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Research investigating the role of emotion in cross-cultural experiences has received little attention by organizational researchers, despite its potential link to expatriate success and adjustment in the international assignment. The present study expands on work by Gullekson and Vancouver (in press), which examined perceptions of emotional display for international sojourners. Specifically, their research revealed the “guest effect” in which international participants reported that one should display less emotion in the host culture, despite the cultural norms for greater display of emotion the host culture than in sojourners’ home cultures. The present study aimed to determine whether there are differential norms for the display of emotion between expatriates and Americans working in the U.S. Status as a key mechanism for the guest effect was also examined.
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Approved: ______________________________________________________________

Jeffrey B. Vancouver

Professor of Psychology
Acknowledgements

There are several individuals I would like to acknowledge for their assistance and support through the successful completion of this dissertation. First, I am grateful for the guidance and support that my advisor and committee chair, Dr. Jeff Vancouver, has provided throughout this dissertation project as well as my throughout my graduate school career. I would also like to thank Dr. Rodger Griffeth and the I/O program for providing financial support to conduct this research. Further, I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Rodger Griffeth, Dr. Paula Popovich, Dr. Mary Tucker, and Dr. Justin Weeks for being a part of this committee and for sharing their respective expertise in order to improve the quality of the research.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends and family for supporting my throughout my graduate school career – without their love and support this journey would have been much more difficult. A special thanks to Krissy More, Samantha Morris, Erin Girio, Nika Karpenko, and Lindsay Johannes for their friendship and support. My gratitude and love also extends to Chad Cutright for his support and encouragement throughout this project. And last, I would like to thank my family (Dad, Breanna, John, and my grandparents) who have continually encouraged, supported, and guided me in everything that I do. To my grandfather, Leslie, who wanted to see my graduation day, I hope you are smiling now from Heaven. And a special thanks to my dad, Jerry Gullekson—without your support and endless love, this would not have been possible—and to my mom (the late), Candis Gullekson, whose strength, love, and determination continues to guide me in everything that I do.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Tables</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Figures</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourners: Crossing Cultural Boundaries</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Adjustment</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Training</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of Emotion in Cross-Cultural Experiences</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Differences in Display Rules of Emotion</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Adjustment and Emotion</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of Status in Emotional Experiences and Display</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Effects</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status and Emotion</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power and Emotion</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status and Culture</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guest Effect: Sojourners as Lower Status Individuals?</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Present Study</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Study</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants and Design</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Tables

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for the Amount of Emotion Felt by Vignette ................................................................. 54
Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations by Nationality and Emotion for Key Variables ........................................................................ 55
Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for Demographic and Individual Difference Variables .......................................................... 60
Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations for Emotional Experience .......................................................... 71
Table 5. Frequencies for Suspicion Check .................................................................................. 72
Table 6. Anger Vignette Correlations, Reliabilities, Means and Standard Deviations Among Variables for American Participants .................................................. 75
Table 7. Happiness Vignette Correlations, Reliabilities, Means and Standard Deviations Among Variables for American Participants .......................................... 76
Table 8. Anger Vignette Correlations, Reliabilities, Means and Standard Deviations Among Variables for International Participants ........................................... 77
Table 9. Happiness Vignette Correlations, Reliabilities, Means and Standard Deviations Among Variables for International Participants ........................................... 78
Table 10. Frequencies for Relationship Perceptions ........................................................................ 93
List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1.</td>
<td>Framework of International Adjustment</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.</td>
<td>International Students’ Status Conferral for Mr. Lee in the Anger Vignette</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.</td>
<td>American Students’ Certainty Ratings for the Anger Vignette</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.</td>
<td>American Students’ Certainty Ratings for the Happiness Vignette</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.</td>
<td>International Students’ Status Conferral for Mr. Smith in Anger Vignette</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.</td>
<td>Intensity by Sex Interaction for Appropriateness of Display by</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Student Sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7.</td>
<td>Nationality by Sex Interaction for Appropriateness of Display by</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Student Sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

In today’s international business arena, organizations are increasingly sending employees on international assignments to gain a competitive edge (Spreitzer, McCall, & Mahoney, 1997). These expatriate workers are considered one type of sojourners (i.e., individuals who temporarily live in a country outside their own1) and their international assignments are indispensable to organizations for both developmental and functional reasons (Caligiuri, Phillips, Lazarova, Tarique, & Burgi, 2001). Unfortunately, some literature reports that the estimates for premature return range between 20 and 50 percent (Aycan, 1997; for criticism see Harzig, 2002) and the estimated cost associated with the early return of an expatriate is between $250,000 and $1.25 million (Mervosh & McClenahen, 1997). Given the importance of successful expatriation for organizations in today’s global business market, researchers and practitioners are interested in examining factors related to expatriate success.

Much of the research on expatriate success has focused on international adjustment, the extent to which an expatriate is able to adjust to the host culture, and cross-cultural training programs designed to facilitate successful adjustment. Such research is important as adjustment is positively related to performance and intent to stay in the host country (e.g., Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005; Black, Gregersen, & Mendenhall, 1992; Caligiuri, 1997; Parker & McEvoy, 1993) and negatively related to the expatriates’ intention to return to their home countries early (Forster, 1997; Gregersen & Black, 1990; Takeuchi, Yun, & Teslucky, 2002). Despite the

1 The terms expatriate and sojourner will be used interchangeably through this document because expatriates are a type of sojourner and because research on both sojourners (generally) and expatriates (specifically) is reviewed to draw support for the thesis.
importance of such findings, the emphasis on international adjustment may have led researchers to ignore other potentially fruitful avenues of research on expatriate experiences, and avenues that may also lead to a better understanding of international adjustment.

In particular, a recent call was made to examine the role of emotion in cross-cultural expatriate experiences (Tan, Hartel, Panipucci, & Strybosch, 2005). Specifically, the authors contend that examining emotion in cross-cultural expatriate experiences is important because “culture shapes an individual’s emotional expressions, experiences and management…and differences in culture lead to differences in acceptable forms of emotional behavior” (p. 4). Indeed, one of the areas where norms and behaviors may differ for expatriates and host nationals is in emotional display rules. Display rules refer to the rules that govern the display of emotion and concern what has been “learned, presumably fairly early in life, about the management techniques to be applied by whom, to which emotions, under what circumstances” (Ekman, 1972, p. 225). They direct how a person is to display his or her emotion in a given situation, and these rules differ across cultures (Matsumoto, Yoo, Fontaine, Anguas-Wong, Ariola, Ataca, Bond, et al., 2008).

Researchers are only beginning to examine the role of emotional display rules among sojourners. For example, Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) examined how international students reported they should display emotions in work contexts, both in their home cultures and in their host culture (i.e., United States), as well as the relationship of such display to international adjustment. According to theories of adjustment, adaptation to host norms and behavior may lead to better adjustment. Thus, it
was expected that the sojourners would report that they should behave more similarly to
the host culture while working abroad.

However, the results contradicted this expectation. Specifically, the results
indicated that international student sojourners reported they should display less intense
emotion as employees in the host U.S. culture than they would display as employees in
their home cultures. This result was surprising because *more* display of emotion was
perceived as acceptable in the host culture (i.e., U.S.) than in the international sojourners’
home cultures. The finding may suggest that the sojourners did not accurately perceive
the appropriate display of emotion in the host, U.S., culture—or did they? Could there be
different behavioral norms (i.e., display of emotion) for sojourners as compared to host
country nationals in the U.S.?

Indeed, the finding, which is referenced herein as the “guest effect,” could imply
that there is a norm in the host country (i.e., U.S.) that requires sojourners to display less
emotion because they are not citizens of the country; rather they are only living there
temporarily. If this is the case, the sojourners in the Gullekson & Vancouver (in press)
study may have accurately perceived that they should not display as much emotion in the
U.S. as compared to the other Americans. Alternatively, the sojourners may have
perceived differences in norms that did not exist, which could be problematic for
adjustment and performance in the host culture. Specifically, suppressing emotions is
purported to lead to interpersonal communication problems, as well as negative effects
for individuals such as lower social support, lower peer rated likeability, reduced
closeness, and negative feelings about the interaction (e.g., Butler, Lee, & Gross, 2007; Gross & John, 2003).

Because the reason the guest effect occurred remains unclear, the current study sought to investigate the results found in Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) by examining emotional display differences between expatriates and Americans in the U.S. and also the role of status in emotional display. Status refers to “an individual’s standing in the hierarchy of a group based on the prestige, honor, and deference accorded to him or her by other members” (Lovaglia & Houser, 1996). Research on display of emotion indicates that there are different display rules for individuals of different status. More specifically, individuals of different status (e.g., high versus low; supervisor versus subordinate) have been found to experience and display emotions differently (e.g., Tiedens, 2000); namely that low status individuals display less emotion (e.g., Clark, 1990; Conway, DiFazio, & Mayman, 1999; Tiedens, 2000). As temporary workers in a foreign country, the sojourners may have a different status than host nationals (i.e., American citizens) and thus are held to different display rules of emotion.

Given the perceived dampening of emotional display by sojourners (i.e., the guest effect), it is important to determine whether differential norms exist for individuals of expatriate status compared to Americans in how they should display their emotions in the U.S. Therefore, the present study investigated whether expatriates were considered lower status by Americans and subsequently expected to display less emotion. On the other hand, the guest effect could reflect a perception by the sojourning individuals that they are of lower status as guests in the country, when in fact they are not perceived that way
by host nationals. However, to determine if the perceptions of the sojourners were accurate or not, the existence (or lack therefore) of a U.S. norm for sojourners needed to be determined.

Thus, the purpose of the present study was to investigate whether or not different norms for emotional display existed for expatriates and host nationals in a U.S. work context, according to members of the host culture as well as international sojourners (i.e., replicate the guest effect). Status as an explanatory mechanism for the intensity of emotional display was also investigated. That is, this study examined whether expatriate sojourners are rated as lower in status in the U.S. than are American workers. No research to date has investigated whether different behavioral norms, specifically regarding emotional display rules, exist for individuals temporarily living in a foreign country (i.e., sojourners) and the citizens of that country. The exploration of these norms is important to our understanding of the expatriate and sojourner experience.

With those goals in mind, the context for which this research is important is reviewed, specifically, international adjustment and cross-cultural training in sojourner experiences. Next, the importance of emotion in cross-cultural experiences is introduced, followed by a review of Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) and their finding of the guest effect. Then the literature on status differences in emotional experience and display is reviewed and applied to the guest effect.

Sojourners: Crossing Cultural Boundaries

Despite an increase in the number of individuals working and studying in foreign countries, the international experience is not always easy for the sojourner, nor beneficial
for the organization sending an expatriate abroad. Sojourners are often faced with differences between their home culture and the new host culture in which they temporarily reside (Feldman & Tompson, 1993; Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy, 1992; 1993). These cultural differences can lead to problems in adjusting to the host culture, as well as performance issues in their international assignment (e.g., Waxin, 2004; Stahl & Caligiuri, 2005). Therefore, international adjustment has been identified as a critical factor in determining the success or failure of a sojourner in the host country. Further, cross-cultural training is often used as a way to facilitate international adjustment. As such, these two topics have been a focus of much sojourner research.

*International Adjustment.* Many models and theories of international adjustment have been developed over the years (e.g., Aycan, 1997; Berry, 1997; Black & Stephens, 1989; Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991; Brislin, 1981; Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1978; Searle & Ward, 1990). Although each may add something unique to the knowledge of adjustment, most theories have many aspects in common. In particular, much of the expatriate adjustment research stems from work by Black and colleagues, who conceptualized international adjustment as the degree of psychological comfort or absence of stress a sojourner has with various aspects of a host culture (Black & Gregersen, 1991).

Three main facets of international adjustment have been proposed, including general adjustment, interaction adjustment, and work adjustment (Black & Stephens, 1989). General adjustment measures the degree to which a sojourner feels comfortable with various non-work factors such as general living conditions, food, housing, etc.
Interaction adjustment refers to the extent to which a sojourner feels comfortable interacting with host country nationals both inside and outside a work environment. Work adjustment refers the degree to which a sojourner feels comfortable with his or her job assignment and task. These three facets of adjustment have generally been empirically supported in the sojourner literature (e.g., Black & Stephens, 1989; Hechanova-Alampay, Beehr, Christiansen, & Van Horn, 2002).

International adjustment proves to be an important factor in expatriate experiences because it is linked to several key variables. Specifically, it has been found to be positively related to performance and intent to stay in the host country (e.g., Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Black, Gregersen, & Mendenhall, 1992; Caligiuri, 1997; Parker & McEvoy, 1993), but negatively related to the premature termination of the international assignment (Forster, 1997; Gregersen & Black, 1990; Takeuchi et al., 2002). Adjustment has even been linked to performance after accounting for major influences such as job satisfaction (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). An inability to adjust is considered “one of the chief determinants of early returns” for expatriates (Sinangil & Ones, 2001, p. 431), and those who remain maladjusted while on the assignment may be inefficient or ineffective in their performance. Further, the adjustment of the expatriate’s family members has even been linked to the expatriate’s success (Black et al., 1999). Thus, successful adjustment to the host culture remains an essential part of the experience abroad and may have important implications for individuals as well as organizations.

According to the model of international adjustment developed by Black et al. (1991; see Figure 1), having accurate expectations of appropriate and inappropriate
Figure 1. Framework of International Adjustment

behavior in the host country is an essential component to international adjustment. Moreover, the model posits that having information regarding the norms for acceptable behavior prior to entering the new situation will reduce uncertainty and allow the sojourner to adjust more quickly to the host culture. For this reason, many sojourners go through cross-cultural training prior to or upon arrival in the host country. Such training programs are designed to increase the likelihood that a sojourner will be successful in his or her international assignment.

*Cross-Cultural Training.* Cross-cultural training (CCT) programs are thought to facilitate international adjustment by enabling the individual to learn both content and skills that will facilitate effective cross-cultural interaction by reducing misunderstandings and inappropriate behaviors (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). For sojourners, many cross-cultural training programs introduce the general differences between the home and host cultures, as well as differences pertaining to social interactions, and require that the trainees practice cross-culturally suitable behaviors (Sinangil & Ones, 2001). That is, the training aims at teaching the expatriate to learn the norms of the country and to behave in a similar manner to the host nationals. For example, one popular method of cross-cultural training is the culture assimilator, which “is a programmed learning experience designed to expose members of one culture to some of the basic concepts, attitudes, role perceptions, customs and values of another culture” (Fiedler, Mitchell & Triandis, 1971, p. 95). More specifically, it consists of critical incidents describing interactions between a sojourner and host national that involve some misunderstanding that results from cultural differences (Bhawuk & Brislin,
Trainees are asked to think about the source of the misunderstanding and choose a behavioral choice for the person in the situation. Then, viewpoints from both cultures are given as well as explanations for avoiding misunderstandings in those situations. Similar to other cross-cultural training methods, the goal is to have sojourners make the same attributions as host national and to have more accurate expectations of appropriate behavior according to the host culture.

Despite the general consensus that such programs are effective (Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Deshpande & Viswesvaran, 1992; Kealey & Protheroe, 1996; Waxin & Panaccio, 2005), many CCT programs have been largely developed using a broad framework and little empirical foundation (e.g., Black & Mendenhall, 1990; 1992; Gudykunst, Guzlely, & Hammer, 1996; Stroh, 2004). In particular, there has been less research conducted on the content of the training courses as opposed to training effectiveness. Currently, many CCT programs are designed in line with the theories of international adjustment, which posit that having accurate expectations of appropriate and inappropriate behavior is crucial to adjustment. Accordingly, some researchers contend that cultural theories (e.g., individualism-collectivism) should be used to facilitate the understanding of cultural differences in appropriate behavior (Bhawuk & Triandis, 1996; Bhawuk, 1998; Sanchez-Burks, Lee, Nisbett & Ybarra, 2007). That means, as mentioned previously, most training courses highlight the differences that exist between one’s home and host culture so that sojourners can change their behavior to be consistent with the norms and behaviors or the host culture. According to Stroh (2004), managers must
become aware of how the host nationals behave before they can “alter their behavior so that it conforms to the norms of the host culture” (p. 82).

Although, training programs have been found to facilitate international skills and adjustment, there may still be important content left unexplored. In particular, it is still unknown if the best thing to do is to act like the host nationals, maintain your home norms or exhibit some other “sojourner” behavior (Caliguiiri, personal communication). Given that sojourners are not citizens of the host country, perhaps there are different norms for how they should be acting. In fact, Stroh (2004) posits that sojourners build cognitive maps regarding when to produce certain behavior, under what circumstances it is acceptable and unacceptable, and more importantly whether it is alright for foreigners to produce the behavior. Despite this contention, little research has directly investigated whether it is always appropriate for sojourners to behave in the same way as host nationals. The current research will explore this notion in the context of one specific nonverbal behavior proposed to be important to international adjustment: emotional display.

In sum, successful sojourner experience is dependent on many factors, but research indicates that adjustment is key to the sojourning process and cross-cultural training programs are designed to facilitate and hasten that adjustment process. Although expatriate and sojourner research has become a topic of interest in organizational and cross-cultural literature with research investigating international adjustment, selection, and training of sojourners (e.g., Anderson, 2001; Bhaskar-Shrininvas et al., 2005; Black et al., 1991; Caligiuri, 2000; Church, 1982; Littrell, Salas, Hess, Paley, & Riedel, 2006;
Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999), little research has examined the expected behavior of sojourners. Moreover, research on the role of emotion in cross-cultural experiences and its link to adjustment is still in its infancy. The next section reviews this issue.

The Role of Emotion in Cross-Cultural Experiences

Although cross-cultural training focuses on reducing misunderstandings by training sojourners to have more accurate expectations of appropriate behavior in the host country, one area of behavior that has received less attention in cross-cultural training, and in sojourner research more generally, is the role of emotional behavior in cross-cultural experiences. According to Tan et al. (2005) “cross-cultural encounters in the expatriate experience are essentially social encounters, where culture shapes an individual’s emotional expressions, experiences, and management in a social setting, and differences in culture lead to differences in acceptable forms of emotional behavior” (p. 4). Therefore, expatriate and cross-cultural researchers need to more thoroughly examine the role of emotion in such experiences.

Matsumoto and colleagues have recently called emotion regulation the “gatekeeper skill” in intercultural adjustment as it “allows people to engage in successful conflict resolution that leads to effective, long-term intercultural communication” (Matsumoto et al., 2003, p. 2). It does so by allowing individuals to not act on their emotions, giving them more time to engage in critical thinking about the causes of differences and miscommunication. In doing so, the individuals are able to create new expectations and awareness for similarities and differences among individuals. A key
point here is that sojourners need to have an accurate representation of what are appropriate emotional displays in the cross-cultural encounter is in order to regulate their emotions appropriately. As sojourners engage in cross-cultural encounters, they need to regulate their emotional displays according to what is appropriate in the host culture—that takes an understanding of what the “correct” behavior is in that country. This understanding of the differences and similarities among cultures is the cornerstone of cross-cultural training. Yet, as indicated previously, current CCT programs only emphasize how the host country natives behave, and do not consider that there may be different ways of behaving for a foreigner in the country.

