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Erklärung (Declaration)

Zusammenfassung


Das Geschlecht als sich ständig veränderndes Phänomen differenziert sich innerhalb der Gesellschaft und im Laufe der Zeit.

Die „Betrachtungsweise der Geschlechter“ oder die „Identität der Geschlechter“, welche die Einstellung im Hinblick auf die Probleme der Geschlechter beinhaltet, ist ein wichtiger Bestandteil innerhalb der Forschung der sozialen Identität der Einwohner Teherans.

Der „Raum“ aus physikalischen und sozialen Bestandteilen bestehend, wurde hier recherchiert mit dem Schwerpunkt auf die „räumlichen Verhältnisse“, also die Einstellung zur Nutzung des „Lebensraumes“, einschließlich privater Räume, halb privater/halb öffentlicher Räume und öffentlicher Bezirke der Stadt.

Betrachten wir die systematische Organisation der Gesellschaft, stellen wir fest, daß durch die wechselseitige Beziehung "Geschlecht" und "Raum", als zwei variable Bestandteile dieser Organisation interagieren.

Diese Studie recherchiert die unterschiedlichen Identitäten der „Geschlechter“ im Hinblick auf ihre Assoziation zu „Räumlichkeiten“.

Es behandelt die „räumliche Manifestation“ der Geschlechter, ebenso wie umgekehrt den Einfluß der „räumlichen Identität“ auf die Entwicklung des Genus.

Die Hypothesen bezüglich dieser Studie lauten wie folgt:

- Da „Geschlechter Identität“ patriarchale Unterdrückung verinnerlicht, wird es ebenso mit räumlicher Unterdrückung assoziiert.
- Innerhalb der gleichen sozialen Schicht, zeigen unterschiedliche „Geschlechter Identitäten“, in Bezug auf Männer und Frauen ähnliche Qualitäten, im Gegensatz zu den „Geschlechter Identitäten“ anderer sozialer Schichten. Diese Situation

- Der oben genannten Hypothese zufolge fällt das Ausmaß der "räumlichen Unterdrückung“ innerhalb verschiedener sozialer Schichten Tehrans entsprechend der Örtlichkeit unterschiedlich aus.

Im Laufe dieser Studie wurden in Tehran Eltern, in deren Haushalt, sowohl eine Tochter als auch ein Sohn leben, bezüglich der unterschiedlichen Aktivitäten und Verhaltensweisen ihrer Kinder in unterschiedlichen Räumlichkeiten befragt, um eben die Wechselwirkung dieser beiden Phenomene darzustellen.

Das Ergebnis verdeutlicht die parallelen Meinungsänderungen der jeweiligen Eltern in Bezug auf die Wechselwirkung der beiden Faktoren "Geschlecht“ und „Raum“ - bestätigt wurde eine starke Verbindung der beiden, sodaß sie als integrierte Komponenten betrachtet werden können.

Es wurde ebenfalls deutlich, dass dieses „variable Konzept“ sich innerhalb der Geschlechter unterscheidet, denn es zeigt sich, dass die Mutter im Gegensatz zu dem Vater, gerechtere Ansichten in Bezug auf „Geschlecht - Raum“ vertreten.


Das Verhältnis vom Status der Versorger innerhalb dieser Familien zu den Haushaltern ist partnerschaftlicher und offener.


Diese Studie zeichnet inhomogene Aspekte im Hinblick auf „Geschlecht – Raum“ bezüglich des Lebens in Tehran;

Mit anderen Worten wird dieser widersprüchliche Lebensstil in Tradition und Moderne der Iranischen Gesellschaft manifestiert, jedoch repräsentiert er gleichzeitig den Wandel hin zur modernen sozialen Beziehung.

Diese Illustration verdeutlicht instabile soziale Situationen, benötigt jedoch sondierte Lösungen für diese soziale Integration. Indem wir die Richtung erkunden, könnten
heterogene soziale Gruppen in ihrer Denkweise und ihrer Art Lebensraum zu nutzen angenähert werden.

Diese Entwicklung muss im Hinblick auf Planung einer sozialen Räumlichkeit, sowohl auf der Makro Ebene, als auch auf der Mikro Ebene einer privaten als auch einer öffentlichen Fläche einer Stadt berücksichtigt werden.

Es scheint, dass demokratische Mittel, wie zum Beispiel gemeinschaftliche Planung und Durchführung, die Stadt in die Lage versetzen könnte, im Hinblick auf mehr Stabilität und Solidarität im sozialen Lebensraum - inklusive der Bedürfnisse der Geschlechter – wirksame Schritte zu unternehmen.
Abstract

This dissertation generally concentrates on the relationships between “gender” and “space” in the present time of urban life in capital city of Tehran.

“Gender” as a changing social construct, differentiated within societies and through time, studied this time by investigation on “gender attitude” or “gender identity” means attitudes towards “gender” issues regarding Tehran residences.

“Space” as a concept integrated from physical and social constituents investigated through focus on “spatial attitude” means attitudes towards using “living spaces” including private space of “house”, semi private semi public space of neighborhood and finally public spaces of the city.

“Activities and practices” in space concentrated instead of “physical” space; this perspective to “space” discussed as the most justified implication of “space” in this debate regarding current situations in city of Tehran.

Under a systematic approach, the interactions and interconnections between “gender” and “space” as two constituent variables of social organization investigated by focus on the different associations presented between different “gender identities” and their different “spatial identities”; in fact, “spatial identity” manifests “gender identity” and in opposite direction, “spatial identity” influences to construction of “gender identity”. The hypotheses of case study in Tehran defined as followed:

- “Gender identity” is reflected on “spatial identity”. Various “gender identities” in Tehran present different perspectives of “space” or they identify “space” by different values.
- As “gender identity” internalizes patriarchal oppression, it internalizes associated “spatial” oppression too.
- Within the same social class, different “gender identities” related to men and women, present interconnected qualities, compared with “gender identities” related to men or women of different social classes. This situation could be found in the “spatial” perspectives of different groups of men and women too.
- Following the upper hypotheses, “spatial” oppression differs among social classes of Tehran living in different parts of this city.
This research undertook a qualitative study in Tehran by interviewing with different parents of both young daughter and son regarding their attitudes towards gender issues from one side and activities and behaviors of their children in different spaces from the other side.

Results of case study indicated the parallel changes of parents’ attitudes towards “gender” and “spatial” issues; it means strong connection between “gender” and “space”. It revealed association of “equal” spatial attitudes with “open, neutral” gender attitudes, and also the association of “biased, unequal” spatial identities with “conservative patriarchal” gender identities. It was cleared too that this variable concept – gender space - changes by “sex”; mothers comparing fathers presented more equitable notions towards “gender spatial” issues. It changes too by “social class” and “educational level”, that means “gender spatial” identity getting more open equitable among more educated people of middle and upper classes. “Breadwinning status in the family” also presents its effect on the changes of “gender spatial” identity so participant breadwinners in the family expressed relatively more equitable notions comparing householders and housekeepers. And finally, “gender spatial” identity changes through “place” in the city and regarding South – North line of the city.

The illustration of changes of “gender spatial” identity from “open” to “conservative” among society indicated not only vertical variation across social classes, furthermore the horizontal changing among each social class.

These results also confirmed hypotheses while made precision on the third one regarding variable of sex.

More investigations pointed to some inclusive spatial attitudes throughout society penetrated to different groups of “gender identities”, to “opens” as to “conservatives”, also to groups between them, by two opposite features; first kind, conservative biased spatial practices in favor of patriarchal gender relations and the second, progressive neutral actions in favor of equal gender relations. While the major reason for the inclusive conservative practices was referred to the social insecurity for women, the second neutral ones associated to more formal & safer spaces of the city. In conclusion, while both trends are associated deeply with the important issues of “sex” & “body” in patriarchal thoughts, still strong, they are the consequences of the transitional period of
social change in macro level, and the challenges involved regarding interactions between social orders, between old system of patriarchy, the traditional biased “gender spatial” relations and the new one of equal relations.

The case study drew an inhomogeneous illustration regarding gender spatial aspects of life in Tehran, the opposite groups of “open” and “conservative”, and the large group of “semi open semi conservative” between them. In macro perspective it presents contradicted social groups according their general life styles; they are the manifestations of challenging trends towards tradition and modernity in Iranian society.

This illustration while presents unstable social situations, necessitates probing solutions for social integration; exploring the directions could make heterogeneous social groups close in the way they think and the form they live in spaces. Democratic approaches like participatory development planning might be helpful for the city in its way to more solidarity and sustainability regarding its social spatial – gender as well – development, in macro levels of social spatial planning and in micro levels of physical planning, in private space of house and in public spaces of the city.
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Introduction

This dissertation which generally investigates about “gender” and “space” in Capital city of Tehran includes two parts; the first part expresses the theoretical framework of study, in fact the theories and debates, this study is based on; the deliberation of two subjects of “gender” and “space” and their relationships. What considered from these concepts and what is the perspective to their relationships, would be discussed in the first part according to the referring theories; the conclusion of these initial studies would be definition of the hypotheses which are to be investigated through a case study in “Tehran” during the second parts.

The second part of study in this way includes debates related to case study in Tehran which supposed to investigate relationships of “gender” and “space” in an actual situation and in present time of life in capital city of “Tehran”. Results of this inquiry in the one hand provides the evaluation of hypotheses, so they illuminate some aspects of "gender" and "space" situations and their relationships in Tehran; and in the other hand, They could provide the scientific materials to contribute to the general knowledge about “gender” and “space” relationships.
Part One, General
**Chapter One**

**Theoretical Bases of Study**

**Introduction**

This chapter is to explain those notions which include the main thoughts this study based on.

The most important is notion of "gender", the basic subject of study. Those thoughts are considered here which take "gender" as a social construct, changeable in time and space. "Sex", is also observed as a fact very related to "gender", that couldn't be neglected when gender is the subject of study. Attention paid to those notions which investigate the relationships between "sex" and "gender".

"Sex" and "gender" both considered as the realities strongly influenced by the power relations of patriarchal social system. Patriarchy is observed as a system of power relation, penetrated all aspects of people life, not only social and economical aspects, but the world of meanings, values, and believes; those values which in fact, present the internalized oppression of this system.

"Space" is the next notion, studied with its two dimensions of social and physical aspects. The relationships between "space" and "gender" identity are investigated and this reality too that different gender identities connect to different spaces or they connect to spaces differently.

This part finally includes discussion about spatial oppression within the interconnections between "space" and "gender” and how this oppression is also internalized as people values and believes.

Conclusion of this chapter draws hypotheses of study which are to be investigated in Tehran.
Gender, Sex

The most basic term in gender studies has been the term "gender". In this notion gender is a social construct. It refers to the social, cultural and historical constructs that define the concepts of men and women in societies. Gender is all the society expectations from men and women to be, to act, even to feel: "Gender is the term used to encompass the social expectation associated with femininity and masculinity." (Unger, quoted by Lips, 2003: 6)

As gender is a social construct, then it is subject to change and variation: "what we take to be real, what we invoke as the naturalized knowledge of gender is, in fact a changeable and revisable reality." (Butler, 1999, xxiii) In fact gender identity like any other aspects of social identities is constructing by social powers. (Castells, 2001: 23).

"...women and men thoughts, feelings, and behavior may indeed be different in many respects, and such differences may reflect their different positions in the social hierarchy of power and status rather than their different "natures". (Lott, quoted by Lips, 2003: 70) As the social powers involved in shaping identities, are themselves in change all the time and in all the spaces, their effects on identities for example gender identities are variable and changeable too.

As a shifting and contextual phenomenon, gender does not denote a substantive being, but a relative point of convergence among culturally and historically specific sets of relations. (Butler, 1999: 15)

Gender is not fixed. We could understand this by considering history: how men and women roles as well as their identities have changed during the times related to a given place. Furthermore we could find different gender roles of men and women who are living at the same time but in different spaces. Considering two different parts of the world, or two areas within a country, even within a specific city, we would find how women for example, might live differently related to their different identities:

Finding that cultures also differ from one another in their rules and expectations for femininity (and for masculinity) is a good clue that gender is "socially constructed". In other words, each society, to some extent, makes up its own set of rules to define what it means to be a woman or a man, and people construct gender through their interactions by behaving in "appropriate ways". Another clue that gender is socially constructed is
the way the rules tend to change arbitrarily over time even within a given culture. (Lips, 2003: 6)

Along with the "gender" the other important term for gender studies has been the "sex" and specifically the kind of relations exist between "sex" and "gender". Thinking about "gender" thoroughly is not possible but to consider "sex" along. These two qualities are strongly related and associated with each other. Any examination about each of them requires considering the other. How they effect and influence each other, if any one is more basic, weather one of them is cause for the other.

We have learned in a very usual way that "sex" is a natural and biological fact of human body, something fixed in male and female bodies that assert itself in heterosexual relation between two sexes: while sex depicts biological differences, gender in contrast …..(McDowell, 1999:13). In the most simple of summaries, sex – male & female – exemplifies biological differences between bodies and gender….. (Rendell, 2000a: 15)

Also we have learned that sex effects (as a natural cause) on gender and define natural gender roles for men and women: "…the presumption here is that the "being" of gender is an "effect"(Butler, 1999: 43). Women as mothers (bearers of children) are taking care of children and responsible for house domestic works, and men as the head and incomer of the family and responsible for going outside and getting income.

This kind of relation between "sex" and "gender" based on natural sex as cause and normal gender as its effect is the foundation of patriarchal system –dominated social system in most part of the world during the long history- have been strongly challenged during the last two centuries by not only women themselves as the oppressed group of patriarchy, but by the different thinkers, first of all feminists. Rejecting this kind of relation between sex and gender in practice and in theory has been the main discursive challenge of feminism for changing constructed positions of men and women in society: Being maternally inclined or nurturing are not obviously biological or anatomical qualities. Rather they arise from social expectations that build on women's biological ability to bear children. (Lips, 2003: 6)

For making possible to imagine a humanistic, equitable relationships between men and women in practice, it is necessary as the first step to refuse those natural connections between sex and gender, whatever is the sex, gender could be independently in change,
there is no necessary relation between being a male or female and being a man or woman. Don't we see females in different part of the world living differently in relation to their womanhood? Many women refused the traditional identities as housewives or homemakers. They are all female in sex but enjoy various gender roles, it's the same with males and men: "In a commonsense way, there is a clear geography to gender relations because there are enormous variations between and within nations in the extent of women's subordination and relative autonomy, and correspondingly in male power and domination." (McDowell, 1999: 12) In fact these changing situations of men and women in societies themselves, refuses the natural connection between "sex" and "gender".

"One is not born a woman but becomes one" (Simone De Beauvoir), this known statement of feminist thought presents the first step in theory of gender that cut the naturalized interpretation of relation between sex and gender as the patriarchal notion of femininity and masculinity: "biology is not destiny" By this step that cut the dependence of gender on sex, it was made possible to deliberate gender more:"...when the constructed status of gender is theorized as radically independent of sex, gender itself becomes a free-floating artifice, with the consequence that man and masculine might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and woman and feminine a male body as easily as a female one."(Butler, 1999: 10)

Deliberating gender identities and qualities of its changes more and more formed other steps in profounding gender knowledge and revealing unequal gender aspects of social constructed phenomenon.

Gender studies by further investigating in history, have presented how social identities even social thoughts about men and women influenced and shaped by social structure of power, in fact by power relations of patriarchal system based on binary relations between men and women and domination of men over women: "Gender systems are not the legacy of nature; they are the legacy of a power struggle" (Alcoff, 1996: 21)"Power seemed to be more than an exchange between subjects or a relation of constant inversion between an subject and an other; indeed, power appeared to operate in the production of that very binary frame for thinking about gender." (Butler, 1999: xxviii)
"...our lives are structured by a small number of crucial relations of power and gender is one of them." (McDowell, 1999: 248)

So, this notion suggested for more investigation through history to found out powers in act of constructing gender: "Feminist critique ought also to understand how the category of "women" the subject of feminism, is produced and restrained by the very structures of power.... (Butler, 1999: 5)

Radical thoughts (like French poststructuralists, Foucault, and Butler) in this relation not only cut the dependence of "gender" as "effect" on "sex" as "cause", even refused to see sex and sexuality (body) as an origin or natural fact: "...hence, sex couldn't qualify as a prediscursive anatomical facticity" (Butler, 1999: 12)

They studied sex along gender as a social constructed identity: "Most feminist theorists today adopt something similar to robin's account in which gender identity and sexuality are taken as social constructs rather than natural attribute, however remediable."(Alcoff, 1996: 21) "The category of sex is understood depending on how the field of power is articulated."(Butler, 1999: 25)

Furthermore some radical thoughts claim that sex and sexuality are themselves the production of gender relations of power regime, that unequal binary of gender relation necessitates the binary heterosexuality: "Bodies can not be said to have a signifiable existence prior to the mark of their gender"(Butler, 1999: 13),"...gender must also designate the very apparatus of production whereby the sexes themselves are established. As a result, gender is not to culture as sex is to nature; gender is also the discursive, cultural means by which sexed nature or a natural sex is produced and established as "prediscursive", prior to culture, a politically neutral surface on which culture acts." (Butler, 1999: 10)

Anyway, even if we put aside the radical thoughts which claim dependence of sex on gender (as environment, or social factors), but the stable, natural, and substantial situation of either gender or sex and the essential relationships between them, have been strongly broken and most of social thinkers confirm the important role of social factors in constitution of human identities, either sexual or social. (Giddens, 1999: 95, 320), (Castells, 2001: 246).
"... the more we learn about human beings, the more we become aware of how much we are all shaped by our context."(Lott, quoted by Lips, 2003: 70)

**Patriarchy, Internalization of oppression**

Patriarchy, as the powerful, dominant system over the long known history of societies, is a complex of entire principles based on honoring of the sacred "family" as the basic unit of society and authority of men, mentally and physically (as the head of family, as fathers or husbands or son), particularly over women as their possessed wives, sisters and daughters: "In its most general sense patriarchy refers to the law of the father, the social control that men as fathers hold over their wives and daughters. In its most specific usage within feminist scholarship, patriarchy refers to the system in which men as a group are constructed as superior to women as a group and so assumed to have authority over them" (McDowell, 1999: 16)

Multilateral system of patriarchy has been pervaded over, not only the socio–economical processes, but also the cultural aspects, also different aspects of human thoughts, philosophy, religion, as well as human knowledge: "The feminist project rests on the explicit recognition that gender and gender differences pervade all aspects of social life, including language, moral consciousness, and the categories with which we think." (Friedmann, 1996: 467)

The most important domain of this system has been the realm of gender structure, definition of gender social roles in family and society on the basis of man's authority.

Patriarchy is a system of power relation that defines the domains of authority of men over women in public and private spaces. Sex and gender as discussed before, have been identified under the power relations of this system. Binary positions of men and women identities have been defined so women belong to the private space and men to the public.

Women as the symbols of sex and beauty and bearer of children and responsible for housework as well, are responsible for giving pleasure and happiness to men (physically and mentally) and keep his house and his children. And men, who are masters of house and control their family, are responsible to earn money to provide satisfaction and safety for their possessed families.
This definition of gender identities and roles are not fair and just. The position of women in societies regarded as inferior, because they couldn't control their bodies and their lives. They are dependent on their men, physically, mentally and emotionally, because they don't have that power to control themselves, because power belong to whom get money in family, to whom their work worth by money, and women's work in house worth nothing but their duties based on their good nature and feelings: "And because this housekeeping was seen to rely on women's natural skills and was financially unrewarded. It was correspondingly devalued and long left untheorized." (McDowell, 1999: 73)

But the most important signs and marks of patriarchy are in the realm of meanings in a very concealed way. Not only socio–economic aspects of men and women lives influenced by this system, but the world of values, believes meanings and symbols, too: "...the social construction of gender and embodiment combines both material social relations and symbolic representations of difference..." (McDowell, 1999: 71)

The point is that all the social values and believes of this system are reflected, in fact are constructed into identities. They are internalized in identity. Castells have said about "identity" that is what, internalized by social actor and that create meaning. (Castells, 2001: 23) "By "identity" I mean the cultural construction of meaning by a social actor...that meaning motivates people to do the things appropriate to the group they belong to." (Castells, 2003b: 67)

The deep understanding of patriarchal system is to perceive how this system acts as a system of values. How it sets meanings in deepest place of minds and feelings, as one's real substantial and essential being. How this system valorize and naturalize what in fact are constructed meanings of a social system, a system of practice and a system of thought. In fact, men and women perceive those values as the original ones. This means that the power relations of patriarchy are so dominated in our lives as natural and normal that people's (men and women)) wishes, ideals and desires are become what the patriarchal system of power have defined and imagined for them: "Foucault describes how power grips us at the point where our desires and our very sense of the possibilities for self-definition are constituted." (Hills, 2000: 74)

Differences between men and women and their oppressive relations which have been the representation of patriarchal power relation, are taken for granted by whole members
of society either men or women, because: "...oppression is structured into our social institutions: political, educational, and organizational..." (Grunig, Toth, Hon, 2001: 351)

The important issue is that women, who are oppressed by this system, haven't been able to observe their oppressed position, because they see those values as their very essential identity not something imposed and enforced. Gender differences always perceived as natural and normal reality of human life: "Historical subjugation has created among women a subaltern culture, negative self images and a mindset that often accepts as natural what in fact is a social product of male domination." (Friedmann, 1996: 467)

"An individual is not necessarily aware of the consequences of their actions in any broad sense, or in relation to others. Actions which reproduce structural relations against their own best interests are produced by "learned ignorance" or habitus, which lends agents a sense of order; so women acting on their subordination to men even while they may sometimes exploit their freedoms to intimate social change." (Hills, 2000: 74)

Social values of patriarchal power sit in the deepest place of men and women identities and minds, it means that men and women perceive the oppression of men's power over women not as oppression but as very natural relation, in this way oppression is internalized: "...internalized oppression is a reality"(Meyers, 2002: 6), "For women, this means that they internalize oppression- that is, subordinating norms influence what they are like and what they aspire to be and do. Still, as individuals, they assimilate these norms in distinctive ways."(Meyers, 2002: 31)

Internalization of oppression of patriarchal system is the process of gender construction in identity: "...to internalize oppression is to incorporate inferiorizing material into the structure of the self- to see oneself as objectified, to value and desire what befits a subordinated individual, and to feel competent and empowered by skills that reinforce one's subordination." (Meyers, 2002: 8)

The process of identity internalization is taking place in the process of people socialization. Within this process, social norms and attitudes are formed and learned (of course during the interconnection between people and society) by each member of society.
Process of socialization which continues in whole life starts from family and continues in other small and large societies such as local neighborhood, school…, by interconnections with other members of family and society. Mass media like TV, radio, journals, and so…also have a very important role through the process of people socialization and teaching social values to each member of society.

Gender roles, gender differences, and gender stereotypes are among those values that configured in people's identity through the process of socialization. (Golombok, Fivush, 1994; Hoominfar, 2003; Ezazi, 2002)

Dissolution of patriarchal system of power in theory and in practice is the main step in process to achieve gender equality. Patriarchy and its particular associated "family" have been challenged through two last centuries by feminists and whom pursuing gender equality: The next stage, I think, involves the transformation of the family." (Castells, 2003: 75) Many different aspects of gender differences have been taken into question. Hidden angles of this system have been taken into the light by different investigation to refuse the natural and essential bases of gender differences. Some basical points of this system strongly shocked. (Castells, 2001: 217, 246, 267),"...the patriarchal family is in crisis..." (Castells, 2003b: 75)

Identities have been valorized by this system of thought, have been rejected in reality, through social practice by men and women. Patriarchal families weakened, even demolished in some parts of the world. Women have acknowledged other identities but the homemaker wives, and men too, but the master of family. New egalitarian families have emerged: "The egalitarian rather than patriarchal, family is a new invention."(Castells, 2003b: 75), even the binary of sexual relation between male and female and its naturality have been challenged in reality and practice. The necessities of this relationship have been taken into question especially by new technology used in reproduction. (Castells, 2001: 246)

But still patriarchy live in many parts of the world in different features: "The reality of the patriarchal family also continued, and still does...the depth of patriarchal values and structures is very great." (Castells, 2003b: 73) It remains many things to be done. Social scientists continue to investigate patriarchy as a system of power proliferated all aspects of life, they suggest revealing the power relations of patriarchy that have been
concealed and have produced a feature of naturalness and essentiality. Butler following Foucault insists on historically genealogy to reveal the political power relation that produce these identities still presented in societies: "...genealogy investigates the political stakes in designating as an "origin" and "cause" those identities that are in fact the "effect" of institutions, practices, discourses with multiple and diffuse points of origin." (Butler, 1999: xxix)

Space

"Space", the term used in various disciplines with an extensive meaning. What is considered in this study, based on common concept of space in social sciences, geography, architecture, and urban design as well. In this relation, "space" which couldn't be imagined without its physical aspects and it could exist by any scale- small, as a room and large as the human world- is strongly associated with social activities and social processes: "Space is relational and constitutive of social process." (McDowell, 1996: 29) "As material culture, space is not innate and inert, measured geometrically, but an integral and changing part of daily life, intimately bound up in social and personal rituals and activities." (Rendell, 2000a: 102)

While social scientists emphasize on the social aspects within "space": "It seems to be well established that physical space has no "reality" without the energy that is deployed within it." (Lefebvre, 1991: 13), architects and urban designers emphasize on physical attributes too: Rob Krier and many others defined "urban space" as a part of urban structure that retains three specifications: physical enclosure, aesthetical qualifications and livability by a set of activities. (Krier, 1979: 15-16), (Zooker, quoted by Tavassoli, Bonyadi, 1992: 18)

But, social aspects of "space" and its influences are what, have been the main focuses in many texts by different specialists: "...space reflect social organization, but of course once space has been bounded and shaped, it is no longer merely a neutral background: it exerts its own influences." (Ardener, 2000: 113) "Public space is produced through public discourse, and its representation is not the exclusive territory of architecture, but is the product of the inextricable relationship between social action and physical space." (Torre, 2000: 145)
"Space" and "Gender identity"

Gender identity as a main part of social identity and so as a social construct, strongly associated with the two dimensional organization of "space". In fact this social construct, like any other social construction is interconnected with the "space", because as it was said “gender” itself is a constitute part of social system and social system is an important dimension of “space”. So in a mutual interconnections between two physical and social dimensions of “space” while physical “space” is produced by social powers – “gender” relations too – then in a opposite direction this physical “space” influences that social system and “gender” identity too. Thus it could be said that identity or gender identity is produced by space and produces it. The relationships between "space" and "identity" is mutual, either the stress would be on physical aspects: "...architectural space is not the container of identities, but a constitutive element in them." (Durning, Wrigley, 2000: 1)

"Behavior & space are mutually dependent... space defines the people in it, at the same time, however (again reflexively), the presence of individuals in space in turn determines its nature...thus people define space." (Ardener, 2000: 113) "Space determines and affects behavior, just as the organization of space is produced by and in relation to behavior." (Hills, 2000: 74)

Or stress would be on the social aspect of “space”, is a means to produce "identity", at the same time itself changed and reproduced by "identity": "space is socially produced, but that space is also a condition of social production." (Harvey & Soja, quoted by Rendell, 2000a: 101)

So space as the representation of social relation – social system of power – or “space” as an entity by its two interconnected social & physical aspects presents a very strong association with "identity". In fact “identity” – or “gender identity” – defined within “space” & in tern defines that “space” too: "Is space indeed a medium? A milieu? An intermediary? It's doubtless all of these, but its role is less & less neutral, and more & more active, both an instrument and as goal, as means and as end. Confining it so narrow a category as that of medium is consequently woefully inadequate." (Lefebvre, 1991: 411)
Difference

Difference a well known debate in gender studies, still used in different meanings. One is common in philosophy, literature …as well as architecture and urban design, is related to the concept of differences in post modernism, in opposite of modernism, the meaning that considers differences and appreciates plurality among people in theory and practice.

Another meaning of differences related to gender differences, attempts to investigate the basic routes of differences between men and women, biological, natural, social, cultural …

But the concept of differences aimed here in this study that it also presents a strong debate, is the concept of differences among women -or men- in fact each group of gender. It investigates how and why different groups among women -or men- are different from each other. This debate is related to former meaning of differences, because both of them study about the reasons of gender differences, either differences between men and women or differences among groups of women or groups of men. Both kinds of these differences are gender differences and related to social reasons. But the last meaning has been so important in feminist politics in defining the category of women: "The very subject of women is no longer understood in stable or abiding terms. There is a great deal of material that not only questions the viability of the subject as the ultimate candidate for representation or, indeed, liberation, but there is very little agreement after all on what it is that constitutes, or ought to constitute, the category of women." (Butler, 1999: 4)," ...it is indisputable that women do not share a common identity" (Meyers. 2002: 7). This notion of differences, except its attention to the political matter, confirms differences among women still as an inferior gender in patriarchal system of binary relationship between genders. This notion accept that women -although all of them as defined in social system of patriarchy, as a group subordinated to men- in this relation of domination differ across spaces and times: "What it means to be a woman or a man is, therefore, contextual dependent, relational and variable" (McDowell, 1999: 23) In fact, this various positions of women or men in society is the result of their positions in social system of power: "...a related change of emphasis revolved around the often painful
recognition that women themselves are situated within networks of unequal power relations..." (McDowell, 1999: 245)

These differences among different women (and different men as well), exist not only between different women of different social classes of any societies, which are in different position of social system of power relation of that society, but also exist among any other unequal or dissimilar positions among ethnics, races, and nations…and also they differ through time: "...it is now widely understood that the forms taken by women oppression, vary historically and culturally over time and are additionally complicated by the intersecting consequences of class, imperialism and sexuality, which have different kinds of significance depending on where women are coming from and how they are positioned..." (Thompson, 2000: 63), "acceptable notions of both manliness and femininity vary by class position and by race, as well as over time and between regions and nations. (Connell, quoted by McDowell, 1999: 20)

Differences among women are so clear because gender, as mentioned earlier, is a social construct, therefore variable and unstable; so how could something constitutive and dependent on social situation, present an stable being within different social situations? In fact the same kind of reasons that make men and women different from each other, they make groups of women – or men – different too: "...these differences themselves are part of the social constitution of gender..." (McDowell, 1999: 12) It is of the same kind when social groups of one society are considered: "Working class men and women may have interests in common that working class women do not share with middle class women or white women with black women...." (McDowell, 1999: 248)

Differences among women show that patriarchy as a system of power relation differs from society to society and from one social group to another. Understanding differences among women (or men), has been an important step in feminist or gender knowledge: "thinking about gender in not enough, for current gender theorists, issue of race, class & sexuality are inextricably involved."(Rendell, 2000a: 8)
Difference, Space

Differences among women related to different position in society, mean that woman who belong to different races (internationally differences), and women who belong to different ethnic groups (internationally or nationally differences)…. even those belong to different social classes within one society or one city, experiencing the society differently: "Women's experiences are mediated by class, they are also mediated by race and ethnicity" (Pratt, Hanson, 1994: 15), this means people (women or men) in different spaces; spaces which represent different physical attributes with different social relations, so they hold different gender identity. The bases of this debate are the same as discussed before in relation between "space" and "identity". In fact these mentioned differences represent different "spaces" or require those differentiated spaces; it means different social situation in different physical places. They are differences among spaces that reflected on different identities among women or men, or inversely. Any different physical spaces in the world which hold different socio-economical, cultural…relations, in fact represent different spaces and retain different identity, that gender is one aspect of it: "Gender is constituted differently in different places, in part because residents in those places differ in class or racial or other social variables, that is places are sites where particular sets of social relations are experienced and compressed." (Pratt, Hanson, 1994: 11-12)

Among these differences, social class retains a special important role; class means socio-economical situations and usually it differs by location even in one city: "Class, too, is a social and economic construct that is lived in and mediated through place." (Pratt, Hanson, 1994: 25) Considering a special place like a city, different social classes which reside in different parts of it, represent different gender identities of their men and women: "The way of being in Gender vary not only from town to town but also from area to area within cities and towns, we hasten to add that across these differences exist pervasive patterns of inequality." (Pratt, Hanson, 1994: 11), “It’s clear that women do not represent a homogenous social category in the Middle East; they are differentiated by region, class and education ….” (Moghadam, 2004:157)

This study investigates those gender identities (men or women) associated with different social classes within different parts of Tehran. The main focus is on the
relationships between gender and space; public or private spaces that different genders interconnected with them. In fact it investigates different gender identities through its different associations with spaces.

