Supporting Appendix

All data and code can be found at https://osf.io/6csgr/

Part 1: The Person

Study 1

Participants were 405 U.S. adults (M_{age} = 38.39, SD_{age} = 11.60) who participated for $1.00 compensation on Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk), a crowdsourcing service in which people can volunteer to complete a variety of tasks for compensation. Participants were predominately White (80%), followed by African American (8%), Asian (6%), Hispanic (3%), and Multiracial (2%). Less than 1% of the sample comprised of Native American, Pacific Islander, or unidentified race. The sample was about evenly distributed male (51%) and female (49%).

Measures. Tightness was measured using items adapted from previous research (1). Participants indicated their agreement (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*) with six statements regarding their typical experiences in three domains: home, work, and public places (*A1*). Although the items in each domain were identical, participants were told that their responses could differ across the different domains and that they should feel free to respond accordingly.

Social comparison tendencies were measured with the 11-item Iowa-Netherlands Comparison Orientation Scale (2; *A2*). Participants indicated their agreement (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) with statements about how much they compare themselves to others. Demographics were assessed at the end of the survey.

Analyses. Structural Equation Modeling was carried out with the *lavaan* package for R (3) and was used to test the prediction that situational tightness would be associated with

increased social comparison activity. Situational tightness was modeled with a higher-order structure, in which each of the six situational tightness items loaded onto a separate latent variable for each of the three domains, and each latent variable then loaded onto a single situational tightness latent variable. Social comparison orientation was modeled with each item from the scale loading onto a single factor. A fixed-factor method was used to fix the latent variances to 1, which allowed us to freely estimate all factor loadings. We then followed conventional recommendations for removing poorly loading items (4), which resulted in the removal of three items with standardized loadings below .32 (situational tightness item 4 in each domain). We also followed recommendations for reducing correlated residuals (and increasing model fit) with parceling (5), which averages the highest and lowest loading items and effectively reduces the number of indicators (and gaining degrees of freedom). After these procedures, the final model fit adequately well, $\chi^2(86) = 364.845$, $p < .001$, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .913, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .089, 90% CI [.080, .099], Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) = .059. Factor loadings for the final model can be found in *S1*.

Study 2

Participants were 402 U.S. adults (M_{age} = 35.72, SD_{age} = 10.88) who participated for $1.00 compensation on Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Participants were predominately White (77%), followed by African American (10%), Asian (6%), Hispanic (5%), and Multiracial (2%). Less than 1% of the sample comprised of Native American or unidentified race. The sample was about evenly distributed male (51%) and female (49%).

Measures. Self-construal was measured with a 30-item measure (6; *A3*). Participants indicated their agreement (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) with 15 statements

assessing independent self-construals (e.g., "I do my own thing, regardless of what others think;" $\alpha = .84$) and 15 items assessing interdependent self-construals (e.g., "I feel my fate is intertwined with the fate of those around me;" $\alpha = .85$).

Tightness-looseness was assessed with the same 6-item scale from Study 1a ($\alpha = .56$), although participants were asked to consider their experiences in "most situations in your everyday life" rather than in the three domains assessed previously. Social comparison tendencies were assessed with the same scale from Study 1.

Analyses. Structural Equation Modeling was used to test the prediction that situational tightness would be associated with increased social comparison activity even when controlling for self-construal. All constructs—independence, interdependence, situational tightness, and social comparison orientation—were modeled as latent variables using *lavaan* for R (3). A fixed-factor method was used to fix the latent variances to 1, which allowed us to freely estimate all factor loadings. We then followed conventional recommendations for removing poorly loading items (4), which resulted in the removal of four items with standardized loadings below .32 (situational tightness items 4 and 5, self-construal items 12 and 23). We also parceled items from the larger scales (self-construal and social comparison orientation), using the same procedure as in Study 1a. After these procedures, the final model fit adequately well, $\chi^2(246) = 800.421$, $p < .001$, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .881, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .075, 90% CI [.069, .081], Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) = .076. Factor loadings for the final model can be found in *S2.* All of the predictor variables were correlated with each other; tightness and independence: $\phi = .420$, $SE = .052$, $z = 8.068$, $P < .001$, 95% CI [.318, .522]; tightness and interdependence: $\phi = .396$, $SE = .054$, $z = 7.379$, $P < .001$, 95% CI

[.291, .501]; independence and interdependence: $\phi = .246$, $SE = .056$, $z = 4.422$, $P < .001$, 95% CI [.137, .355].

