Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: Attitudes and Social Cognition

What makes us similar or different? Evidence from the Mediterranean region on the role of socio-ecological and cultural background factors

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Full Title:	What makes us similar or different? Evidence from the Mediterranean region on the role of socio-ecological and cultural background factors
Abstract:	Adopting a 'just minimal difference' combined with a 'just minimal similarity' approach, we examined the role of socio-ecological and cultural background factors in similarities and differences in a large set of psychological characteristics among different cultural groups sampled from the understudied Mediterranean region. We did this by capitalizing on nine samples from the Mediterranean region that have overlapping and divergent features in terms of religious, ethnic, national, and linguistic factors as well as various physical and socio-ecological characteristics (Spain, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Cyprus [Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities], Lebanon [Muslim Lebanese and Christian Lebanese], Egypt). Across 38 different psychological characteristics, we found that the greatest similarity emerged between groups that had a shared socio-political ecology, rather than among those who shared a superordinate group membership (e.g., religious, linguistic, ethnic/national) yet were exposed to different socio-political ecologies. Our findings contribute to increasing efforts to identify the roots of similarities and differences between cultural groups by taking a unique methodological approach and providing insights from an understudied world region that allowed its implementation.
Article Type:	Article
Keywords:	the Mediterranean, socio-ecology, religious and ethnic identity, cultural similarities and differences
Corresponding Author:	Ayse Uskul University of Sussex UNITED KINGDOM
Corresponding Author E-Mail:	A.K.Uskul@sussex.ac.uk
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Sussex
Other Authors:	Paul H. P. Hanel
	Alexander Kirchner-Häusler
	Shuxian Jin
	Vivian L. Vignoles
	Rosa Rodriguez-Bailón
	Vanessa A. Castillo
	Susan E. Cross
	Meral Gezici Yalçın
	Charles Harb
	Shenel Husnu
	Keiko Ishii
	Panagiota Karamaouna
	Konstantinos Kafetsios

	Evangelia Kateri
	Juan Matamoros-Lima
	Rania Miniesy
	Jinkyung Na
	Zafer Özkan
	Stefano Pagliaro
	Charis Psaltis
	Dina Rabie
	Manuel Teresi
	Yukiko Uchida
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Ayse K. Uskul
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Manuscript Region of Origin:	UNITED KINGDOM
Suggested Reviewers:	Amber Thalmayer University of Zurich: Universitat Zurich amber-gayle.thalmayer@psychologie.uzh.ch Dr Thalmayer works on different world regions including Africa
	Masaki Yuki Hokkaido University: Hokkaido Daigaku myuki@let.hokudai.ac.jp Prof Yuki works at the intersection of cultural and socio-ecological psychology
	Yoshihisa Kashima University of Melbourne ykashima@unimelb.edu.au Prof Kashima is well versed in the cultural and socio-ecological literature.
	Jeremy Ginges LSE: The London School of Economics and Political Science j.ginges@lse.ac.uk Dr Ginges has worked on cultural group differences and similarities and works on the region.
Opposed Reviewers:	Thomas Talhelm University of Chicago Booth School of Business - London We have reason to believe that Dr Talhelm might not have bene impartial in their review of our work in the past.
	Michele Gelfand Stanford University We have reason to believe that Prof Gelfand might not have bene impartial in their review of our work in the past.
Order of Authors:	Ayse K. Uskul
	Paul H. P. Hanel
	Alexander Kirchner-Häusler
	Shuxian Jin
	Vivian L. Vignoles
	Rosa Rodriguez-Bailón

	Vanessa A. Castillo
	Susan E. Cross
	Meral Gezici Yalçın
	Charles Harb
	Shenel Husnu
	Keiko Ishii
	Panagiota Karamaouna
	Konstantinos Kafetsios
	Evangelia Kateri
	Juan Matamoros-Lima
	Rania Miniesy
	Jinkyung Na
	Zafer Özkan
	Stefano Pagliaro
	Charis Psaltis
	Dina Rabie
	Manuel Teresi
	Yukiko Uchida
Additional Information:	
Question	**Response**
My manuscript (a) makes a contribution to theory about attitudes and social cognition, (b) reports a discovery (the demonstration of a new, significant empirical phenomenon (e.g., a particular pattern of social behavior; a type of response not previously identified; and a new, surprising implication of an existing theory) in the areas of attitudes and social cognition, or (c) both (a) and (b) apply.	(c) both (a) and (b) apply
For manuscripts that make a theoretical contribution (a), what is the type of theoretical contribution the manuscript makes? as follow-up to "My manuscript (a) makes a contribution to theory about attitudes and social cognition, (b) reports a discovery (the demonstration of a new, significant empirical phenomenon (e.g., a particular pattern of social behavior; a type of response not previously identified; and a new, surprising implication of an existing theory) in the areas of attitudes and social cognition, or (c) both (a) and (b) apply."	(g)conceptualizing the conditions that give way to different processes previously studied independently (novel identification of conditions under which different processes occur)

My manuscript provides evidence of the psychological processes implicated in the phenomenon.	No
My manuscript has implications for societal outcomes	No
Were any studies preregistered?	No
Are data/materials posted to a repository?	Yes
Please provide the anonymized link here as well as in the author note and Methods section as follow-up to "Are data/materials posted to a repository? "	https://osf.io/a5zh6/
I have included a table containing an assessment of the limitations of the research reported in the paper.	No
I have included a statement of limitations.	Yes
We recommend that introductory materials (the introduction and any introduction to studies) along with the discussion of findings (Discussion and General Discussion sections) total no more than 3,500 words. Excluding methods, results, references, figures, tables, and appendices, the manuscript number of words is _____	3444

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

Ayse K. Uskul, PhD

Professor of Social and Cultural Psychology
School of Psychology
Pevensey 1, University of Sussex,
Falmer, Brighton BN1 9RH

E-mail: a.k.uskul@sussex.ac.uk

06 November 2023

Dear Professor Albarracín,

My co-authors and I are excited to submit our manuscript entitled "What makes us similar or different? Evidence from the Mediterranean region on the role of socio-ecological and cultural background factors" for consideration in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology: Attitudes and Social Cognition*.

The current study represents the first-of-its-kind, large-scale comparison of individuals' social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style, as well as honor, face, and dignity values and concerns among cultural groups sampled from the Mediterranean region that are matched on different socio-ecological and background characteristics. We did this by capitalizing on a design feature of an existing dataset (Uskul et al., 2023, published in *JPSP: ASC*) which combines samples from the Mediterranean region that have overlapping and divergent features in terms of religious, ethnic, national, and linguistic factors as well as physical and socio-political characteristics. By using a 'just minimal difference' (Cohen, 2007) combined with a 'just minimal similarity' approach, we aimed to identify background and socio-ecological factors that may be driving similarities and differences between different cultural groups. This approach helped us examine the role of factors identified as being associated with cultural variation in psychological processes in tandem unlike most previous research that has focused on the study of an isolated set of factors.

