

The authors report two studies on notions of honor (i.e., the situations and behaviors associated with honor, its enhancement, and its loss) in a Mediterranean country (Spain) and a northern European country (the Netherlands). A total of 271 persons (140 Spanish, 131 Dutch) participated in Study 1, and a total of 327 persons (169 Spanish, 158 Dutch) participated in Study 2. The main aim of Study 1 was to characterize Spain and the Netherlands in terms of their value priorities. Study 2 consisted of an in-depth analysis of Spanish and Dutch participants' free descriptions of honor. The results indicated that Spanish and Dutch notions of honor are closely related to the values emphasized in these countries: Honor is more closely related to family and social interdependence in Spain than in the Netherlands, whereas honor is associated with self-achievement and autonomy to a greater extent in the Netherlands than in Spain.

## HONOR IN THE MEDITERRANEAN AND NORTHERN EUROPE

PATRICIA M. RODRIGUEZ MOSQUERA  
ANTONY S. R. MANSTEAD  
AGNETA H. FISCHER  
*University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands*

**Honor has been the subject** of much research in two disciplines, cultural anthropology and social psychology. The study of honor in cultural anthropology is now part of a long-standing tradition in the subdiscipline of Mediterranean anthropology. Ethnographic research on Mediterranean honor began in the 1950s with a series of studies in southern Spain, Greece, Cyprus, Egypt, and Algeria. These resulted in the now classic volume on honor edited by Peristiany (1965), *Honour and shame: The values of Mediterranean society*. Since then, anthropological research on Mediterranean honor has been plentiful and has used a variety of methodological approaches (e.g., participant observation, the use of local informants, demographic analyses) to investigate the role of honor in the belief systems, norms, traditions, and social practices of Mediterranean cultures, in both rural and urban areas (see, e.g., Abu-Lughod, 1999; Gilmore, 1987a; Murphy, 1983; Wikan, 1984). Social-psychological research on honor is comparatively recent in origin and has had as its main focus the study of anger and aggression in the defense of male honor in the Southern culture of honor in the United States (Cohen & Nisbett, 1994; Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle & Schwarz, 1996; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996).<sup>1</sup>

The empirical literature on honor shows that most research on honor has been carried out in Mediterranean cultures. It has been proposed that Mediterranean cultures share an understanding of honor that is specific to this geographical area (see, e.g., Gilmore, 1982, 1987a). However, there is some controversy regarding this point (see, e.g., Herzfeld, 1980, 1987; Pina-Cabral, 1989; Stewart, 1994; Wikan, 1984). This controversy is partly related to the fact that there is a lack of systematic comparisons with other European cultures, especially Northern European cultures, making it impossible to determine whether Mediterranean notions of honor are also present elsewhere in Europe.

---

AUTHORS' NOTE: This research was supported by a Human Capital and Mobility grant from the European Community to Patricia M. Rodriguez Mosquera (ERBCHICT941537). Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Patricia M. Rodriguez Mosquera, Social Psychology Program, Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, Roetersstraat 15, 1018 WB Amsterdam, the Netherlands; e-mail address: sp\_rodriguez@macmail.psy.uva.nl.

JOURNAL OF CROSS-CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY, Vol. 33 No. 1, January 2002 16-36  
© 2002 Western Washington University

The studies reported in this article are intended to contribute to this comparative research by investigating notions of honor (i.e., the situations and behaviors associated with honor, its enhancement, and its loss) in a Mediterranean country, Spain, and a Northern European country, the Netherlands.

## MEDITERRANEAN NOTIONS OF HONOR

Honor has been defined in terms of what has been called the “bipartite theory of honor” (Stewart, 1994): Honor is one’s worth in one’s own eyes and in the eyes of others (Pitt-Rivers, 1965, 1968, 1977). Ethnographic research has provided extensive documentation of the antecedents and consequences of honor in the cultures around the Mediterranean region. Mediterranean honor is centered on the maintenance of a good reputation in general, and more specifically on family reputation, social interdependence, and on masculine and feminine honor codes (Abu-Lughod, 1999; Adamopoulos, 1977; Brandes, 1980; Gilmore, 1987a, 1990; Gilmore & Gwynne, 1985; Jakubowska, 1989; Murphy, 1983; Peristiany, 1965; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Schneider, 1971; Stewart, 1994; Vassiliou & Vassiliou, 1973).<sup>2</sup>

Having honor implies being respected by others. Although one’s own honor is dependent on an internal sense of honor (i.e., a concern for honor), that guides the self to behave in honorable ways and to avoid dishonor, it is the social recognition of individual behavior that legitimizes individual claims to honor. Moreover, this emphasis on maintaining a good reputation is not only emphasized in Mediterranean cultures at the level of individual or personal honor, but also at the level of collective honor. *Collective honor* refers to the honor that is shared by a bounded group of individuals. Although collective honor can be related to different reference groups, like one’s groups of close friends or a political party (see, e.g., Gilmore, 1987b), the family is described in the anthropological literature on honor as the fundamental group with which one shares honor.

The family is conceptualized in Mediterranean cultures as a unit that shares a common identity. This common or collective identity is expressed in the notion of family honor, that is, the value and status of the family in the eyes of others. Honor is thus both a personal attribute and an attribute shared with one’s own family. This implies an interdependence between personal and collective honor. This interdependence leads in turn to a vulnerability of one’s honor to the actions and evaluations of one’s relatives: One’s relatives’ dishonorable behavior will ultimately be reflected in one’s own honor. In the same vein, one’s dishonorable behavior can potentially lead to the loss of family honor. Further, interdependence is highly valued in Mediterranean cultures not only in the context of family relations, but also in the context of social relations outside the family. *Social interdependence* refers to behaviors that strengthen social bonds and preserve interpersonal harmony, such as humility, loyalty, or conformity to social norms and traditions.

The task of upholding reputation, family honor, and social interdependence is equally important for the maintenance of men’s and women’s honor. Masculine and feminine honor codes, in contrast, refer to gender-specific honor codes. The masculine and feminine honor codes define attributes and behaviors that are believed to be desirable for the maintenance of men’s honor or women’s honor, respectively, in Mediterranean cultures. The central ideal in the feminine honor code is sexual shame or chastity. Sexual shame is expressed in terms of virginity before marriage, restraint in sexual relations, *pudeur* in social relations with men, and decorum (e.g., wearing discreet clothing). Moreover, conforming to authority (usually male authority) within the family context is also central to the maintenance of feminine

honor. This is due partly to the strong dependence of family honor on female relatives' sexual shame and partly to the fact that men are regarded in Mediterranean cultures as the guardians of family reputation. The responsibility of ensuring the sexual shame of female relatives for the sake of family honor therefore falls on men.

Besides the importance of protecting family honor, masculine honor centers on notions of virility and a reputation for being tough. Virility in honor cultures is most significant in the context of marriage and is commonly expressed in terms of the ability to father many children. Strongly related to virility and the protection of family honor is the dependence of male honor on a reputation for being tough. In behavioral terms, this translates into a need to appear strong and capable of responding to offenses that undermine one's manhood, one's own honor, or one's family honor.

### OVERVIEW OF PRESENT RESEARCH

The main objective of the studies reported below was to compare notions of honor in a Mediterranean country and a northern European country. The countries compared are Spain and the Netherlands. Ethnographic research in Spain has indicated that honor is a core concern in Spanish culture. Moreover, seeking social recognition, defending family honor, expressing social interdependence, having sexual shame, and having toughness are promoted in Spanish culture as central to the maintenance of honor (see, e.g., Gilmore, 1987a, 1990; Murphy, 1983; Pitt-Rivers, 1965, 1977).

