In 2009, a 20-year old woman, Noor Almaleki, was killed by her father, in Arizona, United States. The Iraqi father wanted Noor to act according to their traditions, but she chose to act like a “Westerner.” She refused an arranged marriage and moved into her own apartment, which brought constant disapproval and harassment by her father (Lee Myers, 2011). Another reason for her father’s reaction was Noor’s photo on the Internet with her male friends. The photo incident was described by one of Noor’s friends as “Nothing salacious. Nothing risqué. Nothing out of the ordinary. Young people posing for a photograph” (Freed & Leach, 2012, para. 31). Yet it was unacceptable to her father. Likewise, an Internet photo recently caused outrage in Morocco. A teenage couple was arrested because their Facebook photo showed them kissing (“Morocco Teens Held”, 2013). The lawsuit charged the couple with breaching public decency, because the photos “deeply affect[ed] Moroccan education and culture, and upset people’s feelings” (“Three Teenagers to Face Trial”, 2013).

One of the common elements in these incidents was the actors’ culture. In both cases, the actors came from the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, which hosts honor cultures such as Iraq, Morocco, and Turkey (e.g., Gregg, 2005). The other common element was the trigger, namely a potentially improper picture in social media such as a picture of a woman with her male friends or of a kissing couple. These pictures may not be perceived as improper by members of non-honor cultures, such as northern United States or Western Europe. In traditional honor cultures, however, they may threaten one’s social reputation, because they can evoke negative impressions about the person. Moreover, in those cultures, the threat may extend from the actors to their families (Bagli & Sev’er, 2003); as a result, their reputation must be publically restored, sometimes through aggressive means (Cohen & Nisbett, 1994).

In this paper, we examine culture, honor endorsement, and self-expression in social media. We address three broad questions: Compared with members of non-honor cultures, are people from honor cultures more willing to avoid certain types of self-expression in social media, because they may threaten their honor? Are women from honor cultures more cautious about this issue than men? What is the role of individual differences in honor endorsement in social media behavior?

HONOR

Honor can be defined as “high respect; esteem” (Oxford dictionaries, n.d.), but it is a complex term that has different associations and implications in different cultures (Wikan, 2008). In traditional honor societies, which are mostly located in the MENA region, the Mediterranean, and southern United States, society puts great emphasis on social respect (e.g., Gregg, 2005; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). In those cultures, a person’s honor is determined not only by one’s own perception of esteem but also by other people’s opinions (Bagli & Sev’er, 2003;
Peristiany, 1965). In non-honor or dignity cultures, in contrast, honor is a private matter, and the actions or perceptions of others do not affect one’s esteem as much as in honor cultures. In dignity cultures, one’s esteem cannot be taken away by others through insults or disrespect; in contrast, esteem is primarily internal (Leung & Cohen, 2011).

A defining feature of the honor concept in traditional honor cultures is that it can be easily lost and difficult to regain (Stewart, 1994). Losing honor brings a bad social reputation and shame, not only to the person, but also to their family (Bagli & Sev’er, 2003). Therefore, compared with members of dignity cultures, members of honor cultures and individuals who strongly endorse honor values experience stronger negative emotions (e.g., anger and shame) as a result of honor threats (IJzerman, van Dijk, & Gallucci, 2007; Rodriguez Mosquera, Manstead, & Fischer, 2002). Moreover, they tend to respond more aggressively to the source of the threat (Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle, & Schwarz, 1996).

**Turkey and the Northern United States**

Turkey is considered an honor culture (e.g., Bagli & Sev’er, 2003), whereas the northern United States is a dignity culture (Leung & Cohen, 2011). Studies comparing these two cultures have revealed differences in the meaning and impact of honor. In a study using a prototype approach to clarify the concept of honor, Turks generated a greater number and more differentiated honor features than northern Americans (Cross et al., 2014). This suggests that honor is a more complex concept in Turkey compared with the northern United States. Studies examining the reactions to honor-related situations have revealed that situations generated by Turkish participants evoked stronger emotions among Turks and northern Americans, compared with situations generated by northern Americans (Uskul et al., 2014). Moreover, when one’s honor is threatened by a false accusation, Turks were more likely than northern Americans to evaluate the person who confronted the accuser more positively than the person who withdrew (Cross, Uskul, Gercek-Swing, Alozkan, & Ataca, 2012).

Cultural differences in the content and impact of honor are most prominent for issues related to honor loss. For example, in the prototype study, Turkish features of honor were more likely to focus on actions to be avoided (e.g., not telling lies) compared with northern U.S. features of honor (e.g., doing the right thing; Cross et al., 2014). Moreover, honor-attacking situations generated in Turkey (e.g., false accusations) had greater perceived impact on close others, compared with the situations generated by northern Americans (e.g., attacking one’s views). In contrast, this cultural difference was not found for honor-enhancing situations (e.g., being an honest person; Uskul, Cross, Sunbay, Gercek-Swing, & Ataca, 2012). In light of these findings, we expected that the difference in the social media behaviors of Turkish and northern U.S. participants would be greater for potentially honor-threatening compared with honor-enhancing situations.

**Honor and Women**

In honor cultures, the penalty for not behaving “honorably” is greater for women than men (e.g., Mojab & Abdo, 2004). Every year, honor killings—the murder of a woman by her male relatives because of her dishonorable acts—take the lives of thousands of women (United Nations Population Fund, 2000). Honor killings mainly occur in Western Asia, North Africa, and South Asia, but they are also observed among immigrant populations in the northern United States and Western Europe (Kulczycki & Windle, 2011).

The most common motives for honor killings are potential “scandals,” such as beliefs that a woman has engaged in premarital sex or infidelity (Kulczycki & Windle, 2011). The reason that these behaviors may be perceived as scandalous and as a threat to honor lies in the two dimensions of “honorable manhood”: To prove their honor, men need to challenge other men, but they also need to “control, conceal and protect” their women (Gregg, 2005, p. 103). Likewise, women in honor cultures need to be sexually modest or chaste to be considered honorable (e.g., Pope, 2012). When a woman engages in potentially improper behaviors, it implies that her husband or male relatives failed to “control” her. As a result, not only the woman but also her whole family loses honor. Therefore, in the present work, we investigated whether in honor cultures, endorsement of honor values more strongly predicted women’s social media behaviors than men’s, especially when the behaviors are “potentially improper.”

**WHY FACEBOOK?**

Since its foundation in 2004, Facebook has been one of the most popular social networking sites (SNSs), especially for young people (e.g., Hargittai, 2008). Compared with the offline world, people tend to share more information on Facebook, such as their interests, pictures, or status updates about their feelings or activities (e.g., Muise, Christofides, & Desmenerais, 2009). People use Facebook and other SNSs to satisfy particular needs (Anderson, Fagan, Woodnutt, & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2012). Some of those needs and reasons for social media use and for participating in groups on Facebook include information seeking, in other words, learning about events, sharing information about oneself, and posting/looking at pictures; friendship needs such as keeping in touch with friends and locating old friends; connection needs or making new friends and feeling connected; and self-status seeking, such as peer pressure to participate or making oneself look “cool” (Bonds-Raacke & Raacke, 2010; Park, Kee, & Valenzuela, 2009).

