

Male Honor and Female Fidelity: Implicit Cultural Scripts That Perpetuate Domestic Violence

Joseph A. Vandello
University of South Florida

Dov Cohen
University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign

Two studies explored how domestic violence may be implicitly or explicitly sanctioned and reinforced in cultures where honor is a salient organizing theme. Three general predictions were supported: (a) female infidelity damages a man's reputation, particularly in honor cultures; (b) this reputation can be partially restored through the use of violence; and (c) women in honor cultures are expected to remain loyal in the face of jealousy-related violence. Study 1 involved participants from Brazil (an honor culture) and the United States responding to written vignettes involving infidelity and violence in response to infidelity. Study 2 involved southern Anglo, Latino, and northern Anglo participants witnessing a "live" incident of aggression against a woman (actually a confederate) and subsequently interacting with her.

Relationship violence occurs across all cultures and social groups. Ultimately, much of this conflict and violence between male and female romantic partners derives from jealousy and fidelity concerns (Buss, Larsen, Westen, & Semmelroth, 1992; Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982). In Daly and Wilson's (1988a, 1988b) review of spousal homicides across a wide range of cultures, they concluded that in the majority of cases, the leading motive is the male's suspicion of infidelity or desertion. Although male violence against women exists in all cultures, there is also great cultural variation in patterns of domestic violence. Cultures vary tremendously in the prevalence of domestic violence, both cross-nationally and among cultural groups within nations (cf. Heise, Pitanguy, & Germain, 1994; Straus & Smith, 1990; Vandello & Cohen, 2003). In addition, the events that trigger episodes of violence may differ across cultures, and the "appropriate"

responses to these events may differ across groups as well. For example, some cultures have social customs sanctioning murder of women in response to the most egregious infractions to family "honor" (Baker, Gregware, & Cassidy, 1999; Beyer, 1999; Ginat, 1987). Many cultures often have had more formal legal traditions defending a man's right to beat or even kill his wife in response to infidelity (M. Wilson & Daly, 1992).¹

In this article, we address honor as a cultural syndrome (Triandis, 1994, 1996) and explore how facets of this syndrome can contribute to male-on-female violence. Three features of this syndrome are examined here by comparing honor and nonhonor cultures using experiments that involve paper-and-pencil vignettes and live interactions. Specifically, we test the hypotheses that in honor cultures as compared with nonhonor cultures (a) female fidelity will cause greater damage to a male's reputation, (b) this reputation can be partially restored through the use of violence, and (c) women are more often expected to remain loyal in the face of such violence.

Male Honor and Domestic Violence

Cultures around the world vary in the importance attached to the construct of honor. In one sense, the definition of honor is consistent across cultures. Almost all cultures place value on honor defined as virtuous behavior, good moral character, integrity, and altruism, and this ideal holds for males as well as females. In some cultures, however, honor carries an additional social significance as a theme around which most interpersonal life is organized. Scholars such as Pitt-Rivers (1966) have noted two definitions of

Joseph A. Vandello, Department of Psychology, University of South Florida; Dov Cohen, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign.

The work was supported in part by a dissertation completion fellowship from the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign Graduate College, by National Science Foundation Grant 9808164, and by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Grant 31037.

We thank the following people for their help in the development and execution of the studies: Carrie Debruler, Rebecca Denosaquo, Renae Franiuk, Kelly Frankovich, Demetrios Georgacopoulos, Chris Georgacopoulos, Anna Lindwedel, Brett McGovern, Tiffany Meier, Beth Oshack, Sylvia Puente, Jesus Ruiz, Jon Schmidgall, Jeff Stone, and Maria Talarico. Also, Andrea Aguiar, Adriana Aguiar, Marina Aguiar, Marcos Aguiar, Nancy Cardia, Betty Siqueira, and Fernanda Siqueira provided invaluable help with Study 1. Special thanks are also due to the members of Joseph A. Vandello's dissertation committee: Dov Cohen, Harry Triandis, Ed Diener, Fritz Drasgow, and Louise Fitzgerald. Finally, we thank Rick Hoyle for his helpful comments on an earlier version of the article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Joseph A. Vandello, Department of Psychology, PCD 4118G, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620-7200. E-mail: vandello@chuma1.cas.usf.edu

¹ Female-on-male violence as well as violence within gay and lesbian couples occurs. We chose to focus here on male violence against women because this violence is much more likely to occur than female-on-male violence and because much of the female-on-male violence is likely to be a response to male aggression (Daly & Wilson, 1988b). Female heterosexual violence (and gay and lesbian violence) may have different etiologies than male violence, and thus the framework for the present article may be quite inappropriate for analyses of these issues.

the term. In addition to the widely shared definition of honor as virtue, a second meaning of honor has to do with honor as status, precedence, and reputation, and is the focus of the present work. It is based on a person's (usually a man's) strength and power to enforce his will on others or to command deferential treatment (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). In some cultures, such honor codes are formal and codified; in others (such as the U.S. South), norms of honor tend to be more informal and implicit.

This second definition of honor is more narrowly emphasized only in certain cultures. Classic examples of "cultures of honor" include Mediterranean societies such as Greece, Italy, and Spain (Campbell, 1965; Gilmore, 1990; Peristiany, 1965), Middle East and Arab cultures (Abou-Zeid, 1965; Antoun, 1968; Bourdieu, 1965; Gilmore, 1990; Ginat, 1987), Latin and South American cultures with Iberian roots (Johnson & Lipsett-Rivera, 1998), and the American South (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Wyatt-Brown, 1982). Whereas there is a great concern with generosity, hospitality, and loyalty in these cultures (the first definition of honor), there is also a great concern for a man's reputation based on his toughness and ability to protect his family and possessions (the second definition of honor).

It is important to note that honor norms in such cultures apply to females as well as males. Whereas the code dictates precedence and toughness for males, norms for females stress modesty, shame, and the avoidance of behaviors that might threaten the good name of the family (e.g., adultery or sexual immodesty). These gender roles imply a more active role for men and a passive role for women, as female honor is centered around the *avoidance* of shame; however, females are neither powerless nor passive in cultures of honor. Indeed, women carry great influence in determining the reputation of a family. It is often said that in such cultures, the honor of the family goes through the female. Women have both negative power (they can "stain" the family honor through their behaviors) and positive power (for instance, they can increase the reputation of the family through marrying up in the social chain; Schneider, 1971). Nevertheless, women's power in honor cultures exists within the context of largely patriarchal and collectivistic social arrangements. As a consequence, female agency and strength are derived partially from interpersonal interaction—the ability to control the emotional tenor of relationships and to withstand or overcome relationship difficulties (a theme we return to in our second study).

A good deal of attention has been paid to the heightened tendencies for male violence against other males in cultures of honor (see, e.g., Anderson, 1994; Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle & Schwarz, 1996; Cohen, Vandello, & Rantilla, 1998; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Vandello & Cohen, in press-b). A cultural emphasis on male honor may also foster certain traditional gender roles that encourage and perpetuate male violence against women. Honor norms require men to be hypersensitive to insults and threats to their reputation, and a key component of the masculine reputation is the good name of a man's female partner. Thus, honor cultures often establish norms where female chastity, purity, and modesty are valued, as emphasized in an Arab expression that a man's honor "lies between the legs of a woman" (Beyer, 1999). In contrast, sexual prowess and assertiveness are often central to the male role in such cultures (Gilmore, 1990). In colonial Brazil, for example, "the honor system led men to protect the women in their own family from sexual assault and thereby preserve the family

honor, whereas . . . men's status and reputation within male culture rose as a function of how many women they were able to conquer" (Nazzari, 1998, p. 104). These contradictory expectations reinforced the belief that women must be protected from rival males to ensure their honor. Adultery is discouraged and stigmatized in many cultures around the world, but it carries an additional significance in honor cultures. Female adultery, or even suspected adultery, can be very damaging to a man's public reputation in such cultures, where most social and economic interactions may depend on the good name of the family.

A man who allows his partner to stray may be seen as less of a man. He may be perceived as weak and vulnerable, someone who can be taken advantage of in other situations as well (Schneider, 1971). As Pitt-Rivers (1966) has written about infidelity in cultures of honor, "her adultery represents not only an infringement of his rights but the demonstration of failure in his duty. He has betrayed the values of his family, bringing dishonor to all the social groups who are involved reciprocally in his honor: his family and his community" (p. 46).

Because male honor often requires female deference and fidelity, relationships between men and women can carry an underlying tension that can serve as a precursor or catalyst to domestic violence. Honor may be used as a justification (either implicit or explicit) for violence; in the most extreme cases, it is used as a justification for homicides of spouses or family members in honor cultures (Abou-Zeid, 1965; Baker et al., 1999; Beyer, 1999; Bourdieu, 1965; Ginat, 1987; Glazer & Abu Ras, 1994), and formal customs and legal traditions have often developed that sanction or excuse such violence (see Vandello & Cohen, 2003; M. Wilson & Daly, 1992).

Within this cultural framework, male violence against women may be seen as necessary and proper to preserve the integrity of the man and the family (Loizos, 1978). In fact, *not* responding with violence after perceived female misbehavior (especially if it is known publicly) may be a source of shame. For females, ideals of feminine sacrifice and family loyalty should be strongest in cultures of honor. The importance of family cohesion, coupled with traditional gender roles, should create strong pressures for women to stay in relationships despite danger or harm. A woman thus bears the responsibility to sacrifice herself for the good of the family or relationship regardless of personal cost.