In contrast, little is known about Dutch conceptions of honor. There are some historical analyses on the importance of honor in Northern European countries in earlier centuries (see, e.g., Stewart, 1994). Furthermore, we know of Dutch expressions that reflect the existence of a notion of honor (e.g., "He is too proud to accept this offer," "he felt honored that he was invited"). These linguistic expressions about honor in the Dutch language suggest, however, a rather different conception of honor when compared to Mediterranean notions of honor, namely as honor being focused more on personal attributes and capabilities than on reputation and interdependence. Nevertheless, the lack of systematic research on honor in the Netherlands makes it difficult to derive predictions concerning the nature of Dutch understandings of honor. Our argument is that notions of honor in a given culture should be closely related to the values emphasized in that particular culture, that is, to cultural value priorities. Recent research has demonstrated that cultural value priorities shape social-psychological processes, and emotional processes in particular. Recent research on culture and emotion in Spain and the Netherlands has indicated that differences between these countries in cultural value priorities are closely related to differences in emotion, such as in the antecedents of emotional experiences, or in the social implications of emotion expression (Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, & Fischer, 2000, in press). Furthermore, a similar approach has been proposed by Schwartz (1999) in relation to the influence of cultural values on the meanings that members of different societies attribute to work.

The purpose of Study 1, therefore, was to replicate and extend previous findings on cultural value priorities in Spain and the Netherlands. Participants were presented with a short list of values and asked to rate the extent to which each value was important in their own culture. In Study 1, we also made an initial attempt to compare notions of honor in the Netherlands and Spain. Participants were presented with a short list of attributes and were asked to rate the extent to which each one of the attributes would contribute positively to a person's honor, that is, would lead to enhanced honor.

The aim of Study 2 was twofold. First, we wanted to examine Spanish and Dutch notions of honor more thoroughly by posing open-ended questions about honor. Second, Study 1 was carried out among Spanish and Dutch university students. In Study 2, we wanted to sample a wider range of Spanish and Dutch respondents. We did this by recruiting male and female Spanish and Dutch participants belonging to four different age groups: 6 to 7, 11 to 12, 16 to 17, and 20 to 23 years.

## STUDY 1

Schwartz and colleagues (Schwartz, 1992, 1999; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995) have developed the most comprehensive theory to date on human values. Schwartz's theory of basic human values distinguishes between individual- and cultural-level analyses of values. At the individual level, values are defined as desirable, trans-situational goals that serve as guiding principles in people's lives. Schwartz found cross-cultural empirical support for a circumplex structure of human values, organized by two underlying motivational dimensions. The values in this circumplex structure cluster into 10 distinct motivational types: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security. At the cultural level, values are seen as central aspects of societies or other bounded groups and are defined as socially shared ideas about what is good, right, and desirable. Values at this level of analysis are organized by different motivational dimensions than are values at the individual level of analysis, leading to 7 rather than 10 distinct motivational clusters of values (for more on the theory, measurement, and implications of an individual- and a cultural-level analysis of values, see Schwartz, 1999; Smith & Schwartz, 1997). Both individuals and cultures can therefore be characterized by their value priorities.

A first aim of Study 1 was to characterize Spain and the Netherlands in terms of their cultural value priorities. In an earlier study on cultural values in these countries, Spanish and Dutch university students were presented with a list of values based on Schwartz's (1992) value questionnaire and were asked to rate the extent to which each value was important in their own culture. We found differences as well as similarities in cultural value priorities (Fischer, Manstead, & Rodríguez Mosquera, 1999, Study 1). In particular, ambition, capability, freedom, helpfulness, independence, moderation, responsibility, and self-discipline were rated as more important in their own culture by Dutch than by Spanish participants. In contrast, family security, honor, humility, respect for parents and elderly, respect for tradition, social power, social recognition, success, and wisdom were rated as more important in their own culture by Spanish than by Dutch participants. The emphasis on cultural values in Spain that relate to family interdependence (e.g., family security), social interdependence (e.g., humility), conformity (e.g., respect for tradition), and reputation (e.g., social recognition) is in line with ethnographic evidence on the relevance of these types of cultural values for the maintenance of honor in this country (e.g., Gilmore, 1987a; Murphy, 1983; Pitt-Rivers, 1965, 1977). Furthermore, no cross-cultural differences were found in the importance ratings of forgivingness, intelligence, protection of one's public image, self-respect, and true friendship. We wanted to replicate these findings to have a reliable characterization of Spain and the Netherlands in terms of their cultural value priorities.

A second aim of this study was to investigate the attributes that are associated with enhanced honor in Spain and the Netherlands. For this purpose, we created a scale containing short items describing different types of attributes. Because our argument is that cultural

value priorities shape understandings of honor, Spanish and Dutch participants were presented with attributes that reflected their own culture's value priorities. Thus, we based our list of attributes on the cultural value differences found in our earlier study on cultural values (Fischer et al., 1999, Study 1) and created items related to achievement (e.g., achieving more than others), self-direction (e.g., having self-respect), reputation (one's own and that of one's family), social interdependence (e.g., loyalty), and conformity (e.g., being obedient to one's superiors). Our expectation was that attributes that reflect achievement and self-direction should be associated with enhanced honor to a greater extent in the Netherlands than in Spain. By contrast, attributes that relate to the maintenance of reputation, social interdependence, and conformity should be associated with enhanced honor to a greater extent in Spain than in the Netherlands. Because gender-specific honor notions (i.e., masculine and feminine honor) were not the focus of this study, we did not expect participants' gender to play a role in either the importance ratings of values or in the type of attributes associated with enhanced honor.

## METHOD

### Participants

One hundred and forty (70 women and 70 men; mean age = 23 years) Spanish and 131 (69 women and 62 men; mean age = 23 years) Dutch persons participated in this study. Spanish participants were students at the University of Seville or at the University of Madrid, and Dutch participants were students at the University of Amsterdam. Students participated in the research on a voluntary basis. Spanish and Dutch participants were only included if the nationalities of both parents were Spanish or Dutch, respectively.

### Questionnaire and Procedure

The list of values used in the present study was based on Schwartz's (1992) questionnaire on values and was the same as the one used in our previous study on cultural values (Fischer et al., 1999, Study 1). This list of values will be referred to below as the Values Scale, and it consisted of the following values: ambition, capability, family security, forgivingness, freedom, helpfulness, honor, humility, independence, intelligence, moderation, protection of one's public image, respect for parents and elderly, respect for tradition, responsibility, self-discipline, self-respect, social power, social recognition, success, true friendship, and wisdom. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale ranging from *not at all important* (1) to *very important* (7) the extent to which each of these values is important in their own culture (e.g., "To what extent do you think social recognition to be an important value in the Spanish [Dutch] culture?").

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of a list of attributes conceptually related to the cultural value differences found between Spain and the Netherlands in our earlier study on cultural values (Fischer et al., 1999, Study 1). This list will be referred to below as the Sources of Honor Scale, and it included the following attributes: achieving more than others; altruism; behaving in a discreet, prudent, modest way; being obedient to one's superiors; conformity to social norms; exhibiting sexual propriety; having a good socioeconomic status; honesty; having self-respect; intimate others' achievements; loyalty; one's family being noble; one's intimate others' having a good reputation; protecting one's own reputation; protecting one's family's reputation; self-achievements; self having a good reputation; tradition;

and wanting to be more important than others. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale ranging from *not at all* (1) to *very much* (7) the extent to which each attribute would positively contribute to a person's honor.