Thus, emotion and emotional behavior likely play crucial roles in the international experiences of sojourners, especially when the norms for emotional behavior are very different in the host culture as compared to the norms in a sojourner’s home culture. If aspects of emotion do play a significant role in the sojourning experience and adjustment process, then these aspects should also be integrated into formal training programs.

Cultural Differences in Display Rules of Emotion. Research on emotion has provided evidence that cultural differences do exist in emotional behavior (e.g., Biehl et al., 1997; Ekman, 1972; Friesen, 1972; Matsumoto, 1990; Matsumoto et al., 2008; Matsumoto, Kasri, & Kooken, 1999; Matsumoto, Yoo, Hirayama, & Petrova, 2005; Mesquita, 2001; Mesquita & Frijda, 1992). One aspect of particular importance for sojourners crossing cultural boundaries is emotional display rules, which are said to govern what is acceptable emotional behavior. Specifically, display rules direct how
people are to display their emotion in a given situation (e.g., to what degree, to whom), and these rules may differ across cultures.

The idea that there are cultural rules governing our emotional display gained prominence in studies by Ekman (1972) and Friesen (1972). They found that Japanese and American participants exhibited the same negative facial expressions while watching a stressful video clip in a room alone. However, when an experimenter was present, there was a substantial difference in the facial displays between the Japanese and American participants. It appeared that cultural display rules required many Japanese to mask their negative feelings with a polite smile, whereas the American display rules allowed the US participants to continue displaying their negative emotions. The results of these two studies demonstrate the existence of emotional display rules and support the idea that display of emotion would differ across cultures. More recent research has corroborated this result, indicating that there are differences in emotional display rules across countries (e.g., Matsumoto et al., 2005; Matsumoto, Takeuchi, Andayani, Kouznetsova, & Krupp, 1998; Stephan, Stephan, & de Vargas, 1996).

For example, Matsumoto and colleagues (Matsumoto et al., 1999) investigated the cultural differences in judgments of expression intensity and subjective experience of emotions, which are governed by the culture’s display rules. American and Japanese participants were shown slides of faces depicting seven universal emotions and asked what emotion was being displayed, the intensity level of the facial expression, and the intensity level that the poser is actually experiencing. Differences were found between American and Japanese observers in their judgments of both the poser’s intensity of
emotional expression and their subjective experience of the emotion. Specifically, it was found that Americans perceived the expression as more intense than did the Japanese participants. However, the Japanese perceived greater intensity than did Americans in the poser’s experience of the emotion. The authors contend that these results may be explained by the differences in the two cultures. That is, the Japanese may infer that the experience is more intense than the expression displayed because, culturally, they have norms that discourage one from outwardly expressing the emotions being felt internally. As a result, the Japanese may understand that one is experiencing an emotion, even though it is not being outwardly expressed as intensely as it is felt. In contrast, Americans infer the opposite due to their culture rules allowing one to express emotion, sometimes expressing the emotion more intensely than it is actually felt. Similar cross-cultural differences in emotional intensity ratings have been observed in other studies (Biehl, et al., 1997; Matsumoto, 1989; Matsumoto & Ekman, 1989; Matsumoto et al., 2002).

Similarly, Stephan and colleagues (Stephan et al., 1996) investigated differences in emotional expression of Costa Rican and American students. Participants rated how comfortable they would feel expressing different emotions to a family member and a stranger if the individual had caused them to feel each specific emotion. Results indicated that the Americans felt more comfortable expressing emotions that supported an independent concept of the self (e.g., proud of oneself, self-satisfied, ashamed, annoyed, envious). Additionally, American participants felt more comfortable than Costa Ricans expressing negative emotions, regardless of the social situation. To the researchers’
surprise, the Americans also felt more comfortable expressing emotions that reflected an interdependent concept of self (e.g., sympathetic, grateful, fearful of angering others, apologetic). These results imply that Costa Rican’s may have different cultural display rules regarding the overall expression of emotion in comparison to Americans. Specifically, it could be that they are expected to have greater control over the expression of emotion, regardless of the valence of the emotion or the social context surrounding these feelings.

Matsumoto and colleagues (Matsumoto et al., 1998) also investigated how display rules lead to differences in emotional behavior tendencies in different social situations. South Korean, American, Japanese, and Russian participants completed a measure asking how they would (and should) display each of seven different emotions in four different social contexts. Results indicated that cultural differences in display rules did exist and some of those differences could be attributed to the individualism and collectivism dimension of culture, which reflects the relationship between the individual and the collective nature of the greater society (Hofstede, 1980; 2001). That is, individualistic cultures stress the self and individual needs and goals over group membership and collective needs and goals. In contrast, collectivist cultures are more concerned with group membership and harmony than with the individual person and focus on the goals and needs of the group (Stephan et al., 1996). Matsumoto and colleagues found that Russians exhibited more control over their display of emotion with family, friends and colleagues than did Americans, Koreans, and Japanese; presumably due to the collectivist nature of the culture, the desire to maintain good in-group relationships, and to remain in
a comfortable situation while interacting with others. In contrast, Americans exhibited more control over the display of emotion (especially negative emotion) in the presence of strangers. Although this may seem contradictory to other research in this area, the authors reasoned this could be due to the individualistic nature of the culture, where uniqueness and autonomy are emphasized. Therefore, Americans may want to control their emotions in the presence of strangers to maintain a positive self-image to those with whom they are not familiar. Other research on display rules has also shown cultural differences in which emotions are acceptable to display in which social contexts (Matsumoto, 1990; Matsumoto et al., 2005).

More recently, Matsumoto and colleagues (Matsumoto et al., 2008) examined emotional display rules in 32 countries around the world. More specifically, over 5,000 respondents completed the Display Rule Assessment Inventory (DRAI), which asks participants to report how they should display their emotions in a variety of situations. Results indicated that both universal and cultural differences exist in the display of emotion. In particular, display of emotion was positively related to display of emotion such that more individualistic countries reported more expression of emotion in comparison to collectivist cultures. Conversely, a universal effect was found in which greater expression of emotion was reported for in-groups as opposed to out-groups, and this effect was shared by members of both individualist and collectivist cultures.

Taken together, these studies demonstrate that culture plays a role in how individuals display emotions such that different emotional display rules may exist across cultures. As a result, individuals crossing cultural boundaries (i.e., sojourners) need to
understand such differences while they are abroad, as well as understand how they are to display their own emotions in the host culture. According to theories of intercultural/international adjustment, effective communication and, ultimately, effective international adjustment may hinge on sojourners understanding the cultural differences that exist in emotional display as well as understanding how they should display their own emotions in their cross-cultural encounters (e.g., Aycan, 1997; Black et al., 1991). The next section gives an overview of how emotional display fits into theories of intercultural adjustment.

*Intercultural Adjustment and Emotion.* The findings of the above studies indicate that, even if individuals experience the same emotions, culture may influence them to regulate or display their emotions differently. Such findings may have direct implications for sojourners studying or working in a country with a culture very dissimilar to their own. As suggested in Black and colleagues’ (Black et al., 1991) model of international adjustment, it is important for sojourners to have accurate perceptions of appropriate behavior in the host culture. That is, they should have clear expectations for their own behavior as well as an understanding of the host national behavior. This understanding of appropriate and inappropriate behavior should include an understanding of how one is to display his or her emotions while in the host country.

If sojourners find themselves immersed in a culture that expects them to emotionally behave in a manner different from what they are used to, it may affect the ease with which they adjust and become comfortable in their new environment, as well as influence communication and conflict between the individuals from different cultures.
This, in turn, may affect the likelihood that sojourners will succeed in their assignment. Thus, when traveling across cultural boundaries, it may be important for sojourners to be able to recognize that variations in different aspects of emotion exist as well as what these differences are. If one is not able to recognize the differences and adjust accordingly, then miscommunication and conflict could arise, possibly leading to decreased adjustment and success for the sojourner.

A recent study by the present author examined whether sojourners’ perception of host culture display rules was in fact related to international adjustment (Gullekson & Vancouver, in press). Specifically, international graduate students reported how they should display their emotions in various work-related contexts (e.g., when interacting with a supervisor, coworker, subordinate) in both their home country and if they were working the host country (i.e., United States). Concurrently, American graduate students reported how they should display emotion in the same work-related contexts in their home (U.S.) culture. Although no relationship was found between perception of host norms and international adjustment, an interesting pattern of behavior was reported by the international sojourners. The sojourners reported lower levels of emotional display working in the host (U.S.) culture as opposed to what they felt they should display if they were working in their home cultures, despite the fact that more display of emotion was reported as acceptable by the host culture participants (i.e., Americans).

This result was unexpected given that theories of international/intercultural adjustment emphasize that having an accurate understanding of, and adaption to, host country behaviors and norms is important to successful adjustment. Moreover, cross-
cultural training programs often teach individuals about the host culture norms and behaviors and generally instruct trainees to adapt to the host culture. Yet, the participants in the previous study were not reporting that they should behave like the host country nationals, but rather that they should suppress or dampen their emotional display even more so than what their own cultural norms would dictate; norms that dictated less emotional display than did the host country. Indeed, for almost all of the participants, they reported displaying less emotion than they would in their home cultures and less emotion than the Americans reported they would display.

Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) dubbed this result the “guest effect” because it appeared that the sojourners felt they should behave as guests in the host country, displaying less emotion than what the host nationals would display. However, the study did not examine whether the sojourners should be acting as guests in the host country. That is, it was not clear from the study whether the participants did not understand the emotional display rules in the U.S. or if they were correct in believing that that their display rules, as visiting sojourners, were different (i.e., that they should display less emotion) than the display rules of the Americans.

The primary purpose of the current study was to examine whether differential norms for emotional display do exist expatriates and American workers in the U.S. No research has specifically examined whether different norms for emotional display exist for individuals temporarily living in a country and the citizens of the host country. However, a review of the literature cross-cultural emotional behavior does lend some evidence to support the notion that different norms may exist, either in reality or at least
in the self-perception of the sojourners. In particular, the results of some research suggests that there are different norms for display of emotion amongst individuals of different status, and that individuals display their emotions differently to members of their in-groups and out-groups. A review of this literature is provided next, as well as its application to the guest effect found in Gullekson and Vancouver (in press).

The Role of Status in Emotional Experience and Display

The main premise behind display rules is that they dictate not only how an individual should display emotion, but to whom one displays his or her emotion. This implies that individuals may display their emotions differently depending on the nature of the interpersonal relationship. Research on social relations has provided evidence that status and power are key variables in influencing behavior. As mentioned previously, status refers to “an individual’s standing in the hierarchy of a group based on the prestige, honor, and deference accorded to him or her by other members” (Lovaglia & Houser, 1996), whereas power is often defined as “relative control over another’s valued outcomes” (Berdahl & Martorana, 2006, p. 497). Although status and power can be differentiated, they are often related. For example, high status is usually associated with greater power and greater status is often attributed to people with greater power (Conway et al., 1999). Thus, consistent with work by Conway et al., status in this study does not distinguish between the two, but rather considers a full representation of status coupled with power.

More recently the notion that status is a key variable in influencing behavior has been applied to emotional behavior. In particular, studies find that emotions are
experienced and expressed differently depending on the social status or power of the individual with whom one is interacting (e.g., supervisor vs. coworker; high status vs. low status). The following sections describe how these variables are thought to influence behavior, and more specifically emotional behavior.

**Status Effects.** The recognition that social relations, such as status, influence behavior has been around for some time (e.g., Berger, Rosenholtz, & Zelditch, 1980). According to Berger and colleagues’ *status characteristics theory*, there exist status organizing processes in which “evaluations of and beliefs about the characteristics of actors become the basis of observable inequalities in face-to-face social interactions” (pg. 479). The key tenant of the theory is that there are status characteristics (e.g., race, age, ethnicity, education) by which people make evaluations about individuals, and these characteristics may become the basis for inequities in interpersonal behavior. Based on these principles, the theory posits that status characteristics representative of the larger society (e.g., age, race, education) are maintained when individuals work together, rather than the members of the group developing a new social hierarchy relevant to the situation at hand. In particular, early observations revealed that inequalities in social influence emerged in newly-formed groups (Bales, 1950; Bales, Strodtebeck, Mills, & Roseborough, 1951; Bales & Slater, 1955; Heinecke & Bales, 1953). For instance, it was documented that the groups developed inequalities in the opportunities to participate, in actual participation, in evaluations of performance outputs, and in influence over group decisions (cf. Berger et al., 1980). The observed inequalities were conceptualized as a single power-prestige order, which was highly stable once it was established.
Although Bales identified the emergence of status orders in group processes of similar status group members, others have found that when the group members have unequal status characteristics at the beginning of group work, these inequalities are maintained inside the group, even if the inequalities are not related to the task (for reviews see Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972; Webster & Foschi, 1988). That is, a status order is said to be “instantaneously” created instead of evolving out of face-to-face interaction of members of the group” (p. 480), and this occurs for a variety of status characteristics (e.g., age, race, office status, ethnicity; Berger et al., 1980). For example, Berger and colleagues (1972) found that, in comparison to lower ranked privates, military personnel with higher rank were more influential when interacting in a problem solving task, even though the task was not related to the military. To explain these effects, Berger and colleagues propose that status characteristics, like education level and formal rank, generate expectations of competence, which gives higher status actors influence in task-oriented interactions.

As this early work demonstrates, status influences interpersonal relations in task groups, but it is also related to a variety of other interpersonal behaviors. For example, people of higher status are more likely to choose their place in social interaction (Lott & Sommer, 1967), control the approach of others (Walker & Borden, 1976) and touch others informally (Hall, 1996). Moreover, according to Ravlin and Thomas (2005) “status structures influence virtually all relational behavior such as indicating when to defer, to listen, to speak, to be polite, to engage in social exchange, to ostracize, to support, and to
engage in many other interpersonal behaviors” (p. 969). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that status affects individuals’ emotional behavior as well.

Status and Emotion. Indeed, researchers have begun to suggest that emotion and social status are related (Clark, 1990; Kemper, 1991; Ridgeway & Johnson, 1990; Tiedens, 2000). For example, Ridgeway and Johnson (1990) posited that interaction in task groups produces emotional reactions, yet the display of such reactions depended on the group member’s status. More specifically, they argued that high status members are freer to express negative emotion (e.g., anger) than are low-status members. Similarly, Clark (1990) contended that the emotions an individual displays communicate one’s position in a hierarchy, namely that anger and disgust reflect high status and sadness and fear reflect lower status. Further, she theorized that this relationship between status and emotion is understood because there are norms which dictate that low status individuals should inhibit their anger.

More recently, several researchers have empirically investigated how status influences both the experience and expression of emotion, as well as examined the norms that dictate how individuals of different status should display their emotions. In particular, research supports the notion that there are systematic differences in the emotions experienced by high and low-status individuals. Further, recent research implies that stereotypes and norms may develop regarding the emotion-status relationship and that these norms may lead people to have expectations about the emotional states of people based on their status as well as infer status from the emotions experienced and expressed.
For example, Tiedens and colleagues have conducted several studies examining the nature of the relationship between social status and emotion (e.g., Tiedens, 2000; Tiedens, Ellsworth, & Mesquita, 2000; Tiedens et al., 1998). Tiedens (2000) contends that social status positions and emotions are part of a vicious cycle that makes changes in social status less likely. This occurs because “social status influences which emotions are experienced and how intensely these emotions are experienced. Then, others make status inferences from these emotions [and treat them accordingly]” (p. 72). She goes on to argue that one way social status affects emotions is through display rules because these rules vary by social status positions. Her research has shown that people in high status roles are allowed to experience and express different emotions than people in low status roles.

For instance, Tiedens and colleagues (Tiedens et al., 1998) demonstrated that high and low status individuals have different emotional responses to situations (e.g., meeting a goal) as a function of their status. In their first study, participants were randomly assigned to be either a boss or subordinate and given 15 minutes to complete a downsizing plan for a fictitious company. Later, the experimenter gave the participants either a positive or negative evaluation and asked the participants to rate their agency appraisals (i.e., who should received credit) and emotions about the evaluation. Agency appraisals depended on social status and valence of the evaluation. That is, when the evaluation was negative, the low status partner was blamed by both participants. When the evaluation was positive, the high status partner was deemed responsible by both participants. Participants in high status positions reported feeling more angry, frustrated
and proud, while low status participants reported feeling more sad, guilty, and appreciative. In a second study, emotion ratings from real social situations at work were examined. Participants reported on 10 situations a day, indicating who they were interacting with (i.e., supervisor, coworker, subordinate), doing what behaviors and experiencing which emotions. A similar pattern emerged; specifically, when interacting with a subordinate, people felt more anger and frustration than sadness and worry. When interacting with a supervisor, they felt more sadness and worry than anger and frustration. Taken together, these studies suggest that social status can influence which emotions people experience.

Further, research also supports the notion that people have implicit knowledge of the status-emotion process and that norms exist for the display of emotion depending on social status. That is, research indicates that individuals both perceive status and award status to people depending on the emotions they experience and express. For example, Tiedens et al. (2000) found that participants who read vignettes about different people perceived both the angry and proud targets as high status (e.g., supervisor) and the sad/guilty and appreciate targets as low status (e.g., subordinate). This demonstrates that individuals believe the emotions people express are diagnostic of their social status. Additionally, Tiedens (2001) revealed in a series of studies that people actually confer more status on targets who express anger than targets who express sadness. Specifically, after watching an interview on video of a job candidate who either expressed anger or sadness about a situation, participants assigned a higher status position and a higher salary to a job candidate who described himself as angry rather than sad.
Jointly, Tiedens and colleagues’ research suggests that there are norms regarding what emotions are to be experienced and expressed by individuals of different social status. Studies by other researchers support this notion (e.g., Carney, Hall, & LeBeau, 2005; Conway et al., 1999; Cote & Moskowitz, 2002; Hall, Coats, & LeBeau, 2005; Hecht & LaFrance, 1998). For example, Conway and colleagues (1999) found that participants rated low-status targets as more likely to experience anger, disgust, sadness, and fear, and less likely to experience happiness, as compared to high status individuals. Yet, the participants also perceived the low-status individuals display less anger, disgust, and happiness, but more sadness and fear, relative to high status individuals. Subsequent findings indicate that this incongruity between the experience and display of emotions, at least for anger and disgust, is a function of the norms that exist for displaying emotion. That is, there are norms (i.e., emotional display rules) dictating the inhibition of emotion for low-status individuals.

The above studies provide support for the existence of status-related differences in the display of emotion. A similar variable that has been investigated in the emotional display research is power, which is described in the next section.

Power and Emotion. In addition to status, other researchers have investigated the role of power in emotional behavior. More specifically, several researchers have applied the approach/inhibit (A/I) theory of power to explain the experience and expression of attitudes and emotion. The A/I theory purports that power activates the behavioral approach system (i.e., rewards) for those in high power and the inhibition system (i.e., threats) for those with less power (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002; Keltner, Gruenfeld, &
Anderson, 2003). That is, individuals with more power activate a behavioral approach system which leads them to express their attitudes more, as well as experience and express more positive emotion. In contrast, they argue that people with low power may inhibit themselves from speaking or expressing attitudes (as opposed to not being given the opportunity to speak) because they have a more activated inhibition system which increases their sensitivity to potential threats (e.g., conflict in interpersonal relationships). That is, individuals with lower power may perform a sort of self-censorship in order to avoid potential threats that could arise.