General Hypotheses

There are several implications of this general culture-of-honor pattern of gender relationships that we test in this article. Specifically, we explored three main hypotheses. First, in cultures of honor, a female's infidelity should be especially likely to harm a man's reputation. Second, in cultures of honor, men should be more likely to feel pressure to restore their honor after perceived infidelity by their partners, and one way this can be done is through punishment with violence. Third, women in cultures of honor should be expected to remain loyal in relationships, even when the relationships become violent. In contrast to more individualistic, nonhonor cultures, a "good" woman in an honor culture will be one who remains loyal. Whereas remaining in an abusive relationship is likely to be seen as passive and foolish in a nonhonor culture, for members of honor cultures, a woman should be seen as

relatively strong, agentic, and “good” for doing the proper thing and remaining loyal.

Latin American and Southern U.S. Cultures of Honor

We believe that themes emphasizing female purity, inequality, and loyalty to the family are likely to be associated with high rates of violence across a number of cultural contexts, and in archival work we have been exploring these issues (Vandello & Cohen, 2003). However, the present article concentrates on how honor cultures, in particular, give rise to norms, scripts, and expectations that can lead to violence against women. The idea that male honor is so tied up with female purity and that this honor and reputation for strength and precedence are so prized are two important features that set cultures of honor apart. The present article uses the experimental method to compare the attitudes, communication patterns, and behaviors of individuals from honor cultures and nonhonor cultures as they might relate to issues of reputational threat, fidelity, loyalty, and violence.

We examined two types of honor cultures in the present work: Latin American and southern U.S. Anglo cultures. Recent work on Spanish populations has shown a link between the honor syndrome and violence (Delgado, Prieto, & Bond, 1997; Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, & Fischer, 2000). With roots in Spanish and Portuguese honor ideologies, Latin American societies are characterized normatively by traditional gender roles, strong familism, and patriarchy (Delgado et al., 1997; Triandis, Lisansky, Marín, & Betancourt, 1984; Vazquez-Nuttall, Romero-Garcia, & de Leon, 1987; Youssef, 1973). The emphasis on male *machismo* in Iberian-influenced Latin American cultures underlies the emphasis on honor (De La Cancela, 1986; Lara-Cantú, 1989; Mirandé, 1977; Peñalosa, 1968). Behaviors associated with *machismo* include stoicism; attempts to avoid shame and gain *respeto* [respect] and *dignidad* [dignity] for the self and family; emphasis on virility; and at times, patterns of assertiveness and dominance (De La Cancela, 1986). There is some debate over whether *machismo* is mostly negative, harmful, or oppressive, or whether it is primarily a culturally valued ideal based on positive attributes such as courage and protection (Andrade, 1982; De La Cancela, 1986; Straus & Smith, 1990). In any event, this form of honor can have implications for relationships among men and women and, taken far enough, can have further implications for violence. As in many honor cultures, women are seen as vital to preserving the status of the family in Latin American cultures (Youssef, 1973). As repositories of family honor, women in traditional Latin American cultures historically “should be virgins until they married, wives should be faithful, and widows chaste. The system of family honor thereby sought to prevent and constrain the sexual activity of single daughters and married women” (Nazzari, 1998, p. 104). In addition, “Latin American cultural attitudes are permissive with respect to men’s sexual freedom,” and so men must be vigilant in protecting their women “against possible overtures of any sexual aggressiveness towards his womenfolk and ready to defend any such offense at the risk of his own life, that of the intruder, or even that of the kinswoman herself” (Youssef, 1973, p. 329).

A recent survey by Grandon and Cohen (2002) comparing over 300 college students in Chile and Canada helps illustrate the points both about the centrality of female honor to the family name and about male responsibility for protecting it. In their survey, twice as

many Chileans (72%) as Canadians (36%) agreed that “a woman must protect the family’s good reputation,” with similar results for a statement that “a woman’s honor must be defended by the men in the family” (77% agreement in Chile vs. 32% agreement in Canada). As a consequence of such concerns about honor and female sexuality, cultures throughout Central and South America seem to be plagued by high rates of domestic violence (cf. Ellsberg, Caldera, Herrera, Winkvist, & Kullgren, 1999; Heise et al., 1994; McWhirter, 1999; Vandello & Cohen, 2003).

In our first study, we compared Brazilian and U.S. samples. The roots of honor run deep in Brazilian culture, tracing back to its Iberian heritage (Johnson, 1998; Nazzari, 1998). Historically in Brazil, allegations of female promiscuity or infidelity “were viewed as a direct assault on the status and reputation of the male household head” and “had the potential to ignite verbal or physical assaults” against wives (Johnson, 1998, p. 145). In extreme situations, domestic violence has been used to cleanse a stained family honor. A Brazilian expression, “*Lavar a honra com sangue*,” translates “wash the honor with the blood,” and such violence (including sometimes murder) has been given legitimacy by the Brazilian court system until very recently (Hatfield & Rapson, 1996; Johnson, 1998; Page, 1995).

In our second study, we examined two subcultures within the United States that have culture of honor traditions: Hispanics² and southern Anglo populations. Latin American subcultures within the United States have rates of husband-on-wife assault more than twice that of Anglo Americans (Straus & Smith, 1990). Hispanic cultures are also characterized by strong, close-knit families and collectivism (Becerra, 1988; Triandis, 1983), which could serve as a buffer against violence, but could also create strong pressures to stay in relationships that may become unhealthy or dangerous. This interpretation is consistent with the finding that Hispanic American women tend to stay in abusive relationships longer than Anglo American women before seeking assistance, and they tend to return to their partners more often after abuse (Torres, 1987)—though there are probably both economic and cultural factors at work here.

Similarly, a good deal of evidence suggests that the U.S. South is home to a culture of honor, particularly among southern Anglos (Cohen et al., 1998; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). Within this culture, violence is more likely to be seen as a legitimate response to insult or cuckoldry. And, as in Brazil, the legal tradition of the United States (particularly the South and Southwest) has sometimes legitimated and excused violence arising from adultery (see Reed, 1981; Vandello & Cohen, 2003). Economic considerations probably play a role in affecting violence rates in various subcultures as well as people’s response to them. But, as the experiments below

² As of this writing, the terms *Hispanic* and *Latino* seem to be used with similar frequency (though this seems to vary by region, and neither have proved entirely satisfactory; del Olmo, 2001; Granados, 2000). We use *Hispanic* throughout most of Study 2 because we think the honor syndrome here is ultimately derived from the honor culture of the Iberian peninsula, though circumstances in the Americas may have reinforced it. We use the term *Anglo* in this article as a shorthand way of saying non-Hispanic White. Great cultural variability exists under all these cultural umbrella labels; and as we note in the General Discussion section, future research should explore the large variability that exists under these labels (Vandello & Cohen, 1999).

seem to indicate, cultural scripts and rules can also implicitly perpetuate male-on-female aggression through expectations about proper male and female behavior.

Overview of Studies

In Study 1 we focused on the question of how a woman's infidelity reflects upon her male partner. Will a man lose honor if his wife is unfaithful? How would a violent response to her infidelity be perceived? To answer these questions, we compared judgments of college students from the United States and Brazil to several hypothetical scenarios in a questionnaire.

In Study 2 we turned to a focus on perceptions of the woman. What should a "good" woman do in response to violence from her partner? We predicted that the answer to this question depends in part on the cultural emphasis on honor and family loyalty. In honor cultures where loyalty is valued (compared with the autonomy and individuality stressed among nonhonor cultures; see Rodriguez Mosquera et al., 2000), women who remain in relationships despite violence might be seen in a relatively positive light. We explored possible ways in which cultural norms about the appropriateness of violence may get communicated (perhaps unwittingly) during interpersonal interactions. In a laboratory experiment comparing Hispanics and southern Anglo Americans to northern Anglos, we examined the private attitudes and public communications of third parties who witnessed an episode of "live" violence.

A final note on our classification of participants into honor and nonhonor cultures: For ease of presentation, and following cross-cultural convention, we describe honor and nonhonor cultures in a dichotomous fashion, implying absolute differences between these groups. However, the differences in social values and norms between honor cultures and cultures where honor is less of a theme are more accurately defined as relative (see Gilmore, 1987). The difference between honor and nonhonor cultures lies largely in the salience and centrality of such themes in everyday social interactions. In other work (Vandello & Cohen, 2003), we emphasized the relative nature of honor by treating honor-related themes on a continuum. Effect sizes are given throughout. Like many cross-cultural studies, effects tend to be smaller when paper-and-pencil measures are used and larger when high-impact variables are used. In all cases in this article, however, there is a good deal of overlap between the two samples, reflecting a good deal of overlap in the wider population as well.³

Study 1: Perceptions of the "Honorable" Man in Two Cultures

Short questionnaires describing married couples were distributed on campuses in Sao Paulo, Brazil, and Illinois, United States. The questionnaire provided very brief descriptions in which a partner was faithful or unfaithful and asked people to give their impressions of each partner on a number of traits.

We hypothesized that a woman's infidelity would reflect negatively on the male partner in terms of people seeing him as less manly and trustworthy (key components of male honor and reputation). Of importance, we predicted that this would be more the case for the Brazilian sample, a culture where honor is a strong and salient theme. In addition, we predicted that a man's violence in response to a wife's infidelity would be more excused in a culture

of honor, where it might be seen as at least somewhat justified in order to restore public honor.