The questionnaire was initially prepared in English, then translated into Dutch and Spanish by native speakers of these languages. The linguistic and conceptual equivalence of the Spanish and Dutch versions was assessed by an independent linguistic expert fluent in both languages.

## RESULTS

### Values Scale

The Spanish and Dutch participants' importance ratings of each value were entered into a MANOVA, with Country and Gender as independent factors.<sup>3</sup> As expected, the multivariate main effect of country was significant,  $F(22, 238) = 15.72, p < .001$ . The means, standard deviations, and univariate  $F$  values are shown in Table 1. Spanish participants rated family security, honor, humility, respect for parents and elderly, respect for tradition, social power, and social recognition as more important in their own culture than did Dutch participants. Dutch participants rated ambition, capability, freedom, helpfulness, independence, moderation, responsibility, self-discipline, and self-respect as more important in their own culture than did Spanish participants. There were no significant differences in the importance ratings by Dutch and Spanish participants of forgivingness, intelligence, protection of one's public image, success, true friendship, and wisdom. Further, neither the multivariate main effect of Gender nor the multivariate interaction between Gender and Country was significant.

### Sources of Honor Scale

The Spanish and Dutch participants' ratings of each attribute were entered into a MANOVA, with Country and Gender as independent factors.<sup>4</sup> The multivariate main effect of Country was significant,  $F(19, 207) = 5.18, p < .001$ . The means, standard deviations, and univariate  $F$  values are shown in Table 2. Spanish participants rated loyalty and honesty as more positively contributing to a person's honor than did Dutch participants. Dutch participants rated achieving more than others, conformity to social norms, having self-respect, and one's family being noble as more positively contributing to a person's honor than did Spanish participants. Spanish and Dutch participants' ratings of the other attributes represented in the scale did not differ significantly.

The main effect of country was qualified by a significant multivariate interaction between Country and Gender,  $F(19, 207) = 2.20, p < .01$ . The univariate effect was significant for achieving more than others,  $F(1, 225) = 6.76, p = .01$ ; being obedient to one's superiors,  $F(1, 225) = 6.89, p < .01$ ; and having self-respect,  $F(1, 225) = 5.78, p < .02$ . In relation to achieving more than others, analyses of simple main effects revealed that Dutch men,  $M = 5.29, SD = 1.16$ , associated this attribute with enhanced honor to a greater extent than did their Spanish counterparts,  $M = 3.39, SD = 2.00, F(1, 266) = 41.98, p < .001$ . Spanish and Dutch female participants' ratings of this attribute did not differ significantly. With regard to being obedient to one's superiors, analyses of simple main effects indicated that Spanish female participants,  $M = 3.14, SD = 1.60$ , associated this attribute with enhanced honor to a greater extent than did Dutch female participants,  $M = 2.46, SD = 1.32, F(1, 268) = 6.68, p = .01$ . No



**TABLE 1**  
**Means, Standard Deviations, and Univariate *F* Values**  
**In Response to the Values Scale**

	<i>Spanish (N = 140)</i>		<i>Dutch (N = 131)</i>		<i>F (1, 259)</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Ambition	4.81	1.26	5.33	.95	14.90****
Capability	5.19	1.40	5.68	.93	10.75****
Family security	5.94	1.04	4.18	1.41	106.80****
Forgivingness	4.03	1.34	4.29	1.13	2.75
Freedom	5.56	1.44	6.09	.91	11.44****
Helpfulness	4.19	1.40	4.69	1.19	12.84****
Honor	4.53	1.52	3.91	1.45	9.64***
Humility	3.65	1.39	2.91	1.32	17.02****
Independence	4.88	1.48	5.80	1.01	28.92****
Intelligence	5.04	1.26	5.19	1.07	<1.00
Moderation	4.06	1.58	5.19	1.27	33.30****
Public image	5.16	1.41	5.07	1.18	<1.00
Respect for parents and elderly	4.95	1.30	4.08	1.32	18.74****
Respect for tradition	5.11	1.52	3.68	1.47	48.44****
Responsibility	4.45	1.47	5.36	1.19	27.09****
Self-discipline	3.56	1.33	4.81	1.08	56.62****
Self-respect	5.14	1.20	5.50	1.13	4.03*
Social power	5.27	1.25	4.56	1.22	19.33****
Social recognition	5.90	1.01	5.40	1.11	14.16****
Success	5.70	1.16	5.55	.94	1.51
True friendship	5.15	1.48	5.24	1.10	<1.00
Wisdom	4.57	1.34	4.51	1.32	<1.00

\* $p < .05$ . \*\*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\*\* $p < .001$ .

significant differences were found between Spanish and Dutch male participants' ratings of this attribute. Finally, in relation to having self-respect, analysis of simple main effects revealed that Dutch female participants,  $M = 6.06$ ,  $SD = 1.01$ , associated this attribute with enhanced honor to a greater extent than did Spanish female participants,  $M = 4.88$ ,  $SD = 1.46$ ,  $F(1, 265) = 24.75$ ,  $p < .001$ . Dutch and Spanish male participants' ratings of this attribute did not differ significantly.

## DISCUSSION

A first aim of Study 1 was to characterize Spain and the Netherlands in terms of their cultural value priorities. There was evidence of both cross-cultural differences and cross-cultural similarities in the responses to the Values Scale. In relation to cross-cultural differences, Spanish participants rated family security, honor, humility, respect for parents and elderly, respect for tradition, social power, and social recognition as more important in their own culture than did Dutch participants. Dutch participants rated ambition, capability, freedom, helpfulness, independence, moderation, responsibility, self-discipline, and self-respect as more important in their own culture than did their Spanish counterparts. In relation to cross-cultural similarities, no significant differences were found in the perceived cultural importance of forgivingness, intelligence, protection of one's public image, success, true friendship, and wisdom.

**TABLE 2**  
**Sources of Honor Scale: Means, Standard Deviations, and Univariate *F* Values**

	<i>Spanish (N = 140)</i>		<i>Dutch (N = 131)</i>		<i>F (1, 259)</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Achieving more than others	3.70	1.95	4.88	1.39	22.79****
Altruism	5.15	1.58	4.81	1.41	2.47
Behaving in a discreet, prudent, modest way	4.13	1.61	4.17	1.45	<1.00
Being obedient to one's superiors	2.96	1.67	2.79	1.44	<1.00
Conformity to social norms	3.21	1.70	4.05	1.42	12.21****
Exhibiting sexual propriety	3.51	1.89	3.63	1.58	<1.00
Having a good socioeconomic status	4.15	2.02	4.85	1.49	9.35***
Honesty	5.72	1.38	5.32	1.46	3.61*
Having self-respect	5.07	1.57	5.84	1.18	22.39****
Intimate others' achievements	4.18	1.67	4.27	1.38	<1.00
Loyalty	5.68	1.52	5.21	1.35	4.59**
One's family being noble	2.91	2.08	3.35	1.69	6.38**
One's intimate others having a good reputation	4.67	1.76	4.57	1.46	<1.00
Protecting one's own reputation	4.27	1.73	4.22	1.66	<1.00
Protecting one's family's reputation	4.77	1.61	4.25	1.52	3.27
Self-achievements	5.72	1.30	5.92	1.08	1.07
Self having a good reputation	5.03	1.55	5.27	1.08	1.86
Tradition	3.70	2.03	3.61	1.68	<1.00
Wanting to be more important than others	3.01	1.69	3.21	1.57	<1.00

\* $p < .06$ . \*\* $p < .05$ . \*\*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\*\* $p < .001$ .

