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Honor cultures are characterized by the importance attached to a specific set of social values: social interdependence, reputation, and family honor (Adamopoulos, 1977; Gilmore, 1987a; Jakubowska, 1989; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965a; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Schneider, 1971; Stewart, 1994; Vassiliou & Vassiliou, 1973). Whereas these honor values are generally regarded as relevant to both males and females, honor cultures also appear to be characterized by gender-specific honor codes. These are usually referred to as the masculine or male honor code, and the feminine, female, or chastity honor code (Blok, 1981; Brandes, 1980; Gilmore, 1987a, 1990a; Gilmore & Gwynne, 1985; Jakubowska, 1989; Murphy, 1983; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965a; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Schneider, 1971; Stewart, 1994). The masculine honor code entails values that are relevant for the protection of the family’s honor, and the feminine honor code centers on values that emphasize the importance of virginity and chastity. These two honor codes define attributes and behaviors that are believed to be desirable for men and women in honor cultures. They are therefore central to the understanding of gender stereotypes in such cultures. It has also been argued that they are closely connected to the division of sex-roles found in many honor cultures, where having a work role outside the home and exercising authority over the family are expected from males, and where engaging in home-based tasks and conforming to authority within the family are regarded as appropriate for females (Brandes, 1980; Gilmore, 1987a, 1990a; Gilmore & Gwynne, 1985; Murphy, 1983; Peristiany, 1965a; Pitt-Rivers, 1977). So these gender-specific honor codes appear to be central to the understanding of attitudes to sex-roles in honor cultures.

However, it has not been established whether masculine and feminine honor codes are specific to gender ideologies in honor cultures. Similarly, there is, to our knowledge, no empirical evidence concerning the extent to which attitudes towards sex-roles are more traditional in honor compared to non-honor cultures. Most research on masculine and feminine honor codes and their influence on attitudes towards sex-roles has been carried out in Mediterranean cultures, which are characterized by their attachment to honor and honor values (for an exception, see Asano-Tamanoi, 1987). Cross-cultural comparisons between honor and non-honor cultures on these issues are needed for a better understanding of the role that masculine and feminine honor codes play in the characterization of honor cultures, and of the extent to which and the way in which they are related to attitudes towards sex-roles.

*This chapter is adapted from Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, & Fischer (1999b).
There are two possible ways in which honor and non-honor cultures might differ with respect to these issues. First, the values associated with the masculine and feminine honor codes might be seen as unimportant in non-honor cultures, such that these values are specific to honor cultures. A second and to us more plausible possibility is that cultural differences in the significance attached to these values are a matter of degree, such that they are simply less important in non-honor cultures. Best and Williams’ (1998) research on gender stereotypes in 25 countries revealed a substantial degree of cross-cultural agreement with regard to the characteristics differentially associated with men and women. In addition, Gilmore’s (1990a) ethnographic research on the structure of manhood also found parallels across cultures in the way in which manhood is construed. Gilmore proposed that cultural differences in manhood ideals are better understood in terms of the relative emphasis placed on the different characteristics. We assume that the same applies with respect to the importance of masculine and feminine honor codes in various cultures.

The present study was designed to compare (1) the significance of the specific values related to the masculine and feminine honor codes, and (2) attitudes towards sex-roles in two countries that have been shown to differ in the significance attached to honor and honor values, namely Spain and the Netherlands. In previous research presented in Chapter 2 it has been established that honor, family-related values (e.g., family security, respect for parents and elderly), social recognition, social power, and social interdependence (e.g., humility) are more important in Spain, whereas values that stress the capacities and achievements of the individual (e.g., ability, self-discipline), freedom, and independence are more important in the Netherlands (Chapter 2, Study 1; Fischer, Manstead & Rodriguez Mosquera, 1999, Study 1). Furthermore, Spain has been described in the anthropological literature as an honor culture and one in which masculine and feminine honor codes are highly significant (Gilmore, 1987a, 1990a; Gilmore & Gwynne, 1985; Murphy, 1983; Pitt-Rivers, 1965, 1977). Although there has been some research on masculine and feminine honor in ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands (see e.g., Brouwer, 1997; Everaert & Lamur, 1993), there is a lack of systematic research on the significance of masculine and feminine honor codes in the broader population.

Gender-Specific and Gender-Neutral Honor Values

Certain honor values can be described as equally important for the maintenance of honor for both women and men. The maintenance of a good reputation, of social interdependence, and of family honor are core values in honor cultures (Adamopoulos, 1977; Gilmore, 1987a; Jakubowska, 1989; Miller, 1993; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965a; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Schneider, 1971; Stewart, 1994; Vassiliou & Vassiliou, 1973). The maintenance of
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honor depends not only on individual behavior, but also on social approval of that behavior. Social approval of one’s behavior establishes a certain reputation. One’s attachment to honor is expressed through the maintenance of a reputation of being honorable, i.e., acting in accordance to honor values. Family honor is also expressed in terms of reputation. The reputation of the family as a collective depends on the reputation of its individual members, whose honor in turn depends partly on the honor of the family. One’s own and one’s family’s honor are therefore highly interdependent. Honor cultures can also be characterized by the emphasis placed on values that strengthen interdependence or social relatedness, such as hospitality. The expression of such values in social behavior strengthens social bonds and contributes to maintain interpersonal harmony. The task of upholding these values can be seen as equally applicable to both sexes.

