

Honor Killings: Global Attitudes & Research

Authored by
mohammed looti

November 20, 2025

RECOMMENDED CITATION

mohammed looti (2025). *Honor Killings: Global Attitudes & Research*. Psychepedia.
Retrieved from <https://psychepedia.arabpsychology.com/?p=25096>

Introduction to Honor Killings and Attitudinal Context

Honor killings represent a lethal form of gender-based violence, perpetrated predominantly against women who are perceived to have violated cultural or religious norms, thereby bringing shame or "dishonor" upon their family or community. The study of attitudes toward these acts is critical, as societal tolerance or acceptance is the primary enabling factor allowing them to persist despite growing international condemnation and legal prohibitions. These attitudes are not monolithic; they range from outright endorsement of the violence as a necessary corrective measure to passive acceptance rooted in fear of social ostracization or a belief in the sanctity of traditional patriarchal structures. Understanding the mechanisms of attitudinal formation requires delving into the deep intersections of **collectivist culture**, gendered expectations, and the psychological frameworks used by individuals and communities to justify lethal violence against kin.

The core challenge in analyzing attitudes toward honor killings lies in distinguishing between private belief and public expression. In contexts where honor violence is socially entrenched, individuals may express public support due to strong **social desirability bias**, fearing reprisal or community exclusion if they voice dissent. Conversely, covert support often manifests through institutional failures--such as police reluctance to investigate thoroughly, judicial leniency, or community silence--which collectively signal a tacit acceptance that honor is a valid mitigating factor in cases of murder. This institutional tolerance reinforces the belief among perpetrators and their sympathizers that the act, while perhaps legally punishable, is morally and socially justified.

The attitudes surrounding honor killings are fundamentally rooted in the concept of honor itself, which, in many societies, is viewed not as an individual virtue but as a **collective family asset** dependent almost entirely on the perceived sexual conduct and moral purity of its female members. When this asset is perceived to be compromised--through alleged infidelity, refusal of an arranged marriage, or even reporting sexual assault--the community attitude often shifts from viewing the victim as a person to viewing her as a source of contamination. This shift facilitates the attitudinal leap necessary to rationalize murder as a restorative act, aimed at cleansing the collective reputation and re-establishing social equilibrium within the community structure.

Socio-Cultural Foundations of Attitudinal Acceptance

Attitudinal acceptance of honor killings is deeply embedded in socio-cultural systems characterized by strong **familial collectivism**. In such systems, the needs and reputation of the family unit supersede individual rights and autonomy. The concept of honor (frequently referred to by terms like *Izzat* or *Sharaf*) becomes the currency of social standing. Attitudes toward violence in this context are shaped by the belief that the family's social capital, economic prospects, and marriageability of other children are directly linked to the sexual behavior of one female member. Consequently, the violence is often viewed not as a crime against an individual, but as a painful,

yet necessary, measure taken to protect the entire social fabric of the kin group from irreparable damage.

This collective mindset fosters an environment where violence is not just tolerated, but often expected. Community attitudes pressure family members, particularly male relatives who are designated as the guardians of honor, to take action. If a family fails to respond to perceived dishonor, the community's attitude toward them shifts from sympathetic to contemptuous, resulting in social isolation, ridicule, and economic disadvantage. This intense social pressure serves as a powerful attitudinal determinant, ensuring that individuals who might otherwise oppose violence feel compelled to support or carry out the act to avoid becoming social pariahs themselves. The perpetuation of honor killings is thus a reflection of community attitudes prioritized over legal or moral considerations.

Furthermore, attitudes are cemented through intergenerational transmission. Children raised in environments where honor violence is discussed as a tragic necessity absorb these norms as fundamental truths about social order and gender roles. This process of **cultural socialization** normalizes the violence, making it difficult for subsequent generations to develop critical attitudes toward the practice. The narratives surrounding honor killings often frame the victim as the ultimate transgressor and the perpetrator as a tragic hero who sacrificed his personal well-being for the greater good of the family name, further solidifying community endorsement.

The Role of Gender Norms and Patriarchal Structures

Patriarchal structures are the essential scaffolding upon which attitudes toward honor killings are built. These structures dictate that women's bodies and sexuality are the property of their male relatives--fathers, brothers, or husbands. Attitudes within these systems reflect the belief that women are inherently less rational and more prone to moral deviation, necessitating strict control and supervision. When a woman deviates from prescribed sexual or social conduct, the resulting attitude is one of betrayal of ownership, rather than merely a personal choice. This proprietary attitude allows the community to rationalize the ultimate punishment, as the woman is seen to have destroyed valuable family property (the honor) through her independent action.