The pattern of cross-cultural differences and similarities observed in the present research is almost identical to the pattern of results observed in our previous study on cultural values in Spain and the Netherlands (Fischer et al., 1999, Study 1). The results of the two studies differ only in relation to self-respect, success, and wisdom: Dutch participants rated self-respect as more important in their own culture than did Spanish participants in the present study but not in the previous one, and wisdom and success were rated as more important in their own culture by Spanish than by Dutch participants in our previous study, but not in the present research. The fact that the results of two independent studies on cultural values are almost identical leads to the conclusion that the cultural value priorities observed can be regarded as reliable: Values that relate to family and social interdependence are emphasized to a greater extent in Spain, whereas values that relate to achievement and self-direction are emphasized to a greater extent in the Netherlands.

The absence of a difference between Spanish and Dutch participants' perceptions of the importance of protecting one's public image is surprising, especially if we take account of the fact that Spanish participants rated social power and social recognition as more important in their own culture than did Dutch participants. These results imply that public image is important in both countries; however, having influence or control over others and one's behavior being approved by others are emphasized more in Spain than in the Netherlands. It seems reasonable to argue that having influence over others and social approval are values that refer to the relation between the self and others, that is, to interdependence, to a greater extent than one's public image, which can be seen as a more personal attribute. The greater importance of social power and social recognition in Spain than in the Netherlands could



therefore be seen as consistent with the greater importance of values that relate to interdependence in Spain than in the Netherlands.

A second aim of Study 1 was to investigate the attributes associated with enhanced honor in each country. We expected the pattern of cultural value priorities observed in Spain and the Netherlands to influence the type of attributes seen as positively contributing to honor in these countries. However, our predictions were only partly confirmed. Dutch participants associated achieving more than others and having self-respect with enhanced honor to a greater extent than did Spanish participants. These attributes are clearly associated with achievement and self-direction. Also in keeping with predictions was the finding that Spanish participants associated attributes related to social interdependence, namely, loyalty and honesty, with enhanced honor to a greater extent than did Dutch participants.

A significant interaction between Country and Gender was found for the attributes achieving more than others, having self-respect, and being obedient to one's superiors. With regard to achieving more than others, Dutch men associated this with enhanced honor to a greater extent than did their Spanish counterparts. This finding is in line with previous cross-cultural research on emotional reactions to insults in Spain and the Netherlands (Rodriguez Mosquera et al., in press). In that study, Dutch male university students reported more intense anger than did their Spanish counterparts in response to insults that portrayed them as not being competent in an academic context. These two sets of findings suggest that self-achievement and capability are core concerns for Dutch men.

With regard to having self-respect and being obedient to one's superiors, Dutch female participants were more likely to associate the former attribute with enhanced honor, whereas Spanish female participants were more likely to associate the latter attribute with enhanced honor. This implies that Dutch women see honor as related to a positive self-image to a greater extent than do Spanish women, whereas Spanish women see honor as related to the maintenance of hierarchical relations to a greater extent than do Dutch women. The association between obedience and enhanced honor on the part of Spanish female participants is in line with the cultural relevance of the feminine honor code in Spain (see, e.g., Gilmore, 1987a), which prescribes conformity to authority (especially within the family context) for the maintenance of feminine honor.

There were also some unexpected results with regard to the Sources of Honor Scale. In particular, Dutch participants associated conformity to social norms and one's family being noble with enhanced honor to a greater extent than did Spanish participants. It is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory explanation for these findings. It might be the case that conforming to social norms is seen as an expression of moderation in the Netherlands, moderation being emphasized to a greater extent in the Netherlands than in Spain, as the results of the Values Scale indicate. In relation to one's family being noble, this item refers to an attribute shared by the entire family, and it is therefore surprising that Dutch participants associated this attribute with enhanced honor. Relatedly, it is surprising that no cross-cultural differences were found with regard to the attributes related to reputation, because Spanish participants rated social recognition as more important in their own culture than did Dutch participants.

More generally, it is somewhat surprising that relatively few cross-cultural differences were found in responses to the Sources of Honor Scale, because we sought to include attributes in this scale that are conceptually related to known cultural value differences between Spain and the Netherlands. One possible explanation is that our scale was unsuccessful in tapping the relevant sources of honor in these two countries. This possible limitation of the Sources of Honor Scale led us to adopt a different methodological approach in a follow-up

study. Specifically, we decided to analyze free descriptions of honor, in the belief that this would allow a more in-depth analysis of how honor is conceptualized in these countries.

## STUDY 2

Participants in Study 2 were asked three questions about honor: what honor meant to them, which situations would lead to the loss of honor, and which situations would lead to the enhancement of honor. We also wanted to sample a wider range of young Spanish and Dutch populations than university students. To this end, we recruited Spanish and Dutch participants belonging to one of four different age groups: 6 to 7, 11 to 12, 16 to 17, and 20 to 23 years. Our expectations were as follows.

First, and in line with our argument that notions of honor in a given culture should be closely related to that culture's value priorities, we expected honor in Spain to be more centered on social and family interdependence than in the Netherlands. By contrast, we expected honor in the Netherlands to be associated with achievement and self-direction to a greater extent than in Spain. Specifically, we expected Spanish participants to report situations in relation to the enhancement and loss of honor in which reputation, one's intimates, or maintaining interpersonal harmony and strong social bonds (e.g., being loyal to others) are central more often than Dutch participants. Spanish participants were also expected to report definitions of honor in which relationships with others are salient more often than were Dutch participants. Furthermore, we expected Dutch participants to report situations in relation to the enhancement and loss of honor in which the self plays the central role, such as one's achievements, autonomy, and independence, more often than would Spanish participants. Similarly, we expected Dutch participants to define honor in terms of one's capabilities and personal attributes more often than would Spanish participants.

Second, we wanted to study the extent to which ideas related to masculine and feminine honor would be reported spontaneously by participants in reaction to the question about what honor means to them: Spanish men should be more likely than Spanish women or Dutch respondents to define honor in terms of virility, protection, and a reputation for being tough. By contrast, Spanish women should be more likely than Spanish men or Dutch respondents to define honor in terms of sexual shame. However, we did not expect gender to play a role in participants' answers to the questions about the enhancement and loss of honor, because these questions were explicitly centered on what enhances or diminishes a person's honor, rather than a woman's or a man's honor.

## METHOD

### Participants

One hundred and sixty-nine Spanish participants (87 women, 82 men) and 158 Dutch participants (85 women, 72 men) belonging to one of four age groups (6 to 7 years, 11 to 12 years, 15 to 16 years, 22 to 23 years) participated in this study. The four groups will be referred to below as 7-, 12-, 16-, and 23-year-old participants, respectively. The number of participants and gender distribution per age group in each country are shown in Table 3. Seven- and 12-year-old Spanish participants were randomly selected from the population of children attending two elementary schools located in Madrid and Mora (Toledo). Their

**TABLE 3**  
**Mean Age and Gender Distribution per**  
**Age Group Within the Spanish and Dutch Samples**

<i>Age Group</i>	<i>Nationality</i>	<i>M Age</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Total</i>
7-year-olds	Spanish	7.0	22	22	44
	Dutch	6.7	24	21	45
12-year-olds	Spanish	12.4	25	26	51
	Dutch	11.7	23	24	47
16-year-olds	Spanish	16.1	24	14	38
	Dutch	15.8	24	12	37 <sup>a</sup>
23-year-olds	Spanish	22.6	16	20	36
	Dutch	22.3	14	15	29

a. One participant did not specify his or her gender.