In a field of research, where establishing causality is near impossible, because participants cannot be randomly assigned to live and be raised in different groups or environments, our approach provides novel insight into factors that matter in what makes individuals in different societies more or less similar in a large variety of psychological characteristics spanning across various cognitive, emotional, relational, self-related and value-related psychological indicators. Our findings show that the greatest similarity emerged among groups that have a shared socio-political background governed by similar social and political configurations (i.e., Turks in Turkey and Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus; Christian and Muslims in Lebanon) rather than among those who share an ethnic or religious background or cultural heritage (thus a superordinate shared identity) yet were exposed to different socio-political ecologies.

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

We believe that our submission fulfils the journal's criteria of general theoretical and empirical significance and methodological rigor. In addition, our submission draws from populations that are currently underrepresented in psychological science (they were sampled from the Mediterranean region including sites in Egypt, Lebanon, Turkey, Greece, Italy, Spain, and the Turkish-Cypriot and Greek-Cypriot communities in Cyprus) and its author team represents the global scientific community. It is also authentic in the sense that it relies on a large number of measures and tasks which we used to test the similarities and differences between the groups included in our study (as opposed to relying on a limited set of measures of a single construct, for example).

We would like to finish by adding that the study on which the current analyses are based was conducted according to the ethical guidelines of APA and the rights of the participants were protected. The manuscript describes original empirical research and has not been published elsewhere. We have also included a statement and a table about study's limitations.

Thank you for your consideration of our manuscript. We look forward to hearing from you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Ayse K. Uskul, PhD (corresponding author, on behalf of all authors)
Professor of Social and Cultural Psychology
University of Sussex, UK

What makes us similar or different? Evidence from the Mediterranean region on the role of socio-ecological and cultural background factors

Ayse K. Uskul[1], Paul H. P. Hanel[2], Alexander Kirchner-Häusler[1], Shuxian Jin[1], Vivian L. Vignoles[1], Rosa Rodriguez-Bailón[3], Vanessa A. Castillo[4], Susan E. Cross[4], Meral Gezici Yalçın[5,6], Charles Harb[7], Shenel Husnu[8], Keiko Ishii[9], Panagiota Karamaouna[10], Konstantinos Kafetsios[11], Evangelia Kateri[10], Juan Matamoros-Lima[3], Rania Miniesy[12], Jinkyung Na[13], Zafer Özkan[14], Stefano Pagliaro[15], Charis Psaltis[16], Dina Rabie[17], Manuel Teresi[15], & Yukiko Uchida[18]

[1] University of Sussex, United Kingdom

[2] University of Essex, United Kingdom

[3] University of Granada, Spain

[4] Iowa State University, United States

[5] Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Turkey

[5] University of Bielefeld, Germany

[7] American University of Beirut, Lebanon, & Doha Institute for Graduate Studies, Qatar

[8] Eastern Mediterranean University, North Cyprus

[9] Nagoya University, Japan

[10] University of Crete, Greece

[11] Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

[12] British University of Egypt, Egypt

[13] Sogang University, South Korea

[14] Ordu University, Turkey

[15] University of Chieti-Pescara, Italy

[16] University of Cyprus, Cyprus

[17] Nottingham Trent University

[18] Kyoto University, Japan

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ayse K. Uskul, School of Psychology, University of Sussex, Pevensey 1 Building, Falmer, BN1 9QH, UK. E-mail: a.k.uskul@sussex.ac.uk

Author Note

The research was supported by a European Research Council Consolidator Grant (HONORLOGIC, 817577) awarded to Ayse K. Uskul.

Abstract

Adopting a 'just minimal difference' combined with a 'just minimal similarity' approach, we examined the role of socio-ecological and cultural background factors in similarities and differences in a large set of psychological characteristics among different cultural groups sampled from the understudied Mediterranean region. We did this by capitalizing on nine samples from the Mediterranean region that have overlapping and divergent features in terms of religious, ethnic, national, and linguistic factors as well as various physical and socio-ecological characteristics (Spain, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Cyprus [Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities], Lebanon [Muslim Lebanese and Christian Lebanese], Egypt). Across 38 different psychological characteristics, we found that the greatest similarity emerged between groups that had a shared socio-political ecology, rather than among those who shared a superordinate group membership (e.g., religious, linguistic, ethnic/national) yet were exposed to different socio-political ecologies. Our findings contribute to increasing efforts to identify the roots of similarities and differences between cultural groups by taking a unique methodological approach and providing insights from an understudied world region that allowed its implementation.

Keywords: the Mediterranean, socio-ecology, religious and ethnic identity, cultural similarities and differences

Word count: 186

Statement of Limitations

Despite presenting a comprehensive approach to identifying the role of socio-ecological and cultural background factors in similarities between groups, our analysis does not allow us to capture all possible similarities between the groups studied in the current research or an exhaustive list of all possible factors that may account for the observed similarities between these groups. It also does not permit us to tap into which exact features of these shared socio-ecologies might drive the observed similarities (e.g., exposure to similar educational *or* political systems). Moreover, using student samples who are more likely to engage in contact with other cultures might have obscured some differences. Finally, our study relies on groups from one world region (i.e., the Mediterranean) with groups varying from each other or being similar to each other on a certain set of characteristics; sampling other groups from other world regions would help test the generalizability of current findings.

Word count: 151

Evidence accumulated over the last three decades has clearly demonstrated that cultural groups in different world regions show substantial variation in preferences, values, motivations, and self-definitions, among other psychological characteristics (for reviews see Cohen & Kitayama, 2018), yet efforts to explain origins of cultural variation thereof are relatively recent. Given that membership in a cultural group or exposure to certain sets of physical or socio-ecological conditions cannot be manipulated (i.e., participants cannot be randomly assigned to live and be raised in different cultural groups or socio-ecological environments), which makes experimental designs in this field of research near-impossible, researchers have had to adopt creative methodological and statistical approaches to shed light on the causal roots of cultural group differences in psychological processes. Some have focused on socio-demographic factors and macro socio-ecological processes such as economic development, historical shifts, or religious denomination (e.g., Greenfield, 2009; Schulz et al., 2019; White et al., 2021) or processes driven by cultural evolution and gene selection (e.g., Newson et al., 2007). Others have analyzed features of individuals' proximal environments to examine their effects on behavior (e.g., Morling et al., 2002; Uskul et al., 2012), used priming methods to examine the links between certain cultural mindsets or construals and the resulting cognitions, affects, or behaviors (for a review see Oyserman & Yan, 2019), or measured theoretically meaningful individual difference variables (e.g., independent and interdependent social orientation) to test whether they account for observed cultural differences in an outcome of interest (McCrae, 2000). Finally, a minority of studies have adopted a 'just minimal difference' approach (Cohen, 2007) to tackle 'third variable explanations' by comparing groups that are similar to each other on a number of variables (e.g., language, ethnicity, economic development), yet differ on a specific cultural variable of interest (e.g., type of socio-economic activity, see Uskul et al., 2008 or relational mobility, see Sato & Yuki, 2014) to isolate its effect on an outcome variable.