Regardless of the reason to use the website, a person’s Facebook profile is public to the people in their friend list (e.g., Boyd & Ellison, 2007). In other words, the social life and the information displayed there can be judged by others or can provide material for gossip, especially if the content is inappropriate. Depending on the preferred privacy settings, Facebook can be a great source of information about people, and even employers examine their potential employees’ Facebook page before they hire (“37 Percent of Employers Use Facebook”, 2012). Not surprisingly, computer scientists have developed online reputation management services such as “Reppler” that look for and warn users against potentially problematic content, such as inappropriate language in their own or their friends’ postings related to them (Golijan, 2011).
Inappropriate material is found not only in explicit, verbal statements such as status updates but also in implicit, non-verbal displays such as pictures (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008). The decision about appropriateness may be difficult for non-verbal information revealed by pictures, except for extreme cases. Whereas most people would agree that posting a pornographic image on their Facebook profile would be improper, there may be less agreement on the propriety of a picture taken at a late-night party. Furthermore, pictures constitute an increasingly greater part of Facebook profiles, such that in 2011, the number of profile pictures uploaded to Facebook was three times the number in 2006 (Turnbull, 2013). For these reasons, in the present research, we focused on pictures to examine cultural differences in Facebook behavior.

Facebook and Psychology

Social networking sites and Facebook in particular have increasingly been the focus of psychological research (Anderson et al., 2012). For example, studies of personality and Facebook use found that people who were high in extraversion, low in agreeableness, and high in openness had more Facebook friends and photos and spent more time on the website than others (Kuo & Tang, 2014). Moreover, by reviewing a person’s website, people could form accurate impressions about the website owner’s personality (Vazire & Gosling, 2004). To form those impressions, people primarily relied on profile pictures (Ivcevic & Ambady, 2012). There has also been cross-cultural research, predominantly comparing northern United States and East Asian users (e.g., Cho, 2010; Jackson & Wang, 2013). To our knowledge, however, there is no study that compared users from honor and dignity cultures.

THE PRESENT STUDIES

We focused on Facebook in the current work because people try to construct an identity on this website, and they do it in front of virtual others (Zhao et al., 2008). Because of this public nature of Facebook, information on the website can be a source of gossip. In honor cultures, gossip is a threat to public reputation because it helps scandals spread (e.g., Awwad, 2001); in those cultures, “reputation matters more than the truth” (Wikan, 2008; p. 17). The wide usage of Facebook in both Turkey and northern United States was another reason for choosing it as our focus. On the basis of the number of Facebook users, Turkey ranks seventh and United States ranks first in the world (Nierhoff, 2013).

In three studies, we investigated picture posting intentions and actual behaviors of Turkish and northern U.S. Facebook users. We expected that members of the two cultures would not differ in creating a positive image by posting honor-enhancing pictures on Facebook (e.g., achievement-related pictures). In contrast, compared with northern Americans, we expected Turkish participants to be less willing to post and let others see pictures that could be perceived as honor threatening in that culture (e.g., at a party; with their boyfriend/girlfriend). Leung and Cohen (2011) suggested that cross-cultural research should also focus on individual differences among the members of cultures, because there may be variation in their level of endorsement of the cultural values. Whereas many members may strongly endorse particular cultural values, there may also be others who reject them. Moreover, individual differences may predict different behaviors in different cultures. Therefore, in this work, we also measured participants’ honor endorsement. We expected that honor endorsement would positively predict the willingness to post honor-enhancing Facebook pictures for both cultural groups, whereas it would negatively predict the willingness to post honor-threatening Facebook pictures primarily for Turkish participants, especially Turkish women.

STUDY 1

In this study, Turkish and northern U.S. participants read descriptions of pictures and indicated whether they would post them on their Facebook page. We expected that compared with northern Americans, Turkish participants would be equally willing to post an achievement picture (a picture of me giving a presentation; Hypothesis 1a) but less willing to post a potentially improper picture of themselves (a picture of me with my boyfriend/girlfriend; Hypothesis 1b).

Method

Participants

Participants were European-American undergraduates at Iowa State University, United States (n = 49, 33 women), and Turkish undergraduates at Boğaziçi University, Turkey (n = 35, 24 women). They received course credit for participation and were recruited through departmental participant pools.

Materials and Procedure

Participants read the following picture descriptions and indicated whether they would or would not post the pictures on their Facebook page by selecting yes or no: A picture of me giving a presentation (achievement picture), a picture of me with my boyfriend/girlfriend (potentially improper picture), and a picture of beautiful scenery (neutral picture).1 We emphasized that even if they did not have a picture like the one described, they should imagine what they would do if they had one. Moreover, we asked them to imagine that they could not hide their picture from anyone in their friend list. Finally, participants provided us with their gender, age, and ethnicity. Materials were translated and back translated by research assistants who were fluent in English and Turkish.

Results and Discussion

Compared with northern Americans (M = 19.14, SD = 1.10), Turkish participants were significantly older (M = 20.49, 1 Participants only saw the descriptions in italics, not the variable names. We named the picture with boyfriend/girlfriend as "potentially improper" just to make it more clear that such pictures may have a greater likelihood to be perceived as improper in traditional honor cultures than in dignity cultures. We acknowledge that there are Turkish people who would not find such pictures improper.
SD = 1.62), t(82) = 4.26, p < .001, d = 0.97, 95% CI = [0.71, 1.97]. Therefore, we controlled for age in our analyses. Consistent with Hypothesis 1a, a binary logistic regression analysis revealed that Turkish participants (57.1%) were equally willing to post their achievement picture compared with northern Americans (34.7%), Wald = 0.04, p = .83, exp (B) = 0.88, 95% CI [exp(B)] = [0.27, 2.88]. We conducted a \( \chi^2 \) test instead of logistic regression for Hypothesis 1b, because of the small sample size in some of the cells.\(^2\) As expected, Turks (71.4%) were less willing to post their potentially improper picture compared with northern Americans (100%), \( \chi^2(1, N=84) = 15.89, p < .001, 95\% \) CI [−0.46, −0.16]. We did not find a cultural difference for the neutral picture, Wald = 1.25, \( p = .26, \exp(B) = 4.21, 95\% \) CI [exp(B)] = [0.34, 52.03].\(^3\)

As expected, Study 1 revealed that compared with northern Americans, Turkish participants were equally willing to post their achievement picture on Facebook but less willing to post a picture with their boyfriend/girlfriend. In honor cultures, posting the latter picture on Facebook may be perceived as potentially improper; in contrast, members of dignity cultures may think that it is completely appropriate and harmless. Study 1 examined the willingness to post different types of pictures regardless of the audience, but in Facebook, one can exclude some viewers from the content of their profiles. Would Turkish and northern U.S. participants differ in their willingness to let others view their pictures? More importantly, Study 1 did not investigate whether honor endorsement was the underlying reason for picture posting preferences. Would Turkish participants who highly endorsed honor values be less willing to post their potentially improper pictures on Facebook? Study 2 examines these additional questions.

**STUDY 2**

As in Study 1, we expected that Turks would be equally willing to post achievement pictures (Hypothesis 1a) but less willing to post potentially improper pictures on Facebook compared with northern Americans (Hypothesis 1b). In addition, we examined whether members of the two cultural groups differed in their willingness to let others view their pictures. In line with the literature, we did not expect a cultural difference for achievement pictures (honor enhancing; Hypothesis 2a); however, culture was expected to make a difference for potentially improper pictures (honor threatening), especially for the willingness to allow relatives to view them (Hypothesis 2b).

