CULTURAL DISTANCE, PERCEPTION OF EMOTIONAL DISPLAY RULES, AND

THEIR INFLUENCE ON SOJOURNER ADJUSTMENT

A thesis presented to

the faculty of

the College of Arts and Sciences of Ohio University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Science

Nicole L. Gullekson

August 2007

This thesis titled

CULTURAL DISTANCE, PERCEPTION OF EMOTIONAL DISPLAY RULES, AND

THEIR INFLUENCE ON SOJOURNER ADJUSTMENT

by

NICOLE L. GULLEKSON

has been approved for

the Department of Psychology

and the College of Arts and Sciences by

Jeffrey B. Vancouver

Associate Professor of Psychology

Benjamin M. Ogles

Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Abstract

GULLEKSON, NICOLE L., M.S., August 2007, Experimental Psychology

CULTURAL DISTANCE, PERCEPTION OF EMOTIONAL DISPLAY RULES, AND

THEIR INFLUENCE ON SOJOURNER ADJUSTMENT (109 pp.)

   With increased globalization, more individuals temporarily leave home to work

and study in foreign countries. These sojourners are confronted with societal norms

different from their home cultures. The present study investigated the extent to which

international student sojourners perceive differences in emotional display norms between

their home and host cultures, as well as the influence of such perception on adjustment.

Although accurate perception of the host culture's emotional display rules was not related

to adjustment, a "guest" effect existed. Specifically, international student participants

reported that one should display *less* emotion in the host culture, despite the cultural

norms for greater display of emotion in the host culture than in the sojourners' home

cultures. Future research directions and practical applications for organizations sending

individuals abroad are discussed.

Approved: _____

Jeffrey B. Vancouver

Associate Professor of Psychology

Acknowledgments

There are several individuals I would like to acknowledge for their assistance and support through the successful completion of this thesis. First, I would like to thank my advisor and committee chair, Dr. Jeff Vancouver, for his assistance with and dedication to the completion of this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Paula Popovich and Dr. Kathi Heffner for sharing their respective expertise in order to improve the quality of the project and for serving on my thesis committee.

Additionally, I would like to thank Ryan Yoder for his assistance in developing and implementing the internet surveys for this project. I would also like to thank Krissy More for her everlasting advice on this project and the life in general, as well as Corey Guenther for his support and encouragement throughout this process. 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. 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

List of Tables

List of Figures

Introduction

Advances in technology and communication, along with increased globalization of business, have contributed to a more global society (Black, Gregersen, Mendenhall, & Stroh, 1999). Today, people throughout the world are able to communicate with nothing more than the click of a mouse or a quick phone call. Vacations to far-off destinations now seem exciting rather than frightening, and individuals are leaving their homes to temporarily reside in foreign countries for work, volunteer activities, or education. Such people are referred to as sojourners; individuals who *temporarily* reside in a foreign place for activities including (but not restricted to) work and education.

Many organizations are joining the world of international business and sending *work* sojourners (expatriates) overseas to gain a competitive edge (Spreitzer, McCall, & Mahoney, 1997). It is estimated that multinational corporations (MNCs) employ more than 1.3 million expatriates from the United States alone (Shepard, 1997). However, the estimates for premature return range between 20 and 50 percent (Aycan, 1997) and the estimated cost associated with the early return of an expatriate is between $250,000 and $1.25 million (Mervosh & McClenahen, 1997). With such an investment in both financial and human resources, it is crucial for organizations to select and train workers who can *successfully* adjust and perform in another country.

Similarly, globalization has led to a growing number of international *student* sojourners who want to live in another country in order to learn a new language, to build their professional skills, and to increase their individual competitive edge. In fact, more than half a million international students studied in the United States in the 2003/2004

academic year, accounting for four percent of the total enrollment in colleges and universities (Institute of International Education, 2004). These students add billions of dollars to the U.S. economy, and additionally, universities spend large amounts of money recruiting and supporting the top international students. However, it is speculated that attrition rates of international students may be as high as rates for domestic students (Tompson & Tompson, 1996), and while abroad, international student sojourners encounter both academic and social difficulties (e.g., Church, 1982).

With so much invested in sojourners, it is important for their occupational, educational, and social experiences to be successful. However, many times sojourners choose to reside and work in countries with cultures dissimilar from their own. Research shows that aspects of emotion (e.g., expression, regulation, display rules) vary across cultures, but little research has investigated how emotions play a role in sojourner experiences, adjustment, or success in their cross-cultural endeavors. Recently, Tan, Hartel, Panipucci, and Sybosch (2005) suggested that the effect of emotion in cross-cultural expatriate experiences is an important topic, but has yet to be examined. Similarly, Matsumoto and colleagues (Matsumoto, et al., 2001) proposed that emotion regulation could be the "gatekeeper skill" needed in intercultural adjustment. Thus, the purpose of the present study was to investigate how cross-cultural differences in emotional display play a role in sojourner adjustment. Adjustment is generally defined as the degree of psychological comfort one has with various aspects of the host culture (Black & Gregersen, 1991) and is considered an influential factor in a sojourner's success abroad. More specifically, the present study aimed at contributing to the existing knowledge of sojourners, culture, and emotions by investigating how emotional display

differs across cultures in one group of sojourners: international graduate students. In particular, I wanted to examine whether international students perceive the differences in appropriate emotional display (i.e., display rules) between their home and host cultures and to determine if the accurate perception of such display rules is associated with increased international adjustment.