Research conducted to identify sources of cultural variation is increasingly revealing strong evidence for the role played by various ecological dimensions in the shaping of psychological processes. For example, ecological characteristics of physical (e.g., green spaces, climate, built environments, prevalence of infectious diseases), demographic (e.g., residential mobility, sex ratio, population density, demographic diversity), economic (e.g., subsistence modes, resource scarcity, national wealth, income inequality), and political (e.g., welfare spending, democratic governing, taxation, gender equality) nature have been linked with a wide range of psychological outcomes including intergroup discrimination, voting behavior, subjective well-being, cooperation, self-disclosure, prosociality, generalized trust, conformity, aggression, impulse control, and susceptibility to visual illusion to name a few (for reviews see Oishi, 2014; Oishi & Graham, 2010; Sng et al., 2018). In parallel, research which focused on demographic factors (e.g., language, socio-economic status), group identities (e.g., ethnic, national, religious identities), and cultural variables (e.g., individualism-collectivism; tightness-looseness, honor-dignity-face) has also revealed strong evidence that these factors can shape psychological processes in important ways making individuals and groups sharing similar demographic and cultural backgrounds, and social identities also look similar in their psychological make up (e.g., showing similar patterns in their attitudes and values) (e.g., Gelfand et al., 2011; Wormley et al., 2023; White et al., 2021). Yet most studies treated these factors of socio-ecological and demographic nature independently, making it difficult to identify the unique role played by each set of factors in cultural variation in psychological processes. In the current paper, we capitalized on an existing dataset which made it possible to examine the role of various demographic and identity factors and socio-ecological variables in explaining similarities and differences between cultural groups, using samples which could be matched on several socio-ecological background and identity characteristics. This approach allowed us, through triangulation of

findings emerging from different sets of comparisons, to identify which shared characteristic(s) may play a stronger role in generating cultural group similarities across a wide range of psychological characteristics. We provide more detail about our approach in the next section.

The Present Research

In the current research, we adopted a 'just minimal difference' combined with a 'just minimal similarity' approach to identify factors that may play a role in shaping similarities in a large set of psychological characteristics between cultural groups matched on different background or a socio-ecological characteristic. We introduced the 'just minimal similarity' approach to investigate whether sharing an overlapping background or a socio-ecological characteristic (yet differing on several other important characteristics) may be sufficient for members of two cultural groups to also show similarities in their psychological make-up. For example, if sharing a religious denomination is a critical feature that shapes psychological characteristics, then belonging to the same religious group (despite differing in other important characteristics such as ethnicity, language, socio-political ecology) may be sufficient to make members of two cultural groups similar in their psychological make-up. We would have converging evidence for the crucial role of religious denomination using the 'just minimal difference' approach if we found that members of two cultural groups who were similar in various characteristics yet differed in their religious group membership showed differences in their psychological make-up.

We explored the roots of group differences and similarities by exploiting a design feature of an existing dataset (Uskul et al., 2023) which combines samples from the Mediterranean region that have overlapping and divergent features in terms of religious, ethnic, national, and linguistic factors as well as various physical and socio-ecological characteristics. Moreover, previous analysis of this dataset (Uskul et al., 2023) has revealed

that the subregions circum Mediterranean (Latin Europe, Southeastern Europe, the Middle East) are 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 (Japan, South Korea) and Anglo-Western (UK, US) regions, making comparisons between subgroups in this region more conservative to identify differences.

Specifically, using this dataset, we conducted the following comparisons, where groups could be matched on a set of relevant variables while varying on others (see Table 1), which allowed us to isolate the role played by a set of factors (i.e., religious denomination, national/ethnic identity, language, exposure to similar physical and socio-political ecologies) that have previously considered as important in shaping differences and similarities of cultural groups in different psychological processes:

a) *Muslim versus Christian participants in a Lebanese sample*: 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.
b) *Greek-Orthodox versus Catholic samples*: 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.

c) *Arab versus non-Arab Muslim participants*: 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.

d) *Greek Cypriot versus Turkish Cypriot samples*: 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.

e) *Greek versus Greek Cypriot samples*: 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.

f) *Turkish and Turkish Cypriot samples*: 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 one is 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).

g) *Egyptian versus Muslim Lebanese samples*: 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.

h) *Spanish versus Italian samples*: 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.

i) *Turkish versus Greek samples*. 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.

In sum, this dataset allowed us to go beyond simply running two-way comparisons between cultural groups in their own terms with a goal to identify which comparison(s) of two groups that have different overlapping shared characteristics would reveal bigger differences or bigger similarities in their psychological characteristics depending on the nature of shared cultural group memberships such as religion, ethnicity/nationality, language, and being exposed to a shared way of life governed by similar physical and socio-political characteristics. For example, if religious membership and ethnic origin play a bigger part in

the shaping of psychological characteristics, then Muslim Lebanese and Egyptians of Arab origin would show greater similarity compared with Muslim and Christian groups in Lebanon. However, if being exposed to similar physical and socio-political ecologies plays a more important role, then Muslim Lebanese and Christian Lebanese would show greater similarity than Muslim Lebanese and Egyptians of Arab origin.

Method

We analyzed a segment of a large dataset originating from a comparative study designed to examine patterns of social orientation, self-construal and cognitive style (as described in Uskul et al., 2023) as well as honor, face, and dignity values and concerns across different world which included samples recruited from different sites in the Mediterranean region, East Asia, and Anglo-West. In the current study, we focus on a subset of this dataset consisting of samples recruited from the Mediterranean region only.

Participants

The sample included 2,228 participants (see Table 2 for descriptive statistics) recruited through collaborating institutions in eight different sites circum Mediterranean (Spain, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Cyprus [Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities], Lebanon, Egypt). Although recruitment of students as participants limits generalizability of findings, in the current context, comparing samples from different cultural groups that share high similarity in terms of daily routines and backgrounds provides a conservative approach to identifying differences.

