Kent Academic Repository
Full text document (pdf)

The Social and Cultural Psychology of Honour:

What Have We Learned from Researching Honour in Turkey?

Ayse K. Uskul*

University of Kent, School of Psychology

Keynes College

Canterbury CT2 7NP, United Kingdom

Phone: +44(0)1227824071

Email: a.k.uskul@kent.ac.uk

Susan E. Cross

Iowa State University

Department of Psychology

901 Stange Rd., W112 Lagomarcino Hall

Phone: 1-515-708-0818

Email: scross@iastate.edu

* Corresponding Author

Word count: 12418 (excluding abstract and references)

Abstract

A growing literature in social and cultural psychology has examined cultures of honour primarily focusing on southern states in the US and on Mediterranean countries of southern Europe. In this article, we review a programme of research that has extended theories of cultures of honour to an under-researched context: Turkey. We first describe research that assessed lay reports of the situations that enhance or attack a person's honour and lay prototypes of honour. Next, we review research that built on this foundation and examined emotional implications, actual retaliatory responses, and preferences for different types of actions (e.g., attack vs. withdrawal) in the face of honour threats. We then briefly comment on our current research focused on the ways that honour threats can impede goal pursuit, on the distinction between different types of honour threats, and on acculturation processes in immigrant groups from cultures of honour. We conclude by highlighting the contributions of this programme of research to the literature on cultures of honour and discuss future directions. (167 words)

Introduction

Comparative evidence accumulated over the last three decades has demonstrated considerable cross-cultural variation in psychological processes, showing that many of the phenomena that we used to think of as 'basic' social psychology turn out to be culture-bound (for reviews see Cohen & Kitayama, 2018; Kitayama & Uskul, 2011). An overwhelming majority of this evidence has originated from comparisons conducted between western (e.g., North America and Western Europe) and east Asian (e.g., Japan, Korea) cultural contexts (De Almeida & Uchida, 2018). One consequence of this has been that findings from studies conducted in North America/Western Europe versus East Asia have generally been taken as representing the West versus the rest, respectively (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). This is clearly problematic because, among other reasons, it limits the evidence base to two regions, assumes that everyone else's psychological processes can be understood and predicted based on studies conducted with these two broad cultural groups, and encourages researchers to think in binary terms. Furthermore, this heavy reliance on western versus east Asian comparisons has been accompanied by an overemphasis on the individualism-collectivism dimension used to predict and make sense of similarities and differences in the psychological processes among members of cultural groups from these large regions. Although this initial comparative work has been extremely valuable and ground-breaking in terms of challenging assumptions of mainstream psychology concerning uniformity in human cognition, emotion, and behaviour across cultural groups, researchers have called for more research to be conducted on unrevealed psychological variation (Henrich, 2015) and for cultural psychological research to go beyond comparisons of East-Asian vs. Western groups (Heine & Norenzayan, 2006).

In this article, we summarize evidence originating largely from our own research that focuses on *honour* as a framework or cultural syndrome which consists of "…shared beliefs, values, behaviours, and practices that are organized around a central theme" (Leung & Cohen, 2011, p.2) and shows how it operates in an under-researched cultural context, Turkey, thereby contributing to diversity in psychological research. Based on previous social science research, we conceptualize Turkey as an example of a context where a cultural logic based on honour is used to respond to events and to build reputations, motivating individuals to engage in a variety of behaviours that can have negative (e.g., aggressiveness) or positive (e.g., reciprocity) interpersonal consequences (Gregg, 2005, 2007). Given the scarcity of social psychological research in this particular context, we started our research by taking a bottom-up approach, first trying to understand the layperson's perspective on honour and then applying it to make sense of how it shapes individuals' motivation, emotion, and behaviour. Before we turn to findings obtained from a series of studies that we conducted over the last decade, a brief background on cultures of honour is in order.

Background on Cultures of Honour

Anthropologists working in Mediterranean societies first described honour cultures (e.g., Abou-Zeid, 1965; Abu-Lughod, 1986). Julian Pitt-Rivers, a British anthropologist who worked in a small Spanish village, described honour as "the value of a person in his own eyes, but also in the eyes of his society" (1965, p. 21). In this definition, Pitt-Rivers articulated a key feature of honour cultures: that an individual's worth is not only self-defined (as in most Western European heritage cultures), but it is also socially defined in terms of one's reputation, status, and respect by others. To maintain their honour, individuals must live up to local codes of conduct (e.g., be honest, care for one's family, reciprocate hospitality) and must vigorously defend their reputation

from affront (Peristiany, 1965). Because honour and respect are easily lost and difficult to recover once lost (Stewart, 1994), any insult or affront that suggests one is not an honourable, honest, virtuous person must be confronted quickly and aggressively. The person who fails to respond aggressively to an insult is viewed as weak, dishonourable, and perhaps guilty of the behaviour that led to the insult (see Uskul, Cross, Gunsoy, & Gul, 2018, for more background on early research on cultures of honour).

Origins of Cultures of Honour

Imagine yourself as a sheep-herder. Your job is to make sure your flock finds sufficient grazing and water, to assist ewes through the birthing process, and to protect your flock from predators. Dogs, fire, or noise may keep non-human predators away, but only strength, weapons, and vengeance can deter human predators. In high mountain pastures or remote grasslands, the police, sheriff, or other state-sponsored law-keepers are unavailable in the event of a human attack. Thus, the protector of the flock must be able to vigorously defend his herd from predation.

Historians argue that cultures of honour arise in such situations: where a family's resources are easily stolen and the rule of law is unavailable (Edgerton, 1971; Fischer, 1989; Gastil, 1971; McWhiney, 1988). In such lawless conditions, men must be "sheriffs on their own hearth" (Fischer, 1989, p. 765), willing to punish anyone who threatens their families' livelihood in order to redress wrongdoing and restore justice. Men must develop a reputation for toughness, strength, and the willingness to retaliate quickly and decisively against an insult or threat, so that others are reluctant to antagonize them. In short, men must develop reputations as 'One Who Cannot Be Messed With' (Cohen, Hernandez, Gruschow, Nowak, Gelfand, & Borkowski, 2018), so that others do not see them as an easy mark for theft or assault.

This review focuses on the concept of honour in Turkey and the ways in which it compares to the concept of honour in the northern United States. Contemporary Turkish people are the descendants of people who originally came from the mountains and arid steppes of Central Asia (Findley, 2005). These Turkic groups were nomadic pastoralists who raised cattle, sheep, and goats, and who migrated in search of greener pastures for their livestock (Findley, 2005). They also domesticated horses, and they are described as developing "the most mobile and militaristic of all major forms of pastoralism" (Fletcher, 1985, p. 37). Contemporary concern for honour in Turkey may have its roots in this early ecological setting.

Whatever its source, honour is a key cultural value in contemporary Turkey. The reputation of being an honourable person is a valued possession, but its loss causes disrepute, ostracism, and sometimes violence (Bagli & Sev'er, 2003; Kardam, 2005). The variety of Turkish terms for the concept of honour (e.g., *onur, namus, seref, haysiyet, nam, san, izzet*) attests to its cultural centrality (Sev'er & Yurdakul, 2001). Honour is shared with one's family, community, and country; a threat to one is a threat to all. Thus, individuals seek to enhance and safeguard their honour for the sake of their in-groups (DeKeseredy & Hinch, 1991; Meeker, 1976; Sev'er, 1997). In general, the desire to be an honourable person leads to attention to moral behaviour, to the desire to be a good family member, and to concern for one's social image. Yet the motivation to defend one's honour (and the honour of one's family) can also lead to violence and aggression, even against one's own family members. So-called "honour killings" still occur in Turkey, in which family members punish a female member of the society accused of illicit behaviour by killing her or forcing her to commit suicide (*A dishonourable practice,* 2007; Arin, 2001; Bagli, & Sev'er, 2003; Kardam, 2005; Sev'er, 2005; Wikan, 2008).

Finally, the central value of honour to the nation of Turkey has been established in the laws of the land. For example, until just 15 years ago, individuals who engaged in crimes in the name of honour benefitted from reduced punishment justified by 'unjust provocation'. Although the new Penal Code makes it more difficult for perpetrators of honour killings to claim that they were provoked as their defence, the implementation of the new code is not without limitations. Furthermore, with the introduction of harsher sentences for honour crimes, it is estimated that the practice of 'honour suicides' has increased (Arin, 2001).

Another example from the legal field highlights the importance of national honour, which is institutionalized in Article 301 of the Turkish Penal Code. This states that insults to the nation, the Turkish Republic, the Grand National Assembly, or the judicial system can result in a prison term of 6 months to 2 years. This article has been used to press charges against more than 60 journalists, writers, and university professors, including the Nobel Laureate novelist Orhan Pamuk. Thus, Turkey is an especially appropriate context for the investigation of the psychological consequences of a culture of honour.

