

The Turkish State as a Pan-Family. From Micro to Macro Environment: Societal Values and the Good-Bad Binomen

Irina-Maria Cosma¹

Abstract

We analyse the role of the Turkish family, as not a singular, but rather a collective entity in the Turkish culture; it is a fundamental element for it represents a micro-Turkish state, as the Turkish state is, extendedly, a pan-family. Therefore, family becomes one of the most important values, a sacred institution which has become a symbolic value for its importance, both religious and societal. Family guides the construction of the society through marriage, a collective process of enclosing the circle of fate and symbolising prosperity. The reference genome in the Turkish society is the people (“el âlem”), being a collectivistic culture. We analyse the societal values around the concept of komşuluk – a term describing close relations between the members of the community, which has become a reference for the good-bad binomen, namely for what is acceptable and what is not acceptable in the society.

Keywords

Turkish family, good-bad binomen, komşuluk, community, values, collectivist culture.

1. Introduction.

Family symbolises the meeting of the communities, becoming a spiritual means of constructing communities and implicitly, constructing the Turkish society in its entirety. The importance of family comes from its meanings in the Turkish culture: to have a home means to have stability, attributes which Turks lacked in the migratory period of their existence, from where the trauma occurred. Getting married is, thence, not a question, but a response representing a micro-Turkish state and vice-versa, the Turkish state and society represent a pan-family.

This response assures the closing of the circle, a crucial symbol for the Turkish cultural identity. For instance, a bride must go from a home to another home (ev-lenmek) in order to avoid displacement and interruption of the existential knots, for düğün (wedding) literally means “to make a knot”

¹ PhD student, Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of European Studies, Cluj-Napoca, Romania. E-mail: irinamaria.cosma@yahoo.com.

in the societal tie. In between homes represents a rift, which is an interruption of the continuous rotation of the Turkish circle.

The idea of circularity is a very important symbol also from the cult teachings, where the deeds and the intentions behind them always come back to the person acting. In a community with strong intra-societal ties such as the Turkish community, the reference genome is not the individual self, but rather all the individual selves, i.e. the collective (*el âlem*) – the people. Due to the fact that good deeds and empathy are always directed towards the other, this alterity becomes a crucial entity in the cultural identity, from where the concept of *komşuluk*.

Family

According to the Turkish sociologist Ziya Gökalp, “*aile milletin küçük bir parçasıdır*”, meaning that “*family is a small piece of the nation*” (İçli). This is why sometimes the rules (in terms of traditions, customs, conducts) coming from the family, and especially in the generational cleavage might be perceived as (peer) pressure and questioned. Nevertheless, it is to be mentioned that till they became routinized, they were first constructed – the construction of familial patterns can be related to the very beginning of administrative existence – where tribal Turks established tight ties among themselves and with each other. In other words, a Turkish tribe is nothing else than an extended family.

The rules they created, the bond, unity and hierarchy are some specific elements that today’s Turkish families have – the routinized patterns were incipiently basic needs for the good continuity of the community.

Therefore, family is crucial since it represents a *mirroring of the society itself* – one entirety bordered in a sole unit, become the reference point of the community.

Before it is a *blood tie*, family is a *construction*, two fundamental characteristics that create a *circle* of determinations: for one generation (the first one), family is a *choice* i.e. *formation* – people *construct* their family based on their choice of wife or husband; for their children (the next negation), family is a *given* – and now we have a binomen. The given determines them to make a choice of their future family – i.e. *transformation* – which is never solely an independent choice, never based on personal preferences only, but rather an accumulation of collective choices and determinations, creating and enclosing the *circle*, predominant symbol in the Turkish culture.

There is a primary *hierarchy*, even if not always consciously perceived, which sets patterns and influences choices – and this is one of the most

important factors that determines the *collective* character of the Turkish culture.

