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*Comparison of the ratings of facial expressions in Experiment 1*

A one-factor ANOVA (facial expressions: happy, happy eyes/sad mouth, sad eyes/happy mouth, sad) with the rating as the dependent variable was conducted to examine whether there was a difference in the way emotions were recognized among the four types of facial expressions. Facial expression was a within-participant factor. The results of the ANOVA showed that the main effect of facial expression was significant (*F*(3, 156) = 263.50, *p* < .001, ηp2 = 0.84). Multiple comparisons using the Holm method showed that happy had the highest rating value, followed by sad eyes/happy mouth, happy eyes/sad mouth, and sad, in that order (*p* < .01).

*Comparison of the ratings of facial expressions in Experiment 2*

A one-factor ANOVA (facial expressions: happy, happy eyes/neutral mouth, neutral eyes/happy mouth, neutral) with the rating as the dependent variable was conducted. Facial expression was a within-participant factor. The results of the ANOVA showed that the main effect of facial expression was significant (F(3, 72) = 196.65, *p* < .001, ηp2 = 0.89). Multiple comparisons using the Holm method showed that happy had the highest rating, followed by neutral eyes/happy mouth and happy eyes/neutral mouth; neutral had the lowest rating (*p* < .001). There was no significant difference between happy eyes/neutral mouth and neutral (*p* = .113).

*Comparison of the ratings of facial expressions in Experiment 3*

A one-factor ANOVA (facial expressions: sad, sad eyes/neutral mouth, neutral eyes/sad mouth, neutral) was conducted with the rating as the dependent variable. Facial expression was a within-participant factor. The results of the ANOVA showed that the main effect of facial expression was significant (*F*(3, 69) = 125.19, *p* < .001, ηp2 = 0.84). Multiple comparisons using the Holm method showed that sad had the highest rating, followed by sad eyes/neutral mouth, neutral eyes/sad mouth, and neutral, in that order (*p* < .001).

*Examination of eyes and mouth alone by difference scores*

To supplementally confirm the results of Experiments 2 and 3, scores of happy eyes and happy mouth were calculated by subtracting the score of neutral from each of happy eyes/neutral mouth and neutral eyes/happy mouth, and the scores of sad eyes and sad mouth by subtracting the score of neutral from each of sad eyes/neutral mouth and neutral eyes/sad mouth. neutral mouth, neutral eyes/sad mouth, and sad eyes/sad mouth, respectively. Next, the correlation coefficients between the cultural self-views and their scores were calculated. The results showed that interdependency and happy eyes was *r* < .001, *p* > .999; interdependency and happy mouth was *r* = -.270, *p* = .193; independency and happy eyes was *r* = .142, *p* = .499; and independency and happy mouth was *r* = .645, *p* = .001. Furthermore, interdependency and sad eyes was *r* = .483, *p* = .017; interdependency and sad mouth was *r* = .208, *p* = .329; independency and sad eyes was *r* = .084, *p* = .695; independency and sad mouth was *r* = -.103, *p* = .632. Overall, happy mouth was significantly correlated with independency and sad eyes with interdependency, similar to the analysis in the main text.