

İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS
CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

MARITAL FUNCTIONING AND PARENTING IN EXTENDED FAMILY
LIVING ARRANGEMENTS: A QUALITATIVE STUDY IN FAMILY
BUILDINGS

Merve ADLI İŞLEYEN

117647005

Assist. Prof. Dr. Anıl Özge ÜSTÜNEL

İSTANBUL

2020

Marital Functioning and Parenting in Extended Family Living Arrangements: A
Qualitative Study in Family Buildings

Aile Apartmanında Yaşayan Çiftlerin Evlilik İlişkisi ve Ebeveynlik Deneyimleri:
Nitel Bir Çalışma

Merve ADLI İŞLEYEN

117647005

Thesis Advisor: Anıl Özge Üstünel, Faculty Member, PhD

İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

Jury Member: Yudum Söylemez, Faculty Member, PhD

İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

Jury Member: Yeşim Keskin, Faculty Member, PhD

University of La Verne

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih : 23.06.2020

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 147

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

1) Aile Apartmanı

2) Geniş Aile

3) Çift ilişkisi,

4) Ebeveynlik

5) Türk Ailesi

Keywords (English)

1) Family Buildings

2) Extended Family

3) Couple Relationship

4) Parenting

5) Turkish Family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis advisor Asst. Prof. Anıl Özge Üstünel. I am grateful for her feedbacks and guidance throughout the process. Her support was priceless and her perspective was eye-opening in each of our meetings. I learned a lot from her and her contribution helped me excessively to create this thesis.

I would like to thank Asst. Prof. Yudum Söylemez, for her teachings and reframing skills throughout my master's studies. Her unlimited energy and her ability to find growth and resilience in everything have inspired me all along. Her perspective influenced both my therapist identity as well as my personal attitude toward life. Also I would like to thank Yeşim Keskin for accepting to be my third advisor and her guidance.

I am thankful to many friends who believed in me. Although they were spread across the world, I felt their presence and guidance in times of a pep-talk. Many thanks to, İrem and İbrahim, despite the long distance they have been great friends and source of inspirations. They opened the doors of their home and created also one for me there. Special thanks to Irmak Gültekin, who was a companion even before this thesis process. She nourished me both professionally and emotionally. She encouraged me in times of desperation and made me feel accompanied even in such a solitary journey. I am very lucky to have her as a friend and hope to be able keep her for years to come. I would like to thank Sumru Duraner for her friendship, which is started long before in a school shuttle by the power of shared dislike towards the same things and continued in the Bilgi University. Her support, humor, and countless intimate chats were big help during this process. To be able to laugh, feel grief, and struggle through being a clinician with you has been a great chance and I am glad to have you by my side. I hope we can realize our dream "Kırk Katır Kırk Satır Danışmanlık"!

I would like to thank my family, who have always looked after me and literally fed me through this process. Even though they both advised me to relax

and at the same time said “have you finished it yet?”, I always knew that they wanted the best for me. Their harmony and alliance despite such complicated family systems have inspired me to become a couple and family therapist and encouraged me to have systemic glasses...

I am grateful for my husband, my quarantine company, who was always understanding and encouraging. I couldn't get through this process without him, whose support and presence I felt constantly. I would like to thank him for accepting the rage, the depression, and the mania. He contained my anxiety, practiced numerous mirroring, and reframing despite the “engineer brain” of his. Many thanks to him, for waiting up for me. This is not the first time and I am sure it's not the last one.

I am very grateful for the opportunity and teachings of this master's program and the people in it.. Besides from that, many great friends...Many thanks to Ezgi, Selin, Nilüfer and Berivan of whom I felt continuous encouragement.

Notwithstanding the support I have received, this process was a very solitary road. Through these years I have experienced a lot difficulty as well as the blessing! I learned to find the resilience in me, which could get me through this process.

Thank you all!

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENT.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
ABSTRACT.....	ix
ÖZET.....	x
CHAPTER 1.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2. CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF CULTURE AND FAMILY FORMS.....	1
1.2.1. Cultural Perspectives on Autonomy and Relatedness in Families.....	4
1.2.2. Relationships with Extended Families.....	8
1.3. FAMILIES IN THE TURKISH CONTEXT.....	10
1.3.1. The structure and composition of the Turkish Family.....	10
1.3.2. Relationships in the Turkish Family.....	12
1.3.2.1. Closeness and Relatedness in Turkish Families.....	12
1.3.2.2. Hierarchy and Boundaries in Turkish Families.....	15
1.3.3. Couple Relationships in Turkey.....	17
1.3.4. Parenting.....	21
1.4 FAMILY BUILDINGS.....	23
1.4.1. The Present Study.....	26
CHAPTER 2.....	28
METHOD.....	28
2.1. DATA COLLECTION.....	28
2.2. PARTICIPANTS.....	29
2.3. DATA ANALYSIS.....	31
2.4. RESEARCHER'S PERSPECTIVE.....	32

CHAPTER 3	35
RESULTS	35
3.1. FB AS A NETWORK OF SUPPORT AND SAFETY	36
3.1.1. Support for Children and Their Safety	36
3.1.1.1. Child Education and Guidance.....	36
3.1.1.2. Safe and Trusted Child Care	38
3.1.2. Reciprocal Caretaking	42
3.1.2.1. Practical Care	43
3.1.2.2. Financial Care	45
3.1.2.3. Emotional Care.....	46
3.2. ROLES AND RULES OF CONDUCT IN FB	49
3.2.1. Roles and Rules of Conduct for Women.....	51
3.2.1.1. Being a wife and a daughter-in law.....	51
3.2.1.2. Relationship Among Women.....	54
3.2.1.2.1. Relationship between Mother in-Law and Daughter-in-Law.....	55
3.2.1.2.2. Relationship among Sister-in-Laws	57
3.2.2. Rules of conduct for men	58
3.2.2.1. Men as Mediators.....	58
3.2.2.2. Conformity to Masculine Norms	60
3.2.2. Social Codes about the Expression of Couple Intimacy	61
3.3. INTERFERENCE IN THE FB	64
3.3.1. Interference in Parenting	64
3.3.1.1 Interference in Child Discipline	65
3.3.1.1. Interference in Child Care.....	66
3.3.2. Interference in Social Life	67
3.3.2.1. Social life in the Family Building.....	68
3.3.2.2. Social Life Outside of the Family Building	69
3.3.3. Interference in Couple Relationship.....	72
3.3.4. Interference in the Home Setting.....	75
3.4. BOUNDARY NEGOTIATIONS IN THE FB	79
3.4.1. Compliance to the FB Expectations and Interferences.....	80
3.4.2. Setting Boundaries to the FB Expectations and Interferences	87
3.4.2.1. Maneuvers and Non-Confrontational Methods.....	87
3.4.2.2. Confrontational Boundary Setting	92
3.4.3. FB members' Response.....	96
3.4.3.1. Understanding the Participants	97

3.4.3.2. Insisting on their Own Position.....	99
CHAPTER 4	101
DISCUSSION.....	101
4.1. RELATEDNESS AND SUPPORT IN THE FB	102
4.2. DIFFERENT PRESENTATIONS OF AUTONOMY AND AGENCY	105
4.2.1. The Structure of the FB	106
4.2.2. Gender Roles in the Family Building.....	112
4.3. CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS.....	117
4.4. LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	122
4.5. CONCLUSION.....	124
REFERENCES	126
APPENDICES	140
APPENDIX A- Informed Consent Form.....	141
APPENDIX B- Demographic Information Sheet.....	143
APPENDIX C- Semi-Structured Interview Questions	145
APPENDIX D- Ethical Approval by the Ethics Committee	147

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: The Demographic Characteristics of the Participants30
Table 3.1: The Themes and The Sub-themes of the Research35



ABSTRACT

In this study, relational and parenting experiences of living in a family building (FB) is interrogated through the experiences of couples. Seven married couples who had at least one child and have been living in family buildings at least for a year were selected for the present study. The participants' mean age was 41, ranging from 30-46, and their average marriage length was 19, varying between 9 and 34. The semi-structured interviews, which took approximately an hour, were held at the participants' apartments and conducted individually with partners. The participants expressed their living experiences in the family building, its effect on their general life, couple relationship, parenting practices and their boundary negotiations. Thematic analysis was carried out and the analysis of the interviews revealed four main themes: FB as a Network of Support and Safety, Roles and Rules of Conduct in the FB, Interference in the FB and Boundary Negotiations in the FB. The overall results of this study demonstrated that the participants' experiences were shaped by the structure of the family building and gender, and that the participants exerted and manifested their agency according to the characteristics and the context of the FB. The results provided useful information for clinicians who work with clients, living in FBs or interdependent families. The findings are discussed in the context of the existing literature, and limitations and suggestions for further studies are presented.

Keywords: Family Building, Extended Family, Interdependent Model of Family, Turkish Family, Extended Family and Couple Relationship, Extended Family and Parenting Practices

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada aile apartmanında yaşamının romantik ilişki ve ebeveynlik üzerine etkisi, aile apartmanlarında yaşayan çiftlerin deneyimleri üzerinden incelenmiştir. Çalışma için 7 evli, en az bir çocuk sahibi ve en az bir yıldır eşlerden birinin ailesi ile aynı apartmanda yaşayan çiftlerin her biri ile görüşülmüştür. Çalışmaya katılan çiftlerin yaş ortalaması 41 olup 30 ve 46 arasında değişkenlik göstermekte; evlilik süreleri ortalama 19 yıl olup 9 ve 34 yıl arasında değişkenlik göstermektedir. Yaklaşık bir saat süren yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler katılımcıların her biri ile ayrı olmak üzere evlerinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Katılımcılar aile apartmanında yaşamının genel hayat deneyimlerine, çift ilişkilerine, ebeveynlik deneyimlerine ve sınır koyma biçimlerine etkilerini ifade etmişlerdir. Veri analizi tematik analiz yöntemiyle yapılmış, analiz sonucunda dört temel tema ortaya çıkmıştır. Bunlar Bir Destek ve Güvenlik Ağı Olarak Aile Apartmanları, Aile Apartmanında Roller ve Kurallar, Aile Apartmanında Müdahaleler, Aile Apartmanında Sınır Koyma Davranışları şeklinde isimlendirilmiştir. Çalışmanın verileri katılımcı deneyimlerinin aile apartmanının yapısına ve toplumsal cinsiyete göre değiştiğini, katılımcıların içinde buldukları yapıya ve bağlama uygun olarak özerklik ve otonomi sergileme davranışlarında bulduklarını göstermiştir. Araştırmanın sonuçları, aile apartmanında ya da birbirine bağlı aile modelinde yaşayan danışanlarla çalışan psikoterapistlere faydalı bilgiler sunmaktadır. Sonuçlar alan yazına göre tartışılmış, kısıtlamalar ve gelecek çalışmalar için öneriler sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Aile apartmanı, geniş aile, Türk ailesi, geleneksel aile, geniş aile ve çift ilişkisi, geniş aile ve ebeveynlik.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to investigate the living experiences of couples who reside in family buildings. The subject of analysis will be 14 participants, 7 couples, 2 of them live in the family building with the wife's side, 5 with the husband's side. Specifically, how family building context influences the relational and parenting experiences of the couples will be examined through semi-structured in-depth interviews. The couple relationship, the parenting practices, the rules of conduct and domains of interferences in the FB are explored. The data provides information about the dominant family model of the FB, the perceived advantages and disadvantages of the FB, the nature of the boundary negotiations of the participants.

This study aims to examine a significant form of Turkish family organization, that is family buildings and to provide helpful findings to be used by the clinicians and couple and family therapists who work populations living in family buildings or psychologically interdependent families

1.2. CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF CULTURE AND FAMILY FORMS

Culture refers to the set of values, beliefs, norms and behaviors which are determined by the membership in specific context or group (Gushue, 1993). Culture is not only visible characteristics such as language and clothing, but also provides a repertoire of behaviors and meanings (Krause, 2002). These cultural repertoires are highly influential in shaping the meaning, characteristics and structure of the family institution, the definition of self and the ideas on relationships with others (Krause, 2002; Thomas, 1998). According to the existing literature, cultural values, rules and practices affect its members' social behaviors and self-development (Göregenli, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991) communication styles and conflict management styles (Akyıl, 2011; Brew & Cairns, 2004; Jandt & Pedersen, 1996),

household configuration and the degrees of economic, psychological, and intergenerational interdependency in families (Yorburg, 1975).

Cultures and families are mostly categorized according to the disposition and the perception of two basic characteristics that are autonomy and relatedness. In the literature they are seen as basic human needs (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975) that are often constructed as conflicting concepts (Miller, 2002; Oishi, 2000). Autonomy refers to independence from others, whereas relatedness implies interdependence with others. Consequently, human developmental process and thereby cultures are grouped in terms of the tendency towards either side.

Generally, cultures are categorized according to their position in the individualism and collectivism spectrum. Individualistic societies are characterized with autonomous features such as agency and self-determination. In the literature, nuclear family households are generally associated with individualized cultures such as Western societies (Georges, 2003). Nuclear family is composed of two generations, consisting of father, mother and single children. Nuclear family forms are self-sufficient and financially independent, and in these families non-kin relationships hold a significant place for psychological needs such as emotional support and daily contact. Lastly, nuclear family is completely autonomous and not under the authority of kin-network (Yorburg, 1975; Georges, 2003).

On the other hand, collectivistic cultures are identified with the emphasis for relatedness and connection. In these cultures, particularly in pre-industrialized and agricultural areas, extended families are more common (Yorburg, 1975; Georges, 2003). Extended families are composed of at least three generations and include members such as grandparents and in-laws (Yıldırım & Canatan, 2013).. These families financially depend on each other for both the exchange of goods and occupations (Yıldırım & Canatan, 2013; Aytaç 1995). Moreover, all psychological needs are met within the family system; extended family functions as a source of support and security and non-kin relationships are discouraged. Lastly, there is notable patriarchal-intergenerational authority in these families (Yorburg, 1975).

Although the distinctions between different cultures and family forms are made in the literature, many researchers have highlighted the fact that cultures and families change in a dynamic manner. Several researchers anticipate an inevitable universal shift towards individualism and individualistic values, with the influence of modernization and urbanization, and argue that the dominant form of the family transforms into nuclear households across the globe (Parsons, 1949; Georgas, 2003). According to Parsons (1949) through industrialization, socioeconomic developments and increase in individuals' wealth and education, nuclear family becomes the dominant family structure and thereby society shifts to a more individualized life style where agency, freedom of speech and independency is embraced rather than sense of unity and collectivism (Inglehart & Oyserman, 2004).

Other researchers focus on the meanings of these changes and suggest that a dominant nuclear family formation does not imply poor kinship connection (Segalen, 1986; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990). On this topic, Kağıtçıbaşı (1990) conducted a cross-cultural study to investigate the relationship between culture and the structure of the family and the functional aspects of the family across 18 different countries. The results reveal that physical distance does not indicate poor emotional connection between nuclear family and other members of the family. Although the frequency of interactions such as telephone calls and visits are lower in nuclear family forms, this difference was found to be relative and does not indicate an isolated family form. These findings were in line with Uzoka's (1979) term, the myth of nuclear family.

In sum, culture is a salient determinant factor in the formation and structure of the family. The general tendency in the literature categorizes cultures according to their position in collectivist-individualist poles. Besides from this binary categorization, cultures can be further examined in terms of their autonomy and relatedness.

1.2.1. Cultural Perspectives on Autonomy and Relatedness in Families

As discussed above, one way to study and think about different cultures is examining them across the dimensions of autonomy and relatedness. In parallel with this literature, various theories and perspectives in family studies have explored the meanings and implications of these two dimensions for families and individuals in diverse settings. Among the pioneers of the field, Murray Bowen (1978) stresses the significance of individual's autonomy and separation for a healthy development and intra-familial relationship. According to his theory, each individual achieves differentiation of the self by emotionally detaching himself/herself from others, while maintaining functioning relationships with the environment, both within and outside of the family. The term "differentiation of the self" defines an individual's ability to function autonomously and in a self-directed way, while at the same time remaining emotionally connected to the members of the system without cutting off (Bowen, 1978). Similarly, Bowen (1978) argues that differentiation of self resolves the tension between agency and need for connection. Regarding agency, people seek independence and autonomy without self-isolation. Regarding connection, individuation requires emotional ties and maintaining attachment with others without fusion or enmeshment. Thereby, the goal of self-differentiation is to ensure exerting agency in the context of relational connection with others (Lapsley, 2010).

In his theory, Bowen (1978) claims that individuals with lower levels of self-differentiation lack self-other boundary and tend to get in enmeshed relationships and fusions, in which individual agency and separation are not possible. Moreover, Bowen (1978) argues that low level of differentiation leads multiple dysfunctions through life, including chronic anxiety, reactive behavior, marital dissatisfaction and triangulation.

Minuchin (1974), another leading theorist in the field of family therapy, also investigates the functioning of the families and describes the poorly structured families who are closely tied to each other to a pathological extent that they lose their autonomy. Similar to Bowen (1978), Minuchin (1974) claims that enmeshed

families lack interpersonal and psychological boundaries among members, and therefore there is a diminishment of individual autonomy. Both theorists focus on manifestations of different levels of self-differentiation and imply pathology in low levels of differentiation. These inferences emphasize the necessity of separation for a healthy development. That is to say, in the Western-based literature, autonomy is seen as far more vital and necessary for a functional and progressive human development than relatedness (Jahoda & Dasen, 1986; Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005; Roland, 1991).

This emphasis on individuation and dichotomous perspective on autonomy and relatedness have drawn significant criticism in the literature. Firstly, it is claimed that the label of enmeshment and its relation with psychological wellbeing is culturally dependent. Scholars conceptualizes that labeling too much relatedness as enmeshment is pejorative, since the definition of enmeshment is culturally dependent (Fişek, 1991). Moreover, it is argued that the effect of enmeshment on individuals' psychological wellbeing and overall functioning depends on the culture's understanding of familial closeness. Despite the predictive value of enmeshment for psychological wellbeing in some Western cultures, the relationship does not apply cross-culturally (Manzi, Vignoles, Regalia, & Scabini, 2006; Akyıl, 2011).

Secondly, a significant criticism highlights that separation-individuation is conceptualized in contradictory terms both semantically and theoretically (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990). Kağıtçıbaşı (2005) examines previous theories and argues that they consider autonomy and relatedness as two mutually exclusive experiences. That is, in these theories, attachment and bonding with others indicate a lack of agency which can only be achieved at the cost of relatedness. In order to understand the construal of self and culture better, she proposes two underlying dimensions of agency and interpersonal distance. In the agency dimension, one end characterizes autonomy and the other heteronomy, whereas interpersonal distance changes between separateness- relatedness. Thereby, Kağıtçıbaşı (2005) conceptualizes the compatibility of the two basic human needs rather than their contradiction.

According to this model, individual's level of autonomy exists and varies separately from his/her level of interpersonal distance.

In her other work, Kağıtçıbaşı (1996a; 1982a) focuses on the co-existence of autonomy and relatedness, and considers their balance as a sign of psychological and family adjustment. According to her contextual-developmental functioning model of family change (1996b, 2005), families can be investigated under three subgroups: 1) interdependent, 2) independent, and 3) psychologically (emotionally) interdependent. The first one, "the family model of interdependence", is mostly seen in agricultural societies and urban low-SES groups, and is characterized by both material and emotional interdependence among its members. In these families, individuals' agency is perceived as a threat and discouraged, and children are reared to contribute to the family life, by providing labor when they are young and offering old-age security when they grow up. With the aim of maximizing and preserving these values in such families, fertility rate is high (Caldwell, 2001). With their emphasis on obedience, members develop heteronomous-related self, which is low in autonomy, but high on relatedness. Secondly, "family of independence" which is the opposite pattern of the first one, is depicted in more individualized and modern countries. In such cultures, neither type of the dependence is present and members function independently from one another. With their orientation towards self-reliance, members develop autonomous-separate self, which is high in autonomy but low in relatedness.

The last family pattern which is a synthesis of the first two is called "family model of psychological (emotional) interdependence". In such family patterns, psychological interdependence continues, while material affiliation weakens. Since the parents no longer depend on their offspring for economic support, agency, independence and autonomy of the children are not regarded as dangerous. Despite the instrumental and economic independence, emotional interdependency among family members prevails, since it is ingrained in cultures of relatedness and collectivism. (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990). Simultaneously valuing order setting, control and autonomy, members develop autonomous-related self, which is high in both

domains of autonomy and relatedness. Kağıtçıbaşı (1990) suggests that this model of family functioning is the optimal combination of two equally important human needs and predicts it to be a healthy universal model for families across the globe.

Similar to Kağıtçıbaşı's analysis, Roland (1991, 1987) also investigates how cultural and familial values of individuation and connectedness shape psychological processes and family relationships of individuals. In his comprehensive studies investigating the variations and manifestations of different selves both in Western countries such as USA and more collectivistic countries such as Japan and India, Roland (1987) introduces two important concepts: individualized self and familial self. Individualized self has an inner organization that prioritizes an individualistic I-ness, has autonomous functioning and a clear boundary between self and other. The individualized self practices less mirroring in social interaction, strives after individual goals and functions towards rationalism and self-actualization. Extra-familial relationships are important for individualized self. This type of self is generally formed in autonomy granting societies where the individual is expected to function independently. The development of individualized self is adaptive in such cultures, since it encourages agency and self-reliance from an early age.

On the other hand, familial self is emotionally connected and interdependent to others, has high empathy and reciprocity to other members in the society to the extent that the experiential self is a we-self. Familial self indicates that self-esteem is derived from the identifications with the honor and reputation of the family, observes traditionally created reciprocal responsibilities and has multilayered communication. This self might develop in cultures in which hierarchically structured kinship relations has central importance and extended family relationships are dominant in individual's life. Formation of familial self and almost-symbiotic-like relationship prepares the individual for close family relationships. Moreover, it ties men to their family, with whom they will co-reside after marriage or stay in a close emotional relationship; for women, the development of familial self prepares them for close family ties with her family of

reproduction. Overall, Roland (1987) conceptualizes the adaptability of each type of self and criticizes the Western theories (Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975) and the stages of psychosocial development (Erikson, 1968) for over-stressing the importance of separation and individuation for a healthy developmental course.

Previous theories have also addressed the issue of social change and what it means for autonomy and relatedness experienced by families and individuals. It is believed that developed and modern societies have individualistic features and functions independently in terms of relations between members of the society (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1997; Oyserman et. al, 2002). It is suggested that through urbanization and modernization, there is a global shift from collectivistic cultures whose members are interdependently related to each other towards more independent models of family functioning. However, this conceptualization is criticized by Kağıtçıbaşı (1990), for being reductionist and presenting agency and relatedness as contradictory to one another. As a matter of fact, later cross-cultural research (Koutrelakos, 2004; Perez & Padilla, 2000) indicate both a shift toward psychologically interdependent models of family with socioeconomic development and also increased importance of relatedness in highly modernized countries (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005; Young, 1992). In sum, although autonomy and relatedness are accepted as common psychological needs, the literature has evolved to recognize them from a both-and perspective, to value them both and study their diverse manifestations across cultural settings. Because the present thesis investigates a living arrangement which involves close physical proximity to extended family members, some empirical studies on how autonomy and relatedness are managed in extended families will be discussed next.

1.2.2. Relationships with Extended Families

Given different cultural values and practices around autonomy and relatedness, it is important to explore what roles extended families play across contexts. Despite cultural differences, individuals are both a part of and under the influence of extended family systems. Relationship with the extended family, especially with the in-laws has a significant place for individual's lives. Although

more collectivistic cultures prioritize the relationship with the extended family (Lam et. al, 2016), the literature reveals that the quality of the relationship with the in-laws is a strong determinant of a couple's functioning in different contexts, influencing marital satisfaction, stability and separation (Fowler & Rittenour, 2017; Morr Serewicz, Hosmer, Ballard, & Griffin, 2008). Conversely, individuals' relationship with their children (Margolin et. al, 2003) and their spouses (Dinero et. al, 2008) are also influenced by their family of origin.

Some studies show that the extended family can be a resource which meets individuals' and families' relatedness needs by offering connection and providing support. Available research shows that close extended family relationships may be adaptive for young couples' adaptation process. Bonds with the extended family are found to be satisfying when in-laws are a source of emotional, financial and practical support (Kim et al., 2015; Morr Serewicz, 2006). Moreover, cross-cultural studies reveal that parenting practices are generally transmitted intergenerationally and parents play important role in individuals' transition to parenthood (Simons et. al, 1991). For instance, availability of grandparents as a source of support plays a significant determinant role in decisions of having children (Aassve, Meroni & Pronzato, 2012; Fingerman, 2004). Moreover, according to the research conducted with US sample, contact with the parents-in-law serves as an emotional support for the new-moms (Chong, Gordon & Don, 2017).

On the other hand, extended family relationships are considered as potential sources of stress and interference with the autonomy needs of families and individuals. According to the family systems theory, close ties with the extended family might unsettle the couple subsystem. That is, close relationships with the extended family might cause unclear boundaries which distinguish the spousal and executive subsystem (Minuchin, 1974) and a third party's involvement in the couple sub-system may create tension between the spouses (Bowen, 1978).

The literature on this topic is dominated by research on the mother-in-law relationship. Similar to the presentations in the media and in the idioms, the

literature generally agrees that mother-daughter-in-law dyad is potentially more conflict-prone than other dyads (Pak, 2011; Genç & Baptist, 2019). This is argued to be linked to the overlapping assigned obligations of women including household chores and child rearing, which lead women to interact with each other than men (Choi, Chan, & Brownbridge, 2010; Kivett, 1989). The nature of these conflicts contains exclusion, critic or intrusion (Fingerman, 1996). Regarding parenting, the extended family, especially parents and parents-in-law, might play an intrusive role by interfering with the individuals' parenting styles. In more individualistic cultures and the families of independent model, individuals' openness determines the older generations' involvement in parenting practices (Johnston-Ataata, 2019). However, in more collectivistic cultures and interdependent families, such interferences are more frequent (Kurter, Jencius, & Duba, 2004).

Overall, research shows that the relationship with the extended family is a significant determinant of an individual's couple relationship and parenting practices. Moreover, the degree of autonomous-relatedness of the families is a salient influence on the intra-familial relationship. These processes will be examined in the Turkish context, which will be covered in the next section.

1.3. FAMILIES IN THE TURKISH CONTEXT

1.3.1. The structure and composition of the Turkish Family

Turkey is a country located at the intersection of the East and the West. Similar to its geographical position, Turkish families carry features from both of these cultures. The existing literature investigating the family forms in Turkey goes back to the late Ottoman period and presents that the dominant family household structure in Turkey has been nuclear family since then (Duben, 1985). Early in the 1950s, Turkey started to carry out policies to encourage industrialization and modernization in the country (Aytaç, 1998). Developments such as increased numbers of factories and compulsory education for children created a huge shift in the society (Aytaç, 1998; Yıldırım, 2009). Increase in individuals' wealth and education level caused significant changes in family forms as well. Big and rapidly

industrialized cities in the western part of the country, such as Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, became the opportunity point for many people from the other parts. As the young people migrated to the western regions, most of them left their extended households in rural areas and they formed new nuclear households in the west. Thereby, overall family structures rapidly transformed to nuclear forms, and this caused significant increase in the nuclear family households (Duben & Behar, 1991).