**Internalization of spatial oppression**

It is argued here that: oppression that associated with gender identities in patriarchal system, reflected on the space and on the relationships between gender and space. In the mutual relationships between gender and space, gender identities take the spatial values and reflect their values on the space and on the social – physical aspects of it. When identities are reflected on the relationships they have with the space, so oppression associated with those identities, reflected on those relations too. It means that oppressive relations could be seen in the space, in the physical aspects and social aspects of it. And as gender identities internalize oppression by making them as their values, they internalize spatial oppression too. It means that those relationships with the space and those attributes of physical space too, which represent spatial oppression, become valuable and reflect people believes and values. It depends on how much their gender identities have internalized oppression itself. As much as they have internalized gender oppression, they internalize spatial oppression too.

**Hypotheses:**

According to the different discussions of this chapter, the hypotheses of research in Tehran are specified as:

- Gender identity is reflected on spatial identity. Various gender identities in Tehran present different perspectives of space or they identify space by different values.
- As gender identity internalizes patriarchal oppression, it internalizes associated spatial oppression too.
- Within the same social class, different gender identities related to men and women, present interconnected qualities, compared with gender identities related to men or women of different social classes. This situation could be found in the spatial perspectives of different groups of men and women too.
• Following the upper hypotheses, spatial oppression differs among social classes of Tehran living in different parts of this city.
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Part Two, Case Study
Chapter Two

Tehran, General Introduction

1 - Geographical situation

Tehran has been placed on Southern foothills of Alborz Mountain chains in the North of Iran so it’s confronted with mountain and high lands in North. (Figures no. 1 &2) In the South, Tehran eliminated by central desert of Iran, the more we go to the South of the city, the more slope of land decreases, green fields in the South East and desert in the South and South West. The quality and desirability of land in Tehran mainly has been affected by these conditions, high lands addition to rivers and gardens and also good quality of air in most parts of the North and low lands and air pollution in the South. This causes the spatial distribution of social groups in Tehran. Mainly, North parts have been location of middle and upper classes and the Southern parts, location of poor classes and rural immigrants, (Figure no.24): "The North – South slope, on which the city is built, has provided a natural setting in which the process of social stratification has taken a particular shape. The North has been traditionally associated with privileges such as a better supply of water, a higher defensive value, a visual dominance over the South and the countryside, and a better climate” (Madanipour, 1998: 103). And of course there have been some urban policies, have affected on spatial location of different social groups. As David Harvey argued, when social classes at first located in some certain areas in the city, this inequality then become more and more by different urban policies associated with those areas: "Location in the city has a major impact on the opportunities and life chances of the residents of different areas, redistributing 'real income' and exacerbating inequalities between social classes” (Harvey quoted by McDowell, 1999: 106).

Tehran climate, generally is hot-arid, but in the North parts relatively, with more humidity and less temperature and inversely in the South, with less humidity and more temperature.

As there is also mountainous area in the East of Tehran, the main direction for extension of the city during the history of development has been the West that there are
Some other conditions, like existence of routes, industrial plants, or closeness to the cities… have enforced this direction.

2 – Tehran development through political, and socio – economical process

Tehran had been a small village up to Safavid era. Then it was gradually changed to a city, till in 1550 AD, Shah Tahmasb, Safavid king built a city wall around it (Figure no. 3).

In 1785, Agha Mohammad khan Qajar, the founder of Qajars dynasty selected Tehran as the capital city of Iran because of the some political and strategic reasons.

Being selected as capital and being the center of government men and the army attracted more people and it caused development of trade and industry and rapid economic development in the capital.

Mostly from the middle of the 19 century, a process of transition into capitalism, through participation of Iran in the world commodity exchange, started which was to restructure all of society and its institutions. The main outcomes of this restructuring included an increase in the population of Tehran and its entry into the world market as a peripheral node (Madanipour, 1998: 8).

kind of relationships have existed between Iran and Western countries (Russia and Britain at first), although accompanied with some aspects of modernization and civilization, but always have retained within, Western domination in policy, economy and …: political threats and territorial losses, colonial contractions like the exemption of the European traders from internal duties and taxes,…

These kind of relationships linked Iran economy to the global economy unequally: Western imported manufactured goods placed instead of locally produced handicrafts; the subsistence crops, wheat and barely, were replaced by export crops such as cotton, rice…, “the economy was gradually restructured to export raw materials and import manufactured goods” (Madanipour, 1998: 9).

These kinds of changes accompanied with other aspects of Westernization and modernization were happening mainly in the capital which was the center of country administration and military. Furthermore, concentration of wealth in this city too, provides an attractive figure of the capital to accept more immigrants or more population.
So during Qajar dynasty, Tehran as the capital developed and extended so in 1890, the first wall destroyed and Tehran and its surroundings were placed in a larger second wall (Figure no. 6). This wall was designed by General Bohler, a French teacher, as a perfect octagon. Tehran in this time represented West influences in different aspects of urban life such as new architectures and new urban streets (Figures no. 8, 9, 10).

Western influences on different aspects of Iranian life in a traditional society caused various interactions during the time: "The modern history of Iran since the beginning of the nineteenth century can be seen as a response to the political, economic, and cultural challenges of a domineering West. The response can be analyzed in the tensions between three sets of actors with different roles and strategies: modernizers, traditionalists, and the state. The modernizers or reformists, as represented by the secular intelligentsia, have sought to transform the country with the aim of economic, political, and cultural development. The traditionalists or conservatives, as represented by the clergy and the bazaar, have sought to resist this process of reform, which they have thought avoidable, and have demanded that the traditional norms and patterns of life be maintained. At their extremes, the traditionalists have manifested a tendency towards maintaining the feudal-tribal structure and refusing to negotiate with any new development. The extremist modernizers, however, have wanted to move towards total assimilation with the capitalist industrialized countries of the West. The state has often played the role of the mediator between, and making alliances with, these trends (particularly with reformists) and the Western influence...the two peaks of the long history of struggle and tension between these forces are two revolutions, each showing a supremacy of one of these two trends in their alliances against the Western political and economical influence and the state” (Madanipour, 1998: 11, 12); the first revolution, the constitutional (1906), with dominance of reformists in the leadership and the other, Islamic Revolution (1979) by dominance of traditionalists in the leadership of the revolution.

Constitutional revolution (1906) which aimed to replace arbitrary rule with the rule of law, in spite of establishing a parliament, couldn't remove the dictatorship from Iran regime. It continued and became so powerful later in Pahlavi dynasty.

After establishing Pahlavi dynasty in 1921, the modern trends were speeding: more attempts for the destruction of feudal dispersion and centralization of government and
consolidation of central power carried out by a new army; A recognized government bureaucracy provided the basis for the growth of an urban middle class; A first major railway in country; The first modern university in Tehran; Secularization of educational and juridical system and cutting the clergy power from those systems; And a major move towards industrialization.

Tehran urban context was changed as well by the trend of modernization. City wall destroyed; construction of new and modern streets opened urban old fabric and in spite of some advantages, damaged the organic pattern of urban texture; modern infrastructure, water and electricity were provided through these routs. The street became the main channels of transportation and the squares became traffic circles, distinct from the older squares and streets which were the places for communication and for pedestrians. Transportation system of capital also provided an appropriate network to control the city. Many new buildings in new functions and new styles (inspired by Western styles) were built. These things altogether changed the city appearance (Figures no. 11, 13, 14, 15). These large changes in Tehran were an attempt to change the morphology of the entire urban area from an oriental city to a modern one.

During the reign of Pahlavi the second, Political and economical changes continued, foreign trade expanded and new foreign partner, the USA gradually became the dominant Western country in foreign relations. The oil industry was running at first by Anglo-Persian Oil Company got little by little major role in economy. After social movement during the nationalization of oil industry during Mossadegh's nationalist government in 1951 and after its collapse by Mohammad Reza Shah, Pahlavi the second, supported by USA, influences of United States grew more and more in foreign relations, politics and economy.

From the mid 1950s, with the increasing of oil revenue, the state started an industrialization drive. Most of the plants were located in Tehran and its environs which caused more immigration to the capital.

Tehran was extended to its surrounding parts, at first all around, but when its expansion was confronted with the mountain in North and East, agricultural lands in South West, some high lands in South East, gradually the main side for its expansion became the West (Figure no. 12).
The fastest term of Tehran’s development of population and land had been after the land reform in Iran rural parts in 1962 by Pahlavi the second. It caused great changes in socio-economic relations in villages and it made great immigrants from rural to urban parts, especially to Tehran as the largest city of country and as the most concentrated area of job, income, and services. The land reform of 1962 which was regarded as the intervention of state to encourage the capitalist transformation of the Iranian countryside, was declared as a "White Revolution": "by then about 70 percent of the fertile agricultural land was owned or controlled by a small number of large absentee landowners and was cultivated on the basis of the small holdings of crop-sharing peasants. In the land reform programme, this system of ownership and production, which was considered as a barrier to both development and the central government control of the countryside, was largely dismantled. According to the reform, large landowners had to sell or lease, their agricultural property, in excess of a certain amount, through the state, to the sharecropping peasants who worked on the same land and had some cultivating rights. However this programme didn’t include the rural wage earner, about 40 percent of the cultivating villagers...The unequal distribution of land created a rural middle class; it also gave impetus to those who had received insufficient or no land to immigrate to the cities” (Madanipour, 1998: 18-19). Most of these immigrants go to the peripheral poor parts of the capital. After that, Tehran grew up as a metropolitan and little by little added to itself small and big villages and cities around it (Figures no. 16, 17, 18, 19, & 20). "Tehran became the largest concentration of economic enterprises as well as the largest market in the country, creating large surpluses of capital and labor” (Madanipour, 1998: 20).

This fact that the state was the recipient of oil income, i.e. the major source of funds, and accordingly, the major distributor of it, gave it a far-reaching place in the economy, somewhat similar to other oil economies (Gilbert & Healey, quoted by Madanipour, 1998: 21). Together with support from its international allies, this allowed the state to practice the utmost degree of political control over the population (Holliday, quoted by Madanipour, 1998: 21). In the 1970s, the Iranian state was characterized as being a royal dictatorship, dependent on support from the advanced capitalist countries, which was promoting the growth of capitalist social relation and the expansion of productive forces
along capitalist lines (Holliday, quoted by Madanipour, 1998: 21). The form of this dictatorship was, however, unique in that it combined the vigorous promotion of capitalist development with a fully constituted monarchist regime, a fundamentally anti-capitalist form of political structure (Madanipour, 1998: 21).

Islamic revolution of 1979, which eroded the powerful dynasty of Pahlavi, was analyzed by many Iranian and Western thinkers in different way, but there are elements of truths in each of them: a traditionalist challenge to a forced and rapid modernization by the Pahlavi regime; as the result of a tension between economic development and political underdevelopment; as the reaction of the local bourgeoisie to the stifling intervention of the state and the international capital in an uneven market-place; as a revolution of a mass movement by the uprooted and disgruntled immigrants who had been concentrated in Tehran and other large cities… Anyway this revolution was a coalition of various groups with different interests and backgrounds which was finally led by traditionalists.

Right after Islamic revolution, eight year war with Iraqi army caused lots of refugees to immigrate to Tehran and other large cities.

During the years after revolution and war, Iran suffered from the weaknesses in policy and economy, high inflation rate increased living costs in Tehran and other large cities, so immigration to these cities especially to Tehran started to decline, but immigration of population to Tehran's suburbs grew very rapidly. In the suburbs especially towards South the quality of life and the living costs are lower and immigrants could relatively afford them. Social exclusion and polarization with its spatial manifestation in the North – South have continued after revolution even intensified.

3 - Tehran population

Population growth rate of Iran before Islamic revolution – 1979 - which became under control and showed a reduction trend, in the first decade after Islamic regime, showed an explosion (3.9%). This had been because of different socio – economic and cultural values played role during that great change. But this high growth has reduced during next decades and now population is growing by the same reduction trend before Islamic revolution (Table & diagram no. 1).
Table no. 1 - Iran population & growth rate, 1956-1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>term</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956-66</td>
<td>18954704 25788722</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-76</td>
<td>25788722 33708744</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-86</td>
<td>33708744 49445010</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-96</td>
<td>49445010 60055488</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: Iran population & growth rate, 1956-1996

Table no. 2 - Iran urban population (percentage) and its changings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>urban</th>
<th>rural</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: urban percentage in change
Urban areas population of the country has always shown increasing in its percentage during the last decades because of mentioned socio-economic situations made continuous immigration from rural to urban parts (Table & diagram no. 2).

Among the urban areas of country, Tehran as the capital city has played the greatest role (Figure no. 28). Population growth of this city has been the greatest one because of various possibilities and services concentrated within (tables’ no. 3 & 4); these tables which present Tehran population percentage to the country and to the urban areas, show that these percentages grew till Islamic revolution (1979) . After that they have been reduced. It can be found that immigration to Tehran- the main city - has been reduced during the years after revolution and according to the table no. 5, that shows growth rate of Tehran population and compare its rates with the same of Iran (table no. 1), it could be seen the same process: population growth rate of Tehran has been more than the country till revolution because of the high immigration and then it has become less because of reduced immigration to Tehran. Population growth rate of 1.1 in Tehran in decade 86-96 might be close to the natural growth without immigration.

Considering table no. 6, that compares population growth rate of Tehran, region of Tehran and region without city with each other, it could be found that high immigration to metropolitan had not been actually stopped at revolution time, but, it had been transferred from main city to its suburbs, to the region of Tehran- small and large villages and cities around the main Tehran the metropolitan’s rate of 10.28 in the region compared with 2.28 in Tehran in decade 76-86, shows high immigration to region around the capital. The growth rate of 7 in region in next years after decade 76-86 shows that immigration to this metropolitan has begun to decrease, however it’s still high.

To find reason for this process it could be said that Tehran’s attractions for immigration have been reduced during two last decades. It occurred first in the main city, then in whole metropolitan. It’s been first of all because of the economic problems after revolution and decreasing different economic possibilities (job, income…) and some economic limitations (high living costs) in Tehran. Distribution of various socio-economic possibilities in other parts of country under development programs after war time might play some roles in this process.
Table no. 3 - Tehran population, proportion to the country, changing process 1956-1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>Tehran</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1512082</td>
<td>18954704</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2719730</td>
<td>25788722</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4330223</td>
<td>33708744</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>6042584</td>
<td>49445010</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>6758845</td>
<td>60055488</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: Tehran population, proportion to the country, changing process 1956-1996

Table no. 4 - Tehran population changes, proportion to the urban areas of country,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>Tehran</th>
<th>urban area</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1512082</td>
<td>5996726</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2719730</td>
<td>9794246</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4330223</td>
<td>15864680</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>6042584</td>
<td>26844561</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>6758845</td>
<td>36817789</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: changing proportion of Tehran population to urban areas of country
Sex proportion & sex ratio in Tehran have always shown greater number of male compared to female. It is because of not only the greater number of male in birth, but also the greater number of male immigrants. Usually immigration to the city begins with the single men then it continues by their families (tables no. 7 & 8).

Household size, except decade 1956-66 that household size was increased (it had been because of improving health factors) it has always been decreased in Tehran. . It’s the result of different socio-economical trends such as more education, changing cultural values in process of modernization, single immigrant men … (table no. 9). Despite this process of nuclearization, family continues to be a strong social economical unit: "especially as supporting networks which allow individuals to cope with hardships of immigration, unemployment, and through various stages of life” (Madanipour, 1998: 92). In addition to economic support, cultural and religious values, which insisted more after Islamic revolution, support traditional family structure. The same reasons caused the low rates of working women that itself is in an interaction process with the size of household.

Proportion of male & female head of household indicates the small number of female householder in Tehran that show low level of working women too, and their dependence on men.

Tables’ no. 11 &12 mean & median ages in Tehran both show the gradual decreasing of young population. Reduction speed has been less in the first decade of Islamic government (76-86) because of the mentioned high growth rate of population in this decade.

According to the diagrams no. 13 and 14 and figure no. 23, population growth rates of Tehran districts – these districts are the municipal or administrative divisions of Tehran - in decade 86-96 have been positive and high in those districts which had first of all the main condition of enough and proper land for developing. This condition has been mostly achieved in districts which set around the core city and have at least one free side to extend. Districts 2 &5 have the most proper lands for development.

The more we go to the core city, the more growth rate decreases. This is in the result of various problems existed in internal parts of the city, high density, noise, pollution, traffic problems and so on. These problems push population to surrounding parts of the city. District no. 12, the location of old bazaar is the most ancient part of Tehran, has
Table no. 7 - Sex proportion, Tehran, changing process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 8 - Sex ratio in Tehran, 1956-1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex ratio</td>
<td>112.2</td>
<td>115.2</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>105.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 9 - Number of household members (Household size), Tehran changing process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>household members</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 10 - Household head (male or female) in Tehran, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>total (male or female)</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1668637</td>
<td>1504075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 11 - Mean age in Tehran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 12 - Median age in Tehran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
most negative rate (-3.6). Addition to the mentioned reasons, commercialization of land use in this district and other its neighbors also push the population out.

Two districts no. 21 & 22 are the newest ones, have been added to Tehran as the new parts of developing lands in the West.

According to the diagrams no. 15 & 16, while there is greater number of male immigrants than female in whole districts, there is relationship between distribution of immigrants in different districts and population growth of them. Comparing these diagrams with the diagram no. 14 – population growth rates of districts – it’s clear the less immigrants in districts with negative growth and more immigrants in districts with positive growth. Some districts like no. 6, 9, 11 show high immigrants in spite of negative rate. These are the districts which not only their population have been reduced, but also have replaced their left population. It occurred when there were commercializations of land use or other reasons that changed the district quality and caused replacement of social groups.

Table no. 17 presents annual growth of household numbers and household size in 22 districts of Tehran. While whole districts of Tehran follow the same process of reduction of household size during last decades, in general, districts allocated to middle & upper classes (figure no. 24) which enjoy of more educated people (diagrams no. 22 - 26), more income and higher health factors show less household size or less children and inversely, districts allocated to poor classes, show larger size of household. Districts no. 4, 21, and 22 too, which allocated to heterogeneous middle classes (figure no. 24), show larger size of household than the Tehran average (4.1).

Table and diagram no. 18 and figure no. 22 present and compare densities of Tehran districts. As a general principle, the older a part of city is, the higher density there is. It’s the same in Tehran. High population density of internal districts of Tehran is related to the dense and small pieces of built land, narrow routes, shortage of green and open spaces and large size of household as well. Although these parts are pushing out their population (existence of negative rates), but still they have much population compared with their areas.
Table no. 17 - household numbers & household size in 22 districts, changing process, 1986-1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of households</th>
<th>Annual growth percentage</th>
<th>Household size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52106</td>
<td>65996 56843 66142</td>
<td>3.7 1.1 2.4 4 4 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>69302</td>
<td>90066 123000</td>
<td>6.5 5.1 6.3 4.1 4 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54541</td>
<td>61667 71766</td>
<td>2.4 3.1 2.8 3.9 3.7 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>105400</td>
<td>124700 156214</td>
<td>3.8 4.5 4.2 4.6 4.4 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>52995</td>
<td>65904 105196</td>
<td>11.3 3.3 7.2 4.6 4.5 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>66881</td>
<td>66525 50863</td>
<td>-9.1 -2 -11 3.9 3.8 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>77019</td>
<td>76206 61647</td>
<td>-3.3 1.4 0.6 5.9 3.7 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>81049</td>
<td>85966 59103</td>
<td>1.1 0.9 1 4.3 4 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>40566</td>
<td>56094 42047</td>
<td>2.7 1 -1.2 4.6 4.5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>74572</td>
<td>73994 75084</td>
<td>-0.2 0.3 0.03 4.1 4 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>66025</td>
<td>62711 60055</td>
<td>-1.1 -1.1 -1 3.9 3.8 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>68588</td>
<td>61907 48679</td>
<td>-2 -4.7 -3.4 3.9 4 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>47461</td>
<td>47612 46082</td>
<td>-0.2 5.4 2.6 4.3 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>90340</td>
<td>96399 98140</td>
<td>1.3 0.4 0.8 4.3 4.2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>105649</td>
<td>124612 142236</td>
<td>2.8 2.7 2.7 4.8 4.8 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>70285</td>
<td>72570 71289</td>
<td>0.8 -0.5 0.1 4.6 4.4 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>89781</td>
<td>72481 68111</td>
<td>0.8 -1.7 -0.5 4.8 4.8 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>61102</td>
<td>67350 64241</td>
<td>2 -0.9 0.5 5.1 5.1 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>44545</td>
<td>4674 47381</td>
<td>1.6 -0.6 0.5 5.3 5.2 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>67175</td>
<td>72286 50836</td>
<td>1.5 2.3 1.1 4.8 4.7 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>40746</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>12589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tehran    | 1370691              | 1511209 1660219          | 1.89 1.93 4.4 4.3 4.1 |
Table no. 18 - Population, Area and density in 22 districts in comparison, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>population</th>
<th>Area km²</th>
<th>population per km²</th>
<th>density (per Hac)</th>
<th>population proportion</th>
<th>Area proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>245676</td>
<td>37093</td>
<td>6730</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>456009</td>
<td>504495</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>256019</td>
<td>312076</td>
<td>8299.9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>665166</td>
<td>751322</td>
<td>8819.6</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>427586</td>
<td>615562</td>
<td>6821.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>220331</td>
<td>19623</td>
<td>11228.2</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>300212</td>
<td>163286</td>
<td>11985.1</td>
<td>195.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>336474</td>
<td>133762</td>
<td>25164.7</td>
<td>261.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>173482</td>
<td>196489</td>
<td>8830</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>282308</td>
<td>793168</td>
<td>36592.6</td>
<td>365.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>226400</td>
<td>114965</td>
<td>19221.2</td>
<td>192.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>183625</td>
<td>13545</td>
<td>13998.6</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>245142</td>
<td>128663</td>
<td>19063</td>
<td>190.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>394611</td>
<td>236642</td>
<td>16754.4</td>
<td>166.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>622517</td>
<td>533102</td>
<td>11673</td>
<td>116.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>295410</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>17901</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>303577</td>
<td>70209</td>
<td>36746.3</td>
<td>367.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>296234</td>
<td>733548</td>
<td>7922.4</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>227389</td>
<td>196553</td>
<td>11429.3</td>
<td>114.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>365079</td>
<td>433061</td>
<td>8222.4</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>196690</td>
<td>52028</td>
<td>3630.5</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>56020</td>
<td>110089</td>
<td>508.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Tehran:
- Population: 733796
- Area: 9211
- Population proportion: 100
- Area proportion: 100

Diagram no. 18 - Population and area coefficients of 22 districts

Diagram no. 19 - Mean age in 22 districts, Tehran 1996

The scale of land uses is the other factor causing density of the district. District no. 6 which included large scale land uses – university, hospitals, long high ways, large parks,…) show low density of population.

North districts of Tehran, in spite of existence high rise building, have low density because of the more open and green spaces, long highways and small size of household. Cultural varieties of the social structure that differ among North and South of Tehran, influences the family size and the density as well.

Diagram no. 19 presents mean and middle age in Tehran districts. According to the distribution of social classes in Tehran (figure no. 24) those districts allocated to lower classes and rural immigrants and have large size of household and more children, show less mean & median age that it means more young population, inversely districts allocated to middle and upper classes show higher mean and median age that it means less young population.

4 – Literacy, Education:

According to the table no. 20, literacy rate have showed increasing in whole population of the country during several last decades. While high speed of rising literacy rates among men & women are partial related to the education in elementary level- that is growing fast in the result of population growth rate in these ages (see table no. 1 and figure no. 29, age pyramid), but it is also effected by the education in all levels, even old people.

Higher speed of increasing is seen among female literacy rate, too. It’s the same after Islamic revolution. Although Islamic rule have had different restrictions for women, but in other way caused that women came out in society (both rural and urban parts). Many prejudiced families that made many restrictions against women activities in society felt security after establishing Islamic rule and let women come out to society from the home and participate in different activities including different educational levels. Female literacy rates have been following the same trend before Islamic revolution, and continued by the same speed, even in the decade 86-96 which there has been a reduction in population growth rate and elementary ages.
Table no. 20 - Literacy rate in country, male & female 
1966-1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 21 - Literacy rate in Tehran of 6 years & over population, changing process, male & female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: Literacy Rate in Tehran of 6 Years & over population, changing process, male & female

Diagram no 22 - Literacy percentage in 22 districts, 1996, male, female

Diagram no. 23 - Higher educated population (%) in 22 districts, male & female
The same process is seen in the capital Tehran with smaller differences between men and women rates (table & diagram no. 21).

According to the diagrams numbers 22 - 26, that show literacy rates and higher education proportions in 22 districts, it could be found that district no. 3 has the highest rank in education. Districts numbers 1, 2, and 6 have also the high ranks in literacy rate and higher education as well. At the same time these districts have the highest ranks in higher educated women. These areas are the residential location of upper & middle classes in Tehran (Figure no. 24).

It’s also seen that poor classes in districts numbers 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, & 20 of Tehran show the lowest proportions in literacy rates and higher education.

Middle education ranks are seen in middle parts of Tehran in districts numbers 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 21 &22 are belonged to the middle classes.

According to the diagram no. 22, the mentioned poorest districts show the high differences between male and female literacy rates and the lowest female literacy rates among Tehran districts.

5 - Dependency rate, Labor force, Employment

Average dependency rate in Tehran in 1996 is 55.3 (table no. 27). It means that more than half of the population of Tehran is out of working age. If districts of Tehran are considered from this point, (diagram no. 28) it is understood that poor classes in poor districts show larger dependency rates and it means larger households, or more children among these social classes.

Employed dependency rate in Tehran and its districts is shown in tables’ no. 29 &30. This rate show the real dependency rate. Instead of last numbers that present only proportion of not working ages to the working ages, this proportion show proportion of not working population (total population – employed population) to the working population (employed). While average employed dependency rate in Tehran is 2.8 and it means one person works and pays for four persons (himself or herself and three others), this rate differs from 2.4 (in district no. 11) to 3.2 (in districts no 17, 18, 19. In general greater numbers of employed dependency rate in poor and poorer districts of Tehran. It
Table no. 27 - Dependency rate in Tehran (percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependency rate = \frac{\text{young population (0-14) + old population (65+)}}{\text{population (15-65)}}

Diagram no. 28 - Dependency rate in 22 districts, 1996

Note: Employed dependency rate = \frac{\text{total population - employed population}}{\text{employed population}}

Table no. 29 - Employed dependency rate in Tehran 1986-1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 30 - Employed dependency rate in Tehran & 22 districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>districts</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>Tehran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table no. 31 - Labour force in Tehran, aged 10 years & over, 1996, percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>labour Force (active)</th>
<th>inactive population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>employed</td>
<td>un employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male &amp; female</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: activity of population (labour force, 10 years & over) in Tehran (total)

Diagram: activity of population (labour force, 10 years & over) in Tehran (female)

Diagram: activity of population (labour force, 10 years & over) in Tehran (male)
means first of all, larger household, more children and less working women as well in these areas.

According to the table no. 31, average labor force in Tehran show low percentage of women population (8%) in labor force, high proportion of housekeeper among them and high proportion of student among both male and female. "...middle aged men are the main breadwinners, supporting a young population in growing households. The economy has not absorbed women and has found it difficult to provide opportunities for the young” (Madanipour, 1998: 55).

According to the diagrams no. 32, although it is not seen meaningful differences of civilian labor force proportion in total population of districts, but looking at male and female numbers, it could be found that among Tehran women, who are located in districts allocated to middle and upper classes, show more participation in labor force, so female proportions increased instead of decreasing male proportions. Inversely in poor and poorer classes (districts no. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, & 20), female proportions show less numbers in labor force compared to the female proportion of other districts and so, male proportion relatively increased in these areas.

Employed population in different economic divisions – agriculture, industry, & services – has been shown in diagram no. 33. In total population, employment in services (basically founded on oil’s revenue) shows the highest proportion. It’s the same in male and female proportion. But female proportion is too high, so it could be said that female employment is concentrated in service division.

According to the diagram no. 34, districts which are located near to the industrial uses of Tehran or belonged to poor classes – mostly in South and West, districts no. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, & 22 – show relative higher proportions in industrial employment. Accommodation of these employees mostly located in these districts. Some surrounding districts like 1, 2, 5, 9, and 21 show relatively higher proportions in agriculture because of some agricultural lands and fruit gardens existed near to these areas.

6 - Changing situations of women in Iran

Generally, changing in social situation of women in Iran, had been started during the modernization and Westernization trends from the lately years of Qajars and especially
during Pahlavi era (from 1925). Before that time, women entirely restricted by patriarchal and religious rules in the private space of house.

Political and economical trends of modernization of Pahlavi regime had been continued in social aspects too. It had major impacts on women's life especially in urban areas and most of all in Tehran, the capital. It could hardly penetrate to rural parts because of the strong traditions there. Even in urban parts, these processes mostly influence middle and upper classes, and not easily poor and rural immigrants.

Among the cases of change in women situation, some important legal ones could be appointed:

1 – Hijab forbidding law; by this law, women are prevented to wear chador and scarf to cover their body or hair in public scenes. This law was implemented by force for several lately years of Reza shah, then was cancelled in reign of Pahlavi the second. It could be imagined that this situation how much could irritate severely a traditional society with strict religious believes. Apart that, these kinds of radical practices during the Pahlavi era against traditionalists received radical responses later, after revolution by Islamic traditional rules, it’s clear that women firstly suffered from those practices, but short period of that forced law made one of the first steps for women going out of home, so after abandoning that law, women without hijab could be seen in urban spaces.

2 – Women’s right to participate in elections; it was approved in reign of Pahlavi the second, during the White Revolution in 1962.

3 – Civil laws for protecting family; it was approved during reign of Pahlavi, the second. It was originally for protecting women against patriarchal polygamy and divorcement and also to recognize women's right to divorce.

After Islamic revolution, in spite of different restrictions against women, and reviving traditional laws, the modernization trends have been continuing and women activities in society have been increasing. As it was mentioned before, what caused many prejudiced families prevent their girls and women to participate in activities out of home, were removed relatively after revolution. They felt that society is Islamic and safe again and women go outside with hijab and cover in the street, schools, offices…and all places are under the control of Islamic rules; so women permitted to go out for different activities. It is the reason that apart from the modernization trend that couldn't be stopped in global
age caused the relatively high rate of participating women in education or other social activities. It couldn't include the employment because of the different economical problems that even prevent young men to enter the work force.

Unfortunately, there is limited statistics information about situation of women in Iran and especially in Tehran. The statistics which are accessible are followed:

- Growing up literacy rate among whole population and faster speed among women (table no. 36).

While Iran female proportions of student in all educational levels are gradually increasing, their percentage is going to be more than male’s one, in spite of female population in the same ages that are less than male. In the level of upper secondary & Pre University, it is more, even at present time (50.9). This process is happening because of the more and more women coming out to society and participates in social activities (table no. 37).

- The process of decreasing difference between male and female numbers of technical and vocational centers (table no. 38).

According to the last table, number of male technical & vocational centers is more than female ones but number of educated women is more than educated men in table no. 39. This shows the greater attention of women to these centers, in other word, the social possibilities have not yet responded to active women necessities.

- In universities too, it is seen the same process of increasing proportion of female student instead of decreasing proportion of male student (table no. 40).

Azad Islamic universities are the private ones, established after Islamic government. They are making some restrictions against women participation in some fields of study (table no. 40).

The process of increasing female students of universities could be clearly presented by admitted students in universities during the last years. The percentage of female admitted are now exceeded than male (table no. 41).

Process of increasing female proportion is also seen in each field of study. In field of technical & engineering the increasing process is not as fast as other ones (table no. 42).

