**SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

**STUDY 1**

**Variables Excluded from Analyses**

Participants indicated their *planned length of stay* using an open-ended format. Since many responses are rendered not eligible for analyses (undetermined period of time, indefinitely, 3-5 years), we decided not to include it in our analyses.

We also measured *group/national honor* with two items derived from Levin, Roccas, Sidanius and Pratto (2015), one referring to family honor and one referring to one’s nation’s honor. Since family honor was assessed as part of the Honor Scale and we failed to specify which nation participants need to think about while answering this question, we did not include this measure in our analyses.

**Cultural Subgroup Differences**

**Demographic Variables.** We examined cultural group differences in length of stay, religiosity, and perceived visual similarity. ANOVAs conducted separately with each variable revealed significant main effects for participants’ length of stay in the UK, *F*(2, 273) = 8.70, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .06, and perceived visual similarity, *F*(2, 274) = 11.12, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .08, but not for religiosity, *F*(2, 274) = 1.51, *p* = .22, *ηp2* = .01. Participants from distal honor cultures reported to have stayed in the UK significantly longer than did participants from proximal honor cultures (*p* = .002) and dignity cultures (*p* < .001); the latter two groups did not differ from each other (*p* = 1.00). Participants from distal and proximal honor cultural groups perceived themselves visually less similar to British people than did members of dignity cultural groups (*p* < .001 and *p* <.01, respectively); the two honor groups did not differ from each other in their perception (*p* = .67). In the ANOVAs reported below, we controlled for these variables where theoretically meaningful.

**Honor concerns.** Although classifying participants into cultural categories based on the past literature may be theoretically meaningful and justified, it is based on an assumption which requires empirical verification. To test whether participants from honor cultures (distal vs. proximal) indeed endorsed honor values at higher levels than did participants from dignity cultures, we conducted a mixed ANOVA with type of honor concern (feminine, masculine, family, integrity honor) as a within-subjects variable, cultural group (dignity, distal honor, proximal honor) as a between-subjects variable, and length of stay as a covariate. As expected, this analysis revealed a significant main effect of cultural group, *F*(2, 272) = 3.51, *p* = .03, *ηp2* = .03; participants in the distal honor group (*M* = 6.21, *SE* = .21) endorsed marginally significantly higher honor concerns than did participants in the dignity group (*M* = 5.54, *SE* = .12) (*p* = .05) and the proximal honor group (*M* = 5.50, *SE* = .19) (*p* = .06). Proximal honor culture group and dignity culture group did not differ from each other in their honor concerns (*p* = 1.00). Thus, we found some support for our expectation: It was only participants from distal honor cultures (and not proximal honor cultures) who reported having stronger honor concerns compared with participants from dignity cultures, but this difference was only marginally significant.

This analysis also revealed a significant main effect of type of honor concerns, *F*(3, 816) = 103.19, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .28: integrity was the most strongly endorsed type of honor concern (*M* = 6.79, *SE* = .11), followed by family honor (*M* = 5.98, *SE* = .18), feminine honor (*M* = 4.83, *SE* = .13), and finally masculine honor concerns (*M* = 4.61, *SE* = .11). All scores were significantly different from each other at *p* < .001, with the exception of masculine and feminine honor concerns, *p* = .30. The interaction effect between cultural group and type of honor values was not significant, *F*(3, 816) = 1.81, *p* = .09, *ηp2* = 013.

