

Attitude toward Honour Killing Among Honour Killers, Murderers and a General Population Sample

Sabeen Rahim

Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Women University, Peshawar

One of the extreme forms of domestic violence is honour killing and every year hundreds of women become victims of honour killings around the world including Pakistan. Many people give justifications for honour killing, such as societal pressure, culture, traditions etc. The aim of the present study is to see whether there is any relationship between criminal thinking and positive attitude towards honour killing. To measure criminal thinking, the TCU-CTS (Urdu version) was used, and a questionnaire was developed to assess people's attitude towards honour killing. Two samples were collected: one from incarcerated people which included 26 honour killers and 46 murderers and the second consisted of general population. The results indicated that there was positive correlation between having a positive attitude towards honour killing and criminal thinking. In addition to that a significant difference was found between the attitudes of men and women towards honour killing.

Keywords: honour killing, criminal thinking, honour killers, murderers, general population

Crime against women is a very common phenomenon in Pakistani society. Different types of crimes are committed against women for example domestic violence, acid throwing, harassment at work, demands for dowry and the most extreme of all; honour killing. Unfortunately, in Pakistani society some people are giving these crimes a name of culture. Three girls were buried alive in Baluchistan who had contracted marriage of their choice in order to redeem family honour and this brutal act was justified by Israrullah Zehri (Former member national assembly) (as cited in Shah, 2008). Honour killing is a woman specific crime mostly committed by men in a preplanned manner (Jafri, 2008). In the commission of this crime the father, brothers and other close relatives of the victim take part to redeem the family honour. The woman is targeted for rejecting the proposal of arranged marriage, seeking divorce and for alleged adultery. Besides the above said reasons other factors could also be responsible for honour killing (Najam, 2006). The causes of honour killing originate in patriarchal society in which women have to obey their fathers and husbands (Jafri, 2008).

Women are treated like commodities and their identities as human beings have no recognition. If they refuse to obey they put themselves at risk of punishment (Hailé, 2008). Lenient laws in Pakistan regarding honour killings provide encouragement to honour killers who view the conduct of the victims such as extra martial relations and wearing attractive dresses etc. as culpable contributory factors deserving punishment (Warraich, 2007).

Western media has reported honour killings in Pakistan, Bangladesh, Palestine and other Islamic countries (Faqir, 2001) for the past few years which have created the impression that honour

killing is rooted in Islam. Besides Muslim countries and Muslim societies honour killing is a common practice in Spain, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico. Even literary works by Spanish play writer Garcia Lorca and Colombian writer Gabriel Garcia Marquez reflect honour killing (as cited in Jafri, 2008).

Nasrullah, Haqqi and Cummings (2009) undertook study to find out the causes of honour killings. They garnered data from print media from 2004 to 2007 which pointed out that in most of the cases the killers were the husbands of the victims. It further established that honour killing was common among Hindu and Christian communities, and was not Muslim specific as it was rooted in the prevalent social standards and cultural practices. The research also highlighted that low education was also responsible for honour killings and most of the honour killing cases are not registered.

Glazer and Abu-Ras also conducted study in 1994 which revealed that unconcerned women were also responsible for honour killings who spread rumors against women provoking their relatives to commit the crime and the affectees are mostly lower status women of such rumors.

Kardam, Alpar, Yuksel and Ergun (2005) in Turkey interviewed people in four cities and concluded that cases of honour killing differed on basis of age, social position, educational background and most of the interviewed persons had seen honour killing and the aforementioned factors were relevant to commission of this crime. Sheeley (2007) conducted study using structured interview techniques and the sample was taken from the urban area. The question was put to them whether honour killers should be punished and 87% replied in the affirmative. Whereas 89.5% opined that honour killing could not redeem family honour.

