**Supplemental Materials for**

**Differences and Similarities in Psychological Characteristics between Cultural Groups Circum Mediterranean**

**Table S1**

*Characteristics of Samples in terms of their Similarities and Differences in Background and Ecological Variables*

|  |  | | **Religious Denomination** | **National / Ethnic Identity** | **Language** | **Physical Ecology** | **Socio-Political Ecology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Muslims vs. Christians in Lebanon** | | These two groups share a national identity (Lebanese), speak the same language (Arabic) and reside in the same location (Beirut and surrounding suburbs), thus are exposed to a shared physical and socio-political ecology. Yet they belong to two different religious denominations (Muslim vs. Christian) with substantial differences in religious beliefs and practices. This comparison allowed us to examine the role of religious identity in the similarities and differences between these two communities in Lebanon. | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **Greek Orthodox (Greek & Greek Cypriots) vs Catholic (Spanish & Italians) Christians** | | The Greek-Orthodox groups from Greece and the Greek Cypriot community of Cyprus and the Catholic groups from Spain and Italy share the same religious denomination (Christianity) yet differ in the dominant Christian sub-denomination (Greek-Orthodox vs. Catholic) in addition to ethnic and national identity, spoken language (Greek vs. Italian or Spanish) as well as physical and socio-political ecologies. This comparison allowed us to examine the role of belonging to the same religious denomination in similarities and differences in a variety of psychological processes between these two groups. | Yes (but different sub-denomination) | No | No | No | No |
| **Arab (Lebanese and Egyptians) vs.**   **non-Arab (Turkish and Turkish Cypriots) Muslims** | | The Muslim groups of Arab origin from Lebanon and Egypt and the Muslim groups of non-Arab origin from Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot community of Cyprus belong to the same religious denomination (Islam) yet differ in linguistic (Arabic vs. Turkish), ethnic (Arabic vs. Turkish or Turkish Cypriot) and national (Lebanese/Egyptian vs. Turkish/Turkish Cypriot) identities, as well as physical and socio-political ecologies. Thus, this comparison allowed us to study the role of belonging to the same religion in shaping the similarities and differences between these two groups. | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| **Greek Cypriots vs. Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus** | | Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities reside on the island of Cyprus, thus inhabiting the same physical ecology, yet belong to communities with different religious denominations (Orthodox vs. Muslim), ethnic (Turkish vs. Greek), and national (Turkish Cypriot vs. Greek Cypriot) identities. The two communities have been segregated since the de facto partition of the island in 1974 by the ‘Green Line’, with the Southern region of the island predominantly inhabited by Greek Cypriots and the Northern region by Turkish Cypriots who used to live side-by-side under a shared socio-political environment interacting with each other in all life domains prior to the partition. Thus, the political configuration on the island has resulted in little, if any, mixing of the two communities for almost four decades. In addition, the northern region is also host to Turkish settlers estimated to make up about half the population of Northern Cyprus. This comparison allowed us to test the role of inhabiting a similar physical ecology in similarities and differences between the two groups. | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| **Greek Cypriots in Cyprus vs. Greeks in Greece** | | Greeks and Greek Cypriots belong to the same religious denomination (Greek Orthodox) and share the same ethnic and linguistic background (Greek) yet reside in different parts of the Mediterranean region in two different countries governed by different state authorities. The two groups have historically had close cultural, religious, political, and educational ties and continue to do so in current times. Both Greek and Cypriot identities have been similarly salient among Greek Cypriots (e.g., Loizides, 2007), with many Greek Cypriots sharing a close cultural affiliation with mainlander Greeks, viewing them as their Hellenic brothers and sisters. There is also considerable overlap in the type of media (e.g., TV programs) and cultural elements (e.g., music, arts) being consumed by the two communities. This comparison allowed us to study the similarities and differences between two groups whose members share many background variables yet differ in the physical and socio-political ecologies in which they pursue their lives. | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Shared to some extent |
| **Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus vs. Turks in Turkey** | | As with Greek and Greek Cypriot groups, Turkish and Turkish Cypriots belong to the same religious denomination (Islam) and share the same ethnic and linguistic background (Turkish) yet reside in two different countries governed by two separate state authorities. As the previous pair, this comparison allowed us to study the similarities and differences between two groups whose members share many background variables yet differ in the physical and socio-political ecologies in which they live their lives. Yet important differences also exist. For example, the connection between the states of Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) is much stronger; Turkey is the only country which recognizes TRNC and the two have strong links in terms of education, finance, politics, and contemporary culture (e.g., the two countries have a cooperation protocol in the field of education). Turkey also acts as a bridge connecting TRNC with the rest of the world and provides basic services such as transportation and telecommunication. Another difference that sets apart this comparison from the Greek versus Greek Cypriot oneis that a significant portion of the Turkish Cypriot community now consists of Turkish settlers which provides opportunities for mixing between the two groups on daily basis (Kızılyürek, 2016; Thompson et al., 2004). | Yes | No/Yes\* | Yes | No | Shared to some extent |
| **Lebanese vs. Egyptian Muslims** | | Lebanese and Egyptians are both of Arab origin and share religious (Islam) and linguistic (Arabic) background yet live under different socio-political systems governed by two separate states (Egypt and Lebanon), thus endorsing different national identities. This comparison allowed us to test the role of shared religious, linguistic, and ethnic identities in similarities between these two groups. | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| **Spanish vs. Italians** | | Spanish and Italians share a religious background (Catholic), but differ in ethnic, national, and linguistic background as well as the socio-political conditions by which they are governed. This comparison allowed us to test the role of belonging to a Catholic identity in the psychological similarities between these two groups. | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| **Turkish vs. Greeks** | | Turkish and Greek samples do not share any of the background characteristics considered above or the physical and socio-political ecologies in which their populations reside. We included this comparison as a case study to examine the degree of similarities in psychological characteristics despite not sharing any of the ecological or demographic characteristics we set out to examine here. | No | No | No | No | No |

*Note*. Yes and No indicate characteristics indicated in the columns being shared between groups (yes) or not (no)

\* National/ethnic identities in the Cypriot context can be rather blurry and not one type of identity tends to be shared by all (e.g., see Loizides, 2017)

**Table S2**

*Description of Study Tasks and Measures*

|  | **Tasks** | **Measures** | **Operationalization/Assessment** | **Meaning of the Dependent Variables** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Social Orientation** | Implicit Social Orientation Questionnaire (ISOQ) (Kitayama et al., 2006) | Intensity of Engaging (vs. Disengaging) Emotions | Intensity of socially engaging emotions (e.g., ashamed) minus intensity of socially disengaging emotions (e.g., proud) | Stronger relative intensity of socially engaging emotions associated with stronger social interdependence |
| Predictors of Happiness | Regression coefficient for socially engaging emotions for happiness minus regression coefficient for socially disengaging emotions | Stronger relative prediction of happiness by socially engaging emotions is associated with stronger social interdependence |
| Sociogram Task (Kitayama et al., 2009) | Symbolic Self-Inflation | Size of circle drawn for the self minus the average size of all circles drawn for others | Stronger symbolic self-inflation associated with greater ***in***dependence |
| Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale (IOS) (Aron et al., 1992) | Ingroup (vs. Outgroup) Closeness Bias | Average of felt closeness to ingroup members (the person they feel closest to, a good friend and family members) minus average of felt closeness to outgroup members (others in general, a stranger on the street) | Relatively greater ingroup closeness bias is associated with stronger social interdependence |
| Nepotism Task (Wang et al., 2011) | Nepotism in Reward Contexts | The amount of money allocated to reward an *honest friend* minus the amount of money allocated to reward an *honest stranger* | Greater monetary reward of friends than strangers is associated with stronger social interdependence |
| Nepotism in Punishment Contexts | The amount of money allocated to punish a *dishonest stranger* minus the amount of money allocated to punish a *dishonest friend* | Greater monetary punishment of strangers than friends is associated with stronger social interdependence |
| **Self-Construal** | Culture & Identity Research Network Self Construal Scale (CIRN-SCS-3) (Krys et al., 2021) | Interdependent self-construal (on 8 dimensions): | Participants rated statements within each dimension for how well each statement described them | Higher scores on each dimension are associated with a stronger interdependent (vs. independent) self-construal for that dimension |
| 1. Similarity (vs. Difference) |
| 2. Connection to Others (vs. Self-Containment) |
| 3. Receptiveness to Influence (vs. Self-Direction) |
| 4. Dependence on Others (vs. Self-Reliance) |
| 5. Variability (vs. Consistency) |
| 6. Harmony (vs. Self-Expression) |
| 7. Commitment to Others (vs. Self-Interest) |
| 8. Contextualized (vs. De-contextualized) Self |
| **Cognitive Style** | Attribution Task (Kitayama et al., 2006) | Causal Situational (vs. Dispositional) Attribution | Average across situational attribution items minus average across dispositional attribution items | Relatively greater attribution of causality to situational factors is associated with stronger holistic cognition |
| Triad Task (Ji et al., 2004) | Thematic (vs. Taxonomic) Categorization | Percentage of items with thematic categorizations out of all items | Relatively greater tendency to categorize objects in thematic terms (based on their spatial, causal, or temporal relationships) is associated with stronger holistic cognition |
| Inclusion Task (Choi et al., 2003) | Inclusion of Contextual Information | Number of pieces of information that were perceived as relevant in resolving the murder case | Higher number of pieces of information perceived as relevant is associated with stronger holistic cognition |
| Outside-In Task (Cohen & Gunz, 2022) | Third-Person Perspective Taking | Extent to which somebody took a third- versus a first-person perspective when remembering specific situations | A stronger tendency to take a third-person perspective is associated with stronger holistic cognition |
| **Cultural Values** | Personal Endorsement | Dignity | Extent of personal agreement with cultural beliefs and norms about how people should behave (“How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?”) | Higher values reflect greater personal agreement with dignity beliefs and norms |
|  |  | Face | Higher values reflect greater personal agreement with face beliefs and norms |
|  |  | Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | Higher values reflect greater personal agreement with honor beliefs and norms related to promoting a positive self-image and retaliating against reputation threats |
|  |  | Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | Higher values reflect greater personal agreement with honor beliefs and norms related to caring about and upholding a positive reputation of one’s family |
|  | Perceived-Societal Endorsement | Dignity | Extent of perceived-societal agreement with cultural beliefs and norms about how people should behave (“How much would most people in your society agree or disagree with the following statements?”) | Higher values reflect greater perceived-societal agreement with dignity beliefs and norms |
|  |  | Face | Higher values reflect greater perceived-societal agreement with face beliefs and norms |
|  |  | Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | Higher values reflect greater perceived-societal agreement with honor beliefs and norms related to promoting a positive self-image and retaliating against reputation threats |
|  |  | Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | Higher values reflect greater perceived-societal agreement with honor beliefs and norms related to caring about and upholding a positive reputation of one’s family |
| **Cultural Concerns** | Personal Endorsement | Loss of Dignity | Extent to which an individual would personally experience negative feelings if they would behave in a certain way or have their reputation threatened (“How bad would you feel about yourself if…”) | Higher values reflect greater personal endorsement of dignity concerns |
|  |  | Loss of Face | Higher values reflect greater personal endorsement of face concerns |
|  |  | Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | Higher values reflect greater personal endorsement of honor concerns related to maintaining a good family reputation |
|  |  | Honor: Loss of Family Authority | Higher values reflect greater personal endorsement of honor concerns related to maintaining authority over one’s family |
|  |  | Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | Higher values reflect greater personal endorsement of honor concerns related to maintaining sexual propriety |
|  |  | Honor: Loss of Integrity | Higher values reflect greater personal endorsement of honor concerns related to maintaining a personal integrity |
|  | Perceived-Societal Endorsement | Loss of Dignity | Extent to which an individual thinks that most others in their society would experience negative feelings if they would behave in a certain way or have their reputation threatened (“How bad would most people in your society feel about themselves if…”) | Higher values reflect greater perceived-societal endorsement of dignity concerns |
|  |  | Loss of Face | Higher values reflect greater perceived-societal endorsement of face concerns |
|  |  | Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | Higher values reflect greater perceived-societal endorsement of honor concerns related to maintaining a good family reputation |
|  |  | Honor: Loss of Family Authority | Higher values reflect greater perceived-societal endorsement of honor concerns related to maintaining authority over one’s family |
|  |  | Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | Higher values reflect greater perceived-societal endorsement of honor concerns related to maintaining sexual propriety |
|  |  | Honor: Loss of Integrity | Higher values reflect greater perceived-societal endorsement of honor concerns related to maintaining a personal integrity |

