

The Social Control of Sexuality: An Examination of Gender and Regional Effects on Turkish Young Adults*

Cinselliğe Yönelik Sosyal Kontrol: Türkiye'deki Genç Yetişkinlerde Cinsiyet ve Bölgesel Etkilerin İncelenmesi

Eda KARACAN **, Rahşan BALAMİR BEKTAŞ ***

Abstract

The main aim of the current study is to investigate the social control over sexuality in Turkish young adult sample. Social institutions, primarily the family, relatives, neighborhood, peer group and religion are the sources of control for sexual expression, and these social institutions may activate sanctioning systems when norms are violated. While societies differ remarkably in what they consider socially desirable and undesirable in terms of sexual behavior, regional differences in given society may have also effect on sexuality and consequently differ in what they attempt to prevent or promote. Thus, the present study investigates social controls over sexuality within the young adults (n= 218) in Turkish male and female sample (129 women and 89 men) in different regions (urban and rural cities). Data were collected through self-report questionnaires including Sexual Communication Scale, Parental Monitoring Scale, Perceived Religiosity and Social Control Scale and demographic informations. In general, results revealed that both gender and regional difference were important factors, which affects sexual behaviors of young people. While in the current study, social control mechanisms similar to other cultures, confirm gender differences in terms of students' behaviors towards nonmarital sexuality, regional differences contribute further understanding within culture variation.

Keywords: Social control, sexuality, sexual communications, gender, young adults

Öz

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, ergen ve genç yetişkin örnekleminde cinselliğe yönelik sosyal kontrol kaynaklarını incelemektir. Temel olarak aile, yakınlar, mahalle, akran grubu ve dini yönelim cinsellik üzerinde sosyal kontrol mekanizmaları olarak işlev görür. Cinselliğin yaşama biçiminden kimlerle yaşanabileceğine kadar uzanan kurallar ve normlar toplum tarafından belirlenir. Toplumlar sosyal olarak beklenen ve beklenmeyen cinsel davranışlar açısından farklılık gösterse de, belirli bir toplum içinde bölgesel farklılıklar da vardır. Bu çalışma cinselliğe yönelik sosyal kontrol mekanizmalarını incelemeyi hedeflemiş ve bu doğrultuda Türkiye'nin farklı bölgelerinde (metropol ve taşra) yer alan üniversitelerden toplam 218 genç yetişkin (129 kadın ve 89 erkek) katılımcı ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Veriler Cinsel İletişimi Ölçeği, Ebeveyn Kontrolü Ölçeği, Algılanan Dindarlık ve Sosyal Kontrol Ölçeği ve demografik bilgiler de dahil olmak üzere öz-bildirim anket formu ile toplanmıştır. Sonuçlar genel olarak değerlendirildiğinde hem cinsiyetin hem de bölgesel farklılıkların cinsel davranışı etkileyen önemli faktörler olduğu görülmüştür. Özellikle evlilik öncesi cinselliğe yönelik tutumlarda sosyal kontrolün kadın üzerinde daha belirleyici olduğu ve bölgelere göre değişkenlik gösterdiği bulunmuştur.

Anahtar sözcükler: Toplumsal cinsiyet, sosyal kontrol, cinsellik, ergenler, cinsel iletişim

* Presented as an oral presentation at International Conference on Social Sciences, 04-05 October, 2013.

** Doç. Dr. Eda Karacan, Ufuk Üniversitesi, Fen-Edb. Fakültesi, Psikoloji Bölümü, edakaracan@yahoo.com

*** Yrd. Doç. Dr. Rahşan Balamir Bektaş, Ufuk Üniversitesi, Fen-Edb. Fakültesi, Psikoloji Bölümü, rbalamir@yahoo.com

Introduction

Sexuality is not only biological but also is an important social issue that is constructed by gender, culture, religion, and social norms. Specifically, the past decades have been a period of great change in adolescent sexual activity and during the current century, adolescents' sexual attitudes and behaviors have changed dramatically. In fact, many attitudes, behaviors, and concepts related to sexuality are socially constructed.

The concept of social control, which is currently used by a variety of disciplines – e.g., sociology, anthropology, and psychology, is one concept that has a central significance. Although the social control concept was more often used for mostly controlling the deviant behavior after 1960s (Scheerer and Hess, 1997, 99), it would be right to express that the network of social control exists in all areas of modern social life. Because social control is conceptualized as a mechanism to regulate relationships in social life in general and to be useful in ensuring social order. Any individuals of the society are involved in social control mechanism in various forms, and specifically the informal social control is developed in areas of gender, family life, body, education, and mass culture (Sumner, 1997, 31).

The control that is performed in the form of interfering in sexual behavior is enabled by informal control agents that are latent in daily activities and interactions of civil society, and the quality of practices is shaped in the moral order of society. Studies in social psychology emphasizes that the feelings of responsibility and perceived importance of the norm are important factors for determining the social control (Chaurand & Brauer, 2008; Chekroun & Brauer, 2002; Nugier, Niedenthal, Brauer, and Chekroun, 2007). The primary function of social control here is to carry out maintaining the social order, and the currently existed order is patriarchal structure in many societies. Sexuality of women in particular is disciplined by the existing honor discourse, and this discourse is interiorized by women. Informal control, of which influence is felt within close personal interactions, affects the perceptions for the style of experiencing sexuality and the reactions to this style.

The study on social control regarding sexuality is rather the part of cultural study, and in this sense, involves studies including social control, socialization, adaptation, internalization of norms, and an agreement on values as a cultural study field (Cohen, 1994, 64). Horwitz (1990, 1) places an emphasis on the perception of “right or wrong” underlying in the social order, and states that social control serves to maintain society's own moral values.

Mayer (1985) remarks the social control exercised by individuals on themselves as result of internalizing the existing norms. According to Mayer (1985, 24-25), social controls as also used at macro or micro sociologic levels, involving self-adjustment. Thus, attention is drawn to the level at which individuals or cultural groups change or influence their behaviors and attitudes through social control. Social control instruments not only involve using force, but also include persuasion, rewards, and punishments that do not require using force. Particularly, when it comes to the control applied on women, consent of women for men's pressure is an element of dominance established to control on themselves. Additionally, from the perspective of social dominance theory which emphasizes that societies producing stable group-based hierarchy and gender is one of the powerful distinctions between groups (Pratto, Sidanius & Levin, 2006; Sidanius, Sinclair & Pratto, 2006). Although, there are cultural differences for gender inequality in different societies, it seems that there is no differences for men's control of women across different societies.

Sexuality and especially woman body is controlled by social institutions in order to preserve social norms and traditions. Primarily the family and religion are the major social institutions that govern

sexual expression (DeLamater, 1981). Jessor and colleagues in their Problem Behavior Theory also addresses both proximal controls such as religiosity, as well as parents and peer influence (Costa, Jessor, and Donovan, 1995; Jessor, 2014). Importantly, this theory addresses both proximal structure such as parents and friends approval and distal structure such as parents and peer influence and controls in perceived environment system. According to DeLamater (1981) social institutions control behavior in different ways. First, they provide norms that define reality in given society. Second, individuals who occupy institutional roles will play an important role as a basis for informal controls. Third, institutions may have sanctioning systems that are activated when norms are violated. Furthermore, every society has a “commonsense theory” about sexual behavior and specify what types of sexual activity are appropriate and inappropriate (DeLamater, 1981). Especially woman sexuality is disciplined at common sense theory and this discourse is internalized by women. The most effective factors of internalization of discourse are informal control agents –parents, siblings, close and distant relatives and even neighbours- who exist mostly in daily activities and interactions of civil society with a latent mode.