Method

Participants and Procedure

A total of 623 university students from two cultures participated voluntarily. Of these students, 273 were from Brazil and 350 were from the United States.⁴ Approximately 58% of each group were females, distributed roughly equally across conditions. For the Brazilian sample, questionnaires were distributed to student volunteers in psychology, business, dentistry, and law undergraduate programs. For the U.S. sample, experimenters approached students around various campus locations and asked for their voluntary participation in filling out a brief questionnaire. The questionnaire took approximately 5 min to complete.

Demographics

At the end of the questionnaire, participants filled out a number of demographic items. The Brazilian and U.S. sample did not differ with respect to number of children, own marital status, or parents' marital status (all F s < 2.70, all p s > .10). The Brazilian sample was slightly older (mean age for Brazil = 20.6 years, mean age for U.S. = 19.6 years), $F(1, 608) = 13.56, p < .001$, and had completed more years of college (mean years for Brazil = 2.2, mean years for U.S. = 1.5), $F(1, 599) = 22.49, p < .001$. The U.S. sample tended to attend religious services more frequently, $F(1, 606) = 6.68, p < .05$. All analyses were rerun controlling for these three variables, and all significant results remained significant.

Questionnaire Content

Each questionnaire contained brief scenarios about married couples. The first scenario described a couple in which the wife was either faithful or was having an affair that the neighbors knew about (a between-subjects manipulation). The second scenario described a couple in which the wife was having an affair, and the husband responded by (a) yelling at her; (b) yelling at her, hitting her across the face, and shaking her; (c) not doing anything; or (d) telling her he wanted a divorce (between-subjects manipulation). Participants were randomly assigned to receive one of the various combinations of the scenarios.

After each scenario, participants were asked to rate the husband on 15 personality characteristics on 5-point bipolar scales. These traits were aggregated into two dimensions reflecting honor: trustworthiness or good character (*trustworthy/untrustworthy, reliable/unreliable, selfish/unselfish*,

³ Regarding effect sizes, when we compare two means, we give the effect size d . When we examine more than two means, we use the effect size measure f (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991). By convention, d s of 0.2, 0.5, and 0.8 and f s of 0.1, 0.25, and 0.4 are considered small, medium, and large, respectively. All simple effects that are presented use the pooled error term from the overall analysis of variance (ANOVA), though results are almost identical if the error terms for the specific contrasts are used. Following Rosenthal and Rosnow (1985), effect sizes are computed using the degrees of freedom from the specific contrast.

⁴ The U.S. sample included 40 southern Anglo Americans and 15 Hispanics. Because these groups can be considered subcultures of honor in the United States (see Study 2), we reran all analyses excluding these individuals from the U.S. sample. Generally, scores for the southern Anglos and Hispanics were somewhere between those of the Brazilians and those from the rest of the American sample. Thus, even after excluding these cases, all significant differences between the U.S. and Brazilian samples in Study 1 remained significant.

reasonable/unreasonable, good person/bad person, smart/dumb) and strength or manliness (masculine/feminine, strong/weak, cowardly/courageous, manly/not manly, timid/self-confident, macho/not macho, tough/wimpy, competent/incompetent, submissive/not submissive). Participants also rated the wife on the same personality dimensions for the first scenario. For ratings of the wife, *macho* and *masculine* were dropped from the second factor because they lowered the reliability of the scale. The reliabilities for the trustworthiness scale were $\alpha = .74$ (.63 for Brazil, .80 for U.S.) for the husband and $\alpha = .87$ (.82 for Brazil, .91 for U.S.) for the wife. The reliabilities for the strength scale were $\alpha = .82$ (.77 for Brazil, .83 for U.S.) for the husband and $\alpha = .71$ (.67 for Brazil, .74 for U.S.) for the wife.

The questionnaire was first written in English. It was then translated into Portuguese by a bilingual translator and backtranslated into English by a second bilingual translator. A researcher then met with the two translators to reconcile any differences. Finally, a third bilingual translator inspected the two final versions of the questionnaire.

Results

There were no gender interactions or main effects, so the results were collapsed across participants' gender for ease of presentation.

Scenario 1: The Unfaithful Woman

The first scenario described a couple in which the wife was either faithful to her husband (Andre) or in which "some of the neighbors know that she has been having an affair, and the neighbors mentioned this to Andre several months ago." We predicted that the woman's infidelity would reflect negatively on people's impressions of the husband, but more so for the Brazilian sample.

Perceptions of the husband. Table 1 shows the mean ratings of the husband by Brazilian and U.S. respondents on the trustworthiness/good character dimension. Consistent with predictions, respondents rated the man as having less trustworthiness or good character if his wife was unfaithful ($M = 3.69$) than if she was faithful ($M = 3.80$)—main effect for affair/no affair: $F(1, 614) = 4.54, p < .05, d = 0.17$. As can be seen from Table 1, this effect was driven solely by the Brazilian sample, who rated the man as less trustworthy if his wife was unfaithful, $t(614) = 3.14, p < .01, d = 0.38$, whereas the U.S. respondents did not rate him as less trustworthy, $t(614) = 0.07, ns$ —Culture \times Affair interaction: $F(1, 614) = 5.35, p < .05, f = 0.09$.

Table 1 also shows the mean ratings of the husband by Brazilians and U.S. respondents on the masculinity dimension. A similar pattern emerged. That is, respondents rated the man as less manly

if his wife was unfaithful ($M = 3.07$) than if she was faithful ($M = 3.53$)—main effect for affair/no affair: $F(1, 615) = 103.79, p < .001, d = 0.83$. As can be seen in Table 1, this difference in ratings of the man between the faithful and unfaithful wife conditions was twice as great for the Brazilian sample as for the U.S. sample—Culture \times Affair interaction: $F(1, 615) = 11.00, p < .01, f = 0.13$.

Perceptions of the wife. Not surprisingly, the woman was rated as less trustworthy when she was unfaithful ($M = 2.20$) than when she was faithful ($M = 3.63$)—main effect for affair/no affair: $F(1, 608) = 761.67, p < .001, d = 2.23$. U.S. respondents tended to see a bigger difference between the faithful and unfaithful woman than did Brazilians—Culture \times Affair interaction: $F(1, 608) = 4.95, p < .05, f = 0.09$. A similar pattern emerged for ratings of the wife's strength: She was rated as less strong if she had an affair ($M = 3.18$) than if she was faithful ($M = 3.47$)—main effect for affair: $F(1, 607) = 41.44, p < .001, d = 0.51$ —and U.S. respondents tended to see a bigger difference between the faithful and unfaithful woman—Culture \times Affair interaction: $F(1, 607) = 7.23, p < .01, f = 0.11$. It appears that the woman's affair reflects relatively more on the woman to U.S. respondents and, conversely, more on the man to Brazilian respondents. Indeed, running a repeated measures ANOVA with ratings of the wife versus ratings of the husband as the within-subject variable, the triple interaction of faithful versus unfaithful, culture, and ratings of the wife versus husband was significant for both the trustworthiness index, $F(1, 607) = 12.55, p < .001, f = 0.14$, and the strength index, $F(1, 607) = 19.79, p < .001, f = 0.18$.

Perceptions of love. Participants were also asked to rate how much the husband loved the wife and how much the wife loved the husband. Not surprisingly, the wife was seen as loving the husband less if she had an affair ($M = 2.36$) than if she was faithful ($M = 4.10$)—main effect for affair: $F(1, 567) = 608.25, p < .001, d = 2.06$. The husband was actually seen as loving the wife slightly more if she had an affair ($M = 4.24$) than if she was faithful ($M = 4.11$)—main effect for affair: $F(1, 601) = 3.46, p = .06, d = 0.16$. There were no interactions with culture ($ps > .15$).⁵

Scenario 2: Violence in Response to Infidelity

A second scenario described a couple who had been married for 7 years. When the husband found out that his wife had been having an affair, he responded by either (a) yelling at her ("You must stop this affair immediately!") or (b) using physical violence (he slaps her hard across the face, grabs her by the arm, shakes her, and tells her, "You must stop this affair immediately!"). Two other conditions were also added for exploratory analysis and involved

Table 1
Mean Ratings (and Standard Deviations) of the Husband in Scenario 1, Study 1

Dimension rated	Wife is faithful	Wife is unfaithful
Trustworthiness, good character ^a		
Brazil	3.72 (0.61)	3.48 (0.59)
United States	3.86 (0.67)	3.85 (0.66)
Masculinity, strength ^b		
Brazil	3.43 (0.44)	2.80 (0.58)
United States	3.61 (0.51)	3.28 (0.66)

Note. All p values refer to interactions between culture and wife's fidelity.
^a $p < .05$. ^b $p < .01$.