Other honor values, however, are constitutive of specific feminine and masculine honor codes (Blok, 1981; Brandes, 1980; Cohen & Nisbett, 1994; Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle & Schwarz, 1996; Gilmore, 1987a, 1990a; Gilmore & Gwynne, 1985; Jakubowska, 1989; Jansen, 1987; Murphy, 1983; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Peristiany, 1965a; Pitt-Rivers, 1977; Schneider, 1971; Stewart, 1994). Protecting and defending the family’s well-being and reputation is the responsibility of male members of the family: Being strong and courageous in standing up for oneself and one’s family are desirable attributes for the maintenance of men’s honor. Strength and courage also relate to the importance of virility for a man’s honor, which is further expressed in a view of manhood that emphasizes sexual potency. The fact that these qualities need to be to some degree demonstrable (in order to acquire the desired reputation) means that competition for precedence and social status is important for men. Male precedence applies not only to social relations but also to the family: Authority over the family is often seen as a male prerogative in honor cultures. In sum, being able to protect the family, virility, and maintaining authority within the family are core attributes associated with the masculine honor code.

The feminine honor code centers on a group of values that emphasize chastity and conformity. The central ideal in the feminine honor code is sexual shame or chastity. Sexual shame includes values centered on an ideal of purity and decorum in relation to female sexual behavior: virginity before marriage, chastity, shyness, and decorum (e.g., wearing discreet clothes). Conformity within the family context is also a central value in the feminine honor code: Respecting the head of the family is expected more from women than from men in honor cultures. Finally, the importance of chastity has also been related to an emphasis on a more general behavioral pattern of restraint in social behavior and attitudes, such as discretion and being controlled (Pitt-Rivers, 1965, 1977).
Abiding by feminine honor and masculine honor codes is important for the maintenance of honor for women and men in honor cultures. The strong interdependence that exists in these cultures between own and family honor means that one's failure to abide by these gender-specific honor codes will reflect on other family members and the honor of the family as a whole. However, the implications for others' honor are greater when the central feature of feminine honor, namely sexual shame or chastity, is violated than when the masculine honor code is violated. This is because the honor of a family is also reflected in the sexual purity or chastity of female relatives: Lack of sexual shame on the part of female relatives not only diminishes the honor of the woman concerned, but also reduces the honor of the family as a whole. Furthermore, the status of male honor is also partly dependent on female relatives' sexual shame. This is because men are seen in honor cultures as responsible for the protection of the family honor, and by implication, as responsible also for female relatives' chastity. A woman's lack of sexual shame is thus conceived in honor cultures as a failure on the part of her male relatives to protect the family honor. The importance of male protection of female sexuality emphasizes the authority role of males and female conformity within the family in honor cultures.

In sum, there are grounds for predicting that values related to the masculine honor code (authority, protection of the family, and virility) will be seen as more desirable in honor cultures than in non-honor cultures, but more so for men than for women; and that values related to the feminine honor code (sexual shame, conformity within the family) will be rated as more important in honor cultures than in non-honor cultures, but more so for women than for men.

**Attitudes towards Sex-Roles in Honor Cultures**

Masculine and feminine honor codes define a pattern of family and inter-sex relations that has implications for attitudes towards sex-roles in honor cultures. The emphasis on authority, protection of the family, and control of female relatives' sexual shame for male honor and the importance of chastity and conformity to authority for female honor can be seen as fostering a traditional view of sex-roles.

The focus on protection of the family in honor cultures implies that men are seen as both protectors of and providers for the family. Although the role of man as bread-winner is found in manhood ideals in many cultures, it acquires special significance in Mediterranean honor cultures, because the ability to support for one's family is central to a man's honor (Gilmore, 1990a). As a consequence, performance of the work role and economic success should be regarded as more important for men than for women in honor cultures. This means that
working outside the home should be considered more important for men than for women, and that men should be seen as more able to fulfill such a role, thereby leading to a stronger association of domestic tasks with women than with men. This salience of public and work contexts for men is further emphasized by an aspect of the masculine honor code which has been referred to by Gilmore as “performative excellence” (Gilmore, 1990a). This refers to the ability to express one’s manhood in public actions that “speak for themselves.” Performative excellence is central to the maintenance of men’s honor: The public expression of one’s virility and capacity to protect the family builds a reputation of being tough which in turn brings social respect and security to the family. Assertiveness in social behavior and being in the public eye should therefore be seen as more important for men than for women in honor cultures.