This makes people perceive themselves in relation with other people to which they belong, and implicitly in relation to groups – their traits are therefore not *abstract* (Nickerson, 2023), but rather meaningful, since they have roots that symbolise the pillars of a people's value system. Even the term used for describing it is meaningful: *evlenmek* means *to get married*, but literally, it means “*to get a home*” – following the same route, the term *ev* (“house, home”) is interchangeably used as “*family*” or “*ancestry*”. Accordingly, a *house* is not entirely a *home* without a *family*. The idea of circularity is also present here: people go from a *home* to another *home*, the first one is given, and the second one is created – families are numerous, but in essence, there is only one.

As a material example in this sense, it is believed that in history, one of the the most important objects in Turks' households was the dowry chest (*çeyiz sandığı*), and in the families with girls, there is the custom of getting a dowry for the girl and preparing the chest for marriage. When she reaches the age of marriage (*gelinlik yaşı*), her dowry chest is considered to be her most important object (Kademoğlu, 1999, p. 18). Therefore, the dowry chest becomes a metaphor – symbolising the importance and necessity of perpetuating the values from one generation to the other.

Family influences Turks' perception on themselves, since the Turkish society is rather a *pan-family* and the Turkish family is a *micro-Turkish state*.

There are numerous stages of creating a family: *görücülük-dünürcülük, söz kesme, nişan, düğün* (Tezcan, 2000, p. 36). *Görücülük* refers to *looking for a girl, choosing a girl* – the word coming from the root “*gör*” which means “*see*”. *Dünürcülük* takes place after *görücülük*, that is after a girl has been chosen, and it refers to the going to the girl and asking for her hand (Tezcan, 2000, p. 37). It is to be noted that in these stages, the most important aspects are *standards*: the boy's relatives, neighbours and close people (Tezcan, 2000, p. 37) are the most important characters – they are the ones that check whether a girl fits their standards or not. Once again, this is a reflection of the predominance of collective values over individual preferences – or, in other words, of the influence of collective norms on personal *choices*. Another such example is “*beşik kertmesi*”, involving promising a new-born girl to a new-born boy from their very birth – this is done by the two families which are in good relations by a mutual promise towards each other, especially when the two babies are born in the same day (Tezcan, 2000, p. 68). This type of engagement promise is present in the Book of Dede Korkut, as a very old custom (Bakırcı, 2018).

The following stage is related to the *agreement* – the two parties take an official decision for the wedding. The idiom *söz kesmek* literally translates as “to cut the word”, but it means to give the promise that the engagement between the two parties will lead to a wedding. This is immediately followed by *nişan*, meaning *engagement*. This is only a verbal engagement, while *nikâh* is a material engagement, which is a more formal, official engagement – either religious or judicial. There is a very important moment around the engagement – and that is the exchange of rings and afterwards, separating them by cutting the ribbon: the engagement rings are brought on a tray, along with a red ribbon with which they are tied together, and scissors. The rings are offered to the bride and groom, put on their hands with the ribbon uniting them, after which the ribbon is cut. The ribbon symbolises a *tie*, a *bond* between the two people coming together, but it also symbolises the approval of the families and of the community on their marriage. The ribbon and especially the colour red symbolise *purity* (Akcan, 2024), symbol present also at the wedding ceremony, where the bride’s dress is accessorised with a red ribbon around the waist to show her purity.

Moreover, the future bride prepares Turkish coffee for the family members present, but adds *salt* to the future husband’s coffee cup, so that the coffee would taste badly and would be difficult to be drunk. This symbolises a test for the future husband – if he drinks the entire cup of coffee, it means he is able to bear any kind of difficulty throughout the marriage. This represents a very important characteristic of the Turkish family – the traditional belief that the husband is the householder, who should take care of the entire family. In this way, family becomes a social *construct*, due to the meanings it is attributed.