Procedure and Materials

All participants[1] completed a study containing a large battery of measures and tasks (see Table 3 for an overview and references) including four tasks tapping into six indicators

[1] The Inclusion of Contextual Information task was not presented to Egyptian participants due to the potentially offensive nature of some of its items (due to their reference to sexual relationships).

of social orientation (intensity of engaging vs. disengaging emotions, predictors of happiness, ingroup vs. outgroup closeness bias, symbolic self-inflation, nepotism focusing on both rewarding friends and punishing strangers), an eight-dimensional self-construal scale with each dimension consisting of an interdependent and an independent pole (similarity vs. difference; connection to others vs. self-containment; receptiveness to influence vs. self-direction; dependence on others vs. self-reliance; harmony vs. self-expression; commitment to others vs. self-interest; variability vs. consistency; contextualized vs. de-contextualized self), and four tasks assessing cognitive style (causal situational vs. dispositional attribution, thematic vs. taxonomic categorization, inclusion vs. exclusion of contextual information, third-person vs. first-person perspective-taking). Participants also responded to items assessing honor, face, and dignity cultural logics as *values* (operationalized as agreement with beliefs and norms) and *concerns* (operationalized as reactions to potentially goal-obstructing or reputation threatening situations), which they rated once for themselves (*personal endorsement*) and once for their perception of most people in their society (*perceived-societal endorsement*). Multilevel measurement models conducted with these items yielded four individual-level factors for values and six individual-level factors for concerns, totaling to 20 measures for self-endorsed and societally perceived values and concerns; the same conceptual factors emerged for both personal and perceived-societal item sets, for values and concerns respectively. Finally, participants also responded to a list of demographic questions including gender, age, subjective social status (Adler et al., 2000), religious background, and ethnicity some of which we used to identify subgroups within each sample to conduct the comparisons reported below. Thus, this dataset made possible comparison of a large battery of psychological characteristics comprised of 38 different measures and tasks between the above-described pairings, tapping into different components or facets of social orientation,

self-construal, cognitive style, and values and concerns related to three cultural logics (face, dignity, and honor).

Open Practices Statement and Ethics

The dataset used in this paper is openly available in the Open Science Framework at https://osf.io/a5zh6/?view_only=b356c2b825144a16aa51bae2dde05012. The original study was approved by the ethics committee of the first author's institution and those of the collaborating institutions where data collection took place. All participants provided consent prior to starting the study.

Results

Analysis Plan

To tap into both differences and similarities between the groups, we applied several different statistical methods. First, we conducted a series of multivariate ANCOVAs to test whether including several demographic covariates influence the overall pattern of results. Second, for each of the pairwise comparisons (e.g., Lebanese Muslims vs. Lebanese Christians), we ran a random effects meta-analysis to get an estimate of the magnitude of the effect across all 38 psychological characteristics. Finally, we also reported similarities between each of the pairwise comparisons since emphasizing similarities allows to quantify by *how much* two groups differ (Manet, 2016). We describe these steps in detail below.

We first analyzed all tasks and measures used to assess social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style using analyses of variance controlling for subjective social status and age as the original analyses reported in Uskul and colleagues (2023) showed significant differences between individuals of different subjective social status and significant age differences between samples[2]. We analyzed honor, face, and dignity values and concerns using multivariate analysis of variance where we treated the four personally endorsed values,

[2] Conducting the analyses without the covariates did not change the pattern of results.

four societally perceived values, six personally endorsed concerns and six societally perceived concerns in separate analyses, again controlling for age and SSS differences. Keeping with the original analyses adopted by Uskul and colleagues (2023), we used Sidak adjustment for multiple comparisons (see Tables 4 and 5). For each pairwise comparison, we report similarities and differences in tasks and measures used to assess social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style first followed by differences and similarities in honor, face, and dignity values and concerns.

Next, to compare the groups with each other across all variables, we first computed Hedges' *g*, which is an unbiased version of Cohen's *d* (Borenstein et al., 2009), as an effect size separately for each variable. Since our main interest lies in the absolute difference between groups, we used the absolute value of each Hedges' *g*. We subsequently computed the overall average across all 38 variables for each pair of groups, employing a random-effects meta-analysis using the R-package *metafor* (version 3.8-1; Viechtbauer, 2010). We used this overall mean effect size as an indicator of how different the two groups in each pair are (Table 6). Additionally, addressing calls to focus also on similarities between groups (Hanel et al., 2019; Maney, 2016), we reported the *Percentage of Common Responses* (PCR; Inman & Bradley, 1989) as an effect size which expresses the amount of overlap between two groups and ranges from 0 (no overlap) to 100% (perfect overlap). The PCR is a non-linear transformation of Cohen's *d*. This analytical approach allowed us to report on mean differences between groups as well as to calculate and display similarities between them using a novel approach (Hanel et al., 2019).

In our analyses and reporting of the findings, we focus on the average size of similarities and differences between cultural groups, rather than the content and types of group similarities and differences. We reported all indicators used to examine differences and similarities between the groups in addition to descriptive statistics for each sample in Tables

4-6. The section below lists the comparisons in order of degree of similarity, starting with two groups that were the least similar to each other and ending with two groups that were the most similar.

Greek versus Turkish Samples

We observed the greatest number of differences (or smallest number of similarities) across all measures of social orientation, dimensions of self-construal, cognitive style, and honor, face, dignity values and concerns between Greek and Turkish participants, with the two groups significantly differing on 32 out of 38 indicators assessed in the dataset. These two groups differed significantly on 15 out of 18 measures used to assess social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style including all social orientation indicators except for predictors of happiness bias, all self-construal dimensions except for difference versus similarity and self-reliance versus dependence, and all cognitive style indicators. On nine of these tasks and measures, Greek participants showed stronger interdependence than did their Turkish counterparts and on the remaining six indicators, Turkish participants exhibited stronger interdependence than did their Greek counterparts. The two groups differed on 17 out of 20 indicators of honor, face, and dignity values and concerns; on all of these, except for two dignity measures, Turkish participants scored significantly higher than did Greek participants. The random-effects meta-analysis revealed that across all 38 variables the two groups differed at $g = 0.44$, 95%-CI [0.34, 0.54].

Arab- versus non-Arab Muslim Samples

We observed the second greatest number of differences (or smallest number of similarities) between Muslim participants of Arab (Muslim Lebanese and Egyptians) versus non-Arab (Muslim Turkish and Turkish Cypriots) origin. These two groups differed significantly (or marginally significantly at $p = .05$) on 14 out of 18 measures used to assess social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style including three social orientation

indicators (symbolic self-inflation, ingroup closeness bias, punishment of strangers), all self-construal dimensions except for commitment to others versus self-interest, and all cognitive style indicators. On ten of these tasks, non-Arab Muslim participants exhibited stronger interdependence than did their Arab Muslim counterparts and on the remaining four, non-Arab Muslim participants exhibited stronger interdependence than did their non-Arab Muslim counterparts. The two groups differed on 14 out of 20 indicators of honor, face, and dignity values and concerns; on half of these indicators non-Arab participants scored significantly higher than did Arab participants and on the remaining half, this pattern was reversed. The random-effects meta-analysis revealed that across all 38 variables the two groups differed at $g = 0.35$, 95%-CI [0.26, 0.43].

Italian versus Spanish Samples

Participants from Italian and Spanish samples differed from each other on half of the 18 measures used to assess social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style including two cognitive style tasks (triad task, inclusion task), two social orientation tasks (predictors of happiness, nepotism in reward contexts) and five self-construal dimensions (containment vs. connection, self-reliance vs. dependence, self-expression vs. harmony, self-interest vs. commitment, decontextualized vs. contextualize self). On five of these indicators, Spanish participants showed a stronger interdependent orientation and on the remaining four Italian participants were more interdependent than their Spanish counterparts. The two groups differed on 17 out of 20 indicators of honor, face, and dignity values and concerns. Spanish participants scored significantly higher on seven out of these indicators than did Italian participants; on the remaining ten indicators this pattern was reversed. The random-effects meta-analysis revealed that across all 38 variables the two groups differed at $g = 0.31$, 95%-CI [0.23, 0.40].

