place. Therefore, people's understanding and perception of gender vary through time. Accordingly, to measure the current perception of gender expressions is important. Since femininity and masculinity are generally seen as behaviors, traits, and appearances that distinguish females from males and these expressions are adopted from males and females (Constantinople, 1973), it is socially desirable that men adopt masculine, and women adopt feminine characteristics. Since femininity is perceived desirable for women and masculinity is perceived desirable for men (Helgeson, 1994); femininity and masculinity expressed by women and men would not be perceived similarly. In other words, masculine women and masculine men -or feminine women and feminine men-

would not be evaluated in the same way. In light of this information mentioned above, in the first study of this thesis, participants will be asked to describe the characteristics of a feminine and masculine person, woman, and man separately.

I believe that considering the socially constructed nature of gender expressions and existence of negative reactions towards gender-inconsistent expressions we need to gain broader understanding by conducting further studies to understand attitudes towards women and men with different gender expressions (masculine, feminine, androgynous). Because women and men who do not behave consistently with the traditional roles gender still suffer from negative reactions at the present time further studies are necessary. In the second study of the thesis, reactions toward different gender expressions will be examined. Specifically, people's feelings and attitudes toward the feminine, masculine, and androgynous women and men will be measured. In the previous research, it was found that gender-inconsistent expressions (e.g., masculine women) were negatively evaluated by women and men in order to defend gender hierarchy (e.g., Rudman et al., 2012). However, the negative evaluation of feminine men was mostly done by men rather than women; besides, there are many studies showing that women express supportive attitudes toward gay men (e.g., Kite & Whitley, 1996; Lambert, Ventura, Hall, & Cluse-Tolar, 2006; Worthen, 2012). For this reason, it is important to consider the participant's gender while evaluating attitudes towards people with different gender expressions. In the second study, participants will be asked to indicate their feelings toward feminine, masculine, and androgynous women and men on the scale including opposite adjectives at the two ends of rating scale (e.g., cold-warm, unfriendly-friendly, positive-negative) (Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, & Bilewicz, 2013); and participants' attitudes will be measured by asking their willingness to socially contact in varying degrees to closeness with people having different gender expressions (Bogardus, 1925).

To sum up, in the first study conducted in this dissertation, contemporary characteristics of feminine and masculine gender expressions will be explored and in the second study reactions of both women and men towards gender-matched expressions (e.g., masculine males), cross-gender expressions (e.g., masculine females), and androgynous gender expressions of males and females will be examined. It is hypothesized that (1) women and men evaluate masculine women more negatively than women expressing feminine and androgynous characteristics, (2) women and



men will evaluate feminine men more negatively than men expressing masculine and androgynous characteristics, (3) men evaluate feminine men more negatively compared to women.

## CHAPTER 2 (THE FIRST STUDY)

### 2.1 METHOD

#### 2.1.1 Participants

A total of 201 students in Ankara, Turkey participated in the first study. Fifty-four participants were removed from the study because they did not answer any of the questions. One hundred ten (75%) of the participants were women and 10 (7%) of them were men; and as a response to gender question one participant chose the other option and 2 of the participants chose not want to answer option, and 24 of the participants didn't answer the gender question. Twenty-seven of the 147 participants did not report their age. The remaining 120 participants' ages ranged from 19 to 44 ( $M = 21.53$ ,  $SD = 2.84$ ). The participants were recruited through convenience sampling. Students from Başkent and Atılım Universities were informed about the study in their classes. Also, the study was announced through social media accounts to reach more participants from different places in Turkey. One hundred twelve students were psychology students and they received bonus points for certain psychology courses in return for their participation. The remaining 35 participants were volunteers and they were not given any incentive for their participation.

#### 2.1.2 Instruments

##### 2.1.2.1 Demographic Form

In order to obtain demographic characteristics of the sample, participants were asked to indicate their sex, age, current education (degree, university, and department) (see Appendix A.1). One hundred and twenty-one of the participants indicated that they were university students, 26 of the participants did not answer the question. One hundred and twelve (76%) of the participants were psychology students, five (3.4%) of the participants were students in the department of elementary education, two of the participants were law students, one of the participants was a student in finance department, one of the participants was in logistic management, and 26 of the participants didn't answer the education question.

##### 2.1.2.2 Gender Expression Survey

In order to obtain perceived characteristics of masculine and feminine gender expressions for both men and women, participants were asked to write 5 to 10 features indicates physical

appearance, behavior patterns, personality traits, adjectives, etc. for a masculine man, masculine woman, masculine person; and a feminine man, feminine woman, and feminine person. The order of questions on gender expressions was given as follows: Participants first answered questions on masculine and feminine gender expressions of a person and the order of feminine person or masculine person questions was random. The main purpose of asking person question in the first hand, was to explore how people perceive femininity and masculinity independent from any reference to the sex of person. A reference to sex of a person with certain gender expression (e.g., women with masculine gender expression) might activate certain biases and intervene the responses towards a person with masculine and/or feminine characteristics; thus firstly questions for gender expression of a person were presented and subsequently, the questions for gender expressions of both men and women were randomly presented to eliminate the order effect.

### **2.1.3 Procedure**

Prior to data collection, an institutional ethics committee approval was taken from Başkent University Social and Human Sciences Academic Research and Publication Ethics Committee for conducting the study (see Appendix D). The study was prepared and conducted by online data collection platform Qualtrics. Therefore, in order to participate to the experiment, the link of the study was distributed to the participants. In the beginning of the study, informed consent was obtained from participants (see Appendix E). This form informed participants about the aim and the duration (approximately 15 minutes) of the study. In this form it was indicated that the study causes no physical and psychological harm to the participants. Besides, they were told that they can leave the study whenever they want, also they could leave empty questions if they do not want to answer any questions, and they were assured of confidentiality and informed that their responses would be used only for research purposes. There were 6 questions for evaluating perception on gender expressions and 4 questions in the demographic information form. Following the informed consent, participants were presented the questions. First, they wrote down characteristics for masculine and feminine person and the order of these two questions was random; then, they answered the questions asking masculine and feminine gender expressions for both sexes. At the end of the study participants were thanked for their participation. The study lasted approximately 15 minutes.

#### **2.1.4 Data Analysis**

In order to analyze the obtained data, content analysis was applied. Boettger and Palmer (2010) defined content analysis as “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts...” and they proposed that content analysis could be applied qualitatively or quantitatively. Content analysis allows to collect recurring themes emerged from the data and its systematical aspect allows converting qualitative data into quantitative data that includes identifying meaning and making relational inferences (Krippendorff, 2004). Therefore, characteristics that written by participants were firstly coded. During the coding process similar words, synonymous were categorized under the same code (e.g., angry-annoyed-furious). Then, codes were categorized into themes (physical appearance, personality traits, cognitive traits and interests) for each gender expression and sex (e.g., masculine person/men/women, feminine person/men/women). Following the coding process the codes were counted.

### **2.2 RESULTS**

#### **2.2.1 Frequency Analyses**

In order to find out the number of codes that have been written; frequency analysis was conducted. Frequency analyses revealed that 201 participants wrote down 2745 responses for feminine expression and 2842 responses for masculine expression. Specifically; 1078 codes for feminine person, 1068 codes for masculine person; 801 codes for feminine women, 866 codes for feminine men; 841 codes for masculine women, and 933 codes for masculine men. Results showed that, responses of participants for feminine person, feminine women, and feminine men showed remarkable similarities such as well-groomed, hair style, kind, emotional, etc. (see Table 2.2.1). In the same way, responses describing masculine person, masculine men, and masculine women indicated a great similarity such as: tough, strong, intelligent, short-haired, etc. (see Table 2.2.2). Results revealed that the most commonly used characteristics to describe masculine gender expressions were tough, rude, authoritarian, short-haired, interested in sports and cars, and intelligent (see Table 2.2.2); whereas the most commonly reported characteristics to describe feminine gender expressions were kind, understanding, warm, emotional, skillful, colorful and different hair styles, love of accessories and makeup (see Table 2.2.1).

When we consider the initially most-mentioned codes for different gender expressions; we see that there are some similarities in terms of written codes. For example, most mentioned characteristics considering physical appearance for masculine and feminine expressions are clothes. However, while for masculine person, masculine men, and masculine women clothes were described as; dark-colored, suits, white shirts, and pants (see Table 2.2.2); for feminine person, feminine men, and feminine women clothes were described as; bloomy and colorful shirts and skinny pants or leggings (see Table 2.2.1).

**Table 2.2.1. Frequencies of Feminine Gender Expression Codes (N = 147)**

Feminine Person		Feminine Women		Feminine Men	
Adjectives	Frequencies	Adjectives	Frequencies	Adjectives	Frequencies
Clothes (Renkli, Çiçekli Kıyafetler)	73	Clothes (Renkli, Çiçekli Kıyafetler)	68	Clothes (Renkli, Çiçekli Kıyafetler)	86
Well-groomed (Bakımlı)	69	Kind (Kibar)	65	Kind (Kibar)	85
Kind (Kibar)	69	Attractive (Çekici)	60	Well-groomed (Bakımlı)	67
Attractive (Çekici)	69	Well-groomed (Bakımlı)	56	Emotional (Duygusal)	65
Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	58	Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	50	Feminine (Kadınsı)	64
Emotional (Duygusal)	56	Strong (Güçlü)	41	Feminine Speech (Kadınsı Konuşma Tarzı)	48
Make-up (Makyaj)	50	Emotional (Duygusal)	40	Warm (Sevecen)	47
Hair Styles (Saç Stili)	49	Make-up (Makyaj)	40	Funny (Komik)	46
Understanding (Anlayışlı)	47	Delicate (Narin)	39	Cheerful (Neşeli)	46
Strong (Güçlü)	47	Hair Styles (Saç Stili)	38	Understanding (Anlayışlı)	38
Delicate (Narin)	45	Authoritative (Baskın, Otoriter)	25	Make-up (Makyaj)	33
Compassionate (Merhametli)	44	Understanding (Anlayışlı)	23	Sensitive (Duyarlı)	30
Intelligent (Zeki)	42	Friendly (Cana Yakın)	20	High-pitched Voice (İnce Sesli)	25
Warm (Sevecen)	39	Happy (Mutlu)	20	Hair Styles (Saç Stili)	23
Body Lines (Kıvrımlı Vücut Hatları)	31	Body Lines (Kıvrımlı Vücut Hatları)	19	Accessories (Aksesuar)	22
Sharp Facial Features (Keskin Yüz Hatları)	26	Stand One's Own Feet (Kendi Ayakları Üzerinde Duran)	19	Social (Sosyal)	18
Talkative (Konuşkan)	23	Attentive (Özenli)	18	Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	15
Feminine Speech (Kadınsı Konuşma Tarzı)	23	Talkative (Konuşkan)	18	Women Friends (Kadınlarla Arkadaş)	13
Tolerant (Hoşgörülü)	20	Nurturing (Anaç)	16	Strong (Güçlü)	13

*Note.* The table is continuing on the other page.

<b>Feminine Person</b>		<b>Feminine Women</b>		<b>Feminine Men</b>	
<b>Adjectives</b>	<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>Adjectives</b>	<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>Adjectives</b>	<b>Frequencies</b>
Successful (Başarılı)	19	Accessories (Aksesuar)	16	Concern w/ Appear (Görünüme Önem)	13
Nurturing (Anaç)	18	Successful (Başarılı)	15	Soft (Yumuşak)	10
Authoritative (Baskın, Otoriter)	16	Flashy (Gösterişli)	12	Niminy (Kırtkan)	10
Elegant (Şık)	15	Defensive (Savunmacı)	11	Smoothed-chinned (Sakalsız- Tüysüz)	8
Attentive (Özenli)	15	Fancy (Süslü)	10	Homosexual (Eşçinsel)	7
High-pitched Voice (İnce Sesli)	13	Brave (Cesur)	8	Brave (Cesur)	7
Brave (Cesur)	12	Elegant (Şık)	8	Interest in Fashion (Modayla İlgili)	6
Accessories (Aksesuar)	10	Free (Özgür)	8	Attentive (Özenli)	6
Fancy (Süslü)	10	Helpful (Yardımsever)	8	Diffident (Özgüvensiz)	5
Decisive (Kararlı)	8	Respectful (Saygılı)	8	Skillful (Yetenekli)	5
Free (Özgür)	7	High-pitched Voice (İnce Sesli)	6	Intelligent (Yetenekli)	5
Respectful (Saygılı)	6	Decisive (Kararlı)	6		
Skillful (Yetenekli)	6	Skillful (Yetenekli)	5		
Amusing (Eğlenceli)	6	Equitable (Eşitlikçi)	5		
Critical Thinking (Eleştirel Düşünme)	6				
Scent (Koku)	6				
Well-adjusted (Uyumlu)	5				
Sincere (Samimi)	5				
Defensive (Savunmacı)	5				
Assertive (Girişken)	5				
Conscious (Bilinçli)	5				

*Note.* Codes having frequency less than 5 were not included in the table.