Another fundamental characteristic of family construction which is present throughout the entire process is the *exchange of gifts*. This is called *armağanlaşma* (Tezcan, 2000, p. 36), a term having roots in old Turkish from the term “*doyumluk*” (armağan), literally meaning the state of being filled, fulfilled – therefore it symbolises abundance and prosperity (*bereket*), an element crucial for the future household. More than prosperity, it is seen as a way through which people *help* each other (Tezcan, 2000, p. 41).

The very moment before the actual wedding is the henna night, *kına gecesi*, a ritual moment dedicated to the future wife, but a rather sad event – symbolising that the wife leaves her family’s home. The future wife has to listen to sad traditional songs because crying is considered to be mandatory (Tezcan, 2000, p. 39). Crying is considered to be mandatory because this very moment means a *fissure* in the *circle* – the bride is *in-between* the first home and the second home, therefore the collective mind translates this as

uprooting or displacement, till the path from a home to the other is completed and the circle is enclosed again.

During the ceremony, the future wife's fist is painted with henna and a gold coin. One of the prevalent meanings of henna in Turkish culture is devotion, commitment. This way, henna is given a spiritual meaning, bringing it closer to divinity. Moreover, due to the fact that it colours, it is believed that it protects from the bad, providing good luck (*şans*) and prosperity (*bereket*) (Tanrıbuyurdu). We can observe that *bereket* is a repetitive symbol in the Turkish familial culture, having a profound religious meaning: in Arabic, the term *baraka* means blessing, especially related to the divine blessing. Therefore, God's *blessing* is *prosperity* for the household. This shows that Turkish cultural identity is multi-layered: everything being governed by supra-human forces and having precise meanings and symbols.

Another important element is *damat hamamu* (the *hammam* of the groom), a tradition where the groom and his male family members gather at the hammam (public bathhouse) before the wedding and prepare themselves in the day before the wedding (Taşçıoğlu, 1998, p. 126). The importance of water is one of the primordial traits of human civilisations, when “people witnessed its help in production, making life possible, a reward when it exists and a punishment when it does not exist or it is little” (Taşçıoğlu, 1998, p. 13). “People even believed that water had hidden forces” (Taşçıoğlu, 1998, p. 13) and “the ones teaching religious rules set the condition of washing due to its importance for praying and purifying from sins” (Taşçıoğlu, 1998, p. 13). This is another example of a construction of reality, where natural elements are attributed supernatural, unearthly forces, creating a tie between the material and the immaterial (spiritual) – the people and the divinity.

We shall analyse the ultimate point of family creation – the wedding. In Turkish, the term for wedding is *düğün*, originating from the old Turkish term *tüğün*, from the root “*tüg*”, literally meaning to create a tie or to make a knot (*düğün*)– therefore the wedding is a knot in the societal tie. In modern Turkish, the term *düğün* can also be used in the sense of *toy – ziyafet*, meaning “celebration” and *cemiyet*, also meaning “community”. According to these meanings, wedding is *celebrating a community formation* – here, one family plus one family equals one family, that is (*one and not two*) because the newly formed family is not new, since the starting point is not zero, but two – therefore, it cannot equal itself.

In other words, the newly formed family is only a result of one family unit and another family unit – it is not new, but only another knot on the *constant*. The Turkish family will always equal one – because no matter how numerous they are, ultimately it is only *one*.

The wedding ritual “takes place within standard patterns” and its objective is to “announce the couple to the *environment*” – this makes *the environment* i.e. community “an important factor in a wedding event” (Tezcan, 2000, p. 35). In other words, “wedding is not only a singular, isolated event, but an event that interests the *community* and in which *community* takes part” (Tezcan, 2000, p. 35). As a social event, wedding has several functions: the first one to be noted is music and ambience, dance and entertainment (Tezcan, 2000, p. 36) – which take it from the pragmatic level to the spiritual one, with accent on the soul – this is a specificity of the Turkish culture, people finding the well-being of the soul more important than the well-being of the body: “73.8% of the Turks included in a survey prioritise the well-being of the soul over the well-being of the body and 75.2% consider that faith has a positive impact on the well-being of the soul” (Araştırma: Türk Halkı için Ruh Sağlığı Beden Sağlığından Daha Önemli, 2024). In relation to this function is another function – that is: weddings “enrich living and ensure relief from a monotonous life” (Tezcan, 2000, p. 36).