Dutch counterparts were also randomly selected from the population of children attending two elementary schools in Amsterdam and Groningen. Sixteen-year-old Spanish and Dutch participants were recruited from high schools located in Madrid and Amsterdam, respectively. All elementary schools and high schools were located in middle-class neighborhoods. Twenty-three-year-old Spanish and Dutch participants were psychology and history students at the Autónoma University of Madrid and at the Free University, Amsterdam, and the University of Amsterdam. The nationalities of both parents of all Spanish and Dutch participants were also Spanish or Dutch, respectively.

### Questionnaires

We constructed interview schedules for the 7- and 12-year-old participants and written questionnaires for the 16- and 23-year-old participants. They were based on a pilot study conducted with Spanish and Dutch children, adolescents, and adults. The interview schedules and the questionnaires contained open-ended questions.<sup>5</sup> All participants were asked "What does honor mean to you?" In addition, 16- and 23-year-old participants were asked to report the types of situations that lead to the loss of honor ("Can you report examples of situations that result in a person's honor being lost?") and the types of situations that lead to an enhancement of honor ("Can you report examples of situations that result in a person's honor being enhanced?").

The words used to refer to honor in the interview schedules and questionnaires were *eer* (Dutch) and *honor* (Spanish). Our aim was to ensure that the terms chosen for honor have equivalent core meanings in the Spanish and Dutch language. Construct or item bias can occur when terms used in multilingual cross-cultural research that supposedly refer to the same construct cover different types of behaviors or situations in the different cultures under study. This can seriously jeopardize the interpretability of cross-cultural comparisons (van de Vijver & Leung, 1997). Our choice of these words for honor was based on three considerations. First, we checked the definitions of these words in Spanish and Dutch dictionaries: The words are commonly used in both languages to refer to reputation and respect, to integrity and decency, to sexual modesty in relation to women's behavior, and to receiving good

treatment or homage (*Diccionario de la Lengua Española*, 1992; *Van Dale*, 1992). Second, interview schedules and questionnaires were prepared in Dutch, then translated into Spanish by a native speaker, and independently back-translated into Dutch by a linguistic expert in both languages. The objective of this process of translation and back-translation was to establish the linguistic and conceptual equivalence of the Spanish and Dutch versions of the interview schedules and questionnaires. Third, we asked a small number of bilinguals and experts in the Dutch and Spanish language about the linguistic equivalence of *eer* and *honor*. They agreed that the Spanish and Dutch words chosen to represent honor were the closest equivalents in the two languages. In summary, we conclude that *eer* and *honor* have an equivalent core meanings in the Spanish and Dutch languages and that if cross-cultural differences are found in the types of behavior and situation associated with honor in Spain and the Netherlands, these cannot simply be attributed to the use of these specific terms.

### Procedure

The 7- and 12-year-old Spanish and Dutch participants were individually interviewed by a Spanish or Dutch woman interviewer, respectively. The interviews were tape-recorded with the consent of the child. The interviewers were trained to follow the interview protocol and never to give children directions or hints. Responses to the questions about honor were transcribed verbatim by native speakers. The 16- and 23-year-old participants completed the questionnaire individually. All respondents participated on a purely voluntary basis.

### Content Analyses

A category system was constructed to code responses to the open-ended questions about honor. To devise the categories, we used the theoretical distinction between responses focused on interdependence (e.g., not living up to intimate others' expectations) and responses focused on the self (e.g., self-failure). Specific categories were developed following inspection of a randomly selected 35% of the Spanish and Dutch interviews and questionnaires. Separate category systems were devised for the meaning of honor, situations that lead to the loss of honor, and situations that lead to an enhancement of honor.<sup>6</sup> Dutch participants' responses were coded by a native Dutch speaker, and Spanish participants' responses were coded by a native Spanish speaker. After the category systems had been created, a sample of questionnaires and interviews were coded independently by the two coders to identify difficulties and possible differences in interpretation of the participants' responses and categories. Disagreements were resolved through discussion. Next, the Dutch coder coded the remaining Dutch participants' responses, and the Spanish coder coded the remaining Spanish participants' responses.

Responses were first divided into statements with regard to the question about the meaning of honor and into situations with regard to the questions about the loss and enhancement of honor. Then, each statement or situation was allocated to the category in which it best fitted. Take the following example: If a participant reported in response to the question "What does honor mean to you?" that "Honor is your self-esteem, keeping one's promises to others, and helping others when they need you," her answer would have been divided into the statements "honor is your self-esteem," "honor is keeping one's promises to others," and "honor is helping others when they need you." The first statement would be coded as "one's sense of worth." This participant would then be given a score of 1 in this category. The second and third statements would be coded as "behaving in an interdependent way." This participant

would be given a score of 2 in this category. A given answer could, in principle, contain more than one statement and could therefore result in a score of more than 1 in any given category or more than one score across categories.

A randomly selected 10% of the Spanish and 10% of the Dutch interviews and questionnaires were independently coded by an additional native speaker judge. The extent of agreement between the codings of the original and additional coders was computed separately for the Dutch and Spanish coders for all three questions about honor. The percentages of agreement were the following: Spanish coders, 77%; Dutch coders, 81%. These agreements were deemed to be satisfactory.

## RESULTS

### Overview of Analyses

The categories created on the basis of the content analysis served as our dependent variables. Preliminary inspection of the data revealed that it was unusual for a participant to have a score higher than 1 in any of these categories. Moreover, it was almost never the case that a respondent had a score higher than 4 in any given category.<sup>7</sup> Scores on these categories were therefore dichotomized into *never mentioned* or *once or more than once*.

Logit analyses were performed to study the effects of Country, Gender, and Age Group on each dichotomous category. Logit analysis is a special case of log-linear analysis in which one categorical variable is treated as dependent and one or more categorical variables are treated as independent (see, e.g., Agresti, 1990; Wickens, 1989). In logit analysis, a set of models that defines different effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable are evaluated in terms of how well each model fits the data when compared to other models. The models to be compared need to be hierarchically related, that is, one model is a subset of the other model, to enable comparisons among models. For instance, the goodness of fit of a main effects model that defines the main effects of Gender and Country on a given dependent variable could be compared to the goodness of fit of a separate main effects model that defines the effects of Gender, Country, and Age Group on the variable in question, because the former model is a subset of the latter model.

The extent to which a given model fits the data is given by the probability associated to the likelihood ratio chi-square statistic. This statistic will be referred to below as LR. In logit analysis, a nonsignificant LR shows that the model concerned has a good fit with the data. Pairs of hierarchically related models can be compared to test for improvement in fit in the following way (Stevens, 1996): The difference between the LR for two models gives a new LR with degrees of freedom equal to the difference between the two models' degrees of freedom. A significant LR indicates that the inclusion of the extra factor improves goodness of fit. The comparison of pairs of hierarchically related models in terms of goodness of fit will be referred to below as the comparison LR test.

In the present research, a set of logit analyses was performed for each category to establish the best fitting model.<sup>8</sup> The set of logit analyses compared all possible models, that is, main effects and interactions, for each category in the manner explained above (i.e., by means of the comparison LR test).<sup>9</sup> However, given that the focus of the present article is on differences between cultures, we limit ourselves to presenting and discussing those models that (a) included the Country effect and (b) were found to be the best fitting models. These models are for the main effect of Country only (i.e., a model that only includes the main effect of Country on the category), the main effects model that includes the main effect of Country,<sup>10</sup>

and models that include interactions with Country (e.g., the interaction between Country and Gender).