*Note*. Initial sections of this table focusing on social orientation, self-construal and cognitive style measures are borrowed from Uskul et al. (2023) with slight modifications. Items used in the honor values and concerns measures were extracted from the scales used by Yao and colleagues (2017), Smith and colleagues (2017), and Guerra and colleagues.

**Table S3**

*Descriptive Statistics and ANCOVA Results for All Comparisons across Social Orientation, Self-Construal, and Cognitive Style*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Greek Sample** | | | **Turkish Sample** | | |  |  |  | **Arab-Muslim Sample** | | | **Non-Arab Muslim Sample** | | |  |  |  |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *F* | *p* | ηp2 | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *F* |  | ηp2 |
| **Social Orientation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Engaging emotion bias | -0.43 | 0.74 | 471 | -0.75 | 0.74 | 351 | 35.71 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | -0.72 | 0.65 | 317 | -0.75 | 0.76 | 375 | 1.23 |  | 0 |
| Social happiness bias | -0.22 | 0.75 | 472 | -0.19 | 0.74 | 351 | 0.1 |  | 0 | -0.14 | 0.7 | 315 | -0.21 | 0.72 | 374 | 1.76 |  | 0 |
| Self-Inflation | 2.23 | 2.26 | 469 | 1.8 | 1.26 | 345 | 9.14 | \*\* | 0.01 | 2.09 | 1.26 | 309 | 1.84 | 1.33 | 365 | 3.86 | † | 0.01 |
| Ingroup closeness bias | 3.44 | 1.2 | 473 | 3.99 | 1.2 | 352 | 36.36 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | 3.51 | 1.26 | 317 | 4.02 | 1.2 | 375 | 35.63 | \*\*\* | 0.05 |
| Loyalty | 1.31 | 2.65 | 473 | 0.8 | 2.82 | 351 | 7.38 | \*\* | 0.01 | 2.6 | 5.06 | 318 | 2.09 | 5.27 | 375 | 1.57 |  | 0 |
| Nepotism | -1.43 | 3.45 | 473 | -0.44 | 3.86 | 352 | 13.16 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | 0.81 | 2.57 | 318 | 0.93 | 2.77 | 375 | 0.23 | \* | 0.01 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Self-Construal** |
| Difference vs. Similarity | -1.53 | 1.28 | 472 | -1.52 | 1.27 | 352 | 0.44 |  | 0 | -1.78 | 1.4 | 326 | -1.49 | 1.33 | 375 | 8.36 | \*\* | 0.01 |
| Containment vs. Connection | 1.83 | 1.3 | 472 | 2.51 | 1.31 | 352 | 44 | \*\*\* | 0.05 | 2.26 | 1.33 | 326 | 2.52 | 1.27 | 375 | 7.4 | \*\* | 0.01 |
| Self-direction vs. Receptiveness to influence | -1.12 | 1.31 | 472 | -1.46 | 1.34 | 352 | 16.92 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | -1.07 | 1.3 | 326 | -1.34 | 1.39 | 375 | 6.54 | \* | 0.01 |
| Self-reliance vs. Dependence | -1.03 | 1.48 | 472 | -0.92 | 1.43 | 352 | 0.13 |  | 0 | -2.15 | 1.52 | 326 | -0.9 | 1.43 | 375 | 125.71 | \*\*\* | 0.15 |
| Consistency vs Variability | 0.05 | 1.56 | 472 | -0.63 | 1.72 | 352 | 37.11 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | 0.55 | 1.9 | 326 | -0.75 | 1.72 | 375 | 90.52 | \*\*\* | 0.12 |
| Self-expression vs. Harmony | -0.64 | 1.45 | 472 | -1.17 | 1.34 | 352 | 24.29 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | -0.03 | 1.6 | 326 | -1.06 | 1.36 | 375 | 85.95 | \*\*\* | 0.11 |
| Self-interest vs. Commitment to others | 0.61 | 1.26 | 472 | 0.24 | 1.4 | 352 | 13.37 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | 0.41 | 1.55 | 326 | 0.32 | 1.37 | 375 | 0.65 |  | 0 |
| De-contextualized vs. Contextualized Self | -1.32 | 1.3 | 472 | -0.82 | 1.28 | 352 | 28.32 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | -1.55 | 1.76 | 326 | -0.74 | 1.27 | 375 | 49.71 | \*\*\* | 0.07 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cognitive Style** |
| Situational attribution bias | -1.24 | 1.07 | 473 | -1.66 | 1.31 | 352 | 23.43 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | -1.29 | 1.25 | 318 | -1.64 | 1.3 | 375 | 10.55 | \*\* | 0.02 |
| % Relationship-based categorizations | 0.61 | 0.31 | 473 | 0.81 | 0.21 | 352 | 95.03 | \*\*\* | 0.1 | 0.58 | 0.25 | 316 | 0.82 | 0.22 | 375 | 173.99 | \*\*\* | 0.2 |
| Exclusion - Relevant items | 12.63 | 3.94 | 473 | 13.77 | 3.39 | 352 | 19.92 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | 12.25 | 3.91 | 140 | 13.42 | 3.37 | 375 | 9.48 | \*\* | 0.02 |
| Memory perspective | 3.71 | 2.1 | 471 | 3.27 | 1.9 | 344 | 9.06 | \*\* | 0.01 | 4.12 | 2.3 | 304 | 3.24 | 1.85 | 369 | 29.01 | \*\*\* | 0.04 |

**Table S3 (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Italian Sample** | | | **Spanish Sample** | | |  |  |  | **Muslim Lebanese** | | | **Egyptian Sample** | | |  |  |  |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *F* |  | ηp2 | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *F* |  | ηp2 |
| **Social Orientation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Engaging emotion bias | -0.44 | 0.7 | 245 | -0.4 | 0.69 | 238 | 0.46 |  | 0 | -0.8 | 0.58 | 140 | -0.66 | 0.70 | 177 | 2.40 |  | 0.01 |
| Social happiness bias | -0.07 | 0.71 | 246 | -0.33 | 0.64 | 237 | 18.41 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | -0.11 | 0.69 | 139 | -0.17 | 0.71 | 176 | 0.83 |  | 0 |
| Self-Inflation | 1.91 | 1.08 | 246 | 1.96 | 1.08 | 236 | 0.28 |  | 0 | 1.99 | 1.04 | 139 | 2.18 | 1.41 | 170 | 1.29 |  | 0 |
| Ingroup closeness bias | 3.65 | 1.14 | 246 | 3.59 | 1.01 | 239 | 0.12 |  | 0 | 3.5 | 1.24 | 140 | 3.51 | 1.28 | 177 | 0.17 |  | 0 |
| Loyalty | 1.14 | 3.99 | 246 | 1.79 | 2.57 | 239 | 4.42 | \* | 0.01 | 1.04 | 2.69 | 140 | 0.63 | 2.64 | 178 | 1.09 |  | 0 |
| Nepotism | -1.03 | 3.69 | 246 | -1.15 | 3.16 | 239 | 0.16 |  | 0 | -1.26 | 3.44 | 140 | -1.15 | 4.02 | 178 | 0.97 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Self-Construal** |
| Difference vs. Similarity | -1.25 | 1.38 | 246 | -1.33 | 1.25 | 239 | 0.57 |  | 0 | -1.79 | 1.5 | 139 | -1.80 | 1.28 | 177 | 0.12 |  | 0 |
| Containment vs. Connection | 2.18 | 1.4 | 246 | 1.73 | 1.56 | 239 | 10.33 | \*\* | 0.02 | 1.98 | 1.5 | 139 | 2.44 | 1.15 | 177 | 10.77 | \*\*\* | 0.03 |
| Self-direction vs. Receptiveness to influence | -1.11 | 1.43 | 246 | -1.13 | 1.2 | 239 | 0.01 |  | 0 | -0.93 | 1.33 | 139 | -1.20 | 1.3 | 177 | 3.26 |  | 0.01 |
| Self-reliance vs. Dependence | -1.85 | 1.38 | 246 | -1.23 | 1.41 | 239 | 23.68 | \*\*\* | 0.05 | -1.67 | 1.6 | 139 | -2.54 | 1.36 | 177 | 27.20 | \*\* | 0.08 |
| Consistency vs Variability | -0.39 | 1.82 | 246 | -0.28 | 1.89 | 239 | 0.34 |  | 0 | 0.46 | 1.88 | 139 | 0.62 | 1.9 | 177 | 0.55 |  | 0 |
| Self-expression vs. Harmony | -1.19 | 1.56 | 246 | -0.77 | 1.55 | 239 | 9.47 | \*\* | 0.02 | -0.08 | 1.5 | 139 | 0.04 | 1.69 | 177 | 0.33 |  | 0 |
| Self-interest vs. Commitment to others | 0.09 | 1.35 | 246 | 0.43 | 1.46 | 239 | 6.92 | \*\* | 0.01 | 0.22 | 1.44 | 139 | 0.59 | 1.64 | 177 | 4.48 |  | 0.01 |
| De-contextualized vs. Contextualized Self | -0.67 | 1.62 | 246 | -1.13 | 1.73 | 239 | 9.45 | \*\* | 0.01 | -1.27 | 1.68 | 139 | -1.80 | 1.79 | 177 | 6.86 | \* | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cognitive Style** |
| Situational attribution bias | -1.26 | 1.22 | 246 | -1.15 | 1.44 | 239 | 0.67 |  | 0 | -1.22 | 1.35 | 140 | -1.35 | 1.17 | 178 | 0.14 |  | 0 |
| % Relationship-based categorizations | 0.78 | 0.26 | 246 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 239 | 9.86 | \*\* | 0.02 | 0.78 | 0.21 | 139 | 0.42 | 0.13 | 177 | 276.9 | \*\*\* | **0.47** |
| Exclusion - Relevant items | 12.21 | 3.91 | 244 | 13.27 | 3.79 | 239 | 8.61 | \*\* | 0.02 | 12.25 | 3.91 | 140 | / | / | / | / | / | / |
| Memory perspective | 3.34 | 1.92 | 236 | 3.4 | 1.94 | 238 | 0.08 |  | 0 | 3.84 | 1.88 | 138 | 4.36 | 2.57 | 166 | 4.18 | \* | 0.14 |