Kulczycki and Windle (2012) established that the victims were from the poor families and the offenders were their younger brothers. Sixteen cases of honour killing were examined in Jordan which revealed that the Jordanian legal system was lenient about honour killers which prescribed very insignificant punishment for honour killers which varied from 6 months to 15 years (Hadidi, Kulwicki, & Jahshan 2001).

Florek studied the perception of jurors about honour related offences in 2013, pertinent to societies where cultural defense was advanced by the lawyers of honour killers. She conducted study on two groups who qualified to be jurors. Scenario was presented to both but to one group the cultural aspect was not explained, the research produced the result that the jurors familiar with cultural perception showed leniency in the verdict. The Black jurors accepted the cultural aspect readily whereas the Caucasians were indifferent to cultural standards in the matter of judgment.

The people in the society usually don't perceive honour killers negatively but rather distinguished them from other murderers and considered them as victims.

Usually the people don't blame honour killers for their crimes but assume that external forces like societal pressure, aggression, impulsivity are the factors responsible for their acts. The fact caught one's attention that why people living in the same society and circumstances, facing the same social pressures behave differently. Person from the same society will throw acid on his wife on demanding divorce, while another would simply divorce her. This indicates that his thinking is also a contributory factor for commission of his crime; as our thinking is manifested in our behavior.

Cognitive theories explain that criminals have faulty thinking which pushes them to criminal behavior (Reid, 1997). Sutherland's in his differential association theory argued that interaction with criminals will lead to criminal behavior (Sutherland, Cressey, & Luckenbill, 1992). Sykes and Matza (1957) state that criminals don't perceive their behavior as rebellious but rather consider it as reaction to circumstances. Yochelson and Samenow (1976) explained criminal thinking and theorized that they thought differently and their faulty thinking resulted in felonious behavior. Yochelson and Samenow (1976) hold the view that erroneous thinking is responsible for criminal behavior. They rebut the assumption that waywardness in children is the result of lack of parental grooming or company. Moreover they also reject the belief that socioeconomic status or bad company has relevance to criminality in children. Yochelson and Samenow (1976) have pinpointed 52 thinking errors, but the most significant are energy level i.e. high level of energy and low level of concentration, anger (criminals have high level of aggression) and pride (the belief of superiority over others). Walters determined that criminality had close association to lifestyle, attitude and the beliefs of the felons who always rationalized and justified their criminal behavior. Although Walters (2002) differed with Yochelson and Samenow in some respect regarding their findings. But, he incorporated many components of their findings into his questionnaire Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS). This questionnaire measures eight thinking styles, i.e. Mollification, Power Orientation, Cutoff Super Optimism, Cognitive Indolence, Sentimentality and Discontinuity.

Another recently developed scale which is devised on the basis of PICTS is Texas Christian University Criminal Thinking Scale (TCU-CTS) scale. In rehabilitative center for criminals at Texas Christian University and for their criminal thinking assessment TCU-CTS is used. It is self-rating questionnaire with 37 items (Knight, Garner, Simpson, Morey, & Flynn, 2006).

Walter (2001) conducted study, the results indicated that males with higher level of masculinity had a higher scores on criminal thinking style of assertion and self-deception, but score low on problem avoidance (sub scale of criminal thinking style, individuals use crime as distraction from their problem). Denying harm to others was related with higher level of femininity in females.

The study sample of Herrington and Nee (2005) comprised 4 groups of women, violent offenders, nonviolent offenders, working women, house wives, their findings suggested that violent offenders perceived themselves as more manly.

Hensley, Tallichet and Dutkiewicz (2009) established through research that animal abusers in childhood indulged in criminal behavior in later life. The animal abusers also have higher criminal thinking style and justified their unlawful acts. The animal abusers displayed criminal behavior in comparison to control group that showed that the animal abusers were prone to indulgence in criminal behavior (Arluke, Levin, Luke, & Ascione, 1999).

