

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379870722>

Honour, acculturation and well-being: Evidence from the UK and Canada

Article in *British Journal of Social Psychology* · April 2024

DOI: 10.1111/bjso.12751

CITATIONS

0

READS

53

5 authors, including:



Ayse K. Uskul

University of Sussex

114 PUBLICATIONS 4,670 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Jorida Cila

Public Health Agency of Canada

15 PUBLICATIONS 91 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Pelin Gul

University of Groningen

45 PUBLICATIONS 710 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Alexander Kirchner - Häusler

University of Sussex

16 PUBLICATIONS 164 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

ARTICLE

Honour, acculturation and well-being: Evidence from the UK and Canada

Ayse K. Uskul¹  | Jorida Cila² | Pelin Gul³  |
Alexander Kirchner-Häusler¹ | Barbora Hubená⁴

¹School of Psychology, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK

²Department of Psychology, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

³Campus Fryslân, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

⁴Department of Psychology, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

Correspondence

Ayse K. Uskul, School of Psychology, University of Sussex, Pevensey 1, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9RH, UK.

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

Abstract

Adopting a social psychological approach, across three studies ($N=927$) in two western immigrant-receiving societies (UK and Canada), we examined the role of honour in acculturation variables (i.e., immigrants' heritage and mainstream cultural orientation and well-being), controlling for some of the commonly studied predictors of immigrant adaptation. We assessed honour as concern (Studies 1 and 2) and as a desired attribute for men and women (Study 3) and studied well-being in terms of acculturative stress (Study 1) and subjective evaluation of one's life (Studies 1 and 3). We examined our questions among groups of immigrants originating from honour (Studies 1 and 2) and dignity cultural groups (Study 1) and from first- and second-generation immigrants (Study 3). Overall, despite some significant associations at the bivariate level between honour and acculturation outcomes, findings provided mixed support for the claim that honour (measured as concerns and cultural codes) plays a significant role in immigrant acculturation above and beyond commonly studied predictors of immigrant adaptation.

KEYWORDS

Canada, cultural orientation, honour, immigrants, UK, well-being

BACKGROUND

Over the last three decades, the media and public discourse in western immigrant-receiving countries such as Canada, the UK, Sweden, Germany, and the Netherlands have regularly been occupied with discussions about honour in immigrant communities (Ewing, 2008; Korteweg, 2014; Korteweg &

Jorida Cila, Pelin Gul and Alexander Kirchner-Häusler are equal second authors.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2024 The Authors. *British Journal of Social Psychology* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of British Psychological Society.

Yurdakul, 2009; Yurdakul & Korteweg, 2020). These discussions have predominantly centred around immigrant groups from Muslim countries that have been represented as following a 'culture of honour', and typically focused on honour-related violence, resulting in the concept of honour taking on a negative connotation among mainstream groups (Korteweg, 2014). Sociologists have provided insightful analyses into how media reporting and public discussions of honour-related violence in western societies were often framed in terms of immigrant backwardness and have led to the politicization of the topic (Gill, 2010), forming ground for further racialization and stigmatization of immigrant groups and reinforcing the boundaries between 'us' and 'them' (Abu-Lughod, 2011; Hearn et al., 2016; Korteweg & Yurdakul, 2009, 2010; Razack, 2008; Terman, 2010). Considering the strong influence of the media and public discourse on intergroup relations, such as how certain immigrant groups are perceived and treated by citizens and institutions of immigrant-receiving countries (Eberl et al., 2018), the question of whether honour indeed plays a role in immigrant acculturation deserves attention.

The public and political discourse on honour-related violence in western immigrant-receiving societies often positions "honour" as a value or concern endorsed by members of certain immigrant groups that is fundamentally incompatible with 'western' values such as individual freedom and gender equality (Korteweg, 2014). Consequently, honour is often viewed as a barrier to the successful integration of immigrants into the mainstream culture (Hague et al., 2013). Yet, we have little insight into whether this claim holds empirically. To address this important gap, in the current research we adopted a social psychological approach to examine whether honour plays a role above and beyond some of the commonly studied predictors of immigrant adaptation in the heritage and mainstream cultural orientations of immigrant groups in two western immigrant-receiving societies: the UK and Canada. In addition, we asked what role honour plays in predicting an important acculturation outcome, namely immigrants' well-being, operationalized in terms of acculturative stress and subjective evaluation of one's life.

Relevant predictors of acculturation orientations and outcomes

Acculturation refers to changes in practices, values, norms, and identities that immigrants experience in the process of interacting with members of the majority group (Berry, 1997, 2017). This process has been studied extensively in terms of changes immigrants undergo in their orientation towards heritage and mainstream cultures, and the impact it has on their adjustment, social relationships, psychological distress, and well-being (Berry, 1997; Birman et al., 2014; González-Castro & Ubillos, 2011; Ward et al., 2001; Yoon et al., 2013). Following recommendations emerging from reviews evaluating methods used to study acculturation (Arends-Toth & Van de Vijver, 2007; Rudmin, 2009; Ryder et al., 2000), we adopted a bi-dimensional approach to acculturation in the current research, which treats immigrants' orientation towards and their immersion in their heritage and mainstream cultural groups as playing independent roles in the acculturation process (Ryder et al., 2000; Uskul et al., 2011).

Acculturation to a new cultural setting has been studied in terms of various intrapersonal, interpersonal, institutional/organizational, larger-scale social, cultural, political, and group-based predictors (for reviews see Bierwiazczonk & Waldzus, 2016; Ward & Geeraert, 2016). In the current study, we examined the role of length of stay in the host country and religiosity as two intrapersonal factors and perceived visual (dis)similarity¹ and perceived cultural distance as two group-based factors in heritage and mainstream cultural orientation. These factors have repeatedly been shown to play an important role in immigrants' acculturation process (Friedman & Saroglou, 2010; Geeraert & Demoulin, 2013; Kashima & Abu-Rayya, 2014; Lalonde et al., 1992; Ward et al., 2001; Yoo et al., 2009). In examining cultural distance, we distinguished between general cultural distance (i.e., immigrants' evaluations of heritage and mainstream cultures in terms of values, beliefs, and social

¹We treated perceived visual dissimilarity as a group-based factor, i.e., we assumed that whether one perceives themselves to look similar or different to others in a society is based on group-based comparisons resulting in belonging to a visible or non-visible minority group.

norms) and honour cultural distance (i.e., immigrants' evaluation of heritage and mainstream cultures in terms of the importance they put on different aspects of honour) to examine their distinct predictive value in immigrants' cultural orientation and well-being. We assessed both types of cultural distance as subjectively perceived constructs (see Galchenko & van de Vijver, 2007; Mahfud et al., 2015) and not as objective cultural distance calculated based on existing data (e.g., using the World Values Survey as was done by Muthukrishna et al., 2020) or linguistic characteristics (Chiswick & Miller, 2005). In addition, we examined socio-economic status (SES), a relatively overlooked intrapersonal factor, in relation to acculturation variables as higher levels of education or income may facilitate minority-majority group interactions (Naumann et al., 2017; Negy & Woods, 1992), assessing it as self-perceived socio-economic position relative to others in one's society. Finally, we measured the role of honour concerns, with their different facets, in acculturation variables. This model allowed us to examine the role of additional variables after accounting for some of the commonly studied intrapersonal and group-based factors relevant to immigrant acculturation.

Cultures of honour

Anthropologists and social psychologists have shown honour to be a core concern and value in Mediterranean, Middle Eastern, Latin American, South Asian, and Southern US contexts (for reviews see Uskul et al., 2019; Uskul & Cross, 2019), and have defined it as reflecting one's self-worth, as well as the worth assigned to them by others in the society (Pitt-Rivers, 1965). In these contexts, honour is experienced as “a right to respect”, which is hard to earn but easy to lose. Consequently, individuals engage in a variety of behaviours that may earn or maintain the respect of others, while vigorously defending themselves against threats to their honour.

Honour is increasingly being studied as a *cultural syndrome* encompassing shared beliefs, values, behaviours, and practices that are organized around a central theme (Leung & Cohen, 2011). These diverse components become part of a *cultural logic of honour* that helps beliefs, values and practices fit together into a coherent whole. This cultural logic then coordinates an individual's responses to events and their efforts to build reputation, motivating individuals to engage in a variety of behaviours that can have both positive consequences (e.g., hospitality) and negative ones (e.g., aggressiveness) (Gregg, 2005). The cultural logic of honour has been contrasted with the *cultural logic of dignity* (Leung & Cohen, 2011). In cultures that promote a cultural logic of dignity, adopted mostly by members of Northern American and Western European societies, individuals are presumed to have inherent worth that is not “losable” like honour (Stewart, 1994). Instead, dignity is like an “internal skeleton” (Ayers, 1984); it is the person's moral centre and the core of identity and motivates behaviour more than social condemnation or punishment.

Most studies on honour conducted in social psychology, criminology, and law have focused on retaliation following threats directed at individuals' honour in interpersonal interactions. Studies on the role of honour in intergroup relations, however, have been limited and, where available, they have generally examined retaliatory responses in the context of intergroup relations (for a review see Uskul et al., 2023). Thus, our focus on the role of honour in immigrant acculturation expands the existing work on honour in intergroup relations. Moreover, in the current research, we differentiated between gendered (feminine and masculine honour), relational (family honour) and individual (morality-based) aspects of honour (for overviews, see Rodriguez Mosquera, 2016, 2018). We argue that such a multi-faceted approach to studying honour in the context of acculturation is likely to provide a more complete picture, shedding light on which components of honour are more or less likely (if at all) to be associated with immigrants' cultural orientation and well-being.