**Table S3 (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Greek Sample** | | | **Greek Cypriot Sample** | | |  |  |  | **Greek Cypriot Sample** | | | **Turkish Cypriot Sample** | | |  |  |  |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *F* |  | ηp2 | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *F* |  | ηp2 |
| **Social Orientation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Engaging emotion bias | -0.43 | 0.74 | 471 | -0.56 | 0.82 | 310 | 4.62 | \* | 0.01 | -0.56 | 0.82 | 310 | -0.74 | 0.71 | 124 | 4.47 | \* | 0.01 |
| Social happiness bias | -0.22 | 0.75 | 472 | -0.28 | 0.88 | 310 | 1.43 |  | 0 | -0.28 | 0.88 | 310 | -0.24 | 0.69 | 124 | 0.32 |  | 0 |
| Self-Inflation | 2.23 | 2.26 | 469 | 2.14 | 1.43 | 310 | 0.78 |  | 0 | 2.14 | 1.43 | 310 | 1.97 | 1.21 | 122 | 1.27 |  | 0 |
| Ingroup closeness bias | 3.44 | 1.2 | 473 | 3.95 | 1.17 | 312 | 27.45 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | 3.95 | 1.17 | 312 | 4.05 | 1.08 | 125 | 1.65 |  | 0 |
| Loyalty | 3.7 | 5.17 | 473 | 3.85 | 4.9 | 312 | 0.19 |  | 0 | 3.85 | 4.9 | 312 | 2.18 | 4.79 | 125 | 10.97 | \*\* | 0.03 |
| Nepotism | 1.31 | 2.65 | 473 | 1.28 | 2.54 | 312 | 0.23 |  | 0 | 1.28 | 2.54 | 312 | 0.92 | 2.86 | 125 | 1.13 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Self-Construal** |
| Difference vs. Similarity | -1.54 | 1.28 | 479 | -1.68 | 1.33 | 315 | 2.45 |  | 0 | -1.68 | 1.33 | 315 | -1.53 | 1.41 | 126 | 1.21 |  | 0 |
| Containment vs. Connection | 1.84 | 1.31 | 479 | 2.26 | 1.31 | 315 | 19.4 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | 2.26 | 1.31 | 315 | 2.34 | 1.34 | 126 | 0.39 |  | 0 |
| Self-direction vs. Receptiveness to influence | -1.12 | 1.31 | 479 | -1.11 | 1.33 | 315 | 0.01 |  | 0 | -1.11 | 1.33 | 315 | -1.36 | 1.4 | 126 | 3.05 |  | 0.01 |
| Self-reliance vs. Dependence | -1.02 | 1.48 | 479 | -0.88 | 1.57 | 315 | 1.77 |  | 0 | -0.88 | 1.57 | 315 | -0.82 | 1.38 | 126 | 0.11 |  | 0 |
| Consistency vs Variability | 0.04 | 1.56 | 479 | -0.27 | 1.62 | 315 | 7.34 | \*\* | 0.01 | -0.27 | 1.62 | 315 | -1.12 | 1.57 | 126 | 24.84 | \*\*\* | 0.05 |
| Self-expression vs. Harmony | -0.64 | 1.46 | 479 | -0.61 | 1.48 | 315 | 0.06 |  | 0 | -0.61 | 1.48 | 315 | -0.99 | 1.34 | 126 | 6.3 | \* | 0.01 |
| Self-interest vs. Commitment to others | 0.62 | 1.25 | 479 | 0.83 | 1.36 | 315 | 4.87 | \* | 0.01 | 0.83 | 1.36 | 315 | 0.49 | 1.34 | 126 | 5.55 | \* | 0.01 |
| De-contextualized vs. Contextualized Self | -1.32 | 1.31 | 479 | -1.59 | 1.56 | 315 | 7.11 | \*\* | 0.01 | -1.59 | 1.56 | 315 | -0.81 | 1.42 | 126 | 23.69 | \*\*\* | 0.05 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cognitive Style** |
| Situational attribution bias | -1.24 | 1.07 | 473 | -1.09 | 1.1 | 312 | 2.58 |  | 0 | -1.09 | 1.1 | 312 | -1.52 | 1.13 | 125 | 12.06 | \*\*\* | 0.03 |
| % Relationship-based categorizations | 0.61 | 0.31 | 473 | 0.69 | 0.28 | 316 | 9.67 |  | 0.01 | 0.69 | 0.28 | 316 | 0.78 | 0.25 | 125 | 16.58 | \*\*\* | 0.04 |
| Exclusion - Relevant items | 12.63 | 3.94 | 473 | 11.92 | 4.13 | 312 | 5.15 | \* | 0.01 | 11.92 | 4.13 | 312 | 13.34 | 3.73 | 125 | 11.72 | \*\*\* | 0.03 |
| Memory perspective | 3.71 | 2.1 | 471 | 3.91 | 2.27 | 302 | 1.25 |  | 0 | 3.91 | 2.27 | 302 | 3.08 | 1.71 | 121 | 9.74 | \*\* | 0.02 |

**Table S3 (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Catholic Sample** | | | **Orthodox Sample** | | |  |  |  | **Turkish Sample** | | | **Turkish-Cypriot Sample** | | |  |  |  |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *F* |  | ηp2 | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *F* |  | ηp2 |
| **Social Orientation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Engaging emotion bias | -0.42 | 0.69 | 483 | -0.48 | 0.77 | 781 | 1.96 |  | 0 | -0.75 | 0.74 | 351 | -0.74 | 0.71 | 124 | 0.08 |  | 0 |
| Social happiness bias | -0.2 | 0.69 | 483 | -0.24 | 0.8 | 782 | 1.22 |  | 0 | -0.19 | 0.74 | 351 | -0.24 | 0.69 | 124 | 0.1 |  | 0 |
| Self-Inflation | 1.93 | 1.08 | 482 | 2.19 | 1.97 | 779 | 5.79 | \* | 0.01 | 1.8 | 1.26 | 345 | 1.97 | 1.21 | 122 | 0.46 |  | 0 |
| Ingroup closeness bias | 3.62 | 1.08 | 485 | 3.64 | 1.21 | 785 | 0 |  | 0 | 3.99 | 1.2 | 352 | 4.05 | 1.08 | 125 | 0.36 |  | 0 |
| Loyalty | 3.87 | 4.99 | 485 | 3.76 | 5.06 | 785 | 0.11 |  | 0 | 1.56 | 5.51 | 352 | 2.18 | 4.79 | 125 | 0.65 |  | 0 |
| Nepotism | 1.46 | 3.38 | 485 | 1.3 | 2.61 | 785 | 1.04 |  | 0 | 0.8 | 2.82 | 351 | 0.92 | 2.86 | 125 | 0.06 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Self-Construal** |
| Difference vs. Similarity | -1.29 | 1.32 | 485 | -1.59 | 1.3 | 786 | 8.85 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | -1.52 | 1.27 | 352 | -1.53 | 1.41 | 126 | 0.01 |  | 0 |
| Containment vs. Connection | 1.96 | 1.5 | 485 | 2 | 1.32 | 786 | 7.89 |  | 0.02 | 2.51 | 1.31 | 352 | 2.34 | 1.34 | 126 | 1.45 |  | 0 |
| Self-direction vs. Receptiveness to influence | -1.12 | 1.32 | 485 | -1.12 | 1.32 | 786 | 0.54 |  | 0 | -1.46 | 1.34 | 352 | -1.36 | 1.4 | 126 | 0.49 |  | 0 |
| Self-reliance vs. Dependence | -1.55 | 1.43 | 485 | -0.96 | 1.52 | 786 | 17.63 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | -0.92 | 1.43 | 352 | -0.82 | 1.38 | 126 | 0.44 |  | 0 |
| Consistency vs Variability | -0.33 | 1.85 | 485 | -0.08 | 1.59 | 786 | 5.61 | \*\* | 0.01 | -0.63 | 1.72 | 352 | -1.12 | 1.57 | 126 | 7.79 | \*\* | 0.02 |
| Self-expression vs. Harmony | -0.98 | 1.57 | 485 | -0.62 | 1.46 | 786 | 7.39 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | -1.17 | 1.34 | 352 | -0.99 | 1.34 | 126 | 1.63 |  | 0 |
| Self-interest vs. Commitment to others | 0.26 | 1.41 | 485 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 786 | 11 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | 0.24 | 1.4 | 352 | 0.49 | 1.34 | 126 | 3.07 |  | 0.01 |
| De-contextualized vs. Contextualized Self | -0.9 | 1.69 | 485 | -1.43 | 1.42 | 786 | 14.89 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | -0.82 | 1.28 | 352 | -0.81 | 1.42 | 126 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cognitive Style** |
| Situational attribution bias | -1.21 | 1.33 | 485 | -1.18 | 1.09 | 785 | 0.23 |  | 0 | -1.66 | 1.31 | 352 | -1.52 | 1.13 | 125 | 0.51 |  | 0 |
| % Relationship-based categorizations | 0.74 | 0.28 | 485 | 0.64 | 0.3 | 789 | 30.67 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | 0.81 | 0.21 | 352 | 0.78 | 0.25 | 125 | 0.08 |  | 0 |
| Exclusion - Relevant items | 12.74 | 3.89 | 483 | 12.34 | 4.03 | 785 | 2.44 |  | 0 | 13.77 | 3.39 | 352 | 13.34 | 3.73 | 125 | 1.26 |  | 0 |
| Memory perspective | 3.37 | 1.93 | 474 | 3.79 | 2.17 | 773 | 11.57 | \*\*\* | 0.01 | 3.27 | 1.9 | 344 | 3.08 | 1.71 | 121 | 0.37 |  | 0 |