Another function of the wedding is that it consolidates solidarity and interdependence and it establishes a psychological reinforcement – approval and validation, in the case of some people, because it opens a way for them to show-off their talents. Moreover, it is a good place for some jobs, occupations to take place (Tezcan, 2000, p. 36). *Circularity* is related to the function that weddings ensure “a redistribution of income, of what people earn” so that “*money changes hands*” and wealth is shared (Tezcan, 2000, p. 36). Therefore, wedding is one of the most important arguments that Turkish culture is collectivistic, due to its functions that re-balance the societal equilibrium. In addition, it is believed that “weddings represent the best example that mirrors the Turkish national culture” (Tezcan, 2000, p. 47).

The new-born is given *gold* and it is usually accompanied by a *nazar* talisman – to have a prosperous (*bereketli*) life away from the *evil's eye* (8 Maddede Türk Kültüründe Bebek Karşılama Geleneği, 2024).

Therefore, according to Turks themselves, the Turkish nation is nothing else but a great family, a big family. This *familist* perspective stands also in the religious principles of perpetuating the traditional family, but also the cultural values. In other words, family is a construction that protects other constructions (the *values*) and ensures their perpetuation.

The Turkish family is a closed circle, the double determination being created by the fact that on one hand, it is the bearer of values, but on the other hand, it is also the nucleus of the values, the starting point, the birth place of those values that weigh a lot in the cultural identity. The mechanism

is simple: if the family is the nucleus, then the society is the meeting point of all the fragments created in the nucleus. When they meet in the large community, the values generate commonalities and thence, practices.

This phenomenon also takes place because families, if having a strong role in a society, function similar to the trend-setters: they generate models.

Value System: The Good-Bad Binomen and Spirituality Reflected in the Society

One of the most difficult subjects to be tackled when describing a people is their traditions, customs or belief system, for “they are hard to isolate enough to define” (Gibbs). In other words, “people would not know their tradition, for they simply lived in it” (Gibbs) – that is, they have been blended so well into the *body* (i.e. *identity*) so that they became one. But in order for people to be able to define one according to the other, the two (identity and tradition) would have to be a little exotic to each other.

Family is the centre or the nucleus of the community also because it is the environment that gives birth to a series of customs, beliefs, traditions and imprints people with a system of values.

This is something especially valid in Eastern civilisations, where the *people's (el âlem) opinions* represent a very strong self-perpetuated restrictive and constrictive mechanism. Therefore, if a family generates good values thence practices, many other such groups would immediately follow their model just because it is seen as a precious act, evaluated positively in the society.

To be more specific, we choose *spirituality* as an example; from a generation to another, the quality of being spiritual (i.e. religious) has been perpetuated and became a self-generated value in the Turkish family and society. Spirituality is culturally-specific, but for the example in question, we explain spirituality as a value that generates the possible following practices: being a good person towards the other members of the community, doing good deeds, wearing a certain type of garments that are considered to be *decent* (i.e. “conforming with standards of propriety, good taste or morality” (decent) in that specific society).

Even if sociologically *good* and *bad* are not general quantifiers, the common sense in each society attributes to each value and practice an opposite value and practice chosen informally, by the members of each society; and in many cases, the pair is made of a good, valuable element and a bad one that should not be followed. The mathematical equation is the *value* and the *non-value*, as its negative.

According to the Turkish societal structure, spirituality is and has been generally seen as a good value, generating good practices and forming people positively. Therefore, the reverse of spirituality is *non-spirituality*, forming people to most probably not be empathetic towards the others, dress indecently, and not follow the praying rituals in places of worship.