Although in Turkey, the dominant family form was already nuclear family structures, the effect of urbanization and modernization became more visible starting from the 1970s, in which there is a rapid decrease in extended family households (Bayer, 2013; TFFS, 2011). In parallel with this, the percentage of nuclear family forms increased significantly. For instance, in 1978, the rate of extended family households was 33 %, which decreased to 16 % in 2011 (TFFS, 2011).

The societal level factors reinforcing increased nuclear family formation are an important aspect to understand the changes in the family functioning and interpersonal socialization in Turkey. In the literature, there are a few studies examining the factors in determining the co-residence decisions and extended family household formation in Turkey. Aykan and Wolf (2000) investigate the patterns and predictors of married adult children's co-residence with their parents using the data of Turkish Demographic and Health Survey from 1993. In line with the previous findings on living arrangements in Turkey, the results reveal that only 25% of the married couples reside with their parents, thereby supporting the conclusion that co-residence is not the norm in family formation in Turkey (Aytaç, 1998).

Aykan and Wolf (2000) claim that traditional attitudes have substantial effect on the possibility of co-residence choice. The changes underlying the modernization, both on the societal (urbanization and increased economic wealth) and individual level (increased education level) are strong determinants of co-

residence decisions. In their study, it is suggested that especially individual educational attainment and more egalitarian views on role division both in marriage and at the societal level significantly decrease the possibility of co-habiting. Moreover, the results show that in comparison to the western cities of Turkey, the likelihood of residence with parents is doubled in the rest of the Turkey where traditional values are maintained in both societal and individual levels. The writers conclude that the decrease in the extended family households is associated with the changes toward individualism and self-fulfillment. These claims are also in line with Aytaç's (1998) study, which presents the first multivariate analysis on co-residence in Turkey, focusing on the living arrangements of the married males. He also suggests that education level is a significant predictor of co-residence, claiming that traditionalism is a salient determinant in co-residence decisions and the increase in the educational level leads to greater preference toward privacy over multigenerational living arrangements (Aytaç, 1998).

In sum, there is a consensus in the literature that as a result of social changes including urbanization, modernization, migration and increased economic affluence, nuclear family forms become more common in the Turkish context. Besides these societal factors, the shift toward individualism and self-reliance are also primary factors for increased rate of nuclear households in the society. Co-residence with extended family members has become less common and observed mostly in more traditional settings.

1.3.2. Relationships in the Turkish Family

1.3.2.1. Closeness and Relatedness in Turkish Families

As explained above, with increased economic affluence, extended family households are less preferred and economic interdependence among the family members decrease. However, psychological interdependence continues as the importance of intra-familial relationships persist regardless of the economic status and living arrangements of individuals. That is to say, the tendency towards individualism does not indicate less significance of the family in Turkish society.

Despite the fact that the extended family households have never become the predominant family pattern in actual practice and that there is an increased tendency towards individuation and agency seeking in Turkey, the family and intra-family relationships have great importance in the society (Aytaç, 1998). In most of the Turkish families, individuals grow up in a culture of unity and collectiveness. Sensitivity and awareness toward other family members is promoted and conflicts in the relationships are overlooked whereas loyalty and connection are emphasized (Akyıl, 2011). In such environment, the conception of self is inseparable from the conception of the family and its members (Fişek, 1991). These traits indicate enmeshment of the family members rather than individuation. However, since the term “enmeshment” bears a rather negative connotation and these characteristics are culturally typical and normal for a majority of the population, Kağıtçıbaşı (1985) proposed the term “closely knit” in describing the Turkish family. Similarly, Turkish families are defined as “functionally extended” in terms of the relationship between family members and more traditional value systems, although they are predominantly formed as nuclear (Abadan-Unat, 1986; Ataca, 2009; Baştuğ, 2002; Fişek, 1982; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982b).

Individuals have close ties with their extended families and frequent communication among close relatives who also live in close physical proximity to one another (Imamoğlu, 1987; Eraslan et. al, 2012). As seen in the nationwide family survey from 1998, although co-residence with the elderly (including aunts and uncles) were 22 %, 48 % of the participants were living nearby to the elderly (Aytaç, 1998). The replication of this survey in 2006 also supports further evidence of individuals’ close living arrangements to other family members (Aile, T. B.& Müdürlüğü, S. A. G., 2006). That is, despite the dominant nuclear household structure, both close physical proximity and emotional ties are prioritized in Turkish families. The term “intimacy at a distance” proposed by Rosenmayr and Köckeis (1963) fits for describing Turkish familial relationship. It is seen that the increasing trend toward forming nuclear family household nearby family members’ neighborhood can be described as an attempt to maintain close family ties while making an effort to ensure individual privacy (Ünalın, 2005).

In a similar vein, Ataca (2009) presents the “Family Model of Change” which proposes that through socioeconomic developments, urbanization, and social change, families shift to the model of psychological interdependence. In Turkey, rural areas and individuals who are less affluent with rural background have characteristics of the family of interdependence, where individuals are both materially and emotionally interdependent to one another. On the other hand, in urban cities with higher education and income levels, people are characterized with family of psychological interdependence. (Ataca, 2009). In her work, instrumental roles of the family members show variations depending on the financial developments. However, regardless of the affluence, the emotional family bond is very close.

For instance, after marriage, individuals leave their family of reproduction to form their own family. They are expected to form their own parental and sibling sub-systems in their nuclear family. In Bowen’s theory, nuclear families are separated from each other with healthy boundaries. However, as opposed to the Western context, Turkish newly established nuclear families are not separated from their family of origin (Genç & Baptist, 2019). In a way, regardless of the living arrangements, a newly-wed couple is expected function as an extension of the paternal extended family (Aykan& Wolf, 2000; Carmichael, 2011). These cases are more common in the more traditional family structures (Genç & Baptist, 2019).

Research suggests that the extent of intra-familial relationships is not limited to parents, but covers other kin. Ünalın (1988) conducts a study to investigate the intra-familial relationships of married adults who live in nuclear family households. The results reveal that, although living separately, these individuals were in close contact not only with their parents, but also siblings, aunts, and uncles. These findings are in line with previous research on the nature of the relationship of the relatives in Turkey (Duben, 1982; Imamođlu, 1987). As claimed by Kađıtıbaşı (1985, 1996a), in Turkish culture individuals grow up in a “culture of relatedness”, where they grow up closely interacting with grandparents, uncles, aunts, and other close relatives.

Moreover, this broad network of family relationships also functions as a support net and even as the main social security in many domains for both the young and the elderly. In Turkish families, different generations are tied closely to each other by reciprocal responsibility which provide financial and practical support (Kağıtçıbaşı 1982a, 1996a, 2007). Parents are responsible for their children to take care of their needs and protect them until they get married and sometimes even after that, until they become financially independent. In return, children are expected to take care of their parents in their old age, regardless of their living arrangements (Hanceoğlu, 1985; Omran & Roudi, 1993). As a matter of fact, elderly care is not prioritized in government policies and historically it is observed that younger people look after the elderly, rather than the government institutions (Aytaç, 1998).

In conclusion, despite the dominant nuclear structure, Turkish family is often functionally extended, which indicates close intra-familial ties. This broad network of extended family relationships serves as a support system across generations in the family. Even though the overall decreased economic interdependency of family members, psychological interdependency still persists in the traditional Turkish family. Because of the close intra-familial relationship in the society, it is important to understand the organization and the nature of the Turkish family, which will be elaborated on in the next section.

1.3.2.2. Hierarchy and Boundaries in Turkish Families

As mentioned before, in the functioning of traditional Turkish family, connection and relatedness with family members and relatives are emphasized and prioritized more than differentiation and separation. As a matter of fact, in this culture of relatedness, hierarchy organizes the family functioning in relationships. In most of the Turkish families, the power and authority are not shared equally among the individuals (Fişek, 1995). The family members are ranked mostly according to two factors: age and gender (Fişek, 1995).

First of all, age is a great determinant of an individuals' position in the family hierarchy. Especially in rural areas, older males are the breadwinner in the

family and only they have the right for property ownership (Turinay, 1996). As one grows older, he/ she becomes more respected and eligible for having a voice. The significance of age is also stressed in the teachings of Islam, in which respect and esteem increases with an individual's age (Dhami & Sheikh, 2000). Moreover, attending the elderly's needs, especially, the needs of one's own parents is deemed as a gift of God and regarded as a good deed (Dhami & Sheikh, 2000). Since the population in Turkey is predominantly Muslim, the emphasis on the importance of age is even stronger. Thereby, according to Muslim and collectivistic nature of the Turkish society, older people are deemed as hierarchically superior and highly respected. Hence, regardless of their co-residence status, older people exert influence on younger people's life decisions and, their opinions and needs are expected to be accepted.

Besides age, gender is also a predictive factor of one's ranking in the Turkish family. The structure of the traditional Turkish family is suggested to be predominantly patriarchal, patrilineal, and patrilocal by many researchers (Ataca, 2009; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982b, 1990; Sunar & Fişek, 2005). According to these previous works, women have subordinate position to men, and therefore, wives have less authority than husbands. In a way, rather than boundaries dividing the nuclear formed households, the entire family unit is organized and functions according to gender and age. For instance, it is very common that fathers interfere with the financial matters of their sons and sons-in-law, and mothers-in-law have a say in the child rearing practices of their daughters and daughters-in-law because they are older and therefore, more experienced (Kurter, Jencius, & Duba, 2004).

Turkey's cultural and societal structure is composed of diverse elements. Population subgroups ranges from modern to very traditional. Turkish culture integrates both the relatedness and trends towards autonomy. The change towards autonomy is especially seen in the shift of characteristics in couple relationship and parenting styles. However, the duality of the relatedness and autonomy persists especially in more traditional settings where individuals who seek agency might experience difficulties. In the following two sections, the changes and the

continuities in couple relationship and parenting styles will be further elaborated.

1.3.3. Couple Relationships in Turkey

According to Bowen (1978), marriage is conceptualized as a stepping stone for forming a new family and differentiation from the family of origin. However, the previous research on the Turkish families claim that often the couple subsystem is not thoroughly separated from the extended family and is under the influence of the extended family, especially in-laws (Carmicheal, 2011; Beşpınar& Beşpınar, 2017). According to these studies mostly, individuals are closely tied to the parents and seek their approval including the life choices they make, such as spouse choice. Individuals prefer to marry with someone who is introduced by the acquaintances of the family (Bayer, 2013; Carmicheal, 2011). In such arranged marriages, family members choose a candidate whose family culture and socioeconomic status are compatible with their own (Beşpınar& Beşpınar, 2017). According to the nationwide statistics, 48 % of the first-marriages are arranged (TÜİK, 2016). As a matter of fact, Bayer characterized the marriage in Turkey as the “union of two families” (2013).

Beşpınar and Beşpınar (2017) investigated the changes in marriage and family formation practices in Turkey by comparing the nationwide statistics in family structure, marriage, and divorce statistics in 2002 and 2016. According to the results, the traditional family system and the central role of the family prevails in the couple relationship throughout the years. Extended family members are key determinants in the individual’s marriage processes. Individuals seek family members’ approval in the spouse choice and appeal to them for advice in case of marital conflict. In a similar vein, Kaya (2019) demonstrates that the acceptance of the bride into a new family depends on the mother-in-law’s approval. Hence, the family of origin is and continues to be a key determinant in the formation of a majority of the marriages in the Turkish context.

Research suggests that the quality of the couple relationship is also influenced by extended family relationships in Turkey. Considering the maintained

and closely knitted relationship with the family of origin after marriage and functionally extended form of Turkish families, both, the couple system and the relationship between spouses, are more open to extended family's influences. Although there is a scarce amount of research on this topic in Turkey, existing studies mostly focus on the relationship between daughter-in-law and mother-in-law, and the conflicts between them. In line with the cross-cultural literature (Fowler & Rittenour, 2017; Choi et. al, 2010), in-law related conflicts are among the primary reasons of couple disagreements and divorce in the Turkish context (TÜİK, 2016). In a recent study analyzing the factors causing conflicts between daughter-in-law and mother-in-law, it is proposed that the attitudes of the mother-in-law is a primary determinant of the relationship between these women. Besides, the mother-in-law's material dependency on the husband, husband's relationship with his mother (Aydın, 2017), the environment the bride was raised in, and her educational level were main factors of a conflictual mother- and daughter-in-law relationship (Kaya, 2019).

Another prominent study examines the relationship between mother and daughter-in-law through the narratives of women who got married in the early years of the Turkish Republic (1923-1945) (Yakali-Camoglu, 2007). The results of this study show that a battle for power was among the primary cause of conflict in this dyad. The narratives of the participants revolved around domination and oppression, implying a battle for power. Related to this struggle, daughters-in-law expressed negativity, criticism, oppression, jealousy, and tension in their relationship with the mother-in-law. Supporting the studies explained above, according to these women, tension stems from the fact that these women share one man, hence causing conflict of interest in the dyad. Furthermore, the results indicate that shared value systems and cultural narratives between mother and daughter-in-law ensures a good relationship in the dyad.

Due to the rapid shift towards egalitarianism and individualism, couples experience conflicts either with or about the in-laws. In a sense, modernized individual's perspective on life collide with the older, more traditional values and

expectations. Considering the co-existence of traditional values of Islam and collectivism with the modern values of both secularism and individualism, (Akyıl, Prouty, Blanchard, & Lyness, 2014; Kagıtcıbası & Ataca, 2005), it can be argued that conflict management and negotiation styles of individuals are strongly determined by the configuration of the family culture. One significant contribution to the literature on in-law relationships in Turkey focuses on this issue and explores the individuals' conflict managing styles with the parents-in-law (Genç & Bapdist, 2019). The results of this study reveal that the conflicts are gendered in nature. Daughters-in-law mostly maintain a silent position in order to avoid conflicts, whereas sons-in-law express their thoughts directly or take the blame in order to avoid further conflict.

The evident differentiation of conflict management styles between genders are related to the assigned gender roles and their position in relation to the parent-in-law. Genç and Bapdist (2019) proposes that the expectation for women to adapt to the rules of conduct in the husband's family and uphold traditional gender norms is to be main reason for withdrawing behavior of daughters-in-law. Furthermore, the fear of losing the benefits of child care and support in household tasks might lead to conflict avoidance behavior in daughters-in-law (Genç & Bapdist, 2019). Daughters-in-law's preference in conflict avoidance is also compatible with the former studies conducted in more collectivistic cultures (Lim & Lim, 2012; Shih & Pyke, 2010). However, Genç and Bapdist (2019) argue that the assumed responsibility for maintaining peace as a means of securing the received support might lead dysfunctional dynamics in the family. For instance, it might magnify the gap in power and hierarchical positioning between the daughter-in-law and parents-in-law. Moreover, the authors went on to explain that this assumed role might render their rights for autonomy and freedom of expression which contradicts with the shift towards self-determination and individualism in the society. On the other hand, the son-in-law's ability for direct communication might reflect their attempt to claim their power and status in the male-dominant family form, whereas the tendency to take on the blame might be due to the feelings of indebtedness since mother-in-law provides child-care support in many cases (Genç & Bapdist, 2019).

These dynamics in extended families can be considered as manifestations of gender roles prevalent in the Turkish social structure. It is argued in the previous studies that similar to the unequal position of men and women in Turkish society, in the couple relationship the roles and rules of conduct for each spouse are significantly divergent (Fişek, 1993; Sunar & Fişek 2005). First of all, men are assigned more power and their roles involve making decisions and exerting their authority. Men are deemed as breadwinners and therefore eligible for authority, whereas women are expected to serve at home and follow the house order which is generally assigned by men or hierarchically higher positioned women such as the mother-in-law (Fişek, 1993; Sunar & Fişek 2005).

Strikingly, research suggests that this inequality between genders are accepted by many women as well. In a study, the value systems of Turkish culture are examined and the results reveal that 71 % of women advocate for “men should be the head of the house.” Moreover, 59 % of the female participants believed that “women should abide by the men’s order” (Esmer, Ertunç, & Pekiner, 2012). Similarly, the housework labor and childcare are seen as the “job” of women, regardless of having another job (Kandiyoti, 1985). Even in modern families which are characterized by a more egalitarian and democratic structure, this division of labor is still persistent between husbands and wives (Fişek, 1993; Boratav, Fişek & Eslen-Ziya, 2017).

Despite an apparent preservation of traditional values, there are certain indicators of modernization and individuation which transform couple relationships and the influence of the extended family on couples. Rapid increase in couple-instigated marriages in younger generations (Atalay et al., 1992), increased acceptance of more individualistic values such as spousal intimacy and personal pleasure (Rothbaum, Pott, Azuma, Miyake, & Weisz, 2000), more egalitarian marriages in terms of gender roles and more separation from extended families (Hortaçsu, 2007) are some of these indicators. Researchers argue that social changes also transform hierarchical relationships between spouses. For example, Beşpınar and Beşpınar (2017) show that throughout the years, the age difference

between the spouses decreased significantly. In another study Yıldırım (2009) reports that as female education and thereby female employment rate increased, the hierarchic structure of the traditional Turkish family transformed into more egalitarian form.

Overall, these data indicate that along with the perseverance of the traditional and collectivistic values in the Turkish culture, there are also salient manifestations of individualistic agency demanding features in couple relationships. Researchers highlight that there is a dual structure where traditional aspects in family functioning are kept intact (Todd, 1985; Carmicheal, 2011), more notably for individuals with lower education and financial level, and an increasing tendency towards independent decision-making processes and agency exerting becomes apparent, particularly in more urban and highly-educated groups (Beşpınar & Beşpınar, 2017; Yıldırım, 2019). Thus, it is observed that traditional values and practices coexist with modern values in shaping couple relationships in Turkey.

1.3.4. Parenting

The co-existence of traditional values and modernization processes such as self-determination and individualism are also seen in the parenting practices in the Turkish society. The most comprehensive research on this topic investigate the meanings that are attributed to children and their changing value in Turkey for over 30 years (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982a; Kağıtçıbaşı& Ataca, 2005). This study shows that in less developed and rural areas, children are seen as part of the workforce, hence they have instrumental and economic values. In such families, intergenerational dependency exists since children contribute to the family economy when they are young and have the “security value” for the parents when they get older (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982a; 1990). Independency and autonomy of the children are perceived as a threat for perpetuity and functionality of the family. Therefore, expectation for obedience is dominant in parenting practices (Kağıtçıbaşı& Ataca, 2005).

According to Kağıtçıbaşı and Ataca, with the societal changes such as urbanization and compulsory education, the material intergenerational dependency decreases in Turkish families (2005). Material independence allows autonomy to be encouraged in child rearing. This is because the child's autonomy is not any longer perceived as a threat when his or her material contribution is not required for family livelihood (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Moreover, in the newly-introduced order, traits such as self-reliance, self-actualization, and assertiveness are promoted and required for a satisfactory life. Hence, autonomy is seen as a necessary characteristic and parents encourage their children towards self-orientation, autonomy, and assertiveness (Imamoğlu, 1987).

On the other hand, regardless of financial developments, psychological interdependency with children remains important in Turkish families (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982a; Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Although the economic importance attached to children is replaced with emotional importance, the emphasis on the family relatedness continues over time (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005; Imamoğlu, 1987). As intergenerational emotional ties gains importance, more democratic parenting practices increase. Rewards and reasoning are embraced in parenting practices, which imply granting agency rather than authoritarian control and compliance (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996; Sunar, 2002; Akyıl, Prouty, Blanchard & Lyness, 2014). Notwithstanding that, together with autonomy, there continues to be control rather than permissiveness in child rearing. Yet this is no longer authoritarian parenting, because with the autonomy of the child being allowed, control becomes “order setting” rather than “dominating” (Lau, Lew, Hau, Cheung, & Berndt, 1990). Similar results are obtained in a recent study which reveals that in comparison to the older generations, there is a salient change towards individual autonomy and authoritative parenting styles which supports the earlier conceptualizations of the societal change in Turkey (Akyıl, Prouty, Blanchard & Lyness, 2014).

Nonetheless, this rapid transition in the value system is not always smoothly accommodated by the society. A recent study investigates parents' intergenerational value transmission to their children and reveals that although

parents are content with the new order, they have certain concerns as well (Akyıl, Prouty, Blanchard & Lyness, 2014). They worry that too much emphasis on individualism might lead children to self-oriented and purely materialistic individuals. Moreover, parents express being torn between the teachings of their parents and new generation's expectations. They experience dilemmas of following the value of their family of origin which prioritize collectivism and teachings of Islam and meeting the new generations' wish for more autonomy (Akyıl, Prouty, Blanchard & Lyness, 2014). Parents' concerns about too much individualism of their child is coherent with the former work of Sunar (2002). In her study, she investigates the changes and continuities in the childrearing practices across three generations and reveals that the importance of family over the individual is emphasized in parenting behavior of all three generations.

In sum, available studies suggest that despite increased tendencies towards individualism and undeniable changes in the parent-child relationship, family has a central position in individual's lives and children's agency is perceived as a treat if it causes separation from the kin.

1.4 FAMILY BUILDINGS

Apartment building was introduced to Turkey at the end of the Ottoman period by the Western cultures and the first examples of family buildings were commissioned by wealthy elites to famous architects and represented an upscale and elite way of urban life (Görgülü, 2017; Acar, 2019). Although only an urban and high income group could afford apartments for a certain period of time, beginning with the 1960's, it became a common dwelling type for lower socioeconomic strata (Tanyel, 1998). In 1950's, industrialization and automatization endorsements in agricultural sector led huge unemployment rates in the sector. Consequently, big cities such as Istanbul, Ankara, and Izmir drew great numbers of immigrants in a short period of time from eastern cities where agriculture is the dominant source of income (Görgülü, 2017; Sevilay Acar, 2019).

The transition process from village to the city occurred collectively mostly

with the entire extended family and even sometimes with close neighbors (Acar, 2019). People who used to live in close proximity in their hometowns wanted to reside close to each other when they migrated to big cities (Bayer, 2013). In order to meet the ever-increasing real estate demands, tall buildings were built in great numbers. Despite the government's efforts to carry out mass housing projects, these cities could not meet the housing demands of rapidly increasing population (Görgülü, 2017). Consequently, a new solution to meet the demand was introduced by the migrant population itself. They started squatting in slums such as Kağıthane and Çağlayan, building multi-floored buildings by themselves or hiring a contractor to build one where they resided with the extended family, each living in individual flats (Acar, 2019).

Consequently, family buildings have become a part of big cities. Family buildings are defined as structures with several floors where nuclear family and close extended family member such as mother, father, uncles, sisters etc. reside in separate flats, but in the same building (Acar, 2019; Aykan & Wolf, 2020). These family buildings are often built as “roofless structures” in order to add an extra floor to meet the future housing need of a newly-wed child (Acar, 2019). Generally, in an extended Turkish household each room had the functions “*to be home for a nuclear family*”, however in the new housing types called “apartments”, each room has its own function and each flat can contain one nuclear family (Mutdoğan, 2014). Confirming Mutdoğan's analysis (2014), several studies showed that if a married couple resides in a family building, the likelihood that this couple lives with the husband's parents is extremely high (approximately 95%) (Aykan & Wolf, 2000; Acar, 2019).

By this way, urbanization influenced family dynamics by transforming existing extended family households into nuclear forms (Akçay& Yavuz, 2014). However, it is important to note that the instrumental role of the family buildings is to enable people to remain in close connection with their extended families. Even though the extended form of the family transformed into nuclear, these families remain both in physical and psychological proximity with the extended family

(Bayer, 2013). Mutdoğan (2014) argues that even though the first examples of family buildings represented privileged elites' lifestyles, as a result of the societal changes such as migration and housing problems, current family buildings symbolize the preservation of the family's patriarchal and interdependent structure in the face of migration to a big and foreign city.

Despite the frequency and psychosocial dynamics of family buildings, the literature on the experiences of individuals living in these buildings is scarce. Among one of the rare studies on family buildings (Kaynar, 2014; Yılmaz & Sabuncuoglu, 2019), Acar (2019) investigates the spatial living experience of men, average age of 50, who reside in these places for at least 40 years. These participants express various advantages and opportunities regarding their living experience, that are close family ties, sense of solidarity and belonging, privacy, support system including help with practical, financial, and child-care issues. Notwithstanding the benefits of living in a family building, the participants voice experiencing certain disadvantages, as well. They complain about the lack of personal space, building members' interferences in their decisions, and getting alienated from relationships outside the building and from the city. Acar (2019) reports that despite the apparent disadvantages due to the comfort and instrumental support received from the family buildings, the participants wish to continue living here and they express their wish for their children to live there as well. The participants describe the building as a whole and the flats as parts of the whole, which indicates a sense of unity rather than separation and individuation.

Further studies focus on the psychological well-being of the members who reside in family buildings (Kaynar, 2014; Yılmaz & Sabuncuoglu, 2019). These studies argue that both the perceived support and possible disadvantages such as criticism in the FB are salient predictors of the mothers' satisfaction level. This level of satisfaction is suggested to be salient determinants for both the parents' and children's psychological well-being, children's attachment style and overall nuclear family functioning (Kaynar, 2014). Further, it is argued that children may be the symptoms bearers in more rigid contexts of FB (Yılmaz & Sabuncuoglu, 2019). In

sum, FB is a unique form of living arrangement which may function both as a source of support and also significant determinant on the psychological wellbeing of its members.

1.4.1. The Present Study

Although the research on family buildings has been very limited in the literature, an examination of the phenomenon of family buildings and members' living experiences are significant to understand in the Turkish context. In a sense, family buildings represent the intermediate form in transition from extended families to more independent family forms. With trends towards individuation and modernization, newly-wed couples are likely to form their own nuclear families and live in separate flats (Hanceoğlu, 1985), consistent with Bowen' theory (1978). However, in the case of family buildings, despite separate flats, a couple lives in extremely close physical proximity, usually to the husband's family of origin (Acar, 2019). Under these circumstances, a newly-wed couple is not entirely independent from their family of origin and this close connection would have inevitable influences on a couple's functioning. The present thesis aims to investigate couples' experiences of living in a family building and particularly focuses on how couples manage autonomy and relatedness with the members of family buildings. In this context, how couples negotiate boundaries with the members of their building is of particular interest, because their experiences can inform cultural perspectives on separation-individuation.

In the present study, the impact of living in a family building and the issues around autonomy, relatedness and boundaries will be explored in relation to marital and parental functioning, considering the fact that research indicates these two significant domains as influenced by extended family members (Kaynar, 2014; Yılmaz & Sabuncuoğlu, 2019; Margolin et. al, 2003). Taken into consideration the fact that most of clinical and family psychology theories are born in the Western cultures, this study is designed to contribute to the development of culturally relative perspectives on couple relationships and provide some practical recommendations in the Turkish context. Thus, the present study aims to address

the following research questions:

- a) What are the experiences of couples who reside in the FB?
- b) What are the relational experiences of being a couple in the FB?
- c) What are the parental experiences of couples who live in the FB?
- d) How do couples negotiate boundaries in the FB?



CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1. DATA COLLECTION

Upon the approval by the Ethics Board Committee at Bilgi University, convenience and snowball sampling methods were used to recruit volunteer participants. A flyer was prepared and shared in e-mail groups and social media groups to find participants for the study. The inclusion criteria were a) being married, b) residing in the same building but in separate flats with either partner's parents at least for a year and lastly, c) having at least one child. The inclusion criteria were created after reviewing the literature. A minimum duration of one year was set in order to collect rich experiences (Aytaç, 1988; Yılmaz & Sabuncuoğlu, 2019). The exclusion criteria were a) having lived in a family building in the past, but currently residing in independent apartments, b) living only with one parent (either mother or father) in a family building. Further, no more than one couple were interviewed in each family building in order to capture broader perspectives. Couples who met the inclusion criteria were contacted and visited at their home in their preferred time for the interviews. Interviews were conducted individually with each partner in a separate room at their home.

At the beginning of each interview, participants were presented with the informed consent form and the interview process started only after participants agreed the procedure and signed the form (See Appendix I). After the informed consent was signed, the voice recorder was turned on. The interview questions were preceded by demographic forms which were filled by participants and asked about their age, birthplace, education level, salary, prior family building experience, and residents of the current building (See Appendix II). After that, the researcher explained the purpose of the meeting and initiated small talk in order to ease the participants into the semi-structured interview, which took 30 to 90 minutes. The semi-structured interview involved 25 open-ended questions, inquiring participants' decision to marry, to move in the family building and their experiences as a couple, as parents, and as individuals living in the family building. The

questions investigated certain aspects of their experiences and aimed to determine advantages and difficulties they had in the family building. Further, participants' conflict resolution methods and how they perceived their relational and parenting experiences in comparison to other couples who reside in separate buildings from their parents were explored (See Appendix III).

The researcher took field notes during the home-visits and the interviews in order to properly capture and understand the participants' living experiences in the family building, and noted down the observations about the home-setting, family members' interactions with each other, features of the buildings and physical characteristics of the participants' living arrangements. All 14 semi-structured interviews were audiotaped by two voice recorders and the voice recordings were transcribed afterwards. All audio files and written transcriptions are protected in a locked file and will be kept for 5 years for publication.

2.2. PARTICIPANTS

Seven married couples (7 men, 7 women) participated in the study. The age of the participants varied between 30-56 and the mean age was 41. The length of marriage varied between 9-34 years and the mean duration was 19 years. For a majority of the couples, total household income was between 4000-6000, except one couple, earning more than 8.000.

Demographics including the details about children, education and occupation are presented in table below.

Table 2.1 The Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

ID	Age	Marriage Duration (years)	Children	Current FB Residency (years)	Education	Occupation	FB of the
1M	45	17	M(14), F(5)	14	Primary School	Chauffeur	Wife's side
1F	43	17	M(14), F(5)	14	University	Accountant	Wife's side
2M	41	16	M(13), F(10)	16	University	Assistant to customs broker	Husband's side
2F	35	16	M(13), F(10)	16	Primary School	Housewife	Husband's side
3M	56	34	F(32), F(25)	31	High School	Manager	Wife's side
3F	53	34	F(32), F(25)	31	Primary School	Housewife	Wife's side
4M	41	23	M(22), F(16,6)	23	Primary School	Auto repair	Husband's side
4F	40	23	M(22), F(16,6)	23	Primary School	Housewife	Husband's side
5M	34	9	M(3)	9	High School	Plastic workman	Husband's side
5F	30	9	M(3)	9	High School	Housewife	Husband's side
6M	40	16	M(15,9,3)	16	High School	Automobile spare parts seller	Husband's side
6F	34	16	M(15,9,3)	16	High School	Tradeswomen	Husband's side
7M	46	20	M(18,16)	7	High School	Textile worker	Husband's side
7F	40	20	M(18,16)	7	High School	Housewife	Husband's side

*M: Male, F: Female

2.3. DATA ANALYSIS

Thematic analysis method was used in the analysis of all fourteen transcripts. This analysis method is preferred for two reasons. First, it organizes and summarizes data set in rich details, combining obtained information under meaningful themes. Second, it enables us to explore, describe and understand the experiences, meanings and realities of participants who live in the family buildings (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The software program MAXQDA was used throughout the analysis process in order to capture the themes and subthemes emerging from the data set.

Six steps of the thematic analysis were followed as proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006). In the first step, both, the transcriptions and field notes, were systematically read several times before the coding period in order to familiarize with the data set and have a general understanding of the participants' accounts. In the second step, interesting features of the participants' accounts were coded in a systematic fashion. During the coding process, as many codes as possible were produced in order to capture the details of the participants' experiences. Before proceeding to the next transcripts, code lists were read and revised. After completion of the coding of the entire data set, codes were gathered together and collated, in order to be organized under potential themes. For the next step, themes were checked whether they were matching to the assigned data extract and also to the entire data set. During this phase, visual tools, such as maps, were created to simplify the generation of themes and sub-themes that go under them. Next, the themes were clearly described and labeled. The final themes were decided based on their relevance to the research question and the participants' reports. Data extracts, memos and field notes were checked to ensure that repeated meanings were adequately captured by final themes. In the last step, the final themes were reported.

2.4. RESEARCHER'S PERSPECTIVE

As a student of couple and family therapies program, I have never thought the individuals, let alone couples, as separate from their families. As systems theories suggest, each individual is a part of a system including intergenerational value sets and each member both affects the system and is also affected by it (Nichols & Schwarz, 1984). During my clinical internship, through observations I have also come to the realization that although two individual people unite their lives with the marriage bond, they carry the value systems and expectations which were shaped by the family of origin. Further, it drew my attention that Turkish culture presents different ways of separation-individuation processes from what has been taught in the Western-led psychology literature. I believe that in Turkish culture, separation-individuation process does not even start until the marriage, causing many confusion and conflicts both between couple and extended families. During my internship, I also observed the difficulties couples face in differentiating the family of origin from the family of reproduction. For instance, even if an individual starts his own family, becomes a father, he still keeps on being the “child” of his own family of origin. Becoming a husband and a parent, while maintaining the role of “child” is confusing at the least one can say. Furthermore, I believe there are both certain difficulties and also enriching and supportive aspects of this closeness and strong family ties. These observations arouse my curiosity and therefore, for my thesis, I chose the experiences of couples who live in a family building to investigate. Because I believe living in a really close proximity to family of origin can present rich experiences of the couple.

This research question has also a personal importance for me, since I have lived in a family building until the age of 13. I have personally witnessed both the advantages and difficulties of living in a family building, “perceived” responsibility to the family, both the emotional and practical support, and the constant boundary negotiations. I became really curious about the experiences of couples who live in a family building. The experiences of forming a new family structure while living really close to the former family structure shaped this thesis’ theme.

As I created the 25 interview questions I was very cautious not to steer participants into a certain direction. I believe talking about their “parents” or “in-laws” carries a certain negative connotation in our culture. I showed specific attention not to make participants feel like they are gossiping, not to feel the necessity to “defend” their family and way of life. Therefore, I started by asking about their decision to marry, to move to the family building. Gradually asking about the experience of living in a family building, both the advantages and difficulties of living there, the experience of living as a couple, the decision-making processes, the conflicts and whether these are affected by living in a family building and how. Further questions investigated the experience of child raising in a family building, the advantages and difficulties of it, the decision-making process and whether family building members affect these processes and how. Later I asked about whether living in a family building affect their social and work life and how. Last two questions enquired the individuals’ perception of relationship of couples who live independently and what would it be like to live in a family building with the other partner’s family of origin. I mostly stuck with these 25 questions, refraining from unintentionally directing participants’ answers and securing the validity across participants.

For the data collection process, I personally wanted to visit couples at their homes, to have a chance to observe their home setting and the family building. I interviewed each partner individually to make them feel relaxed and be able to express their experiences without filtering what they have to say. Although each partner was interviewed individually, the challenging part of the interviews was sustaining the confidentiality since the walls were not sound-proof. Participants, mostly women, kept their voice low during most of the interview. Moreover, some partners make their husbands leave the flat to start talking and they paused when they heard someone entering the flat. I believe these observations supported my decision for separate interviews. Further, although this could not be used in the data analysis, as I observed the participants’ efforts to sustain the confidentiality I realized there are certain maneuvers to keep living, keeping the peace in the family such as hiding certain thoughts and feelings from partners, which might cause

disturbance.

Overall, the data collection process was very informative for me, I got the chance to enter the family buildings. In some cases, you had to take your shoes off as you enter the apartment, in others there were keys hanging outside each door and you could just “enter”. As it is expected in Turkey, at the beginning of my data collection, most of the wives volunteered to participate, yet their husbands did not accept. Therefore, it was remarkable to hear from the volunteer husbands. As one of the intentions of this study, I was hoping to maintain valuable information from the participants to help me understand the experiences of couples with close bonds with the in-laws, especially the ones who live in the same building. As a clinician, I was very enthusiastic to be able to find proper interventions to help them set healthy boundaries and facilitate the separation individuation process.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

This section provides the results of the analysis pertaining to the 14 participants' (7 couples) accounts. Theoretical elaboration of the results will be handled in the discussion section. According to the accounts of 14 participants, 4 main themes describing their relational and parenting experiences in a family building were constructed: FB as a network of support and safety, social codes and rules of conduct, interventions, and relational strategies. Each theme included subthemes which offered a comprehensive summary of the data analysis. The themes and sub-themes are presented in the Table 3.1:

Table 3.1. The Themes and The Sub-themes of the Research

Themes	Fb as a Network of Support and Safety	Roles and Rules of Conduct in FB	Interference in the FB	Boundary Negotiations in the FB
Sub-themes	Support for Children and Their Safety	Roles and Rules of Conduct for Women	Interference in Parenting	Compliances to the FB Expectations and Interferences
	Reciprocal Caretaking	Roles and Rules of Conduct for Men	Interference in Social Life	Setting Boundaries to the FB Expectations and Interferences
		Social Codes about the Expression of Couple Intimacy	Interference in Couple Relationship Interference in the Homes Setting	FB Members' Response

3.1. FB AS A NETWORK OF SUPPORT AND SAFETY

Mutual support was the most salient theme in the participants' accounts. This theme described the support they received from and gave to the other members living in the building and the resulting sense of trust and safety. Two subthemes emerged from this theme. These were support for children and their safety and reciprocal care taking. Further, in this section, both the types and nature of the support described in family buildings will be presented along with the participants' accounts.

3.1.1. Support for Children and Their Safety

Support for children and their safety was the most frequently mentioned issue in most of the interviews. The participants focused on two aspects of the support regarding children in family buildings: 1) child education and guidance, 2) safe and trusted child care.

3.1.1.1. Child Education and Guidance

Nearly all of the participants described the environment in the building as very nourishing for the children. Most of the couples stated that children were lucky to grow up in a family building. According to their accounts, the building was rich with educating experiences and access to people who had valuable knowledge. Living together in family buildings provided for children the opportunity to establish close family ties and enabled the knowledge and tradition transmission across generations. The participants regarded this value transfer opportunity as really important for children's development and for them to learn good manners. Six of the participants highlighted that in family buildings, children got to spend time with their extended family including multiple generations and learned from them, which otherwise would not be possible in a big city life.

They are really close with their grandmother, they are really close with their uncle and aunt, they are really close with their cousins. So if I were living elsewhere, they wouldn't be so closely connected. They wouldn't be able to grow up like brothers together. (6F)

It's very good to live here... because living close to the relatives is really important in terms of kinship relations... Cousins and their children.... Grandmother, grandfather. This environment is really good for children..... I want it to be like that, because they shouldn't forget their relatives. Because they need their relatives after all, so I don't want their ties to break. (3F)

Children who grew up with their grandmother and grandfather know everything such as respect and love. For example, nowadays young people are growing up in separate environments from their relatives, they don't know the holiday rituals like visiting the elderly, they are just celebrating by text messages. For example, we do not have it here, they visit their grandparents on holidays. On holidays, everyone gathers at the same table, drinks their tea. You know, they learn those concepts very well. Like, Ramadan and what is fasting like. (4F)

One couple, whose family building included multiple cousins from a broad age spectrum stated that growing up with others taught children to share and think others' wellbeing in their actions.

So there is no such thing as "my child" in our apartment, but "our child". When I go to the market with my child, he does not buy anything just for himself, he always gets 6. He says "Mom, these are for my other older sisters, for my brothers and sisters" Both the joy and sadness of one is shared by all members. (2F)

Apart from teaching manners and traditions, being close to family members ensured safe connections for the children. Participants explained that in the family building, cousins, aunts and grandparents functioned as guides and safeguards for

children. Through multiple and more sustainable surveillance, children's safety was guaranteed and they had multiple parental figures to protect and guide them if they faced a problem or danger.

Children don't have bad habits, it's the biggest advantage of living here, they control each other very well, like a parent. For example, older sisters asks how her cousins and younger siblings are doing they protect younger ones, there is no violence among them.

(1M)

I think, children can analyze a problem that they may encounter in life faster. I think it's because of their confidence. If my child is unable to solve a problem here, he will be able to solve it in the downstairs. If he can't solve his problem, he can invite his grandfather and ask him. Now, grandfathers are a little more knowledgeable than fathers. Sometimes my son says, "let me ask my grandfather", he goes downstairs and comes back with a solution. (4M)

Lastly, participants claimed that in the family buildings, there were many children from a broad age spectrum and therefore, they were role models and inspiration sources for each other. They inspired each other in academic success and opened up each other's horizons starting from an early age:

Children look up to each other's academic success... For instance they say "look at my brother, he did this or my cousin did this, so I should achieve that too". (1M)

3.1.1.2. Safe and Trusted Child Care

Along with the benefits for child development, living in the family building also benefited parents in childcare support. The most salient type of help received

from the family building was childcare. Eleven of the 14 participants described childcare support as an advantage of living in a family building.

When I go to my own mom, I say that it is really a blessing to live close to my mother-in-law. I say “look, my child will come home from school. I am not at home, I left the key to my mother-in-law. What would I do without them?” (2F)

For example, my wife has to leave the child to go somewhere, to the hospital or somewhere else. Who is the most reliable person? She leaves him to my mother. “Mother, you look after the child for an hour, I will go to the market and come back” ... you can't have such trust if you were living outside, in a foreign building. Even if you trust your neighbors, there is always a question mark in your mind: “I wonder if something would happen”. But since she leaves our child to my own mother, there is no question mark. I think living in a family apartment has just benefits and no harm. (4M)

Especially for women with children. There is someone you can trust, you can go somewhere or if you have something to do, you can leave your child very easily under the supervision of your parents. (3F)

When it came to childcare, couples sought reliable and trustworthy caretakers. Even when their financial status sufficed for a babysitter, relying on the “family” for childcare was preferred. For one couple, the decision to move in the family building was purely based on their childcare needs which intensified after their newborn had some health complications.

After my first son was born, he received 42 days of intensive care treatment and needed good care afterwards. Our previous plans were to get help from

a paid babysitter. But for good care, we did not dare to leave our children to a person we did not know. Because my mother was already looking after her other grandchildren and she was experienced, we moved here. (1F)

A notable issue emerging in the participants' accounts was the feeling of safety and trust in the family building and the family members. Eleven of the 14 participants described family building as a safe place in terms of both the physical boundaries and the members of the building. Thirteen of the 14 participants used the term "gözü arkada kalmamak" when leaving their child in the building, attributing safety to their family building experience. This idiom meant that the participants had great trust in the safety of the building. Thus, they neither felt compelled to check on the ones they left in the building or worried about them.

I'm going to work, but I'm unaware of the house. Sometimes I call and I can't reach my wife's phone. Then I call my mom and tell her that I can't reach my wife and ask her to take a look. She immediately goes to my apartment, since she already has the key... She comforts me and says they are sleeping, don't be afraid. (4M)

Even for two women who did not prefer to live in a FB and counted many disadvantages of living in it, it still provided a feeling of safety for their children.

There is only one (advantage). When you go somewhere and leave your children, you don't worry about their safety. I went to my aunt's daughter recently and I did not worry at all. Because my mother-in-law is in the building, my sister-in-law is in the building, if something happens. I don't know any other good side of living in this building. (7F)

According to participants' accounts, childcare support in the family building had two distinct features, guaranteed and familiar, therefore trusted. A majority of the couples claimed that separate living arrangements would be really difficult for childcare. All members were well-known in family building, since the buildings either entirely constituted of family members, or long-known neighbors. Thereby, participants were able to securely entrust their loved ones to the building, since

“familiarity” ensured the trust on the members. Related to “familiarity” concept, participants described family buildings as free of foreigners who could pose a threat to the safety of the entire building.

If I live in another apartment, I cannot send my child to my neighbors very comfortably, or when I need to go out I cannot leave my child there very comfortably. But here in the building if you are sick, if you have to go to work you leave your children very easily and without any worry about their wellbeing. (6F)

Being in the building also assures safety. You know, the more foreigners in the building, the more risk there is. Now I have my sister in a flat, my parents in a flat, for example. It would be even more comfortable and safe if my sister would live here too. (2M)

In my opinion being close to elderly like mother or father is very different than being alone. When we went to the contractor, we lived in separate buildings for a year and I felt the absence of the elderly. So for instance I had to go to the market but I could not leave my child and go. I couldn't trust to leave my child to the neighbor either. For example, I had to take a shower but I couldn't. (2F)

Besides easing the burden of parenting responsibilities, childcare support also benefited the participants' life outside the building and enabled them to maintain their social life and work life uninterrupted, without any worries. The participants who shared the childcare responsibilities with the building members claimed that they were able continue working and worked even for longer hours, which was stated especially by the women participants.

When there is a problem at work, I can easily say, "No problem, I can stay until late in the evening." I know that there is someone who looks after my

children at home, I am comfortable with it...Actually, it even affects my work positively. Oh! I am not worried, I know that there is no problem at home. I will not be missing anything, My late arrival would not hinder anything at home, I can work comfortably with the assurance that people in the building will fill my shoes. (1F)

So my wife always worked. She worked at supermarkets. She came home And she does not worry at all... Otherwise she couldn't work, there is no such possibility. (6M)

This feeling of family building as a safe place also influenced the participants' social life and couple relationship. There was a consensus on the idea that, being able to leave their children securely in the building, helped them to maintain a social life without the kids.

If you would live in a separate building and want to go somewhere or go to a movie theater with your wife, you look for places to leave your child, sometimes you leave him with the neighbor. When I go to the cinema, your mind is mostly occupied with your child, how is he, is he treated well... So you don't have that anxiety here in the family building (1M)

3.1.2. Reciprocal Caretaking

Family building was described as a place where adult members both received help from and provided support to other members. This subtheme was put forward by 12 of the 14 participants. There was only one couple who did not feel supported very much and complained about the lack of support. In other words, the accessibility of the support is expected by all the members. Overall in the participants' accounts, three different types of caretaking came to the fore: 1) practical, 2) economic, 3) emotional.

3.1.2.1. Practical Care

Eleven of the participants delineated that the support and caretaking in the building had a reciprocal nature and each member was part of a connected and mutually supportive relationship network. Eight of them stated that family building provided many practical supports on a daily basis, ranging from lending an egg to cooking for each other.

It is really comfortable. I am working, there is at least someone who cooks at home, so you can go upstairs to eat even I don't have anything to eat or they can call you for dinner. (3F)

The help and cooperation here is excellent. When you need something, swing the basket up and down, and say "put this and that". I think it's wonderful. (3M)

When my mother-in-law goes somewhere, when she needs something or when she is sick, I go down to their flat and prepare a meal, or if I need something, when I come back from work, she asks if I have a meal ready and I can get some from her. (3F)

Besides supporting each other on a daily basis, family building members took care of each other and were particularly supportive during sickness and helped with meal preparation and house cleaning. Receiving support in sickness was mentioned many times.

For example, (when diagnosed with bone disease), the doctor had told me not to get up for 1 month. He told me: "You will never get out of bed. You will use crutches, even when you go to the toilet. Then, for example, I had a real hard time. My mother was living in a far neighborhood at that time. God bless her, my mother-in-law used to come every day. She used to look after my kids, cook my meal, clean the house. (2F)

Related to reciprocity of caretaking in the building, 3 participants said that the members of the family buildings lived in a sense of unity. They cared about the other members, their needs and wishes, and considered the well-being of each other in their decisions. Participants described cooperation among members and perpetual exchange of support. For instance, a husband living with her wife's parents in a family building mentioned how they considered the whole family instead of just themselves:

According to my moral understanding, the family is very important. For example, when I bought a car, I never thought that "a car with two doors is enough for us", I have always searched for a car that the whole family could fit in so that I could take the whole family to trips and look for a place to take a tour. (3M)

The majority was very happy to be living with this sense of unity and providing the much needed help to their family. The feeling of responsibility to take care of others, especially the elderly was a repeating theme in ten participants' statements. They were pleased to provide the necessary support and run errands for their parents, who would not be able manage without their help. They were very happy to be helpful and accommodate to other members' needs. As a matter of fact, moving out was deemed as "selfish" by one male participant:

My brother moved into a separate building and he didn't come back. That is why it would not be right for me to move away, because my parents are 70 years old now. It has been 3-4 years since my grandmother passed away, but I often helped her to take her to the hospital or visit a relative. So it's good to be close, better to be in the same building. Now you can go to another district and get married and have children.... There are people who think that they can feel comfortable alone. But now it's a responsibility to be close to the family. (2M)

That being said, two participants stated their discomfort about providing support, in case of in-laws' dependency on them. They gave two reasons for their

sense of discomfort: conflict in labor division among “eltiler (sister in-laws)”, and the participants’ reluctance to live in a place where they were asked to provide more support than they received. In other words, it was significant for the participants that the support received and provided were comparable and balanced. Where they anticipated an imbalance, it had an impact on their decisions. A female participant described how she would refuse to live in a building with her husband’s family, where she would receive very little help in comparison to what she would be obligated to provide.

I wouldn't be able to live in the same apartment with my husband's family, because they wouldn't be able to support me, because they need care. My mother and father think, "Let me take care of the children, let me look after them". But they wouldn't do this. I would have to take care of them. I wouldn't get any support. (1F)

3.1.2.2. Financial Care

Along with the daily household support and elderly care, family building was a place where members supported each other financially if needed. Economic necessity also played a role in the couples’ decisions to live in a family building. Among 7 couples, 6 moved to family building primarily because of financial reasons. The buildings belonged either to one of the couple’s parents or in-laws and there was no expectation for paying a rent. Living in an expensive city like Istanbul, the lack of rent expenses helped the participants’ finances and eased their struggle to afford a living. Five of the six couples resided in a building that belonged to the husband’s side, where men had been living with their family of origin until the marriage and then moved into a spare apartment in the same building. For one couple, the wife’s father offered the couple a spare apartment with the intention to ease their economic burden.

We had no other option but to move here ... To save a little bit from the rent ... I think if I didn't have to, I would have lived here again. But I decided to

move here in order not to have financial difficulties and to have better life standards (3M)

In the participants' statements, it was noticed that their parents or in-laws expected these couples to live in the same building as well and they were prepared for this. The participants explained that there was always an available flat for them in the building or the possibility to create an available place for the participants. Three couples mentioned of already available flats in the apartment; the parents of two couples gave the building to a constructor to demolish it and build a new one with more apartments and two couples described their apartment as "çatisız ev", a roofless building, convenient for adding more floors for each married child.

My father in-law proposed me to add another story for us to move in, since the roof of the building was not completed for these occasions. (1M)

Although some of the couples complained about certain challenges of living in a FB, they still considered it as a source of economic support as well as necessity, and described it as their "only way out":

Each of us were living in separate buildings and tenants. Then the house of my mother-in-law was given to the contractor. She proposed to sell her home. She said "I will buy an apartment, let's all live together". Nobody wanted this, we all knew the difficulties of living together. But we were obliged because we had no way of buying a house otherwise. We had no other opportunity than this opportunity. Or we would have to live in rentals for life. Because we didn't have the luxury of buying a house with one salary. Even when we were like that, we said we had to live like this. Our decision was obligatory. (7F)

3.1.2.3. Emotional Care

In the participants' descriptions, the nature of caretaking and support was not only practical or financial, but also emotional and moral. First, living in close physical proximity with the family of origin ensured close contact with each other.

Five participants mentioned that being close to loved ones and having the opportunity to closely monitor their parents was an important aspect of the family buildings. Thereby, family building enabled the participants to carry on their life while looking after their parents and other members of their family of origin. Furthermore, six participants claimed that having their parents nearby gave them confidence about their potential support and resources. It also enabled them to frequently check on their parents and be sure of their health. In other words, being close to each other both made participants feel safer and protected and also ensured for the elderly to receive support from their children and other building members if needed:

It is not boring for me, it is a good thing because it is nice to be close to your parents, to care for them, to be there whenever he wants, to get to them fast in case of any emergency. So, if I lived somewhere else, I would be worried for them. What happened to my parents? Because people should love their parents under normal circumstances. Since I do not have such a discomfort, I cannot say that I would be OK even if I went far away and saw them once a month. I feel very close to them. It is so good by me. (2F)

I am happy to live with my family. After all, you can build a life for yourself, you are getting married, but all your loved ones are with you. So, I'm living this happiness. I am so closer to my parents or my sisters when there is the slightest discomfort to my mother or father. I am close to them whatever happens good or bad. Being close both to my parents and my husband makes me happy. In other words, even if you lived in a big city like Istanbul, even if you lived in a close neighborhood, you would still have difficulty due to the traffic to go to your parents. So, it makes me happy to have all my loved ones around. (1F)

Additionally, the members' presence, especially in-laws or parents served as an emotional support system. They were described as providing guidance in the

participants' transition to adulthood, by giving marriage advice and assisting the couple to resolve conflicts. The parents were perceived as experienced, therefore wise and the participants actively sought their guidance. Three participants explained that their parents'/ in-laws' advices offered necessary guidance in their transition to adulthood:

How does it contribute to my [marriage]? The suggestions of my parents: "Son, you are married now. Pull yourself together." I told you, my father has a temper. My father used to tell me that I could not enter the house after 9 pm and he would not take me home if I was late. I was married, I had a wife inside, I had a child, but still he used to say, "It is over, you cannot enter after 9 pm". These gave us a little more direction and got our lives on track. If you don't listen to the advices, you can easily get into trouble. If there is no discipline, you can't achieve anything in your life. (4M)

Now, my parents inform us how the family should be organized, how the childcare is carried on, how to manage the family house, how to host guests, and so on. If they were far from us, we would not be informed by them. Either we could handle these tasks with the information we get from the neighbors and trial and error or we could not at all. Family support is very important. If you get along well, it is very important that you live in the family apartment or parents live close to you. (2M)

Family members' guidance was also sought in times of couple conflicts. Two women participants explained their call for family members' support to convince their husbands in the desired direction.