Research investigating the A/I theory of power has generally supported its claims. For example, Anderson and Berdahl (2002) found that participants with lower personality dominance (i.e., a personality trait associated with social power) “inhibited themselves from expressing their emotions, kept their disagreements to themselves and expressed agreement even when they disagreed” (p. 1368). Yet, they did not show a stronger bias in perceiving their partners threatening emotions, nor did those with higher personality dominance experience more positive emotion. In a second study, the results were replicated and extended, such that participants assigned to high power positions expressed their true attitudes more often than those in low power position.

Additionally, Berdahl and Martorana (2006) manipulated social power in 3-person groups that engaged in a controversial discussion designed to elicit strong emotions. In support of the A/I theory, results indicated that high power individuals openly expressed their opinions more, as well as experienced more positive emotions and less anger than did low power individuals. In a similar vein, Langner and Keltner (2008)
examined how a partner’s social power relates to an individual’s emotions, finding that actors’ social power related to increased positive emotional experience, whereas the partners’ social power was related to an individual’s increased negative emotional experience. Despite the increased negative emotional experience associated with the behavioral inhibition, increased expression of negative emotions was not investigated or found in many of the studies using the A/I theory. This could imply that lower power is related to more inhibition in general, which would be consistent with the results found in Gullekson and Vancouver (in press). Other studies also suggest support for the A/I theory of power on emotions (e.g., Cote & Moskowitz, 2002; Hecht & La France, 1998).

Researchers have also investigated the nature of power and nonverbal behavior. Specifically, Carney and colleagues (Carney et al., 2005) examined beliefs about the nonverbal behavior and communication skills associated with high and low social power. Participants were asked to imagine persons of high or low rank in an organization and rate the extent to which these persons would display different nonverbal behaviors or skills. With regard to emotion, participants reported that high power individuals would show more anger and disgust, as well as less fear and sadness, than would low power individuals. Similarly, in a meta-analysis on nonverbal behavior and the vertical dimension of social relations (i.e., hierarchy), Hall et al. (2005) found that more verticality (i.e., higher social power) was related to more intense facial expression.

In sum, these studies lend support for the notion that both status and power influence emotional behavior. Further, the studies imply that there may be norms guiding how individuals of different status (and power) should display their emotions. However,
few researchers have expanded these results to examine the influence of culture on these status effects. The next section describes two studies that investigated the effects of status on communication patterns across cultures and in intercultural interactions.

Status and Culture. Kowner and Wiseman (2003) extended the examination of status on communication patterns across cultures. Similar to Tiedens (2001), they contend that higher status individuals may communicate more aggressively, which (albeit unconsciously) reflects and defines one’s status as well as forces the other party to behave in a lower status mode. Consequently, lower status individuals may behave in a more timid, considerate, and respectful manner. They posit that this pattern is relatively stable across cultures. In one study, they investigated whether there were differences between Japanese and American participants in their perceptions of verbal and nonverbal behaviors for high and low status individuals interacting with one another. Results indicated that a similar pattern of status-related behavior was found in both cultures. More specifically, the findings revealed that high status individuals were perceived to exhibit more aggressiveness in their communication than were low status individuals, yet an interaction also revealed that culture appears to affect the magnitude at which the status-related behavior is manifested. In particular, the Japanese reported perceptions of greater differences in high and low status individuals than did Americans. For example, the Japanese reported that more aggressiveness is acceptable by those with high status than for those with low status, and this was a larger status differential than what was reported by the Americans. Hence, it appears that status-related behavior follows similar patterns across cultures, but culture may exacerbate or mitigate the degree of such effects.
In the above study, Kowner and Wiseman (2003) found that two cultures have similar perceptions of communication behaviors for high and low status individuals. Yet, they did not examine status-related behavior in actual or imagined intercultural interactions. In another study, Kowner (2002) investigated the pattern of status related behavior among intercultural dyads, finding that Japanese participants perceive Western foreigners to display more high-status nonverbal communication. More specifically, Kowner investigated how Japanese perceive communication with Western foreigners of equal status. When asked to imagine an intercultural encounter with a Westerner of equal status, the Japanese participants reported perceiving different communication styles between themselves and the foreigners. Moreover, it was found that they perceive their own communication style as similar to that of low-status Japanese in a within-culture encounter. In contrast, they perceived the communication style of foreigners as similar to high-status Japanese in a within-culture encounter. Overall, the participants reported that the intercultural interactions with foreigners would be more unpleasant than interactions with fellow Japanese. The authors contend that the lack of comfort associated with these intercultural relations stems from the Japanese perception that their status boundaries were being violated. Thus, the results of Kowner (2002) and Kowner and Wiseman (2003) imply that cultural differences in communication styles could lead to a status hierarchy in which those exhibiting less expression are deemed, or perceive themselves as, lower status.

As a whole, these studies suggest that there exist norms for the experience and display of emotion depending on an individual’s status in the interpersonal relationship.
More specifically, these norms often dictate that lower status individuals should not display as much emotion as higher status individuals. Further, when investigating communication styles across cultures, it appears that similar status effects can also be found. Therefore, status seems like a plausible mechanism to explain why the guest effect is occurring—namely, that sojourners are displaying their emotions as lower status individuals would be expected to display them. Whether this is an accurate reflection of the host culture norms has yet to be determined.

*The Guest Effect: Sojourners as Lower Status Individuals?*

With the above studies in mind, the guest effect (i.e., less emotion is displayed in the host country than the home country; Gullekson & Vancouver, in press) could indicate that sojourners are perceived (either by themselves or by the host society) as lower status individuals because of their temporary status in the host country, as well as their foreign status (i.e., nationality). Indeed, temporary employees are considered a low status group relative to permanent employees (von Hippel, 2006; Boroughs, 1994; Davidson, 1999; Feldman, Doeringhaus, & Turnley, 1994). Further, according to Terry, Pelly, Lalonde, and Smith (2006):

“a number of commentators (e.g., Berry, 1997; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Lalonde, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1992) have observed that immigrant, refugee, and sojourner groups frequently identify with, or are identified by others, as belonging to social categories that have some negative valence (e.g., foreigner)…Moreover, when intergroup social comparisons are made in the new context, low status is often conferred on these groups” (p. 252).
Less work has been conducted on the perception of status of temporary foreign workers (e.g., expatriates), yet there is some evidence that there can be resistance towards the acceptance of foreign workers by host nationals (e.g., Harvey, Novicevic, Buckley, & Fung, 2005; Joardar, Kostova, & Ravlin, 2007). In particular, as foreigners, and as minorities in the host culture, expatriates are often viewed as out-group members, and as such, are ascribed lower status. For example, Suzuki (1998) investigated whether members of an international organization with a bicultural (U.S. and Japanese) workforce make in-group and out-groups distinctions by their national labels. Indeed, it was found that the host nationals (i.e., U.S. workers) perceived more distance to their out-group (i.e., Japanese expatriate managers) than to their in-group (i.e., U.S. workers) in terms of their beliefs and values. A similar result was found for the Japanese participants. Thus, both groups view their social identity as more similar to individuals of their own national cultures.

Thus, based on the status-emotion literature, the guest effect has two possibilities for its occurrence. On one hand, the sojourners could be accurate in perceiving that they should, as temporary sojourners in the United States, dampen their emotions such that they display emotion consistent with a lower status individual. That is, there may actually be a host culture (i.e., American) norm that dictates that sojourners should not display as much emotion as Americans because they are of lower status as individuals temporarily living in the United States.

Alternatively, the guest effect could demonstrate a misperception on the part of the sojourners. In particular, they may have perceived themselves as lower status and
therefore felt they should display less emotion, or at least misperceived that they should dampen their emotions such that they exhibit behaviors similar to lower status individuals. If a misperception does exist, such behavior could continue the vicious cycle of emotion described by Tiedens (2000) and miscommunication and conflict in intercultural relationships could result. However, to determine which of these two possibilities is occurring, the existence (or lack thereof) of a host country norm for the inhibition of emotion by sojourners needs to be determined.

Understanding the nature of host norms for emotional display will help shed light on both the expatriate experience as well as cross-cultural training (CCT) programs. In particular, if the emotional display norms for host nationals and sojourners differ, then evidence will be lent for the notion that CCT programs should not always teach individuals to behave as host nationals do. Rather, more research would be needed to examine how sojourners should behave in the host country. For example, it could be that there are different expectations for sojourner behavior in different situations. Indeed, there may be times when it is more appropriate to act in line with one’s own norms, the norms of the host culture, an integration of the two, or some new norm as a sojourner (Caligiuri, personal communication). In contrast, if sojourners are misperceiving what is the appropriate display in the host culture, further research should investigate why this effect is occurring.

_The Present Study_

Although researchers have begun investigating the role of status in the experience and display of emotion, no study has examined sojourner/expatriate status in this
relationship. Given that both foreign individuals and temporary workers are often considered lower status out-groups in the U.S., norms for less display of emotion may exist for expatriates as compared to host national workers (i.e., Americans). Indeed, the guest effect found in Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) implies that, at least in the U.S., there may be different display rules of emotions for host nationals and expatriate sojourners who are working in the host country temporarily. Given the importance of global human resource management in today’s organizations, it would be beneficial to investigate this finding to determine if such differential norms do exist in the United States. Such a result has important implications for our understanding of the international experience as well as for the development of cross-cultural training programs, which currently emphasize training individuals on the cultural differences that exist and not how behavioral expectations may differ for sojourners. Thus, the present study examined the guest effect and the potential mechanism by which it works (i.e., perceptions of status differences and display rule norms).

Specifically, the present study examined whether participants (both Americans and international sojourners) reported that more emotional display is appropriate for an American worker in comparison to an expatriate in the United States. Further, it examined whether this discrepancy in emotional display was a result of a perceived status differential in which expatriates are considered lower social status in the host country. As discussed previously, research by Tiedens and others (e.g., Conway et al., 1999; Hall et al., 2005; Tiedens, 2000; Tiedens et al., 2000; Tiedens et al., 1998) indicates that emotions are both experienced and displayed differently according to social status and
power, and that this status-emotion effect is implicitly understood. Applying such findings, the guest effect then could be the result of the sojourners being lower status, and as a consequence, they display less emotion. That is, as lower status individuals in the host country, it was argued herein that participants would find less display of emotion appropriate for the target character when he was an expatriate than when he was an American worker. Thus, Hypothesis 1 stated that

\textbf{H1:} Less display of emotion (i.e., anger; happiness) would be reported as appropriate for an expatriate worker than for a host national worker in a workplace interaction. More specifically,

\textbf{H1a:} In the muted display condition, participants would report that the display was more appropriate for expatriates than for host nationals. Yet,

\textbf{H1b:} In the intense display condition, participants would report that the display was less appropriate for expatriates than for host nationals.

Further, this hypothesis existed for both the American sample and the international students, separately, in order to determine whether a norm existed by American participants and also whether internationals students perceived a norm for differences in emotional display. The same is true for all other hypotheses and exploratory analyses.

Additionally, it has been argued throughout this paper that the guest effect found in Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) could be the result of host nationals perceiving expatriates and other sojourners as lower status. And, given that temporary workers and foreign individuals are often categorized as out-groups and of lower status, Hypothesis 2 stated that, for both the anger and happiness vignettes:
**H2:** Lower status would be conferred to an expatriate worker than to a host national worker in the workplace interaction.

Although no a priori hypotheses were developed, exploratory analyses were conducted on the ratings of competence and certainty of display attributed to the target character. Previous research indicates that higher status individuals are often thought of as more competent, and conversely, individuals with high ability are often thought to have higher status (e.g., Georgesen & Harris, 1998; Tiedens, 2001). Thus, if expatriates are considered lower status, they may be rated less competent in general or at least in terms of their knowledge about host culture norms.

An experimental design was utilized to test these hypotheses. Specifically, a pilot study was first conducted to determine whether the vignettes developed for this study implied the desired emotions by American students. Additionally, preliminary analyses were conducted on the status and emotional display relationship in order to better develop the methodology for the primary study. In the pilot study, participants read vignettes about a work-place interaction where the target character experiences an emotion. For some participants, this character was an American and for others he was an expatriate worker; thereby allowing us to determine whether there were differential norms for expatriates and host nationals. For the main study, the highest-rated vignettes for anger and happiness from the pilot study were developed into videotaped vignettes. This was done to increase the fidelity of the stimuli. Furthermore, both Americans and international students viewed the videotaped vignettes so that the host country norms and the perceived norms of the sojourners could be assessed and compared to one another.
Pilot Study

Participants and Design

Participants in this study were 106 American undergraduate students (65% female; 35% male) enrolled in an introductory psychology course at a large Mid-western university. The majority of the participants were freshman (63%) or sophomores (29%), and the sample consisted of 86% Caucasian and 10% African American participants. Participation was voluntary in exchange for course credit. The study utilized a 2 (nationality) x 3 (emotion) mixed-subjects design in which nationality (i.e., expatriate or American) was the between-subjects factor and emotion (anger, happiness, sadness) was the within-subjects factor. The dependent variables included emotion experienced, appropriateness of display, certainty of display, and status.

Materials

Emotional Display Vignettes. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two nationality conditions (e.g. expatriate or American) and read a series of vignettes about two characters in a business context where an emotion is experienced. The characters varied in whether or not they were an expatriate worker (i.e., nationality). Each vignette described a situation that made the target person experience an emotion (i.e., anger, happiness, or sadness). The scenarios were developed based on research conducted by Conway et al. (1999) which identified several elicitors of emotion. For example, for the first vignette, the anger scenario was designed to correspond to the elicitor of anger, “feel wronged and treated unfairly in a situation.” Similarly, the happiness scenario was designed in line with the elicitors for happiness, “receive respect” and “get something
that he/she wanted or worked hard for” and the sadness scenario was designed to correspond to the elicitors of “have experienced an undesirable event” and “not get something that he/she wanted or wished for.”

Before reading the vignettes, individuals in the expatriate conditions read a definition of an expatriate: “An expatriate worker is defined as an employee who is sent by his/her organization to a foreign country to accomplish a job or organization-related goal for a pre-designated temporary time period of usually more than six months and less than five years in one term”. The first vignette read as follows:

**Anger:** Mr. Lee is a technology consultant working for ZiCOM, a technology consultant firm based in New York City. With branches in more than 50 countries, ZiCOM is a growing multi-national company that has gained recognition for its excellent service.

Mr. Lee, a native New Yorker/an expatriate, began working for ZiCOM two weeks ago after ZiCOM recruiters offered him a desirable salary to leave the consulting firm for which he had been working. Mr. Lee’s first assignment was to develop a client proposal with a fellow technology consultant, Mr. Smith. The two had been working hard to complete the project and were finally prepared to present the proposal to the client.

On the day of the presentation to the client, Mr. Lee arrives at work to find that Mr. Smith has already begun the presentation and taken credit for the project as his own. Mr. Lee feels angry with Mr. Smith for what he has just done.

Depending on the condition of the participant, the highlighted statement was different.

After reading the first anger vignette, participants were asked to answer a series of questions regarding the scenario and what Mr. Lee should do in the situation. After completing the questions, the participants were asked to consider two alternative endings—one which depicted happiness and another which depicted sadness. After each
of these vignettes, they completed the series of questions again, adapted for the emotion at hand. The first happiness ending read as follows:

**Happiness:** Mr. Lee’s first assignment was to develop a client proposal with a fellow technology consultant, Mr. Smith. The two had been working hard to complete the project and were finally prepared to present the proposal to the client. The client loves the proposal and agrees to work with ZiCOM on the project. Mr. Lee and Mr. Smith are congratulated by the boss for their hard work and excellent performance. Moreover, the boss is so impressed with Mr. Lee’s work that he is offered a promotion to senior consultant. Mr. Lee feels happy as the presentation turned out better than expected and he was offered a promotion for his hard work.

Similarly, the first sadness ending read as follows:

**Sadness:** Mr. Lee’s first assignment was to develop a client proposal with a fellow technology consultant, Mr. Smith. The two had been working hard to complete the project and were finally prepared to present the proposal to the client. Although the client appreciated their hard work, he did not like the proposal and decided to go with another firm on the project. Mr. Lee was not expecting such an outcome and felt sad with the way things turned out.

Upon finishing the questions for the sadness ending, participants were asked to read two more vignette sets. Vignette 2 and 3 were designed for reliability purposes and followed the same format, but the scenarios involved two different characters and slightly different emotion-eliciting situations (see Appendix A for all vignettes). Moderate reliability estimates for the experience of each of the three emotions were found, $\alpha = .70, .69, .69$ for anger, happiness, and sadness respectively.

**Questionnaire.** After reading each vignette (or alternative ending) participants responded to a series of questions. To determine whether the situations actually depicted the emotion intended, participants rated “To what extent should Mr. Lee feel angry with this situation?” on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all angry) to 7 (very angry). Additionally, to assess emotional display, participants rated “To what extent should he display his anger to Mr. Smith?” on a scale from 1 (display no emotion) to 7 (display
intense emotion). The appropriateness of emotional display was assessed by participants rating “How appropriate is it for Mr. Lee to display his anger with Mr. Smith, according to U.S. culture?” on a scale from 1 (not at all appropriate) to 7 (very appropriate). Similarly, to determine how certain the target was regarding how he should display his emotion, participants rated “To what extent do you feel Mr. Lee was certain about the appropriate way to display his emotions in this situation?” on a scale from 1 (not at all certain) to 7 (very certain).

Additionally, to investigate status of the individuals, participants were told “People who have higher status have more prestige and power. For example, they hold better social positions” (taken from Conway et al., 1999). Then the participants were asked to report “How much status do you feel Mr. Lee has in the organization?” on a scale from 1 (low status) to 7 (high status). Likewise, using the same response format, participants responded to the question “How much status do you feel Mr. Smith has in the organization?” Lastly, the participants responded to demographics questions on sex, race, class rank, and the number of times they had traveled abroad (if in the expatriate condition).

Procedure

Upon giving their consent to participate in the study, participants were given a questionnaire with one of the versions of the vignette followed by the adjoining questions. The versions were handed out in random order. Upon completion of the study, the participants were thanked and given experimenter contact information in case they had further questions.
Results

Manipulation Check

As discussed above, three vignettes were completed for each emotion. To determine whether the vignettes depicted the desired emotion, the study examined how much of the targeted emotion the participants reported the target character should feel in each situation. As the Table 1 shows, all means were above 6 for anger and happiness, and above 4.6 for sadness, on the 7-point scale. This indicates that the anger and happiness vignettes were successful at depicting the desired emotions. Although the sadness vignette was representative of the desired emotion, the effect was not as strong. Next, the vignettes examined to determine which one depicted the highest emotion so that the vignettes could be developed into videos for the main study. As Table 1 shows, Vignette 1 (i.e., Mr. Lee) was rated as representing the most anger and the most happiness. Consequently, these vignettes were used for the video development in the main study. For sadness, Vignette 3 (i.e., Mr. Vourinen) was rated as depicting the most sadness. However, because of the lower ratings, sadness scenarios were not used in the main study.