As noted above, protection of the family on the part of males extends beyond the physical and economic protection: Control of female relatives’ sexual behavior is also their responsibility. Not being able to live up to such responsibility translates into a loss of honor for male relatives and for the family. This dependence of male honor on female sexual constraint should lead to a restriction of social activities for women, strengthening the belief that home-related spheres are more appropriate for women than for men. As Murphy (1983, p. 653) put it, “a man’s reputation is partly contingent on his ability to protect the virtue of his women by limiting the nature and scope of their activities outside the family home.” Further, sexual shame embodies a cultural view of sexuality in which ideals of virginity and chastity are central. In contrast, virility is the core ideal in relation to the masculine honor code. In other words, taking the initiative in sexual relations should be seen as more appropriate for men than for women. Being sexually active should also be tolerated (or even encouraged) to a greater extent among men than among women. By contrast, maintaining virginity before marriage and being restrained in sexual relations should be seen as more appropriate for women than for men.

In sum, attitudes towards sex-roles are likely to be more traditional in honor cultures, such as Spain, than in non-honor cultures, such as the Netherlands. Furthermore, individual differences in the perceived desirability of abiding by masculine and feminine honor codes should (regardless of culture) be associated with differences in attitudes to sex-roles.

**Present Study**

One objective of the present study was to examine the extent to which feminine and masculine honor values, as compared to gender-neutral honor values, are considered desirable in Spain and in the Netherlands. Another aim was to study the extent to which attitudes towards sex-roles are more traditional in honor than in non-honor cultures. Finally, we wanted to
investigate the extent to which individual differences in desirability scores of gender-specific honor values predict the extent to which attitudes towards sex-roles are traditional.

Two measures were used in the present research. The first was a list of attributes that were operationalizations of gender-neutral (e.g., “one’s own good reputation,” “hospitality”) and gender-specific (e.g., “having authority over one’s family,” “virginity before marriage”) honor values. Participants were asked to make separate ratings of the extent to which each attribute would be found desirable in their culture in women and in men. The second measure was a modified version of the simplified attitudes towards women scale (AWS-S; Nelson, 1988). This version of the AWS-S was designed to assess attitudes towards men and women’s roles in three domains: work and public behavior; family roles; and sexuality.

We had the following predictions. First, we expected gender-neutral honor attributes to be seen as more desirable by Spanish than by Dutch participants. Second, we expected attributes related to the masculine honor code to be rated as more desirable by Spanish than by Dutch participants, but especially so in relation to men. Similarly, we expected attributes related to the feminine honor code to be rated as more desirable by Spanish than by Dutch participants, but especially so in relation to women. Third, in line with previous research on attitudes towards sex-roles (Nelson, 1988; Parry, 1983; Willemsen, 1992) we expected male participants to express more traditional attitudes towards sex-roles than female participants. Fourth, we expected Spanish participants to hold more traditional attitudes towards sex-roles than Dutch participants. Finally, we expected individual differences in desirability ratings of gender-specific honor attributes to predict attitudes toward sex-roles: The more desirable gender-specific honor attributes are seen to be, the more traditional attitudes towards sex-roles should be.

**Method**

**Participants**

One hundred and twenty-one Spanish (64 females, 57 males) and 146 Dutch participants (71 females, 75 males) participated in this study. The Spanish participants were university students attending the Autónoma University of Madrid, and had a mean age of 22.55; the Dutch participants were university students attending the University of Amsterdam, and had a mean age of 21.83. Care was taken to establish that the nationalities of both parents of the Spanish and Dutch participants were also Spanish or Dutch, respectively. Participation was on a purely voluntarily basis.
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Questionnaire and procedure

Participants individually completed two measures, one concerning honor-related attributes, and the other assessing attitudes to sex-roles. The first measure consisted of 22 items relating to gender-neutral and gender-specific honor values. Masculine honor values were operationalized in the following attributes: “authority over the family,” “physical strength,” “having pride,” “sexual adventures,” “high socio-economic status,” “precedence,” and “protecting one’s family’s well-being and property.” Feminine honor values were operationalized in the following attributes: “controlling sexual desires,” “discretion,” “modesty,” “respecting the head of the family,” “virginity before marriage,” “discreet clothing,” “loyalty to one’s partner,” and “shyness.” Gender-neutral values relating to honor were operationalized in terms of the following attributes: “accepting social norms,” “honesty,” “hospitality,” “marrying somebody with a good reputation” “one’s family having a good reputation,” “one’s own good reputation,” “protecting one’s family’s reputation,” “being respected by others,” and “satisfying one’s parents’ expectations.”

Participants made two ratings in relation to each of these attributes, one with reference to women and the other with reference to men. Specifically, participants were asked to rate the extent to which each attribute was desirable in their culture (i.e., “To what extent is modesty desirable in Spanish [Dutch] culture for women [men]?”) on 5-point scales ranging from not at all desirable (1) to extremely desirable (5).

