Tilburg University

A different kind of honor culture

van Osch, Y.M.J.; Breugelmans, S.M.; Zeelenberg, M.; Bölük, P.

Published in:
Group Processes & Intergroup Relations: GPIR

DOI:
[10.1177/1368430212467475](https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430212467475)

Publication date:
2013

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
van Osch, Y. M. J., Breugelmans, S. M., Zeelenberg, M., & Bölük, P. (2013). A different kind of honor culture: Family honor and aggression in Turks. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations: GPIR*, 16(3), 334-344.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430212467475>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Group Processes & Intergroup Relations

<http://gpi.sagepub.com/>

A different kind of honor culture: Family honor and aggression in Turks

Yvette van Osch, Seger M. Breugelmans, Marcel Zeelenberg and Pinar Bölük

Group Processes & Intergroup Relations 2013 16: 334

DOI: 10.1177/1368430212467475

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://gpi.sagepub.com/content/16/3/334>

Published by:

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://gpi.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://gpi.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://gpi.sagepub.com/content/16/3/334.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - May 10, 2013

[What is This?](#)

A different kind of honor culture: Family honor and aggression in Turks

Group Processes & Intergroup Relations

16(3) 334–344

© The Author(s) 2013

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1368430212467475

gpir.sagepub.com

Yvette van Osch,¹ Seger M. Breugelmans,¹
Marcel Zeelenberg¹ and Pinar Bölük¹

Abstract

Masculine honor has been found to explain the relationship between insults and aggression in the USA. However, detailed accounts of Mediterranean honor cultures suggest that family honor may be more important in explaining cross-cultural differences in aggression. Two studies revealed that people from Turkish honor culture intended to aggress more after being insulted than Dutch people from a nonhonor culture (Study 1), and that this effect was driven by differences in family honor rather than differences in masculine honor (Study 2). We posit that family honor may be a key factor in explaining insult-related aggression in Mediterranean honor cultures.

Keywords

honor, aggression, Turkish culture, family honor, masculine honor, insults, biculturals

Insults to honor should be retaliated against quickly and with force. This rule seems to be at the core of what is traditionally called honor culture (Henry, 2009). The central question is of course what exactly constitutes an insult to one's honor. The hallmark work by Nisbett and Cohen (1996) showed that masculine honor (i.e., toughness, strength, protecting one's reputation) plays an essential role in explaining aggressive reactions in the south of the USA. Men from the south were more likely to become more angry, physically aroused, and aggressive when insulted than did men from the north (Cohen, Bowdle, Nisbett, & Schwarz, 1996; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). Apart from the USA, the Mediterranean area is

also characterized by honor cultures (Abu-Lughod, 1985; Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, & Fischer, 2002a, 2002b). The fact that masculine honor underlies aggressive behavior in the USA has been taken almost by default as characteristic for honor cultures in other parts of the world. We argue that another aspect of honor, family honor, might be key in predicting insult-related

¹Tilburg University, The Netherlands

Corresponding author:

Yvette van Osch, Department of Social Psychology,
Tilburg University, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The
Netherlands.

Email: Y.M.J.vanOsch@tilburguniversity.edu

aggression in Mediterranean honor cultures. In this article we reveal that cultural differences in aggressive reactions towards insults between a nonhonor culture and a Mediterranean honor culture—Turkish culture—are not explained by cultural differences in masculine honor but rather by cultural differences in family honor.

“Honor is the value of a person in his own eyes, but also in the eyes of his society” (Pitt-Rivers, 1965, p. 21). Honor codes have been subdivided into four different types of honor concerns; family honor, masculine honor, feminine honor, and social interdependence (e.g., Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2002b). In the present paper we will focus only on family honor and masculine honor. Family honor refers to a concern for the reputation of one’s family (Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2002b), whereas masculine honor refers to a concern for being able to live up to the standards set for males (e.g., being tough, able to take care of one’s family, produce offspring; Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, & Fischer, 2000). Honor is not a sentiment in itself, but is closely linked to emotions, such as anger, shame, and pride (Stewart, 1994). Having honor is usually associated with pride, whereas losing one’s honor or dishonor is usually associated with shame and anger. It has been shown that the adherence to honor norms can affect emotional reactions (e.g., Rodriguez Mosquera, Fischer, Manstead, & Zaalberg, 2008). For instance, people with a strong concern for honor react with more anger after being insulted than people with a weak concern for honor (IJzerman, van Dijk, & Galucci, 2007).