Muslim Lebanese and Egyptian Samples

Muslim participants from the Lebanese and Egyptian samples differed from each other on five out of 18 used to assess social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style including one social orientation indicator (intensity of engaging emotions), three self-construal dimensions (connection vs. containment, dependence vs. self-reliance, contextualized vs. decontextualized self), and one cognitive style indicator (categorization bias). On two of these indicators, Muslim Lebanese exhibited stronger interdependence than did their Egyptian counterparts, whereas on the other two this pattern was reversed. The two groups differed on seven out of 20 indicators of honor, face, and dignity values and concerns; Muslim Lebanese participants scored significantly higher on three of these indicators than did Egyptian participants and on the remaining four, this pattern was reversed. The random-effects meta-analysis revealed that across all 37 variables the two groups differed at $g = 0.25$, 95%-CI [0.06, 0.45].

Greek versus Greek Cypriot Samples

Greek and Greek Cypriot participants showed significant differences in eight out of 18 used to assess social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style including two social orientation (engaging emotion bias, ingroup closeness), and two cognitive style (categorization task, exclusion task) tasks and four dimensions of the self-construal scale (containment vs. connection, consistency vs. variability, self-interest vs. commitment to otters, contextualized vs. decontextualized self). Across these eight measures, Greek Cypriot participants exhibited a stronger interdependent pattern than did Greek participants on half of them; on the remaining half Greek participants exhibited a stronger interdependent pattern than did Greek Cypriot participants. The two groups differed on 13 out of 20 indicators of honor, face, and dignity values and concerns, with Greek Cypriot participants scoring significantly higher than did Greek participants on almost all of these indicators except for two on which Greek participants scored significantly higher than did Greek Cypriot

participants. The random-effects meta-analysis revealed that across all 38 variables the two groups differed at g = 0.22, 95%-CI [0.17, 0.28].

The Case of Cyprus (Greek Cypriot vs. Turkish Cypriot Communities)

The two communities of Cyprus differed from each other in significant ways on half of the measures used to assess social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style (9/18) including one social orientation task (engaging emotion bias), four self-construal dimensions (consistency vs. variability, self-expression vs. harmony, self-interest vs. commitment to others, contextualized vs. decontextualized self), and all cognitive style tasks. Differences pointed to a stronger interdependent pattern among Greek Cypriot (vs. Turkish Cypriot) participants, with Greek Cypriot participants showing stronger interdependence in seven of these nine indicators and Turkish Cypriot participants showing stronger interdependence compared with their Greek Cypriot counterparts on two indicators only. The two groups differed on 8 out of 20 indicators of honor, face, and dignity values and concerns, with Turkish Cypriot participants scoring significantly higher on five of these indicators and Greek Cypriot participants scoring significantly higher on the remaining three. The random-effects meta-analysis revealed that across all 38 variables the two groups differed at g = 0.22, 95%-CI [0.18, 0.26].

Catholic versus Greek-Orthodox Samples

The comparison between participants of Catholic background consisting of the Spanish and Italian samples and participants of Greek-Orthodox background consisting of Greek and Greek Cypriot samples revealed significant differences on half of the measures used to assess social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style (9/18) including in a social orientation task (symbolic self-inflation), six self-construal dimensions (difference vs. similarity, self-reliance vs. dependence, consistency vs. variability, self-expression vs. harmony, self-interest vs. commitment to others, contextualized vs. decontextualized self),

and two cognitive style tasks (categorization task, perspective taking in memory task). On five of these indicators, the Orthodox sample endorsed stronger interdependence than did the Catholic sample, whereas on the remaining four, the Catholic groups endorsed a stronger interdependence than did the Orthodox sample. The two groups differed on all indicators of honor, face, and dignity values and concerns except for two; on half of these indicators Catholic participants scored significantly higher than did Greek Orthodox participants and on the remaining half, this pattern was reversed. The random-effects meta-analysis revealed that across all 38 variables the two groups differed at g = 0.20, 95%-CI [0.16, 0.24].

Turkish versus Turkish Cypriot Samples

We observed the second lowest number of differences (or greatest similarity) between Turkish participants recruited in Turkey and Turkish Cypriot participants recruited in Cyprus across all 38 measures[3]. The two groups differed significantly on one self-construal dimension (consistency vs. variability), on which Turkish participants from Turkey showed stronger interdependence than did Turkish Cypriot participants and on nine of the twenty indicators of honor, face, dignity values and concerns on seven of which Turkish participants scored higher than did Turkish Cypriot participants. This similarity was reflected in the random-effects meta-analysis which revealed an effect of g = 0.15, 95%-CI [0.11, 0.19].

Muslim versus Christian Participants in the Lebanese Sample

We observed the lowest number of differences (or greatest similarity) between Muslim and Christian participants recruited in Lebanon who differed on only seven out of 38 measures. Analyzing group differences in social orientation, self-construal, and cognitive style across these two groups revealed significant group differences in 3 out of 18 measures, with Muslim participants showing significantly stronger interdependence on one social orientation indicator (predictors of happiness) and one cognitive style indicator

[3] Note that this comparison excluded Turkish-born settlers who reside in northern Cyprus.

(categorization bias) and Christian participants showing greater interdependence on one social orientation indicator (intensity of engaging emotions). The two groups differed significantly on only four out of 20 variables assessing dignity, face, and honor values and concerns with Muslim participants scoring significantly higher on three of the four of these indicators than did Christian participants. The random-effects meta-analysis revealed that across all 38 variables the two groups differed at $g = 0.16$, 95%-CI [0.11, 0.20].

Discussion

Using a large battery of tasks and measures including several implicit tasks assessing different aspects of social orientation (self-other overlap, symbolic self-inflation, emotional orientation, loyalty/nepotism) and cognitive style (attribution, categorization, perspective taking, exclusion of information), as well as an explicit measure of self-construal tapping into eight different dimensions and a battery of honor, face, dignity values and concerns indicators, we showed that the greatest similarity emerged among groups that inhabit a shared ecology governed by similar socio-political configurations (i.e., Turks in Turkey and Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus; Christian and Muslims in Lebanon) rather than among those who share a superordinate identity (e.g., religious, linguistic or ethnic) but were exposed to different socio-political ecologies. In a field of research where the study of causality is difficult to establish, our approach which allowed triangulating findings originating from unique comparisons across different pairs of cultural groups and pitting alternative sources of similarities and differences between cultural groups against each other sheds novel light on which socio-ecological and cultural background factors may be responsible for stronger or weaker similarity between groups in how individuals see themselves, relate to others, process information, and in the types of values and concerns they strongly endorse. Overall, our findings add to the increasing evidence pool which demonstrates that cultural diversity and similarity around the globe is at least partly due to the socio-ecologies individuals inhabit

(Sng et al., 2018; Tooby & Cosmides, 1992) using just minimal difference and just minimal similarity approaches.