- Stable proportion of male & female as university teachers during the last years (table no. 43).
### Table no. 35, Iran male & female population, 1996 - 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3015159</td>
<td>29540329</td>
<td>29540329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>30994247</td>
<td>30030698</td>
<td>30030698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>31473335</td>
<td>30494482</td>
<td>30494482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>31952423</td>
<td>31011437</td>
<td>31011437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32431511</td>
<td>31501807</td>
<td>31501807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>32913350</td>
<td>31993352</td>
<td>31993352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table no. 36, Literacy rate (6 years & over) during 1996 - 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male &amp; fam</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table no. 37, Proportional distribution of female students in all educational levels, 1996 - 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female student %</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-00</th>
<th>00-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>primary</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary &amp; pre</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diagram: Literacy rate, male & female, 1996-2000

[Diagram showing literacy rate comparison]

### Diagram: Proportional distribution of female student in all educational levels, %, 1996 - 2000

[Diagram showing percentage distribution]
Table no. 38. Technical & vocational centers (number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female centers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male centers</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: Technical and vocational centers

Table no. 39. Educated persons in technical & vocational centers (male & female), 1996 - 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female number</td>
<td>71563</td>
<td>106676</td>
<td>191234</td>
<td>549114</td>
<td>921018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male number</td>
<td>404389</td>
<td>401204</td>
<td>534651</td>
<td>573664</td>
<td>847116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female %</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>52.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male %</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>47.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: Percentage of educated men and women in technical & vocational centers

Table no. 40. Proportional distribution of students in universities & higher educational institutions - male & female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Azad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-8</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: Proportional distribution of students in universities & higher educational institutions, male & female
Table no. 41. Proportional distribution of students admitted by universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: Proportional distribution of students admitted by universities

Table no. 42. Proportional distribution of male and female students in different fields 99-00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Academic year 95-97</th>
<th>Academic year 99-00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary &amp; Agriculture</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Sciences</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: Proportional distribution of male & female students in different fields 99-00

Table no. 43. Proportional distribution of university teachers - male & female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic year</th>
<th>public universities &amp; Azad Islamic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: Proportional distribution of university teachers, male & female
- In general, female candidates & members of the parliament have increased in number and percentage, in spite of low proportion - because of some formal restrictions against women participation especially in the governmental field of activities - but in some terms there are reductions, because of the politics and kind of authorities had been made during those terms (table no. 44).

- Only 2.2 of whole council's candidates in country have been women. These councils are in their first steps and their area of activity is not known for women, but despite low participation of women in these councils, it's surprising that female elected number is higher in rural parts (table no. 45).

- Table no. 46 shows the low proportion of women participation in managing area of employment.

- In spite of small number of employed women, their percentage in public sector is relatively high. The public sector offers women employment opportunities unavailable else where (table no. 47).

- Growing up the number of women N.G.O.s in spite of its lowness (table no. 48).

- Participation of women in labor force has been growing up during the last years, while the total proportion of labor force has decreased during the same years. It is because of fasting process of women participation in social activities in last years (table no. 49).
Table no. 44, Female candidates & member percentage in various terms of parliamentary election

| Terms | Candidates | | | | | Members | | | |
|-------|------------|--|--|--|--|-------|--|--|
|       | Numbers    | %  | Numbers | %  |
| 1 st  | 90         | 3.02 | 4        | 1.66 |
| 2 nd  | 32         | 1.98 | 4        | 1.66 |
| 3 rd  | 47         | 1.99 | 5        | 1.6  |
| 4 th  | 86         | 3    | 9        | 3.6  |
| 5 th  | 351        | 6.43 | 14       | 5.6  |
| 6 th  | 504        | 7.3  | 12       | 4.1  |

Diagram: Female candidates & members percentage in various terms

Table no. 45, Percentage of male & female candidates & members in Islamic councils - 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Female elected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male &amp; female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336138</td>
<td>7276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 46, Employed men & woman in management & direction - public sector - 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Male &amp; female</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy of organization</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General manager</td>
<td>3192</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>8229</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy of general</td>
<td>4143</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy of manager</td>
<td>3931</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of institution</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director assistant of</td>
<td>8970</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57959</td>
<td>3029</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table no. 47, Proportional distribution of public sector employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female employee %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 48, Distribution of women NGOs - number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Social-Cultural</th>
<th>Charity</th>
<th>Specialized</th>
<th>Total NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1997</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: Women NGOs

Table no. 49, Percentage distribution of active & inactive population, 1986 - 1999, male & female

| Year | Female | | Male | | Total | |
|------|--------|--------|------|--------|------|
|      | No information | inactive | active | No information | inactive | active | No information | inactive | active |
| 1986 | 0.7 | 91.1 | 8.2 | 0.4 | 31.2 | 68.4 | 0.7 | 60.4 | 38.9 |
| 1991 | 1.18 | 90.1 | 8.7 | 1.2 | 33.3 | 65.5 | 1.2 | 60.7 | 38.1 |
| 1996 | 1.0 | 89.9 | 9.1 | 1.4 | 37.8 | 60.8 | 1.2 | 63.5 | 35.3 |
| 1999 | 1.0 | 88.3 | 11.7 | 0 | 38.1 | 61.9 | 0 | 63.0 | 37.0 |

Active population: labour force (employed + unemployed)
Inactive population: students + householders + income holder without employment
Figure no. 3
Tehran first city wall (1550 AD)
Safavieh era

area: 400 hectar (4km2)
population: max 10,000

1 - Citadel
2 - Bazaar (commercial center)
3 - Neighbour hoods
4 - Gardens
5 - Mosque
6 - City Gates
7 - Sabze Meydan

Figure no. 4
(Sabze Meydan) Main Square of Tehran
Time: Safavieh & Ghajarieh era
Figure no. 5

Tehran in 1857 AD, Ghajari era
Population # 50,000

1- Citadel  3- Mosque
2- Bazar    4- Gates

Figure no. 6

Tehran second city wall

Time: 1899 AD
Area: 20 Km²
Population: max 150,000

1- Citadel
2- Bazar
3- Gates
4- Mosque
Figure no. 11
Tehran expansion during the first pahlavi king (Reza shah) - (1921 - 1941)
population = max 700,000
area = 50 Km²

Figure no. 12
General obstructions of Tehran expansion
- Agricultural lands
- Mountain and high lands
- Major directions of expansion
Figure no. 13
Central post office
Pahlavi the first

Figure no. 14
Hassan - Abad square
Pahlavi the first

Figure no. 15
Bank, Pahlavi the first
Figure no. 16
Tehran expansion till # 1970
- expansion till # 1950
- expansion during 50s & 60s
Village of Tajrish that expanded little by little finally joined to Tehran.
Population: # 3,000,000

Figure no. 17
Tehran expansion to the north & South included two villages (Rey & Tajrish)

Figure no. 18
Metropolitan of Tehran
Large & small cities & villages around the great Tehran that altogether have made the metropolitan.
Figure 21
Changing process of land use in Tehran main structure

Legend:
- Red: Islamic Republic era (1979-)
- Orange: Second quarter of 19th century (1806-18)
- Yellow: Third quarter of 19th century (1816-26)
- Green: First quarter of 19th century (1841-56)
- Purple: Ghajar era
- Blue: Safavid era

Scale: 1:50,000
References


Statistical Center of Iran, 1999, *General census of population & housing1996, detailed results for city of Tehran (22 districts)*, 7 (in Persian), Tehran: Statistical Center of Iran.


Chapter Three

Case Study, the Method and Methodology

Structure of Inquiry in Tehran

Method and Methodology

Regarding to several considerations method and methodology of the case study has been defined. The method of inquiry means the way of collecting data, here has been done by the “semi structured interviews” as a qualitative method of inquiry and the methodology of research, means the way of analyzing data here approaches to qualitative analyzing either; They were defined regarding to the followed conditions:

First of all, the subject of study is to be investigated has the major role in this regard. The objectives points to the relationships between “gender” and “space” in Tehran, here it precisely means study about those influences on the way people think about “spaces”, use them, or do their activities within (their spatial identity), that comes from the way they think about gender issues (their gender identity). The focus actually is to the people’s attitudes about the subjects which haven’t been researched before in the way this study tends to do; actually these kinds of relationships between “gender” and “space” and involved different aspects, have not studied before. The subject as well as the place (city of Tehran) is new, so it seems that kind of qualitative method could be helpful, because qualitative way of study could provides initial information about the subject which is necessary in organizing a widespread quantitative way of data collecting to provide a reliable assessment of the society regarding the related issue. It’s also useful in better conceptualizing the main ideas of the study and making it useful for theory development: "The objective of qualitative research should more correctly considered to be 'theoretical generalization', simply put, this means that qualitative researchers are not only documenting the experiences of a group of people for their own sake (however interesting or important they may be considered to be) but also because they hope that their case study will contribute to theory development” (Damaris, Rose: 2001, 6).

Another advantage of qualitative research, here interviewing with the people which is important to be pointed is"...The chief strength of this method lies in the depth
understanding it may permit, although other research method may be challenged as 'superficial', this charge is seldom lodged against field research” (Babbie, 1998, 303). By interviewing with the people, it could be comprehended and illustrated people’s gender values influences on space the same way as people evaluate them: “Intensive interview as a way of qualitative research method is considered for study about institutionalized values & believes” (Marshal & Rossman, 1998, 147), “Field research is specially effective for studying the subtle nuances of attitudes and behaviors ...” (Babbie, 1998, 303); like internalized gender or spatial values in this regard: "... discovering subject experiences and how subjects make sense of them ...” (Babbie, 1998, 281). That is really the chief strength of qualitative interviewing that indicates its more “validity”, it means that what is aimed to be measured is actually the same as it’s studied: “Field research seems to provide more valid measures than surveys and experimental measurements, which are often criticized as superficial and nor really valid” (Bobbie, 1998, 303).

Possibility of continuous checking or changing the questions and the way those questions being asked during different interviews to be more appropriate, are the other advantage of this method of inquiry; it means that within the series of interviews, each interview could remove its last weaknesses and develop its strengths: "Qualitative interviewing design is flexible, interactive and continuous, rather than prepared in advance and locked in stone” (Herbert & Riene, quoted by Babbie 1998, 290), “Qualitative methodologies are seen as less structured and consequently more flexible” ((Damaris Rose: 2001, 5). It’s been the same about process of checking and changing during about 40 interviews within this inquiry.

And at last Since this case study is to be done within a PhD research and there is no organizational support, there are limitations in the time duration and its budget, so the method of data collecting – quantitative or qualitative – tends to be of small scale one, it usually means qualitative one; specially regarding to the objective of study that intends to search in a great populated city like Tehran that any kind of generalization of conclusions necessitates large number of sampling which is not appropriate regarding mentioned reasons, so a qualitative method would be more appropriate: "... it's not an appropriate means to arriving at statistical descriptions of a large population” (Babbie, 1998, 303).
The methodology of study, means the way the data would be analyzed, mostly approaches to qualitative interpretivism, because despite the method of data collecting from unrepresentative samples that necessitate qualitative analyzing, but also the way the researcher analyze the concepts and notions that people expressed about the issues during the interviews, justify it; in fact in many cases, kind of reasoning and explanation samples made to the issues, provide the basis for the assessment of their thoughts: “the subject (interviewee) not only answer questions prepared by the researcher but themselves formulate in a dialogue their own conceptions of their lived world” (Babbie, 1998, 281). For example regarding to the question of “which one of your children opens the door” or “which one of them do the local shopping”, while the parents’ answers could pointed to the same sex but they are really placed in different groups of “spatial attitudes” because of the different explanation in their preferences. In this regard, study approaches to the phenomenology, interpretivism and it keeps distance from objectivity and positivism: "Qualitative research is characterized by subjectivity rather than objectivity, closeness to the subject, uniqueness over universality ...”(Runde, Mandell, 2000, 413, 'encyclopedia of feminist theories'). Subjectivity means here that different groups of people evaluate phenomenon (gender and spatial relations, here) differently, and researcher efforts to understand people's view to find how and why these differences exist.

And also within the analyzing of the information and assessment of people’s concepts, those observed relations which repeated and repeated for times, considered as the major social facts; in this way process of data analyzing sometimes approaches to the quantitative study.

In fact, this inquiry benefit from a method between qualitative and quantitative ones; while the structure of study, the purposes, the hypotheses, even the variables and indicators are defined earlier, like a quantitative research, but from the points of sampling, collecting data and analyzing, approaches to the qualitative one. The last scientific texts relating to the method and methodology referred to the possibility of using both methods in one research. They’ve stressed on the complementarity between two methods (Roberts, 2002).

It’s said that qualitative analyzing is not “reliable”, it means it couldn’t be repeatable by other researches: “Compared with surveys and experiments, field research
measurements generally have more validity but less reliability” (Babbie, 1998, 305). Here for reducing this problem, study benefits from the conclusions of some quantitative studies that their findings could be considered along with the conclusions here to help this study to quantify some of its conclusions or verify some others.

An important point about the subject of this case study is what is actually under focus in “space” as the influences or as the manifestation of “gender”. “Space” itself reflexes two different concepts, one material, all of that related to building, form, volume, construction materials …, and the other non material, all of the activities and behaviors with their various social aspects happened in “spaces”. These two different aspects of “space” are strongly interconnected to each other. Any change in one side, followed by the change in other side. This fact is not disputable; there are much studies mentioned before about it; in the theoretical framework of study, this subject has been discussed under the debate related to “gender” and “space”, “gender” as the social aspect of “space” that itself is physical.

Interconnections between social and physical aspects of “space” have changed during history; the social physical factors involved in these interconnections have been tremendously complicated so their clear integrity, the clear physical spatial manifestation of social (geographical, cultural, economical…) aspects observed during the past times, no longer is obvious. It’s because of the other influential factors in the modern age especially the influences of international forms – modern style - of built environment.

In this time, influences of social aspects – including gender aspects too - on “space” instead of “physical form”, more obviously could be seen in the kind of “activities and behavior in space”: “More recent discussions of gender and space have argued for a more sophisticated analysis of the ways space is negotiated and lived in the family house / home. There is for example, increasing recognition that rooms or spaces in the family home are not effectively gendered even when they are designed to meet the requirements of a man or a woman (e.g. height of kitchen benches). Rather it is the activities that are performed in these spaces at given times & in given relational contexts that reflect and / or subvert particular ideas about gender, age, and role” (Muntro and Madigan; Mallett; Bowlby et al; Massey; quoted by Mallett, 2004:76 – 7).
These conditions influenced the subject of focus and the categories of the questions in the study, so we focused on spatial behaviors or activities instead of the spatial forms of the private or the public spaces. It must be mentioned that only three first categories regarding “private space” could present physical aspects of “space”.

**Samples**

Samples of this inquiry are specified according to purpose of study which is to investigate the gender aspects of different spaces in Tehran at present time. For this objective, people’s gender identity, also their spatial identity (of course that part related to gender) is investigated. Gender identity includes those values and believes behind gender roles and gender practices in society; and spatial identity includes values, believes and attitudes towards space that reflect gender values and are presented in spaces, their activities, or uses of spaces; so samples are those who are asked about their notions, their attitudes about gender relations and about their preferences in uses of space in Tehran.

Now, which social group living in Tehran could present better the actualized notions about gender or space? By actualized I mean those notions that are live and mostly associated with current situations of life in Tehran. If attitudes of old people represent the notions of last generations they are now powerless in social life; and if youth believes are representative of the future conditions (potential situations), so for inquiry about existence situation, adult attitudes could illustrate the moderate of current situations; now which group of adults?

Family is the basic container of patriarchal gender values dominated in this society. Every member of society especially adults – who are old enough - know about gender values of society including those influence spatial uses, but those adults who themselves participate in transferring gender values to the next generation directly, fathers and mothers, could be one of the best representatives of those values. They also present patriarchal values much better, because they are the basic members of the patriarchal family. Among parents living in Tehran, those who have both sexes of children, experience situations of comparing between them permanently. They experience gender differences when they are treating their boys and girls how to practice in different
situations or how to use different spaces, or when they are deciding for them in every aspect of their living including spatial aspects. Their thoughts in fact are actualized partially by their children practice in society. They are more conscious than other parents to these kinds of differences in society. They experience actual situation, then they are the representatives of actual gender values in society, they have to practice in actual conditions, so they could illustrate differences in gender values relatively better than other parents.

This kind of sampling named "purposive sampling": "Usually they (qualitative researchers) do "purposive" sampling for "information – rich" cases." (Damaris Rose: 2001, 6). "Purposive sampling is a type of non probability sampling method in which the researcher uses his or her own judgment in the selection of sample numbers, it's sometimes called a judgmental sample” (Babbie, 1998, 228). The thought behind this sampling is that parents, who have both sexes of young children at the same (present) time, could give rich information about gender value differences and their repercussions on space, so it could be possible to get rich information in spite of small number of samples.

Sample selection because of the kind of purposive samples defined here means fathers or mothers having at least two young (15 and upper) girls and boys, inevitably tends to the selection of “available samples”. This could be possible because of the kind of research, qualitative one which doesn’t need for representative samples.

Variables and indicators

In order to investigate about relationships between “gender attitude” and “spatial attitude”, the first one considered as “independent variable” of study that its influences on “spatial attitude” as the “dependent variable” examined by its differentiation among society by three indicator of “social class”, “sex”, and “breadwinning status in family”. These sub variables supposed to have great influences in differentiation of social groups regarding their “gender attitudes”. In this way, various groups of “gender attitudes” who are differentiated by “sex” means mothers and fathers, “social class” means lower, middle and upper class, and “breadwinning status in family” mean being housekeeper or participant breadwinner or only breadwinner in their families, are investigated according
to their “gender & spatial attitudes”. So in combination of three indicators there are 15
groups of “gender identity”:
  - breadwinner men of upper class
  - breadwinner men of middle class
  - breadwinner men of lower class
  - participant breadwinner\(^1\) men of upper class
  - participant breadwinner men of middle class
  - participant breadwinner men of lower class
  - breadwinner women of upper class
  - breadwinner women of middle class
  - breadwinner women of lower class
  - participant breadwinner women of upper class
  - participant breadwinner women of middle class
  - participant breadwinner women of lower class
  - homemaker women of upper class
  - homemaker women of middle class
  - homemaker women of lower class

In sample selection, it has been tried to have at least two samples of each group. This
occurred for most of the groups except the group of “participant breadwinner men from
lower class” which has no sample, and two groups of “participant breadwinner women
from lower class” and “only breadwinner women from upper class” which have only one
member within. This implicitly indicates the small members of these social groups in real
society especially regarding the groups of participant breadwinner men and women from
lower classes.

It is important to note that since there isn’t the homemaker men as usual group in this
society, so they abandoned totally. This situation adding the fact that women in some
groups have more than two samples – it might be because of the sex of the main
interviewer, the female researcher, that caused female samples accept more easily to be
interviewed – resulted that total number of women’s samples are more than men.

\(^1\) Participant breadwinner is one who belongs to a household which have another breadwinner too. This
situation here exists when wife and husband both employed.
Specifying two sub variables “sex” and “breadwinning status in family” is easy and it’s enough to see their sex or ask them whether they and their spouse are employed. But for specifying sample social class, the residential districts in Tehran has been the indicator. Regarding to former information about Tehran districts, their characteristics were specified according to their social classes of their residences which is the dominant feature of districts. So the initial assumption about the sample’s social class relied on the location of their residencies, and then after, by getting more information about their employment, education … and visiting the house building (since the most of interviews have done in interviewees’ houses), the sample’s social class specified more precisely; later information was necessary especially in inhomogeneous districts. Consequently, in this way samples of study distributed in different districts of the city representative of different social classes.

These 15 groups of “gender identity” are studied regarding to their “gender” & “spatial” identities, it means the gender values, conditions, and positions beneath the activities of their girls and boys within spaces, the gender aspects of how they use spaces, how they prefer to use spaces, or who they should to use spaces. The “spaces” focused here, are the “private space” of house, “semi private semi public spaces” of neighborhood, and “public spaces” of the city.

**The Logic of the questions**

The questionnaire has five different parts. One of them provided the questions related to “gender identity”, three other parts allocated to questions about “spatial identity” regarding three domains of spaces, and the last part includes questions which specify indicators defining sample’s group of study means mentioned 15 groups which are differentiated by “sex”, “social class”, and “breadwinning status in family”. Asking the questions is how that the questions related to “spatial identity” (three domains of spaces) are firstly asked; then questions related to “gender identity”; at last questions of personal familial information which specify the group of the sample.
Questions of “gender identity”

By these questions different groups of parents present their thoughts about “gender issues”, in fact their “gender identities”. They are very open questions about homemaking, employment, education, financial independence, and …relating to each gender.

Questions of “spatial identity”

Other section itself included from three parts asking from parents about their “spatial identity”. Parents responding to these questions present their attitudes towards the way they preferred their children, girl or boy use different spaces or do some activities in those spaces. By comparing between their girl and boy regarding different activities in spaces in fact they present their gender values towards space, the gender aspect of space important for them, their “spatial identity” which influenced by their gender attitudes.

This main part of questions (questions of parts 1 to 3) which specified to elicit spatial identity, the dependent variable of study, includes three parts in three spatial spheres: private space of home, semi private, semi public space of neighborhood, and public space of city. Spatial attitudes towards using these three domains are the main concern in these questions.

This questioning concentrates on one of the basic gender notion of patriarchal system as public man and private woman that clearly manifested by space: "The most pervasive representation of gendered space is the paradigm of the 'separate spheres', an oppositional and an hierarchical system consisting of a dominant public male realm of production (the city) and a subordinate private female one of reproduction (the home)" (Rendell, 2000, 103). Regarding this notion, this gender relation deliberated in various spaces from private one to the public. It is supposed that notion of public man and private woman, not only characterize private space to women and public space to men, but it also influences each domain of private to public ones. The effects of this separation could be seen within each space itself, public or private.
Questions of private space

Even in private space of home there are different domains of private and public ones. Having private room in the house could reflect different points of view either positively having independence or having authority to a space or negatively being protected from views (questions no. 1, 2). Some elements like window or main door of the house connect private space of the home to the outside (being in public realm or closeness to it), so it could reflect different notions towards using them (questions no. 3 & 4). Answering to the phone is the other way of connection to the outside (question no. 5). At last reception some guests (friends, not closed relatives …) in the home reflect the other aspect of connection between private and public realms in the house (question no. 6).

Questions of semi public, semi private spaces

Semi public, semi private spaces are those between private space of house and public space of the city. Originally they are spaces of neighborhood or those within private spaces of house could be seen by neighbors. Activity in these spaces that contains outsider view, reflect the feeling of being in the public realm, even if they have feeling of security of being either in the house or in the close neighborhood. These spaces could also reflect different views towards using them by different genders.

There are some places of this kind in the building of house shared within the neighbors, especially in apartments, like yard, staircase, parking, and roof. Some questions investigate gender relations in the spaces of the house being seen by neighbors like private yard, and balcony. Other questions examine activity in the neighborhood spaces.

Questions of public spaces of city

Questions in third part investigate about how different genders experience different spaces of the city (spaces for work, education, shopping, moving, or recreation), alone or with someone else who is accompanied; by which kind of transportation, by walk, bicycle, car, by private taxi, or by public transport; and during what time of the day or night. Each of these aspects reflects different notions regarding different genders.
Notes

- Totally four interviewers did the interviews including myself which did most of the interviews and three men, two educated in sociology and one journalist. The sex of interviewer was the important issue regarding the subject of questions related to gender issues. Actually for reducing the negative reactions of interviewees’ responses against gender issues regarding their children and improving their comfort in this relation, the same sex of interviewer and interviewee was helpful, so the interviewer assistants were chosen to be men to do the interviews with male samples.

- The questionnaire modified meanwhile the interviews having done, some questions removed because they couldn’t reflect gender aspects of space, and some new appropriate questions added. Some questions were asked from all of the samples which were not analyzed after because of the mentioned reason.

- The way the questions having asked were modified either during the interviews. For example, while the main purpose of questions was specifying the parents’ preferences about their children according different activities in spaces but sometimes because of the same reason, eliminating parents’ reflexive reactions, instead of asking that which one of the children do you prefer to do certain kind of activity, they have been asked that which one of them do those activities usually. Précising on the answers, both kinds of answers involved the intended purpose regarding parents’ preferences. Also according to mentioned situation, the interview’s time of deliberation on different issues took long according to the patience and eagerness of interviewee to the subjects, mostly between half to one hour.

- This case study includes usual available samples living within formal borders of the capital Tehran. It doesn’t include samples from most deviated people of southern suburban of the city or certain social groups like powerful authorities.
Variables and Indicators of Study in Tehran
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Chapter Four

Gender Identity

Introduction

In order to investigate about interviewees’ gender identities as are reflected on their gender attitudes, twelve open questions have been asked from mothers and fathers. These questions have made the forth part of questionnaire. Now for analyzing the answers, these twelve questions and their answers are themselves classified to 5 categories as followed:

1 - Attitude towards women working out of the house (question no. 2 & 3).

2 - Attitude towards financial independence of women (questions no. 9).

3 - Attitude towards social role of women and men in society (questions no. 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 12).

4 - Attitude towards existing social differences between men and women (question no. 5).

5 - Attitude towards appropriate educational level for boys and girls (question no. 8).

In this chapter at first for each category, interviewees’ attitudes will be investigated compared to other interviewees’; investigation about each category has its conclusion followed. Then, those five categories which in fact all together make general gender attitudes are put together for each interviewee parent. Therefore a general view could be provided for each interviewee’s gender attitudes or gender identity. In the last part of this section and in a comparable view, all interviewees’ notions analyzed through their general gender attitudes. In this way, in a general assessment, various ranges of gender attitudes of Tehran resident parents of this sampling could be investigated; so in the next chapters, through investigation on interviewees’ spatial notions, the possible connection between gender identity and spatial identity could be analyzed.
Categories of Gender Attitude:

Category no. 1: Attitudes towards women’s employment

– What's your opinion about women employment out of home?
– If you agree about women employment, which areas of employment are appropriate for women? Must they be different for men and women?

General findings

1 – In general, most mothers of this study agreed with women’s employment for different reasons like earning money, social promotion, or even for having fun out of the house, even housewives who themselves never worked outside, wished that for their daughters. This group of agreeable mothers has been from different social classes with different level of education. They are either employed mother – participant or head – or not, a housewife who preferred employment for their girls.

2 – Some fathers, educated from middle or upper classes agreed with working women out of the house and considered it as an advantage in women’s life to promote socially or personally. These fathers are either householder or participant breadwinner (it means they have housewife or employed wife).

3 – In a comparable view, while women agreeable are from all social classes, men are from middle and upper. So by the same way while women are either educated or not, all men are educated (mostly higher educated).

4 – Group conditional included the majority of fathers and several mothers of this sampling. They expressed something as a condition for women working outside. Among this group, some mothers and fathers mentioned some special fields of profession appropriated to women like field of education or health or office works. These works are sometimes gender separated or their working time could be short – a useful situation for women could arrange both their work in and out of the house – And some other parents referred to the physical strength differences of men and women which affect their appropriate jobs differently.

5 – An important condition was mentioned for women working outside by many fathers. These fathers asserted housework – all kinds of them including mothering,
cooking, cleaning …- must be done properly by women if they want to work outside. Actually in their minds, housework is a womanish issue, anyway she must arrange it.

6 – Some fathers said that if women are not proud of themselves, they could work and earn money. What’s the meaning of proud in these fathers’ opinion? It seems these fathers are anxious about the women autonomy resulted from her working and earning, not to be a good obeyed wife any more.

7 – It’s important to remind that the both conditions men asserted for working women – housework having done well and not to be proud – are not referred by any women in this way as a condition, even if they have them in their minds..

8 – Mothers of group conditional are from different social classes that mean they have different level of education, primary till university education; also they are housewife, or householder or participant breadwinner. But it’s important that most of the fathers belonged to this group and accepted working women with some limitation, are educated –mostly with higher level of education. The difference between number of university educated mothers and fathers in this group are tremendous; and this is while they referred to different conditions in some cases.

9 – While the majority of mothers belong to the group agreeable, majority of fathers belong to the group conditional.

10 – According to the upper fact, while university educated women mostly are from group 1, agreeable, university educated fathers mostly are from group 2, conditional.

11 – Group disagreeable with working women out of the house, include mothers and fathers from lower and lower middle classes, almost all low educated. It’s so interesting to know mothers of this group, who opposed to working women, are themselves employed even employed householder. The Important fact about this disagreement is these mothers have been forced to work because of their strong need to money to cover main expenses of their family life, while their husbands doesn’t provide it for some reasons (sickness, addiction, unemployment…) or he is absent (he is dead or divorced). Since these mothers are low educated, the job they could afford, is kind of unskilled, mostly hard physical ones with low wages, and at the same time all the housework is on their shoulders; while these situations are not the fact for their counterparts from upper middle or upper classes since those women either employed or
housewife, enjoy from some kind of help in doing housework whether they have servants or they could benefit of ready made foods or kindergartens or…: “Greater financial resources facilitate the purchase of domestic services that, presumably, relieve a share of task burden that otherwise would be performed by the wife. Income also captures class differences, where lower or working class men & women appear to be less egalitarian in their values…” (Brines, 1994: 671); so it could be understood why they wish to be a usual housewife with a good incomer husband in a safe family life: “...working class men and women may have interests in common that working class women do not share with middle class women or white women with black women ...” (McDowell, 1999:248).

12 – Two householder fathers belong to this group, from lower class with low education represented a very traditional patriarchal perspective to the subject of working women out of the house and assert their strong opposition to it.

### Category no. 2: Attitudes towards women financial independence

- What's your opinion about financial independence of women? How much should they participate in family income and living costs?

### General findings

1 – All the mother interviewees expressed their positive opinion about women financial independence. They counted various advantages for that: from having their own money to spend on what ever they want – house expenses or personal needs … - without any other’s argument, to psychic effects of it like self confidence, authority and autonomy in family relations …. It seems while earning money to cover much better family expenditure is a reason for women to work outside home, but having independence and authority in family is the important issue for many of them.

2 – While women all included in group agreeable, men expressed different perspectives to the issue of women financial independence.

3 – Most of The fathers who agreed with financial independence of women and women participation in family expenses and seem to be equitable in this aspect of family relation, have university education and are from middle and upper classes.
4 – Group 2 of fathers, the largest group included those who accepted women having their own money conditionally; some fathers asserted that women financial independence is acceptable if they are not proud, if they don’t argue with their husband about this money …. In fact they don’t like their patriarchal authorities and the resulted relations within their family to be altered; the peaceful situation that is the consequence of their absolute authorities in family relations not to be changed. Some others declared that women could have their own money but they don’t like to spend women income in life main expenses. At first, this seems an advantage to women to spend their money for themselves not for shared expenses, but the internal concept is the same with the first conditional group; there isn’t any difference between previous group and this one, because this notion doesn’t accept women autonomy resulted from their parts in covering life expenses neither. It seems this belief unconsciously expresses the same anxiety about alteration in men’s power in family as the master of the house who is responsible to provide all family financial needs. This issue under the definition of masculinity or masculine identity is very well deliberated in article of Julie Brines, 1994, Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home.

5 – This belief has its route in Islamic rules too that now is legislated and accomplished.

6 – These fathers that accepted women financial independence conditionally are distributed all over fathers’ social groups of study, from lower middle class to upper class, it means from low educated to university educated. They are either householder or participant breadwinner.

7 – A few fathers from lower and lower middle class expressed their strong opposition to the issue of women financial independence. They expressed very conservative notion towards the existence patriarchal gender relationships among some social groups of society.
Category no. 3: Attitude towards social role of women and men in society

– How is your opinion about social roles of men and women in society? Do you think they are different or not?
- What's your opinion about girls and boys training? Do you think that it must be different or not? If yes, in which cases?
– In your opinion, what is the best social role for women in society?
- In your opinion, what is the best social role for men in society?
– What's your opinion about the time that women must appropriate to the home, homemaking, caring children ...?
– In your opinion, do women or men have a main duty?
– What are your ideal woman and man in society?

General findings

1 – Mothers who expressed equitable balanced perspective to the issue of gender social roles for men and women are all educated, have high school diploma or university education. Fathers of this group all have university education. All the parents are from middle or upper classes.

2 – Most of women belonged to group agreeable are employed either participant breadwinner or head of family.

3 – The number of women who expressed their equitable notions to the issue is clearly more than men.

4 – The majority of mothers and the majority of fathers belonged to the group 2, conditional, parents whose opinions to the gender social roles are semi open, semi conservative. While they accept dual roles for men or women, both in and out of house, but they believe men and women have originally separated domain for their activity. Men are the main breadwinner and women the main housekeeper. They could help each other by activity in other’s domain. They have a moderate view to the boys and girls training and referred to some differences.