**Table 2.2.2. Frequencies of Masculine Gender Expression Codes (N = 147)**

Masculine Person		Masculine Women		Masculine Men	
Adjectives	Frequencies	Adjectives	Frequencies	Adjectives	Frequencies
Hairy Face (Sakal- Bıyık)	70	Clothes (Koyu Renkli, Gömlek, Pantolon)	83	Hairy Face (Sakal- Bıyık)	71
Tough (Sert)	63	Short Hair (Kısa Saç)	63	Tough (Sert)	69
Strong (Güçlü)	60	Tough (Sert)	61	Clothes (Koyu Renkli, Gömlek, Pantolon)	56
Rude (Kaba)	59	Masculine (Erkeksi)	55	Strong (Güçlü)	52
Tall (Uzun Boylu)	58	Rude (Kaba)	54	Authoritarian (Baskın, Otoriter)	49
Muscular (Kaslı)	58	Strong (Güçlü)	51	Rude (Kaba)	45
Authoritarian (Baskın, Otoriter)	54	Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	46	Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	43
Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	47	Authoritarian (Baskın, Otoriter)	46	Muscular (Kaslı)	35
Short Hair (Kısa Saç)	46	Brave (Cesur)	25	Deep Voice (Kalın Sesli)	35
Suit (Takım Elbise)	45	Decisive (Kararlı)	23	Serious (Ciddi, Ağırbaşlı)	33
Angry (Sinirli)	42	Unkempt (Bakımsız)	22	Angry (Sinirli)	33
Serious (Ciddi, Ağırbaşlı)	37	Stand One's Own Feet (Kendi Ayakları Üzerinde Duran)	22	Attractive (Çekici)	30
Protective (Koruyucu)	35	No Make-up (Makyaj Yapmaz)	19	Short Hair (Kısa Saç)	26
Brave (Cesur)	35	Serious (Ciddi, Ağırbaşlı)	19	Protective (Koruyucu)	22
Kind (Kibar)	33	Masculine Speech (Erkeksi Konuşma)	18	Well-groomed (Bakımlı)	20
Attractive (Çekici)	30	Deep Voice (Kalın Sesli)	17	Tall (Uzun Boylu)	20
Intelligent (Zeki)	24	Easy (Rahat)	17	Suit (Takım Elbise)	20
Well-groomed (Bakımlı)	24	Emotional (Duygusal)	16	Decisive (Kararlı)	20
Decisive (Kararlı)	23	Free (Özgür)	14	Strapper (İri, Yapılı)	19
Glitzy (Havali)	21	Use Bad Language (Küfürlü Konuşma)	13	Beads (Tespîh)	19
Funny (Komik)	20	Sport (Spor)	13	Competent (Yetkin)	19
Dark Color (Koyu Renk)	18	Emotionless (Duygusuz)	12	Fighter (Kavgacı)	19

*Note.* The table is continuing on the other page.



<b>Masculine Person</b>		<b>Masculine Women</b>		<b>Masculine Men</b>	
<b>Adjectives</b>	<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>Adjectives</b>	<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>Adjectives</b>	<b>Frequencies</b>
Use Bad Language (Küfürlü Konuşma)	16	Funny (Komik)	11	Insensible (Duyarsız, Anlayırsız)	18
Strapper (İri, Yapılı)	15	Have Tattoos (Dövmesi Olan)	11	Emotionless (Duygusuz)	17
Reckless (Umursamaz)	14	Considerate (Düşünceli)	10	Masculine (Erkeksi)	17
Sharp Facial Features (Keskin Yüz Hatları)	14	Angry (Sinirli)	10	Sharp Facial Features (Keskin Yüz Hatları)	16
Patriarchal (Ataerkil)	11	Warm (Sevecen)	9	Warm (Sevecen)	14
Emotionless (Duygusuz)	11	Kind (Kibar)	9	Funny (Komik)	11
Masculine (Erkeksi)	11	Tall (Uzun Boylu)	9	Interest in Football and Basketball (Futbol ve Basketbola İlgi)	10
Potbellied (Göbekli)	8	Homosexual (Eşcinsel)	8	Leader (Lider)	9
Jealous (Kıskanç)	8	Men Friends (Erkeklerle Arkadaş)	8	Patriarchal (Ataerkil)	9
Respectful (Saygılı)	8	Reckless (Umursamaz)	8	Brave (Cesur)	8
Deep Voice (Kalın Sesli)	7	Protective (Koruyucu)	7	Rational (Mantıklı)	8
Football (Futbol)	7	Successful (Başarılı)	6	Intelligent (Zeki)	8
Honest (Dürüst)	7	Lumber Along (Hantal Yürüyüş)	6	Honest (Dürüst)	8
Fit (Fit)	7	Football (Futbol)	5	Brunet (Esmer)	8
Warm (Sevecen)	6	Interest in Technology (Teknolojiyle İlgili)	5	Wise (Bilgili)	6
Compassionate (Merhametli)	6	Athletic (Sportif)	5	Slanging (Argo Konuşma)	6
Elegant (Şık)	5	Not Attractive (Çekici Olmayan)	5	Interest in Cars (Arabalara İlgi)	5
Beads (Tespah)	5				
Interest in Cars (Arabalara İlgi)	5				

*Note.* Codes having frequency less than 5 were not included in the table.

## **2.2.2 Content Analysis**

Several themes of gender expressions were constituted. As mentioned in the procedure section, participants were asked to write down 5 to 10 characteristics that come to their mind when thinking about feminine person/men/women, masculine person/men/women and to stimulate participants' thinking, some suggestions about what to write were given in the instruction (physical appearance, behavior patterns, and personality traits). Accordingly, these instructions influenced the emergence of specific themes. One of these themes is personality traits. This theme has the most-frequently mentioned theme in compare to other themes, and it includes descriptive and possibly proscriptive codes for feminine and masculine person, women, and men. Second theme is physical appearance theme. It includes participants tangible perception about the indicated individuals such as clothing, height, hair style, etc. The third theme is cognitive traits, which include participants' perception about the target individual in terms of intelligence, skills, etc. One other theme is social traits. This theme has only emerged in cross-gender conditions (e.g., feminine men), the theme includes participants perception about the target individuals' sexual orientation, their friendship group (e.g., men friends). Final theme is the interest theme. This theme is emerged in masculine conditions (e.g., interest in football) and in feminine men (e.g., fashion) condition. Participants did not mention interests for feminine person and feminine women. Each of the themes and their frequencies were shown in the Table 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.

### **2.2.2.1 Codes and Themes of Masculine Gender Expression**

#### **2.2.2.1.1 Personality Traits**

This theme is the most-frequently mentioned theme for masculine gender expressions with negative and positive codes, which indicated that when people think about a masculine individual, they are mostly thinking about those individual's dispositions. Masculine were generally defined as though, strong, rude and authoritarian. As seen in Table 2.2.3, participants reported similar codes for masculine person, masculine man, and masculine woman under the personality traits theme. However, different from masculine person and masculine men some codes were only reported for masculine women such as, feel free, stand on their own feet. Besides, in compare to masculine man and masculine woman, masculine person was defined as jealous, compassionate, and respectful and these codes were not reported for neither masculine men nor masculine women; different from masculine person and masculine woman, only

masculine men were defined as fighter and insensible. Also, although some codes were reported for three conditions, the difference between frequencies of codes worth to mention. For example; protective code was reported 35 times for masculine person and 22 times for masculine men, it was reported only 7 times for masculine women. Likewise, brave was reported 35 times for masculine person and 25 times for masculine women; it was reported only 8 times for masculine men. There are other interesting findings emerged from this study; to illustrate, masculine person and masculine women were described with opposite words at the same time, such as; masculine women were reported as emotional (16) and emotionless (12). In the same way, masculine person was reported as rude and kind. The most frequent codes reported for masculine person were tough, strong, and rude; the most frequent codes reported for masculine men were tough, strong, and authoritarian; and the most frequently reported codes for masculine women were tough, masculine, and rude.

#### **2.2.2.1.2 Physical Appearance**

After personality traits theme, most-frequently mentioned theme is physical appearance. According to participants perception about masculinity, masculine individuals have short and plain hairstyles, are not fancy, have deep voice, muscular, sharp facial features (see Table 2.2.3). Although many physical appearances for masculine person, masculine man, and masculine woman were defined similar; there are also some characteristics in which they differ from each other. For example; while masculine person and masculine men were perceived as attractive and well-groomed, masculine women were perceived as unattractive and unkempt; when there were not any references for masculine person's and masculine men's walking style, masculine women's walking was described specifically as masculine; also masculine women was visualized as having tattoos whereas there was not any reference on tattoos for masculine person and masculine men. Besides, while masculine person and masculine man were reported as muscular with high frequencies (58 and 35 respectively), masculine woman was reported as athletic and only 5 times. The most frequent codes reported for masculine person were hairy face, tall, and muscular; the most frequent codes reported for masculine men were hairy face, clothes, and muscular; and the most frequent codes reported for masculine women were clothes, short-hair, and unkempt.

**Table 2.2.3. Themes of Masculine Gender Expression**

Themes	Masculine Person		Masculine Women		Masculine Men	
	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total
Personality Traits	Tough (Sert)	63	Tough (Sert)	61	Tough (Sert)	69
	Strong (Güçlü)	60	Masculine (Erkeksi)	55	Strong (Güçlü)	52
	Rude (Kaba)	59	Rude (Kaba)	54	Authoritarian (Baskın, Otoriter)	49
	Authoritarian (Baskın, Otoriter)	54	Strong (Güçlü)	51	Rude (Kaba)	45
	Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	47	Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	46	Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	43
	Angry (Sinirli)	42	Authoritarian (Baskın, Otoriter)	46	Serious (Ciddi, Ağırbaşlı)	33
	Serious (Ciddi, Ağırbaşlı)	37	Brave (Cesur)	25	Angry (Sinirli)	33
	Protective (Koruyucu)	35	Decisive (Kararlı)	23	Protective (Koruyucu)	22
	Brave (Cesur)	35	Stand One's Own Feet (Kendi Ayakları Üzerinde Duran)	22	Decisive (Kararlı)	20
	Kind (Kibar)	33	Serious (Ciddi, Ağırbaşlı)	19	Fighter (Kavgacı)	19
	Decisive (Kararlı)	23	Easy (Rahat)	17	Insensible (Duyarsız, Anlayışsız)	18
	Glitzy (Havalı)	21	Emotional (Duygusal)	16	Emotionless (Duygusuz)	17
	Funny (Komik)	20	Free (Özgür)	14	Masculine (Erkeksi)	17
	Use Bad Language (Küfürlü Konuşma)	16	Use Bad Language (Küfürlü Konuşma)	13	Warm (Sevecen)	14
	Reckless (Umursamaz)	14	Emotionless (Duygusuz)	12	Funny (Komik)	11
	Patriarchal (Ataerkil)	11	Funny (Komik)	11	Leader (Lider)	9

*Note.* The table is continuing on the other page.