\(^2\)Age could not be controlled in the \( \chi^2 \) analysis.

\(^3\)Throughout the paper, we explain gender effects in the footnotes unless gender interacted with culture or honor endorsement. In this study, gender was not a significant predictor for the likelihood to post the achievement picture, Wald = 0.02, \( p = .88, \exp(B) = 1.11, 95\% \) CI [exp(B)] = [0.29, 4.28], nor did it interact with culture, Wald = 0.17, \( p = .68, \exp(B) = 0.64, 95\% \) CI [exp(B)] = [0.08, 5.29]. For the potentially improper picture, the cultural difference was significant for both genders and in the same direction (significantly fewer Turks said yes than Americans); however, it was greater for women, \( \chi^2(1, N=57) = 9.22, p < .01, 95\% \) CI [−0.46, −0.10], than for men, \( \chi^2(1, N=27) = 6.83, p < .01, 95\% \) CI [−0.60, −0.10]. For the neutral picture, gender was a significant predictor, Wald = 4.34, \( p < .05, \exp(B) = 12.33, 95\% \) CI [exp(B)] = [1.22, 124.39], such that women (94.7%) were more willing to post it than men (66.7%); however, it did not interact with culture, Wald = 0.04, \( p = .85, \exp(B) = 1.36, 95\% \) CI [exp(B)] = [0.06, 29.61]. Compared with dignity cultures, in honor cultures, dishonorable behaviors of individuals have greater negative impact on their own and on their families’ reputation (Uskul et al., 2012). Therefore, even if Facebook users in honor cultures post some potentially improper pictures, they may be more willing to hide them from others, compared with users from dignity cultures. Moreover, in honor cultures, relatives may be very aware of and sensitive to each other’s behaviors to prevent potential reputation loss as a family. This could make people anticipate that their relatives might not like their improper pictures to be posted on Facebook, because they would perceive them as inappropriate and as potentially damaging to their family’s reputation. In contrast, people may think that their friends would be less likely to perceive those pictures as inappropriate compared with relatives. Therefore, in this work, we expected Turkish participants to be less willing than northern Americans to let others see their improper pictures, but this cultural difference would be greater for the willingness to allow relatives as opposed to friends (Hypothesis 2b).

More importantly, we investigated whether the endorsement of honor values could explain the expected cultural differences. We hypothesized that honor would positively predict the willingness to post and let others view one’s achievement pictures in both cultural groups, because of its emphasis on positive social image (Hypothesis 3a). Owing to the risk of getting a negative social reputation, however, we expected that honor values would negatively predict the willingness to post and let others (especially relatives) view one’s improper pictures primarily in Turkey. Given the emphasis on women’s sexual modesty in honor cultures, we also hypothesized that this negative relation would be stronger for Turkish women than Turkish men (Hypothesis 3b).

In all analyses, we controlled for modesty and upbringing. “Honor- and-modesty” is one of the value systems that characterize MENA societies, and modesty is an alternative way of gaining honor if the person lacks the strength to use assertive methods (Gregg, 2005). Moreover, immorality may predict one’s self-expression style on Facebook. For example, narcissism predicts greater activity and self-enhancing behaviors on SNSs (Buffardi & Campbell, 2008). Upbring (i.e., coming from a rural versus urban background) may be another confounding variable in the relation of honor values and Facebook behavior. Because honor cultures are typically more rural than non-honor cultures, rurality tends to be controlled in studies examining these cultures (Barnes, Brown, & Tamborski, 2012). Furthermore, having a rural upbringing may negatively predict levels of self-expression on Facebook for reasons other than honor endorsement. For example, before coming to college, students with a rural background might have less access to technology and less familiarity with the Internet, especially in Turkey. Thus, controlling for upbringing and modesty allows us to focus on the role of social esteem pursuit in these processes.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants were European-American undergraduates at Iowa State University, United States (\( n = 143, 85 \) women), and
Turkish undergraduates at Boğaziçi University, Turkey \( (n=229, 142 \text{ women}) \), who did not take part in Study 1. Six participants from the northern United States and 16 from the Turkish sample were excluded from the analyses because they were not active Facebook users (i.e., they logged on to Facebook less than once a week). Moreover, one participant from Turkey did not provide answers for the main outcome variables (i.e., the willingness to post pictures on Facebook) and was excluded from the analyses. The resulting sample size was 137 (84 women) for the northern United States and 212 (136 women) for Turkey. Participants received course credit for participation and were recruited through departmental participant pools. Throughout the results, degrees of freedom varied because of missing data.

**Materials**

Participants indicated their willingness to post achievement pictures (a picture of me giving a presentation and a picture of me accepting an academic award), potentially improper pictures (a picture of me with my opposite sex friends\(^4\)), and neutral pictures (a picture of beautiful scenery and a picture of a famous person I like) on their Facebook page. They indicated their willingness on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely). Bivariate correlations showed that pictures within categories were significantly and positively correlated with each other in both cultural groups, \( r_{\text{Achievement}} = .53 \), \( r_{\text{Improper}} = .54 \), \( r_{\text{Neutral}} = .39 \), \( p < .001 \).

Participants also indicated how willing they would be to allow their relatives and friends to view their pictures. We asked this question only for the pictures for which they gave a rating other than the neutral option (i.e., 4 on the scale) in the previous willingness question.\(^5\) To prevent neutral answers for relatives and friends questions, participants used a scale from 1 (would definitely not allow) to 6 (would definitely allow).

**Scales.** Participants completed the Honor Values Scale (Rodriguez Mosquera, Fischer, Manstead, & Zaalberg, 2008), which contains statements measuring the endorsement of personal honor (e.g., to be seen as someone who deserves respect) and family honor (e.g., to defend my family from criticism). Participants indicated how important they found each statement on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely). Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) was .87 in Turkey and .78 in the northern United States.\(^6\) They also completed the Modesty Scale (Costa & McCrae, 1992), which contains 10 statements such as “I dislike being the center of attention” or “I believe I am better than others” (reverse-coded). Participants reported how accurately each statement described them on a scale of 1 (very inaccurately) to 7 (very accurately). Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) was .77 in Turkey and .80 in the northern United States.

Finally, participants completed a demographic form in which they indicated their gender, age, ethnicity, and their upbringing on a scale of 1 (very rural) to 9 (very urban). Materials were translated and back translated by research assistants who were fluent in English and Turkish.

**Procedure**

Participants indicated how frequently they logged on to Facebook and how frequently they posted something on their page, using a scale from 1 (less than once a year) to 6 (daily). After that, they read the picture descriptions and indicated how willing they would be to post each picture on their Facebook wall or in their albums. We emphasized that they should imagine what they would do, even if they did not have a picture like the one described. Next, we asked them to assume that they had actually posted the pictures and to indicate how willing they would be to let their friends and relatives view them. Then, they completed the Honor Values Scale, the Modesty Scale, and the demographic questions. Finally, we asked whether they would allow us to send them a friend request from our laboratory Facebook account so that we could examine their profiles for further analyses (reported in Study 3).