5 – Mothers belonged to this group are from any social classes with any level of education; They are all either housewife from all social classes, or householder from lower and lower middle classes. At the same time no educated participant breadwinner is included. It seems natural that housewives because of their own situation present semi
conservative notions to the issue of gender roles as these housewives even educated from upper class included. As it’s said they accept dual roles for each gender but basically they counted main separated roles for each of them. As it’s mentioned before, some employed householder mother from lower classes belonged to this group presented some conservative notions to the working women because of the hard situation in their working lives. Anyway except their opinion in this relation, they presented semi open notions in other aspects of this category.

6 – The fathers of this group as usual, have some differences in their characteristics. They are educated (secondary diploma or higher) men from middle and upper classes.

7 – The group 3 of disagreeable, included only fathers presented very conservative thoughts to the separated social roles of men and women in society and strongly rejected women involving in men’s domain. They also believed that boys and girls training are totally different. These fathers are all low educated from lower and middle class.

Category no. 4: Attitude towards existing social differences between men and women

- How much do you agree with the differences there are in our society between men and women?

General findings

1 – Majority of Mothers from very different social positions in society – regarding class & breadwinning status – expressed their disagreements about social differences existed in the city. They referred to the limitations and obstacles existed in city against women social promotion and women using freely urban facilities. Two main groups of limitations pointed: 1 - many mothers pointed to the issue of insecurity and spoiled situations in the city that limit their girls using urban facilities freely in different times of day or night. This unsafe situation is the consequence of different complicated social
reasons; the heterogeneous residences living in the metropolitan from the point of cultural and socio economical aspects are one of their presentations. 2 – The other important limitation pointed by some mothers was the dominated cultural atmosphere against women’s presence in public spaces and rules and regulation that made some limitations special for women like wearing Hejab, restriction in going into some places like football stadium, or….and the weak practicing of laws against insecurity which must protect women properly. This second point mentioned mostly by educated mothers from middle and upper class.

2 – Some of these mothers educated referred to the shortage of urban facilities for women.

3 – Few fathers belonged to this group disagreeable with social differences between girls and boys, are all educated from middle and upper classes.

4 – Few mothers from lower and lower middle classes and majority of father interviewees from different social classes agreed with some social differences existed in society and reject some others.

5 – Only one low educated man from middle class agreed with social differences between girls and boys and made the third group.

**Category no. 5: Attitude towards appropriate educational level for boys and girls**

– What's your opinion about the appropriate level of education for girls (women) and boys (men)?

**General findings**

1 – Most of the parents (fathers and mothers) expressed the same appropriate high level of education for their daughters and sons; this willing as a social value distributed all over urban social classes and social groups: “children’s education has become an
important need for all classes of people; parents admire education for their children, regardless of gender” (Aghajanian, 2001: 19).

2 – Few educated and well informed parents from middle and upper classes stressed on the importance of girl education in society. They declared since women and girls don’t have proper social support (of any kind, cultural, legal …) so they themselves must be enough strong to support themselves and education is the main way to be prepared: “Access to education seems to have an immediate, tremendous impact on women’s perception of themselves, their reproductive and sex roles, and their social mobility expectations” (Mernissi, quoted by Moghadam, 2004:152).

3 - Few other parents from middle and lower classes said that boys need education more than girls because they will be the householder in the future and if they want to have a good job and earn enough money then they need education.

4 – The fact about group no. 1 & 2 is that group 1, those who assert same level of education for their daughter and son and group 2, those who mentioned the importance of girl education in society, both believe in presence of women in society and relatively dual roles for women at least. The traditional gender roles if it hasn’t broken completely in their mind, but it has changed in a way, but parents in group no. 3 (mostly lower and lower middle) who expressed their preferences about boys’ education seem to support mentally the traditional separated gender roles.

**General Groups of gender attitudes**

Now, in order to provide a general summarized perspective to the respondents’ gender identity, by precision on each interviewee and putting all her – his – answers to the five categories together, a general knowledge could be provided to her – his – attitude comparing to other interviewees’. These notions as their general perspectives to the gender issues regarding to the table no. 6, could be arranged in four groups:

1 – Group of “open – informed”

These parents presented a very equitable notion to all or most of different gender issues – five mentioned categories. Addition to their equitable view, they analyze issues
very well from an intellectual perspective. The importance about first group is they are able to imagine, illustrate and analyze the ideal situations well. This group of attitudes belonged to a few parents, mothers and fathers all of them educated (almost higher educated) and employed from upper classes or upper middle classes.

2 – Group of “open”

The second range of gender attitudes belongs to the parents who also presented equitable notion towards gender issues. The difference between this group and the first one is the consciousness and clear knowledge the first group have about equal gender relations; the first group presented an obvious well analyzed notion about gender issues. This second group included mostly of mothers – employed or housewife - from different social classes, of course mostly educated from middle and upper classes. Only one father could be considered in this group.

3 – Group of “semi open semi conservative”

Third group, the largest in this study, includes much differentiated social characteristics mothers and fathers. These parents while in actual daily life passed from traditional way of living, but in mind, they still support traditional men and women social roles so they presented open gender notions towards some issues and conservative ones towards some others.

The mothers, are employed or housewife from lower and lower middle classes, and housewives from upper class. Of course well educated ones from upper class have more developed way of living in the city; these housewives activating in the city much more than housewives from lower classes. The fathers are either only breadwinner (householder) or participant; mostly have university education from middle and upper classes.
Sample's Distribution Considering "gender identity" and "sex"
4 – Group of “conservative”

Fourth group, these parents expressed very closed perspectives to the most of the different gender issues and clearly supported the divided public-private spheres appropriated to men and women presence and activities.

The mothers who belong to this group, having high school diploma or lower; they are from lower middle or lower class; either employed or housewife. The fathers of the fourth group are from different social classes, educated or low educated, and all of them are householder (the only breadwinner).

Conclusion

This conclusion tries to illustrate main findings of this section, gender identity or gender attitudes, as the independent variable. This conclusion presents some different changing processes of gender attitudes which could be found through deliberation on the categories’ general findings and the general gender attitudes as well. As a social fact, distinguishing these processes, means that they are main dominated trends in society – of this samples of course; mentioned processes are repeated again and again within different categories of study and confirmed by this study itself, so they are major social facts of society. And the important point is that there are several quantitative surveys in Tehran which their findings could be regarded here, since they confirm findings of this study in other ways. Findings of those quantitative researches will be referred in appropriate places of this chapter or others, also the final conclusion of study.

The major independent variable of study is “gender identity” which its mutual associations with “spatial identity” is on focus. For this measuring, “gender identity” considered to be changed by three indicators: “sex”, “social class”, and “employment” (or “breadwinning status”); they made 15 groups of “gender identity”.

Now here, before entering to the main discussion of “spatial identity” (and its relationship with “gender identity”), at first “gender identity” itself should be understood through its variation within mentioned 15 groups. In other words, in present discussion, focus would be on the changing of “gender identity” as dependent variable according to three variables of “sex”, “social class” and “employment” as the independent ones.
1 – “Sex”

This variable makes two main groups of fathers and mothers. In general and by deliberation on the analyses within different five categories of gender identity, mothers comparing fathers in all social classes, all educational levels, and in all family breadwinning status have explicitly presented more open equitable thoughts about gender issues. The majority of mothers - of this study - expressed their agreement about woman working out of the house (category no. 1), women financial independence (category no. 2), and their disagreement with existing social differences between men and women (category no. 4), while inversely the majority of fathers expressed their conditional agreement with women employment and women financial independence and their partial disagreement with existing social differences. Furthermore kind of referring fathers asserted as the condition for women employment are so different from the mothers’. There isn’t any woman disagreeable with women dual roles it means women working out of the house (categories no. 1 & 3), neither any woman disagreeable with women financial independence and nor agreeable with existing social differences; this is while there are some men in those groups.

Distribution of fathers and mothers among different groups of “general gender attitudes” presents most of the women in groups of “open” and “semi open – semi conservative”, while most of the men in groups of semi open – semi conservative and conservative.

This fact means women’s relatively more consciousness about their benefits and social rights, at the same time men relatively more conservations towards existing gender relations: “…women have been much more prepared than men to reject traditional gender role attitudes” (Oriel Sullivan, 2004: 213).

2 – “Social class” and its associated variable “education”

Social class considered by three classes of lower, middle and upper. The base of samples selecting has been their residential districts which made the initial concept about their social classes. Base studies in Tehran – presented in the last chapters – revealed different characteristics of Tehran districts regarding their socio – economic & cultural
aspects; it was mentioned that educational level as a factor changes by social class, changes within districts too; as much as the social class getting upper among the districts, the average of educational level getting higher. Mentioned social characteristics of different Tehran’s districts have been confirmed by several quantitative researches in universities (Rabie, 2004; Maleki, 1996; Afrough, 1998; Ansari, 1996; Biabani, 2002; Mahmoodi, 1999). Regarding to the samples characteristics, this fact is confirmed here by this study too; samples of study selected from various districts of Tehran confirmed those characteristics again, so selected samples followed the before mentioned characteristics of socio – economic & cultural aspects of the districts; and the educational level’s association with social class confirmed either.

Now to deliberate relationships between “social class” and “gender identity” two social facts about their relationships have been found important to be mentioned:

First, according to mentioned social association between class and education this sampling showed that more open equitable notions belong to the more educated people who socially belong to upper classes (middle and upper); and inversely more “conservative” gender notions belong to the lower educated people, usually belong to lower classes (lower & lower middle).

In category no. 1 (working women issue), there is a trend of belonging more sample mothers from middle and upper classes (educated) to the groups of agreeable and then conditional, so only one from upper class belong to the group conditional. Those middle class mothers belong to the groups disagreeable and conditional are mostly low educated. Although there are some lower class ones in group agreeable (it shows women’s relatively more consciousness in all social classes), but most of mothers of this group are from middle and upper classes. For fathers too, lower class fathers (low educated) belong to the group disagreeable, and group agreeable include only middle and upper or educated fathers. But educated fathers from middle and upper classes mostly place in the group conditional (it shows more conservative notion of fathers).

Category no. 2 (women financial independence) doesn’t show any differentiations among different social classes regarding to mothers, since all mothers of any social classes agreeable with women financial independence (relatively more consciousness of women) but fathers mostly from upper & middle classes belong to groups of agreeable
and conditional and fathers from lower and lower middle classes to group of disagreeable.

In category no. 3 (gender social roles and social training), mothers and fathers who considered equal gender roles and balance social training for men and women, are all from middle and upper classes (educated). Although there are educated (from middle and upper classes) ones (fathers and mothers) in group of semi balance notion to the issues but there is no educated one in group of unequal notions towards gender roles; the only father of middle class belong to this group is low educated.

In category no. 4 (attitudes towards existing social differences) there is no sample (mother or father) educated from middle and upper classes in group agreeable with these differences. Mothers from all social classes included in group disagreeable with social differences and it means women consciousness to their benefits; but fathers from all social classes included to the group conditional that means relatively more conservative notions of fathers towards issue. And of course only fathers from middle and upper classes (educated) belong to the group agreeable.

Category no. 5 (comparing between girls and boys educational level) while basically shows equitable attitudes towards issue in all social classes also speaks about presence although weak of some conservative notions towards issue among educated people from middle class.

But the most important table, concluding table of no. 6 that shows distribution of interviewees among different groups of “general gender attitude”, is more considerable in this relation. It presents mentioned situations of association between social class (or level of education) and gender identity clearly with the mentioned differences between mothers and fathers’ so more number of mothers comparing fathers from lower classes and lower education seen in more “open” group of gender attitudes. In general mother samples’ distribution tends to “open” groups and inversely father samples’ distribution tends to “conservative” groups. This situation as mentioned before is the consequences of more consciousness among women comparing men to existing unequal gender relations. According to the four gender groups of table if we consider group of “semi open semi conservative” gender attitudes that is the largest one as the representative of moderate and most general situation of whole society (this seems true because this group is the
largest group of sampling and includes samples from any social classes, table no. 6 & 7), two extreme groups are in two side of this group (meanly “open” and “open informed” in one extreme and “conservative” group in the other); distribution of mothers shows only mothers from lower and lower middle classes that non of them have university education in conservative group of gender attitudes and most of university educated mothers of middle & upper classes in “open” and “open – informed”. The moderate group of “semi open semi conservative” of mothers while includes mother of all social classes and all educational level, but domination of lower classes is obvious. But for fathers this distribution differs so we see university educated fathers from middle and upper classes in all gender groups not only “open” groups; it’s interesting many of them in “semi conservative semi open” group. Of course the same process of women distribution relatively could be seen here again with some differences, it means “open” groups only included from educated fathers from upper and upper middle classes (while for women low educated from middle even lower are included) and “conservative” group mostly included from low educated fathers of lower and lower middle classes (upper classes fathers are also included but are not regarding mothers).

Generally relating to mentioned relationships between “gender identity” and “class” and combination of those relations with the relationships between “gender identity” and “sex”, following trends could be drawn that in each social classes, number of open minded women (towards gender attitudes) are more than men; it is so that many lower educated from lower classes’ mothers presented open notions while many higher educated from higher classes’ fathers showed conservative notions. This situation could be found in other way according to different gender groups too, so that, except that mothers’ distribution tend to open groups and fathers’ distribution tend to conservative ones, regarding to conservative gender groups, while they are included mostly from low educated mothers from lower classes, but this is not the fact for fathers; many educated fathers from middle and upper classes included; and inversely regarding to open groups while only educated fathers included, many low educated mothers included too. If we consider “semi open semi conservative” group of gender identity as the middle and moderate situation of society, mentioned differences between mothers & fathers are presented in the best way.
Despite the upper mentioned dominated social trend that people from upper classes generally belong to open gender attitudes and inversely people from lower classes generally belong to “conservative” gender attitudes (These class relationships among Tehran’s residences have been confirmed by the quantitative social researches, for example Biabani, 2002, that made her study according to other social variable, religious modernism), deliberation on the sample distribution among different gender groups presents some conservative notions among people of middle and upper classes and inversely some open gender attitudes among people of lower and lower middle classes. This social situation could be revealed better when we focus on “educational level” as the base of comparison rather than the “social class” (in this study “class” defined by three variables of “economic income”, “employment social status”, and “educational level”). This relates to the subject of next perspective to the issue:

Second, when we change our perspective from focus on analysis based on majorities to other point to see the minorities too in each “gender” groups then we see other feature of the social relations. These minorities speak about the opposition trends about belonging of upper classes people to “conservative” notions or belonging of lower classes people to “open” gender notions. In this way we could follow the social existence of parallel gender notions across the society. From this viewpoint according to the tables no 6 & 7, “conservative” gender attitudes exist throughout social classes from lower to upper and of course because of the first upper mentioned trend these traditional kinds of thoughts have more appropriated members from lower middle and lower classes and more members among fathers comparing mothers. By the same way, “open” and “open informed” has also distributed across social classes but by more strength in higher classes and among mothers.

It’s mentioned before that “class” usually considered as a multi layer variable composed of three components of “economical income”, “employment’s social status” and “educational level”, it’s the same in this study too. We saw the parallel changes of “educational level” with the “class” among the samples in most of cases; it seems normal when the economic income gets more, the “educational level” getting more either as a consequence of more convenience that more income provides, and also its reciprocal relations that better education leads to better income; this is the usual and mutual.
connections between “economical income” and educational level” which is the fact in most of the cases (Ansari, 1996: 359), but not all the cases. Among samples sometimes there have been cases of upper classes means well off incomers with appropriate social status of their employments but with low education – at most, till high school diploma – these samples are exactly those with conservative gender attitudes; it seems more association of “gender identity” to “educational level” than to the composed variable of “social class”. Now considering two extreme gender groups means “conservative” in one end and “open informed” in other, if we focus only on educational level rather than the social class, it could be found that “conservative” gender notions not existed in level of university education – the only one higher educated conservative sample has military education which totally differs from other usual university fields – also “open informed” group has no member of low educated (lower than high school diploma) samples.

This fact about “open – informed” group followed by the “open” group but only among fathers; mothers have members from all educational level in this group.

So, while traditional view to the gender relations crossed all social classes (from lower incomers to higher incomers) but not crossed all educational level, it hardly could find a member in higher educated people of any social classes; in other words, while appropriate place for extreme patriarchal traditional notions is among low educated people of lower classes, but when we separate economic aspects of social class from its educational, we observe that “conservative” thoughts exist in all social classes including upper class but not in all level of education.

It is the same for “open informed” gender group; there are only higher educated (high school diploma and higher) samples in this group of gender attitudes. No need to remind its different strength among different educational groups. In “open” group of gender attitude, while mothers included samples from any educational levels but fathers included only higher educated one.

Other than mentioned extreme gender groups of society – much open and much conservative – there is group of “semi conservative semi open” gender attitudes which’s the most including among samples; it seems dominant situation of gender attitudes among society. It’s the largest group of social attitude towards gender relation. Members’ distribution of this moderate group presents comparable equal members of either all
social classes or all educational levels. It means that large number of people of this society are living by gender values between those two extremes; they seems conservative in some of their gender attitudes and seems open in some others. This group also has equal members among mothers and fathers although they are differentiated by their social characteristics as mentioned earlier.

So in general, when our scale is “social class”, we could find conservative notions in all social classes including upper classes too, and also open notions in all social classes including lower classes either; but when our scale base changes to “educational level”, then there would be no “conservative” attitude in higher lever of education, and no “open - informed” gender notions in lower level of education. It seems here level of “education” could be more implying than the “social class”. Two quantitative researches in Tehran one about differentiation of lifestyle and social identity (Chavoshian Tabrizi, 2002), and the other about relationship between lifestyle and social class (Sazegara, 2003) confirmed that cultural capital - and among it level of education - shows a strong connection with the lifestyle and its associated values and attitudes – gender values either – while the “social class” and “level of income” don’t.

In the first study, Chavoshian follows an assessment about the relationship between people “lifestyles” – which includes gender relations and attitudes too – from one side, and the “social class”, “economical capital” – level of income - and “cultural capital” – which includes level of education too - from the other side. Among these, more meaningful relationships exist between people “lifestyle” and people’s “cultural capital”; then “social class” presented more connection to “lifestyle”, and at last there would be no meaningful relationships between “lifestyle” and “economical income”. It seems again when “economical income” as an important indicator of “social class” causes on “cultural aspects” of “social class” - here level of “education”, it could change the effect of “social class” on “lifestyle”, otherwise it couldn’t effect on that.

In other study, Sazegara investigates about two different sub groups of Tehran’s middle class, old and new stratum (layers). These two groups, while they have similar “income” and “employment social status” among middle class, but they are totally differentiated according to their “lifestyles” and “cultural capital” or - “level of
education”; here again association between “education” and “lifestyle” confirmed in other way.

“Gender identity” and its differentiations among society is one special aspect of strong contradictory social powers existed between modernity and tradition in this society. This sampling explored one important area of this contradiction related to “gender” attitude.

In the next chapters these contradictory powers would be looked for their possible presentation on the “space”, different domains of “space” from private to public.

And now, according to the relationships discussed in this part between “gender identity” and “social class” and considering before mentioned association between “social class” and “location in the city” – various characteristics of Tehran districts – it could be concluded that: “gender identity” in Tehran differentiated by the place in the city: :

“Gender is constituted differently in different places, in part because residents in those places differ in class or racial or other social variable ...” (Pratt, Hanson, 1994: 11-12). This differentiation in Tehran follows the North – South line of the city: “The North – South divide in the city of Tehran shows a very clear social and spatial segregation across economic lines” (Madanipour, 1998:235).

3 – Breadwinning status in family

Which itself includes three status in family as householder (or only breadwinner), participant breadwinner, and housekeeper.

It seems this variable (status of breadwinning in family) influences differently for men and women, also its effect is totally different within social classes.

In category no. 1(attitudes towards working women out of the house), while there are employed mother in all groups of agreeable, conditional and disagreeable, but it’s important to note employed mothers (mostly householder) of group disagreeable are all from lower middle or lower classes who are working by force. Except these women, it seems logical that women, who selected to work are agreeable with working woman and it is the fact for middle and upper classes’ employed women either householder or participant. Housewives distributed among groups agreeable and conditional. It seems
these women who worked never or for a short time wish to change their situations or at least their daughters’ situations.

The fathers who are only householder or participant breadwinner and not housekeeper, with these two positions in family distributed among different groups, of course with the tendency of more participant in group agreeable and less (actually no one) in group disagreeable. It’s important that many participant breadwinner fathers expressed their conditional agreement with working woman and it means partially hard situation for these working woman in their families and partially men conservative notions towards issue.

Category no. 2 (financial independence of women) shows distribution of mothers in all positions only in group agreeable (women consciousness) and fathers within different groups with the tendency of more participant in group agreeable and less in group conditional and no one in group disagreeable; and the contrary trend for the householder men.

Category no. 3 (attitudes towards gender social roles) shows all employed (participant breadwinner or householder) mothers of middle and upper classes who work by their willing in group agreeable with balanced social roles; and all employed mother from lower middle or lower classes who work by force, in group agreeable with semi balanced gender roles. It also presents almost all housewives from any social class in group agreeable with semi balanced gender roles.

This category presents that group of fathers agreeable with balanced gender roles only contains participant fathers from middle and upper classes; and group agreeable with unbalanced separated gender roles only contains middle and lower householders. Group agreeable with semi balanced gender roles include mostly householder fathers.

Category no. 4 (attitudes towards existing social differences) doesn’t show any meaningful differences between groups of mother employed, participant, or householder since mothers mostly disagreeable with social differences; but for fathers, group disagreeable with social differences only includes participant breadwinner father (of course from middle and upper classes since there isn’t any lower class participant at least in this study) and group agreeable and group conditionally agreeable with social differences mostly includes householder fathers.
Category no. 5 (attitude towards girls and boys level of education) present no meaningful differences between groups, since most of the parents included in group who asserted same level of education for their girls and boys.

Distribution of interviewees among different groups of general gender attitudes presents a tendency of placing more participant mother (of course from middle and upper classes) in groups of “open – informed” and “open” attitudes; no housewife in “open – informed”; no participant breadwinner in group “conservative”; also housewives in different groups from “conservative” to “open” except “open – informed”.

For fathers, group “open” and “open – informed” includes only participant fathers and group “conservative” only includes householder father.

In general, breadwinning status in family influences gender attitudes among social class so being an employed mother – participant or householder – when they work in a usual situation and by their willing, means at least accepting dual roles for women, then more open attitude towards gender issues: “Women’s employment has been almost as important as women’s education in changing the position and self perception of women, and in altering the patriarchal gender contract” (Moghadam, quoted by Moghadam, 2004: 155). There is an exception for lower employed mother who work by force in a situation of harsh financial difficulties while at the same time, householders of these lower classes bear the cultural burden of being a lonely mother, so they wish to live in a peaceful situation of a housewife mother with a good husband incomer (a patriarchal formation of family with divided gender roles).

For fathers who have a housewife or an employed wife, there are some differences in their gender attitudes, so participant fathers often show more open and less conservative attitudes towards gender issues and inversely householder fathers showed more conservative and less open. Since there isn’t any lower class participant father in this study (it shows few of them in society), so the mentioned tendency belong to the middle and upper classes.

So, it could be said employment that means for mothers being a participant breadwinner or a householder in their family has a positive affect on their gender attitudes to get more equitable notions; it’s especial for middle and upper classes. And for fathers who are all employed, being a participant breadwinner – having an
employed wife – has positive effect on their gender attitudes too to get more open and equitable notion It’s while that inversely householder fathers, who have a housewife, mostly presented more conservative gender notions: “The conclusion is that there are now more equal or more nearly equal couples, particularly among couples wherein both parents are full – time employed” (Sullivan, 2004: 216).

**Internalization of discrimination**

Important point implicit within the discussions having done above, about gender attitudes of different groups of people, is the concept of “consciousness”, here means consciousness towards unequal gender relations.

The social fact have been shown by the sampling is that people think differently about the same social phenomenon of unequal gender relations of patriarchal system dominated over society. In fact it’s the same about other social phenomenon as the gender relations. It’s the fact that people live by different values and believes in society. Although the patriarchal social system is dominated throughout the society, but people live differently within; they experience the society differently. In fact there are subsystems of living within the same patriarchal social system. Among these subsystems of living people think differently, feel differently and practice differently. People practice differently because they feel or they think differently or inversely they feel or think differently because their experience is different. These differences present different identities; and one important aspect of identity is gender identity.

These subsystems of social (or gender) values and social (or gender) practice, as they have been investigated in sampling, include people who believe in their group’s gender values and practice and reject other groups’ gender values and practice. In fact as these values make their identities it means they are internalized in their identities, so people think about those values as their very deep and natural fact of their existences; those values are vital and essential.

Since people live naturally on their essential values, they are not conscious to those values; in fact they couldn’t look at them as outsider, because they are insider. So those groups who their gender identities associated with unequal gender relations they
obviously internalize unequal discriminated gender relations as their very essence of identities; it means for them these kinds of patriarchal relation are natural and honorable, even sacred.

Sampling presented different groups of gender identities differentiated by “sex”, “social class”, and “breadwinning status”. According to above discussion, these gender groups from “conservative” attitudes to “open – informed” attitudes internalize discriminated gender relations by different level from “deep internalization” to “complete externalization”; or in other words from “completely being insider” to “completely being outsider” towards unequal gender relations.

A good example of this issue is groups’ attitudes towards the issue of women and men’s social roles and social training. When they presented their notions towards women’s employment or this issue that who is responsible for housework or family expenditure when both parents are working outside home, we have seen that different groups differentiated by sex, social class and breadwinning status presented different consciousness towards the unequal separated domain of a housekeeper and an employed person. There are kinds of attitudes, very insider to the subject of traditional social role of men and women in one end (like Sample no. 31: Yes, in my opinion women should work at home….Yes, it (men and women social roles) should be different. Men’s should be different…..She has been called woman and he has been called man. Therefore each one of them should have specific role…….Yes, girls and boys are different…..Girls should be trained by their mother in the fields of Hejab and house working because in the future they should know how to behave with their husbands and children. Boys can be also trained by their mother…..I don’t know but I know that you should train girls more ….) and kind of attitudes, very outsider to the issue in the other end who deal with the issue consciously (like Sample no. 21: I agree with their (women) financial independence….If they both work, and they both do the house chores, they should be equal in financial affairs. I think there’s no difference that one pays more (for expenditure). Men usually have more income, any way they both should pay as much as they can…).

In general, internalization of oppression in different social groups follows the same distribution as gender identities; it’s getting less in “open” gender attitudes or getting more in “conservative” gender attitudes; it also means that internalization of oppression
gets less in women’s thoughts compared to men’s (variable of sex) and by social class
gets upper means getting more education (variable of social class), and by employment
(variable of breadwinning status).
Chapter Five

“Gender” & “Private Space of the House”

Introduction

This chapter is to deliberate gender aspects of the private space of house, the association there is between gender and space as it is presented within different domains of the house.

For this, as it’s pointed before, Parents attitudes towards the way children use different spaces of the house are investigated.

All the questions of this chapter intends to reveal gender aspects of spatial organization of the house and children’s (with different sexes) practices in using spaces; those aspects that present gender values associated with this system. Again, questions generally test the before mentioned spatial division of “public – private” spheres as the manifestation of gender relation between man and woman (girl and boy). In fact they are testing how space of the house is gendered; how this old gender division of public man and private woman is manifested in space; this time “house” as the most private space of the city is in focus; different houses, the residences of different social groups in capital city of Tehran in present time.

Although “house” itself is a private space, but within has different domains of privacy; in fact these different domains created through house spatial organization and associated circulation, different kinds of connection spaces hold with “outdoor” space (through window, door …); also different ways of using and moving within these organized internal spaces. These are domains except those attached external ones that connect house space to the outdoor space, like staircase, balcony, roof … - they are considered as “semi private – semi public” spaces in this study, which would be examined in the next chapter.

Six categories (presented in different questions) considered here for investigation about house spaces and its different domains which could present gender relations. These categories include either spatial organization of the house or type of space’s using by individuals (here children). In this relation, Parents attitudes towards these categories are studied. In fact parents preferences about how their children use spaces, reflect their
values and among them gender values are in focus. These six categories which considered to present parents gender values are as followed:

1 – Parents preferences about their children necessity to private room.

2 - Parents preferences about the closeness of children’s room to parents’.

3 – Parents preferences about the position of children’s rooms whether they are overlooked by (or overlooking to) other places or not.

4 – Parents preferences whether their boys or girls open the apartment door when somebody unknown knocks at the door.

5 – Parents preferences whether their boys or girls answer the phone.

6 – Parents preferences whether their boys or girls entertain non – mahram guests.

1 – Parents preferences about their children necessity to private room

Question: In your opinion, which one of your children is preferred to have private room? Why?

Or: If you could afford only one private room for children, which one of them is preferred to have it?

General findings:

1 – Majority of parents either mothers or fathers asserted their daughters needed more to have a private room (space) for their private affairs such as changing clothes or … specially in sleeping time; in fact issues related to their body in the situations might be seen without proper covering. This point of view presented throughout different groups of gender identity from “conservative” to “open – informed”.

2 – Having a private room for girls is an advantage, since they themselves feel inconvenience to do many of their private affairs in common spaces.

3 – Some mothers all from groups of “open” and “open – informed” gender identity presented a neutral attitude towards their boys and girls necessity to private space. Actually they presented neutral attitudes towards using of house spaces like their neutral attitudes towards gender relations.
Some parents, who expressed other effective factors in this relation like “age” and “education” requirements, considered in this group of gender neutral too.

4 – Several parents with conservative notions about gender issues – groups of “conservative” & “semi conservative - semi open” asserted their boys neediness to private space for doing whatever they want. It seems as before that they considered more power for men in gender relationships they also manifest those relationships on the spaces of house.

5 – The important point about mothers who named their son for having private space is that most of them are lower classes householder mothers who had to run family with all difficulties and problems a lonely mother faced in this condition (they presented their opposition with working women before) so it seems natural they need their son responsibility as their men from one side and so their authority in the family and house from the other side to support the family. It’s while most of these mothers live in small houses with small numbers of bedrooms at the same time there isn’t need to parent’s room so it seems normal mother sleep with daughter and son sleep separately.

5 – Some parents from lower classes claimed private space for their son from the other point of view; they said their boys (comparing to their girls) is preferred to be separated (having private space) from parents in the sleeping time. It must be because of more sexual drives of their young sons in this age to be controlled. It doesn’t need to point that in a patriarchal society, they are men which their sexual desires seen normal to be developed to that extent then they must be controlled from possible bothers for others.

2 – Parents preferences about the closeness of children’s room to parents’

Question: If your children have their rooms, whose room would you prefer to be closer to yours?

General findings:

1 – No parent preferred his or her son having room near to their rooms. It seems boys are training their future roles as the head of family so they practicing independence and courage.
2 – Most of parents either mothers or fathers declared their girls’ room better to be closer to their room. They referred to two reasons; some said that girls need more attention and care – that means inversely for the boys - and some referred that boys’ room preferred to be far from parents’ room comparing to girls’ room; it’s because of an ethical reason that they want their sexual affairs not to be considered by their boys since boys are more interested in this relations than girls. This kind of reasoning means when both sexes of children have their own rooms, it’s preferred boys’ room to be farer and when all family have to sleep in one place in the case of lower classes, it’s preferred young boys to sleep in other room separated from parents (for example quest room). So again it’s a common belief in this society and it’s repeated by parents from any gender attitude group that they prefer their girl’s room to be closer to their room although they refer to different reasons.

3 – Parents with neutral notions towards this issue declared no preferences in closeness of their children rooms. They said either it’s better both of them to be far or there is no difference in this relation or referred to other factors like age influencing the closeness of children’s rooms. Most of the mothers of this group are open minded about gender issues, but not the fathers.

3 – Parents preferences about children’s rooms position whether they are overlooked by (or overlooking to) other places or not

Question: If the room is overlooked by other people – either neighbors or public – which one of your children is preferred to have it?

General findings

1 – All the fathers and most of the mothers presented their preferences about considering the overlooked room for their boys. They are from any groups of gender attitudes, so it’s a common belief.