In general, family constructs a set of explanations for understanding the both internal and external familial experiences (Edgar-Smith and Wozniak, 2010). In a broader sense, different kinship and family relationships in society may have their own internal logic and this creates variety of person’s perceptions of gender (Sirman, 2006). Hence, determination of individual sexuality and appropriate sexual behaviours are subject to control of entire society. Especially this control becomes more apparent in mate selection for marriage issue (Kandiyoti, 2011).

Specifically, cultural values regarding sexuality, can be transmitted and taught by family and adolescent sexual behaviors appear to be related to a number of parental factors, including communication, values, monitoring and control, and warmth and support (Meschke et al., 2002). The literature revealed contradictory results for the relation between parent-adolescent communication and teen sexual behavior in the West (e.g., DiIorio, Pluhar & Belcher, 2003; Handelsman, Cabral, and Weisfeld, 1987; Widmer, 1997). Overall, more frequent and positive parent-adolescent communication has been most commonly associated with fewer sexual partners and later and less frequent sexual activity (Miller, Forehand, and Kotchik, 1999; Leland and Barth, 1993). Moreover, the quality of parent–adolescent communication, the gender of parents, and the gender and age of adolescents seem to be related to parent–adolescent sex-related communication (Noller and Callan, 1990; Rosenthal and Feldman, 1999). However, as adolescents become involved in different groups within a given culture (e.g., peers, teachers, other youths’ parents, media) they may develop values differ from their parents.

As part of the modernization of Turkey, many changes are taking place, although the impact of socioeconomic changes is greater in the big cities (i.e, urban cities) than the other Anatolia cities (i.e. rural cities). The responses of a large sample of Turkish university students showed they still held fairly traditional values, especially women and students from rural areas were more traditional and conservative in their attitudes and behaviors regarding sexuality (Askun and Ataca, 2007). In fact, it seems that patriarchy is still effective in constructing social values, norms, and gender roles. Although, Cindoglu (2004) states that the modernization process weakens patriarchal and traditional values especially among young educated people in the western part of Turkey, virginity of unmarried women is still sustain the importance in traditional parts of Turkey as well as in modern metropolisitan areas. Specifically, virginity of woman is not seen as a personal issue, rather it is evaluated as a social value, which belongs to entire family. Patriarchal control over women’s bodies is reproduced by honour and shame codes (Cindoglu, 2004).

Since pre-marital sexual activities are important for families, adolescent activities that related to sexual behaviors are affected from parental monitoring and control. While some studies revealed that

higher levels of parental monitoring promote the delay of first sexual intercourse (Capaldi, Crosby, and Stoolmiller, 1996), others suggested that monitoring and control appear to have a curvilinear effect which emphasized that both too many rules and too little supervision have been related to a greater likelihood of adolescent sexual activity (Miller et al., 1986).

Another major institutions that directly govern sexual activity is religion (DeLamater, 1981). Traditional and religious rules and practices are used as tools for control of women's sexuality (Ilkkaracan, 2004). However, studies revealed contradictory results regarding the effect of religiosity on sexual behavior. On the one hand, some studies found a negative relationship between sexual experience and strength of religious commitment (Mahoney, 1980), on the other hand other studies showed the greater religiosity were associated with less sexual activity (Pluhar et al., 1998; Zaleski and Schiaffino, 2000).

In light of all these issues, the present study investigates social controls over sexuality and gender relations within the young adults in different regions. Unfortunately direct measure of social control is rare, but it is only inferred from religious affiliation or social pressure from others. Especially family members, peers, and neighbours can feel responsibility for exert social control, because they can feel as an part of their self. Additionally, the current study tried to extend previous research by using different region data to identify sexuality of youth with different effects. Because, most research on adolescent sexuality has also tended to focus on metropolitan samples, with rural samples being largely neglected. Two regions (metropolitan/urban cities and other Anatolia cities/rural cities) were distinguished. Typically, sexual activity rates among rural youth are assumed to be lower than among urban youth. Both gender were included so that the antecedents for each gender could be determined. Importantly, different factors (i.e., sexual communication and approval of parents and friends, parental monitoring, religious belief, and social control over sexuality) representing alternative explanations of adolescence sexual behavior were examined, providing a more comprehensive picture of the factors influencing sexuality of youth.

METHOD

Participants

The sample was comprised of 216 undergraduates in different regions; 58% were women and 42% were men. 60.6% of the sample from at a large universities that were located in big cities/metropolis (i.e., urban cities), and 36.7% of the sample from universities that were located in other Anatolia cities (i.e., rural cities). The ages of participants ranged from 19 to 28 (median = 22). All of the participants were single. 43.6% of the sample lived with families and 56.4% of the sample stayed at dorm or lived with friends. In terms of religious belief 69% of the sample defined themselves as liberal; 17% of the sample as conservative and 6% of the sample as atheist. 47.6% of the participants reported that they have a romantic relationship currently. Characteristics of the sample were given in Table 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of the Sample (N= 218)

	Female (N=129)	Male (N=89)
Age (in years)		
Mean (SD), range	21.95 (2.19); 19-28	22.64 (1.70); 19-28
Marital Status		
Single	129 (100%)	89 (100%)
Mother's Education		
Middle or High School	108 (84.4%)	71 (81.6%)
University or Higher Degree	20 (15.5%)	16 (18.4 %)
Father's Education		
Middle or High School	92 (71.3%)	54 (61.4%)
University or Higher Degree	37 (28.7%)	34 (38.6%)
Perceived SES		
Low	11 (8.6%)	18 (20.2%)
Middle	81 (63.3%)	46 (51.7%)
High	36 (28.2 %)	25 (28.1%)
Living Placement		
Living with parents	52 (40.3%)	41 (46.0%)
Living with relatives	2 (1.6%)	3 (3.4%)
Living at dorm	36 (27.9%)	11 (12.4%)
Living lonely or with friends at home	35 (27.1%)	33 (37%)
Religious Belief		
No religious beliefs	4 (3.1%)	9 (10.6%)
Religious/Liberal	94 (73.4%)	54 (63.5%)
Conservative/religious	21 (16.4 %)	13 (15.3%)
Number of Romantic Relationships		
1	21 (16.3%)	5 (5.6%)
2-3	28 (21.7%)	12 (13.5%)
4-5	8 (6.2%)	10 (11.3%)
5 >	-	13 (14.6%)
Relationship Status at the current age		
Having boy/girl friend	44 (34.1%)	38 (42.7%)
Engaged	14 (10.9%)	9 (10.1%)
Types of Sexual Contact		
Kissing	82 (63.6%)	75 (84.3%)
Hugging	100 (77.5%)	75 (84.3%)
Sexual Intercourse	23 (17.8%)	72 (80.9%)
First Intercourse Age		
< 14 years	1 (0.8%)	7 (7.9%)
15-18 years	4 (3.1%)	32 (36.0%)
19-25 years	18 (14.0%)	32 (36,0%)

Procedure

The data were collected through self-report questionnaires. Before the study, informed consents were obtained from all participants and only volunteer participants were given the questionnaires. There were no identifying informations on the questionnaires, in order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. The questionnaires were collected as soon as completed.