Schwartz, Fremouw, Schenk and Ragatz (2012) study results showed that college age animal abusers had the bent of mind to attain power. The subscales measurement showed that the subject had uncontrolled urge to overpower others and gain mastery over the environment. Their study was directed at exploring the psychological makeup of animal abusers i.e. criminality, empathy and personality traits, and to elucidate past bullying behavior and to unravel gender differences. Results pointed out that male animal abusers had ingrained criminal behavior and were prone to bully and scored high on power orientation scale. Female animal abusers scored higher on criminal thinking scale, and had proclivity to bully and score low on empathy as compared to female control group.

Hall (2009) conducted a study on three groups comprising parishioners, college students and probationers. The results indicated that there was no substantial association between religious beliefs and anti-social attitude. Probationers scored higher on the criminal thinking scale as compared to students and parishioners.

Objective

The objective of the present study is to assess whether high criminal thinking has a relationship with positive attitude towards honour killing.

Hypotheses

1. There will be significant differences between the scores of honour killers, murderers, men and women in general population on criminal thinking scale (TCU-CTS).

2. Those individuals who have positive attitude towards honour killing would score high on criminal thinking scale (TCU-CTS).

Method

Participants

The participants comprised two samples. Sample one was a general population sample of 303, which included mostly college/university students. The sample consisted of 176 females and 126 male, averaging 22 years of age.

The second sample included 72 men who were incarcerated. The incarcerated group consisted of 26 honour killers and 46 men who were convicted of man slaughter but not related to honour killing. The average age of the offenders was 32. All of them belonged to different regions of Khyber PakhtunKhwa (KPK).

Instruments

Texas Christian University Criminal Thinking Scale (TCU-CTS)

The TCU-CTS was developed to be used with incarcerated prisoners in Texas Christian University, at the Institute of Behavioral Research to measure criminal thinking, but before using the scale in this study formal permission was taken from the authors. The TCU-CTS consists of 37 items. It comprises six subscales, i.e. Entitlement (EN): means misconception of a person who focuses on his rights, privileges and desires that he/she should be treated preferentially. Justification (JU): means that a person is justifying his criminal acts, advancing reason that his acts are determined by external circumstances beyond his control. Personal Irresponsibility (PI): when a person shifts responsibility to others for his anti-social acts. Power Orientation (PO): when a person exploits others and tries to control external environment. Cold Heartedness (CH): means demonstration of extreme cruelty and emotional detachment. Criminal Rationalization (CN): when a person believes that his illegal acts are not different from the persons in authority who indulge in unlawful acts daily (Knight, Garner, Simpson, Morey, & Flynn, 2006). TCU-CTS was used for both the study samples i.e. with men and women in general population and incarcerated sample. As in Pakistan mostly people could not write or read English, therefore its Urdu version was prepared through committee approach. Two items of the scale to be used were not relevant to the general population that is why these were omitted, because one referred to a person undergoing imprisonment in jail and the other one referred to racism which did not relate to Pakistani population. Urdu translation of the questionnaire was rendered by small group of educationists, psychologists and scholars of English literature separately. The translated version was then put up to a new set of experts comprising, psychologists, academicians and educationists who presented their comments on the same to the author. In the

light of their opinion some amendments were made in the text again. To establish whether the translation was satisfactory the English version of the questionnaire was administered to 115 university students, and after two weeks Urdu version was given to them. The correlation between both the versions of the questionnaire was .740**. Urdu version cronbach's alpha was .803.

Attitude towards honour killing (AHK)

Newly developed scale was used for measuring attitude towards honour killing. It contained 11 scenarios portraying honour killing situations, which were based on print, electronic media reports, personal information, interviews etc. For instance in one scenario it was depicted that by contracting love marriage; three girls were buried alive by their kinsmen to redeem the honour of the family. At the end of each scenario, four different responses were presented on the degree of severity ranging from no punishment to the victim, to the justification of honour killing. The AHK scale was revised several times. After the incorporation of 11 items in the test, ten academics included responses on the degree of severity. On getting feedback on the draft from academics the portion pertaining to the responses was revised and modified.