**Perceived general and honor-related cultural distance.** To examine the pattern of perceived cultural distance across the cultural groups, we conducted a mixed ANOVA with general and honor cultural distance as within-subjects variable and cultural group as between subjects-variable, and length of stay as covariate. This analysis revealed significant main effects of type of cultural distance, *F*(1, 272) = 34.97, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .11 and cultural group, *F*(2, 272) = 22.32, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .14. Overall, participants perceived significantly greater general cultural distance (*M* = 4.82, *SD* = 1.33) than honor cultural distance (*M* = 4.15, *SD* = 1.37). Participants from distal honor cultures (*M* = 5.12, *SE* = .13) perceived the highest level of cultural distance, followed by participants from proximal honor cultures (*M* = 4.55, *SE* = .12) and dignity cultures (*M* = 4.03, *SE* = .10), all *p*s < .006. These main effects were qualified by a significant cultural group X type of cultural distance interaction effect, *F*(2, 272) = 17.54, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .11. Unfolding this interaction effect revealed that participants from dignity cultures and proximal honor cultures differentiated between general and honor cultural distance, perceiving significantly higher general cultural distance than honor cultural distance (*F*(1, 272) = 98.66, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .27 and *F*(1, 272) = 18.04, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .06, respectively); whereas those from distal honor cultures reported perceiving comparable levels of general and honor cultural distance (*F* < 1). In terms of cultural group differences across the two types of cultural distance, the pattern for honor cultural distance followed that of the main effect with participants from distal honor cultures perceiving the greatest honor cultural distance, followed by those from proximal cultures and dignity cultures, all *ps* < .001, *F*(2, 272) = 42.07, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .24. For general cultural distance, a significant difference emerged only between the distal honor group and dignity group (*p* < .01), with the former perceiving significantly bigger general cultural distance than the latter, with all other groups perceiving comparable levels of general cultural distance (*p*s > .17), *F*(2, 272) = 3.90, *p* = 021, *ηp2* = .03.

**Host and heritage cultural orientation.** The same mixed ANOVA described above with heritage and host culture orientations as within subjects variable revealed a significant main effect of acculturation orientation, *F*(1, 272) = 38.70, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .13. The main effect of cultural group was not significant, *F*(2, 272) = 1.80, *p* = .17, *ηp2* = .01. Overall, all cultural groups identified more strongly with their heritage culture (*M* = 6.65, *SE* = 1.45) than they did with the host culture (*M* = 6.14, *SD* = 1.36). A significant acculturation orientation X cultural group interaction effect, *F*(1, 272) = 5.15, *p* = .006, *ηp2* = .04, revealed that the pattern of the main effect held for participants from both proximal and distal honor cultures (*F*(1, 272) = 25.78, *p* < .001, *ηp2* =.09 and *F*(1, 272) = 6.91, *p* = .009, *ηp2* =.03, respectively), but not for dignity cultures who reported comparable levels of identification with both heritage and host cultures, *F*(1, 272) = 1.38, *p* = .24, *ηp2* =.005.

**Acculturative stress.** An ANOVA with acculturative stress across the five domains as dependent variable and cultural group as between-subjects variable revealed a non-significant main effect of type of acculturative stress, *F*(2, 272) < 1.



**Table A2**

Descriptive Statistics for RASI Subscales (*N* = 278)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *M (SD)* | *α* |
| work | 3.11 (1.04) | .66 |
| language skills | 2.11 (1.04) | .75 |
| intercultural relations | 1.02 (.96) | .75 |
| discrimination | 2.50 (1.08) | .78 |
| social isolation | 2.09 (.88) | .58 |

*α* : reliability coefficient

**Subgroup Analyses**

We classified participants as members of a dignity culture when they self-reported as originating from countries in North America or Western Europe (e.g., Scandinavian countries, Germany) (*N*dignity= 121, 90 women), as members of a proximal honor culture when originating from southern or south-eastern European countries (e.g., Spain, Greece, Italy) (*N*proximal honor = 79, 59 women), and as members of a distal honor culture when originating from countries in South Asian, the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), or South American regions (e.g., Turkey, Pakistan, Egypt, Venezuela) (*N*distal honor= 78, 54 women).

**STUDY 2**

**Variables Excluded from Analyses**

Participants also completed Worthington and colleagues’ (2003) 10-item measure of religiosity. This measure assesses the extent to which individuals report being committed to their religion (e.g., “My religious beliefs lie behind my whole approach to life.”, *α* = .95). The overall pattern of results using this measure was the same as that observed with the single-item measure of religiosity. To maintain consistency with Study 1 measures, we used the single-item measure of religiosity in the main analyses in Study 2.