Part 2: The Context

Study 3: Within-Individual Perceptions

Participants were 102 U.S. adults ($M_{age} = 38.31$, $SD_{age} = 12.30$) who participated for $0.70 compensation on Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Participants were predominately White (67%), followed by African American (13%), Asian (7%), Hispanic (6%), Native American (4%) and Multiracial (3%). The sample was about evenly distributed male (54%) and female (46%).

Materials. Participants were given three lists of 15 social settings (job interview, funeral, classroom, library, bank, movie theater, doctor's office, workplace, elevator, restaurant, bus, party, city sidewalk, public park, your bedroom) and asked to rank them according to how tight, interdependent, and prone to comparison each one is. Settings were taken from Gelfand et al. (1) and were presented in random order. Each ranking task was presented on a separate screen, and the ranking tasks were presented in random order. After the ranking, participants completed demographics before finishing the study.

Analyses. Partial Spearman rank-order correlations were calculated using the *ppcor* package for R (7). We wrote a function to calculate (a) the partial correlation between the ranks of tightness and comparison controlling for interdependence, (b) the partial correlation between ranks of interdependence and comparison controlling for tightness, and (c) the correlation between ranks of tightness and interdependence for each participant. We obtained the average correlations across all participants using a bootstrapping technique (5,000 resamples) and examined the confidence interval to determine whether each correlation was significantly

different from zero. Mean ranks of tightness, interdependence, and comparison for each setting can be found in *S3*.

Study 4: Cross-Individual Perceptions

The same data and participants were used as in the within-individual perceptions study.

Study 5: Cross-Sample Perceptions

Participants were 151 U.S. adults (M_{age} = 35.12, SD_{age} = 12.17) who participated for $0.30 compensation on Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Participants were predominately White (78%), followed by Asian (6%), Hispanic (6%), African American (4%), Native American (< 1%), Pacific Islander (< 1%) and Multiracial (5%). The sample was slightly more male (58%) than female (42%).

Participants were randomly assigned to rank situations on tightness, interdependence, or social comparison and were provided the same instructions as in the within-individual perceptions study above. Mean and adjusted ranks for each of the settings can be found in *S4*. These ranks (Sample 2) were then combined with the data from the within-individual perceptions study (Sample 1) such that each participant had six columns of data: three for their own individual ranks for each setting and three for the ranks obtained from Sample 2.

Analysis. As above, partial Spearman rank-order correlations were calculated using the *ppcor* package for R. We wrote functions to calculate (a) the partial correlation between the Sample 1 ranks of tightness and the Sample 2 ranks of comparison controlling for Sample 1 interdependence, and (b) the partial correlation between ranks of Sample 1 interdependence and Sample 2 comparison controlling for Sample 1 tightness. Furthermore, we calculated the correlations between (a) Samples 1 and 2 tightness, (b) Samples 1 and 2 interdependence and (c) Samples 1 and 2 comparison ranks. We obtained the average correlations across all participants

using a bootstrapping technique (5,000 resamples) and examined the confidence interval to determine whether each correlation was significantly different from zero. Mean ranks of tightness, interdependence, and comparison for each setting can be found in *S4*.

Part 3: Culture

Two pilot studies were conducted to validate key variables used in Part 3. Search frequency data was obtained using the *Google Correlate* tool online (8). *Google Correlate* uses anonymized logs of *Google* web search queries from January 2003 to the present and allows a user to input a target search term (e.g., "flu symptoms") for analysis. *Correlate* then returns search terms that most highly correlate with the target search term across time (weeks or months) or across U.S. state (averaged across all time). Raw, normalized search frequency data can be obtained for each target search term. Search frequency data is adjusted for year-over-year growth, and state-by-state variation in Internet usage.

Pilot Study 1

In the first pilot study, we established convergent and discriminant validity of our cultural indices and showed how each can be meaningfully connected to Internet search behavior across states. We obtained search terms most strongly positively and negatively correlated with tightness-looseness and individualism-collectivism across states. To do so, we uploaded separate data files for tightness and collectivism; each data file had one column indicating state and another column indicating tightness/collectivism. To obtain negative correlations, each value of tightness/collectivism was multiplied by -1. The resulting search terms were downloaded direction from *Google Correlate,* and we chose to focus on the 20 most highly correlated terms for each cultural index. Search terms can be found in *S4*. Searches that were positively related to tightness were about religion (God, prayer), health concerns (high blood pressure), and what

could be construed as southern culture (types of food, popular brands). These searches align with the notion that cultural tightness is related to behavioral restriction and disease threat, and that tightness emerges most strongly in the southern part of the United States (9). Searches negatively related to tightness, or rather positively related to looseness, were mostly about international topics (currency conversions) and alternative diets (vegan recipes), which aligns with the notion that looseness is related to behavioral latitude and a high degree of social diversity (9).