**Table S3 (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Muslims** | | | **Christians** | | |  |  |  |
|  | **in Lebanon** | | | **in Lebanon** | | |  |  |  |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *M* | *SD* | *n* | *F* |  | ηp2 |
| **Social Orientation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Engaging emotion bias | -0.8 | 0.58 | 140 | -0.62 | 0.67 | 80 | 5.2 | \* | 0.02 |
| Social happiness bias | -0.11 | 0.69 | 139 | -0.33 | 0.81 | 80 | 4.02 | \* | 0.02 |
| Self-Inflation | 1.99 | 1.04 | 139 | 1.93 | 1.11 | 78 | 0.18 |  | 0 |
| Ingroup closeness bias | 3.5 | 1.24 | 140 | 3.65 | 1 | 80 | 0.32 |  | 0 |
| Loyalty | 2.84 | 4.88 | 140 | 3.39 | 5.01 | 80 | 0.77 |  | 0 |
| Nepotism | 1.04 | 2.69 | 140 | 1.15 | 2.63 | 80 | 0.08 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Self-Construal** |
| Difference vs. Similarity | -1.77 | 1.53 | 142 | -1.37 | 1.37 | 80 | 3.71 |  | 0.02 |
| Containment vs. Connection | 2.02 | 1.5 | 142 | 1.98 | 1.32 | 80 | 0.02 |  | 0 |
| Self-direction vs. Receptiveness to influence | -0.93 | 1.32 | 142 | -0.69 | 1.43 | 80 | 1.61 |  | 0.01 |
| Self-reliance vs. Dependence | -1.69 | 1.6 | 142 | -1.43 | 1.84 | 80 | 1.24 |  | 0.01 |
| Consistency vs Variability | 0.45 | 1.87 | 142 | 0.37 | 1.72 | 80 | 0.09 |  | 0 |
| Self-expression vs. Harmony | -0.11 | 1.51 | 142 | -0.22 | 1.44 | 80 | 0.27 |  | 0 |
| Self-interest vs. Commitment to others | 0.19 | 1.43 | 142 | 0.52 | 1.5 | 80 | 2.6 |  | 0.01 |
| De-contextualized vs. Contextualized Self | -1.23 | 1.69 | 142 | -1.41 | 1.36 | 80 | 0.68 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cognitive Style** |
| Situational attribution bias | -1.22 | 1.35 | 140 | -1.35 | 1.17 | 80 | 0.29 |  | 0 |
| % Relationship-based categorizations | 0.78 | 0.21 | 139 | 0.71 | 0.25 | 80 | 4.27 | \* | 0.02 |
| Exclusion - Relevant items | 12.25 | 3.91 | 140 | 13.05 | 3.91 | 80 | 2.68 |  | 0.01 |
| Memory perspective | 3.84 | 1.88 | 138 | 4.01 | 1.88 | 80 | 0.98 |  | 0.01 |

*Note.* Arab Muslim = Muslim from Egypt and Lebanon, Non-Arab Muslim = Muslims from Turkey and Turkish Cypriot Community, Orthodox = Christians from Greece and Greek Cypriot Community, Catholic = Christians from Italy and Spain. We did not collect data on Exclusion - Relevant items from the Egyptian Sample.

\**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\* p < .001. † p = .05. The figures reflect the Sidak adjustment used in conducting the multiple comparisons. The bold effect size indicates the highest effect size reported in this table.

**Table S4**

*Descriptive Statistics and ANCOVA Results for All Comparisons across All Cultural Values and Concerns*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Greek Sample** | | **Turkish Sample** | |  |  |  | **Arab-Muslim Sample** | | **Non-Arab Muslim Sample** | |  |  |  |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *F* |  | ηp2 | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *F* |  | ηp2 |
| **Values** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Personal Endorsement* | *n* = 471 | | *n* = 350 | |  |  |  | *n* = 317 | | *n* = 374 | |  |  |  |
| Dignity | 0.1 | 0.22 | -0.07 | 0.25 | 135.4 | \*\*\* | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.19 | -0.06 | 0.23 | 45.85 | \*\*\* | 0.06 |
| Face | -0.4 | 0.54 | 0.29 | 0.46 | 383.5 | \*\*\* | **0.32** | 0.32 | 0.45 | 0.31 | 0.46 | 0.25 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | -0.12 | 0.62 | 0.26 | 0.62 | 97.83 | \*\*\* | 0.11 | 0.34 | 0.71 | 0.25 | 0.62 | 0.76 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | -0.55 | 1.17 | 0.53 | 0.91 | 235.8 | \*\*\* | 0.22 | 0.79 | 1 | 0.54 | 0.93 | 5.89 | \* | 0.01 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Perceived-Societal Endorsement* | *n =* 470 | | *n* = 348 | |  |  |  | *n* = 306 | | *n* = 373 | |  |  |  |
| Dignity | 0.04 | 0.73 | -0.22 | 0.82 | 17.58 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | -0.34 | 0.88 | -0.11 | 0.76 | 15 | \*\*\* | 0.02 |
| Face | -0.21 | 0.64 | 0.14 | 0.69 | 47.99 | \*\*\* | 0.06 | -0.21 | 0.82 | 0.14 | 0.67 | 33.3 | \*\*\* | 0.05 |
| Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | 0.07 | 0.81 | 0.21 | 0.74 | 4.98 | \* | 0.01 | 0.52 | 0.87 | 0.14 | 0.74 | 36.14 | \*\*\* | 0.05 |
| Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | -0.08 | 0.74 | 0.32 | 0.62 | 67.88 | \*\*\* | 0.08 | 0.55 | 0.65 | 0.26 | 0.62 | 27.56 | \*\*\* | 0.04 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Concerns** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Personal Concerns* | *n* = 473 | | *n* = 351 | |  |  |  | *n* = 318 | | *n* = 375 | |  |  |  |
| Loss of Dignity | 0.12 | 0.46 | 0.09 | 0.34 | 2.86 |  | 0 | -0.07 | 0.43 | 0.06 | 0.34 | 15.78 | \*\*\* | 0.02 |
| Loss of Face | -0.21 | 0.54 | 0.05 | 0.46 | 25.21 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.52 | 0.05 | 0.45 | 0.77 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | -0.24 | 0.75 | 0.32 | 0.5 | 146.4 | \*\*\* | 0.15 | 0.32 | 0.64 | 0.33 | 0.47 | 0.01 | \*\*\* | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Authority | -0.22 | 1.34 | 0.68 | 1.11 | 95.18 | \*\*\* | 0.1 | -0.3 | 1.52 | 0.68 | 1.13 | 91.7 |  | 0.12 |
| Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | -0.95 | 1.55 | 0.91 | 1.39 | 250.7 | \*\*\* | 0.23 | 0.75 | 1.43 | 0.89 | 1.35 | 0.14 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Integrity | 0 | 0.24 | 0.03 | 0.2 | 0.29 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0.03 | 0.2 | 0.57 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Perceived-Societal Concerns* | *n* = 472 | | *n* = 351 | |  |  |  | *n* = 314 | | *n* = 375 | |  |  |  |
| Loss of Dignity | -0.09 | 0.61 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 17.03 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | -0.3 | 0.71 | 0.15 | 0.67 | 63.56 | \*\*\* | 0.08 |
| Loss of Face | -0.34 | 0.86 | 0.18 | 0.91 | 53.33 | \*\*\* | 0.06 | -0.39 | 0.97 | 0.21 | 0.88 | 52.32 | \*\*\* | 0.07 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | 0.05 | 0.45 | 0.04 | 0.48 | 1.39 |  | 0 | 0.34 | 0.5 | 0.01 | 0.45 | 81.91 | \*\*\* | 0.11 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Authority | -0.01 | 1.02 | 0.21 | 0.94 | 8.42 | \*\* | 0.01 | 0.33 | 1.26 | 0.2 | 0.93 | 0.73 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | -0.46 | 1.22 | 0.55 | 1.35 | 75.22 | \*\*\* | 0.08 | 0.62 | 1.24 | 0.49 | 1.31 | 9.69 | \*\* | 0.01 |
| Honor: Loss of Integrity | -0.13 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.51 | 35.93 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | -0.26 | 0.58 | 0.11 | 0.49 | 64.59 | \*\*\* | 0.09 |