Acculturation and cultures of honour

Despite frequent reference in media and public discourse to the role of honour in immigrant integration in western contexts, empirical research designed to test this association has been scarce and the

few studies that we were able to locate failed to demonstrate evidence for an association between honour and acculturation. For example, in an analysis of acculturation strategies and culture of honour (measured as an emphasis on the defence of honour, see López Zafra, 2007) among Moroccan women immigrants in Andalucía, Spain, Lopez-Zafra and El Ghoudani (2014) failed to find a significant difference in the endorsement of culture of honour as a function of immigrants' acculturation strategies. They concluded that "...culture of honour... does not impede them in integrating or determining which (acculturation) strategy to follow" (p. 6). Similarly, among honour-oriented Polish immigrant couples in Norway, Świdrak et al. (2019) did not find a significant association between locus of self-worth (measured to identify participants' inalienable versus socially conferred self-worth following the cultural logic of honour, see Leung & Cohen, 2011) and adaptation to mainstream culture.

In the current research, we built on this scarce evidence base by further examining the role of honour in immigrants' cultural orientations and well-being in two immigrant-receiving societies (the UK and Canada) where dignity norms and concerns tend to prevail (Vignoles et al., 2024) that are different to the host country settings covered in existing literature (i.e., Norway and Spain). Importantly, we did this by building on the literature on cultural distance which has demonstrated mixed evidence for the assumption that greater cultural distance between immigrants' culture of origin and their destination culture is linked to greater adjustment difficulties (Ward & Geeraert, 2016). This literature has tended to examine both global (e.g., cultural values) and specific (e.g., power distance, egalitarian commitment) cultural distance indices (Kashima & Abu-Rayya, 2014). In the current work, to assess cultural distance, we considered (in addition to general cultural distance) potential differences between honour-related norms and concerns held by immigrants and the dignity-based host societal context and introduced for the first time a continuous measure of perceived cultural distance in honour value importance to examine its role on acculturation variables and outcomes. In addition, we also assessed immigrants' own endorsement of honour concerns as an indirect measure of honour cultural distance in dignity-based societal contexts and studied the role of these two sets of predictors above and beyond several commonly examined predictors of immigrant acculturation.

Current research

Given the limited amount of evidence for the role of honour in immigrant acculturation, we formulated our research in terms of exploratory questions rather than specific predictions. We designed three studies conducted with different groups of immigrants in two acculturative contexts and used different measures of honour and well-being to test the replicability of the observed relationships between variables. Specifically, we examined the following research questions across three studies:

Research Question 1 (RQ1): Does honour play a role in immigrants' cultural orientation? We examined this question in three studies conducted with immigrants in the UK (Studies 1 and 3) and Canada (Study 2) to test the role of their perceived honour cultural distance and endorsement of four different types of honour concerns (Studies 1 and 2) and evaluations of desirability of gender-neutral and gendered honour attributes (Study 3) in heritage and mainstream cultural orientations. We studied the role of honour in cultural orientations in and of itself, as well as above and beyond the roles played by commonly examined factors relevant to immigrant acculturation: length of stay in the host country (Studies 1 and 2), religiosity (Studies 1, 2, and 3), visual (dis)similarity (Study 1), cultural distance (Studies 1 and 2), and SES (Study 3).

Research Question 2 (RQ2): Does honour play a role in immigrants' well-being? We took a similar analytical approach as above to study this question and examined well-being in terms of immigrants' self-reported acculturative stress (Study 1) and subjective evaluations of one's life (Studies 2 and 3).

Research Question 3 (RQ3): Are there any differences in the patterns of the relationship observed between honour and cultural orientation on the one hand (RQ1) and honour and well-being on the other (RQ2) across different subgroups of immigrants? We examined this question in Study 3 focusing on first- and second-generation immigrants in the UK who originate from cultures of honour in different world regions (Study 3). In addition, we exploratorily studied the association between honour-related variables on the one hand and cultural orientation and well-being on the other within immigrant groups originating from different world regions that can be characterized as ‘cultures of honour’, which we report in footnotes in Studies 1 and 2.

STUDY 1

In Study 1, we examined the role of honour in acculturation variables (heritage and mainstream cultural orientation, and acculturative stress) in a group of immigrants recruited in the UK categorized as originating from world regions identified as cultures of honour versus cultures of dignity (based on past research and theory, for reviews see Cross & Uskul, 2022; Uskul et al., 2019).

We examined honour in terms of family, integrity, feminine, and masculine honour concerns, which have been suggested to provide guidance to individuals in groups that follow a cultural logic of honour on how to maintain and protect a positive social image in relation to family, gender, and morality (Rodríguez Mosquera, 2016, 2018). *Family honour* refers to an interdependence between an individual's and their family's social image. Individuals who are concerned about family honour often show willingness to take action to maintain a positive image of their family, for example by protecting them from insults and other disrespectful actions or by acting vigilantly so as not to cause damage to their family's reputation (Rodríguez Mosquera et al., 2014; Uskul et al., 2012). *Integrity honour* is about being loyal to one's own values and principles, showing consistency between one's values and actions, and having a reputation that one can be trusted and relied upon by others (Cross et al., 2014; Guerra et al., 2013; Rodríguez Mosquera et al., 2002).

At the core of *feminine honour* lie values of modesty, decorum, and sexual propriety. How these values are met can vary across different cultural and social groups, ranging from showing modesty in dress code to not coming into eye contact with other men, especially before marriage. *Masculine honour* is defined in reference to exhibiting toughness, strength, and sexual potency, and, as feminine honour, can be earned through different strategies including being autonomous, occupying a respectable social status in family and other social groups, or having authority over and providing for one's family (Rodríguez Mosquera, 2011; Rodríguez Mosquera et al., 2002). We measured these four facets of honour using a tool that contains items reflecting the diversity of ways in which each type of honour can manifest itself as a concern (Guerra et al., 2013).

Method

Participants

The original sample for the study consisted of 379 participants; data for 101 participants were excluded from analysis due to incomplete data and/or failed attention checks, but primarily due to participants' cultural background not meeting the study criteria (e.g., East Asian origin or residing in the UK as short-term exchange students or reporting to be of mixed ethnicity [e.g., Iranian-Swedish]). The final sample used for analyses consisted of 278 participants (74 men, 203 women; 1 participant did not indicate their gender; $M_{\text{age}} = 22.73$ years, $SD = 4.67$). Participants reported having lived in the UK for an average of 55.36 months (range: 1–312 months, $SD = 66.90$); more than 90% of the participants reported having a mother tongue other than English. The majority of participants originated from European countries (63.1%, e.g., Bulgaria, Italy), countries in South America

or Africa (17.7%, e.g., Venezuela, Ghana) or Middle Eastern or South Asian countries (19.3%, e.g., Saudi Arabia, India).

Procedure and measures

Participants who moved to the UK from abroad were invited to complete a study on their adaptation to the British culture. They were recruited through different methods including a university participant pool, through announcements on social media and posters. Those who agreed to participate completed a paper-based questionnaire which consisted of the following sections in the order described below. The study received approval from the Research Ethics and Governance Committee of the University of Kent.

Demographic information

Participants first indicated their gender, age, country of origin, ethnicity, purpose of stay in the UK, length of stay, and religion.

Religiosity

We assessed religiosity with the item 'How religious do you consider yourself to be?' (1: *not religious at all* to 7: *very religious*).

Perceived visual (dis)similarity

We assessed visual similarity using the item 'How visually similar or different do you perceive yourself to be in comparison to British people?' (1: *very similar* to 7: *very different*), with higher scores indicating greater perceived visual *dissimilarity*.

Cultural distance

Three items designed to assess general perceived cultural distance were derived from the Brief Perceived Cultural Distance Scale by Demes and Geeraert (2014) which measures perceived differences in *values and beliefs* (what people think about religion and politics), *people* (how friendly people are) and *social norms* (how to behave in public) between the home and host country. We generated four additional items to measure perceived cultural distance in relation to honour-related values (inspired by the Honour Scale described below), which asked participants to indicate how similar or different their home country and the UK are in terms of the emphasis put on family (family honour), the role of the man in the family (masculine honour), female purity (feminine honour) and integrity (1: *very similar* to 7: *very different*), (general cultural distance subscale: $\alpha = .72$; honour cultural distance subscale: $\alpha = .77$).² The rationale for adding the honour subscale was to explore whether perceptions that one's mainstream and heritage cultures differed on honour dimensions (vs. on more general dimensions) mattered more for immigrants originating from cultures of honour in predicting acculturation variables.

Honour concerns

We used the short version of the original Honour Scale developed by Rodriguez Mosquera et al. (2002) to assess participants' endorsement of honour concerns focusing on four different aspects (Guerra et al., 2013). Participants indicated on four items per subscale how bad they would feel if their family honour (e.g., your family had a bad reputation, $\alpha = .85$), feminine honour (e.g., you were known as someone who had had many different sexual partners, $\alpha = .78$), masculine honour

²An exploratory factor analysis using principal component method as extraction method with oblimin rotation with all seven cultural distance items revealed that the honour cultural distance items and the general cultural distance items loaded on separate factors. One exception to this pattern was the item on integrity honour which loaded on both factors with comparable loadings.

(e.g., you were known as someone who cannot support a family, $\alpha = .64$), and integrity (e.g., you had a reputation for being dishonest with others, $\alpha = .83$) was threatened (1: *not bad at all* to 9: *very bad*). Because items comprising the masculine honour subscale revealed less than a desirable reliability coefficient, we removed one item (you had the reputation of someone without sexual experience) from this subscale which resulted in an increased α of .71. In the analyses reported below, we used this three-item masculine honour subscale.