Hypothesis Testing

Although the primary reason for the pilot study was to identify vignettes that depicted emotion-eliciting situations for the main study, a preliminary examination of how nationality is related to status and emotional display was also conducted. As
Table 1

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Amount of Emotion Felt by Vignette.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Anger (SD)</th>
<th>Happiness (SD)</th>
<th>Sadness (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6.34 (0.83)</td>
<td>6.55 (0.73)</td>
<td>4.66 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6.13 (1.02)</td>
<td>6.06 (0.97)</td>
<td>4.69 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6.05 (0.98)</td>
<td>6.02 (0.96)</td>
<td>4.99 (1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6.17 (0.75)</td>
<td>6.21 (0.70)</td>
<td>4.78 (0.97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Responses were given on a 7-point scale.

indicated previously, adequate reliability was found for the anger, happiness, and sadness vignettes, $r = .70, .69, .69$, respectively. Therefore, I collapsed across the vignettes and all analyses utilize this combined data set for the hypothesis testing.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine whether there were significant differences across the nationality condition for any of the questions. No significant main effect was found for nationality of the target, $F(18, 85) = 1.52, \ p = .10$, indicating that the questionnaire (as a whole) did not differ according to the nationality of the target. Yet, the individual questionnaire items were examined to test the specific hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1 stated that less display of emotion will be reported as appropriate for expatriate workers than for host national workers in a workplace interaction. A marginally significant difference between the expatriate and American conditions was found for the appropriateness of the display of happiness and of sadness, $F(1, 102) =$
3.75, $p = .056$ and $F(1, 102) = 3.10, p = .08$, respectively. For all variables, individuals in the expatriate conditions gave higher ratings (see Table 2). Thus, it appears that it is more appropriate for expatriates to display happiness and sadness than it is for Americans to display these emotions, according to an American sample. In sum, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Table 2

*Means and Standard Deviations by Nationality and Emotion for Key Variables.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
<th>Certainty</th>
<th>Status-Target</th>
<th>Status-Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.33 (1.32)</td>
<td>4.20 (1.01)</td>
<td>4.02 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.49 (1.08)</td>
<td>4.45 (1.01)</td>
<td>4.94 (0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.01 (1.01)</td>
<td>3.76 (0.95)</td>
<td>4.06 (0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.67 (1.30)</td>
<td>4.35 (0.89)</td>
<td>4.57 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.87 (0.95)</td>
<td>4.74 (0.99)</td>
<td>5.37 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.41 (1.21)</td>
<td>3.95 (1.02)</td>
<td>4.24 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Responses given on a 7-point scale.

Hypothesis 2 stated that lower status would be conferred to expatriate workers than to host national workers in the workplace interaction. Significant differences between the American and expatriate conditions were found for status conferral in the
anger and happiness vignettes, $F(1, 102) = 8.21, p < .01$ and $F(1, 102) = 7.90, p < .01$, respectively. However, the findings were in the opposite direction as predicted. In particular, participants in the expatriate conditions gave the target experiencing the emotion (e.g., Mr. Lee) higher status than individuals in the American condition gave to the target. Similarly, individuals in the expatriate condition gave higher status to the “other” target (e.g., Mr. Smith) as well. Considering the characters were meant to be of equal status, these two findings suggest that the characters were rated as having higher status when they were expatriates than when they were Americans. This result was found for both the anger and happiness vignettes. In sum, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

**Discussion**

The primary purpose of the pilot study was to determine whether the vignettes developed for the pilot study depicted situations that should elicit emotion. Additionally, it aimed to identify the best vignettes, which were subsequently be used to develop the videotaped vignettes for use in the main study. Results indicated that the scenarios developed do depict strong emotions, particularly for anger and happiness, and the best two vignettes were chosen for subsequent use. These videotaped vignettes are described in more detail in the upcoming section.

The study also aimed to investigate whether there are different norms for the display of emotion by expatriates sojourning in the United States and American workers. Contrary to expectations, a status effect was found in which expatriates were given *higher* status than the Americans in most scenarios. More specifically, across almost all emotions participants viewing the target character as an expatriate conferred more status to him than did participants who viewed the target as an American. Similarly, higher status was conferred to the “other” character in the expatriate conditions, but not in the
American conditions. Given that the characters were designed to be colleagues of equal status, this result reinforces the notion that expatriates were given higher status.

With regard to the guest effect, the results of this study would suggest that there may not be an American norm for the dampening of emotion by sojourning individuals, including expatriate workers. Indeed, although the international sojourners in the Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) study were reporting emotional display consistent with lower status individuals, the results in the pilot study indicated that expatriates were actually given higher status than American workers by host national participants. There are several plausible explanations for why this finding may have occurred. First, it could be that lower status is not conferred upon expatriate workers in the U.S., but rather higher status is conferred. Consequently, if this is correct, more display of emotion, rather than less, would be appropriate for expatriates to display as higher status individuals. The results lent some support for this conclusion. If it is the case that expatriates have higher status, then the sample in the Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) study could have been misperceiving the way in which they should display their emotions in the host culture. Recall, they reported they should be displaying less emotion as employees in the U.S. than what is the norm for emotional display.

Although this is a plausible interpretation, the finding in this pilot study could also be spurious. In particular, the finding could be a result of social desirability in which the participants became sensitive to the “expatriate” status in the vignettes. Indeed, the definition of expatriate for individuals in the expatriate condition was written such that the participants may have been influenced to think this was a highly regarded position. As a result, they conferred more status in the expatriate condition rather than thinking about the norms surrounding culturally different expatriate workers. In addition, the
stimuli had low fidelity. For instance, it might not have communicated cues that often accompany sojourners (e.g., heavy accents).

Because potential artifacts (e.g., social desirability; low fidelity) may have confounded the results, the main study will focus on the latter explanation for the guest effect finding. Although it is possible that the sojourners in the study were misperceiving how they should behave in the host country, the host norms for sojourner behavior first need to be established. If it is found that sojourners are considered high status, then research can investigate why the participants in the previous study were displaying their emotions in a manner consistent with low status individuals. Thus, the main study further examined the host country perception of display rules for expatriate workers as well as investigated the status conferred to these individuals. Additionally, international students’ perceptions of the host country display rules were also assessed. This was done to replicate the guest effect and to determine if sojourners do perceive that expatriates should display less emotion than host nationals.

However, rather than using vignettes, participants viewed video clips of emotion-eliciting interactions between two coworkers. Similar to the vignettes, half of the participants watched an expatriate character experiencing an emotion and the other half saw this target character as an American. Moreover, participants also viewed the target character displaying one of two different intensities of emotion and rated the appropriateness of the display. Further, additional items for each of the dependent variables were included in the questionnaire to make more reliable measures. This design should have improved upon the pilot study and allowed better examination the emotional display rules for expatriates in the United States.
Main Study

Participants

Three-hundred fifteen students from a large Mid-western university participated in this study. Participants included 164 host nationals (i.e., Americans) enrolled in an introductory psychology course. Thirty-five percent of the American sample was male and 65% was female. These individuals were recruited via a web-based experimental management system maintained through the Psychology Department. In exchange for participation in the study, the American sample received partial course credit.

Additionally, 151 international students, from 39 different countries, enrolled at the same university made up the sojourner sample. The sample was generally consistent with the international student sample at the university, with the largest nationalities represented being India ($n = 44; 14\%$) and China ($n = 31; 10\%$). For all other countries there were less than eight people contributing to the study, with most countries represented by only one or two participants. Similar to the American sample, 40% of the international participants were male and 60% were female. The international participants were recruited via emails and flyers posted and sent out through campus organizations (See Appendix B). Participants volunteered for the study and were compensated with pizza or ten dollars depending on the session. When comparing the international and American samples several significant differences were found (See Table 3).
Table 3

*Means and Standard Deviations for Demographic and Individual Difference Variables.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International Participants</th>
<th>American Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age*</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income*</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Free Time (Americans)*</td>
<td>35.38</td>
<td>25.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Abroad*</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Level*</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months in U.S.</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>28.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Traveled to U.S.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to host country</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison**</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Differential*a</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependent**</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent**</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant difference exists between international and American student sample.

a Individual difference variables used in exploratory analyses.

**Design**

This study utilized a 2 (nationality) x 2 (display) between-subjects factorial design. More specifically, the between-subject experimental manipulations included the nationality of the main character (expatriate or American) and emotional display (muted
display, intense display). Thus, participants were randomly assigned to one of four
groups and viewed videotaped vignettes of workplace interactions that differed only
according to the manipulations. Further, each participant viewed two vignettes, one
depicting an interaction that led to feelings of anger and one depicting an interaction that
led to feelings of happiness, and these emotions are analyzed separately. These two
emotions were chosen to reflect both positive and negative emotions. Moreover, they
were in line with the research that currently exists on the status-emotion relationship,
which contends that there are status differentials in the expression of anger and happiness
(e.g., Anderson & Berdahl, 2002; Conway et al., 1999; Tiedens et al, 2000). The
nationality (i.e., expatriate or American) and level of display (muted; intense) was held
constant throughout the viewing of two vignettes. For example, one participant may be
randomly assigned to an expatriate, high display condition in which he or she views the
target character (Mr. Lee) as an expatriate displaying intense anger and happiness. In
contrast, another participant may be randomly assigned to view the target character as an
American displaying little anger and little happiness. Dependent variables pertaining to
the hypotheses include appropriateness of display and status conferral.

Materials

Emotional Display Videos. A total of 8 videotaped vignettes were used in the
laboratory study (see Appendix C for the vignette scripts). These videotaped vignettes
served to manipulate expatriate status, emotion experienced and intensity of emotional
display. For each experimental condition, participants watched two emotion-eliciting
vignettes involving the same two actors (Mr. Lee and Mr. Smith) in an organizational
context. Each video depicts an interpersonal workplace situation that made the target character, Mr. Lee, experience an emotion (i.e., anger or happiness). More specifically, the participants viewed the actors working together on a project that would be presented to a client the following day. The following day, the target character feels and displays anger or happiness based on the outcome of the presentation. The videos used in the study were designed and recorded by the author. The actors were volunteers recruited to fit the needs of the study design. The videos were recorded in an organizational setting and put together using online media design software (i.e., www.onetruemedia.com).

**Nationality.** To manipulate nationality, some participants heard via the script that Mr. Lee was an American and others heard that he was an expatriate worker from India. Additionally, in the expatriate condition, the actor playing Mr. Lee affects an accent consistent with an Indian expatriate. In the American condition the accent was that of an American. In all interactions, it is Mr. Lee who feels and displays the targeted emotion. To ensure that other status variables are not confounded with expatriate standing, the actors are coworkers (i.e., same status), appear the same age, and are both male. Further, the context (surroundings) of the interaction was kept constant in order to control for other intervening variables. For example, all vignettes were staged in a conference room and office hallway and included the same characters and general situational context.

**Emotion.** The emotional display scenarios were based the vignettes developed for the pilot study. In particular, the anger and happiness vignettes that were rated as depicting a situation that elicited the most emotion in the pilot study were used in the main study. That is, the anger vignette shows Mr. Lee arriving to the conference room to
find Mr. Smith has given the presentation to the client early and taken credit for the project as his own with no recognition of Mr. Lee’s contribution. Similarly, the happiness vignette shows Mr. Lee and Mr. Smith after they successfully presented their work to the client. They are congratulated by their boss and the client on their great work, the CEO specifically comments on Mr. Lee’s great contributions to the proposal. As discussed in the pilot study, the vignettes were developed based on research conducted by Conway et al. (1999) which identified several elicitors of emotion. For example, for the first vignette, the anger scenario was designed to correspond to the elicitor of anger, “feel wronged and treated unfairly in a situation.” Similarly, the happiness scenario was designed in line with the elicitors for happiness, “receive respect” and “get something that he/she wanted or worked hard for.”

Intensity of Display. To manipulate the display of emotion, there were two versions of the anger and happiness vignettes, which varied the intensity of emotion displayed. That is, Mr. Lee either displayed little emotion or intense emotion (muted and intense conditions, respectively). For the muted emotion condition, Mr. Lee shows no emotion during the interaction, but rather just makes a statement to Mr. Smith about the situation. The display of emotion for the intense vignettes was designed using prototypical attributes of emotional situations identified by Fernandez and colleagues (Fernandez, Carrera, Sanchez, Paez, & Candia, 2002). In the intense display of anger, Mr. Lee raises his arms, furrows his brow, and raises his voice. Similarly, for the happiness vignettes there is little expression of happiness displayed (i.e., small smile) in the muted
emotion condition, but Mr. Lee smiles intensely and give an enthusiastic “yes” and bounce in the intense display of emotion condition.

*Questionnaire.* Participants were told that the researchers were interested in understanding emotional display at work, and that after watching a brief video on workplace interactions, they would complete a short questionnaire. Further, they were told that they would watch another video, which is an alternative ending to the first situation, and finish the remainder of the questionnaire. The participants were not told that the nationality of the target was a focus of the study.

*Emotion.* As a manipulation check to determine whether the situations actually depicted the emotion intended, as well as to substantiate the cover story, participants were asked: “*How much anger (sadness, guilt, happiness, fear, pride) does Mr. Lee feel in this video?*” and “*Please rate the level of anger (sadness, guilt, happiness, fear, pride) Mr. Lee has just experienced?*” Responses were given on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (no anger) to 7 (intense anger) and 1 (not at all angry) to 7 (very angry), respectively. The manipulation check was considered successful if the perceived experience rating was highest for the intended emotion (i.e., anger, happiness for the two vignettes).

*Emotional Norm.* Additionally, to assess whether Mr. Lee should feel the emotion (i.e., a norm exists) in this situation, participants were asked “*To what extent should Mr. Lee feel angry with this situation?*” on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all angry) to 7 (very angry) and “*How much anger should Mr. Lee feel in this video?*” on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (no anger) to 7 (intense anger). The two items had poor reliability ($\alpha = -.30$), and were negatively correlated ($r = -.13$) for the anger vignette. Participants
responded much higher in the first question regarding how Mr. Lee should feel with this “situation” than they did when asked how he should feel in this “video.” Conversations with the participants revealed that they were likely considering Mr. Lee’s emotion throughout the video (of which he is very cheerful) and not focusing solely on the end situation that intended for the study. Because it was intended that the focus be on the end situation, subsequent analyses only used the first “situation” item for both vignettes. Even though the happiness vignette had better reliability ($\alpha = .77$), a similar bias may have influenced the response.

**Appropriateness of Display.** The appropriateness of emotional display was assessed with three questions including “How appropriate is it for Mr. Lee to display his anger/happiness in this way to Mr. Smith?”, “How acceptable do you think Mr. Smith would find the way Mr. Lee expressed his anger/happiness?”, and “Indicate the extent to which Mr. Lee’s display of anger/happiness was suitable for the situation”. All responses were given on a 7-point scale from 1 (not at all appropriate) to 7 (extremely appropriate). For the anger vignettes, the three items had adequate reliability ($\alpha = .74$ and $\alpha = .66$), as did the happiness vignettes ($\alpha = .84$ and $\alpha = .85$) for American and international student samples, respectively.

**Display Level.** To determine how intensely the emotion should be displayed, participants rated “To what extent should he display his anger/happiness to Mr. Smith?” on a scale from 1 (display no emotion) to 7 (display intense emotion), “How much display of anger/happiness is acceptable by Mr. Lee in this situation?” on a scale from 1 (not very much emotion at all) to 7 (a lot of emotional display), and “How appropriate is it to display the anger/happiness elicited in a very strong way?” on a scale from 1 (not at
all appropriate) to 7 (extremely appropriate). Good estimates of reliability were found for the anger vignettes ($\alpha = .87$ and $\alpha = .80$) and for the happiness vignettes ($\alpha = .87$ and $\alpha = .84$) for the American and international samples.

**Certainty.** To determine how certain participants think the target would be regarding how he should display his emotion, participants rated three questions: “To what extent do you feel Mr. Lee was certain about the appropriate way to display his emotions in this situation?”; “How likely is it that Mr. Lee knew how to display his emotion?”; and “How sure do you think Mr. Lee was that his display of emotion was appropriate?” Responses were given on a 7-point response format with anchors from 1 (not at all certain) to 7 (extremely certain). For the anger vignette, reliability estimates for the three certainty variables were high, $\alpha = .86$ and $\alpha = .77$ for American and international student samples, and similar estimates were found for the happiness vignettes, $\alpha = .88$ and $\alpha = .84$.

**Status.** To investigate status of the individuals in the vignettes participants reported “How much status does Mr. Lee/Smith have?”; “What do you think Mr. Lee’s/Smith’s rank is in the organization?”; “How much influence do you think Mr. Lee/Smith has on others?”; “How likely is it that Mr. Lee/Smith will get promoted within the organization?” Again, all responses were given on a 7-point scale from (1) low status to (7) high status. This 4-item status index for Mr. Lee had adequate reliability, but was shown to have increased reliability if the “promotion” item was removed. More specifically, although the 4-item scale had good reliability (i.e., $\alpha = .78$ and .81 for anger and $\alpha = .87$ and .85 for happiness for the two samples), the 3-item status index had better reliability. In particular, the reliability estimates increased to $\alpha = .82$ for anger and .89 for
happiness, for both the American and international student samples. Therefore, the 3-item was used in the hypothesis testing and the likelihood of promotion was a unique item.

The same pattern was found for the status index for Mr. Smith, resulting in increased coefficient alphas from .86 and .83 to .90 and .87 for the anger vignettes, and slightly increased alphas for the happiness vignette (i.e., $\alpha = .87$ and .89 to $\alpha = .90$ and .91) for the American and international students, respectively.

**Competence.** To assess competence, participants rated Mr. Lee on a trait semantic differentiation scale, including 7-point ratings between incompetent-competent, knowledgeable-ignorant (reverse scored), and unable-able. The reliability estimates for each of the samples were greatly increased if the reverse-coded item was removed. Specifically, the reliabilities for the anger vignette increased from $\alpha = .69$ and .70 to $\alpha = .77$ for both samples, and for the happiness vignette, the reliabilities increased from $\alpha = .73$ to .77 and .63 to $\alpha = .83$ for the American and international student samples. Therefore, competence scores were based on the two remaining items.

**Relationship.** To assess the perceived relationship between Mr. Smith and Mr. Lee, participants were also asked whether Mr. Smith is Mr. Lee’s (a) coworker, (b) subordinate, or (c) supervisor.

**Nationality.** Additionally, participants were asked where Mr. Lee, Mr. Smith and the CEO’s assistant were from to determine whether the participants recognized that Mr. Lee was either an American or an expatriate.

**Demographics.** The participants also responded to a series of demographic questions including, but not limited to, sex, race, class rank, marital status, major, percentage of time they spend with individuals from another country, and the number of times they had traveled abroad. The international sojourner sample had additional
demographics questions including home country, number of months in the United States, exposure to U.S. culture, and plans to remain in the country. Additionally, for exploratory purposes, there was an open-ended question asking what the participants thought the study was about.

Social Comparison. To assess how the participants perceive themselves in comparison to others, participants completed the 11-item Social Comparison Rating Scale (SCRS; Allan & Gilbert, 1995). For example, they rated “in relationship to others, I feel” inferior-superior, weaker-stronger, untalented-more talented using an 11-point scale. Previous research found the 11-item scale had good reliability, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .91 (Allan & Gilbert, 1995). The present research also found good reliability estimates ($\alpha = .91$ and $\alpha = .86$ for the American and international students, respectively).