⁵ We also included a third control scenario at the end of the questionnaire in which the *husband* was either faithful or in which he had been having an affair that the neighbors knew about, thus reversing the gender roles from the first scenario. Both groups of respondents were condemning of the man for the affair—main effect for trustworthiness, $F(1, 610) = 1,082.87, p < .001, d = 2.66$, and manliness, $F(1, 610) = 74.28, p < .001, d = 0.70$, comparing the affair versus no affair husband—but Brazilians were less condemning than the U.S. sample—Culture \times Affair interaction for trustworthiness: $F(1, 610) = 8.66, p < .01, f = 0.12$; Culture \times Affair interaction for manliness: $F(1, 610) = 7.24, p < .01, f = 0.11$.

extreme responses having nothing to do with violence, in which the husband responded by either (a) doing nothing or (b) telling his wife he wanted a divorce. Participants again rated the husband on the trustworthiness ($\alpha = .76$; .68 for Brazil, .81 for U.S.) and strength dimensions ($\alpha = .86$; .84 for Brazil, .88 for U.S.) on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. A 2×4 ANOVA, using an omnibus F test, revealed significant Culture \times Husband Response interactions for both trustworthiness, $F(3, 608) = 9.32, p < .001, f = 0.21$, and manliness, $F(3, 610) = 5.44, p = .001, f = 0.16$. We tested our specific predictions with focused contrasts. Thus, to isolate the effect of violence, we compared ratings of the husband who just yelled with ratings of the one who yelled and used physical violence.

Yell versus yell and hit. As can be seen in Table 2, using violence had different implications for honor for our U.S. and Brazilian samples. In terms of trustworthiness ratings, the husband's violence made him far less trustworthy for our U.S. respondents as compared with our Brazilian respondents—Culture \times Violence/Yell interaction: $t(608) = 5.10, p < .001, f = 0.30$. In terms of masculinity ratings, violence made ratings go down for U.S. respondents and up for Brazilian respondents, $t(610) = 2.28, p < .05, f = 0.13$. Thus, the violence sent U.S. and Brazilian judgments about the husband's manliness in opposite directions.

When asked how much the husband loved the wife, respondents saw the husband who used violence as loving his wife less ($M = 3.42$) than the one who yelled ($M = 3.92$)—main effect for violence versus yelling: $t(602) = 3.92, p < .001, d = 0.46$. Of importance, however, this was only the case for the U.S. sample. That is, U.S. respondents believed that the husband who hit his wife loved her less—simple main effect: $t(602) = 4.67, p < .001, d = 0.72$ —but Brazilians did not believe the man who hit loved his wife significantly less—simple main effect: $t(602) = 1.40, p > .10$; Culture \times Violence/Yell interaction: $t(602) = 1.90, p < .06, f = 0.11$.

Finally, we asked how justified the husband was in his response. In general, respondents believed that the husband who used violence was less justified ($M = 2.24$) than when he yelled ($M = 3.95$)—main effect for violence versus yelling: $t(604) = 11.82, p < .001, d = 1.37$. U.S. respondents saw yelling as more justified than Brazilians did, whereas Brazilians saw

violence as more justified than the U.S. respondents did—Culture \times Violence/No Violence interaction: $t(604) = 6.25, p < .001, f = 0.36$.

Exploratory analyses. Taking advantage of the significant omnibus F test, we also did an orthogonal analysis of the exploratory conditions where the nonviolent husband did nothing versus demanded a divorce. Brazilians and Americans generally did not differ in their evaluations of these nonviolent responses. There were no interactions of culture and divorce versus do nothing (all $ps > .16$), with the exception that U.S. respondents thought that getting a divorce would be relatively more manly than Brazilians did—interaction contrast: $t(610) = 1.93, p = .05, f = 0.11$. There was thus little in the way of differential ratings by U.S. and Brazilian participants when extreme responses having nothing to do with violence were considered.

Summary

Results were consistent with a culture-of-honor interpretation. A man was seen as less honorable (trustworthy, manly) if his wife had an affair. However, this was particularly the case for the culture of honor, where the woman's infidelity seemed to reflect more negatively upon the man. There were also sharp cultural differences in views of a man who used violence against his wife after finding out about her infidelity. Only the U.S. sample rated him as less trustworthy and manly if the man hit as opposed to just yelled at his wife. In fact, the Brazilian sample tended to see the violent man as slightly more manly than the one who merely yelled, recouping part of his lost honor through the hit. In addition, only the U.S. sample believed the man who used violence loved his wife less than the one who yelled, whereas Brazilians did not show this difference. When asked explicitly how justified the violence was, neither the Brazilians nor the Americans approved of the man hitting his wife. However, although the violence may not have been looked on favorably in response to this explicit item, the Brazilian sample seemed to be more likely to excuse the husband or at least stigmatize him less for his violent actions.

The sizes of the effects were not large. (Using conventional definitions, seven of our interaction effect sizes would be considered small, two would be considerable moderate, and one would be

Table 2
Mean Ratings (and Standard Deviations) of the Husband in Scenario 2, Study 1

Dimension rated	Husband yells at wife	Husband hits wife
Trustworthiness, good character ^a		
Brazil	2.99 (0.57)	2.81 (0.60)
United States	3.51 (0.61)	2.61 (0.64)
Masculinity, strength ^b		
Brazil	3.04 (0.76)	3.22 (0.76)
United States	3.59 (0.63)	3.41 (0.60)
How much does the husband love his wife? ^c		
Brazil	3.67 (0.99)	3.42 (1.06)
United States	4.16 (0.98)	3.43 (1.03)
How justified was the husband in his response? ^a		
Brazil	3.13 (1.33)	2.40 (1.37)
United States	4.55 (1.37)	2.14 (1.12)

Note. All p values refer to interactions between culture and husband's response (yell vs. hit).

^a $p < .001$. ^b $p < .05$. ^c $p < .06$.

considered large.) This reflects real within-culture variability, but it also may partially reflect the ambivalence people (at least in our samples) felt about condoning any type of male violence against women, and it may partially reflect the limitations of relatively uninvolved paper-and-pencil measures. Despite these constraints, consistent cultural differences did emerge on these rather simple hypothetical scenarios. In the second study, we attempted to create more engaging and realistic scenarios.

Study 2: Perceptions and Norm Transmission in Interpersonal Interactions

Having noted cultural differences in perceptions of cuckolded men as well as differences in perceptions of male violence in response to infidelity, we turned to an examination of cultural views on the proper female response to such violence. A goal of the second study was to explore evaluations of women in violent relationships. Female loyalty and sacrifice are strongly valued in cultures where male honor is a major organizing theme (Loizos, 1978; Schneider, 1971). This might carry over to a belief in relational altruism for the female, even at the expense of personal safety. In addition, honor norms may serve to diminish or excuse a certain degree of male aggression, particularly if it results from perceived threats of infidelity.

A second goal of Study 2 was to go beyond hypothetical questionnaire measures to consider how people react to more realistic encounters with domestic violence. Verbal survey responses may mute real differences for at least two reasons. First, there are social desirability effects that can sometimes mute differences. Second, survey questions may be particularly likely to obscure differences when the outcome of interest is driven by automatically activated cultural scripts and implicit cultural norms (Cohen, 1997; Kitayama, 2002; Heine, Lehman, Peng, & Greenholtz, 2002; Wagar & Cohen, in press). Puente and Cohen (in press) have argued that there is likely to be an important disjunction between consciously articulated, explicit condemnation of domestic violence and a more implicit approval of the scripts, norms, and roles that lead to such violence. Through the "live" experimental situation of Study 2, we were hoping to overcome some of the social desirability effects and tap into these more implicit norms that might emerge in a "real" situation.

Finally, we were interested in examining how cultural beliefs and norms about "proper" behavior might get transmitted and reinforced in interpersonal interactions. Women who are in violent relationships often turn to friends or family for advice. This type of informal interpersonal counseling might serve as an important means of perpetuating and enforcing cultural norms about what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior.

In Study 2, college students at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign from three subcultures were selected: Hispanics, southern Anglos, and northern Anglos. To create a real, immediate, and impactful situation, participants in this study actually witnessed a couple get into a physical confrontation, and they later interacted with the woman. In addition to measuring individuals' private attitudes and impressions of a woman in an abusive relationship, the study was set up such that individuals were asked to give advice to the woman. The hypothesis was that Hispanics and southern Anglos (relative to northern Anglos) would be more favorable to the woman who was loyal and chose

to persevere in the relationship, whereas northern Anglos would be more favorable to the woman who intended to leave the relationship, seeing her as strong and assertive. We predicted that these differences would show up both in the private evaluations of the woman and in participants' direct communication with her.

Method

Participants

Participants were 112 students from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Thirty-three participants were Hispanics (16 males, 17 females), 41 were northern U.S. Anglos (22 males, 19 females), and 38 were southern U.S. Anglos (17 males, 21 females). Selection of southern and northern participants was based on permanent residence.⁶ All participants were drawn from the introductory psychology participant pool and were prescreened on ethnicity and where they had grown up with data from university records.

Demographics

Participants filled out an extensive demographics questionnaire (e.g., rural vs. urban background, parents' income) Although there were a few scattered differences between the groups, none of the differences correlated with any dependent variables of interest (all $ps > .10$), and all significant results remained significant or marginally significant when controlling for each of these variables.

Procedure

When participants arrived individually, there was a sign on the laboratory door saying that the experimenter would be a few minutes late and asking participants to fill out a consent form and a questionnaire that were both in envelopes on the door as well. There were two chairs in the hallway next to the door where the participants sat while waiting. The consent form explained that the experiment involved the acquaintance process and the accuracy of people's impressions of others. Participants were told that they would be interacting with a partner and then answering some questionnaires about their impression of that person.