Moreover, Turkey differs in various ways from other contexts in which most social psychological research on honour has been conducted. It shows collectivistic as well as individualistic cultural tendencies, with both autonomous and relational characteristics making up individuals' selves (especially in urban contexts, see Kagitcibasi & Ataca, 2005, 2015; Uskul, Lalonde, & Hynie, 2004). Most of the Turkish population is Muslim, and the country is situated at the crossroads of the European and Middle-Eastern cultural influences. Finally, it has a fragile economy and unreliable law enforcement. These features contrast with the Christian, economically developed, more legally sound, and culturally Western settings of southern US and Spain, where most of social psychological research on honour has taken place (e.g., Brown,

2016; Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle, & Schwarz, 1996; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Ramirez-Marin & Shafa, 2017; Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, & Fischer, 2002a, 2002b). It could be argued that Turkey is similar to other Middle Eastern (e.g., Qatar) and North African (e.g., Egypt) cultural contexts (e.g., Aslani et al., 2016; Gelfand et al., 2015), but Turkey's secular outlook (at least until recently) and strong political, economic, and cultural ties with the West make Turkey different from these (and other Middle Eastern) contexts, as well. Finally, individuals residing in Turkey differ in educational attainment, occupational status, family and friendship ties and religious and gender-role values from their immigrant counterparts in Europe (e.g., in Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium; see Guveli et al., 2016) who have participated in honour-related research (e.g., Rodriguez Mosquera, Fischer, Manstead, & Zaalberg, 2008, Shafa, Harinck, Ellemers, & Beeersma, 2014; Shafa, Harinck, Ellemers, & Beersma, 2015; van Osch, Breugelmans, Zeelenberg, & Boluk, 2013). It is against this unique background that we chose to conduct our programme of research, comparing the Turkish context with northern American[1] cultural settings. In the next section, we briefly review the theoretical foundations of the existing social psychological research on honour cultures.

Theoretical Foundations of Cultures of Honour

Until approximately thirty years ago, almost all research in social psychology originated in societies that shared a Western European heritage: Western Europe, Australia, and North America (Canada and the United States). These societies are largely marked by individualism, democracy, and relative equality. In addition, these societies have been described as *dignity*

---

[1] We use the term 'northern American' here and elsewhere in the paper to refer to northern United States and 'northern Americans' to refer to participants recruited from the northern United States.

cultures, in which an individual's worth is inherent and inalienable; it cannot be taken away by others (see Table 1 in Leung & Cohen, 2011). These beliefs are enshrined in institutional documents, such as the European Union's Charter, which affirms individual freedoms, inherent worth, equality, and privacy.

In a dignity cultural context, individuals are expected to internalize the society's norms and values for a good person, and then to look inward to their own personal standards and beliefs as guides for proper behaviour. People are expected to behave lawfully and morally whether or not others are observing them; the pangs of one's own conscience (rather than the disapproval of others) are supposedly enough to encourage good behaviour (Leung & Cohen, 2011). Adages such as "to thine own self be true" (Shakespeare, 2009, Act 1, Scene 3) are invoked to encourage individuals to resist social pressure and to live up to their own standards for behaviour. Individuals rely on (mostly) reliable legal systems to enforce the rules of lawful behaviour, to support contractual agreements, and to defend the rights of the accused. Apart from established laws for behaviour (do not steal, cheat, murder, assault others, and so on), the norms and expectations for appropriate behaviour are situational and often individually defined. People who defy or ignore social norms and expectations are sometimes viewed as clueless or disrespectful, but at other times they may be held up as heroes, trailblazers, and leaders (see Kim & Markus, 1999, for examples). In short, the cultural logic of dignity cultures is like a one-legged stool (individual worth) that is supported by an institutional structure of laws and law-keepers.

In contrast, as mentioned above, honour cultures develop in ecologies where one's wealth is portable (herds of cattle or sheep, for example) and the justice system is weak or ineffectual. In such situations, the individual must be willing to protect his/her own livelihood, family, and

reputation, by violent means if necessary. The lasting legacy of these contexts is a cultural logic

that rests on three legs: one's views of oneself (individual worth), one's social reputation, and the

honour code (or normative expectations against which one's behaviour is measured; Campbell,

1964; Gilmore, 1987; Peristiany, 1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1965). An individual who adheres to the

honour code can view him/herself as a worthy person (and have high self-esteem). The

individual's self-assessment is necessary but not sufficient to be an honourable person, however.

Others in the person's social environment must also view the individual as honourable (Leung &

Cohen, 2011). An individual's (or family's) social and economic prospects depend on being

viewed as reputable, trustworthy people. For example, in the absence of a court that can

adjudicate a wrong, an agreement between two people relies on each person's reputation for

trustworthiness and honesty. If a man cannot be trusted to keep his word and follow through on

an agreement, then others will shun him. If one's reputation is sullied, the individual or family

may lose social connections that afford jobs, housing, mates, trade, or other resources. Thus, it is

imperative than any challenge to an individual's honesty, integrity, or honour is challenged

quickly and assertively; the person who fails to do so is assumed to have earned the insult and is

viewed as weak, shameful, and dishonourable.

This context, in which the rule of law is weak and one's social standing and opportunities

depend on others' regard, creates an environment in which *reciprocity* or *payback* is an

organizing principle (Leung & Cohen, 2011). The honourable person pays back his or her debts

but also exacts retaliation or revenge on anyone who seeks to do them wrong (Miller, 1993).

Indeed, members of honour cultures are more likely to reciprocate positive behaviours (a favour,

hospitality) as well as negative behaviours (an insult or threat), compared to members of non-

honour cultures (such as northern US states). Furthermore, honour can easily be stolen by others

or lost through one's own failings, and once lost, it is difficult to regain (Stewart, 1994). Consequently, members of cultures of honour tend to be vigilant for threats to their honour, both for their own sake and for the sake of their family.

The cultural logic of honour can lead to great hospitality, politeness, and sincere concern for behaving in a virtuous, moral fashion (Cohen, Vandello, Puente, & Rantilla, 1999; Cohen & Vandello, 2004). In addition, it can lead to what may seem to outsiders to be "irrational" defence of one's honour. As pointed out by Nisbett and Cohen (1996) in their examination of the culture of honour in the American South, bar fights or school brawls over seemingly trivial insults or threats are more common in southern than in other states. For men in cultures of honour, ignoring an insult to oneself or one's family allows one to be labelled as weak, feminine, and a "push-over." At times, this vigilance and retaliation may seem "irrational," such as when the individual endures a beating so as not to appear weak. Yet, as Cohen and his colleagues have shown in agent-based modelling approaches, the short-term irrationality of both positive and negative reciprocity pays off in the long term in the form of good repute and fewer threats (Cohen et al., 2018; Nowak, Gelfand, Borkowski, Cohen, & Hernandez, 2016).

This earlier social psychological work comparing honour and dignity contexts by Cohen and colleagues (in the United States), as well as research by Rodriguez Mosquera and colleagues (in Europe) (for reviews see Rodriguez Mosquera, 2016, 2018; Uskul et al., 2018), inspired us to extend the concept of honour and its consequences to the cultural context of Turkey. We started a programme of research in which we turned to Turkey to examine the meaning of honour, the situations that are relevant to honour, and the emotional and behavioural consequences of honour. In our studies, we also included samples from northern parts of the US to allow for comparisons with a much-studied cultural group, both in the literature on cultures of honour and

the wider literature in cultural psychology. For the most part, our data originate from samples recruited at large, public universities in Turkey (mostly urban, e.g., Istanbul, Ankara) and North America. In this article, we review evidence that has emerged from this programme of research. We discuss our findings in relation to evidence provided by other researchers who study honour in different cultural contexts and the theory and research in cultural psychology in general.

The Cultural Construction of Honour: Situations and Prototypes

As mentioned above, there is ample evidence from anthropological and social psychological research demonstrating that although the existence and importance of honour have been identified in many cultures, the salience and forms of honour, and responses to honour-relevant situations vary considerably (see Uskul et al., 2018 for a review). However, surprisingly, what honour means to individuals in different cultural contexts has not been studied in detail (for a notable exception see Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2002a), and to our knowledge, there was no research on this question in the Turkish[2] context. In addition, theoretical definitions of honour and the key features attributed to it also differ widely. In the absence of systematic social psychological research on honour in Turkey and a clear definition of honour in the social sciences, we decided to start our research by simply asking individuals to share with us their understanding of the concept. We did this in two different ways. First, adopting a situation sampling approach, we asked participants to list situations that they considered as honour-relevant. We then coded these situations for the types of attributes, events, or behaviours that they entailed, with the goal of identifying the kinds of situations that are considered to have an effect on one's honour and to examine whether these situations were different or similar to each

---

[2] We use 'Turkish' not to refer to an ethnic group, but as a shortcut to refer to the samples that we worked with when conducting our studies in Turkey.

other in Turkish and north American cultural contexts (Uskul et al., 2012). Second, we used a prototype approach to uncover the content and structure of the layperson's conceptions of honour in these two contexts (Cross et al., 2014). The notion of honour is not foreign in dignity cultures, but as others have shown, it is often defined or experienced differently than in cultures of honour (Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2002a). We included members of a dignity culture (northern US) in these studies to clarify both similarities and differences in conceptions of honour and honour-related situations across dignity and honour cultures and to examine how honour-related conceptions and situations of one cultural group would be perceived and responded to in the other cultural group.

Situations as Carriers of Honour

Cultures leave their stamps both inside and outside of our heads, shaping not only what we think, feel, and prefer, but also the customs, structures, and everyday practices and scripts that we experience and follow (Kitayama, 2002; Morling & Lameraux, 2008). Ideals, values, and beliefs are typically communicated through social situations and contexts that afford certain responses and behaviours (called cultural affordances, Kitayama & Markus, 1999; also see Kitayama, 2002). Thus, examining social situations encountered in different cultural contexts can provide important insights into whether different cultural groups are exposed to different types of experiences.[3] Capitalizing on the informative value of the situation sampling approach, we asked 84 Turkish participants and 97 participants of European-American background to list situations that they considered as most effective if someone wanted to a) *attack or insult* somebody else's

---

[3] For example, American contexts have been shown to afford many more opportunities for self-enhancement than do Japanese contexts (e.g., Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, & Norasakkunkit, 1997).

honour, or b) *enhance or increase* somebody else's honour (Uskul et al., 2012). By making the questions focus on somebody else's honour, we aimed to capture examples of culturally consensual situations that would either threaten or enhance one's honour. We then coded the situations generated by participants for who they involved (e.g., themselves, close others, groups, audience). We predicted that situations generated by Turkish participants would be more likely to involve close others, social groups, and an audience (reflecting the relational nature of honour in this context) than would situations generated by northern American participants, which would be more likely to involve an individual target only (reflecting the individual focus of honour in this context). We also coded the situations for the kinds of incidents they involved (e.g., false accusations, praise).