Studies on Turkish honor culture are scarce, focusing mainly on honor killings (Navai, 2009), ethnographic reports (e.g., Meeker, 1976; Starr, 1978) or sociological analyses (e.g., Sevrer, 1999; UNPF, 2007). Statistics on violence, though, are clear; showing that Turkey ranks in the top three of countries with the highest homicide rates and violent crimes in the European Union and its aspiring members (Eurostat, 2010). Thus, Turks deal with relatively high rates of physical violence in everyday life (Deveci, Acik, & Ayar, 2008). Western European countries that have Turkish minority groups (such as the Netherlands)

struggle with honor-related violence (e.g., Bakker, 2005). Although these findings suggest that an honor culture may be prevalent in Turkish communities, very little is known on the relationship between insults and aggression. It has been shown that insults in high honor groups (Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch) motivated verbal disapproval after the experience of shame (Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2008). However, no link between insults, aggression, and the specific type of honor that potentially mediated these effects was investigated.

There are three reasons that lead us to expect that, in Turkish honor culture, family honor is more important in explaining the relationship between insults and aggression than masculine honor. First, the Turkish language has two terms for honor. *Şeref* (Sharaf in Arabic; Stewart, 1994) is the term for honor associated with (mostly male) esteem, prestige, dignity (Gezik, 2002), personal honor, courage, bravery, loyalty (Ermer, 2007), both social and financial status (Simsek, 2002), and the ability to support one’s family. *Namus*, also known as sexual honor, is associated with family honor (Gezik, 2002), public decency, and chastity (Simsek, 2002).

Namus is a type of honor that reflects on the whole family. If the *namus* or purity of one female family member is threatened, which can be an actual threat but could also be rumors, the honor of the entire family is at stake (Arslan & IJsselmuiden, 2001; van Eck, 2003). The protection of *namus* by both women and men is very important because it is impossible to fully restore the *namus* of a family once it is lost. Potential solutions to loss of *namus* include marrying the person who violated the *namus* or for the woman to commit suicide. Even if such measures are taken, the family will be known as *namussuz*: lacking *namus*. It is the responsibility of male family members to protect and restore the *namus* of the family (van Eck, 2003). So, in the Turkish language there seems to be no direct emphasis on masculine honor, but a very strong emphasis on family honor.

Second, studies in Spain have shown that Mediterranean honor and nonhonor cultures

differ in the extent to which they are concerned about family honor but not in the extent to which they are concerned about masculine honor (e.g., Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2002b). Rooted in ethnographical studies (e.g., Pitt-Rivers, 1954, 1965), these studies focused on differences in values (Fischer, Manstead, & Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999; Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2000), honor concerns, and emotional processes between the honor culture of Spain and a nonhonor culture (i.e., Dutch culture; Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2002a, 2002b). All studies showed that concerns for family honor might be just as important as or even more important than concerns for masculine honor in Mediterranean honor cultures. In particular, family honor mediated the effect between nationality and the experience of shame (Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2002b). The central unit of social organization is the family, and one's personal honor is intertwined with the honor of one's family (Moxnes, 1996; Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2002b).

Third, the extent to which people value masculine honor has been found to hardly vary across cultures. In fact, masculine honor seems to be a pan-cultural idea, not a culture-specific one (Rodriguez Mosquera, 2011). This means that cross-cultural differences in reactions to insults cannot be explained by differences in endorsement of masculine honor. As a case in point, Dutch men who value honor highly also act more hostile when insulted (IJzerman et al., 2007).

Taken together, these three reasons led us to expect that differential reactions to insults in Turkish honor culture—as compared to Dutch nonhonor culture—would be explained by family concerns not by masculine concerns.

Study 1

This study first established that in Turkish culture people intend to react more aggressively to insults than people from Dutch culture. Therefore, we presented Dutch and Turkish-Dutch with a situation in which someone was insulted and were asked whether they would act aggressively. Because the Turkish-Dutch group is a bicultural

group, we included an additional factor in our design. We primed Turkish-Dutch participants with either a Dutch or Turkish context, in order to see whether manipulating the cultural context would also influence the tendency to act aggressively after an insult. In the paradigm of cultural frame switching this technique is used to make one of two cultural frameworks in biculturals more salient (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000). In effect, when primed with a Turkish context, it can be expected that Turkish-Dutch will act more “Turkish,” when primed with a Dutch context they will act more “Dutch.” We therefore expected Turkish-Dutch primed with a Turkish context to intend to react more aggressively towards the insult than would Dutch and Turkish-Dutch primed with a Dutch context.