A short while after the participant arrived, a female and male (both confederates and both blind to the specific hypotheses of the study)

⁶ Respondents were classified as "southern" if they had spent at least a third of their lives in the South. Consistent with previous research (Cohen et al., 1996; Cohen, Vandello, Puente, & Rantilla, 1999; Vandello & Cohen, in press-b), the South included Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. Southern culture, of course, does not necessarily follow political state boundaries. Indeed, as C. R. Wilson and Ferris (1989) have noted, "'The South' is found wherever southern culture is found, and that culture is located not only in the Deep South, the Upper South, and border cities, but also in 'Little Dixies' (the southern parts of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and parts of Missouri and Oklahoma) . . ." (p. xv). Of our Illinois participants, respondents from Springfield and below were considered southern, because this region's predominant cultural influence at the time of settlement was the South. Of the approximately 50 counties below Springfield, there are in fact only 2 counties that were not settled primarily by people from Tennessee, Kentucky, or the Carolinas (Atack, 1989, p. 72). Culturally, southern Illinois is considered by many historians, anthropologists, political scientists, and sociologists to be part of the South (see extended discussion in Cohen et al., 1999, and experimental support from lab experiments in Cohen et al., 1999, Vandello & Cohen, in press-b).

approached the lab.⁷ The female (who played the role of the second participant in the study) set her bookbag down next to the participant after reading the sign on the door. The male (pretending to be her boyfriend) asked how long her experiment would take. She mentioned that it would take “about an hour” but that she needed to “go over to John’s after this for a little bit to pick up a few things.” The boyfriend, obviously upset by this, grabbed the female by the arm and walked her down the hallway until they were approximately 15 feet from where the participant sat. At this point, the couple began arguing, loudly enough that the participant could overhear what was going on, but at the same time attempting to be discreet.

The argument involved the female wanting to go over to a former boyfriend’s house after the experiment. The male asserted that he did not want her to do this and that they had discussed this before. As the argument progressed, things became more heated and voices raised. Finally, the male demanded that the female hand him her car keys. When she refused, he grabbed her by the wrist and ripped them from her hand. She immediately attempted to take them back, but the male shoved her very forcefully against the wall by her shoulders, making a loud crashing noise. As he pinned her against the wall, he said in an intimidating voice, “I’ll see you at home,” and then he left down the hallway. The female, obviously shaken up, turned toward the male and stood for a few moments as he walked away. Then, after trying to compose herself, she walked over to where the participant sat, read the sign on the door, and took the consent form and questionnaire to fill out.

At this point, the question of interest was what types of signals or messages the participants would send to the victim regarding the conflict they just witnessed. To encourage a response, the confederate probed the participant with scripted dialogue. The persona of the victim was manipulated such that in half the cases she took on a “contrite” role and in half the cases she took on an opposite “no-tolerance” role.

In the contrite condition, the confederate used the following two probes:

Probe 1: “That was my fiancé. He gets so jealous sometimes . . . I guess it was kind of my fault, huh?”

Probe 2: “He really cares about me. I guess that’s just how he shows it, you know?”

In the no-tolerance condition, the confederate reacted by suggesting that she should not put up with the abuse from the male and that she should leave him:

Probe 1: “That was my fiancé. He gets so jealous sometimes . . . I’m getting so damn tired of this, you know? He really makes me mad when he’s like that.”

Probe 2: “I should just give him his keys *and his ring* back.”

The confederate was instructed to note any responses and covertly write them down verbatim later in the study.

Shortly after, the experimenter arrived, apologized for being late, and invited the participants into the lab. After briefly describing the experiment as an impression-formation study, the experimenter explained that he wanted to get participants’ first impressions of each other before they had any conversations (apparently oblivious to any interaction in the hall). He told the participants that they would soon have a brief get-acquainted session with each other, but first he had each of the participants separately fill out a questionnaire in which they rated the others’ personality on a number of dimensions and also rated their overall impression of the other person. During this time, the confederate covertly wrote down the participant’s responses to her probes in the hallway, also noting any body language or physical actions. In addition, she rated the participant’s responses on a number of dimensions indicating tolerance or intolerance for the abuse.

Then, the 2 participants were told that they would spend a few minutes “getting acquainted.” They were given a list of five topics to discuss. They were told the purpose was to get to know the other person better, so that

they could again fill out the same questionnaire rating the other person’s personality to see if their initial impressions changed at all.

During the get-acquainted session, the experimenter left the room so that the participants could freely chat. One of the discussion topics asked the participants to recall how they spent their summer. At this point, the female confederate recounted her recent engagement. A second conversation topic asked the participants to describe an event that made them sad. The female confederate again recalled the physical conflict in the hallway. Then, she probed the participant a second time for a response. This time, she took on the opposite persona she portrayed in the hallway (self-blaming or assertive), thus creating a within-subject manipulation. Rather than seeming strange, such a reaction was intended to seem like the natural vacillation of someone who had very conflicting emotions about her fiancé. Again, the confederate noted the participant’s responses for later recording. (While the participant filled out the questionnaire after the get-acquainted session, the confederate again transcribed the participant’s responses to the probes and rated the responses on a number of dimensions indicating tolerance or intolerance for the abuse.)

In summary, there were several opportunities to record the participants’ reactions to a woman involved in a situation of intimate violence. Confederates recorded the participants’ direct responses to scripted probes; and privately, the participants themselves rated the contrite or assertive confederate on a number of personality dimensions under the guise of an impression-formation task.

After the experiment, but before being fully debriefed, participants filled out a questionnaire on the justifiableness of various conflict situations and a demographics questionnaire.⁸ Participants were then fully debriefed. Debriefings were thorough and done in an unstructured interview format. The experimenter asked the participants about their suspicions regarding the accomplices and the true nature of the study, and made a coding for whether they expressed suspicion. Overall, participants found the study very believable and engaging. Ten of the 112 participants expressed some suspicion. When results were reanalyzed, omitting data from these 10 participants, all conclusions remained unchanged. The experimenter discussed with participants the problem of domestic abuse and gave them information about local domestic violence resources. Participants were also told about the nature of the deception and our reasons for doing so, emphasizing the need for honest and spontaneous participant reactions. Participants were reintroduced to the confederate couple, and every effort was made to ensure that participants were comfortable with the experiment, not upset or angered, and that they understood the reasons for the procedures. Finally, all participants filled out a short questionnaire assessing their reactions to the experiment (how interesting it was, how worthwhile it was, how happy they were to have participated, and how angry they were to have participated), were thanked, and dismissed. From both informal

⁷ It is possible that participants would be more comfortable interacting with and giving advice to members of their own ingroups as opposed to out-group members. Because of this, we attempted to equate the cultural group of the participants with that of the confederates. One of our male confederates was Hispanic (“Jesus”). None of our female confederates were; however, we did have a female confederate who was passable as a Hispanic (dark hair and skin), and in cases in which she was paired with a Hispanic participant, she used the name “Anna Gomez.” In cases in which she was paired with a non-Hispanic White participant, she used the name “Beth Schmidt.”

⁸ Participants in Study 2 were also given two questionnaires to measure individual-difference variables that we predicted might be associated with attitudes and beliefs about domestic violence: a measure of traditionality of gender roles (the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory; Glick & Fiske, 1996) and a measure of individualism and collectivism (the INDCOL; Hui, 1988). However, neither of these measures predicted any of the dependent variables of interest.

conversations and postexperimental ratings, it was clear that participants found the study to be interesting and valuable. No participant appeared unhappy or upset at the completion of the study. The experiment was given very high ratings. In general, participants found the study quite interesting (mean rating of 4.81 out of 5.00) and worthwhile (mean rating of 4.76 out of 5.00). They appeared to be happy to have participated (mean rating of 4.64 of 5.00) and not at all angry (mean rating of 1.05 out of 5.00).

Postexperiment coding. After the experimental sessions, two people independently coded the confederate-recorded transcripts for objective content. The coders (blind to hypotheses and experimental conditions) recorded the presence or absence of verbal and behavioral cues of two types: (a) statements suggesting tolerance for abuse (e.g., “he’s just concerned about you”) and (b) statements or behaviors suggesting intolerance for the abuse (e.g., “it’s not your fault”). These codings allowed a more descriptive and more objective evaluation of participants’ responses than the somewhat brief and covert subjective ratings made by the confederates themselves. Because this coding was meant to be objective, there were very few disagreements between the two coders. For the few instances in which the two coders disagreed, a third independent coder was asked to make a final judgment to resolve the difference.

Results

Our main comparison of interest was between the honor groups and the nonhonor group. For the following analyses, we used focused contrasts comparing southern Anglos and Hispanics with northern Anglos. As expected, southern Anglos and Latinos responded similarly across dependent measures ($ps > .30$ for all major dependent variables). As in Study 1, there were no gender main effects or Gender \times Culture interactions for any of the dependent measures (all $ps > .10$). For the following results, the data were collapsed across gender.

Public Communication by Participants

Participants gave a wide variety of reactions to the witnessed conflict ranging from messages that conveyed disapproval of the violence (“He shouldn’t push you like that! That really upsets me”; “You shouldn’t let him treat you like that”; “If he wasn’t so much bigger than me, I would have done something”; “That’s not the right way to show love. You should tell him you’re a human being and shouldn’t be pushed”) to messages that conveyed more acceptance of the violence or encouraged her to remain in the relationship (“Yeah, it’s probably for your own good”; “He’s just concerned about you”; “I honestly don’t know what to say, because I would have done the same thing (if I were him)”; or, after the woman says she should leave him, “You shouldn’t make decisions like that in haste. I know my husband would be furious if I went to another man’s house”). Again, participants’ communication to the confederate was measured in two ways: (a) The confederate herself made a few immediate, subjective ratings of the interactions, and (b) more extensive, objective codings of the confederates’ transcripts of the interaction were made later.