Themes	Masculine Person		Masculine Women		Masculine Men	
	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total
Personality Traits	Emotionless (Duygusuz)	11	Considerate (Düşünceli)	10	Patriarchal (Ataerkil)	9
	Masculine (Erkeksi)	11	Angry (Sinirli)	10	Brave (Cesur)	8
	Jealous (Kıskanç)	8	Warm (Sevecen)	9	Honest (Dürüst)	8
	Respectful (Saygılı)	8	Kind (Kibar)	9	Slanging (Argo Konuşma)	6
	Honest (Dürüst)	7	Reckless (Umursamaz)	8		
	Warm (Sevecen)	6	Protective (Koruyucu)	7		
	Compassionate (Merhametli)	6				
		<b>627</b>		<b>538</b>		<b>502</b>
Cognitive Traits	Intelligent (Zeki)	24	Successful (Başarılı)	6	Competent (Yetkin)	19
					Rational (Mantıklı)	8
					Intelligent (Zeki)	8
					Wise (Bilgili)	6
		<b>24</b>		<b>6</b>		<b>41</b>
Social Traits			Homosexual (Eşcinsel)	8		
			Men Friends (Erkeklerle Arkadaş)	8		
Interests				<b>16</b>		
	Football (Futbol)	7	Sport (Spor)	13	Interest in Football and Basketball (Futbol ve Basketbola İlgi)	10
	Interest in Cars (Arabalara İlgi)	5	Football (Futbol)	5	Interest in Cars (Arabalara İlgi)	5
			Interest in Technology (Teknolojiyle İlgili)	5		
		<b>12</b>		<b>23</b>		<b>15</b>

*Note.* The table is continuing on the other page.

Themes	Masculine Person		Masculine Women		Masculine Men	
	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total
Physical Appearance	Hairy Face (Sakal-Bıyık)	70	Clothes (Koyu Renkli, Gömlek, Pantolon)	83	Hairy Face (Sakal-Bıyık)	71
	Tall (Uzun Boylu)	58	Short Hair (Kısa Saç)	63	Clothes (Koyu Renkli, Gömlek, Pantolon)	56
	Muscular (Kaslı)	58	Unkempt (Bakımsız)	22	Muscular (Kaslı)	35
	Short Hair (Kısa Saç)	46	No Make-up (Makyaj Yapmaz)	19	Deep Voice (Kalın Sesli)	35
	Suit (Takım Elbise)	45	Deep Voice (Kalın Sesli)	17	Attractive (Çekici)	30
	Attractive (Çekici)	30	Have Tattoos (Dövmesi Olan)	11	Short Hair (Kısa Saç)	26
	Well-groomed (Bakımlı)	24	Tall (Uzun Boylu)	58	Well-groomed (Bakımlı)	20
	Dark Color (Koyu Renk)	18	Lumber Along (Hantal Yürüyüş)	6	Tall (Uzun Boylu)	20
	Strapper (İri, Yapılı)	15	Athletic (Sportif)	5	Suit (Takım Elbise)	20
	Sharp Facial Features (Keskin Yüz Hatları)	14	Not Attractive (Çekici Olmayan)	5	Strapper (İri, Yapılı)	19
	Potbellied (Göbekli)	8			Beads (Tespah)	19
	Deep Voice (Kalın Sesli)	7			Sharp Facial Features (Keskin Yüz Hatları)	16
	Fit (Fit)	7			Brunet (Esmer)	8
	Elegant (Şık)	5				
	Beads (Tespah)	5				
	<b>410</b>		<b>258</b>		<b>375</b>	

*Note.* Codes having frequency less than 5 were not included in the table.

### **2.2.2.1.3 Cognitive Traits**

This theme has less codes compare to other themes that emerged for all three stimuli (masculine person, masculine woman, and masculine man). Masculine gender expression was generally associated with intelligent. As seen in Table 2.2.3, masculine man and masculine person were defined as intelligent and logical whereas masculine woman was defined as intelligent and successful; besides, masculine man had more codes in the cognitive trait theme (e.g., competent, wise) compare to masculine person and masculine woman. Compared to masculine men and person, masculine women had the lowest frequency on that theme. Intelligent as a characteristic was only reported for masculine person; and successful as a characteristic was only reported for masculine women; whereas participants described masculine men as competent, rational, intelligent, and wise (see Table 2.2.3).

### **2.2.2.1.4 Interests**

Participants' perception of this theme is related to being masculine or to being male. This theme was only emerged when masculine individuals and feminine men were at the issue. Generally, interests in masculine expressions were reported as sports and cars. As seen in Table 2.2.3, masculine person was reported as interested in cars and football; participants reported interests in cars, basketball, and football for masculine man; and participants reported interest in sport, football, and technology for masculine woman.

### **2.2.2.1.5 Social Traits**

This theme is the least-frequently mentioned theme, it only appears in cross-gender expressions such as masculine woman responses. The frequencies of the codes in this theme were the lowest in compare to other themes. According to the results, participants mentioned friendship with males for masculine women and sexual tendency of masculine women. This result indicates that people associate cross-gender expressions with sexual orientation and they perceive masculine women as lesbians (see Table 2.2.3).

## **2.2.2.2 Codes and Themes of Feminine Gender Expressions**

### **2.2.2.2.1 Personality Traits**

This theme is the most-frequently mentioned theme for feminine gender expressions, which assumes that when people think about a feminine individual, they are mostly thinking about those individual's dispositions. Feminine were generally described as; kind, emotional,

understanding, and warm. As seen in Table 3.4, on one hand there were similarities on high frequently reported personality traits for feminine person, feminine woman, and feminine man. The most frequently reported codes for feminine person were kind, self-confident, and emotional; the most frequently reported codes for feminine women were kind, self-confident, and strong; whereas the most frequently reported codes for feminine men were kind, emotional, and feminine (see Table 2.2.4). On the other hand there are some differences on certain characteristics described for feminine person, feminine woman, and feminine man; to illustrate, different from feminine person and feminine woman, participants described feminine man as cheerful, feminine, sensitive, social, and funny; feminine person was more frequently described as compassionate tolerant, and sincere in compare to feminine woman and feminine man; feminine woman was described as friendly, happy, stand on her own feet however there were no references to these characteristics for feminine person and feminine man. Besides, even though some codes were reported for three conditions, the difference between frequencies of codes are worth to mention. For example, while strong was reported for 47 times for feminine person and 41 times for feminine woman, it was reported only 13 times for feminine man. Other remarkable finding of this study is, while authoritarian and free were reported for both feminine person and feminine woman it was not reported for feminine man. One other interesting finding is for feminine man it was reported as self-confident and diffident.

#### **2.2.2.2.2 Physical Appearance**

After personality traits theme, the most-frequently mentioned theme is physical appearance. As a gender expression, feminine was associated with different and colorful hairstyles, being fancy, well-groomed, and attractive, loving accessories, and doing make-up. In masculine gender expression, it was found that masculine woman perceived as unattractive and unkempt; however, for feminine gender expression, feminine man was perceived as attractive and well-groomed as well as feminine person and feminine woman. The most frequently reported codes for feminine person and feminine women were clothes, well-groomed, and attractive; whereas the most frequently reported codes for feminine men were clothes, well-groomed, and feminine speech (see Table 2.2.4). This result indicates that participants' perception of femininity is associated with self-caring/being well-groomed regardless of sex of a person. The characteristic that was only used to define feminine man rather than feminine person and feminine woman is niminy, smoothed-chinned, and concern with appearances. While feminine



person and feminine woman were reported as attractive and curved body lines, attractiveness and body lines were not reported for feminine man.

#### **2.2.2.2.3 Cognitive Traits**

The characteristics under this theme were less frequently reported in compare to other themes that emerged for all three stimuli (feminine person, feminine woman, and feminine man). Feminine was generally defined as skillful. As seen in Table 2.2.4, in this theme participants reported more codes for feminine person than feminine woman and feminine man. Participants reported skillful code for all three stimuli namely, feminine person, feminine women, and feminine men. Different from feminine men, participants reported successful code for feminine women; and they reported intelligent code for feminine men; whereas participants reported intelligent, successful, conscious, and critical thinking codes for feminine person (see Table 2.2.4). Compared to feminine person and feminine woman, codes for feminine man had the lowest frequency on this theme.

#### **2.2.2.2.4 Interests**

As in mentioned above, participants' perception of this theme is related to being masculine or being male. Accordingly, this theme only emerged when masculine individuals and feminine men were at the issue. Participants only reported interests in fashion code for feminine man (see Table 2.2.4).

#### **2.2.2.2.5 Social Traits**

This theme is the least-frequently mentioned theme, it only appears in cross-gender expressions such as responses given for feminine man. According to the results, participants reported codes of friendship with females, sexual tendency, and they described feminine men as soft (see Table 2.2.4). Supposedly, the term used to indicate feminine man as girly, instead of manly. This result indicates that people might associate cross-gender expressions with sexual orientation and there is a tendency to perceive feminine men as gays.

**Table 2.2.4. Themes of Feminine Gender Expression**

Themes	Feminine Person		Feminine Women		Feminine Men	
	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total
Personality Traits	Kind (Kibar)	69	Kind (Kibar)	65	Kind (Kibar)	85
	Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	58	Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	50	Emotional (Duygusal)	65
	Emotional (Duygusal)	56	Strong (Güçlü)	41	Feminine (Kadınsı)	64
	Understanding (Anlayışlı)	47	Emotional (Duygusal)	40	Warm (Sevecen)	47
	Strong (Güçlü)	47	Delicate (Narin)	39	Funny (Komik)	46
	Delicate (Narin)	45	Authoritative (Baskın, Otoriter)	25	Cheerful (Neşeli)	46
	Compassionate (Merhametli)	44	Understanding (Anlayışlı)	23	Understanding (Anlayışlı)	38
	Warm (Sevecen)	39	Friendly (Cana Yakın)	20	Sensitive (Duyarlı)	30
	Talkative (Konuşkan)	23	Happy (Mutlu)	20	Social (Sosyal)	18
	Tolerant (Hoşgörülü)	20	Stand One's Own Feet (Kendi Ayakları Üzerinde Duran)	19	Self-confident (Özgüvenli)	15
	Nurturing (Anaç)	18	Attentive (Özenli)	18	Strong (Güçlü)	13
	Authoritative (Baskın, Otoriter)	16	Talkative (Konuşkan)	18	Brave (Cesur)	7
	Attentive (Özenli)	15	Nurturing (Anaç)	16	Attentive (Özenli)	6
	Brave (Cesur)	12	Defensive (Savunmacı)	11	Diffident (Özgüvensiz)	5
	Decisive (Kararlı)	8	Brave (Cesur)	8		
	Free (Özgür)	7	Free (Özgür)	8		
	Respectful (Saygılı)	6	Helpful (Yardımsever)	8		
	Amusing (Eğlenceli)	6	Respectful (Saygılı)	8		

Note. The table is continuing on the other page.

Themes	Feminine Person		Feminine Women		Feminine Men	
	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total
Personality Traits	Well-adjusted (Uyumlu)	5	Decisive (Kararlı)	6		
	Sincere (Samimi)	5	Equitable (Eşitlikçi)	5		
	Defensive (Savunmacı)	5				
	Assertive (Girişken)	5				
		<b>556</b>		<b>448</b>		<b>485</b>
Cognitive Traits	Intelligent (Zeki)	42	Successful (Başarılı)	15	Skillful (Yetenekli)	5
	Successful (Başarılı)	19	Skillful (Yetenekli)	5	Intelligent (Yetenekli)	5
	Skillful (Yetenekli)	6				
	Critical Thinking (Eleştirel Düşünme)	6				
	Conscious (Bilinçli)	5				
		<b>78</b>		<b>20</b>		<b>10</b>
Social Traits					Women Friends (Kadınlarla Arkadaş)	13
					Soft (Yumuşak)	10
					Homosexual (Eşçinsel)	7
					<b>30</b>	
Interests					Interest in Fashion (Modayla İlgili)	6
						<b>6</b>

*Note.* The table is continuing on the other page.

*Note.* Codes having frequency less than 5 were not included in the table.