**Table S4 (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Italian Sample** | | **Spanish Sample** | |  |  |  | **Muslim Lebanese** | | **Egyptian Sample** | |  |  |  |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *F* |  | ηp2 | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *F* |  | ηp2 |
| **Values** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Personal Endorsement* | *n* = 246 | | *n* = 239 | |  |  |  | *n* = 140 | | *n* = 177 | |  |  |  |
| Dignity | -0.02 | 0.26 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 20.11 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.04 | 0.16 | 0.46 |  | 0 |
| Face | 0.17 | 0.48 | -0.08 | 0.56 | 27.89 | \*\*\* | 0.05 | 0.24 | 0.48 | 0.39 | 0.43 | 8.12 | \*\* | 0.03 |
| Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | -0.1 | 0.56 | -0.24 | 0.61 | 7.61 | \*\* | 0.02 | -0.03 | 0.77 | 0.64 | 0.49 | 88.87 | \*\*\* | 0.22 |
| Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | 0.2 | 0.98 | -0.61 | 1.24 | 64.51 | \*\*\* | 0.12 | 0.37 | 1.2 | 1.12 | 0.63 | 51.16 | \*\*\* | 0.14 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Perceived-Societal Endorsement* | *n* = 246 | | *n* = 239 | |  |  |  | *n* = 138 | | *n* = 168 | |  |  |  |
| Dignity | 0.2 | 0.72 | 0.16 | 0.68 | 0.17 |  | 0 | -0.47 | 0.93 | -0.24 | 0.82 | 5.97 | \* | 0.02 |
| Face | 0.16 | 0.79 | -0.11 | 0.67 | 15.23 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | -0.2 | 0.83 | -0.21 | 0.81 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | -0.36 | 1.02 | -0.01 | 0.78 | 17.17 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | 0.52 | 0.97 | 0.52 | 0.79 | 0.04 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | -0.06 | 0.7 | -0.21 | 0.76 | 4.83 | \* | 0.01 | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.56 | 0.57 | 0.03 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Concerns** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Personal Concerns* | *n* = 246 | | *n* = 239 | |  |  |  | *n* = 140 | | *n* = 178 | |  |  |  |
| Loss of Dignity | 0.01 | 0.55 | 0.24 | 0.49 | 22.61 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.45 | -0.16 | 0.4 | 19.46 | \*\*\* | 0.06 |
| Loss of Face | -0.2 | 0.56 | -0.03 | 0.49 | 15.31 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | -0.01 | 0.55 | 0.03 | 0.49 | 0.68 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | 0.01 | 0.74 | -0.86 | 0.74 | 165.2 | \*\*\* | 0.26 | 0.12 | 0.75 | 0.47 | 0.48 | 26.22 | \*\*\* | 0.08 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Authority | 0.05 | 1.19 | -0.55 | 1.15 | 32.19 | \*\*\* | 0.06 | 0.3 | 1.46 | -0.77 | 1.39 | 44.19 | \*\*\* | 0.12 |
| Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | -0.25 | 1.69 | -1.78 | 1.47 | 108.8 | \*\*\* | 0.18 | 0.35 | 1.64 | 1.08 | 1.15 | 25.64 | \*\*\* | 0.08 |
| Honor: Loss of Integrity | -0.05 | 0.26 | 0.03 | 0.21 | 14.19 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | -0.02 | 0.27 | 0.01 | 0.23 | 0.89 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Perceived-Societal Concerns* | *n* = 246 | | *n* = 239 | |  |  |  | *n* = 140 | | *n* = 174 | |  |  |  |
| Loss of Dignity | 0.26 | 0.76 | 0.07 | 0.72 | 7.96 | \* | 0.02 | -0.3 | 0.68 | -0.3 | 0.74 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Loss of Face | 0.37 | 0.99 | -0.18 | 0.92 | 38.83 | \*\*\* | 0.08 | -0.42 | 0.93 | -0.36 | 1.01 | 0.46 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | -0.34 | 0.6 | -0.11 | 0.56 | 18.52 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | 0.33 | 0.48 | 0.34 | 0.51 | 0.03 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Authority | -0.36 | 1.04 | 0.01 | 1.02 | 14.71 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | 0.59 | 0.93 | 0.13 | 1.44 | 10.98 | \*\* | 0.03 |
| Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | -0.54 | 1.28 | -0.66 | 1.4 | 0.69 |  | 0 | 0.59 | 1.21 | 0.64 | 1.27 | 0.29 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Integrity | 0.27 | 0.59 | -0.09 | 0.54 | 46.5 | \*\*\* | 0.09 | -0.3 | 0.55 | -0.23 | 0.61 | 1.15 |  | 0 |

**Table S4 (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Greek Sample** | | **Greek Cypriot Sample** | |  |  |  | **Greek Cypriot Sample** | | **Turkish Cypriot Sample** | |  |  |  |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *F* |  | ηp2 | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *F* |  | ηp2 |
| **Values** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Personal Endorsement* | *n* = 471 | | *n* = 314 | |  |  |  | *n* = 314 | | *n* = 125 | |  |  |  |
| Dignity | 0.1 | 0.22 | 0.08 | 0.2 | 4.5 | \* | 0.01 | 0.08 | 0.2 | -0.01 | 0.23 | 17.61 | \*\*\* | 0.04 |
| Face | -0.4 | 0.54 | -0.05 | 0.5 | 87.86 | \*\*\* | 0.1 | -0.05 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.51 | 20.08 | \*\*\* | 0.04 |
| Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | -0.12 | 0.62 | -0.05 | 0.64 | 6.81 | \*\* | 0.01 | -0.05 | 0.64 | 0.14 | 0.65 | 8.18 | \*\* | 0.02 |
| Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | -0.55 | 1.17 | 0.01 | 1.08 | 49.99 | \*\*\* | 0.06 | 0.01 | 1.08 | 0.19 | 1.17 | 2.51 |  | 0.01 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Perceived-Societal Endorsement* | *n* = 470 | | *n* = 310 | |  |  |  | *n* = 310 | | *n* = 124 | |  |  |  |
| Dignity | 0.04 | 0.73 | 0.2 | 0.67 | 8 | \*\* | 0.01 | 0.2 | 0.67 | -0.03 | 0.73 | 10.76 | \*\* | 0.02 |
| Face | -0.21 | 0.64 | -0.05 | 0.63 | 9.71 | \*\* | 0.01 | -0.05 | 0.63 | 0.15 | 0.61 | 7.54 | \*\* | 0.02 |
| Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | 0.07 | 0.81 | -0.05 | 0.74 | 3.74 |  | 0 | -0.05 | 0.74 | 0.05 | 0.77 | 1.34 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | -0.08 | 0.74 | -0.04 | 0.63 | 1.53 |  | 0 | -0.04 | 0.63 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 3.79 |  | 0.01 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Concerns** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Personal Concerns* | *n* = 473 | | *n* = 316 | |  |  |  | *n* = 316 | | *n* = 125 | |  |  |  |
| Loss of Dignity | 0.12 | 0.46 | 0.01 | 0.37 | 13.59 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.37 | 0.09 | 0.42 | 4.07 | \* | 0.01 |
| Loss of Face | -0.21 | 0.54 | 0.08 | 0.48 | 34.31 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.48 | -0.01 | 0.49 | 4.77 | \* | 0.01 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | -0.24 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 29.81 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.64 | 0.07 | 0.69 | 0.03 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Authority | -0.22 | 1.34 | 0.32 | 1.29 | 29.4 | \*\*\* | 0.04 | 0.32 | 1.29 | 0.62 | 1.16 | 3.39 |  | 0.01 |
| Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | -0.95 | 1.55 | 0.17 | 1.57 | 62.28 | \*\*\* | 0.07 | 0.17 | 1.57 | 0.16 | 1.76 | 0.39 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Integrity | 0 | 0.24 | 0.03 | 0.19 | 1.03 |  | 0 | 0.03 | 0.19 | 0 | 0.22 | 3.48 |  | 0.01 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Perceived-Societal Concerns* | *n* = 472 | | *n* = 315 | |  |  |  | *n* = 315 | | *n* = 125 | |  |  |  |
| Loss of Dignity | -0.09 | 0.61 | 0.1 | 0.58 | 20.77 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | 0.1 | 0.58 | 0.2 | 0.76 | 1.95 |  | 0 |
| Loss of Face | -0.34 | 0.86 | 0.02 | 0.85 | 25.69 | \*\*\* | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.85 | 0.16 | 0.98 | 1.4 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | 0.05 | 0.45 | -0.04 | 0.42 | 10.88 | \*\* | 0.01 | -0.04 | 0.42 | -0.09 | 0.56 | 1.15 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Authority | -0.01 | 1.02 | 0.04 | 0.94 | 0.07 |  | 0 | 0.04 | 0.94 | 0.19 | 0.98 | 1.93 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | -0.46 | 1.22 | -0.09 | 1.2 | 5.87 | \* | 0.01 | -0.09 | 1.2 | 0.04 | 1.35 | 0.42 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Integrity | -0.13 | 0.5 | 0.01 | 0.47 | 15.09 | \*\*\* | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.47 | 0.09 | 0.55 | 1.51 |  | 0 |

**Table S4 (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Catholic Sample** | | **Orthodox Sample** | |  |  |  | **Turkish Sample** | | **Turkish-Cypriot Sample** | |  |  |  |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *F* |  | ηp2 | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *F* |  | ηp2 |
| **Values** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Personal Endorsement* | *n* = 177 | | *n* = 140 | |  |  |  | *n* = 350 | | *n* = 125 | |  |  |  |
| Dignity | 0.04 | 0.16 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.46 |  | 0 | -0.07 | 0.25 | -0.01 | 0.23 | 7.81 | \*\* | 0.02 |
| Face | 0.39 | 0.43 | 0.24 | 0.48 | 8.12 | \*\* | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.46 | 0.2 | 0.51 | 4.19 | \* | 0.01 |
| Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | 0.64 | 0.49 | -0.03 | 0.77 | 88.87 | \*\*\* | 0.22 | 0.26 | 0.62 | 0.14 | 0.65 | 3.57 |  | 0.01 |
| Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | 1.12 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 1.2 | 51.16 | \*\*\* | 0.14 | 0.53 | 0.91 | 0.19 | 1.17 | 10.8 | \*\* | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Perceived-Societal Endorsement* | *n* = 168 | | *n* = 138 | |  |  |  | *n* = 348 | | *n* = 124 | |  |  |  |
| Dignity | -0.24 | 0.82 | -0.47 | 0.93 | 5.97 | \* | 0.02 | -0.22 | 0.82 | -0.03 | 0.73 | 4.42 | \* | 0.01 |
| Face | -0.21 | 0.81 | -0.2 | 0.83 | 0 |  | 0 | 0.14 | 0.69 | 0.15 | 0.61 | 0.06 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | 0.52 | 0.79 | 0.52 | 0.97 | 0.04 |  | 0 | 0.21 | 0.74 | 0.05 | 0.77 | 3.46 |  | 0.01 |
| Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | 0.56 | 0.57 | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.03 |  | 0 | 0.32 | 0.62 | 0.11 | 0.65 | 11.65 | \*\* | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Concerns** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Personal Concerns* | *n* = 178 | | *n* = 140 | |  |  |  | *n* = 351 | | *n* = 125 | |  |  |  |
| Loss of Dignity | -0.16 | 0.4 | 0.05 | 0.45 | 19.46 | \*\*\* | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.34 | 0.09 | 0.42 | 0.01 |  | 0 |
| Loss of Face | 0.03 | 0.49 | -0.01 | 0.55 | 0.68 |  | 0 | 0.05 | 0.46 | -0.01 | 0.49 | 1.11 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | 0.47 | 0.48 | 0.12 | 0.75 | 26.22 | \*\*\* | 0.08 | 0.32 | 0.5 | 0.07 | 0.69 | 19.3 | \*\*\* | 0.04 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Authority | -0.77 | 1.39 | 0.3 | 1.46 | 44.19 | \*\*\* | 0.12 | 0.68 | 1.11 | 0.62 | 1.16 | 0.56 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | 1.08 | 1.15 | 0.35 | 1.64 | 25.64 | \*\*\* | 0.08 | 0.91 | 1.39 | 0.16 | 1.76 | 26.98 | \*\*\* | 0.05 |
| Honor: Loss of Integrity | 0.01 | 0.23 | -0.02 | 0.27 | 0.89 |  | 0 | 0.03 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.22 | 1.45 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Perceived-Societal Concerns* | *n* = 174 | | *n* = 140 | |  |  |  | *n* = 351 | | *n* = 125 | |  |  |  |
| Loss of Dignity | -0.3 | 0.74 | -0.3 | 0.68 | 0 |  | 0 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.76 | 1.95 |  | 0 |
| Loss of Face | -0.36 | 1.01 | -0.42 | 0.93 | 0.46 |  | 0 | 0.18 | 0.91 | 0.16 | 0.98 | 0.09 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | 0.34 | 0.51 | 0.33 | 0.48 | 0.03 |  | 0 | 0.04 | 0.48 | -0.09 | 0.56 | 7.4 | \*\* | 0.02 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Authority | 0.13 | 1.44 | 0.59 | 0.93 | 10.98 | \*\* | 0.03 | 0.21 | 0.94 | 0.19 | 0.98 | 0.22 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | 0.64 | 1.27 | 0.59 | 1.21 | 0.29 |  | 0 | 0.55 | 1.35 | 0.04 | 1.35 | 19.47 | \*\*\* | 0.04 |
| Honor: Loss of Integrity | -0.23 | 0.61 | -0.3 | 0.55 | 1.15 |  | 0 | 0.1 | 0.51 | 0.09 | 0.55 | 0.02 |  | 0 |