2 – Some mothers from lower classes and “semi open – semi conservative” group said they prefer their boys’ room not overlooking neighbor’s places since there might be
some problems with the neighbors. In fact they referred to the same issue mentioned in no. 1, but from the view of the son’s mother.

3 – It seems the important issue for both group of parents – it could be said for all parents of this society – is that they don’t like their daughters being overlooked by strangers in secured space of the house. While many fathers and mothers looked at the issue from the position of a daughter’s parent, only mothers looked at the issue from son’s mother views; it shows more consciousness among mothers.

4 – Few neutral mothers from “open” group of gender identity declared no preferences in this relation.

4 – Parents preferences whether their boys or girls open the apartment door

Question: When somebody unknown knocks at the door (or apartment door), in your opinion which one of your children is preferred to open it?

General findings

1 – There is a common behavior among different groups of gender identity towards issue of opening the door by boys of family since it’s kind of relationships with possible strangers. This common action observed among majority of interviewees belongs to different social groups of society with different gender attitudes. It’s the same either parents preferred their sons do the job or their sons tend or feel responsibility to do this job or it’s easier that boys to do the job because women should wear a covering clothes; all present a dominated social phenomenon; an institutionalized act (although different social classes cleared its different aspects).

2 – The minority of interviewees (mostly mothers) asserted their daughters open the door; because their son either is not at home during day time or he doesn’t take responsibility. Anyway answering to this question people believed their son should to it but they have an excuse not to do that. These parents (mostly mothers) belong to “semi conservative – semi open” group of gender identity.
3 – Some of the mothers and fathers who belong to “open” and “open – informed” groups of attitudes towards gender issues, asserted no preferences in this relation either their boy or girl open the door. Except these parents who presented similar notions towards gender and opening the house’s door, there are some fathers in this neutral group belong to “conservative” group of gender attitude; more questioning needed to make clear their notion either they understood the question unclearly – they might consider the main door of house opening by electric instrument – or there is other effective factor.

5– Parents preferences whether their boys or girls answer the phone

Question: Which one of your children do you prefer to answer the phone?

Reviewing the answers and précising on them it seems there are no meaningful relations between gender attitudes and kind of preferences parents made for answering the phone by their children and it seems other factors involved (table no. 5). Since answering the phone is not a direct relation to the out or with the strangers, people don’t feel worry about their children especially their girls – although some parents feel – so mentioned relation hardly could find.

6 – Parents preferences whether their boys or girls entertain the guests

Question: Which one of your children do you prefer to entertain non – mahram (not closed relatives, friends or strangers; in fact those persons that female members of family must cover their body and hair in presence of them in Islamic tradition) guests?

General findings:

1 – Traditionally, from one side, serving the guests included in housework and so it’s a womanish work then naturally referred to girls of the house comparing to boys; but from the other side for many families serving non – mahram guests (not closed relatives, also non relatives) is not preferred to be done by girls or women; these trends in combination create different situations in different social groups.
2 – Serving the guests in spite of its gender aspects, also influenced by other characteristics of children like how much they are sociable or interested to spend time with guests, or have time to do the job.

3 – Some parents with “conservative” or “semi conservative – semi open” notions towards gender issues asserted they prefer their son serves the non-mahram guests because guests are non-mahram and it’s better girls not to serve them.

4 – Some parents with conservative or semi conservative notions towards gender issues asserted that their girls do the serving non-mahram guests but with proper covered clothes. It seems they must refer it to their son similar with parents of the first group, but maybe their sons are not at home most of the time (they’re employed) or boys are not willing to do this womanish job.

5 – Some “open” minded mother also said their girl do the job and their son don’t participate in this work, maybe they are not so sociable or not willing to do this womanish job; other characteristics might be involved.

6 – Some parents which belong to “semi conservative – semi open” group of gender identity said that they themselves do serving the non-mahram guests not the children. It seems other family characteristics might be involved too.

7 – Some parents who actually could be named neutral declared no difference, both of them do this kind of job. They mostly are from “open” and “open informed” group of gender identity. These parents neither consider serving the guests as a womanish job, nor pay attention to serving the non-mahram guests as a male job.

8 – Some parents, actually neutral to the issue with “open” notions towards gender issues asserted boys serve the non-mahram guests, but this time because girls don’t like this job or they are not sociable.

9 – Therefore in general, it seem there isn’t a simple connection between girls and boys participating in serving the guest so that more conservative family refer it to boys and more open refer to girls or both of them. In fact from one side, serving the guest is a womanish work like housework, so as much as a family is open minded to gender issue, and then men and boys participate in this job too. But from the other side serving non-mahram guests for religious traditional family is a men job, so these two trends in
combination with other factors related to children and family characteristics create different cases as mentioned.

**Conclusion**

The investigation having done in this chapter about different gender aspects of house’ spaces, cleared how spatial organization of the house and circulation within from one side, and kind of using residences make, from the other side could present gender values of this organization. In fact gender relations manifested in space of the house and influence its spatial organization and the living, moving and using of people within.

Regarding to the five categorical conclusions of this chapter about different gender attitudes of parents towards their girls and boys using spaces of the house in different situations, the most common attitudes in this relation which are represented by different gender (or social) groups of Tehran’s residences, could be drawn as followed:

1 – Girls need personal private space (room) for their private issues (related to their body) more than boys.

2 – Girl’s room (girl sleeping space) is preferred to be near to parents’ room comparing to boy’s room (boy’s sleeping space) for more caring or controlling.

3 – It’s preferred that boys open the door when an unknown person knocks to the door.

4 – The overlooked rooms are preferred to use by boys comparing to girls.

It’s important to note that these kinds of notions penetrated all gender groups from “open” to “conservative” indicate tendency towards biased spatial attitudes against neutral ones in society; they present that dominated gender relations in society still dominated by patriarchal values based on more caring, preservation or controlling of girls specially when they connect to the “out” (opening the door, overlooked room); the situations in society is so that even groups of “open” gender attitudes presented the same notions; but important point about “open” groups is that although apparently they do the same behavior but they are more conscious about those practices. This subject would be discussed under the title of “internalization of discrimination”.
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Except these common gender believes towards space of the house, still there are other attitudes are represented by mostly some certain gender groups of people. It means that some spatial behaviors (or attitudes) represented mostly by “open” groups of “gender identity” and some other represented mostly by “conservative” ones.

It should be noted that “semi open semi conservative” group of gender attitudes as the middle group shares their spatial notions with one of the “open” or “conservative” groups, sometimes with the first and sometimes with the other one and of course when there is general spatial notions, most of them belong to those ones.

“Conservative” and sometimes “semi conservative” gender groups showed “spatial attitudes” are more associated with patriarchal gender relations:

1 – Boys need private room more than girls (in most of the cases boys claim room themselves or parents think they need it more).
2 – Overlooking room is better not to be used by boys (because boys might look at neighbors and bother them).
3 – Serving the non-mahram guests are done by girls because boys are employed and not usually at home or don’t do it (they do not do this womanish job).
4 - Serving the non – mahram guests done by boys because guests are non – mahram (girls should not presented to the strangers).
5 – None of boys or girls does serving the non – mahram guests; only parents do it (strict parents who also are conservative or semi conservative in their gender attitudes).

This is while more “open” and sometimes “semi open” gender attitudes presented more neutral attitudes towards their boys and girls activities in private space of the house:

– No difference between girls and boys neediness to private room.
– No difference between girls’ and boys’ room closeness to parents room.
– No difference between girls and boys having overlooked or overlooking rooms.
– Serving the non - mahram guests are done by girls because boys are not sociable (in fact neutral spatial attitude).
- Serving the non – mahram guests done by boys because girls are shy and not sociable (in fact neutral spatial attitude).
– No difference between girls and boys serving non – mahram guests.
Therefore in this way the meaningful relationship between “gender attitude” and “spatial attitude” is revealed so as much as people are open in their “gender attitudes” most probably they think openly – neutral - towards the spatial issues regarding private space. Otherwise, as much as people are “conservative” in their gender attitudes, they show conservative notions towards spatial issues.

Besides these relationships, there are some general spatial attitudes across all gender groups of society. These notions like covering women’s body although are apparently the same spatial practices but they have different meanings in people minds that are different in their gender attitudes.

Variables of “sex”, “social class”, & “breadwinning status”

After specifying general relationships seen between “gender identity” and “spatial identity” of private space of the home, also pointing to the general spatial tendencies among different gender groups, now it’s possible to point to various influences of three different variables of “gender identity” mean “sex”, “social class”, & “breadwinning status” - into “spatial identity”.

Variable “sex”

Distribution of mothers and fathers among different groups of spatial attitudes, regarding attached tables, in half of the cases seems to be relatively similar. According to the questions no. 2, “closeness of children’s room to the parents””, no. 3, “allocation of overlooking room”, and no. 4, “opening the door”, mothers and father’s distributions among groups of attitudes are similar. This indicates effective factors other than “sex”, the same factors caused mentioned general attitudes across all gender groups, involved. Despite this similarity, in some questions mothers showed more numbers in open groups of spatial attitudes. In question no. 1, “having private room”, while there is only one father in “neutral group” – gender equality - of spatial attitudes, many mothers included. And in question no. 3, “allocation of overlooking room” there are only mothers despite
their few numbers in neutral group. Also the numbers of mothers in “neutral” group of category no. 6, “entertaining the guests” are relatively high. This relatively high numbers of mothers in “open” groups of spatial attitudes inversely shows relatively higher numbers of fathers in “conservative” groups of the same categories. *It seems normal that women comparing men as the inferior sex in patriarchal relations to be more equitable in their attitudes.*

**Variable “social class”**

In spite of mentioned inclusive spatial attitudes within private space that obscure the relationships between “spatial identity” and “gender identity” and therefore three variables of “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status” either, but still those relationships could be drawn in some ways. Like the upper mentioned relations between “sex” and “spatial identity”, relations between “class” and “spatial identity” could be pointed in different categories of private space. And as it was pointed before that “education” is an important indicator of “social class” and its changes associated with changes of “social class”, here it shows its influences again.

According to the distribution of spatial identity groups, tables’ no. 1 to 6 present *more educated parents from middle and upper classes in more equitable “open” groups of spatial attitudes and inversely more low educated parents from lower middle and lower classes in more “conservative” groups.*

In category no. 1, “allocation of private room”, neutral group included mostly educated parents from middle and upper classes. It’s the same in category no. 2, “closeness of children’s room to parents”, category no. 4, “opening the door”, and category no. 6, “entertaining the guests”.

And inversely in category no. 1, “allocating private room”, and category no. 6, “entertaining the guests”, numbers of lower and lower middle classes in more “conservative” group of “boy preferred” are relatively high.

Within discussion about “gender identity” – last chapter – was pointed to the special meaningful relationships between levels of “education” – per se not as an indicator of social class - and “gender identity”. Here similar relationship between “education” and “spatial identity” could be seen only according to fathers and their distribution among
“neutral” groups mean most “open” groups of “spatial identity”. According to the tables’ no. 1 to 6, there are no low educated fathers among these “open” (neutral) groups (the exception of the category no. 4 was explained before). As always women of all social groups – all educational level, here – might show “open” attitudes. The opposite relations mean lack of association between higher educated samples within “conservative” attitudes haven’t been clear here, because of the same general inclusive spatial attitudes (of course if we precise on the samples’ referring, we could find parents differences in those general attitudes).

**Variable of “breadwinning status”**

“Breadwinning status” as one of the variables of gender identity has shown before relations with gender attitude. Now in this part, relations between breadwinning status” and “spatial identity” is investigated.

“Breadwinning status” for fathers means to be either an only breadwinner (householder) or a participant (having employed wife) but for mothers means to be a housewife (unemployed) or participant breadwinner wife (employed wife) and at last only breadwinner or householder (divorced or a widow mother).

If we consider mothers and fathers’ different positions regarding patriarchal family, the position of a householder father is related to a housewife, they have made a traditional patriarchal family. And a participant father with a participant mother, they have made a family with changed relations regarding patriarchal one. But a householder mother makes an incomplete patriarchal family. These parallel positions in family create parallel attitudes among fathers and mothers towards different issues; for example a householder father’s attitude might be similar to a housewife’s attitude and both of their attitudes are likely to be associated with patriarchal values; and two participant parents of a family might show changed gender values regarding patriarchal values… but the position of a householder mother and her attitude is not comparable with a father of any position.

“Breadwinning status” in family according to the different private space categories’ investigations didn’t show a clear relation with “spatial attitude”; it might be because of the mentioned general attitudes among different social groups which attract majority of social samples to those general groups; also influences of other variables like
“social class” or “sex” might be considerable. Despite this, in category no. 1, “allocating private room” considering “conservative” group of “boy preferred” all the fathers are householder and most of the mothers are householder from lower and lower middle classes. In category no. 2, (closeness of children’s room to parents’) considering “open” group of “neutral” most of the fathers are participant breadwinner. Also in category no. 6, “entertaining the guests” considering “open” group of “neutral” half of the parents are participant breadwinner.

**Internalization of oppression**

Internalization of oppression means being unconscious towards oppressive patriarchal relations, while they’re lived and practiced in society; it differs among different gender groups. As much as a gender group (differentiated by “sex”, “social class”, and “breadwinning status”) is unconscious towards patriarchal relations and live or practice in society adapted to those relations, it means that group has internalized those relations and their associated oppressive values, by the same way.

Different groups of gender identities as they are studied in this chapter presented different attitudes towards different issues related to private space of house. In fact they made different groups of spatial identities. *And like their various consciousness towards unequal gender relations they showed different level of consciousness towards unequal spatial relations regarding their children’s spatial experiences.*

There are many examples of these different consciousnesses towards spatial issues could be referred like differences existed between these two samples who delivered their notions related to the question no. 6, “entertaining the non – mahram guests”. While the first one who named his son for entertaining non – mahram guests, pointed to his religious believes as the reason for this spatial behavior, the second sample referred to the social norms as the reason for her practice not her internal values and she declared she practices differently in other situations:

Sample no. 16 (a higher educated – military education - householder father)
from middle class):

I do it myself or my wife. Some times Alireza (son) helps. Since they are non-mahram, I prefer that a man entertains them. We don’t want strange cultures.

Sample no. 7 (a higher educated and participant breadwinner mother from middle):

My husband is kind of religious, but not so much that believes the girl should stays in bedroom and the boy does the reception. I usually wear scarf and long clothes when a worker comes to clean the house, the same as my daughter. Whenever we have guests, if they are religious we wear our scarves, if not, we don’t wear scarves and usually younger ones (children) do the reception.

Good examples of these different spatial consciousnesses might be seen among different members of general spatial attitudes mean those spatial attitudes shared among different groups of society. Different members of these general groups apparently showed the same attitude towards the issue but in fact their notions are from different standpoints. While existence of these general notions as was pointed, indicates patriarchal values still dominated in society, but still there are differences between the “open” reasoning and “conservative” one. For example, among members of the spatial group of “boy preferred” in category no. 1, about “allocating private space”. Sample no. 1 referred to family believes (internal values) for separating daughter in private room, but the second sample pointed to daughter’s comfort and freedom (consciousness towards the differences) in having private room:

Sample no. 5 (an educated – high school diploma – and housewife mother from lower middle class):

My daughter. ... Their (my sons and daughter) studying and working’s things are all in a same room. My sons sleep in that room. And my daughter sleeps in the living room. We’re tenants; they couldn’t have their own rooms. We’re building a house for ourselves. She’s (my daughter) religious and doesn’t put the curtains away. Despite there are video and satellite in our house. My son (the older) is religious too. He doesn’t like to have a room with her sister.

Sample no. 20 (a housewife from lower class with low education):
The girl. It's better; ...of course it's better for both of them to have a private room but I prefer the girl. That's because she will be more comfortable, the boy is always out. He has the freedom outside. ...Then she knows what to wear, how to sleep because the boy is free he can wear whatever he wants and sleep.

It’s the same about selected two samples regarding to the reasons they delivered for “allocating overlooked room” to their sons. While the first one referred to basic gender differences in this relation, two other samples consciously referred to likely social situations for their selection.

Sample no. 38 (an educated – upper high school diploma - and participant breadwinner of lower middle class):

If one of the rooms were overlooked I have to give to my son. My daughter’s room shouldn’t be overlooked; we try to make it better by curtains. Because of the differences between girls and boys in gender and the girls’ problems which are pointed in our religion, we’re more anxious for our daughter. For example if the boy went out and come 2 hour late, although we have anxiety we don’t think that something has happened for him. But our daughter shouldn’t come 2 hours late. Because of her differences in gender and the problems in society she shouldn’t be out late in the evening or she shouldn’t be with her mother or someone reliable.

Sample no. 15 (a higher educated and participant breadwinner father from upper middle class):

I prefer especially my daughter's room wasn't overlooked because other people may bother her. You know we have depraved society. But they're comfortable and they don't feel this problem.

Sample no. 21 (a higher educated and participant breadwinner mother from upper class):

Well, the not overlooked one is better for my daughter. But I think both of them should be in such a room, but if I have to choose one, my daughter is preferred. Maybe someone from other side look at a girl’s room not a boy’s room.

And the other example in this relation regarding the category no. 4, “opening the out door” is:
Sample no. 5 (an educated – high school diploma – and housewife mother from lower middle class):

My daughter even doesn’t go near the door - my son opens the door. She doesn’t like it. We were in a neighborhood for 28 years and my daughter didn’t know a supermarket. She doesn’t go shopping and out. In the morning, She goes to the class (for university entrance exam) and English classes but she’s not naughty and doesn’t go shopping .she even doesn’t clean the stairs and her brother doesn’t let either. He cleans the balcony and stairs himself. He even doesn’t let me.

Sample no. 26 (a higher educated housewife mother from upper class):

The boys are preferred. Wearing clothes is different in our country, according to be religious or not. I even don’t go to the door sometimes. It’s so easier for my sons to run to the door before I wear suitable covered clothes.

In general could be said that in dominated relations of patriarchal social system in a society, there are people who consciously reject those values and practice differently in society as much as it’s possible. But majority of people who live among those dominated situations and apparently practice the same, don’t have the same consciousness towards the situations they live in. Some of them consciously understand the conditions and know that they might act differently in different conditions, while some think about the dominated patriarchal relations as the normality and essentiality
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Chapter Six

“Gender” and “Semi Public Semi Private Spaces”

Introduction

“Semi public semi private spaces” are those spaces attached to the house, either used only by one family like balconies or private courtyards or used by some neighbors like roofs or staircases or shared courtyards. Neighborhood spaces like alleys or common spaces of residential complexes are other kinds of “semi public semi private spaces” considered here; all of these spaces have common uses with small number of other neighbors and if they haven’t common use still they have neighbors’ view to them.

Parents attitudes towards the ways their children use or should use these kinds of spaces are focused in this chapter. Nine categories as they have been presented within questionnaire will be investigated as followed:

1 - Parents attitudes towards the ways their children use space of courtyard
2 – Parents attitudes towards the ways their children use overlooked balcony
3 – Parents attitudes towards the way their children use semi public spaces of neighborhood
4 – Parents attitudes towards the ways their children do the local grocery shopping
5 – Parents preferences towards the way their children take the garbage out in the evening
6 – Parents preferences towards the way their children water the flower bed in the courtyard or in front of the door
7 – Parents preferences towards the way their children clean shared staircase
8 – Parents attitudes towards the way their children use the roof of the house
9 – Parents preferences towards the way their children hang the clothes up in courtyards, balconies or roofs
1 – Parents attitudes towards the ways their children use courtyard space

Question: Which one of your children does some activities in the courtyard (the overlooked or shared one)?
Or: Which one of them uses courtyard more?

General findings

1 - Parents who responded to this question presented their notions in three ways. Some said that neither of them uses yard space and some of them neutrally said that both of their children use space of courtyard, overlooked or shared one. Last group said that their boys use yard more freely than their girls. No one declared that their girls enjoys from space of yard freer than their boys.

2 – The largest group, parents who said neither of them uses space of courtyard present different social trends. The first one seen among different groups of society (gender groups too); since yard in many cases is a common place shared by neighbors – in apartments specially - and since there is a trend of individualism and reduction of social closed relationships among people specially within neighbors of urban areas, so there is an unwillingness towards neighborhood connections; it’s against people interference towards family lives and then there is reduction in using common spaces of neighborhood or being overlooked in those spaces while doing something. This trend is fortified in heterogeneous neighborhoods from one side and by attractive activities of closed space of house like watching television or satellite programs or computer uses from the other side.

3 – The other trends among this group of parents –both don’t use - belong to those conservatives or semi conservatives who don’t like their children connections to the neighbors from the point of gender issues.

4 – Parents of neutral group which their both children use space of yard are mostly mothers with open or semi open gender attitudes – from middle and upper classes - towards gender issues.

5 – Some parents who belong to the group of “limitation for girls’ and are mostly fathers with conservative or semi conservative notions towards gender issues – and mostly from lower and lower middle classes - asserted that their sons do some activities
Courtyard

Although many families don’t use space of yard at all (specially when it’s shared among apartments), in some cases it has a favorite space (and sometimes favorite privacy), so in neutral families young girls might use this overlooked space freely.
in yard more than their daughters or their daughters wear covered cloths while have something to do in courtyard.

2 – Parents attitudes towards the ways their children use overlooked balconies

Question: Which one of your children does some activities in the balcony (the overlooked one)?
Or: Which one of them uses balconies more?

General findings

1 – Near to half of the samples missed in this category. Either they have not been asked about this question or their houses don’t have an overlooked balcony. The other respondents made the same three groups.

2 – Those parents – mostly mothers - who asserted neutral notions towards using of balcony by their children are mostly either open minded in their gender attitudes or semi open but from upper classes. It’s important to point that some upper class parents of this sampling despite their semi open semi conservative notions towards gender roles showed neutral notions towards the way their children use different spaces.

3 - Parents who asserted that none of their children they prefer to use space of balcony – they either referred to the gender issues or not - are mostly fathers with conservative or semi conservative notions towards gender relationships and from any social classes.

4 – Mothers who made third group – more free boys - and said that their boys use overlooked space of balcony freer, they pointed to the issue from different perspective. Middle or upper class’s open minded parents towards gender differences said that they have to consider social situations. Beside this view, one conservative mother asserted this difference as her internalized belief. Since this category lost near to half of the samples, so that seems the reason for the existence of only mothers in this group.
Balconies

In most Tehran’s residential buildings, balconies are not a suitable space for spending living time; they are mostly used for hanging up clothes, putting flower boxes or storing something.
In rare cases, balconies have a suitable space for different living activities. In neutral families, young girls might use this overlooked space like boys.
3 – Parents attitudes towards the way their children use semi public spaces of neighborhood

Question: Which one of your children allowed to spend time in the alley or neighborhood spaces?
Or: Which one of your children spends time in neighborhood spaces more?

General findings

1 – Despite the fact that many neighborhoods in Tehran have lost their old familiar characteristics so their neighborhood activities have decreased in general but still there are different perspectives to the issue. As usual, three groups of respondents answered to this question.

2 – Most of the parents of group “neutral” are mothers and with open or semi open gender attitudes from middle and upper classes.

3 - Group of “limitation for both” made mostly from fathers, conservative or semi conservative in their gender attitudes but from any social classes.

4 – Regarding to the neighborhood spaces, parents from any social classes and any gender attitudes included in group of “limitation for girls” or “more free boys” (the largest group), but the way that parents referred to the issue is totally different. Educated open minded parents referred to the social conditions as the reason make limitation for girls in using neighborhood freely; but more conservatives pointed to the situation as necessities of normal situation, as their internalized social values.

4 – Parents attitudes towards the ways their children do the grocery shopping

Question: Which one of your children do you prefer to do the grocery shopping in the neighborhood?
Or: which one of them does it?
• Neighborhood spaces in most urban areas allocated to passing roads for cars, so adding to the general decreasing of urban closed relationships, there is no appropriate social place for neighbors relationships.
Neighborhood

- In some old neighborhoods mostly belonged to lower parts of the city, urban texture is relatively safe from passing cars and make the space appropriate for closed neighbors relationships.
General findings

1 – Different interviewee parents presented their spatial preferences towards the way their children do the local shopping in four different ways.

2 – There is a general widespread preference in whole society among different groups of gender attitudes that “boys do it”, the local shopping, especially during the dark time. Of course there are differences between those parents of “open” gender attitudes who pointed to the social limitations for freely moving of girls in society related to this spatial category, and those “conservative” attitudes that look at the issue as the social normality.

3 – Some parents with “open” gender attitudes from middle and upper classes and some parents with “semi open” gender attitudes from upper class asserted no differences between their children related to this issue. For many upper class family financial facilities they enjoy, like personal cars and cell phones that allocated to each of their children, provide more security while moving in the city, so they could present neutral attitudes to the issue more easily.

4 – Those parents who declared none of them do the local shopping are mostly conservative or semi conservative householder mothers with financial difficulties in their lives.

5 – Only two (employed) mothers from lower & lower middle class despite their semi conservative gender attitudes said their daughters do the job instead of their boys; it might be because of the social security of the neighborhood they live there so they could permit their daughters do the local shopping instead of their sons.

5 – Parents attitudes towards the issue that which one of their children take the garbage out in the evening

Question: Which one of your children do you prefer to take the trash out in the evening?
Or: which one of them does it?
Local shopping

While local shopping mostly preferred to be done by young boys of family, but among neutral families it might be done by young girls too.
General findings

1 – At the time of interviewing with samples, in most part of the city, the system of garbage gathering has been in this way that people put their garbage in front door of the house in early evening and they were gathered at nine o’clock or later by special tracks. The “place” and “time” related to this job – putting the garbage out – mean “out” and “darkness of the night” are two definitive factors associate this job with men.

2 – So, according to mentioned relations, absolute majority of parents made the group of “boys do it”, means boys preferred to put the garbage out.

3 – A few mothers (all employed) and one father, mostly from lower and lower middle classes said that they do it themselves instead of their sons.

4 – Only two middle class and “open” minded mothers asserted their girls like their boys might put the garbage out.

6 – Parents preferences towards their children watering the courtyard’s flower bed or the flowerbed in front of the door

Question: Which one of your children do you prefer to water the courtyard flower bed (shared or overlooked one) or flower bed in front of the door?

Or: which one does it?

General findings

1 – There has been a trend of increasing mass density in Tehran and inversely decreasing of open and green spaces especially those related to houses, flower beds in courtyards or in alleys so this question has lost many of interviewees because their houses don’t have any flower beds. There are also samples which haven’t been asked about this question.

2 – Many parents, among them most of the mothers – it seems accidentally - placed in the group of “none of them do it”. While in many complexes especially of upper classes, there is a custodian doing these kinds of jobs, in other cases these are parents to do the job. It sometimes considered as a house work that usually children and specially
Putting garbage out

- Putting garbage out in front of the door is generally a task of men or young boys of family, specially in its old manner during dark time.
- In new style of urban garbage gathering in any time of day or night, women and girls (from neutral families) might do the job too.
Watering courtyard flowerbeds

- In large residential complexes a custodian most probably do watering courtyard flowerbed
- Daughters of neutral families might do the job too like the sons
Watering outdoor flowerbed or washing outdoor space

In lower and middle parts of the city, most probably it's mother who water the outdoor flowerbed while her daughter might water the insider one.
boys are not interested to do it; it might be because they are busy with their studies and the reason among others is might be related to the decreasing of open spaces activities in general and increasing of closed space ones as it mentioned before. While considering watering as a womanish job prevents boys to do it, for girls its relation to out might be the reason too.

3 – Group of “boys do it” includes mostly fathers with conservative or semi conservative gender attitudes and from middle and upper classes; they asserted their preferences if the task is to be done by their children. Lower class fathers belong to other group as it will be mentioned later.

4 – Group of “neutral” parents includes mostly mothers with “open” or “semi open” gender attitudes from middle and upper classes.

5 – Group of “girls do it” includes parents mostly from lower classes who live in single unit houses so they have private yards (of course it’s overlooked) and since their sons are not at home during the day (they’re employed), so their daughter do these kinds of housework – like watering flowerbeds - of course with covered clothes. Beside this there are mothers that their daughters do the job because they enjoy it; they actually belong to “neutral” group.

7 – Parents preferences towards their children cleaning shared staircase

Question: Which one of your children do you prefer to clean the staircase of apartment?
Or: which one does it?

About three quarters of interviewees didn’t have an appropriate respond to this question; the important reason is that in most of apartments – prevailing kind of house form in Tehran – a worker cleans shared parts of the apartments like staircase. Many of answers presented this fact; and it’s why in many cases this question hasn’t been asked at all since the question had been inappropriate in interviewer’s mind. Furthermore in some houses, single units, there isn’t a shared staircase at all. These houses are seen in lower parts of the city as small units or inversely in upper parts as large villas.
So with this few numbers of answers it doesn’t seem right to be entered analyzing them, although they confirm previous findings.

8 – Parents attitudes towards their children using roof of the house

Question: Which one of your children allowed to use the roof for some activities?
Or: which one does something there?

During the past time when people lived in single unit houses and the roofs was private; and when the urban density was low and urban air was clean, residences of Tehran use the roofs for many activities, among them and most important ones sitting and sleeping there in summer during dark and cool time.

But now, roof uses limited to placing cooler set, TV and satellite antenna and in some cases hanging up the clothes. Very seldom people use it for sitting or sleeping.

So in this relation the appropriate question to be asked from samples, should be the one asking about whom goes to roof for setting the cooler or antenna or hanging the clothes up (like the next question about hanging up clothes)? But unfortunately the way the question has been asked that who uses roof for some activities caused wrong impression in interviewees’ mind about activities and in most cases people said no one use roofs; in few cases samples referred to occasional activities related to antenna or cooler setting. In this way the answers to this question were not appropriate and couldn’t present the actual situation, so it seems right not to be entered to its analyzing.

9 – Parents preferences towards their children hanging the clothes up in courtyards, balconies or roofs.

Question: Which one of your children do you prefer to hang the washed clothes in the yard or balcony or roof?
Or: which one does it?
Activities related to roofs most probably done by men or sons.

Very seldom this so overlooked space might be used for living free time activities.
Hanging up clothes in courtyard, balcony or roof

Hanging up clothes is generally considered a housework, so it’s usually done by mothers.
General findings

1 – Hand washing clothes and hanging those up, as housework is usually done by women even if it is related to overlooked spaces like courtyards, balconies or roofs. Women, who care about covering their bodies, do this job with suitable covering clothes. Since doing housework has changed during last decades, this job has also changed and in some cases men help women doing this job.

2 – So the largest group belong to those parents asserted that it’s mainly mothers who do this job. These parents belong to any social groups of gender identity.

3 – The second large group includes those parents who said that their daughters help their mothers doing this job, hanging up clothes. In many families children even daughters don’t participate in doing housework; they usually are studying in schools or universities, in families whose daughters don’t continue study anymore, they usually participate to help their mothers and this is mostly seen in conservative families – fathers of this group mostly – and lower or lower middle classes (mothers & fathers).

4 – Group of “neutral” parents is only “open” minded mothers as usual that asserted both of their children participate to do this job. Some of them said their daughters do it more and it present that most of the housework are still done by women even in “open” groups of gender identity.

5 – Parents who preferred their son hang up clothes in overlooked spaces are mostly fathers with “conservative” or “semi conservative” gender attitudes.

Conclusion

Now in this part, according to the general findings of different categories related to this chapter – activities in “semi public semi private spaces” and “gender identity” – the most important social spatial trends among different social groups in fact gender groups – here, among parents with different gender identities - would be extracted.

At first it’s referred to the most general trends, those which might be found among all gender groups of society. Then it’s pointed to those spatial attitudes found among some certain groups of gender identity for example “conservative” gender attitudes.
Now at first, the most general attitudes towards spatial uses of “semi public semi private spaces” seen among parents from different gender groups:

1 – Parents from different groups of gender identities asserted that their girls use “semi public semi private” spaces less than their boys or with more limitations. This conclusion made on the basis of former findings related to different categories of this chapter:

- finding no. 4, general findings of category balconies.
- finding no. 4, general findings of category neighborhood.
- finding no. 2, general findings of category local shopping.
- finding no. 2, general findings of category garbage.

