

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article**Changing Surname Upon Marriage from The Male Perspective***Erkeklerin Bakış Açısından Evlilik Sonrası Soyadı Değişimi*Dolunay ŞENOL¹& Burcu KÖMÜRCÜ²DOI : [10.63556/ankad.v10i3.459](https://doi.org/10.63556/ankad.v10i3.459)

Geliş/Received: 01/03/2026

Kabul/Accepted: 05/06/2026

Abstract

In patriarchal societies, women are generally expected to adopt their husbands' surnames upon marriage. After a prolonged period during which women were required to adopt their spouse's surnames, the recent shift in this practice makes it important to examine men's perceptions of this change. In order to comprehend this perspective, it was necessary to utilise the theoretical frameworks proposed by Talcott Parsons and Raewyn Connell. Connell, a distinguished figure in feminist studies, advanced a critique of the structural-functionalist approach pioneered by Parsons, a sociologist who dominated this field in the United States. The rationale behind the utilisation of a dual theoretical framework in this study is still felt today: Parsons' "role theory" and Connell's concept of "hegemonic masculinity". Parsons' structural-functionalist approach elucidates the significance of family unity and the perpetuation of lineage, as articulated by the interviewees. Connell's theory demonstrates that patriarchal structures reproduce asymmetrical power relations not only in male-female relationships but also among men themselves. In this study, a total of 25 male participants who had been married at least once and residing in Ankara were selected through purposive sampling to provide insights into the subject matter.

Key words: Surname usage, gender, masculinity, gender role theory, hegemonic masculinity.

Öz

Ataerkil toplumlarda genellikle, kadınların evlendikten sonra eşlerinin soyadını almaları beklenmektedir. Kadınların uzun bir süre boyunca eşlerinin soyadlarını almaları gerektiği bir dönemin ardından, bu uygulamada son dönemde yaşanan dönüşüm, erkeklerin bu değişime ilişkin algılarının anlaşılmasını gerekli kılmaktadır. Bu bakış açısını anlamak için Talcott Parsons ve Raewyn Connell tarafından önerilen teorik çerçevelerden yararlanılmıştır. Feminist çalışmaların önemli ismi Connell çalışmalarında Amerika'da çığır açan sosyolog Parsons'ın yapısal-işlevselci yaklaşımını eleştirmiştir. Bu çalışmanın kuramsal çerçevesini birbirine karşıt iki teörinin oluşturmasının sebebi hem Parsons'ın "rol teorisi"nin hem de Connell'in "hegemonik erkeklik" kavramının etkilerinin günümüzde de varlığını hissettiriyor ediyor oluşudur. Parsons'ın yapısal-işlevselci yaklaşımı, görüşmecilerin ifadelerinde vurgulanan aile birliğinin ve soy bağının sürdürülmesi gerekliliğine vurgu yaparken, Connell'in teorisi ataerkil yapılanmanın yalnızca kadın-erkek ilişkilerinde değil, erkekler arasında da asimetrik güç ilişkileri yeniden ürettiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu çalışmada, amaçlı örneklem yöntemiyle seçilen ve Ankara'da yaşayan en az bir evlilik yapmış 25 erkeğin görüşlerine başvurulmuştur.

Anahtar kelimeler: Soyadı kullanımı, toplumsal cinsiyet, erkeklik, cinsiyet rolü teorisi, hegemonik erkeklik.

¹ Prof. Dr., Kırıkkale Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, Kırıkkale, Turkey. e-posta: dolunay_senol@yahoo.com

² Sorumlu Yazar/Corresponding Author, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Kırıkkale Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, Kırıkkale, Turkey. e-posta: burcukomurcu@kku.edu.tr

Önerilen Atıf/Suggestion Citation

Şenol, D. & Kömürcü, B. (2026). Changing Surname Upon Marriage from The Male Perspective. *Anadolu Kültürel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 10(3), 1686-1702.

1. INTRODUCTION

The issue of women taking the surname of their husbands with the marriage contract can be considered as a multi-layered social problem in sociology. In the literature, there are many studies (Aksakal, 2020; Moroğlu, 2012; Havutçu & Kalkancı, 2020; Efedayioğlu, 2019; Mortaş, 2016) on issues such as the loss of identity experienced by women; the evaluation of constitutional court decisions; the right to personality; the best interests of the child.

Current studies have approached the surname issue in a gender-orientated manner, bringing the lens closer to "women". The fact that the subject of the surname issue is woman justifies the literature's bypassing the male perspective. However, starting from the thesis that this issue is a social problem, we believe that it is important to address both the socio-cultural and historical construction process of men/masculinity and to rethink masculinity under the guidance of Connell's (2016) concept of "hegemonic masculinity". Although men are not the direct subjects or addressees of the surname problem, it is critical to understand their perspectives on this issue. Men's perspectives, which are not free from the social order and patriarchal structures, affect women's thoughts, decisions and expectations.

From this point of view, it is possible to understand men's thoughts and perspectives on the surname issue at the intersection of two different approaches. The first of these is Parsons and Bales' (1955) "gender role theory", which deeply influenced social scientists in the 1950s; the other is Connell's (2016) concept of "hegemonic masculinity", which criticised "gender role theory" in the 1970s. In his studies, Parsons revealed that roles are indispensable parts of social structuring, that roles are realised within the social learning process and that individuals have to accept roles within this structuring. Connell, on the other hand, criticises this claim of Parsons. According to Connell (1979) "role" is a complex term in itself. The role of men within the existing gender regime harbours heterogeneity in the hierarchical structure in which men take part.

Within the scope of this study, it is possible to use these two theories, whose discourses are different, as the theoretical framework. Most of the male interviewees, while strictly demanding that their wives take their own surname, emphasised the necessity of maintaining the family lineage and protecting the integrity of the family. These findings obtained from the interviewees regarding the necessity of maintaining the social order bring Parsons' "gender role theory" to mind. On the other hand, the findings obtained from the interviewees who thought that they would not feel like "men" if their wives did not take their own surnames after marriage, in other words, they would be excluded from the field of "masculinity", evoke Connell's "hegemonic masculinity" thesis.

Parsons' and Connell' theories are used as an analytical framework. These theories are used to describe the analysis of men's thinking patterns regarding their wives' surnames. In this sense, the theory does not represent an explanatory model imposed on the facts. Rather, it serves as a conceptual framework that guides the analysis process. Given that masculinity is a product of complex social, cultural, historical and ideological interactions, we hope to increase the number of masculinity studies that address the issue of women's surnames.

2. THEOROTICAL FRAMEWORK: FROM "GENDER ROLE THEORY" TO "HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY"

Talcott Parsons (1948, pp. 157-158), who tried to develop a theory that he aimed to include the science of sociology, called this attempt "social system theory". In the social system theory, which is in line with the structural-functionalism approach, the motivational elements of expected behaviours in social roles and the tendencies that lead to social deviations are emphasised. Parsons' role theory also popularised functionalist gender role theory in the 1950s. The concept of "role" in the social sciences was developed in the 1930s and then applied to gender roles. In functionalist gender theory, the power difference between men and women was not addressed and the gender issue was linked to the concept of family (Carrigan et al., 1985, p. 554).