Searches positively related to collectivism were primarily about close relationships (song lyrics about love) and social networks (Instagram), which points to the relational nature of selves in collectivistic cultures (10). Searches negatively related to collectivism, or positively related to individualism, were mostly about so-called frontier lifestyles, groups, or politics (wind energy, farming, libertarianism), which aligns with the notion that people are strongly independent in individualistic cultures (10). There was virtually no overlap in the search terms related to tightness and those related to collectivism, suggesting strong discriminate validity of the two indices. Altogether, our first pilot study suggests that these two indices predict culturally relevant but unique Internet searches across states. See *S5* for the full lists of correlated terms.

Pilot Study 2

In the second pilot study, we created an empirically derived set of emotions perceived as arising from social comparison for use in Part 3. Participants were 200 U.S. adults (M_{age} = 36.23, SD_{age} = 10.57) who participated for $0.20 compensation on MTurk. Participants were predominately White (80%), followed by African American (10%), Hispanic (5%), Asian (3%), and Multiracial (2%). Less than 1% of the sample was Native American and Pacific Islander. The sample was about evenly distributed male (45%) and female (55%). After providing consent, participants were given the following description of the study:

> We are interested in the emotions people might feel when comparing themselves to others. Think about the reasons why someone might feel each of the emotions in the list below and indicate how likely it is that someone is comparing themselves to others when feeling that emotion. For instance, there may be many reasons to feel excited--we want to know how likely it is that social comparison is a reason for feeling excited. Use the scale to rate how likely it is that someone is comparing themselves to others when feeling each emotion.

Then they saw a list of 17 emotions: 11 were selected based on Smith's (11) taxonomy of social comparison related emotions and 6 were based on Ekman's (12) theory of basic emotions. Participants were asked to think about the reasons why someone might feel each of the emotions in the list and indicate how likely it is that someone is comparing themselves to others when feeling that emotion, using a 7-point scale (1 = *extremely unlikely*, 7 = *extremely likely*).

Each emotion received 200 ratings. From these ratings, we computed an average score for each emotion as well as an overall average score for the entire set of ratings. We used the overall group average as a cut-off ($M = 4.566$, $SD = 1.777$) to select only those emotions rated above the average. Seven of the selected social comparison emotions scored above the average and were thus used for the social comparison search index ($\alpha = .761$; $M = 5.233$, $SD = 1.057$). Importantly, all of the basic emotions were rated below the average ($\alpha = .788$; $M = 4.046$, $SD = 1.168$), and these emotions were perceived as less likely to be caused by social comparison compared to the social comparison emotions, $t(199) = 14.25$, $P < .001$. A table of the emotions and their ratings can be found in Table S6.

Study 6

State-level interdependence was obtained from Vandello and Cohen's Collectivism Index (13), with high scores indicating higher interdependence. Political voting tendencies were obtained from the Cook Partisan Voting Index from the 2008 and 2012 elections (14), and we coded scores so that positive numbers indicated more Republican states and negative scores indicated more Democratic states. Region codes, residential mobility, and percent minority population were obtained from the 2014 U.S. Census Bureau report. Residential mobility was calculated as the percent of the population who had lived in a different state one year ago. Minority population was calculated as the percent of Hispanic, Black, and Asian residents in each state. Search frequencies were obtained with *Google Correlate* for each of the 7 emotion words from Pilot Study 2.

Analyses. Best subsets regression analysis was conducted with the *leaps* package for R (15). This method searches for the best set of predictor variables from all possible combinations of variables, according to some goodness-of-fit indicators. We chose to use the Bayesian Information Criteria (BIC) as the model selection criteria, as we were interested in arriving the most parsimonious model for explaining variation in comparison emotion searches. Model selection based on BIC imposes stricter penalties on complex models, that is, the BIC method is less likely to "reward" models that increase model fit simply because there are more predictor variables. Given that our predictor variables are correlated with one another, our goal was to select the smallest model that could maximally explain variation in comparison searches. In other words, we were interested in which variables could stand alone as predictors, and which variables were unnecessary.

Study 7

The same best subsets regression procedure was used in Study 4 as in Study 3.