**Cultural Subgroup Differences**

**Demographic Variables.** We first examined cultural group differences (distal honor, proximal honor) in ratings of religiosity and length of stay in Canada. Analysis of variance showed that participants from distal honor cultures reported higher religiosity compared to those from a proximal honor culture, *F*(1,356) = 3.81, *p* = 0.52, *ηp2* = .01. Those from proximal honor cultures, however, reported living in Canada for a longer period of time, *F*(1,354) = 20.32, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .05. In the analyses reported below, we entered length of stay in Canada and religiosity as covariates, but the pattern of results did not differ whether these covariates were included in the analyses or not. Therefore, the results reported below are those without covariates in the model.

**Honor concerns.** To test for any cultural group differences in endorsement of honor concerns, we rana mixed analysis of variance with type of honor concern (feminine, masculine, family, integrity honor) as a within-subjects variable and cultural group (distal honor, proximal honor) as a between-subjects variable. As expected, results showed a significant main effect of cultural group, *F*(1,353) = 13.22, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .04, with participants from distal honor cultures scoring higher on honor concerns *M* = 7.16, *SE* = .07) compared with those from proximal honor cultures (*M* = 6.60, *SE* = .14).

Results also showed a main effect of type of honor concerns, *F*(3, 1059) = 205.55, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .37: integrity was the most strongly endorsed type of honor (*M* = 7.84, *SE* = .08), followed closely by family honor (*M* = 7.83, *SE* = .10), whereas feminine honor (*M* = 5.94, *SE* = .13), and masculine honor (*M* = 5.92, *SE* = .09) were endorsed significantly less.

Importantly, a significant type of honor concern X cultural group interaction was also observed, *F*(3,1059) = 11.75, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .03. Probing of this interaction revealed two statistically significant comparisons: members of distal honor cultures scored higher than their counterparts from proximal honor cultures on family honor concerns, *F*(1,353) = 5.23, *p* = .02, *ηp2* = .02, and feminine honor concerns, *F*(1,353) = 25.46, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .07. Cultural differences in masculine honor concerns, on the other hand, approached statistical significance, *F*(1,353) = 3.36, *p* = .068, *ηp2* = .01, and no statistically significant differences were observed for integrity honor concerns, *F*(1,353) = .84, *ns*.

**Perceived general and honor-related culture distance.** To examine the pattern of perceived cultural distance across the cultural groups, we conducted a mixed ANOVA with general and honor cultural distance as within-subjects variable and cultural group as between subjects-variable. This analysis revealed significant main effects of type of cultural distance, *F*(1, 355) = 74.32, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .17 and cultural group, *F*(1, 355) = 15.33, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .04. Overall, participants perceived significantly greater general cultural distance (*M* = 4.96, *SD* = 1.45) than honor cultural distance (*M* = 4.49, *SD* = 1.40). In addition, participants from distal honor cultures (*M* = 4.86, *SE* = .08) perceived higher cultural distance compared to those from proximal honor cultures (*M* = 4.21, *SE* = .15). These main effects, however, were qualified by a significant cultural group X type of cultural distance interaction, *F*(1, 355) = 16.79, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .05. Unpacking of this interaction showed that it was mostly driven by cultural group differences in honor related distance, *F*(1,355) = 29.73, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .08, with differences in general cultural distance approaching statistical significance, *F*(1,355) = 3.21, *p* = .07, *ηp2* = .01.

**Host and heritage cultural orientation.** Another mixed ANOVA tested for differences in acculturation orientations across both honor groups, but found no main or interaction effects, all *F*s < .24, *p*s > .62. In other words, both honor groups reported similar levels of orientation to both heritage and mainstream cultures (*M*s ranging from 7.00 to 7.09, *SD*s ranging from 1.21 to 1.63).

**Table A3**

*Means and standard deviations of study variables per cultural group (Study 2)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Proximal Honor Group | Distal Honor Group |
|  |  | *M* (*SD*) | *M* (*SD*) |
| 1 | General distance | 4.69 (1.43) | 5.03 (1.45) |
| 2 | Honor distance | 3.73 (1.18) | 4.69 (1.39) |
| 3 | Family honor | 7.61 (1.57) | 8.04 (1.43) |
| 4 | Feminine honor | 5.27 (1.20) | 6.60 (2.04) |
| 5 | Masculine honor | 5.74 (1.38) | 6.10 (1.47) |
| 6 | Integrity | 7.77 (1.21) | 7.91 (1.25) |
| 7 | Mainstream acculturation | 7.09 (1.26) | 7.03 (1.22) |
| 8 | Heritage acculturation | 7.09 (1.57) | 7.00 (1.63) |
| 9 | Religiosity | 4.17 (2.02) | 4.68 (2.01) |
| 10 | Well-being | 5.95 (0.83) | 5.73 (0.97) |