Results of logit analyses will be presented in the following way. Because our key prediction concerns country differences, information about the Country main effect model is reported for all categories in the tables, along with results of the comparison LR test between this model and the independence model (i.e., the model that only includes the dependent variable). We also applied the Bonferroni-Holm correction (Holland & Di Ponzio Copenhaver, 1988) to each of the three sets of categories (i.e., the set of categories corresponding to the meaning of honor, the set corresponding to the loss of honor, and the set corresponding to the enhancement of honor) to control for alpha inflation resulting from multiple LR comparisons. This correction is applied to a family of tests; in the present research, we defined the family of tests as the set of comparison LR tests between the Country main effect model and the independence model carried out for each of the three sets of categories, because the key prediction is that concerning country differences. The application of the Bonferroni-Holm correction provides an adjusted critical value of alpha for each individual comparison LR test, that is, for the comparison between the Country main effect model and the independence model for a given category. These adjusted alpha values are also shown in the tables. We will only discuss in the text those cases in which the Country main effect model was shown to be the best fitting model in relation to these adjusted alphas (i.e., when the Country main effect model was shown to be the best fitting model for a given category when compared to all other possible models, and also when compared to the independence model after applying the Bonferroni-Holm correction).

Furthermore, for some categories, it was found that the Country main effect model was not the best fitting model; the main effects model that included the main effect of Country (along with the main effect(s) of Gender or/and Age Group) or a model including an interaction with Country was the best fitting model for a given category, when compared to all other possible models. In these cases, information about the best fitting model and the results of the comparison LR test will be reported in the text. With regard to the comparison LR test to be reported in these cases, when the main effects model was found to be the best fitting model, we will report in the text the results of the comparison LR test between the main effects model that includes the main effect of Country, and an identical model except for the exclusion of the main effect of Country in the model. When a model including an interaction with Country was found to be the best fitting model, we will report in the text the results of the comparison LR test between the model including the interaction with Country, and an identical model except for the exclusion of the interaction with Country in the model.

### Meaning of Honor

Preliminary inspection of responses revealed that 37 (84%) 7-year-old Spanish and 39 (87%) 7-year-old Dutch participants reported not knowing what the word *honor* means. For this reason, the responses of this age group were excluded from further analyses. Furthermore, some of the 12-year-old Spanish and Dutch children also reported not knowing what the word *honor* means; this applied to 9 (18%) 12-year-old Spanish and 12 (26%) 12-year-old Dutch participants. These participants' responses were also excluded from the logit analyses. Frequencies as a function of Country, the Country main effect model, the comparison LR test, and the adjusted critical value of alpha for each category corresponding to the meaning of honor are shown in Table 4.



**TABLE 4**  
**Results of Logit Analyses for Meaning of Honor**

Category	Country Frequencies		CME <sup>a</sup>		CT <sup>b</sup>		
	Spain (n = 116)	The Netherlands (n = 101)	LR	p	LR	p	$\alpha$
Positive feedback for one's actions or personality	16	37	5.63	.845	15.84	<.001	.010
Behaving in an interdependent way	38	20	34.56	<.001	4.51	.037	.013
One's achievements	10	18	30.67	.001	4.21	.042	.017
One's sense of worth	38	31	8.18	.611	.19	.674	.025
One's socioeconomic status	13	10	26.51	<.01	.08	.781	.050

NOTE: CME = Country main effect model; LR = Likelihood ratio chi-square statistic; CT = Comparison LR test between the country main effect model and the independence model;  $\alpha$  = adjusted critical value of  $\alpha$  for each individual CT after applying Bonferroni-Holm correction procedure.

a.  $df = 10$ .

b.  $df = 1$ .

The Country main effect model provided the best fit for the category "positive feedback for one's actions or personality" (see Table 4). Dutch participants scored higher in this category than did Spanish participants. The main effects model including the main effect of Country also provided the best fit for the category "one's achievements,"  $LR = 8.64$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p = .374$ . This model provided a significant improvement in fit when compared to the model that did not include the Country's main effect,  $LR = 5.02$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .027$ . Consistent with predictions, Dutch participants scored higher in this category than did Spanish participants (see Table 4). The main effects model including the main effect of Country also provided the best fit for the category "behaving in an interdependent way,"  $LR = 4.17$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p = .842$ . This model yielded a significant improvement in fit when compared to the model that did not include the main effect of Country,  $LR = 4.79$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .031$ . Again consistent with predictions, Spanish participants scored higher in this category than did Dutch participants (see Table 4). Finally, neither the Country main effect model nor any other models including the main effect of Country or interactions with Country provided a good fit for any of the other categories.

### Loss of Honor

Frequencies as a function of Country, the Country main effect model, the comparison LR test, and the adjusted critical value of alpha for each category corresponding to loss of honor are shown in Table 5. The Country main effect model provided the best fit for the category "self-failure" (see Table 5). Consistent with predictions, Dutch participants scored higher in this category than did Spanish participants. The main effects model including the main effect of Country also provided the best fit for the category "not living up to intimate others' expectations,"  $LR = 2.37$ ,  $df = 5$ ,  $p = .797$ . This model yielded a significant improvement in fit when compared to the model that did not include the main effect of Country,  $LR = 15.57$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p < .001$ . Again consistent with predictions, Spanish participants scored higher in this category than did Dutch participants (see Table 5). Neither the Country main effect model nor any other models including the main effect of Country or interactions with Country provided a good fit for any of the other categories.

**TABLE 5**  
**Results of Logit Analyses for Loss of Honor**

Category	Country Frequencies		CME <sup>a</sup>		CT <sup>b</sup>		
	Spain (n = 74)	The Netherlands (n = 66)	LR	p	LR	p	$\alpha$
Not living up to intimate others' expectations	16	1	9.36	.154	15.67	<.001	.010
Self-failure	6	17	4.95	.550	8.37	.006	.013
Being criticized or humiliated	8	14	6.17	.405	3.00	.087	.017
Lack of personal integrity	48	51	2.99	.809	2.44	.125	.025
Being weak, cowardly in relation to others	12	8	2.13	.908	.43	.520	.050

NOTE: CME = Country main effect model; LR = Likelihood ratio chi-square statistic; CT = Comparison LR test between the country main effect model and the independence model;  $\alpha$  = adjusted critical value of  $\alpha$  for each individual CT after applying Bonferroni-Holm correction procedure.

a.  $df = 6$ .

b.  $df = 1$ .

### Enhancement of Honor

Frequencies as a function of Country, the Country main effect model, the comparison LR test, and the adjusted critical value of alpha for each category corresponding to enhancement of honor are presented in Table 6. The Country main effect model provided the best fit for the category "self-achievement" (see Table 6). Consistent with predictions, Dutch participants scored higher in this category than did Spanish participants. The main effects model including the main effect of Country provided the best fit for the category "being autonomous and independent," LR = 7.33,  $df = 5$ ,  $p = .197$ . This model provided an improvement in fit when compared to the model that did not include the main effect of Country that only just fell short of significance, LR = 3.8,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .051$ . Again consistent with predictions, Dutch participants scored higher in this category than did Spanish participants (see Table 6). Finally, neither the Country main effect model nor any other models including the main effect of Country or interactions with Country provided a good fit for any of the other categories.