I go and tell my sister-in-law, I tell my mother-in-law. After that, they talk to my husband. (2F)

Moreover, the participants were sure that they will get the required help or support from the building members when needed. In other words, they were assured

with guaranteed support. Two participants who had the financial means to move out of the family buildings, preferred to continue living there because they felt supported and protected in the building. Moving out to a new place meant leaving that security net behind and therefore, becoming vulnerable to the foreign. For 3 participants, the safe zone extended to the neighbors, who lived in the same street with them. In other words, the participants voiced that living in a building and even a street full of long-known acquaintances provided the feeling of security which was hard to find in a big city.

“Sometimes we talk to each other and say: “Let's go somewhere else to live.”. We decide the next day: “Let's stay here”. I am not here for 12 hours a day. They are together for 12 hours. In other words, they constantly communicate with each other. My wife says that if I moved to a residence, I would not have these kinds of relations. My mother does not stay in the building for 6 months a year. In these 6 months, they are like family here: the neighbor across us, the one below. For example, she takes the child to the neighbor below for babysitting. If the windows are forgotten open, the neighbor living across our apartment calls to say that the window is open. She is checking on us from her window. Let's say the lights are still off. The neighbor calls and asks why your lights are still off. Now, these are the advantages of being in a family building and this neighborhood environment.” (4M)

3.2. ROLES AND RULES OF CONDUCT IN FB

This theme handles the expectations and specified rules of conduct in the family buildings. It elaborates on the participants' responsibilities in the building which were mostly assumed due to the social roles.

Although among the participants' statements, there was only one expectation applied to all building members regardless of their gender or age, it was noted that most of the social codes in the building segregated according to the members' genders, and the hierarchical power they had on the basis of their age.

Overall in the participants' accounts, three subthemes containing the expectations from men and women both as individuals and as couples came forward: 1) rules of conduct for women, 2) rules of conduct for men 3) social codes about the expression of couple intimacy

The one and only manner expected from all members regardless of their age or gender was the expectation for compliance. Eight participants from 4 couples complained about this expectancy for compliance. They further elaborated on this expectancy and explained that, building members and especially mother-in-law and father in-law expected all members to follow their wishes and instructions, and considered any kind of alternative point of view as disobedience towards the building order.

They expected her to come and go as they wished. I think they were expecting for such a bride (5M)

When her words were not listened to or someone offered alternative thoughts ... (laughs) ... it bothered my mother (3F)

In the participants' expressions it came to the fore that these expectations were mostly organized and inspected by the mother in-law herself. A mother in-law was even likened to a dictator by the neighborhood with her strict attitude and demand for submission from the daughter in-laws.

When my sister-in-law's husband went to the army, she lived together with my in-laws. So my mother-in-law saw the right to rule her. my mother-in-law is a bit of a dictator on the street. She is even called as the most dictator of the street. This is how everyone knows her on the street. She likes to interfere. She always wants to say whatever she wants and speaks without thinking that she will break hearts. (6F)

This mother-in-law fended off any kind of disagreement and even resorted to violence in the past when her expectation for compliance was not met by her daughter-in-laws.

My mother-in-law wants no one to react to her. Since she got used to it from my sister-in-law, she started to behave to me the same way she did to my sister-in-law. When I said that I didn't like this attitude very much, she says "shut up, don't answer back" and she can talk this way with everyone. when my sister-in-law protested her behavior, my mother-in-law rose her hand and tried to hit her (6F)

3.2.1. Roles and Rules of Conduct for Women

In the interviews, the participants described distinct roles, responsibilities and expectations from the women living in family buildings. There were tasks specially appointed to women, such as housework labor, and specific manners to perform the right way of being the daughter in-law. Further, these women were assigned certain roles, that had mostly negative connotations such as jealous and spiteful. This section was divided into two parts to comprehensively cover the participants' statements: 1) being a wife and a daughter-in law, 2) relationships among women.

3.2.1.1. Being a wife and a daughter-in law

Ten of the participants described the housework as women's duty. Six couples stated that husbands or children at the apartment helped the women, however without embracing any permanent responsibility on the housework duties.

In our house, burden of the housework is on woman. I do not interfere with the housework, even I do not do anything related to housework. (7M)

I was always out because of work ... After our child was born my sister in-law moved in with us, they do the housework and share the child care, But of course when they want something from me, for example, "Can you sweep

the house?" I help them when they ask from me or when the guests are coming over and the house is messy (5M)

A couple of the participants described a division of labor, so that women were responsible inside of the entire apartment and men were responsible from the chores outside the apartment such as supermarket shopping.

The division of work regarding the home setting and housework is usually mine. Chores outside of the apartment, such as supermarket shopping belongs to my husband. (4F)

It was notable to see that all female participants either accepted or at least accommodated to this assigned responsibility of housework labor. Only one woman mentioned that she shared housework with her children, whom were expected to perform daily chores in the house:

Since I have been working for years, everyone in the house knows the responsibilities that they have to do. For example, I have 3 sons, my little son is about 3 years old. I never clean his toys. My eldest son is 9 years old, I have not tidied up his bed or his wardrobe for 2 years. They know the responsibilities they have to do. (6F)

Along with the responsibility of their own apartments, women were also expected to provide housework labor to their mother in-laws. Three women explained the extent of their in-law's expectations.

They are constantly waiting for service. "Bring this, do this, take this. come sit with us and stay with us. Come here early in the morning and do the housework and do not leave before the evening." (5F)

As a matter of fact, one couple was arranged to get married in order to ensure that housework tasks were taken care of by the bride, because the mother in-law was diagnosed with cancer and could no longer perform housework. This woman was in a sense "employed" to fulfill the mother in-law's duties.

My mother-in-law was sick she had stomach aches, therefore I had responsibility of entire house on me. She was 43 kilos when I got married, she couldn't get out of the bed for 2 months ... When I got married and came here, there were 3 men. My mother-in-law was sick so I had to cook. I had to light the stove, I had to collect the house and host the guests who came to visit my mother-in-law (4F)

Furthermore, participants mentioned the buildings' expectancies about the proper way of "gelinlik yapmak", meaning being a proper bride. They described certain standards and norms set for them.

Being a proper bride means showing respect for my in-laws. Not taking your child on your lap, not sitting next to the father-in-law and mother-in-law and not eating. These behaviors are the way for being a proper bride. Not opening your mouth, closing your veil. (2F)

For example, the bride of the house waits standing at the door, she does not sit. Or, for example, she shows great respect for her mother, father or father-in-law. (5M)

Some of the female participants mentioned external pressure, demanding her to be a proper and exemplary daughter in-law. Either their family of origin or their husband asked the women to follow and comply with the demands and expectations of their in-laws:

I already got married at a young age that I didn't know what marriage was, there was also pressure from my parents. "You came there with your wedding dress, you will only come out with a shroud. You have to accept it, no matter what your mother-in-law says, your father-in-law or even your brother-in-law or your husband. You won't say a word" There was pressure from this side too. (4F)

Another female participant explained an incident where her husband asked her to follow the FB order even if it bothered her:

I am uncomfortable with notifying my mother-in-law each time I go out, but my husband says, "Let her know what happens, tell her where you are going." But I say, "Your mom is pouting anyways when I say I'm going out." He says " don't go then," but this is not a satisfactory answer for me. (7F).

Being a proper daughter-in-law was a lifelong job including multiple generations, since the responsibilities and rules of conduct were mostly taught and transmitted across generations. A number of female participants stated that they were familiar with these standards either because they faced similar expectations for compliance from their own mothers or some elderly relative advised them as they grew up. It was even taught to two of the participants that the only way to break free of these responsibilities was death.

My mom used to say something to me, that her mother said her as well" you get out of the place with a shroud where you entered with the wedding dress". (2F)

3.2.1.2. Relationship Among Women

This part handles the relationship between the women living in the family building. In the participants' statements it was noticed that, certain roles and behaviors were attributed to women and to relationships among them. In a sense, women were expected to behave in certain ways, such as behaving passive-aggressively and easily getting in fight with other women. For instance, mother in-laws deemed as causing troubles, being critical and oppressive towards their daughter-in-law; brides were assigned the lowest place in the power hierarchy and expected to fight with other brides in the building. From the interviews with the participants, relationships among women can be outlined as: 1) relationship between mother-in-law and daughter-in law, 2) relationships among sisters-in-law.

3.2.1.2.1. Relationship between Mother-in-Law and Daughter-in-Law

When asked about the difficulties of living in a family building, most of the participants mentioned the relationship between mother-in-law and the daughter-in-law as problematic. The participants gave examples such as, the mother in-law being oppressive and getting in verbal quarrels with their daughter-in-law or the daughter-in-law getting easily offended by their mother-in-law. As a matter of fact, even men who were out of the building most of the time, left early in the morning for work and came back in the evening admitted that they did not experience the same things as their wives, and acknowledged the conflicts among women in the building:

I think there is no problem. There is no problem for me. Because I go to work in the morning. I come in the evening, eat my food, watch my TV. If women have problems among themselves, they actually know better, since they are experiencing them. Because they are constantly in the same house and they are in constant communication, I don't know, I don't have a problem like that. (7M)

But I don't know how was it for my wife. My wife did not reflect anything to me like "your mother did this and that" she did not reflect. What she lived through, she lived through by herself. (4M)

However, it was striking to see that 4 of these men pointed solely at the relationship among women when asked about the difficulties of living in the building.

Yes, in general the main things are related to the daughter- mother-in-law relationship. (2M)

Although most of the male participants expected their wives to be more agreeable in order to end the conflicts, one man imparted some responsibility to his mother in conflicts:

Of course, the conflicts may be due to the mother-in-laws and therefore my mother. The elders are a little difficult to understand. Whatever they say is true according to them. (6M)

Related to this matter, the compatibleness between the daughter-in-law's culture and culture of the daughter-in-law's families was voiced many times. In order to ensure this, some in-laws took the matters in their hands and arranged their son's marriages. Two male participants proposed that the lack of conflicts was due to choosing appropriate bride, in other words bride's adaptability to the in-laws' expectations.

My family liked her." She suits you. This girl fit us and our family they said." (4M)

There are no areas of interest or conflict between my wife and my mother. Maybe some mothers are very oppressive to their son or have financial expectation from them or they are simply jealous and intervenes the bride's clothing. Since my wife has no such flaws or anything conflicting with my mother's understanding of family life, my mother does not have nothing to criticize or suppress her. (2M)

On the other hand, female participants who experienced frequent disagreements with their mothers-in-law expected them to be more agreeable. One woman wished their in-laws to be more parent-like and to show some empathy rather than being critical in the way they were.

I would love to have my mother-in-law to approach me like a mother and my father-in-law to approach me like a father and we would be on a very different level. I really wanted to make this happen. I tried very hard for this, but it didn't happen. They always criticized and never showed affection at all. (5F)

Another female participant argued that her “mother-daughter like” relationship with her mother-in-law contributed to the peaceful environment in the building.

Because we are really like mother and daughter with my mother-in-law. God bless her.... She doesn't interfere with my guests, we don't experience the usual bride- mother-in-law problems. (2F)

3.2.1.2.2. Relationship among Sister-in-Laws

The relationships among sisters-in-law were also described as conflictual many times by five participants. These participants, most of them are men, looked upon the issues in the building as women’s conflicts, most of the time triggered by the “gelinler/ sisters-in-laws”.

Usually, we did not have much quarrel or friction in our building. But there may be families, there is a fight between sister-in-laws. But we didn't have much of conflicts. (2M)

Sister-in-laws were seen as foreign figures coming into the building, who disturbed the perceived “building homeostasis” and who were ultimately responsible for possible conflicts that might occur in the building.

Such the people who come from outside, the more foreign people come to your own house, the less peaceful that house is. For example, in general, unrest and trouble always come from outside. I mean these brides, our wives. All are foreigners, each is from a different city.. For example, when we were a nuclear family, we were 5 people, my mother, father were and brothers. Back then, we did not have any big problems among us. Even if we experienced problems, we would forget in a day. But these external factors(brides) are causing more issues. (7M)

Similarly, a woman who resided in a building with her family of origin believed that the peaceful environment was possible for them since there was no “sister-in-law” in the building.

So the grooms somehow adapt to their wives, they somehow manage to live together. It is easier for men to live together, but it is not easy when women come together. Now if a foreign woman is in the apartment as a bride..... For example when my mother says something, I don't mind, But if she makes the same sentences to the daughter in-law, she would be upset. so I think it wouldn't be so peaceful with a bride living in this apartment. So our biggest advantage is to live as 3 sisters and mothers rather than living with a bride in a family apartment. (1F)

3.2.2. Rules of conduct for men

This section grounds on the expectations and rules of conduct applied to the men in the building. According to the participants' statements, it was found that that there were two salient matters regarding the roles of men in the buildings. 1) men as mediators 2) conformity to masculine norms.

3.2.2.1. Men as Mediators

From six participants' descriptions about the relations in the building, it appeared that the men in the building were generally assigned the role of a mediator. Men were appointed the position to change the course of events, generally conflicts, taking place between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law. There were two different representations of men's power in the participants' statements. In the first one, mother in-laws told on the daughter-in-law's behavior to the son with the expectation that he would put pressure on her to comply.

For example, if I run afoul of my mother-in-law and do not listen to what she says. For example, I do not inform her where I am going to but I go unannounced.... After the third time my mother-in-law would say to my husband, "What does she think of us, by not telling us where she goes?" (7F)

In the second one, female participants complained about the tyranny of their mother-in-law to their husbands and expected him to take action:

I know if I am right or wrong in a fight with my mother in love. My husband doesn't have to say that to me anyway. The important thing for me is that he finds the middle between me and his mother, or that he develops the proper attitude towards me or his mother, but he acts a little more hesitant about showing a position. (6F)

One female participant who had a good relationship with her mother-in-law stated the importance of “not gossiping about each other to the husband“:

My mother in-law never complained about me to him. I did not gossip about his mother to him either. Since he was not caught in the middle of anything, he was not involved in any kind of conflicts. Our relationship with my mother-in-law continued in a framework of respect and love. (2F)

Although generally it was the male participants who were asked to take control, in one case a mother in-law employed the father-in-law, another hierarchically superior male figure, to step in:

Everything was a problem. For example, we were going somewhere with my mother-in-law. Look, my husband doesn't know any about these. I have never told my husband. We went to a friend's house with my mother-in-law. A friend bought an item for her apartment, I said “how nice”. We came home, my mother-in-law cried to my father-in-law and said, "This bride is jealous of others and she wants to leave." Of course that caused an unrest at home. My father-in-law was also very angry; he didn't say anything to me but it was difficult. (4F)

In another case, when in-laws could not enforce rules on the couple, they complained about the daughter in law’s social life to her parents, once again using male hierarchy as a mediator for problem solving:

We went out with my husband one day. My mother-in-law and father-in-law called my father and told "Your daughter is going to places we don't approve and meet people we don't want." (5F)

It was important to note that, there were no such dynamics of using the male figure as a mediator in the conflicts experienced in the buildings where the couple resided with the wife's side.

Five of the seven men, all of them living with their side of the family in the building, admitted the inconveniency of being caught up in the middle of a fight, in which their own mothers quarreled with their own wives.

It is very difficult to stay in between (his mother and his wife). It is very difficult to stay in-between and, to manage the conflict and please both of them. (4M)

I'm trying not to hurt anybody, but of course at the end either my wife is hurt or my mother is hurt. Men get stuck in-between generally. (6M)

One man asked her wife to comply with the in-laws' expectations. There was an instance, when a daughter in-law and her father in-law fought because she refused to give her old TV to him and her husband stepped in to do what his parents wanted:

My father-in-law was very bored at his home. My husband came home and said, "I'm taking this television upstairs, don't even open your mouth." After that, I said nothing I didn't want any more fights, I said "okay take it away." (7F)

3.2.2.2. Conformity to Masculine Norms

Concerns about protecting and maintaining the independency and autonomy in case of living in a building with their wife's side was a salient theme among four men.

Two men, who were the only participants living in the building that belonged to their father in-laws mentioned their concerns about the decision to move into the building. According to their accounts, moving into their in-laws'

apartment meant getting labeled as “içgüveysi” by the society, which was a special term describing the son-in-law living with his wife's parents and implying a lack of men's authority.

I was really hesitant in my decision to move in this building, I hesitated because I got suspicious that people would say , "Look, you are sitting in our house," I wondered if they'd say “you are içgüveysi... “ (3M)

I was worried that the people around might say "Has this man settled there as an inner groom?" I was very anxious to hear such words. (1M)

Living in an apartment that belonged to the in-laws might have indicated the loss of authority on the part of the men. These men suspected that their in-laws might possibly expect them to accept their authority and show compliance in exchange for the financial help they provide by letting the couple live in the building rent-free. This caused a lot of stress to those men who lived with their wives' side, and generated concerns about how well they fulfilled masculinity norm.

After all, if a husband moves into a building that belongs to his in-laws as inner groom, he prepares himself for this and he is expected to be milder and more accepting. A woman usually goes into a new family as a bride, she accepts her man and her family. She thinks I'm like their daughter now. Therefore, she accepts the orders and pressure coming from her in-laws. But it is the opposite in men... when the man moves in a building with his wife's family there is a conflict area there.... Because a man is ultimately a chief, the head of the household ... like a manager ... (7M)

3.2.2. Social Codes about the Expression of Couple Intimacy

This part handles the social code for the couples' expression of intimacy in the family building. The rules about displaying intimacy in the presence of building members varies among couples. In this regard, the participants can be grouped into

two: 1) the expression of couple intimacy is accepted, 2) couple intimacy is not approved by the building.

For 3 couples, couple intimacy was accepted in the presence of the family building members. They explained that they could both call each other names such as “my love” and also show physical affection without any negative reaction from the members.

No, living in a family apartment does not affect our closeness. I can hug and kiss my wife on the cheek next to my parents and her mother or father. (5M).

There is no problem, I hug my wife next to my father-in-law, kiss her, say her “I love you.... my love”. Other building members are also comfortable with showing affection next to me. (1M)

Two couples stated that although there was no disapproval from the building members, there was a limit to feeling comfortable with showing affection to each other in the presence of others:

In my opinion, it is necessary to pay attention to our behaviors next to our elders in terms of manners and our dialogue with our husband. For example, I call my husband by his name. In some places it is not welcomed, but I name it.... But no teasing or joking next to them. (2F)

Another group of three couples stated that, display of affection was not approved by the building and this kind of intimacy was found as unacceptable by the FB members:

I think I am not comfortable to display intimacy, because of my mother and father... They don't like so pert relationships. I guess that's why I am not comfortable with public display of affection... my father would be upset, I suppose. (3F)

When you are with your in-laws, you do not have much affinity or intimacy with your husband. For example, if my husband sits there, I cannot sit next to him. It would be regarded as odd and found shameful. (4F)

As a matter of fact, two men admitted that the building members' potential reactions deterred them from gestures such as buying flowers for their wives. They shared concerns about how their masculinity and authority might be questioned when others witnessed these expressive behaviors.

Maybe I am not buying roses for my wife because of people's reaction... Because if I enter the house with roses in my hand and someone might see it, they might say, "What the hell! are you a henpecked husband?" (4M)

The building members do not say anything explicitly, but they say things like "did he buy flowers, why did he did such thing?" In their eyes, it looks like I am afraid of my wife. They say "I wonder if this guy bought these flowers out of fear" they don't consider me buying flowers out of love. (7M)

That being said, 10 participants admitted that the display of intimacy as a couple was always possible and not interfered with in their individual flats. In a sense, cultural codes regarding the family life as sacred ensured the individual apartments were free from the building members' gaze and therefore free from potential criticism.

So living in a family apartment never affects my relationship with my wife. We are distant and show no affection on the street. We go arm in arm, hold hands and enter our apartment. After entering our flat, no one gets involved. We can make jokes and be playful We might watch a movie. Neither my family, nor other member in the apartment interfere with this. (4M)

3.3. INTERFERENCE IN THE FB

This sub-theme elaborates on the participants' experiences of interferences in the building. The participants lived in a close physical proximity to their family of origin or procreation. Due to this living arrangement, some of them expressed many interferences of the building members in their personal life or couple relationship. A majority, particularly women, complained about the building members' interference or pressure with child care, social life and multiple other domains, while minority reported a peaceful and free family building setting.

According to their statements, these participants experienced the external interference mostly in four main domains, which were 1) parenting, 2) social life, 3) couple relationship and lastly 4) home setting.

Many participants described their experience in a family building as collective living, in the sense that members were present in each other's lives and constantly informed about each new update and event. Three participants argued that the physical proximity naturally increased the interference:

Sometimes they(her parents) can't hold themselves and intervene suddenly, but then they realize and withdraw themselves. My mother is doing it more, unconsciously and with good intentions, this is a situation that comes with living together, because you live every moment together, she cannot help but expresses her opinions. (1F)

3.3.1. Interference in Parenting

The most frequently voiced type of interference was interventions in the participants' parenting styles regardless of the characteristics of the building and families. Thirteen of the 14 participants mentioned their dissatisfaction with this interference, involving the building members' advices, opinions, direct interventions related to their parenting. It is important to note that both men and women were on the same side, criticizing the building members' interference in their parenting. The building members' interference regarding the participants' parenting can be grouped into two: 1) child discipline 2) child care.

3.3.1.1 Interference in Child Discipline

All 13 participants complained about the impossibility of maintaining a consistent child discipline in the family building. They said that, their attempts to set up rules and to ensure a persistent order for their children are challenged by the other building members, especially by grandparents. It was stated multiple times that building members regarded the participants' parenting style as harsh and felt pity for their little grandchildren, so they felt entitled to reverse the participants' rules and judgements. In this way, children had more than one authority figure in the building and mostly chose not to listen to their parents, since they had guardians to protect themselves like grandparents or uncles. Thereby, the participants complained about being unable to maintain order for their children.

You're trying to establish rules on your child, For example you say "you can't buy this." Of course grandma or grandfather have mercy for their grandson, they allow everything you banned.(3F)

For example, I cannot get angry with my children. If I get angry and raise my voice a little, I immediately think "What does my (mother-in-law) from upstairs would say right now?". She would go down immediately and say, "What are you yelling for? Whom are you yelling at?" she would say. So,, my child is spoilt by her. So I couldn't ensure my authority as I wanted to on my child (7F)

On the other hand, in the two specific cases among the seven couples, in-laws were the party who was more rigid. In-laws tried to control their grandchildren and therefore kept a close eye on them. In these cases, grandparents warned the participants to be more authoritarian and more restricting towards the children.

For example, my daughter wants to go to the cafe with her friends and. My mother in-law comes and says "why did you send her? What if something happens to her, what if she has a boyfriend and brings us shame? She says

this all the time. For example, when my son leaves the house she says "Why did he go so late, what if he has bad friends and becomes bonsai addict?" (4F)

"Do it like this, do it like that" he is constantly involved in matters related to children. "Why did you send him there. Why did you send her here. Why did you do that?" my father always interferes with these. (7M)

3.3.1.1. Interference in Child Care

As mentioned above, building members, especially grandmothers functioned as a major child care support for the participants. However, provision of this support also presented them with the opportunity to meddle with and interfere in child care decisions. The participants counted many examples of interference in domains such as children's diet, clothing and haircut.

They (my parents) were very involved when the children were very young in their eating, drinking, clothing. They say "his cloths are really thin" or "are you going to cut his hair?" Or "look he coughs, did you go to the doctor?" (2M)

My mother-in-law always said, "Don't do this, don't do this." For example, I put normal clothes on my child, she would put really thick clothes on him and when the boy went out, he got cold and got asthma. She was very involved with my the child. She didn't trust me. For example when she went out, she would call me 50 times and say. "Did you feed the child, did you give him water?" (4F)

In the participants' accounts, it was apparent that building members saw themselves entitled to state opinions and decide on behalf of the actual parents. In

other words, in the family building decisions related to a child was not solely made by the parents and other members also believed that they had some authority on the children and decisions concerning them.

For example, after my son is born and we were bathing him for the first time at home. My mother-in-law held the baby from the feet and shook him. You are doing this but I am not okay with this, why are you doing it, what if he falls? So for her, this is a health ritual for the child. Just wash the child and leave it. Well, if you ask me I will not accept it. (2M)

For example, I want to enroll my child to a medical high school. My brother-in-law came and said “don’t do it, don’t enroll him there, don’t do it”... I said, “what’s it to you? It’s non of your business.” Now of course I couldn’t tell this to his face.. what’s it for you?, I send my child where I want. (7F)

Two participants stated that, as they grew older and became more experienced in childcare, the extent of building members’ interference in their parenting decreased. In other words, as the building members trusted the participants’ parenting, they advised less and interfered less.

When you become capable of doing something, for example, you raise your child, bring him to the hospital in your child is sick, they do not intervene because they feel that I can follow up with these tasks (my parents). But if the child suffers, for example if he hurt himself and his wounds worsen, if the disease increase, my father would say “what are you doing? Let’s take the kid to hospital” Now he doesn’t feel such deficiency, therefore they are not very involved. (2M)

3.3.2. Interference in Social Life

Six participants voiced the building members’ interference in their social life. All the participants who complained about this type of interference were living

in the building with the husbands' side of the family. According to their description, the building members, especially in-laws, tried to control any kind of relationship of the participants other than the family and wished to be informed about any kind of mobility regarding the building members.

So my parents usually don't want any guests. They don't want anybody to come, or us to go to go outside, go anywhere...They have some kind of a "we are self-sufficient" logic. (7M)

From the interviews with the participants, the building members' interference in the social life can be grouped into to: 1) social life in the building, 2) social life outside of the building.

3.3.2.1. Social life in the Family Building

This part handles the participants' social life taking place in the family building, such as inviting some guests over and hosting people. Building members, especially parents/ parents-in-law tried to control the guests visiting the building from outside and sometimes vetoed the ones they did not approve. In a way, they supervised who entered into the building.

For example, when I bring a friend from outside, my father says "Who is this man?" I say "my friend". "Where do you know this?" He says, "I know him from the old neighborhood, I have known this friend for years", "What is he doing?", "He is doing this job". So I feel uncomfortable with these questions, this questioning of my friend's identity makes me uncomfortable. I reply to his questions, but he is mostly not satisfied. We are having these kind of problems, they usually do not want outside guests. (7M)

My father-in-law and my mother-in-law say, "Only the ones I want them to come will visit this building," I don't know the reason why. "People I love will come, people I don't like will not come" they say. (4F)

In two of the seven cases, even when the guests were approved, the supervision continued. Mother- and sister-in-laws wanted to be included and to be invited to the participants' house as well. Two female participants explained the building members' expectation to be invited when there was a guest over and their reaction when they were not invited:

There is a difficulty of living in a family building.. For instance, a friend of mine comes and I want to sit alone with my friend but it doesn't happen.... My mother in-law expects me to invite her as well, my sister in-law expects me to invite her as well. If I do not invite them a few times, she tells on my husband, then my marriage is damaged. (7F)

In a way, the participants described no space for individual social life in the building. Once the guests entered the building, they saw and met all the building members, even if they were not familiar with them. One female participant explained the case when her guest preferred to meet outside to be able to chat privately.