The attitudes towards sex-role measure was based on the Dutch version (Willemsen, 1992) of Nelson’s (1988) AWS-S. The AWS-S is a simplified version of the Spence-Helmreich attitudes toward women scale (AWS; Spence & Helmreich, 1972). The AWS is frequently used to measure sex-role attitudes. The original AWS scale consisted of 55 items; it was later shortened to a 25-item form (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1973). The reliability and validity of both forms of the scale have been repeatedly demonstrated (Nelson, 1988). The short form of the AWS was simplified by Parry (1983) and further adapted by Nelson (1988). Nelson’s AWS-S has been shown to have acceptable internal consistency and construct validity (Nelson, 1988). The AWS-S was translated into Dutch by Willemsen (1992) and slightly adapted: two items that did not apply to Dutch culture were eliminated. The Dutch AWS-S contained 20 statements describing attitudes towards women’s roles in relation to work outside the home and behavior in public, sexuality, marriage and the family. Because we were also interested in assessing attitudes towards men’s sex-roles, we added 10 items describing men’s roles in these domains. Our version of this measure will be referred to as the Attitudes towards Sex-Roles Scale (ASRS).

The ASRS was presented to participants as containing a set of statements about women’s and men’s roles. The statements were short and included items phrased so as to express
traditional and liberal attitudes. The 30 statements included in the ASRS are shown in Appendix 3A. Participants were asked to report the extent to which they agreed with each statement on a 5-point scale ranging from *in total disagreement* (1) to *in total agreement* (5).

The questionnaires were prepared in Dutch and then translated into Spanish by a native speaker. The linguistic and conceptual equivalence of the Spanish and Dutch questionnaires was assessed by a process of back-translation carried out by a linguistic expert in both languages. Order of presentation of the honor-related attributes questionnaire and the ASRS was counterbalanced across participants.

Results

Honor-related attributes

Honor-related attributes were grouped into three clusters: gender-neutral, masculine, and feminine honor attributes. Ratings of the desirability of attributes within a cluster were averaged for male and female targets, separately. The reliabilities of these composite scores were computed separately for the whole sample, and for the Spanish and Dutch subsamples. The alphas are shown in Table 3.1, and were in all but one case .60 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honor attribute clusters</th>
<th>Whole sample (N = 267)</th>
<th>Spanish (n = 121)</th>
<th>Dutch (n = 146)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender-neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female targets</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male targets</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine honor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female targets</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male targets</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine honor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female targets</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male targets</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, the averaged scores in each cluster were entered as multiple dependent variables in a MANOVA, using country, gender and sex of target (i.e., the desirability of an attribute in males or in females) as factors, the last being a within-participant variable.

The multivariate main effect of country was significant, $F(3, 249) = 18.35, p < .001$. The univariate effect was significant for gender-neutral honor attributes and masculine honor attributes, $F(1, 251) = 13.21, p < .001$; and $F(1, 251) = 33.85, p < .001$; respectively. Spanish participants rated gender-neutral honor attributes and masculine honor attributes (M =
4.09, $SD = .47$; and $M = 3.51, SD = .48$; respectively) as more desirable than Dutch participants did ($M = 3.87, SD = .52$; and $M = 3.17, SD = .48$; respectively).

The multivariate main effect of sex of target was also significant, $F (3, 249) = 201.58, p < .001$: Feminine honor and gender-neutral attributes were rated as more desirable in women ($M = 3.22, SD = .51$; and $M = 3.61, SD = .50$; respectively) than in men ($M = 2.83, SD = .49, F[1, 251] = 215.71, p < .001$; and $M = 3.45, SD = .45, F[1, 251] = 81.09, p < .001$; respectively). The reverse was found in relation to masculine honor attributes: Participants rated these attributes as more desirable in men ($M = 3.68, SD = .57$) than in women ($M = 2.97, SD = .57), $F (1, 251) = 494.33, p < .001$.

These main effects of country and sex of target were qualified by a significant multivariate interaction between country and sex of target, $F (3, 249) = 7.38, p < .001$. The means and standard deviations as a function of country are shown in Table 3.2. The univariate interaction was significant for gender-neutral honor attributes and feminine honor attributes, $F (1, 251) = 15.20, p < .001; F (1, 251) = 5.19, p < .03$; respectively. Although both Spanish and Dutch participants rated the gender-neutral honor attributes as more desirable in women than in men (as reflected in significant simple main effects of sex of target within each level of country), this difference was greater in Spanish participants’ ratings than in those of Dutch participants (see Table 3.2). Further, analyses of simple main effects revealed that although Spanish participants’ and Dutch participants’ ratings of the desirability of feminine honor attributes in women did not differ significantly, $F (1, 257) = .10, p = .75$, Dutch participants rated feminine honor attributes as more desirable in men than Spanish participants did, $F (1, 257) = 6.00, p < .02$ (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honor attribute clusters</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Spain (n = 121)</th>
<th></th>
<th>the Netherlands (n = 146)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender-neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female targets</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male targets</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine honor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female targets</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male targets</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine honor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female targets</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male targets</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The multivariate interaction between gender and sex of target was also significant, $F(3, 249) = 3.59, p < .02$. The means and standard deviations as a function of gender are shown in Table 3.3. The univariate interaction was significant only for masculine honor attributes, $F(1, 251) = 9.56, p < .01$. Although female and male participants rated these masculine attributes as significantly more desirable in men than in women (as reflected in significant simple main effects of sex of target within each level of gender), the difference as a function of sex of target was greater in the ratings made by female than by male participants (see Table 3.3).

