Appendix B1: Values Studies for Supplemental Analysis (Overall *d* = 0.12, *n* = 1)

Study	Sample is undergraduates unless otherwise specified (Language)	Reason for exclusion	Expected individualism prime effect	Expected collectivism prime effect	Effect size (*d*)
		European Heritage			
Cultural icon exposure (Collective group)					
Briley & Wyer (2001, Study 3)	35 U.S. (English)	No individualism prime. Only cultural icon vs. *they* prime		Endorsing individuality less, emotional connectedness and self sacrifice more	Results unclear, 0.05[1]
Writing a paragraph (autobiography focusing on personal responsibilities, reasons for doing things, how others see & treat you, uniqueness and differences from others [individualism prime] vs. membership in an important group [collectivism prime])					
Bovasso (1997)	104 U.S. (about 50% Hispanic Americans)	Individualism prime mixed social with personal aspects		Disinhibiting aggression & antisocial behavior	No priming effects reported
		Asian			
Cultural icon exposure (Collective group)					
Briley & Wyer (2001, Study 3)	41 Hong Kong Chinese (English)	No individualism prime. Only cultural icon vs. *they* prime		Endorsing individuality less, emotional connectedness and self sacrifice more	Results unclear, 0.19[2]

Note. *n* = 1 because Briley & Wyer (2001, Study 3) involved European and Asian participants so appeared twice in the table but contributed only one study-level effect size to the overall *d*; and because Bovasso (1997) contributed no effect size to our calculations.

[1] Because *SD*s for the three dependent variables (individuality, emotional connectedness, and self sacrifice values) were not available, effect sizes were based on means (reported in the original article) and *SD*s estimated using *F*-ratios pertaining to the other two dependent variables (winning and not being outperformed). An average of the two *SD*s was taken as the *SD* estimate for the three dependent variables of current interest.

[2] Same as Footnote 1.

Appendix B2: Self-Concept Studies for Supplemental Analysis (Overall *d* = 0.35, *n* = 7)

Study	Sample is undergraduates unless otherwise specified (Language)	Reason for exclusion	Expected individualism prime effect	Expected collectivism prime effect	Effect size (*d*)
		European Heritage			
Pronoun circling					
Brewer & Gardner (1996, Study 3)	126 U.S. (English)	No individualism prime. Only *we* vs. *they* vs. *it*.		More relational & collective TST self-descriptions	0.56 (*we* vs. *they*, 0.46; *we* vs. *it*, 0.67)
Mixed pronoun circling (PC) and scrambled sentence (SS)					
Stapel & Koomen (2001, Study 4)	106 Dutch (Dutch)	No collectivism prime. Only *I* (PC) vs. *I* (PC) & differentiation (SS) vs. differentiation (SS) vs. neutral words (PC).	Contrast (self-evaluation, perceived self-others similarity)		0.16 (*I* vs. neutral, 0.37; *I* & diff. vs. neutral, 0.08; diff. vs. neutral, 0.01)
Group imagination (imagining self as in a socially unskilled group on another planet)					
Chen, Chen, & Shaw (2004, Study 1)	51 U.S. (English)	No individualism prime.		Self-verification motive – prefer to interact with in-group partner who affirms negative group view	0.28
Chen, Chen, & Shaw (2004, Study 2)	88 U.S. (English)	Making central social identity confounded with an additional individualism or collectivism prime (going to a session with another college student focused on personal coping or coping as a group member).		Stronger desire to interact with in-group partner who affirms negative group view	0.34
Subliminal priming with masking in lexical decision task					
Mussweiler & Bodenhausen (2002, Study 3)	36 male U.S. (English)	No collectivism prime. Only *I* vs. neutral words.	Quicker recognition of target-consistent self-knowledge after judging in-group target (male) than after judging out-group target (female)		1.18
Minimal group instantiation					