For example, my friend says, "Let's meet outside from now on because you have your sister-in-law at yours every time I come." In other words, we cannot speak in any way, we cannot sit in private. We can't do anything. (6F)

3.3.2.2. Social Life Outside of the Family Building

The participants described a social life outside of the family building as well, such as interactions with friends and other family members. However, it was a salient theme in their interviews that building members expected to be informed about their activities outside of the building. Five participants mentioned the expectation to notify the building members about their trips and any kind of mobility in their social life.

For example, one day I went out with my friends .. My husband was in the night shift that evening, he could not attend. I came home around 11 o'clock

at night. I opened the door, the phone started to ring. It was my father-in-law "Where were you" he said, "I was outside." "Why didn't we know of it?" He said, "there is nothing that would require you to know because I got permission from my husband." Then my father-in-law said to me, "Who is your husband, he is my son, he has to answer for me!" (5F)

You can't live many things as you wish in the family building. You get inevitably shy, you give account for everything... not giving account, but reporting. For instance in the simplest term, when we go to the cinema they call and ask "where are you? why did you go to the movies? Didn't I tell you not to go? " But if we were outside in another building maybe it would be different. (6F)

In the participants' statements it was notable that this expectation for notifying each other was not only applied to the participants, but in the building life it was essential for everyone to know each other's location and what they were up to:

For example, there is no freedom in the FB. You are absolutely not free. Everyone knows where everyone went, where everyone came from. I know about them as well. They know about me, the same thing, nothing changes. (7F)

It's not asking for permission, I let my parent know when I go somewhere, I will inform my mother. I will ring the bell and say "We're going to this place." If I'm a little late, they'll call. "You don't seem around, where are you?" they say. If they go somewhere and if I don't see their car, we call them and say "dad where are you? Did something happen?" (4M)

In two cases, although the female participants notified the mother-in-laws about where they were going, mother in-laws reacted negatively to them anyways. By slamming the door to the participants' face, they showed their disapproval about

those social activities. In other words, for some cases having a social life outside of the building was unacceptable and disapproved under any circumstances:

When I go somewhere, I step by my mother-in-laws', I press the bell and say "I am going", she says "where", I say "here", and she slams the door in my face and goes inside. (7F)

As a matter of fact, in some cases the building's disapproval extended to having a job. In one particular household, childcare support was used as a leverage for expecting obedience by mother in-laws against their daughter in-law. The mother-in-law refused to take care of the child, when the participant set on her mind to work in spite of the mother-in-law's expectations:

I told my mother-in-law that I will start working soon. My mother-in-law said, "No, you can't, then I will not take care of your child." I talked to my friend the next day I left the boy to my friend and I started to work.(4F)

It was salient in some participants' accounts that the couple's financial situation effected the extent of in-laws' interference with their social life. Four of the seven couples claimed that the building members saw themselves as rightful to interfere in their spending and warn about the potential expenses when they went out.

We got married with some debt. When we were going out, my father used to say, "Where are you going, are you going out again, are you going to buy something again?" (5M)

In fact, one couple admitted that as they became financially independent and bought their own car, the in-laws/ parents were able to interfere less when they went out.

For example, We were going to my mothers with my husband and my in-laws would say "why did you come so late" or they would make a phone call. We did not have a car, we were taking their car, they would say "where is the car, we will go somewhere, come quickly". ... I was afraid to even tell

that I was going to my mom's. But now, they don't intervene. I can go anywhere I want, we were getting permission before when we go out, now we don't. (4F)

Formerly. we did not have economic freedom, our salary was limited. When we went out we were taking permission at that time; now we are informing. Back then we were saying, "Can we go there for a while?" "Why?" they would say. Our economic freedom is limited. When they said, "What are you going to do there, stay where you are!" Now we have our economic freedom. We now say, "Let my parents know where to call us when we leave the house. Just in case"..... I am reporting to them, I do not get permission, but we were getting permission before. Because we didn't have a car. When we wanted the car, "Dad, I'll go somewhere can you give the car". Sometimes he would say, "yes go go", and sometimes, "no we need it". (4M)

Having said that, a minority of the participants mentioned that building members did not interfere in their social life. One couple stated that there was no control neither on the guests visiting them or on their visits outside of the building:

There is no one that my parents don't want me to go, because they leave it to me. I decide who I want to meet with. So they don't say "Don't talk to this, this should not come to our house or don't meet with him". This goes like this because they don't see any drawback in my social life decisions. (3F)

3.3.3. Interference in Couple Relationship

This part elaborates on the fields in which family building members interfere in the participants' couple relationship. Five participants, 3 women and 2 men, complained about the external effect on their couple relationship. The extent of building members' interference in the participants' couple relationship varied from causing new conflicts to interfering in the couple conflicts and decision making processes.

Firstly, two couples narrated many conflicts that were caused solely by the building members. For instance, in one case, when the parents-in-laws' expectations from the daughter-in-law were not met, they told on her to the husband and endangered the couple dynamics. The participant admitted that she was especially more careful in such cases in order to prevent possible conflicts caused by the in-laws.

My mother-in-law would say to my husband, "Do you see?... we don't know anything about your wife. How would I know where she comes from and where she goes?" After some time, my husband comes to me and tell me these little things... He doesn't fight, he tells me all the complains.. If I say something, I know that it would turn into a fight. So I don't say much so that there is no fight. (7F)

Another couple told that the mother-in-law and daughter-in-law fought a lot. This tense relationship in the building also damaged the couple relationship. Tensions with the in-laws influenced couple relation and created distress and conflicts, which sometimes lead to the possibility of separation.

Both sides were right in their own term. But when this goes on like this, family unity starts to deteriorate after a while. We argued with my wife. We had also come to the stage of divorce many times. (5M)

Second of all, three participants explained the building members' interference in couple's ongoing conflicts. Mostly, in those cases, building members caused even more tension and conflict between the couple.

*For example, my husband was going out too much... I couldn't even react to that... My mother-in-law used to say "let the man go out and have a walk". Sometimes she would say nasty things like "tie him to your ** hair" (4F)*

When we go to my in-law's, even if we are not speaking with each other I try not to reveal it. What would happen if I show that we are estranged from each other, they will say, "They had a fight. Why can't they get along?" this time everything will be even worse. (7F)

Three participants, one woman and two men, all of them living in buildings with the husband's side of the family admitted that separate living arrangements would be very liberating. They could live independently as a couple without any criticism and external supervision.

In a different building the couple relationship becomes closed to the external factor. Perhaps there may be couples living more positive lives when there is no criticism. (2M)

Besides these, there were also participants who described no interference of the building members in their couple relationship. Two couples who were living in the building that belonged to the wife's side, claimed that there was no interference in their couple relationship. All of the four participants described the building environment as respectful towards the couple, because everyone was deemed as independent in the building.

They do not involve with our relationship. Even if a member who sees that we are discussing, he/she would ignore. None of them say "Let me intervene a little bit mix things up. Let me find I a way to worsen their relationship ..." (1M)

Similarly, one female and one male participant described their decision making process as an independent and claimed that their freedom stemmed from building members' understanding and thoughtful natures:

Probably my parents do not interfere with us because they are understanding people, they leave the decisions to us. (1F)

For example, if I am going to buy a car, or if I am switching to a job, or let's say there is something related to the workplace, my parents may come and talk and maybe give an idea. But we do not experience them saying anything like "Do just like as I told you, we know this." (2M)

3.3.4. Interference in the Home Setting

This sub-sub-theme is about the participants' perception of interference attempts regarding their home setting and private life. Although the participants resided in the family building, they were living as nuclear family in separate flats. Notwithstanding this fact, they voiced many interferences in their home settings such as blurred boundaries between flats, uninvited visits and meddling in house order such as what to purchase.

Firstly, three participants, two women and one man, described in a sense a "leakage" between flats in the building. Although these participants lived in individual flats with their doors closed, building members could potentially hear each other's voices despite sound isolation. Although this kind of sound permeability could be seen in any kind of building, in these buildings the participants felt the presence of constant surveillance and faced questions from the building members.

For example, when you have a problem with your spouse, the people in the building hear the voice, even if it's the neighbor's voice, they know from us "What happened? What happened girl?" My mother-in-law opens her door and shouts to the building. Its none of your business! I can have a discussion at home. You have no right to shout at me from the ladder. For example, I get angry with my children and the door knocks immediately. "What happened? Why are you fighting? Who are you angry with?" Why are you getting involved with this, if I don't reflect it to you don't get involved with it. (7F)

For example, sometimes the children bring me to the point of going crazy, and I come to a place that I start to scream. Then I say, "You disgraced me." I say, "Your grandmother will hear my voice " (2F)

Secondly, three female participants described uninvited visits at their homes. Their time as a couple and family was subjected to sudden interruptions by the building members' unnoticed visits. There was a constant anxiety of potential visits, which they had to be prepared for and which they could not refuse.

For example, I can't wear what I want at my own house. For example, I want to sit next to my husband without any headscarf on. For example, I would like to wear a pair of tights, I would like to wear a pair of tights. I want to turn off the lights and what TV while laying down. But I can't do anything. Until 12 o'clock at night, we are sitting like this, with my scarf on my head. Because the door might knock at any time, I answer the door and its either my brother- in-law, my father-in-law, they directly come in. (7F)

I do not like the fact that my mother-in-law or sister-in-law come out of blue without any notice. No matter how much I state this maybe my mother-in-law pays some attention, but my sister-in-law doesn't. I can say that she is at my place 24/7 so this is one of the issues that I suffer most. (6F)

One participant complained about the lack of freedom to refuse these visits in the building. In a way, this participant was in a passive position and felt obligated to communicate with the members of the building even when she did not want to.

For example, you are very tired and you sleep next to your newborn. Knock knock knock she knocks the door. For example, if I was in another apartment, I would react if a neighbor came and knocked on the door in that way. But here you have to get up and open so your child doesn't get up, and maybe you have to listen to a conversation you never want to listen to. (5F)

Thirdly, 3 female participants explained about their in-law's attempts to interfere with their shopping and to control their decisions on what to purchase. Sometimes these interferences were made out of concerns about the couple's financial state and sometimes it was about asking the participant persistently to buy things that would appeal to the in-laws' tastes:

For example, our television was really small. We bought a new television. My father-in-law said, "Wow, sir, how come are you paying so much and buying a TV? Who do you think you are?" (7F)

We went to the market a few times together. For example, I love small peppers, she loves big peppers. I love big cucumber, she loves small cucumber. She started interfering with what to buy." Buy this and cook this..." (5F)

In the participants' statements, it came to the fore that in some buildings, members kept copies of each other's keys, just in case for security reasons. Although these keys had the potential for further interference in the home settings by ensuring accessibility to everyone's house, one male participant stated that these keys were used only in case of emergency or the homeowner's approval:

My mother does not come in and open the door with her keys if I am at home. When I visit them, I go by ringing the bell as well. Of course, this is my private area and downstairs is their private area. They may have the key, we use the keys when we are not at home and in case of emergency. Why should I use the key when they are at home? I ring the bell and they open the door, and they ring the bell and I open the door. (4F)

As a matter of fact, in one of the buildings which solely consisted of family members, keys were hanging on the doors and members let themselves in. This couple stated that although adults would always knock before entering into a flat,

children in the building would come and go as they liked without the necessity of ringing bells.

There are keys on our doors if you have noticed. Everyone, especially children open the door and enter. We are that comfortable with each other. But my mother, my father, my sister never come in without clicking the door anyway. There is a key on it, but they click the door and enter. (1F)

That being said, 8 participants who were mostly men, experienced no interference in their home setting and claimed that separate apartments differentiated the households and served as boundaries. They elaborated that, separate flats ensured privacy and space for personal freedom to a certain extent.

I know we are in a family apartment. But our flat is individual. Just because we are in the same apartment doesn't mean they're in this house every day. (4M)

Since, I came here as a bride in separate flats. The fact that this is a family building doesn't change anything for me, I have my separate flat. (5F)

It was notable that three participants stated the distinction between cohabiting and family building. These participants mentioned this difference between living arrangements while referring to the freedom of separate flats.

I think there is a lot of difference between living in the same flat and living in the same building, because we don't live in the same house, only certain hours are spent together with other building members. Apart from that, we have time to stay alone and chat with my husband after sleeping children together. (1F)

Two participants purposed that, the reason for lack of interference in home setting was the ideology in the building. The building members believed that each

individual was responsible from his/ her own life and had no right to intervene in others' business and each members' choice was respected by others.

They don't usually get involved. Because there is no reason for them to get involved. Why should they intervene in, This is my own family, I am an adult person, I have children, why would they interve? As I cannot interfere, they have no right to interfere with anyone else's house as well. (7M).

Everyone is in their own home, everyone is independent.... Everyone can do anything they wish. It is easier to live here because nobody can interfere with anyone's freedom, because they have the freedom to do anything at any time they want, they can drink, they can gamble, they can play,...(1M)

Another male participant also stated no interference in their home setting and suggested that this stemmed from parents' tender-minded and empathic approach. Because parents gave space to each member, there was not conflicts:

For example, my father is not an impulsive, hard tempered person. He doesn't get too involved with other people. He doesn't expect others to follow his orders. So there is no conflict, they live their own lives, we live our own lives. (2M)

3.4. BOUNDARY NEGOTIATIONS IN THE FB

As mentioned in the former themes, FB had certain expectations from the participants and interfered in certain domains of their lives. In the interviews, it came to the fore that the participants differed in their reactions to the family buildings' expectations and interventions. The way they chose to react, whether by showing compliance or setting boundaries reflected the participants' mindset and motivations. This theme handles their reactions, the driving mindset behind them and the building members' reactions in case of noncompliance. Overall, the response of the participants can be grouped into two: 1) compliance, 2) boundary

setting, and FB' reaction into two: 1) understanding the participants, 2) insisting on their own position.

3.4.1. Compliance to the FB Expectations and Interferences

In most situations, the participants chose to behave according to the building members' expectations or accommodated to their wants and wishes. This attempt for conformity and accommodation continued even in the cases of notable disagreement or discomfort with the building members' positions and their interference. Underlying their compliant behaviors, the participants had certain concerns and motivations, such as feelings of responsibility and wish to make the elderly happy and a majority of them had more conservative mindsets. Those participants who reported accommodative behaviors also reframed the building members' interference in positive ways, such as believing the interventions were done with good intentions and in some cases, accepted that the members couldn't change. It was important to see that there is no significant gender difference in the compliant reactions towards the order of the family building, both men and women adopted conformity frequently.

Seven participants admitted a feeling of responsibility towards their family, especially towards the elderly. From their perspective, obeying their rules and meeting their expectations meant fulfilling this duty adequately. Thus, they did not object any kind of rules of conduct or interferences in their lives. They believed that not following the orders or stating their own mind would hurt the building members and also perceived as disrespectful.

For example, let's say my mother-in-law is here and my wife is doing some chores, "No, don't do that, do it like this" she would say to my wife in order to have things get done as she likes. I think that my wife will do what she says in order not to disrespect her mother and father. (3M)

“Elders speak the truth, they are not to be challenged” this was not something that was said to us verbally, my parents did not tell me, but I felt it. So I wouldn't object to them too much. (3F)

Further, the participants believed that building members had the authority or at least right to intervene in each other's' in certain areas. It was either believed that older people had a say in younger people's lives regardless of their age, or participants felt the need to pay respect by compliance in return of the members' support. For instance, in one case although participant was annoyed with her parent's interference in parenting, because she provided child care support, this participant recognized her mother's right to have a saying in the child care and kept silent.

When I get angry at my mother and say "why did you say yes to something that I say no to my child", she finds the right to say, "Oh, don't I have that much right?"... Because she has the right... Yes, she has that much right to intervene. (1F,)

Gaining the parents'/in-laws' approval had great importance for some male participants. They believed that leading a happy and successful life was possible only if one gained the parents'/in-laws' consent. Thereby, these participants neither disobeyed the building's expectations nor openly argued against their interventions. On the contrary, they tried very hard to fulfill their expectations and adjusted accordingly with the aim of gaining the parents'/ in-laws' approval and in some cases, love.

I do not want to do anything without their approval or blessing. I would never want to hurt them. There were some things I did without getting their approval, but I always failed. So, this was a lesson for me. “I got on a path without getting their approval, but I failed halfway.” (4M)

In most accounts, the desire to convey respect and avoid disappointing parents originated from a sense of connectedness and responsiveness to their needs, and at times, this extended to other building members. In those buildings, all

members were in a way connected and interdependent to one another. Thus, changing one's own plans to accommodate to other's needs considered as the right thing to do

I also have a family, a husband and children, but my priority is always my extended family. For example, my sister's guest is coming, I think that "I should stay with her and help her" but I should not interrupt my own program... then again... I say that "when my guest is coming over, my sister does not leave me alone." (1F)

The necessity to fulfill the perceived duties and meet the building members' expectations were extremely prioritized. The participants admitted to following the order even if it was a burden or challenging for them.

For example, let's say we're going to the village as family. Because my parents need to go to the village and I want to go there too. Now my wife does not like the village very much I know that, but she comes with me to be with me because I should be with them. She also fulfills her duty and she doesn't need to enjoy it. (2M)

I make sacrifices for my parents. No matter how much work I have, if they are going somewhere, I put all of my job aside and go with them, I will do this for them. My parents are very important to me. The concept of parents is very important to me. (4M)

If there is a need to waive some personal things in order to meet their (parents) needs, I fulfill this responsibility. (2M)

A majority of the participants who took on these roles and did their best to fulfill them reported of learning proper behaviors through modeling or direct advices from older generations. Among these participants, most of them were

women. Even in cases of apparent discomfort with the expectations, conformity to cultural norms was highly critical for them, which was explained by references to upbringing and the values they learned as they grew up

Although my grandparents treated my mother very badly, my mother said to me “you will take care of your grandmother and grandfather until your last breath even if I am not alive and she also took care of them as well. I also behaved like this, perhaps because I learned so from my mother because I saw it this way. (6F)

My wife assumes a humble attitude towards her parents because of her respect and love for her family ... because she does not want them to be upset, she would risk getting hurt. So, I think in terms of our upbringing...., Because we grew up in such a family, at such a home.... we can think like this, because we grow up like this. (3M)

Three male participants admitted that they followed religious teachings regarding how to approach family members and the elderly. From their viewpoints, in the teachings of Islam, kinship relations and respecting elderly took an important place and those who followed these teachings would be rewarded by God would be one step closer to a better afterlife. These men’s position towards family is mediated by a religious base and the intention of doing a good deed.

One cannot be offended with his parents. The Quran verse says “do not even say huff and puff to parents.” You shouldn't hurt them. I studied in a religious school for 6 years. You know... the heaven is under the feet of mothers. No matter what you do, if you hurt them you cannot achieve anything. (6M)

My behaviors towards my parents stemmed from spirituality as well., If a man cares about religious things, spirituality or religion advises one to try

to gain the parents' love and to respect them. Doing things, such as fulfilling their wishes, not upsetting them, not saying no to them, indulging them....
(2M)

A group of participants, both men and women, followed the building order and complied the members' wishes with the intention of maintaining a good karma. In other words, these participants followed the rules and put up with many inconvenient demands of the building members with the expectation of similar deeds from others in the future. This mindset was similar to religious motivation in the sense that they believed that their actions would affect the course of their lives.

My parents did not want us to leave this apartment anyway, because everyone would like their children to be nearby. As I hope to be like this in the future, I am acting like that now and I think that this expectation will be fulfilled. My kids will treat me the way I treated to my parents. (2M)

After all, she is my husband's mother, if I hurt her, I have a child as well... My child will be the same, what you plant now, you will harvest later. (6F)

There were also another group of participants who believed that if you love someone you meet their expectations and needs. Three individuals, including both men and women stated that love accompanies certain responsibilities such as pleasing the other and thereby trying your best to meet their needs. In other words, these participants were very eager to accommodate to the building members' needs and expectations, and any kind of interference would be accepted by them because their compliance expressed their love for the members.

Since I have accepted this family as my own, there is no problem for me. When there is love, there is no hardship. When we go somewhere, I ask my father-in-law, "Let's go?" When they go somewhere, I propose, "Let's go together, let us take you there, let's do it together." (3M)

Showing compliance with the in-laws' expectations also expressed the love the participants felt for their spouses. They claimed that loving your spouse brings along the duty of making her/him happy. They reported that their adaptable and conforming behaviors towards in-laws stemmed from their love towards their spouses. In these cases, respecting the spouse's parents and meeting their needs were thought to bring happiness for the partner and therefore the participants behaved accordingly.

After his father was diagnosed, my husband started to coddle him a lot. My husband is a very good person, a very precious person. He has not done anything up to this time that would upset me, he always supported me. So, after my father-in-law was diagnosed with the disease, I started to pay no attention to my in-laws' behaviors and did not mind anything no longer. (5F)

Given the emphasis on respect, approval and love in their relationships with FB members, it was not surprising to see that some participants considered and reframed the interventions and expectations in a positive way. A group of 5 participants, all of whom were men, believed that interventions of FB members and their mothers into their couple relationship, children, social life and his wife were done with good intentions.

For example, my mother says, "All of these lights are on, turn them off." My wife might say, "What's it to you? It's my own lamp and not your business." But my mom thinks from a different perspective. "Turn off the lights, so my son would pay less for the electricity bill " she thinks. (4M)

For example, my son has gained a lot of weight, my father says "Don't give him too much food." or he says "the child is hungry, you have not fed him" and he feeds him downstairs. I believe, they do this because they mean well and consider our benefit, therefore I don't mind much. (2M)

For three of these men, the building's attempts of control were perceived as caring and normal. Although in all of these cases interferences created discomfort to the participants, they rationalized the building's motivation behind it as caring and just put up with those interventions.

So if you are their child, it's normal that they want to keep you in sight. Parents want that "Let our child be in front of our eyes. Let us know what you are doing and tell us everything." But it is not good for us. Maybe it's normal for them, they may think so, I understand them. But when I think from my own point of view, I say that its better, if they leave me alone and if they don't interfere too much,. Unfortunately, not all of your wishes come true. (7M)

In a few women's accounts, conformity had a totally different meaning than showing respect and justifying the actions of the FB members. These women gave a report of their silent acceptance of the FB order and the futility of attempts to change it. They shared a state of learned helplessness as a reason for their compliance with the building's order. It was noteworthy that these two participants were females living with the husband's side in a building. They explained a sense of powerlessness against the building members. Since they did not believe that their actions would cause any change, they went along with the interferences and followed the rules of conduct.

For example if something is black and they call it white. You can't say " Mom, dad this is black". It is white in their eyes. So I don't want to say "this is black" and put myself out. What is the point of trying if they are going to keep saying white after all. (4F)

She's my mother-in-law and my husband's mother, I won't be able to change her.. Maybe my husband is not happy about her and how she behaves, but you do not have a chance to change her. I do not know. Maybe you may

show your reaction, but that is her habits, her personality. After a certain age it does not change any more. (6F)

3.4.2. Setting Boundaries to the FB Expectations and Interferences

This part examines the participants who react to the building order in ways other than compliance. It also covers the instances, in which the participants stand against or avoid conforming to the building members' expectations and interferences. According to the participants' statements, the reactions to the FB expectations and interferences can be categorized into two groups, that were: 1) maneuvers and non-confrontational methods and 2) confrontational boundary setting.

3.4.2.1. Maneuvers and Non-Confrontational Methods

For certain participants and situations, a direct boundary setting was not an option. In those cases, more non-confrontational tactics were called in by the participants. That is, the participants used certain maneuvers in order to avoid possible interferences before they actually happened, such as lying in order to prevent a possible interference. According to the interviews, the mostly widely used maneuvers were hiding things from and lying to the building members. It was apparent that almost all participants used certain maneuvers in certain times, even if they could set direct boundaries in other matters. Therefore, there were no gender differences in this approach except in lying, which will be further explained in detail in the next section.

The most frequently used maneuver among the participants was hiding information from the FB members, and keeping it to themselves particularly when, they would like to be unbothered by the building. With the intention of avoiding their interference or judgements, the participants both individually and as a couple hid things, such as plans or decision making processes from the FB members. They admitted only sharing common issues which would concern other FB members as well or issues which the participants would not mind to be interfered in.

For example, when we have to choose a color for our house paint we choose it together with my wife.. But in the purchase of goods, for example, I cannot decide, I say” you make the choice.” Then she can also ask my mom or look at the catalog with my sister. If the matters we disagree are very important, if it only concerns us, I do not want to share it with the outside. (2M)

If it is something private, we do not share it with other people in the apartment, but if it is a common thing.. for example, if it’s about a refrigerator to be bought, we also ask them. (1M)

These participants explained their motivation behind their practice of selective disclosure as avoiding unwanted interference. In one case, a male participant admitted that he would not share something if he anticipated a possible reaction.

I know what members will react to, or maybe I know what they would intervene in too much, I don't share these matters with them. (6F)

Participants’ decisions to filter the shared information was also apparent in their decision making process. They admitted that they did not share anything before it was decided, in order to keep the FB members away from their decision making process. These couples made an effort so that their important decisions were made by themselves without any influence from the FB.

In general, as the husband and wife, we are trying to handle everything within ourselves. We try to make decisions always together. (2F)

First, we talk as husband and wife, without even consulting our children. In fact, if we have a problem, we decide to meet outside at a cafe. We discuss our problem while drinking coffee. This is it. We make a this and execute it. (3M)

Furthermore, in the participants' statements it was realized that they generally kept the matters related to their couple relationship or nuclear family private. Living in a separate flat in the building enhanced the privacy of the couple relationship. In addition, the notion of family as a sacred and confidential unit seemed to contribute to this practice. For instance, six participants mentioned that the conflicts between couples were not shared with the building members. As a matter of fact, some couples paid attention not to fight next to a FB member in order to manage the privacy and avoid their possible involvement.

Nobody can be involved in our relationship since I do not tell anyone about our arguments. I don't want anyone to be involved. (3F)

We have our fights within ourselves. Even when we resided in the same flat with my parents, we would argue in our own room. My mother and father did not witness an argument with my wife even once. (4M)

Further, those participants also admitted to hide that they were not on speaking terms with their partners from the FB members. They explained that they pretend to have no problems with their spouses and kept on talking with each other, so that the FB members would not realize anything. Because if they did, they would also interfere in their couple relationship either with good intentions or bad.

My mother-in-law always took her son's side. How would they be useful if they hear about our conflicts anyway?... . It would escalate and, it will become unsolvable. We could solve it among us in our own room. (4F)

Sometimes, I want to pull a long face with my husband a bit, but I can't because my mom understands it and she gets upset. They don't understand that this is a small thing, they think there's a big issue. My mother and father

say, "Is your husband offended by something, was he upset at something..... why are you angry, or did you do something? Look, apologize, there will be no rupture between the family" they say.... So I cannot even get upset with my husband in the family building. (1F)

One female participant improved her tactics and maneuvers to avoid the interferences in her social life. She explained an instance when she hid her guests from her mother-in-law.

My mother-in-law was involved in who would enter and leave the house. My friends took off their shoes and came to my house. (4F).

Besides these maneuvers, one female participant admitted that she lied when she went out in order to avoid her mother-in-law's reaction and to maintain her social life. It is important to note that none of the male participants report lying to the FB.