### DISCUSSION

The results show that there are differences between and similarities in Dutch and Spanish notions of honor. The observed differences can best be described as relative differences, in the sense that all response categories were mentioned by both Spanish and Dutch participants. In other words, the Spanish and Dutch notions of honor refer to a similar set of behaviors and situations; what varies cross-culturally is the emphasis given to some of these behaviors and situations, and this variation is consistent with the types of values emphasized in each country: those that are centered on social and family interdependence in Spain, and those that are centered on achievement and self-direction in the Netherlands.

In relation to the meaning of honor, our predictions were supported. Spanish participants associated honor with behaviors that tend to enhance interdependence with others, such as being generous or fulfilling one's social obligations, to a greater extent than did Dutch participants. Dutch participants, by contrast, were more likely than Spanish participants to report that honor is related to one's achievements and to positive feedback about what the self does

**TABLE 6**  
**Results of Logit Analyses for Enhancement of Honor**

Category	Country Frequencies		CME <sup>a</sup>		CT <sup>b</sup>		
	Spain (n = 74)	The Netherlands (n = 66)	LR	p	LR	p	$\alpha$
Self-achievement	11	23	8.60	.198	7.97	.007	.013
Positive feedback for one's actions or personality	5	13	10.41	.109	5.49	.019	.017
Being autonomous and independent	6	12	12.16	.058	3.32	.073	.025
Having personal integrity	53	40	3.49	.745	1.59	.208	.050

NOTE: CME = Country main effect model; LR = Likelihood ratio chi-square statistic; CT = Comparison LR test between the country main effect model and the independence model;  $\alpha$  = adjusted critical value of  $\alpha$  for each individual CT after applying Bonferroni-Holm correction procedure.

a.  $df = 6$ .

b.  $df = 1$ .

or is. Both types of situations are centered on the self, on personal qualities or achievements. Regarding cross-cultural similarities, both Spanish and Dutch participants tended to equate honor with one's sense of worth and to see it as related to one's socioeconomic status.

In relation to loss and enhancement of honor, our predictions were partially supported. Consistent with predictions, concerns that relate to achievement and self-direction were present more often in Dutch than in Spanish descriptions: Dutch participants reported self-failure as a cause of loss of honor, and self-achievement and being autonomous and independent as sources of enhancement of honor more often than Spanish participants did. However, results in relation to the role of others were less clear cut. No cross-cultural differences were found in the extent to which criticism or humiliation by others and being weak in relationships were reported as causes of loss of honor. Differences between Spanish and Dutch descriptions were confined to a specific, other-related situation, namely, failing to live up to intimate others' expectations in relation to loss of honor, which was more often reported by Spanish than by Dutch participants. Furthermore, both Spanish and Dutch participants referred to lack of personal integrity, such as not being loyal to one's principles, as a cause of loss of honor, and to having personal integrity, such as behaving in a way that is consistent with one's values, as a cause of enhancement of honor.

Although Spanish participants defined honor in a relational way to a greater extent than Dutch participants did, other persons also played a role in Dutch definitions of honor. However, the view of these others was generally more self-serving in the Dutch than in the Spanish descriptions: Spanish participants' descriptions were more centered on intimates and the relationship between the self and others, whereas Dutch participants' descriptions were more focused on the role of others as sources that verify the behavior and attributes of the self.

With respect to the influence of gender on definitions of honor, our predictions were not confirmed. Participants did not spontaneously refer to situations or behaviors related to masculine or feminine honor. This probably reflects the way in which this question was phrased. Participants were asked to report what honor meant to them. In other words, we did not ask explicitly for a definition of masculine honor or feminine honor. Our rationale for not asking about gender-specific honor was to avoid evoking negative reactions by participants, given that masculine and (especially) feminine honor are strongly related to sexuality. The lack of an explicit reference to feminine and masculine honor in the question posed may be why

participants did not spontaneously refer to masculine and feminine honor in their answers. Another possible explanation is that certain aspects of feminine and masculine honor are taboo and would not be referred to by participants even if they were asked more specific questions.

Finally, the majority of responses of the youngest Spanish and Dutch participants (7-year-olds) fell into the category "I do not know what honor is." Taken at face value, this result suggests that knowledge of honor begins to be acquired in both countries at around the age of 12. However, the fact that the youngest participants did not know what the words *eer* or *honor* mean does not necessarily imply that these children have no concept of honor. It could be the case that these children did have a concept of honor but did not know the meaning of the words. It is not possible to determine which of these two explanations is correct on the basis of the present research. A task for future research could be to examine further the development of knowledge about honor from a cross-cultural perspective. For instance, this could be done by creating vignettes in which prototypical honor situations in different cultures are depicted, with a view to studying how children in these cultures respond to such situations.

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

The primary objective of the present research was to gain insight into notions of honor in Spain and the Netherlands. Our central argument was that notions of honor in a given culture should be closely related to that culture's value priorities. Study 1 was designed to investigate cultural value priorities in Spain and the Netherlands. Results indicated that values related to social and family interdependence (e.g., humility, respect for parents and elderly) were perceived as more important in their own culture by Spanish than by Dutch participants. By contrast, values that emphasize achievement and self-direction (e.g., ambition, capability, independence) were perceived as more important in their own culture by Dutch than by Spanish participants. This pattern of results replicates earlier findings on cultural value priorities in these countries (Fischer et al., 1999, Study 1). This characterization of Spain and the Netherlands in terms of their value priorities can therefore be regarded as reliable. Furthermore, in Study 2 we found evidence that the observed profile of cultural value priorities in Spain and the Netherlands is closely related to notions of honor in these countries: Spanish participants' free descriptions of honor were centered more often on the interdependence between the self and others, whereas Dutch participants' free descriptions of honor were centered more often on the self's autonomy, achievements, and failures.

These findings have several implications for current knowledge on European honor. Previous research on honor has mainly focused on honor in countries in the Mediterranean region, and a central question addressed by the studies reported in this paper was the extent to which Mediterranean notions of honor are present in other European cultures. We have shown that Mediterranean notions of honor as centered on family and social interdependence can be found in the Dutch conceptualization of honor, although they are less prominent than notions of honor centered on achievement and self-direction. This suggests that the Mediterranean conceptualization of honor is also present in Northern Europe, albeit in a less salient form. The reverse also seems to be true: Notions of honor centered on the achievements, capabilities, and attributes of the self were more salient in Dutch than in Spanish descriptions of honor, but they were also reported by Spanish participants. This suggests that differences between Northern and Mediterranean Europe in the way honor is conceptualized are relative rather than absolute. This conclusion is based on Spanish and Dutch conceptualizations of

honor, and more cross-cultural research between other Southern and Northern European countries is needed to establish the generalizability of this finding. Future cross-cultural comparisons on notions of honor between Mediterranean and Northern European countries could draw on the theoretical and methodological approach adopted in the present research.

Finally, a key aspect of the present research that warrants some comment is the representativeness of the findings. We believe that the findings regarding notions of honor can be generalized to young, middle-class populations living in other European cultures that have sociodemographic attributes and cultural value priorities comparable to those that characterize the samples involved in the present research. The samples used in the present studies were not representative of the respective national populations, but they were well matched with each other. Furthermore, the fact that Study 2 included 7- to 23-year-old participants increases the generalizability of the findings by showing that differences between Spain and the Netherlands are not limited to student (or student-aged) groups.

## NOTES

1. For a detailed review of the theoretical and empirical literature on honor in cultural anthropology and in social psychology, see Rodriguez Mosquera (1999).