Themes	Feminine Person		Feminine Women		Feminine Men	
	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total	Codes	Frequencies /Total
Physical Appearance	Clothes (Renkli, Çiçekli Kıyafetler)	73	Clothes (Renkli, Çiçekli Kıyafetler)	68	Clothes (Renkli, Çiçekli Kıyafetler)	86
	Well-groomed (Bakımlı)	69	Attractive (Çekici)	60	Well-groomed (Bakımlı)	67
	Attractive (Çekici)	69	Well-groomed (Bakımlı)	56	Feminine Speech (Kadınsı Konuşma Tarzı)	48
	Make-up (Makyaj)	50	Make-up (Makyaj)	40	Make-up (Makyaj)	33
	Hair Styles (Saç Stili)	49	Hair Styles (Saç Stili)	38	High-pitched Voice (İnce Sesli)	25
	Body Lines (Kıvrımlı Vücut Hatları)	31	Body Lines (Kıvrımlı Vücut Hatları)	19	Hair Styles (Saç Stili)	23
	Sharp Facial Features (Keskin Yüz Hatları)	26	Accessories (Aksesuar)	16	Accessories (Aksesuar)	22
	Feminine Speech (Kadınsı Konuşma Tarzı)	23	Flashy (Gösterişli)	12	Concern w/ Appear (Görünüme Önem)	13
	Elegant (Şık)	15	Fancy (Süslü)	10	Niminy (Kırtkan)	10
	High-pitched Voice (İnce Sesli)	13	Elegant (Şık)	8	Smoothed-chinned (Sakalsız- Tüysüz)	8
	Accessories (Aksesuar)	10	High-pitched Voice (İnce Sesli)	6		
	Fancy (Süslü)	10				
	Scent (Koku)	6				
	<b>444</b>		<b>333</b>		<b>335</b>	

*Note.* Codes having frequency less than 5 were not included in the table.

## 2.3 DISCUSSION

The aim of the first study conducted in this thesis was to explore how masculine and feminine gender expression of a person, gender-matched expressions (e.g., masculine man), and cross-gender expressions (e.g., feminine man) are perceived by the sample of Turkish university students. For this purpose, participants were asked to write down 5 to 10 words considering the feminine and masculine person, woman, and man, respectively.

Generally, the frequencies of codes reported for specific gender expression of a person, women and men were similar. In other words, codes reported for feminine person, feminine man, feminine woman were similar; and in parallel, codes reported for masculine person, masculine man, and masculine woman were similar to a great extent. However, in terms of certain codes there are some salient differences; for example; self-confident code was among the most frequently reported code for feminine person and feminine woman whereas, this code was less-frequently reported for feminine man. Also, for feminine person and feminine woman, strong was more frequently reported code in compare to feminine man. Feminine man was reported as cheerful and funny but there were not any references for feminine person and feminine woman considering these codes. In the same way, protective code had higher frequencies for masculine person and masculine man whereas it was less-frequently reported for masculine woman. Another example is while masculine person and masculine man were described as well-groomed, masculine woman was perceived as unkempt.

Further, the results of this study demonstrated that some codes reported for the feminine woman, feminine man (e.g., caring, delicate, well-dressed, attractive, emotional); masculine woman, and masculine man (e.g., self-confident, muscular, short-hair, deep voice, aggressive, intelligent) are in line with previous studies (Bem, 1974; Helgeson, 1994). However, this study also demonstrated that feminine was perceived different than previous studies. For instance, in the previous studies (Bem, 1974; Helgeson, 1994) feminine was perceived as shy, gullible, flatterable but in this study feminine was not described by these adjectives. In the same way, while the previous studies showed that masculine was perceived as being individualistic, having strong personality, and making decisions; in this study those statements were not reported. In this chapter, the findings of the study will be discussed with the connection of previous studies.

### **2.3.1 Overview of Findings on Gender Expressions**

The findings of this study showed that masculine and feminine gender expression of a person had the most frequent codes in compare to masculine and feminine woman and man. This could stem from the order of the questionnaire such as participants were firstly assigned gender expression of person conditions. Findings also showed that being feminine is generally related to positive traits such as; being kind, understanding, compassionate, warm, etc. But masculinity was more frequently associated with negative traits such as; being though, rude, authoritarian, and use bad language, etc. These findings are in line with previous studies of gender expressions (e.g., Helgeson, 1994; Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2018). The findings showing that feminine women are perceived as emotional and delicate and masculine men are perceived though, strong, and protective indicate that people still endorse the tenets of benevolent sexism that women need protection and men can provide this protection to women. The results also demonstrated that, gender expression is associated with sexual tendency. Because for cross-gender expressions participants provided responses of being homosexual, while there aren't any references about person's sexual tendency.

Although I state that masculine person is perceived more negatively than feminine person, these negative words may not be actually perceived negative when it comes to being masculine because these characteristics such as authoritarian, tough and rude might be perceived normative standards for traditional male gender role (Thompson & Pleck, 1986; Thompson, Pleck, & Ferrera, 1992). To illustrate, being though may not be perceived negative considering the daily struggles that men need to face in order to take money to their home. There was another interesting difference between masculine and feminine gender expressions: While all three masculine conditions had masculine code, there was only feminine code for feminine man. This finding is in line with the tenets of traditional male role that men need provide their masculinity especially to other men (Vandello et al., 2008).

#### **2.3.1.1 Masculine Gender Expression**

In this study, the most frequently reported codes for masculine individuals was though, rude, strong, authoritarian. These results suggest that people still associated masculinity with physical strength and tendency to violence. These findings suggest that physical strength is expected to be more prevalent within people that have masculine expressions.

As mentioned in the result section, most of the reported adjectives for masculine gender expression are similar for each sex. But there are some differences among them which indicate some prejudices towards people with cross-gender expressions. For example; generally, individuals with cross-gender expressions are perceived more negatively than individuals with gender-matched expressions. In terms of physical appearance, like masculine person, masculine men was perceived well-groomed, whereas masculine women was perceived unkempt. This suggests that being men with a masculine gender expression is socially desirable whereas being a woman with masculine expression has been negatively stereotyped. In the study, masculine women's talking style was described as masculine, but there was not any reference for masculine person and masculine man in terms of how they talk. This might be due to participants do not need to indicate this code for masculine person and masculine man.

Participants also associated masculine gender expression and being male with having interests. In fact, participants reported couple of interests while they described masculine person, masculine man, and masculine woman. Specifically, masculine person was described as having interest in cars; masculine man was reported to having interest in watching football and basketball matches, and interest in cars; masculine woman was described as being interested in technology, sports, and football. Participants' perception of masculinity could be -especially-related to watching football matches than other sports' matches. Even though interest in sports was related to be masculine, football was specifically associated with being men. However, there was not any interest reported for feminine person and feminine woman. But feminine man was reported to be interested in fashion.

Masculine women's social traits were also reported in this study. The codes reported for masculine woman in this theme were having men friends and being homosexual. According to this finding, cross-gender expressions are still being confused with sexual orientation. This finding is similar with what Helgeson (1994) was found in her study. However, the frequencies of both studies are different. In Helgeson's study, the frequency of homosexual item was 20 (9%); in this study the frequency of homosexual item was found 8 (5.4%).

The frequencies of the words showed that the difference between gender-matched expressions and cross-gender expressions is not as much as it before. Also, masculine women and masculine men were described with same traits even there were differences in the frequencies of

these traits. For example, strong, brave, self-confident codes were reported for masculine person, masculine woman, and masculine man. This finding seems promising. Because the less the gap between attitudes towards masculine women and masculine men will get, people will be less prejudiced and there will be more equality between the evaluation of people with different sexes. In the previous studies (e.g., Bem, 1974; Helgeson, 1994) masculine men were defined with caring with work, dark, arrogant, dates with women. In this study masculine men were not defined with these words. Possibly the women's increasing participation in the business world and society could be the reason that these statements are not reported in this study. Also, those statements are not seen as important as they were before. A recent study conducted in Turkey (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2018) demonstrated that being man was associated with being jealous, ambitious, selfish, childish, liar, impatient, stubborn, lazy. These items were not reported for masculine individuals in this study. This finding is interesting because the dates of the studies are close, and the samples of studies are similar (both samples are consisted of Turkish university students) yet those codes were not reported in this study. The reason of the difference could be the methodological differences of these two studies. Sakallı-Uğurlu et al. asked participants write down "adjectives" for "women and men"; however, in this study instead of adjectives, participants were instructed to write down words which comes to their mind considering feminine and masculine person, woman, and man, respectively.

There are some codes that emerged in all three conditions but with different frequencies. For example, while protective was reported more-frequently for masculine person and masculine man, it was not highly mentioned for masculine woman. This could be related to benevolent sexism that is associated with an idea that men should give protection to women (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Also considering the cognitive traits of masculine individuals, the frequency of codes in this theme reported for masculine person was 24, the frequency was 41 for masculine man, whereas the frequency of this theme reported for masculine woman was 6. This finding revealed that masculine women are not as much as associated with issues related with cognitive features in compare to masculine person and masculine man.

### **2.3.1.2 Feminine Gender Expression**

Feminine was generally described as delicate, emotional, kind, warm, understanding, well-groomed, intelligent, high-pitched voice, fancy, colorful clothes, talkative, and make-up.



Even though there are many similar words reported for feminine person, feminine men, and feminine women, there are some differences among them. For example, feminine person and feminine woman was reported as free whereas there was not any reference to this code for feminine man. In a similar way, feminine man was reported as cheerful and funny, but these codes were not reported for feminine person and feminine man. These items are also similar with previous studies (Helgeson, 1994). However, items for feminine woman such as family-oriented, smile, shy, traditional are not found in this study that suggests the roles given for feminine females have been changing. Also, characteristics like strong, stand on her own two feet were reported for feminine women in this study whereas in the previous studies, there was no reference to feminine women's strength. A recent study carried out in Turkey (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2018) indicated similar items to this study for feminine women, such as emotional, delicate, warm, nurturing. However, there are also many different words reported for feminine women, as mentioned above, it might be due to the methodology of the two studies. Sakallı-Uğurlu et al. asked participants write down "adjectives" for "women and men"; however, in this study instead of adjectives, participants were instructed to write down words which comes to their mind considering feminine and masculine person, woman, and man, respectively. But when we look other studies about gender expressions, we can see that there are some changes happened for defining feminine men too. In the previous studies (Helgeson, 1994) feminine men was perceived as weak, insecure, shy, and dislikes sports; the result of the current study is the other way around. Feminine men were found self-confident, brave, and strong. Even though with lower frequencies, feminine men were also reported as diffident in this study. The reference of the feminine men's bravery and strength might be about their sexual orientation. Because, like masculine woman, feminine man is reported as homosexual, and soft. Therefore, acting as who they really are in society could be associated with their bravery and strength by the participants. However, the frequency of strong is lowest in feminine man condition in compare to feminine person and feminine woman.

In this study, feminine person and feminine women are reported happy while feminine men are reported funny. The reason why feminine men are perceived funny could be twofold. Firstly, their behaviors, actions or even talking styles might be perceived as funny; or feminine men are trying to be funny to get accepted from the people around them. Most of the physical appearance between feminine person, feminine man, and feminine woman are similar but there

are some differences. Feminine man was perceived smoothed-chinned and niminy while there was not any reference for feminine person and feminine woman considering these codes.

In some previous studies it was found that feminine males are perceived negatively by most of the people, especially by men (e.g., McCreary, 1994; Rudman & Mescher, 2013; O'Neil, 1981; Hunt et al., 2016). But in this study, feminine man was associated more-frequently with positive words than previous studies. It could be related that most of the participants were females, or participants were only asked to write down some words. Thereby, participants had not been seen as feminine men so, they did not have the risk to be stigmatized as feminine. Additionally, while there was not any reference to interests for feminine person and feminine woman, feminine man was reported as having interest in fashion. Also, while feminine person and feminine man were associated with feminine speech, there were not any reference for feminine woman considering feminine speech. This might be stem from that participants do not need to state feminine specifically for woman's speech.

Another interesting finding of this study is that intelligent was most frequently ( $F = 42$ ) reported for feminine person, feminine man was less frequently ( $F = 5$ ) described as intelligent, however, there is not any reference to feminine woman's intelligence. This result is similar with masculine gender expression conditions. Masculine person and masculine man were reported as intelligent but there was not any reference to masculine woman's intelligence. These findings might indicate that women are not associated with intelligence.

## CHAPTER 3 (THE SECOND STUDY)

### 3.1 METHOD

#### 3.1.1 Participants

A total of 312 participants from Ankara, Turkey participated in the current study. Two hundred twenty-four (72%) of the participants were female and 32 (10%) of them were male; as a response to gender question one participants chose the other option, and one participant chose not to want to answer option. Thirty-seven participants were removed from the study because they did not answer any of the questions. The participants were recruited through convenience sampling. Two hundred of the 312 participants were students enrolled in psychology courses and they received bonus course points in return for their participation. The remaining 75 participant were volunteers and they did not receive any incentive for their participation. Seventeen participants did not report their age; the remaining participants' age ranged from 18 to 29 ( $M = 21.48$ ,  $SD = 1.96$ ).