1. Measures

Multiple Questionnaires were administered to university students. First, demographic information were collected from all participants. Sexual behavior/experience scale, sexual communication and approval scale, parental monitoring, religiosity, and social control scales were also administered to all participants.

Demographic data

All participants reported their age, marital status, their own education levels, educational level of their own parents, number of siblings at home, how long they had been living in big city, and their perception of their SES in Turkey.

Measures of Adolescent Sexual Behavior/Experience Scale

Sexual Behavior/Experience Scale was developed by Akgün (2000) to measure the sexually oriented behaviors of the participant's during the university life. Different levels of sexual experience (gradually increasing from holding hands and kissing to intercourse) were measured with eight "yes/no" items. The highest level of sexual experience as indicated by the participants was determined to be their sexual behavior scores. Cronbach's alpha values for the whole scale were .88 for female and .90 for male. Although in the original scale any subscales were identified for the participants own sexual experience/behavior, in this study for both female and male samples two factors were revealed. Therefore, these two factors (accepted sexual behaviors and pre-marital sexual behaviors) were also competed. Cronbach's alpha values for the accepted sexual experience/behavior (holding hands, hugging, kissing) subscale were .93 for female and .94 for male, and alpha values for the pre-marital sexual experience/behavior subscale (petting with or without clothes, intercourse) were .88 for female and .94 for male.

Sexual Communication and Approval Scale

Sexual Communication and Approval Scale was developed by Akgün (2000). Sexual Communication Subscale measures the level of information they share/communicate with their parents and best friends. The topics were their opposite sex romantic/non-romantic relationships, and sexuality issues (sexually transmitted diseases, contraception, sexual abuse). The participants were expected to rate 6 items on 6-point scales for their mother, father, and best friend (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree). As the total score increases the participant's communication about sexuality with his/her parents and best friend increases, and vice versa. Cronbach alphas for sexual communication with mother were .88 for both gender; alpha values for sexual communication with father were .82 for female and .92 for male; and cronbach alphas for sexual communication with friends were .87 for female and .89 for male.

Sexual Approval Subscale measures the approval level of parents and best friends about the premarital sexual behaviors (kissing, petting, and intercourse) perceived by the adolescent. Participants were expected to indicate the extent to which the items are appropriate for them on 6-point scales (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree). As the total score increases the participant's perceived approval from his/her parents and best friend about sexual behaviors increases, and vice versa. Cronbach alphas for sexual approval of mothers' were .72 for female and .86 for male; alpha values for sexual approval of fathers' were .75 for female and .87 for male; and Cronbach alphas for sexual approval of friends' were .83 for female and .86 for male.

Religiosity Scale

The religion scale was developed by the authors for the present study. The scale measured the subject's adherence to and belief in any religion rituals and practices. The scale included nine statements describing required and optional religious rituals, practices, and beliefs or attitudes toward the person's religion. In order to identify the factor structure of the scale, exploratory factor analyses were performed. The single factor solution including 9 items accounted for 70.39 % of the the total variance (eigenvalue =6.33), showing that one factor solution could explain attitudes toward religiosity. The participants were asked to indicate their degree of agreement on 6-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree). Higher scores indicated greater attachment to the religion. Cronbach's alpha value for female sample was .94 and alpha value for the male sample was .95.

Social Control Scale

The social control scale was developed by the authors to measure the sociocultural factors of sexuality. In fact, each society constraints the age, gender, and kin relationships between sexual actors and set limits on the behavior of sexuality. In the light of literature the participants were asked to indicate their degree of agreement on 6-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree) on 25 items. Some sample items are "I don't want to be known my partner/close relationship from my neighbours (reverse item)", "I believe that every member of a family should protect the family wholeness", and "I respect to my relatives' ideas". Social Control Scale includes three subscales; (1) Parental Permissiveness toward having a romantic partner (10 items, alpha = .87 for female and .86 for male); (2) Relational Orientation with Surroundings representing positive relationships with relatives and neighbours (7 items, alpha =.81 for female and .85 for male); and (3) Communal Sharing of Family Values representing the viewpoint of the family wholeness (7 items, alpha = .76 for female and .82 for male). Higher scores indicated positive attitudes toward parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner, positive relationships with relatives and neighbours and perceived family wholeness.

Initially factor analyses revealed a six-factor solution explaining total 63.46% of the variance. Since three subscales were planned (i.e., parental control, extended family/relative control, and neighbourhood control) the Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation was forced to three factor solution. When the sum of squared of loadings were examined, it was seen that after the rotation, the total variance explained by the three factors was 48.73 % (eigenvalue = 5.68), of which 19.58%, 15.09%, and 14.06% explained by the first, second, and third factors respectively. Factor loadings ranged from .42 to .85. Each factor renamed as a (1) parental permissiveness toward having

a romantic partner, (2) relational orientation with surroundings, and (3) communal sharing of family values according to the results. Higher scores indicated positive attitudes toward these three factors. Cronbach's alpha values for the parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner subscale were .87 for female and .86 for male; for the relational orientation with surroundings subscale were .81 for female and .85 for male; and for the communal sharing of family values subscale were .76 for female and .82 for male.

Parental Monitoring Scale

The parental monitoring scale was developed for the current study by the authors to measure the perceived parental monitoring about friendship, academic grades, and time spent in home and out home. Participants were asked to rate 12 items on a 6-point Likert type scale (1= Never; 6 = All time) for both their mother and father. The higher score reflects the participant's perception of their mother's'/father's monitoring. In order to identify the factor structure of the scale, exploratory factor analyses were performed. The single factor solution accounted for 45.72 % (eigenvalue= 4.11) and 46.65 % (eigenvalue= 4.19) of the the total variance for mothers and fathers sample respectively. Factor loadings ranged from .55 to .80. Cronbach's alpha values for maternal monitoring were .80 for the female and .87 for male; and alpha values for the paternal monitoring were .75 for the female and .86 for male.

Data Analyses

First, descriptive analyses were conducted to gather information about the means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients of the variables (see Table 2). For descriptive purposes, the major study variables among females and males were compared by using the *t*-test for independent samples (see Table 2). For the analysis of the relations between different university regions, these were coded as region 1= metropolis/big cities and 2 = other Anatolia cities. Because place in which participants lived for the longest time after their teenage years affect their sexual attitudes, participants were categorized into regions according to place in which they have lived for the longest time after they were 13 years old. Thus, the longest time spent region was controlled in the analysis. Therefore, in order to compare the groups (gender and university regions) in sexual behaviors and other study variables, multivariate analyses of covariance (MANCOVA) was used. Hierarchical regression analysis was performed in order to see whether there was a main effect of social control mechanisms on sexual behavior of adolescents for both gender and regions. The frequency of missing data was relatively small per measure. Therefore, to maintain sample size and reduce sample bias, person-mean substitution for missing data on the scales was utilized. All analyses were conducted by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences.