Mainstream and heritage cultural orientations

We used the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA, Ryder et al., 2000) to measure immigrants' mainstream (10 items, e.g., "I often participate in mainstream British cultural traditions", $\alpha = .86$) and heritage cultural orientation (10 items, e.g., "I would be willing to marry a person from my heritage culture", $\alpha = .87$) in the domains of values, social relationships, and adherence to traditions (1: *strongly disagree* to 9: *strongly agree*).

Acculturative stress

Using the 15-item Riverside Acculturation Stress Inventory (RASI; Benet-Martinez, 2003), which we adapted to fit to the British mainstream culture, we measured acculturation-related challenges in five domains: *work*, *language skills*, *discrimination*, *isolation*, and *intercultural relations* (1: *strongly disagree* to 5: *strongly agree*). For brevity purposes, we conducted our analyses using the average score across all domains ($\alpha = .81$).

Results and discussion

As can be seen in Table 1, which reports the descriptive analyses for and bivariate correlations between study variables for the entire sample, none of the honour concern facets was significantly associated with mainstream cultural orientation, whereas all facets of honour concerns were significantly positively associated with heritage cultural orientation and acculturative stress (with the exception of integrity concerns). Perceived honour cultural distance was significantly negatively correlated with mainstream cultural orientation and significantly positively with acculturative stress.

Predicting acculturation variables

To investigate the predictive role of honour concerns in our acculturation variables above and beyond the factors previously shown to be highly relevant to immigrants' acculturation experiences, we conducted a series of hierarchical linear regression analyses with length of stay in the UK, religiosity, visual (dis)similarity, and perceived cultural distance (general) entered in step 1, followed by perceived honour cultural distance, family, feminine, masculine honour, and integrity concerns entered in step 2. No concerns regarding collinearity were observed (all VIFs < 5) (see Table 2 for results of the regression analyses).

In step 1, we found that our first set of variables (length of stay in the UK, religiosity, perceived visual similarity, and general cultural distance) explained a significant amount of variance in all acculturation variables, *heritage cultural orientation*, $F(4, 270) = 10.11, p < .001, R^2 = .13$; *mainstream cultural orientation*, $F(4, 270) = 13.65, p < .001, R^2 = .17$; *acculturative stress*, $F(4, 270) = 8.38, p < .001, R^2 = .11$. Mainstream cultural orientation was significantly predicted by longer stay in the UK, lower perceived visual dissimilarity, and lower perceived general cultural distance. Heritage cultural orientation was significantly predicted by stronger religiosity and perceived visual dissimilarity, and lower perceived general cultural distance. Finally, acculturative stress was significantly predicted by stronger religiosity, perceived visual dissimilarity, and perceived general cultural distance.

TABLE 1 Descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations among key measures (Study 1).

Variable	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Length of stay	55.36 (66.90)	–	.13*	–.02	.02	.10	.14*	.22***	.12	.03	.21***	–.06	.04
2. Religiosity	3.10 (2.04)	–	–	.23***	–.08	.04	.08	.23***	.14*	–.06	–.03	.27***	.15*
3. Visual (dis)similarity	4.09 (1.66)	–	–	–	.27***	.26***	.12*	.07	.15*	.00	–.33***	.22***	.23***
4. General cultural distance	4.81 (1.33)	–	–	–	–	.53***	.09	.09	.13*	.11	–.23***	–.09	.25***
5. Honour cultural distance	4.14 (1.37)	–	–	–	–	–	.15*	.20*	.20*	.12*	–.23***	–.11	.17**
6. Family honour	6.27 (1.99)	–	–	–	–	–	–	.50***	.62***	.66***	.05	.25***	.16**
7. Feminine honour	4.79 (2.10)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	.67***	.50***	–.02	.15*	.23***
8. Masculine honour	4.99 (2.01)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	.47***	–.00	.18*	.24***
9. Integrity honour	6.82 (1.76)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	.08	.14*	.07
10. Mainstream CO	6.14 (1.37)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	.19*	–.08
11. Heritage CO	6.64 (1.45)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	.12
12. Acculturative stress	2.37 (0.66)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Note: *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively.

Abbreviation: CO, Cultural orientation.

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

TABLE 2 Predicting cultural orientation and acculturative stress (Study 1).

Variable	Heritage CO		Mainstream CO		Acculturative stress	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]
<i>R</i> ²	.13***	.21***	.17***	.21***	.11***	.15***
ΔR^2	–	.08***	–	.04*	–	.04†
Length of stay	0.00 [–0.00, 0.00]	0.00 [–0.01, 0.00]	0.00*** [0.00, 0.01]	0.00*** [0.00, 0.01]	0.00 [–0.00, 0.00]	0.00 [–0.00, 0.00]
Religiosity	0.16*** [0.08, 0.25]	0.16*** [0.07, 0.24]	–0.00 [–0.08, 0.08]	0.03 [–0.05, 0.11]	0.04*** [0.00, 0.08]	0.03 [–0.01, 0.07]
Visual dissimilarity	0.19*** [0.08, 0.30]	0.19*** [0.09, 0.29]	–0.22*** [–0.32, –0.12]	–0.22*** [–0.31, –0.12]	0.06* [0.01, 0.10]	0.05* [0.00, 0.10]
General cultural distance	–0.15* [–0.27, –0.02]	–0.08 [–0.22, 0.06]	–0.17** [–0.29, –0.05]	–0.14* [–0.27, –0.01]	0.12*** [0.06, 0.18]	0.11*** [0.05, 0.18]
Honour cultural distance	–	–0.18** [–0.07, 0.05]	–	–0.08 [–0.19, 0.04]	–	–0.01 [–0.07, 0.05]
Family honour	–	0.17** [0.06, 0.28]	–	0.03 [–0.07, 0.14]	–	0.02 [–0.03, 0.07]
Integrity honour	–	0.00 [–0.11, 0.11]	–	0.10 [–0.00, 0.20]	–	–0.02 [–0.07, 0.03]
Feminine honour	–	0.02 [–0.06, 0.10]	–	–0.10* [–0.17, –0.02]	–	0.05* [0.01, 0.08]
Masculine honour	–	0.00 [–0.10, 0.10]	–	0.03 [–0.06, 0.13]	–	0.02 [–0.03, 0.07]

Note: Regression values represent unstandardized regression coefficients.

Abbreviation: CO, cultural orientation.

†*p* = .054.

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

In step 2, we found that the inclusion of perceived honour cultural distance and endorsement of the four types of honour concerns significantly increased the amount of explained variance for *heritage cultural orientation*, $\Delta F(5, 265) = 5.15, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .08$, and *mainstream cultural orientation*, $\Delta F(5, 265) = 2.63, p = .024, \Delta R^2 = .04$, but did so only marginally significantly for *acculturative stress*, $\Delta F(5, 265) = 2.22, p = .053, \Delta R^2 = .04$. In the model with heritage cultural orientation as the dependent variable, perceived honour cultural distance and family honour concerns emerged as additional significant predictors in step 2, with weaker perceived honour cultural distance and stronger family honour concerns predicting stronger heritage cultural orientation. In the model with mainstream cultural orientation as the dependent variable, only feminine honour concerns emerged as an additional significant predictor in step 2, with weaker feminine honour concerns predicting stronger mainstream cultural orientation. Finally, feminine honour concerns also were a significant positive predictor in the marginally significant regression model with acculturative stress as the dependent variable, with stronger feminine honour concerns predicting stronger acculturative stress.

Overall, we found mixed support for the predictive power of honour-related variables in our acculturation variables, above and beyond commonly studied variables in the literature. While addition of honour concerns increased the explained variance of all our models, systematic links only emerged for two facets of honour concerns (family and feminine honour). Perceived cultural honour distance mattered for heritage cultural orientation only, with stronger perceived cultural honour distance predicting lower heritage cultural orientation.³

STUDY 2

In Study 2 we sought to extend the findings from Study 1 in two ways. First, we examined how perceived honour cultural distance and honour concerns were related to acculturation in a different cultural context (Canada), focusing only on immigrants originating from locations reflecting the recent trends of immigration into Canada. Whereas a majority of earlier immigration trends had been from dignity cultures (primarily England and France), recent immigration has been more diversified, with a large majority of immigrants coming from Asia (e.g., South Asia), as well as, increasingly, the Middle East, Latin America, and Southeastern Europe (Statistics Canada, 2019) – these are also regions that have been viewed as representing honour cultures (see Uskul et al., 2019 for a review). Second, we examined psychological well-being, operationalized as individuals' satisfaction with their life, as a different facet of the subjective acculturation process.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from a large multicultural university in Toronto, Canada. After providing informed consent, they completed an online survey in exchange for course credit. Data from 34 participants out of an initial 392 participants were excluded from analysis due to failing attention checks ($n = 30$), or ineligibility (i.e., participant was not from a proximal or distal honour culture, $n = 4$), resulting in a final sample of $N = 358$ participants (276 women, 81 men, 1 participant did not indicate gender, $M_{\text{age}} = 20.40, SD = 5.12$). Participants reported having lived in Canada for an average of 108.56 months (or around 9 years; $SD = 82.37, \text{range} = 2\text{--}790$ months). The vast majority reported being Canadian citizens or permanent residents ($N = 307, 85.75\%$); the remaining participants were

³This pattern of findings was largely replicated across different subgroups of immigrants classified as originating from dignity (e.g., Netherlands), distal (e.g., South Asia) and proximal (e.g., Greece) honour cultural contexts. We report this pattern in a footnote only for inspiration for future research as our sample sizes did not allow us to conduct robust subgroup analyses.