**Table S4 (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Muslims in Lebanon** | | **Christians in Lebanon** | |  |  |  |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *F* |  | ηp2 |
| **Values** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Personal Endorsement* | *n* = 140 | | *n* = 80 | |  |  |  |
| Dignity | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.56 |  | 0 |
| Face | 0.24 | 0.48 | 0.09 | 0.49 | 5.11 | \* | 0.02 |
| Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | -0.03 | 0.77 | -0.26 | 0.66 | 5.58 | \* | 0.03 |
| Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | 0.37 | 1.2 | 0.03 | 1.03 | 4.12 | \* | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Perceived-Societal Endorsement* | *n* = 138 | | *n* = 80 | |  |  |  |
| Dignity | -0.47 | 0.93 | -0.41 | 0.92 | 0.04 |  | 0 |
| Face | -0.2 | 0.83 | -0.15 | 0.73 | 0.01 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation | 0.52 | 0.97 | 0.44 | 0.81 | 0.07 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Defense of Family Reputation | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.48 | 0.7 | 0.11 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Concerns** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Personal Concerns* | *n* = 140 | | *n* = 80 | |  |  |  |
| Loss of Dignity | 0.05 | 0.45 | 0.06 | 0.42 | 0.02 |  | 0 |
| Loss of Face | -0.01 | 0.55 | 0.06 | 0.53 | 0.41 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | 0.12 | 0.75 | -0.14 | 0.65 | 7.24 | \*\* | 0.03 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Authority | 0.3 | 1.46 | -0.02 | 1.21 | 2.21 | \* | 0.01 |
| Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | 0.35 | 1.64 | -0.12 | 1.54 | 6.79 |  | 0.03 |
| Honor: Loss of Integrity | -0.02 | 0.27 | -0.02 | 0.24 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Perceived-Societal Concerns* | *n* = 140 | | *n* = 80 | |  |  |  |
| Loss of Dignity | -0.3 | 0.68 | -0.42 | 0.67 | 2.78 |  | 0.01 |
| Loss of Face | -0.42 | 0.93 | -0.54 | 0.84 | 1.89 |  | 0.01 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Reputation | 0.33 | 0.48 | 0.39 | 0.47 | 1.43 |  | 0.01 |
| Honor: Loss of Family Authority | 0.59 | 0.93 | 0.38 | 1.11 | 0.98 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety | 0.59 | 1.21 | 0.51 | 1.24 | 0.28 |  | 0 |
| Honor: Loss of Integrity | -0.3 | 0.55 | -0.36 | 0.5 | 1.53 |  | 0.01 |

*Note.* Arab Muslim = Muslim from Egypt and Lebanon, Non-Arab Muslim = Muslims from Turkey and Turkish Cypriot Community, Orthodox = Christians from Greece and Greek Cypriot Community, Catholic = Christians from Italy and Spain. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\* *p* < .001. The figures reflect the Sidak adjustment used in conducting the multiple comparisons. The bold effect size indicates the highest effect size reported in this table.

**Table S5**

*Comparison between Pairs of Cultural Groups: Self-construal*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Groups** | ***n*** | **# of sign.  differences** | **Hedges’ g** | **SE** | ***p*** | **95%-CI** | **PCR** |
| Greek vs. Turkish Samples | 830 | 6/8 | .29 | .06 | <.001 | [.17, .41] | 88.44 |
| Arab- vs. non-Arab Muslim Samples | 703 | 7/8 | .43 | .10 | < .001 | [.23, .64] | 82.90 |
| Italian vs. Spanish Samples | 487 | 5/8 | .21 | .05 | < .001 | [.11, .31] | 91.71 |
| Muslim Lebanese vs. Egyptian Samples | 466 | 4/8 | .22 | .06 | < .001 | [.10, .33] | 91.44 |
| Greek vs. Greek Cypriot Samples | 796 | 3/8 | .14 | .04 | < .001 | [.07, .21] | 94.52 |
| Greek Cypriot vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 442 | 4/8 | .24 | .07 | < .001 | [.11, .37] | 90.30 |
| Catholic vs. Orthodox Samples | 1,280 | 6/8 | .22 | .08 | < .001 | [.12, .32] | 91.38 |
| Turkish vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 478 | 1/8 | .11 | .03 | .001 | [.04, .18] | 95.63 |
| Lebanese Christians vs. Lebanese Muslims | 223 | 1/8 | .13 | .05 | < .001 | [.04, .23] | 94.73 |

*Note.* Hedges’ g: Overall meta-analytically derived mean effect size, *SE*: standard error, PCR: Percentage of common responses which expresses overlap or similarities between two groups (Hanel et al., 2019; Inman & Bradley, 1989). Comparisons are listed in ascending order using overall ES and PCR figures.

**Table S6**

*Comparison between Pairs of Cultural Groups: Cognitive style*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Groups** | ***n*** | **# of sign.  differences** | **Hedges’ g** | **SE** | ***p*** | **95%-CI** | **PCR** |
| Greek vs. Turkish Samples | 830 | 4/4 | .40 | .11 | <.001 | [.18, .62] | 84.06 |
| Arab- vs. non-Arab Muslim Samples | 703 | 4/4 | .51 | .18 | .003 | [.17, .86] | 79.70 |
| Italian vs. Spanish Samples | 487 | 2/4 | .17 | .07 | .009 | [.04, .30] | 93.27 |
| Muslim Lebanese vs. Egyptian Samples | 466 | 2/3 | .71 | .54 | .190 | [-.35, 1.76] | 72.45 |
| Greek vs. Greek Cypriot Samples | 796 | 2/4 | .16 | .04 | < .001 | [.09, .23] | 93.52 |
| Greek Cypriot vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 442 | 4/4 | .37 | .05 | < .001 | [.27, .46] | 85.40 |
| Catholic vs. Orthodox Samples | 1,280 | 2/4 | .16 | .06 | .009 | [.04, .29] | 93.47 |
| Turkish vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 478 | 0/4 | .12 | .05 | .007 | [.03, .21] | 95.11 |
| Lebanese Christians vs. Lebanese Muslims | 223 | 1/4 | .19 | .07 | .005 | [.06, .32] | 92.54 |

*Note.* Hedges’ g: Overall meta-analytically derived mean effect size, *SE*: standard error, PCR: Percentage of common responses which expresses overlap or similarities between two groups (Hanel et al., 2019; Inman & Bradley, 1989). Comparisons are listed in ascending order using overall ES and PCR figures. The Inclusion of Contextual Information task was not presented to Egyptian participants.

**Table S7**

*Comparison between Pairs of Cultural Groups: Social orientation*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Groups** | ***n*** | **# of sign.  differences** | **Hedges’ g** | **SE** | ***p*** | **95%-CI** | **PCR** |
| Greek vs. Turkish Samples | 830 | 5/6 | .27 | .06 | <.001 | [.14, .39] | 89.42 |
| Arab- vs. non-Arab Muslim Samples | 703 | 3/6 | .16 | .06 | .005 | [.05, .27] | 93.53 |
| Italian vs. Spanish Samples | 487 | 2/6 | .13 | .06 | .039 | [.007, .26] | 94.69 |
| Muslim Lebanese vs. Egyptian Samples | 466 | 0/6 | .08 | .04 | .039 | [.00, .15] | 96.89 |
| Greek vs. Greek Cypriot Samples | 796 | 2/6 | .12 | .06 | .044 | [.00, .25] | 95.05 |
| Greek Cypriot vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 442 | 1/6 | .15 | .04 | <.001 | [.07, .22] | 94.09 |
| Catholic vs. Orthodox Samples | 1,280 | 1/6 | .09 | .02 | <.001 | [.04, .13] | 96.59 |
| Turkish vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 478 | 0/6 | .06 | .04 | .106 | [-.01, .13] | 97.59 |
| Lebanese Christians vs. Lebanese Muslims | 223 | 2/6 | .15 | .05 | .007 | [.04, .26] | 94.11 |

*Note.* Hedges’ g: Overall meta-analytically derived mean effect size, *SE*: standard error, PCR: Percentage of common responses which expresses overlap or similarities between two groups (Hanel et al., 2019; Inman & Bradley, 1989). Comparisons are listed in ascending order using overall ES and PCR figures.

**Table S8**

*Comparison between Pairs of Cultural Groups: Personal Values*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Groups** | ***n*** | **# of sign.  differences** | **Hedges’ g** | **SE** | ***p*** | **95%-CI** | **PCR** |
| Greek vs. Turkish Samples | 830 | 4/4 | .93 | .16 | <.001 | [.61, 1.25] | 64.17 |
| Arab- vs. non-Arab Muslim Samples | 703 | 2/4 | .24 | .10 | .017 | [.04, .43] | 90.49 |
| Italian vs. Spanish Samples | 487 | 4/4 | .46 | .10 | <.001 | [.25, .66] | 81.97 |
| Muslim Lebanese vs. Egyptian Samples | 466 | 3/4 | .64 | .20 | .002 | [.24, 1.03] | 75.04 |
| Greek vs. Greek Cypriot Samples | 796 | 1/4 | .33 | .14 | .019 | [.05, .60] | 86.96 |
| Greek Cypriot vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 442 | 3/4 | .34 | .07 | <.001 | [.20, .48] | 86.48 |
| Catholic vs. Orthodox Samples | 1,280 | 4/4 | .28 | .11 | .009 | [.07, .48] | 89.03 |
| Turkish vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 478 | 3/4 | .26 | .05 | <.001 | [.17, .35] | 89.63 |
| Lebanese Christians vs. Lebanese Muslims | 223 | 3/4 | .28 | .07 | <.001 | [.15, .41] | 88.97 |

*Note.* Hedges’ g: Overall meta-analytically derived mean effect size, *SE*: standard error, PCR: Percentage of common responses which expresses overlap or similarities between two groups (Hanel et al., 2019; Inman & Bradley, 1989). Comparisons are listed in ascending order using overall ES and PCR figures.