Method

Eighty-six high school students ($M_{age} = 13.58$, $SD = 1.44$; $\bar{n} = 41$) participated voluntarily. Data were collected on three high schools in the Rotterdam area. Consent for the study was obtained from the schools. Adolescents participated during regular school classes. The experiment had three conditions: Dutch primed with a Dutch context ($n = 25$; $\bar{n} = 8$), Turkish-Dutch primed with a Dutch context ($n = 30$; $\bar{n} = 17$), and Turkish-Dutch primed with a Turkish context ($n = 31$; $\bar{n} = 16$).

We first presented participants with a short film clip in which someone was insulted. In the clip we manipulated the cultural context (i.e., cultural prime). Turkish-Dutch saw either Dutch actors speaking in Dutch or Turkish-Dutch actors speaking in Turkish. Dutch saw only the Dutch version. Both versions of the scenario portrayed a young man/woman walking alone on a street (participants were instructed to take the position of the young man/woman; gender of the insulted person was matched with the gender of the participant). Subsequently, another young man bumped into him/her (the insulter), and would say: “Hey Casper/Karin/Ali/Fatma, what are you saying about my girlfriend? Who do you think you are? You will hear from me.” The

insulted person reacted in a startled fashion, like (s)he did not know what was going on. Being falsely accused of something can be interpreted as an insult to one's honor in Turkish culture. Next, participants were instructed to think about how they would react to this. Turkish-Dutch participants were given a Dutch questionnaire in the Dutch prime condition and a Turkish questionnaire in the Turkish prime condition. The questionnaire was translated using a committee approach (the committee was composed of three bilingual experts and the first author). Subsequently, participants indicated to what extent they would want to hit, swear at, or punish the person in the film clip (on 11-point scales; 0 = *not at all*, 10 = *completely*). We computed a composite aggression score from these three items ($\alpha = .83$).

Results

An ANOVA with condition and gender as independent variables and the composite aggression measure as dependent variable revealed a main effect of condition, $F(2, 85) = 3.30, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .08$. Post hoc Tukey tests indicated that Turkish-Dutch participants primed with a Turkish context ($M = 5.81, SD = 2.90$) wanted to react more aggressively than Dutch participants ($M = 3.79, SD = 2.61; p = .036$). Turkish-Dutch participants primed with a Dutch context scored in between and did not differ significantly from either condition ($M = 4.57, SD = 3.33; p = .251$ and $p = .598$). Gender did not have a main effect on aggression $F(1, 85) = 0.02, p = .902, \eta_p^2 = .00$, nor an interaction effect with condition on aggression, $F(2, 85) = 0.22, p = .802, \eta_p^2 = .01$.

Discussion

The first study shows that people from a Turkish honor culture want to display more aggression after insults than people from a nonhonor culture. So, in line with findings from the south of the USA, people from the Turkish honor culture are also more likely to aggress after being insulted. Turkish-Dutch placed in a Dutch context showed intermediate levels of aggression. This suggests

that the cultural context is important in predicting behavior. It can be assumed that the immediate (cultural) context provides people with norms on how to act (Yamagishi, Hashimoto, & Schug, 2008).

We did not find any gender differences. Females and males were just as likely to aggress after an insult. This finding could be driven by the fact that we asked participants to what extent they *would want* to aggress instead of *would* aggress, but may also indicate that in predicting aggression after an insult, gender-specific honor codes are not that important, but that mainly the concern for family honor is predictive of aggression.

Because we did not include any measures for honor concerns we cannot conclude that being part of an honor culture or not produces the differences between these groups. Therefore, we included measures for honor concerns in Study 2, in order to ensure that this specific cultural difference is the cause of the effect. In addition, we included a Turkish reference group living in Turkey.

Study 2

The main aim of this study was to look at the role of masculine and family honor in the relationship between insults and subsequent aggression in three groups: Dutch, Turkish-Dutch, and Turks. We gave each participant two insult scenarios and asked them how likely it would be that they would aggress. We measured people's concern for both masculine and family honor. We closely followed the design by Vandello, Cohen, and Ransom (2008), who studied the link between insults and aggression, and investigated whether norms for aggression existed due to pluralistic ignorance. Vandello and Cohen (2004) demonstrated that norms of aggression in the south of the USA perpetuate due to pluralistic ignorance. This means that men falsely believe other men to think that physical aggression is the appropriate response to insults. In order to conform to this "norm" of violence, men might thus act aggressively, even though they do not value it themselves. Due to this misperception, norms for

honor-related violence still exist in the south of the USA, whereas the direct functionality of violence has disappeared. We included Vandello and Cohen’s measure for pluralistic ignorance to investigate whether norms of violence in Turkish honor culture perpetuate due to pluralistic ignorance.