**STUDY 3**

**Variables Excluded from Analyses**

We also measured desirability of masculine attributes rated for women and desirability of feminine attributes rated for men but did not include these in our regression analyses to keep it to gender-congruent attributes of honor (i.e., masculine honor attributes as rated for men, feminine honor attributes as rated for women) as indicators of the endorsement of gendered honor norms.

**First-Generation Country Differences**

**Frequency Distribution of Countries.** A Chi-Square difference test showed that the frequencies of participants were different between the three regions of Southern-Europe, the MENA region, and South-East Asia, *X2*(2) = 56.9, *p* < .001. Of the 145 first-generation 91 (63%) participants were from Southern-Europe, 30 (21%) were from the MENA region, and 24 (17%) were from South-East Asia.



**Demographic Variables.** Using a one-way ANOVA with Region (Southern Europe vs South-East Asia vs MENA Region) as the between-factor we tested for differences between the three regions in the demographic variables of socio-economic status and religiosity. We did not find any region differences for socio-economic status (*M* = 5.71, *SD* = 1.6), *F*(2, 142) = 1.342, *p* = .265, *ηp2* = .019, but did find significant differences in religiosity between regions, *F*(2, 142) = 34.19, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .325, with South-East Asia (*M* = 3.29, *SD* = 1.04) being significantly higher than both the MENA region (*M* = 2.5, *SD* = 1.17, *p* < 0.01, using Tukey’s HSD tests) and Southern Europe (*M* = 1.57, *SD* = 0.87, *p* < .001), with the latter two also showing significant differences (*p* < .001).

**Host and heritage cultural orientation.** We tested differences in cultural orientations with a mixed ANCOVA, with Region (Southern Europe vs South-East Asia vs MENA Region) as the between-factor, Orientation (Heritage vs Host orientation) as the within-factor, and religiosity as the covariates. We found a significant interaction effect between Orientation and Region, *F*(2, 141) = 3.593, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .048. However, splitting the interaction into ANOVAs for the two outcome variables showed no significant differences between regions for neither mainstream orientation, *F*(2, 141) = 0.086, *p* = .427, *ηp2* = .012, nor heritage orientation, *F*(2, 141) = 2.62, *p* = .076, *ηp2* = .036.

**Honor attributes**. We tested differences in honor attributes with a mixed ANCOVA, with Region (Southern Europe vs South-East Asia vs MENA Region) as the between-factor, Rating Target (men vs. women) and Honor Facet (Neutral vs Feminine vs Masculine) as the within-factors, and religiosity as the covariate (reporting Greenhouse-Geisser corrected values). We found no significant main effect for region, *F*(2, 141) = 1.369, *p* = .258, *ηp2* = .019, nor any significant interaction terms of region with either honor facets, *F*(4, 282) = 1.845, *p* = .131, *ηp2* = .026, rating target, *F*(2, 141) = 1.688, *p* = .189, *ηp2* = .023, or both in a three-way interaction, *F*(4, 282) = 2.492, *p* = .043, *ηp2* = .034.

**Well-being.** Finally, we tested differences in subjective well-being with a between-factor ANCOVA, with Region(Southern Europe vs South-East Asia vs MENA Region) as the between-factor, and religiosity as covariate. We found no significant effect for region, *F*(2, 141) = 1.432, *p* = .242, *ηp2* = .02.

**Generational Groups Differences**

**Demographic Variables.** We first tested differences between groups in the step 1 background variables, socio-economic status and religiosity. For each variable, we conducted an independent samples t-test with Generation (1st vs. 2nd generation) as the between-factor. We found that there were significant differences between generational groups in both religiosity, *t*(289) = 3.3, *p* < .01, *d* = .39, and socio-economic status, *t*(289) = 3.13, *p* < .01, *d* = .37. We therefore included the two variables in the group comparisons for the remaining variables.