#### 3.1.2 Instruments

The questionnaire set that presented to participants included gender expression manipulation, Semantic Differential Task (Golec de Zavala et al., 2013), Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925), and demographic information form. In the following section, detailed information about experimental manipulation and the scales used in the study will be given.

##### 3.1.2.1 Gender Expression Manipulation

In order to manipulate gender expression, participants were given a short paragraph including a description of an individual. Participants were told that this paragraph is about an individual; there would be information about the characteristics of that person, also there would be comments made by his/her own friends of that individual. In the paragraph, characteristics of the person were described in order to manipulate gender-expression of the person. The characteristics written in the paragraphs were chosen according to the result of first study of this dissertation. In fact, these characteristics were presented in the paragraph to indicate feminine, masculine, and androgynous gender expression. In the first study, most frequently reported codes categorized under themes as personality traits, physical appearance, cognitive traits, interests, and social traits, respectively. For this study, feminine and masculine traits were chosen among most

frequent codes categorized under these themes. Additionally, if a code reported for all groups of certain gender expression (e.g., for feminine person, feminine woman, and feminine man), it was chosen to include in the paragraphs (e.g., well-groomed). Androgynous traits were formed with equal traits from feminine and masculine characteristics as mentioned the definition of androgyny (Bem, 1977). In addition to gender expression, the sex of the person in the paragraph was manipulated. The sex of the person in the paragraph was indicated by using male and female names (Fatma Yılmaz as female name and Mehmet Yılmaz as male name). These names were selected according to the most commonly used names for men and women in Turkey<sup>5</sup>. (see Appendix B). Accordingly, for the manipulation of both sex and the gender expression of an individual described in the paragraph, six conditions were created, and participants were randomly assigned to one of 6 conditions namely, feminine female, feminine male, masculine female, masculine male, androgynous female, androgynous male. The paragraphs used in the study were given below.

#### **3.1.2.1.1 Masculine Gender Expression**

The manipulation of male gender expression was given in the study is below:

*Fatma Yılmaz/ Mehmet Yılmaz usually wears dark-colored clothes, and suits, she/he is well-groomed, and short-haired person; and s/he has been described by her/his friends as intelligent, rational, self-confident, authoritarian, harsh and rude.*

#### **3.1.2.1.2 Feminine Gender Expression**

The manipulation of female gender expression was given in the study is below:

*Fatma Yılmaz/ Mehmet Yılmaz usually wears colorful and bloomy clothes, she/he is well-groomed, frequently using accessories, and long-haired person; and s/he has been described by her/his friends as intelligent, successful, kind, emotional, understanding, and warm.*

#### **3.1.2.1.3 Androgynous Gender Expression**

The manipulation of androgynous gender expression was given in the study is below:

---

<sup>5</sup> Nüfus ve Vatandaşlık İşleri Genel Müdürlüğü. May 2019. <[https:// www. nvi. gov. tr/ PublishingImages/Lists/PageContents/EditForm/2016%20Y%C4%B1%C4%B1%20En%20C3%87ok%20Verilen%20C4%B0simler.pdf](https://www.nvi.gov.tr/PublishingImages/Lists/PageContents/EditForm/2016%20Y%C4%B1%C4%B1%20En%20C3%87ok%20Verilen%20C4%B0simler.pdf)>.

*Fatma Yilmaz/ Mehmet Yilmaz sometimes wears dark-colored clothes, and suits, and sometimes colorful and bloomy clothes, she/he is well-groomed, she/he uses both short and long hair styles; and s/he has been described by his/her friends as intelligent, successful, authoritarian, harsh, emotional, and understanding.*

### **3.1.2.2 Semantic Differential Task**

Feelings of participants towards an individual (male or female) with specified gender expression were measured by semantic differential scale (Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, & Bilewicz, 2013). This scale includes six pairs of cold-warm, unfriendly-friendly, distrustful-trustful, negative-positive, contempt- respect, and disgust- admiration. By considering these pairs, participants reported their feelings towards the individual described in the paragraph on a 7-point scale (see Appendix C.1). The composite score for the scale was calculated by taking mean score of responses giving to the 6 items. Higher scores on the scale indicates more positive feelings toward the person in the paragraphs. The Cronbach's Alpha score for the scale is .88.

### **3.1.2.3 Social Distance Scale**

Participants' willingness to socially contact in varying degrees of closeness with the individual described in the paragraph was measured by Bogardus-type Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925). In the original scale, there were 7 statements. But in different studies, researchers have used different number of statements. For example; Miller (1991) (as cited in Wark & Galliher, 2007) used 5 statements. For this study 4 of the original statements were used, the remaining three items were excluded because these items more specifically related to national identity which is out of scope of this study. Also, 5 more statements have been written in accord with the purpose of this study. In this scale, participants were asked to indicate to what extent they will prefer a person (sex-matched expression, cross-sex expressions, or androgynous) as their coworker, family member, neighbor, etc. on a 6-point scale from definitely 1 (I do not prefer) to 6 (definitely I prefer) (see Appendix C.2). Higher scores indicate more positive attitudes toward the person in the paragraphs. The Cronbach's alpha score for the scale is .93. Thus, the mean score of responses giving to the 9 items was used to calculate composite score for Social Distance Scale.

#### **3.1.2.4 Demographic Information Form**

In order to obtain information about demographic characteristics of the sample, participants were asked to indicate their sex, age, current education, employment status, and the city they currently live in (see Appendix A.2).

#### **3.1.3 Procedure**

Prior to data collection, an institutional ethics committee approval was taken from Başkent University Social and Human Sciences Academic Research and Publication Ethics Committee for conducting the study (see Appendix D). The study was prepared and conducted by using online data collection platform Qualtrics. In order to recruit participants, the link of the study was distributed to the participants. In the beginning page, informed consent was presented to participants (see Appendix E). Participants were told the study concerns how different characteristics of individuals are perceived and they were informed that the study would last approximately 5-10 minutes. They were assured of confidentiality and were informed that their responses would be used for only research purposes. The order of the questionnaires was as follows for all participants; gender expressions manipulation, semantic differential task, social distance scale, and demographic information form. At the end of the questionnaire, participants were thanked for their participation.

#### **3.1.4 Data Analysis**

The obtained data was analyzed by using SPSS (v.20). Firstly, descriptive statistics were analyzed for the study variables. Then, multivariate analysis of variance (MANCOVA) was performed to explore people's attitudes and feelings toward women and men with different gender expressions (feminine, masculine, androgynous) by controlling the effect of the sex of participants.

### **3.2 RESULTS**

Before conducting data analyses, data were screened for the study variables concerning data accuracy, missing values, outliers, and fit between distributions of variables in the study and the assumptions of multivariate analysis. Firstly, data were screened for missing values. The missing value analysis (MVA) revealed that the total number of missing for cases were below 5%. In order to examine the possibility of violation of normality assumption, skewness and kurtosis values were investigated for all variables. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), to

assume normal distribution for variables, skewness and kurtosis values should be in the range of -1, +1. In this study, the skewness and kurtosis values have been found in the range of -.216, -.674. Therefore, the scores were within the acceptable range. Subsequently, data were screened for multivariate outliers among cases, which were examined by Mahalanobis score ( $\chi^2(2, N = 275) = 13.82, p < .001$ ) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). According to the acceptable Mahalanobis score range, 3 cases were found as outliers. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), Z-scores greater from the range of -3.3, +3.3 should be accepted as outliers. Examination of Z-scores for each variable revealed that there was 1 outlier. Univariate outlier and one of the multivariate outliers were the same participant, thus three cases were removed, leaving 272 participants. As a following step, variables were evaluated for linearity and multicollinearity assumptions; results of these assumptions were satisfactory. It was found that correlation between semantic differential task and social distance scale were not highly correlated with each other ( $r = .50$ ). After the removal of participants who lead to violation of assumptions for MANCOVA further analyses given below were performed with 272 participants.

### **3.2.1 Descriptive Statistics for the Research Variables**

Mean scores for semantic differential task and social distance scale were assessed to obtain descriptive information of the study variables. Participants' mean scores on Semantic Differential Task ( $M = 4.54, SD = 1.16$ ) was higher than the midpoint of the scale. Since higher scores on this scale refer positive feelings, the results indicate that participants had positive feelings toward the person they have read in the paragraph. Participants' mean scores on Social Distance Scale slightly above the midpoint of the scale ( $M = 4.48, SD = .97$ ) which indicates that the participants were willing to be in socially contact with people described in the paragraph (see Table 3.21).

**Table 3.2.1. Descriptive Statistics for the Research Variables**

<b>Dependent Variables</b>	<b>Gender Expressions</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b><i>M</i></b>	<b><i>SD</i></b>	<b>Alpha Coefficiency</b>
<b>Semantic Differential Task</b>	Masculine	Female	4.56	.88	.88
		Male	4.30	1.17	
	Feminine	Female	4.76	1.11	
		Male	4.38	1.24	
	Androgynous	Female	4.62	1.12	
		Male	4.63	1.22	
<b>Social Distance Scale</b>	Masculine	Female	4.37	.97	.93
		Male	4.05	1.05	



---

Feminine	Female	4.78	.79
	Male	4.50	1.01
Androgynous	Female	4.61	.97
	Male	4.57	.90

---

### 3.2.2 MANCOVA Analysis

Factorial multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was conducted to assess attitudes and feelings towards men and women with different gender expressions (feminine men/women, masculine men/women, androgynous men/women); in this analysis participants' sex included as a covariate. A 2 X 3 between-subjects factorial MANCOVA was performed to investigate the effects of sex and gender expression and their interaction on attitudes and feelings towards a described person in the paragraph. Independent variables were gender expressions (feminine, masculine, and androgynous), and sex of the individual (male, female) in the gender expression manipulation. In order to measure attitudes and feelings towards a person described in the paragraph semantic differential task and social distance scale were used.

In order to examine the assumptions of MANCOVA, required analyses were conducted. A non-significant Box's M test ( $p = .32$ ) indicates that homogeneity of covariance matrices of the dependent variables. Because the number of participants in each cell is approximately equal and the Box's M test indicates homogeneity of covariances, Wilks' lambda was reported. With the use of Wilk's criterion, the combined DVs was significantly affected by gender expressions (feminine, masculine, androgynous) [ $F(4, 500) = 2.73, p < .05, partial \eta^2 = .21$ ]. However, participants' sex [ $F(2, 250) = 2.01, p = .13, partial \eta^2 = .016$ ], sex of the individual in the paragraphs [ $F(2, 250) = 2.03, p = .13, partial \eta^2 = .016$ ], and the interaction effect of IVs [ $F(4, 500) = .40, p = .80, partial \eta^2 = .003$ ] was not significantly affected the combined DVs.

Before conducting a series of follow-up ANCOVA's, homogeneity of covariance assumption was tested. A non-significant Levene's tests for semantic differential task ( $p = .76$ ) and for social distance scale ( $p = .34$ ) indicates equality of variances of the groups. Attitudes toward individuals in the paragraphs measured by social distance scale was not significantly affected by participants' sex [ $F(1, 251) = 2.99, p = .085, partial \eta^2 = .012$ ]. Attitudes toward individuals in the paragraphs was significantly affected by gender expressions [ $F(2, 251) = 5.42, p < .05, partial \eta^2 = .041$ ]; however, it was not affected by sex of the individuals in the paragraphs [ $F(1, 251) = 3.53, p = .061, partial \eta^2 = .014$ ], and the interaction effect of IVs [ $F(2, 251) = .52, p = .59, partial \eta^2 = .004$ ] was not significant. Pairwise comparison using the Bonferroni correction revealed that, participants' scores on social distance scale for individuals having masculine gender expressions ( $M = 4.20, SD = 1.02$ ) were significantly lower than

individuals having feminine gender expressions ( $M = 4.64$ ,  $SD = .91$ ), and individuals having androgynous gender expressions ( $M = 4.60$ ,  $SD = 0.93$ ) (see Table 3.2.2).