Method

To most closely replicate the study by Vandello et al. (2008) we only included male participants. Nineteen Dutch, 20 Turkish-Dutch, and 27 Turkish males ($M_{age} = 22.38, SD = 3.48$) participated voluntarily. All samples were community samples. The Dutch data were collected in the south of the Netherlands (Tilburg and Eindhoven), the Turkish data were collected in the west of Turkey (Balıkesir province, districts Edremit and Akçay). Dutch and Turkish-Dutch received a Dutch version of the questionnaire. Turks received a Turkish version that was translated using a committee approach (three bilingual experts and the first author). Participants were asked to respond to two scenarios. The first scenario stated that Niels (Mehmet in Turkish-Dutch and Turkish conditions) went to the cinema and another man cut in front of him in line. Niels responded to this and the man insulted him. Niels then hit the other man. The second stated that Kevin (Murat) was eating fries and drinking coke and a guy spilt the coke all over him and did not apologize, subsequently Kevin hit the guy. Both scenarios were based on Study 1 by Vandello et al. (2008; the first scenario is described in Vandello & Cohen, 2004, p. 288). After reading each scenario, participants indicated the likelihood that they would also hit the other man (from 0 to 100; aggression measure). In order to assess pluralistic ignorance they also indicated the likelihood that a typical Dutch (Turkish-Dutch or Turkish) male would have also hit the other man (from 0 to 100; measure for peer aggression). Finally, participants responded to items that measured the concern for honor, based on a selection of items developed by Rodriguez Mosquera et al. (2002b). We only used those items that were related to family honor (“If I damage my family’s reputation,” “If

my family has a bad reputation,” “If I let others insult my family”; $n = 3; \alpha = .82$) and masculine honor (“If I don’t defend myself when others insult me,” “If I do not have authority over my family,” “If I cannot maintain my family,” “If I am incapable of having children,” “If I’m known as someone who has no authority over my family,” “If I am known as someone who cannot support my family,” “If everybody knows that I am sterile”; $n = 7; \alpha = .73$). Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they would feel uncomfortable with what was stated in the item ($1 = not uncomfortable at all, 7 = very uncomfortable$)¹. Correlations of all dependent measures are provided in Table 1.

Results

A repeated measures ANOVA with the aggression ratings for both scenarios as within-subjects factor and cultural group as between-subjects factor, revealed no effect of scenario, $F(2, 63) = 0.28, p = .600, \eta_p^2 = .00$, nor an interaction effect between scenario and cultural group, $F(2, 63) = 1.42, p = .25, \eta_p^2 = .04$. Aggression differed between groups, $F(2, 63) = 7.36, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .19^2$.

We collapsed the data across scenarios. Analyses revealed that Turks reported to react more aggressive than Dutch, and that Turkish-Dutch did not differ significantly from either group (see Table 2). Turks were more concerned with family honor than Dutch; Turkish-Dutch did not differ significantly from either group. Turks, Turkish-Dutch, and Dutch did not differ in their concern for masculine honor. Turks and Turkish-Dutch thought their peers were more likely to respond with aggression than Dutch participants.

Table 1. Zero-Order Correlations Between Variables in Study 2.

Measure	1	2	3
1. Own aggression	–		
2. Family honor	.47**	–	
3. Masculine honor	.49**	.40**	–
4. Peer aggression	.74**	.44**	.29*

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations, and F-tests for All Dependent Variables in Study 2.

	Dutch <i>M (SD)</i>	Turkish-Dutch <i>M (SD)</i>	Turks <i>M (SD)</i>	<i>F</i> (2, 64)	Partial η^2
Own aggression	18.61 (18.14) _a	40.75 (41.11) _{ab}	57.50 (36.56) _b	6.90*	.19
Family honor	5.43 (0.96) _a	5.88 (1.14) _{ab}	6.54 (0.75) _b	7.71*	.20
Masculine honor	5.40 (0.75) _a	5.46 (1.00) _a	5.39 (1.29) _a	0.03	.00
Peer aggression	35.26 (20.65) _a	58.75 (35.35) _b	67.96 (22.03) _b	8.72*	.22
Difference score aggression	-17.37 (17.19) _a	-11.30 (32.69) _a	-18.00 (19.29) _a	0.52	.02

Note. Means in a row with different subscripts differ significantly in Tukey post hoc tests ($p < .05$).