Social Dominance Orientation. The Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) was used to assess measure attitudes toward group differences and social hierarchy. This 16-item scale includes items such as “Inferior groups should stay in their place” and responses are given on a 7-point scale from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. Pratto and colleagues (Pratto et al., 1994) reported reliability for the scale to be good, with an alpha of .83. Similarly, reliability estimates in this study were $\alpha = .90$ and $\alpha = .88$ for the two samples.

Self-Construal. Participants were given the 24-item Self-Construal Scale (SCS; Singelis, 1994), which is designed to assess both the strength of one’s independent and interdependent self-construal. The two images of the self are considered to coexist in individuals and reflect “the emphasis on connectedness and relations found in non-Western cultures (interdependent) and the separateness and uniqueness of the individual (independent) stressed in the West” (Singelis, 1994, p. 580). The scale consists of twelve
statements reflecting an interdependent self-construal (e.g., It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group) and twelve items reflecting and independent self-construal (e.g., I am comfortable being singled out for praise or rewards). Responses were given on a 7-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The scale is reported to have adequate reliability for both the independent \( \alpha = .69 \) and interdependent \( \alpha = .73 \) subscales (Singelis, 1994). The estimates of reliability were similar for the American sample \( \alpha = .68 \) and \( \alpha = .71 \) for interdependent and independent self-construal, respectively), but slightly lower for the international students \( \alpha = .57 \) and \( \alpha = .67 \).

Procedure

American participants signed up for the study on the Department of Psychology experiment website, and the international students were sent a recruitment email. Interested participants came to the research laboratory and were told that the researchers were interested in emotional display at work. Upon giving their consent to participate in the study, participants were randomly assigned by the computer program to one of the four groups described above (e.g., expatriate, muted display; American, intense display) and watched the anger vignette on a computer. After viewing the first video, participants responded to a series of questions regarding the scenario. After completing the questions, the participants were told they would now watch an alternative ending to the situation. After watching the happiness video, they completed the series of questions again as well as the demographics and individual difference measures. Upon completion of the study, participants were thanked, debriefed and given experimenter contact information in case of further questions.
Results

The results section is organized by first discussing the manipulation check, followed by the hypotheses testing, and exploratory analyses. Each of these analyses were run separately for the American and international student sample to distinguish between American norms and perceptions of sojourners. Further, the anger and happiness vignettes are analyzed separately, which is consistent to previous research on emotional display.

Manipulation Checks

Emotion. To determine whether the situations actually depicted the emotion intended, as well as to substantiate the cover story, participants were asked how much Mr. Lee had experienced six different emotions. The manipulation check was considered successful because anger and happiness were rated the highest emotion experienced for the associated vignettes. However, as Table 4 shows, happiness, pride and anger were all rated highly for the anger vignette. Based on feedback and questions from the international student participants, it appears that, for the experience questions, many participants were considering Mr. Lee’s emotion throughout the video (of which he is very cheerful) and not focusing solely on the end situation that was intended for the study. Nonetheless, the correct emotion is rated most highly so it was concluded that the manipulation was effective.

Nationality. Participants were also asked where Mr. Lee was from (as well as Mr. Smith and the CEOs assistant to disguise the question). All participants accurately identified that Mr. Lee was from the U.S. in the American condition, and that he was
from India in the expatriate condition, indicating that the nationality manipulation worked.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Emotional Experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International Participants</th>
<th>American Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Vignette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness Vignette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Responses given on a 7-point scale.

Suspicion Check

To determine whether the participants knew what the study was about, participants responded to an open-ended question asking what they thought the study was about. Additionally, international students were debriefed in person to get their reactions and further insight to the study. After coding the open-ended results, six different categories regarding what participants thought the study was about were identified: (1) emotions/emotional display, (2) inequality (class, race, ethnicity, discrimination or
(1) racism), (3) groups/interactions, (4) perceptions or judgments of others, (5) international student perceptions/working in the U.S., and (6) other. As Table 5 shows, about half of the participants believed the study had to do with emotions or group interactions, which was how the research was depicted in the description and consent. However, 32% of the Americans thought the research had to do with inequality issues, whereas 27% of the international students thought it had something to do with foreigners or international students. A significant chi-square was found when comparing American and international participants perceptions of the research goals, \( \chi^2(6) = 60.80, p < .000 \); however, no differences were found between participants who viewed the nationality conditions, \( \chi^2(6) = 3.37, p > .05 \). Thus, the nationality condition did not differentially influence these perceptions, but the ethnicity of the target (i.e., not Caucasian) and the specific inclusion of international students may have contributed to these results. The implications of this difference are presented in the discussion section.

Table 5

* Significant chi square difference exists between international and American student sample.
Hypothesis Testing

Appropriateness of Emotional Display. The first research question asked whether the guest effect was based on an accurate perception of differential display rules for sojourners as opposed to host nationals. To investigate this question, the effect of the nationality manipulation and emotional display intensity were examined using the American sample. Specifically, if the guess effect is a function of actual differential display rules, then American participants should rate the appropriateness of a muted display as more appropriate for the expatriate than the American worker (H1a) and the appropriateness of the intense display as more appropriate for the American worker than for the expatriate (H1b). To analyze this hypothesis, a 2 x 2 ANOVA was computed for the American and international student sample, where nationality and intensity of display were the fixed factors and the appropriateness of display index was the outcome variable. A significant interaction between the nationality condition and the display condition on the appropriateness of display would lend support for Hypotheses 1a and 1b.

No significant interaction was found for the anger vignette, $F(1, 160) = 1.02, p > .05$, (see Table 6). Likewise, no significant interaction was found for the happiness condition as well, $F(1, 160) = 1.69, p > .05$ (see Table 7). The simple main effects were also examined. Specifically, Americans might have found the level of expression of emotion in the intense conditions to be less appropriate for the expatriate as compared to the American worker. This was not the case with either anger or happiness, $t(86) = .90, p > .05$ and $t(86) = 1.05, p > .05$, respectively. Together the lack of support for Hypothesis 1 implies that the guest effect may be only in the misperception of sojourners.
To assess the guest effect in sojourners, the above analysis was replicated using the international sample. Similar to the American sample, a significant interaction was not found between nationality and intensity on the appropriateness of display in the anger condition, $F(1, 147) = .57, p > .05$, or the happiness condition, $F(1, 147) = .10, p > .05$, (see Tables 8 and 9). Again, the simple main effects for the intense emotion conditions were examined, but the results were not significant for anger or happiness, $t(75) = -1.21, p > .05$ and $t(75) = .71, p > .05$, respectively. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was not supported for the international sample either, indicating that the video scenarios did not elicit the same response as those found by Gullekson and Vancouver (in press). However, unlike the Gullekson and Vancouver study, additional variables were assessed in the current study, which are examined next.

Status. Recall that it was suggested that status may be a key mechanism for determining display rules and could possibly be an explanation for the perceived lower display of emotion by sojourners in the U.S. found previously (Gullekson & Vancouver, in press). Specifically, it was suspected that, as temporary foreign workers, expatriates working in the U.S. may be considered lower status, if not by Americans perhaps in their own eyes (i.e., a misperception). Subsequently, they may display less emotion (or think they should). Although the above analysis did not support the display aspect of this thesis, status differences must also be examined. Thus, determining whether an actual status differential exists in the U.S. was the goal of Hypothesis 2. More specifically, the second hypothesis stated that lower status would be conferred to expatriate workers than
Table 6

*Anger Vignette Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations Among Variables for American Participants.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience of Anger</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriateness of Display</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Display of Anger</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Certainty of Display</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Status of Mr. Lee</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Promotion</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Respect</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample (n = 164)</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate, Low Display (n = 41)</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate, High Display (n = 51)</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American, Low Display (n = 35)</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American, High Display (n = 37)</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05; *p* < .01. Reliabilities are along the diagonal.
Table 7

Happiness Vignette Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations Among Variables for American Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience of Happiness</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriateness of Display</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Display of Anger</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Certainty of Display</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Status of Mr. Lee</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Promotion</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Respect</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 164)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate, Low Display</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 41)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate, High Display</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 51)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American, Low Display</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 35)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American, High Display</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 37)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05; *p* < .01. Reliabilities are along the diagonal.
Table 8

*Anger Vignette Correlations, Reliabilities, Means and Standard Deviations Among Variables for International Participants.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience of Anger</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriateness of Display</td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Display of Anger</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Certainty of Display</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Status of Mr. Lee</td>
<td>(8.2)</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Promotion</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Respect</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Competence</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Sample                  | M 5.90 | 5.08  | 4.53  | 4.39  | 3.35  | 3.16  | 4.77  | 4.97  |
| (n = 151)                     | SD 1.46 | 1.27  | 1.35  | 1.48  | 1.28  | 1.52  | 1.48  | 1.31  |

| Expatriate, Low Display       | M 5.53 | 5.09  | 4.27  | 4.36  | 2.98  | 2.88  | 4.60  | 4.81  |
| (n = 43)                      | SD 1.70 | 1.16  | 1.35  | 1.48  | 1.08  | 1.59  | 1.69  | 1.42  |

| Expatriate, High Display      | M 6.18 | 4.86  | 4.44  | 4.21  | 3.34  | 3.21  | 4.66  | 4.88  |
| (n = 38)                      | SD 1.33 | 1.58  | 1.38  | 1.73  | 1.41  | 1.68  | 1.65  | 1.41  |

| American, Low Display         | M 5.74 | 5.14  | 4.53  | 4.40  | 3.76  | 3.17  | 4.97  | 5.16  |
| (n = 31)                      | SD 1.57 | 1.35  | 1.57  | 1.36  | 1.34  | 1.42  | 1.22  | 1.28  |

| American, High Display        | M 6.15 | 5.22  | 4.90  | 4.60  | 3.44  | 3.41  | 4.92  | 5.09  |
| (n = 39)                      | SD 1.09 | .97   | 1.06  | 1.31  | 1.23  | 1.37  | 1.27  | 1.22  |

*Note. *p*< .05; *p*< .01. Reliabilities are along the diagonal.*
Table 9

**Happiness Vignette Correlations, Reliabilities, Means and Standard Deviations Among Variables for International Participants.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience of Happiness</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriateness of Display</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Display of Anger</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Certainty of Display</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Status of Mr. Lee</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Promotion</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Respect</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 151)</td>
<td>M 6.29</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.05</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate, Low Display</td>
<td>M 6.14</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 43)</td>
<td>SD 1.30</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate, High Display</td>
<td>M 6.26</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 38)</td>
<td>SD 1.08</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American, Low Display</td>
<td>M 6.35</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 31)</td>
<td>SD 0.95</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American, High Display</td>
<td>M 6.44</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 39)</td>
<td>SD 0.75</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05; *p* < .01. Reliabilities are along the diagonal.
to host national workers. If this hypothesis was supported by Americans there would be initial evidence for actual status differences in the U.S.

To analyze the second hypothesis, independent samples t-tests were run to determine if there were differences in status conferral between the expatriate and American conditions. The American participants reported no differences in status between the expatriate and American for the anger vignette, \( t(162) = .50, p > .05 \), or for the happiness vignette, \( t(162) = .54, p > .05 \). Hence, the results do not provide evidence for status differences in U.S. culture. Yet, these analyses were replicated with the international sample to determine whether they perceived that status differentials exist.

Indeed, differences in status conferral for the expatriate and American worker did exist for the anger vignette, \( t(149) = -2.08, p < .05 \), but not for the happiness condition, \( t(149) = -1.62, p > .05 \). These results partially support the notion that a misperception is occurring by the sojourners such that they believed expatriates are lower status than American workers in the U.S. In addition to status perceptions, it also seemed important to investigate the emotional display - status relationships in more depth, so those analyses are described next.

*Assessing Assumptions*

As discussed previously, research on emotions and status indicates that emotional display can be a cue for status conferrals (i.e., the emotion one displays communicates one’s level of status) and that status also may dictate how one should display emotion (e.g., Tiedens, 1998; 2000). These notions were examined, as well as how they may change with intercultural interactions, using data from this study.
Emotional Display as a Cue for Status. To assess whether the way in which emotional display and nationality affects status conferrals, a 2 x 2 analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Specifically, nationality and intensity of display were the fixed factors and the status index was the outcome variable. For the display of anger, the intensity of the display was not related to status conferral, $F(1, 159) = 1.86, p > .05$, nor was there an interaction between intensity and nationality of the target, $F(1, 159) = .45, p > .05$, for the American participants. No effects were found for the happiness vignette either. Accordingly, there was no evidence to suggest that the amount of emotion the target displayed in these vignettes (i.e., muted and intense) influenced the level of status conferred to the target character. These analyses were also conducted with the international student sample to assess their status conferrals.

For the international sample there was no main effect found for the intensity of display as well, $F(1, 147) = .01, p > .05$, for the anger vignette or for the happiness vignette, $F(1, 147) = 1.73, p > .05$. However, there was a marginally significant nationality by intensity interaction\(^2\) for the anger vignette, $F(1, 146) = 3.23, p = .075$, suggesting that the international students perceive Mr. Lee’s behavior differently as a function of his nationality and emotional display (see Figure 2). Specifically, when Mr. Lee was viewed as an Indian expatriate, higher status was conferred to him in the intense display condition as compared to the muted condition. Conversely, when Mr. Lee was viewed as an American, higher status was given to him when he muted his display of anger rather than displayed more intense anger. Thus, it appears that the level of

\(^2\) Consistent with the results of Hypothesis 2, a significant effect for nationality on status was found for the anger vignette, $F(1, 147) = 5.06, p < .05$, and a marginally significant effect for the happiness vignette, $F(1, 147) = 3.06, p = .08$. 
emotional display is cueing different perceptions of status for the American and expatriate worker, but only for the international students.

Consistent with research on emotional display and status conferral, the previous interaction implies that the way anger is displayed may influence the status that is conferred to individuals. Interestingly, this relationship appears to differ for expatriates and Americans, and was only supported by the international sojourners, but nonetheless the notion that emotional display affects perceptions of status is consistent with the literature.

*Figure 2. International Student’s Status Conferral for Mr. Lee in the Anger Vignette*
Status as a Cue for Emotional Display. Researchers in this area also suggest that one’s status level influences the intensity of emotional display (e.g., Tiedens, 2000; Anderson and Berdahl, 2002). To test this assumption, the relationship between ratings of status conferral and ratings of emotional display level was examined, as well as appropriateness of display for individuals in the high display condition only. Specifically, status was regressed onto display level (i.e., how much emotion should be displayed) and appropriateness of the display.

For anger, status ratings by the American sample significantly predicted the ratings of display level, $b = .24, t(86) = 2.29, p < .05$, and the appropriateness of display, $b = .28, t(86) = 2.67, p < .01$. These results imply that perceptions of status do influence how much emotion can be displayed – namely, that higher status is associated with higher levels of display of anger. However, these results were found only for the American sample. For the international sample status did not significantly predict the intensity of display of anger, $b = -.07, t(75) = -.61, p < .05$, or the appropriateness of display, $b = -.05, t(75) = -.44, p > .05$. Yet, a test for a moderator effect for sample, and nationality of the target, was not significant, indicating that the status-display relationship did not depend on sample or on target nationality.

When examining the relationship between status and display of happiness, slightly different results were found. In particular, it was the international students who reported the strongest relationships between status and display of happiness. More specifically, for the international students, status ratings significantly predicted the display level, $b = .33, t(75) = 3.03, p < .01$, and ratings of status conferral significantly
predicted the appropriateness of display, \( b = .27, t(75) = 2.39, p < .05 \). In contrast, status did not significantly predict display level ratings or appropriateness ratings for the American participants, \( b = .20, t(86) = 1.88, p > .05 \), and \( b = .17, t(86) = 1.61, p > .05 \), respectively. Again, the moderating effects of sample and nationality of the target were examined, but were not significant. This implies that, similar to anger, the status-display relationship for happiness did not depend on sample or on the nationality of the target.

In sum, the results described in this section describe a complex relationship between status and emotional display – a relationship that may be perceived differently by Americans and international sojourners in the U.S. In this last section, exploratory analyses, which are not directly related to the hypotheses, are presented.

**Exploratory Analyses**

*Certainty.* In the sojourner literature, uncertainty has been identified as an influential factor in cross-cultural experiences because often sojourners are not sure of how they should behave in the host country and what cultural norms exist. For this reason, the study also assessed how certain participants felt the target character, Mr. Lee, was in how he should display his emotion when he was an expatriate compared to when he was an American. Again a 2 x 2 ANOVA was conducted using nationality and intensity as the fixed factors and certainty as the outcome variable. A significant main effect for nationality was not found, but a significant interaction did exist for the certainty index, \( F(1, 160) = 9.86, p < .01 \), from the American sample data. As Figure 3 shows, American participants who viewed Mr. Lee in the high display, expatriate condition reported that he was more certain of his emotional display than did participants who
viewed him in the low display condition (see Tables 6 and 7 for means). In contrast, participants who viewed Mr. Lee in the high display, American condition rated him as less certain about how to display emotions than those who viewed him as an American in the low display condition. Indeed, recall that this pattern of certainty conferral is consistent with the nationality and intensity of display pattern for status conferral reported by the international students.

![Figure 3. American Students’ Certainty Ratings for the Anger Vignette](image)

The main effects in the above interaction were also tested for significance. Specifically, there was a significant difference in certainty ratings for the American and expatriate worker in the intense display condition, $t(86) = 3.11, p < .01$, but not for the muted condition, $t(74) = -1.45, p > .05$. Further, there was a significant difference in certainty for the expatriate worker between the intense and muted display conditions,
\( t(90) = -2.67, p < .01 \), but only a marginal difference between the display conditions for individuals in the American condition, \( t(70) = 1.83, p = .07 \).

A significant interaction was also found by Americans with the happiness vignette, \( F(1, 160) = 4.92, p < .05 \), such that certainty scores do not change between the high and low intensity conditions when Mr. Lee is an Indian expatriate (see Figure 4). However, when Mr. Lee is an American, higher certainty is given in the low display condition than for the high display condition (see Tables 7 and 8). No significant results were found for the international sample.

![Figure 4. American Student’s Certainty Ratings for the Happiness Vignette](image-url)
Mr. Smith’s Status. Similar to the analyses run to examine the status conferral of Mr. Lee, ratings of status conferral for Mr. Smith were also examined to determine whether the nationality and emotional display of his colleague (Mr. Lee) influenced the perceptions of Mr. Smith’s status. In particular, a 2 x 2 MANVOA was run entering nationality and intensity as the fixed factors and Mr. Smith’s status index, respect, likelihood of promotion and competence as the outcome variables. For the American sample, in the anger vignette a marginally significant main effect for nationality was found, $F(4, 157) = 2.11, p = .08$. In the happiness vignette a significant main effect was found, $F(4, 157) = 3.75, p < .01$. The follow-up tests for anger revealed a marginally significant effect for status between the nationality condition, $F(1, 160) = 3.44, p = .065$, and a significant effect for competence, $F(1, 160) = 4.13, p < .05$. American participants conferred higher status to Mr. Smith, and rated him as more competent when he was seen interacting with an expatriate than when he was seen interacting with an American than with an expatriate ($M = 5.69$ and $5.34$ for status; $M = 5.18$ and $4.72$ for competence).