Confederate ratings of participant communication. The female confederate made seven ratings of the interaction with the participant after each of the two interactions (“How accepting was the person of the violence?”; “The person’s reactions would tell me I should leave/stay”; “The person seemed to think blame for the incident rested with me/with the boyfriend”; “How understandable was my boyfriend’s actions?”; “This person’s reactions would tell me my relationship is probably okay/is not repairable”; “How

encouraging was the person in your self-blame?”; “How encouraging was the person in you leaving your boyfriend?”). These ratings were aggregated to form a scale measuring how much the participant communicated tolerance or acceptance of the violence versus intolerance ($\alpha = .97$; .97 for Hispanics/southerners, .97 for northerners). The three groups did not differ in their communication as rated by the confederate—contrast comparing southerners and Hispanics with northerners: $t(108) = 0.71, p = .48$.

However, it was clear from discussions with the female confederates that the subjective ratings they were given were not particularly specific or relevant enough to capture the richness of the communication by the participants. We believe this was due in part to the fact that it was difficult to anticipate the specific types of participant reactions prior to the experiment. In addition, ratings made by the female confederate were all made on bipolar rating scales; thus, it was impossible to disentangle communication suggesting tolerance from communication suggesting intolerance (i.e., a high rating could indicate a participant who communicated tolerance for the violence, or one who did not communicate intolerance). Later codings of transcripts made by two blind raters attempted to correct for these shortcomings by coding for more specific, objective verbal or behavioral content, and by independently coding for communication suggesting tolerance and intolerance.

Tolerance for the violence. Raters coded for the presence of statements indicating tolerance for the witnessed violence. These statements included (a) showing support for the participant blaming herself, (b) suggesting that the female should not leave the relationship, (c) suggesting her fiancé was just concerned about her, (d) suggesting that the couple should just try to work out their problems (as opposed to ending the relationship), or (e) suggesting jealousy is a good thing. We recorded whether a participant mentioned any of the above types of statements, and we also created a tolerance scale by summing the number of times a participant mentioned each of the five statements across the two interactions. (Participants were given a 1 if the statement was mentioned and a 0 if the statement was not mentioned).

As predicted, southerners and Hispanics were more likely to voice tolerance for the abuse than were northerners. Twenty-nine percent of the southern participants and 24% of Hispanic participants communicated at least one statement of tolerance for the violence, whereas only 10% of the northern participants did so, $\chi^2(1, N = 110) = 4.61, p < .05$. Southerners and Hispanics also voiced more tolerance overall, as indicated by our aggregate tolerance scale—1 1 –2 contrast of southern Anglos and Hispanics versus northern Anglos: $t(109) = 2.28, p < .05, d = 0.45$ (southern mean = .17, Hispanic mean = .17, northern mean = .05).

Intolerance for the violence. Raters coded for the presence of statements indicating intolerance for the witnessed violence. These statements included (a) saying that the violence was not her fault, (b) saying that the fiancé should not hit her, (c) showing support for her leaving the man, (d) suggesting that jealousy is a bad thing, (d) attempting some type of physical intervention during the fight, or (e) saying that they should or would have intervened during the fight. As with the tolerance ratings, we recorded whether a participant mentioned any statements of intolerance, and we also created an intolerance scale by summing the frequency with which a participant communicated each of the six statements or behaviors.

Southerners and Hispanics and northerners did not differ in the likelihood of communicating intolerance for the violence. Fifty percent of the southern participants, 55% of the Hispanic participants, and 46% of the northern participants communicated at least one type of intolerance, $\chi^2(1, N = 110) = 0.35, p = .55$; the groups did not differ in the frequency of communicating statements of intolerance for the interaction—contrast: $t(109) = 1.25, p > .20$.

Private Ratings of Attitude Toward Confederate

Overall global reaction to the confederate. Participants were asked to rate their overall global impression of their interaction partner on five items (1 to 5 scales). These items asked (a) how similar the participant felt to the woman, (b) how likely it was that they would be friends, (c) how much they shared the same values, (d) how easily they could relate to the woman, and (e) how much they would enjoy interacting with the woman. The five items were aggregated to form an overall personal reaction scale ($\alpha = .76; .75$ for Hispanics/southerners, $.70$ for northerners). Participants made these ratings twice, thus giving them a chance to rate both the contrite and no-tolerance confederate. As may be seen in Table 3, Hispanics and southerners had a more positive reaction to the contrite, self-blaming confederate, whereas northerners had a more positive reaction to the assertive “intolerant” confederate—contrast testing the Culture \times Confederate Persona interaction: $t(106) = 3.28, p < .001, f = 0.32$; simple effect for combined southerners and Latinos: $t(106) = 2.96, p < .01, d = 0.72$; simple effect for northern Anglos: $t(106) = 1.99, p < .05, d = 0.65$.

Personality ratings of the confederate. Participants were given a list of 55 bipolar personality dimensions on which to rate the female confederate (1 to 5 scales). Of particular interest, several traits having to do with (a) strength or agency, (b) warmth, and (c)

wisdom were included among a number of filler items (e.g., stylish/not stylish).

Strength, “agency.” A dimension of strength or agency versus weakness or passivity was created based on an aggregate of 10 traits: secure, strong, courageous, active, competent, stable, assertive, talkative, energetic, and lively ($\alpha = .84; .80$ for Hispanics/southerners, $.87$ for northerners). The prediction was that northern Anglos would view the contrite woman as weak and passive and unwilling or unable to control her fate. In contrast, southern Anglos and Hispanics should see the woman who was contrite as loyal and strong. She was strong enough to do her duty and was actively trying to control her fate and make the relationship work, instead of abandoning the relationship at the first signs of conflict. As may be seen in Table 3, northern Anglos rated the no-tolerance confederate as more agentic than the contrite female, whereas southern Anglos and Hispanics rated the loyal, contrite woman as just as strong as the no-tolerance confederate—contrast testing a Culture \times Confederate Persona interaction: $t(109) = 2.13, p < .05, f = 0.21$; simple effect for northern Anglos: $t(110) = 2.41, p < .05, d = 0.77$; simple effect for combined southern Anglos and Latinos: $t(110) = 0.25, ns$. Southern Anglos and Hispanics rated the woman who stayed and the woman who planned to leave as equivalent, suggesting there may be more than one way to be strong in this situation.

Warmth, goodness. A warmth dimension was created on the basis of an aggregate of five traits: kind, good person, good friend, caring, and warm ($\alpha = .62; .60$ for Hispanics/southerners, $.62$ for northerners). There was a marginally significant Culture \times Confederate Persona interaction, such that southerners and Hispanics rated the confederate who expressed a more assertive reaction to her partner as having less warmth or goodness than the self-blaming one, whereas northerners rated the two reactions of the

Table 3
Participants' Private Mean Ratings (and Standard Deviations) of the Female Confederate in Study 2

Dimension rated	Confederate persona	
	Assertive, leaving	Self-blaming, loyal
Overall impression of the woman ^a		
Hispanics	3.34 (0.61)	3.49 (0.63)
Southern Anglos	3.06 (0.52)	3.29 (0.51)
Northern Anglos	3.32 (0.61)	3.14 (0.46)
Ratings of the woman's strength or “agency” ^b		
Hispanics	3.23 (0.53)	3.33 (0.57)
Southern Anglos	3.24 (0.65)	3.23 (0.72)
Northern Anglos	3.43 (0.51)	3.18 (0.76)
Ratings of the woman's warmth, goodness ^c		
Hispanics	4.15 (0.54)	4.30 (0.49)
Southern Anglos	4.09 (0.52)	4.27 (0.45)
Northern Anglos	4.23 (0.48)	4.23 (0.45)
Ratings of the woman's wisdom ^d		
Hispanics	3.43 (0.59)	3.55 (0.65)
Southern Anglos	3.33 (0.60)	3.30 (0.54)
Northern Anglos	3.44 (0.48)	3.36 (0.62)

Note. Interaction terms are based on contrasts testing Hispanics and southern Anglos versus northern Anglos on ratings of the assertive, leaving female persona versus the self-blaming, loyal persona.

^a $p < .001$. ^b $p < .05$. ^c $p < .08$. ^d $p > .35$.

confederate equivalently—contrast testing the Culture \times Confederate Persona interaction: $t(109) = 1.76, p = .08, f = 0.17$; simple effect for combined southerners and Hispanics: $t(109) = 3.11, p < .01, d = 0.75$; simple effect for northern Anglos: $t(109) = 0.00, ns$ (see Table 3).

Wisdom. An aggregate of six variables (intelligent, inquisitive, wise, practical, naive, foolish) made up a wisdom dimension ($\alpha = .65; .61$ for Hispanics/southerners, $.68$ for northerners). There were no significant interactions with culture with respect to this dimension—contrast: $t(109) = 0.87, p > .35$.

Postinteraction Questionnaire

After interacting with the female confederate, the participants filled out a 33-item questionnaire measuring their explicit beliefs about the justifiableness of a husband hitting his wife under various circumstances. Because of a probable floor effect, there was little group variation in responses, with participants answering 1 (*not at all understandable*) for most items (mean scale scores: Hispanics = 1.45, southern Anglos = 1.52, northern Anglos = 1.55; $p > .45$). There was a significant gender main effect, with males scoring higher on the scale, $F(1, 107) = 4.64, p < .05, f = 0.22$. Also, the justifiableness of conflict scale was uncorrelated with the dependent variables of interest. The only notable effect that emerged was a significant negative correlation between Justifiableness of Conflict scores and communication of intolerance for the conflict to the confederate ($r = -.24, p < .05$).