This coding exercise revealed that, on average, Turkish participants generated more situations than did northern American participants. As predicted, a greater number of the honour-threatening (but not honour-enhancing) situations generated by Turkish participants (11.6% vs. 3.5% in the US sample) involved a reference to a relational target (e.g., calling someone's sister a liar), whereas a greater number of situations generated by northern American participants (95% vs. 88.4% in the Turkish sample) involved a reference to an individual target (e.g., accusing someone of being dishonest). Furthermore, supporting our prediction, a greater number of Turkish honour-attacking situations involved a reference to an audience (overall 25.3% vs. 4.7% in the US sample) such as a close other (e.g., mother, 7.8% vs. 0.7%) or a social group (e.g., classroom or sports team, 17.5% vs. 4.1%). These findings are congruent with previously documented culturally variable forms of honour and further highlight that individuals in Western individualistic settings tend to experience honour more as based on one's own behaviour, whereas in cultures of honour, honour is both based on treatment by and respect of others and

shared among others (close others or ingroups). In contrast, members of collectivistic honour cultures tend to experience honour in more diverse and arguably complex ways: Honour involving the individual as well as close others and honour involving how the individual is viewed by other people (see Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2000, 2002a, 2002b).

The analysis of the content of the situations revealed that honour-attacking situations mainly involved a person being subjected to humiliation, false accusation, sexual or physical attack, challenge or criticism, or a person being attributed negative character or behaviour, or lack of achievement. As shown in Table 1, Turkish and northern American participants mentioned honour-attacking situations that involved an insult or explicit humiliation of another person with about the same frequency, but other types of situations were mentioned with different frequencies. Turkish participants were much more likely than the American participants to mention situations that referred to false accusation, unfair treatment, and physical or sexual attacks. In contrast, American participants were more likely than Turkish participants to mention situations that contained a criticism of a person's ideas or character, or situations that focused on a person's lack of integrity. These findings suggest that for Americans, one's honour is primarily threatened by what one does or is (e.g., immoral behaviour or having bad character) or fails to do (e.g., being outperformed by another person), whereas for Turkish individuals, one's honour is open to being impugned by others' actions.

This differing conception of honour is also reflected in the types of honour-enhancing situations generated by Turkish and American participants. The largest proportion of situations generated by Turkish participants involved being praised or appreciated by others, whereas the largest proportion of situations generated by American participants involved helping and serving others. Again, this may reflect the perspective that in Turkey, one's honour derives from both

one's own self-appraisals and the appraisals of others, whereas for Americans, one's honour is primarily due to one's own character and behaviour.

Insert Table 1 about here

Next, we examined the ways individuals from these two cultural contexts respond to the situations generated by Turkish and American individuals in the previous study. We asked a new sample of 81 Turkish participants and 76 participants of European-American background to imagine themselves in each situation and to evaluate how these experiences would impact their own feelings about themselves and the feelings of close others. We found that Turkish participants, compared with American participants, rated their own feelings and close others' feelings about themselves more extremely, especially when they imagined themselves in situations generated by their Turkish peers (and more strongly so when imagining honour-attacking situations). Furthermore, Turkish participants rated the implications of honour-relevant situations similarly for self and family, whereas American participants rated the implications of these situations more negatively for themselves than for their family. This finding suggests that the impact of honour situations on oneself is likely to spill over and generate similar consequences for close others in the Turkish cultural settings, whereas the primary impact of such situations is on the individual him/herself in the American cultural settings, with close others' feelings affected to a lesser degree. A further interesting finding in this study revealed that both Turkish *and* American participants evaluated situations generated by Turkish participants as producing more impact on both themselves and their close others than situations generated by American participants.

This initial set of studies provided important insights into how the concept of honour is understood and experienced in the Turkish cultural group and represents the departure point of our research. Overall, findings from these two studies demonstrate that both similarities and differences exist in the cultural conceptualization of honour. In terms of similarities, both Turkish and northern American participants generated more honour relevant situations that involve self as a target compared with relational targets (e.g., close others) and evaluated insults and humiliating acts as similarly honour-attacking. Findings also demonstrated differences. For example, in the Turkish context compared with the northern American context, honour was likely to be viewed as a shared commodity, regardless of whether honour is enhanced or attacked; honour situations covered a wide range of domains of behaviour (from humiliation and criticism to sexual attack) and the spillover occurs for a wide range of situations; and there was greater sensitivity to the self- and close other-relevant implications of honour-threatening situations compared with honour-enhancing situations. Moreover, similar patterns of findings emerged when examining response patterns from the perspective of the participants and the situations, suggesting that the concept of honour operates similarly psychologically *and* in the composition of situations.

Our comparative approach helped identify the common core of honour across the Turkish and northern American cultural contexts: the person's own self-appraisals of worth. It also showed that the appraisals of others represent a culturally variable component. Also, in line with the features of the cultural syndromes of dignity and honour as discussed by Leung and Cohen (2011), we observed that Northern Americans were more likely than Turkish participants to think of honour as a characteristic that belongs primarily to the individual and is not defined by others. Moreover, the types of situations described as honour-threatening or honour-enhancing varied

between the two groups, suggesting that the cognitive representations of honour are likely to show differences. Finally, situations generated by Turkish participants were found to be more impactful by both groups than situations generated by American participants. This raises the question what it is about these situations that make them perceived to be more impactful. Before we turn to this question in a later section, in the next section we continue to focus on the meaning of honour, which we studied by asking participants what they think honour is.

The Meaning of Honour: A Prototypes Approach

To gain further insight into how honour is understood and conceptualized in the Turkish and Northern American contexts, we used a prototype approach in a separate set of studies (Cross et al., 2014). This approach helps to uncover the content and structure of the layperson's representations of a concept (e.g., love, forgiveness, modesty, and in the current case: honour) and can be used to evaluate existing theories of that concept. We used this approach comparatively to identify cultural similarities and differences in the features of the honour prototype and to search for meaningful dimensions underlying that prototype. To these ends (and following the methods employed by previous psychological research on prototypes, e.g., Fehr [1988]), we first asked participants to generate all the features of honour that they could think of. We then created a shorter list of features by combining conceptually meaningful features (e.g., brave and courageous) and we examined the average number of features generated in each group, as well as any overlap in the features generated. This analysis revealed, first, that Turkish participants had a more complex representation of honour than did northern American participants, generating an average of 7.42 features as opposed to 4.97 features generated by northern American participants. Second, frequencies of the most common features varied between the two cultural groups. In the Turkish sample, the most frequently mentioned feature of

honour was honesty (generated by 40% of the participants), followed by *namus* (generated by 20% of the participants).[4] In contrast, the most frequently mentioned northern American features (doing the right thing and being respected) were mentioned by only 15% of the sample. Thus, a greater proportion of Turkish participants agreed on the specific features of honour than did northern American participants. We inspected the overlap in the features generated by the members of the two groups using the index of prototype similarity (Cantor, Mischel, & Schwartz, 1982) and we found a low level of similarity (.14) between the two lists, which suggests differences in the cognitive representations of honour between the two groups. The comparison of the features in these two lists also yielded an interesting observation, namely that 30% (vs. 4% in the northern American sample) of the statements generated by Turkish participants used negative phrasing (e.g., not cheating; not going back on your word), highlighting the importance paid in this context to ways in which honour can be lost.

Next, we asked a separate sample of 197 Turkish participants and 249 participants of European-American background to rate the list of features generated by their co-nationals by indicating how central they thought the features were to their concept of honour. The centrality ratings showed that, in the Turkish sample, the features that were high in both frequency and centrality included honesty, keeping promises, not telling lies, trustworthiness, having personal values, truthfulness, dignity, self-respect, not being a hypocrite, and not stealing anything. In the northern American sample, the features that were high in frequency and centrality included doing the right thing, being respected, trustworthiness, being respectful, being honest, integrity, self-

---

[4] *Namus* is a term used to refer to sexual honor that presupposes certain physical and moral qualities that women are expected to have (Sev'er & Yurdakul, 2001), but the term is also used to denote a person's trustworthiness and morality in a more general sense.

respect, having morals, helping others, following one's own morals, having personal values, how one acts, and being hardworking. Most of the features in the Turkish list focused on moral behaviour and self-respect, whereas most of the features in the American list also reflected good behaviour, but in contrast to the Turkish list, there was relatively little mention of specific moral behaviours (except for vague terms such as 'doing the right thing'). This prototype approach helped us identify the central and peripheral features of honour reported by lay people in Turkey and the northern US.

The next step involved an examination of the cultural similarities and differences in the centrality ratings of the combined set of features. This allowed us to investigate (a) each group's ratings of features generated by members of their own group vs. members of the other group, and (b) whether there may be meaningful dimensions underlying these features (the latent structure of the ratings). In relation to (a), we found that participants rated the features generated by members of their own culture as more central to their prototypes of honour than features generated by the other cultural group. In response to (b), an exploratory factor analysis of the ratings revealed a four-factor solution (with similar fit in both cultural groups), which explained 52.9% of the variance in the ratings of Turkish participants and 49.8% of the variance in the ratings of the northern American participants. In both groups, the first factor reflected the notion of honour as social reputation and one's regard by others (example item: how much the society values the person); we labelled this factor '*Social Status/Respect*'. The second factor was prescriptive and included a range of actions that an individual should or should not do (example item: being just); we called this factor '*Moral Behaviour*'. The third factor included items that tap the importance of one's moral convictions and the feeling that the person is worthy of respect (example item: the value one gives to him/herself); we labelled this factor '*Self-Respect*'. The

fourth factor reflected engagement with the welfare of others (example item: doing something for the society); we called this factor '*Helping Others*'. Comparisons between the two groups revealed differences in the means of Moral Behaviour (with Turkish participants scoring higher than northern American participants) and Helping Others (with northern American participants scoring higher than Turkish participants).