TABLE 3 Descriptive statistics and zero-order correlations among key measures (Study 2).

Variable	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Length of stay	108.34 (82.02)	.04	-.10	-.14**	-.01	-.01	.02	.01	.24***	-.00	.04
2. Religiosity	4.58 (2.02)		-.12*	-.001	.17**	.41***	-.003	.13*	.15**	.42***	.16**
3. General cultural distance	4.96 (1.45)			.65***	-.03	-.01	-.03	.01	-.08	-.07	-.07
4. Honour cultural distance	4.49 (1.40)				.02	.08	-.05	.02	-.08	-.08	-.06
5. Family honour	7.95 (1.47)					.51***	.49***	.66***	.17**	.35***	.17**
6. Feminine honour	6.32 (2.10)						.27***	.51***	.02	.28***	.10
7. Masculine honour	6.02 (1.45)							.40***	.14*	.02	.07
8. Integrity honour	7.88 (1.24)								.15**	.25***	.12*
9. Mainstream CO	7.05 (1.23)									.28***	.21***
10. Heritage CO	7.02 (1.62)										.20***
11. Well-being	5.78 (0.95)										

Note: *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively.

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

international students ($N = 50$, 14.0%), and one participant reported being a protected person (i.e., a person who has been granted temporary resident status due to emergency reasons). More than 90% of the sample reported having a mother tongue other than English and to originate from a country based in southern or eastern Europe (18.3%, e.g., Greece, Italy), a country from South America (6.2%, e.g., Mexico, Columbia), or a country from the Middle East or South Asia (75.5%, e.g., Iran, India).

Procedure and measures

The study received ethical approval from the York University's Research Ethics Board. Procedure and measures of cultural distance ($\alpha_{\text{general}} = .76$, $\alpha_{\text{honour}} = .76$), mainstream cultural orientation ($\alpha = .83$), heritage cultural orientation ($\alpha = .91$), honour concerns (family honour: $\alpha = .84$; feminine honour: $\alpha = .89$; masculine honour: $\alpha = .74$; integrity: $\alpha = .90$), and religiosity were the same as in Study 1.

Psychological well-being

We measured well-being using Diener et al. (2009) 8-item psychological flourishing measure (e.g., "I lead a purposeful and meaningful life." $\alpha = .90$) (1: *strongly disagree* to 7: *strongly agree*).

Results and discussion

As reported in Table 3, family, masculine and integrity honour (but not feminine honour) were significantly and positively associated with mainstream cultural orientation. At the same time, family, feminine, and integrity honour (but not masculine honour) were significantly and positively related to

heritage cultural orientation. Family and integrity honour concerns were significantly and positively associated with well-being.

Predicting acculturation variables

We conducted separate sets of hierarchical linear regression analyses to predict mainstream and heritage cultural orientations, and well-being using the same analytical procedure as in Study 1 (note: this study did not include a measure of visual similarity) (see Table 4). No concerns regarding multicollinearity were observed (all VIF < 2.2).

In step 1, we found that our first set of variables (length of stay, religiosity, general cultural distance) explained a significant amount of variance in all acculturation variables, *heritage cultural orientation*, $F(3, 348) = 24.38, p < .001, R^2 = .17$; *mainstream cultural orientation*, $F(3, 348) = 10.19, p < .001, R^2 = .08$; and *well-being*, $F(3, 346) = 3.41, p = .018, R^2 = .03$. Stronger mainstream cultural orientation was significantly predicted by longer length of stay and stronger religiosity, whereas stronger heritage cultural orientation and greater well-being were both only predicted by stronger religiosity.

In step 2, the inclusion of perceived honour cultural distance and different facets of honour concerns significantly increased the amount of explained variance for *heritage cultural orientation*, $\Delta F(5, 343) = 9.50, p < .001, \Delta R^2 = .10$, and *mainstream cultural orientation*, $\Delta F(5, 343) = 3.98, p = .002, \Delta R^2 = .05$, but not for *not well-being*, $\Delta F(5, 341) = 1.61, p = .156, \Delta R^2 = .02$. Whereas heritage cultural orientation was positively predicted by family honour and negatively predicted by masculine honour as well as honour distance, mainstream cultural orientation was only negatively predicted by feminine honour.

Overall, we once again found mixed support for the role of honour concerns in our acculturation variables. While the addition of honour variables to our set of commonly studied predictors (length of stay, religiosity, and general cultural distance) increased the explained variance of our models examining heritage and mainstream cultural orientations (but not well-being), the majority of honour variables only mattered for the prediction of heritage cultural orientation.⁴

STUDY 3

To expand on Studies 1 and 2, we conducted Study 3 to examine the role of honour in (first and second generation) immigrants' cultural orientations and well-being using a gendered measure of honour attributes. Thus, we shifted our focus from honour concerns to honour attributes, to examine the role of honour in acculturation using a more normative approach and treating honour as a set of codes applied to women and men. Honour codes have been defined as a set of values, norms, and social practices (Rodriguez Mosquera, 2011), with some prescribed attributes seen equally important for the maintenance of both women and men's honour (e.g., having a positive reputation, being honest) and other attributes differentially applied to men (e.g., physical protection of family and property) versus women (e.g., being modest, sexually restrained). Incorporating masculine (e.g., physical strength) and feminine honour attributes (e.g., sexual abstinence) as gendered honour codes in our research allows us to provide a more detailed picture on the role of honour in acculturation, especially given that gender honour codes have long been seen as incompatible with gender equality, and thus as a barrier to immigrant integration (see Korteweg, 2014). Finally, we also considered SES as an additional factor relevant to immigrant acculturation. Higher SES has previously been found to be associated with greater assimilation into the mainstream society (Naumann et al., 2017) and stronger mainstream cultural orientation (Negy & Woods, 1992), yet remains a relatively understudied variable in acculturation research.

⁴This pattern was largely replicated across different subgroups of immigrants classified as originating from distal or proximal honour cultural contexts.

TABLE 4 Predicting cultural orientation and well-being (Study 2, full sample).

Variable	Heritage CO		Mainstream CO		Well-being	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]
R ²	.17***	.27***	.08***	.13***	.03*	.05*
ΔR ²	–	.10***	–	.05**	–	.02
Length of stay	0.00 [–0.00, 0.00]	–0.00 [–0.00, 0.00]	0.00*** [0.00, 0.01]	0.00*** [0.00, 0.01]	0.00 [–0.00, 0.00]	0.00 [–0.00, 0.00]
Religiosity	0.33*** [0.25, 0.41]	0.29*** [0.21, 0.37]	0.09** [0.02, 0.15]	0.12*** [0.05, 0.18]	0.07** [0.02, 0.12]	0.07* [0.01, 0.12]
General cultural distance	–0.03 [–0.13, 0.08]	0.08 [–0.05, 0.22]	–0.04 [–0.12, 0.05]	–0.02 [–0.13, 0.10]	–0.03 [–0.10, 0.04]	–0.01 [–0.10, 0.08]
Honour cultural distance	–	–0.17* [–0.31, –0.03]	–	–0.02 [–0.14, 0.09]	–	–0.03 [–0.12, 0.07]
Family honour	–	0.36*** [0.22, 0.50]	–	0.11 [–0.01, 0.23]	–	0.09 [–0.01, 0.19]
Integrity honour	–	0.05 [–0.11, 0.21]	–	0.10 [–0.04, 0.23]	–	0.03 [–0.08, 0.14]
Feminine honour	–	–0.00 [–0.09, 0.09]	–	–0.11** [–0.19, –0.04]	–	–0.02 [–0.08, 0.04]
Masculine honour	–	–0.15* [–0.26, –0.03]	–	0.07 [–0.03, 0.17]	–	0.00 [–0.08, 0.08]

Note: Regression values represent unstandardized regression coefficients.

Abbreviation: CO, cultural orientation.

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

Method

Participants

Participants were first- and second-generation immigrants residing in the UK, recruited via Prolific (96%; compensated with £1.87) and university participant pool (4%; compensated with course credits). We invited first-generation immigrants born in a country from southern Europe (Spain, Italy, Portugal, Greece), the MENA region (Turkey, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Syria, UAE, Yemen, Oman), and South Asia (Pakistan, Bangladesh, Afghanistan), typically classified as honour cultures, as well as second generation immigrants born in the UK, with one or more parents born in one of the above countries, to participate in our study. In total, 326 participants completed the study. Excluding participants who failed an attention check item or had missing values on the main study variables resulted in a final sample of 291 participants entered in the analyses reported below (first-generation: $N=145$ with 49.7% female; second generation: $N=146$ with 48.6% female; $M_{age} = 29.73$, $SD=9.62$).

First-generation participants reported having lived in the UK on average for about 10 years ($M=10.28$, $SD=9.51$, range = 0–48) and residing in the country primarily for work reasons (45.4%). The majority of first-generation participants were from Italy (33.8%), Spain (11.7%), and Pakistan (10.3%), while second generation participants most frequently reported their parents (mother/father) originating from Pakistan/Pakistan (16.4%), Bangladesh/Bangladesh (13.7%), and the UK/Pakistan (11.6%).

Procedure and measures

Participants took part in a wider 15-min online study designed to examine honour values and gender beliefs; here we will only present the measures relevant to the current manuscript. The study received ethical approval from the Research Ethics and Governance Committee of the University of Kent.