From all the above written, we deduce that very many Turkish families embraced the value of being spiritual, since it is socially not only acceptable, but also rewarded.

Because of that, an entire culture was formed to promote spirituality: for instance, geopolitically, *Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı* (*The Directorate for Religious Affairs*) has been building mosques in the Balkans, “slowly positioning itself as the strongest Muslim institution in the region” (Muhasilovic).

Many *customs* are related to the very beginning of the Turkish existence – tribal and migratory life – since they invoke a number of natural elements. For example, water has a great significance in the Turkish culture, especially due to its *motion*. When someone close – either a family member or a friend – leaves for a journey, the ones who remain at home use to throw a bucket of water behind them under the saying “*su gibi git, su gibi gel*”, meaning “go like the water, come like the water” and “*yolun açık olsun*”, i.e. “may your path be clear”. This means that they wish a clear path with no obstacles but also, we can observe the idea of *circularity*: coming back to the starting point, i.e. to the *origins*.

The value system in the Turkish culture is, similar to other cultures, based on the *good-bad binomen*, where good values (like empathy, helpfulness, good intentions) should prevail upon the bad ones (bad intentions, envy etc.).

Komşuluk

The term “*komşuluk*” comes from the noun “*komşu*”, which means “neighbour”, from the old Turkish term “*konşu*”, describing “*someone who lives in proximity*” (*komşu*) Therefore, *komşuluk* describes *neighbourhood*, the state of living close to each other. In the case of the Turkish society, neighbourhood is considered “one of the fundamental relations”, having an *informal* character (Yıldız), due to the fact that it has a great impact on the way in which people conduct their life. The importance of neighbours is described in the proverb “*ev alma, komşu al*” (Yıldız), meaning: “*do not pick a house, but rather pick a neighbour*”, according to the general belief that “neighbours are even *more important* than the house”. The respect between neighbours (*komşu hatırı*) is an obligation with religious origins, found in Islamic cult teachings: “A Muslim will greet their neighbour when they meet, on a good basis; they will honour the invitation of their neighbours when it

is the case, they will visit their neighbour if they are sick and if they are hungry, they will give their neighbours half of their own food” (Yıldız). At the psychological level, neighbourhood contributes to the feeling of “us” instead of “I” (Yıldız). In other words, neighbourhood contributes profoundly to the creation of the *belonging feeling* of an individual, combining both the material and immaterial elements of the world: “neighbourhood means building the soil with a spiritual foundation” (Yıldız).

In more technical terms, this social group not only contributes to the belonging of the individual to the community, but also and more importantly, functions similar to a regulating mechanism in terms of accepted and acceptable social values and norms.

Extended to the Turkish community, one of the most important *repressive mechanisms* is considered to be “*el âlem*”, literally “*the people*” – the *collective character* becomes the *genome of reference* for the individuals. This is a mechanism of the society itself through which the balance is constantly restored, starting from the moral level to the level of concrete deeds. This governing power’s sui-generis character resides in the lack of actual punishments – individuals who do not comply with the rigours are not actually banned from the community, but rather detached, hence the greatest form of punishment is the comeback from “us” to “I”, i.e. the social and communal individualisation of a person, rather difficult to be dealt with in a collectivist community and society. The problem is not that the individual is excluded, but in fact, that the individual cannot be excluded since its *social attributes* are part of the mass culture – what makes an individual unique is not that each person owns some attributes that are necessarily and essentially different from those of other people, but rather the rotation and combination of attributes leading to a unique blend of those attributes. This can be understood as a mechanism that guarantees the *continuity* of values and thence, of the society itself – again, the idea of self-sacrifice for the common good. Not only the continuity of values, but the continuity of *good values* is crucial so that there are more values considered *good* than values considered *harmful* for the society.