* $p < .001$.

We conducted mediation analyses to investigate whether family honor could explain the relationship between cultural group and aggression. Masculine honor could not function as mediator because masculine honor did not differ between cultural groups. Two dummies were created to represent the three cultural groups; the Dutch group was used as the reference group. We employed a bootstrapping procedure for multicategorical agents with 1,000 bootstrap resamples and 95% confidence intervals (CI; Hayes & Preacher, 2012; Preacher & Hayes, 2004). The analyses revealed that family honor mediated the relationship between cultural group and aggression (Figure 1). The indirect effect of family honor was significant for the Turkish group (the CI did not contain 0), indicating that for Turks higher concerns for family honor predicted more aggression after an insult. The Turkish-Dutch group displayed a similar pattern; albeit not significant. To be complete, we also included the mediation analysis for masculine honor. The indirect effect of masculine honor, as could be expected, was not significant³.

Of secondary interest was the difference between one's own aggression and what was believed to be the level of aggression among peers. Overall, males predicted their peers ($M = 55.76$, $SD = 29.41$) to be more aggressive than themselves ($M = 40.68$, $SD = 36.91$), $t(65) = -4.89$, $p < .001$, $d = -0.63$. This was the case for the Dutch, $t(18) = -4.40$, $p < .001$, $d = -1.02$, the Turkish-Dutch, $t(19) = -4.17$, $p = .001$, $d = -0.37$, but not for the Turks, $t(27) = -1.80$, $p = .084$, $d = -0.96$ ⁴. We calculated a difference

score between the estimation of one's own aggression and the aggression of one's peers ($M_{\text{Dutch}} = -17.37$, $SD = 17.19$; $M_{\text{Turks}} = -18.00$, $SD = 19.29$; $M_{\text{Turkish-Dutch}} = -11.30$, $SD = 32.69$). This difference score did not differ between groups, $F(2, 63) = 0.52$, $p = .600$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, indicating no differences in pluralistic ignorance.

Discussion

Turks reacted more aggressively to insults than did Dutch participants. This cultural difference covaried with the concern for family honor. Turks had higher concerns for family honor, and stated that they would react more aggressively to the insults. Even though masculine honor did predict aggression, it did so for all groups, and thus cannot explain cultural differences in levels of aggression.

As could be expected from a bicultural group, the Turkish-Dutch participants did not differ from Dutch and Turks on both honor measures. For masculine honor there were no differences at all, for family honor Turkish-Dutch scored in between the Dutch and Turks. This finding might indicate that this sample was truly bicultural, endorsing both Dutch and Turkish norms. The question arises of whether we can call this group a culture of honor or even a culture high in honor, as has been done in many studies (e.g., Bakker, 2005; Ermers, 2007; Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2008; Shafa, Harinck, Ellemers, & Beersma, 2011; van Eck, 2003). In addition, in both our studies Dutch did not differ from Turkish-Dutch primed with a Dutch context (Study 1) and Turkish-Dutch

Figure 1. Mediation models for Study 2 for the relationship between cultural group and aggression as explained by family and masculine honor. Unstandardized beta values are reported for the direct paths and the c' paths. Only the indirect path for family honor between Dummy 2 and own aggression is significant, because its confidence interval does not contain zero (Preacher & Hayes, 2004).

(Study 2) in terms of aggression. Rodriguez Mosquera et al. (2008) also found no differences between Dutch and Turkish/Moroccan-Dutch on verbal attack after an insult. However, Study 1 showed that Turkish-Dutch primed with a Turkish context, act more like a Turkish sample. So what are the differences in honor and aggression between Dutch and Turkish-Dutch? Maybe, there is not so much a quantitative difference between these groups in the concern for honor, but are concerns for family honor more likely to underlie intentions to aggress, as can be seen from the mediation model.

No cultural differences were found in the discrepancy for own and peer aggression, indicating that pluralistic ignorance might not be an explanation for aggression norms in the Turkish honor culture. This suggests that in Turkish honor culture norms for aggression are still endorsed by its members and not the result of a misperception.

General Discussion

We found that members of the Turkish honor culture are more likely to aggress after being

insulted than are members of a nonhonor culture. The data show that these specific honor and nonhonor cultures differ in the extent to which they endorse family honor, but that they did not differ in the extent to which men endorse masculine honor. Family honor explained the qualitative difference between groups in terms of aggression. It seems that masculine honor indeed leads to more aggression, but that this effect is uniform across groups, and thus cannot explain differences in aggression between groups. This underscores the importance of family honor when studying Mediterranean honor cultures. In sum, both masculine and family honor predict aggression, but only family honor explains cultural differences in aggression.