Gaertner, Sedikides, & Graetz (1999, Study 3)	42 U.S. (English)	Hard to argue minimal group as collectivism prime.	More angry to insult		0.91
Kanagawa, Cross, & Markus (2001)	133 U.S. female (English)	Hard to argue individualism vs. collectivism were primed by having TST read 20 times alone by audiotape, by peer, by professor (alone in office), or in group.	More self-descriptions; more abstract, internalized, positive in describing self	Fewer self-descriptions; more behavioral, contextualized, negative in describing self	0.02
		Asian			
Minimal group instantiation					
Kanagawa, Cross, & Markus (2001)	128 Japanese female (Japanese)	Hard to argue individualism vs. collectivism were primed by having TST read 20 times alone by audiotape, by peer, by professor (alone in office), or in group.	More self-descriptions; more abstract, internalized, positive in describing self	Fewer self-descriptions; more behavioral, contextualized, negative in describing self	-0.01

Note. $n = 7$ because Kanagawa, Cross, & Markus (2001) involved European and Asian participants so appeared twice in the table but contributed only one study-level effect size to the overall *d*.

Appendix B3: Relationality Studies for Supplemental Analysis (Overall *d* = 0.41, *n* = 14)

Study	Sample is undergraduates unless otherwise specified (Language)	Reason for exclusion	Expected individualism prime effect	Expected collectivism prime effect	Effect size (*d*)
		European Heritage			
Pronoun circling					
Crisp, Hewstone, Richards, & Paolini (2003)	81 U.K. adults (English)	No individualism prime. Only *we* vs. *they* vs. *the*.		Higher liking & similarity to self for groups that included both in- & out-group members	0.11 (*we* vs. *they*, 0.16; *we* vs. *the*, 0.06)
Stapel & Tesser (2001, Study 3)	67 Dutch (Dutch)	No collectivism prime. Only *I* vs. *it*.	Stronger social comparison tendency		0.35
Stapel & Tesser (2001, Study 4)	77 Dutch (Dutch)	No collectivism prime. Only *I* vs. *it*.	Stronger social comparison tendency		0.48
Vorauer & Cameron (2002, Study 3)	45 Canadian friend pairs (English)	No individualism prime. Only *we* vs. *they*.		Stronger felt bond, closeness, & similarity to friend; more liking; better ability of target friend to judge one's own preference (latter not found)	0.20
Vorauer & Cameron (2002, Study 5)	26 Canadian previously unacquainted pairs (English)	No individualism prime. Only *we* vs. *they*.		Higher felt transparency with same-ethnicity confederate	0.77
Reading (or writing) a paragraph					
Fitzsimons & Kay (2004, Study 1)	175 U.S. (English)	No individualism prime. Only *Valerie and I* vs. *we*.		Higher perceived quality & closeness of relationship between characters in paragraph	0.40
Fitzsimons & Kay (2004, Study 2)	117 U.S. (English)	No individualism prime. Only *"friend's name" and I* vs. *we*.		Higher quality (importance, intimacy, & closeness) of own relationship with closest friend	0.49
Fitzsimons & Kay (2004, Study 3)	23 U.S. (English)	No individualism prime. Only *the other passenger and I* vs. *we*.		Higher perceived closeness of interaction with confederate; higher expected closeness if to become friend with confederate	1.34
Fitzsimons & Kay (2004, Study 4)	46 U.S. (English)	No individualism prime. Only *Valerie and I* vs. *we*.		Higher gestalt attribution of friendship qualities (similar & common	0.84 (Gestalt, 0.76; closeness,

				fate); higher perceived closeness of relationship between characters in paragraph	0.93)
Utz (2004a, Study 2)	73 German (German)	No collectivism prime. Only *I* vs. *he/she*.	Less cooperative		-0.18
Word game using pronouns as guesses					
van Baaren et al. (2003, Study 1)	38 Dutch female (English)	No collectivism prime. Only *I* vs. *he*.	Less mimicking		0.40[3]
Sumerian warrior					
Finlay & Trafimow (1998)	162 U.S. (English)	No collectivism prime. Only *I* vs. no-prime.	More empathy, more voluntary & actual helping behavior, towards AIDS group		0.33
Subliminal priming					
Holland et al. (2004, Study 1)	77 Dutch (Dutch)	No collectivism prime. Only own name vs. neutral word.	Fewer chairs between own & other's		0.67
Film clip prime					
Mandel (2003, Study 2)	91 U.S. (English)	Questionable primes (resume writing as "individualism" vs. family man as "collectivism").	Weaker felt social, financial, & moral support; avoidance of social risk (ingroup embarrassment)	Stronger felt social, financial, & moral support; avoidance of social risk (ingroup embarrassment)	0.50
Minimal group instantiation (1-person vs. 3-person vs. 6-person minimal group)					
Wit & Kerr (2002, Study 1)	60 U.S. (English)	Not clear if 3- or 6-person groups constituted collectivism prime.	Less resource allocated to group, boundaries of which depended on prime		
Wit & Kerr (2002, Study 2)	120 U.S. (English)	Not clear if 3- or 6-person groups constituted collectivism prime.	Less resource allocated to group, boundaries of which depended on prime		
Wit & Kerr (2002, Study 3)	100 Dutch (Dutch)	Not clear if 3- or 6-person groups constituted collectivism prime.	Less resource allocated to group, especially if can think of multiple in-group bonds		