**Table S9**

*Comparison between Pairs of Cultural Groups: Perceived Societal Values*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Groups** | ***n*** | **# of sign.  differences** | **Hedges’ g** | **SE** | ***p*** | **95%-CI** | **PCR** |
| Greek vs. Turkish Samples | 830 | 4/4 | .40 | .09 | <.001 | [.23, .58] | 84.04 |
| Arab- vs. non-Arab Muslim Samples | 703 | 4/4 | .40 | .04 | <.001 | [.31, .49] | 84.21 |
| Italian vs. Spanish Samples | 487 | 4/4 | .25 | .08 | <.002 | [.09, .40] | 90.21 |
| Muslim Lebanese vs. Egyptian Samples | 466 | 1/4 | .10 | .06 | .107 | [-.02, .22] | 96.07 |
| Greek vs. Greek Cypriot Samples | 796 | 1/4 | .17 | .04 | <.001 | [.09, .25] | 93.37 |
| Greek Cypriot vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 442 | 3/4 | .25 | .05 | <.001 | [.15, .35] | 90.19 |
| Catholic vs. Orthodox Samples | 1,280 | 3/4 | .18 | .04 | <.001 | [.10, .26] | 92.98 |
| Turkish vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 478 | 2/4 | .20 | .07 | .002 | [.08, .33] | 91.85 |
| Lebanese Christians vs. Lebanese Muslims | 223 | 0/4 | .07 | .07 | .310 | [-.06, .20] | 97.29 |

*Note.* Hedges’ g: Overall meta-analytically derived mean effect size, *SE*: standard error, PCR: Percentage of common responses which expresses overlap or similarities between two groups (Hanel et al., 2019; Inman & Bradley, 1989). Comparisons are listed in ascending order using overall ES and PCR figures.

**Table S10**

*Comparison between Pairs of Cultural Groups: Personal concerns*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Groups** | ***n*** | **# of sign.  differences** | **Hedges’ g** | **SE** | ***p*** | **95%-CI** | **PCR** |
| Greek vs. Turkish Samples | 830 | 4/6 | .58 | .19 | .002 | [.22, .95] | 77.10 |
| Arab- vs. non-Arab Muslim Samples | 703 | 2/6 | .23 | .11 | .032 | [.02, .44] | 90.86 |
| Italian vs. Spanish Samples | 487 | 6/6 | .62 | .14 | <.001 | [.34, .91] | 75.50 |
| Muslim Lebanese vs. Egyptian Samples | 466 | 4/6 | .45 | .12 | <.001 | [.22, .68] | 82.31 |
| Greek vs. Greek Cypriot Samples | 796 | 5/6 | .41 | .08 | <.001 | [.25, .57] | 83.79 |
| Greek Cypriot vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 442 | 2/6 | .15 | .04 | <.001 | [.06, .23] | 94.19 |
| Catholic vs. Orthodox Samples | 1,280 | 4/6 | .19 | .05 | <.001 | [.09, .29] | 92.39 |
| Turkish vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 478 | 2/6 | .22 | .08 | .008 | [.06, .39] | 91.14 |
| Lebanese Christians vs. Lebanese Muslims | 223 | 1/6 | .17 | .06 | .004 | [.06, .29] | 93.11 |

*Note.* Hedges’ g: Overall meta-analytically derived mean effect size, *SE*: standard error, PCR: Percentage of common responses which expresses overlap or similarities between two groups (Hanel et al., 2019; Inman & Bradley, 1989). Comparisons are listed in ascending order using overall ES and PCR figures.

**Table S11**

*Comparison between Pairs of Cultural Groups: Perceived societal concerns*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Groups** | ***n*** | **# of sign.  differences** | **Hedges’ g** | **SE** | ***p*** | **95%-CI** | **PCR** |
| Greek vs. Turkish Samples | 830 | 5/6 | .39 | .11 | <.001 | [.17, .62] | 84.40 |
| Arab- vs. non-Arab Muslim Samples | 703 | 5/6 | .47 | .12 | <.001 | [.25, .70] | 81.37 |
| Italian vs. Spanish Samples | 487 | 5/6 | .38 | .08 | <.001 | [.23, .54] | 84.88 |
| Muslim Lebanese vs. Egyptian Samples | 466 | 1/6 | .16 | .04 | <.001 | [.08, .25] | 93.58 |
| Greek vs. Greek Cypriot Samples | 796 | 5/6 | .26 | .05 | <.001 | [.16, .36] | 89.58 |
| Greek Cypriot vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 442 | 0/6 | .14 | .04 | <.001 | [.06, .22] | 94.42 |
| Catholic vs. Orthodox Samples | 1,280 | 6/6 | .30 | .04 | <.001 | [.21, .38] | 88.26 |
| Turkish vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples | 478 | 2/6 | .14 | .06 | .018 | [.03, .26] | 94.27 |
| Lebanese Christians vs. Lebanese Muslims | 223 | 0/6 | .14 | .05 | .010 | [.03, .25] | 94.36 |

*Note.* Hedges’ g: Overall meta-analytically derived mean effect size, *SE*: standard error, PCR: Percentage of common responses which expresses overlap or similarities between two groups (Hanel et al., 2019; Inman & Bradley, 1989). Comparisons are listed in ascending order using overall ES and PCR figures.

**Table S12a**

*Heatmap of Variability in Dignity, Face, and Honor Values*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Honor**  **Values** | **Personally Endorsed Values** | | | | **Perceived Normative Values** | | | |
| **Dignity** | **Face** | **Self-Promotion & Retaliation** | **Defense of Family Reputation** | **Dignity** | **Face** | **Self-Promotion & Retaliation** | **Defense of Family Reputation** |
| Greek sample | 0.22 | 0.54 | 0.62 | 1.17 | 0.73 | 0.64 | 0.81 | 0.74 |
| Turkish sample | 0.25 | 0.46 | 0.62 | 0.91 | 0.82 | 0.69 | 0.74 | 0.62 |
| Arab-Muslim sample | 0.19 | 0.45 | 0.71 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.82 | 0.87 | 0.65 |
| Non-Arab Muslim sample | 0.23 | 0.46 | 0.62 | 0.93 | 0.76 | 0.67 | 0.74 | 0.62 |
| Italian sample | 0.26 | 0.48 | 0.56 | 0.98 | 0.72 | 0.79 | 1.02 | 0.70 |
| Spanish sample | 0.26 | 0.56 | 0.61 | 1.24 | 0.68 | 0.67 | 0.78 | 0.76 |
| Lebanese Muslim sample | 0.23 | 0.48 | 0.77 | 1.20 | 0.93 | 0.83 | 0.97 | 0.74 |
| Egyptian Muslim sample | 0.16 | 0.43 | 0.49 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 0.81 | 0.79 | 0.57 |
| Greek Cypriot sample | 0.20 | 0.50 | 0.64 | 1.08 | 0.67 | 0.63 | 0.74 | 0.63 |
| Turkish Cypriot sample | 0.23 | 0.51 | 0.65 | 1.17 | 0.73 | 0.61 | 0.77 | 0.65 |
| Catholic sample | 0.16 | 0.43 | 0.49 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 0.81 | 0.79 | 0.57 |
| Orthodox sample | 0.23 | 0.48 | 0.77 | 1.20 | 0.93 | 0.83 | 0.97 | 0.74 |
| Lebanese Christian sample | 0.23 | 0.49 | 0.66 | 1.03 | 0.92 | 0.73 | 0.81 | 0.70 |

Note: *SD*s increase in size as color move from yellow to green.

**Table S12b**

*Heatmap of Variability in Dignity, Face, and Honor Concerns*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Honor**  **Concerns** | **Personal Concerns** | | | | | | | **Perceived Normative Concerns** | | | | | |
| **Loss of Dignity** | **Loss of Face** | **Loss of Family Reputation** | **Loss of Family Authority** | **Loss of Sexual Propriety** | **Loss of Integrity** | **Loss of Dignity** | | **Loss of Face** | **Loss of Family Reputation** | **Loss of Family Authority** | **Loss of Sexual Propriety** | **Loss of Integrity** |
| Greek sample | 0.46 | 0.54 | 0.75 | 1.34 | 1.55 | 0.24 | 0.61 | | 0.86 | 0.45 | 1.02 | 1.22 | 0.50 |
| Turkish sample | 0.34 | 0.46 | 0.50 | 1.11 | 1.39 | 0.20 | 0.70 | | 0.91 | 0.48 | 0.94 | 1.35 | 0.51 |
| Arab-Muslim sample | 0.43 | 0.52 | 0.64 | 1.52 | 1.43 | 0.25 | 0.71 | | 0.97 | 0.50 | 1.26 | 1.24 | 0.58 |
| Non-Arab Muslim sample | 0.34 | 0.45 | 0.47 | 1.13 | 1.35 | 0.20 | 0.67 | | 0.88 | 0.45 | 0.93 | 1.31 | 0.49 |
| Italian sample | 0.55 | 0.56 | 0.74 | 1.19 | 1.69 | 0.26 | 0.76 | | 0.99 | 0.60 | 1.04 | 1.28 | 0.59 |
| Spanish sample | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.74 | 1.15 | 1.47 | 0.21 | 0.72 | | 0.92 | 0.56 | 1.02 | 1.40 | 0.54 |
| Lebanese Muslim sample | 0.45 | 0.55 | 0.75 | 1.46 | 1.64 | 0.27 | 0.68 | | 0.93 | 0.48 | 0.93 | 1.21 | 0.55 |
| Egyptian Muslim sample | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0.48 | 1.39 | 1.15 | 0.23 | 0.74 | | 1.01 | 0.51 | 1.44 | 1.27 | 0.61 |
| Greek Cypriot sample | 0.37 | 0.48 | 0.64 | 1.29 | 1.57 | 0.19 | 0.58 | | 0.85 | 0.42 | 0.94 | 1.20 | 0.47 |
| Turkish Cypriot sample | 0.42 | 0.49 | 0.69 | 1.16 | 1.76 | 0.22 | 0.76 | | 0.98 | 0.56 | 0.98 | 1.35 | 0.55 |
| Catholic sample | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0.48 | 1.39 | 1.15 | 0.23 | 0.74 | | 1.01 | 0.51 | 1.44 | 1.27 | 0.61 |
| Orthodox sample | 0.45 | 0.55 | 0.75 | 1.46 | 1.64 | 0.27 | 0.68 | | 0.93 | 0.48 | 0.93 | 1.21 | 0.55 |
| Lebanese Christian sample | 0.42 | 0.53 | 0.65 | 1.21 | 1.54 | 0.24 | 0.67 | | 0.84 | 0.47 | 1.11 | 1.24 | 0.50 |

Note: *SD*s increase in size as color move from yellow to green.