Parsons (1942, p. 605) argues that the differentiation of gender roles begins in childhood. The fact that girls are generally docile and act in a way to conform to the expectations of adults depends on the fact that their mothers are always at home and therefore they take them as role models. However, especially

in the urban middle class, the fact that fathers work outside the home deprives boys of the opportunity to observe their fathers. The basic status of women in urban life depends on their basic responsibilities such as being a wife, mother to their children and childcare. In addition, Parsons (1942, p. 609) sees marriage and the occupational system as the main reasons for the structuring of gender roles. The main source of the status of the family is the professional status of the father. This status is the status achieved through individual success and directly and indirectly determines the status of the family within the social structure. While being a symbol of prestige is a direct determining factor, the fact that the source of income determines the living standards of the family is an indirect factor. The fact that occupational status has become decisive has created tension in the gender role structure as it deprives women of their share in the common life.

Peal (1975) states that Parsons argues that the function between the sexes is primarily determined by biological factors; the role of the father is emphasised through the economic activities of the society, while the role of the mother becomes more challenging because they do not share a common experience with other women and are left alone. She states that gender roles theory does not attribute the reasons for high divorce rates and the popularity of units such as psychiatry/family counselling to inherent weaknesses in the concept of family, but rather to the difficulties associated with adapting to changes in the new family structure. Peal (1975) argues that social deviance is relative, that normative standards will vary from society to society and over time, and that it is therefore not easy to assume a pathogenic factor.

Criticising Parsons' theory, Secord (1982) argues that the main problem with theories that attempt to explain social order, such as this and similar theories, is the attempt to put forward fixed structures that restrict the behaviour of individuals. This endeavour seems incompatible with the active world of the individual and suspends the potential of individuals to change/transform their social environment.

One of the comprehensive criticisms of Parsons' theory is Connell's work. Connell (2016) claims that scholars such as Parsons developed a functional theory of gender roles and that these views are useful for services such as marriage guidance and counselling. According to Parsons (1955), who analysed the long process of change in the American family in the 20th century, "structural changes in social systems" always bring disorder and conflict. Connell (2016), who coined the term "hegemonic masculinity", offers both a new interpretation of the unstable historical meaning of masculinity and a comprehensive critique of structural-functionalist gender role theory:

Hegemonic masculinity" is always constructed in relation to various subordinated masculinities as well as in relation to women. The interplay between different forms of masculinity is an important part of how a patriarchal social order works. (Connell, 2016, p. 268)

The concept of hegemonic masculinity (Messerchmidt, 2019a, p. 62), which was first used to understand bullying and violence among boys and to explore the challenges of pedagogy in particular, is used by Connell (2016). Connell (2016) does not see the structural changes articulated by Parsons in his functional approach as a disorder and does not believe that roles are the concomitant force of maintaining society. Differentiation between men and women is controlled by many factors such as class patterns and ethnicity.

According to Connell (1979, p. 8), functionalism has an ideological function in concealing the reality of political inference, class struggle and capitalist society. Role theory, which came to the fore in the 1950s and 1960s, weakened with the decline of functionalism. The concept of "role", which regained momentum with the women's movement in the 1970s, does not have a simple agreed definition and there is disagreement among role theorists on this issue. Some theorists argue that the concept of "role" is what people actually do, while others argue that it is what they are expected to do. However, there is still a common concept underlying role theories. Connell (1979, p. 9) categorises them under five main headings: the position occupied (place, task, status); a set of actions (role, task); expectations (rule, norm); counter-positions (reference groups); sanctions applied to correct correct or incorrect performance (positive and negative reinforcements). According to the author, these common topics in the role literature can be applied to many different cultures and role theory is not a model of reality but an extension of ideology. The author argues that in order to prove this, it is necessary to investigate the counterpart of the role perspective in social practice.

The maintenance of hegemonic masculinity involves much more than the action of an individual and involves the "material institutionalisation of specific masculinity practices" that are only realised through social structures. In this sense, there are differences with gender role theory. Hegemonic masculinity is the "construction of gender practice" realised through social actions/structures. Secondly, hegemonic masculinity is a relational concept and offers much more than a simple gender binary. Finally, masculinity is a concept that needs to be understood plurally. Hegemonic masculinity intersects with age, class, ethnicity and other social variables. In this respect, it contains different forms of stratification of gender. For example, while "complicit masculinities" benefit from the advantages of hegemonic masculinity, "marginal masculinities" point to men with relatively less social power such as the unemployed, the homeless and the disabled at the extreme end of the spectrum. Although marginal masculinities are likely to inflict forms of violence and abuse on women and men, these men are often not legitimised by the "dominant gender order" (Nayak, 2023, pp. 171-172).

The central question at the centre of hegemonic masculinity theory is which type of masculinity is "sublimated" or becomes hegemonic in a particular geographical region or time. How is this hegemonic identity symbolically reproduced among actors? This non-fixed form of masculinity is determined by time and space (Hopkins & Giazitzoglu, 2025, p. 85). Similarly, there are also studies that argue that the change in the way men in Turkey think, live, dress and behave is the new neoliberal masculinity (Avşar, 2017; Özbay & Balıç, 22004).

Hearn (1996, pp. 208-209) emphasises that the concept of masculinity has changing meanings. For example, at the beginning of the Victorian period in England, masculinity was associated with "Christianity, seriousness, self-sacrifice and honesty", while at the end of the period it started to manifest itself with "Stoicism, hardness and endurance". The main point the author draws attention to here is not the changing nature of masculinity in the historical process, but the emphasis that the context of masculinity can be misleading. Moreover, based on some anthropological studies, the author argues that the concept of masculinity cannot be applied to some cultural situations. Even the binary gender system has no place in the life practices of some indigenous peoples.

Guttman (1997) mentions two themes that attract attention in anthropological masculinity studies. The first is studies that deal only with male spaces, male-specific practices and cults. The other is studies that include women in the research as a more comprehensive part of masculinity. Gilmore's (1991) study, which investigates the appearance of forms of masculinity that vary due to numerous factors in different geographies, is an example of the first theme mentioned by Guttman.

Gilmore tries to reveal common patterns of behaviour among men. In *Manhood in the Making*, one of the most well-known and debated studies of masculinity studies in the field of anthropology, he interprets the formation process of masculinity culturally. Based on various cultural samples such as Micronesia, Melanesia, Equatorial Africa, South America, Middle East, North America, England, he presents how masculinity is perceived and how being a "real man" is a difficult process to be achieved with a "panoramic perspective" on Western and non-Western societies. In this study, which addresses the prevalence of masculinity in different cultures with a functionalist approach, Gilmore (1991) argues that "ideals of masculinity make an indispensable contribution to both the continuity of the social system and the psychological integration of men into society". Gender roles are also a part of the *problem-solving* style of societies. Connell (2019, pp. 77-78) claims that Gilmore's (1991) study is a futile endeavour to establish a positivist science of masculinity. He argues that cross-cultural comparative studies produce generalisations and that it is a reductionist approach to uncover the "deep structure of masculinity".