RESULTS

Descriptive Results

Preliminary examinations for male and female samples (i.e., means, standard deviation, alpha (α) values) of the data were given in Table 2. As can be seen in Table 2 all major study variables

were significantly differed between female and male sample. As would be expected male had significantly higher ratio of pre-marital sexual behavior than female ($t = -5.93$; $p < .01$). Females had more religious belief than males ($t = 2.75$; $p < .01$). While females communicated more with their mothers ($t = 4.41$, $p < .01$) and friends ($t = 3.52$; $p < .01$) on sexuality, males communicated on sexual topics with their fathers ($t = -2.82$, $p < .01$). Both fathers ($t = -4.32$; $p < .01$) and friends ($t = -2.32$; $p < .01$) approved significantly outnumbered of male's sexual behavior. However, there were no differences between gender in terms of mother's approval ($t = -1.71$, $p > .05$). All participants perceived that both mother ($t = 4.30$; $p < .01$) and father ($t = 2.26$; $p < .05$) monitoring their daughters more than sons. There was also significant gender differences on modern view about living close relationship freely in which male significantly outnumbered female ($t = -5.01$; $p < .01$).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for all study variables

Variables	Female (N=129)			Male (N=89)			Independent sample
	Mean	SD	α	Mean	SD	α	t-test
Sexual Experience/Behavior							
Accepted Sexual Behavior	7.00	1.56	.93	7.38	1.34	.94	-1.83†
Pre-marital Sexual Behavior	4.98	1.46	.88	6.31	1.83	.94	-5.93**
Religiosity							
Religiosity Belief	42.72	9.86	.94	38.59	12.21	.95	2.75**
Sexual Communication							
Sexual communication with mother	18.37	9.35	.88	13.03	7.87	.88	4.41**
Sexual communication with father	10.39	5.78	.82	13.11	8.41	.92	-2.82**
Sexual communication with friends	28.39	8.05	.87	24.06	9.46	.89	3.52**
Sexual Approval							
Mother's sexual approval	5.41	3.38	.72	6.30	4.27	.86	-1.71
Father's sexual approval	4.47	2.85	.75	6.62	4.51	.87	-4.32**
Friend's sexual approval	10.08	5.21	.83	11.77	5.29	.86	-2.32**
Parental Monitoring							
Maternal monitoring	37.24	9.37	.80	31.28	10.97	.87	4.30**
Paternal monitoring	35.01	9.76	.75	31.66	11.39	.86	2.26*
Social Control							
Parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner	34.01	11.14	.87	41.56	10.78	.86	-5.01**
Relational orientation with surroundings	31.20	7.74	.81	32.42	6.57	.85	-1.25
Communal sharing of family values	28.44	6.26	.76	29.47	7.31	.82	-1.08

Note: * $p < .05$; † $p = .06$

Mancova

Differences in university region and gender were tested by means of a MANCOVA with gender and university region as the independent variable, place in which they have lived for the longest time after they were 13 years old as the covariate, and sexual behavior, religious belief, sexual communication with parents and friends and approval of parents and friends, parental monitoring and social control as the dependent variables. Table 3 summarizes the group mean performance and statistical comparisons for each task.

Table 3. Means and standard deviations for variables

Variable	University Region						Group Differences a
	Region I Metropolis/ Urban Cities		Region II Other Anatolia/ Rural Cities		Total		
	Women (n= 77)	Men (n=54)	Women (n= 48)	Men (n= 29)	Women (n= 131)	Men (n= 77)	
Sexual Behavior							
Mean	5,14	6,59	4,79	5,86	5,00	6,33	M > F**
SD	1,48	1,78	1,45	1,82	1,47	1,82	UC > RC*
Religiosity							
Mean	40,88	37,31	45,16	41,03	42,52	38,61	F > M**
SD	10,62	13,58	8,19	9,29	9,94	12,32	RC > UC*
Sexual Communication with Mother							
Mean	19,14	14,44	17,41	10,10	18,48	12,92	F > M*
SD	9,75	8,94	8,44	5,08	9,27	8,05	UC > RC*
Sexual Communication with Father							
Mean	10,96	14,37	9,60	10,51	10,44	13,02	M > F*
SD	6,11	9,02	5,35	6,95	5,85	8,51	UC > RC*
Sexual Communication with Friends							
Mean	28,42	25,68	28,83	21,75	28,58	24,31	F > M**
SD	8,36	8,64	7,35	10,51	7,96	9,46	
Mothers' Sexual Approval							
Mean	6,03	7,44	4,31	4,17	5,37	6,30	UC > RC**
SD	3,66	4,79	2,61	1,94	3,39	4,31	
Fathers' Sexual Approval							
Mean	4,88	7,51	3,72	5,13	4,44	6,68	M > F**
SD	3,24	4,82	1,91	3,62	2,85	4,56	UC > RC**

Friends' Sexual Approval							
Mean	11,00	12,64	8,91	10,31	10,20	11,83	M > F*
SD	5,45	4,98	4,66	5,79	5,24	5,36	UC > RC**
Maternal Monitoring							
Mean	36,94	32,35	37,47	28,20	37,15	30,90	F > M**
SD	8,63	10,91	10,71	10,69	9,44	10,95	
Paternal Monitoring							
Mean	34,37	32,16	35,72	29,72	34,89	31,31	F > M*
SD	9,06	11,11	10,93	12,11	9,80	11,45	
Parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner							
Mean	35,19	43,33	32,22	38,00	34,05	41,46	M > F**
SD	10,64	10,44	11,84	11,31	11,17	10,98	UC > RC*
Relational orientation with surroundings							
Mean	29,41	31,51	33,87	34,48	31,12	32,55	RC > UC**
SD	8,08	7,18	6,38	5,28	7,76	6,70	
Communal sharing of family values							
Mean	26,57	28,64	31,45	31,27	28,44	29,56	RC > UC**
SD	5,91	8,11	5,61	5,29	6,25	7,32	

Note: aThis column indicates which group (UC= Urban Cities; RC= Rural Cities, F =Female, M= Male), have significantly different means at * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Results indicated that multivariate main effect were significant for both gender (Wilks- $\lambda = 0.52$, $F(13,191) = 13.20$, $p < .01$), and university region (Wilks- $\lambda = 0.81$, $F(13,191) = 3.37$, $p < .01$). However, there was no significant interaction effect of gender and university region on the study variables (Wilks- $\lambda = 0.93$, $F(13,191) = 0.97$, $p > .05$). No significant effect was also detected for the covariate of the longest lived place (Wilks- $\lambda = 0.94$, $F(13,191) = 0.92$, $p > .05$).