Another group of 20 academics and professionals (doctors, teachers, counselors etc.), who were expert in their respective field assessed the responses and more modifications were introduced in the draft. A third draft was considered by 20 academics who approved it.

Procedure

Procedure

A letter was addressed to the inspector general of prisons for permission to collect data from jails. After his approval the author traveled many times to Mardan, Swabi, Charsadda and Peshawar jails. The jailors brought under trial prisoners for honour killing and convicts in murder cases, before administration of the questionnaire, consent was taken from the inmates and it was assured by the researcher that their responses would be kept confidential and would not be used against them in court.

Three inmates filled out the questionnaires by themselves while to the others the questionnaires were administered by the author or research assistant in the presence of jail superintendents and a guard. During the course of interview the superintendent and the guard stayed in the room (due to security reasons the security personnel remained in the room at such a distance where from their presence could not affect the proceedings).

A convenient sampling technique was used in the collection of data from the general public. The data from 126 men and 176 women was collected from general population, who were approached in different public places like markets, malls, bus stops etc. The students of three colleges and two universities were also approached. Prior permission was taken from the head /principal of the institution before approaching the students.

Results

One way ANOVA was conducted to assess the differences between the four groups, i.e. honour killers, murderers, men and women in general population, on criminal thinking scale. The results of the one way ANOVA indicates that there is significant differences between these groups except between the men and women in the general population there was no differences ($F(3,370) = 57.95, P=.000$) on criminal thinking. Results suggested that the mean score of the honour killers

($M=245.5$, $SD=19.11$) was greater as compared to murderers ($M=226.05$, $SD=24.30$) and from the mean scores of men ($M=190.93$, $SD=25.6$) and women in general population ($M=188.3$, $SD=27.6$). Contrary to the assumption that honour killers will score less as compared to the murderers, honour killers score high on the TCU-CTS as compared to the murderers. General population as compared to incarcerated population score low on TCU-CTS, but there was no significant differences between the scores of men and women in general population. The results of the t test analysis indicated that people whose criminal thinking was high had also a positive attitude about the honour killing ($t(262) = 9.031$, $p < .000$, Cohen's $d = -1.12$).

Table 1

One way ANOVA and follow up Post Hoc analysis for pair wise comparison with Bonferroni correction factor, showing Mean, Standard deviation, and F-values of Male, Female, Honor Killers and other Offenders on TUC and its subscales(N=374)

Scale	1 Male (n = 126)		2 Female (n = 176)		3 Honor Killer (n = 26)		4 Other Offender (n = 46)		F	i-j	MD _{i-j}	SE	95% CI	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD					LL	UL
EN	30.17	5.91	27.65	6.23	35.33	4.15	32.68	4.32	19.88**	1>2	2.52**	.68	.73	4.31
										1<3	5.16**	1.24	-8.47	-1.85
										2<3	7.68**	1.22	-10.91	-4.45
										2<4	5.03**	.96	-7.57	-2.48
JU	28.90	6.48	25.44	7.84	37.44	6.04	33.84	5.16	34.40**	1>2	3.45**	.82	1.29	5.62
										1<3	8.54**	1.51	-12.53	-4.54
										1<4	4.94**	1.21	-8.14	-1.74
										2<3	11.95**	1.47	-15.88	-8.09
PO	30.11	6.61	28.23	7.54	41.87	5.62	36.37	4.50	39.75**	1<3	11.76**	1.50	-15.76	-7.76
										1<4	6.26**	1.20	-9.45	-3.06
										2<3	13.64**	1.46	-17.54	-9.74
										2<4	8.14**	15.15	-11.21	-5.06
CH	37.75	6.88	41.71	6.95	42.77	4.04	40.76	5.92	10.07**	1<2	3.36**	0.77	-6.02	-1.90
										1<3	5.02**	1.43	-8.82	-1.21
										1<4	6.97**	1.07	-9.83	-4.12
CN	35.37	5.95	36.50	6.95	44.48	3.96	42.35	5.03	26.44**	1<3	9.11**	1.34	-12.67	-5.54
										1<4	6.97**	1.07	-9.83	-4.12
										2<3	7.98**	1.31	-11.46	-4.50
										2<4	5.85**	1.03	-8.59	-3.11
PI	28.63	6.77	28.76	8.48	43.65	3.33	40.05	7.71	55.09**	1<3	15.01**	1.63	-19.35	-10.68
										1<4	11.41**	1.30	-14.88	-7.95
										2<3	14.89**	1.59	-19.12	-10.66
										2<4	11.29**	1.25	-14.62	-7.96
TCU	190.93	25.6	188.3	27.6	245.5	19.11	226.05	24.30	57.95**	1<3	8.84**	0.94	-11.34	-6.33
										1<4	5.53**	0.75	-7.53	-3.52
										2<3	9.54**	0.92	-11.98	-7.09
										2<4	6.23**	0.72	-8.15	-4.30
										3>4	3.31*	1.07	0.45	6.16