Let us now turn to two observations. First, we found no gender differences on aggression in Study 1. As mentioned before, the absence of gender differences might be due to the fact that the wording of the aggression measure suggested intended behavior instead of actual behavior. If interpreted as such, it might be the case that both women and men would want to aggress, but that actual aggression is displayed more by men than women. Although counterintuitive, gender differences in aggression under provocation conditions are small or even absent (Bettencourt & Miller, 1996). This finding might indicate that aggression in honor cultures need not be related to gender-specific honor codes or gender-specific insults. The relationship between type of insult and type of honor might not be a one-on-one relationship. As we saw in Study 2, cultural differences in aggression between groups after a threat to male honor, could not be explained by the concern for masculine honor. Furthermore, different types of honor concerns can be highly correlated (see Study 2), and sometimes different types of honor cannot even be distinguished statistically (IJzerman et al., 2007). Whether the relationship between insult and aggression is explained by a specific type of honor, may be highly dependent on the type of insult and the specific situation. These suggestions however require further study.

Second, please note that we measured intentions for aggression instead of actual aggressive

behavior. However, the measurement of self-reported aggression is common (e.g., Tangney, Wagner, Fletscher, & Gramzow, 1992), and correlates with findings of actual behavior (Cohen et al., 1996). One could also argue that we measure norms for aggression instead of intentions to aggress. What people report might actually be influenced by what they think they should report. However, inferring that people only report what they think they should report or are consciously aware of this influence on their report could be erroneous (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977).

The present data imply that any type of insult towards Turks could be interpreted as a threat to one's family. This would mean that if the family is insulted in a more direct manner, Turks could react even more aggressively. Turkish culture is more interdependent than Dutch culture, which could imply that any type of insult in Turkey is an insult to one's interdependent self, encompassing both the self and relations (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), whereas in the Netherlands, it is an insult to the self only. It could be argued that the differences we find between masculine and family honor are due purely to differences in conceptions of the self.⁵ However, even though family honor could be seen as a form of interdependence, it is a more concrete operationalization of a broad theoretical construct and may thus add predictive value. How family honor and the interdependent self are related requires further study.

We would like to emphasize that none of our findings invalidate what has been shown in the south of the USA. Masculine honor is also predictive of aggression among Dutch and Turkish participants. Our results do indicate that we cannot assume that one honor culture is just like any other honor culture; different psychological mechanisms might be at work. In addition, the codes and norms, that cultures have for the retention and loss of honor differ (Stewart, 1994), perhaps both between honor cultures, and between honor- and nonhonor cultures.

Turkish-Dutch endorse Turkish culture at home, and Dutch or Turkish culture in public, which makes them an acculturating group (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2007). Acculturation in a

nonhonor culture seems to change the extent to which people adhere to honor concerns and the extent to which they are likely to aggress after being insulted. Although this is an interesting finding, we think this is only one side of the coin for minorities with an honor culture living in a nonhonor culture. Apart from acculturation processes, these minorities run into social situations that are very different from those in honor cultures. For instance, they could be insulted by or in front of ingroup and outgroup members. Being insulted by Dutch might mean something else than being insulted by other Turkish-Dutch; likewise, being insulted in front of Dutch or Turkish-Dutch might require different measures in order to defend one's honor. These uniquely bicultural aspects of insults might produce different behavioral outcomes, which are important to study because there are large Mediterranean minority groups living in Western countries (e.g., the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, and Sweden). Furthermore, people from an honor culture living in a nonhonor culture deal with more than just coming from another cultural background. Turkish-Dutch also have to deal with the fact that they have a minority status (van Osch & Breugelmans, 2012). It has been shown that low-status positions could potentially cause honor-related violence (Henry, 2009), which then might prove to have an additive effect. Based on our findings, we believe this is not the case, because Turkish-Dutch did not respond more aggressively than Turks did. Of course, we cannot say whether our samples actively think of themselves as a low-status group, therefore subsequent research is needed.

The concern for family honor explained cross-cultural differences in the relationship between insults and aggression for Turks and Dutch. Masculine honor also predicted aggression, but did so in all cultural groups. Thus, in order to understand cultural differences in aggression a focus on family honor is needed.