**Results**

Compared with northern Americans, Turkish participants were significantly older (\( M_{TR} = 20.17, SD = 1.24, M_{US} = 19.35, SD = 1.31 \), \( t(346) = 5.88, p < .001, d = 0.64, 95\% \ CI [0.54, 1.09] \), and posted less frequently on Facebook (\( M_{TR} = 4.23, SD = 1.18, M_{US} = 4.71, SD = 0.95 \), \( t(347) = -4.20, p < .001, d = 0.45, 95\% \ CI [-0.71, -0.26] \). Moreover, they were less modest (\( M_{TR} = 3.90, SD = 0.94, M_{US} = 4.18, SD = 0.90 \), \( t(343) = -2.76, p < .01, d = 0.30, 95\% \ CI [-0.48, -0.08] \), and more upward (\( M_{TR} = 6.68, SD = 1.98, M_{US} = 4.83, SD = 2.17 \), \( t(343) = 8.17, p < .001, d = 0.89, 95\% \ CI [1.41, 2.30] \) than northern Americans. We controlled for these variables in all analyses.\(^7\)

**Would You Post that Picture?**

We expected that Turks would be equally willing to post achievement pictures (Hypothesis 1a) but less willing to post potentially improper pictures compared with northern Americans (Hypothesis 1b). To test these hypotheses, we conducted univariate analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) for each picture type, in which we entered culture and gender as between-subjects factors, and age, posting frequency, modesty, and upbringing as covariates.

Consistent with Hypothesis 1a, people from both cultural groups were similarly willing to post their achievement

\(^4\)Unfortunately, we did not ask participants’ sexual orientation. The person has to be heterosexual for this picture to be perceived as potentially improper in Turkey. Even if the person is homosexual, however, this picture may still be perceived as potentially improper, because coming out may be less likely in honor cultures compared with dignity cultures. Hence, not knowing that the person is homosexual, others might still find “a picture with opposite sex friends” potentially improper, and this could still predict profile owners’ posting preferences.

\(^5\)We excluded the pictures, for which participants were neutral about posting, because we did not think that they would provide valuable information for the next question about audience. We did not exclude pictures that were unlikely to be posted because we wanted to capture from whom (relatives or friends) those pictures were mostly to be hidden on Facebook.

\(^6\)Bivariate correlations showed that personal honor and family honor subscales were positively related in both cultural groups, \( r_{TR} = .56, r_{US} = .37, p < .001 \).

\(^7\)We also examined a potential cultural difference in response styles by comparing the use of middle and extreme points of the scales across cultures. We did not find enough evidence for a cultural response bias and therefore used the raw data in our analyses. Details can be provided upon request.
pictures on Facebook ($M_{TR} = 4.65$, $SD = 1.70$, $M_{US} = 4.87$, $SD = 1.51$), $F(1, 334) = 2.46$, $p = .14$, $d = 0.14$, 95% CI $[-0.09, 0.71]$. Consistent with Hypothesis 1b, Turkish participants ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 1.77$) indicated significantly less willingness to post their potentially improper pictures compared with northern Americans ($M = 6.32$, $SD = 0.88$), $F(1, 334) = 78.21$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.16$, 95% CI $[-2.02, -1.29]$ (Figure 1). Finally, Turkish participants were also less willing to post neutral pictures compared with northern Americans ($M_{US} = 4.93$, $SD = 1.54$, $M_{TR} = 3.09$, $SD = 1.69$), $F(1, 334) = 45.09$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.14$, 95% CI $[-1.80, -0.98]$.

Who Would You Allow to View that Picture?

We did not expect a cultural difference for the willingness to allow relatives and friends to see one’s achievement pictures (Hypothesis 2a). For potentially improper pictures, however, we predicted that Turks would be less willing to allow others compared with northern Americans, and this cultural difference would be greater for the willingness to allow relatives compared with friends (Hypothesis 2b). We conducted repeated-measures ANCOVAs for achievement and improper pictures, in which we entered audience (friends vs. relatives) as a within-subjects variable, culture and gender as between-subjects factors, and age, posting frequency, modesty, and upbringing as covariates.

Contrary to Hypothesis 2a, Turkish participants ($M = 5.11$, $SD = 1.23$) were less willing to let others see their achievement pictures compared with northern Americans ($M = 5.39$, $SD = 1.01$), $F(1, 327) = 7.85$, $p < .01$, $d = 0.25$, 95% CI $[-0.71, -0.12]$, but there was no significant interaction of audience and culture, $F(1, 327) = 0.04$, $p = .84$ (Figure 2). Similarly, Turks ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 1.41$) were less willing to let others view their potentially improper pictures compared with northern Americans ($M = 5.56$, $SD = 0.77$), $F(1, 321) = 89.01$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.15$, 95% CI $[-1.77, -1.16]$; notably, this cultural difference was greater than for the achievement pictures. Moreover, we found a significant Audience × Culture interaction for improper pictures, $F(1, 321) = 35.42$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.10$.

Consistent with Hypothesis 2b, Turks ($M = 3.87$, $SD = 1.57$) were less willing to allow their relatives to see their improper pictures than were northern Americans ($M = 5.53$, $SD = 0.84$), $F(1, 321) = 118.02$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.32$, 95% CI $[-2.24, -1.56]$, and the difference was greater compared with the willingness to allow friends ($M_{TR} = 4.67$, $SD = 1.55$; $M_{US} = 5.60$, $SD = 0.79$), $F(1, 321) = 36.92$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.76$, 95% CI $[-1.35, -0.69]$.10

Honor Values

We hypothesized that in both cultural groups, endorsement of honor values would positively predict the willingness to post and to let others view one’s achievement pictures (Hypothesis 3a); however, it was expected to negatively predict the willingness to post and let others (especially relatives) see one’s improper pictures primarily in Turkey, especially for women (Hypothesis 3b). We conducted linear regressions for each outcome variable (willingness to post and willingness to let relatives and friends see pictures), in which we entered culture, gender, honor values, modesty, upbringing, age, and overall Facebook posting frequency in the first step; the two-way interactions of culture, gender, and honor values in the second step; and their three-way interaction in the third step.11

Willingness to Post Achievement Pictures. In line with Hypothesis 3a, honor was positively associated with the willingness to post achievement pictures, $B = 0.35$, $\beta = .25$, $p < .001$, 95% CI $[B] = [0.21, 0.49]$. We also found a significant three-way interaction of culture, gender, and honor, $B = -0.87$, $\beta = -1.13$, $p < .05$, 95% CI $[B] = [-1.52, -0.21]$. In Turkey, honor had a positive association with the

10 Audience × Gender or Audience × Gender × Culture interaction was not significant for any picture type, $ps > .10$.

11 An independent samples t-test showed that compared with northern Americans, honor endorsement was significantly lower among Turkish participants ($M_{TR} = 5.54$, $SD = 1.26$, $M_{US} = 5.86$, $SD = 0.91$), $t(346) = -2.81$, $p < .01$, $d = 0.29$, 95% CI $[-0.56, -0.10]$. The direction of this difference was unexpected, and it may be due to the reference group effect (Heine, Lehman, Peng, & Greenholtz, 2002). When participants complete Likert-type scales, they tend to compare themselves not with a different cultural group but with others in their own society; in other words, their reference group is people in their own society. When a Turkish participant responds to the Honor Values Scale, for example, he or she may think that compared with other people in the Turkish society, his or her endorsement of honor values is lower. This may reverse the expected cultural differences in psychological constructs. Examining the associations of those constructs with other variables within cultures, however, provides more accurate and methodologically less biased results (Bond & van de Vijver, 2010).
willingsness to post these pictures and interacted significantly with gender (Table 1). For Turkish men, honor positively predicted the willingness to post achievement pictures, but the relation was not significant for women. In the northern United States, honor was positively associated with the willingness to post these pictures and marginally interacted with gender. Contrary to the finding in Turkey, however, honor positively predicted the willingness for women but not for men.