### Table 3.3
Means and Standards Deviations for Honor Attribute Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honor attribute clusters</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female ($n = 135$)</th>
<th>Male ($n = 132$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female targets</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male targets</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine honor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female targets</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male targets</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine honor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female targets</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male targets</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitudes towards Sex-Roles Scale**

Items worded in a liberal way were reverse-scored, such that higher scores always reflected a more traditional attitude toward sex-roles. Cronbach’s alphas were computed to assess the reliability of the ASRS scale. The alpha for the whole sample was .91; the alphas for the Spanish and Dutch subsamples were .92 and .91, respectively. A total score was computed for each participant and entered as a dependent variable into an ANOVA, using country and sex of participant as factors. The main effect of gender was significant, $F(1, 253) = 40.70, p < .001$. Consistent with predictions, males ($M = 1.94; SD = .53$) expressed more traditional attitudes towards sex-roles than females did ($M = 1.58; SD = .35$). However, neither the main effect of country nor the interaction effect between country and sex of participant was significant.

We then computed subscales of ASRS items on the basis of the domain referred to in the item. There were three domains: work and public behavior, sexuality, and family roles. The work and public behavior domain included statements referring to the roles of women and men in public places (e.g., “Women should be able to go everywhere men do, or do the same things men do, such as going into bars alone”) and to opportunities and capacities in education
and at work (e.g., "Women and men should have equal opportunities in getting a job, or a promotion"). The sexuality domain included statements describing sex-roles in the context of sexual relations and marriage (e.g., "Women should retain virginity till marriage"). The family roles domain included statements referring to sex-roles within the family (e.g., "In general, the father should have more authority than the mother in bringing up children"). The alphas for these domains were all greater than .70, and were typically greater than .80, whether the alphas were calculated for the sample as a whole or separately for Spanish and Dutch participants.

Next, average scores in each of these domains were entered as multiple dependent variables into a MANOVA, with country and gender as factors. Means and standards deviations of these average scores as a function of country and gender are shown in Table 3.4. The multivariate main effect of gender was significant, F(3, 248) = 22.70, p < .001. The univariate effect was significant for work and public behavior, F(1, 250) = 42.19, p < .001; sexuality, F(1, 250) = 10.49, p = .001; and family roles, F(1, 250) = 52.13, p < .001. Males held more traditional attitudes than did females with regard to sex-roles in work contexts and public places, sexual relations and marriage, and in family contexts (see Table 3.4). A significant multivariate main effect of country was also found, F(3, 248) = 8.11, p < .001. The univariate effect was significant for the sexuality domain, F(1, 250) = 4.94, p < .03. Spanish participants expressed more traditional attitudes towards sex-roles in relation to sexuality and marriage than did Dutch participants (see Table 3.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASRS Domains</th>
<th>Country Spain (n = 121)</th>
<th>Neth. (n = 146)</th>
<th>Gender Female (n = 135)</th>
<th>Male (n = 132)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work and public</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family roles</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regression Analyses**

To study the extent to which attitudes towards sex-roles could be predicted by gender, country, and individual differences in desirability scores on gender-specific and gender-neutral honor attributes, we derived two sets of honor-related attribute scores. One was based on the desirability ratings for women targets of attributes relating to sexual shame and conformity within the family (i.e., respecting the head of the family, shyness, virginity before marriage,
discreet clothing), and the desirability ratings for men targets of attributes related to virility and
to authority over and protection of the family (i.e., sexual adventures, physical strength,
having pride, authority over family, protecting one’s family’s well-being and property).
Averaged ratings on these attributes formed a measure of gender-specific honor attributes, with
higher scores on this cluster indicating that sexual shame and conformity within the family are
regarded as desirable in women, while authority over the family, protection of the family and
virility are seen as desirable in men. A second set of attribute scores was derived by averaging
the desirability ratings for men and women targets of all gender-neutral honor attributes.
Higher scores on this measure reflect greater perceived desirability of gender-independent
honor attributes.

These two sets of scores were used as predictors, together with country and gender, in a
series of hierarchical regression analyses. Four analyses were carried out: one using total
ASRS score as the outcome variable, a second using score in the work and public behavior
domain, a third using the score in the sexuality domain, and a fourth using the score in the
family roles domain. Correlations between the predictor and outcome variables are shown in
Table 3.5.