Our findings are mostly in support of San Martin et al.'s (2018) observations in two studies with Lebanese participants in which the Muslim versus non-Muslim groups were not different from each other on five tasks assessing independence and interdependence in social orientation and cognitive style. Similarly, our findings are in line with Akalliyski et al.'s (2021) take on the nation as a meaningful grouping unit which captures a greater share of cultural variation when it is compared to alternative ways of grouping individuals (e.g., by using subnational identities such as religious, linguistic and ethnic/racial identities) as nations provide a common ground through socializing its citizens by way of institutions such as a national educational system. The similarities between Turkish participants from Turkey and Turkish Cypriots from Cyprus may in the first instance appear to go against this argument, however, as explained above, the strong political and economic connections between the Turkey and TRNC have likely produced greater similarity between two nations that we would see between any other two nations included in the current pool of samples.

Our approach and the features of the dataset used here allowed us to contribute to discussions on the origins of cultural differences and similarities in the following ways. First, most investigations attempting to identify sources of cultural variation have focused on associations between a single socio-ecological variable (e.g., pathogen prevalence) or a cultural variable (e.g., religious traditions) on one hand and a single cultural outcome (e.g., collectivism/individualism) or a small set of such outcomes (e.g., a set of political and economic attitudes) on the other. In the current research, we focused on the examination of the roles played by different factors including ethnic, religious, linguistic and national group memberships and shared physical and socio-political ecologies in multiple self-related, relational, cognitive, and value-related outcomes. Second, the dataset we re-analyzed for the

current research originates from the Mediterranean region, thus our study contributes to the growing cultural diversity within behavioral sciences (e.g., Henrich et al., 2010; Thalmayer et al., 2021) and contributes to emerging efforts to put this understudied region on the map of psychological knowledge (e.g., Kirchner-Häusler et al., 2023; Uskul et al., 2023). Third, by focusing on the within-region diversity in the reported comparisons, our findings contribute to the growing literature on regional variation of psychological processes (e.g., East- vs. South-Asians in the U.S., Lu et al., 2020; rice vs. wheat farming in China, Talhelm et al., 2014; church-exposure within Europe, Schulz et al., 2019). Fourth, our research extends research on sources of cultural similarities and differences within and between world regions or countries that has typically focused on values, opinions, and personality to sources of cultural similarities and differences in social orientation, self-views, and cognitive style. Fifth, our work contributes to research highlighting the importance of capturing similarities (in addition to differences) between groups, which can have implications for how groups are perceived and the relations between them, as well as of moving beyond comparison of means, as is routinely done in psychological research, to also report the extent of overlap between responses of different groups. Emphasizing those similarities might help to improve attitudes between groups (Hanel et al., 2019; Stephan & Stephan, 2000) and contribute positively to conflict resolution efforts in a region that is ripe with ethnic, religious, and national conflicts between different groups (e.g., Çakal & Husnu, 2022; Lynch, Schwedler, & Yom, 2022). Finally, research testing the role of the environment on cultural variation has been critiqued as not appropriately taking into account the proximity of cultural groups, as any cultural variables that tend to be similar between neighbors will also tend to correlate with environmental variables (Brohman & Yaxley, 2023). Although this may be true if the focus is primarily on the physical environment, the broader socio-ecological environment between closely neighboring groups can vary as for example is the case for the neighboring Greek

Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities. Our approach thus capitalizes on the opportunities that studying neighboring or geographically close cultural groups provides in terms of the insights into the role played by shared (or non-shared) environmental, socio-political, or cultural identity variables in variation across a range of psychological variables.

Limitations and Future Suggestions

Although our comprehensive approach is a comprehensive one has allowed us to identify the role of socio-ecological and cultural background factors in similarities between groups (also see Wormley et al., 2023), it comes with several limitations outlined in Table 7. Despite these limitations, our findings highlight the importance of not equating socio-cultural similarities with ethnic, religious, and linguistic similarities between groups when it comes to their members' psychological make-up. Future research should apply a similar approach to analyzing data from other world regions based on representative samples to contribute further to this field of research where establishing causality is near impossible. If Future research would also benefit from attempts to identify whether certain types of psychological processes or outcomes (e.g., attitudes vs. self-definitions) may be more or less open to being shaped by different group characteristics. For example, does religious group identity play a more important role in shaping individuals' attitudes towards social issues (e.g., conflict, prosociality), thus making individuals from the same religious denomination similar to each other in their attitudes on these issues, than inhabiting similar socio-political ecologies which might shape similarities between groups in different domains (e.g., self-definitions). Big datasets including information on a large battery of psychological variables originating from groups that can be compared to each other on a large set of characteristics would allow us to answer questions in a detailed manner allowing to study the cross-over between demographic and ecological characteristics and different domains of psychological processes.

References

Adler, N. E., Epel, E. S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J. R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: preliminary data in healthy white women. *Health Psychology, 19*(6), 586–592.

Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*(4), 596–612. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.4.596

Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. (2009). *Introduction to meta-analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.

Bromham, L., & Yaxley, K. J. (2023). Neighbours and relatives: accounting for spatial distribution when testing causal hypotheses in cultural evolution. *Evolutionary Human Sciences, 5*, e27.

Çakal, H., & Husnu, S. (Eds.) (2022). *Examining Complex Intergroup Relations: Through the Lens of Turkey. Routledge.*

Choi, I., Dalal, R., Kim-Prieto, C., & Park, H. (2003). Culture and judgement of causal relevance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(1), 46–59.

Cohen, D. (2007). Methods in cultural psychology. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 196–236). The Guilford Press.

Cohen, D., & Gunz, A. (2002). As seen by the other...: Perspectives on the self in the memories and emotional perceptions of Easterners and Westerners. *Psychological Science, 13*(1), 55–59.

Cohen, D., & Kitayama, S. (2018). *Handbook of cultural psychology* (2nd Edition). New York: Guilford Press.

Gelfand, M. J. et al. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science, 332*,1100-1104.

Greenfield, P M. (2009). Linking social change and developmental change: Shifting pathways of human development. *Developmental Psychology, 45*, 401-418.

Hanel, P. H. P., Maio, G. R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2019). A new way to look at the data: Similarities between groups of people are large and important. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *116*(4), 541–562. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000154

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *33*(2–3), 61–83.

Inman, H. F., & Bradley, E. L. (1989). The overlapping coefficient as a measure of agreement between probability distributions and point estimation of the overlap of two normal densities. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, *18*(10), 3851–3874. https://doi.org/10.1080/03610928908830127

Ji, L.-J., Zhang, Z., & Nisbett, R. E. (2004). Is it culture or is it language? Examination of language effects in cross-cultural research on categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*(1), 57–65.