2. The objective of this section is to identify common themes in notions of honor in Mediterranean cultures. For detailed information about honor and the social practices related to its maintenance in specific Mediterranean cultures, the reader is referred to the original sources.

3. Participants were asked to report at the end of the questionnaire whether they endorse a religion. Of the participants, 160 did not endorse any religion (67 Spanish and 93 Dutch participants). Seventy-five participants (64 Spanish and 11 Dutch) endorsed Catholicism, 3 (all of them Dutch) endorsed Protestantism, and 32 participants (9 Spanish and 23 Dutch) endorsed a rather large variety of other religions. We dichotomized this variable into the values 'endorsing a religion' and 'not endorsing any religion' and included it in the MANOVA as an independent factor on an exploratory basis. Neither the multivariate main effect of religion nor the multivariate interactions between religion and the other independent factors were significant.

4. Religion (dichotomized) was also included as an independent factor in the MANOVA on an exploratory basis. Neither the multivariate main effect of religion nor the multivariate interactions between religion and the other independent factors were significant.

5. The interview schedules and questionnaires included other measures. These are described in Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, and Fischer (2000).

6. The full coding system is available from the first author on request.

7. Only one respondent had a score higher than 4 in a category.

8. The expected frequencies for all categories conform to the criteria for the minimum recommended expected frequencies in logit analyses (Wickens, 1989).

9. Due to space limitations, we will not report the results of all the comparison LR tests carried out. We will report the results of the comparison LR tests related to our key predictions.

10. In the main effects model, the main effect of Country is independent of the other main effects, that is, the main effects of Gender and/or Age Group. We will, therefore, only discuss the results concerning the main effect of Country.

## REFERENCES

- Abu-Lughod, L. (1999). *Veiled sentiments. Honor and poetry in a Bedouin society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Adamopoulos, J. (1977). The dimensions of the Greek concept of philotimo. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 102, 313-314.
- Agresti, A. (1990). *Categorical data analysis*. New York: John Wiley.

- Brandes, S. (1980). *Metaphors of masculinity: Sex and status in Andalusian folklore*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania 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.
- Diccionario de la lengua Española*. Real Academia Española. (1992). Madrid, Spain: Real Academia Española.
- Fischer, A. H., Manstead, A.S.R., & Rodríguez Mosquera, P. M. (1999). The role of honour-related versus individualistic values in conceptualizing pride, shame and anger: Spanish and Dutch cultural prototypes. *Cognition and Emotion*, 13, 149-179.
- Gilmore, D. D. (1982). Anthropology of the Mediterranean area. *Annual Reviews in Anthropology*, 11, 175-205.
- Gilmore, D. D. (Ed.). (1987a). *Honor and shame and the unity of the Mediterranean*. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Gilmore, D. D. (1987b). Honor, honesty, shame: Male status in contemporary Andalusia. In D. D. Gilmore (Ed.), *Honor and shame and the unity of the Mediterranean* (pp. 90-103). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Gilmore, D. D. (1990). *Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gilmore, D. D., & Gwynne, G. (Eds.) (1985). Sex and gender in southern Europe [Special issue]. *Anthropology*, 9.
- Herzfeld, M. (1980). Honor and shame: Problems in the comparative analysis of moral systems. *Man*, 15, 339-351.
- Herzfeld, M. (1987). "As in your own house": Hospitality, ethnography, and the stereotype of Mediterranean society. In D. D. Gilmore (Ed.), *Honor and shame and the unity of the Mediterranean* (pp. 75-89). Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Holland, B. S., & DiPonzio Copenhaver, M. (1988). Improved Bonferroni-type multiple testing procedures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 104, 145-149.
- Jakubowska, L. (1989, April). A matter of honor. *The world and I*, 670-677.
- Murphy, M. (1983). Emotional confrontations between Sevillano fathers and sons. *American Ethnologist*, 10, 650-664.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Cohen, D. (1996). *Culture of honor: The psychology of violence in the South*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Peristiany, J. G. (Ed.). (1965). *Honour and shame: The values of Mediterranean society*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Pina-Cabral, J. de. (1989). The Mediterranean as a category of regional comparison: A critical view. *Current Anthropology*, 30(3), 399-406.
- Pitt-Rivers, J. (1965). Honour and social status. In J. G. Peristiany (Ed.), *Honour and shame: The values of Mediterranean society* (pp. 18-77). London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Pitt-Rivers, J. (1968). Honor. In D. Sills (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences* (pp. 503-511). New York: Macmillan.
- Pitt-Rivers, J. (1977). *The fate of Shechem or the politics of sex: Essays in the anthropology of the Mediterranean*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodríguez Mosquera, P. M. (1999). *Honor and emotion: The cultural shaping of pride, shame and anger*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Rodríguez 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.
- Rodríguez Mosquera, P. M., Manstead, A.S.R., & Fischer, A. H. (in press). The role of honor concerns in emotional reactions to offenses. *Cognition and Emotion*.
- Schneider, J. (1971). Of vigilance and virgins. *Ethnology*, 9, 1-24.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the structure and content of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48, 23-47.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Towards a psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 550-562.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal structure and content of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 878-891.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying culture specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 92-116.
- Smith, P. B., & Schwartz, S. (1997). Values. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitçibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Social behavior and applications* (Vol. 3, pp. 77-118). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Stevens, J. (1996). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Stewart, F. H. (1994). *Honor*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.



- Van Dale: *Groot Woordenboek der Nederlandse taal*. (1992). Utrecht, the Netherlands: Van Dale Lexicografie.
- Van de Vijver, F., & Leung, K. (1997). *Methods and analysis for cross-cultural research*. London: Sage.
- Vassiliou, V. G., & Vassiliou, G. (1973). The implicative meaning of the Greek concept of *philotimo*. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 4, 326-341.
- Wickens, T. D. (1989). *Multiway contingency tables analysis for the social sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wikan, U. (1984). Shame and honour: A contestable pair. *Man*, 19, 635-652.

*Patricia M. Rodriguez Mosquera received her Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Amsterdam in 1999. She is currently holding a post-doctoral research position at the Department of Social Psychology at the same university. Her research activities are centered on the interplay between culture and emotion. Her Ph.D. research involved a series of field cross-cultural studies between Spain and the Netherlands on the role of honor in the elicitation, experience, communication and social implications of pride, shame and anger. Her current post-doctoral research focuses on the relationship between culture, emotion and interpersonal conflict.*

*Antony S. R. Manstead is a professor of social psychology at the University of Amsterdam. He has research interests in social and cultural aspects of emotion, the impact of attitudes on behavior, attitude change processes, and the way in which identity is influenced by social and cultural contexts. He studied psychology and sociology at the University of Bristol and gained his Ph.D. in social psychology from the University of Sussex. He held positions at the University of Sussex and the University of Manchester before moving to Amsterdam. He has been chief editor of the *British Journal of Social Psychology* and an associate editor of *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* and of *Cognition and Emotion*. He is co-editor of *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Psychology* (Blackwell, 1995), of *The Blackwell Reader in Social Psychology* (Blackwell, 1997), and of *Emotions and Beliefs: How Feelings Influence Thoughts* (CUP, 2000).*

*Agneta H. Fischer received her Ph.D. from the University of Leiden, the Netherlands. She is currently professor in gender, culture and management, at the Psychology Department of the University of Amsterdam. Her research interest is in the social context of emotions, including gender and cultural differences in emotion.*