In sum, Connell specifically criticises Parsons' gender role theory, but in a broader perspective she distances herself from all structural functionalist approaches. In many of her works, she has taken it upon herself to criticise the idea that women and men have a role in the social order and that this role is an integral part of normative structuring.

In the following sections of the study, both the justified aspects of Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity through the issue of women's surnames and the current manifestations of gender role theory will be discussed. The views of men who face the risk of being "relegated to a subordinate position", as Connell (2016) puts it, if their wives do not take their own surnames will be included. On the other hand,

the recurring emphasis on themes such as maintaining social order, family unity and the continuation of the family lineage during the interviews justifies some of the points emphasised by Parsons in his gender role theory.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study is designed as a qualitative research using a semi-structured interview approach to understand the views and experiences of married and divorced men living in Ankara. A qualitative design was preferred because the aim of the study is to deeply understand participants' perceptions, interpretations, and attitudes regarding the research topic rather than to measure variables quantitatively.

The study is exploratory and interpretive in nature, aiming to reveal how men perceive this topic within their social and cultural contexts. Semi-structured interviews allowed participants to express their views in their own words while enabling the researcher to examine the emerging themes in detail.

The subject, purpose, scope, and limitations of the research were determined prior to data collection and the research design took into account the participants' descriptive characteristics such as age, education level, marital status, and number of children.

3.2. Participants and Sampling

The study group consisted of married and divorced men living in Ankara. A purposive sampling was employed to capture a range of experiences and perceptions within this group. The primary inclusion criterion was having been married for at least five years.

Approximately 40 individuals were invited to participate, of whom 25 agreed to be interviewed. Interviews continued until data saturation was reached, that is, until no new themes emerged.

Among the participants, 23 were married and 2 were divorced; three of the married participants were in their second marriages. Participants ranged in age from 33 to 70 years ($M = 49.52$). They represented diverse educational and occupational backgrounds. Detailed demographic information is presented in Table 1.

3.3. Data Collection

Ethics committee approval was obtained and interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview form. The interviews lasted between 20-45 minutes.

In the semi-structured interview questions, an easy and understandable language was used as much as possible. When participants gave unexpected responses, the questions were rephrased to ensure clarity.

3.4. Data Analysis

In the data analysis of this study, the three-stage classification method proposed by Miles and Huberman (1984) for qualitative research was used. The first stage, "data reduction," involved selecting relevant parts of the interview statements for analysis. These statements were coded and categorised. In the second stage, "data display," tables were created to obtain an overall view of the data. In the final stage, "conclusion drawing and verification," the research questions were revisited and the meanings of the data were interpreted. The initially ambiguous aspects of the research became clearer during this stage.

Table 1. Demographic information of the interviewees

Interviewer no (P)	Age	Education	Profession	Marital Status	Children
1	59	University graduate	Civil servant	Married	1
2	40	University graduate	Civil servant	Married	1
3	69	High school graduate	Self-employed	Second marriage	3
4	56	High school graduate	Workplace	Married	2
5	59	High school graduate	Plumber	Married	3
6	70	Primary school graduate	Self-employed	Married	2
7	42	Doctorate in progress	Academician	Divorced	1

8	66	High school graduate	Has a carpentry shop	Married	1
9	51	University graduate	Civil servant	Married	1
10	48	High school graduate	Workplace	Married	1
11	39	PhD graduate	Civil servant	Second marriage	1
12	44	University graduate	Advertiser	Married	1
13	43	High school graduate	Self-employed	Married	2
14	35	High school graduate	Self-employed	Married	2
15	62	University graduate	Civil servant	Married	1
16	54	PhD graduate	Administrator	Married	1
17	51	PhD graduate	Assistant manager	Married	1
18	33	Master's degree graduate	Civil servant	Divorced	1
19	62	Primary school graduate	Workplace	Married	1
20	51	University graduate	Civil servant	Married	1
21	40	University graduate	Civil servant	Married	2
22	48	University graduate	Civil servant	Second marriage	2
23	38	Master's degree graduate	Civil servant	Married	His wife pregnant
24	42	Master's degree graduate	Civil servant	Married	1
25	36	High school graduate	Executive Assistant	Married	3

3.5. Ethics Committee Approval

The conceptual framework of this research, the collection of data, and the analysis and interpretation of data were conducted in full compliance with ethical guidelines. The ANKAD Journal Editorial Board bears no responsibility for any ethical violations that may arise. All responsibility lies with the author. I declare that this study has not been submitted for evaluation to any academic publication medium other than the ANKAD Journal. All rules specified in the “Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Guidelines” have been complied with in this study. None of the actions listed under the heading “Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics” in the second section of the guidelines has been carried out. Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Ethics Committee for Social and Humanities Research at Kırıkkale University via Decision No. 7 dated July 17, 2025.

4. FINDINGS

4.1. On Surname

In this study, it was aimed to understand how the surname law, which came into force with Article 187 of the Turkish Civil Code (*Türk Medeni Kanunu*) in the first years of the Republic, was perceived in the world of men and what meaning they attributed to the surname. When the interviewee men were asked about the place of the surname in their world and what it means to them, it was possible to categorise the answers received into two groups: "family name" and "system for tracing the lineage". Some of the statements of 16 male interviewees in the interview group who defined the surname as a family name are given below to give an idea:

“My grandfather took this surname when Atatürk enacted the surname law. After that, every individual who entered this family through marriage or birth took this surname. I think we show the people in our family in this way.” P(4)

“You know, we say pine tree, hornbeam, acorn. Not individual trees, but I think the surname is something that shows common characteristics.” P(8)

“How should I say it, it is a name that shows people from the same family.” P(14)

“Since it is a patriarchal society, it shows the patriarchal structure. The male family is organised under a single name. When women get married, they enter and belong to this family” P(9)

“It's like a common denominator of the family. I never thought of it. It's like a family name. This is the way it is in my mind” P(20)

When we look at the statements of the interviewees, it is noteworthy that they have difficulty in defining the surname despite the fact that it is used a lot in daily life, and that they try to define the surname according to their own world of meaning. In the statements above, it is understood that they consider the surname as an indicator of belonging to a certain family and see it as a distinguishing element between families. During the interviews, the discourse that the family has a common name and that women are included in this family by getting married was repeated frequently:

There were 9 interviewees in the interview group who defined the surname as a system that enables the tracing of lineage. The statements of some of these interviewees are given below:

“Our family members have this surname. They know us by our surname. Actually, all people have surnames. That shows which lineage they come from. That's how it is.” P(24)

“Without a surname, it would be impossible to know which lineage people come from, which families they come from. I think it shows our lineage.” P(3)

“Isn't it better to say that I belong to this family, to this family, rather than to talk about it at length?” P(1)

“Like street names. When you say that you live in neighbourhood, people can guess many things about you. This is like that. It shows your family lineage. You know how some people find out that they are adopted and then they change their surname? Why do they do that? To show that they've found their real family. They do it to show which family they are descended from. I think his/her surname shows which lineage one comes from.” P(10)

When the statements of the interviewees are analysed, the emphasis on the fact that the surname is a symbol showing which lineage they are descended from stands out. However, as it is also understood from the statements, it is accepted that what is meant by the surname is the man's lineage, and that the woman has inherited the surname of her husband, with whom she has no lineage, through marriage. If the surname indicates the line of descent of people, it is clear that the woman should use the surname that reveals her own line of descent without changing her surname.