Kızılyürek, N. (2016). *Milliyetçilik kıskancında Kıbrıs* (5th ed.). İletişim Yayıncılık.

Kirchner-Häusler, A., Schönbrodt, F. D., Uskul, A. K., Vignoles, V. L., Rodríguez-Bailón, R., Castillo, V. A., Cross, S. E., Gezici-Yalçın, M., Harb, C., Husnu, S., Ishii, K., Karamaouna, P., Kafetsios, K., Kateri, E., Matamoros-Lima, J., Miniesy, R., Na, J., Özkan, Z., Pagliaro, S., … Uchida, Y. (2023). Proximal and distal honor fit and subjective well-being in the Mediterranean region. *Journal of Personality*, *00*, 1–17.

Kitayama, S., Ishii, K., Imada, T., Takemura, K., & Ramaswamy, J. (2006). Voluntary settlement and the spirit of independence: Evidence from Japan's "northern frontier." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*(3), 369–384.

Kitayama, S., Park, H., Sevincer, A. T., Karasawa, M., & Uskul, A. K. (2009). A cultural task analysis of implicit independence: Comparing North America, Western Europe, and East Asia. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*(2), 236–255.

Krys, K., Park, J., Kocimska-Zych, A., Kosiarczyk, A., Selim, H. A., Wojtczuk-Turek, A., Haas, B. W., Uchida, Y., Torres, C., Capaldi, C. A., Bond, M. H., Zelenski, J. M., Lun, V. M.-C., Maricchiolo, F., Vauclair, C.-M., Poláčková Šolcová, I., Sirlopú, D., Xing, C., Vignoles, V. L., … Adamovic, M. (2021). Personal Life Satisfaction as a Measure of Societal Happiness is an Individualistic Presumption: Evidence from Fifty Countries. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 22*(5), 2197–2214.

Loizides, N. (2007). Ethnic nationalism and adaptation in Cyprus. International Studies *Perspectives, 8,* 172-189.

Lu, J. G., Nisbett, R. E., & Morris, M. W. (2020). Why East Asians but not South Asians are underrepresented in leadership positions in the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 117*(9), 4590–4600.

Lynch, M., Schwedler, J., & Yom, S. (Eds.) (2022). *The political science of the Middle East:*

Theory and research since the Arab uprisings. Oxford University Press.

Maney, D. L. (2016). Perils and pitfalls of reporting sex differences. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 371*(1688), 20150119.

McCrae, R. R. (2000). Trait Psychology and the Revival of Personality and Culture Studies. *American Behavioral Scientist, 44*(1), 10–31.

Morling, B., Kitayama, S., & Miyamoto, Y. (2002). Cultural practices emphasize influence in the U.S. and adjustment in Japan. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 311-323.

Newson, L., Richerson, P. J., & Boyd, R. (2007). Cultural evolution and the shaping of cultural diversity. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 454–476). The Guilford Press.

Oishi, S. (2014). Socioecological psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65,* 581–609.

Oishi, S., & Graham, J. (2010). Social ecology: Lost and found in psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*(4), 356–377.

Oyserman D., Yan V. X. (2019). Making meaning: A culture-as-situated cognition approach to the consequences of cultural fluency and disfluency. In Kitayama S., Cohen D. (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 536–565). The Guilford Press.

San Martin, A., Sinaceur, M., Madi, A., Tompson, S., Maddux, W. W., Kitayama, S. (2018). Self-assertive interdependence in Arab culture. *Nature Human Behavior,* 2, 830–837.

Sato, K., & Yuki, M. (2014). The association between self-esteem and happiness differs in relationally mobile vs. stable interpersonal contexts. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9,* 5:1113.

Schulz, J., Beauchamp, J., Bahrami-Rad, D. & Henrich, J. (2019). The church, intensive kinship, and global psychological variation. *Science, 366,* 1-12.

Sng, O., Neuberg, S. L., Varnum, M. E. W., & Kenrick, D. T. (2018). The behavioral ecology of cultural psychological variation. *Psychological Review, 125*(5), 714–743.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23–45). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Talhelm, T., Zhang, X., Oishi, S., Shimin, C., Duan, D., Lan, X., & Kitayama, S. (2014). Large-scale psychological differences within China explained by rice versus wheat agriculture. *Science, 344*(6184), 603–608.

Thalmayer, A. G., Toscanelli, C., & Arnett, J. J. (2021). The neglected 95% revisited: Is American psychology becoming less American? *American Psychologist, 76*(1), 116–129.

Thompson, S., St. Karayanni, S., & Vassiliadou, M. (2004). Cyprus after history. *Interventions, 6*(2), 282–299.

Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (1992). The psychological foundations of culture. In J. H. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture* (pp. 19–136). Oxford University Press.

Uskul, A. K., Kitayama, S. & Nisbett, R. N. (2008). Ecocultural basis of cognition: Farmers and fishermen are more holistic than herders. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA, 105*, 8552-8556.

Uskul, A. K., Cross, S., Gercek-Swing, B., Sunbay, Z., & Ataca, B. (2012). Honor bound: The cultural construction of honor in Turkey and the Northern US. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 43,* 1131-1151.

Uskul, A. K., Kirchner-Häusler, A., Vignoles, V. L., Rodriguez-Bailón, R., Castillo, V. A., Cross, S. E., Yalçın, M. G., Harb, C., Husnu, S., Ishii, K., Jin, S., Karamaouna, P., Kafetsios, K., Kateri, E., Matamoros-Lima, J., Liu, D., Miniesy, R., Na, J., Özkan, Z., . . . Uchida, Y. (2023). Neither Eastern nor Western: Patterns of independence and interdependence in Mediterranean societies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *125*(3), 471–495.

Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *36*(3), 1–48.

Wang, C. S., Leung, A. K. -y., See, Y. H. M., & Gao, X. Y. (2011). The effects of culture and friendship on rewarding honesty and punishing deception. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*(6), 1295–1299.

White, C. J. M., Muthukrishna, M., & Norenzayan, A. (2021). Cultural similarity among co-religionists within and between countries. *PNAS, 118* (37): e2109650118.

Wormley, A. S., Kwon, J. Y., Barlev, M., & Varnum, M. E. W. (2023). How much cultural variation around the globe is explained by ecology? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B, 290,* 20230485.