Using a different sample of participants consisting of 287 Turkish individuals and 305 participants of European-American background, we examined whether the four-dimensional structure obtained above would replicate when participants rated the same features in terms of the importance of these features to themselves. A similar factor structure emerged, with the exception that most items that had loaded on the Helping Others factor in the previous study loaded on the Moral Behaviour factor in this study; this resulted in a three- rather than a four-factor solution, which had a better fit better with the importance ratings (Moral Behaviour, Social Status/Respect, and Self-Respect). As shown in Table 2, these factors correlated positively with each other, but notably, the correlations between moral behaviour and the other dimensions was stronger for the northern US participants than for the Turkish participants. In this study, we also examined how these factors related to other theoretically meaningful constructs and found that, overall, the three factors predicted scores on other individual difference measures (e.g., the Honour Values Scale [Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2008], the Others' Approval subscale of the Contingencies of Self-Worth Scale [Crocker, Luhtanen, Cooper, & Bouvrette, 2003], and the Inalienable Worth Scale [Leung & Cohen, 2011]) in predictable ways.

Insert Table 2 about here

These studies provide the following insights. First, the factor structure that emerged from the factor analyses of the centrality ratings and the personal importance ratings revealed that there were three shared factors that explained substantial variance in these measures. These factors (Moral Behaviour, Social Status/Respect, and Self-Respect) support the dual theory of honour that includes self-worth and social recognition (Pitt-Rivers, 1965; Wikan, 2008) and extend it by highlighting the importance of moral behaviour for understanding honour. Thus, honour is respecting oneself and being respected by others, but it is also the self- and social-esteem that has good and proper behaviour as its basis. This finding echoes the work of the early anthropologists (Peristiany, 1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1965) who focused on the honour codes that directed behaviour. Identification of the moral behaviour dimension of honour points out that both self-esteem and social esteem are conditional; they are based on the individual's adherence to the local norms and expectations for persons who occupy specific cultural niches (defined by gender, class, age, and other statuses). Second, despite considerable differences at the level of specific features, lay conceptions of honour in a dignity culture (northern US) and in an honour culture (Turkey) share some underlying similarities.

Despite these similarities between the two groups, there were also some important differences. The correlations of the moral behaviour subscale with the self-respect and social respect subscales were much stronger among the northern Americans than among the Turkish participants. We interpreted this finding in terms of differences in the cultural tightness-looseness of the two societies. In tight societies, the social norms for behaviour are very strict; individuals who do not comply with the local norms and codes for behaviour are likely to be strongly chastised, punished, or shunned (Gelfand et al., 2011). In contrast, loose cultural

contexts allow people discretion as to whether to comply with local norms; there are fewer proscriptive norms or codes; and deviation from the norms is not only allowed but may even be applauded (Kim & Markus, 1999). Thus, in a tight society such as Turkey, adherence to the moral code is viewed as compulsory and may not be grounds for enhancing one's self-respect or social respect ("In being honest, I only did what I was supposed to do"). In other words, doing what is expected is not laudable. In contrast, in the culturally loose context of northern US dignity states, individuals may self-enhance by viewing themselves as especially moral ("In being honest, I was behaving exceptionally, and so I am worthy of respect"). Another possible interpretation is that Turkish participants might recognize that their honour does not entirely lie in their own control (i.e., is not entirely based on their own actions [moral or otherwise]); despite acting upright or honestly, others can impugn their honour with false accusations and attacks. Thus, self- and social respect may be in part in the hands of others.

We should note that these studies were designed to examine the conceptualization of honour among lay people and thus do not shed light on how honour (even if it conceptualized similarly by lay persons in different cultural groups) may differentially shape emotions, motivate behaviour, and create honour-related situations in different cultural contexts. How honour shapes psychological processes may be more culturally variable than how honour is culturally constructed. We turn to this next.

Responses to Honour Threats: Situational and Cultural Variation

Our initial studies demonstrated that a range of different situations can be construed as threatening to one's own (and close others') honour. What happens when individuals find themselves in these situations? How would they respond emotionally and behaviourally? Would

they attack or aggress against the person who threatens their honour or ignore and withdraw from the situation? Would we see any cultural group differences in responses to honour-relevant situations and does the type of situation shape responses? In a series of studies, we investigated these questions with Turkish and northern American samples.

Emotional Responses to Honour-Threatening and Honour-Enhancing Situations

In a direct follow-up to the situation sampling study we described above, we started our investigations of responses to honour relevant situations by asking why situations generated by Turkish participants were evaluated as more potent (i.e., as having greater impact on oneself or close others) by both Turkish and northern American participants compared with situations generated by northern American participants (Uskul et al., 2014). One possibility could be that these situations tend to be associated with stronger emotions. To investigate this possibility, we asked 168 Turkish participants and 228 participants of European-American background to report the extent to which they would experience a large set of negative or positive emotions if they found themselves in different honour-threatening or honour-enhancing situations. We derived these situations from the list of situations generated by Turkish and northern American participants in Uskul et al. (2012). Before collecting the ratings of these situations in terms of their emotional consequences, we asked a separate sample of 200 Turkish and 167 European-American participants to rate them for how central or representative they think these situations are to their concept of situations that would enhance (or threaten) a person's sense of honour. This allowed us to examine the degree to which the situations' centrality to the concept of honour would play a role in the emotional impact that they might have. The findings revealed a main effect of centrality, with highly central honour-threatening situations ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 1.04$) eliciting higher levels of negative affect than less central situations ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 1.00$), $d =$

.65. More importantly, there was a main effect of situation origin, with situations generated by Turkish participants ($M = 4.17$, $SD = .93$) eliciting higher levels of negative emotion than those generated by northern American participants ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 1.02$). Furthermore, a significant interaction between situation centrality and situation origin showed that the difference in the intensity of emotions elicited by highly versus less central Turkish situations ($d = 1.15$) was greater than highly versus less central American situations ($d = .23$), suggesting they were differentiated more by the participants. Also, Turkish participants responded similarly to the highly and less central situations generated by northern Americans, suggesting that they perceived these situations to be relatively similar in their emotional consequences.

The pattern was similar for honour-enhancing situations: there were significant main effects of centrality and situation origin, with highly central situations eliciting higher levels of positive emotions ($M = 4.74$, $SD = .81$) than less central situations ($M = 4.58$, $SD = .79$), and with situations generated by Turkish participants eliciting higher levels of positive emotions ($M = 4.80$, $SD = .79$) than those generated by northern American participants ($M = 4.53$, $SD = .83$). Overall, these findings demonstrate that Turkish situations were viewed as being associated with stronger emotional consequences than U.S. situations by both Turkish and northern American participants, providing an explanation for our previously observed findings that Turkish situations were evaluated as having greater impact than US situations (Uskul et al., 2012). Investigating situations in a given cultural context helps us to understand the situatedness of individuals' responses to events and sheds light on how human psychology and the environment may be mutually constituted. It also highlights the impact of situations on our responses regardless of our cultural background.

Retaliatory Responses to Honour-Threatening Situations

It has been at the heart of the theorizing in the social psychological literature on cultures of honour that members of honour cultures (especially men) aim to create and maintain reputations for strength and toughness, and they strive to be prepared to engage in aggressive actions when their honour faces a threat (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). Empirical research using attitudinal, archival, and experimental methods converges with this. For example, white men from southern US states are more likely than their northern counterparts to endorse violence when it is used to defend one's honour (e.g., the violent response to an insult is justified; Cohen & Nisbett, 1994) and to show physiological readiness for aggression and to actually engage in aggressive displays when insulted (Cohen et al., 1996). Similarly, Turkish participants reported that they would respond more aggressively than did Dutch participants when asked how they would react in different situations involving an insult or rude behaviour (van Osch et al., 2013, Study 1). Furthermore, when Turkish-Dutch participants were primed with their Turkish identity (compared to those primed with their Dutch identity), they reported that they would react more aggressively in a situation that involved a false accusation (van Osch et al., 2013, Study 2).

There is also evidence showing that aggressive responding is not the only likely action in the face of honour threats among members of honour cultures. For example, when faced with accumulating minor annoyances over time, southern Americans did not rush to respond and seemed to keep their anger under control, but when a line was crossed and they did respond, their reactions contained more aggression and hostility than those of individuals from northern US states (Cohen et al., 1999). In a series of studies, we examined evaluations of responses to hypothetical situations, as well as emotional and behavioural responses to honour threats using situations informed by our initial bottom-up research on honour-relevant situations (Uskul et al.,

2012). Based on previous research, we predicted retaliatory behaviour to honour-threatening situations among Turkish participants as members of honour cultures, especially when these involve events that are likely to stain someone's social reputation. We tested this general prediction using honour threats of varying potency (e.g., rude behaviour vs. false accusation) and using honour threats directed to the individuals themselves or to individuals close to them.