Study 8

Mediation analyses were conducted with the *lavaan* package for R (3). State tightness-looseness was entered as the focal predictor, generic-you searches as the mediator, and comparison emotion searches as the outcome. Collectivism and political orientation were included as predictors of comparison emotions. From this model, we estimated the direct effect of tightness-looseness on emotion searches (c path), the direct effect of tightness-looseness on generic-you searches (a path), and the direct effect of generic-you searches on comparison emotion searches (b path). The indirect effect is significant if the a × b coefficient does not equal zero. We utilized a bootstrapping technique (1,000 resamples) to determine if this was the case.

A1. Situational Tightness Measure

Instructions: Here are some statements describing your surroundings in your HOME/WORK/PUBLIC PLACES. Think about your typical experiences at home/work/in public places as you respond to each of the items. How much do you agree/disagree with each one? Note that the statements sometimes refer to "social norms," which are standards for behavior that are generally unwritten.

"In my home/at my work/in public places…"

1. People adhere to social norms.
2. There are clear expectations for how people should act.
3. People agree upon what behaviors are appropriate versus inappropriate.
4. People have the freedom to decide how they want to behave.
5. If someone acts in an inappropriate way, it is important that they are punished.
6. It is important that people comply with social norms.

A2. Iowa-Netherlands Comparison Orientation Scale

Instructions: Use the scale to indicate your feelings about each of the statements below. Think about your typical daily experiences as you consider each one.

1. I often compare myself with others, with respect to what I have accomplished in life.
2. If I want to learn more about something, I try to find out what others think about it.
3. I always pay a lot of attention to how I do things compared with how others do things.
4. I often compare how my loved ones (boy or girlfriend, family members, etc.) are doing with how others are doing.
5. I always like to know what others in a similar situation would do.
6. I am not the type of person who compares often with others.
7. If I want to find out how well I have done something, I compare what I have done with how others have done.
8. I often try to find out what others think who face similar problems as I face.
9. I often like to talk with others about mutual opinions and experiences.
10. I never consider my situation in life relative to that of other people.
11. I often compare how I am doing socially (e.g., social skills, popularity) with other people.

A3. Self-Construal Scale

Instructions: This is a questionnaire that measures a variety of feelings and behaviors in various situations. Listed below are a number of statements. Read each one as if it referred to you and use the scale to indicate how much you agree or disagree.

Note. Independence items 1-15; Interdependence items 16-30

1. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.
2. I can talk openly with a person who I meet for the first time, even when this person is much older than I am.
3. I do my own thing, regardless of what others think.
4. I feel it is important for me to act as an independent person.
5. I'd rather say "No" directly, than risk being misunderstood.
6. Having a lively imagination is important to me.
7. I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I've just met.
8. I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards.
9. Speaking up during a class (or a meeting) is not a problem for me.
10. I act the same way no matter who I am with.
11. I value being in good health above everything.
12. I try to do what is best for me, regardless of how that might affect others.
13. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.
14. My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.
15. I act the same way at home that I do at school (or work).
16. Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.
17. I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.

18. I respect people who are modest about themselves.
19. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.
20. I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education/career plans.
21. I feel my fate is intertwined with the fate of those around me.
22. I feel good when I cooperate with others.
23. If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.
24. I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.
25. I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor (or my boss).
26. My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.
27. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I am not happy with the group.
28. It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group.
29. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.
30. I usually go along with what others want to do, even when I would rather do something different.

S1. Part 1 Study 1: Factors, Reliabilities, and Item Loadings for Primary Variables

Latent Variable (Reliability)	Item	Fully Standardized Factor Loading
Home (ω = .832)		
	Parcel 1 (item 6 + item 5)	.914
	Parcel 2 (item 1 + item 3)	.793
	Item 2	.684
Work (ω = .805)		
	Parcel 1 (item 6 + item 3)	.751
	Parcel 2 (item 2 + item 5)	.781
	Item 1	.753
Public Places (ω = .786)		
	Parcel 1(item 2 + item 3)	.740
	Parcel 2 (item 6 + item 1)	.873
	Item 5	.668
Situational Tightness (second order factor)		
	Home	.535
	Work	.703
	Public Places	.856
Social Comparison Orientation (ω = .899)		
	Parcel 1 (item 1 + item 9)	.813
	Parcel 2 (item 3 + item 10)	.765
	Parcel 3 (item 11 + item 2)	.823
	Parcel 4 (item 7 + item 8)	.856
	Parcel 5 (item 4 + item 5)	.778
	Item 6	.663