Table 3.5
Correlations between ASRS Scores and other Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Work/publ.</th>
<th>Sexuality</th>
<th>Family roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Specific Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole sample</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Independent Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole sample</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Work/publ. = Work and public behavior. * p < .05, ** p < .01.

As expected, the perceived desirability of the gender-independent honor attributes did not
correlate significantly with any of the outcome measures. By contrast, the perceived
desirability of gender-specific honor attributes correlated positively with total scores on the
ASRS and with scores in the sexuality domain in the whole sample, and with all outcome
measures in the Spanish subsample.

The order of predictors in all analyses were entered as follows. Country (coded as 1 =
Spain and 2 = the Netherlands), gender (coded as 1 = female participants and 2 = male
participants), and scores on the gender-neutral honor cluster were first entered into the equation using the stepwise method. Next, the gender-specific honor score was forced into the equation to see if it added significantly to the explained variance in the outcome variable. Total ASRS scores were significantly predicted by gender ($\beta = .37$), but not by country or the gender-independent honor score. The gender-specific honor score was also a significant predictor ($\beta = .12$). ASRS scores in the work and public behavior domain were significantly predicted by gender ($\beta = .37$). Country and the gender-independent honor score were not significant predictors. The gender-specific honor score was a significant predictor ($\beta = .08$). ASRS scores in the sexuality domain were significantly predicted by gender ($\beta = .18$) and by country ($\beta = -.14$), but not by the gender-neutral honor score. The gender-specific honor score was also a significant predictor ($\beta = .15$). ASRS scores in the family roles domain were significantly predicted by gender ($\beta = .42$). Country and the gender-independent honor score were not significant predictors. Again the gender-specific honor score was a significant predictor ($\beta = .11$).

In sum, gender was the most consistently significant predictor of traditional sex-role attitudes, typically explaining between 13% and 18% of the variance on attitudes towards sex-roles. As expected, men held more traditional attitudes. Country was only a significant predictor when it came to ASRS scores in the sexuality domain, where it accounted for around 2% of the variance: Spanish participants held more traditional attitudes towards sexuality and marriage than Dutch participants did. Consistent with predictions, the gender-independent attribute score was not a significant predictor of sex-role attitudes. Also consistent with predictions is the finding that the gender-specific honor score was a significant predictor in all analyses, although it typically only explained around 1-2% of the variance in attitudes towards sex-roles. The more desirable these gender-specific honor attributes were found to be, the more traditional were attitudes towards sex-roles.

**Discussion**

The results regarding the perceived desirability of gender-neutral honor attributes confirm the assumption that honor values are in general more important in Spain than in the Netherlands. Maintaining one's own good reputation, family honor, and social interdependence were all rated as more desirable attributes in men and in women by Spanish than by Dutch participants. The notion that certain honor values are gender-specific was confirmed by the finding that the attributes that we assumed on theoretical grounds to be relevant to masculine honor were in general seen as more desirable in men than in women, whereas the reverse was true for the attributes that we assumed to be relevant to feminine honor. Attributes that express strength,
status and agency are regarded as more desirable in men than in women, whereas attributes that express restraint and pudeur are regarded as more desirable in women than in men.

However, we also anticipated that culture and sex of target would interact in determining the perceived desirability of gender-specific honor attributes in men and women, such that masculine attributes would be seen as more desirable by Spanish than by Dutch participants, especially in men, and feminine attributes would be seen as more desirable by Spanish than by Dutch participants, especially in women. Some aspects of the results were in accordance with our predictions. Thus masculine honor attributes were rated as more desirable by Spanish than by Dutch participants, although there were no significant differences between Spanish participants’ desirability ratings of these attributes in male and female targets. Furthermore, Spanish and Dutch participants’ ratings of the desirability of feminine honor attributes did not differ, even for female targets. However, Spanish participants did rate feminine honor attributes as less desirable in male targets than did Dutch participants.

The finding that masculine honor attributes were seen as more desirable by Spanish than by Dutch participants, but to an almost equal extent in women and in men, suggests that masculine honor values serve as a kind of norm in Spain. Thus Spanish participants found it less desirable for a man to have attributes typically associated with feminine honor than for a woman to have attributes typically associated with masculine honor. The expression by a man of shyness or sexual shame or the acceptance by a man of a submissive position within the family would meet with more socially disapprobation in Spain than would a woman displaying attributes associated with masculine honor. One implication of these findings is that behaving in a way that is inconsistent with social prescriptions derived from one’s own gender-specific honor code would be more damaging for the self-esteem, self-image, and reputation of a Spanish man than for the self-esteem, self-image, and reputation of a Spanish woman. These implications for self-conception and reputation merit further research.