Honour attributes

We assessed honour codes using the Honour Attribute Scale (HAS; Rodriguez Mosquera, 2011), which contains 24 attributes (9 gender-neutral honour attributes [e.g., honesty], 8 feminine honour attributes [e.g., controlling sexual desires], and 7 masculine honour attributes [e.g., physical strength]), that were rated by participants for desirability (1: *not desirable at all* to 5: *extremely desirable*) separately for men and women (in this order). Participants were not told that these attributes were related to honour, and the order of attributes was randomized between participants. Reliability coefficients for all subscales were above $\alpha > .70$, apart from masculine honour attributes as rated for men ($\alpha = .67$). Excluding an item (*Sexual Adventures*) increased the reliability coefficient when rated for men ($\alpha = .70$), and we therefore computed the masculine honour subscale without this item when rated for both genders. For our regression analyses, we combined the two scales of neutral honour attributes (as rated for men, and as a rated for women) into a combined neutral honour attribute scale, as we had no expectations regarding gender differences in these variables when it came to these attributes and since the two scales showed a strong correlation with each other ($r = .84$).

Mainstream and heritage cultural orientation

As before, we used the VIA to assess participants' cultural orientations (Mainstream Cultural Orientation: $\alpha = .90$; Heritage Cultural Orientation: $\alpha = .88$).

Subjective well-being

We used a measure of subjective well-being by Diener et al. (1985) that assesses participants' evaluation of their life ("The conditions of my life are excellent.", 1: *strongly disagree* to 7: *strongly agree*) ($\alpha = .90$).

TABLE 5 Means, standard deviations, and correlations with confidence intervals (Study 3).

Variable	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Length of stay (1st Generation only)	10.28 (9.51)	-.04	-.05	-.09	-.04	-.04	-.12	.07	-.10
2. Religiosity	2.29 (1.24)		-.12*	.45***	.32***	.58***	.33***	-.08	.04
3. SES	5.41 (1.64)			.01	-.03	-.13*	.09	.11	.49***
4. Honour Neutral	3.84 (0.63)				.71***	.75***	.38***	.11	.09
5. Honour Masculine	3.39 (0.68)					.60***	.25***	.10	.09
6. Honour Feminine	3.45 (0.80)						.27***	-.04	-.01
7. Heritage CO	6.84 (1.42)							.18**	.15*
8. Mainstream CO	6.84 (1.45)								.14*
9. Well-being	4.40 (1.47)								

Note: *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Length of stay was only included in the first-generation group. Abbreviation: CO, cultural orientation.

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

Religiosity

We assessed religiosity by asking how important religion was to participants (1: *not at all important* to 4: *very important*).

SES

We used the *MacArthur Scale of Subjective Status* (Adler et al., 2000) to assess subjective SES with a single item asking participants to indicate their self-perceived socio-economic position on a pictorial ladder relative to others in their country (*Where would you place yourself on this ladder compared to people in the country you live in?*), ranging from 1 (*bottom*) to 10 (*top*).

Results and discussion

As reported in Table 5, all three scales of honour attributes were significantly positively associated with heritage cultural orientation, but none of the honour attributes had a significant association with mainstream cultural orientation or well-being.

Analytic strategy

As before, we conducted a series of hierarchical linear regression analyses to predict heritage cultural orientation, mainstream cultural orientation, and well-being. In step 1, we again entered the variables examined as relevant to acculturation as predictors (religiosity and socio-economic status),⁵ followed by our three honour attribute scales in step 2. For honour attributes, we focused on the gender-congruent attributes of honour (i.e., masculine honour attributes as rated for men, feminine honour attributes as rated for women) as indicators of the endorsement of gendered honour

⁵We were not able to include length of stay in our regression analyses as this variable had only been measured for first-generation participants only (i.e., not for second-generation participants), and thus would not have allowed us to include moderation effects or test for R^2 differences between steps. A set of exploratory subsample analyses showed that including length of stay in our analyses did not change the pattern of results for first generation participants (please see Table A.5 in the Appendix S1).

codes, as well as on the combined gender-neutral honour attributes.⁶ Furthermore, as a primary goal or our analyses was to examine differences in the relationship between honour and acculturation orientations and well-being between generational samples, we then continued our analyses with a moderation analyses in two further steps: in step 3, we added generational status as a covariate into the model (deviation-coded as first generation = -0.5 and second-generation = 0.5), and in step 4 we then added the interactions of generational status with our three honour variables in order to examine differences between generations. We grand-mean-centered the honour variables prior to including them in our models. No concerns regarding multicollinearity were observed in any of the models (all VIFs <5).

Predicting acculturation orientations and well-being

Table 6 shows the results of the hierarchical regression and moderation analyses for all three of our dependent variables (acculturation orientations and well-being). The regression models conducted for *heritage cultural orientation*, $F(2, 288) = 21.6$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .13$, and *well-being*, $F(2, 288) = 49.18$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .25$, showed that both step 1 variables (religiosity, SES) contributed significantly to the model; this was not the case with *mainstream cultural orientation*, $F(2, 288) = 2.59$, $p = .08$, $R^2 = .02$ for which neither was found to be a significant predictor. Both heritage cultural orientation and well-being were positively predicted by religiosity and SES.

The inclusion of honour attributes in step 2 explained a significant amount of additional variance in *heritage cultural orientation*, $\Delta F(3, 285) = 8.40$, $p < .001$, $\Delta R^2 = .07$, and *mainstream cultural orientation*, $\Delta F(3, 285) = 4.60$, $p = .004$, $\Delta R^2 = .05$, but not *well-being*, $\Delta F(3, 285) = 1.55$, $p = .201$, $\Delta R^2 = .01$. Both heritage cultural orientation and mainstream cultural orientation were positively predicted by the desirability of neutral honour attributes, while mainstream cultural orientation was further negatively predicted by the desirability of feminine honour attributes for women. The desirability of masculine honour attributes for men did not predict any of the three dependent variables significantly.

In step 3, we found that the inclusion of generational status as a covariate only explained a significant amount of additional variance in *mainstream cultural orientation*, $\Delta F(1, 284) = 20.64$, $p < .001$, $\Delta R^2 = .06$, but not in *heritage cultural orientation*, $\Delta F(1, 284) = 0.00$, $p = .950$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, or *well-being*, $\Delta F(1, 284) = 3.38$, $p = .067$, $\Delta R^2 = .01$. Generational status only significantly predicted mainstream cultural orientation negatively (suggesting that second generation participants showed lower levels of mainstream cultural orientation), but not heritage cultural orientation or well-being.

Finally in step 4, the inclusion of interactions between general status and our three honour variables did not add a significant amount of additional variance for any of our dependent variables, *heritage cultural orientation*, $\Delta F(3, 281) = 1.00$, $p = .395$, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, *mainstream cultural orientation*, $\Delta F(3, 281) = 0.37$, $p = .772$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, *well-being*, $\Delta F(3, 281) = 1.04$, $p = .373$, $\Delta R^2 = .01$. Similarly, we found none of the interaction terms of generational status with the three honour attribution scales to be significant for any dependent variable, suggesting no differences in the effects of our honour predictors between generational groups.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Despite frequent references to honour in the context of immigrant groups in western societies, there has been limited empirical research examining the role of honour in immigrant acculturation. Using a social psychological approach and taking a bi-dimensional view on immigrant adaptation (see Berry, 1980; Ryder et al., 2000), we conducted three studies in two immigrant-receiving contexts, the UK and Canada,

⁶We decided to not include the gender-*incongruent* attributes (i.e., masculine honour attributes as rated for women, feminine honour attributes as rated for men) in our regression analyses, as we did not believe that these mismatched cases provided a strong theoretical basis for testing gender honour endorsement compared to the gender-matched cases.

TABLE 6 Predicting cultural orientations and well-being (Study 3).

Variable	Heritage CO				Mainstream CO				Well-being			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]	<i>B</i> [95% CI]
<i>R</i> ²	.13***	.20***	.20***	.21***	.02	.06**	.13***	.13***	.25***	.27***	.28**	.28***
Δ <i>R</i> ²	–	.07***	.00	.01	–	.05**	.06***	.00	–	.01	.01	.01
Religiosity	0.40*** [0.28, 0.52]	0.30*** [0.15, 0.45]	0.30*** [0.15, 0.45]	0.29*** [0.14, 0.44]	–0.08 [–0.22, 0.05]	–0.10 [–0.26, 0.07]	–0.13 [–0.29, 0.03]	–0.13 [–0.29, 0.03]	0.13* [0.01, 0.24]	0.14 [0.00, 0.29]	0.13 [–0.02, 0.28]	0.12 [–0.03, 0.27]
SES	0.12* [0.02, 0.21]	0.09 [0.00, 0.18]	0.09 [0.00, 0.18]	0.09 [0.00, 0.18]	0.09 [–0.01, 0.20]	0.07 [–0.04, 0.17]	0.10 [†] [0.00, 0.20]	0.10* [0.00, 0.20]	0.45*** [0.36, 0.54]	0.44*** [0.35, 0.54]	0.46*** [0.36, 0.55]	0.45*** [0.36, 0.54]
Honour neutral	–	0.86*** [0.45, 1.28]	0.87*** [0.45, 1.28]	0.91*** [0.49, 1.33]	–	0.62** [0.16, 1.08]	0.71** [0.27, 1.16]	0.72** [0.27, 1.18]	–	0.09 [–0.33, 0.54]	0.12 [–0.29, 0.53]	0.14 [–0.27, 0.56]
Honour Masculine	–	–0.03 [–0.35, 0.28]	–0.03 [–0.35, 0.28]	–0.02 [–0.34, 0.30]	–	0.16 [–0.18, 0.51]	0.08 [–0.26, 0.42]	0.08 [–0.26, 0.42]	–	0.25 [–0.06, 0.57]	0.22 [–0.09, 0.53]	0.24 [–0.07, 0.56]
Honour Feminine	–	–0.26 [–0.57, 0.05]	–0.26 [–0.57, 0.05]	–0.27 [–0.58, 0.04]	–	–0.42* [–0.76, 0.51]	–0.48** [–0.82, –0.15]	–0.49** [–0.82, –0.15]	–	–0.22 [–0.53, 0.09]	–0.24 [–0.55, 0.06]	–0.24 [–0.55, 0.07]
Generation	–	–	–0.01 [–0.32, 0.30]	–0.01 [–0.32, 0.30]	–	–	–0.76*** [–1.09, –0.43]	–0.76 [–1.09, –0.43]	–	–	–0.28 [–0.59, 0.02]	–0.28 [–0.58, 0.03]
Honour Neutral × Generation	–	–	–	–0.64 [–1.48, 0.20]	–	–	–	0.04 [–0.86, 0.95]	–	–	–	–0.68 [–1.51, 0.15]
Honour Masculine × Generation	–	–	–	0.02 [0.66]	–	–	–	–0.29 [–0.98, 0.39]	–	–	–	0.14 [–0.49, 0.77]
Honour Feminine × Generation	–	–	–	0.32 [0.89]	–	–	–	0.22 [–0.39, 0.84]	–	–	–	0.44 [–0.13, 1.00]