Note. All factor loadings were significant at $P < .001$

S2. Part 1 Study 2: Factors, Reliabilities, and Item Loadings for Primary Variables

Latent Variable (Reliability)	Item	Fully Standardized Factor Loading
Independence (ω = .870)		
	Parcel 1 (item 15 + item 4)	.708
	Parcel 2 (item 8 + item 7)	.697
	Parcel 3 (item 6 + item 5)	.682
	Parcel 4 (item 11 + item 1)	.660
	Parcel 5 (item 2 + item 14)	.750
	Parcel 6 (item 9 + item 13)	.693
	Parcel 7 (item 10 + item 3)	.703
Interdependence (ω = .856)		
	Parcel 1 (item 24 + item 29)	.708
	Parcel 2 (item 18 + item 28)	.697
	Parcel 3 (item 21 + item 22)	.682
	Parcel 4 (item 20 + item 19)	.660
	Parcel 5 (item 26 + item 17)	.750
	Parcel 6 (item 16 + item 30)	.693
	Parcel 7 (item 25 + item 27)	.703
Situational Tightness (ω = .779)		
	Item 1	.712
	Item 2	.715
	Item 3	.687
	Item 6	.622
Social Comparison Orientation (ω = .910)		
	Parcel 1 (item 9 + item 7)	.809
	Parcel 2 (item 10 + item 1)	.733

Parcel 3 (item 6 + item 11)	.748
Parcel 4 (item 8 + item 3)	.874
Parcel 5 (item 2 + item 4)	.841
Item 5	.762

Note. All factor loadings were significant at $P < .001$

S3. Part 2 Study 3: Mean and Adjusted Ranks of Tightness, Interdependence, and Social Comparison for Each Setting in the Within-Individual Perceptions Study

Setting	Tightness Rank (Adjusted)	Interdependence Rank (Adjusted)	Comparison Rank (Adjusted)
job interview	4.29 (1)	6.94 (5)	5.83 (4)
workplace	4.59 (2)	4.43 (1)	4.37 (2)
funeral	5.30 (3)	5.85 (4)	8.17 (6)
classroom	6.02 (4)	5.44 (3)	4.27 (1)
library	6.24 (5)	9.06 (10)	9.24 (11)
doctor's office	6.90 (6)	7.85 (6)	8.49 (7)
bank	7.48 (7)	8.71 (8)	8.74 (8)
elevator	7.77 (8)	9.47 (12)	9.27 (12)
restaurant	8.22 (9)	8.14 (7)	6.75 (5)
movie theater	8.74 (10)	8.87 (9)	9.71 (13)
bus	8.79 (11)	9.46 (11)	8.84 (9)
party	10.45 (12)	5.03 (2)	4.51 (3)
city sidewalk	11.16 (13)	10.86 (15)	10.25 (14)
public park	11.51 (14)	9.49 (13)	9.06 (10)
your bedroom	12.54 (15)	10.39 (14)	12.49 (15)

S4. Part 2 Study 5: Mean and Adjusted Ranks of Tightness, Interdependence, and Social Comparison for Each Setting in the Cross-Sample Perceptions Study

Setting	Tightness Rank (Adjusted) N = 45	Interdependence Rank (Adjusted) N = 54	Comparison Rank (Adjusted) N = 52
Library	5.33 (1)	4.98 (3)	3.00 (1)
Workplace/office	5.73 (2)	6.50 (5)	5.48 (4)
Job interview	6.29 (3)	11.91 (14)	4.00 (2)
Classroom	6.40 (4)	4.43 (2)	4.73 (3)
Party	7.40 (5)	6.22 (4)	8.67 (6)
Funeral	7.51 (6)	4.41 (1)	8.79 (7)
Bank	8.18 (7)	6.91 (6)	9.17 (9)
Movie theater	8.56 (8)	12.44 (15)	12.06 (15)
City sidewalk	8.62 (9)	8.44 (10)	9.77 (13)
Elevator	8.64 (10)	9.28 (11)	6.79 (5)
Doctor's office	8.87 (11)	8.37 (9)	9.12 (8)
Your bedroom	9.16 (12)	11.04 (13)	9.54 (11)
Bus	9.36 (13)	6.98 (7)	9.21 (10)
Restaurant	9.84 (14)	7.15 (8)	9.71 (12)
Public park	10.11 (15)	10.94 (12)	9.96 (14)

S5. Part 3 Pilot Study 1: Search Terms Positively and Negatively Correlated with State-Level Tightness and Collectivism