Summary

There was converging evidence for a cultural difference in reactions to a woman who had been in an abusive encounter. Participants from cultures of honor (southern Anglos and Hispanics) who witnessed the physical conflict had a more favorable impression of the woman if she expressed contrition and loyalty as opposed to intolerance and independence; northern participants showed the opposite pattern, favoring the woman who suggested she would leave the aggressive fiancé. In addition, whereas northerners viewed the woman who stayed as weak, southerners and Hispanics viewed the woman who stayed as equally strong (and as showing more warmth and goodness) than the one who said she would leave.

There was also some evidence that these differences in private evaluations influenced individuals' interactions with and explicit advice to the woman. Although the honor and nonhonor groups did not differ in their communication of intolerance of the witnessed aggression, southerners and Hispanics, compared with northern Anglos, communicated more messages of tolerance for the aggression or messages suggesting that the woman stay in the relationship, when transcripts of the communication between the participants and the female confederate were analyzed.

It is notable that the experimental method used was able to pick up cultural differences that explicit attitude items did not. It is likely that social desirability concerns and explicit negativity toward violence led to most all participants condemning violence on our justifiability of conflict measure, thus muting possible differences. However, when we measured actual behaviors and feelings toward contrite and intolerant confederates, we were able to bring

differences potentially arising from more implicit norms and scripts into sharper relief.

General Discussion

Two experiments examined differences in the way honor and nonhonor cultures perceived male-on-female aggression by exploring norms about fidelity, reputation, loyalty, and violence. The proximal way that honor concerns influence perceptions and behaviors related to such aggression was illustrated in a questionnaire study comparing Brazilian and North American samples and a high-impact experimental study comparing southern Anglos, Hispanics, and northern Anglos within the United States. Specifically, in Study 1, it was shown that Brazilian students were more likely than Illinois students to think that a husband who was cheated on was less masculine than one whose wife was loyal. Further, Brazilian students thought such an affair reflected as well on the trustworthiness and general good character of the man, whereas Illinois students saw the affair as having no relevance to the man's good character. Whereas Brazilians were more likely than Illinois students to view a woman's affair as reflecting negatively on the man, Illinois students were more likely than Brazilians to believe that the woman's infidelity reflected poorly on her. Further, it was shown that a husband's violence in response to his wife's infidelity had very different effects on Brazilian and U.S. respondents in terms of how violence affected their perceptions of the husband's manliness, perceptions of his trustworthiness, judgments about the husband's love for his wife, and judgments about the reasonableness of his actions. Results in this experiment were consistent, though effect sizes illustrated that there was considerable overlap in the distributions of the two groups.

In Study 2, we used a high-impact lab experiment to see how southern Anglos, Latinos, and northern Anglos would react to a "real" incident of jealousy-related violence between a woman and her fiancé. Southern Anglos and Latinos were more likely than northern Anglos to approve of the woman when she was contrite and loyal to her fiancé as opposed to assertive and leaving him. Publicly, they were more likely than northern Anglos to express tolerance of the violence when they spoke directly to the woman. Privately, southern Anglos and Latinos had a better overall impression of the woman who would stay with her fiancé, whereas northern Anglos had a better overall impression of the woman who would leave. In terms of specific personality traits, southern Anglos and Latinos were likely to think that the woman who stayed was just as strong and agentic as the woman who left, whereas northern Anglos thought that the woman who left was much stronger. Further, southern Anglos and Latinos viewed the woman who left as much colder and less morally good than the woman who stayed, whereas there was no difference in ratings by northern Anglos. There was again a good deal of overlap in the distributions for the groups. But generally, effect sizes were larger in Study 2 than in Study 1, perhaps partially because of the limitations of paper-and-pencil measures that have a hard time tapping into people's implicit scripts and/or getting around social desirability problems. (This argument about the limitation of paper-and-pencil measures was supported by data within Study 2 itself. Explicit ratings on the justifiableness of conflict scale showed no differences between honor and nonhonor groups and, further, showed little correlation with the variables of interest in this experiment.)

Levels of Focus in Domestic Violence Research

Stepping back from these studies, the most popular approaches in attempting to understand male violence against women have generally looked at personal characteristics of the perpetrator or the victim (Koss et al., 1994, p. 19). Although these approaches are certainly valid, they often strip the abusive events from their larger sociocultural context and implicitly view violence as an individual pathology or deviant act, ignoring the important ways that themes related to violence can be embedded in cultures.

In the present studies, we have attempted to focus on how the syndrome of honor might relate to violence. The current approach argues that domestic violence might be at least partially a by-product of culturally valued ideals, norms, and expectations about honor and proper masculine and feminine behavior. Individual differences undoubtedly exist, and some men will be violent regardless of the cultural context, but the focus of the present work has been to look at how components of a culture of honor syndrome make it possible for otherwise well-adjusted or "normal" men to become violent and for women to be accepting of this violence. Strikingly, there were almost no gender differences in our data, suggesting that men and women are both sharing the same scripts and expectations in their respective cultures—a conclusion that should not be so surprising given the huge role of women in socializing in cultures of honor (and all cultures) (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Wyatt-Brown, 1982). Both men and women may perpetuate aggression through a tacit acceptance and transmission of cultural norms that reinforce the view that men can sometimes use violence and women should sometimes tolerate it.

Within-Culture Variation

The present article has described between-culture variation in the honor syndrome. However, we have noted throughout that there is considerable within-culture variation as well. This is a point that must be stressed. Additionally, this point can serve as a springboard for future research into the function of honor norms in given contexts within a society.

There are, of course, individual differences in attitudes that derive from temperament, personal experiences, and so on. Further, however, there are also important social and structural factors within a culture that make honor a more or less relevant concern for some parts of a society. Depending on one's goals, opportunities, and means for attaining status, honor may be a more or less central construct. Recent work by Ghazal and Cohen (2002) in Saudi Arabia illustrated this point. Collecting data from a community sample in Saudi Arabia, they found that concern with a woman's honor was most pronounced at the extreme ends of the social hierarchy. Those who self-reported being from a particularly high socioeconomic status family and those who reported being from a particularly low socioeconomic status family were more likely to agree with statements linking women and family honor (e.g., "The husband's honor depends on his wife's virtue"), more likely to oppose women's freedoms (e.g., "A woman should be free to choose how to live her life"), and more likely to mention an event having to do with women when asked to imagine "the worst thing that would bring disgrace on you or your close family" (see Vandello & Cohen, in press-a). Thus, the emphasis on women's honor may be particularly acute in the strata of society where there

is the most focus on traditional extended family arrangements, and it may be lessened in the middle strata of a society where opportunities allow for status and social mobility to depend more on personal achievement, secular education, and individual ambition (Ghazal & Cohen, 2002). Further, age may be an important qualifying variable as well. In Ghazal and Cohen's sample of young to middle-aged adults (ages 21 to 46), it was the young people who were most likely to express some sort of support when asked to imagine how they would respond if a friend of theirs "killed his sister after finding out she was pregnant before marriage." Age and generation are, of course, confounded in any cross-sectional sample. However, it is plausible that, all other things equal and absent of generational effects, it would be young people who might be most concerned with honor because they are actively competing for space in the status hierarchy. In future research, we think it will be interesting to examine how emphasized honor concerns are as a result of how honor norms function for different groups within particular societies (Cohen, 2001). For now, these results serve as an important qualification on theorizing about cultures of honor, suggest sources for potential systematic within-culture variation, and serve as a cautionary note about generalizing too widely about a given society.

Conclusion

To return to and sum up the empirical studies of the present article, these lab and questionnaire experiments have illustrated concretely one of the ways male honor can operate as a focal point for violence against women. Female infidelity can motivate honor concerns, and a man's lost honor can be at least partially redeemed through his use of violence. On the other side, female loyalty is expected in the face of such aggression. Such loyalty is not seen as weakness but as a sign of warmth and goodness, and the woman who stays in such a situation may be perceived more positively in a global sense than the woman who leaves. In both studies, there were few if any gender effects, suggesting that both males and females endorsed the same general scripts about fidelity, honor, and loyalty. There are often economic and safety reasons that make it extremely difficult for women to leave dangerous relationships that they would rather not be in. However, the present studies also suggest that there might occasionally be more indirect, social psychological reasons that keep women in abusive relationships by suggesting that it is sometimes the proper thing to do.

Domestic violence is the product of many forces. Some reside within the abusive male himself, but culture also plays a causal role by providing the scripts for the ways in which males and females are to behave. A full understanding of the problem of domestic violence must incorporate an understanding of the way culture serves to define social relationships and must give consideration to the ways that both men and women are embedded within the larger cultural meaning system.