It is noteworthy that it is only the male line of descent that is meant. Parsons (1942, p. 609) argues that the status of a family is determined by the status of the man. The professional status of the man directly and indirectly constitutes the determining force of the status of the family. Although this determination of status is mostly related to modernisation and the post-industrial period, the structuring of the male-dominated order throughout history, which keeps the man in the primary position, clarifies the statements of the interviewees. The fact that the male interviewees refer to only their own families by genealogy is a product of the internalisation process that puts the male at the centre in the historical process, as the gender role theory draws attention to.

4.2. Men' Views on Women's Surname Change

As explained in detail above, the obligation of women to take their husbands' surnames upon marriage contract has been regulated through amendments. With the new regulations, women can, upon application, use their own surname in front of their husbands' surnames or the surname they had before marriage without taking their husbands' surnames. However, it is a reality that the sanctioning power of unwritten rules often goes beyond the written rules. Although women are no longer obliged to take their husbands' surnames with the amendments made in the Türk Medeni Kanunu, the men in the interview group were asked what they think about whether women should take their husbands' surnames or not. It is possible to categorise the answers under four headings: "they should take it", "they may not", "not taking it would cause confusion" and "if there is an alternative, it should be put forward and discussed".

These four headings indicate that men have different opinions on the issue of women's surnames and that masculinity cannot be categorised as a homogenous group. Gender regimes, which are valid for almost every society, are constructed by social structures and institutions. Each man produces a different gender identity and there are conflicting, competing and contradictory models of masculinity in every society. Masculinities in a society are positioned in a plural and dissimilar wide range (Özbay, 2013, p. 186). However, in this study, although the male interviewees presented different views on women's surnames, none of them claimed that it is wrong for women to take their husbands' surnames in terms

of the integrity of the family and the continuity of society. Almost all of the male interviewees seem to agree that it is a better decision for women to take their husbands' surnames, although a few of the interviewees acknowledge that there may be problematic aspects for women. The most comprehensive group consists of 14 interviewees who think that it is necessary for women to take their husbands' surnames. Some of the statements of these interviewees are as follows:

“This is a patriarchal society. Whether you like it or not, women in these lands take the surnames of men. This is the established order here. If there was a matriarchal society, women's surnames would have continued. Nowadays some women use two surnames. Do you think it's appropriate? I think it means I'm competing with my husband. There will be no peace in that house. Someone will be one step ahead. In these lands, it is the man who is ahead. It's as simple as that.” P(18)

“A woman should take her husband's surname. It is necessary to accept some things. It has been like this for so many years. Now these are being discussed. Either you will take the woman's surname or the woman will take yours. In this country, there are not as many patterns as the fingers of one hand where a man takes his wife's surname. This is how the organisation is set up.” P(13)

It is noteworthy that male participants who advocate that women should take their husbands' surnames generally emphasise that women have taken men's surnames until today due to the patriarchal structure and that this is a social acceptance. During the interviews, the interviewees who expressed their opinions in this direction generally emphasised that the existing order should be maintained. They pointed out that the opposite situation is contrary to what they have learnt throughout their lives, that past generations ensured the social order by fulfilling their own duties, and that their duty is to ensure the continuity of this order:

“My mother took my father's surname. My aunts took the surnames of my brothers-in-law. My two older sisters also took it. They get along very well. They have almost no problems. There are small things in every house, there are things of that kind. Nothing important. Three women in our flat didn't take it either, so they had two surnames. I can't call it a coincidence, two of them are divorced and one is about to get divorced. You shouldn't act against the nature of things, brother. My wife never even questioned it. We get along very well. Do not disturb the nature of things, do not confuse them. Let me advise you.” P(15)

Interviewee no. 15 expressed the view that masculinity and male power are innate and natural as "do not disturb the nature of things". Giazitzoglu argues that "men are not hegemonic by birth", but become hegemonic by referring to masculinity codes within certain social actions (2020, p. 69). In other words, the theory of hegemonic masculinity argues that even the assertion that the structured gender order is "natural and naturalistic" is itself a product of social actions and patriarchal interactions.

Another group of interviewees emphasised that it is important for women to take their husbands' surnames in order to maintain social order. In order to reveal the opinions of the interviewees in this group, the statements of some of the interviewees are given below:

“Of course she must take it. Why shouldn't a woman take her husband's surname? Not taking it means disorganisation. As they say, who is who's wife, who is who's husband. Who is the wife of whom, who is the husband of whom, the children are a different model. What will happen to the children's surname if the woman doesn't take her husband's surname? I ask you, tell me? There is no need for chaos.” P(2)

“Let me tell you something. The source of the chaos in the country starts in the family. Everyone tries to be the head there. Is that right? Everywhere there is a manager, there are assistant managers. If everyone walks around saying they are a manager, will it ever work? When there is no order and hierarchy at home, this is reflected in the life outside. I don't think you should ask these questions and confuse people. Women will take their husbands' surnames. That's how we saw it. This would never have occurred to my mother. It comes to the minds of today's women. First, did I take your surname or not? Then, was I oppressed or not? Stop questioning them.” P(6)

When the statements of the interviewees are analysed, it is noteworthy that they think that there is a close relationship between the continuation of the social order and women taking the surname of the man. The statements of interviewee 18: "This is the established order here"; interviewee 15: "It is against the nature of things"; interviewee 2: "There is no need for chaos for no reason"; interviewee 6: "Stop questioning these things" show that they think that the existing order is accepted as natural and should be maintained.

During the interviews, the opinions of individuals with a relatively low level of education and those who are older than the other interviewees stand out. These interviewees approached the idea that a different order is possible or opposition to the existing social order with surprise and anger. It was noteworthy that they did not believe that the construction of another social order was possible. It is understood from their expressions that from the first moments they became aware of their own selves, women believed that the social order would be threatened if they did not take their husbands' surnames for reasons such as the fact that they had lived in the existing order and had no stimulus or education that required them to question.

There are only two interviewees in the interview group who stated that women may not take their husbands' surnames when they get married.