**Host and heritage cultural orientation.** We tested differences in cultural orientations with a mixed ANCOVA, with Generation (1st vs. 2nd Generation) as the between-factor, Orientation (Heritage vs Host orientation) as the within-factor, and SES and religiosity as the covariates (marginal means can be found for all variables in table A.2). We found a significant interaction effect between Orientation and Generation, *F*(1, 287) = 12.67, *p* < .001, *ηp2* = .04. Splitting the interaction into ANOVAs for the two outcome variables showed that there was a significant difference between generations for mainstream orientation, *F*(1, 287) = 19.02, p < .001, *ηp2* = .06, with 2nd generation participants (*M* = 7.2) reporting higher mainstream orientation than did 1st generation participants (*M* = 6.84). No significant difference was found for heritage orientation, *F*(1, 287) = .00, p = .98, *ηp2* = .00.

**Honor attributes**. We tested differences in honor attributes with a mixed ANCOVA, with Generation (1st vs. 2nd Generation) as the between-factor, Rating Target (men vs. women) and Honor Facet (Neutral vs Feminine vs Masculine) as the within-factors, and SES and religiosity as the covariates. We only found a significant main effect for Honor Facets, *F*(2, 286) = 4.947, *p* < .01, *ηp2* = .03. Pairwise comparisons between the different honor facets showed that neutral honor facets (*M* = 3.84) were rated significantly more desirable than both feminine (*M* = 3.45, *p* < .001) and masculine attributes (*M* = 3.36, *p* < .001); furthermore, feminine attributes were also rated as significantly higher in desirability than masculine attributes, *p* < .01.

**Well-being.** Finally, we tested differences in subjective well-being with a between-factor ANCOVA, with Generation (1st vs. 2nd Generation) as the between-factor, and SES and religiosity as covariates. We found a significant main effect for Generation, *F*(1, 287) = 3.6, *p* < .05, *ηp2* = .01, indicating that 2nd generation participants (*M* = 4.54) rated their well-being higher than 1st generation participants (*M* = 4.25).

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A.4***Means and Standard Deviations of Study Variables per Generational Group (Study 3)* |
|  |  | **1st Generation** | **2nd Generation** |  |
| *Study variables* |  | *M (SE)* | *M (SE)* |  |
| Mainstream Cultural Orientation |  | 6.84 (.11) | 7.2 (.12) |  |
| Heritage Cultural Orientation |  | 6.83 (.11) | 6.47 (.12) |  |
| Honor Attributes Neutral*(rated for men)* |  | 3.82 (.05) | 3.87 (.05) |  |
| Honor Attributes Feminine*(rated for men)* |  | 3.39 (.05) | 3.51 (.05)  |  |
| Honor Attributes Masculine*(rated for men)* |  | 3.32 (.05) | 3.47 (.05) |  |
| Honor Attributes Neutral*(rated for women)* |  | 3.83 (.05)  | 3.86 (.05)  |  |
| Honor Attributes Feminine*(rated for women)* |  | 3.39 (.06) | 3.51 (.06) |   |
| Honor Attributes Masculine*(rated for women)* |  | 3.29 (.06) | 3.36 (.06) |  |
| Honor Attributes Neutral*(combined score across both genders)* |  | 3.78 (.05) | 3.91 (.05) |  |
| Subjective Wellbeing |  | 4.25 (.11) | 4.54 (.11) |  |