References

- Abou-Zeid, A. (1965). Honour and shame among the Bedouins of Egypt. In J. Peristiany (Ed.), *Honour and shame: The values of Mediterranean society* (pp. 243–259). London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Anderson, E. (1994). The code of the streets. *Atlantic Monthly*, 5, 81–94.
- Andrade, S. J. (1982). Social science stereotypes of the Mexican American

- woman: Policy implications for research. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 223–244.
- Antoun, R. T. (1968). On the modesty of women in Arab Muslim villages. *American Anthropologist*, 70, 671–696.
- Atack, J. (1989). The evolution of regional economic differences within Illinois, 1818–1850. In P. Nardulli (Ed.), *Diversity, conflict, and state politics* (pp. 61–94). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Baker, N. V., Gregware, P. R., & Cassidy, M. A. (1999). Family killing fields: Honor rationales in the murder of women. *Violence Against Women*, 5, 164–184.
- Becerra, R. (1988). The Mexican American family. In C. H. Mindel, R. W. Habenstein, & R. Wright Jr. (Eds.), *Ethnic families in American: Patterns and variations* (pp. 141–159). New York: Elsevier.
- Beyer, L. (1999, January 18). The price of honor. *Time*, 55.
- Bourdieu, P. (1965). The sentiment of honour in Kabyle society. In J. Peristiany (Ed.), *Honour and shame: The values of Mediterranean society* (pp. 191–242). London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science*, 3, 251–255.
- Campbell, J. (1965). Honour and the Devil. In J. Peristiany (Ed.), *Honour and shame: The values of Mediterranean society* (pp. 139–170). London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Cohen, D. (1997). Ifs and thens in cultural psychology. In R. Wyer (Ed.), *Advances in social cognition* (pp. 121–131). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cohen, D. (2001). Cultural variation: Considerations and implications. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 451–471.
- Cohen, D., Nisbett, R. E., Bowdle, B., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Insult, aggression, and the southern culture of honor: An “experimental ethnography.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 945–960.
- Cohen, D., Vandellos, J. A., Puente, S., & Rantilla, A. K. (1999). “When you call me that, smile!” How norms for politeness, interaction styles, and aggression work together in southern culture. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 62, 257–275.
- Cohen, D., Vandellos, J. A., & Rantilla, A. K. (1998). The sacred and the social: Cultures of honor and violence. In P. Gilbert & B. Andrews (Eds.), *Shame: Interpersonal behavior, psychopathology, and culture* (pp. 261–282). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988a, October). Evolutionary social psychology and family homicide. *Science*, 242, 519–524.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988b). *Homicide*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, S. J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 3, 11–27.
- De La Cancela, V. (1986). A critical analysis of Puerto Rican machismo: Implications for clinical practice. *Psychotherapy*, 23, 291–296.
- del Olmo, F. (2001). Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano? A historical review. *The National Association of Hispanic Journalists*. Retrieved December 2001 from <http://nahj.org/resourceguide/intro2.html>
- Delgado, A. R., Prieto, G., & Bond, R. A. (1997). The cultural factor in lay perceptions of jealousy as a motive for wife battery. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 1824–1841.
- Ellsberg, M., Caldera, T., Herrera, A., Winkvist, A., & Kullgren, G. (1999). Domestic violence and emotional distress among Nicaraguan women: Results from a population-based study. *American Psychologist*, 54, 30–36.
- Ghazal, R., & Cohen, D. (2002). *Values in Saudi Arabian society*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.
- Gilmore, D. D. (1987). *Honor and shame and the unity of the Mediterranean*. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Gilmore, D. D. (1990). *Manhood in the making*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ginat, J. (1987). *Blood disputes among Bedouin and rural Arabs in Israel*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Glazer, I. M., & Abu Ras, W. (1994). On aggression, human rights, and hegemonic discourse: The case of a murder for family honor in Israel. *Sex Roles*, 30, 269–288.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491–512.
- Granados, G. (2000, December). Hispanic vs. Latino. *Hispanic Magazine.com*. Retrieved December 2001 from <http://www.hispanicmagazine.com/2000/dec/Features/latino.html>
- Grandon, R., & Cohen, D. (2002). *Honor and violence in Chile and Canada*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.
- Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R. L. (1996). *Love and sex: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Heine, S., Lehman, D., Peng, K., & Greenholtz, J. (2002). What’s wrong with cross-cultural comparisons of subjective Likert scales?: The reference-group effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 903–918.
- Heise, L. L., Pitanguy, A., & Germain, A. (1994). *Violence against women: The hidden health burden*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Hui, C. H. (1988). Measurement of individualism–collectivism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 22, 17–36.
- Johnson, L. L. (1998). Dangerous words, provocative gestures, and violent acts. In L. L. Johnson & S. Lipsett-Rivera (Eds.), *The faces of honor: Sex, shame, and violence in colonial Latin America* (pp. 127–151). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Johnson, L. L., & Lipsett-Rivera, S. (Eds.). (1998). *The faces of honor: Sex, shame, and violence in colonial Latin America*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Kitayama, S. (2002). Culture and basic psychological processes: Toward a system view of culture. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 89–96.
- Koss, M. P., Goodman, L. A., Browne, A., Fitzgerald, L. F., Keita, G. P., & Russo, N. F. (1994). *No safe haven: Male violence against women at home, at work, and in the community*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Lara-Cantú, M. A. (1989). A sex-role inventory with scales for “machismo” and “self-sacrificing woman.” *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20, 386–398.
- Lipsett-Rivera, S. (1998). A slap in the face of honor. In L. L. Johnson & S. Lipsett-Rivera (Eds.), *The faces of honor: Sex, shame, and violence in colonial Latin America* (pp. 179–200). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Loizos, P. (1978). Violence and the family: Some Mediterranean examples. In J. P. Martin (Ed.), *Violence and the family* (pp. 183–196). New York: Wiley.
- McWhirter, P. T. (1999). La violencia privada: Domestic violence in Chile. *American Psychologist*, 54, 37–40.
- Mirandé, A. (1977). The Chicano family: A reanalysis of conflicting views. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 39, 747–755.
- Nazzari, M. (1998). An urgent need to conceal. In L. L. Johnson & S. Lipsett-Rivera (Eds.), *The faces of honor: Sex, shame, and violence in colonial Latin America* (pp. 103–126). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Cohen, D. (1996). *Culture of honor: The psychology of violence in the South*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Page, J. (1995). *The Brazilians*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Peñalosa, F. (1968). Mexican family roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 30, 680–689.
- Peristiany, J. (Ed.). (1965). *Honour and shame: The values of Mediterranean society*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Pitt-Rivers, J. (1966). Honour and social status. In J. Peristiany (Ed.), *Honour and shame: The values of Mediterranean society* (pp. 19–77). London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.

- Puente, S., & Cohen, D. (in press). Jealousy and the meaning (or non-meaning) of violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Reed, J. S. (1981). Below the Smith and Wesson line: Reflections on southern violence. In M. Black & J. S. Reed (Eds.), *Perspectives on the American South: An annual review of society, politics, and culture* (pp. 9–22). New York: Cordon and Breach Science Publications.
- Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M., Manstead, A. S. R., & Fischer, A. H. (2000). The role of honor-related values in the elicitation, experience, and communication of pride, shame, and anger: Spain and the Netherlands compared. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 833–844.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. (1985). *Contrast analysis: Focused comparisons in the analysis of variance*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. (1991). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schneider, J. (1971). Of vigilance and virgins. *Ethnology*, 9, 1–24.
- Straus, M. A., & Smith, C. (1990). Violence in Hispanic families in the United States. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 341–367). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Torres, S. (1987). Hispanic-American battered women: Why consider cultural differences? *Response*, 10, 20–21.
- Triandis, H. C. (1983). *Allocentric versus idiocentric social behavior: A major cultural difference between Hispanic and mainstream* (Tech. Rep. ONR-16). Champaign: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Department of Psychology.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Triandis, H. C. (1996). The psychological measurement of cultural syndromes. *American Psychologist*, 51, 407–415.
- Triandis, H. C., Lisansky, J., Marín, G., & Betancourt, H. (1984). Simpatía as a cultural script of Hispanics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 14, 489–500.
- Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (1999). Patterns of individualism and collectivism in the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 279–292.
- Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (2003). *Cultural themes associated with violence against women: A cross-cultural analysis*. Unpublished manuscript, Princeton University.
- Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (in press-a). Tenuous manhood and domestic violence against women. In S. Fein, A. Goethals, & M. Sandstrom (Eds.), *Gender and aggression: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (in press-b). When believing is seeing: Sustaining norms of violence in cultures of honor. In M. Schaller & C. Crandall (Eds.), *The psychological foundations of culture*. New York: Erlbaum.
- Vazquez-Nuttall, E., Romero-Garcia, I., & de Leon, B. (1987). Sex roles and perceptions of femininity and masculinity of Hispanic women: A review of the literature. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 11, 409–425.
- Wagar, B., & Cohen, D. (in press). Culture, memory, and the self. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.
- Wilson, C. R., & Ferris, W. (Eds.). (1989). *Encyclopedia of southern culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The man who mistook his wife for chattel. In J. H. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture* (pp. 289–322). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wyatt-Brown, B. (1982). *Southern honor: Ethics and behavior in the Old South*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Youssef, N. (1973). Cultural ideals, feminine behavior, and family control. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 13, 326–347.

Received September 16, 2001

Revision received July 8, 2002

Accepted July 8, 2002 ■

Wanted: Your Old Issues!

As APA continues its efforts to digitize journal issues for the PsycARTICLES database, we are finding that older issues are increasingly unavailable in our inventory. We are turning to our long-time subscribers for assistance. If you would like to donate any back issues toward this effort (preceding 1982), please get in touch with us at journals@apa.org and specify the journal titles, volumes, and issue numbers that you would like us to take off your hands.