The finding that Spanish and Dutch participants did not differ with respect to the perceived desirability of feminine honor values in women is surprising. Attributes such as having sexual shame, conforming to authority within the family, and having discretion were seen as equally desirable attributes for women in Spain and the Netherlands. However, the fact that attributes related to feminine honor were regarded as equally desirable in women in these two countries should not be taken as implying that these attributes play an equivalent role in women’s self-definition and social interactions in Spain and the Netherlands, or that they relate to the same social practices in these countries. Ethnographic research has shown that feminine honor values are central to female gender identity, and to family and social interactions in Spain (Gilmore, 1987a, 1990a; Gilmore & Gwynne, 1985; Pitt-Rivers, 1965, 1977). Their significance in Spain relates to their implications for the maintenance of honor: Not living up to
feminine honor values damages both a woman’s own honor and her family’s honor. Thus maintaining a self-image and a social reputation that conforms to the feminine honor code appears to be a central concern for women in Spain. It is unclear how important it is for Dutch women to live up to feminine honor values. The fact that social recognition and honor play a less important role in the Netherlands than they do in Spain (see Chapter 2, Study 1; Fischer et al., 1999, Study 1) suggests that maintaining a social reputation that conforms to the feminine honor code is less important for women in the Netherlands than in Spain. In Chapter 5 we report a study in which we investigate the extent to which behaving or maintaining a reputation in conflict with feminine honor values affect women’s self-esteem in the Netherlands and Spain. Further, the fact that different value systems operate in these countries, honor-based in Spain and individualistic in the Netherlands, implies that the maintenance of feminine honor relates to different social practices in these countries. This suggestion is worthy of future investigation.

The observed pattern of findings is consistent with the characterization of Spain as a masculine country and the Netherlands as a feminine country (Hofstede, 1998). Masculine countries are characterized by values emphasizing notions of assertiveness and toughness. Our finding that masculine honor attributes, which focus on strength, pride, and precedence, are seen as more desirable in Spain than in the Netherlands is consistent with the idea that Spain is a masculine country. Feminine countries emphasize modesty-related values. Our finding that feminine honor attributes, which also emphasize modesty, discretion and shyness, were rated as more desirable in men by Dutch than by Spanish participants are consistent with the characterization of the Netherlands as a feminine country.

Turning now to the results of the ASRS, we expected male participants to hold more traditional attitudes towards sex-roles than female participants. This expectation was confirmed by the results, both for the total ASRS score and for each sex-role domain. Thus male participants held more traditional attitudes towards sex-roles than female participants did in relation to work outside the house and public behavior, sexuality, and family roles. Both Spanish and Dutch male participants were more likely than their female counterparts to believe that home-related tasks are more appropriate for women and that the role as bread-winner is more appropriate for men; that men are better able to fulfill higher social positions than women; that men ought to be more assertive than women and to have a more active role in sexual relations than women; that women should show restraint in social and sexual relations; and that men should have a superior position than women in the family in terms of authority. With regard to the effect of country on attitudes towards sex-roles, our expectations were only partly confirmed. The effect of country on attitudes towards sex-roles was domain-dependent: the sex-role attitudes of Spanish participants were not more generally traditional than those of their
Dutch counterparts, but they were more traditional in the specific domain of sexuality and marriage. The fact that sex-roles in this domain are more traditional in Spain than in the Netherlands is of course consistent with the implicit theories of sexuality embedded in the masculine and feminine honor codes: Virility and an active role in sexuality are part of the masculine code, whereas chastity and virginity are part of the feminine code.

We expected that the perceived desirability of gender-specific attributes relating to honor would significantly predict the traditionality of attitudes towards sex-roles, but that this would not be the case for the perceived desirability of gender-independent attributes relating to honor. The results were consistent with these predictions. The more sexual shame and conformity within the family was rated as desirable in female targets and authority, protection of the family and virility as desirable in male targets, the more traditional were attitudes towards sex-roles. However, the amount of variance in attitudes towards sex-roles explained by individual differences in desirability ratings of the gender-specific honor attributes was low, only around 1-2% of the variance once the effects of gender had been taken into account. The small amount of variance in sex-role attitudes accounted for by the desirability ratings of gender-specific honor attributes has to be seen in the context of the way these two sets of variables were assessed. In the case of sex-role attitudes, participants were asked to report their own attitude to different aspects of sex-roles; in the case of gender-specific honor attributes, participants were asked to report how desirable it was for a man or a woman to have these attributes in their culture. In the first case, then, participants were expressly invited to report their personal attitude, whereas in the second case they were in effect acting as cultural informants. Thus it would be entirely possible for a given Spanish respondent to report that it is desirable for men in Spain to exercise authority over the family, and yet to endorse liberal items concerning sex-roles in the family domain when it came to completing the ASRS. Despite this, the perceived desirability of gender-specific honor attributes helped to explain variance in attitude towards sex-roles, even after controlling for the effect of gender.