Approved responses to honour threats: Attack or withdrawal? To examine when aggressive or withdrawal reactions may be seen as the more appropriate response to an honour threat, we investigated evaluations of and reactions to two types of situations. Building on our research on honour relevant situations (Uskul et al., 2012), moderate honour threats were represented by situations that involved rude or humiliating behaviour inflicted on a target person (e.g., being called a vulgar name or being ridiculed). Strong honour threats were represented by situations that involved false accusations (e.g., being falsely accused for acts one has not committed or being subjected to unfair treatment one does not deserve; Cross, Uskul, Gercek-Swing, Sunbay, & Ataca, 2013). We created scenarios based on a randomly selected list of situations generated by participants in an earlier study (see Uskul et al., 2012, Study 1) that depicted the targets of the honour attacks as either exercising restraint and withdrawing from the situation, or confronting their attacker and showing disapproval (see also Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2008) (see Table 3 for an example of each type of situation). With respect to the moderate honour threats (rudeness), we hypothesized that Turkish participants would report more approval of someone who behaves in a restrained fashion than of someone who confronts the attacker. With respect to the strong honour threats (false accusations), we hypothesized that Turkish participants would report more approval of someone who confronts than someone who withdraws from the attack, because such accusations may have serious repercussions for the

individuals' own and their family's honour. We expected European American participants to exhibit a similar pattern of evaluations of and reactions to the two types of situations, albeit with a weaker differentiation in the evaluations of targets who withdraw versus targets who confront compared with the Turkish sample.

Insert Table 3 about here

We assessed participants' perceptions of the justifiability of the behaviour described in the scenario (e.g., necessary-unnecessary; good-bad) and approval of the target's behaviour (e.g., immoral-moral; weak-strong). We also asked participants to indicate the extent to which they thought that others in their society would approve of the target's behaviour, to report their estimate of how others would respond in the situation, and to disclose whether they would encourage others to behave like the target. Asking about both personal evaluations of the situation and their perceptions of the expectations of their society helps to bridge conceptions of culture as inside the head of individuals and conceptions of culture as outside of the person, embedded in social norms and practices (see e.g., Chiu, Gelfand, Yamagishi, Shteynberg, & Wan, 2010; Zou, Tam, Morris, Lee, Lau, & Chiu, 2009).

We found that, across a variety of evaluations, Turkish participants ($n = 186$) distinguished between the two types of scenarios (rudeness vs. false accusations) and the responses to them (withdrawal vs. confrontation) to a greater extent than did the northern American participants ($n = 196$). The differences in evaluations were most marked for the rudeness scenarios: Turkish participants viewed the person who withdrew from the rude honour threat as more justified than the person who confronted (d for the differences in the ratings of the

two types of scenarios was .37), whereas northern American participants evaluated the two

responses fairly similarly (d = .23). This pattern is consistent with the notion that members of

honour cultures may be slow to respond to some types of threats to avoid starting a cycle of

violence. In response to false accusations, both Turkish and northern American participants

endorsed the justification of confrontation more than withdrawal, but this effect was overall

stronger among the Turkish participants (d for the differences in the two types of situations = -

.74) compared to the US participants (d = -.52; a negative sign indicates higher endorsement of

confrontation than withdrawal). This pattern is consistent with the notion that in honour cultures

strong honour threats must be dealt with vigorously. Overall, these findings suggest that

members of honour cultures will pay attention to the distinction between situations which

promote restraint and withdrawal (rude insults) and those that require a swift confrontation of the

accuser (false accusations). Finally, both Turkish and northern American participants perceived

that others in their society would approve of confrontation more than withdrawal in response to

both rude affronts and false accusations. Again, however, the differences in ratings of withdrawal

versus confrontation were much larger for Turkish participants (d_{rude} = -.76; $d_{false\ accusation}$ = -1.12)

than for the northern US participants (d_{rude} = -.59; $d_{false\ accusation}$ = -.78). These observations reveal

that the Turkish participants perceived much stronger normative support for confronting an

insulter than did the northern US participants. These findings suggest the need for a more fine-

tuned approach to understanding how politeness norms operate across different honour-relevant

situations cross-culturally; researchers must also pay careful attention to different types of

honour threats if we are to understand and predict how members of honour cultures are likely to

respond to them.

Behavioural responses to honour threats. An overwhelming majority of studies in the social psychological literature on cultures of honour (and honour endorsement used as an individual difference variable) has focused on responses to threats directed to the (male) individual alone and to his masculine honour. However, as we and other researchers have shown using samples from different cultural contexts, honour is more than just masculine honour; it encompasses moral behaviour, self-respect and social reputation (Cross et al., 2014; Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2002; Uskul et al., 2012). Moreover, honour (especially in the Mediterranean and Middle Eastern regions) does not rely exclusively on one's own social reputation in the eyes of others, but also on how close others are socially evaluated (e.g., Miller, 1993; Rodriguez Mosquera, Tan, & Saleem, 2014; Stewart, 1994; Uskul et al., 2012). Thus, responding to both individual and relational honour attacks (i.e., directed to one's close others and social groups) in culturally appropriate ways would be important to maintain and protect honour. Moreover, with a few exceptions (e.g., Cohen et al., 1996; Cohen et al., 1999), most available evidence comes from studies that employed imagined or recalled honour threats. We attempted to address these gaps in the literature by examining retaliatory responses to actual honour threats among Turkish and northern American participants (Uskul, Cross, Günsoy, Gercek-Swing, Alozkan, & Ataca, 2015), thereby moving beyond the typically studied threats to masculinity and focusing on individual and relational forms of accusations of dishonesty as threats to honour. We focused on interpersonal threats to a person's honesty based on our findings showing that both Turkish and northern American participants view honesty as central to their lay conception of honour (Cross et al., 2014). We studied retaliation using behavioural measures in controlled experimental designs.

In two studies, we adopted a paradigm that allowed us to expose participants to an honour

threat by another (bogus) participant who was ostensibly in a nearby cubicle in the lab. In one study, 90 Turkish and 101 European American participants from a northern dignity state wrote an essay describing the role of honesty in their lives, and they received feedback from the (bogus) participant that either accused them of dishonesty (the honour threat) or gave them neutral feedback. Following the feedback, participants were invited to select a task for the (bogus) participant to complete using the cover story that we wanted to avoid any bias that might be introduced if the experimenter selected the task. Participants were asked to select 11 tangrams (a task that involves puzzles consisting of smaller shapes that are put together to form a bigger shape) out of 30 tangrams that varied in their level of difficulty (easy, medium, difficult) (see Saleem, Anderson, & Gentile, 2012). They were also told that the other participant would win a prize if they solved 10 tangrams in 10 minutes. Thus, our dependent measure was the number of tangrams that the participant would select from each difficulty level for the other (bogus) participant to complete; an aggressive response is indicated by the choice of more difficult tangrams, which would reduce the likelihood of the (bogus) participant winning the prize.

Our findings showed that Turkish participants retaliated more aggressively than did northern U.S. participants to the (bogus) person who provided the feedback critical of their honesty, by assigning this person more difficult tangrams to solve than easy ones (see Figure 1) (and hence making it less likely for the participant to be eligible for the prize). This was the case despite the fact that participants in both cultural groups evaluated the honour threatening feedback equally negatively. These findings indicate that the crucial cultural difference lies in how an honour threat affects subsequent behaviour and not in whether the feedback is found to be more or less negative by one group than the other. Importantly, the number of difficult over easy tangrams chosen did not differ between the two groups in the neutral feedback condition,

ruling out the possibility that Turkish participants had a generalized tendency to choose difficult

tangrams over easy ones (or to be retaliatory in the absence of threatening feedback).

Insert Figure 1 about here

In another study run with a separate sample of Turkish (*n* = 99) and northern European-

American (*n* = 106) participants, we examined retaliatory responses using a different behavioural

outcome and in relation to honour attacks directed to close others (parents) or to the individual

(in a between-subjects design). We also assessed honour endorsement at the individual level to

examine its role in relation to retaliatory behaviour in both cultural groups. The procedure of this

study was identical to the one described above, with the addition of a condition in which

participants wrote an essay about their family's honesty and the feedback given to the

participants in this condition targeted their family. Again, a bogus participant provided written

negative feedback that implied that the individual (or their parents, depending on the condition)

was dishonest (vs. neutral feedback).[5] Finally, we used a different measure to serve as a proxy

for retaliation (modified after Mussweiler & Förster, 2000); we asked participants to choose

---

[5] In the honor threat condition, the feedback was "*This essay isn't very persuasive, because I

think this person just made this up and doesn't really mean it. It's easy [for someone's parents]

to say that you value honesty, but do you really live it out? I think this person is just trying to

make himself/herself [his/her family] look good. Nobody [nobody's family] is really like this.*"

In the neutral condition, the feedback was "*Writing about our values is a difficult task. Most of

the time, we hardly recognize what our [parents'] values are and how much they shape our 'our

parent's] life [lives].*"

material for a subsequent study to be completed by the bogus participant from a list of sensory

tasks that varied in intensity (e.g., for touch, they could choose among eight possible intensities

that ranged from very short [30 seconds] to very long [135 seconds] exposure of a hand to ice

cold water). Our dependent variable was the average intensity level chosen for five different

sensory tasks that participants believed would be completed by the other participant who

provided feedback on their essay. We assessed individual-level honour endorsement using the

Honor Values scale by Rodriguez Mosquera et al. (2008) (sample item: It is important that others

have a positive image of me).

   Once again, the results revealed that Turkish participants retaliated more strongly (by

assigning more intense and potentially painful stimuli: $M = 5.08$, $SD = 1.19$) than did northern

American participants ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 1.28$) against the person who challenged their honesty.