The deep-seated belief in the necessity of female chastity is reflected in attitudes that place the burden of maintaining honor entirely on women. This gendered asymmetry means that men are rarely held to the same strict standards of sexual conduct, and their transgressions seldom result in comparable violence. This attitudinal double standard highlights the symbolic function of honor killings: they are not merely about moral correction, but about the enforcement of **male authority** and control within the domestic sphere. Attitudes that support this violence are fundamentally attitudes that uphold the hierarchy of gender relations, ensuring that female autonomy is brutally suppressed.

The language used to discuss honor killings further reveals these entrenched attitudes. Victims are often described using language that dehumanizes them, focusing on their "immorality" or "disobedience," while perpetrators are sometimes characterized sympathetically as victims of circumstance forced into a terrible choice. This linguistic framing is a powerful mechanism for shaping and maintaining supportive attitudes within the community. It allows individuals to distance themselves from the brutality of the act by focusing on the purported transgression, reinforcing the attitudinal belief that the violence, while regrettable, was an inevitable consequence of the victim's actions.

Psychological Mechanisms of Justification and Cognitive Dissonance

The psychological mechanisms underlying attitudes toward honor killings are complex, involving both individual coping strategies and collective defense mechanisms. For perpetrators and those who support them, **cognitive dissonance** plays a significant role. Since murder is universally condemned in legal and often religious frameworks, individuals must reconcile the act of killing a family member with their own moral identity. This reconciliation is achieved through powerful cognitive restructuring, where the victim is thoroughly blamed, the violence is re-framed as a selfless duty, and the preservation of honor is elevated above the sanctity of life.

Another key psychological attitude observed is **moral disengagement**. This process allows individuals to suspend their internal moral standards when participating in or supporting harmful acts. Mechanisms of moral disengagement commonly employed in the context of honor killings include euphemistic labeling (calling the murder "cleansing the honor"), advantageous comparison (arguing that other crimes are worse), and diffusion of responsibility (blaming the community's expectations). These psychological maneuvers enable supporters to maintain a positive self-image while endorsing lethal violence, thereby solidifying their attitude that the act was justified.

Furthermore, attitudes of **bystander apathy** are crucial for the continuation of the practice. In communities where HK is common, neighbors, extended family members, and even local officials often adopt an attitude of non-interference. This apathy is driven by fear of retaliation, adherence to the principle of non-intervention in domestic affairs, and a psychological desire to avoid confronting the inherent moral horror of the act. This collective silence acts as powerful reinforcement, signaling to potential perpetrators that the community will not actively oppose their actions, thus strengthening the attitudinal climate of tolerance.

The psychological pressure on male relatives, particularly the designated killer, is often immense. Their attitude toward the victim is shaped by the conflict between familial affection and intense social obligation. Studies indicate that the act is often carried out under severe emotional duress, not necessarily out of hatred, but out of a desperate need to maintain their own status and avoid the shame that would accompany inaction. The community's attitude effectively weaponizes

shame, turning it into a mandatory psychological driver for violence.

Legal and Institutional Attitudes and Enforcement Gaps

Legal frameworks theoretically prohibit honor killings, yet institutional attitudes often undermine effective enforcement, creating significant gaps that perpetuate the practice. In many jurisdictions where honor killings occur, the judicial and law enforcement systems reflect the prevailing cultural attitudes, leading to a de facto acceptance of the violence. This institutional attitude manifests as **reluctance to investigate** thoroughly, a tendency to categorize the murder as a domestic dispute rather than a premeditated crime, and a willingness to accept mitigating circumstances based on the concept of provocation linked to honor.

A critical attitudinal barrier within legal systems is the persistence of specific legal loopholes, such as provisions allowing for reconciliation or reduced sentencing based on the concept of *Qisas* (retaliation) and *Diyat* (blood money). Even where these laws are reformed, the prevailing attitude among prosecutors and judges may lead to seeking lesser charges or accepting settlements that are heavily influenced by the family's desire to maintain the illusion of honor restored. This institutionalized tolerance sends a clear message to the public: while the state nominally condemns the act, it understands and partially accommodates the cultural motivations behind it, thereby reinforcing permissive community attitudes.

Police attitudes are equally crucial. Victims often face skepticism, indifference, or outright hostility when seeking protection. Officers, themselves products of the same cultural environment, may prioritize familial reconciliation over criminal prosecution, exhibiting an attitude that minimizes the danger faced by the potential victim. Furthermore, the institutional attitude often views the victim as partially responsible for her own fate due to her perceived transgression, contributing to systemic failures in protective measures and witness cooperation, which ultimately emboldens perpetrators.