In order to examine participants' feelings toward individuals in the paragraphs which was measured by semantic differential task, a multivariate analysis of variance was used. Feelings toward individuals in the paragraphs was not significantly affected by participants' sex [ $F(1, 251) = 2.90$ ,  $p = .090$ ,  $partial \eta^2 = .011$ ], gender expressions [ $F(2, 251) = .67$ ,  $p = .51$ ,  $partial \eta^2 = .005$ ], sex of the individuals in the paragraphs [ $F(1, 251) = 2.28$ ,  $p = .13$ ,  $partial \eta^2 = .009$ ], and the interaction effect of IVs was not significant [ $F(2, 251) = .58$ ,  $p = .56$ ,  $partial \eta^2 = .005$ ].

Even though multivariate statistics revealed a that the combined DVs were significantly affected by gender expressions, the univariate results did not indicate this finding. This could be the reason of that multivariate tests consider the correlation between dependent variables, whereas univariate tests consider dependent variables one by one. Therefore, it was indicated that, univariate tests might not be useful for interpretation when it comes to more than one dependent variables. Consequently, it was suggested to conduct a discriminant analysis, which shows how dependent variables interact in order to make a proper comparison (Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

The MANCOVA was followed up with discriminant analysis, which revealed two discriminant functions for gender expressions. The first function explained 97.3% of the variance, *canonical*  $R^2 = .05$ ; whereas the second function explained only 2.7 % of the variance, *canonical*  $R^2 = .001$ . In combination these discriminant functions significantly differentiated the gender expressions (feminine, masculine, androgynous),  $\Lambda = .95$ ,  $\chi^2(4) = 13.1$ ,  $p = .01$ ; but removing the first function indicated that the second function did not significantly differentiate the gender expression groups,  $\Lambda = 1.00$ ,  $\chi^2(1) = .36$ ,  $p = .55$ . The correlations between outcomes and the discriminant functions revealed that attitudes toward people loaded more highly on first function ( $r = .99$ ) than the second function ( $r = .10$ ); feelings toward people loaded more highly on second function ( $r = .92$ ) than the first function ( $r = .41$ ). The discriminant function plot showed that the first function discriminated the masculine individuals from the feminine and androgynous individuals, and the second function differentiated androgynous individuals from masculine and feminine individuals. Discriminant analysis conducted for sex of the individuals in the paragraphs

variable revealed the discriminant function was not significantly differentiated the sexes (female, male),  $A = .99$ ,  $\chi^2(2) = 3.40$ ,  $p = .18$ .

The results of discriminant analysis and ANCOVA analysis indicated similar findings. They both revealed social distance scale was significantly affected by gender expressions. Also, masculine individuals were more negatively evaluated than androgynous and feminine individuals.

**Table 3.2.2. ANCOVA Table: Differences Between Feelings and Attitudes Based on Gender Expressions and Sexes**

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	M	SD	F	Partial Eta Squared	95% Confidence Interval		
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
<b>Social Distance Scale</b>	Gender	Masculine	4.20	.10	5.42*	.041	4.00	4.41
		Feminine	4.66	.10			4.46	4.86
		Androgynous	4.57	.10			4.37	4.77
<b>Semantic Differential Task</b>	Expressions	Masculine	4.23	.12	.67	.005	4.17	4.67
		Feminine	4.60	.12			4.36	4.85
		Androgynous	4.60	.12			4.36	4.85
<b>Social Distance Scale</b>	Sex	Female	4.59	.08	3.53	.014	4.42	4.76
		Male	4.37	.08			4.20	4.53
<b>Semantic Differential Task</b>	Sex	Female	4.65	.10	2.28	.009	4.45	4.85
		Male	4.43	.10			4.24	4.63

Note. \* *F* value is significant at the .05 level.

### **3.3 DISCUSSION**

The second study in the dissertation aimed to investigate how men and women react to gender-matched expressions (e.g., feminine women), cross-gender expressions (e.g., feminine men), and androgynous men and women in a sample of Turkey. For this purpose, two research questions were examined. Firstly, it was examined that whether cross gender expressions were evaluated more negatively than gender-matched expressions and androgynous expressions. Secondly, the aim was to investigate whether participants' gender influence the evaluation of different gender expressions of women and men. To this end, participants were asked to read a paragraph about an individual and they answered questions measuring attitudes and feelings towards that individual.

In this chapter, the findings of the second study in this thesis will be discussed by considering research questions and hypotheses presented in the first chapter. For this purpose, an overview of the findings will be discussed. Subsequently, contributions of the study to the literature will be presented. Then, particular limitations of the current study will be mentioned with defining directions for future researches. Finally, the chapter will be concluded with importance of maintaining this line of research.

#### **3.3.1 Participants' Gender Effect**

Multivariate analysis of covariances revealed that men and women did not significantly differ on major study variables scores; therefore, thus the third hypotheses, indicating that men's and women's evaluations would be different, was not supported. Regarding scores on semantic differential task and social distance scale, males and females did not differ on their attitudes and feelings toward people with gender-matched expressions (e.g., masculine men), cross-gender expressions (e.g., masculine women), and androgynous men and women. This finding is inconsistent with most of the previous study findings showing that masculine women and feminine men are evaluated more negatively by men than women (e.g., Hoffman & Fidell, 1979; Rudman et al., 2012). Before suggesting certain explanations to clarify the inconsistent finding with the literature we firstly need to indicate that this result should be interpreted cautiously because of unequal sample sizes of men and women participants which is as big limitation of the study. In addition to unequal sample sizes of women and men in the current study the other reason leading to difficulty in interpretation of the result is scarcity of the studies conducted with

Turkish sample. Further studies should carry out equal sample sizes of women and men participants in order to make better interpretations.

It is possible that this inconsistent finding stems from social desirability effect, or the age range of the sample, or the recent gender-equality movements going on social media. Since the sample of this study consisted of university students, on one hand it might be possible that higher education levels could prevent reporting prejudices among both sexes; on the other hand, considering the amount of social media usage of university students; this finding might be related of gender-equality movements going on social media. Prejudice refers to negative feelings associated with certain groups and becoming familiar to certain group could diminish the prejudices against them (Ruscher, 2001). Thus, with the increasing use of social media, it becomes more frequent to contact with different group of people. Consequently, the use of social media makes more possible that different group of people acquainted with each other. Also, social media usage could increase empathy towards out-group people. According to Becker and Swim (2011), “emotional empathy” leads to decrease in males’ prejudiced and discriminant behaviors. Consequently, although we need to be cautious while interpreting the insignificant effect of gender, the reasons mentioned above could be the reason of females’ and male’s do not differ on their attitudes and feelings toward individuals with different gender expressions.

### **3.3.2 Gender and Gender Expression Effect**

A multivariate analysis of covariances was conducted to examine the interaction effect of gender and gender expressions. According to multivariate analysis of covariance results, participants’ scores on semantic differential task and social distance scale were not significantly different for women and men described in the paragraph. In other words, the main effect of gender of the described person in the paragraph was not significant in predicting attitudes and feelings towards that person.

However, as multivariate analysis of covariances revealed, participants’ scores on social distance scale significantly differed for people with different gender expressions. But the main effect of gender expression was not significant for semantic differential task. Therefore, hypothesis 1 is partially supported. Related to participants’ scores on semantic differential task, participants feelings toward individuals with different gender expressions did not differ. This finding might be attributed to social desirability. Participants’ mean scores on semantic

differential task was higher than the midpoint ( $M = 4.54$ ), that is to say, they reported positive feelings toward the individuals that they had read about; because in this scale higher scores indicate more positive feelings. This finding may also be due to the educational level of participants. As mentioned above, intellectual profundity and having chance to socialize with many different people may decrease the negative evaluations, and negative feelings toward different groups (McClelland & Linnander, 2005).

Related to gender expressions effect on social distance scale, participants who read paragraphs about masculine individuals scored lower on social distance scale compared to participants who read androgynous and feminine individuals. This result indicates that, participants are less willing to be in socially contact with masculine individuals compared to androgynous and feminine individuals. This result is parallel with the findings of the first study in this thesis: In the first study masculine traits were described more negatively than feminine traits; therefore, it might be understandable that people are reluctant to be in socially contact with masculine individuals. While this finding is consistent with the literature from one perspective, from another perspective it is inconsistent with previous studies. In the previous studies, it was found that masculine women were evaluated negatively (e.g., Rieger et al., 2010). However, this study's finding shows -different from previous studies finding- that not specifically masculine women are evaluated negatively but rather it is masculinity that being evaluated negatively. The most explanatory reason of why masculine individuals is evaluated more negatively could be that in the first study masculine items were involved negative codes such as, tough, authoritarian, and rude. Since the paragraphs were composed of these codes, participants' willingness to socially contact with individuals possessing these characteristics were decreased.

Previous studies (e.g., O'Neil, 1981; Vandello et al., 2008) mentioned men's fear of being perceived as feminine. Since feminine men have been accepted as homosexual and femininity is related to females who are seen as low-status group members; negative attitudes toward gay people and men's superiority over women are the roots of men's fear of perceived as feminine. Therefore, research indicated that heterosexual men and homosexual men want to be perceived as more masculine than other men (Hunt et al., 2016). The opposite finding in the current study indicating negative evaluations on masculinity could be due to incidents such as increasing violence and rape against women, and femicides. Since most of the participants of the current



study is female (72%) and all of the participants are college students, it could not be as preferable to socially contact with a person who possess authoritarian, harsh, and rude traits.

According to this findings, masculine individuals were evaluated more negatively than androgynous individuals and feminine individuals on social distance scale. Considering feminine individual's traits such as; kind, intelligent, successful, understanding, etc. it is highly desirable that socially contact with those individuals. Androgynous individual's traits consist of both masculine and feminine traits.

## CHAPTER 4

### 4.1 GENERAL DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

#### 4.1.1 Contributions and Implications of the Study

The purpose of the study is twofold. Firstly, the aim is to explore contemporary perception about gender-matched expressions (e.g., feminine women), cross-gender expressions (e.g., feminine men). Secondly, the purpose is to investigate people's attitudes and feelings toward feminine, masculine, and androgynous individuals with respect to their sexes. Therefore, the dissertation including two studies aim to provide insights about contemporary perception of gender expressions in Turkey by analyzing the interaction effect of gender expression and sex of a person. While some findings (e.g., delicate, emotional, make-up well, warm, etc.) are consistent with existing Western studies (e.g., Bem, 1974; Helgeson, 1994; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975), and some Turkish studies (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2018; Sunar, 1982), the findings in the thesis indicated changes for feminine stereotypes in a more positive way. The implication of this finding is that with women's role became more active in society, perception about women is re-constructed through more independent and stronger way. Accordingly, people's attitudes and feelings toward feminine individuals is found to be more positive, regardless of gender.

Also, this study brought different perspective on previous studies indicating that masculine traits for men such as; tough and authoritative are perceived as acceptable or desirable by men and "males as representative of humanity as a whole... the norms of masculinity as the standards for the behavior of both males and females" (Levant, 2011). This study reveals that even though people's feelings are not negative toward masculine individuals, their willingness to socially connect with individuals with masculine traits are not high. Therefore, it could be said that those traits are not found desirable or acceptable as they were. Although masculine traits are found to be similar with the previous years, the meanings attributed to these characteristics and the desire for these features have been socially re-constructed among Turkish university students.

Secondly, the current study contributes to gender research in Turkey by examining reactions toward different gender expressions. Generally, studies about gender expressions are out of date and those studies did not give much attention to women's perspective on feminine, masculine, and androgynous men and women. This study contributes to the gender studies in

Turkey by investigating both men and women's definition of feminine person/men/women and masculine person/men/women and within a Turkish sample. Also, the methodology of the current study gives another point of view in the line of gender expression research. Previous studies were given adjective lists and they were asked participants to choose among them in order to find out if these adjectives define feminine or masculine men and women. But in this study, participants were asked to write down words, statements, adjectives freely.

#### **4.1.2 Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

There are some limitations of this study which should be mentioned. One of them is that the samples of two studies were mostly constituted of college students with middle to upper class background. However, for the generalizability of the findings, in future research data should be collected from samples including people coming from divergent age and different socioeconomic groups.