"I don't care if my wife takes my surname or not. She shouldn't even take it. Why should she take my surname? No one can or should force my daughter to give up her surname." P(11)

"I don't care about that. Do I take her surname? No, I don't. Then I won't tell her to take mine. If she wants to take it, she can do as she pleases. Whether she takes it or not is her problem. But my child will take my surname. That's different." P(16)

Interviewee no. 11's statement is different from the views that women not taking their surnames would disrupt the social order. The interviewee approaches the obligation for women to take the surname differently from the others. As a man, he does not see himself as a decision-maker on whether women should take their surname or not. Interviewee no. 16 similarly states that it is not his decision whether his wife should take his own surname or not, and that his wife will decide on this issue. However, this interviewee sees it as an obligation for their child to take his own surname. Although interviewee no. 16 leaves this decision to his wife, his attitude towards their child's surname is a symptom of hegemonic masculinity.

It is noteworthy that these interviewees emphasised that their husbands can make their own decisions and that they believe it is wrong to attribute a different meaning to them if they do not. During the interviews, it was noteworthy that while they left their husbands free to take their own surnames, they were determined that their children should take their own surnames. It was noticed that some of the male interviewees who said that they did not attach much importance to women taking the surnames of their husbands had problems arising from the lack of clarity in their ideas about how to show the integrity of the family in a formal way and how to maintain the lineage of their children. From this point of view, it is seen that they believe that if their wives do not take their surnames after marriage, different arrangements can be introduced to show that they are a family in a formal way. Some of the statements in this direction are given below:

"My spouse does not have to take my surname. This is OK. There is no problem at this point. But we went somewhere, for example, we do not have a common surname. How will it be now? Whose surname will the children take? One of my surname and one of his surname? Should we travel with the identity card in our hands?" P(17)

"My mate left his wife. She took her father's surname. The law now allows it. The woman tried to change the child's surname because the mother had custody. You're in trouble. There's no end to it. Today the woman won't take your surname. Tomorrow the child won't. Should we walk around with a DNA test to say that I am the father of this child? If the state finds a concrete solution, it will be okay, if not, this will be discussed a lot more. I don't have that concrete idea. If there is any, tell us and we will discuss it." P(12)

“Today the woman doesn't take her surname. Tomorrow the child won't take it. And we walk around saying we're men. I don't care about anyone's surname, but it must somehow be clear that we are a family. I don't know how it will be.” P(25)

Interviewee no. 25's statement "we walk around saying we are men too" appears as a manifestation of the fear of falling into "subordinated masculinity". The interviewee both defends the continuation of the family order in a way that supports Parsons and also fears losing his hegemonic masculinity. From the perspective of interviewee no. 25, the widespread freedom of women to use their own surname threatens the social order.

While a group of male interviewees emphasised the need for different arrangements to ensure family integrity, they stated that they had no idea what these arrangements could be. During the interviews, it was noteworthy that even though they stated that they did not insist that their wives take their own surnames, they showed that such a situation upset them as men, albeit in different ways. The following statement of the male interviewee no. 7 reveals this resentment more clearly:

“My grandfather, God rest his soul, used to say that a man will be a man. A man should know his own manliness first and then let others know it. I divorced my wife after 7 years. When I got married, she said she would use two surnames and I said OK. The compromise never ends. It's too early for democracy. If I had shaken my fist, my marriage would have lasted, my wife and child would have been with me.” P(7)

Interviewee no. 7's statements can be interpreted at different levels of meaning. The expression "My grandfather would say that a man will become a man" points to internalisation in the sense of Parsons' approach. According to this approach, the family appears as a special institution of society. The family is both a small group and a functional part of the socialisation process of young people. The structural requirements of the social order ensure that "gender roles are stereotyped and reproduced from generation to generation" (Carrigan et al., 1985, p. 555). The statement of the same interviewee "If I had shaken my fist, my marriage would have lasted, my wife and child would have been with me" evokes the concept of "foregrounded woman" used by Connell while explaining the concept of hegemonic masculinity. Connell (2016, pp. 268-269) explains the concept of foregrounded femininity as "submission to subordination" in the social order where women are subordinated. Interviewee no. 7's statement also confirms this. According to this statement, it is possible for a woman to maintain her marriage if she maintains her submission behaviour in situations where hegemonic masculinity is dominant.

The term "foregrounded woman" refers to different forms of femininity. Connell (2016, p. 188) considers Marilyn Monroe as "both the archetype and the greatest satire of femininity" in the spectrum of foregrounded femininity. Parsons (1942, p. 610) describes women's attractiveness as "a stabilising force in the competition between the sexes". Women's attractiveness and the attention they pay to their clothing do not pose a threat to the status and prestige of men who are more careless in this regard. According to Parsons, this situation is meaningful for the continuity of gender roles and social order. While Parsons (1942) argues that the role of women is exactly as it should be in terms of social order as a balancing element, Connell argues that gender roles are a social construct.

4.3. The Significance of Wives Taking Their Husbands' Surnames

It is important to know what is the response of men to their wives' (women's) decision to take their (men's) surnames in their worlds in order to maintain the process in a healthy way. The men in the interview group were asked how they felt in case their wives did not want to take their surnames and what was behind this feeling. It was possible to categorise the responses into three groups: "those who said that it was not important for them", "those who said that they felt inadequate" and "those who said that they had difficulty in telling their families".

Interviewee number 21, one of the men who said that it was not very important for them whether their wives took their surnames or not: "It is not very important for me, but when everyone else's wife takes their surname and yours does not, you question this situation. It was like that for me. It doesn't matter if she doesn't get it, but why didn't mine get it?". Similarly, interviewee no. 7 stated the following: "It was not important for me when I got married, but I realised that it was important when I got divorced. I think

it also brings respect to the man. Can you say that there should be respect for men? There should be respect for both men and women. This was disrespect for men. It was not then, it is now." As the statements of these participants reveal, although they say that it is not important for them, the fact that they emphasise that the way they behave against the accepted customs in the society disturbs them suggests that they want their husbands to take their surnames.

Interviewee 21's statements point to the ever-changing nature of hegemony among men. The interviewee's statement "when everyone else's wife takes it and yours does not, it makes you question this situation" seems to be a verbalisation of the hegemonic competition with other men, either overtly or covertly. In this statement, it is possible to catch traces of the masculinity codes that men are expected to conform to. While the men whose wives (women) take their own surname display their masculinity codes, the men in the group whose wives do not take their own surname feel the anxiety of being excluded from this field.

As Hearn (2004, p. 52) puts it, "much of men's power is still taken for granted...consent has a place in theorising men's power in patriarchal systems". Hegemonic masculinity cannot be conceived without the concept of "consent". The concept of hegemonic masculinity claims that male domination is not something that is achieved by force, but a form of hegemony that "infiltrates the organisation of cultural processes". There is no such thing as "absolute cultural domination". The balance of power within hegemonic masculinities can change at any moment (Connell, 2016, p. 269).

There were 5 participants in the interview group who stated that they would feel inadequate if their wives did not take their surnames:

"Of course my wife took my surname. In my opinion, it would not be right not to take it, but why not? I cannot understand that. Why not? If there is a deficiency in me or if she does not like me, my lineage, she should not have been married me. Am I wrong?"