Note: PI=Personal Irresponsibility, EN=Entitlement, JU=Justification, PO=Power Orientation, CH=Cold Heartedness, CN=Criminal Rationalization, TCU-CTS (total) = General Criminal Thinking, Between group $df = 3$, within group $df = 370$, group total $df = 373$; * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$.

Table 1 shows the mean difference on TCU–CTS of the four groups that are Male, Female, Honor Killers and other Offenders. Results show higher differences among these four groups.

Table 2

Mean scores, Standard Deviation and t-values on Attitude towards honour killing with respect to high and low scorers on TCU-CTS (N=262)

Scales	Low scorers (n=133)		High scorers (n=129)		<i>t</i> (262)	<i>p</i>	95%CI		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
HK	16.99	3.77	22.36	5.69	-9.031	.000	-6.55	-4.203	-1.12

Note. CI = Confidence interval; LL = Lower limit; UL = Upper limit, HK=Attitude towards Honour Killing
The result indicates that there is a significant difference between the scores of people, who have high scores on TCU-CTS as compared to people who have low scores on TCU-CTS, in their attitude towards honour killing.

Discussion

In Pakistan 1000 persons are killed in the name of honor every year. The number of such incidents is believed to be very high but many cases go unregistered. Killings committed in the name of honor are reported in many communities i.e. Muslims, Hindus, Christians, etc. Many people justify these killings and the perpetrators justify their acts under various pretexts including social pressure, culture, traditions, rage etc.

The present study is designed to investigate other possible cause of honour killing by hypothesizing that criminal thinking may be a reason behind these kinds of killings.

To investigate if honour killers’ criminal thinking is like men in general population or other incarcerated murderers, their criminal thinking is measured by using TCU-CTS. The results show that there is significant difference between the scores of honour killers, murderers, men and women in general population. There is significant difference between scores of honour killers and murderers as the mean scores of the honour killers are high, as compared to murderers (table 1). As anticipated, the score of sample from the general population was lower as compared to the score of incarcerated sample.

The results on the TCU-CTS clearly illustrate that honour killers have more sense of ownership; they have tendency to justify their actions; they are not ready to accept responsibility for their actions and try to be dominant and control other people. The findings also refute the myth that honour killers are not like ordinary criminals.