A potential explanation for this finding is that the American participants perceive a greater status differential between the two characters when Mr. Lee is an expatriate than when he is an American. Although a status differential was not found when examining status conferral of Mr. Lee, this indirect measure of status may be more resilient to the bias which could have resulted from perceptions that the study was about discrimination or inequality. That is, when conferring status to Mr. Lee participants may have been more salient about the ethnicity of the target, but when rating Mr. Smith ethnicity was not an
issue. Thus, a larger status difference resulted in the expatriate condition than the American condition.

Similarly, for the happiness vignettes, the American participants rated Mr. Smith more competent when he was interacting with an expatriate than when he was interacting with an American, $F(1, 160) = 3.31, p = .07$. Yet, a marginally significant effect for respect, $F(1, 160) = 3.67, p = .057$, reveals that higher respect was given to Mr. Smith when Mr. Lee was an American than when he was an expatriate. Although this result contrasts the other status-related effects, it could be that this variable has less to do with status or rank in the organization and more to do with one’s attitude toward Mr. Smith.

For the international student sample, a marginally significant nationality by intensity interaction was found, $F(4, 144) = 2.37, p = .055$. Follow-up tests reveal marginally significant differences on the status index, $F(1, 147) = 3.59, p = .06$. As shown in Figure 5, Mr. Smith’s status was highest when seen interacting with an expatriate displaying little emotion as opposed to high emotion ($M = 5.40$ and $5.04$), yet Mr. Smith was conferred higher status when he was viewed interacting with an American displaying high emotion as compared to low emotion ($M = 5.27$ and $4.88$). This finding is consistent with the idea that expatriates are perceived as higher status when they are more emotionally expressive, but Americans are perceived as higher status when they are less expressive. That is, Mr. Smith’s status increased when seen interacting with an expressive American and non-expressive expatriate because this relationship could represent more hierarchy between the two characters.
Other Characteristics of Mr. Lee. The additional variables pertaining to perceptions of characteristics of Mr. Lee (i.e., likelihood of promotion, respect, competence) were also assessed using the 2 x 2 MANOVA described previously. For the American participants, no significant differences were found on any of the variables for the anger or happiness vignettes. For the international sample, some of the variables followed the same pattern found with the status index for the happiness vignette only. Specifically, a significant effect for the likelihood of promotion was found, $F(1, 147) = 5.27, p < .05$, as well as a marginally significant effect for competence, $F(1, 147) = 3.11, p = .08$, in which Mr. Lee was rated as more likely to be promoted, and more competent, when he was an American than when he was an Indian expatriate. The lack of significant findings for Americans, and the results in which the expatriate was rated lower for the

Figure 5. International Students’ Status Conferral for Mr. Smith in the Anger Vignette
international sample, is consistent with the status effects found for Hypothesis 2, but for the happiness, not the anger vignettes.

**Individual Difference Covariates.** To reduce the potential effect of noise from individual differences among the participants, particularly regarding views on hierarchy and group relations, the main hypotheses were also run with controlling for specific individual difference variables. In particular, social comparison, social dominance orientation, and independent/interdependent self-construals were each included as covariates into a 2 x 2 MANOVA. No changes in the results of Hypothesis 1 occurred when social comparison, social dominance or self-construal was included as a covariate. For Hypothesis 2, none of the results changed for the American sample when the covariates were included in the analysis. However, for the international sample significant differences between the nationality conditions were found not only for status (as in the original analyses), but also in ratings of Mr. Lee’s competence for each of the covariates for the anger vignette. More specifically, a significant effect of nationality on competence was found when social comparison, \( F(1, 144) = 5.77, p < .05 \), social dominance orientation, \( F(1, 144) = 6.21, p < .05 \), and independent and interdependent self-construal, \( F(1, 142) = 5.31, p < .05 \), were entered into the analyses as covariates. Similar to the status effects, Mr. Lee was rated as more competent when he was viewed as an American than when he was viewed as an expatriate. For the happiness vignette, the results did not change (i.e., competence and likelihood of promotion remained significant). Thus, controlling for these individual difference variables does not change

---

\(^3\) For these analyses, experience of emotion, appropriateness, display, and certainty were entered when examining Hypothesis 1 and all status-related variables were included in the MANOVA for Hypothesis 2.
the results of the hypotheses found previously. However, it actually strengthens the results of Hypothesis 2 and also reveals an additional significant variable (i.e., competence) by the international students.

**Sex differences.** Previous research has indicated that sex may influence how one perceives a situation, even if the person is just an observer (e.g., Bem, 1981). For this reason, the primary hypotheses were again analyzed with sex included as an additional fixed factor. Although a significant main effect for sex was found for the American sample, $F(1, 156) = 3.92, p < .05$, no significant interactions with sex were revealed. Thus, the results only tell us that males rated the displays as more appropriate than did females ($M = 5.06$ and $M = 4.62$), but this does not differ as a function of the intensity of the display, and thus does not allow us to make a sound sex difference interpretation. For the international sample, a marginally significant intensity by sex interaction was found for the anger vignette, $F(1, 143) = 3.73, p = .056$.

As Figure 6 shows, females in the international sample gave higher appropriateness ratings when they viewed Mr. Lee in the muted display condition than in the intense display condition ($M = 5.29$ and $M = 4.89$). In contrast, the male participants gave higher appropriateness ratings when the view Mr. Lee displaying more intense anger ($M = 5.30$) rather than muting his anger ($M = 4.87$).

For the happiness vignette, a significant nationality by sex interaction was found for the international participants, $F(1, 143) = 6.17, p < .05$. Specifically, when viewing Mr. Lee as an expatriate the males gave higher appropriateness ratings ($M = 5.62$) than
they did when they viewed him as an American worker ($M = 4.81$). For the female participants, the relationship was reversed, but was not as pronounced. That is, appropriateness ratings were higher for the American worker ($M = 5.33$) than the expatriate worker ($M = 5.07$; see Figure 7).

In sum, for Hypothesis 1, the sex of the participants does appear to influence the results, but only for the international student sample. For Hypothesis 2, there were no significant interactions between sex and the key variables, but a significant main effect for sex was found for the American sample in both the anger, $F(1, 156) = 4.48, p < .05$, and happiness vignettes, $F(1, 156) = 14.29, p < .000$. For both the anger and happiness emotions, females conferred higher status to Mr. Lee ($M = 3.74; M = 5.13$) than did males ($M = 3.29; M = 4.42$).
The last variable explored was the perception of the relationship between Mr. Lee and Mr. Smith. Specifically, participants were asked whether Mr. Smith is Mr. Lee’s (a) coworker, (b) subordinate, or (c) supervisor. Results indicated that some participants perceived Mr. Smith to be a coworker to Mr. Lee, whereas others perceived him as Mr. Lee’s supervisor (a few saw him as a subordinate; see Table 10). However, no significant differences in perceptions of the relationship between Mr. Smith and Mr. Lee existed among the conditions (i.e., nationality or intensity) for either the American or international student samples. Thus, a systematic difference in perception according to the manipulated conditions did not account for the differences. Yet, these differences in perception may lead to different findings. For this reason, relationship was used as an additional fixed factor in the 2 x 2 ANOVA described previously. Individuals who
viewed Mr. Smith as a subordinate were excluded from the analysis due to the small group size; thus there were two levels to this variable: supervisor and coworker.

Table 10

*Frequencies for Relationship Perceptions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Relationship</th>
<th>International Participants</th>
<th>American Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Hypothesis 1, perception of the relationship did not influence appropriateness ratings for the international students in either the anger or happiness vignettes. Yet, for the American sample, a nationality by relationship interaction was found for the anger vignette, $F(1, 130) = 5.94, p < .05$. More specifically, individuals in the expatriate condition who perceived Mr. Smith as a coworker rated Mr. Lee’s display more appropriate than participants who viewed him as a supervisor ($M = 5.04; M = 4.06$), yet individuals perceiving Mr. Smith as a supervisor gave higher appropriateness ratings than those viewing him as a coworker in the American condition, ($M = 5.02; M = 4.83$). Because this result did not interact with the intensity condition, little interpretation can be made of this result. No differences in the happiness vignette resulted for the American participants.

For Hypothesis 2, relationship did not interact to influence status conferrals for American participants for anger, but for happiness a significant interaction between nationality and intensity did result when relationship was included in the model, $F(1,$
Attributions of status were higher for Mr. Lee when he was an expatriate expressing more intense emotion than less intense emotion ($M = 5.49; M = 4.28$). Yet, when Mr. Lee was an American, he was given slightly higher status ratings when he muted his happiness ($M = 4.75; M = 4.43$). Recall that this is the same pattern of display found in the hypothesis testing by the international student sample.

For the international student sample, a main effect for relationship was found for the anger vignette, $F(1, 125) = 22.15, p < .001$, such that higher status was conferred to Mr. Lee when the participant saw Mr. Smith as a coworker rather than a supervisor ($M = 4.84; M = 3.56$). For the happiness vignette, there were main effects for nationality, $F(1, 125) = 5.98, p < .05$, and relationship, $F(1, 125) = 7.41, p < .01$, and a nationality by intensity interaction, $F(1, 125) = 5.39, p < .05$. Although a status effect was not found for happiness in the original analysis, the result found here follows the same pattern as the status conferred in the anger vignette originally. The results and implications of the results are discussed next.
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to better understand the nature of emotional display rules for expatriates in the U.S. by investigating whether or not differential norms for display of emotion exist for expatriates as opposed to American workers, and whether status plays a role in this relationship. As business environments become increasingly intercultural, it is important to understand cross-cultural behavior, including emotional behavior, so that expatriates and other employees in intercultural work groups can be successful. A recent study by Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) sought to investigate perceptions of display rules for individuals working abroad. Their work revealed the “guest effect,” in which sojourners report that they should display less emotion when working in the host U.S. culture than they would in their home cultures, despite the fact that display of emotion is more acceptable in the U.S than abroad. This result begged the question of whether or not these sojourners were correct in thinking expatriates and host nationals (i.e., Americans) should display emotion differently or were incorrect in believing such differential norms existed in the U.S.

This study was not able to replicate the guest effect for emotional display found by Gullekson and Vancouver, but found that if it exists, it may result from the misperception of status differences held by international sojourners. That is, neither sample revealed differences in the appropriateness ratings of emotional display as a function of expatriate/American condition. However, the results did indicate that expatriates were perceived to be lower status than American workers by the international sojourner sample; however, this status differential was not actually held by Americans.
(i.e., the Americans did not confer lower status to the expatriate). Further, an interesting pattern of emotional display for expatriates as opposed to Americans was revealed by the international students. It appears that higher status was given when Americans displayed little anger, whereas higher status was conferred to expatriates when they displayed more anger. This finding implies that status could be a mechanism in the guest effect, but this study design was not able to capture emotional display differences involved in the guest effect. It also implies that the way emotions are displayed may trigger different perceptions of status for expatriates and Americans.

Below is a discussion of what the current data imply about the guest effect and differential norms existing in the U.S. for sojourners and Americans. Then, the role of status in sojourner experiences and in emotional display is discussed, as well as how status differentials may be more a misperception by international sojourners than actual representations of U.S. culture. Finally, the implications for cross-cultural training, future directions for this research, and limitations are discussed.

**Theoretical Implications**

*The Guest Effect: Evidence for Differential Norms?* One goal of this study was to reexamine the guest effect found in Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) to determine whether differential norms for emotional display existed in the U.S. for American workers and expatriate workers. Recall that, in this study, participants viewed two levels of emotional display and were asked to rate the appropriateness of the display, whereas in the Gullekson and Vancouver study participants rated the intensity they felt they should display when experiencing various emotions in the host culture. The present results
provided no evidence for the guest effect when the appropriateness of the emotional display was rated – neither the international students nor American student samples reported differences in the appropriateness of emotional display as a function of whether the main character was American or an expatriate from India. Therefore, the guest effect was not replicated in this study.

One caveat to the current study that may have contributed to the lack of a guest effect finding was that the methodology differed between the two studies. As mentioned above, in this study participants viewed another sojourner’s (or American’s) emotional display and rated the appropriateness of that display, whereas in the Gullekson and Vancouver study international participants were rating how they thought they should display their emotion in the U.S. Because participants viewed videos of an interaction, the current results correspond to how they perceived the interaction, but may not accurately reflect the norms that exist for expatriates and Americans. For instance, the results may not represent how the international sojourners would react in a similar situation, only their reaction to how Mr. Lee responded to the situation observed. That is, the reactions one has to watching another person in an intercultural interaction may be very different than how one would react when they are personally involved in the interaction. In particular, the reaction itself may provide information that was used to assess appropriateness. Thus, the guest effect, especially as a misperception by sojourners, may not have been replicated because international participants were not asked how they should respond in the situation. Future research should continue examining emotional display rules of actual expatriates or sojourners in intercultural
groups. For example, the videos could be stopped just before the emotional display and respondents asked how Mr. Lee *should* respond. The logic for showing the display was to assess Americans’ reaction to it; to see if the reactions were consistent with the norms expressed by the international students in the Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) study.

However, this study did provide some other evidence for perceptions of status differentials by the international sample depending on the nature of the emotional display and nationality. Recall that several researchers have posited that the level of intensity of display of emotion, as well as the type of emotion, can communicate an individual’s status (Anderson & Berdahl, 2003; Kowner, 2003; Tiedens, 2000). For example, the Approach/Inhibition (A/I) theory of emotional display contends that high status individuals will be more expressive of attitudes and emotions such as anger (i.e., approach), whereas lower status individuals will inhibit their attitudes and emotions (Anderson & Berdahl, 2003). With this in mind, the study examined how the emotional display cued different levels of status conferral and whether this relationship varied for the expatriate and American worker. Indeed, an interesting pattern of status conferral did occur as a function of emotional display and nationality by the international students. That is, although differential norms were not found for the appropriateness of display, status conferrals by the international sample differed for the American and expatriate as a function of how the target displayed his anger and where he was from.

More specifically, international students conferred higher status to an American worker who displayed little anger, but conferred higher status to an expatriate who displayed more intense anger. The same pattern was revealed for happiness in the
exploratory analyses (i.e., when relationship was included in the analysis). Thus, it appears that emotional display was cueing perceptions of status, but the cues were interpreted differently depending on where the target was from. This pattern of emotional display and status conferral was partially supported by the American sample with exploratory analyses. For example, the American participants reported the same pattern of status conferral when displaying happiness. Namely, more intense emotional display cued higher status conferrals for expatriates and muting one’s happiness was related to higher status conferral for the American worker. Moreover, a similar pattern was found for the anger vignette regarding the certainty the emotional display. That is, according to the American sample, the expatriate who displayed more intense emotion (both anger and happiness) was rated as more certain of the appropriate way to respond to the situation, whereas they perceived the American worker to be more certain of how to respond when he displayed little emotion. Albeit indirectly, this finding could imply that differential norms for emotional display do exist such that it is acceptable for expatriates to display more intense emotion, but for Americans, the more appropriate response is to display less emotion. Follow-up studies are necessary to make any concrete conclusions regarding this potential interpretation.

Overall, these results do not replicate the guest effect, but they do lend preliminary evidence that there may be different expectations and consequences of behavior for expatriates and Americans in the U.S. Namely, that displaying more intense emotion could be associated with higher status perceptions for expatriates, but for Americans, controlling emotion may be associated with higher status. This result was
confirmed, albeit somewhat indirectly, by both the American and the international student samples. Thus, it may be important for an expatriate to be more expressive and communicate his emotion in an intercultural team. Why might such differential norms exist?

Given that sojourners have several barriers to overcome, such as language, cultural, and perhaps status barriers, it may be important to be more assertive in communication patterns so that miscommunication does not arise and one’s status is clearly visible. In contrast, for Americans one appears to have higher status when he regulates or controls his anger rather than expresses it. Indeed, the notion that an American should keep his emotions, particularly anger, under control at work appears consistent with some organizational research on emotional intelligence, emotion regulation, and emotional labor. That is, research has identified controlling negative emotions through emotional labor is a necessary function in many jobs (e.g., Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000; Wharton, 2008). Further, emotional intelligence, an ability with a hypothesized link to leadership and performance, involves knowing when, and how, to regulate one’s emotions (e.g., Joseph & Newman, 2010). Thus, perhaps the control of emotion is not required for expatriates in the same way as it is for Americans, but rather increased communication is expected.

Notice that these perceptions of differential norms by the international students are somewhat inconsistent with the guest effect found previously. That is, rather than reporting that an expatriate should display less emotion in the host country than host nationals, these sojourners conferred higher status to an expatriate who displayed more
emotion than one who displayed less. Despite the discrepancy, these results are not necessarily conflicting. That is, this study found that international sojourners perceive expatriates as lower status than Americans, which could explain why the guest effect in Gullekson and Vancouver (in press) resulted in perceptions that one should display less emotion in the U.S. than what was reported as accepted by Americans. Yet, if a sojourner does have higher status, then intense display is fine. That is, the nationality by emotional display interaction found in this study could be revealing another angle of the guest effect – that for international sojourners with higher status, more display of emotion is acceptable. Specifically, the emotion displayed in the vignettes cued the participants as to what the expatriate’s (and American’s) status was in the organization (i.e., no display, low status; high display, high status), but this does not necessarily mean that sojourners do not perceive status differentials between expatriates and Americans. In contrast, the international participants did perceive status differentials such that they rated Mr. Lee, the expatriate, as lower status than Mr. Lee, the American. This finding is discussed next.

The guest effect: Driven by a Status Misperception? As mentioned previously, the investigation of status as a mechanism by which the guest effect occurs was a key objective in this study. Certainly, as discussed, the intensity of emotional display did seem to cue participants to perceive different levels of status depending on whether the target was an expatriate or American worker. Yet, that finding did not speak to whether the expatriate was perceived as lower status than the American overall. Indeed, the results do indicate that international students conferred lower status to expatriates than to Americans working in the U.S. However, this result was unique to these sojourners; no
similar effect was found for the American sample in the hypothesis tests, implying that
the guest effect likely is a function of the sojourners’ perception, not necessarily a
reflection of actual American norms for expatriate/American differences. Although this
status effect was found, a clean interpretation of it with regard to the guest effect is
problematic because the guest effect was not replicated. However, as mentioned
previously, the lack of a guest effect finding may be a function of methodological
differences between the two studies. This status misperception by the sojourners may
very well be related, but future research will need to establish this relationship. For now,
such a finding begs the question, if expatriates are not considered lower status in the U.S.,
and differential norms for their behavior do not exist according to American participants,
then why do international sojourners hold these perceptions?

One potential explanation is that the participants could be using their experiences
to interpret the vignettes. Indeed, research on self and group-identity reveals that people
can vicariously share in outcomes and subjective experiences of fellow in-group
members, yet they may also project their experiences and perceptions on other people
they observe (e.g., Cohen & Garcia, 2005; Dunning, 2000; 2003). Thus, the international
students in this study may have perceived that Mr. Lee was of lower status as an
expatriate because they have experienced feeling of lower status while studying in the
U.S. or because expatriates and foreigners are considered lower status in their home
countries. In fact, when examining what the international students thought the study was
about, nearly a third thought the study had something to do with international students or
foreigners working in the U.S. Therefore, they could have been using their experiences as a filter to the results.