Note: Regression estimates represent unstandardized coefficients. Abbreviation: CO, Cultural Orientation. [†]*p* < .054. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

to address this gap in the literature and to start uncovering the role of honour in immigrants' heritage and mainstream cultural orientation and well-being. We operationalized honour as perceived honour cultural distance and multi-faceted concerns to examine the role of gendered, relational, and morality-related aspects of honour in immigrant cultural orientation (Studies 1 and 2) and as gendered codes assessing the desirability of neutral, feminine, and masculine honour attributes for women and men (Study 3). We examined well-being both in terms of acculturative stress across different life domains (Study 1) and subjective evaluations of one's life (Studies 2 and 3). Finally, we also explored the honour-acculturation link in immigrants of different generational status (1st generation and 2nd generation immigrants; Study 3).

What is the role of honour in immigrants' cultural orientation and well-being?

Across all studies, we observed several significant bivariate associations (20 out of 36 possible correlations; 55.6%) between honour-related variables on one hand, and immigrants' mainstream and heritage cultural orientations and well-being on the other hand. In Studies 1 and 3, which included immigrant participants from the UK, the significant positive associations concerned almost exclusively heritage cultural orientation. In Study 2, which included immigrant participants from Canada, significant positive associations were observed for both mainstream and heritage cultural orientations. None of the associations between honour variables and cultural orientations at the bivariate level in any of the samples was negative, demonstrating that stronger endorsement of honour in the form of concerns and gendered codes was *not* associated with reduced heritage *or* mainstream cultural orientation. Consistently positive associations between honour variables and heritage cultural orientation suggest that honour values are especially relevant to connection with heritage culture. These findings raise questions about the claims that honour concerns and values may act as a barrier to immigrant integration in western mainstream cultures.

Yet, most of these significant positive associations at the bivariate level became negligible once we accounted for commonly studied factors in acculturation research. Specifically, across Studies 1 and 2, out of 30 possible predictions by four types of honour concerns and perceived honour cultural distance across the three criterion variables, different facets of honour concerns emerged as a significant predictor only six times, and of those occurrences only two were significantly associated with mainstream cultural orientation (both times feminine honour; see next paragraph). Perceived honour cultural distance emerged as a significant predictor only twice, in both cases in relation to heritage cultural orientation. In Study 3, only three out of 9 possible predictions emerged as significant (two linked to mainstream cultural orientation, and one to heritage cultural orientation). Thus, overall, after commonly studied intrapersonal and group-based factors in acculturation were accounted for, evidence from three studies with over 900 participants provided mixed support for the claim that honour (as measured either as family, masculine, feminine, and integrity honour concerns, perceived honour cultural distance, or as desirability of honour-relevant attributes) is a meaningful predictor of immigrant acculturation, if anything it plays a stronger role in predicting heritage versus mainstream cultural orientation. This pattern is slightly different to findings from other studies that reported absence of evidence for a meaningful role of honour in immigrant integration (Lopez-Zafra & El Ghoudani, 2014; Świdrak et al., 2019).

Despite the overall pattern revealing a mixed predictive role of honour in immigrants' cultural orientation and well-being, there are several important findings worth noting. First, stronger family honour concerns (Studies 1 and 2), lower masculine honour concerns (Study 2), and greater desirability of neutral honour attributes for both genders (Study 3) predicted stronger *heritage culture orientation*. Second, greater desirability of neutral honour attributes for both genders (Study 3), as well as higher feminine honour concerns (Study 1 and 2) and greater desirability of feminine attributes for women (Study 3) predicted weaker *mainstream cultural orientation*. These findings point to some role played by both relational and gendered honour aspects in immigrants' cultural orientation, with family honour associated with stronger connections with one's heritage culture. They also point to some counterintuitive patterns, with for example masculine honour concerns negatively predicting heritage cultural orientation. Third, despite some significant bivariate correlations in Studies 1 and 2 (see [Tables 1 and 3](#)), only one

of the honour-relevant factors (feminine honour concerns in Study 1) significantly predicted *well-being* when controlling for commonly studied variables in acculturation (in a marginally significant model). Thus, despite our attempt at a diverse assessment and operationalization of well-being (as psychological stress associated with acculturation in different life domains or as subjective evaluations of one's life), honour-related variables did not emerge as substantial predictors of individual, subjective well-being. As aforementioned, perceived honour cultural distance emerged as a significant predictor of heritage cultural orientation only, with perceived distance in honour values between heritage and host countries predicting weaker heritage cultural orientation. This may appear as a somewhat counterintuitive finding; however, it may be possible that weaker perceptions of cultural honour distance may generate less tension between host and heritage cultural values, which could strengthen the heritage cultural orientation among immigrants. A statistical interpretation could be that other variables included in our regression analysis (such as perceived general cultural distance) might have explained greater variance, rendering perceived cultural honour distance to be a less important predictor. Finally, the moderation analyses by immigrants' generational status in Study 3 demonstrated similar patterns of associations between study variables across the two subgroups. Similarly, exploratory analyses with subgroups of immigrants originating from different regions showed similar patterns. These findings require to be re-examined with larger sample sizes and different immigrant groups in future research.

The role of commonly studied background variables in acculturation

Although it was not the main focus of our studies, current findings also provide important insights into commonly studied predictors of acculturation. Consistent with existing research (for a review see Bierwaczonk & Waldzus, 2016), our studies highlighted the importance of various intrapersonal variables (time spent in the host country, religiosity, SES) and group-related variables (cultural distance, perceived visual dissimilarity) in immigrants' cultural orientation and well-being. *Religiosity* consistently emerged as a stronger positive predictor of heritage cultural orientation (across all studies) compared with mainstream cultural orientation; interestingly it also showed some positive associations with both greater well-being (Studies 2 and 3) as well as higher acculturative stress (Study 1). In Study 3, *socio-economic status* most consistently predicted greater well-being; links to either cultural orientation showed a more inconsistent pattern, but, at least in the models considering generational status, our analyses suggested a positive link between SES and mainstream cultural orientation. This positive link between SES and mainstream cultural orientation aligns with previous research showing a link between higher SES and stronger assimilation (Naumann et al., 2017) and stronger mainstream cultural orientation (Negy & Woods, 1992). *Length of time* in the mainstream society predicted stronger mainstream cultural orientation across Studies 1 and 2 (see Ward et al., 1998), but, interestingly, was not associated with either decreased or increased connection with one's heritage culture (and did not show any associations with acculturation variables in first-generation immigrants in Study 3). It is noteworthy that this particular result contrasts with previous findings (Berry et al., 2006; Berry & Hou, 2021; Hou et al., 2018) that showed a link between length of residence and generational status on the one hand, and assimilation and separation preferences on the other; future research should look to explore the characteristics that may shape this relationship (e.g., geographical origin of the heritage country, cultural distance between heritage and host country).

In terms of perceived cultural distance and dissimilarity, *perceived honour cultural distance* emerged as a significant negative predictor of heritage cultural orientations in both Studies 1 and 2, but did not show any associations with mainstream cultural orientation across both studies. Interestingly, we found a different set of associations for *perceived general cultural distance*, which predicted weaker mainstream cultural orientation and better well-being only in Study 1. These findings suggest that it may be worth distinguishing between immigrants' perceptions of distance between heritage and mainstream cultures in terms of central cultural dimensions when examining their predictive role in acculturation outcomes (see Demes & Geeraert, 2014). Finally, *perceived visual dissimilarity* was a significant predictor of all acculturation variables in Study 1, with higher perceived physical dissimilarity predicting weaker mainstream and higher heritage cultural orientations and greater acculturative stress.

Overall, our findings add to the existing literature on factors predicting acculturation in mainstream societies and suggest that the pattern of associations between these predictors and acculturation outcomes may depend partly on how variables are measured (e.g., general perceived cultural distance or distance perceived on specific cultural dimensions) as well as on the interplay of specific groups of immigrants and the acculturative context under study (e.g., as reflected in visual dissimilarity).