[3] This is a within-participants design. The dependent variables were imitative behavior and nonimitative behavior. Because raw data could not be obtained from the original authors, for each dependent variable, the correlation (*r*) between *I* and *he* conditions was assumed to be 0. With this assumption, for imitative behavior $d = .51$, and for nonimitative behavior $d = .29$. One might argue, however, that correlations might exist because the same participant is likely to demonstrate more behaviors in both conditions (positive correlations) or because *I* and *he* primes had the intended, opposite effects (negative correlations). To demonstrate the effects of these possibilities, two additional analyses were run. If *r*s = .5, *d*s = .48 and .28, respectively. If *r*s = -.5, *d*s = .52 and .30, respectively. For our current purposes, these differences are small enough to be considered negligible.

Appendix B4: Cognition Studies for Supplemental Analysis (Overall *d* = 0.44, *n* = 5)

Study	Sample is undergraduates unless otherwise specified (Language)	Reason for exclusion	Expected individualism prime effect	Expected collectivism prime effect	Effect size (*d*)
		European Heritage			
Pronoun circling					
Brewer & Gardner (1996, Study 1)	80 U.S. (English)	No individualism prime. Only *we* vs. *they* vs. positive adjectives vs. negative adjectives.		Assimilation (ambiguous attitudes perceived as more similar to self-views; quicker judgment)	0.53 (*we* vs. *they*, 0.87, *we* vs. positive adjective, 0.41; *we* vs. negative adjective, 0.31)
Brewer & Gardner (1996, Study 2)	61 U.S. (English)	No individualism prime. Only *we* vs. *they* vs. *it*.		Assimilation (ambiguous attitudes perceived as more similar to self-views; quicker judgment)	0.86 (*we* vs. *they*, 0.65; *we* vs. *it*, 1.06)
SDFF modified (writing task)					
Reed (2004, Study 1)	121 U.S. (English)	No individualism prime. Only *we* vs. mixed prime.		Higher likelihood of purchasing product associated with in-group	0.60
Group instantiation, then thinking about similarities/differences with group members					
Wenzel (2002, Study 3)	72 Australia (English)	Individualism involves group focus.			
Cultural icon exposure					
Briley & Wyer (2002, Study 6)	60 U.S. (English)	"Individualism" prime was in fact a *they* prime. Thus, only *we* vs. *they* vs. no-prime.		Higher likelihood of compromise choice; lower likelihood of self-referent explanation	0.40 (*we* vs. *they*, 0.40; *we* vs. no-prime, 0.42)
Describing self with 5 personality traits					
Stapel & Koomen (2001, Study 3)	126 Dutch (Dutch)	No collectivism prime. Only *I-am-unique* instructions vs. *I-am-different* instructions vs. describing room.	Contrast (self-evaluation, perceived self-others similarity)		0.13 (*unique* vs. room, 0.17; *diff.* vs. room, 0.09)
		Asian			
Cultural icon exposure					

Briley & Wyer (2002, Study 6)	127 Hong Kong Chinese (English)	"Individualism" prime was in fact a *they* prime. Thus, only *we* vs. *they* vs. no-prime.	Higher likelihood of compromise choice; lower likelihood of self-referent explanation	0.28 (*we* vs. *they*, 0.40; *we* vs. no-prime, 0.18)

Note. $n = 5$ because Briley & Wyer (2002, Study 6) involved European and Asian participants so appeared twice in the table but contributed only one study-level effect size to the overall *d*.