Positive with Tightness	**Negative with Tightness**	**Positive with Collectivism**	**Negative with Collectivism**
Healthy sides	USD to DKK	Ruth Chris menu	American wind
Yeti 30	55cm	Who's loving you	American wind energy association
God is not	Vegan French toast	Life with you lyrics	American wind energy
Grilled chicken sandwich	Best vegan	Close to you lyrics	Production tax credit
Pray about	Vegan	Ghost followers	Oil subsidies
Symptoms of high blood pressure	Sasha Rose	Ruth Chris	AWEA
Walmart bakery	1 USD to EUR	I can live	Chaw
Why God	Vegan pasta	What is general	Republican health care
Chrome wheels	Vegan rice	Windbreaker jacket	US climate
Pitmasters	Time in Ireland	Saving all my love	Opensecrets.org
Fought the good fight	Still Dre	Saving all my love for you	Exports to China
I am God	Cobra pose	Song for mama lyrics	2008 farm bill
30 oz.	Vegan cream cheese	I have nothing lyrics	2004 election results
Jesus wept	Puree recipe	Close to you	Election history
Shower punch	Healthy vegan	Ghost followers on Instagram	Subsidies
Trust in	Trumpland	Let me know lyrics	Democrats
Air conditioner not cooling	Vegetarian protein	Convert video to mp3	Tax cuts
The will of God	Creamy polenta	Post Instagram	Power plan
Yeti 30 oz	English slang	Pictures on Instagram	US population 2010
Baby shower punch	Vegan dessert	So in	Federal gas tax

S6. Part 3 Pilot Study 2: Emotion Words and Mean Ratings

Emotion Word	Mean Rating	Std. Deviation
Envious	**5.835**	**1.603**
Jealous	**5.785**	**1.724**
Admiration	**5.405**	**1.576**
Resentful	**5.180**	**1.715**
Inspired	**4.915**	**1.613**
Sympathetic	**4.850**	**1.793**
Proud	**4.660**	**1.522**
Happy*	4.480	1.556
Ashamed	4.415	1.681
Depressed	4.295	1.776
Sad*	4.285	1.633
Optimistic	4.225	1.361
Angry*	4.110	1.724
Disgusted*	4.070	1.800
Surprised*	3.810	1.652
Worried	3.775	1.621
Afraid*	3.520	1.701
Total	**4.566**	**1.777**

Note. Bold-faced words are those used in the social comparison emotion index in Part 3.

*Indicates a basic emotion

1. Gelfand MJ, et al. (2011) Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. Science 332:1100–1104.
2. Gibbons FX, Buunk BP (1999) Individual differences in social comparison: Development of a scale of social comparison orientation. J Pers Soc Psychol 76:129–142.
3. Rosseel Y (2012) lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. J Stat Softw 48:1–36.
4. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS, Osterlind SJ (2001) Using Multivariate Statistics (Allyn and Bacon, Boston).
5. Little TD, Cunningham WA, Shahar G, Widaman KF (2002) To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. Struct Equ Modeling 9:151–173.
6. Singelis TM (1994) The measurement of independent and interdependent selfconstruals. Pers Soc Psychol Bull 20:580–591.
7. Kim S (2015) ppcor: An R package for a fast calculation to semi-partial correlation coefficients. Commun Stat Appl Methods 22:665–674.
8. Mohebbi M, et al. (2011) Google Correlate Whitepaper. Available at https://www.google.com/trends/correlate/whitepaper.pdf. [Accessed September 1, 2016].
9. Gelfand MJ, et al. (2011) Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. Science 332:1100–1104.
10. Vandello JA, Cohen D (1999) Patterns of individualism and collectivism across the United States. J Pers Soc Psychol 77:279–292.
11. Smith RH (2000) Assimilative and Contrastive Emotional Reactions to Upward and Downward Social Comparisons (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands).

12. Ekman P (1992) An argument for basic emotions. Cogn Emotion 6:169–200.
13. Vandello JA, Cohen D (1999) Patterns of individualism and collectivism across the United States. J Pers Soc Psychol 77:279–292.
14. Wasserman D (April 4, 2013) Introducing the 2014 Cook Political Report Partisan Voter Index, Cook Political Report. Available at cookpolitical.com/story/5604. [Accessed September 1, 2016].
15. Lumley T, Miller A (2009) Leaps: Regression Subset Selection. R Package, Version 2.9. Available at https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/leaps/index.html. [Accessed December 15, 2017].