Contributions, limitations and future directions

Our research contributes to the scarce literature on the relationship between honour and acculturation and extends the limited evidence on the role of honour in group contexts. It also adds to the growing research on cultural distance, both in psychology (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Demes & Geeraert, 2014; Muthukrishna et al., 2020) and related disciplines (Wimmer & Soehl, 2014), by introducing cultural distance on honour-related dimensions as an innovative way of tapping into perceptions of differences between heritage and mainstream cultures. Moreover, we avoided taking a 'one size fits all' approach (Schwartz et al., 2010) and examined acculturation patterns for first- and second-generation immigrants separately. We also exploratorily studied the role of cultural proximity of one's heritage culture to the mainstream culture in the study variables. Finally, our research adds to the literature on predictors of acculturation by providing further insight into the role of intrapersonal and group-based factors in immigrants' cultural orientation and well-being.

Yet, our research only scratches the surface regarding the link between honour and acculturation, and it is important that research continues to study this link by focusing on other aspects of the acculturation experience and by capturing its complexity in a more comprehensive manner. For example, we conducted cross-sectional studies, which did not allow us to capture the role of honour in the dynamic processes involved in acculturation concerning the change and adjustment immigrants undergo as they interact with groups of the mainstream society; longitudinal designs would help address this gap (Brown & Zagefka, 2011; Kashima & Abu-Rayya, 2014). In addition, we did not attend to the ecological characteristics of acculturative contexts (e.g., immigration policies, severity of acculturative stressors [e.g., institutional racism, hate crimes]), characteristics that could be relevant to understanding the relationship between honour and cultural orientations (Ward & Geeraert, 2016). We also limited our examination to a subset of predictors relevant to acculturation and individual acculturation outcomes by focusing on immigrants' cultural orientation and well-being; yet acculturation manifests itself in a variety of different outcomes including more social and economic outcomes (e.g., inter-marriage, socio-economic mobility, quality of intergroup relations). Some of these predictors (e.g., religiosity, perceived visual similarity, SES) were measured using single items – a potential limitation that could be addressed by employing multi-item scales for these predictors in future studies. Furthermore, in the current studies we measured honour as concerns and gendered codes. Studying the link between honour in its other forms (e.g., as values [see Yao et al., 2017] or ideologies [see Barnes et al., 2012]) and acculturation would shed further light on the role of honour in immigrant integration. Finally, we treated honour as a predictor rather than a consequence in the acculturation process. It is possible that immigrants' experiences with the mainstream groups may shape the extent to which they hold onto the heritage value systems that position honour as a core concern and value (Wimmer, 2013). It is thus important for future research to consider the bidirectional relationship between honour and acculturation.

It is also important to note that our findings originate from the UK and Canada, two multicultural contexts where migrant groups arguably have ample opportunities to practice ways of life associated with their heritage cultures relative to other immigrant-receiving societies and where immigration may attract different type of groups (e.g., more educated) when compared with other immigrant-receiving countries (e.g., Germany, France). It remains to be examined if current findings replicate in more homogenous and less welcoming societies which would help consider the interactive nature of immigrant and host community relations (see Bourhis et al., 1997). It is also worth considering in greater depth the (mis)match (or lower/higher cultural distance) between immigrants and the host country in terms

of distinct characteristics (e.g., religiosity, honour background) to examine the role it can play in shaping the acculturation process and individual well-being (see Kirchner-Häusler et al., 2024). Finally, we would like to note that in Studies 1 and 2, our samples sizes were small, and groups consisted mostly of first-generation immigrant women, imbalances that we attempted to rectify in Study 3 by recruiting a greater sample and a comparable number of men and women from both first- and second-generation immigrants of a larger age range. Future studies examining honour-acculturation link using bigger and representative samples including individuals from different life stages would help test the generalizability of the findings in more diverse samples.

CONCLUSION

In a world of increasing mobility where members of cultural groups that vary in terms of values, norms, and practices interact more than ever, it is easy to fall back on stereotypes and assumptions to characterize groups and to draw inaccurate conclusions about their social behaviour and underlying motivations. Social science research can help to demystify assumptions that cloud the ways we perceive other cultural groups and make sense of their similarities and differences. In this research, we started studying the widespread assumption that honour as a cultural value may act as a barrier in immigrants' acculturation experiences in western societies by investigating the predictive role of honour in immigrants' cultural orientations and well-being and found that honour plays a much less significant role in immigrant acculturation than has been commonly assumed.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Ayse K. Uskul: Conceptualization; investigation; methodology; formal analysis; data curation; writing – review and editing; writing – original draft; visualization. **Jorida Cila:** Visualization; writing – original draft; writing – review and editing; data curation; formal analysis. **Pelin Gul:** Writing – original draft; writing – review and editing; formal analysis. **Alexander Kirchner-Häusler:** Conceptualization; writing – original draft; writing – review and editing; validation; formal analysis; data curation. **Barbora Hubená:** Data curation; formal analysis.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Deborah Ogunyemi and Anna Kwofie for their assistance in data collection in Study 1.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

Authors declare no conflict of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All data files will be made available for public access upon acceptance of the manuscript.

ORCID

Ayse K. Uskul  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8013-9931>

Pelin Gul  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1856-2744>

REFERENCES

- Abu-Lughod, L. (2011). Seductions of the 'honor crime'. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 22(1), 17–63. <https://doi.org/10.1215/10407391-1218238>
- Adler, N. E., Castellazzo, G., Epel, E. S., & Ickovics, J. R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy white women. *Health Psychology*, 19(6), 586–587. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.19.6.586>
- Arends-Toth, J., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2007). Acculturation attitudes: A comparison of measurement methods. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(7), 1462–1488. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00222>
- Ayers, E. L. (1984). *Vengeance and justice: Crime and punishment in the 19th century American south*. Oxford University Press.

- Barnes, C. D., Brown, R. P., & Osterman, L. L. (2012). Don't tread on me: Masculine honor ideology in the U.S. and militant responses to terrorism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(8), 1018–1029. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212443383>
- Benet-Martínez, V. (2003). *The Riverside Acculturation Stress Inventory (RAStI): Development and psychometric properties*. Technical Report. Department of Psychology, University of California at Riverside.
- Benet-Martínez, V., & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural identity integration (BII): Components and psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality*, 73(4), 1015–1050. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00337.x>
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 9–25). Westview.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology. An International Review*, 46(1), 5–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026999497378467>
- Berry, J. W. (2017). Acculturation. In *Reference module in neuroscience and biobehavioral psychology*. Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809324-5.05455-9>
- Berry, J. W., & Hou, F. (2021). Immigrant acculturation and wellbeing across generations and settlement contexts in Canada. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 33(1–2), 140–153.
- Berry, J. W., Phinney, J. S., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, P. (2006). Immigrant youth: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 55(3), 303–332.
- Bierwaczzonek, K., & Waldzus, S. (2016). Socio-cultural factors as antecedents of cross-cultural adaptation in expatriates, international students, and migrants: A review. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47(6), 767–817. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116644526>
- Birman, D., Simon, C. D., Chan, W. Y., & Tran, N. (2014). A life domains perspective on acculturation and psychological adjustment: A study of refugees from the former Soviet Union. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 53, 60–72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-013-9614-2>
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senecal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32, 369–386. <https://doi.org/10.1080/002075997400629>
- Brown, R., & Zagefka, H. (2011). The dynamics of acculturation: An intergroup perspective. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 44, pp. 129–184). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385522-0.00003-2>
- Chiswick, B. R., & Miller, P. W. (2005). Linguistic distance: A quantitative measure of the distance between English and other languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 26, 1–11.
- Cross, S. E., & Uskul, A. K. (2022). The pursuit of honor: Novel contexts, varied approaches, and new developments. In *Advances in culture and psychology*. Oxford University Press. <https://kar.kent.ac.uk/81613/>
- Cross, S. E., Uskul, A. K., Gerçek-Swing, B., Sunbay, Z., Alözkan, C., Günsoy, C., Ataca, B., & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z. (2014). Cultural prototypes and dimensions of honor. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40(2), 232–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213510323>
- Demes, K. A., & Geeraert, N. (2014). Measures matter: Scales for adaptation, cultural distance, and acculturation orientation revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 45(1), 91–109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113487590>
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2009). New measures of well-being: Flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(2), 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y>
- Eberl, J.-M., Meltzer, C. E., Heidenreich, T., Herrero, B., Theorin, N., Lind, F., Berganza, R., Boomgaarden, H. G., Schemer, C., & Strömbäck, J. (2018). The European media discourse on immigration and its effects: A literature review. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 42(3), 207–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2018.1497452>
- Ewing, K. P. (2008). *Stolen honor: Stigmatizing Muslim men in Berlin*. Stanford University Press.
- Friedman, M., & Saroglou, V. (2010). Religiosity, psychological acculturation to the host culture, self-esteem and depressive symptoms among stigmatized and non-stigmatized religious immigrant groups in Western Europe. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 32(2), 185–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973531003738387>
- Galchenko, I., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2007). The role of perceived cultural distance in the acculturation of exchange students in Russia. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31(2), 181–197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.03.004>
- Geeraert, N., & Demoulin, S. (2013). Acculturative stress or resilience? A longitudinal multilevel analysis of sojourners' stress and self-esteem. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44(8), 1241–1262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113478656>
- Gill, A. (Ed.). (2010). Reconfiguring 'honour'-based violence as a form of gendered violence. In M. M. Idriss & T. Abass (Eds.), *Honour, violence, women and Islam* (1st ed.). Routledge-Cavendish. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203846988>
- González-Castro, J. L., & Ubillos, S. (2011). Determinants of psychological distress among migrants from Ecuador and Romania in a Spanish City. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 57, 30–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764009347336>
- Gregg, G. S. (2005). *The Middle East: A cultural psychology*. Oxford University Press.
- Guerra, V. M., Giner-Sorolla, R., Vasiljevic, M., & Rodriguez Mosquera, P. M. (2013). The importance of honor concerns across eight countries. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 16, 298–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430212463451>
- Hague, G., Gill, A. K., & Begikhani, N. (2013). 'Honour'-based violence and Kurdish communities: Moving towards action and change in Iraqi Kurdistan and the UK. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 22, 383–396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2012.708825>