Another limitation of the study is that the number male participants were considerably lower than female participants for both studies. This may be the cause of why feminine individuals were defined with more positive words in the first study, and why feminine individuals were evaluated more positively in the second study (Rudman & Goodwin, 2004; Turner, Brown, & Tajfel, 1979). Given the difficulty of reaching male individuals for their participation in the study, future research should assure the participation of male participants by providing some incentives.

Another point that could be considered as limitation of the first study, when participants were asked to write down words for feminine and masculine person, men, and women their instructions involved a statement like; "physical appearance, personality traits, behavior patterns, etc.". Even though, these categories were given to stimulate ideas of participants, this statement may influence and inhibit participants possible responses on different categories. Although the results showed there are other themes not mentioned in the instruction such as, cognitive traits, interests, and social traits still the instructions might have guided what people mostly think when they were writing their responses. Therefore, in future researches without giving categories as an example in the instruction participants responses can be analyzed. In the first study participants were asked to write down 5 to 10 words for each condition. So, it may be criticized that this constraint may have limited participants responses and forced them to write down certain number

words instead of everything that comes to their mind. When the data was analyzed, it was seen that some of the participants wrote down only six or seven words for each condition which demonstrates that constraint them with certain number of words was not a problem in this study.

Also, in the study participants were firstly asked how they feel about the individual in the paragraph and then their attitudes toward that individual were asked. The order of the scales would also affect participants reactions. Therefore, future research should be randomized the order of the scales. Besides, in this study, it is possible that participants could not visualize the individual given. But, if the person in the paragraph was a familiar person they could visualize, their reactions would be different. Accordingly, future studies might include some changes that will make the individual whose characteristics are given more concrete for the participants.

#### **4.1.3 Concluding Remarks**

In the light of contributions and limitations of the current dissertation, this study tried to reveal how gender expressions are socially constructed, it is important to conduct further studies about gender expressions in order to gain broader insights about how gender expressions are socially constructed throughout years. It is important to note that when it was indicated “feminine or masculine” participants can describe feminine and masculine features similar to existing ones, and some prejudices still occur among participants; to illustrate individuals having cross-gender expressions are perceived as homosexual. However, when “feminine or masculine” as a word are not indicated, as in the second study of this thesis, participants’ prejudices toward feminine, masculine, or androgynous individuals -if it exists- are not revealed. Their evaluations might be based on the traits and interests the individuals have (e.g., kind, well-groomed, interest in fashion, etc.). Eventually, we all live in a society with our similarities but mostly with our differences. Therefore, further studies should explore not only how people perceive and feel about different gender expressions but also why people react in certain ways towards people with certain gender expressions. It would be promising that the implications of this line of research might help us find a way to reduce prejudices among genders and help to establish gender equality in societies.

## REFERENCES

- Addis, M. E., & Mahalik, J. R. (2013). Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help seeking. *American Psychologist, 58*(1), 5-14.
- Bacchi, C. L. (1983). *Liberation deferred: The ideas of the English-Canadian suffragists 1877-1918*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Basow, S. A. (1992). *Gender: Stereotypes and roles* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Bayeh, E. (2016). The role of empowering women and achieving gender equality to the sustainable development of Ethiopia. *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences, 2*(1), 37-42.
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2011). Seeing the unseen: Attention to daily encounters with sexism as way to reduce sexist beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(2), 227-242.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*(2), 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. (1977). On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45*(2), 196-205.
- Berger, J. M., Levant, R., McMillan, K. K., Kelleher, W., & Sellers, A. (2005). Impact of gender role conflict, traditional masculinity ideology, alexithymia, and age on men's attitudes toward psychological help seeking. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6*(1), 73-78.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Blackwood, E. (1984). Sexuality and gender in certain native American tribes: The case of cross-gender females. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 10*(1), 27-42.
- Boettger, R. K., & Palmer, L. A. (2010). Quantitative content analysis: Its use in technical communication. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 53*(4), 346-357.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1925). Social distance and its origins. *Sociology and Social Research, 9*, 216-225.

- Bonnett, A. (1996). The new primitives: Identity, landscape and cultural appropriation in the mythopoetic men's movement. *Antipode*, 28(3), 273-291.
- Brandth, B. (1994). Changing femininity: The social construction of women farmers in Norway. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 34(2), 127-149.
- Brooks, G. R., & Silverstein, L. S. (1995). Understanding the dark side of masculinity: An interactive systems model. In *A new psychology of men* (pp. 280-333). New York: Basic Books.
- Buck, R. W., Miller, R. E., & Caul, W. F. (1974). Sex, personality, and physiological variables in the communication of affect via facial expression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 587-596.
- Butler, E. K., Winfree JR, L. T., & Newbold, G. (2003). Policing and gender: Male and female perspectives among members of the New Zealand police. *Police Quarterly*, 6(3), 298-329.
- Cherulink, P. D. (1979). Sex differences in the expression of emotion in a structured social encounter. *Sex Roles*, 5, 413-424.
- Cho, S. Y. (2013). Integrating equality: Globalization, women's rights, and human trafficking. *International Studies Quarterly*, 57(4), 683-697.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. L. (1984). Structure of gender stereotypes: Interrelationships among components and gender label. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 991-1004.
- DeLamater, J. D., & Hyde, J. S. (1998). Essentialism vs. social constructionism in the study of human sexuality. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 35(1), 10-18.
- DuBois, E. C. (1978). *Feminism and suffrage the emergence of an independent women's movement in America*. London: Cornell University Press.
- Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress: Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. *Behavior Modification*, 11(2), 123-136.

- Eisler, R. M., Skidmore, J. R., & Ward, C. H. (1988). Masculine gender-role stress: Predictor of anger, anxiety, and health-risk behaviors. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *53*, 133-141.
- f, L. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2004). Gender differences in automatic in-group bias: Why do women like women more than men like men. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*(4), 494-509.
- Flood, M. (1996). Four strands. *XY: Men, Sex, Politics*, *6*(3), 21-23.
- Flood, M. (1997). Responding to men's right. *XY: Men, Sex, Politics*, *7*(2), 37-40.
- Gagnon, J. H. (1990). The explicit and implicit use of the scripting perspective in sex research. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, *1*, 1-43.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*(3), 491-512.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*(1), 119-135.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The ambivalence toward men inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *23*, 519- 536.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychology*, *56*(2), 109-118.
- Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., & Bilewicz, M. (2013). The paradox of in-group love: Differentiating collective narcissism advances understanding of the relationship between in-group and out-group attitude. *Journal of Personality*, *81*(1), 16-27.
- Gollwitzer, P. M. (1981). Masculine (instrumental) and feminine (expressive) traits a comparison between students in the united states and west Germany. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *12*(2), 142-162.
- Good, G. E., Dell, D. M., & Mintz, L. B. (1989). Male role and gender role conflict: Relations to help seeking in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *36*, 295-300.

- Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1940). A multiphasic personality schedule (Minnesota): Construction of a schedule. *Journal of Psychology*, *10*, 249-254.
- Helgeson, V. S. (1990). The role of masculinity in a prognostic predictor of heart attack severity. *Sex Roles*, *22*, 755-774.
- Hoffman, D. M., & Fidell, L. S. (1979). Characteristics of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine middle-class women. *Sex Roles*, *5*(6), 765-781.
- Holahan, C. K., & Spence, J. T. (1980). Desirable and undesirable masculine and feminine traits in counseling clients and unselected students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *48*, 300-302.
- Hunt, C. J., Fasoli, F., Carnaghi, A., & Cadinu, M. (2016). Masculine self-presentation and distancing from femininity in gay men: An experimental examination of the role of masculinity threat. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *17*(1), 108-112.
- Isaac, G. (1978). The food-sharing behavior of protohuman hominids. *Scientific American*, *238*(4), 90-108.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1978). *Kadınlarda psiko-sosyal değişim boyutları: Cinsiyet ve kuşaklar arası bir karşılaştırma [Dimensions of psycho-social change in women: A comparison between genders and generations]*. Unpublished associate professorship thesis. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University.
- Katz, J. N. (1995). *The invention of heterosexuality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kelly, J. A., & Worell, J. (1977). New formulations of sex roles and androgyny: A critical review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *45*, 1101-1115.
- Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *11*, 83-96.
- Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behavior, and civil rights: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*(4), 336-353.



- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). California: Sage Publications.
- Lambert, E. G., Ventura, L. A., Hall, D. E., & Cluse-Tolar, T. (2006). College students' views on gay and lesbian issues: Does education make a difference? *Journal of Homosexuality*, 50(4), 1-30.
- Lerner, G. (1979). *The majority finds its past: Placing women in history*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levant, R. F. (2011). Research in the psychology of men and masculinity using the gender role strain paradigm as a framework. *American Psychologist*, 66(8), 765-776.
- Lorber, J. (1994). "Night to his day": The social construction of gender. In *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lovejoy, C. O. (1981). The origin of man. *Science*, 211(4480), 341-350.
- Maddison, S. (1999). Private men, public anger: The men's rights movement in Australia. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Gender Studies*, 4(2), 39-51.
- Marecek, J., Crawford, M., & Popp, D. (2004). On the construction of gender, sex, and sexualities. In *The psychology of gender* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 192-216). New York: The Guilford Press.
- McClellan, K., & Linnander, E. (2005). The role of contact and information in racial attitude change among white college students. *Sociological Inquiry*, 76(1), 81-115.
- McCreary, D. R. (1994). The male role and avoiding femininity. *Sex Roles*, 31, 517-531.
- Mendes, K. (2011). *Feminism in the news: Representations of the women's movement since the 1960s*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mennesson, C. (2000). 'Hard' women and 'soft' women: The social construction of identities among female boxers. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 35(1), 21-33.
- Messner, M. A. (1998). The limits of the male sex role. An analysis of the Men's liberation and men's right movements' discourse. *Gender & Society*, 12(3), 255-276.

- Miller, D. C. (1991). *Handbook of research design and social measurement* (5th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Myers, A. M., & Gonda, G. (1982). Utility of the masculinity-femininity construct: Comparison of traditional and androgyny approaches. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *43*, 514-523.
- O’Leary, V. E., & Donoghue J. M. (1978). Latitudes of masculinity: Reactions to sex-role deviance in men. *Journal of Social Issues*, *34*(1), 17-28.
- O’Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men’s lives. *Personnel & Guidance Journal*, *60*(4), 203-210.
- Özkan, T., & Lajunen T. (2005). Masculinity, femininity, and the Bem Sex Role Inventory in Turkey. *Sex Roles*, *52*, 103-110.
- Rieger, G., Linsenmeier, J. A. W., Gygax, L., Garcia, S., & Bailey, J. M. (2010). Dissecting “gaydar”: Accuracy and the role of masculinity–femininity. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *39*, 124-140.
- Robinson, B. E., Skeen, P., & Flake-Hobson, C. (1982). Sex role endorsement among homosexual men across the life span. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *11*, 355-359.
- Rudman, L. A., & Mescher, K. (2013). Penalizing men who request a family leave: Is flexibility stigma a femininity stigma. *Journal of Social Issues*, *69*(2), 322-340.
- Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice toward female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*, 165-179.
- Ruscher, J. (2001). *Prejudiced communication: A social psychological perspective*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Ryan, B. (1992). *Feminism and the women’s movement: Dynamics of change in social movement, ideology and activism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Saurer, M. K., & Eisler, R. M. (1990). The role of masculine gender role stress in expressivity and social support network factors. *Sex Roles* *23*(5/6), 261-271.

- Sawyer, J. (1970). On male liberation. *Liberation*, 15(6,7, & 8), 32-33.
- Schippers, M. (2007). Recovering the feminine other: masculinity, femininity, and gender hegemony. *Theory and Society*, 36, 85-102.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1980). Masculine instrumentality and feminine expressiveness: Their relationships with sex role attitudes and behaviors. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5(2), 147-163.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationship to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1673-1682.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1974). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 4, 127.
- Spence, J., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32(1), 29-39.
- Strong, E. K. (1936). Interests of men and women. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 7(1), 49-67.
- Sunar, D. (1982). Female stereotypes in the United States and Turkey: An application of functional theory to perception in power relationships. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 13(4), 445-460.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Thompson, E.H., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientists*, 29(5), 531-543.
- Thompson, E.H., Pleck, J. H., & Ferrera, D. L. (1992). Men and masculinities: Scales for masculinity ideology and masculinity-related constructs. *Sex Roles*, 27(11-12), 573-607.