Univariate analyses of gender indicated that extra-marital sexual behavior ($F(1,203) = 28.63$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .12$), religiosity ($F(1,203) = 6.86$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$), sexual communication with mother ($F(1,203) = 20.68$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$), sexual communication with father ($F(1,203) = 4.35$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$), sexual communication with friends ($F(1,203) = 14.17$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$), father's sexual approval ($F(1,203) = 15.65$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .07$), friend's sexual approval ($F(1,203) = 4.28$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$), maternal monitoring ($F(1,203) = 21.08$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .09$), paternal monitoring ($F(1,203) = 6.65$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$), and Parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner ($F(1,203) = 18.43$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .08$), significantly differed which indicates that male's sexual behavior ($M = 6.24$, $SD = 0.18$) higher than female's ($M = 4.96$, $SD = 0.14$), female's religiosity ($M = 43.08$, $SD = 0.98$) higher than male's ($M = 38.92$, $SD = 1.24$), female's sexual communication with their mother ($M = 18.25$, $SD = 0.80$) higher than male's ($M = 12.38$, $SD = 1.01$), male's sexual communication with their father ($M = 12.43$, $SD = 0.80$) higher than

female's ($M = 10.28$, $SD = 0.64$), female's sexual communication with their friends ($M = 28.60$, $SD = 0.78$) higher than male's ($M = 23.84$, $SD = 0.98$), father's sexual approval for males ($M = 6.37$, $SD = 0.41$) higher than females ($M = 4.29$, $SD = 0.32$), friend's sexual approval for males ($M = 11.54$, $SD = 0.60$) higher than females ($M = 9.94$, $SD = 0.48$), maternal monitoring for female ($M = 37.19$, $SD = 0.92$) higher than male ($M = 30.37$, $SD = 1.16$), paternal monitoring for female ($M = 35.03$, $SD = 0.56$) higher than male ($M = 31.01$, $SD = 1.21$), in terms of social control for males ($M = 40.69$, $SD = 1.27$) parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner higher than females ($M = 33.70$, $SD = 1.01$) respectively.

Univariate analyses of university region also significantly differed on pre-marital sexual behavior ($F(1,203) = 4.54$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$), religiosity ($F(1,203) = 4.75$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$), sexual communication with mother ($F(1,203) = 4.69$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$), sexual communication with father ($F(1,203) = 6.36$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$), mother's sexual approval ($F(1,203) = 19.22$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .08$), father's sexual approval ($F(1,203) = 10.05$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$), friend's sexual approval ($F(1,203) = 7.21$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$), in terms of social control, parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner ($F(1,203) = 6.22$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$), positive relations with surroundings ($F(1,203) = 10.79$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$), and family wholeness viewpoint ($F(1,203) = 13.25$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$) significantly differed which indicates that sexual behavior in metropol/big cities ($M = 5.85$, $SD = 0.14$) higher than in other Anatolia cities ($M = 5.34$, $SD = 0.19$), religiosity in other Anatolia cities ($M = 42.75$, $SD = 1.27$) higher than in metropol/big cities ($M = 39.26$, $SD = 0.95$), sexual communication with their mother in metropol/big cities ($M = 16.72$, $SD = 0.77$) higher than in other Anatolia cities ($M = 13.90$, $SD = 1.03$), sexual communication with their father in in metropol/big cities ($M = 12.67$, $SD = 0.62$) higher than in other Anatolia cities ($M = 10.05$, $SD = 0.82$), mother's sexual approval in metropol/big cities ($M = 6.69$, $SD = 0.32$) higher than in other Anatolia cities ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 0.42$), father's sexual approval in metropol/big cities ($M = 6.17$, $SD = 0.31$) higher than in other Anatolia cities ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 0.42$), friend's sexual approval in metropol/big cities ($M = 11.78$, $SD = 0.46$) higher than in other Anatolia cities ($M = 9.69$, $SD = 0.61$), parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner in metropol/big cities ($M = 39.24$, $SD = 0.98$) higher than in other Anatolia cities ($M = 35.15$, $SD = 1.30$), positive relations with surroundings in other Anatolia cities ($M = 34.02$, $SD = 0.84$) higher than in metropol/big cities ($M = 30.53$, $SD = 0.63$), and family wholeness viewpoint in other Anatolia cities ($M = 31.16$, $SD = 0.75$) higher than in metropol/big cities ($M = 27.70$, $SD = 0.56$) respectively.

Correlations among observed variables

As can be seen from Table 4, correlations among the measures of the current study indicated that there was a significant correlation between sexual behavior and parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner ($r = .33$, $p < .01$); relational orientation with surroundings ($r = -.14$, $p < .05$); communal sharing of values ($r = -.14$, $p < .05$); religiosity ($r = -.36$, $p < .01$); maternal monitoring ($r = -.14$, $p < .05$); sexual communication with father ($r = .16$, $p < .05$); sexual communication with friends ($r = .16$, $p < .05$); mother's sexual approval ($r = .29$, $p < .01$); father's sexual approval ($r = .25$, $p < .01$); and friend's sexual approval ($r = .54$, $p < .01$).

Table 4. Correlations Among Major Study Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner	1												
2. Relational orientation with surroundings	-.028	1											
3. Communal sharing of family values	-.215**	.459**	1										
4. Religiosity	-.452**	.298**	.509**	1									
5. Maternal monitoring	-.106	.114	.035	.182**	1								
6. Paternal monitoring	-.103	.165*	.066	.137*	.902**	1							
7. Sexual communication with mother	.299**	-.122	-.275**	-.247**	.102	.048	1						
8. Sexual communication with father	.388**	.000	-.212**	-.339**	-.036	.015	.576**	1					
9. Sexual communication with friends	.218**	-.033	-.243**	-.182**	.073	.010	.401**	.186**	1				
10. Mother's sexual approval	.497**	-.105	-.324**	-.490**	-.036	-.035	.382**	.424**	.257**	1			
11. Father's sexual approval	.476**	-.091	-.260**	-.454**	-.118	-.114	.198**	.512**	.160*	.844**	1		
12. Friend's sexual approval	.446**	-.145*	-.261**	-.494**	-.109	-.130	.218**	.267**	.502**	.517**	.493**	1	
13. Sexual behavior	.332**	-.146*	-.144*	-.362**	-.148*	-.128	.076	.159*	.164*	.296**	.250**	.546**	1

Regression Analysis for Regional Differences

A hierarchical regression analysis was performed in order to see whether there was a main effect of social control mechanisms on sexual behavior of adolescents in different regions (i.e., other Anatolia cities and metropolises). Since the correlation coefficients between maternal monitoring and paternal monitoring ($r = .90$) and between mother's sexual approval and father's sexual approval

($r = .84$) were very high in different regions, only maternal monitoring and father's sexual approval included in the regional differences analysis. In the first step, social control variables (parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner, relational orientation with surroundings, communal sharing of family values, maternal monitoring, and religiosity) were entered in order to control for the potential variance accounted for by these variables. Since sexual communication and approval are affected from social norms and controlled by societies, these variables were entered at the second step. Before the hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed, the independent variables were also examined for collinearity. Values of variance inflation factors (VIF) greater than 10 is often taken as a signal that the data have collinearity problems (Chatterjee & Hadi, 2006). Results of the variance inflation factor indicated that except for sexual communication with father (VIF= 3.62) and sexual communication with mother (VIF= 3.04), all variables less than 2.3.

As can be seen in Table 5 social control variables over sexuality were entered first and explained 22% of the total variance in Anatolia cities and 15% of the total variance in metropolis/big cities. While religiosity had an independent effect in Anatolia cities ($t = -3.81, p < .01$), parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner had an independent effect in metropolis/big cities ($t = 2.69, p < .01$). In the second step, sexual communication and approval variables were entered and explained additional 34% of the total variance in Anatolia cities, bringing the total proportion of explained variance to 41%. In metropolis/big cities, addition of the second block explained an additional 29% of the total variance, bringing the total proportion of explained variance to 35%. In the final step, relational orientation with surroundings ($t = 2.38, p = .02$) and friend's sexual approval ($t = 1.81, p = .07$) had a significant on sexual behavior in Anatolia cities. In addition, sexual communication with friends ($t = 1.81, p = .07$) and father's sexual approval ($t = 1.81, p = .07$) had a marginally significant effect on sexual behavior in Anatolia cities. In metropolis or big cities, only friend's sexual approval ($t = 1.81, p = .07$) had a significant on sexual behavior. In sum, our model has accounted for 34% of the variance in sexual behavior of adolescents in Anatolia cities and accounting for 29% of the variance in metropolis/big cities.