Measuring and Mapping Attitudinal Support Globally

Measuring attitudes toward honor killings is methodologically challenging due to the sensitive nature of the topic and the high risk of **social desirability bias**. However, large-scale demographic and health surveys, as well as specialized sociological studies, provide crucial insights into the geographical distribution and intensity of attitudinal support. These studies often employ indirect questioning techniques, such as asking respondents if they believe violence against women is justified under specific circumstances (e.g., adultery or disobedience), rather than directly asking about murder.

Findings consistently demonstrate that attitudinal support for violence linked to honor is significantly higher in areas with strong collectivist traditions, high levels of gender inequality, and low levels of educational attainment among women. While overt endorsement of murder is rare in

most public surveys, a significant portion of the population in identified regions expresses attitudes that justify lesser forms of violence or support the principle that a woman's behavior can bring legitimate shame upon her family. This gradation of attitudinal acceptance reveals a foundational belief system that prioritizes family reputation over individual safety.

Geographically, attitudinal acceptance is not confined to a single religious or regional bloc, though prevalence is highest across South Asia, the Middle East, and parts of North Africa, as well as within diaspora communities originating from these areas. Mapping attitudinal support helps interventionists target educational and legal reforms. For instance, studies have shown that women who are economically empowered and highly educated consistently exhibit lower levels of attitudinal support for honor-based violence, underscoring the role of socio-economic factors in shaping moral views on the subject.

Furthermore, a key finding involves the difference in attitudes between younger and older generations, and between rural and urban populations. While urbanization and modernization often correlate with a decrease in overt attitudinal support for HK, these shifts are slow. In diaspora communities, the attitude toward preserving "pure" cultural norms can sometimes intensify, leading to an increased rigidity in attitudes toward honor and female conduct among immigrant populations compared to their counterparts in the country of origin.

Interventions and Shifting Community Attitudes

Effectively combating honor killings requires interventions that directly target and dismantle the foundational attitudes that sustain them. Legal reform, while necessary, is insufficient unless accompanied by community-level efforts designed to change deeply internalized socio-cultural norms. These interventions must aim to redefine the concept of honor itself, shifting the attitudinal focus from female chastity to concepts like **integrity, education, and human rights**.

Successful strategies involve sustained educational campaigns that utilize media, religious leaders, and educational curricula to challenge patriarchal attitudes and promote gender equality. Crucially, these programs must be locally relevant and delivered by trusted community figures. When religious scholars or respected elders publicly condemn honor killings, viewing them as cultural deviations rather than religious mandates, the attitudinal climate begins to shift, legitimizing dissent among community members who previously feared speaking out.

Interventions also focus on empowering women economically and legally, as increased female autonomy correlates strongly with reduced attitudinal support for violence. When women become visible contributors to the family economy and attain higher social status, the traditional view of them as mere repositories of male honor begins to erode. Furthermore, providing safe houses and robust psychological support systems signals an institutional attitude of protection, which slowly encourages victims and potential dissenters to step forward.

Key strategies for attitudinal change include:

Legal Clarity and Enforcement: Ensuring that honor killings are classified as premeditated murder, removing loopholes like *Diyat*, and demonstrating a strict institutional attitude toward prosecution.

Educational Redefinition of Honor: Implementing school curricula that teach gender equality and redefine honor as individual responsibility and respect, rather than control over female sexuality.

Male Engagement Programs: Creating community platforms where men are encouraged to question traditional notions of masculinity and express non-violent attitudes toward conflict resolution.

Media Counter-Narratives: Promoting stories that celebrate female autonomy and portray perpetrators of honor violence negatively, challenging the heroic narrative often prevalent in local discourse.

Conclusion: The Challenge of Change

Attitudes toward honor killings represent a formidable barrier to the eradication of this violence, rooted as they are in centuries of patriarchal and collectivist social structures. The persistence of these attitudes demonstrates that the issue is not merely a failure of law enforcement, but a profound cultural and psychological phenomenon where lethal violence is rationalized as necessary for social survival. Changing these attitudes requires a comprehensive, multi-layered approach that simultaneously targets institutional tolerance, legal loopholes, and the fundamental socio-cultural definitions of honor and gender roles.

The core challenge lies in shifting the collective community attitude from one of passive acceptance or justification to one of active condemnation. This requires empowering dissenting voices within the community and providing them with the legal and social protection necessary to challenge established norms without fear of reprisal. Only when the majority attitude views honor killings as an abhorrent violation of human rights and a source of genuine shame--rather than a tragic necessity--will the violence begin to subside.

Ultimately, the study of attitudes toward honor killings provides a crucial map for intervention, revealing that sustainable change depends on elevating individual human rights above the perceived demands of collective reputation. The future successful elimination of honor killings rests not just on legal prohibition, but on the successful transformation of the hearts and minds of the communities that currently tolerate or endorse this devastating violence.