Table 1

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	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greek Orthodox (Greek & Greek Cypriots) vs Catholic (Spanish & Italians) Christians	Yes (but different sub-denomination)	No	No	No	No
Arab (Lebanese and Egyptians) vs. non-Arab (Turkish and Turkish Cypriots) Muslims	Yes	No	No	No	No
Greek Cypriots vs. Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus	No	No	No	Yes	No
Greek Cypriots in Cyprus vs. Greeks in Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Shared to some extent
Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus vs. Turks in Turkey	Yes	No/Yes*	Yes	No	Shared to some extent
Lebanese vs. Egyptian Muslims	Yes	No	No	No	No
Spanish vs. Italians	Yes	No	No	No	No
Turkish vs. Greeks	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 2

Sample Characteristics for each Data Collection Site and Comparison Group

Research Site	*n*			Age		SSS (1-10)		Language	Data Source	Local Institution	Compensation
	Men	Women	% Women	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*				
Turkish Cypriot	35	91	72.20%	24.80	9.86	6.46	1.28	Turkish	Online, In-Lab	Eastern Mediterranean University	Course Credit
Greek Cypriot	103	214	67.50%	20.89	2.36	6.04	1.19	Greek	Online, In-Lab	University of Cyprus	Course Credit, Raffle
Egypt	95	110	53.70%	20.73	1.56	6.44	1.31	Arabic	Online	British University of Egypt	Donation to Charity
Greece	284	196	40.80%	23.14	6.07	6.04	1.21	Greek	Online	University of Crete	Course Credit
Italy	112	135	54.70%	22.76	4.07	5.9	1.39	Italian	Online, In-Lab	University of Chieti-Pescara	Course Credit
Lebanon	96	165	63.20%	19.14	1.64	6.70	1.41	English	Online	American University of Beirut	Course Credit
Spain	124	116	48.30%	22.53	6.02	5.72	1.47	Spanish	Online	University of Granada	Course Credit
Turkey	111	241	68.50%	20.8	1.59	5.64	1.29	Turkish	Online	Bolu Abant Izzet Baysal University, Ordu University	Course Credit
Comparison Group											
Christian (Lebanon)	23	57	71.30%	19.15	1.78	7.10	1.20				
Muslim (Lebanon)	63	80	55.90%	19.06	1.47	6.56	1.49				
Arab Muslim	148	180	54.90%	20.01	1.74	6.54	1.34				
Non-Arab Muslim	109	266	70.90%	21.64	4.75	5.82	1.30				
Orthodox	387	410	51.40%	22.24	5.06	6.04	1.20				
Catholic	236	251	51.50%	22.65	5.12	5.81	1.43				

Note. SSS: Subjective Socio-Economic Status (borrowed from Uskul et al., 2023). 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.* In some cases the numbers in the two sections of the table may not align due to some participants having listed a group identity other than the ones we compared in dyadic groups.

Table 3

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

	Tasks	Measures	Operationalization/Assessment	Meaning of the Dependent Variables
Self-Construal	Culture & Identity Research Network Self Construal Scale (CIRN-SCS-3) (Krys et al., 2021)	Interdependent self-construal (on 8 dimensions): 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	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
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	Higher values reflect greater personal agreement with dignity beliefs and norms

	Tasks	Measures	Operationalization/Assessment	Meaning of the Dependent Variables
		Face	behave ("How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?")	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	Higher values reflect greater personal endorsement of dignity concerns
		Loss of Face		Higher values reflect greater personal endorsement of face concerns

	Tasks	Measures	Operationalization/Assessment	Meaning of the Dependent Variables
		Honor: Loss of Family Reputation	their reputation threatened ("How bad would <u>you</u> feel about yourself if…")	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 <u>most people in your society</u> 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.

Table 4

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
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 4 (continued)

	Italian Sample			Spanish Sample						Muslim Lebanese			Egyptian 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
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

	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	-0.63	0.71	193	4.15	*	0.01
Social happiness bias	-0.07	0.71	246	-0.33	0.64	237	18.41	***	0.04	-0.11	0.69	139	-0.18	0.76	194	2.06		0.01
Self-Inflation	1.91	1.08	246	1.96	1.08	236	0.28		0	1.99	1.04	139	2.15	1.38	188	1.24		0
Ingroup closeness bias	3.65	1.14	246	3.59	1.01	239	0.12		0	3.5	1.24	140	3.48	1.31	195	0		0
Loyalty	1.14	3.99	246	1.79	2.57	239	4.42	*	0.01	1.04	2.69	140	0.74	2.64	196	0.9		0
Nepotism	-1.03	3.69	246	-1.15	3.16	239	0.16		0	-1.26	3.44	140	-1.06	4.02	196	1.87		0.01
Self-Construal																		
Difference vs. Similarity	-1.25	1.38	246	-1.33	1.25	239	0.57		0	-1.79	1.5	139	-1.73	1.38	194	0.55		0
Containment vs. Connection	2.18	1.4	246	1.73	1.56	239	10.33	**	0.02	1.98	1.5	139	2.42	1.19	194	12.41	***	0.04
Self-direction vs. Receptiveness to influence	-1.11	1.43	246	-1.13	1.2	239	0.01		0	-0.93	1.33	139	-1.16	1.3	194	0.06		0
Self-reliance vs. Dependence	-1.85	1.38	246	-1.23	1.41	239	23.68	***	0.05	-1.67	1.6	139	-2.49	1.4	194	11.5	**	0.03
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	194	1.67		0.01
Self-expression vs. Harmony	-1.19	1.56	246	-0.77	1.55	239	9.47	**	0.02	-0.08	1.5	139	0.05	1.67	194	1.56		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	0.57	1.66	194	2.27		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	-1.78	1.8	194	3.97	*	0.01
Cognitive Style																		
Situational attribution bias	-1.26	1.22	246	-1.15	1.44	239	0.67		0	-1.22	1.35	140	-1.3	1.19	196	0.02		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	195	299.8	***	0.48
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	4.43	2.57	183	5.55	*	0.02

Table 4 (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 4 (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 4 (continued)

	Muslims in Lebanon			Christians 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.

Table 5

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 5 (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 5 (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 5 (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 5 (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.

Table 6

Comparison between Pairs of Cultural Groups

Groups	*n*	# of sign. differences	Hedges' g	SE	*p*	95%-CI	PCR
Greek vs. Turkish Samples	830	32/38	0.44	.05	<.001	[0.34, 0.54]	82.60
Arab- vs. non-Arab Muslim Samples	703	28/38	0.35	.04	< .001	[0.26, 0.43]	86.17
Italian vs. Spanish Samples	487	26/38	0.31	.04	< .001	[0.23, 0.40]	87.49
Muslim Lebanese vs. Egyptian Samples	466	12/37	0.25	.06	< .001	[0.06, 0.45]	89.98
Greek vs. Greek Cypriot Samples	796	20/38	0.22	.03	< .001	[0.17, 0.28]	91.10
Greek Cypriot vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples	442	17/38	0.22	.02	< .001	[0.18, 0.26]	91.24
Catholic vs. Orthodox Samples	1,280	26/38	0.20	.02	< .001	[0.16, 0.24]	92.01
Turkish vs. Turkish Cypriot Samples	478	10/38	0.15	.02	< .001	[0.11, 0.19]	93.94
Lebanese Christians vs. Lebanese Muslims	223	7/38	0.16	.02	< .001	[0.11, 0.20]	93.75

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 7

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, note that despite the limitation student samples present in terms of generalizability of findings, comparing samples from different cultural groups that share high similarity in terms of daily routines and backgrounds provides a conservative approach to identifying differences.
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 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 societally-perceived 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 we cannot 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.