In sum, the overall model achieved statistical significance in both Anatolia region; $F(9, 97) = 6.57, p < .001, R = .63$, accounting for 41% of the variance in sexual behavior of adolescents, and in metropolis/big cities; $F(9, 119) = 6.62, p < .001, R = .59$, accounting for 35% of the variance in sexual behavior of adolescents. Table 5 presents partial regression coefficients and R^2 values. The R^2 change score between blocks 1 and 2 was examined to investigate the proportion of variance in sexual behavior of adolescents explained by sexual communication and approval after controlling for social control variables scores predicted an additional 14% of the variance in Anatolia cities and 16% of the variance in metropolis/big cities.

Table 5. Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting sexual behavior of adolescents in different regions.

Variable	Rural/Other Anatolia Cities (N=98)					Urban/Metropolis Cities (N=120)				
	B	SE B	β	R ²	DR ²	B	SE B	β	R ²	DR ²
Step I				.26	.22				.18	.15
Parental permissiveness toward being in a romantic relationship	.04	.02	.18			.06	.02	.27**		
Relational orientation with surroundings	-.06	.03	-.16			-.01	.03	-.01		
Communal sharing of family values	.04	.04	.10			.04	.04	.10		
Religiosity	-.11	.03	-.43**			-.03	.02	-.14		
Maternal Monitoring	.01	.02	.06			-.04	.02	-.17*		
Step II				.41	.34				.35	.29
Parental permissiveness toward being in a romantic relationship	.03	.02	.13			.03	.02	.13		
Relational orientation with surroundings	-.07	.03	-.22*			.01	.03	.03		
Communal sharing of family values	.01	.04	.03			.03	.04	.08		
Religiosity	-.04	.03	-.16			-.01	.02	-.02		
Maternal Monitoring	.01	.02	.02			-.02	.02	-.09		
Sexual Communication with Mother	-.03	.04	-.12			-.02	.02	-.07		
Sexual Communication with Father	.07	.05	.20			.01	.04	.04		
Sexual Communication with Friends	-.05	.03	-.21†			-.01	.03	-.02		
Fathers' Sexual Approval	-.16	.09	-.21†			-.04	.07	-.06		
Friends' Sexual Approval	.27	.06	.56**			.28	.06	.52**		

** p<.01 *p<.05 †p<.08

Regression Analysis for Gender Differences

A hierarchical regression analysis was performed in order to see whether there was a main effect of social control mechanisms on sexual behavior of adolescents for females and males. Since the correlation coefficients between maternal monitoring and paternal monitoring ($r = .95$) and between sexual communication with mother and sexual communication with father ($r = .85$) were very high in gender groups, only maternal monitoring and sexual communication with mother included in the gender difference analysis. In the first step, social control variables (parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner, relational orientation with surroundings, communal sharing of family values, maternal monitoring, and religiosity) were entered in order to control for the potential variance

accounted for by these variables. Since sexual communication and approval are affected from social norms and controlled by societies, these variables were entered at the second step. Before the hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed, the independent variables were also examined for collinearity. All values of variance inflation factors (VIF) less than 2.3.

As can be seen in Table 6 social control variables over sexuality were entered first and explained 19% of the total variance in females and 6% of the total variance in males. While religiosity had an independent effect in females ($t = -4.23, p < .01$), parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner had an independent effect in males ($t = 2.68, p < .01$). In the second step, sexual communication and approval variables were entered and explained additional 50% of the total variance in females, bringing the total proportion of explained variance to 53%. In males, addition of the second block explained only an additional 4% of the total variance, bringing the total proportion of explained variance to 14%. In the final step, while friend's sexual approval ($t = 8.04, p < .01$) had a significant on sexual behavior for females, parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner ($t = 2.01, p < .05$) had a significant on sexual behavior for males. In sum, our model has accounted for 50% of the variance in sexual behavior of adolescents for females, but accounting only 4% of the variance for males.

Table 6. Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Sexual Behavior of Adolescents for Gender.

Variable	Female (N=129)					Male (N=89)				
	B	SE B	β	R ²	ΔR^2	B	SE B	β	R ²	ΔR^2
Step I				.22	.19				.11	.06
Parental permissiveness toward being in a romantic relationship	.01	.02	.04			.07	.03	.31**		
Relational orientation with surroundings	-.03	.03	-.10			-.02	.05	-.05		
Communal sharing of family values	-.01	.04	-.01			.01	.05	.05		
Religiosity	-.10	.02	-.41**			-.01	.03	-.04		
Maternal Monitoring	.01	.02	.01			-.02	.02	-.07		
Step II				.53	.50				.14	.04
Parental permissiveness toward being in a romantic relationship	-.02	.01	-.09			.06	.03	.26*		
Relational orientation with surroundings	-.01	.02	-.04			-.02	.05	-.06		
Communal sharing of family values	-.01	.03	-.01			.01	.05	.03		
Religiosity	-.01	.02	-.01			-.01	.03	-.05		
Maternal Monitoring	-.01	.01	-.01			-.01	.02	-.05		
Sexual Communication with Mother	.03	.02	.10			-.01	.04	-.04		
Sexual Communication with Friends	-.01	.02	-.03			-.01	.04	-.04		
Fathers' Sexual Approval	-.06	.06	-.07			-.05	.08	-.08		
Friends' Sexual Approval	.36	.04	.75**			.11	.08	.22		

In sum, the overall model achieved statistical significance for only women; $F(9, 128) = 15.38$, $p < .001$, $R = .73$, accounting for 53% of the variance in sexual behavior of females, but not for men; $F(9, 88) = 1.44$, $p = .18$, $R = .37$. Table 6 presents partial regression coefficients and R^2 values. The R^2 change score between blocks 1 and 2 was examined to investigate the proportion of variance in sexual behavior of adolescents explained by sexual communication and approval after controlling for social control variables scores predicted an additional 31% of the variance in females and 3% of the variance in males.

DISCUSSION

The main aim of the present study was to investigate the effect of social control mechanisms over sexuality among college students in different region of Turkey (i.e., urban and rural). In the present study social institutions, primarily the family, relatives, neighbourhood, peer group, and religion factors were assessed as a social control mechanisms. In general, results revealed that both gender and regional differences were important factors for affecting sexual behaviors of young people.