Comparing different spaces of the kind, semi public semi private, it’s cleared that some of these spaces are more public like neighborhood spaces and some of them are more private like space of balcony. The important point about upper mentioned attitude is that it’s mostly related to activities in more public spaces of these kind means activities in neighborhood like local shopping in neighborhood, and putting garbage at the outdoor. (This last activity although it’s a short time one but it’s done in the dark time. Those two first activities in the neighborhood are surely done by boys during the dark time too). It’s obvious that insecurity in outdoor spaces is an important factor involved here. So activities in this kind of spaces getting more masculine while spaces getting more public; it’s why parents from different gender attitudes placed in this group or why this attitude is a general one dominated in whole society.

The other important point is the different references different gender groups made to the issue. As it’s pointed before, parents look at the issue by different values so more conservative parents think it’s a normal situation of society that girls should connect to public spaces of neighborhood more limited and by more controlled ways while more open minded parents look at this existed situation in society as social inequalities to be altered. It’s the important issue of internalizing the social spatial discriminations as values and believes.
Now, the attitudes mostly seen in more conservative groups of gender attitudes:

1 – Parents from “conservative or semi conservative” gender groups asserted that none of their children do something in semi public semi private spaces or they prefer so. These conservative parents more probably are fathers. This conclusion made on the basis of following former findings of this chapter:

- finding no. 3, general findings of category courtyards.
- finding no.3, general findings of category balconies.
- finding no. 3, general findings of category neighborhood.
- finding no.4, general findings of category local shopping.

2 - Parents from conservative or semi conservative gender groups asserted that their boys use semi public semi private spaces more than their girls; or their girls use those spaces with more limitations. Comparing this attitude – prevailed mostly in conservative groups - with the one of general attitudes – prevailed in most of the social groups – actually they are the same; the only fact could be found why some of these cases which referred to “more free boys”, are general and the others is associated to only conservative groups is that the general cases are related to the more public of this kind of spaces like neighborhood. This conclusion made on the basis of following findings has been made before during study on different categories of semi public semi private spaces:

- Finding no. 5, general findings of category courtyards.
- Finding no. 3, general findings of category watering flowerbeds.
- Finding no. 5, general findings of category hanging clothes up.

3 - Parents from lower and lower middle classes with conservative attitudes towards gender issues asserted that their girls do some of the housework even in semi public
spaces (overlooked ones) of house like balconies, yards or roofs with proper covered clothes. This conclusion made on the basis of following findings pointed before:

- Finding no. 5, general findings of category watering flowerbeds.
- Finding no. 3, general findings of category hanging up clothes.

And at last, attitudes have been seen in “open” group of gender identity:

1 - Parents with open attitudes towards gender issues who are mostly mothers asserted neutral notions about their children in using semi public semi private spaces most of the time. This conclusion made on the basis of following former findings:

– Findings no. 4, general findings of category courtyards.
- Finding no.2, general findings of category balconies.
– Finding no.2, general findings of category neighborhood.
- Finding no 3, general findings of category local shopping.
- Finding no. 4, general findings of category garbage.
- Finding no. 4, general findings of category watering flowerbeds.
- Finding no. 4, general findings of category hanging up clothes.

In this way there is a meaningful relationship between “gender identity” and “spatial identity” in “semi private semi public spaces” so parents with more conservative gender attitudes presented more “conservative” or “unequal” spatial attitudes and inversely more open gender attitudes asserted more “open” or “neutral” spatial attitudes.

Furthermore there is a tendency towards “conservative spatial behavior” in using “semi private semi public spaces” throughout society. We emphasize on “behavior” instead of “attitude” here and it points to the mentioned differences between open minded parents and conservative ones; while they are all placed in the group of “unequal” spatial identity, in fact they presented different reasoning for their behaviors.
Analyzing “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status”

“Sex”

Looking at the differences between mothers and fathers, following relations have been repeated in different categories of this chapter about fathers that:

1 – In different categories, most of the time fathers’ distribution tends to the group of “conservative” or “semi conservative” attitudes towards the issue (like group of limitation for girls). This is clear in categories no. 1 (yard), 2 (balcony), 3 (neighborhood), 4 (local shopping), 5 (garbage), and 6 (watering flowerbeds).

2 - In “conservative” or “semi conservative” spatial attitudes, most of the time, the weight of the parents distribution tends to the fathers. This is presented in categories no. 1 (yard), 2 (balcony, 3 (neighborhood), 6 (watering flowerbed), 9 (hanging up clothes).

And inversely the most important fact about mothers is that in repeated situations:

1 - Most of the time, number of mothers in “open” groups of spatial attitudes, relatively has been considerable. This is the fact about categories no.1 (yard), 2 (balconies), 3 (neighborhood), and 9 (hanging up clothes).

2 – In “open” groups of neutral, the weights of interviewees have been towards mothers. This fact has been the case in all categories.

So in general, mothers, in opposite to fathers in different situations have shown relatively more “neutral” or “open” spatial attitudes. And the opposite conditions are the fact for fathers.

“Class”

During debates on nine categories of this chapter (except categories no. 7 & 8), and on relationships between “spatial identity” and “gender identity”, and according to the tables no. 1 to 9 (except no. 7 & 8) of this chapter, it has been pointed in different categories that: educated parents from middle and upper classes have mostly presented equitable “open” attitudes towards spatial issues and inversely low educated parents from lower middle and lower classes have mostly presented more “conservative” notions. This has been concluded according to following points:
1 – Groups of neutral parents made mostly from educated samples from middle and upper classes.

2 – Educated parents from middle and upper classes who are seen within conservative general spatial groups, most of the time were those “open” (in their gender attitudes) minded parents within conservative spatial groups – like groups of “more free boys” - they were analyzing the social conditions as the reasons for their conservative spatial behavior.

3 - Again these educated parents from middle and upper classes who rarely belonged to group of “both don’t use” or “limitation for both”, are those “open” minded parents which other reasons except their gender identities had been the motives for their spatial behavior for example compare these two sayings from two mothers who are opposite in their gender identities but both placed in the same group of “both don’t use” courtyard:

   ![Sample no. 36](image)

   Sample no. 36 (a higher educated and participant breadwinner mother from upper class):

   Your yard is overlooked by other neighbors. Are your children allowed to use it?
   -They are allowed but they don’t use it themselves. They don’t like to use the yard.
   -What’s the reason?
   -It’s so small. Maybe the reason is that it’s not beautiful perhaps if it was built more beautifully, they would prefer to spend if it was built more beautiful. It’s not big either. Therefore they wouldn’t think about it.

   ![Sample no. 5](image)

   Sample no. 5 (an educated housewife – high school diploma - from lower middle class):

   Q: If you had a shared yard would they use?
   A: No now we can use the roof but my son doesn’t go there. He thinks maybe our neighbors don’t like it. My husband even doesn’t go near the windows causes a problem (for neighbors).

4 –Several parents from upper classes despite their semi conservative attitudes (actually semi conservative) towards gender issues showed open neutral notions towards
spatial issues related to their children in different cases. It seems financial possibilities they have and their more connections to the modern culture of western world make the situation so that their both children connect to public spaces more freely even than the children of “open” minded parents.

5 - “Conservative” group of “limitation for girls” or “boys do it”, most of the time included more parents from lower or lower middle classes, these parents showed internalized values towards the issue.

6 – Those activities in semi public semi private spaces of the house which considered as housework are done by covered daughters helping mothers mostly in lower and lower middle classes. It’s based on traditional division of gender roles.

To précising these parallel changes of “social class” and “spatial identity”, or “educational level” and “spatial identity”, as was pointed in the discussion related to “gender identity” also of “private space”, two last chapters, we could see the mentioned parallel existences of “open” and “conservative” spatial identities in each social classes (although by different strengths), in other words, parallel existences of these opposite notions throughout society. Distribution of different spatial attitudes would be better explained by the “educational level” than the “social class” since the “social class” is a multilayer variable composed by not only “educational level” but also “income” and “employment”. If we set aside two last variables and only consider the “educational level”, it would be cleared that while conservative spatial attitudes are seen throughout social classes including upper classes too, but the most conservative claims never seen among higher educated people. The opposite trend means distribution of “open” spatial group also excludes “open” spatial attitudes from lower educated samples (of course not mothers).

For presenting how “educational level” could be more implying than the “social class”, we could compare these two answers of two fathers which although they placed in the same middle class, also the same group of “boys do it” – in category of watering flowerbed - but they actually have different level of education along with their opposite gender identities and different attitudes to this spatial issue:
Sample no. 15 (a higher educated and participant breadwinner father from upper middle class):

Because of the situations here, my son usually does it. Not because I have problem with it, just for the atmosphere of here.

Sample no. 10 (a low educated and householder father from middle class):

Which one of your children has the permission to water the flower bed of the yard?
The boy
Who waters the flowerbed in front of the door?
None of them. The municipality would do. But if it was necessary, my son does it. Sometimes I myself water the flowers too.

And the same is about these two fathers of upper class placed in two opposite spatial attitudes:

Sample no. 29 (a higher educated householder father from upper class):

Do they have permission to spend time in an overlooked balcony? Even they are seen?
100% there’s no problem

Sample no. 11 (an educated – high school diploma - householder father from upper class):

If your balcony was overlooked by your neighbors’ house or the alley or the street, would you let your children use it?
No, they’re not comfortable themselves and also they draw other people’s attention.

These two fathers while both from upper class they presented opposite notions towards this spatial attitude. They have different levels of education and different kinds of gender attitudes either. So it confirms again the more importance of “educational level” than “social class” to imply “gender spatial identity”.
**Breadwinning status**

Generally since there are small numbers of samples within different groups of gender identity – considering 15 groups of study – while in this chapter near to half of the samples missed for many questions and probably because of the other influential factors like “sex” or “class”, also existence of general spatial attitudes in society, a clear relationship couldn’t be seen between gender identity and breadwinning status.

**Internalized discrimination**

This matter was pointed for different times meanwhile this chapter’s discussion; internalized discriminations could generally being interpreted as being unconscious towards unequal gender relations. This issue is a relational situation which has been referred previously in different parts as followed:

- In general changes from “conservative” spatial attitudes towards “open” spatial attitudes, means a range of people from whom they are unconscious to those who are conscious towards existing unequal gender relations.

- This different consciousness was seen among each spatial group of “boy preferred to do the job” or “none of them preferred to do the job”; these groups against “neutral” groups apparently seem to present a conservative attitude towards using different spaces, while in fact samples within each group presented different consciousnesses towards the situation, since they delivered different reasoning for their attitudes or behaviors.

- The variables studied here as they influence on “gender identity” or “spatial identity”, mean “class”, education”, “sex”, and breadwinning status, all of them should be considered as influential to “gender consciousness” either.
Chapter Seven

“Gender” and “Public Space”

Introduction

In this chapter questions related to public spaces of city will be investigated. Through these questions mothers and fathers of young girls and boys expressed their opinions about how their children (boys and girls) should use different public spaces or how their children use those spaces in their real practice which both reflect parents’ attitudes towards studying spatial issues.

Ten questions in this general subject made ten categories of public space here that are examined from a gender perspective:

1 – Parents attitudes towards the way their children go to educational spaces.
2 – Parents attitudes towards the condition their children could drive in the city.
3 - Parents attitudes towards the way their children do their personal shopping.
4 – Parents attitudes towards the condition their children spend their free times in the city.
5 - Parents attitudes towards the ultimate time in the evening their children could stay out of home.
6 - Parents attitudes towards the condition their children could cycle in the neighborhood or the city.
7 - Parents attitudes towards the condition their children could ride a motorbike in the city.
8 - Parents attitudes towards the condition their children could educate in other city far from family.
9 - Parents attitudes towards the condition their children do official or banking affairs.
10 - Parents attitudes towards the condition their children could work to earn money.
1 – Parents attitudes towards the ways their children commute to educational spaces

Question: Since when have your children gone to school or university alone and how? Or: Do you let them go to school or university alone? (Table no. 1)

General findings

1 – Responding to this question, parents expressed their notions in two different ways: those who presented the same attitudes towards their both girls and boys according the way and conditions they commute to educational spaces; and those parents who let their boys commute to school more independently than their girls.

2 – Considering this issue (the way of commuting to school), some strong factors except gender attitude involved: - The neighborhood social security - The plan of neighborhood and its safety from motor traffic (safety conditions of the route between house and school considering motor traffic) - the distance between house and school.

These factors strongly influence the condition of independency of girls and boys in the way they go to and back from school and obscure the influences of parents’ gender attitudes into the using of space considering this issue.

3 – Mentioned conditions – social security, safety from motor transportation, and short pedestrian distance to school – if happened in neighborhood, the situations could be so that parents feel security and let their children even their little girls go to elementary school independently. In these cases the influence of gender attitude that makes differences among different gender groups of parents is weaken so different parents of different gender identity groups could be seen in the same group who asserted the same condition of independency for their boys and girls in going to school (group of equal situation).

4 – “Age” is other affective factor which influences the independency of girls and boys. In fact, as much as they are getting old as teenagers or older, they go to university or their job more independently. In this situation differences between girls and boys in the ways of commuting to university or job presented in the kind of vehicle they use
(from the point of their personal safety) or the time of day and night they move in the city (it’s the subject of other question).

5 – Except upper mentioned conditions in the city or neighborhood which could provide the same safe situations for both girls and boys, many parents from different social classes or different gender identity groups expressed more dependency of their girls compared to their boys: parents accompany their girls going to school more than their boys; when they both using school services, boys leave this kind of vehicle service in younger age sooner than girls usually during secondary school, while girls continue till the end of high school; boys use different systems of public transport more easily but girls use the safer ones. This is all because of the insecure situations in the city caused girls commute to school in a more controlled way.

6 - In fact gender differences existed in practice in society considering this issue of commuting to school is strongly influenced by social reality of insecurity for women too. These situations like the urban structure and neighborhood social security obscure the parents’ gender identity as an affective variable here as it is seen in other cases of this study, so the meaningful relations couldn’t be seen between parents’ gender identity and the way of children’s commuting to school (spatial identity).

7 – As conclusion, there are two social trends regarding this issue of commuting to school, both general and distributed among different gender groups; first trend is that in secure situations in the neighborhood caused from urban structure and social factors or short distance to school, parents let both their children go to school independently; and the second trend is that in insecure situation – caused from motor traffic and social factors too - dominated in many parts of the city, girls commute to school under more controlled ways.

8 – Influences of “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status” - Since “gender identity” couldn’t present its influences here, its variables of “class”, “sex”, and “breadwinning status” don’t show meaningful relations with the “spatial identity” neither.
Formal bus & minibus make more safety vehicle comparing informal taxis for young girls and boys commuting to school.
• Different standing line of different kinds of public transportation:
• Formal bus (gender separated)
• Minibus & taxis (gender mixed)
2 – Parents attitudes towards the conditions their children could drive in the city

Question: Which one of your children could have or drive private car in the city? (If you could provide a private car for your children, which one of them is preferred)? (Table no. 2)

General Finding

1 – Regarding the issue of driving in the city, parents expressed their attitudes in three ways: those who declared no preferences about their girls or boys driving in the city; the second and third group are those who mentioned one of their girls or boys in their preferences.

2 – The largest group belongs to those who presented a neutral attitude towards the issue; they are mostly educated parents from middle and upper classes that distributed among different gender groups except conservative parents.

3 - Some parents – few ones – mentioned their girls in their preferences. The important point about their reasoning is that they pointed to the more safety using the car could provide for their girls moving in the city especially during the dark time. These parents are mostly from upper class and “open” groups of gender identity.

4 – Those parents who mentioned their boys in their preferences, implicitly referred to their sons’ employment as the reason that they need a car for easier commuting to their job. This is the fact especially about lower and lower middle classes that their sons work very soon after graduation. Furthermore these parents are mostly conservative in their gender attitudes; this is clear especially for fathers; all the conservative fathers and most of the conservative mothers belong to this group.

5 – So in general, there is a trend of parallel changes between “gender identity” and “spatial attitude” that when “gender identity” getting more open, “spatial attitude” towards the condition of children’s driving in the city getting more neutral (or in this case towards girls’ benefits).

Existence of parents with semi open, semi conservative gender attitudes in different groups of spatial attitudes from open to conservative shows again the duality of situations this largest group of society lives in.
Influences of “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status” (variables of gender identity) – Distribution of fathers and mothers (variable of sex) among different groups of “spatial attitudes” presents relative equality. “Social class” shows a parallel changes in relation with “spatial identity”; it means that distribution of parents of different social classes among different spatial groups is so that the class goes higher where the spatial group tends to “open” notions (means “neutral” notions towards girls & boys’ driving and for this case means group of “girl preferred” too) and inversely. In other words, the numbers of upper classes (upper class and upper middle class) samples getting more when spatial group getting “open”; inversely in “conservative” group of spatial attitudes (group of “boy preferred” here), the number of lower classes (lower class and lower middle class) samples getting more. This relation, seen within changes of “spatial identity” and “social class”, is the same as relation between “spatial identity” and “gender identity” mentioned before, since “social class” is one variable of “gender identity” and the main among them.

Deliberation on sample distribution, also shows other mentioned fact about social classes that: despite the process of arranging more “open” spatial or gender attitudes in upper classes and inversely more “conservative” spatial or gender attitudes in lower classes, but also there are samples of different social classes in each of “open” group of “neutral”, “girl preferred” and “conservative” group of “boy preferred”. This indicates second social trend of coexistence of “open” and “conservative” notions along, in one “social class.

“Breadwinning status” shows most of the householders (fathers and mothers) in conservative group of “boy preferred”; and most of the participants (fathers and mothers) in open group of “equal situation”.

3 – Parents attitudes towards the way their children do their personal shopping

Question: How do your children do their personal shopping, with parents, or friends or alone? (Table no. 3)
Different parts of the city, different public scene of men & women drivers in the city
General findings

1 – Regarding the issue of children’s shopping, parents asserted four different kinds of attitudes: some parents said one of their girls or boys are more independent in their personal shopping; some said that both of them are independent and some declared that both of them do their shopping with parents or other member of family.

2 - Considering the interviewee distributions, it seems this issue – shopping – is strongly influenced by financial possibilities of social class so in those upper middle or upper classes with more budgets for shopping, children do their shopping more easily and more independently; and inversely in lower middle or lower classes with limited budgets, shopping is done by parents’ supervision in more cases.

3 – Few mothers mostly from upper class and all open minded in their gender attitudes asserted that their daughters do shopping independently and sometimes do it for their sons too, while their sons depend on their families in this relation; and the reasons except family gender attitudes, seems to be related to age, personal characteristics or sociability of the sons.

4 - Those parents who let both of their children do shopping independently are either those parents from middle classes belong to open gender attitude groups, or upper classes parents either open or semi open – semi conservative towards gender issues; in fact for upper class, financial possibilities and the money spending for the children needs make the situation so that semi open - semi conservative parents of this social class let both of their girls and boys doing their shopping independently.

5 - Controlling parents who accompany their both children in their shopping are mostly those from lower and middle classes that either they have presented before conservative – or semi conservative - gender attitudes or they have limited money to spend for children’s shopping (lower class).

6 – At the same time, some parents mostly from lower and lower middle, either conservative or open said that they (mostly mothers) accompany their girls but not the boys in their shopping. It presents more dependency of girls to mothers in their shopping in some families. Existence of some open minded parents in this conservative spatial attitude is in the result of social insecurity for women that closes this spatial behavior to
general one and caused these open minded parents to be influenced in their spatial behaviors; of course these parents are more conscious to their behaviors.

7 – The important point is that all householder mothers from lower and middle classes belong to those two groups of “equal dependency” and “more independent boys”. It means more conservative spatial attitudes towards their children both or their daughters only.

8 – So in general regarding this issue of shopping, there is a general association between “gender identity” and “spatial attitude”; a parallel change of “gender identity” with “spatial identity”; it means while “gender identity” getting more open, “spatial identity” getting more neutral and even towards girls independency in this case.

Also there is a strong influence of financial possibilities of social class regarding this issue of shopping.

9 – Influences of “sex”, “social class”, and “breadwinning status” – While mothers have more members in two “open” groups of “more independent girl” and “equal independency”, fathers have more members in two “conservative” ones of “equal dependency” and “more independent boys”.

“Social class” firstly presented its influences in upper mentioned process in last paragraph as a variable of “gender identity”; secondly it presents its influence this time stronger because of the association between financial possibility and shopping; more upper and middle class samples seen in two “open” spatial attitudes (“more independent girl” and “equal independency”), and more lower and lower middle class samples in “conservative” groups of “equal dependency” and “more independent boy”. Third important point about social class is that regarding “conservative” spatial group of “both dependencies”, samples with “conservative” gender attitude from all social classes are seen; it presents of existence of conservative notions either towards gender or space in all social classes; of course as it was mentioned in chapter of “gender identity”, “conservative” notions haven’t seen in higher educated people from any social classes. Higher educated people at their most conservative situation are placed in “semi conservative, semi open” group of attitudes. The opposite relation means lack of association between low educated parents with “open” spatial attitudes is true for the fathers not the mothers.
Shopping has various characteristics in different parts of the city, residential places of different groups:
Some youngsters do shopping with family and some do it independently.
The meaningful relation of “breadwinning status” with spatial identity is seen in the association of all householder mothers (except upper class householder) and “conservative” spatial attitudes; and including of most participant breadwinner mothers in group of “neutral”.

4 - Parents attitudes towards the ways their children spend their free times in the public spaces of city

Question: 1 - How do your children spend their free time in public spaces of city (like cinemas, parks, restaurants, sport centers ...), with families, friends, or alone? 2 - Do they spend most of their free time out or at home? (Table no. 4)

General findings:

1 – Parents attitudes towards the ways that their children spend their free time out of the house could be placed in four groups; group who asserted equal dependency for their boys and girls, group who expressed equal independency for them, and two groups who asserted more dependency of their girls or boys to their families.

2 - It’s worth mentioning that only one mother said her girls go out more to the city than her boy and it’s because of son’s personality.

3 – Group of equal independency who asserted that both daughter and son spend most of their free time out of the house independently with friends, mostly includes upper class parents – semi open or open in their gender attitudes – and open minded mothers from middle class. The important point about upper class is that their children have got different material facilities for using city spaces more easily and safely like personal cars or personal cell phones, so even parents with semi conservative notions towards gender issues let their children both spend time out of the house with more peaceful mind and less anxiety.

4 – Parents from different social classes – with decreases among upper class - and mostly fathers made the third group of respondents that asserted the same dependency of their children to their family in spending time in the city. Although there are open minded
parents within group but relatively this group included more conservative attitudes towards gender issues. This is the fact especially among fathers.

5 – The last group belongs to largest group of parents (mostly mothers) that presented more independency of their sons in this relation, that boys going out and use public spaces of the city more easily and more often than girls; although they are mostly from lower and middle classes with semi conservative or conservative gender attitudes, but upper social classes and open gender attitudes are also included., so it is also a general notion among society. Among this group more conservative parents expressed the situation as social normality, and parents who pointed to the social abnormality that cause girls couldn’t use city as free as boys and to be more dependent on their families (they are conscious parents with open attitudes towards gender issues). This largest group shows the general situation in society that girls comparing to boys use public spaces of the city with more limitations, either girls themselves don’t use city freely or couldn’t use or they are not allowed.

6 – The other fact about this group – more dependency of girls - is that all the householder mothers from lower and middle class belong to this group. As pointed before, these lonely mothers live in the city without proper social support and with more anxiety towards their situations in society, so it’s natural that they worry about their girls more and try to save them from the dangers of the city.

7 – As conclusion, this issue again shows the parallel changes between “gender identity” and “spatial identity”; it points to the increasing of samples with “open” gender attitudes in two groups of “more independent girls” and “equal independency” and inversely decreasing of those samples in two groups of “more independent boys” and “equal dependency”.

The other fact is shown by this issue is the more insecurity for girls and women in society that cause general spatial attitude in society regarding the “more dependency of girls”; of course there are differences among “conservative” and “open” samples pointing to this notion according their consciousness towards gender differences.

8 – Influences of “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status” – Mothers comparing fathers have more members in two open groups of spatial identity (sex). Despite this, total numbers of fathers and mothers in conservative group of “more independent boy”
- Cinemas in different parts of the city with different characteristics:
- Domination of young girls and boys
- Domination of male presence
Many parks in day time have a family safe characteristics and young girls could also enjoy from it.
Restaurants with different characteristics in different parts of the city:
Restaurant with gender mixed characteristics used by family and youngsters
Restaurants with male domination near to male job centers
are high and near to each other; this show the situation resulting from social insecurity in the city.

“Class” shows its influences strongly in placing most members of upper class in group of “equal independency” and all lower class samples in conservative spatial attitudes (“more independent boys” and “equal dependency”); so as before, class influences seen in parallel with gender identity changes within different spatial attitudes.

Secondly regarding to two conservative groups of spatial attitudes having members from different social classes, it reflects the social insecurity specially for women from one side, and it presents spatial conservative notions as the general notion in all social classes of society from the other side.

“Breadwinning status” (being housekeeper or householder or participant breadwinner) doesn’t show meaningful relations with “spatial identity” except that conservative householder mother from middle and lower all belong to conservative group of “more independent boy”.

5 – Parents attitudes towards the ultimate time in the evening their children could stay out of home

Question: How long after darkness (till what time) could your children stay out of home? (Table no. 5)

General findings

1 - Different interviewee parents presented their notions towards the time in the evening their boys and girls should be at home in three ways; some set the longer time for their boys could be out, some set the same limitation, short time after darkness for both of them could be out, and at last some parents allow both of them to be out for longer time after darkness.

2 – There aren’t any parents who allow their daughters stay out of home for longer time than their boys.
3 - The absolute majority of parents allow their boys come back home later than their girls. This attitude distributed among all social groups of society, within mothers and fathers, different social classes, different position of breadwinning in family, and also different groups of gender identities. So again social insecurity for girls provides the same condition for all groups of society and obscures the influences of other variables. But the important point here again is the way that parents point to the issue so that conservative parents think about this issue as a natural and normal fact of relationship between genders that make unsafe situation for girls so they try to make secure situation for their girls by not letting them to be out after darkness and let their boys experience their dominated situations. While open minded parents most of the time refer to the issue of insecurity for girls as the social abnormality that could and should be changed to ideal one in that every one like women feel safe and move in the city freely. These parents while preserve their daughters from dangers of the city, they believe that their boys should be learned to behave in society in a right way to provide secure situations for all.

4 – The important point about mentioned group – more freely boys – is again that all the householder mothers of any social class belong to this group who are worry about their girls.

5 - Some strict parents, mostly fathers and mostly with conservative or semi conservative gender identity from middle and upper classes asserted the same limited time for both of their girls and boys.

6 – A few parents, only from upper class considered the same time relatively long for both of their children. These parents instead of their gender notions, semi open – semi conservative, because of their material facilities - providing private car or possibility of using private taxis or having cell phone - for all of their young children could let them to be out of home safe for longer time.

7 – Here, two social trends could be seen; one trend, general and strong included in most of social & gender groups and resulted from the insecure conditions for the girls in the city especially during dark time that caused more limitations and more limited time for them staying out of home. As before, kind of referring different groups of gender identities did to the issue is totally different and it again indicates parallel changes of “spatial identity” and “gender identity”. These situations of insecurity in the city caused...
Public scene getting more male dominated and unsafe for women, while it’s getting more dark
Men comparing women use public spaces of city more easily & more comfortably
some more strict parents specially fathers make limitations for both of them. Second trend only seen in upper classes that letting their both children staying out for long time and it’s possible because of their financial facilities.

8 – *Influences of “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status”* – As mentioned, social situations of insecurity for girls especially during the dark time provide the same general attitudes among samples towards the issue but among this general attitude relatively more mothers (sex), more educated people of middle and upper classes (class) and more participant breadwinners (breadwinning status) expressed their open analysis towards the issue. This is beside the conditions of some upper class people who could provide same secure situation for their children by their material possibilities (influence of class); also this fact that the father’s numbers in strict group of “equal limitation” is clearly more than mothers (influence of sex).

6 – **Parents attitudes towards their children’s cycling in the neighborhood or the city**

**Question:** Which one of your children could cycle in the neighborhood area or city? (Table no. 6)

**General findings**

1 – As introduction, cycling isn’t a kind of usual transportation vehicle in Tehran now days and the urban planning and design didn’t regard it to plan especial safe routs for cycling. So in general it’s not accepted as a safe vehicle in the city except as the recreational facilities in some rare neighborhood or in some special parks. From the other side it also considered as a male vehicle; from the point of cultural and social values, females are not usual to cycle in the city freely everywhere, except little girls or within some certain neighborhoods and parks far away from public scene.

2 - Parents attitudes towards their children’s cycling in the neighborhood or the city are distributed relatively balanced (total numbers of mothers and fathers) among three groups of notions: 1 - Parents who asserted that their both of their children allowed to
cycle but there are some external limiting conditions. 2 – Parents who allowed none of them cycle in the city. 3 – And those parents who let their boys cycle but not their girls.

3 - Those parents of first group asserted that if the city is safe from the motor vehicles and if the cultural and social aspects permit, they certainly let their both children enjoy from cycling in the city. These parents are mostly mothers and belong mostly to the open and open informed groups of gender identity; they are only from middle and upper classes; they deliberate the issue very well.

4 – Parents of second group (both not allowed) definitely rejected their children cycle in the city. Despite apparent similarity with the first group they didn’t refer to the issue like them. Insecurity routes and limiting social values are something usual in their notions not challenging with them. These parents are mostly conservative or semi conservative in their gender attitudes.

5 – Parents of third group said their boys are allowed and cycle in the neighborhood or city, but their girls are not allowed or don’t do it. Samples of this notion although included few open minded mothers but they are mostly conservative or semi conservative in their gender attitudes. Existing open minded parents in this group is in the result of the social and cultural limitations for girls’ cycling in the public that they didn’t refer to it clearly.

6 – Almost all householder mother from lower and lower middle classes belong to two conservative notions towards cycling in the city; it means groups of “both not allowed” and “boys allowed”.

7 – Again it could be seen a general trend relating the issue of cycling in the city; this strong trend shows changes in attitudes towards cycling associated with changes of gender identity that parents of the open groups of gender identity mostly like cycling for both girls & boys (if it was possible) while more conservative ones don’t let none of them or only their girls cycling in the public.

8 – Influences of “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status” – Mothers comparing fathers (sex) include most of the numbers of group “both allowed” means open and conscious group of spatial attitude.

Only upper and middle classes included in group of “both allowed” and only few upper class in conservative groups of “both not allowed” or “boys allowed” (class).
While cycling isn’t a usual safe kind of transportation in the city, culturally it’s a male kind too in public scene.
Regarding “social class” again must be pointed that meanwhile the general associated changing process between “spatial” or “gender” attitudes and “social class” mentioned above, there are minorities of samples narrate about other process; it presents the existence of all social classes in each group of “spatial” or “gender” identity. In most of the cases like this category of cycling, there are samples of upper classes in “conservative” spatial attitudes; the opposite situation means existence of lower classes in “open” spatial groups are rarely and only within mothers observed; and as it will be analyzed later it’s because of the variable of education in “social class”.

Most of participant breadwinner mothers belong to open group of “both allowed”. And almost all householder mothers from lower and lower middle classes belong to two conservative notions towards cycling in the city; it means groups of “both not allowed” and “boys allowed” (breadwinning status).

7 - Parents attitudes towards their children’s riding motor bike in the city

Question: Which one of your children could ride a motor bike in the city? (Table no. 7)

General findings

1 - Motor bike is one of the usual vehicles of transportation in Tehran, only used by men and since it costs relatively lower so used mostly by lower and lower middle classes for commuting to work or as a facility of their job (carrying something related to their job). And it sometimes used dangerously as family’s vehicle of transportation.

2 - Most of the parents – from any social classes or any gender group - disagreed with their sons and of course their daughters ride motor bike in the city because of its low safety.

3 – Other few parents (conservative or semi conservative mostly from lower and lower middle social classes) said that their sons ride or could ride motor bike in the city. They mostly use it for commuting to their work.
4 – So there is a strong and general trend of refusing riding motorbike because of its low safety in all gender groups. Other trend presents boys’ riding bicycle in lower or lower middle classes usually with conservative or semi conservative gender attitudes.

5 – **Influences of “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status”** - In first trend, since “gender identity” doesn’t show its influences, neither do its variables. In second trend only “class” shows its affect.