For example, sometimes we go somewhere with our friends from the neighborhood. We never meet at the door of the apartments, we meet at the bus stop. Otherwise, my mother-in-law will say that "You see, she went for a trip. What are you doing again? Sit down and take care of your children. What are you doing outside?" For example, last year, everybody was heading for the bus stop. My mother-in-law saw my friends. "Where to" she said, "Nowhere, we have some business," my friend said. My mother-in-law understood of course.. We came home in the evening and she asked the children, "You were not there, where did you go?" The child said that we went to dinner. After that, my mother-in-law said to my sister-in-law, "Did you go to dinner today?" She said "No, what diner?". Then my mother-in-law said "The child told me and I saw the other brides on the street and they did not tell me neither ". But you know... we want to go out from time to time, but my mother-in-law always criticizes it. (7F)

In addition to maneuvers like hiding and lying, the participants explained further non-conflictual attempts to prevent interference and simultaneously avoid

direct confrontations with the FB members. In these tactics, the participants were more active and engaged in an interaction with the FB members in order to negotiate with them on certain issues. One such tactic involved genuinely trying to convince the building members. The participants who used this method did not agree with the FB's thoughts, yet tried to persuade the members without directly challenging their expectations and interferences.

For example, my father says to me, "Who is this guest of yours?", I say "I know him. He is an old friend, a good friend, such a friend, such a good friend. We go to them and they come to us. " So I'm trying to convince him that this man is a decent person, has a decent character. (7M)

In one case, the parents interfered with a male participant's parenting style and he attempted to explain his parenting style to his parents in order to ensure their collaboration with their rules:

We talk to my parents, "We try to behave to our child in certain ways. We are trying to prevent this child from being spoiled and from learning that he can get what he wants by crying and making a fuss." We try to persuade my parents into our parenting techniques. (5M).

A second tactic which involved negotiation involved adjusting the tone of the communication with the FB members, which enabled a couple of participants to set boundaries that were "digestible" for the building members. In other words, these mild boundaries were gently constructed with the aim of not hurting the building members. The participants mentioned using a soft voice, avoided direct confrontations when setting these boundaries.

For example, if I say to them, "What's it to you mother, why are you intervening?" they would get really upset. They have never seen such a reaction from me until now. I am 41 years old, they have never seen such a reaction from me. So if I treat them a bit harshly, they will get very upset. I'll be damned if they get upset. So I never want to upset them. (4M)

When I say boundary setting, it's not said very harshly like "You cannot do this" or "I don't do that." (3F)

Another method for the participants to gently build up their own boundaries while avoiding direct confrontation was overlooking the external interventions. In other words, half of the participants chose to resist the FB order silently and ignore the building members' instructions and demands. They did not react to the rules of conduct or the expectations in any way and carried on with what they set their mind on. This method ensured there was no opposition towards the FB and still enabled the participants to have their way. In a case, when his mother tried give advices about his couple relationship, a man followed this method to quickly end the talk.

So I say okay to what my mom said, but still, I will do what I want. (7M)

My mother-in-law says something over and over "Don't open the heater this much, its expensive" she says.. I don't say anything, I just listen and I say "OK mother." She goes away and I do the same again. Even if I say ok, I don't compromise from anything. (4F)

3.4.2.2. Confrontational Boundary Setting

Regardless of the times they resorted to non-confrontational ways, the participants also reported more confrontational boundary setting attempts. This section elaborated on the techniques they used and the factors enabled participants to more direct boundary setting attempts.

All the female participants voiced at least one example of direct opposition or confrontational boundary setting towards FB members. These included direct opposition to the FB order, refusal to compliance, limiting the members' interferences via confrontation.

When he tries to intervene something I say to my brother in-law “This is a problem between us, it concerns both of us, nobody but us. There is nothing that concerns you, we will handle it ourselves”. (5F)

I tell my mother-in-law if I'm angry at her. I tell her “I am a 33 ,34-year-old woman. If I don't speak to you like this, don't talk to me this way either. ” If I am not talking in a way that will hurt the other person, I do not want her to talk to me in this way. Maybe I'm trying to draw some limits. I am trying to draw my limit. I say things that I don't like or say that I am hurt when I am hurt. (6F)

It was important to note that, male and female participants showed a significant divergence in their reactions of direct boundary setting. It came to the fore that all of the women could be able to set a direct boundary at least for one time, whereas male participants remained hesitant and could set direct boundaries mainly in instances related to their parenting. It can be said that, topics related to the well-being of children encouraged everyone regardless of their gender to stand against the FB order and interventions.

When my parents tried to get involved with matters related to the child, I tried to dominate the issue to implement what I wish for. For instance, I wasn't doing what they said, if my father joked about it I joked as well, if he was stern I was stern too. (2M)

Besides from the instances regarding parenting, female participants voiced many complaints about the FB pressure and explained direct boundary setting examples against interferences in other areas such as social life, home setting and couple relationship. They frequently explained feeling of inconvenience and disturbance by the FB members’ interventions and rules of conduct. These statements were mostly absent in the male participants’ interviews.

It upsets me that my mother-in-law interferes where I am going to, I say to myself "why does she interfere with me, she has no right to interfere with me, what's it to her? After I told my husband, I go wherever I want ". (7F)

These female participant were able to maintain a tough stance even in times of pressure. One woman explained her attitude when the mother-in-law withdrew practical support as trump to ensure the participant's compliance to quit her job.

During the month of Ramadan, my mother-in-law sent food to my husband and son, and she said, "I only send these to you and the child." But because she behaved like this, I stubbornly did not resign from work, no matter how tired I got. At first, my mother-in-law never wanted me to work. She didn't talk to me when I started working. She tried to make trouble in every way because I was working, but later she understood that she could not cope with me and stopped. (6F)

On the other hand, when male participants voiced boundary setting examples, they were generally about the ones their wives set.

My partner puts distance to her parents. I don't go in too much because it's her father and her mother. If we are going to make a decision, if they say "No" to her, my wife will be certain, "It shall be as I say." Since, she is their child, they don't oppose her word. (3M)

Moreover, it was notable to see that, the presence of certain factors effected the participants' responses to the expectations and interference in the building. In the participants' accounts, these factors can be outlined as: maturity with age, financial liberty, the support of the spouse and their familial background. The participants admitted that they got strength from these factors in order to confront and set more direct boundaries with the FB members.

First, a group of participants, admitted that once they grew older they also grew in confidence to claim their right and stand against the FB in case of a disagreement or an expectation they found as unreasonable. They believed that

growing old provided them with a sense of entitlement and that it became a legitimate option for them to defend themselves and set boundaries. There was no gender differences detected related to this factor.

For example, I was also following the rules at home before I got married. After you get married, you're still perceived as a child. But as we grew old we became more free and independent. (2M)

Now I opened my eyes a little more. I am 40 years old now. My children are old enough to get married. So what they say isn't always followed by me. (4F)

Secondly, financial independence encouraged the participants to state their own minds and position themselves against the FB expectations to a certain extent. Both men and women explained that, even if the building supported them financially by offering a free flat, once they were self-sufficient, earned their wage and did not depend on the FB members for their living expenses, they were able to exert their own will more.

Even if the people in the building interfere with you, you now have economic freedom. You've got something now. So you have self-confidence. Now you can say, "Okay, mother, I got this. Leave it to me Don't interfere with it." (4M)

My in-laws cannot interfere with my guests. I should decide on the guest that will come to my house. Because my house is separate. I have no obligation to or dependency on anyone. Therefore when they attempt to intervene I restrain them. I say "It is not your business." (5F)

Next, it was voiced mostly by the female participants that presence of a supportive spouse encouraged them to stand against the FB order and the members'

interventions. They expressed that knowing that their husband would offer support gave them confidence to openly voice their opinions.

I didn't have any trouble with my in-laws, because my husband understood me and could think like me. Because at least when my in-laws do something, he understands me. He knows how I would react to them or he reacts by thinking like me before I do. I know that he would support my position and boundaries towards his parents, so I speak my mind freely towards my ilaws. (5F)

Lastly, what the participants learned in their nuclear families influenced their reactions. There were no gender differences in this matter, both men and women explained that the way they were raised influenced their behavior towards the FB. The participants who were able to adapt confrontational boundary setting skills had the possibility to be flexible and to imagine the alternative way of living prior to their FB experience. One female participant explained that, she was familiar with the FB's expectations, however she refused to follow them in order to avoid becoming like her mother.

My mother lost her mother at the age of 13. His father died at the age of 19 and she suffered a lot because of this. If I allowed them, if I showed humility and tolerated my in-laws maybe, I would be treated in the same way. My biggest example was actually my mother. I saw my mother and I said that it should not be like this, something should be different. (5F)

3.4.3. FB members' Response

In this section, the reported responses of the building members will be presented. The participants' boundary setting attempts evoked various responses among the building members. The reported responses varied from understanding the participants to insisting on their own position, which will be further elaborated on in the next sections.

3.4.3.1. Understanding the Participants

Some participants reported less interference and expectations after certain boundary setting attempts. These were either really gentle boundaries or direct confrontations toward the FB members' rules of conduct and interferences.

It came to the fore that the participants' boundary setting attempts to be the only authority figure on their children and to block the FB members' interferences in their parenting had been mostly successful. Both men and women participants determinately drew lines to the FB members to prevent their interferences in their parenting. Most of the participants explained that although unsatisfied, FB members acknowledged their authority and their interferences regarding the parenting decreased.

Because I'm a little sensitive about the child. For example, nobody should give chocolate to the child under any circumstances before the meal is eaten. If the child gets chocolate, he should give it to me and I will give it to the child back when its time. Moreover, if I said no to something, the people in the apartment would say "your mother says no, I say I can't interfere any further." (6F)

It was very difficult at first. I managed to hurdle those hardships. How did I get over these? I said "This child is my child and I can take care of my child. You cannot come and interfere with me. When you come and see that I do everything my child needs. "I always gave the same reaction to my mother-in-law by saying this. And gradually my mother-in-law interferes much less. (4F)

Besides the issues related to parenting, participants claimed that their reactions influenced the FB members' responses. The participants' reactions varied from mild non-confrontational attempts to firm confrontations.

Some of the participants explained that building members showed respect when they stated alternative opinions and set boundaries regardless of the subject. They believed that decrease in interventions were due to the FB member's understanding towards their position and the drawn line.

My mother-in-law would cook, my husband would come from work in the evening we would eat at the in-laws'. Then we would go down to our own house. Then I could not adapt to my own home and wanted to prepare food for my husband and I said to my mother-in-law that "Mother let us cook downstairs at our home and eat there." May Allah be pleased with her, she showed respect to my wish and said "As you wish my daughter." (2F)

Next, few of the participants explained that when they set mild boundaries, explained themselves really gently, building members responded with understanding.

I explain them in soft language and gently. Because of this, they are understanding and do not interfere. (3F)

Another group admitted that they ignored the building members' interferences and after realizing their demands are not met and members gave up.

If I do not ignore them, they will continue to speak and intervene. But when I don't care, when they still see the boy's hair long, they say, "These aren't listening us anyway, let's not get involved.". After a while they stop interfering. (5F)

Besides from these, some participants explained that building members changed their formed behaviors towards the participants once they adopted a tough stance against them and set firm boundaries. A female participants explained that his husband objected FB members' monitoring of her social life and the interferences decreased.

My husband said to his parents " I know everywhere she goes, It doesn't concern you, this is our problem" Then my father-in-law apologized, but

I'm still offended. Since then, they have been distant and they did not interfered much again after that incident. (5F)

3.4.3.2. Insisting on their Own Position

On the other hand, some participants mentioned the building's continued demand for compliance and interferences. In these cases, FB members either crossed with the participants or kept on demanding the same things repeatedly regardless of the participants' reactions.

The majority of the participants who resided with the husbands' side mentioned the members getting crossed with them if they show any kind of noncompliance towards expectations.

For example when she sweeps her own home, she gets offended with the brides. She's doing her own job and crosses with us (7F)

Even when the participants gently pointed out in-laws' fault and demanded justice and understanding for herself in mother-in-law's interferences, the mother-in-law closed the case by crossing with her, rather than accepting any alternatives.

So I try not to hurt my in-laws as much as I can. Sometimes things happen that I can't bear, "You're wrong here, why do you think so?" This time she gets angry. She stops talking with ne. I mean, you are in the same apartment, you are going downstairs, she is coming. I have gotten used to their attitudes for years, but if it had not been like this from the beginning maybe I would oppose them and I would hurt them.(4F)

Besides, some of the female participants described an endless vicious cycles with the members, even when they strictly refuse these demands, they kept insisting on in the next attempts. For example, a female participant explained an instance when she confronted the interferences regarding her social life directly and refused to meet these expectations, her mother-in-law's attempts continued anyways.

I say, "If I am late or if there is a problem, I will inform you, but I do not have to say everywhere I go." Then the next time they're asking again, not much changes. (6F)



CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

This study investigates the relational and parenting experiences among married couples who reside in family buildings in Istanbul. The nature of the couple relationship, parenting experiences, household formation, assigned roles and rules of conduct to the family members and boundary negotiations among the members are examined in the context of close physical proximity to the family of origin. The results revealed four main themes. That are named as FB as A Network of Support and Safety, Roles and Rules of Conduct in the Fb, Interference in The FB and Boundary Negotiations in the FB. The first theme presents the domains in which FB functions as a support network for its members, including child care support, practical help, financial and emotional support system. Second theme explores the assigned roles and order in the FB which is gendered in nature. Next, explores the FB's interferences in its members' lives. Last main theme elaborates on the extent and ways of boundary negotiations and the FB's response in return. Following the findings of the participants' accounts will be further handled in detail.

Despite forming their own nuclear households, families with psychologically interdependent models tend to live in close proximity to the extended family (Aytaç, 1998), either nearby in the neighborhood or as seen in this study in the same building. The participants voice many advantages of this closeness, such as receiving material, practical and emotional support for the members. While benefiting from these advantages, some of them also have a space for exerting their agency. In other words, even in these contexts where close physical proximity to the extended family is sustained, connectedness and togetherness co-exist with self-determination and autonomy (Akyıl, Prouty, Blanchard, & Lyness, 2014; Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005).

However, in the present study, some families hold features of the total interdependent model of family where individual agency and self-determination may indicate a threat to the continuity of family relations (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). Therefore, these types of the families may enforce group-identity,

responsibility and loyalty, and discourage equal self-determination for individuals. These participants, although living in separate flats of the family building, experience significant pressure, inhibition in their freedom and a sense of learned helplessness with regards to their couple relationship and parenting practices.

In line with the thematic analysis method, the results are obtained from the accounts and experiences of the participants. In the following section, four themes which are presented in the results section will be discussed in terms of their similarities and differences with the existing literature.

4.1. RELATEDNESS AND SUPPORT IN THE FB

Regardless of the existence of negative experiences, all participants except one couple voiced the support they received in the family building and its positive effects on their lives. Especially child care support had significant importance for the members. The current study provided supporting data for the existing literature about the positive influence of received parenting support on individuals' stress level (Telleen, Herzog, & Kilbane, 1989), self-confidence about parenting (Edwards, 1995), quality of family life (Sung & Park, 2012) and work-social life (Callan & Dolan, 2013). In fact, the access for free and trusted child care influenced the participants work life positively, since they did not need to worry about their children. A couple of women in the present study felt grateful for this child care support, and explained that it enabled them to work. Similarly, previous research suggests that geographical proximity to parents or parents-in-law may ensure child care support for married women with children and thereby, can increase women employment by encouraging them to work (Compton & Pollak, 2014).

Besides economic relief, getting childcare support from trusted family members was stressed as a major advantage of the family building. Thereby, current study finds consistent evidence with previous studies suggesting that parents experience trust problems related to outsourcing child care support (De Ruijter, Van Der Lippe & Raub, 2003). A further consistent finding with previous research (Compton & Pollak, 2014) is that proximity ensures the availability of child care,

even when the participants' needs for support are unanticipated and irregular, which is another benefit of living in the family building as a parent.

Despite the numerous benefits reported by the participants, Western literature is dominated by research which de-emphasize and ignore the concepts of relatedness and interdependence (Jahoda & Dasen, 1986; Miller, 2002; Oishi, 2000). According to these researchers, unless separation from the family and differentiation of the self are achieved, individuals are not able to adequately form healthy relationships within and outside of the family (Bowen, 1978). In contrast, the current study presents that the participants are happy and satisfied with the relatedness and accessibility of support, which the family relationships ensure. The results suggest that interdependency functions as an invisible security net for the building members and provides many benefits. The participants in the current work are pleased with the interdependent organization of the building, which provides the aforementioned support and numerous benefits for them. They voiced experiencing a sense of security and a sense of belonging in this type of family organization. These findings are in line with a recent study on Turkish family buildings (Acar, 2019). The participants in the present study report that even in the construction of the building, their possible future housing needs are considered and these family buildings are built as "roofless" structures in order to add extra floors. Similar constructs were seen in Acar's work (2019), which examines the family building phenomenon in one neighborhood of Istanbul. In fact, her work shows that even people with financial means and spare flats elsewhere want to live in their family buildings because of the support and belongingness they feel.

In the family buildings, the participants are surrounded with trusted others, who look after each other, ensuring a secure living environment for one another. In steps toward adulthood, such as getting married or becoming a parent, the family building provides close surveillance and experienced guidance in case of need. The participants explain frequent involvement of "the third" in their daily lives. Parent-, sister- or brother in-laws are often included either in the couple or parent-child relationships. However, the narratives of the participants present contradictory

experiences to the existing literature. This triangulation process is deemed as a dysfunctional attempt of including a third in order to avoid direct communication and to release tension in the dual relationship (Bowen, 1978). However, the participants experienced this as an advantage and guidance for improving their relationships. In a way, this interdependent network of relationships helps and sheds light to the road in individuals' transition processes. This is in line with Genç and Bapdist's work (2019) which suggests that, the presence of extend family members functions as an emotional support for the individuals. This difference may be explained with Roland's concept of familial-self (1991). That is, the participants who are expected to honor their family and to be good as children, spouses and parents may hesitate and worry about doing wrong and thereby, the inclusion of an older and experienced family member may decrease their burden and responsibility, and relieves them. In other words, in contexts where this support system works smoothly, triangulation is experienced as support.

This support network in the family building functions self-sufficiently in the sense that members' current and future needs are provided for within the building. For instance, the children are taken care of by all the members. As they grow up and get married, the spouse selection and housing needs are arranged by the members. In return, the younger members are responsible to take care of the elderly as they get older. The organization and role division are in line with the current literature on Turkish family buildings which are illustrated as structures closed to the outside world and solely interacts within the building (Acar, 2019). Similarly, the results of this research shows that the family building's capacity of self-sufficiency engenders clear boundaries between the building and the outside world. In fact, the participants voice building members' discouragement towards non-family relations and social life. These findings support previous research on Turkish family functioning, which argues that nuclear family forms facilitate social activity, whereas extended family functioning prevents it (Kapız, 2002). This closeness of the organization may be speculated as the contributing factor for the individuals' the feelings of security.

Overall, these results indicate that the family building functions as a support system which benefits couples, parent-in-laws and their children. The sense of safety, belongingness and togetherness are valued by the FB members who support each other in economic, emotional and practical matters. Married couples share the responsibility of caring for their children, have available role models for themselves and for their children, and enjoy fulfilling the duty of taking care of the elderly in FB buildings. In this sense, family buildings offer opportunities to sustain extended family bonds and experience relatedness, which is a valued notion for these families.

4.2. DIFFERENT PRESENTATIONS OF AUTONOMY AND AGENCY

Existing literature argues that separation from the environment and autonomy are two significant factors for a healthy individual development (Bowen, 1978; Mahler, Pine, & Bergman, 1975). The lack of emotional detachment from others, diffused boundaries between self and other, and enmeshed relationships suggest a lack of agency and self-determination (Minuchi, 1974). These perspectives suggest that a healthy developmental process and intra-familial relationships are possible only with successful differentiation from others. According to this general discourse in the literature, separation precedes autonomy, and to be able to exert agency, one must first accomplish emotional detachment from others (Erikson, 1968; Bowen, 1978; Minuchin, 1974). Otherwise, problems in multiple domains of life are predicted to increase, such as problems in romantic relationships, chronic anxiety, reactive behavior, marital dissatisfaction and triangulation (Bowen, 1978). However, despite the emotionally and psychologically interdependent functioning of the family buildings, in this study the participants voice the ability to exert agency and practice their autonomy in their lives. That is to say, the absence of emotional separation does not necessarily imply a lack of agency and freedom for the participants, consistent with Kağıtçıbaşı's work which defines autonomy and relatedness as two interdependent concepts rather than contradicting (1996b; 2005). The current study reveals various different

presentations of agency, rather than a single one that is only possible with emotional separation from the family.

Having said that, the analysis revealed that the manifestations of agency are shaped and at times, constrained, by two important factors. According to the participants' accounts, their autonomy is significantly influenced by the structure of the family building and the gender of the individuals. In the following sections, these two factors will be further elaborated on in detail, and their implications for the themes identified in this study will be explained.

4.2.1. The Structure of the FB

The structure of the family building is a significant determinant of the type and the extent of couples' and individuals' manifestations of agency and their exertion of autonomy. More direct and confrontational ways of boundary negotiations and autonomy are present in some family buildings, whereas in others more covert and non-confrontational attempts are observed. The results reveal that these different negotiations and experiences depend on the extent to which individual and couple agency are tolerated in the structure of the family building and its context.

In the family structures which are less hierarchical, more tolerant and flexible about the notion of agency, couple relationships and individual lives are more independent. The participants report no interference in their decision making process, social life, couple relationship or house setting. In such contexts, members deem each other as self-sufficient and provide space to each other for making decisions as couples or individuals. As a matter of fact, in those more tolerant contexts, when rules are not followed or expectations are not met, family members react more flexibly, and the participants' attempts for boundary negotiations are received well and mostly accepted. Each individual is responsible for their own actions rather than bounded to a single executive authority. The narratives of the participants from more tolerant contexts are in line with Kağıtçıbaşı's description of psychologically interdependent model of family functioning (1996b, 2005). In

this model, despite the continuity of emotional interdependency, due to the decreased material value of children, members tolerate individual agency and freedom.

For certain family buildings, exerting agency or direct boundary setting was not an option. In such hierarchically organized structures, there is only one right, which is determined by the highest ranked member of the family, who is mostly the oldest man, and any attempts for the alternative are perceived as a danger to the family structure. In a way, in comparison to more tolerable contexts where it is believed that each individual can reach a version of “right” on their own, in these rigid structures, there is no room for individual space interdependent from the “common will”. The participants from these more rigid family buildings expressed more interferences in their lives in domains such as social life, couple relationship and house setting. These findings are in line with the previous work on Turkish families, which emphasize the traditional values of control, hierarchy and obedience (Kurter, Jencius & Duba, 2004; Sunar & Fisek, 2005; Fişek & Kağıtçıbaşı, 1999).

The participants’ accounts about these more rigid family buildings provide supportive evidence for Kağıtçıbaşı’s total interdependence model of family, in which children are valued and considered as old age security, and any kind of tendency preventing the fulfillment of family duties are perceived as a threat and discouraged by the family (1990, 1996b, 2005). Similarly, in this study despite forming individual nuclear households, FB members still have material and instrumental value for the entire family building, and any overt form of independence is discouraged in order to maintain the reciprocal interdependency of the family structure. This interdependence is supported by religious discourses on how to be a proper child, authoritarian family culture and individuals’ own conscience. In accordance with that, the participants report guilt and anxiety about being labeled as selfish if they do not meet the expectations and demands of their extended family. A similar conclusion is reached by other researchers highlighting

the influence of guilt on individuals with authoritarian upbringing (Cornell & Frick, 2007; Donenberg & Weisz, 1998).

Moreover, the results reveal that these family cultures adopt strategies to teach collective values to its members. There are the concepts of reciprocal responsibility and unity which tie generations and nuclear households in the family building to each other with a close bond. Regardless of their age, the building members grow up learning the duties toward kin and looking after each other. The underlying note both in religious teachings and in the values that are intergenerationally transmitted conveys the responsibilities and duties toward others. In case of the participants' actions disclaiming such duties or any indication of divergence from common values, they face condemnation of the environment or eternal punishment of the divine power. Considering the lower socioeconomic levels of the participants, this is consistent with what was found in previous research. Existing work on this domain suggest that lower socioeconomic class tend to adopt parenting styles pertaining compliance and submission (Konrad Adenauer Foundation, 1999), whereas in higher strata self-determination and autonomy are taught to children (Kohn, Slomczynski, & Schoenbach, 1986; Akyil, Prouty, Blanchard & Lyness, 2016)."

The structure of the family buildings have different implications for couple relationships and the functioning of the couple. According to the vast amount of research in the literature the relationship with the extended family has great influence of the couple relationship. Extended family can play a supportive role for the couple (Fowler & Rittenour, 2017; as well as be the main reasons leading to divorce (TFSS, 2011). In line with the existing literature, the current study reveals the extended families' variant influences on the couple relationship. In more flexible family buildings, couple relationship is seen as confidential and the participants report that few interferences are done with the intention of making peace for the couple. This is consistent with previous research which demonstrate that in the traditional Turkish family, the couple relationship is regarded as sacred, and thereby confidential (Canel, 2012: Kurter, M. F., Jencius, M., & Duba, J. D.

2004). For some couples in these buildings with more flexible structures, living in a separate flat enhanced the privacy of the couple relationship. Similar to Acar's work on family buildings (2019), in the current research the participants voiced the difference between cohabiting with extended family members and family building experience many times. These participants were able to have some private space and sustain their parenting or their couple relationship as they wished in their separate flat.

Contrastingly, in more rigid family buildings, the couple relationship is negatively affected by the building members, who either cause conflict among the couple or interfere with the ongoing discussions of the couple. In these buildings, the borders separating the individual flats are not clear, and individuals experience and complain about way more interference in their home setting and private space. This outcome resembles once again the findings of Acar's work (2019), in which the term "flat" symbolizes separateness and is deemed as contradictory to the unity of the family building spirit. Overall, the results show that in flexible contexts, extended family plays a protective role for the couple relationship, whereas in more rigid family buildings extended family can stress the couple relationship.

Notwithstanding the interference in couples' and individuals' lives and intolerance for independence, it is found that the participants still attempt to exert autonomy and seek freedom, even in such rigid contexts. In line with the previous work, in a way individuals seek out ways to exert autonomy under any circumstances (Veltman & Piper, 2014). However, as seen in the participants' narratives, the structure of the context shapes the way and the means of individuals' autonomy. In terms of more confrontational autonomy attempts such as direct non-compliance and verbal opposition, the FB reacts in a discouraging way and the participants report feeling disrespectful and disobedient if they oppose the FB order. As a matter of fact, in case of noncompliance, FB members react either by crossing with the participants or keep on demanding the same things repeatedly and overlook their boundary setting attempts.