However, if the international sojourners perceive this status difference, and if it is indeed based on their experiences in the U.S., then credence still remains for the idea that it is not a misperception, differences could exist. In particular, status differences between expatriates and Americans may exist in the U.S. (and the international students were correct), but for methodological reasons no effect was found by the American participants. For example, it is possible that, like other foreigners in the U.S., expatriates are considered low status, but because of sensitivity to issues of prejudice and stereotyping the Americans in this study were more “politically correct” in their responses. As a result, no status effects were found.

To assess this self-presentation possibility, the post-study debriefing responses were examined. They showed that, although none thought the study was about international issues, many of the American participants thought that the study was about discrimination or inequality at work despite study design attempts to hide the true purpose of the study (particularly from the Americans). Indeed, it is unclear when this perception about the study was formed. Two of the individual difference measures (located at the end of the survey) dealt with group harmony and status differentials in society. Thus, the participants may only have formulated this perception after answering the appropriateness and status questions of the study, which were provided only after the main dependent variable measures were collected, or they may have thought this after seeing the main character as a minority (i.e., not Caucasian). If the latter occurred, then
both nationality conditions may have been sensitive to discrimination/race issues and responded more sensitively to the questionnaire.

In sum, a status effect was found by the international sample such that lower status was conferred to the expatriate than to the American. This implies that if the guest effect exists, it could be a misperception by sojourners; however, actual replication of the guest effect did not occur and so a clean interpretation cannot be made. Nonetheless, the results found have implications for practitioners and researchers in terms of expatriate experiences and training. These results and implications are discussed next.

**Practical Implications**

The internationalization of business over the last several decades has led to a growing importance of international human resource management, as well as specific attention to expatriates and their international assignments (Caligiuri et al., 2001). In particular, cross-cultural training programs are often utilized to teach expatriates appropriate behavior in the host country. The findings in this study have important implications for expatriate training, as well as for our understanding of the expatriate experience in the U.S.

As discussed previously, little is known about cross-cultural emotional experience for expatriate workers. Tan and colleagues (2005) contend that expatriates likely encounter different emotional display rules in the host culture as compared to their home cultures, and recognizing these differences is important for the expatriate’s success. The concern was that expatriates might also be expected to adhere to different norms within the host culture than do host nationals. However, this research indicates that expatriates
coming to the U.S. may not encounter different norms for themselves in comparison to Americans while working in the country. Moreover, Americans do not appear to infer status from one’s emotional display as strongly as the international sample does. Therefore, it may be best for cross-cultural training to highlight aspects of emotional display differences, but emphasize that the U.S. is somewhat lenient in emotional display. In particular, although regulation of anger is often good, expatriates are not likely to suffer from increased emotional display and communication of their emotions.

Additionally, cross-cultural training programs could benefit from making international sojourners aware that status differences between expatriates and Americans are not typical in the U.S. Therefore, perceptions of themselves as foreigners of lower status are not necessary and could be influence their experiences abroad. Rather, expatriates and other sojourners should aim to communicate effectively, which may involve some violations of their own emotional display rules. Yet, this may be acceptable for expatriates and other foreign workers. That said, there may be a psychological cost to expatriates when they violate their host norms to adapt to the norms of the host culture. Future research should examine the psychological cost of doing so.

Certainly, further research is needed to make more concrete prescriptions for the role of emotional display in cross-cultural training and in the understanding of emotion in expatriate experiences more generally. Nonetheless, the results found can leave practitioners and researchers with some food for thought. Yet, there are several limitations to this study that may have influenced the results, as well as affect the generalizability of the results found. These issues are discussed next.
Limitations and Future Research

Like all research, the present study has some limitations. First, although the video-vignettes and laboratory-based study enhanced the control of some extraneous variables, the videos also reduced the generalizability of the results. For example, by having the participants watch a video of a workplace interaction, they were confined to 1) viewing an Indian expatriate, and 2) a limited scope of emotional display (i.e., muted or intense). Expatriates in the U.S. come from a variety of countries, including many European and Asian countries, so by using an actor who was of Indian origin, the results may not generalize to expatriates in general. Further, the results may not generalize to all Americans because the same actor of India origin played Mr. Lee as an American to reduce confounding factors. Although no mention of the character’s American heritage, he was likely viewed as a minority (i.e., non-Caucasian), which may have limited the results to similar minorities or ethnic groups in the U.S.

Future research should examine emotional display with other expatriate groups (e.g., Western Europeans, Eastern Europeans, African, South American, and other Asian nationalities besides Indians) to see if similar findings occur. Researchers may also consider using alternative paradigms such as paper and pencil vignettes, so that the participants can refer to their norms for expatriates without focusing on a specific nationality. Lastly, research should examine whether differential norms exist for expatriates and host nationals in countries other than the U.S., especially for U.S. expatriates because they are particularly prone to adjustment difficulties (Black, Gregersen, Mendenhall, & Stroh, 1999).
In addition to the narrow focus on an Indian expatriate, the researcher chose the level and manner of display for the target character, reducing the range of display. In real interactions, there are a wide range of emotional displays and only two possible reactions to a situation were captured in the videos for this study. Further, the “intense” display of emotion may not have been intense enough, or the best method of conveying high emotion, which could also have restricted the results. Thus, the results found herein may not generalize to other levels of emotional display.

Alternatively, although the level and manner of display may have influenced the results, it could also be that the situations designed to elicit emotion in the target character were culturally specific. That is, individuals across cultures may not feel angry when another individual takes sole credit for team work, or feel happy when he is congratulated in front of others. Future research should identify whether the situations would elicit the emotion in all cultures, and also consider using more culturally universal situations.

Moreover, similar to other research on status and emotional display, this study focused on the emotions of anger and happiness. Indeed, there are many other emotions to explore, and given the number of unexpected interactions found in this study, there is a lot of potential research to be done examining intercultural perspectives on emotional display. Therefore, future research should examine varying levels of emotional display as well as other emotions that one experiences at work. Additionally, the emotional situations in this study were not counterbalanced, which could have influenced responses in the happiness vignette. Specifically, participants may have maintained perceptions of
the characters from the anger vignette and used those perceptions when responding to the questionnaire for the happiness vignette. When possible, the videos should be counterbalanced to ensure no carry-over effects influence the results.

An additional limitation of this research is that students, not organizational employees, participated in the study, and as a result the findings may not generalize to the expatriate population. Although international students responded to the video vignettes, the experience they have in the U.S. as students may differ from what an expatriate employee in the U.S. may experience. That is, the responses may stem from the international students’ exposure to the student-professor relationship (where, as the student, they are of lower status) and not represent an expatriate-American worker relationship. Similarly, the American sample who participated in the study were primarily Caucasian college freshman, with limited experience working, particularly with intercultural groups. Thus, their responses may not reflect the norms for workplace behavior in the U.S. With that said, many researchers argue that using student populations is generalizable to real-world settings (Locke, 1986) and that international students do not differ significantly from expatriate employees, at least in terms of adjustment processes (Hechanova et al., 2002). Nonetheless, future research would benefit from examining emotional display with an expatriate sample.

Finally, this study is limited to the expatriate-American relationship and may not generalize to expatriates working in other countries. That is, this study examined the nature of emotional display and status for expatriates in the U.S., but these results may differ significantly for expatriates working in other countries or American expatriates
abroad. As discussed previously, countries vary in their emotional display rules so expatriates going to countries outside the U.S. may experience different status conferrals and expectations of their behavior. However, the emotional display-status relationship may hold true across cultural boundaries as well if one considers that expatriates, regardless of their destination, are encountering barriers such as being a “foreigner,” as well as cultural and language differences. Future research should identify whether expatriates across the globe are awarded higher status if they display some anger in an interpersonal relationship or if this result is unique to how international sojourners in the U.S. perceive expatriate behavior. Future research could also examine the emotional display – status relationships using cultural dimensions (e.g., Hofstede, 2000) to see how the relationships varies with culture.

**Conclusion**

As the results of the present study indicate, the nature of emotional display for expatriates in the U.S. is complex and sojourners and host nationals may not view behavior and status in the same way. Yet as more employees are crossing cultural boundaries, it is important to understand when expatriates should “do as the Romans do” and when they should not, including not only emotional displays, but also other aspects of interpersonal behavior. Therefore, future research should further investigate how norms are similar and different for expatriates and host nationals throughout the world. In the present study, the answer seems to be “do as the Romans do,” because Americans do not see status or emotional display differences between themselves and sojourners.
Thus, sojourners should aim to accommodate the host norms and confer similar status to themselves as they would to an American in the U.S.
References


Appendix A
Pilot Study Emotional Display Vignettes

Please read over the following scenarios carefully before answering the corresponding questions.

**Scenario 1 (American)**
Mr. Lee is a technology consultant working for ZiCOM, a technology consultant firm based in New York City. With branches in more than 50 countries, ZiCOM is a growing multi-national company that has gained recognition for its excellent service.

Mr. Lee, a native New Yorker, began working for ZiCOM only two weeks ago after ZiCOM recruiters offered him a desirable salary to leave the consulting firm for which he had been working. Mr. Lee is an expatriate worker who has been working in ZiCOM’s New York City branch for two weeks after ZiCOM offered him a desirable salary to leave his home country to work in the New York office. Mr. Lee’s first assignment was to develop a client proposal with a fellow technology consultant, Mr. Smith. The two had been working hard to complete the project and were finally prepared to present the proposal to the client.

On the day of the presentation to the client, Mr. Lee arrives at work to find that Mr. Smith has already begun the presentation and taken credit for the project as his own. Mr. Lee feels angry with Mr. Smith for what he has just done.

Please **CIRCLE** your answers to the following questions regarding the above scenario:

1. To what extent should Mr. Lee feel angry with this situation

   __1__ Not at all angry __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ Very Angry

2. To what extent should he display his anger to Mr. Smith

   __1__ Display no emotion __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__ Display intense emotion

3. How appropriate is it for Mr. Lee to display his anger with Mr. Smith

   __1__ Not at all appropriate __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__ Very appropriate

4. To what extent do you feel Mr. Lee was certain about the appropriate way to display his emotions in this situation.

   __1__ Not at all certain __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__ Very certain
People who have higher status have more prestige and power. For example, they hold better social positions.

5. How much status do you feel Mr. Lee has in the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Status</td>
<td>High Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How much status do you feel Mr. Smith has in the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Status</td>
<td>High Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario 1b**

Now please consider the alternative ending to the above scenario and answer the corresponding questions.

Mr. Lee’s first assignment was to develop a client proposal with a fellow technology consultant, Mr. Smith. The two had been working hard to complete the project and were finally prepared to present the proposal to the client. The client loves the proposal and agrees to work with ZiCOM on the project. Mr. Lee and Mr. Smith are congratulated by the boss for their hard work and excellent performance. Moreover, the boss is so impressed with Mr. Lee’s work that he is offered a promotion to senior consultant. Mr. Lee feels happy as the presentation turned out better than expected and he was offered a promotion for his hard work.

Please **CIRCLE** your answers to the following questions regarding the above scenario:

1. To what extent should Mr. Lee feel happy with this situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all happy</td>
<td>Very happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To what extent should he display his happiness to Mr. Smith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display no emotion</td>
<td>Display intense emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How appropriate is it for Mr. Lee to display his happiness with Mr. Smith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all appropriate</td>
<td>Very appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. To what extent do you feel Mr. Lee was certain about the appropriate way to display his emotions in this situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all certain</td>
<td>Very certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How much status do you feel Mr. Lee has in the organization  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How much status do you feel Mr. Smith has in the organization  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario 1c**  
Now please consider the alternative ending to the above scenario and answer the corresponding questions.

Mr. Lee’s first assignment was to develop a client proposal with a fellow technology consultant, Mr. Smith. The two had been working hard to complete the project and were finally prepared to present the proposal to the client. Although the client appreciated their hard work, he did not like the proposal and decided to go with another firm on the project. Mr. Lee was not expecting such an outcome and felt sad with the way things turned out.

Please **CIRCLE** your answers to the following questions regarding the above scenario:

1. To what extent should Mr. Lee feel sad with this situation  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all sad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To what extent should he display his sadness to Mr. Smith  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Display intense emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display no emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How appropriate is it for Mr. Lee to display his sadness with Mr. Smith  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. To what extent do you feel Mr. Lee was certain about the appropriate way to display his emotions in this situation  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How much status do you feel Mr. Lee has in the organization  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How much status do you feel Mr. Smith has in the organization  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now please consider a different scenario:

**Scenario 2a**
Mr. Iyer is a finance manager in the corporate office for SENE, an electronics company based in Minneapolis. SENE is a large electronics company known for the quality of its products, and with offices and factories in more than 20 countries, it is rapidly becoming a global competitor.

Mr. Iyer, a native Minnesotan, began working for SENE two weeks ago after leaving his job with as a finance manager with a different company. Mr. Iyer had just finished his first financial report for SENE and asked a colleague, Mr. Johnson, to read it over before he would give it to his boss. After not hearing anything from Mr. Johnson for two days, Mr. Iyer called him only to find he had gone out of town and taken the materials with him.

Mr. Iyer was angry with Mr. Johnson because now he would not be able to meet the deadline for the report, which was due the following day. It had taken him two weeks to write the report and now he had nothing to turn in to his boss.

Please **CIRCLE** your answers to the following questions regarding the above scenario:

1. To what extent should Mr. Iyer feel angry with this situation
   __1__         __2__         __3__         __4__         __5__         __6__         __7__
   Not at all angry  Very Angry

2. To what extent should he display his anger to Mr. Johnson
   __1__         __2__         __3__         __4__         __5__         __6__         __7__
   Display no Emotion  Display intense emotion

3. How appropriate is it for Mr. Iyer to display his anger with Mr. Johnson
   __1__         __2__         __3__         __4__         __5__         __6__         __7__
   Not at all appropriate  Very appropriate

4. To what extent do you feel Mr. Iyer was certain about the appropriate way to display his emotions in this situation.
   __1__         __2__         __3__         __4__         __5__         __6__         __7__
   Not at all certain  Very certain

5. How much status do you feel Mr. Iyer has in the organization
   __1__         __2__         __3__         __4__         __5__         __6__         __7__
   Low Status  High Status

6. How much status do you feel Mr. Johnson has in the organization
   __1__         __2__         __3__         __4__         __5__         __6__         __7__
   Low Status  High Status
Scenario 2b
Now please consider the alternative ending to the above scenario and answer the corresponding questions.

Mr. Iyer had just finished his first financial report for SENE and asked a colleague, Mr. Johnson, to read it over before he would give it to his boss. Mr. Johnson returned the report with few comments and remarked that he was really impressed with Mr. Iyer’s work, noting that he believes Mr. Iyer has talent that only the best financial managers possess. Mr. Iyer was happy to hear his colleague give him such respect and positive remarks about his work.

Please CIRCLE your answers to the following questions regarding the above scenario:

1. To what extent should Mr. Iyer feel happy with this situation
   __1__ Not at all happy  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__ Very happy

2. To what extent should he display his happiness to Mr. Johnson
   __1__ Display no emotion  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__ Display intense emotion

3. How appropriate is it for Mr. Iyer to display his happiness with Mr. Johnson
   __1__ Not at all appropriate  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__ Very appropriate

4. To what extent do you feel Mr. Iyer was certain about the appropriate way to display his emotions in this situation.
   __1__ Not at all certain  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__ Very certain

5. How much status do you feel Mr. Iyer has in the organization
   __1__ Low Status  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__ High Status

6. How much status do you feel Mr. Johnson has in the organization
   __1__ Low Status  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__ High Status
**Scenario 2c**
Now please consider the alternative ending to the above scenario and answer the corresponding questions.

Mr. Iyer had just finished his first financial report for SENE and asked a colleague, Mr. Johnson, to read it over before he would give it to his boss. Mr. Johnson returned the report with several comments and remarked that he was not impressed with Mr. Iyer’s work. Mr. Iyer felt sad that Mr. Johnson had not approved of his work.

Please **CIRCLE** your answers to the following questions regarding the above scenario:

1. To what extent should Mr. Iyer feel sad with this situation
   - Not at all sad
   - Very sad

2. To what extent should he display his sadness to Mr. Johnson
   - Display no emotion
   - Display intense emotion

3. How appropriate is it for Mr. Iyer to display his sadness with Mr. Johnson
   - Not at all appropriate
   - Very appropriate

4. To what extent do you feel Mr. Iyer was certain about the appropriate way to display his emotions in this situation.
   - Not at all certain
   - Very certain

5. How much status do you feel Mr. Iyer has in the organization
   - Low Status
   - High Status

6. How much status do you feel Mr. Johnson has in the organization
   - Low Status
   - High Status
Now please consider a last scenario:

Scenario 3a
Mr. Vuorinen is a manager working for an international retail company called Swoosh that specializes in athletic apparel. The company is based in Portland, where Mr. Vuorinen works, but has distributes its apparel throughout the world and has offices in more than 20 countries.

Mr. Vuorinen, a native Oregonian, began working for Swoosh two weeks ago after leaving his job with as a manager with a different company. Mr. Vuorinen was hired because of his expertise in transforming problematic departments into super performers. After working with the departmental members for two weeks, Mr. Vuorinen was frustrated because he was seeing little progress with the department and felt more resistance to this authority than he had experienced in his years of management. As he was contemplating the current situation, another organizational member stopped by his office and informed him that his problems were likely arising because a fellow manager, Mr. Callihan, was telling people that Mr. Vuorinen was fired from his last job for incompetence.

Mr. Vuorinen was angry with Mr. Callihan for spreading rumors about him, especially ones that were interfering with his performance at work and causing him to lose status among his department—not to mention the rumors were outrageous and very inaccurate.

Please CIRCLE your answers to the following questions regarding the above scenario:

1. To what extent should Mr. Vuorinen feel angry with this situation
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Not at all angry  Very Angry

2. To what extent should he display his anger to Mr. Callihan
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Display no Emotion  Display intense emotion

3. How appropriate is it for Mr. Vuorinen to display his anger with Mr. Callihan
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Not at all appropriate  Very appropriate

4. To what extent do you feel Mr. Vuorinen was certain about the appropriate way to display his emotions in this situation.
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Not at all certain  Very certain

5. How much status do you feel Mr. Vuorinen has in the organization
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Low Status  High Status
6. How much status do you feel Mr. Callihan has in the organization

Low Status 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High Status

Scenario 2b
Now please consider the alternative ending to the above scenario and answer the corresponding questions.

Mr. Vuorinen was hired because of his expertise in transforming problematic departments into super performers. After working with the departmental members for two weeks, Mr. Vuorinen was noticing a huge change in the department, both in terms of productivity and general attitude of the organizational members. A fellow manager, Mr. Callihan, also noticed the change and told Mr. Vuorinen what a great transformation he had made with the department, which made him feel happy.

Please CIRCLE your answers to the following questions regarding the above scenario:

1. To what extent should Mr. Vuorinen feel happy with this situation

Not at all happy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very happy

2. To what extent should he display his happiness to Mr. Callihan

Display no emotion 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Display intense emotion

3. How appropriate is it for Mr. Vuorinen to display his happiness with Mr. Callihan

Not at all appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very appropriate

4. To what extent do you feel Mr. Vuorinen was certain about the appropriate way to display his emotions in this situation.