"Am I an insecure person? What's wrong with me that my wife will tell me not to take his surname? That's not possible. Maybe if she becomes very rich (laughs). No, no, not even then. I am not low. I don't want to." P(5)

The statements of the interviewees clearly reveal that women attach importance to men taking their surnames and that they would feel inadequate as men if they did not. During the interviews, it was noteworthy that the interviewees in this group were older and had relatively lower levels of education. It was noteworthy that when they were forced to act outside the acceptance of the society, i.e. when their wives did not want to take their surnames, they reacted because they thought that there was a deficiency in themselves.

Although they could not reveal it clearly during the interviews, it was observed that men revealed that they felt the pressure of their parents and the society on them, albeit with different expressions. Interviewee number 3:

"Am I going to tell my family that my wife does not want to take our surname that shows our lineage? Even this is very difficult. Neither I nor my family will accept a woman who is ashamed of my lineage or who says she will use her father's surname." P(3)

"I cannot take someone who does not wear my surname with pride to my family. The family surname means that we have the right to carry on the lineage through the male. It is also in the law, isn't it? My child will take my surname, my wife will not. Mothers would never accept this. My mum says her surname with pride. Can I tell her that you have it and my wife doesn't? These are contradictions. There is no need for unrest. I think it is not very related to education. It is related to the education you receive from your family." P(14)

In order to achieve hegemonic masculinity in Turkey, characteristics such as circumcision, completing military service, heterosexuality, having a full-time job and, if possible, having a son are required. Men are not born with dominant patriarchal norms and undergo a process of social construction (Avşar, 2017, p. 230).

The interviewees in this group perceive the fact that their spouses do not want to take their family surnames or that their spouses only want to use their own family surnames as not liking and not accepting

their families and surnames. During the interviews, it was understood that the reason behind these perceptions was their fear of the reactions of family elders. Men whose wives (women) do not want to take their surnames can understand the reasons/reasons for this situation. However, they fear that if the women in their relatives and neighbourhood take their wives' surnames, they will face reactions from these groups.

4.4. Gender Inequality in Surname Practices

It is often discussed whether it is gender inequality to expect women to take men's surnames while men do not take women's surnames. When the same question was asked to the men in the interview group, it was determined that 21 interviewees did not consider this situation as gender inequality, while 4 interviewees perceived it as gender inequality. Although the statements were in this way, it was noticed that they emphasised that it might be good to adapt to what is common in society for different reasons. The statements of some of the interviewees who stated that they did not perceive the discussions on surnames as gender inequality are as follows:

“No, I don't think it's necessary to say everything as inequality. I don't think it's inequality, I think it's the fact that the order is set up like this.” P(9)

“Inequality should not be cut off by saying inequality. Life is not that sharp. The family surname continues from the man in our country. It will continue on one side. As far as I know, there is no other form. Even if there is, it is not common. This is how society has found a solution. We should not think of this as equality or inequality. I do not see it as inequality. The more you question these, the more complicated things get.” P(20)

“Let's not call it equality or inequality, let's call it the division of labour between spouses, reconciliation. There are men who take their wife's surname. They are few, but they exist. Should we say that inequality is applied to men in these cases too? Such agreements happen within the family. Society has established such an order, it should not be broken. When men's surnames are used, it is as if men have a say in the household (laughs). This is a symbol. We should not make a big deal out of it. When women take their husbands' surnames, they do not have a say.” P(17)

“I don't think it's inequality, but maybe women are asked to sacrifice as they have always done.” P(22)

As can be understood from the statements, it is noteworthy that women do not consider women taking their husbands' surnames and using them immediately after their maiden names as social gender inequality and the surname issue is accepted as a part of maintaining the social order. Due to the internalisation of hegemonic masculinity, women taking their wives' surnames seems to be perceived by the men in the interview group as the continuation of the social order.

4 interviewees considered it as gender inequality for men to take their wives' surnames. However, it is understood from the following statements that they think that inequality can be accepted on the grounds that it protects social structure and values:

“Yes, it is gender inequality as it is called in the literature, but when I was saying the expression, I realised how harsh it was. This is something that is done to be a family. Either the woman or the man will take the other's surname. Is that right? That's right. Because of the patriarchal structure in these lands, if this is a sacrifice, it is expected from the woman. But it shouldn't be called a sacrifice. Women have also accepted this order. We all accepted it, both men and women. I don't know, I was uncomfortable with the expression of inequality, but as I said, this is the name in the literature.” P(11)

“Gender inequality, yes, gender inequality. It is, but this is one of the symbols of the patriarchal structure. I can't suggest a more egalitarian structure either. I work on these issues, but I can't bring myself to say inequality. We were raised internalising the patriarchal structure. That's probably why I know inequality, but I don't want to say exactly that.” P(7)

The male interviewees in this group define the issue of women's surnames as gender inequality. However, even if this is the case, it seems that the internalisation of the patriarchal structure in the

socialisation process has a share in the legitimisation of women's practice of taking their husbands' surnames.

5. CONCLUSION

How all these changes are reflected in the world of men is the subject of this study. Based on the statements of the men interviewed, the fact that the patriarchal system still makes itself felt today comes to the fore. With the influence of gender roles and the role models they have learnt, it is understood that they attach importance to women taking their wives' surnames and consider this as a guarantee of family unity. It is noteworthy that some interviewees attach importance to giving their own surname to their children rather than having the same surname with their wives. It is understood that they perceive this situation as fulfilling the duty of maintaining their own family ties. In parallel with the changes in the world, women do not consider the change of their surnames as equality. Instead, it is very thought-provoking that they advocate that this system should continue until a system that satisfies/convinces them is introduced.

This tendency to maintain their own genealogical ties and practise gender roles proves that Parsons' 'role theory' mentioned in the previous sections continues to exist today. Parsons, who assigned roles to the genders within the family in his theory, considered this as a continuation of both the family unity and the social system (1942). One of the most important details we come across throughout the study is that almost every interviewee accepts these roles within the family without any doubt. The interviewees seem to accept the responsibilities that their roles as husband/father impose on them.

Connell (2016), who offers a critical interpretation of Parsons and develops an argument against the necessity of internalising gender roles, argues that there cannot be a fixed definition of masculinity and therefore a fixed role. The expectation of a fixed role within the family carries the risk of perpetuating already existing structural inequalities. The statements of the interviewees, who accept that it is unquestionable for their wives (women) to take their (men's) surnames, shade structural inequalities in line with Connell's theory.

The effort to maintain social norms and values legitimises this issue by claiming that it is "by nature" for women to take their husbands' surnames. On the other hand, sociological thought reminds us of the importance of addressing this issue from a woman's perspective. When we take the surname issue beyond the debates on the preservation of social values, we are confronted with different dimensions of this issue. This situation also has the potential to lead to gender inequality for women. Connell's definition of hegemonic masculinity has helped to understand the hidden experiences of women in the surname issue through the eyes of men. Men's perspectives and approaches are orientated towards maintaining the genealogical bond. However, it also determines their position within the group of other men. If their wives (women) do not take their own surnames, this situation carries the risk of weakening their masculinity. In this sense, women taking men's surnames helps men's social position to become more prominent.