**Table S12c**

*Heatmap of Variability in Self-Construal Measures*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Self-Construal Measures** | **Difference vs. Similarity** | **Containment vs. Connection** | **Self-Direction vs. Receptiveness to Influence** | **Self-Reliance vs. Dependence** | **Consistency vs. Variability** | **Self-Expression vs. Harmony** | **Self-Interest vs. Commitment to Others** | **De-Contextualized Self vs. Contextualized Self** |
| Greek sample | 1.28 | 1.30 | 1.31 | 1.48 | 1.56 | 1.45 | 1.26 | 1.30 |
| Turkish sample | 1.27 | 1.31 | 1.34 | 1.43 | 1.72 | 1.34 | 1.40 | 1.28 |
| Arab-Muslim sample | 1.40 | 1.33 | 1.30 | 1.52 | 1.90 | 1.60 | 1.55 | 1.76 |
| Non-Arab Muslim sample | 1.33 | 1.27 | 1.39 | 1.43 | 1.72 | 1.36 | 1.37 | 1.27 |
| Italian sample | 1.38 | 1.40 | 1.43 | 1.38 | 1.82 | 1.56 | 1.35 | 1.62 |
| Spanish sample | 1.25 | 1.56 | 1.20 | 1.41 | 1.89 | 1.55 | 1.46 | 1.73 |
| Lebanese Muslim sample | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.33 | 1.60 | 1.88 | 1.50 | 1.44 | 1.68 |
| Egyptian Muslim sample | 1.38 | 1.19 | 1.30 | 1.40 | 1.90 | 1.67 | 1.66 | 1.80 |
| Greek Cypriot sample | 1.33 | 1.31 | 1.33 | 1.57 | 1.62 | 1.48 | 1.36 | 1.56 |
| Turkish Cypriot sample | 1.41 | 1.34 | 1.40 | 1.38 | 1.57 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.42 |
| Catholic sample | 1.32 | 1.50 | 1.32 | 1.43 | 1.85 | 1.57 | 1.41 | 1.69 |
| Orthodox sample | 1.30 | 1.32 | 1.32 | 1.52 | 1.59 | 1.46 | 1.30 | 1.42 |
| Lebanese Christian sample | 1.37 | 1.32 | 1.43 | 1.84 | 1.72 | 1.44 | 1.50 | 1.36 |

Note: *SD*s increase in size as color move from yellow to green.

**Table S12d**

*Heatmap of Variability in Social Orientation Measures*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Social Orientation  Measures** | **Engaging Emotion  Bias** | **Social Happiness  Bias** | **Self-Inflation** | **Ingroup Closeness  Bias** | **Loyalty** | **Nepotism** |
| Greek sample | 0.74 | 0.75 | 2.26 | 1.20 | 2.65 | 3.45 |
| Turkish sample | 0.74 | 0.74 | 1.26 | 1.20 | 2.82 | 3.86 |
| Arab-Muslim sample | 0.65 | 0.70 | 1.26 | 1.26 | 5.06 | 5.06 |
| Non-Arab Muslim sample | 0.76 | 0.72 | 1.33 | 1.20 | 5.27 | 5.27 |
| Italian sample | 0.70 | 0.70 | 1.08 | 1.14 | 3.99 | 3.99 |
| Spanish sample | 0.69 | 0.69 | 1.08 | 1.01 | 2.57 | 2.57 |
| Lebanese Muslim sample | 0.58 | 0.69 | 1.04 | 1.24 | 2.69 | 2.69 |
| Egyptian Muslim sample | 0.71 | 0.76 | 1.38 | 1.31 | 2.64 | 2.64 |
| Greek Cypriot sample | 0.82 | 0.88 | 1.43 | 1.17 | 4.90 | 2.54 |
| Turkish Cypriot sample | 0.71 | 0.69 | 1.21 | 1.08 | 4.79 | 2.86 |
| Catholic sample | 0.69 | 0.69 | 1.08 | 1.08 | 4.99 | 3.38 |
| Orthodox sample | 0.77 | 0.80 | 1.97 | 1.21 | 5.06 | 2.61 |
| Lebanese Christian sample | 0.67 | 0.81 | 1.11 | 1.00 | 5.01 | 2.63 |

Note: *SD*s increase in size as color move from yellow to green.

**Table S12e**

*Heatmap of Variability in Cognitive Style Measures*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cognitive Style Measures** | **Situational Attribution Bias** | **Categorization** | **Exclusion** | **Memory Perspective** |
| Greek sample | 1.07 | 0.31 | 3.94 | 2.10 |
| Turkish sample | 1.31 | 0.21 | 3.39 | 1.90 |
| Arab-Muslim sample | 1.25 | 0.25 | 3.91 | 2.30 |
| Non-Arab Muslim sample | 1.30 | 0.22 | 3.37 | 1.85 |
| Italian sample | 1.22 | 0.26 | 3.91 | 1.92 |
| Spanish sample | 1.44 | 0.30 | 3.79 | 1.94 |
| Muslim Lebanese sample | 1.35 | 0.21 | 3.91 | 1.88 |
| Egyptian Muslim sample | 1.19 | 0.13 |  | 2.57 |
| Greek Cypriot sample | 1.10 | 0.28 | 4.13 | 2.27 |
| Turkish Cypriot sample | 1.13 | 0.25 | 3.73 | 1.71 |
| Catholic sample | 1.33 | 0.28 | 3.89 | 1.93 |
| Orthodox sample | 1.09 | 0.30 | 4.03 | 2.17 |
| Lebanese Christian sample | 1.17 | 0.25 | 3.91 | 1.88 |

Note: *SD*s increase in size as color move from yellow to green. The exclusion task was not presented to Egyptian participants due to the potentially offensive nature of some of its items (given their reference to sexual relationships).

**Table S13**

*Intraclass correlations (ICC[1]) across all countries, separately for each of the 38 dependent variables*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Variable | ICC(1) |
| Self-construal | Similarity (vs. Difference) | .01 |
| Self-construal | Connection (vs. Containment) | .04 |
| Self-construal | Receptiveness to Influence (vs. Self-Direction) | .01 |
| Self-construal | Dependence (vs. Self-Reliance) | .11 |
| Self-construal | Variability (vs. Consistency) | .07 |
| Self-construal | Harmony (vs. Self-Expression) | .07 |
| Self-construal | Commitment to others (vs. Self-Interest) | .03 |
| Self-construal | Contextualized Self (vs. De-Contextualized Self) | .05 |
| Cognitive style | Causal Situational attribution | .02 |
| Cognitive style | Inclusion of contextual information | .03 |
| Cognitive style | Thematic categorization bias | .17 |
| Cognitive style | Third-person perspective taking | .03 |
| Social Orientation | Intensity of engaging emotions | .04 |
| Social Orientation | Predictors of happiness | .01 |
| Social Orientation | Symbolic self-inflation | .01 |
| Social Orientation | Ingroup closeness bias | .04 |
| Social Orientation | Nepotism (reward) | .01 |
| Social Orientation | Nepotism (punishment) | .01 |
| Values | Dignity (own) | .08 |
| Values | Face (own) | .24 |
| Values | Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation (own) | .20 |
| Values | Honor: Defense of Family Reputation (own) | .14 |
| Values | Dignity (perceived) | .09 |
| Values | Face (perceived) | .05 |
| Values | Honor: Self-Promotion & Retaliation (perceived) | .14 |
| Values | Honor: Defense of Family Reputation (perceived) | .09 |
| Personal concerns | Loss of Dignity (PC) | .05 |
| Personal concerns | Loss of Face (PC) | .05 |
| Personal concerns | Honor: Loss of Family Reputation (PC) | .24 |
| Personal concerns | Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety (PC) | .27 |
| Personal concerns | Honor: Loss of Family Authority (PC) | .12 |
| Personal concerns | Honor: Loss of Integrity (PC) | .01 |
| Perceived-societal concerns | Loss of Dignity (PSC) | .08 |
| Perceived-societal concerns | Loss of Face (PSC) | .09 |
| Perceived-societal concerns | Honor: Loss of Family Reputation (PSC) | .15 |
| Perceived-societal concerns | Honor: Loss of Sexual Propriety (PSC) | .15 |
| Perceived-societal concerns | Honor: Loss of Family Authority (PSC) | .05 |
| Perceived-societal concerns | Honor: Loss of Integrity (PSC) | .10 |

**Table S14**

*Study Limitations*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Sample Characteristics* | Study samples were drawn from student populations, which raises the question whether the findings would generalize to representative samples drawn from the countries included here. However, while student samples can score differently on various outcome measures compared to more representative samples (e.g., Petersen & Merunka, 2014), both sample types are surprisingly similar in terms of their variability across numerous countries and variables (Hanel & Vione, 2016). |
| *Comprehensiveness of Background and Socio-Ecological Variables* | Our analysis does not allow us to capture all possible similarities between the groups included here or an exhaustive list of all possible factors on which they differ or not and that may account for the observed similarities between these groups. It also does not permit us to identify which exact features of these shared socio-ecologies might drive the observed similarities (e.g., exposure to similar educational *or* political systems). |
| *Comprehensiveness of Outcome Variables* | Our study was limited to set of variables used in an existing dataset (Uskul et al., 2023) and therefore reported similarities and differences in a large battery of variables including four indicators of social orientation, eight different dimensions of self-construal, four indicators of cognitive style, and personal and perceived normative honor, face, and dignity values and concerns. Although this is a larger coverage of variables than many existing studies in the field, it still falls short of covering other variables form previously examined domains such as attitudes and opinions. |
| *Generalizability to Other World Regions* | Our data originates from one particular world region (i.e., the Mediterranean) and thus we are not in a position to speak to how current findings generalize to other world regions. Note, however, that this contained focus also meant that our comparisons we were comparing groups from subregions that were found to be more similar to each other in terms of independent and interdependent make-up of their social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style than they are to samples in the East Asian and Anglo-Western regions, making comparisons between groups in this region more conservative to identify differences. |