8 – **Parents attitudes towards the condition their children could educate in other city far from family**

**Question:** In your opinion, which one of your children could continue her (his) education in university in other cities? (Table no. 8)

**General Findings**

1 – Parents who responded to this question – not all the samples - made three groups of answers: those who let both their girls and boys continue their education in other cities; those who disagreed with this issue; and those who let only their boys go to other cities for university education.

2 - The largest group of interviewee that among them mothers made the majority, agreed with both of their children continuing their university education in other cities far away from their families. Large number of interviewee in this group shows again the importance of university education for both girls and boys in people’s mind from any social groups.

3 – While parents from any social classes and any gender identity groups belong to this group, and this shows the expansion of the notion among society, but considering the table no. 8, most of the upper class interviewees and half of the middle class respondents belong to this group of agreeable; and this shows either the importance of the issue for these social classes or their financial possibilities to make them able to send their children to other cities.
Motorcycle, a main vehicle of transportation used only by men for different uses: commuting to job, transportation of family in the city, and as instrument of carrier
4 - Parents (mostly mothers) of the second group who presented their disagreements with their both girls and boys go to another city for their university education, conservative or semi conservative, either are anxious parents about unsafe society, or have financial problem in this relation (lower classes).

5 – Parents who said that they let only their boys go to other cities for education they expressed their anxious about social insecurity for their girls, lonely in other cities far from the family. This group made from mostly conservative or semi conservative parents. Most of them are fathers, and most of the respondent fathers belong to this group too.

6 – Although only half of the samples and fewer fathers among them responded to this question, but a general trend could be seen that shows parallel changes of “gender attitudes” with “spatial attitudes” towards the subject of education in other cities; it presented relatively more open gender attitudes in group of “both allowed” and more conservative ones in conservative groups of “both not allowed” and “boys allowed”. This trend seems to include gradually more and more from conservative gender group in neutral spatial group since there are some of them already; in fact within this trend, neutral attitudes towards the issue is more strong even now.

7 – Influences of “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status” – For this general trend mothers showed more eagerness towards the issue (sex); middle and upper class show more numbers that except than their gender attitudes it’s because of their financial possibilities (class). By these numbers of samples it’s seen no meaningful relation between “breadwinning status” and spatial attitudes”.

9 – Parents attitudes towards the way their children do family’s official or banking affairs

Question: Do you let your children (which one) doing official or bank affairs of the family? (Table no. 9)

General findings

1 - Different sample parents presented their attitudes about how their children do family’s official or banking affairs, in four different ways.
2 – Only one householder mother said that her girl do the job instead of her son. According to her other sayings about her son that he has done some social crime, it seems she doesn’t trust her son for doing this kind of job.

3 – Majority of parents, mostly mothers said their both children are allowed or are doing the job, no difference. These notions belong to different social groups of gender attitudes and different social classes, of course with more members of middle and upper. In other words, some members of lower class, many members of middle class and all members of upper class included. Those who referred to the age of children as the involved condition are included in this group too

4 – A few mothers lower or lower middle class householders (conservative or semi conservative) said that their children don’t do the job, so they themselves do it.

5 – Some parents – more fathers among them and most of the respondent fathers in this group too – asserted their son do the job. They are mostly conservative or semi conservative in their gender attitudes.

6 – Although small numbers of samples included but a general trend could be seen. This trend shows relatively more open gender attitudes with more neutral spatial attitudes from one side and more conservative gender attitudes with more conservative groups of spatial attitudes – “both not to do” and “boys allowed” – from the other side. This trend meanwhile shows some conservative or semi conservative parents in group of letting “both do the job” and it shows that this trend – girls’ participating in social works like boys – is developing among more conservative groups too, gradually. It also indicates of relatively more women’s security in this official places.

7 – Influences of “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status” – Because of the small numbers of samples specially among fathers, it’s not possible to conclude about “sex”; only regarding mothers could be said that most of them placed in the neutral group of “both allowed”. “Breadwinning status” doesn’t present its affect because of the same reason, also because of the general trend in society about social practice of women. But social “class” changes parallel by “gender identity” in relation to “spatial attitudes” towards the issue. But the important point is that this trend changes gradually to be a general one included all gender groups in neutral group of spatial identity, it means more
Bank spaces in different parts of the city,
Young boys mostly do banking affairs of the family;
in some families young girls do the job too.
and more gender identity groups of all social classes of society let both their girls and boys do this kind of job.

10 – Parents attitudes towards the conditions their children could work out of the house to have income

Question: Do you let your children (which one) work to have income, by which conditions? (Table no. 10)

General findings

1 – Responding to this question, parents’ answering made only two groups; those who permit both of them to have a job in society and those who permit only their boys to work.

2 – Majority of parents and almost all the mothers allow their both children working out of the house, so they are from any social groups of gender attitude or any social classes. This general notion towards the issue of working girls rather than its social– economical necessities, it seems influenced by more safety of this kind of official working places for women comparing to other public spaces. It seems the same regarding the last category about banking or official works.

3 – Mostly lower class parents of this group (agreeable) and semi conservative expressed some kind of condition for their working girls, something like a good feminine environment, or a promising and honorable job.

4 – All the householder mothers included in the group of agreeable with working girls. Those conservative householder mothers from lower and lower middle classes that presented before their unwillingness to their employment – they have said before that they work because they have to, in absence of their husbands – this time said their daughters are better to work. It seems again that the financial conditions of the family force them to live opposite to their wishes. Also it’s the social changing trend that they couldn’t stop following it; they have accepted before their girls continue their education
Young girls and women are entering the workforce more and more.
at least till graduation of high school; now they couldn’t stop their girls to get benefit from their education, to work in society, being independent and having income.

5 – All the semi conservative fathers of this group, agreeable are participant breadwinner and have employed wives; so it seems that even if they have some conservative notions towards gender issues, but since their wives are working and they have accepted it before, so they let their daughters work too.

6 – Group disagreeable with working girls that let only their boys work outside, are almost all householder conservative fathers.

7 – Although this question like two last ones included half of the samples and less fathers among them, but a general trend could be seen in society accepting girls employment out of the house more and more, only some conservative householder fathers from lower class and a few from middle class refused their daughters’ employment.

8 – Influences of “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status” – regarding the subject of employment, relatively more mothers (sex), more middle and upper classes (class), and at last more employed mothers and more participant fathers (breadwinning status) are included in more open attitudes towards employment (group of “both allowed”).

Conclusions

In this section, main spatial attitudes concluded from the chapter’s ten part discussions about the parents’ attitudes towards the preferred way their girls and boys use public spaces of the city, the general findings and the main trends defined in each ten sections.

At first it’s pointed to those general attitudes of society that’s expanded in almost all social groups of gender identity; they certainly include as much more of parents of different social classes, fathers and mothers, and parents with different status of breadwinning in their family (three variables of sex, class & breadwinning status considered in this study for gender identity as the main independent variable of study).

Then it’s referred to those attitudes belong to some gender groups of urban society of Tehran. It means attitudes mostly seen in, for example “open” group of gender identity or
those of “conservative” groups. It’s important to note that “semi conservative – semi open” groups of gender identity have always a position shared with one of the “open” or “conservative” groups. In fact this binary position between those two groups is the logic of their name.

In the next part, consideration would be towards the three variables – “sex”, “class”, and “breadwinning status” – of “gender identity and their relations with “spatial attitude”.

Finally there would be a discussion about important issue of “internalized discrimination”.

Now at first, the most general attitudes:

**A - The most general spatial attitudes**

These are notions which are seen throughout different social groups of the study, it means different groups of “gender identity” from “open” to “conservative” groups of parents. It also means almost all gender identity groups with their changes by social class, sex, and breadwinning status:

**A - 1 – Parents by different gender identities believe that their girls should use urban spaces of the city with more limitations and by more controlled ways:**

The common point among all following cases is issue of insecurity for women in the city that in some cases added by social cultural understanding of the issue. This conclusion made on the basis of some general findings of different ten section discussion in this chapter:

– Finding no. 5, general findings of category commuting to school.
– Finding no. 6, general findings of category personal shopping.
- Finding no. 5, general findings of category spending free time in the city.
- Finding no. 3, general findings of category the time in the evening to be at home.

**A – 2 – Parents from different “gender identities” believe neutrally towards their boys’ and girls’ some activities in society.**
In addition to the upper mentioned attitude – more preservation of girls in society – as a common attitude in society, there is other general notion in different gender groups which look at some girls and boys activities in society in similar way. In most of these attitudes, some other strong conditions in society influence the situation and weaken gender differences and push it to other areas. According to four following cases and except the first finding, others indicate the general process of society towards equal gender relations. This conclusion made on the basis of following general findings in ten section discussion:

- Finding no. 2, general findings of category motorbike riding.
- Findings no. 2 & 3, general findings of category education in other cities.
- Finding no. 3, general findings of category banking and official works.
- Finding no. 2, general findings of category employment.

**B – Attitudes mostly seen in “open” groups of gender identity**

These parents are mostly educated from middle and upper classes.

**B – 1 – Parents of more “open” group of “gender identity” believe neutrally towards their girls’ and boys’ activities in public spaces of the city.**

This conclusion made on the basis of following general findings of ten section discussion of the chapter:

- Finding no.2, general findings of category driving in the city.
- Finding no. 4, general findings of category personal shopping.
- Finding no. 3, general findings of category spending free time in the city.
- Finding no.6, general findings of category the time in the evening to be at home.
- Finding no. 3, general findings of category cycling.

**B – 2 – Parents of more “open” groups of “gender identity” believe they should consider more facilities for their girls’ safety in society.**
This conclusion made on the basis of one following case of ten section discussion:

- Finding no. 3, general findings of category driving in the city.

**C – Attitudes are mostly seen in more “conservative” groups of gender identity.**

These parents, “conservative” or “semi conservative – semi open”, although seen in different social classes but they increases by social class getting lower and uneducated.

**C – 1 – Parents of more “conservative” groups of “gender identity” present more dependency of their girls to family or more limitation for them compared to their boys in using public spaces and inversely more freedom for their boys**

This conclusion made on the basis of following general findings of ten section discussion in the chapter:

- Finding no. 5, general findings of category cycling.
- Finding no. 5, general findings of category education in other cities.
- Finding no. 5, general findings of category banking or official works.
- Finding no.6, general findings of category employment.

This attitude of more “conservative” parents has been pointed before as a “general” attitude. By precision on the base findings of each attitude, it would be found that while cases of “general” attitude, mostly referred to recreational activities in the city like shopping, cases included in “conservative” attitude referred to official daily jobs like banking jobs of family which are more secure regarding women presence.

**C – 2 – Parents of more “conservative” groups of “gender identity” consider some facilities for their boys because of his employment or breadwinning role**

These parents are naturally from lower or lower middle classes. Conclusion made on the basis of following findings:
- Finding no.4, general findings of category driving in the city.
- Finding no. 3, general findings of category riding motorbike in the city.

C-3 – Parents of more “conservative” groups of “gender identity” control both of their girls and boys in their social activities and caused their dependency on the family

These conservative or semi conservative parents are much controller and make limitations for both of their children. They mostly belong to lower or lower middle classes or some times middle class. It seems for these parents who make limitation for both their girls and boys, besides their gender conservatism, other factors like social pessimism are also included. This conclusion made on the basis of following general findings in ten section discussion:

- Finding no.5, general findings of category personal shopping.
- Finding no. 4, general findings of category spending free time in the city.
- Finding no. 5, general findings of category the time in the evening to be at home.
- Finding no. 4, general findings of category cycling.
- Finding no. 4, general findings of category education in other cities.
- Funding no.4, general findings of category banking or official works.

So regarding to mentioned spatial attitudes appropriated to different “gender identities”, there is general conclusion that: “spatial identity” gets along with “gender identity”.

Variables “class”, “sex”, and “breadwinning status”

“Sex”

In fact differences between mothers and fathers regarding their spatial attitudes. Different findings distinguished that:
Mothers presented more “open” spatial attitudes in many cases and inversely fathers presented more conservative spatial attitude in many cases.

This conclusion made on the basis of following findings of ten section discussions:

- Finding no. 3, general findings of category shopping.
- Finding no. 9, general findings of category shopping.
- Finding no. 4, general findings of category spending free time in the city.
- Finding no. 8, general findings of category spending free time in the city.
- Finding no. 8, general findings of category ultimate time being out.
- Finding no.8, general findings of category cycling.
- Finding no. 2, general findings of category education in other cities.
- Finding no. 5, general findings of category education in other cities.
- Finding no. 2, general findings of category employment.
- Finding no. 6, general findings of category employment.

“Class”

Regarding to the different social – spatial trends defined during general findings of ten section discussions and the debates about three variables of “gender identity” in those ten general findings, a general common trend could be concluded that indicates: the parallel changes of “social class” with “spatial attitudes”. As it was presented before, it’s the same relation between “social class” and “gender identity”, this time again: more parents from upper and middle classes presented more open spatial attitudes and inversely, more parents from lower and lower middle classes presented more conservative spatial attitudes.

“Educational level” is the most important variable involved to these kinds of class differences. While educational level usually changes by multi variable of “social class” and so confirms the upper mentioned relation about parallel changes of “social class” and “gender spatial identity”, But it has independent influence on “gender spatial identity”; as mentioned in the discussion about general “gender identity” groups, samples belonged to the “conservative” gender attitude, are no one higher educated; they have at best level,
high school diploma even when they are from upper classes; (the only higher educated father of this “conservative” group, Sample no. 16, has military education which its general conditions are completely different from a usual university education). In fact, this difference between social classes is associated with variable “education” which is differentiated among “social classes” and usually goes up with social class, so when ever “education level” doesn’t follow the “social class”, whatever the reason is – there would be a general discussion about this issue in the last conclusions - then “gender attitude” doesn’t present the same association with “social class”; it means that “gender attitude” or “spatial attitude” here, doesn’t tend to “open” when “social class” tend to upper and inversely it doesn’t tend to “conservative” when “social class” tend to lower.

This social condition indicates other social process; it suggests that each social class embodies parallel powers of “open” and “conservative” notions towards “gender” or “space”; in other way it means: there are two parallel social – spatial powers of “open” and “conservative” attitude throughout society that changes along educational level; these parallel powers change their balances in society as educational levels change so in lower educated members of society this balance deranges in favor of “conservative” notions and inversely in higher educated ones, it deranges in favor of “open” attitudes.

Other important aspect of “social class” is its economical condition which directly influences “spatial attitude” strongly. This kind of affects was mentioned in the case of financial facilities upper classes giving their children which causes them to practice in the city more easily, to shop independently, to spend their free time in the city with their friends safely, to educate in other cities comfortably, to drive in the city, and to be at home later in the evening; it means their open attitudes towards their children’s using urban spaces. That is while the opposite financial possibilities of lower classes cause the opposite tendencies in the same cases. The appropriate example is case of householder women from lower classes in their conservative notions towards spatial issues regarding their both children; this will be pointed later in next parts.
“Breadwinning status”

While in many cases, meaningful relations haven’t seen between “breadwinning status” and “spatial attitudes” because of the small samples in this relation, but still there are some conclusions related to the issue.

1 - *Participant breadwinner mothers and fathers presented more “open” spatial attitudes.*

This conclusion made on the following bases:

- Finding no. 9, general findings of category shopping.
- Finding no 8, general findings of category cycling.
- Finding no. 8, general findings of category employment.

2 - *Householder fathers especially from lower and middle classes presented more “conservative” attitudes towards spatial issues:*

- Finding no. 6, general findings of category driving.
- Finding no.6, general findings of category employment.

3 - *Householder mothers especially from lower and lower middle classes are more conservative towards their both children’s or girls’ activities in society*

Householder mothers especially low educated from lower and lower middle classes who are conservative or semi conservative in their gender attitudes, in many cases presented conservative notions towards spatial issues related to their children too (and this is except than their girl employment because of the same reason about their employment themselves). Their “conservative” notions towards gender – spatial issues are not only because of their social position as a lonely mother with double pressure regarding their responsibilities and cultural pressure of being a divorced or a widow woman, but is also because of their economical pressures of their social class too.
This conclusion made on the basis of following general findings in ten section’s discussions:

- Finding no.7, general findings of category personal shopping.
- Finding no. 6, general findings of category spending free time in the city.
- Finding no. 4, general findings of ultimate time in the evening to be at home.
- Finding no. 6, general findings of category cycling.
- Finding no. 4, general findings of category official or banking affairs.

So while being an employed wife – a participant breadwinner in the family - has a positive effect towards equality in gender – spatial attitude for both mother and father, being an only householder for mothers and fathers has different meanings. A family with participant breadwinner parents means changing position from patriarchal family towards equalized family, which surely has its effects on parents’ attitudes, but an only householder father in a family with a housewife means a patriarchal formation of family and it has its patriarchal influences on parents’ attitudes too; and a family with a householder mother while has broken the patriarchal formation of family, but in this hard social situations push much pressure, material and nonmaterial too, on the part of householder woman specially when she is from lower classes (in lower classes, cultural pressures too ,on lonely householder women are much more than upper classes).

**Internalization of gender – spatial oppression**

During the discussions made in this chapter, attentions paid to the issue of “internalized gender values” in some cases. As mentioned before, gender differences practiced in society in everyday lives, those presented in different social activities, or those which parents expressed their notions towards them in this study, are social phenomenon that different groups of people look at them in different ways, and by different values, in fact from different social standpoints.

For different people, social gender differences mean differently; these differences have been the focus of this study. During this study pointed to the relationships existed
between “gender attitudes” and “spatial attitudes”: how different groups of people who presented different attitudes towards “gender issue”, now express their notions towards “spatial issues”? Are there relations?

Upper part of this conclusion pointed to these relations between “gender identity” and “spatial identity”; now in continue, it would be pointed to the issue of “internalized spatial values”.

The claim is that people while internalize gender social relations as their values; they internalize spatial relations caused from gender relations by the same way. This notion has been cleared during deliberations on parents’ attitudes.

The study presented that this relation – internalized spatial values - is not the same for different groups of “gender identity”; it presents different meanings. In fact those “open” groups of “gender identity” analyze spatial differences between genders very well most of the time, from a conscious mind. They are outsider to the issue. They refer those differences to the social conditions which could be changed, while for the more conservative notions, those spatial differences between girls and boys are natural and essential. They are insider to these differences.

These differences are especially clear in those common attitudes spread among all groups of gender identities; while there is an apparent similarity among different members of one certain spatial notion, but in fact, there are differences among the ways they look at the issue. For example in that common attitude towards the issue of using public spaces of city in free time that there were a commonsense that boys use those public spaces independently more than girls, parents of “open – informed” attitudes pointed to social limitations for girls must be changed so girls could benefit of them too; while more conservative ones refer to the situations as social normality, as fixed natural existing.

This different attitude caused “open” gender groups present neutral attitudes towards the spatial issues that their equalities could be possible in reality while more conservative ones reject this equality as social deviation. It means limitations for girls equal social activity with boys, are mostly in their mind not in reality in society, otherwise these activities are possible in practice. Like driving or shopping having done independently by
both girls and boys of educated middle and upper classes (mostly open minded), while for these conservative families are not usual.

So, either limitations for equal social activities of girls & boys are in conservative minds of people (in these cases, limitations acted only for their girls and boys of their social groups otherwise girls and boys from other social groups practicing more equally) or those limitations act in society for all social groups (social insecurity for women or other social reason) the consequence is the same. Those both kinds of limitations have been internalized in their minds as their internal values.
Chapter Eight

Conclusions

Introduction

This final chapter will point to the main conclusions from various discussions during case study which associated with the basic theoretical debates of the first chapter. Besides direct conclusions of the case study, it will surely provide the evaluation of hypotheses defined at the first chapter resulting from theoretical framework.

The main purpose of the study defined as the investigation about the relationships between “gender” and “space” in Tehran, in other words, the illustration of Tehran’s spaces whether they are gendered at present time. And for this objective, study undertook a qualitative research and focused on “gender attitudes” of Tehran’s residences as their “gender identity” from one side, and kind of their connections to living “spaces” which indicates their “spatial identity”, from the other side. Among Tehran’s residences, parents’ of both young girl and boy have been selected as the purposive samples which their attitudes towards gender issues, and towards the ways their children use different spaces – from private to public – have been considered as their gender and spatial identities. Spaces studied here, included private space of house, semi private semi public spaces of neighborhood, and public spaces of city.

At first part of case study, “gender identity” means parents’ attitudes towards gender issues examined. Changing nature of “gender identity” investigated by three variables of “sex” (mothers or fathers), “social class” (lower, middle or upper), and “employment status in family” (housekeeper, participant breadwinner, or only breadwinner), means among 15 different groups of “gender identity” which provided from combination of those variables. Evaluating “gender attitudes” of these different groups of samples provided a general view towards the changing processes of “gender identity” among different groups of Tehran residences. It made clear that:
According to “gender identity”:

- Mothers comparing fathers in all social groups presented more “open” equitable attitudes towards “gender” issues. It means: gender identity differentiated by “sex” in Tehran.

- There is a social association between “gender identity” and “educational level”, so: more open equitable notions belong to the more educated people and inversely more “conservative” gender notions belong to the lower educated people. It means that: “gender identity” in Tehran differentiated by “level of education”.

- Since there is relationship between “level of education” and “social class”, it affected on the relationship between “social class” and “gender identity” so: more open equitable notions belong to the more educated people who mostly belong to upper classes (middle and upper); and inversely more “conservative” gender notions belong to the lower educated people, usually belong to lower classes (lower & lower middle). It means that: “gender identity” in Tehran differentiated by “social class”. Précising on relationship between “gender identity” in one side and “social class” and “educational level” in other side cleared that: “Gender identity” has more explicit relationship with “level of education” than the “social class”. This doesn’t reject upper mentioned association between “gender” and “class”; it is a complementary finding about social groups. This social fact about special conditions according Tehran residences would be discussed from a macro perspective later in this chapter.

- In general: “employment” has a positive effect on “gender identity”, but here it presents its effect through the family formation. It differs among mothers and fathers too, also among social classes, so: employment that means for mothers being a participant breadwinner or a householder in their family has a positive affect on their gender attitudes to get more equitable notions; it’s especial for middle and upper classes. And for fathers who are all employed, being a participant breadwinner – having an employed wife – has positive effect on their gender attitudes too to get more open and equitable notion. It’s while that inversely householder mothers from lower classes and householder fathers from any social classes, who have a housewife, relatively presented more conservative gender notions.
- Among all different “gender” groups, group of “semi open semi conservative” is the largest one, also most inclusive; it includes members from different sexes, all social classes, all positions of breadwinning status in family, and all educational levels, although sexes’ social positions are totally different. It cleared that: large number of people of this city is living by gender values between those two extremes; they seem conservative in some of their gender attitudes and open in some others.

- “Gender identity” in Tehran differentiated by place in the city. It follows the same association of “social class” and “educational level” with the different districts in the city, the before mentioned distribution of social groups from South to the North of the city, so place differentiations of “gender identity” in Tehran follow the South – North line of the city.

- So, according to “gender identity” differentiations among different social groups who are different by their “sex”, “social class”, “educational level”, “employment status in family”, and “place” in the city, it could be concluded that: internalization of discriminated “gender values”, here means internalization of unequal gender relations of patriarchal system differentiated by the same variables of “sex”, “social class”, “educational level”, “employment status in family”, and at last, the “place” in Tehran.

According to “spatial identity”:

Regarding discussion in three chapters of “private”, “semi private semi public”, and “public” spaces, it’s been found that:

- There is an explicit parallel change of “spatial identity” along with “gender identity”, so we could speak of “gender – spatial attitude”. While parents with more conservative gender attitudes presented more “conservative” or “unequal” spatial attitudes adapted to patriarchal social system (based on divided public private gender roles and controlling of women in more private spaces), inversely more open gender attitudes asserted more “open” means “neutral” or “equal” spatial attitudes (even in some cases regarding to upper classes, parents allocate more facilities to their girls for their more safety towards equal using of the city). And also “semi open semi conservative” group of “gender attitude” as the largest group, this time again confirmed their moderate
social position by presenting “conservative” spatial attitudes in some cases and “open” spatial attitudes in some others.

- Furthermore there are some inclusive spatial opinions throughout society of Tehran. These inclusive attitudes are distributed not only among different “gender identity” groups, but also among different “spaces” from private to public. These general spatial attitudes in many cases tended to “biased” gender – spatial attitudes. **In three kinds of spaces studied here, parents generally presented the necessities of more caring, protecting, controlling, and restricting their girls comparing their boys in using spaces.** These inequitable notions towards “gender – spatial” issues reflect different social spatial reasons; they are consequences of either women’s position in patriarchal system of thought is relatively present in whole society, or that of insecurity for women in this special situation. It means it’s partially because of the patriarchal values still dominated in society in the one hand, and partially because of weaknesses of social system which should protect women social security in the other hand. In fact, the “conservative” political (management) system penetrated different social institutions like educational, juridical, legal … and disciplinary forces which believes in women place is in the house, is not able to practice against social insecurity especially in a great metropolitan like Tehran. These conservative spatial attitudes while include people with “conservative” and “semi conservative semi open” gender attitudes, also penetrated to “open” attitudes, so it seems there is a fragmentation between “gender” and “space” that people are mentally “open” but practically “conservative”; but there are differences within the references these different groups with different gender consciousness made in their reasoning for their same practices; since conscious “open” parents referred to existing social conditions in their reasoning, while “conservative” people claimed their patriarchal values. **So in other way, these public inclusive attitudes confirm again the upper mentioned relationships between “gender identity” and “spatial identity”.**

- These general “gender spatial” attitudes despite their general tendency towards “conservative” notions, **in some other cases regarding girls’ employment, education, and official works have shown a progressive neutral tendency.** They resulted except from their social economical necessities, also from the more security of these official spaces comparing other ones and the day time of their practicing. This time again like the
upper mentioned cases while it apparently seems a gap between “gender” and “space” process of change, but there are differences among references different gender attitudes made to the issues; it means that it doesn’t reject the parallel changes of “gender” and “space”.

- According to different domains of spaces from private to public, mothers compared to fathers presented a general tendency towards “open” spatial attitudes, while fathers inversely presented the opposite general tendency towards “conservative” spatial attitudes. Since this relation have been presented before according to “gender” issues, so it confirms again the association between “gender” and “space”.

- In three different domains of spaces, parents presented their “spatial attitudes” like their “gender attitudes” associated with their “educational level” so in general there is a meaningful relation between “gender spatial identity” and “educational level”.

- And again as “educational level” usually changes by “social class” so there would be a relative change of “gender spatial identity” along with “social class”. It must be pointed that since “educational level” in some cases doesn’t follow the “social class”, in those situations, “gender spatial identity” doesn’t follow the “social class” too.

- The large number of parents distributed in all social classes and all levels of education and all breadwinning statuses in family, also among different sexes, live in a situation of “semi open, semi conservative gender spatial attitude”.

- “Employment” presented its effect on “gender spatial identity” through the changes in patriarchal formation of family, so participant breadwinner mothers and fathers presented relatively more “open” gender spatial attitudes. It is while householder father (a patriarchal formation of family) from any social class and householder mother from lower and lower middle classes presented relatively more “conservative” attitudes.

- And again: “gender spatial identity” in Tehran changes by place and according to South – North line of the city.

- Unequal “gender spatial values” practiced in society, internalized in people minds by different strength according to studied variables of “sex”, “social class”, “educational level”, and “breadwinning status”; according those patriarchal values, people differ from being the unconscious insider to the conscious outsider.
Gender Spatial Differentiations in Tehran

Considering variables “sex”, “social class”, “breadwinning status in family”, and “place”
Gender Spatial Differentiations in Tehran
Considering variable “educational level”
Hypotheses appraisal

Association between changing trends of “gender” identity and “spatial” identity found through the case study in fact confirms the first hypothesis: Gender identity is reflected on spatial identity. Various gender identities in Tehran present different perspectives of space or they identify space by different values.

Association between changing trends of “gender spatial identity” and “social class” in different spaces relatively confirms the third hypothesis that: Within the same social class, different gender identities related to men and women, present interconnected qualities, compared with gender identities related to men or women of different social classes. This situation could be found in the spatial perspectives of different groups of men and women too. In fact this finding must be completed and corrected with other important finding of case study regarding the variable of “sex” that indicated mothers comparing to fathers from any social classes presented more “neutral” or “equal” gender spatial attitudes.

Mentally internalization of unequal “gender spatial” values of society’s practices, differs for different groups of people who are differentiated by “sex”, “social class”, “educational level”, and “breadwinning status in family”; this confirm and complete the second and forth hypotheses: As gender identity internalizes patriarchal oppression, it internalizes associated spatial oppression too. And spatial oppression differs among social classes of Tehran living in different parts of this city.

Gender, Space in Tehran through a Systematic Approach

Under this title, four important issues of study would be discussed through a systematic approach:

1 – The macro social system, the subsystems of “gender” and “space”
2 – Kind of relationships between “gender” and “physical space” among the macro social system
3 – The opposite direction in “gender – space” relationship
4 – The transitional period of social change and the challenges within the social system

1 – The macro social system, the subsystems of “gender” and “space”

Returning to the first chapter’s (theoretical framework of study) discussions about relationships of “gender” and “space” and according to the case study’s conclusions about association of “gender” and “space” changes in Tehran, now through a general perspective we could see that these two, “gender” and “space” are associated subsystems of an entire imagined social system, here urban social system in Tehran in macro level; the social system which includes material and non material integral parts, “gender” as non material constituent and “space” – here physical space – as the material subsystem of the macro social system\(^2\). Since subsystems are interconnected to each other systematically and their changes are associated among the whole changes of system, so it is the same about the mutual relationships of “gender” and “space” within the universal system practicing in Tehran.

Within the case study, when we spoke of “space”, private to public, in fact we considered it as “physical space” which its association with “gender” as the social aspect was investigated; so both of them as the material and non material constituents of the macro system of city of Tehran change systematically in relation with other urban variables (like “social class”, “sex”, …) within the changes of the whole system. And then we spoke of “gender space” as one integrated part of social system to emphasize on the strong association between them found during case study; or “gender spatial” identity to emphasize on integration between these two material and non material parts of “social identity”.

\(^2\) Before, when we focused on “space” and its two material and non material aspects, as we did in theoretical discussion, we imagined “space” itself as a general “social system” with different physical and non physical subsystems. However the reality is the same, in second perspective, space as physical space is on focus while in first one, “space” as a thorough system is on consideration.
2 – Kind of relationships between “gender” and “physical space” among the macro social system

The important point related to the association between “gender” and “space” which has been mentioned before in debates related to method and methodology, is kind of influences that “gender” make to the “space” or it accepts from “space”. Within the systematic relationships, kind of relationship between “gender” and “space” is not simple and stable in any of its direction. According to the case study, while spaces from private to public influenced by gender structure or gender relationships in general, these influences are not easily clear among physical space. The influences we observed through case study in Tehran, manifested mostly through spatial behaviors or kind of activities practiced in spaces comparing to physical aspects or spatial form of space, in fact through activities and behaviors in space not by physical characteristics. Regarding to private space of house, we observed gender aspects of house space for example, by specifying which one of girl or boy is preferred to open the apartment door, in fact we studied kind of activity in space of house which is different, not the physical characteristics of that which is similar; because actually there wasn’t major physical differences in this relation between houses belonged to different families that preferred their boys or their girls. Or according to urban spaces, while urban spaces in different parts of the city are very similar in their physical characteristics but they are used by very different people and very different kinds of activities (regarding the categories related to private space, the first category: which one of the girl or boy preferred to have the private room and the second one: which one’s room preferred to be closer to parent’s room, and the third category: which one’s room could be overlooked, could partially present physical differences, but not the other categories of private space or the categories of other kinds of spaces). Actually, what specified this kind of investigation about “space” was this fact that there aren’t clear and direct relationships between physical space and all kinds of social aspects as existed in the past time, since physical differences could no longer reflect social differences thoroughly. In fact the clear association between physical and social aspects of space in many of their sides has broken because of the influences of some major factors, although they might be social, economical too. Architecture and city
spaces in the past time formed by more simple and definable forces\(^3\), but in the modern age variables involved to form the physical form of spaces are numerous and complicated. In past, the system defined the physical space was more simple comparing present time. It would be more obvious if we consider only the role of “international modern style” in the form of built environment in this modern era\(^4\); or if pay attention to this fact that people don’t build their favorite houses but live in the houses built by others, so kind of relationships between “gender” and “space” - physical space - studied here, and is claimed as the valid way of study about their present relationships at least in a great metropolitan like Tehran, characterized by “practice and activity in space”.