Thus, across two studies, Turkish participants engaged in behaviour that they expected to lead to

negative consequences for the person challenging their honesty. This pattern did not replicate

when the negative feedback was directed to one's parents. An interesting result in relation to

responses to negative feedback involving parents emerged when we inspected the data taking

into account participants' honour value endorsement. Unfolding the significant interaction effect

between type of feedback (negative vs. neutral), essay content (parents' honesty vs. personal

honesty), and endorsement of honour values in the Turkish sample revealed that honour value

endorsement predicted the level of intensity of selected sensory stimuli only when the essay

concerned parents' honesty and when the feedback was negative (this interaction did not hold in

the northern American sample; see Figure 2). In other words, Turkish participants who cared

more about their social image retaliated more when their parents' honesty was attacked than did

those who cared less about their social image. Social image concerns were less relevant to

retaliation level when negative feedback targeted the self.

Insert Figure 2 about here

These two studies contribute to the scarce comparative literature on honour that uses behavioural measures and honour threats directed to targets other than individuals themselves. One important limitation that needs to be addressed by future research is to assess directly whether the negative feedback we used in these studies was indeed found to be honour threatening. We assumed this on the basis of our previous work, where participants indicated false accusations to constitute attacks to honour (Uskul et al., 2012), honesty being one of the core elements of what honour means (Cross et al., 2014). A further important avenue for future research is to examine the distinction between public versus private settings in which honour attacks take place, in order to test the potentially moderating effect of the presence of witness(es) in responses to such attacks.

In other recent research, we have examined cultural variation in response to different kinds of threats. To date, most experimental research has operationalized an honour threat in terms of false accusations (Uskul et al., 2015) or insults (Cohen, et al., 1996). For members of an honour culture, a true accusation of misconduct (e.g., lying or cheating) may be especially threatening to both self-esteem and social respect. When one has not acted morally, one cannot claim to be an honourable person. In addition, existing research has seldom compared an honour

threat to another kind of threat, such as negative feedback about one's competence.[6] Do

members of honour cultures respond aggressively to *any* threat, or do they differentiate between

threats that strongly implicate one's honour and those that do not? This question has been

addressed in two studies by Günsoy and her colleagues (Günsoy, Cross, Sarıbay, Wasti, Altinoz

& Yildiz, 2018). The first of these was a scenario study, in which 156 Turkish participants and

170 European American participants from northern states responded to situations in which a

target either behaved immorally (e.g., claimed someone else's idea was their own), or behaved

incompetently (e.g., failed to follow instructions for a task). In the second study, a separate

sample of participants from the same universities as in Study 1 (n_{Turkey} = 151; n_{US} = 147) came to

the lab and were induced to cheat on a task, and were accused either of cheating or of poor

performance on the task. The participants in Study 2 could retaliate by rejecting offers in an

ultimatum game, where their rejections would penalize both themselves and their accuser. Both

studies found that Turkish participants responded more strongly to a true accusation of

wrongdoing than to negative feedback about their own (Study 2) or another person's (Study 1)

performance on a task; in contrast, the northern US participants responded similarly to both types

of threat. For example, in Study 1, Turkish participants who read a scenario about an accusation

of wrongdoing endorsed retaliation more than did those who read about a negative performance

situation (p < .01; d = .55). In contrast, the northern US participants endorsed retaliation in these

two situations to a similar extent (p = .13, d = .27). In Study 2, Turkish students were more likely

to harm their own prospects of earning money in the ultimatum game by rejecting offers when

---

[6] However, see Rodriguez Mosquera et al. (2008) for the different types of insults that were

identified in insults described in participants' narratives; some focused on insults to competence,

and others on interpersonal neglect.

they were rightly accused of cheating ($M = 1.86$, $SD = 2.26$) than when they were accused of poor performance ($M = 1.27$, $SD = 1.86$; Wald = 5.54, $p < .05$, 95% CI [Wald] = [.06, .70]). Rejection rates were positively related to endorsement of honour values for the Turkish participants in the cheating condition ($r = .34$, $p < .05$), but not in the negative feedback condition ($r = .02$, ns.), indicating that the cheating accusation primed honour-related thoughts and feelings more strongly than did the negative feedback of poor performance. Among the northern Americans, there was no difference in rejection rates between the two conditions ($M_{cheating} = 2.88$, $SD = 2.31$; $M_{negative feedback} = 2.96$, $SD = 2.81$; Wald = .04, $p = .84$, 95% CI [Wald] = [-.22, .27]);[7] endorsement of honour values was also not related to rejections. These studies go beyond those in which honour threats focus on insults or false accusations, and suggest that in a cultural context in which social respect is vitally important, a true accusation of misconduct must be vigorously refuted in an attempt to "cleanse the stain" of dishonour.

Finally, members of our team have also investigated honour-related behaviour in the context of social media use. Günsoy, Cross, Sarıbay, Olcaysoy-Ökten, and Kurutaş (2015) hypothesized that Turkish young people would be less likely than American young people to post pictures or information on Facebook (a widely used social media platform at the time) that was potentially harmful to their reputation or that would expose them to gossip. In Turkish contexts, examples of such postings might include references to parties and alcohol, or pictures with opposite sex friends or a romantic partner. In their initial pilot study, they examined

---

[7] The northern US participants rejected more offers than the Turkish participants overall, but this may be due to differences in income, cost of living, or other factors. Consequently, Gunsoy and colleagues focused on within-culture differences across conditions rather than cross-cultural differences.

attitudes and preferences regarding what one would (or would not) post on Facebook. Gunsoy and her colleagues recruited Turkish ($n = 35$) and northern US participants ($n = 49$). Their findings revealed that, compared to northern American participants, Turkish participants were less willing to post such pictures (100% of Americans would post such pictures, compared to 71.4% of Turkish participants, $p < .001$). There were no cultural differences in willingness to post a picture representing an achievement or a neutral picture. Study 2 examined actual posting behaviour on the part of 212 Turkish participants and 137 US participants from the same universities who had not participated in Study 1. This study replicated the findings from Study 1, showing that Turkish participants were less willing to post potentially improper pictures compared to northern Americans ($d = 1.16$; $p < .001$) but were similarly willing to post achievement-related pictures ($d = .14$, $p = .14$). Turkish participants also were less willing to allow family members to view potentially improper pictures, compared to northern Americans ($d = 1.32$, $p < .001$). Among Turkish participants, endorsement of honour values was negatively related to willingness to post potentially improper pictures, especially among women ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .05$). Curiously, endorsement of honour values was positively related to willingness to post such pictures among northern American participants ($\beta = .25$, $p < .01$). Because honour is shared among families (Uskul et al., 2012), Turkish participants may have feared that relatives would be especially upset at seeing pictures that could be construed as dishonourable. In contrast, there were no cultural differences in willingness to post pictures related to achievement (e.g., a picture of themselves winning an academic award).

Günsoy and her colleagues also requested permission to download pictures from participants' actual Facebook profiles from the previous six months; they were able to code the pictures from 46 Turkish participants and 65 northern American participants who provided

access to their Facebook accounts (only pictures posted by the participants were coded).

Research assistants from both Turkish and US backgrounds coded these pictures into categories

that represented achievement-related situations (e.g., receiving an award, playing an instrument),

potentially dishonourable or improper situations (e.g., pictures with a boyfriend / girlfriend,

holding a drink at a bar). The authors found that individual endorsement of honour values was

related to differential rates of posting these two categories of pictures in the two groups. For

Turkish participants, endorsement of honour values was negatively related to posting improper

pictures (e.g., pictures of the participant at a party; $\beta = -.29$, $p = .08$), but honour values did not

predict rates of posting achievement-related pictures ($\beta = .24$, $p = .20$). Among the northern US

participants, endorsement of honour values was positively related to posting achievement-related

pictures for women (but not men; $\beta_{women} = .43$, $p < .05$; $\beta_{men} = -.11$, $p = .59$), but honour values

were not related to rates of posting improper pictures ($\beta = .09$, $p = .47$). This suggests that

honour values have different implications for members of the two groups: Turkish people who

strongly endorse the importance of maintaining one's honour may avoid possible harm to their

reputation by not sharing pictures that could lead to gossip and criticism (which is consistent

with the Turkish way of thinking about honour in terms of involving NOT doing what is

inappropriate, see Cross et al., 2014). Northern Americans who strongly endorse the importance

of honour and reputation, in contrast, are more likely to post pictures that show them in a

favourable light. These findings suggest that the same situation (i.e., posting on Facebook or

other social media platforms) engages different concerns and motives for members of honour

and dignity cultures. In a culture of honour, one's reputation and respect from others is easy to

lose and very difficult to restore. For example, a woman who appears in Facebook with many

different men may be viewed as slutty or impure, and she may have a hard time overcoming that

stigma. One must therefore be careful about what one posts. In contrast, in northern US contexts, one's worth is inherent, and social media affords opportunities to enhance the self and to demonstrate one's competence and achievement. In short, people in both cultural contexts who cared about others' views of them used social media to present themselves positively, but they did so in different ways.

Contributions, Limitations and Future Directions

Social psychological research on honour has been blossoming in the last decade, following the initial work by Cohen and his colleagues. Researchers in different parts of the world (e.g., the Middle East, North Africa, South Asia, South-East Europe, Latin America and with immigrant groups in Western cultural settings) are examining questions related to emotional, attitudinal, and behavioural consequences of operating within an honour logic, endorsing honour-related values or ideologies, or using an honour mindset (for a review see Uskul et al., 2018). Our work contributes to this growing and exciting literature in several ways. First, we started our research programme taking a bottom-up approach, initially trying to comprehend how honour is understood and experienced by people living in a cultural context (Turkey) that had not been systematically researched before. These initial studies that we conducted using a situation sampling and prototype approach demonstrated similarities, as well as differences, in the construal of honour between Turkish and northern American cultural contexts. Emerging findings paved the way for later studies, which were designed on the basis of this initial set of findings (Cross et al., 2014; Uskul et al., 2012).