Not at all certain 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very certain

5. How much status do you feel Mr. Vuorinen has in the organization

Low Status 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High Status

6. How much status do you feel Mr. Callihan has in the organization

Low Status 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High Status
Scenario 3c

Now please consider the alternative ending to the above scenario and answer the corresponding questions.

After working with the departmental members for two weeks, Mr. Vuorinen noticed that the department was performing much better. However, it seemed like the departmental members did not like him as they excluded him from the weekly social gatherings and never invited him to lunch. In an attempt to better his relationship with his department, Mr. Vuorinen asked Mr. Callihan, a fellow manager to lunch, but he declined the offer as well. Mr. Vuorinen felt sad that he was not able to make meaningful connections with his department.

Please CIRCLE your answers to the following questions regarding the above scenario:

1. To what extent should Mr. Vuorinen feel sad with this situation
   __1__  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__
   Not at all sad  Very sad

2. To what extent should he display his sadness to Mr. Callihan
   __1__  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__
   Display no emotion  Display intense emotion

3. How appropriate is it for Mr. Vuorinen to display his sadness with Mr. Callihan
   __1__  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__
   Not at all appropriate  Very appropriate

4. To what extent do you feel Mr. Vuorinen was certain about the appropriate way to display his emotions in this situation.
   __1__  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__
   Not at all certain  Very certain

5. How much status do you feel Mr. Vuorinen has in the organization
   __1__  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__
   Low Status  High Status

6. How much status do you feel Mr. Callihan has in the organization
   __1__  __2__  __3__  __4__  __5__  __6__  __7__
   Low Status  High Status
**Demographics Section**

1. What is your sex? (circle one)  Male  Female

2. Year in school?  Freshman  Sophomore  Junior  Senior  Other  
________________

3. Race _____________________
Dear OU international students:

Would you like to help out a fellow student complete research for her dissertation? Would you like a free pizza dinner (to earn $10)? If so, please spare 30-45 minutes of your time and come watch a short video clip and fill out survey about the video. For coming to hear more about the study, I would gladly treat you to a pizza dinner ($10).

I am a graduate student in the psychology department here at Ohio University and am conducting research on emotional display at work. In particular, I need you to come watch a short clip of a workplace interaction (3 minutes) and fill out a survey on your reaction to the video. If you could take 30-45 minutes out of your busy schedule to help out, I would GREATLY appreciate it.

Again, participation will only take approximately 45 minutes and would be GREATLY appreciated. If you are willing to participate please send me an email at ng248604@ohio.edu to schedule a time.

If you have any questions regarding this research or the content of the survey, please feel free to contact Nicole Gullekson at ng248604@ohio.edu.

Thank you,

Nicole Gullekson, M.S.
Department of Psychology
200 Porter Hall
Office: 044L Porter Hall
Email: ng248604@ohio.edu
Appendix C
Scripts for Video Vignettes

ANGER SCENARIO  (Mr. Lee and Mr. Smith are finishing up in the office)

Mr. Smith: Well, Mr. Lee I think we have things pretty well wrapped up here. I think the board will really like the presentation we put together and hopefully we will get the new client contract.

Mr. Lee: Yeah, after two months of late nights all of our hard work should finally pay off. I think we really have a solid campaign for this client.

Mr. Smith (laughs): Ya, I agree and it was great working together. I think we make a good team, hopefully we can will get assigned to the same project again! Well, we better head home. I guess I will see you at 9am to set up for the presentation.

Mr Lee: Sounds good, have a nice evening.

NEXT DAY (Mr. Lee walks in with coffee in hand)

Jane: Hi, Mr. Lee. I don’t think we have formally met yet. I’m Jane, the CEO’s new assistant.

Mr. Lee: Hi Jane, it is nice to meet you. How are you liking it here at SENCO so far.

Jane: It’s nice, but coming from Florida, New York is cold! Where are you from?

Mr. Lee: I’m from (Pennsylvania/foreign), I’m assigned to the corporate office for two years. I will be going back to (Pennsylvania/foreign) in a few months. I think you will enjoy it here though.

Jane: Glad to hear it, I am excited to be with the company.

Mr. Lee: Well I should get going, Mr. Smith and I have a presentation to give.

(at that moment Mr. Smith walks out of the board room, smiling and laughing with the board members)

CEO: Great presentation, Mr. Smith. You really have outdone yourself this time and I can’t believe you pulled this off all by yourself in such a short time! I think the client will be very impressed with your work and we should definitely get the contract. Great job!

(CEO turns the corner and Mr. Smith and Mr. Lee are left facing one another). Display of anger…

Muted display condition:
Mr. Lee (to Mr. Smith): You gave the presentation without me? [no emotion display, straight face]

Intense display condition:
Mr. Lee (to Mr. Smith): You gave the presentation without me? [fists clenched, furrowed brow, raised/strained voice]
HAPPINESS SCENARIO
(Now consider this alternative ending when the presentation is to be given the next day).

NEXT DAY (Mr. Smith walks in with coffee in hand)

Jane: Hi, Mr. Lee. I don’t think we have formally met yet. I’m Jane, the CEO’s new assistant.

Mr. Lee: Hi Jane, it is nice to meet you. How are you liking it here at SENCO so far.

Jane: It’s nice, but coming from Florida, New York is cold! Where are you from?

Mr. Lee: I’m from (Pennsylvania/foreign), I’m assigned to the corporate office for two years. I will be going back to (Pennsylvania/foreign) in a few months. I think you will enjoy it here though.

Jane: Glad to hear it, I am excited to be with the company.

Mr. Lee: Well I should get going, Mr. Smith and I have a presentation to give.

(He goes into the boardroom and comes out a bit later)

CEO: Great presentation. You both really have outdone yourself this time and I can’t believe you pulled this off all in such a short time! I think the client is very impressed with your work and we should definitely get the contract. Mr. Lee your contributions were excellent, I think I will put you on the SENE project next, they are our leading client! Great job!

(CEO turns the corner and Mr. Smith and Mr. Lee are left facing one another). Display of happiness…

Muted display condition:
Mr. Lee (to Mr. Smith): Nice work, see you tomorrow [slight curve of the lips (not full smile, otherwise straight face]

Intense display condition:
Mr. Lee (to Mr. Smith): Nice work, see you tomorrow [smiling intensely, small jump and clap of the hands and voice very cheerful]
Appendix D
Questionnaire for Main Study

Please **CIRCLE** your answers to the following questions regarding the scenario you just viewed:

**Please answer the following questions regarding the emotional experience of Mr. Lee that you just viewed.**

1. How much **happiness** does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
   No happiness  A lot of happiness

2. How much **sadness** does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
   No sadness  A lot of sadness

3. How much **anger** does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
   No anger  A lot of anger

4. How much **fear** does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
   No fear  A lot of fear

5. How much **guilt** does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
   No guilt  A lot of guilt

6. How much **pride** does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
   No pride  A lot of pride

7. Please rate the level of **happiness** Mr. Lee has just experienced in this situation.
   1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
   No happiness  Intense happiness

8. Please rate the level of **sadness** Mr. Lee has just experienced in this situation.
   1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
   No sadness  Intense sadness

9. Please rate the level of **anger** Mr. Lee has just experienced in this situation.
   1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
   No anger  Intense anger

10. Please rate the level of **fear** Mr. Lee has just experienced in this situation.
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
    No fear  Intense fear

11. Please rate the level of **guilt** Mr. Lee has just experienced in this situation.
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
    No guilt  Intense guilt

12. Please rate how intensely Mr. Lee experienced **pride** in this situation.
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
    No pride  Intense pride
Now we are going to focus on the experience of anger.

1. To what extent should Mr. Lee feel angry with this situation?
   1__           __2__           __3__          __4__          __5__          __6__          __7__
   Not at all angry
   Very angry

2. How much anger should Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__           __2__           __3__          __4__          __5__          __6__          __7__
   No Anger
   Intense Anger

3. How appropriate is it for Mr. Lee to display his anger in this way to Mr. Smith?
   1__           __2__           __3__          __4__          __5__          __6__          __7__
   Not at all appropriate
   Extremely appropriate

4. How acceptable do you think Mr. Smith would find the way Mr. Lee expressed his anger?
   1__           __2__           __3__          __4__          __5__          __6__          __7__
   Not at all acceptable
   Extremely acceptable

5. Indicate the extent to which Mr. Lee’s display of anger was suitable for the situation.
   1__           __2__           __3__          __4__          __5__          __6__          __7__
   Not at all suitable
   Extremely suitable

6. To what extent should Mr. Lee display his anger to Mr. Smith?
   1__           __2__           __3__          __4__          __5__          __6__          __7__
   Display no anger
   Display intense anger

7. How much display of anger is acceptable by Mr. Lee in this situation?
   1__           __2__           __3__          __4__          __5__          __6__          __7__
   Not very much emotional display
   A lot of emotional display

8. How appropriate is it to display the emotion of anger in a very strong way?
   1__           __2__           __3__          __4__          __5__          __6__          __7__
   Not at all appropriate
   Extremely appropriate

9. To what extent do you feel Mr. Lee was certain about the appropriate way to display his anger in this situation?
   1__           __2__           __3__          __4__          __5__          __6__          __7__
   Not at all certain
   Very certain

10. How likely is it that Mr. Lee knew how to display his anger?
    1__           __2__           __3__          __4__          __5__          __6__          __7__
    Not at all likely
    Very likely

11. How sure do you think Mr. Lee was that his display anger was appropriate?
    1__           __2__           __3__          __4__          __5__          __6__          __7__
    Not at all sure
    Very sure
Now please think of Mr. Lee.

1. How much status does Mr. Lee have?
   \[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Low status} & \text{High status}
   \end{array} \]

2. How much influence do you think Mr. Lee has on others?
   \[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{No influence} & \text{A lot of influence}
   \end{array} \]

3. Please rate Mr. Lee on the following traits.
   \[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Incompetent} & \text{Competent} \\
   \text{Knowledgeable} & \text{Ignorant} \\
   \text{Unable} & \text{Able}
   \end{array} \]

4. What do you think Mr. Lee’s rank is in the organization?”
   \[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Low rank} & \text{High rank}
   \end{array} \]

5. How likely is it that Mr. Lee will get promoted within the organization?
   \[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Not at all likely} & \text{Very likely}
   \end{array} \]

6. How much respect do you have for Mr. Lee?
   \[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Not respect} & \text{Extreme respect}
   \end{array} \]

Now please think of Mr. Smith.

1. How much status does Mr. Smith have?
   \[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Low status} & \text{High status}
   \end{array} \]

2. How much influence do you think Mr. Smith has on others?
   \[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{No influence} & \text{A lot of influence}
   \end{array} \]

3. Please rate Mr. Smith on the following traits.
   \[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Incompetent} & \text{Competent} \\
   \text{Knowledgeable} & \text{Ignorant} \\
   \text{Unable} & \text{Able}
   \end{array} \]
4. What do you think Mr. Smith’s rank is in the organization?”
   1__         2__         3__         4__         5__         6__         7__
   Low rank

5. How likely is it that Mr. Smith will get promoted within the organization?
   1__         2__         3__         4__         5__         6__         7__
   Not at all likely

6. How much respect do you have for Mr. Smith
   1__         2__         3__         4__         5__         6__         7__
   Not respect

7. Mr. Smith is Mr. Lee’s (a) coworker, (b) subordinate, (c) supervisor.

8. How do you think Mr. Lee should display his emotion at the end of the video?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

STOP HERE!!

If you are finished with this portion of the questionnaire, please press PLAY and watch an alternative ending to the situation. When the video is over, please complete the rest of the questions.
Please answer the following questions regarding the emotional experience of Mr. Lee that you just viewed in this alternative scenario.

1. How much happiness does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
   No happiness              A lot of happiness

2. How much sadness does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
   No sadness                 A lot of sadness

3. How much anger does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
   No anger                  A lot of anger

4. How much fear does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
   No fear                  A lot of fear

5. How much guilt does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
   No guilt                A lot of guilt

6. How much pride does Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
   No pride                Intense pride

7. Please rate the level of happiness Mr. Lee has just experienced in this situation.
   1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
   No happiness             Intense happiness

8. Please rate the level of sadness Mr. Lee has just experienced in this situation.
   1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
   No sadness              Intense sadness

9. Please rate the level of anger Mr. Lee has just experienced in this situation.
   1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
   No anger                Intense anger

10. Please rate the level of fear Mr. Lee has just experienced in this situation.
    1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
    No fear                Intense fear

11. Please rate the level of guilt Mr. Lee has just experienced in this situation.
    1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
    No guilt               Intense guilt

12. Please how intensely Mr. Lee experienced pride in this situation.
    1__   2__   3__   4__   5__   6__   7__
    No pride               Intense pride
Now we are going to focus on the experience of happiness.

1. To what extent should Mr. Lee feel happy with this situation?
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Not at all happy Very happy

2. How much happiness should Mr. Lee feel in this video?
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   No happiness Intense happiness

3. How appropriate is it for Mr. Lee to display his happiness in this way to Mr. Smith?
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Not at all appropriate Extremely appropriate

4. How acceptable do you think Mr. Smith would find the way Mr. Lee expressed his happiness?
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Not at all acceptable Extremely acceptable

5. Indicate the extent to which Mr. Lee’s display of happiness was suitable for the situation?
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Not at all suitable Extremely suitable

6. To what extent should Mr. Lee display his happiness to Mr. Smith?
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Display no happiness Display intense happiness

7. How much display of happiness is acceptable by Mr. Lee in this situation?
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Not very much emotional display A lot of emotional display

8. How appropriate is it to display the happiness in a very strong way?
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Not at all appropriate Extremely appropriate

9. To what extent do you feel Mr. Lee was certain about the appropriate way to display his happiness in this situation?
   __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
   Not at all certain Very certain

10. How likely is it that Mr. Lee knew how to display his happiness?
    __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
    Not at all likely Very likely

11. How sure do you think Mr. Lee was that his display happiness was appropriate?
    __1__ __2__ __3__ __4__ __5__ __6__ __7__
    Not at all sure Very sure
Now please think of Mr. Lee.

1. How much status does Mr. Lee have?
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Low status} & \text{High status}
   \end{array}
   \]

2. How much influence do you think Mr. Lee has on others?
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{No influence} & \text{A lot of influence}
   \end{array}
   \]

3. Please rate Mr. Lee on the following traits.
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Incompetent} & \text{Competent} \\
   \text{Knowledgeable} & \text{Ignorant} \\
   \text{Unable} & \text{Able}
   \end{array}
   \]

4. What do you think Mr. Lee’s rank is in the organization?
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Low rank} & \text{High rank}
   \end{array}
   \]

5. How likely is it that Mr. Lee will get promoted within the organization?
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Not at all likely} & \text{Very likely}
   \end{array}
   \]

6. How much respect do you have for Mr. Lee
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Not respect} & \text{Extreme respect}
   \end{array}
   \]

Now please think of Mr. Smith.

1. How much status does Mr. Smith have?
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Low status} & \text{High status}
   \end{array}
   \]

2. How much influence do you think Mr. Smith has on others?
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{No influence} & \text{A lot of influence}
   \end{array}
   \]

3. Please rate Mr. Smith on the following traits.
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccccccc}
   1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
   \text{Incompetent} & \text{Competent} \\
   \text{Knowledgeable} & \text{Ignorant} \\
   \text{Unable} & \text{Able}
   \end{array}
   \]
4. What do you think Mr. Smith’s rank is in the organization?”

1. Low rank
2. ____________
3. ____________
4. ____________
5. ____________
6. ____________
7. High rank

5. How likely is it that Mr. Smith will get promoted within the organization?

1. Not at all likely
2. ____________
3. ____________
4. ____________
5. ____________
6. ____________
7. Very likely

6. How much respect do you have for Mr. Smith

1. Not respect
2. ____________
3. ____________
4. ____________
5. ____________
6. ____________
7. Extreme respect

7. Mr. Smith is Mr. Lee’s (a) coworker, (b) subordinate, (c) supervisor.

8. Where is Grace from? ________________________

9. Where is Mr. Lee from? _______________________

10. Where is Mr. Smith from? ____________________

11. How do you think Mr. Lee should display his emotion at the end of the video?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________


Please provide the following information about yourself.

1. Gender: Male _____ Female _____

2. Age: _____

3. Country of origin (home country): _________________________________

4. Marital status (please check one):
   Single _____ Married _____ Divorced _____ Widowed _____ Other _____

5. Household situation (living with):
   American roommate(s) _____ International roommate(s) _____ Family _____
   Significant Other _____ Alone _____ Other _____

6. Of your free time, what percentage (0-100) of the time is spent socializing with Americans? _______

7. Of your free time, what percentage (0-100) of the time is spent socializing with international students?_____

8. How would you characterize the economic level of the household in which you grew up?
   Low income _____ Low middle income _____ Middle income _____
   High-middle income _____ High income _____

9. Number of months in the United States: ______________________________

10. How many times had to traveled to the United States prior to moving here: _____

12. Besides your present stay in the United States, have you ever lived outside your home country? YES____ NO____

13. Before moving to the United States, how exposed were you with American culture?

   very unexposed moderately unexposed slightly unexposed neutral slightly exposed moderately exposed very exposed

14. Are you planning on staying in the U.S. after your academic studies are completed? Yes / No
15. What is your class rank (if a graduate student please see below)
   Freshman ____
   Sophomore ____
   Junior ____
   Senior ____
   Other (please specify) ____

15. Are you currently a graduate student? Yes ____  No ____

16. What is your class level?
   Master’s level                  Ph.D. level
   1st year ____                  1st year ____
   2nd year ____                  2nd year ____
   3rd year ____                  3rd year ____
   4th year ____                  4th year ____
   5th year ____                  5th year ____
   6th + year ____

17. What is your degree program/ major? ______________________________

18. Number of times you have travelled outside of your country ____
Please select the numbered response provided by the following scales which best describes the way in which you generally see yourself in comparison to others.

*Example:*

*Short* 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  *Tall*

If you select response #3, this means that you see yourself as shorter than others; if you select #5 (middle) about average; and if you select #7, somewhat taller.

If you understand the above instructions please proceed. Select one numbered response for each domain according to how you see yourself in relationship to others, using the following scale.

**In relationship to others, I feel:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inferior</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>More competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikable</td>
<td>More likable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left out</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untalented</td>
<td>More talented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaker</td>
<td>Stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconfident</td>
<td>More confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable</td>
<td>More desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattractive</td>
<td>More attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An outsider</td>
<td>An insider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please that the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. All groups should be given an equal chance in life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. No one should discriminate in society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Inferior groups should stay in their place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. It would be good if groups could be equal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Group equality should be our ideal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. It’s OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Increased social equality is desirable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. Its probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Please that the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I have respect for authority figures with whom I interact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. I value being in good health above everything.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. My personal identity independent of others is very important to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. I would rather say “no” directly than risk being misunderstood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Having a lively imagination is important to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. I act the same way no matter who I am with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10. I respect people who are modest about themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. I feel comfortable using someone’s first name soon after I meet them, even when they are much older than I am.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Speaking up during a class is not difficult for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. It is important for me to respect decisions made by the group, even when I am not happy with the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
19. I should take into consideration my parents’ advice when making education/career plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. I am the same person at home that I am at school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I’ve just met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I am not happy with the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. I am comfortable being singled out for praise and rewards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>moderately disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>moderately agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What do you think this research was about?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________