Acknowledgements

We thank Elif Durgel, Mehtap Gürbulak, Louisa Habtemicael, Nurcan Caliskan, and Ferzana Alidjan for their help with translations for Study 1 and 2 and data collection for Study 1.

Notes

1. We decided to exclude two items of Rodriguez Mosquera et al.'s (2002b) 9-item scale for masculine honor. Extensive probing by the fourth author who collected the data in Turkey showed that male Turkish respondents were extremely uncomfortable answering questions about "Not yet having had a sexual relationship" and "Having the reputation of being someone without sexual experience." The questions in themselves could be insulting, if asked by a woman to a man. That is also the reason for why we excluded the item "One's sister or mother having the reputation of having diverse sexual relations" from the scale for family honor. We performed a factor analysis with all 10 items for masculine and family honor. The factor analysis indicated four factors with an Eigenvalue over 1. The first factor explained 35% of the variance, the second 17%, the third 12%, and the fourth 10%. The scree plot suggested a cut-off after two factors. The pattern matrix revealed that five items of the masculine honor scale loaded on the first factor (between .422 and .895), one of the masculine honor items ("If everybody know that I am sterile") had a small loading on both factors, the other ("If I am known as someone who cannot support my family") loaded on the second factor. Exclusion of the two items from the masculine honor scale however reduced the reliability of the scale considerably. Therefore, we decided not to exclude them from the scale. Removing these items from analyses did not alter the outcome of the study in any way. All three family honor items had high negative loadings (between $-.817$ and $-.851$) on the second factor.
2. Correlations between the types of honor and aggression were similar across scenarios (Scenario 1: $r_{\text{familyhonor-aggression}} = .45$, $r_{\text{masculinehonor-aggression}} = .48$; Scenario 2: $r_{\text{familyhonor-aggression}} = .47$, $r_{\text{masculinehonor-aggression}} = .46$, all $ps > .001$).
3. The measures for family honor and masculine honor were positively correlated, $r = .40$, $p = .001$, indicating that they share a significant amount of variance. When both masculine and family honor were entered into the same mediation model, the regression weight of family honor on own aggression, reduced to nonsignificant. The indirect effect via masculine honor remained nonsignificant.
4. The estimation of peer aggression mediated the relationship between cultural group and own aggression for both dummy variables.
5. We thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out to us.

References

- Abu-Lughod, L. (1985). Honor and the sentiments of loss in a Bedouin society. *American Ethnologist*, 12, 245–261. doi: 10.1525/ae.1985.12.2.02a00040
- Arends-Tóth, J., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2007). Acculturation attitudes: A comparison of measurement methods. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 1462–1488. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00222.x
- Arslan, Z., & Ijsselmuiden, S. (2001). Eerwraak en de positie van Turkse vrouwen [*Honor revenge and the position of Turkish women*]. Deventer, the Netherlands: Steunpunt Minderheden Overijssel.
- Bakker, H. (2005). *Eergerelateerd geweld in Nederland: Een bronnenboek* [*Honor related violence in the Netherlands: A source book*]. Utrecht, the Netherlands: TransAct.
- Bettencourt, B. A., & Miller, N. (1996). Gender differences in aggression as a function of provocation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 422–447. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.119.3.422
- Cohen, D., Bowdle, B. F., Nisbett, R. E., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Insult, aggression, and the southern culture of honor: An “experimental ethnography.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 945–960. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.5.945
- Deveci, S. E., Acik, Y., & Ayar, A. (2008). A survey of rate of victimization and attitudes towards physical violence among school-aged children in Turkey. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 34, 25–31. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2214.2007.00756.x
- Ermers, R. (2007). *Eer en eerwraak: Definitie en analyse* [*Honor and honor revenge: Definition and analysis*]. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Bulaag.
- Eurostat. (2010). *Population and social conditions: Crime and criminal justice*. Retrieved from http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-SF-10-058/EN/KS-SF-10-058-EN.PDF
- Fischer, A. H., Manstead, A. S. R., & Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M. (1999). The role of honour-related vs. individualistic values in conceptualizing pride, shame, and anger: Spanish and Dutch cultural prototypes. *Cognition & Emotion*, 13, 149–179. doi: 10.1080/026999399379311
- Gezik, E. (2002). *Eer, identiteit en moord* [*Honor, identity, and murder*]. Utrecht, the Netherlands: NCB.
- Hayes, A. F., & Preacher, K. J. (2012). *Statistical mediation analysis with a multicategorical independent variable*. Manuscript under review. Retrieved from <http://www.afhayes.com/public/hp2011.pdf>
- Henry, P. J. (2009). Low-status compensation: A theory for understanding the role of status in cultures of honor. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 451–466. doi: 10.1037/a0015476
- Hong, Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 55, 709–720. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.7.709
- Ijzerman, H., van Dijk, W. W., & Gallucci, M. (2007). A bumpy train ride: A field experiment on insult, honor, and emotional reactions. *Emotion*, 7, 869–875. doi: 10.1037/1528-3542.7.4.869
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self. Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224–253. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224
- Meeker, M. E. (1976). Meaning and society in the Near East: Examples from the Black Sea Turks and the Levantine Arabs. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 7, 383–422. doi: 10.1017/S0020743800025721
- Moxnes, H. (1996). Honor and shame. In R. L. Rohrbaugh (Ed.), *The social sciences and New Testament interpretation* (pp. 21–40). Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Navai, R. (2009). *Women told: “You have dishonoured your family, please kill yourself.”* Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/women-told-you-have-dishonoured-your-family-please-kill-yourself-1655373.html>
- Nisbett, R. E., & Cohen, D. (1996). *Culture of honor: The psychology of violence in the south*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review*, 84, 231–259. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.84.3.231
- Pitt-Rivers, J. (1954). *The people of the Sierra*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pitt-Rivers, J. (1965). Honour and social status. In J. G. Peristiany (Ed.), *Honour and shame: The values of Mediterranean society* (pp. 18–77). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 36, 717–731. doi: 10.3758/BF03206553
- Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M. (2011). Masculine and feminine honor codes. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 26, 63–72. doi: 10.1174/021347411794078499
- Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M., Fischer, A. H., Manstead, A. S. R., & Zaalberg, R. (2008).