If *komşuluk* represents a desirable type of interaction among the members of the community, there are also relations that are believed to be harmful – socially and psychologically. These are related to jealousy and envy, elements considered to be hurtful and not desirable in the Turkish value system. The popular beliefs are formed around the concept of *nazar*, from the Arabic *nadhar*, literally meaning “look”, “sight”, but materialised under the form of a *blue eye*. *Nazar* is believed to be the “evil eye”, referring to a bad-intended look of someone towards another person. In the popular culture, it is believed that people can actually get sick because of someone’s

bad look (*nazar*), saying that those people “*have come to nazar*” (*nazara gelmek*). There is also a cure in the mystic culture – pouring lead to send away bad thoughts (Gelenek ve Görenekler). Despite the fact that these beliefs are superstitions, the aspects that are more ideologically relevant are religious-based, i.e. the *intention* (*niyyah*) of that person, which can be envy, hate or other similar feelings, considered to be “*a disease of the soul*”.

These moral aspects are materialised through the *eyes* – a symbolic element in the Middle Eastern history throughout time, where eyes had a dualist character – they were either *good* or *bad*, just like any other force in the nature (Dilek). This is present in today’s society as well, in the relations between people – when someone makes a compliment, the response is usually not only “thank you”, but also “*gören gözlerin güzeldir*”, which translates as “*your eyes that see like this are beautiful*”; in other words, if someone sees the other person as beautiful or good, it is because of themselves, because their own eyes are *good*.

Conclusions

Etymologically, family comes from the Latin “*familia*”, referring to the *servants* in a house or household (from the “*famulus*” – “*servant*”).

Extendedly, we can use this etymological route to explain that family serves in the community formation process. Another understanding can refer to the aspect of family members serving each other, especially in the case of a collectivist culture, where individuals give and take from each other values and teachings shared in the community.

The Turkish family represents the starting point, the *centrum* for the perpetuation of societal values, traditions, customs. The state mirrors at a macro level the structure of a family, i.e. the values, principles learnt by the people among their families are extended to the level of the entire society and mirrored by the state policies. Therefore, family is crucial since it represents a *mirroring of the society itself*.

We can admit that family represents a symbol in itself, having become a crucial part of *Turkishness* (the Turkish ethos) and being both material and immaterial due to its profound significances for the continuity of the community itself.

In the Turkish society, the reference genome is considered to be the entire community, due to its collectivist cultural profile, where the individual good arises from the common good and implicitly coincides with it.

Therefore, *komşuluk* – the relations of vicinity – are crucial for the society, not only because they contribute to the perpetuation of values, but they also represent a coercive mechanism: the sanctions for those who do

not follow tradition represent the comeback from “us” to “I” or, in other words, an isolation of the individual from the group. *Komşuluk* has become one of the most important relations in the society also because of its spiritual foundation, appealing to the need to act according to the acceptable or good aspects in the value system.

Furthermore, within the society, there is a value system formed around the principle of good (i.e. acceptable) and bad (i.e. unacceptable) behaviours or deeds. This value system is protected by *the people* (*el âlem*) and inter-generationally perpetuated. In this way, it was incorporated in the Turkish common sense, understood as the collective subconscious and acting according to standardised patterns.

The Turkish value system is an abstract representation of the concrete predominance of collective values over individual preferences in the Turkish society and within Turkish communities. Therefore, within communities, values become self-generated in order to maintain circularity whenever the *societal circle* is *fissured*. That is why we can admit that marriage is symbolically doubled – not only it means the perpetuation of the community, but is a metaphor in itself, where *düğün* (wedding) refers to the continuum of knots in the societal tie.

Mirroring the familial analogy, the circle is enclosed in the following manner: the people is the one that mirrors the growth – i.e. education – and the state – understood as the representative entity of the people – mirrors people’s conduct at the level of policies.