Other related researches support the findings i.e. criminals usually score high on criminal thinking as compared to other people in general population. Walters & Geyer, 2004 conducted a study by comparing three groups of offenders i.e. White Collar Offenders, White Collar Offenders having history of violent crimes and Non White Collar Offenders. The findings suggested that there is no significant difference between three groups on criminal thinking. Another study was conducted on college students to find out the relationship between criminal thinking style and illegal behavior. The students were divided into four categories i.e. students involved in illegal behavior (i.e. control status offenders), students involved in crimes like drugs, students involved in property crimes and students

involved in violent crimes against people. The researchers concluded that the more they were involved in severe illegal behavior, the higher they scored on criminal thinking scales. Men as compared to females score high on Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Style (PICTS) (McCoy, Fremouw, Tyner, Clegg, Johansson-Love, & Strunk, 2006). Dembo, Turner and Jainchill (2007) determined in a study that male and female scores were similar on the five subscales of TCU-CTS i.e. Personal Irresponsibility, Entitlement, Justification, Power Orientation, Criminal Rationalization.

The finding also suggested that the people who have high criminal thinking have positive attitude toward honour killing (table 2). The finding indicates that people with high criminal thinking can also give a positive opinion about honor killing. Honour killing is a crime and a person who supports such act definitely have a criminal mentality, and the present research also supports it. The other researches also support the findings that people with high criminal thinking are mostly involved in illegal behavior.

A study was conducted on college students to assess the association between the kind of dogs students have and criminal thinking. Result indicated that students who kept vicious dogs had higher level of criminal thinking in comparison to the pupils who did not have a dog or had a harmless dog. And the students with high criminal thinking also approved illegal behavior (Schenk, Ragatz, & Fremouw, 2012).

Conclusion

The research finding clearly shows that there is no difference between the criminal thinking of murderers and honour killers; refuting the opinion of majority of the people that honour killers are the victim of circumstances as they commit such crimes because of societal pressure, rage culture, etc. The results clearly show that they are prone to commit crime but in such cases giving perfect alibi to their crime and giving it a name of killing for honour is misleading. The present study also confirms that those people who are having positive attitude towards honour killing also have high criminal thinking.

References

- Arluke, A., Levin, J., Luke, C., & Ascione, F. (1999). The relationship of animal abuse to violence and other forms of antisocial behavior. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14(9), 963-975. doi: 10.1177/088626099014009004
- Dembo, R., Turner, C. W., & Jainchill, N. (2007). An assessment of criminal thinking among incarcerated youths in three states: *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 34(9), 1157-1167. doi: 10.1177/0093854807304348
- Faqir, F. (2001). Intra family femicide in defense of honour: The case of Jordan. *Third World Quarterly*, 22, 65-82. doi: 10.1080/01436590020022583
- Florek, A. C. (2013). *Honor as a motive for murder: Examining mock-juror perceptions of honor killings as a cultural defense in the American courtroom*. (Doctoral Thesis). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI Number: 3643945).
- Glazer, I. M., & Abu-Ras, W. (1994). Aggression, human rights and hegemonic discourse: The case of a murder for family honor (in the Arab Society) in Israel. *Sex Role*, 30 (3/4), 269-288. doi: 10.1007/BF01420994
- Hadidi, M., Kulwicki, A., & Jahshan, H. (2001). A review of 16 cases of honour killings in Jordan in 1995. *International Journal of Legal Medicine*, 114(6), 357-359. doi: 10.1007/s004140000166