In sum, we believe that the present research makes a useful contribution to current knowledge about the relationship between culture and gender ideologies. Cultural differences in gender-specific honor values between Spain and the Netherlands are especially apparent with regard to the perceived desirability of masculine honor attributes in both women and men, and the perceived desirability of feminine honor attributes in men. These cultural variations clearly reflect differences in the degree of emphasis placed on these gender-specific honor codes. In other words, attributes related to masculine and feminine honor are clearly present in both Spanish and Dutch gender stereotypes. Further, cultural differences in attitudes towards sex-roles between Spain and the Netherlands appear to be limited to the domain of sexuality and marriage, presumably reflecting the fact that Spanish participants’ found attributes relating...
(among other things) to sexual virility in males more desirable than did their Dutch counterparts. Finally, at least some of the variation in attitudes towards sex-roles can be accounted for in terms of the degree to which attributes related to masculine honor are regarded as desirable in men, and the degree to which attributes related to feminine honor are regarded as desirable in women, presumably reflecting the way in which the endorsement of different values for men and women influences sex-role attitudes.

In the present and preceding chapters we have investigated the differential significance of honor and honor values in Spain and the Netherlands. In the second part of the thesis, in Chapters 4 and 5, we turn to an examination of how the observed cross-cultural value differences affect pride, shame and anger.
Appendix 3A

Attitudes towards Sex-Roles Scale (ASRS) Items

1. It sounds worse when a woman swears than when a man does.
2. There should be more women leaders in important jobs, such as in politics.
3. It is worse when a woman tells dirty jokes than when a man does.
4. If a woman goes out to work her husband should help with the housework, such as washing dishes, cleaning, and cooking.
5. Women and men should have equal opportunities in getting a job, or a promotion.
6. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.
7. Men who have most of the responsibility for taking care of the children in a family are "softies."
8. A drunken woman is worse than a drunken man.
9. Women should worry less about having equal rights as men and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
10. A woman who earns as much as her date should pay for herself.
11. Marriage is for a woman much more important than for a man.
12. Important jobs in business and industry should be filled by men.
13. Women should be able to go everywhere men do, or do the same things men do, such as going into bars alone.
14. Sons in a family should be more encouraged to go to college than daughters.
15. It is ridiculous for a woman to drive a train.
16. It is insulting for a man when a women pays for him.
17. In general, the father should have more authority than the mother in bringing up children.
18. The task of a woman is to stay at home and care for the family rather than pursuing a career of her own.
19. Women are not better off when being treated like a "lady" in the old-fashioned way.
20. It is ridiculous for a man to be a nursery school teacher.
21. Men should take the initiative in sexuality.
22. Women have less to offer than men in the world of commerce and industry.
23. It is worse if a woman begins an extramarital affair than when a man does.
24. Men should be the breadwinners of the family.
25. Women should retain virginity till marriage.
26. Women should have equal opportunities as men to do apprenticeships and learn a trade.
27. Girls nowadays should have the same freedom as boy, such as being allowed to stay out late.
28. Men should not behave emotionally in public.
29. A divorced woman is more a failure than a divorced man.
30. Men should have equal opportunities as women to take care of their children and develop an emotional bond with them.
1. It sounds worse when a man's mother is a person who never worked outside the home. A woman's work outside the home is not considered as important as a man's work outside the home. 

2. It is worse when a woman tells other people that she has been in a non-traditional job, because it might cause problems in her family. 

3. If a woman goes out to work, she should be able to lead the household, even when the husband is working. 

4. Women need to be more supportive and understanding, especially when the husband is going through a tough time. 

5. Women should not be seen as merely supporting their husband, as many of them are also working outside the home. 

6. A woman should be more active and vocal in her terms of marriage. 

7. A woman who does not do house chores is seen as disloyal to her husband. 

8. Women should not have to worry about being left alone at home and losing the support of their husband. 

9. Women should worry less about becoming good wives and mothers. 

10. A woman should not be seen as more than a housewife. 

11. Women should be more independent and work outside the home. 

12. Women should be able to go everywhere, even up the mountain, when the husband is not there. 

13. Women should be encouraged to go to college and learn more. 

14. Women in a family should be seen as more seriously when they disagree with the husband. 

15. It is ridiculous for a woman to drive a car. 

16. It is humiliating for a woman when a man pays for her. 

17. In general, the man should have more authority in the family. 

18. The role of a woman is to stay at home and care for the family, rather than pursuing their own goals. 

19. Women should be taken off when being treated like a "lady" in the old-fashioned way. 

20. It is ridiculous for a man to be a married school teacher. 

21. Men should not be seen as being in a minority. 

22. Women have less to offer than men in the world of business and industry. 

23. It is wrong if a woman is perceived as a commercial object, even when a man does the same. 

24. Men should be the heads and masters of the family. 

25. Women should focus on getting married. 

26. Women should have equal opportunities as men to do apprenticeships and learn a trade.