In those cases, two main responses were found in the analysis. Firstly, the participants complied with the FB order and possible interferences. Seymour (1986) argue that individuals who have been forced to engage in behaviors which contradict their attitudes find numerous ways to justify their inconsistencies. In line with this, current participants who reported accommodative behaviors also reframed the building members' interference in positive ways, such as believing the interventions were done with good intentions and in some cases, accepted that the members couldn't change. Further, in most accounts, the desire to convey respect and avoid disappointing parents originated from a sense of connectedness and responsiveness to their needs. In those buildings, all members were in a way connected and interdependent to one another. Thus, changing one's own plans to accommodate to other's needs considered as the right thing to do. These results are similar to the Roland's (1987) concept of familial self, which preaches community above personal gratification. Thus, given the emphasis on respect and approval in their relationships with FB members, it was not surprising to see that some participants considered and reframed the interventions and expectations in a positive way.

Secondly, more non-confrontational tactics were called in by the participants for exerting their autonomy and searching for freedom. The participants develop maneuvers and particular covert boundary negotiations to be able to exert autonomy to a certain extent. Lying, hiding information, ignoring the members' interferences and restraints are among the most frequently used techniques in these negotiations. These participants explained their motivation behind their practice of selective disclosure as avoiding unwanted interference. They did not explicitly react to the rules of conduct or the expectations in any way and carried on with what they set their mind on. This method ensured there was no opposition towards the FB and still enabled the participants to have their way. The participants voiced numerous covert communication techniques including covert boundary setting attempts. These results provide consistent evidence for previous cross-cultural studies which suggests that collectivistic cultures prefer covert

expression methods, while overt expression of problems is easier for individualistic cultures (Sullivan & Cottone, 2006; Ting-Toomey, 2009).

Regarding parenting experiences, the analysis revealed that the structure of the family building has a more limited influence on couples and extended families. In the current study, all couples complain about experiencing frequent interventions regarding child care practices. They report interference both in child discipline and child care decisions, such as diet and haircut of their children. Parents and parents-in-law may see themselves entitled to decide what is best for the child and intervene due to being experienced in child care. It came to the fore that although the participants value the child care support they received from FB members as explained in the previous section, they also want to be considered as the only authority figures in their children's lives and do not welcome interferences in their parenting. The results indicate that their attempts to set boundaries when it comes to make decisions about their children have been mostly successful and accepted in the FB. Most of the participants explained that although unsatisfied, FB members acknowledged their authority and their interferences regarding their parenting decreased. These results show that, regardless of the nature of the structure of FB, the participants' persistently attempted to support the well-being of their children and took individual responsibility for it, consistent with previous research (Hamilton, 2005). These results are also consistent with previous research which shows increasing attention to children's psychological health and expectations for their emotional well-being (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). The importance attached to children seems to unify FB members and prevent ongoing conflicts in this domain.

In sum, family buildings differed along dimensions of patriarchal hierarchy, tolerance and flexibility. In flexible settings, couples enjoyed exerting their autonomy, sustained a private life and did not avoid conflicts with FB members if need be. In these families, conflict, individual opinions and independence were mostly accepted and the FB order adapted to couples' and individuals' different needs. On the other hand, in rigid settings, conflict was understood as riskier and

disagreements were managed with more indirect and covert strategies. With respect to parenting, all FB members seemed to work together for enhancing children's well-being, stopping interference and conflict. Thus, couples and individuals seek autonomy in ways that are suitable to the context in their buildings, either non-confrontational or confrontational.

Besides the structure of the FB, as mentioned above, gender also influences the relational and parenting experiences of individuals and couples living in family buildings. Following, the factor of gender which shape the nature of the participants' experiences and their reactions will be handled in detail.

4.2.2. Gender Roles in the Family Building

In the traditional Turkish family, roles and rules of conduct assigned to individuals are determined by the hierarchical and patriarchal authorities, like the elderly, and cultural codes. Existing studies on the Turkish culture suggest important inequalities among genders in terms of role distribution and assigned rules (Fişek, 1993; Sunar & Fişek 2005). Similar to these previous findings, the current study reveals that aside from the structure of the context, gender is still a significant factor in the organization of the families. In accordance with their position in the family, the participants vary in their ways of exerting autonomy and agency. Hence, in order to understand various representations of agency across genders, the different roles attributed to men and women must be understood first.

Existing literature examining the Turkish family organizations reveal that assigned roles and rules of conduct applying to the members of the family building are determined by the gender of the subjects (Boratav, Fişek & Ziya, 2014; Vatandaş, 2007). Women are assigned a rather passive role, whereas men are expected to be more active and determinant in the process. According to this study, compliance and accommodation were expected from women, while men were expected to exert patriarchal authority, inspect women's compliance and act as a mediator in family life.. The present study also reveals that similar to other families, in family buildings, different expectations are placed on men and women, and as a

result, women seem to experience more hardship in comparison to men, more notably in rigid contexts.

Women's compliance with the family order is argued to be closely tied to the preservation of the family's honor in the more traditional societies (Kulwicki, 2002). Similarly, in the present study, female participants explained intergenerationally transmitted values that advised women to obey their husband and his family. These teachings define women's disobedience as a dishonorable act. These women were under close surveillance for the protection of the family honor. Previous research on Turkish family functioning suggest that mothers in-law are authorized to police the daughter-in-law in order to maintain the family order (Yakali- Camoglu, 2007). A similar pattern stands out in the current study showing that mothers-in-law may criticize, verbally abuse and oppress the brides if not satisfied with their performance or in case of disobedience. As a matter of fact, in case of ongoing dissatisfaction with the bride, those who are higher up in the hierarchical order are called in to step in, starting from the husband, father-in-law and lastly father of the bride.. These patterns are more notable in more rigid and hierarchical FB structures. These results provide further evidence for the previous research showing that mother-in-law may complain about the daughter-in-law to the son (Fischer, 1983) and that women are under the control of male family members for the preservation of family dignity (Boratav et al., 2014).

The inequality of genders seems to persist in family buildings, as well. Women who enters the family as daughter-in-law is situated in the lowest position in the hierarchy. Conversely, the son-in-law is seen as the executive power in the nuclear family, and thereby much respected by the traditionally patriarchal Turkish family (Sunar & Fisek, 2005). Similarly, results of the current work reveal that all male participants living in the family buildings of the wife's side expressed more freedom and tolerance. In comparison to that, the family buildings with husband's side are described as more rigid and oppressive by the female participants. For instance, being crossed with some members in the FB is a common response which is only seen in the buildings with the husband's side. Mothers-in-law stopped

talking if their expectations are not met or the rules are broken. This result ties well with previous studies which show that the dual relationship between the mother-in-law and the daughter-in-law is the most conflict-prone relationship among in-laws (Choi, Chan, & Brownbridge, 2010; Kivett, 1989).

It is striking to see the term “gelinlik yapmak”, a term referring to the appropriate way of being a daughter in-law, comes across in a majority of the participants’ narratives. Women are expected to behave in a certain way which is modeled and taught since they are children. In a sense, the reputation of the family of origin depends on the satisfaction of the husband and the in-laws and thereby, the performance of the daughter in-law. These findings provide support for Boratav et al.’s (2014) claim that the honor of the family is attributed to the females’ behaviors.

However, it is a challenging and impossible task to be a “good” daughter in-law. In accordance with former studies (Fişek, 1993; Sunar & Fişek 2005), regardless of a paying job, the female participants are totally responsible from the household duties and child care, and even in the most egalitarian households, the husbands would only “help” the wife. Besides their own house, in family building contexts, the female participants are expected to help with their parent-in-laws’ household tasks. Under such unequal conditions, being able to receive any kind of support is vital for the women. As a matter of fact, in line with previous work (Genç & Bapdist, 2019; Wu et al., 2010), mothers-in-law may attempt to use child care support as leverage in exchange for daughters-in-law’ obedience, particularly in rigid and hierarchical FB structures.

Even in the representations in the media, the daughter-in-law is presented as ill-intentioned and vicious (Lin, 2006). Similarly, despite spending only a few hours at home, male participants blame the daughters-in-law for any problems. They are regarded as “foreigners” who disturb the family homeostasis. It was striking to see that the negative associations attributed to the daughters-in-law were also shared by the women themselves in the current work. They describe the fellow sisters-in-law as trouble-maker foreigners who are jealous of them. A similar result

is seen in Dolev and Shifron's work (2016), where sisters-in-law envied and criticized each other. These results simply show that not only the environment, but fellow females also stigmatize each other and sometimes take part in sustaining the patriarchal power relations in family buildings with rigid and hierarchical structures.

Under these pressures, the women in the present study reported at least one confrontational boundary negotiation attempt in domains including social life, house setting and couple relationship. These include direct opposition to the FB order, refusing to comply and limiting the members' interferences via confrontation. In some families, women seem to openly voice their ideas and risk conflict with FB members, which might be considered as attempts to resist pressure and exert their power and autonomy. However, in a few families with rigid structures, women gave a report of their silent acceptance of the FB order and the futility of attempts to change it. Previous work on the subject claim that internalized oppression can cause individuals to perceive themselves as a deviant agent (Liebow, 2016). Similarly, these women shared a state of learned helplessness as a reason for their compliance with the building's order and its oppressive structure. In a consistent way, previous studies show daughters-in-law's preference for avoiding conflict by remaining silent (Lim & Lim, 2012; Shih & Pyke, 2010; Genç & Bapdist, 2019).

Previous work suggests that the men are considered as the provider and protector of the family, being on the top on hierarchy (Boratav et al., 2014). Similar to this, overall in the study male participants, living with either side of the couple in the FB, expressed much less interferences and compliance. There is especially a significant divergence in the experiences of the spouses who live in the FB with the husband's side. These men expressed no or much less interference in their couple relationship, home setting or social life than their wives. This salient difference may be explained by their unequal positions in the family, since traditionally men are expected to exert patriarchal authority whereas women are expected to comply with the order.

Despite being assigned to a more active role, the male participants from rigid structures are no less bound to the structure than women as they report no choice of abandoning the assigned roles or duties. A majority of the male participants who resided in their family of origin's building reported the experienced pressure for the mediator role, which is not seen in family buildings owned by the wife's side. These men are expected to fulfil the mediator role in order to protect their male dominant reputation at the cost of choosing either of their mother's or their wife's side in a conflict. Similar experiences of staying in between family of origin and the spouse are reported in previous work (Wu et al., 2010). In these negotiations, men either remain silent or try to soothe both parties. A previous study suggests that married men may align with their mothers in order to avoid conflict (Wu et al., 2010). This may imply the pressure and expectations placed on men in more rigid contexts to sustain the patriarchal dynamics at cost of psychological and relational well-being.

The continuous struggle for the preservation of their power and position are salient in the men's narratives, and influence various aspects of their lives and relationships. Some men, particularly those who live with their wife's side, reported the anxiety about being labeled as "içgüveysi", which refers to losing masculine power and autonomy in exchange for the support received from the wife's family. These men are expected to be tough and any kind of softness is labeled as weak. The emphasis on masculine power in family buildings also shapes men's behaviors towards their children. Similar to previous research (Fişek, 1991; Boratav et, al. 2014; Boratav et, al. 2017), in more rigid forms of family buildings, "feminine" activities such as looking after children, playing with them are not received well by the environment, when carried out by men. This expectation also affects the couple relationship of the participants who reported hesitance about buying flowers or calling their wives by sweet names and even by her actual name, because the expression of intimacy is not tolerated in more rigid contexts. Alternatively, the expression of couple intimacy simply demonstrate the noncompliant side of women and the non-dominating side of men. In a sense, despite the broader extent of agency and freedom, in more rigid contexts, it is limited and can only be used to

pursue the male-dominant order of the society. In these settings, men have to avoid being similar to women by any means.

Notwithstanding these, two men living in a family building with his wife's side were very pleased with their living arrangements and expressed no plan of leaving the building. Moreover, one female participant expressed satisfaction about her living experience in the family building with her husband's side. The most likely cause of this difference was related to the quality of the relationship with the FB members, consistent with previous research demonstrating their importance for couples (Peters-Davis, Moss & Pruchno, 1999). Despite the negative cultural norms of being a proper daughter-in-law and being an "içgüveysi", 3 couples were content about their lives in the FB. These results show that, despite the common disadvantages of the cultural attributions about gender inequality, in more flexible FB contexts, these cultural attributions are not strictly followed and they do not seem to impact the participants' relationships negatively.

Overall, traditional gender roles seem to shape couple's experiences in the family buildings. Women are expected to be compliant, respectful daughters-in-law who perform household tasks and take care of the family. Although they resist to these expectations at times, some show compliance and fulfill the expectations of the FB. On the other hand, men are expected to sustain their authority and act as mediators if need be. These gender roles are more strictly followed in rigid and hierarchical structures, increasing conflicts among daughters-in-law, mothers-in-law and sisters-in-law and increasing the pressure on men to resolve them.

4.3. CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The current results are hoped contribute to clinical practice along with relevant theoretical discussions in the Turkish context. As seen in the participants' accounts, the different contexts of the family buildings yield different presentations of agency, and thereby a diverse range of experiences. In line with the existing literature (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1996b), it is observed that agency and connectedness co-exists together rather than being contradictory concepts. Individuals voice feelings

of being supported in the interdependent functioning of the buildings and express gratitude to the FB members. However, in more rigid contexts where agency is indeed perceived as a threat to integrity of the building, individuals experience different forms of oppression.

First of all, clinicians working with the population who lives in family buildings or functions as an extended family should adopt a culturally sensitive perspective in order to understand their experiences (Park & Park, 2019). The existing literature is dominated by the advocates for separation even at the cost of relatedness. As a matter of fact, in these perspectives closeness might be regarded as enmeshment, and thereby dysfunctional. Yet, as seen in the participants' accounts, the need to relate is equally important and nurturing in these individuals' lives. They voice that emotional interdependency ensures numerous support and advantages, which they do not wish to give up. Similarly, in the clinical practice, clients might experience the struggle between the wish to connect and the wish to separate, between dependency and freedom from their family (Akyıl, et. al, 2014). Hence, clinicians working with this population should adopt a culturally sensitive approach in the treatment plan and develop a more encompassing understanding of relationships including autonomy, control and connectedness, rather than solely separation. Considering this family form as dysfunctional and forcing it to change into total independence pattern might marginalize these clients and harm their family relationships (Fişek & Kağıtçıbaşı, 1999). In fact, psychotherapists should normalize the co-existence of both wishes and try to understand the experience of the client (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005).

Moreover, families with psychologically interdependent model are mostly in a process of shift in which there is a change from more traditional values to modern ones. However, this shift may imply poor familial bonds, and hence disturb the family of origin. The clients may experience a struggle between following the traditional values which are upheld by their parents and older generations, and adopting values of self-sufficiency and separation. Psychotherapists should foster self-determination in the clients as well as help them find ways to remain connected

and related to the family of origin. Even in cases of rupture in the relationship with the family of origin, clinicians should help clients negotiate different values and beliefs about autonomy and relatedness according to their inner beliefs rather than external reactivity. Since cut off's might point unsuccessful separation-individuation process, clinicians might be advised to observe carefully and coach the clients to re-engage with others in healthier ways (McGoldrick & Carter, 2001).

Further, the interdependency of the members and closed structure to the outside world in the family building may be misunderstood as oppression in the clinical presentation. However, since the meaning of parental control varies across cultures and does not indicate a lack of parental warmth, clinicians should be attentive to the clients' authentic experiences in order to assess the situation (Kwak, 2003). It is important to explore and understand the nature of control and the client's understanding of it. Moreover, clinicians should take into consideration the co-existence of autonomy, control and relatedness (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005). Thereby, clinicians should develop and maintain a professional viewpoint that is sensitive to cultural variances and understand clients' authentic experiences. In case of perceived oppressive control, the psychotherapist should work for strengthening the client.

Next, as presented above traditional family organizations, including Turkish families, have differentiated rules and roles for different genders. Clients may voice problems that are inflicted by gender inequalities in the family structure. In such cases, clinicians should take the family culture into consideration. In order to maintain the therapeutic alliance as well as protecting any functioning familial relationships of the client, it is important not to marginalize or to present the client as the victim. The psychotherapist should inform clients about their rights and types of violence including economic and psychological. Meanwhile, the psychotherapist should be alert for any sign of violence and should report to the authorities if necessary. Through the process, the therapist should implement strategies to strengthen the female in the therapy, including exploring the resources of the client and areas in which she has control and agency.

The results suggest that daughters-in-law are at higher risk for experiencing conflicts, experiencing distress related to these conflicts and considered as scapegoats for problems in the family. In these contexts, systemic therapy perspectives are particularly informative to assess the situation from a broader perspective and decreasing individual responsibility on women. Systemic therapy perspective positions individuals as part of greater systems, in which individuals are influenced and simultaneously influence the systems. Considering conflicts in the family and women's roles in them as parts of a patriarchal and rigid system can expand the psychotherapist's perspective to focus on the inequalities in the system, rather than individual women.

Even if changing the entire extended family system might not always be an option, working with parts of a family in individual and couple therapy is also considered as a means for change. Hence, an awareness of culture and gender becomes significant for psychotherapists working in different modalities. In the case of individual modality, both adults and children whose agency is hindered and who experience learned helplessness might present internalizing or psychosomatic symptoms. Clinicians should be attentive for non-verbal cues when working with such cases and should help clients explore and focus on what they can control and which resources they have to exert agency. On the basis of the results, different manifestations of agency should be kept in mind and discussed with clients living in rigid and hierarchically organized contexts.

Couples may experience disagreements regarding the nature of the family ties and the extent of which the closeness and interdependence to the extended family should be. Since a couple sub-system is formed by two separate individuals, spouses may have different values as well as shared values with each other. Thereby, partners from different familial backgrounds may differ in their understanding of the optimal family ties. Living in a family building or having really close ties with one partner's side may cause conflicts in the couple relationship. In such cases, realizing the family of origin themes and understanding the intergenerational value transmissions can be a crucial intervention for clients.

Benefiting from the genogram can help both the clinician and the clients to realize each spouse's organization, rules and relationship patterns of the family of origin and their dependence or independence from to these concepts (Kerr, Bowen, & Kerr, 1988). Clients living in such rigid contexts may experience frequent problems in terms of interpersonal relations, which require functional conflict management skills. Hence, clinical work may aim facilitating useful conflict management and problem solving skills. Notwithstanding the room for skill enhancement, clients may already have certain existing skills, such as lying to and filtering information from the FB members. However, it is important to be attentive and culturally understanding to such sources and not to stigmatize these clients' and already functioning ways of conflict management and resources.

Further, either one or both of the spouses may complain about the external interference of the families into their relationship and inability to maintain integrity of the couple sub-system. As presented above, participants voiced numerous similar interferences in domains such as parenting relating issues and decision making process. It is important to and maintain the integrity of the family organization in the FB while setting boundaries for the couple subsystem. Spouses should be encouraged to discuss and reach a mutual understanding of the extent of the necessary boundaries.

Moreover, in an entire family system just one individual might present symptoms. For instance, a family might apply for therapy for child's behavioral problems. A recent study shows that ADHD and anxiety related diagnoses may be common among children who live in family buildings (Kaynar, 2014; Yılmaz & Sabuncuoğlu, 2019). However, as argued in the family systems theory, the client who presents a symptom manifests the unrest and discomfort in the entire system. Therefore, it is important for clinicians to take into consideration the context in which the symptoms arise and to encourage clients to relate in healthy ways which will make symptoms ineffective.

4.4. LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study contributes to the literature on relational and parenting experiences of Turkish married couples who reside in family buildings in Istanbul. It is one of the first studies investigating the phenomenon of family buildings and familial organizations in them. This study presents the accounts of both parties of couples and provide a comprehensive perspective regarding their living experience in a building both as a couple and as parents. The sample consists of 14 participants from 7 couples all of whom are interviewed at their home setting. The researcher's observation of the home setting also provides contextual information and captures the participants in their authentic environment. Nevertheless, there are some limitations about the sample of the research and the analysis. Following, these limitations and suggestions for further research in this field will be presented.

In order to capture the experiences of both parties in the couple relationship, both the husband and the wife are interviewed for this research. However, two possible limitations arose during the study indicating the lack of generalizability of the participants' narratives. Firstly, despite initial acceptance of the couples, some husbands later refused to take part in the study. Secondly, despite the fact that wives explained the dissatisfaction and complaints as a couple, some husbands pictured a problem-free family building experience. These husbands may have denied any negative experiences or refused to participate in the study in order to protect their family honor to the outside world (Fişek, 2001). Therefore, the participants' accounts may not represent the entire family building experience, and thereby cannot be generalized. Further research may consider to adopt strategies to include a sample with broader experiences.

Next, the participants' mean age are 41 ranging from 30-46 and their average marriage length are 19 years varying between 9 and 34. Couples in the sample were living in their FB approximately for ten years on average, except for one couple. Thus, the participants in this sample already experienced and resolved the conflicts to a certain extent some years ago. The experiences of younger couples from younger marriages who just moved to the family buildings could be different.

Therefore, further research could consider including younger generations who are early in their marriages in order to understand the transition period of individuals into becoming a couple and a parent in the context of family buildings.

Moreover, all six couples were in low socioeconomic strata, except one who could be regarded as slightly more affluent. Moreover, except two university degrees, all participants had low educational levels. Both the level of economic and educational status also influences the organization of the family. As argued by Imamoğlu and Karakitapoğlu-Aygün (2006), individuals from lower economic levels tend to have closer relationships with the extended family, compared to higher SES. In low economic and educational levels, members might be materially interdependent and hold traditional values, and thereby they might be closely connected to each other. It is possible to observe a different organization and family dynamic in more affluent and educated family buildings, since decreased material dependencies might give space for more agency and higher educational degree might facilitate modern values. Future research could consider sampling participants from more heterogeneous groups. Another important consideration for the future research is whose family lives with the couple in the FB. As discussed above, gender is a significant predictor for the participants' experiences as well as the structure and dynamics of the FB. Therefore, future research may explore the differences of these FBs and the experiences of the participants.

Next, the thematic analysis process is conducted with only one coder and the lack of a second coder hinders the inter-rater reliability of the current research. In the case of possible publication, in order to ensure trustworthiness of the analysis a second coder should be employed.

As seen in the participants' accounts individuals' experiences vary according to their gender and the structure of the FB. Further research may focus on the relationship between the structure of the context, gender of the individuals and the psychological well-being of the FB members including the children. In order for a comprehensive assessment of the psychological well-being and appropriate treatment planning, further research may focus on these relationships.

Lastly, the self of the researcher is significant in qualitative studies. The researcher's past experience of living in a family building helped preparing meaningful questions that would be relevant to the participants' context and would capture their experience. However, the very fact that the researcher lived in a family building in the past might also cloud the analysis of the participants' experiences.

4.5. CONCLUSION

The current study aims to explore the experiences of couples living in family buildings in Istanbul. The main objective of this work is to explore how the relational and parenting experiences of each party are influenced by living in a family building. The experiences of 7 couples with at least 1 child and have been living in a family building for at least 1 year are explored through semi-structured interviews conducted individually in their houses. Although family buildings are unique living arrangements, particularly in big cities, the current literature analyzing the experience of living in a family building is limited. Hence, the study aims to provide comprehensive information about the general experience of living in family buildings and generate interest in cultural family forms in future research.

The results show that couples describe family buildings as a trusted support network where caretaking responsibilities are carried out reciprocally and collectively. Their experiences show that family building members meet their relatedness needs and value family connectedness in their lives. Despite the dominant discourse in the field which defines autonomy and relatedness as mutually exclusive and suggests that separation is a pre-condition for agency, the present results also reveal that agency may have different forms and manifestations in family buildings. In the present study, two significant determinants which shape the manifestations of autonomy in family buildings are identified, namely the structure of and gender roles in the family building. In more flexible contexts which are similar to families with psychologically interdependent model (Kağıtçıbaşı 1996b, 2005), couples' and individuals' autonomy is tolerated and they may exert agency and create individual boundaries. In these contexts, it is believed that each individual may reach to their own form of the truth. On the other hand, in more

rigid contexts which resemble the total interdependent model of the family (Kağıtçıbaşı 1996b, 2005), agency is perceived as a threat for the family continuity. In these structures, there is only one form of truth and any alternative attempts is discouraged.

Gender influences the expectations and rules in family buildings, creating somewhat different pressures on men and women. The traditional gender roles persist and even increases in the rigid contexts of some family buildings. Despite these different structures and norms, individuals find ways to seek autonomy suitable to their contexts. They rely on either non-confrontational or confrontational strategies, with some women adopting more direct boundary negotiations than men. In other words, autonomy is possible and has variant forms even in the presence of relatedness. Lastly, couples frequently reach a consensus to set boundaries in matters related to well-being of their children and decision making processes as couple.

REFERENCES

Aassve, A., Meroni, E., & Pronzato, C. (2012). Grandparenting and Childbearing in the Extended Family. *European Journal of Population / Revue Européenne de Démographie*, 28(4), 499–518. doi:10.1007/s10680-012-9273-2)

Acar, S. (2019). Şehir dokusunda mahalle: İstanbul Esenler'de aile apartmanı olgusunun incelenmesi.

Aile, T. B., & Müdürlüğü, S. A. G. (2006). TC Başbakanlık Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu. *Aile Yapısı Araştırması*.

Akçay, F. M., & Yavuz, A. Ö. (2104). Cumhuriyetten Günümüze Kent-Konut İlişkisi:İstanbul Örneği. *Şehir ve Şehircilik Sempozyum Kitabı*, Ankara, p.:192.

Akyıl, Y., Prouty, A., Blanchard, A., & Lyness, K. (2016). Experiences of families transmitting values in a rapidly changing society: Implications for family therapists. *Family process*, 55(2), 368-381.

Akyıl, Y. (2011). Being a family therapist in the United States: Multicultural competency through the lenses of an immigrant therapist. *Journal of family psychotherapy*, 22(2), 157-171.

Akyıl, Y., Prouty, A., Blanchard, A., & Lyness, K. (2014). Parents' experiences of intergenerational value transmission in Turkey's changing society: An interpretative phenomenological study. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*, 25(1), 42-65.

Ataca, B. (2009). Turkish family structure and functioning. *Perspectives on human development, family, and culture*, 108-125.

Atalay, B., Kontas, M., Beyazıt, S. & Madenog˘lu, K. (1992). Türk aile yapısı Aras ırması Devlet planlama Tes ıkilatı Sosyal Plan- lama Genel Müdürlüğü Aras ırma Dairesi. Yayın no: DPT 313- SPGM: 421. Ankara: DPT Matbaası.

Aydın, E. (2017). Anne-oğul bağlanmasının gelin-kayınvalide ilişkisi ve evlilik doyumunu yordamadaki rolü.

Aykan, H., & Wolf, D. A. (2000). Traditionality, modernity, and household composition: Parent-child coresidence in contemporary Turkey. *Research on Aging*, 22(4), 395-421.

Aytaç, I. A. 1998. "Intergenerational Living Arrangements in Turkey." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology* 13:241-64.

Baştuğ, S. (2002). Household and family in Turkey: An historical perspective. *Autonomy and dependence in the family: Turkey and Sweden in critical perspective*, 99-115.

Bayer, A. (2013). Değişen toplumsal yapıda aile. *Şırnak Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(8), 101-129.