Bibliography

- 8 Maddede Türk Kültüründe Bebek Karşılama Geleneği. (2024, September 11). Accessed on February 10, 2025. Halkbank Kültür ve Yaşam: <https://kulturveyasam.com/8-maddede-turk-kulturunde-bebek-karsilama-gelenegi/>.
- Araştırma: Türk Halkı için Ruh Sağlığı Beden Sağlığından Daha Önemli. (2024, February 20). Accessed on February 3, 2025. AREDA Araştırma Eğitim Danışmanlık : <https://www.areda.com/3077-2/>.
- Akcan, E. (2024, June 21). *İncili Kurdele Birlikteliğin ve Sadakatın Simgesi*. Accessed on February 3, 2025. Rima Peçete Baskı: <https://rimapeçete.com/blogs/nisan-ve-soz/incili-kurdele>
- armağan*. (fârâ an). Accessed on February 3, 2025. Nişyan Sözlük: <https://www.nisanyansozluk.com/kelime/arma%C4%9Fan>.
- Bakırcı, N. (2018, November 4). *Dede Korkut Kitabı'nda ve Halk Hikâyelerinde Evlilik*. Retrieved February 6, 2025. Türuk Uluslararası Dil, Edebiyat ve Halkbilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi : http://www.turukdergisi.com/Makaleler/623521425_11%20N.BAKIRCI%201-20.pdf.pdf.

- decent*. (2026, January 22). Accessed on February 10, 2025. Merriam-Webster: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/decent>.
- Dilek, Y. (2021). *Eye Symbolism and Dualism in the Ancient Near East*. Accessed on February 12, 2025. Istanbul University Press: <https://cdn.istanbul.edu.tr/file/JTA6CLJ8T5/3F7D185772DF4E138657F82F052B2FA7>.
- düğün*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 3, 2025, from Nişanyan Sözlük: <https://www.nisanyansozluk.com/kelime/d%C3%BC%C4%9F%C3%BCn>.
- Gelenek ve Görenekler*. (n.d.). Accessed on February 12, 2025. T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı. Manisa İl Kültür ve Turizm Müdürlüğü: <https://manisa.ktb.gov.tr/TR-72971/gelenek-ve-gorenekler.html>
- Gibbs, L. A. (2023). *Reflecting on "Tradition" as a "Hollow Concept" in Contemporary Anthropology and Beyond*. Accessed on February 10, 2025. South East Network for Social Sciences: https://sentiojournal.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/SenitoJournal_15_Nov23.pdf.
- İçli, T. (n.d.). *Atatürk ve Aile*. Accessed on September 18, 2024. Atatürk Ansiklopedisi: <https://atamdergi.gov.tr/tam-metin-pdf/527/tur>.
- Kademoğlu, O. (1999). *Çeyiz Sandığı*. İstanbul: Duran Ofset.
- komşu*. (fără an). Accessed on February 11, 2025. Nişyan Sözlük: <https://www.nisanyansozluk.com/kelime/kom%C5%9Fu>.
- Muhasilovic, J. (2018). *Turkey's Faith-based Diplomacy in the Balkans*. Accessed on February 11, 2025. Research Gate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356596091_Turkey's_Faith-based_Diplomacy_in_the_Balkans.
- Nickerson, C. (2023, October 16). *Understanding Collectivist Cultures: Overview & Examples*. Accessed on February 3, 2025. Simply Psychology: <https://www.simplypsychology.org/what-are-collectivistic-cultures.html>.
- Tanrıbuyurdu, G. (2016). *Klâsik Türk Şiirinde Bir Sembol Dili Olarak "Kına"*. Accessed on February 3, 2025. İnsan ve Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/206350>.
- Taşçioğlu, T. (1998). *Tülay Taşçioğlu, Türk Hamamı*. İstanbul: Duran Ofset.
- Tezcan, M. (2000). *Türk Ailesi Antropolojisi*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Yıldız, M. G. (2008). *Türk Yazılı Kültüründe Komşuluk*. Accessed on February 11, 2025. Elektronik Sosyal Bilimleri Dergisi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/70046>.