**Table A.5**

*Subsample Regressions by Generational Group (Study 3)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **1st Generation Sample** |  | **2nd Generation Sample** |
|  |  | **Not including length of stay** | **Including length of stay** | **Not including length of stay** |
| **Heritage CO** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** |
| R2 | .13\*\*\* | .17\*\*\* | .14\*\*\* | .18\*\*\* | .14\*\*\* | .25\*\*\* |
| ∆R2 | - | .04 | - | .04 | - | .11\*\*\* |
| **Variable** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** |
| Length of Stay | - | - | -0.01 [ -.04, .01 ] | -0.01 [ -.03, .01 ] | - | - |
| Religiosity | 0.37\*\*\* [ .18, .56 ] | 0.28\* [ .06, .50 ] | 0.37\*\*\* [ .18, .55 ] | 0.28\* [ .06, .50 ] | 0.42\*\*\* [ .24, .59 ] | 0.29\*\* [ .09, .50 ] |
| SES | 0.17\* [ .04, .31 ] | 0.15\* [ .01, .29 ] | 0.17\* [ .03, .31 ] | 0.15\* [ .01, .29 ] | 0.07 [ -.07, .20 ] | 0.03 [ -.10, .16 ] |
| Honor Neutral  | - | 0.57 [ -.02, 1.17 ] | **-** | 0.55 [ -.05, 1.14 ] | - | 1.28\*\*\* [ .66, 1.89 ] |
| Honor Masculine | - | -0.03 [ -.51, .45] | **-** | -0.03 [ -.51, .45 ] | - | -0.05 [ -.48, .38 ] |
| Honor Feminine  | - | -0.08 [ -.54, .38 ] | - | -0.07 [ -.54, .39 ] | - | -0.47\* [ -.90, -.04 ] |
| **Mainstream CO** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** |
| R2 | .03 | .08† | .04 | .08† | .06\* | .13\*\* |
| ∆R2 | - | .04 | - | .04 | - | .07\* |
| **Variable** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** |
| Length of Stay | - | - | 0.01 [ -.01, .04 ] | 0.02 [ -.01, .04 ] | - | - |
| Religiosity | -0.03 [ -.24, .17 ] | -0.02 [ -.27, .23 ] | -0.03 [ -.24, .18 ] | -0.02 [ -.26, .23 ] | -0.21\* [ -.39, -.05 ] | -0.23\* [ -.44, -.02 ] |
| SES | 0.17\* [ .02, .32 ] | 0.15 [ -.01, .30 ] | 0.17\* [ .02, .33 ] | 0.15 [ .00, .30 ] | 0.09 [ -.05, .22 ] | 0.06 [ -.08, .19 ] |
| Honor Neutral  | - | 0.74\* [ .08, 1.40 ] | - | 0.78\* [ .11, 1.44 ] | - | 0.79\* [ .16, 1.42 ] |
| Honor Masculine | - | -0.08 [ -.62, .45 ] | - | -0.10 [ -.63, .44 ] | - | 0.17 [ -.27, .62 ] |
| Honor Feminine  | - | -0.45 [ -.97, .07 ] | - | -0.46 [ -.98, .06 ] | - | -0.55\* [ -.99, -.10 ] |
| **Well-being** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** | **Step 1** | **Step 2** |
| R2 | .37\*\*\* | .38\*\*\* | .38\*\*\* | .38\*\*\* | .18\*\*\* | .21\*\*\* |
| ∆R2 | - | .01 | - | .01 | - | .03 |
| **Variable** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** | ***B [95% CI]*** |
| Length of Stay | - | - | -0.01 [ -.03, .01 ] | -0.01 [ -.03, .01 ] | - | - |
| Religiosity | 0.11 [ -.06, .27 ] | 0.09 [ -.11, .29 ] | 0.10 [ -.06, .27 ] | 0.09 [ -.11, .28 ] | 0.10 [ -.08, .27 ] | 0.14 [ -.08, .36 ] |
| SES | 0.55\*\*\* [ .43, .67 ] | 0.54\*\*\* [ .42, .66 ] | .55\*\*\* [ .43, .67 ] | 0.54\*\*\* [ .42, .66 ] | 0.39\*\*\* [ .25, .53 ] | 0.36\*\*\* [ .22, .50 ] |
| Honor Neutral  | - | -0.22 [ -.75, .30 ] | - | -0.25 [ -.77, .28 ] | - | 0.55 [ -.12, 1.21 ] |
| Honor Masculine | - | 0.29 [ -.14, .71 ] | - | 0.29 [ -.13, .72 ] | - | 0.15 [ -.31, .62 ] |
| Honor Feminine  | - | 0.04 [ -.37, .45 ] | - | 0.05 [ -.36, .46 ] | - | -0.53\* [ -.99, -.07 ] |

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