**Willingness to Let Others View One’s Achievement Pictures.** Consistent with Hypothesis 3a, we found that in both cultural groups, the more people valued honor, the more willing they were to allow their relatives and friends to view their achievement pictures, \( B_{\text{Relatives}} = 0.20, \beta = .20, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [B] = [0.09, 0.30]. B_{\text{Friends}} = 0.19, \beta = .17, p < .01, 95\% \text{ CI} [B] = [0.07, 0.32]. \) As expected, there was no interaction with culture or gender, \( p s > .11. \)

**Willingness to Post Improper Pictures.** Endorsement of honor values negatively predicted the willingness to post improper pictures, \( B = -0.21, \beta = -1.4, p < .05, 95\% \text{ CI} [B] = [-0.40, -0.02]. \) There was also a significant interaction of Honor Values × Gender, \( B = 0.40, \beta = .65, p < .05, 95\% \text{ CI} [B] = [0.07, 0.72], \) and a marginally significant interaction of Honor Values × Culture, \( B = 0.38, \beta = .67, p = .06, 95\% \text{ CI} [B] = [-0.02, 0.79]. \) Consistent with Hypothesis 3b, in Turkey, honor negatively predicted the willingness to post improper pictures, and it interacted with gender (Table 2). The more Turkish women valued honor, the less they said they would post potentially improper pictures, whereas the relation was not significant for Turkish men. In contrast, honor positively predicted the willingness to post improper pictures in the northern United States and did not interact with gender.

**Willingness to Let Others View One’s Improper Pictures.** Honor values did not predict the willingness to let relatives or friends view one’s improper pictures, and contrary to Hypothesis 3b, it did not interact with culture, \( p s > .11. \)

**Discussion**

Replicating Study 1 results, we found that people from both cultural groups had similar levels of willingness to post their achievement pictures on Facebook, whereas Turks were more hesitant to post their potentially improper pictures compared with northern Americans. Moreover, compared with northern Americans, Turkish participants were less willing to let others view their pictures in general, but the difference was greatest for the willingness to let relatives see their potentially improper pictures. This is in line with our argument that people from honor cultures would be more hesitant to display such pictures.

---

**Table 1. Hierarchical regression analyses for predictors of the willingness to post achievement pictures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Honor Values</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modesty</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upbringing</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posting frequency</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Honor Values</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honor Values × Gender</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Control variables are not displayed in step 2 for the sake of brevity.

*p < .10;

*p < .05;

**p < .01;

***p < .001.

---

12For the willingness to allow relatives, there was a marginally significant Gender × Honor interaction, \( B = 0.30, \beta = .53, p = .06, 95\% \text{ CI} [B] = [-0.01, 0.60]. \) The slopes were different for women, \( B = -0.11, \beta = -.08, p = .26, 95\% \text{ CI} [B] = [-0.29, 0.08], \) and men, \( B = 0.16, \beta = .12, p = .19, 95\% \text{ CI} [B] = [-0.08, 0.40], \) but they did not differ significantly from zero.
pictures to their family members than to their friends, because family members would find them more inappropriate and reputation threatening than their friends would. More importantly, we found that in Turkey (especially among women), the more people valued honor, the less willing they were to post their improper pictures on Facebook. For northern Americans, however, endorsement of honor values was positively associated with the willingness to post such pictures. These findings suggest that the pictures we called potentially improper might be perceived as honor threatening in Turkey but honor enhancing in the northern United States.

In Studies 1 and 2, the information we gathered reflected participants’ intentions to post pictures on Facebook, but not necessarily their actual behaviors. In Study 3, we investigate participants’ actual Facebook behavior and test our hypotheses by analyzing their profiles.

**STUDY 3**

We downloaded and coded photos from Study 2 participants’ Facebook profiles. As in Studies 1 and 2, we expected that compared with northern Americans, Turks would be equally likely to post their achievement pictures (Hypothesis 1a) but less likely to post their potentially improper pictures (Hypothesis 1b). We also hypothesized that endorsement of honor values would positively predict the posting behavior for achievement pictures in both cultures (Hypothesis 2a); however, it would negatively predict the posting behavior for improper pictures primarily for Turkish participants, especially for women (Hypothesis 2b).

**Method**

**Participants**

Eighty-five European-American (62.04% of the Study 2 sample) and 80 Turkish participants (37.56% of the Study 2 sample) gave us permission to send them a friend request on Facebook from our laboratory account. We downloaded and examined the profiles of 65 participants (31 women) in the northern United States and 46 (32 women) in Turkey, who accepted our friend request.

**Materials and Procedure**

Two research assistants in each country downloaded and coded the profiles. They saved a minimum of 50 and a maximum of 100 photos posted in participants’ *Your Photos* and *Profile Pictures* albums within the last 6 months.\(^{13}\) Those albums include photos posted by the users themselves, not by their friends; hence, the users have direct control over them.

\(^{13}\)Research assistants started the downloading with the most recent pictures and worked backwards in time. To prevent an overlap with “Gezi protests” in Turkey, research assistants in both countries downloaded the pictures that were posted before 28 May 2013.