Beşpınar, F. U., & Beşpınar, L. Z. (2017). Türkiye’de hane halkı yapıları ve evlilik pratiklerinde ikili resim: geleneklerin yani sıra değişimin yansımaları. *Nüfusbilim Dergisi*, 39(1), 109-149.

Boratav, H. B., Fişek, G. O., & Ziya, H. E. (2014). Unpacking masculinities in the context of social change: Internal complexities of the identities of married men in Turkey. *Men and Masculinities*, 17(3), 299-324.

Boratav, H. B., Fişek, G. O., & Eslen-Ziya, H. (2017). Erkekliğin Türkiye Halleri. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Bowen, M. (1978). Family therapy in clinical practice. New York, NY: Jason Aronson.

Bozkurt, V. (2011). Değişen dünyada sosyoloji. Bursa: Ekin Yayınevi.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

Brew, F. P., & Cairns, D. R. (2004). Do culture or situational constraints determine choice of direct or indirect styles in intercultural workplace conflicts? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28(5), 331-352.

Callan, F. D., & Dolan, E. M. (2013). Parenting constraints and supports of young low-income mothers in rural United States. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 44(2), 157-174.

Canel, A. N. (2012). Evlilik ve aile hayatı. Marriage and family life]. İstanbul, Turkey: Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı.

Carmichael, S. (2011). Marriage and power: Age at first marriage and spousal age gap in lesser developed countries. *The History of the Family*, 16(4), 416-436.

Choi, A. W. M., Chan, E. K. L., & Brownridge, D. A. (2010). Unraveling the In-law conflict and its association with intimate. *Women's Health and Urban Life*, 9(1), 72-92.

Chong, A., Gordon, A. E., & Don, B. P. (2017). Emotional support from parents and in-laws: The roles of gender and contact. *Sex Roles*, 76(5-6), 369-379.

Compton, J., & Pollak, R. A. (2014). Family proximity, childcare, and women's labor force attachment. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 79, 72-90.

Cornell, A. H., & Frick, P. J. (2007). The moderating effects of parenting styles in the association between behavioral inhibition and parent-reported guilt and empathy in preschool children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 36(3), 305-318.

De Ruijter, E., Van Der Lippe, T., & Raub, W. (2003). Trust problems in household outsourcing. *Rationality and Society*, 15(4), 473-507.

Dhami, S., & Sheikh, A. (2000). The Muslim family: predicament and promise. *Western Journal of Medicine*, 173(5), 352.

Dinero, R. E., Conger, R. D., Shaver, P. R., Widaman, K. F., & Larsen-Rife, D. (2008). Influence of family of origin and adult romantic partners on romantic attachment security. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*(4), 622

Dolev, A., & Shifron, R. (2016). Envy in siblings-in-law relationships. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 72*(2), 121-139.

Donenberg, G. R., & Weisz, J. R. (1998). Guilt and Abnormal Aspects of Parent—Child Interactions. In *Guilt and children* (pp. 245-267). Academic Press.

Duben, A. (1982). The significance of family and kinship in urban Turkey. *Sex roles, family and community in Turkey, 73-99.*

Duben, A. (1985). Turkish families and households in historical perspective. *Journal of Family History, 10*(1), 75-97.

Duben, A., ve Behar, C. (1991). *Istanbul households: Marriage, Family and Fertility, 1880- 1940.* Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, J. (1995). Parenting skills': Views of community health and social service providers about the needs of their 'clients. *Journal of Social Policy, 24*(2), 237-259.

Eraslan, D., Yakali-Çamoğlu, D., Harunzade, Y. P., Ergun, B. M., & Dokur, M. (2012). Interpersonal communication in and through family: Structure and therapy in Turkey.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis* (No. 7). WW Norton & Company.

Esmer, Y., Ertunç, B., & Pekiner, Y. (2012). *Türkiye değerler atlası 2012: değişimin kültürel sınırları.* Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Yayınları

Fingerman, K. L. (2004). The role of offspring and in-laws in grandparents' ties to their grandchildren. *Journal of Family Issues, 25,* 1026–1049.

Fischer, L. R. (1983). Mothers and mothers-in-law. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 187-192.

Fişek, G. O. (1995). Gender hierarchy: Is it a useful concept in describing family structure. *Family, gender and beyond*, 63-72.

Fişek G. O., & Kağıtçıbaşı Ç. (1999). Multiculturalism and psychotherapy: The Turkish case. In P. Pedersen, (Ed.), *Multiculturalism as a fourth force*. Philadelphia, PA: Taylor & Francis.

Fişek, G. O. (1982). Psychopathology and the Turkish family: A family systems theory analysis. *Sex roles, family and community in Turkey*, 295-321.

Fişek, G. O. (1991). A cross-cultural examination of proximity and hierarchy as dimensions of family structure. *Family Process*, 30(1), 121-133.

Fişek, G. O. (1993). Life in Turkey. *International handbook of gender roles*, 438-451.

Fişek, G. O. (2001). Child health and family process in the Turkish urban context. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University, Proje Raporu.

Fowler, C., & Rittenour, C. (2017). A life-span approach to children-in-law's perceptions of parent-in-law communication. *Journal of Family Communication*, 17(3), 254-272.

Genç, E., & Baptist, J. (2019). Managing Conflict with Parents-in-Law in a Secular Society Steeped in Islamic Traditions: Perspectives of Married Turkish Couples. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*, 30(1), 20-39.

Georgas, J. (2003). Family: Variations and changes across cultures. *Online readings in psychology and culture*, 6(3), 2307-0919.

Göregenli, M. (1997). Individualist-collectivist tendencies in a Turkish sample. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28(6), 787-794.

Görgülü, T. (2017). Apartman Tipolojisinde Geçmişten Bugüne; Kira Apartmanından “Rezidans’a” Geçiş. *Kültür Envanteri*, 14(14).

Gushue, G. V. (1993). Cultural-identity development and family assessment: An interaction model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 21(3), 487-513.

Hanceoglu, A. (1985). Turkiye’de aile bicimleri ve aile buyuklugo [Family types and household size in Turkey in 1978]. *Unpublished master’s thesis, Hacettepe Institute of Population Studies, Ministry of Health, and Macro International Inc.*

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture’s consequences: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hortaçsu, N. (1995). Parents' education levels, parents' beliefs, and child outcomes. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 156(3), 373-383.

İmamoğlu, E. O. (1987). An interdependence model of human development

Imamoğlu, E. O., & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z. (2006). Actual, ideal, and expected relatedness with parents across and within cultures. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(5), 721-745.

Inglehart, R., & Oyserman, D. (2004). Individualism, autonomy and self-expression: The human development syndrome.

Jahoda, G., & Dasen, P. R. (Eds.). (1986). Introduction. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 9(4), 413-416.

Jandt, F. E., & Pedersen, P. B. (Eds.). (1996). *Constructive conflict management*. Sage.

Johnston-Ataata, K. (2019). Space and the navigation of intimacy in intergenerational Tongan-European Australian relationships during partnering and early parenthood. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 31, 71-77.

Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (1982a). Changing value of children in Turkey.

Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (1982b). *Sex roles, family and community in Turkey*. Indiana University.

Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (1985). Intra-family interaction and a model of family change. *Family in Turkish Society*. Turkish Social Science Association, Ankara, 149-165.

Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (1990). Family and socialization in cross-cultural perspective: A model of change. In J. Berman(Ed.), *Cross-cultural perspectives: Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1989* (pp. 135-200). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (1996a). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers, 10 Industrial Avenue, Mahwah, NJ 07430-2262.

Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (1996b). The autonomous-relational self: A new synthesis. *European Psychologist, 1*, 180–186.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1997). Individualism and collectivism. In J. F. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology vol. 3* (pp. 1-49). London: Allyn & Bacon.

Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology, 36*(4), 403-422.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology, 36*(4), 403-422.

Kağıtçıbaşı, C., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children and family change: A three-decade portrait from Turkey. *Applied Psychology, 54*(3), 317-337.

Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (2007). Family, self, and human development across cultures: Theory and applications. Routledge.

Kandiyoti, D. (1985). Women in rural production systems: problems and policies.

Kapız, S. (2002). Sosyal Değişim Sürecinde İş-Aile Yaşamı Etkileşimi,(Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi).

Kaya, T. (2019). Gelin-kaynana iletişiminin niteliğini belirleyen kültürel etmenler. Erciyes İletişim Dergisi, 6(1), 185-204.

Kaynar, S. Y. (2014). Aile apartmanında yaşamının çocuk ruh sağlığı üzerine etkilerinin değerlendirilmesi.

Kerr, M. E., Bowen, M., & Kerr, M. E. (1988). Family evaluation. WW Norton & Company.

Kim, K., Bangerter, L. R., Liu, Y., Polenick, C. A., Zarit, S. H., & Fingerman, K. L. (2016). Middle-aged offspring's support to aging parents to parents with emerging disability. The Gerontologist. Advance online publication. doi:10.1093/geront/gnv686

Kivett, V. R. (1989). Mother-in-law and daughter-in-law relations. In J. A. Mancini (Ed.), Aging parents and adult offspring (pp. 17–32). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Koç, İ. (2014). Türkiye’de Aile Yapısının Değişimi: 1968-2011. *Türkiye Aile Yapısı Araştırması: Tespitler, Öneriler, İstanbul: TC Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı Aile ve Toplum Hizmetleri Genel Müdürlüğü Araştırma ve Sosyal Politika Serisi*, 7, 24-54.

Kohn, M. L., Slomczynski, K. M., & Schoenbach, C. (1986, December). Social stratification and the transmission of values in the family: A cross-national assessment. In Sociological forum (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 73-102). Kluwer Academic

Publishers.

Konrad Adenauer Foundation. (1999). *Turkish youth 98: The silent majority high- lighted*. Istanbul, Turkey: Istanbul Mülkiyeliler Foundation Social Research Center (IMV-SAM).

Koutrelakos, J. (2004). Acculturation of Greek Americans: Change and continuity in cognitive schemas guiding intimate relationships. *International Journal of Psychology*, 39(2), 95-105.

Kurter, M. F., Jencius, M., & Duba, J. D. (2004). A Turkish perspective on family therapy: An interview with Hürol Fisiloglu. *The Family Journal*, 12(3), 319-323.

Kwak, K. (2003). Adolescents and their parents: A review of intergenerational family relations for immigrant and non-immigrant families. *Human development*, 46(2-3), 115-136.

Lam, B. C., Cross, S. E., Wu, T. F., Yeh, K. H., Wang, Y. C., & Su, J. C. (2016). What do you want in a marriage? Examining marriage ideals in Taiwan and the United States. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42(6), 703-722.

Liebow, N. (2016). Internalized Oppression and Its Varied Moral Harms: Self-Perceptions of Reduced Agency and Criminality. *Hypatia*, 31(4), 713-729.

Lim, S. L., & Lim, B. K. (2012). Po Xi Wen Ti: The “mother-in-law problem” navigating tradition and modernity in transforming familial relationships in the Chinese family. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*, 23(3), 202-216.

Lin, S. Y. (2006). The Media Image of Mother-in-law and Daughter-in-law in Taiwan TV Drama and in Korean drama by Narrative Theory and Ideological Theory. In *Cultural Space and Public Sphere in Asia International Conference*, Hallym University, Korea.

Mahler, M. S., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (1975). The Psychological Birth of

the Human Infant. Symbiosis and Individuation. New York (Basic Books) 1975.

Margolin, G., Gordis, E. B., Medina, A. M., & Oliver, P. H. (2003). The co-occurrence of husband-to-wife aggression, family-of-origin aggression, and child abuse potential in a community sample: Implications for parenting. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(4), 413-440.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological review*, 98(2), 224.

Martin, L. G. (1990). Changing intergenerational family relations in East Asia. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 510(1), 102-114.

McGoldrick, M., & Carter, B. (2001). Advances in coaching: Family therapy with one person. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 27, 281–300

Miller, J. G. (2002). Bringing culture to basic psychological theory—Beyond individualism and collectivism: Comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(1), 97-109.

Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families and Family Therapy*, London.

Mutdoğan, S. (2014). Türkiye’de Çok Katlı Konut Oluşum Sürecinin İstanbul Örneği Üzerinden İncelenmesi. *Ankara, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyolojik Araştırmalar E-Dergisi*, 1-27.

Nichols, M. P., & Schwartz, R. C. (1984). *Family therapy: Concepts and methods*. New York: Gardner Press.

Oishi, S. (2000). Goals as cornerstones of subjective well-being: Linking individuals and cultures. In E. Diener & E. M. Suh (Eds.), *Culture and subjective well-being* (pp. 87-112). Cambridge, MA: Bradford.

Omran, A. R., & Roudi, F. (1993). *The Middle East population*

puzzle. *Population Bulletin*, 48(1), 1-40.

Oyserman, D., Kemmelmeier, M., & Coon, H. (2002b). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(1), 97-110.

Park, T. Y., & Park, Y. (2019). Living with an In-Law and Marital Conflicts: A Family Therapy Case Study. *Journal of Asia Pacific Counseling*, 9(2).

Parsons, T. (1949). The social structure of the family. In R. N. Anshen (Ed.). *The family: Its functions and destiny* (pp. 173-201). New York: Harper.

Perez, W., & Padilla, A. M. (2000). Cultural orientation across three generations of Hispanic students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Psychology*, 22, 390-398.

Peters-Davis, N. D., Moss, M. S., & Pruchno, R. A. (1999). Children-in-law in caregiving families. *The Gerontologist*, 39(1), 66-75.

Roland, A. (1991). *In search of self in India and Japan: Toward a cross-cultural psychology*. Princeton University Press.

Rosenmayr, L., and E. Köckeis. 1963. "Propositions for a Sociological Theory of Aging and the Family." *International Social Science Journal* 15:410-26.

Rothbaum, F., Pott, M., Azuma, H., Miyake, K., & Weisz, J. (2000). The development of close relationships in Japan and the United States: Paths of symbiotic harmony and generative tension. *Child development*, 71(5), 1121-1142.

Segalen, M. (1986). *Historical anthropology of the family*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Serewicz, M. C M.. (2006). The difficulties of in-law relationships. In D. C. Kirkpatrick, S. Duck, & M. Foley (Eds.), *Relating difficulty: The process of constructing and managing difficult interaction* (pp. 101–118). Mahwah, NJ:

Lawrence Erlbaum.

Serewicz, M. C. M., Hosmer, R., Ballard, R. L., & Griffin, R. A. (2008). Disclosure from in-laws and the quality of in-law and marital relationships. *Communication Quarterly*, 56(4), 427-444.

Seymour, D. T. (1986). Forced compliance in family decision-making. *Psychology & Marketing*, 3(3), 223-237.

Shih, K. Y., & Pyke, K. (2010). Power, resistance, and emotional economies in women's relationships with mothers-in-law in Chinese immigrant families. *Journal of Family Issues*, 31(3), 333-357.

Simons, R. L., Whitbeck, L. B., Conger, R. D., & Wu, C. I. (1991). Intergenerational transmission of harsh parenting. *Developmental Psychology*, 27(1), 159.

Sullivan, C., & Cottone, R. R. (2006). Culturally based couple therapy and intercultural relationships: A review of the literature. *The Family Journal*, 14(3), 221-225.

Sunar, D. (2002). Change and continuity in the Turkish middle class family. *Autonomy and dependence in family: Turkey and Sweden in critical perspective*, 217-238.

Sunar, D., & Fişek, G. (2005). Contemporary Turkish families. *Families in global perspective*, 169-183.

Sung, M., & Park, J. (2012). The Effects of a Family Support Program Including Respite Care on Parenting Stress and Family Quality of Life Perceived by Primary Caregivers of Children with Disabilities in Korea. *International Journal of Special Education*, 27(3), 188-198.

Telleen, S., Herzog, A., & Kilbane, T. L. (1989). Impact of a family support program on mothers' social support and parenting stress. *American Journal of*

Orthopsychiatry, 59(3), 410-419.

TFSS (2011). Turkish Family Structure Survey, Turkish Ministry of Family and Social Policy.

Thomas, A.J. (1998). Understanding culture and worldview in family systems: Use of the multicultural genogram. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 6(1), 24-32.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2009). Intercultural conflict competence as a facet of intercultural competence development. *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence*, 100-120.

Todd, E. (1985). *The explanation of ideology: Family structures and social systems*. Oxford [Oxfordshire]; New York, NY, USA: B. Blackwell.

Turinay, N. (1996). *Değişen toplum ve aile*. Akçağ Yayınları.

Ünalın, T. (2005). Changing family structure in Turkey, 1968–1998. In *Population, Resources and Development* (pp. 181-201). Springer, Dordrecht.

Uzoka, A.F. (1979). The myth of the nuclear family. *American Psychologist*, 34, 1095–1106.

Wu, T. F., Yeh, K. H., Cross, S. E., Larson, L. M., Wang, Y. C., & Tsai, Y. L. (2010). Conflict with mothers-in-law and Taiwanese women's marital satisfaction: The moderating role of husband support. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 38(4), 497–522. doi:10.1177/0011000009353071

Vatandaş, C. (2007). TOPLUMSAL CİNSİYET VE CİNSİYET ROLLERİNİN ALGILANIŞI. *Sosyoloji Konferansları*, (35), 29-56.

Veltman, A., & Piper, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Autonomy, Oppression, and Gender*. Oxford University Press.

Yadigar, A. L. U. Ş. (2015). *Kültürel ve Toplumsal Gerçekliğimiz*

Açısından Aile Anlayışlarının ve Türk Ailesinin Değerlendirmesi. *PESA Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 1(1), 15-24.

Yakali-Çamoğlu, D. (2007). Turkish family narratives: The relationships between mothers-and daughters-in-law. *Journal of Family History*, 32(2), 161-178.

Yıldırım, E. (2009). Toplumsal Değişme Sürecinde Aile. *Aile Sosyolojisi*, 3, 121-138.

Yıldırım, E., & Canatan, K. (2013). Aile Sosyolojisi.

Yılmaz, S., & Sabuncuoğlu, O. (2019). Life in Family Buildings as a unique environment in Turkey. *Mental illness*, 11(1).

Yorburg, B. (1975). The nuclear and the extended family: An area of conceptual confusion. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 6(1), 5-14.

Young, N. (1992). Postmodern self-psychology mirrored in science and the arts. In S. Kvale (Ed.), *Psychology and postmodernism* (pp. 135-145). London: Sage.

APPENDICES



APPENDIX A- Informed Consent Form

Bilgilendirilmiş Onam Formu

Bu araştırma İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Klinik Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Merve Adlı İşleyen'in bitirme tezi kapsamında, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Anıl Özge Üstünel'in danışmanlığında yürütülmektedir. Bu araştırma için İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Etik Komisyonu'ndan gerekli izinler alınmıştır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, aile apartmanında yaşayan çiftlerin evlilik ve ebeveynlik deneyimlerini incelemektir. Bunun yanında elde edilen veriler Türkiye ve dünyada çiftlerle çalışan terapistlerin geniş aile kavramının etkileri hakkında daha fazla bilgi edinmesine katkıda bulunacaktır.

Çalışmanın amacı gereği sizinle yapılan derinlemesine görüşmelerde sizden düşüncelerinizi paylaşırken mümkün olduğunca içtenlikle ve eksiksiz paylaşımlarda bulunmanız beklenmektedir. Görüşme, 1-1.5 saat sürecektir ve gizliliğin korunması adına görüşmelerde eşlerle ayrı ayrı konuşulacaktır.

Araştırmaya katılımınız tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır. Herhangi bir nedenden dolayı sorulara cevap vermek istemediğiniz takdirde, çalışmaya katılımınızı sonlandırabilirsiniz. Görüşme esnasında ya da sonrasında kendinizi dilediğiniz takdirde görüşme istediğiniz noktada sonlandırılıp ses kaydınız silinebilir. İhtiyaç halinde araştırmacı uygun ruh sağlığı uzmanına yönlendirme yapacaktır.

Görüşme anında verdiğiniz cevaplar daha sonra detaylı bir şekilde incelenmek amacıyla, kayıt cihazı kullanılarak kaydedilecektir. Ses kaydı istemediğiniz durumda görüşme başlamadan sona erecektir. Katılımcıların gerçek isimleri kaldırılarak, görüşmeler gizlilik esasına uygun bir şekilde saklanacaktır. Araştırma süresince elde edilen bilgiler sadece bilimsel amaçlar için kullanılacaktır.

Çalışmayla ilgili sorularınız için (merveadli1@gmail.com) e-posta adresinden araştırmacıya ulaşabilirsiniz.

Araştırmaya yaptığımız katkıdan dolayı teşekkür ederiz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum ve istediğim zaman bırakabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin kimliğim gizli kalmak şartıyla bilimsel amaçlı yayınlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.

Görüşmenin sesli olarak kayıt altına alınmasını kabul ediyorum. Herhangi bir sebepten ötürü kayıt alınmasından rahatsız olduğum takdirde kaydın durdurulup silineceğini ve görüşmenin sonlandırılacağını biliyorum.

<i>Katılımcı Adı</i> <i>Soyadı:</i>		<i>Tarih ve İmza:</i>
<i>Adres ve Telefon:</i>		

<i>Araştırmacı Adı</i> <i>Soyadı:</i>		<i>Tarih ve İmza:</i>
<i>Adres ve Telefon:</i>		

APPENDIX B- Demographic Information Sheet

1. **Cinsiyet**
2. **Yaşadıkları İlçe**
3. **Evlilik Öncesi Beraberlik Süresi**
4. **Evlilik Süresi**
5. **Çocuk Sayısı**
6. **Çocuk Cinsiyeti ve Yaşı**

7. **Eğitim düzeyiniz:**

- Okumadım
- İlköğretim
- Lise
- Üniversite
- Lisansüstü
- Doktora

4. **Şu anda çalışıyor musunuz?**

- Evet, çalışıyorum.
- Hayır, çalışmıyorum

5. **Daha önce çalıştıysanız...**

- a. Ne kadar süre çalıştınız

- b.** Ne zaman bıraktınız?
- c.** Çalışmayı bırakma nedeniniz?

- Evlilik
- Çocuk doğumu
- İhtiyaç olmaması
- Diğer

8. Meslek

6. Ortalama geliriniz:

- 0-2.000 TL
- 2.000-4.000 TL
- 4.000-6.000 TL
- 6.000-8.000 TL
- 8.000-10.000 TL
- 10.000 TL ve üzeri

9. Önceden aile apartmanında yaşadınız mı?

10. Evet ise kaç yıl ve kiminle:

11. Şu anda yaşadığınız apartmanda sizin dışınızda kimler yaşıyor?

APPENDIX C- Semi-Structured Interview Questions

GÖRÜŞME SORULARI

Bu görüşmede aile apartmanında yaşama deneyiminizle alakalı size bazı sorular soracağım. Soruların doğru ya da yanlış bir cevabı bulunmamaktadır. Düşüncelerinizi paylaşırken mümkün olduğunca içtenlikle ve eksiksiz paylaşımlarda bulunmanız büyük önem taşır.

- 1) Nasıl tanıştınız, nasıl evlendiniz?
- 2) Aile apartmanında yaşamaya nasıl karar verdiniz?
- 3) Aile apartmanında yaşamak sizin için nasıl bir şey, biraz anlatabilir misiniz?
 - a. Hoşunuza giden tarafları neler?
 - b. Zorlukları neler? Nasıl çözüyorsunuz? Mesela bir örnek anlatır mısınız, yaşadığınız ve çözdüğünüz?
- 4) Evli bir çift olarak aile apartmanında yaşamak sizin için nasıl bir şey?
 - a. Bir konuda karar vermeniz gerektiğinde nasıl karar veriliyor, biraz anlatabilir misiniz? Bir örnek verebilir misiniz?
 - i. Bir konuda karar alırken apartmandakilerin dahil olduğu olur mu? Nasıl olurlar(olmazlar)?
 - b. Evde iş bölümü nasıl yapılıyor? Nasıl karar veriyorsunuz?
 - c. Eşinize yakınlık göstermek istediğinizde nasıl gösteriyorsunuz? Neler yapıyorsunuz?
 - i. Aile apartmanında eşinizle yakınlığı nasıl yaşıyorsunuz?
 - d. Eşinizle aranızda bir anlaşmazlık olduğunda ne yapıyorsunuz?
 - i. Peki apartmandakilerin dahil olduğu olur mu? Nasıl olurlar(olmazlar)?
 - 5) Çocuklarınızı aile apartmanında büyütmek sizin için nasıl?

- a. Gün içerisinde çocuklarınıza kimler bakıyor?
 - b. (Eşinizin) hamilelik süreci nasıl geçti? Bu süreci aile apartmanında geçiriyor olmak nasıldı?
 - c. Çocuğum iyi ki burada, aile apartmanında,” büyüyor dediğiniz zamanlar oluyor mu? Anlatır mısınız?
 - d. Çocuğunuzu büyütürken apartmandakiler dahil oluyor mu? Nasıl?
 - e. Çocuğunuzu aile apartmanında büyütmenin zorluk yanları var mı? Neler? Nasıl çözüyorsunuz? Mesela bir örnek anlatır mısınız, yaşadığınız ve çözdüğünüz?
- 6) Aile apartmanında yaşamak sosyal hayatınızı (apartman dışındaki akrabalar, arkadaşlar) etkiliyor mu? Nasıl?
 - 7) Aile apartmanında yaşamak çalışma hayatınızı nasıl etkiliyor? Anlatır mısınız?
 - 8) Şu an kendi/ eşinizin ailesi ile aynı apartmanda yaşıyorsunuz.. Bu zamana kadar sorduğum soruları düşünerek, eşinizin/ kendi aileniz ile aynı apartmanda yaşamak nasıl olurdu? Benzerlikler/ farklılıklar olur muydu?
 - 9) Sizce ailelerinden ayrı apartmanlarda yaşayan çiftlerin birlikteliği sizin birlikteliğinizden farklı mıdır? Ne bakımdan?
 - 10) Konu ile ilgili eklemek istediğiniz herhangi bir şey var mı?

APPENDIX D- Ethical Approval by the Ethics Committee

ETİK KURUL DEĞERLENDİRME SONUCU/RESULT OF EVALUATION BY THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

(Bu bölüm İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurul tarafından doldurulacaktır /This section to be completed by the Committee on Ethics in research on Humans)

Başvuru Sahibi / Applicant: Merve Adlı İşleyen

Proje Başlığı / Project Title: Marital Functioning and Parenting in Extended Family Living Arrangements: A Qualitative Study

Proje No. / Project Number: 2020- 20024-45

1.	Herhangi bir değişikliğe gerek yoktur / There is no need for revision	XX
2.	Ret/ Application Rejected Reddin gerekçesi / Reason for Rejection	

Değerlendirme Tarihi / Date of Evaluation: 20 Şubat 2020

Kurul Başkanı / Committee Chair

Doç. Dr. Itr Erhart



Üye / Committee Member

Prof. Dr. Turgut Tarhanlı



Üye / Committee Member

Prof. Dr. Koray Akay

Üye / Committee Member

Prof. Dr. Ash Tunç (izinli)



Üye / Committee Member

Prof. Dr. Hale Bolak Boratav