In terms of gender differences congruent with previous studies (Askun and Ataca, 2007; Gelbal et al., 2008) having sexual experience differs greatly between genders; while majority of the male had sexual experience, only a minority of female had sexual experience, and this was the case for each region that the students came from. As indicated by Cindoglu (2004), virginity of unmarried women is very important in traditional parts of Turkey as well as in modern metropolitan areas. The role of social control (bonds to conventional persons and institutions) over sexual behavior was supported primarily for females. In addition, with respect to premarital sexual approval, all study sample perceived that both fathers and friends approve male nonmarital sexual behavior than females. Thus, in the current study, participants held more permissive attitudes for men toward nonmarital sexuality compared to women. Although such traditional attitudes are less in Western nations, this traditional gender attitudes remain strong in many Asian and Middle Eastern societies (Higgins et al., 2002; Sprecher & Hatfield, 1996; Zuo et al., 2012). In traditional Islamic societies, all aspects of life, including sexual behavior, are organized by religious and conservative rules and with the effects of traditional and religious discourse, women sexuality may considered as a threat to social order and there is a belief that women cannot control themselves. This approach caused more approval for free sexual lives for men (Mernissi, 2004, Ahmed, 2004, Imam, 2004). In addition, “double standard” of sexuality is a well documented across cultures (Eşsizoglu et al., 2011, Jonason and Marks, 2009, Lyons et al., 2011) where men are evaluated more positively or less negatively than women who have similar sexual activities. In fact, in the current study, all participants perceived that both mothers and fathers monitor their daughter’s sexual behavior compared to their son’s.

Inconsistent with some findings in the United States (Dilorio et al. 1999; Noller and Callan, 1990) where both male and female adolescents preferred discussing sex-related issues with their mothers than with their fathers, the present study revealed that while female preferred to communicate sex-related issues with their mothers, male preferred to communicate with their fathers similar to other Asian countries (Zhang et al., 2007). Similarly Gelbal et al’s (2008) research shows that girls talk about sexual issues with their mothers much more than do boys, whereas boys talk with their fathers more than do girls. According to this result, it can be concluded that young adolescents were willing to ask for, and gain, information on sexual issues from their same-sex parent and friends. Furthermore, results also revealed regional differences which indicates that communication concerning sexual matters with parents and approval of sexual behavior from parents were higher in urban/metropolis cities rather than rural/Anatolia

cities. As a social control factors while parental permissiveness toward having a romantic partner was higher in urban/metropolis cities compared to rural/Anatolia cities, positive relations with relatives and neighbours, family wholeness viewpoint and religious belief were higher in rural/Anatolia cities. Moreover, students who were in urban/metropolis rather than rural/Anatolian cities, having higher sexually related behaviors. These results may be caused to modernization process has been lived higher in urban/metropolis cities and therefore social control mechanisms might much more loose in these regions. Since individualization develops, people become independent from external control and traditional morality of society. In addition, after internalizing the free market policies in 1980's, new ideologies, which might be called as liberal gender ideology, have taken place in Turkey. This liberal gender ideology was based on the liberation of woman and sexuality was no longer seen as a taboo. Especially women who live in metropolis areas have gained right of sexual intimacy (Cindioğlu, 2004). Thus, it seems that, social control mechanisms much more tight in urban areas. Pluhar et al. (1998) also emphasized that very religious students had less liberal attitudes. In the current study, although females and individuals from rural areas reported that they had more religious orientation, religiosity was not the main predictor of sexual behavior for both gender and regions. In fact, in Turkey, both traditional/Islamic and liberal gender ideologies exist together (Cindioğlu 2004). Mainly results revealed that while adolescent's perception of friends' approval of sexual behavior was only predictor of their own sexuality in urban/metropolis cities, in rural/Anatolian cities besides friends' approval relations with surroundings (e.g., neighbours, relatives) were also important factors for predicting the sexual behavior.

Importantly, it seems that, especially peer social network is influencing sexual behavior among adolescents. Because, an adolescent's self-reported perception of friends' approval of sexual behavior has been identified as an important predictor of their own sexuality in both regions and as an important factor especially for females. Thus, adolescent's behavior is mainly determined by how acceptable the behavior is believed to be among their peers. However, the remarkable finding revealed that while fathers and friends approve male nonmarital sexual behavior, maternal approval of nonmarital sexual behaviours did not differ for males and females. The difference between mothers and fathers can be explained by the patriarchal structure. The dominant value of patriarchy is still effective in constructing social values, norms, and gender roles. Specifically, with the impact of gender role socialization and the understanding of "namus"/honor, unmarried women are expected to stay pure and virginity signifies the honor of a woman's family. While woman's participation to public sphere was supported by modernity project (Kandiyoti, 2011), women were also mostly seen as cultural symbols of society as a vehicle for honour of community and intergenerational reproducers of community culture (Davis, 2007). In all of this process, women have taken more active role in transfer of national identity and values, strenghten of family as a major unit of society, arrangement of relations in family, in-between near surroundings and relatives in social life, and control of descent and sexuality. Consequently, new strategies with aim of control of women, especially their sexualities have been generated as a result of this perspective (Ilkkaracan, 2004).

In sum, these results indicate that multiple processes influence the adolescent's sexuality. Family and kinship relations have a functional importance especially in the continuation of tradition. Women being controlled by their families have a central importance for the need of continuation of the existing social order. At this point, it can be argued that social control that is effective for the continuity of a regime or social order serves more to the continuity of the patriarchal order. Similar to other Asian and Islamic cultures, pre-marital sexual affair has been a strong taboo for unmarried women (Cindoglu, 2004) and extramarital sexual relationships are still generally disapproved like in most Asian countries (Higgins and Sun, 2007).

There are a number of shortcomings that should be considered when interpreting the results of this study. Since our samples represented only a limited part of the whole population, the findings cannot be generalized. Although this study clearly suggested that social control mechanisms had some effect on adolescent's sexuality, larger sample size and more longitudinal research is needed to determine the particular mechanisms accounting for this effect. It is also important to ask how accurate questionnaire responses are as a measure of sexual activity in young people. Clearly, even in an anonymous questionnaire this was too personal questions for students to answer. Therefore, social desirability can arise and most students may expressed their thought about what should be reported rather than their own actual sexual behaviour. Further research is needed to determine the extent to which social control mechanisms effects on sexual related behaviors within a more represented sample. Furthermore, only adolescent or young adults participated in this study and their perceptions were handled. Further studies can also included parents and/or peer groups and their own viewpoints.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, L. (2004). Arap Kùltürü ve Kadınların Bedenlerinin Yazılışı. In P., Ilkcaracan (Ed.), *Mùslùman Toplumlarda Kadın ve Cinsellik* (ss. 55-74). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Akgün, E. (2000). Predictors of adolescent sexual attitudes and behavior: the role of parents and best friends. *Unpublished master thesis*. Ankara: METU
- Askun, D. and Ataca, B. (2007). Sexuality related attitudes and behaviors of Turkish university students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*; 36:741-752.
- Capaldi, D.M., Crosby L., and Stoolmiller M.(1996). Predicting the timing of first sexual intercourse for at-risk adolescent males. *Child Development*, 67:344–59.
- Chatterjee S, Hadi AS (2006). Regression analysis by example. New Jersey, John Wiley & Sons, pp 236
- Chaurand, N. & Brauer, M. (2008). What Determines Social Control? People's Reactions to Counternormative Behaviors in Urban Environments. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38 (7), pp. 1689–1715.
- Chekroun, P., & Brauer, M. (2002). The bystander effect and social control behavior: The effect of the presence of others on people's reactions to norm violation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 853–867.
- Cindoglu, D. (2004). Modern Türk tıbbında bekaret testleri ve suni bekaret. In P. Ilkcaracan (Ed.), *Mùslùman Toplumlarda Kadın ve Cinsellik* (pp. 115-132). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Cohen, S. (1994). Social control and the politics of reconstruction. In D. Nelken, (Ed.), *The Futures of Criminology* (63-88). London: Sage Publications.
- Costa, F.M., Jessor, R., and Donovan, J.E. (1995). Early initiation of sexual intercourse: The influence of psychosocial unconventionality. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 5(1), 93-121.
- Davis, N. Y. (2007). *Cinsiyet ve millet*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- DeLamater, J. (1981). The social control of sexuality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 7: 263-290.
- Dilorio, C., Kelley, M., and Hockenberry-Eaton, M. (1999). Communication about sexual issues: mothers, fathers, and friends. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 24, 181–189.
- DiIorio, C., Pluhar, E., and Belcher, L. (2003). Parent-child communication about sexuality: A review of the literature from 1980–2002. *Journal of HIV/AIDS Prevention & Education for Adolescents & Children*, 5(3-4), 7-32.
- Edgar-Smith, S.E., and Wozniak, R.H. (2010). Family relational values in the parent-adolescent relationship. *Counseling and Values*, 54, 187-200.
- Eşsizoglu, A., Yasan, A., Yıldırım, E.A., Gürgen, F., and Özkan, M. (2011). Double Standard for Traditional Value of Virginity and Premarital Sexuality in Turkey: A University Students Case. *Women & Health*, 51:136–150.
- Gelbal, S., Duyan, V., and Öztürk, A.B. (2008). Gender differences in sexual information sources, and sexual attitudes and behaviors of university students in Turkey. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 36(8): 1035-1052.
- Jonason, P.K. and Marks, M.J. (2009). Common vs. Uncommon Sexual Acts: Evidence for the Sexual Double Standard. *Sex Roles*, 60:357–365.
- Handelsman, C.D., Cabral R.J., and Weisfeld G.E. (1987). Sources of information and adolescent sexual knowledge and behavior. *Journal of Adolescence Research*, 2:455–63.
- Higgins, L.T. and Sun, C. (2007). Gender, social background and sexual attitudes among Chinese students. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, 9(1): 31–42