---

| Regression | Turkey | | United States | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total sample | | | | |
| Step 1 | | | | |
| Honor Values | –0.11 | 0.09 | –0.08 | [–0.29, 0.08] | 0.24 | 0.08 | 0.25* [0.09, 0.39] | .16*** | .22*** |
| Gender | –0.48 | 0.25 | –0.13* | [–0.97, 0.01] | –0.44 | 0.15 | –0.24* [–0.74, –0.14] | | |
| Modesty | –0.35 | 0.13 | –0.19** | [–0.60, –0.10] | –0.05 | 0.08 | –0.05 [–0.21, 0.11] | | |
| Upbringing | 0.15 | 0.06 | 0.17* | [0.03, 0.27] | –0.07 | 0.03 | –0.16* [–0.13, –0.00] | | |
| Age | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.04 | [–0.13, 0.24] | –0.13 | 0.06 | –0.19* [–0.24, –0.02] | | |
| Posting frequency | 0.31 | 0.10 | 0.21** | [0.12, 0.50] | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.21* [0.05, 0.34] | | |
| Step 2 | | | | |
| Honor Values | –0.24 | 0.11 | –0.17* | [–0.47, –0.02] | 0.21 | 0.11 | 0.22* [0.00, 0.42] | .02* | .00 |
| Honor Values × Gender | 0.40 | 0.19 | 0.59* | [0.02, 0.78] | 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.18 [–0.26, 0.36] | | |
| By gender | | | | |
| Women | | | | |
| Honor Values | –0.23 | 0.11 | –0.18* | [–0.44, –0.01] | 0.19 | 0.10 | 0.23* [–0.00, 0.38] | .15** | .07 |
| Modesty | –0.15 | 0.15 | –0.09 | [–0.45, 0.14] | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.03 [–0.18, 0.22] | | |
| Upbringing | 0.24 | 0.07 | 0.28** | [0.09, 0.38] | –0.01 | 0.04 | –0.03 [–0.09, 0.07] | | |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.14 | 0.01 | [–0.25, 0.28] | –0.08 | 0.08 | –0.11 [–0.24, 0.08] | | |
| Posting frequency | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.15* | [–0.02, 0.45] | 0.16 | 0.10 | 0.19 [–0.04, 0.37] | | |
| Men | | | | |
| Honor Values | 0.14 | 0.17 | 0.08 | [–0.21, 0.48] | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.26* [–0.00, 0.54] | .23** | .25* |
| Modesty | –0.67 | 0.23 | –0.31** | [–1.14, –0.20] | –0.11 | 0.13 | –0.11 [–0.38, 0.16] | | |
| Upbringing | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.04 | [–0.17, 0.25] | –0.13 | 0.06 | –0.29* [–0.24, –0.01] | | |
| Age | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.04 | [–0.22, 0.33] | –0.18 | 0.09 | –0.29* [–0.35, –0.01] | | |
| Posting frequency | 0.42 | 0.17 | 0.27* | [0.09, 0.75] | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.24* [–0.03, 0.46] | | |

*Note: Control variables are not displayed in step 2 for the sake of brevity.*

\(^{*}p < .10;\)

\(^{*}p < .05;\)

\(^{**}p < .01;\)

\(^{***}p < .001.\)
Table 3. Cultural comparison of posting ratios for picture categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture group and category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Turkey Mean</th>
<th>Turkey SD</th>
<th>United States Mean</th>
<th>United States SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Receiving an award, giving a talk, graduation</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>6.28*</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.09]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other achievement</td>
<td>Playing sports, playing an instrument</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[−0.06, 0.03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper</td>
<td>Pictures of boyfriend/girlfriend/opposite sex friends</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3.91*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>Profile owner wearing a swimsuit</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[−0.01, 0.06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In swimsuit</td>
<td>Profile owner with formal or elegant outfit</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>[−0.04, 0.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partyting</td>
<td>Holding drinks, at a bar, dancing</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>[−0.02, 0.08]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other improper</td>
<td>Smoking, pictures with curse words</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>[−0.04, 0.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessions</td>
<td>Profile owner’s car, bike, clothing item</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>[−0.02, 0.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Pictures of food or non-alcoholic drinks</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4.91*</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>[0.00, 0.07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td>Profile owner at a vacation spot (e.g., beach)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>10.42**</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>[0.03, 0.12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>At concerts, sports games</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>[−0.03, 0.08]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressed up</td>
<td>Profile owner with formal or elegant outfit</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>[−0.07, 0.08]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10;  **p < .05;  ***p < .01.

In case the participant had fewer than 50 photos within the last 6 months in any of those albums, research assistants went back further in time until they reached 50.

We created 11 picture categories under four broad groups (Table 3): achievement pictures (academic achievements such as giving a presentation or other achievements such as pictures taken while playing sports), potentially improper pictures (pictures of their boyfriend/girlfriend or opposite sex friends, pictures of the participant partying, etc.), consumption pictures (pictures of possessions, events they attended such as concerts, etc.), and other, for pictures that did not belong to any of the previous categories. Research assistants coded the most recent pictures until they reached 20 pictures that belonged to one of the categories except other. In Turkey, the average number of pictures coded was 31.83 (SD = 17.95) and in the northern United States 32.82 (SD = 20.54) per participant. Percent agreement between coders ranged from 0.95 to 0.99 in the northern United States and from 0.92 to 0.99 in Turkey. Disagreements were resolved by the principal investigator of the project. In addition to the picture codes, participants’ data on Honor Values Scale, Modesty Scale, upbringing, frequency of Facebook posting, and demographic information from Study 2 were used in the analyses.

Results

Compared with northern Americans, Turkish participants were significantly older (\(M_{TR} = 20.10, SD = 1.24, M_{US} = 19.48, SD = 1.53\)), \(t(108) = 2.12, p < .05, d = 0.45, 95\%\ CI [0.04, 1.12]\), and posted marginally less frequently on Facebook (\(M_{TR} = 4.15, SD = 1.19, M_{US} = 4.57, SD = 1.08\)), \(t(109) = -1.93, p = 0.06, d = 0.37, 95\%\ CI [−0.85, 0.01]\). Moreover, they were less modest (\(M_{TR} = 3.63, SD = 1.05, M_{US} = 4.09, SD = 0.91\)), \(t(108) = -2.41, p < .05, d = 0.47, 95\%\ CI [−0.82, −0.08]\), and more urban (\(M_{TR} = 6.61, SD = 1.97, M_{US} = 5.00, SD = 2.13\)), \(t(109) = 4.04, p < .001, d = 0.78, 95\%\ CI [0.82, 2.40]\) than northern Americans. We controlled for these variables in all analyses.

\(p < .10;  **p < .05;  ***p < .01.\)

Picture Posting Behavior

To calculate the posting ratio of a picture category (e.g., pictures of them partying), we divided the number of pictures that belonged to that category by the total number of pictures coded (i.e., if a participant had five party pictures and a total of 30 pictures coded, the party picture ratio would be 0.17). To obtain the ratio for a picture group (e.g., improper pictures), we calculated the sum of the individual picture category ratios in the group (i.e., the sum of the ratios for partying, boyfriend/girlfriend, in swimsuit, and other improper pictures). We expected that Turks would post achievement pictures to the same degree (Hypothesis 1a), but potentially improper pictures less compared with northern Americans (Hypothesis 1b).

To test these hypotheses, we conducted univariate ANCOVAs, in which we entered culture and gender as between-subjects factors, and age, posting frequency, modesty and upbringing as covariates. Consistent with Hypothesis 1a, the posting ratio of achievement pictures did not differ significantly across cultures (\(M_{TR} = 0.02, SD = 0.05, M_{US} = 0.04, SD = 0.06\)), \(F(1, 101) = 1.80, p = .18, d = 0.36, 95\%\ CI [−0.04, 0.01]\).\(^{14}\)

Contrary to Hypothesis 1b, the ratio of improper pictures was higher for Turks (\(M = 0.41, SD = 0.37\)) than for northern Americans (\(M = 0.35, SD = 0.26\)), \(F(1, 101) = 4.41, p < .05, d = 0.19, 95\%\ CI [0.01, 0.28]\).\(^{15}\) We also found a significant Culture × Gender interaction, \(F(1, 101) = 5.05, p < .05, \eta^2 = 0.05\). As expected, Turkish women (\(M = 0.36, SD = 0.36\)) posted improper pictures somewhat less than Turkish men (\(M = 0.52, SD = 0.38\)), \(F(1, 40) = 0.78, p = .38, d = 0.43, 95\%\ CI [−0.33, 0.13]\), whereas in the United States, women (\(M = 0.42, SD = 0.27\)) posted these pictures somewhat more than men (\(M = 0.30, SD = 0.23\)), \(F(1, 57) = 2.80, p = .10, d = 0.48, 95\%\ CI [−0.02, 0.25]\); but the within-culture

\(^{14}\)There was no main effect or interaction with gender for achievement pictures, \(ps > .56\).