This social dilemma is the main issue we are trying to discuss in this article. This study conducted with male interviewees shows that the internalisation of gender roles continues today. According to the interviewees, gender roles are a guarantee for preserving social norms and values, and for maintaining the bond of descent and family unity. According to the interviewees, the fact that women take their husbands' surnames does not refer to a compromise on their own self/identity; on the contrary, this situation is seen as one of the basic responsibilities of women in the family.

Studies on gender inequality are gaining importance day by day. The main problem emphasised by the studies on women's change of surname related to the marriage contract is the legal dimension of the surname and discrimination based on gender inequality. In this context, previous studies have also been utilised, and it has been argued that studies in this direction should be accelerated by accepting that any contribution that may form the basis of inequality is undeniable. Similarly, this research is expected to contribute to new research to be conducted in this direction.

REFERENCES

- Aksakal, İ. (2020). Evli kadında soyadı sorunu ve kimlik kaybı üzerine bir değerlendirme. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 16(30), 2883-2910.

- Avşar, S. (2017). Toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri bağlamında tarihsel rollerini yitiren erkekliğin çöküşü: Küllerinden “yeni erkek”liğin doğuşu. *KADEM Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(2), 224-241. <https://doi.org/10.21798/kadem.2018236599>
- Carrigan, T., Connell, B., & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society*, 14(5), 551-604.
- Connell, R. W. (1979). The concept of role and what to do with it. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 15(3), 7-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/144078337901500302>
- . (2016). *Toplumsal cinsiyet ve iktidar* (Trans. C. Soydemir). Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- . (2019). *Erkeklikler* (Trans. N. Konukçu). Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Efedayıoğlu, K. K. (2020). Evli kadının soyadı problemi. *Ankara Barosu Dergisi*, 77(4), 1-36. <https://doi.org/10.30915/abd.700001>
- Giazitzoglu, A. (2020). This sporting life: The intersection of hegemonic masculinities, space and emotions among rugby players. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 27(1), 67-81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12367>
- Gilmore, D. D. (1991). *Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity*. Yale University Press.
- Gutmann, M. C. (1997). Trafficking in men: The anthropology of masculinity. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 26, 385-409.
- Havutçu, A., & Kalkancı, Y. (2020). Anayasa Mahkemesi bireysel başvuru kararları ışığında kadının soyadı. *İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2), 135-180.
- Hearn, J. (1996). Is masculinity dead? A critique of the concept masculinity/masculinities. In M. M. Ghail (Ed.), *Understanding masculinities: Social relations and cultural arenas* (pp. 202-217). Open University Press.
- Hopkins, P., & Giazitzoglu, A. (2024). Hegemonic masculinity: New spaces, practices, and relations. *Progress in Human Geography*, 49(1), 84-98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325241307387>
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (2019a). *Hegemonik erkeklik: Formülasyon, yeniden formülasyon ve genişleme* (Trans. Eleştirel Erkeklik İncelemeleri İnisiyatifi). Özyeğin Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (2019b). The salience of “hegemonic masculinity.” *Men and Masculinities*, 22(1), 85-91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X18805555>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis*. Sage.
- Moroğlu, N. (2012). Kadının kimlik sorunu “kadının soyadı.” *Türkiye Barolar Birliği Dergisi*, 99, 245-268.
- Mortaş, S. (2016). Evlenen kadın ile velayeti kadına bırakılan çocuğun soyadının belirlenmesinde “kocanın soyadı” parametresi. *Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(2), 311-370.
- Nayak, A. (2023). Decolonizing care: Hegemonic masculinity, caring masculinities, and the material configurations of care. *Men and Masculinities*, 26(2), 167-187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X231166900>
- Özbay, C. (2013). Türkiye’de hegemonik erkekliği aramak. *Doğu Batı Dergisi*, 63, 185-204.
- Özbay, C., & Balıç, İ. (2004). Erkekliğin ev halleri. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 101, 89-114.
- Parsons, T. (1942). Age and sex in the social structure of the United States. *American Sociological Review*, 7(5), 604-616.
- Parsons, T. (1948). The position of sociological theory. *American Sociological Review*, 13(2), 156-171.
- Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. (1955). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. Free Press.

- Peal, E. (1975). “Normal” sex roles: An historical analysis. *Family Process*, 14(3), 389-409.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.1975.00389.x>
- Secord, P. F. (1982). The origin and maintenance of social roles: The case of sex roles. In W. Ickes & E. S. Knowles (Eds.), *Personality, roles, and social behavior* (pp. 33-53). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-9469-3_2

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

Changing Surname Upon Marriage from The Male Perspective

Erkeklerin Bakış Açısından Evlilik Sonrası Soyadı Değişimi

Dolunay ŞENOL  & Burcu KÖMÜRCÜ 

DOI : [10.63556/ankad.v10i3.459](https://doi.org/10.63556/ankad.v10i3.459)

Geliş/Received: 01/03/2026

Kabul/Accepted: 05/06/2026

Genişletilmiş Özet

Giriş

Kadınların evlilik akdi ile eşlerinin soyadını alması, genellikle kadın odaklı bir bakış açısıyla incelenmiştir. Ancak soyadı meselesi çok katmanlı bir toplumsal meseleyi de beraberinde getirmektedir. Mevcut çalışmalar büyük ölçüde kimlik kaybı, yasal düzenlemeler ve bireysel haklara odaklanırken, bu konuya dair erkeklerin bakış açısına yönelik çalışmaların yetersizliği literatürdeki eksikliğe işaret etmektedir. Erkekler soyadı değişikliğinin doğrudan öznelere olmasa da tutumları ataerkil normlar tarafından şekillenmekte ve kadınların kararlarını ve deneyimlerini önemli ölçüde etkilemektedir. Bu çalışma, erkeklerin görüşlerini iki teorik eksen üzerinden tartışmaya açmaktadır: Parsons'ın "cinsiyet rolü teorisi" ve Connell'in "hegemonik erkeklik" kavramı. "Cinsiyet rolü teorisi" aile birliğini ve soyun devamını sağlamada sosyalleşmenin rolünü vurgularken, "hegemonik erkeklik" erkekler arasındaki hiyerarşik güç ilişkilerini ve ataerkil düzeni sürdürmede erkekliğin rolünü öne çıkarmaktadır. Nitel görüşmelere dayanan bu çalışma, erkeklerin daha geniş cinsiyet ilişkileri bağlamında kadınların soyadı uygulamalarını nasıl algıladıklarını yorumlamak için bu çerçeveleri analitik araçlar olarak kullanmaktadır. Ayrıca çalışma, soyadı uygulamalarının yalnızca hukuki bir düzenleme alanı olmadığı tezinden yola çıkıp, toplumsal cinsiyet ilişkilerinin yeniden üretildiği sembolik bir alanın işlerliğine de vurgu yapmaktadır. Bu bağlamda araştırma, gündelik yaşam pratikleri içerisinde erkeklik algılarının nasıl inşa edildiğini anlamaya katkı sunmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Yöntem