- Attack, disapproval, or withdrawal? The role of honour in anger and shame responses to being insulted. *Cognition & Emotion*, 22, 1471–1498. doi: 10.1080/02699930701822272
- 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. doi: 10.1177/0146167200269008
- 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. doi: 10.1177/0022022102033001002
- Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M., Manstead, A. S. R., & Fischer, A. H. (2002b). The role of honour concerns in emotional reactions to offences. *Cognition & Emotion*, 16, 143–164. doi: 10.1080/02699930143000167
- Sev'er, A. (1999). Culture of honor, culture of change: A feminist analysis of honor killings in rural Turkey. *Violence Against Women: An International and Interdisciplinary Journal*, 7, 964–999. doi: 10.1177/10778010122182866
- Shafa, S., Harinck, F., Ellemers, N., & Beersma, B. (2011). Asociaal of imbeciel? Invloed van culturele verschillen op beledigingen na een normovertreding [Antisocial or imbecile? The influences of cultural differences on insult after a norm violation]. In B. Derks, R. J. Renes, K. Ruys, N. van de Ven, & M. Vliek (Eds.), *Jaarboek Sociale Psychologie 2010* (pp. 403–410). Groningen, the Netherlands: ASPO Press.
- Simsek, J. (2002). *Eervraak: Alle ogen op haar gericht* [Honor revenge: All eyes on her]. Utrecht, the Netherlands: Stichting Insprakorgaan Turken in Nederland.
- Starr, J. (1978). *Dispute and settlement in rural Turkey: An ethnography of law*. Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill.
- Stewart, F. H. (1994). *Honor*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., Fletcher, C., & Gramzow, R. (1992). Shamed into anger? The relation of shame and guilt to anger and self-reported aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 669–675.
- United Nations Population Fund (UNPF). (2007). *The dynamics of honor killings in Turkey: Prospects for action*. Retrieved from <http://www.unfpa.org/public/publications/pid/383>
- Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (2004). When believing is seeing: Sustaining norms of violence in cultures of honor. In M. Schaller & C. Crandall (Eds.), *The psychological foundations of culture* (pp. 281–304). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Vandello, J. A., Cohen, D., & Ransom, S. (2008). US southern and northern differences in perceptions of norms about aggression: Mechanisms for the perpetuation of a culture of honor. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 39, 162–177. doi: 10.1177/0022022107313862
- Van Eck, C. (2003). *Purified by blood: Honour killings amongst Turks in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Van Osch, Y. M. J., & Breugelmans, S. M. (2012). Perceived intergroup difference as an organizing principle of intercultural attitudes and acculturation attitudes. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 43, 801–821. doi: 10.1177/0022022111407688
- Yamagishi, T., Hashimoto, H., & Schug, J. (2008). Preferences versus strategies as explanations for culture-specific behavior. *Psychological Science*, 19, 579–584. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02126.