- Turner, J. C., Brown, R. J., & Tajfel H. (1979). Social comparison and group interest in ingroup favoritism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 9, 187-204.
- Unger, R. K. (1979). Toward a redefinition of sex and gender. *American Psychologist*, 34(11), 1085-1094.
- Unger, R. K., & Crawford, M. (1993). Sex and gender: The troubled relationship between terms and concepts. *Psychological Science*, 4(2), 122-124.
- Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1325-1339.
- Wark, C., & Galliher, J. F. (2007). Emory Bogardus and the origins of the social distance scale. *American Sociologist*, 38(4), 383-395.
- Worthen, M. G. F. (2012). Understanding college student attitudes toward LGBT individuals. *Sociological Focus*, 45(4), 285-305.
- Wright, S., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73-90.
- Wyllie, J., Acton, J., & Goldblatt D. (2018). Kadınların Versay Sarayı'na yürüyüşü. In *Zaman yolcusunun el kitabı* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 116-138). İstanbul: Maya Kitap.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### Appendix A.1. Demographic Information Form (For Gender Expression Survey)

1. Yaş: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Cinsiyet:  
 Kadın       Erkek       Diğer       Cevap Vermek İstemiyorum
3. Öğrenci misiniz?  
 Evet                                       Hayır
4. Öğrenciyseniz okulunuzu belirtiniz. Değilseniz bu soruyu boş bırakabilirsiniz.  
\_\_\_\_\_

### Appendix A.2. Demographic Information Form

1. Yaş: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Cinsiyet:  
 Kadın       Erkek       Diğer       Cevap Vermek İstemiyorum
3. Eğitim Durumu:  
 İlkokul                       Ortaokul                       Lise                       Üniversite  
 Yüksek Lisans       Doktora
4. Çalışıyor musunuz?  
 Evet                                       Hayır
5. Yaşanılan Şehir: \_\_\_\_\_

## **APPENDIX B.**

### **Appendix B.1 Gender Expression Manipulation**

#### **Femininity**

Fatma Yılmaz, genellikle renkli ve çiçekli kıyafetler giyen, bakımlı, sıklıkla aksesuar kullanan, uzun saçlı; arkadaşları tarafından akıllı, başarılı, kibar, duygusal, anlayışlı ve sevecen olarak nitelendirilen biridir.

Mehmet Yılmaz, genellikle renkli ve çiçekli kıyafetler giyen, bakımlı, sıklıkla aksesuar kullanan, uzun saçlı; arkadaşları tarafından akıllı, başarılı, kibar, duygusal, anlayışlı ve sevecen olarak nitelendirilen biridir.

#### **Masculinity**

Fatma Yılmaz, genellikle koyu renkli kıyafetler ve takım elbise giyen, bakımlı, kısa saçlı; arkadaşları tarafından zeki, mantıklı, özgüvenli, otoriter, sert ve kaba olarak nitelendirilen biridir.

Mehmet Yılmaz, genellikle koyu renkli kıyafetler ve takım elbise giyen, bakımlı, kısa saçlı; arkadaşları tarafından zeki, mantıklı, özgüvenli, otoriter, sert ve kaba olarak nitelendirilen biridir.

#### **Androgyny**

Fatma Yılmaz, zaman zaman koyu renkli kıyafet ve takım elbiseler giyen; zaman zaman ise renkli ve çiçekli kıyafetler giyen, bakımlı, hem kısa hem de uzun saç stillerini kullanan; arkadaşları tarafından zeki ve başarılı, otoriter, sert, duygusal ve anlayışlı olarak nitelendirilen biridir.

Mehmet Yılmaz, zaman zaman koyu renkli kıyafet ve takım elbiseler giyen; zaman zaman ise renkli ve çiçekli kıyafetler giyen, bakımlı, hem kısa hem de uzun saç stillerini kullanan; arkadaşları tarafından zeki ve başarılı, otoriter, sert, duygusal ve anlayışlı olarak nitelendirilen biridir.

## APPENDIX C

### Appendix C.1. Semantic Differential Task

Yukarıda o özelliklerini okumuş olduğunuz kişiye karşı nasıl hissediyorsunuz? 1 ile 5 arasında bir rakam seçerek belirtiniz. Ölçeğin bir ucu bir duyguyu nitelerken diğer ucu bu duygunun tam tersini ifade etmektedir.

<b>Soğuk</b>						<b>Sıcak</b>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Düşmanca</b>						<b>Arkadaşça</b>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Güvensiz</b>						<b>Güvenli</b>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Olumsuz</b>						<b>Olumlu</b>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Küçümseme</b>						<b>Saygı</b>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>İğrenme</b>						<b>Hayranlık</b>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7



## Appendix C.2. Social Distance Scale

Yukarıda özelliklerini okumuş olduğunuz kişiyi göz önünde bulundurarak bu kişiyi aşağıda verilen farklı sosyal ilişki koşullarında ne derece kabul edeceğinizi 1 ile 6 arasında bir rakam seçerek belirtiniz.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Kesinlikle	Tercih	Biraz Tercih	Biraz Tercih	Tercih	Kesinlikle
Tercih	Etmem	Etmem	Ederim	Ederim	Tercih
Etmem					Ederim

- \_\_\_1)- Kardeşim olarak  
\_\_\_2)- Ailemden birinin eşi olarak  
\_\_\_3)- Çocuğumun öğretmeni olarak (çocuğunuz yoksa olduğunu varsayarak cevap veriniz)  
\_\_\_4)- Yakın arkadaşım olarak  
\_\_\_5)- Komşum olarak  
\_\_\_6)- İş yerinden arkadaşım olarak  
\_\_\_7)- Çalışanım olarak  
\_\_\_8)- Patronum/ İşverenim olarak  
\_\_\_9)- Ülkemde yaşayan bir vatandaş olarak

## **APPENDIX D. ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL**



**BAŞKENT** 25.  
**ÜNİVERSİTESİ** Yılı

Akademik Değerlendirme Koordinatörlüğü



**Sayı** : 62310886-604.01.01/ 15530  
**Konu** : Zeynep Kara'nın Etik Onay Başvurusu  
Hk.

22/04/2019

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

**İlgi** : 28/03/2019 tarih ve 12393 sayılı yazımız.

Enstitünüz Sosyal Psikoloji Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Zeynep Kara'nın, Öğretim Görevlisi Dr. Leman Korkmaz danışmanlığında yürütmekte olduğu "Toplumsal Cinsiyetin Sosyal İnşası: Kadın ve Erkeklerin Farklı Cinsiyet İfadelerini Nasıl Algılıyoruz?" başlıklı tez çalışması, Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler ve Sanat Araştırma Kurulunda değerlendirilmiş ve bilgilerinize ekte sunulmuştur.

**e-imzalıdır**  
Prof. Dr. M.Abdülkadir VAROĞLU  
Kurul Başkanı

Ek : Değerlendirme Formu

Başkent Üniversitesi Bağlıca Kampüsü Fatih Sultan Mahallesi Eskişehir Yolu 18. Km 06790  
Etimesgut/ANKARA  
Birim Telefon No: 0 312 246 67 40  
E-Posta: [adk@baskent.edu.tr](mailto:adk@baskent.edu.tr)

Faks No: 0 312 246 66 05  
İnternet Adresi: [www.baskent.edu.tr](http://www.baskent.edu.tr)

Bilgi İçin: Gamze SONBAY  
Unvan: Koordinatör  
Telefon No: 246 66 66 / 2078



Sayı : 17162298.600-238

9 NİSAN 2019

Konu : Tez Çalışması

### İlgili Makama

Üniversitemiz Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Psikoloji Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Zeynep Kara'nın, Öğretim Görevlisi Dr. Leşan Korkmaz danışmanlığında yürütmekte olduđu "Toplumsal Cinsiyetin Sosyal İnşası: Kadın ve Erkeklerin Farklı Cinsiyet İfadelerini Nasıl Algılıyoruz?" başlıklı tez çalışması değerlendirilmiş ve yapılmasında bir sakınca olmadığı tespit edilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımızla sunarız.

### Başkent Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler ve Sanat Araştırma Kurulu

Ad, Soyad	Değerlendirme	İmza
Prof. Dr. M.Abdülkadir Varođlu	Olumlu/ <del>Olumsuz</del>	
Prof. Dr. Kudret Güven	Olumlu/ <del>Olumsuz</del>	
Prof. Ali Sevgi	Olumlu/ <del>Olumsuz</del>	
Prof. Dr. İşıl Bulut	Olumlu/ <del>Olumsuz</del>	
Prof. Dr. Sadegül Akbaba Altun	Olumlu/ <del>Olumsuz</del>	
Prof. Dr. Can Mehmet Hersek	Olumlu/ <del>Olumsuz</del>	
Prof. Dr. Özcan Yađcı	Olumlu/ <del>Olumsuz</del>	

## APPENDIX E

### Appendix E.1. Informed Consent Form (For Gender Expression Survey)

#### GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM ve BİLGİLENDİRME FORMU

Bu çalışma Başkent Üniversitesi Sosyal Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans tezi kapsamında Zeynep Kara tarafından yürütülmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı günümüzde feminen/kadını ve maskülen/erkeksi ifadelerle ilgili olduğu düşünülen özellikleri belirlemektir. Çalışmada yer alan soruların doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Bizim için önemli olan sizin ne düşündüğünüz ve hissettiğinizdir.

#### **Katılımınızla ilgili bilmeniz gerekenler:**

Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayalıdır. Çalışmanın yaklaşık 5 dakika sürmesi beklenmektedir. Çalışma fizyolojik ya da psikolojik herhangi bir risk içermemektedir. Ancak, herhangi bir yaptırıma maruz kalmadan çalışmaya katılmayı reddedebilirsiniz veya çalışmayı herhangi bir zamanda bırakabilirsiniz. Araştırma esnasında cevap vermek istemediğiniz sorular olursa boş bırakabilirsiniz.

Araştırmaya katılanlardan herhangi bir kimlik bilgisi istenmeyecektir ve toplanan veriler tamamen gizli tutulacaktır ve anonim olarak değerlendirilecektir. Toplanan verilere sadece araştırmacılar ulaşabilecektir. Bu araştırmanın sonuçları sadece bilimsel veya eğitim amaçlı kullanılacaktır.

#### **Araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isterseniz:**

Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Zeynep Kara (zeynepkara94@gmail.com) ile iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

**Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum. Çalışmayı istediğim zaman yarıda kesip bırakabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.**

## **Appendix E.2. Informed Consent Form**

### **GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM ve BİLGİLENDİRME FORMU**

Bu çalışma Başkent Üniversitesi Sosyal Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans tezi kapsamında Zeynep Kara tarafından yürütülmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı bireylerin sahip olduğu farklı özelliklerin nasıl algılandığına yöneliktir. Çalışmada yer alan soruların doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Bizim için önemli olan sizin ne düşündüğünüz ve hissettiğinizdir.

#### **Katılımla ilgili bilmeniz gerekenler:**

Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayalıdır. Çalışmanın yaklaşık 5-10 dakika aralığında sürmesi beklenmektedir. Çalışma fizyolojik ya da psikolojik herhangi bir risk içermemektedir. Ancak, herhangi bir yaptırıma maruz kalmadan çalışmaya katılmayı reddedebilirsiniz veya çalışmayı herhangi bir zamanda bırakabilirsiniz. Araştırma esnasında cevap vermek istemediğiniz sorular olursa boş bırakabilirsiniz.

Araştırmaya katılanlardan herhangi bir kimlik bilgisi istenmeyecektir ve toplanan veriler tamamen gizli tutulacaktır ve anonim olarak değerlendirilecektir. Toplanan verilere sadece araştırmacılar ulaşabilecektir. Bu araştırmanın sonuçları sadece bilimsel veya eğitim amaçlı kullanılacaktır.

#### **Araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isterseniz:**

Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Zeynep Kara (zeynepkara94@gmail.com) ile iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

**Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum.**

**Çalışmayı istediğim zaman yarıda kesip bırakabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.**