Second, we examined the consequences of honour-relevant situations using a number of different outcome variables, focusing on emotional implications (Uskul et al., 2014), actual retaliatory responses (Uskul et al., 2015), and preferences for different types of actions (e.g.,

attack vs. withdrawal) in the face of honour threats (Cross et al., 2013). In doing so, we employed methods ranging from vignettes to experiments conducted in highly controlled lab settings. Furthermore, we examined most of these outcomes both for honour-threatening and honour-enhancing situations, thereby extending the literature on cultures of honour which has tended to focus on the psychological consequences of honour threats. We also differentiated between different types of threats (e.g., true accusations of misconduct, false accusations of dishonesty, and negative feedback on performance), further refining our understanding of psychological consequences of different honour-relevant situations. There is however more work to be done in this domain to examine further the psychological response to different types of humiliating situations or situations that involve false accusation (e.g., In what ways is a person is being humiliated and in the presence of whom? What is the person being accused of?). This set of studies demonstrated striking differences between the Turkish and northern American cultural contexts, suggesting that despite similarities in how individuals from different cultural backgrounds construe or experience a cultural logic, there can be differences in how this logic shapes related attitudes, preferences, and behaviours. One obvious limitation concerns the nature of our samples, with most of them originating from student groups in both Turkey and northern US. This leaves open the question of whether our findings are generalizable to other groups and regions within these societies.

Third, we expanded the literature by introducing systematic evidence from an under-researched cultural context in which honour is a central value; this Turkish context has a strikingly different historical, religious, and ideological background compared to the southern US or European contexts in which honour cultures have been most frequently studied by social psychologists. As mentioned above, the traditional approach in cultural psychology has assumed

(implicitly or explicitly) that Turkey and other non-western cultural groups would fit the pattern of findings observed in studies conducted with East Asian cultural groups. However, theories of honour (e.g., Leung & Cohen, 2011) as well as (scarce) comparative evidence (see for exceptions Leung & Cohen, 2011; Smith et al., 2017; Uskul, Oyserman, Schwarz, Lee, & Xu, 2013; Yao et al., 2017) suggest that important differences between East Asian groups and other collectivistic non-western cultural groups are to be expected. Our past and current work has not delved into these potential differences in detail; this is an obvious and much needed step in the future (for a notable exception, see Boiger, Güngör, Karasawa, & Mesquita, 2014). Another obvious next step is to gather evidence in a greater variety of honour cultures. Although our work extends research in this field beyond US and European contexts, additional work is needed in African, South Asian and Latin American contexts. Diversifying the evidence base in the literature on honour cultures will be important for understanding the different ways in which the concept of honour is construed, the various forms that honour attacks can take, and differences in how individuals respond to those attacks (e.g., Günsoy, Cross, Uskul, Adams, & Gercek-Swing, 2015; Severance et al., 2013). In addition, such studies would permit in-depth investigation of the role of other cultural constructs, such as individualism-collectivism or tightness-looseness, in the cultural logic of honour, face, and dignity. Finally, studies aiming to compare Turkish cultural settings with other types of honour cultures would help to reveal the commonalities and differences between our findings and findings emerging in other settings concerning the role of honour in social psychological processes. In a currently ongoing programme of research, we are conducting a series of studies in Turkey and southern US to start teasing apart differences and similarities between these two contexts in which previous research has shown the salience of honour in individuals' social lives. Future research is needed to examine how findings obtained in other

honour cultures in relation to social psychological behaviours, such as negotiation, creative agreements, collaboration, and conflict management (e.g., Aslani et al., 2016, Gelfand et al., 2015, Ramirez-Marin & Shafa, 2017), would replicate in the Turkish cultural settings.

Fourth, our findings also provide valuable insight for social scientists who study immigrants of Turkish origin, who form sizeable minorities in several European countries (e.g., the Netherlands, Germany, Belgium), and practitioners in these contexts (e.g., social workers, counsellors) who work with these immigrant groups' experiences in an acculturation context. Our findings have already been utilized in social psychological research on honour with Turkish samples in different immigration contexts (e.g., Shafa et al., 2015; van Osch et al., 2013) to examine applied questions such as interpersonal conflict management or emotional acculturation. They also provide a valuable starting-point for practitioners for making sense of important cultural differences within immigration contexts when it comes to resolving family conflicts, intergenerational differences in values, or acculturation strategies (for sociological discussions of honour in the context of immigrant societies, see Korteweg & Yurdakul, 2009, 2014). Given the importance of group processes and intergroup relations in acculturation contexts, extending the concept of honour to include group honour or national honour in these contexts would help shed light on the role of honour in the relationships between the mainstream culture and immigrants who originate from cultures of honour. More generally, understanding that honour can motivate not only individual behaviour but also group and national behaviour (e.g., groups and nations are concerned about how they are viewed by others, and may respond aggressively to threats to enhance or protect their reputations) is an area that needs further development (see examples of emerging research on social group or national honour by Barnes, Brown, Lenes, Bosson, &

Carvallo, 2014; Levin, Roccas, Sidanius, & Pratto, 2015; Rodriguez Mosquera, Khan, & Selya, 2017).

In summary, our work is part of an effort to move beyond the binary 'East vs. West' approach that has thus far tended to dominate research in cultural psychology. We hope that this work sparks interest in conducting further research in Middle Eastern and North African contexts, where concerns for honour are likely to influence a wide range of behaviours. We anticipate the day when theories and tools are available to distinguish between different types of honour cultures (Mediterranean, Latin American, African). We are confident that the community of cultural psychologists will continue to develop measures, theories, and approaches that help to unfold the dynamics of honour in individual, group, and national contexts.

References

Abou-Zeid, A. (1965). Honor and shame among the *Bedouins* of Egypt. In J. G. Peristiany (Ed.), *Honor and shame: The Values of Mediterranean society.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Abu-Lughod, L. (1986). *Veiled sentiments: Honor and poetry in a Bedouin society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Arin, C. (2001). Femicide in the name of honor in Turkey. *Violence against Women, 7*, 821-825.

Aslani, S., Ramirez-Marin, J., Brett, J. M., Yao, J-J., Semani-Azad, Z., Zhang, Z., Tinsley, C., Weingart, L., & Adair, W. (2016). Dignity, face, and honor cultures: A study of negotiation strategy and outcomes in three cultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37,* 1178-1201.

Bagli, M. & Sev'er, S. A. (2003). Female and male suicides in Batman, Turkey: Poverty, social change, patriarchal oppression and gender links. *Women's Health & Urban Life*, *2*, 60-84.

Barnes, C. D., Brown, R. P., Lenes, J., Bosson, J., & Carvallo, M. (2014). My country, my self: Honor, identity, and defensive responses to national threats. *Self and Identity*, *13*, 638-662.

Boiger, M., Güngör, D., Karasawa, M., & Mesquita, B. (2014). Defending honor, keeping face: Interpersonal affordances of anger and shame in Turkey and Japan. *Cognition and Emotion, 28*, 1255-1269.

Brown, R. P. (2016). *Honor bound: How a cultural ideal has shaped the American psyche*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, J. K. (1964). *Honor, family, and patronage.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cantor, N., Mischel, W., & Schwartz, J. (1982). A prototype analysis of psychological situations. *Cognitive Psychology, 14,* 45-77.

Chiu, C., Gelfand, M. J., Yamagishi, T., Shteynberg, G., & Wan, C. (2010). Intersubjective culture: The role of intersubjective perceptions in cross-cultural research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*, 482–493.

Cohen, D., Hernandez, I., Gruschow, K., Nowak, A., Gelfand, M., & Borkowski, W. (2018). Rationally irrational?: The ecologies and economics of honor. In A. K. Uskul and S. Oishi (Eds.) *Socioeconomic environment and human psychology: Social, ecological, and cultural perspectives* (pp. 77-102). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, D., & Kitayama, S. (Eds.) (2018). *The handbook of cultural psychology* (2nd Edition). New York: Guildford Press.

Cohen, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1994). Self-protection and the culture of honor: Explaining southern violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 551-567.

Cohen, D., Nisbett, R. E., Bowdle, B. F., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Insult, aggression, and the southern culture of honor: An experimental ethnography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 945-960.

Cohen, D., & Vandello, J. A. (2004). The paradox of politeness. In M. Anderson (Ed.) *Cultural shaping of violence: Victimization, escalation, response* (pp. 119-132). West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

Cohen, D., Vandello, J. A., Puente, S., & Rantilla, A. K. (1999). "When you call me that, smile!" How norms for politeness, interaction styles, and aggression work together in southern culture. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 62*, 257-275.

Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R.K., Cooper, M.L., & Bouvrette, S.A. (2003). Contingencies of self-worth in college students: Measurement and theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 894-908.

Cross, S., Uskul, A. K., Gerçek-Swing, B., Sunbay, Z., Alozkan, C., Gunsoy, C., Ataca, B., & Karakitapoglu-Aygun, Z. (2014). Cultural prototypes and dimensions of honor. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40*, 232-249.

Cross, S., Uskul, A. K., Gerçek-Swing, B., Sunbay, Z., & Ataca, B. (2013). Confrontation vs. withdrawal: Cultural differences in responses to threats to honor. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 16*, 345-362.

De Almeida, I., & Uchida, Y. (2018). *Is international social psychology diverse enough*? Manuscript in preparation.

DeKeseredy, W. S., & Hinch, R. (1991). *Woman abuse: Sociological perspectives*. Toronto, Canada: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Edgerton, R. B. (1971). *The individual in cultural adaptation.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Fehr, B. (1988). Prototype analysis of the concepts of love and commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 557-579.