\(^{15}\)When we did not control for upbringing and modesty, this difference became non-significant, \(F(1, 104) = 2.37, p = .13, 95\%\ CI [−0.03, 0.23]\).
Honor Values

We predicted that endorsement of honor values would relate positively to the proportion of achievement pictures in both cultural groups (Hypothesis 2a), whereas it would relate negatively to the ratio of improper pictures primarily for Turkish participants, especially for Turkish women (Hypothesis 2b). We conducted linear regressions for each picture group, in which we entered culture, gender, honor values, modesty, upbringing, age, and overall Facebook posting frequency in the first step; the two-way interactions of culture, gender, and honor values in the second step; and their three-way interaction in the third step.\(^\text{16}\)

Achievement Pictures. Honor had a non-significant positive relation to the proportion of achievement pictures, \(B = 0.02, \beta = 0.20, p = 0.17, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.01, 0.06] \); however, it significantly interacted with culture, \(B = 0.05, \beta = 1.16, p < 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [0.00, 0.10] \), and gender, \(B = -0.08, \beta = -1.89, p < 0.001, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.13, -0.04] \). In Turkey, honor values did not have a significant relation to achievement picture posting, \(B = 0.03, \beta = 0.24, p = 0.20, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.02, 0.08] \); however, there was a marginally significant interaction with gender, \(B = -0.08, \beta = -1.34, p = 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.16, 0.00] \). Unfolding this interaction, we did not find a significant relation of honor values and the proportion of achievement pictures for Turkish women, \(B = 0.02, \beta = 0.22, p = 0.28, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [0.02, 0.06] \), or for Turkish men, \(B = -0.04, \beta = -0.21, p = 0.55, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.17, 0.10] \). In the northern United States, honor significantly and positively predicted the posting ratio of achievement pictures, \(B = 0.07, \beta = 0.63, p < 0.001, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [0.03, 0.11] \), and interacted with gender, \(B = -0.08, \beta = -2.18, p < 0.01, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.13, -0.02] \). The more northern American women valued honor, the more they posted these pictures, \(B = 0.07, \beta = 0.43, p < 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [0.01, 0.14] \); whereas the relation was close to zero for men, \(B = -0.00, \beta = -0.11, p = 0.59, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.02, 0.01] \).

Potentially Improper Pictures. Honor values negatively predicted the ratio of improper pictures, \(B = -0.08, \beta = -0.29, p < 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.17, -0.00] \), and consistent with Hypothesis 2b, there was a significant Culture × Honor Values interaction, \(B = 0.16, \beta = 1.56, p < 0.01, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [0.04, 0.28] \). In Turkey, people who valued honor more were somewhat less likely to post those pictures, \(B = -0.09, \beta = -0.29, p = 0.08, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.18, 0.01] \); whereas in the northern United States, the relation was close to zero, \(B = 0.03, \beta = 0.09, p = 0.47, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.04, 0.09] \). Contrary to expectations, we did not find a significant interaction of Honor Values × Gender in any of the cultural groups, \(B_{\text{Turkey}} = -0.06, \beta = -0.38, p = 0.57, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.25, 0.14] \) and \(B_{\text{US}} = -0.08, \beta = -0.92, p = 0.27, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.22, 0.06] \).

Discussion

Consistent with Studies 1 and 2, Study 3 revealed that members of the two cultural groups did not differ in their actual posting of achievement pictures, but contrary to expectations, we found that Turks posted their potentially improper pictures more than Americans; this effect was primarily due to differences in posting pictures with one’s girlfriend/boyfriend and with opposite sex friends. Similar to Study 2, we found a (non-significant) trend for honor values to positively relate to actual posting of achievement pictures, but this association was weaker for Turkish than for American participants. Moreover, as we expected, honor values were negatively associated with posting improper pictures, and this relation was stronger for Turkish participants than for Americans. The findings that were somewhat different in Study 3 compared with Study 2 raise the possibility of a systematic difference between the samples of the two studies. Were the participants who allowed us to add them on Facebook and accepted our friend request different from the ones who did not give us that permission?

One potential difference between the two samples could be in their modesty level, such that those who allowed us (i.e., strangers) to examine their profiles were less modest than those who did not. We compared the modesty scores of these two groups and found that participants who gave us permission to examine their profiles in Study 3 had lower modesty scores (\(M = 3.89, SD = 0.99\)) than those who did not (\(M = 4.06, SD = 0.91\), \(F(1, 334) = 4.90, p < 0.05, d = 0.18, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.49, -0.03] \). This may be partly responsible for the finding that Turkish participants in Study 3 were more

\(^{16}\)An independent samples t-test showed that compared with northern Americans, honor endorsement was somewhat lower among Turkish participants (\(M_{\text{Turkey}} = 5.51, SD = 1.22, M_{\text{US}} = 5.88, SD = 0.93\), \(t(108) = -1.78, p = 0.08, d = 0.34, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.77, 0.04] \)).

\(^{17}\)The trend was in the expected direction such that Turkish women who valued honor were somewhat less likely to post improper pictures, \(B = -0.09, \beta = -3.2, p = 0.13, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.22, 0.03] \); whereas for northern American women, there was a non-significant positive relation, \(B = 0.06, \beta = 1.9, p = 0.33, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.07, 0.02] \). The associations were close to zero for Turkish and northern American men, \(B_{\text{Turkey}} = -0.03, \beta = -0.08, p = 0.64, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.14, 0.09] \) and \(B_{\text{US}} = -0.01, \beta = -0.04, p = 0.84, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [-0.09, 0.07] \).

likely to post improper pictures than were the northern Americans. We also compared the two samples in terms of honor values, upbringing, overall Facebook posting frequency, and age but did not find significant differences, \( p > .27 \).

Another reason for the different findings in Study 3 could be that people’s intentions do not necessarily reflect their actual behavior. An example of this discrepancy is the classic study of LaPiere (1934), in which he traveled with a Chinese couple in the United States to assess anti-Chinese sentiments. He found that whereas only one establishment actually denied service to the Chinese couple (i.e., behavior), 90% of the establishments stated that they would not serve Chinese customers when they were asked later in a questionnaire (i.e., attitude). The theory of reasoned action suggests that people evaluate their attitudes and weigh the consequences of certain behaviors to form their intentions, which in turn lead to behaviors that are consistent with those attitudes and intentions (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). In addition to this deliberate process, however, there is also a spontaneous process, in which the attitude that is automatically triggered or easily accessible in a certain situation determines the person’s perception of the situation and his or her behavior (Fazio & Towles-Schwen, 1999). Because the attitudes that are evaluated deliberately could be different from the ones that are automatically triggered in a situation, there may be a discrepancy between the measured attitudes and observed behaviors. Study 2 assessed participants’ attitudes about posting behavior, capturing the deliberate process. Their actual posting behavior (examined in Study 3) may have been more spontaneous, however, reflecting situational triggers or other impulses at the time.