- Hearn, J., Husu, L., Strid, S., & Verloo, M. (2016). Interrogating violence against women and state violence policy: Gendered intersectionalities and the quality of policy in The Netherlands, Sweden and the UK. *Current Sociology*, 64(4), 551–567. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921166639220>
- Hou, F., Schellenberg, G., & Berry, J. (2018). Patterns and determinants of immigrants' sense of belonging to Canada and their source country. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 41(9), 1612–1631.
- Kashima, E. S., & Abu-Rayya, H. M. (2014). Longitudinal associations of cultural distance with psychological well-being among Australian immigrants from 49 countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 45(4), 587–600. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113519857>
- Kirchner-Häusler, A., Schönbrodt, F. D., Uskul, A. K., Vignoles, V. L., Rodríguez-Bailón, R., Castillo, V. A., Cross, S. E., Gezici-Yalçın, M., Harb, C., Husnu, S., Ishii, K., Karamaouna, P., Kafetsios, K., Kateri, E., Matamoros-Lima, J., Miniesy, R., Na, J., Özkan, Z., Pagliaro, S., ... Uchida, Y. (2024). Proximal and distal honor fit and subjective well-being in the Mediterranean region. *Journal of Personality*, 92, 38–54. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12803>
- Korteweg, A. C. (2014). 'Honour killing' in the immigration context: Multiculturalism and the racialization of violence against women. *Politikon*, 41(2), 183–208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02589346.2013.866186>
- Korteweg, A. C., & Yurdakul, G. (2009). Islam, gender, and immigrant integration: Boundary drawing in discourses on honour killing in The Netherlands and Germany. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(2), 218–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870802065218>
- Korteweg, A. C., & Yurdakul, G. (2010). *Religion, culture and the politicization of honour-related violence: A critical analysis of media and policy debates in Western Europe and North America*. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- Lalonde, R. N., Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1992). The process of social identification for visible immigrant women in a multicultural context. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23(1), 25–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022192231002>
- Leung, A. K., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within- and between-culture variation: Individual differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(3), 507–526. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022151>
- López Zafra, E. (2007). Elaboración de una escala para medir cultura del honor [Creating a scale to measure culture of honor]. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 22(1), 31–42. <https://doi.org/10.1174/02134740779697520>
- Lopez-Zafra, E., & El Ghoudani, K. (2014). The influence of culture of honor and emotional intelligence in the acculturation of Moroccan immigrant women. *Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 17(e49), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2014.53>
- Mahfud, Y., Badae, C., & N'gbala, A. (2015). Cultural distance and prejudice against immigrants in France: The role of integration models. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale*, 28, 53–79.
- Muthukrishna, M., Bell, A. V., Henrich, J., Curtin, C. M., Gedranovich, A., McInerney, J., & Thue, B. (2020). Beyond western, educated, industrial, rich, and democratic (WEIRD) psychology: Measuring and mapping scales of cultural and psychological distance. *Psychological Science*, 31(6), 678–701. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620916782>
- Naumann, L. P., Benet-Martínez, V., & Espinoza, P. (2017). Correlates of political ideology among U.S.-born Mexican Americans: Cultural identification, acculturation attitudes, and socioeconomic status. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(1), 20–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616662124>
- Negy, C., & Woods, D. J. (1992). A note on the relationship between acculturation and socioeconomic status. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 14(2), 248–251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07399863920142004>
- Pitt-Rivers, J. (1965). Honour and social status. In *Honour and shame: The values of Mediterranean society* (pp. 19–78). Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
- Razack, S. (2008). *Casting out: The eviction of Muslims from western law & politics*. University of Toronto Press.
- Rodríguez Mosquera, P. M. (2011). Masculine and feminine honor codes. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 26, 63–72. <https://doi.org/10.1174/021347411794078499>
- Rodríguez Mosquera, P. M. (2016). On the importance of family, morality, masculine and feminine honor for theory and research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 10(8), 431–442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12262>
- Rodríguez Mosquera, P. M. (2018). Cultural concerns: How valuing social-image shapes social emotion. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 29(1), 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2017.1412180>
- Rodríguez Mosquera, P. M., Manstead, A. S. R., & Fischer, A. H. (2002). Honor in the Mediterranean and northern Europe. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(1), 16–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033001002>
- Rodríguez Mosquera, P. M., Tan, L. X., & Saleem, F. (2014). Shared burdens, personal costs: On the emotional and social consequences of family honor. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 45(3), 400–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113511299>
- Rudmin, F. (2009). Constructs, measurements and models of acculturation and acculturative stress. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33(2), 106–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.12.001>
- Ryder, A. G., Alden, L. E., & Paulhus, D. L. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(1), 49–65. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.1.49>
- Schwartz, S. J., Unger, J. B., Zamboanga, B. L., & Szapocznik, J. (2010). Rethinking the concept of acculturation: Implications for theory and research. *American Psychologist*, 65(4), 237–251. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019330>

- Statistics Canada. (2019). *Immigrant population by selected places of birth, admission category and period of immigration, Canada, provinces and territories, census metropolitan areas and areas outside of census metropolitan areas, 2016 Census*. <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/dv-vd/imm/index-eng.cfm>
- Stewart, F. H. (1994). *Honor*. University of Chicago Press.
- Świdrak, J., Kryś, K., Kwiatkowska, A., Kosakowska-Berezecka, N., & Gjerstad, B. (2019). Polish honor and Norwegian dignity: Life satisfaction, acculturation, and self-worth. *Acta de Investigación Psicológica*, *9*(3), 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.22201/fpsi.20074719e.2019.3.316>
- Termer, R. L. (2010). To specify or single out: Should we use the term 'honor killing'? *Muslim World Journal of Human Rights*, *7*(1). <https://doi.org/10.2202/1554-4419.1162>
- Uskul, A. K., & Cross, S. E. (2019). The social and cultural psychology of honour: What have we learned from researching honour in Turkey? *European Review of Social Psychology*, *30*(1), 39–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2018.1542903>
- Uskul, A. K., Cross, S., & Alözkan, C. (2023). The role of honour in intrapersonal, interpersonal and intergroup processes. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *17*, e12719.
- Uskul, A. K., Cross, S. E., Gunsoy, C., & Gul, P. (2019). Cultures of honor. In D. Cohen & S. Kitayama (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 793–821). The Guilford Press.
- Uskul, A. K., Cross, S. E., Sunbay, Z., Gercek-Swing, B., & Ataca, B. (2012). Honor bound: The cultural construction of honor in Turkey and the northern United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *43*(7), 1131–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022111422258>
- Uskul, A. K., Lalonde, R. N., & Konanur, S. (2011). The role of culture in intergenerational value discrepancies regarding intergroup dating. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *42*, 1165–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110383311>
- Vignoles, V. L., Kirchner-Häusler, A., Uskul, A. K., Cross, S. E., Na, J., Uchida, Y., Rodriguez-Bailón, R., Bossom, I. R. L., Castillo, V. A., Gezici Yağcı, M., Harb, C., Husnu, S., Ishii, K., Karamaouna, P., Kafetsios, K., Kateri, E., Matamoros-Lima, J., Miniesy, R., Na, J., ... Wohl, M. J. A. (2024). Are Mediterranean societies 'cultures of honor'? Prevalence and implications of a cultural logic of honor across three world regions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. (Manuscript submitted).
- Ward, C., & Geeraert, N. (2016). Advancing acculturation theory and research: The acculturation process in its ecological context. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *8*, 98–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.09.021>
- Ward, C., Okura, Y., Kennedy, A., & Kojima, T. (1998). The U-curve on trial: A longitudinal study of psychological and socio-cultural adjustment during cross-cultural transition. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *3*, 277–292. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(98\)00008-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(98)00008-X)
- Ward, C. A., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Wimmer, A. (2013). *Ethnic boundary making: Institutions, power, networks*. Oxford University Press.
- Wimmer, A., & Soehl, T. (2014). Blocked acculturation: Cultural heterodoxy among Europe's immigrants. *American Journal of Sociology*, *120*(1), 146–186. <https://doi.org/10.1086/677207>
- Yao, J., Ramirez, M. J., Brett, J., Aslani, S., & Semnani-Azad, Z. (2017). A measurement model for dignity, face, and honor cultural norms. *Management and Organization Review*, *13*, 713–738. <https://doi.org/10.1017/mor.2017.49>
- Yoo, H. C., Gee, G. C., & Takeuchi, D. (2009). Discrimination and health among Asian American immigrants: Disentangling racial from language discrimination. *Social Science & Medicine*, *68*(4), 726–732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.11.013>
- Yoon, E., Chang, C.-T., Kim, S., Clawson, A., Cleary, S. E., Hansen, M., Bruner, J. P., Chan, T. K., & Gomes, A. M. (2013). A meta-analysis of acculturation/enculturation and mental health. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *60*, 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030652>
- Yurdakul, G., & Korteweg, A. C. (2020). State responsibility and differential inclusion: Addressing honor-based violence in The Netherlands and Germany. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, *27*, 187–211. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxz004>

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

How to cite this article: Uskul, A. K., Cila, J., Gul, P., Kirchner-Häusler, A., & Hubená, B. (2024). Honour, acculturation and well-being: Evidence from the UK and Canada. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *00*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12751>