Findley, C. V. (2005). *The Turks in world history*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fischer, D. H. (1989). *Albion's seed: Four British folkways in America.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Fletcher, J. (1985). Integrative history: Parallels and interconnections in the Early Modern Period, 1500-1800. *Journal of Turkish Studies, 9,* 37-57.

Gastil, R. D. (1971). Homicide and a regional culture of violence. *American Sociological Review, 36,* 412-27.

Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., ... & Yamaguchi, S.

(2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science, 332*, 1100-1104.

Gelfand, M. J., Severance, L., Lee, T., Bruss, C. B., et al. (2015). Getting to Yes: The linguistic signature of the deal in the U.S. and Egypt. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*, 967-989.

Gilmore, D. D. (1987). *Honor and shame and the unity of the Mediterranean.* Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

Gregg, G. S. (2005). *The Middle East: A cultural psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gregg, G. S. (2007). *Culture and identity in a Muslim society*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Günsoy, C., Cross, S. E., Sarıbay, A., Olcaysoy-Ökten, I., & Kurutaş, M. (2015). Would you post that picture and let your dad see it? Culture, honor, and Facebook. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 323-335.

Günsoy, C., Cross, S. E., Sarıbay, A., Wasti, A., Altinoz, E., & Yildiz, D. (2018). *Better to be a cheater or a failure? Cultural background and honor values predict responses to conflict.* Manuscript under review for publication.

Günsoy, C., Cross, S. E., Uskul, A. K., Adams, G., & Gercek-Swing, B. (2015). Avoid or fight back? Cultural differences in responses to aggressors and the role of interdependence, honor and enemy perception. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *46*, 1081-1102.

Guveli, A., Ganzeboom, H. B. G., Platt, L., Nauck, B., Baykara-Krumme, H., Eroğlu, Ş., Bayrakdar, S., Sözeri, E. K., & Spierings, N. (2016). *Intergenerational consequences of*

migration: Socio-economic, family and cultural patterns of stability and change in Turkey and Europe. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Heine, S., & Norenzayan, A. (2006). Towards of psychology for a cultural species. *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, 1, 251–269.

Henrich, J. (2015). Culture and social behavior. *Current Opinion in Behavioral* Sciences, *3*, 84-89.

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 33*, 61-83, 111-135.

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

Kagitcibasi, C. & Ataca, B. (2015). Value of children, family change, and implications for the care of the elderly. *Cross-Cultural Research, 49*, 374-392.

Kardam, F. (2005). *The dynamics of honor killings in Turkey: Prospects for action*. United Nations Development Programme: Population Association.

Kim, H., & Markus, H. R. (1999). Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 785-800.

Kitayama, S. (2002). Cultural and basic psychological processes—Toward a system view of culture: Comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 189-196.

Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self-enhancement in the US and self-criticism in Japan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 1245-1267.

Kitayama, S., & Markus, H. R. (1999). Yin and yang of the Japanese self: The cultural psychology of personality coherence. In D. Cervone & Y. Shoda (Eds.), *The coherence of*

personality: Social cognitive bases of personality consistency, variability, and organization
(pp. 242-302). New York: Guilford Press.

Kitayama, S., & Uskul, A. (2011). Culture, mind, and the brain: Current evidence and future
directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *62*, 419-449.

Korteweg, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2009). Islam, gender, and immigrant integration: Boundary
drawing in discourses on honor killing in the Netherlands and Germany. *Ethnic and
Racial Studies, 32*, 218-238.

Korteweg, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2014). *Headscarf debates: Conflicts of national belonging.*
Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Levin, S., Roccas, S., Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (2015). Personal values and intergroup outcomes
of concern for group honor. *Personality and Individual Differences, 86,* 374-384.

Leung, A. K.- Y., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within- and between-culture variation: Individual
differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 100,* 507-526.

McWhiney, G. (1988). *Cracker culture: Celtic ways in the Old South.* Tuscaloosa, AL:
University of Alabama Press.

Miller, W. I. (1993). *Humiliation*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Morling, B. & Lamoreaux, M. (2008). Measuring culture outside the head: A meta-analysis of
cultural products. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 12,* 199-221.

Mussweiler, T., & Förster, J. (2000). The sex → aggression link: A perception-behavior
dissociation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 507-520.

Nisbett, R. E., & Cohen, D. (1996). *Culture of honor: The psychology of violence in the South*.
Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Nowak, A., Gelfand, M., Borkowski, W., Cohen, D. & Hernandez, I. (2016). The evolutionary basis of honor cultures. *Psychological Science, 27*, 12-24.

Peristiany, J. G. (1965). *Honor and shame: The values of Mediterranean society.* London, England: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Pitt-Rivers, J. (1965). Honor and social status. In J. G. Peristiany (Ed.), *Honor and shame: The values of Mediterranean society* (pp. 19-78). London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Ramirez Marin J., & Shafa S., (2017), Social rewards: The basis for collaboration in honor cultures. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, *25*, 53-69.

Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M. (2016). On the importance of family, morality, masculine and feminine honor for theory and research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 10/8*, 431–443.

Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M. (2018). Cultural concerns: How valuing social-image shapes social emotion. *European Review of Social Psychology.* Advance online publication.

Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M., Khan, T., & Selya, A. (2017). American Muslims' anger and sadness about in group social-image. *Frontiers in Psychology 7*, 2042.

Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M., Manstead, A. S. R., & Fischer, A. H. (2000). The role of honor-related values in the elicitation, experience, and communication of pride, shame, and anger: Spain and the Netherlands compared. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 833-844.

Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M., Manstead, A. S. R., & Fischer, A. H. (2002a). Honor in the Mediterranean and Northern Europe. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *33*, 16-36.

Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M., Manstead, A. S. R., & Fischer, A. H. (2002b). The role of honor concerns in emotional reactions to offenses. *Cognition & Emotion, 16*, 143-163.

Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M., Fischer, A. H., Manstead, A. S. R., & Zaalberg, R. (2008). Attack, disapproval, or withdrawal? The role of honor in anger and shame responses to being insulted. *Cognition and Emotion, 22*, 1471-1498.

Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M., Tan, L., & Saleem, F. (2014). Shared burdens, personal costs: On the emotional and social consequences of family honor. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 45*, 400–416.

Saleem, M., Anderson, C. A., & Gentile, D. A. (2012). Effects of prosocial, neutral, and violent video games on children's helpful and hurtful behaviors. *Aggressive Behavior, 38*, 281-287.

Sev'er. A. (1997). Recent or imminent separation and intimate violence against women: A conceptual overview and some Canadian examples. *Violence Against Women, 3*, 566-589.

Sev'er, A. (2005). In the name of fathers: honor killings and some examples from South-eastern Turkey. *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice, 30*, 129-145.

Sev'er, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2001). Culture of honor, culture of change: A feminist analysis of honor killings in rural Turkey. *Violence against Women, 7*, 964-998.

Severance, L., Bui-Wrzosinska, L., Gelfand, M. J., …, Yamaguchi, S. (2013). The psychological structure of aggression across cultures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *34*, 835–865.

Shafa, S., Harinck, S., Ellemers, N., & Beersma, B. (2015). Regulating honor in the face of insults. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 47*, 158-174.

Shafa, S., Harinck, S., Ellemers, N., & Beersma, B. (2014). Who are you calling rude? Honor-related differences in morality and competence evaluations after an insult. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 7,* 38-56.

Shakespeare, W. (2009). *Hamlet.* Auckland, NZ: The Floating Press.

Smith, P. B., et al. (2017). Original culture as perceived context: An exploration of the distinction between dignity, face and honor cultures. *Acta de Investigación Psicológica, 7,* 2568-2576.

Stewart, F. H. (1994). *Honor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Uskul, A. K., Cross, S. E., Gunsoy, C., & Gul, P. (2018). Cultures of honor. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (2nd Ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.

Uskul, A. K., Cross, S., Alozkan, C., Gercek-Swing, B., Ataca, B., Gunsoy, C., & Sunbay Z. (2014). Emotional responses to honor situations in Turkey and the U.S. *Cognition and Emotion, 28*, 1057-1075.

Uskul, A. K., Cross, S. E., Gunsoy, C., Gercek-Swing, B., Alozkan, C., & Ataca, B. (2015). A price to pay: Turkish and American retaliation for threats to personal and family honor. *Aggressive Behavior, 41*, 594–607.

Uskul, A. K., Cross, S. E., Sunbay, A., Gerçek-Swing, B., & Ataca, B. (2012). Honor bound: The cultural construction of honor in Turkey and the Northern US. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 43,* 1131-1151.

Uskul, A. K., Hynie, M., & Lalonde, R. (2004). Interdependence as a mediator between culture and interpersonal closeness for Euro-Canadians and Turks. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35,* 174-191.

Uskul, A. K., Oyserman, D., Schwarz, N., Lee, S. W., & Xu, A. J. (2013). How successful you have been in life depends on the response scale used: The role of cultural mindsets in pragmatic inferences drawn from question format. *Social Cognition*, *31*, 222-236.

van Osch, Y., Breugelmans, S. M., Zeelenberg, M., & Boluk, P. (2013). A different kind of honor culture: Family honor and aggression in Turks. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 16*, 334-344.

Yao, J., Ramirez-Marin, J., Brett, J., Aslani, S., & Semnani-Azad, Z. (2017). A measurement model for dignity, face, and honor cultural norms. *Management and Organization Review, 13,* 713-738.

Wikan, U. (2008). *In honor of Fadime: Murder and shame*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zou, X., Tam, K., Morris, W. M., Lee, L., Lau, I., & Chiu, C. Y. (2009). Culture as common sense: Perceived consensus vs. personal beliefs as mechanisms of cultural influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*, 579–597.