Bu çalışma, Ankara'da yaşayan evli/ boşanmış erkeklerin görüş ve deneyimlerini araştırmak için yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmelerden yararlanan nitel bir tasarım kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Nitel yaklaşım, değişkenleri nicel olarak ölçmekten ziyade katılımcıların algı ve yorumlarını derinlemesine anlamak amacıyla tercih edilmiştir. Çalışma, erkeklerin soyadı meselesini sosyal ve kültürel bağlamları içinde nasıl algıladıklarını araştıran keşifsel ve yorumlayıcı niteliktedir. Yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler, katılımcıların görüşlerini kendi sözleriyle ifade etmelerine olanak tanıyarak araştırmacının ortaya çıkan temaları derinlemesine araştırmasına da imkân sağlamıştır. Çalışmanın konusu, kapsamı, sınırlılıkları; yaş, eğitim, medeni durum ve çocuk sayısı gibi demografik özellikler dikkate alınarak veri toplanmadan önce belirlenmiştir. Araştırmanın örneklemini, Ankara ilinde ikamet eden evli ve boşanmış erkeklerden oluşmaktadır. Farklı deneyimleri anlamak için amaçlı örnekleme kullanılmıştır. Katılımcıların tamamı en az beş yıllık evlilik deneyimine sahiptir. Yaklaşık 40 kişi görüşmeye çağrılmış ve 25'i görüşmeyi kabul etmiştir. Bazı katılımcılar, zaman kısıtlılığı veya konuya ilişkin görüş bildirmeye isteksiz olmaları nedeniyle araştırmaya katılmayı reddetmiştir. Görüşmeler, veri doygunluğuna ulaşılan kadar devam etmiştir. Katılımcılardan 23'ü evli, 2'si boşanmış; evli katılımcıların 3'ü ise ikinci evliliklerini sürdürmektedir. Yaşları 33 ila 70 arasında değişmektedir (M = 49,52). Ayrıntılı demografik bilgiler Tablo 1'de sunulmuştur. Veri toplanmadan önce etik kurul onayı

alınmıştır. Görüşmeler yarı yapılandırılmış bir form kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiş ve görüşme 20 ila 45 dakika arasında sürmüştür. Sorular, anlaşılır ve açık bir biçimde hazırlanmış; katılımcıların soruları doğru şekilde kavrayabilmelerini sağlamak amacıyla gerektiğinde yeniden ifade edilmiştir.

Bulgular

Bu çalışma, erkeklerin Medeni Kanunun 187. Maddesinde yer alan soyadı kanununu nasıl algıladıklarını ve soyadlarına atfettikleri anlamları araştırmaktadır. Görüşme yanıtları, soyadına ilişkin iki temel temayı açığa çıkarmıştır: “aile adı” ve “soybağını sürdürme”. Birçok katılımcı, soyadını belirli bir aileye ait olmanın bir göstergesi ve aileleri birbirinden ayırt edici bir unsur olarak tanımlamıştır. Tekrarlanan anlatımlar, ailenin ortak bir soyadını paylaştığını ve kadınların evlilik yoluyla bu ailenin bir parçası haline geldiğini vurgulamaktadır. Diğerleri ise soyadını öncelikle, erkek soyu olarak anlaşılan bir soy göstergesi olarak görmekte ve bu durum erkekleri aile statüsünün ve sürekliliğinin merkezine yerleştiren ataerkil normların içselleştirilmesini yansıtmaktadır. Erkeklerin, kadınların soyadı değişikliği konusundaki görüşleri dört kategoriye ayrılmıştır: “kadınlar eşlerinin soyadını almalıdır”, “almamayı tercih edebilirler”, “soyadını almamaları karışıklığa yol açar” ve “alternatif düzenlemeler tartışılmalı”dır. Görüşler farklılık gösterse de, katılımcıların çoğu aile birliğini ve sosyal düzeni korumak için eşin soyadını almanın gerekli olduğunu düşünmektedir. Argümanlar genellikle gelenek, sosyal kabul ve mevcut düzenin korunması gerekliliğini öne sürmektedir. Katılımcıların küçük bir kısmı, soyadı seçiminde kadınların kendi kararını desteklemekte ancak bu katılımcılar çocukların babanın soyadını alması gerektiğini vurgulayarak, ataerkil varsayımları ortaya koymaktadır. Soyadını almama kararına yönelik duygusal tepkiler arasında yetersizlik duygusu, toplumsal tepkilerle ilgili endişe ve durumu aile üyelerine açıklama noktasında yaşanan zorluk yer almaktadır. Birçok katılımcı bu uygulamayı cinsiyet eşitsizliği olarak algılamamakta bunun yerine sosyal istikrar için gerekli görmektedir. Genel olarak, bulgular soyadı uygulamalarının ataerkil aile yapıları, erkeklik kimliği ve sosyal düzenin algılanan sürekliliği ile yakından bağlantılı olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu durum hem cinsiyet rolü beklentilerini hem de erkekliğin hiyerarşik yönlerini yansıtmaktadır.

Sonuç

Bu çalışma, soyadı pratiklerindeki güncel dönüşümlerin erkekler tarafından nasıl anlamlandırıldığını incelemiş ve ataerkil normların, erkeklerin algılarına etki ettiğini ortaya koymaya çalışmıştır. Katılımcıların çoğu, kadınların eşlerinin soyadını almasını aile birliğini, soyu ve sosyal düzeni korumak için gerekli görmüştür. Babanın soyadının çocuklara aktarılması genellikle birincil sorumluluk olarak görülmüştür. Bu durum Parsons’ın “rol teorisi” ile tutarlı, içselleştirilmiş cinsiyet rollerini yansıtmaktadır. Aynı zamanda, Connell’in “hegemonik erkeklik” kavramı, bu beklentilerin yapısal eşitsizlikleri nasıl yeniden ürettiğini ve erkek hiyerarşileri içindeki erkeklerin konumlarını nasıl sürdürdüğünü açıklamaya yardımcı olmaktadır. Katılımcılar genellikle kadının erkeğin soyadını almasını cinsiyet eşitsizliği sorunu olarak yorumlamamış, bunun yerine bu uygulamayı doğal veya gerekli olarak nitelendirmişlerdir. Ancak kadınlar bu normları reddettiğinde, toplumsal yargı ve erkeklik statüsünün kaybı konusunda endişeler ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu bulgular, soyadı uygulamalarının sadece aile kimliğinin belirleyicisi olarak değil, aynı zamanda ataerkil ilişkileri pekiştiren mekanizmalar olarak da işlev gördüğünü göstermektedir. Kadınların soyadı değişiminin yerleşmiş geleneksel beklentilere nasıl entegre olacağını ya da nasıl bu beklentilerden kopup yeni bir pratiğe dönüşeceğini anlamak için daha fazla çalışmaya ihtiyaç vardır.