To test the association between attitudes toward posting and actual Facebook behavior, we conducted regression analyses for the Study 3 posting ratios of academic achievement and boyfriend/girlfriend/opposite sex friend pictures as dependent variables, because those were the picture types that were used in Study 2. We entered Study 2 posting willingness scores, culture, and gender in the first step, and their two-way and three-way interactions in the second and third steps, respectively. Results showed that the willingness to post academic achievement pictures from Study 2 did not predict the actual behavior in Study 3, \( B = 0.00, \beta = .01, p = .97, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [−0.02, 0.02] \); however, it significantly interacted with culture and gender, \( B = 0.05, \beta = 1.20, p < .05, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [0.00, 0.09] \). For northern American men, Study 2 willingness predicted Study 3 behavior marginally, \( B = 0.00, \beta = .32, p = .07, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [0.000, 0.003] \), but for all other groups, the relation was non-significant, \( p > .26 \). Participants’ willingness to post boyfriend/girlfriend/opposite sex friend pictures in Study 2 was weakly related to their actual behavior in Study 3, \( B = 0.04, \beta = .26, p = .13, 95\% \text{ CI } [B] = [−0.01, 0.09] \), and it did not interact with culture or gender, \( p > .33 \). The failure of the willingness measure to predict actual posting behavior could be due to the small sample size of Study 3, or to the relatively brief window of actual posting behavior examined. As mentioned previously, it also suggests that actual posting behavior may be influenced by other factors such as attitudes that were automatically triggered, spur-of-the-moment feelings, or others’ recent posts. Moreover, we could not categorize the pictures in terms of the audiences allowed to view them. People’s willingness to post a particular type of picture may be contingent on their ability to exclude some audiences from viewing the picture.

Another reason for the unexpected findings in Study 3 could be that what we presumed to be an improper picture might not be perceived as improper by the participants; or even if it was perceived as improper, some participants might have felt the need to challenge that perception. As cultural rejectionism suggests, some members of a culture may reject the dominant cultural norms and values (Leung & Cohen, 2011). Honor codes are more stringent on women than on men (e.g., Mojab & Abd, 2004); therefore, women may be more likely to show this rejectionist tendency, especially if they are highly educated (as it was the case in our studies). The proportion of female participants was greater in Study 3 compared with Study 2, which might make it more likely to observe this rejectionist tendency and the unexpected result of Turks posting their potentially improper pictures more than Americans. In short, even though our findings for people’s actual Facebook behaviors were somewhat weaker than the findings of Study 2, they were mostly consistent with our expectations and in the same direction as our previous findings.

**GENERAL DISCUSSION**

This is the first research that focused on the intriguing interface of Facebook and the endorsement of honor values. Moreover, we focused not only on self-reports about posting pictures on Facebook but also on participants’ actual behavior.

Facebook is a social platform in which people display their lives to other people’s view. In honor cultures, those views can determine whether the person gains or loses honor (Peristiany, 1965). Previous research found greater cultural differences for situations that could cause a loss of honor (e.g., false accusations) than situations that could enhance honor (e.g., being honest; Uslu et al., 2012). Consistent with those findings, we did not find a cultural difference for the willingness to post honor-enhancing, achievement-related pictures on Facebook in any of the studies. Moreover, in both cultural groups, the more people valued honor, the more willing they were to post and to let others view such pictures. In other words, the more people cared about their image in the eyes of others, the more willing they were to present themselves positively in social media.

In honor cultures, it is not wise to give people reasons for gossip, if one wants to maintain one’s honor (Wikan, 2008). Pictures of a woman with her male friends, or other potentially improper pictures on Facebook, such as those taken at a party, may be a source of gossip and may threaten one’s reputation in honor cultures. Given the greater risks and implications of losing honor in those cultures as opposed to dignity cultures, we expected and found that Turkish participants were less willing to post those potentially improper pictures on Facebook compared with northern Americans. Moreover, only in Turkey and especially among Turkish women, people who highly endorsed honor values were less likely to be willing to post such pictures. This suggests that in honor cultures, the underlying reason for avoiding certain types of postings on Facebook could be people’s honor concerns and their fear of creating a potentially negative social image. Moreover, the finding concerning
Turkish women implies that compared with men, women from honor cultures with strong honor values may have a greater need to avoid that negative image, because losing honor may be riskier for them than for men (e.g., Mojab & Abdo, 2004).

In the northern United States, in contrast, the more people cared about their image in the eyes of others, the more willing they were to post pictures which showed them with their boyfriend/girlfriend or partying. This may be because posting such pictures is perceived as something positive rather than honor threatening in the northern United States. For example, it may indicate that the person is sociable or is proud of his or her happy romantic relationship. This finding is also consistent with the argument that the same individual-level construct (i.e., endorsement of honor values) can predict different behaviors in different cultures, and it points to the necessity of including individual difference measures to discover these interesting cultural differences (Leung & Cohen, 2011).

On websites, people tend to share information that is appropriate for all types of audiences (Hogan, 2010); however, they also have the option of hiding content from certain people in their friend list. This could provide another window to cultural differences in self-expression styles in social media. Therefore, the current work went beyond the investigation of picture postings and also examined the types of audience people were willing to allow to view their information on Facebook. We expected and found that compared with northern Americans, Turkish participants were more willing to hide their potentially improper pictures from others, especially from their relatives. Members of honor cultures might anticipate that relatives would not like such pictures to be posted on Facebook, because they would perceive them as a threat to their family’s reputation. Friends, however, would not have that concern; they would be more likely to perceive the pictures as the participant would.

Limitations and Future Research

One limitation of these studies was that we focused on one country each to represent honor and dignity cultures; therefore, our results cannot be generalized to all honor and dignity cultures. Another limitation was that all of our participants were university students with similar ages and education levels. Future research can focus on people from different demographic groups to examine whether honor-related differences vary in those groups. Using student participants could also be an advantage for this work, however, because young people use SNNs more actively and freely compared with older generations, providing more variation in their posting behaviors (e.g., Hargittai, 2008).

Honor-related violence may continue to be an important social issue in the new multicultural Europe (Wikán, 2008). Therefore, future studies can examine social media behaviors of young immigrants coming from honor cultures. For example, young people who live in a non-honor society, but whose family has strong honor values, may develop styles that reflect their integration with the host culture, but at the same time do not explicitly disregard their families’ values. Moreover, future research may also examine verbal self-expression through Facebook status updates and focus on other social media channels such as Twitter or Instagram.

Concluding Remarks

Facebook behavior matters and deserves more research. Cultural values reflected in the offline world may also be reflected in the online world. Behaviors of people from traditional honor cultures, especially of women, are strongly shaped by the rules of the society, and this work shows that we can see the traces of this influence in social media as well. Cultures of honor emphasize many positive human qualities such as respect, honesty, and trustworthiness (Cross et al., 2014). Real world examples of punishment of women and our findings in this work, however, suggest that cultural differences are more strongly observed in honor-threatening rather than in honor-enhancing situations. People from honor cultures, especially women who highly endorse honor values, tend to be more hesitant to display certain types of information on Facebook compared with people from a dignity culture. We hope that our research sheds light on this previously unexamined aspect of social media and inspires researchers to discover other causes and consequences of online self-expression styles with respect to social psychological phenomena.
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