- Higgins, L. T., Zheng, M., Liu, Y., and Sun C. H. (2002). Attitudes to marriage and sexual behaviors: A survey of gender and culture differences in China and United Kingdom. *Sex Roles*, 46, 75–89.
- Horwitz, A. (1990) *The logic of social control*. London: Plenum Press, 1990.
- İlkkaracan, P. (2004). Müslüman Toplumlarında Kadın ve Cinsellik. In P., İlkkaracan, (Ed.), *Müslüman Toplumlarında Kadın ve Cinsellik* (ss. 11-32). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- İmam, A. (2004). Müslüman dinsel sağ (“köktendinciler”) ve cinsellik. In P., İlkkaracan, (Ed.), *Müslüman toplumlarında kadın ve cinsellik* (pg. 75-98). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Jessor, R. (2014). Problem behavior theory. In Lerner, R.M., Petersen, A.C., Silbereisen, R.K., and Brooks-Gunn, J. (Eds) *The Developmental Science of Adolescence: History Through Autobiography* , 239-256. New York: Psychology Pres.
- Kandiyoti, D. (2011). *Cariyeler, bacılar; yurttaşlar kimlikler ve toplumsal dönüşümler*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Leland, N.L., and Barth R.P.(1993). Characteristics of adolescents who have attempted to avoid HIV and who have communicated with parents about sex. *Journal of Adolescence Research*, 8:58–76.
- Lyons, H., Giordano, P.C., Manning, W.D., and Longmore, M.A. (2011). Identity, Peer Relationships, and Adolescent Girls’ Sexual Behavior: An Exploration of the Contemporary Double Standard. *Journal Of Sex Research*, 48(5), 437–449.
- Mahoney, E.R. (1980). Religiosity and sexual behavior among heterosexual college students. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 16, 97-113.
- Mayer, J. A. (1985). Notes towards a working definition of social control in historical analysis” In S. Cohen and A. Scull, (Ed.), *Social Control and state*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Mernissi, F. (2004). Bekaret ve ataerki. In P., İlkkaracan (Ed.), *Müslüman toplumlarında kadın ve cinsellik* (ss. 99-114). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Meschke, L.L., Bartholomae, S., and Zentall, S.R. (2002). Adolescent Sexuality and Parent-Adolescent Processes: Promoting Healthy Teen Choices. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 31, 264–279.
- Miller, K.S., Forehand, R., and Kotchik, B.A. (1999). Adolescent sexual behavior in two ethnic minority samples: The role of family variables. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61, 85-98.
- Miller, B.C., McCoy, J.K., Olson, T.D., and Wallace, C.M. (1986). Parental discipline and control attempts in relation to adolescent sexual attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 48, 503–512.
- Noller, P., and Callan, V.J. (1990). Adolescents’ perceptions of the nature of their communication with parents. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 19, 349–362.
- Scheerer, S. And Hess, H. (1997). Social control: a defence and reformulation. R. Bergalli, and C. Sumner, (Eds.), *Social Control and Political Order* (pg. 96-130). London: Sage Publication.
- Nugier, A., Niedenthal, P. M., Brauer, M., & Chekroun, P. (2007). Moral and angry emotions provoked by informal social control. *Cognition and Emotion*, 21(8), 1699–1720.
- Sumner, C. (1997). Social Control: the history and politics of a central concept in Anglo-American sociology. R. Bergalli, and C. Sumner, (Eds.), *Social Control and Political Order* (pg. 1-33). London: Sage Publication.
- Pluhar, E. Frongillo, E.A., Stycos, J.M. and Dempser-McClain, D. (1998). Understanding the relationship between religion and the sexual attitudes and behaviors of college students. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*, 23, 288-296.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17, 271–320.
- Rosenthal, D.A., and Feldman, S.S. (1999). The importance of importance: adolescents’ perceptions of parental communication about sexuality. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22, 835–851.
- Sidanius, J., Sinclair, S. & Pratto, F. (2006) Social Dominance Orientation, Gender, and Increasing Educational Exposure. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2006, 36, 7, pp. 1640–1653.
- Sirman, N. (2006). Akrabalık, siyaset ve sevgi: Sömürge sonrası koşullarda namus - Türkiye örneği. In S. Mojab, N. , Abdo (Ed.), *Namus adına şiddet: Kuramsal ve siyasal yaklaşımlar* (ss. 43-61). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Sprecher, S., and Hatfield, E. (1996). Premarital sexual standards among US college students: Comparison with Russian and Japanese students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 25(3), 261-288.
- Widmer, E.D.(1997). Influence of older siblings on initiation of sexual intercourse. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 59, 928–938.
- Zaleski, E.H., and Schiaffino, K.M. (2000). Religiosity and sexual risk-taking behavior during the transition to college. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 223-227.
- Zhang, L., Li, X., Shah, I.H., Baldwin, W., and Stanton, B. (2007). Parent–adolescent sex communication in China. *The European Journal of Contraception and Reproductive Health Care*, 12(2), 138–147.
- Zuo, X., Lou, C., Gao, E., Cheng, Y., Niu, H., and Zabin, L.S. (2012). Gender differences in adolescent sexual permissiveness in three Asian cities: Effects of gender role attitudes. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 50, 18-25.