- Hailé, J. (2008). *Honour killing its causes & consequences: Suggested strategies for the European parliament*. Retrieved from <http://edz.bib.uni-mannheim.de/daten/edz-ma/ep/07/EST18859.pdf>
- Hall, F. (2009). *Religiosity and criminal thinking patterns among religious non-offenders*. (M.Sc. Thesis, Central Connecticut State University, Connecticut, New Britain). Retrieved from <http://content.library.ccsu.edu/cdm/ref/collection/ccsutheses/id/1309>
- Herrington, V., & Nee, C. (2005). Self-perceptions, masculinity and female offenders. *Internet Journal of Criminology*, 1-30. Retrieved from <http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/Herrington%20%20Nee%20-%20Self-perceptions,%20Masculinity%20and%20Female%20Offenders.pdf>
- Hensley, C., Tallichet, S. E., & Dutkiewicz, E. L. (2009). Recurrent childhood animal cruelty: Is there a relationship to adult recurrent interpersonal violence? *Criminal Justice Review*, 34, 248-257. doi: 10.1177/0734016808325062
- Jafri, A. H. (2008). *Honour killing: dilemma, ritual, understanding*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Kardam, F., Alpar, Z., Yuksel, I., & Ergun, E. Report for UN Population Fund (UNFPA). (2005). *The Dynamics of honourkillings in Turkey: Prospects for action*. Retrieved on July 8, 2015 from http://www.unfpa.org/upload/lib_pub_file/676_filename_honourkillings.pdf
- Knight, K., Garner, B. R., Simpson, D. D., Morey, J. T., & Flynn, P. M. (2006). An assessment for criminal thinking. *Crime and Delinquency*, 52(1), 159-177. doi: 10.1177/0011128705281749
- Kulczycki, A., & Windle, S. (2012). Honor killings in the Middle East and North Africa: A systematic review of the literature. *Violence Against Women*, 17(11), 1442-1464. doi: 10.1177/1077801211434127
- McCoy, K., Fremouw, W., Tyner, E., Clegg, C., Johansson-Love, J., & Strunk, J. (2006). Criminal-thinking styles and illegal behavior among college students: Validation of the PICTS. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 51(5), 1174-1177. doi: 10.1111/j.1556-4029.2006.00216.x
- Nasrullah, M. Haqqi, S., & Cummings, K. J. (2009). The epidemiological patterns of honour killing of women in Pakistan. *European Journal of Public Health*, 9(2), 193-197. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckp021>
- Najam, N. (2006). *Honour killings in Pakistan*. Retrieved from <http://www.islamawariness.net/Honourkilling/Pakistan.html>
- Reid, S. T. (1996). *Crime and Criminology* (8th ed.). USA: McGraw Hill.
- Schwartz, R.L., Fremouw, W., Schenk, A., & Ragatz, L. L. (2012). Psychological profile of male and female animal abusers. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 27(5), 846-861. doi: 10.1177/0886260511423254
- Shah, S. (2008, September 1). *Pakistan: Three teenage girls buried alive in tribal honour killing*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/sep/01/pakistan>
- Sutherland, E. H., Cressey, D. R., & Luckenbill, D. F. (1992). *Principles of criminology* (11th ed.). Dix Hills, NY: General Hall.
- Sykes, G., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A Theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 664-673.
- Sheeley, E. R. (2007). *Reclaiming honor in Jordan: A national public opinion survey on "honor" killings*. Amman, Jordan: Black Iris.
- Schenk, A. M., Ragatz, L. L., & Fremouw, W.J. (2012). Vicious dogs part 2: Criminal thinking callousness, and personality styles of their owners. *Journal of forensic sciences*, 57(1), 152-159. doi:10.1111/J.1556-4029.2011.01961.x
- Walters, G.D. (2001). The Relationship between masculinity, femininity, and criminal thinking in male and female offenders. *Sex Roles*, 45(9), 677-689. doi:10.1023/A: 1014819926761

- Walters, G. D. & Geyer, M.D. (2004).Criminal thinking and identity in male white-collar offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 31*(3):263-281.doi: 10.1177/0093854803262508.
- Warraich, S.A. (2007). Honour killing:The law in Pakistan. In Welchman, L., & Hossain, S.(Eds.),*Honour: Crimes, paradigms and violence against women* (pp.79-80). Karachi, Pakistan: Oxford University Press.
- Yochelson, S., & Samenow, S. (1976). *The criminal personality.Vol.1.A profile for change*. New York: Jason Aronson, Inc.
- Walters, G. D. (2002). The Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles (PICTS): A review and meta-analysis. *Assessment, 9*, 283-296.doi: 10.1177 / 1073191102009003007

Received: Dec 25th, 2016

Revisions Received: March 20th, 2017