3 – The opposite direction in “gender – space” relationships

The association between “gender” and “space” as it was mentioned before is a mutual systematic one. Relationships between “gender” and “space” in opposite direction mean affects that “gender” accepts from “space”, in fact they relate to the reproduction of “gender relationships” within “spaces”. And by the same way as “gender” influences to the kind of behavior and activity in “space”, this time again “gender relations” mutually reproduced by the activities in “spaces” and kind of uses people make of “spaces”. It means for example when parents preferred their boys doing the daily shopping of family, in one hand they prefer this practice because of their gender identity (one direction), and in the other hand they produce or reproduce special kind of “gender relations” by this kind of activity in neighborhood “space” (opposite direction).

4 – The transitional period of social change and the challenges involved within the social system

The other important point found during case study in Tehran about relationships between “gender” and “space”, is influences of other social factors make their relationship complicated so in some cases “spatial identity” doesn’t follow “gender

---

\(^3\) For example there is a study about relationships between traditional Iranian architectures and city forms with the “gender structure”: Sadoughianzadeh, M. 2006 “Gender social structure & space, reflection on Iranian traditional spaces”, Architecture and Urbanism, no. 82 / 83,

\(^4\) There is a long debate in Iranian literature about the split between form and function in Iranian architecture and urbanism after modern influences. This split translated here to the separation of form from social cultural contexts including gender aspects too.
identity” apparently; according to inclusive spatial attitudes found among very different groups, some cases indicated a tendency of whole society towards “open” or “equal” spatial practices, and more cases presented the opposite tendency towards “conservative” or “unequal” spatial behaviors. While kind of references people made to the issues reject the initial assumption about the split between “gender” and “space”, however they are so important to be analyzed. For analyzing these widespread opposite tendencies, they should be understood among the same macro social system and variables involved. The factors made the progressive tendency towards equal opportunities for girls’ education and employment in whole society, also the major social factor pointed in the case study about the social phenomenon of women’s insecurity in the metropolitan of Tehran caused a general “conservative” tendency against women’s activities in the city, both should be analyzed within the entire urban social system practiced in the city. Actually these spatial tendencies, while they are the other feature of same social fact regarding contradicted social groups of “open” and “conservative” and “intermediate” (in fact by reductionism, we could say that in some “gender spatial” issues, society responds by contradicted “open” and “conservative” actions, in some other cases, relatively whole society responds only by “open” actions, and at last, in some cases, only by “conservative action), manifest the greater social facts which influences to the “gender” and “space” relationship too among the universal system of the city. The emergence of these “gender spatial” tendencies among society could be understood according to the historical descriptions related to Iranian social development discussed in chapter no. 2.

We would pay attention to the historical bases caused the emergence of these opposite social tendencies in the following section, but the important issue should be pointed here is that both of progressive and conservative tendencies among society, either represented by contradicted groups of “open” and “conservative” gender spatial attitudes, and the group of “semi open semi conservative” between them, or manifested by two inclusive opposite spatial tendencies among society should be considered within the process of change, that the patriarchal social system is practicing towards the new social order of equal gender relation within the capital city of Tehran.

According to the contradicted inclusive attitudes among society, while patriarchal old system has changed in some way (the general progressive attitudes towards girls’
education & employment as the examples), but these changes themselves created challenges (women’s insecurity in public spaces) must be confronted properly. Actually the old social order resists against new changes and women’s insecurity is one of its major resistances. Considering the issue of women’s insecurity in city except the conditions caused from urban characteristics of Tehran emerged during its changes from a small familiar city towards a great metropolitan of strangers, other reasons should be considered among the changes of the patriarchal social system of the city, so while the old system, have been experienced great changes from the defined gender relations based on separated secured spaces for women and men, towards the new social system based on equal gender relations on shared spaces, but the process is not complete yet. While women are coming out from their specified secured private space, but their new position in public is not appropriate in all cases; many challenges should be confronted and many problems should be solved through the time and through the hard efforts to create the appropriate conditions. And the situation of women’s insecurity is one of those challenges towards the new social order. In fact city experiencing the transitional period and the great challenges special to this period of time in the situations that new social order hasn’t been reached to its appropriate spaces yet. These appropriated spaces couldn’t be produced till now.

In other words, the new social powers of “gender equality” at first captured the spaces, more formal and safer; they’re under public supervision (employment & education), so more ready to be conquered, while insecure spaces, strong and remained to be captured by the following efforts.

The important point here, respected according to the issues of “gender” and “sex” and their implications in patriarchal thought. Although these two issues challenged by “gender” studies associated to each other, however they have differences; while issues related to “gender equality”, “gender roles equality” means “women social activities” have processed much of their social legitimacy and public acceptance, even penetrated to more “conservative” of gender groups, but those activities which reflect issue of “sex”, is still controversial; “sex” differences have much more social acceptance comparing “gender” differences. And two practices of “education” and “employment” could more easily reflect issue of “gender”; they are mostly considered as “safe social activities”,
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they hardly reflect issue of “sex”, so they have more legitimacy for even “conservative” notions; while those social activities in “spaces” more vulnerable to women insecurity could reflect issue of “sex” which still is a resistant notion in patriarchal thought.

According to inclusive “conservative” attitudes, they are not included only activities related to “public” spaces which could be unsafe, but the categorical activities of “private” spaces and “semi private semi public” spaces as well which considered safe. If we pay attention to these categories of private and semi private space, it would be cleared that these kinds of activities as well are mostly associated to issues of “sex” or “body” – category of necessity of private room for girls, for example in private space – from one side and insecure public spaces– putting garbage out in the darkness - from the other side.

**Parallel social powers in Tehran, historical bases**

The main concept was formed through deliberation in Tehran parent’s attitudes towards gender - spatial issues, points to the contradicted gender values manifested in spatial attitudes throughout society, so we’ve confronted with two main parallel social powers of contradicted perspectives – “open” & “conservative” - towards “gender” and “space”. This social duality presents itself not only in opposed groups in two ends of social powers but also a widespread moderate group in between of two extremes; the largest group of this case study and other quantitative ones, “semi conservative semi open” group of “gender spatial attitude”; two widespread spatial tendencies present the same social duality in other way. It seems these two parallel perspectives are parts of two general trends of “tradition” and “modernity in society penetrated all aspects of life in Iranian society. They have their roots in recent history of Iran. Here we focused only on two aspects of “gender” and “space” as two important manifestations of these contradictory powers related to our debate.

To understand conditions regarding modernity and tradition in this city or in this country and the contradictions between them among social groups is necessary to go through history to see its backgrounds in lately 150 years; this review would be short and only points to the main related issues.
Looking at the recent history

As it was mentioned before (in the chapter of general introduction about Tehran) recent history of Iran experienced a very great & rapid change in different aspects of its life through the connections with the modern West and the reactions to those influences.

The first serious contacts of Iranian society with the West initiated in the middle of nineteenth century by sending students to the European universities. This accompanied by gradual decline of Feudalism, development of national industrial bourgeoisie, and increasing pressure of European countries entering to Iran’s bazaars which gradually led to some social institutional necessity of reformations… These social economical changes at last led to Constitutional Revolution in 1906. In fact from mid of nineteenth century Iran’s society has experienced challenges of its transitional period from a closed traditional society towards a modern one which it hasn’t finished yet.

The fastest term of these changes began after World War I in Iran during Pahlavi dynasty: “The first half of the twentieth century saw a sustained effort of modernization and Westernization by government. Political centralization and expansion of oil facilitated some industrial development and modernization of the infrastructure (Abrahamian, 1982; Lapidus, 1988). Economic development and modernization was accompanied with growth of a strong modern army, secular educational system, and strong nationalist ideology” (Aghajanian, 2001: 2). This process of change is not eliminated to Iran; it could be traced in the region of Middle East and its different countries; there are similarities in the processes these countries passing through. The same process which initiated in Iran by Pahlavi the first king, Reza shah, in Turkey had started before by Kemal Ataturk: “When the Turkish Republic was founded in 1923 by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk following the Ottoman defeat in World War I, the republican regime adopted a top – down reformism based on modernization cum Westernization. From its inception, the Turkish state promulgated a strong – armed secularism based on the subjugation of religious practices, scholars and educational institutions to state regulation and administration (Berkes, quoted by Secor, 2001: 194).
Changes according to the relationships between Iran and the West countries influenced not only policy and political regimes but the different aspects of Iranian social life.

During the long period of Pahlavi’s dynasty (1925 – 1979) beside military actions for central unification, and political economical changes made the basis for Iran’s transition into capitalism – based on merchants and rant owners - and participation in world commodity exchange, social cultural changes accompanied towards modernism. Important secular institutional changes made in educational and judicial system traditionally managed by traditional clergies; some other important changes caused challenges to patriarchal system of family, changes related to marriage, divorce, polygamy, child custody, and inherence,…all these efforts besides mass schooling for all and for women too, women’s right to participate in election, even the superficial law against women presence in public with their traditional covering clothes, hejab (chador) were made towards empowering women and improving women status in family and society; these situations were very similar to Turkey after Ataturk reforms: “In Turkey, where modernism, secularism and Westernization comprised the national ideals of the new post Ottoman state, the state’s efforts to create women – citizens went hand in hand with the denunciation of veiling as a backwards and uncivilized practice, a tradition to be overthrown ...” (Secore, 2002: 5 - 6). But the main point here is that all these changes practiced by force, formally and superficially, while deep social values couldn’t be changed forcefully, further it was practiced by a corrupted dependent system of a monarchy.

The important point associated with the relationships with the domineering West and the process of Westernization, modernization and secularization in the countries of the region like Iran has been that these influences imposed by the political dictatorships and attached groups dependent on the West policies; in fact West countries\(^5\) were protecting dependent political regimes favoring their interests. So the social process of change towards modernism that had been before begun gradually among a traditional society and needed time to be settled, suddenly interfered by strong Western powers with the

\(^5\) Great Britain, sometimes accompanied rival Russia in Iran till the mid of the twentieth century, had the upper hand influencing Iran political system and then gradually USA took their place.
dependent dictatorship inside: “Unlike many other countries of the third world, these new forms were not directly introduced by westerners, since Iran was never colonized. Instead the agents of transformation here were the groups that came into existence as a result of contacts with those powers ... this (changing) was made possible by the direct intervention of the state in the creation and support of new institutions ...” (Madanipour, 1998: 246). In fact those rapid social changes had never had internal appropriate bases in the society at least among most of the social groups or institutions and till a long period of time; it was imposed to the whole society so it caused many tensions in a traditional society like Iran as it was. While people accepted some aspect of new social system, but rejected some others, so they’re living with kind of crisis in their social cultural identity. After many years, and after great social changes towards modernism, these challenges still continued to influence the social and political life of people in Iran and in the region: “However, like many other colonized countries, the imposition of new institutions led to a crisis of cultural identity ...” (Madanipour, 1998: 246).

This kind of secularization imposed into the traditional society dominated by patriarchal relationships although changed social situations gradually in different aspects but the costs society paid and still paying for those imposing changes, couldn’t been compensated easily. While social changes imagined through the process of modernization and secularization were progressive social goals per se, but unfortunately they didn’t evolve out from the internal powers and social necessities.

Modern waves haven’t influenced all groups of society equally. Changes towards Western modernism although has become a slightly internal process for some social groups, but it caused severe resistance among more traditional parts (Sazegara, 2003). Islamic Revolution (1979) led by traditional clerics, was interpreted by many social scientists not only as a response of national powers against the corrupted dependent government, but as the society’s response to superficial, rapid, and forceful practices towards modernism during the Pahlavi’s era: “…Along with the modernization efforts, the strong infiltration of western culture & specially the component of western culture which were at odds with the Iranian Islamic traditions, created another dividing line among the population of all areas” (Aghajanian, 2001: 3).
“This rapid social change – the impact of industrialization, urbanization and education on marriage, the family and gender roles – has caused a conservative backlash in the form of the Islamist movement, fundamentalists are concerned that education for women has dissolved traditional arrangements of space segregating, family ethics, and gender roles” (Moghadam, 2004:155).

And the important point here is that although Islamic traditional regime got the power from Pahlavi’s modern monarchy and gave it to traditional social groups, but it couldn’t stop the process of change towards modernism, neither the challenges between the modern and old lifestyles: “The battle between the old & new continues, even after the apparent victory of the traditional values and forms” (Madanipour, 1998: 247). The process of Modernism in Iran during Pahlavi regime and afterwards meanwhile its response by the Islamic regime both have been characterized as the imposed actions towards people in favor of interests of domineering groups against others. Unfortunately this process of change of values has never happened through the public sharing within a democratic process. Recent history of this country have been a representation of the challenges between old & new social powers caused its way of development accompanied with great difficulties: “A tense coexistence of the old & new, in which they constantly struggle for domination, is a hallmark of the modern history of Iran and its capital, Tehran) (Madanipour, 1998: 252).

**Social groups**

Any way under this process of change towards modern values, by force or by peace and through a long period of time, configuration of social classes or social groups changed. Along with old social groups, new social groups, new social institutions with new social values and believes emerged; although old social powers transformed or accepted changes but some of them still alive and influential for some social groups so now we confronted with an inhomogeneous society; mentioned process caused that the homogenous traditional society divided to pieces as the contradictory social groups; in general, the reaction of society presented itself in social groups in behalf of these changes, and groups opposed, and many of them in intermediate position as well.
During near to one and a half centuries, formation of social classes gradually changed; Iran society changed from its social formation of feudalism to a kind of dependent capitalism, a special capitalistic social structure which is mostly depended on oil revenue and its economic rants. In fact since 1.5 centuries Iran is in a form of transition from a traditional to modernized social relations, from feudality to industrial capitalism. Iranian history and social development is still influencing from these challenges. In new formation of social classes through the process of modernization, secularization, and urbanization, the new middle class in urban areas emerged which become larger and larger through the time while the urban population has been increasing by a rapid change to get about 65% of the total population of country at present time (refer to the chapter 2). Increasing urban population so fast is the consequences of great immigration from rural to urban parts - based on poor rural infrastructures, traditional agricultural system and water problem of agriculture from one side and expanding service sector of country’s economy founded substantially on oil revenue in urban parts from the other side. Among urban population the urban middle and upper classes, most educated people among them, have been influencing by Western lifestyle and modern culture through education and communication with the West. Although modern culture influenced whole population of the country little by little, but urban educated people adapted to those values basically much more. Abrahamian described the roots and changes of this urban educated people through the time: “The modern intelligentsias were those intellectuals who, through travel, translations, and new educational establishments, had adopted modern ideas, aspiration, and values along western lines. Initially they come from different strata, from aristocracy as well as from bazaar, and were two few to form a social class. In twentieth century however, resulting mainly from expansion of the bureaucracy and the armed forces, they developed into a salaried middle class” (Abrahamian, quoted by Madanipour, 1998: 245).

And inversely while rural population, newcomer poor urban immigrants along with the clerical organization and traditional urban middle classes of merchants basically constitute the old traditional social groups of society so: “The constituent parts of the traditional middle classes were the clergy and the bazaar community of merchants & artisans who, before the impact of the West, practiced a large degree of control over
economic & social affairs. The traditional privileges of this group were lost through the establishment of new economic orders and the predominance of foreign interests and their associates and through secularization of the society by the government. Integration of the country into the world economy somewhat marginalized this group, which turned into a propertied middle class (Madanipour, 1998:245).

Old middle class is the social groups with properties, mostly included commercial traders of the bazaar, traditionally associated with religious clerics in Iran; now their upper parts – with some changes compared the past - got the power in Islamic regime again. But the new middle class are those whose properties are mostly included cultural capitals. They are educated and professional. They included bureaucrats, experts, managers, or moderate wagers in public and private sectors (universities, ministries, army or industry), (Sazegara, 2003, Ansari, 1996 & 2006).

Now as a general conclusion to the social position of these contradictory groups in society and connecting these overall view to the findings of the case study, as it was mentioned, some parts of population have been prepared to accept modern changes more than others; they have been those with more connection to modern life through education and other communications, This is why urban population generally, and middle and upper incomers of it especially – because of their financial possibilities which provide for them possibility of higher education & communication with Western countries - adapted to modern life more than others. So we see a process of increasing modern values and modern lifestyles through social classes when they go towards middle and upper classes, and decreasing of those values among lower classes. In fact we confronted with vertical differentiations among society from traditional to modernity, from lower class to upper and from South of the city to the North: “These are reflected in the more or less distinguishable residential areas of the ethnic & religious minorities as well as of the different lifestyles produced by the clash of modernity & traditionalism. This created a secular space in the north, in line of incoming social environment, leaving the religious institutions for the south, where the previous social habits and believes have continued to exist” (Madanipour, 1998: 114).

But besides this vertical process of changes along social classes, as mentioned before not all parts of each social classes for example middle or upper adapted to new values;
there are social groups among these social classes which retained their distances from modern life; it means among middle and upper parts of social groups there are people who are more attached to traditional values, these people most probably are from those old community of bazaar and merchant attached to clerical organization and their closed groups. These groups of people most probably don’t have higher educated members among and so many of them have lower level of education. It’s obvious most of the lower urban population culturally is along with traditional groups of middle and upper classes; they have lower education and less communication with modern life. This situation, indicates horizontal split within each social classes, the position of this split changes vertically it means according to the vertical trend of change among modernity and tradition, this split line, in upper middle and upper classes placed in favor of “open” or “modern” attitudes, and inversely in lower middle and lower classes placed in favor of “conservative” or “traditional” attitudes. And the groups of “semi open semi conservative” or “semi modern semi traditional” while generally the largest group of society and distributed among different social classes, it changes its inclusion among different social classes regarding to sexes; according to case study, among fathers this moderate notion mostly seen in middle and upper, and among mothers it’s mostly seen in lower classes.

This social situation of duality especially among middle classes obviously investigated by a quantitative PHD research: Sazegara, 2002, compared two groups of these two contradicted parts of middle class in their lifestyles; samples from community of bazaar, the traditional middle class and samples from university teachers, the new middle class were compared. She found that lifestyles of these two social groups are totally different while both group shared the same economical income and the same social status of their employments. The first group showed a kind of traditional attitudes and lifestyles, while the second one presented attitudes and lifestyle more connected to modern values. Actually these two groups were differentiated by their level of education either. Actually it confirms horizontal differentiations among society. These two contradicted lifestyles as representatives of traditional and modern trends and as Sazegara investigated are differentiated in their tastes – all kinds of tastes according food and clothes to artistic – and kinds of spending leisure times … actually all that interpreted as
“lifestyle”. Although Sazegara didn’t study about “gender” & “spatial” attitudes as they’re focused here, actually her study found the same contradicted social powers regarding other aspect of social life; anyway it’s obvious they are differentiated in their attitudes for example towards “gender” or “space” too. Other social scientists have pointed to this social fact either; lifestyles of these two parts of middle class are totally different; while new middle class’s lifestyle is associated with Western and modern world, the old middle class follow the traditional old values of society (Ansari, 1996 & 2006). They claimed that these fragmented groups are sometimes too contradicted in their values, behaviors and lifestyles which hardly could be placed them as one certain social class (Sazegara, 2003; Chavoshian Tabrizi, 2002).

This obvious contradiction in urban population as we seen, it’s not a simple or distinctive fragmentation, while according to some people, the tendency towards one side of duality is distinctive but for many people actually it’s not easy to be in one side of this split. In reality most people live in a situation between these two powers; while old and religious values are still strong in their minds, ideas of modern world are attractive too. So challenges between different social groups tended more to modernity or tradition also include challenges in the people’s mind of some groups between this duality. In other words these horizontal differentiations become more obvious when we focus on middle situation. By middle situation I mean those groups between these two contradicted ones, those who are “open” or “modern” in some aspects of their life, and “conservative” or “traditional” in some other, those who classified in our study as “semi open semi conservative” parents. They have made the largest group of “gender attitudes”. They are distributed in all social classes (according to the table no. 6 of chapter of gender identity, their distribution differentiated by class, sex, education and employment), so they represent the situation of a large number of people. According to other valuable quantitative PHD study by Chavoshian about social identity, he found that 61% of people in Tehran are those who presented indeterminate attitudes means “semi conservative, semi open” towards “traditional values of family” means “traditional gender relations” (Chavoshian, 2002: 167). This social situation pointed by different social scientists: “The reality, however is that at all times and under any regime in the country, the battle between tradition & modernity has been fought, as both tendencies can be clearly traced
in both the modern intelligentsia & the traditional middle classes... these contradictions are signs of tension inside both camps and a continuing struggle between tradition & modernity” (Madanipour, 1998: 247).

Many social scientists pointed to the challenges people living in, as a social problem; while modern values are present in society and they are reality but they are not fixed and generalized throughout society, so this instability in social system values are the origins of present social problems and behavioral abnormalities in individuals and social groups (Hazeri, 2001: 44).

The other feature of social contradiction between tradition and modernity could be traced as the intergeneration gap in Iran between young and old generation. Young generation much tended to modern values so they are representative of modernity and they are against of old generation as the representative of old traditional values (Azadarmaki, 2001: 56; Aghajanian, 2001: 38). This pattern interfered with mentioned interclass differentiation towards modern values so young generation of middle and upper classes are more associated with modern valued than their counterparts from lower classes; or old generation of lower classes are much more associated to traditional values than their counterparts from upper classes.

This social situation, in fact, indicating the transitional period from traditional society to a modern one and it’s not only seen in Iranian society but the Middle Eastern countries as well.

The conclusions have been made in upper parts with referring to the history and valid researches have confirmed the findings of our case study about vertical and horizontal distributions of “gender spatial” attitudes of parents in Tehran. These parents presented the same general tendencies of “open – modern”, “conservative – traditional” and at last “semi open semi conservative” or “semi modern semi traditional”. The focused subject of “gender” and “space” here surely placed in general issue of “lifestyle”. “Lifestyle” defined by the way people think and live in society so it includes all their attitudes and practices, “gender” attitudes and “spatial” either, so the way they use spaces.

Bourdieu’s social theory about lifestyle despite its references to Western societies seems close to our discussion. Special relationships among modernity and tradition in
city of Tehran, vertically and horizontally, could be analyzed very well by Bourdieu’s theory about groups of lifestyles and their distributions according to social classes\(^6\).

---

\(^6\) According to him, “social class” could no longer analyze all attributes of social groups in modern societies, because in these societies social classes strongly divided to sub groups with the different social – cultural tastes; and these sub groups of homo tastes of different social classes are connected to each other vertically. He pointed to the “lifestyle” and its associated notion of “consumption” as the appropriate notion for analyzing social groups’ differentiations in present societies. Bourdieu emphasized to the four kinds of capital including economical, social, cultural and symbolical, which could be exchanged to each other; and a combination of these four kinds of capitals defines social groups in modern societies. “Bourdieu reveals that this space of social positions is organized by two crosscutting principles of differentiation, economic capital and cultural capital, whose distribution defines the two oppositions that undergird major lines of cleavage and conflict in advanced society. The first vertical, division pits agents holding large volumes of either capital – the dominant class – against those deprived of both –the dominated class. The second, horizontal, opposition arises among the dominant, between those who posses much economic capital but few cultural assets (business owner and managers, who form the dominant fraction of the dominant class), and those whose capital is preeminently cultural (intellectuals and artists, who anchor the dominated fraction of the dominant class). Individuals and families continually strive to maintain or improve their position in social space by pursuing strategies of reconversion whereby they transmute or exchange one species of capital into another” (Wacquant, 2006:8).

In fact the contradictory positions existed between tradition and modernity in Iranian society and the distinctive position, the modernized groups have taken against traditionalists, and inversely the negative position of traditional groups towards modernists, is not only a vertical differentiations between well off and deprived people but also horizontally it’s the reality among different parts of each social classes associated with their kind of cultural assets, level of education, their profession and their lifestyle, modern or traditional.

What Bourdieu pointed as the major agent to differentiate social groups, is their “lifestyles” which differs by a combination of four kinds of capital, basically two economical and cultural. “Lifestyle” is defined by the way of “consumption”; and “taste” is a main concept to distinguish the “lifestyle” and way of “consumption”. Bourdieu (also some other social scientists like Weber, and Giddens) emphasized on the “lifestyle” and “consumption” as the main factor to differentiate social groups, since in modern societies, consumption is itself a social value that people define their social identity by consuming certain kinds of good (Chavoshian Tabrizi, 2002). Or they make social distinction by their special taste and kind of goods they consume; people consume different goods by their different tastes.; these goods involve basic life necessities like clothes or foods, also things related to their cultural or artistic tastes like film, music, novels, …
So in other perspective to the subject, this study has been about different lifestyles lived in Tehran which their two important aspects related to “gender” and “space” have been investigated; also the distribution of these different lifestyles in society and among different social groups, vertically and horizontally have been pointed according to social variables of “sex”, “social class”, “educational level”, “breadwinning status in family” and “place” in Tehran.

In special situation in Iran, contradictory social groups of tradition and modernity present contradictory kinds of lifestyles as their contradictory attitudes towards “gender” issues; they also evaluate spaces and practice in spaces – private to public – differently related to their contradictory spatial identities. Modernists with showing Western values & believes and affiliation to the Western lifestyles make distance from traditional groups and define their distinctive social identity and lifestyle against traditional lifestyle. This group of modern people with much cultural capital presents modernized “open” believes relating to their gender attitudes too; they use spaces culturally belong to them or they experience “spaces”, use them, and behave through them by their certain kind of “taste” which is associated to modernized, Westernized, and more “open” kind of attitude. And traditional groups with less cultural capital, inversely attached to old “conservative” lifestyle and define their social or “gender identity” in negation with modernist lifestyle; they either use spaces culturally belong to them and by the same way they experience spaces by their “traditional” kind of taste.

So in general, distinction between modern and traditional groups of society as distinction between their lifestyles is originally associated with their different kinds of cultural attainments, educational level in the one hand, and to their position in social classes in the other hand because social class itself associated with cultural attainment or educational level. This neither rejects the differences exist among groups of modern attitudes associated to different social classes or the differences among traditional peoples of different social classes, but in general kinds of similarities among modernists or traditionalists distinguish them within society.
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While this study illuminated some aspects related to “gender spatial” relationships in the city, it could provide some suggestions to the urban planning & design of the city regarding the issue for the coming spatial programs in Tehran.

One of the most important aspects of life in Tehran pointed by the study is its duality in “gender spatial identity” and association of this social spatial segregation across the North – South economic lines of the city, and meanwhile their relatively parallel distribution among social classes. We see an inhomogeneous society respecting its different aspects of life, in better word their lifestyles; people live within “spaces” of the city from private to public regarding their different gender – social - identities.

The situations in the city are so that people suffer from this heterogeneity in their living spaces. Surely, most problematic are public “spaces”; although private spaces also in crisis according to changes of family relations, but the most problem would be when they come out. People from different areas in the city from their residential “spaces” come together to pass through common shared passages to go to shared “spaces” for work, for eat, for walk, … they have to use many places inappropriate to them, they have to deal with those people who are so different to them; those whom they rejected their kind of attitudes and lifestyles, actually humiliated them and their values. Sometimes people deny going to others’ places, but sometimes they have to. So what happens to these people so different with each other? Sometimes they’re struggling, sometimes they’re bearing, and anyway they’re suffering.

These inhomogeneous contradicted groups of people have a long history of struggle for domination; domination in power relations to get the authority, to be them which define the justified kind of lifestyle, the authoritative way of values, attitudes, behaviors and activities in spaces, in private and specially public lives.

No matter which side of these contradicted groups had the upper hand in social system of power relation and no matter which group’s attitude whether is progressive, the traditionalist or modernists, what the history tells, either of them in power tried to suppress the other, to negate them, at least to ignore them. In fact by struggling on power they try to assert their “identity”, make “spaces” favorable to their social lifestyle so inappropriate for the others. And so what the response of suppressed group is that they
reciprocally do the same, struggle for domination, compensate their obsessions, making the “spaces” appropriate to their lifestyle, when in power. And this story repeated and repeated during the past history; no group of people feels peace and convenience in these challenging struggling situations. Till the time that any side of this struggling sees its living based on non living of the other side, no matter which one has the power; no improvement in social, gender relations towards equality and not “spaces” achieved the progressive objective of equal gender social relations. The existence of the large “gender spatial” group of “semi open semi conservative” itself is a strong reason for invalidity of biased actions towards one side.

This duality in social life and most important, its manifestation on “space” not only affects people’s life in the city but more important make its process of development challenging, reflexive, problematic and slow.

What really could be done to associate the developing process of the city spaces with peace? How city spaces could healthfully pass through this transitional period? What could provide the city spaces more integrity? How city could achieve consensus in its public spaces?

The special conditions dominated in this society, the long history of hate and rejection among social group’s identity and lifestyles, which prevent them to practice in city spaces peacefully, require a long time patience and sustainable efforts on public actions under democratic systems so that these contradictory groups could be able to look at each other as deserving people and rightful members of society.

And this struggling wouldn’t be finished till the achievement of some kind of public agreement and consensus. Despite the major role of political system of power in macro level which must provide the different social contexts appropriated to social integrity, any way, in any level of space production, the democratic actions would be the answer.

Urban planning and design among the entire social system seems to be successful if it is practiced through democratic developments like participatory planning; it means the system of decision making could provide the most social agreements related to their living spaces. For sustainable consequences in the long period kinds of communicative planning might be able to make contradicted notions close to each other, so they could understand differences and accept their social rights. The system of decision making that
aims the closeness among different notions, to make solutions concluded from different attitudes, satisfy most of the people.

And the major point make the communicative planning too serious, is the important issue of internalized values regarding to unequal gender spatial practices; in fact this is people’s social identity which internalized these discriminated patriarchal values; and as Manuel Castells theorized: “It’s important to realize that these identities are essential to people and are not fading” (Castells, 2003, 68). To understand it deeply helps any social action while encouraging equal gender relations. It’s important to pay attention to people’s gender values as the very deep, sacred, and internalized notions to deal with. Historical experiences indicated any forceful action favoring what is supposed progressive and valuable is a great fault; because what is supposed progressive for one group of people might be a hostile and anti-value in opinions of other group. A good example in this relation is the issue of women clothes in public scenes which still is a live national even international debate. Iranian society have experienced both sides of practices, one Act in behalf of the women presence in the city without traditional covering clothes (chador) during the Reza shah, Pahlavi the first, and the other Act practicing now during Islamic Republic, against the presence of women in the city without hejab. These kinds of social obligatory Acts, while don’t move towards their objectives, cause great social reactions among society and make its way of development slow, unstable, and challenging. While achieving equal gender spatial situation in the different spaces of the city, and in architectural spaces, is itself a progressive objective, but the process, the method for obtaining that valuable goal is as important as the ends per se.

It seems that kinds of democratic public actions in different level of decision making from micro to macro could provide the successful and sustainable consequences.

**Findings of this research bring up areas necessitate more studies:**

- Focusing on gendered spaces of different North–South locations in the city, their differences according to their associated behaviors, activities or perhaps physical characteristics.
- Quantitative researches in subjects of this study to specify the quantified distribution of different gender spatial groups, and more specification of social characteristics.

- People differentiations by “sex” means “gender spatial identity” differences between women and men require an special study looking for its presentation on different scales, particularly among families; it seems the obvious crisis in many of Iranian families, and increased numbers of divorcement in the city are the indications of family’s disagreement related to the different level of consciousness towards gender inequality among women and men in family relations.

- Case study clarified the importance of social phenomenon of women’s insecurity in the city as a major obstacle to the women’s freely moving in the city and using its different spaces. Insecurity of the city causes that even gender equitable thoughts tend to conservative actions in using spaces; in fact it pushes whole the society towards inequality in spatial practices. Understanding this social phenomenon thoroughly needs an special study to investigate its various aspects in its complicated situation in Tehran.

- While this research provided material for theoretical study about “gendered spaces”, it also clarified the necessity of theorizing the framework for this kind of study mean “gender – space” relationships.

- Related to “gender – space” theory, it’s necessary to do more researches in other places investigating their kinds of relationships, whether physically or through practice to specify theoretically the place of findings of this research about the associations between “gender” and “space” through “spatial practice and activity”.
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