Investigating this relationship could be useful for organizations that involve sojourners such as academic, business, and non-profit organizations by identifying what contributes to successful adjustment in a host country. Further research could be beneficial in selection and training activities for expatriates going to work abroad or for international students studying in a foreign country. For instance, cross-cultural training has been found to facilitate expatriate adjustment (Waxin & Panaccio, 2005), and incorporating cultural differences in emotional display rules into cross-cultural training may increase the success of the training program.

In addressing this issue, first research on cultural dimensions is discussed. Second, sojourner adjustment is addressed, and third, research on cultural differences in emotion is described. Lastly, the incorporation of emotion into adjustment theories is discussed, followed by a brief description of the purpose of the present study.

Dimensions of Culture

Culture can be defined as "a set of attitudes, behaviors and symbols shared by a large group of people and usually communicated from one generation to the next" (Shiraev & Levy, 2004, p. 4). It generally consists of "patterned ways of thinking, feeling, and reacting" (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 86). For example, individuals from other

cultural regions, such as the Middle East, have different customs, fashion, religion, and languages than what is a normal part of American culture. Although most people recognize that different cultures do exist, it was not until Hofstede's (1980) seminal work, originally dealing with international work attitudes that researchers were able to identify some *specific* cross-cultural differences that exist across nations.

Between 1967 and 1973 Hofstede's team of researchers collected responses from more than 117,000 international questionnaires, primarily regarding worker attitudes and goals. The participants worked for a large multinational company specializing in high-technology products (IBM) and came from more than 40 different countries, requiring the questionnaire to be translated into 20 different languages. Four dimensions on which national cultures differ were identified: individualism, power distance, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance.

The individualism-collectivism (IC) dimension is one of the more recognized and researched cultural dimensions. This dimension is related to the relationship between the individual and the collective nature of the greater society (Hofstede, 1980; 2001). 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. These cultures focus on the goals and needs of the group and are more concerned with relationships among its members (Stephen, Stephan & DeVargas, 1996).

The power distance dimension (Hofstede, 1980; 2001) refers to the willingness of a culture to accept status and interpersonal power differences among its members. The cultural variability that exists reflects the differences in how power is perceived. In high

power distance cultures, differences in interpersonal power are expected; hierarchy and rank are respected. The differences between those with higher power and lower power simply reflect "existential inequality" (Hofstede, 1980). In contrast, low power distance cultures emphasize more equal relationships between members of the group.

The masculinity and femininity dimension relates to how a culture differentiates between sex roles (Hofstede, 1980; 2001). More specifically, it is the tendency of a culture to value either stereotypical masculine traits (e.g., competition and assertiveness; success and money) or to value feminine traits (e.g., interpersonal sensitivity, concerns for quality of life). In masculine cultures the sex roles are clearly differentiated, whereas in feminine cultures they are more fluid and not associated with power (Earley & Francis, 2002).

Uncertainty avoidance refers to the extent to which people feel threatened by ambiguous situations and deals with "the level of anxiety about the future in a country and the consequent need to protect society…" (Hofstede, 1980, p. 183). High uncertainty avoidance cultures enforce strict codes and social control in an attempt to reduce uncertainty and increase predictability. However, individuals in cultures with lower uncertainty avoidance do not require such strict rules regarding behavior nor do they perceive such a need to reduce ambiguities.

These four dimensions have continued to be used in research throughout the last twenty-five years (Hofstede, 2001; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). Further studies have led to improvements in defining these dimensions while also developing other cultural dimensions or theories (e.g., Bond, 1988; Smith, Dugan, & Trompenaars, 1996; Triandis, 1995). For example, Smith et al., (1996) paralleled

Hofstede's study on values and culture by surveying 8,841 participants from a database of international organization employees. The participants came from 43 different countries, including ex-communist countries that were not included in Hofstede's original work. Results support Hofstede's IC and power distance dimensions; however, they provide suggestions to better identify dimensions of culture by incorporating other aspects of culture such as those related to Confucian work dynamism (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987) and Triandis' (1995) work on horizontal and vertical individualism.

Triandis (1995) has also investigated cultural dimensions and uses the Individualism-Collectivism (IC) construct to explain cultural differences in a variety of psychological phenomenon. He views the IC constructs as "social patterns" or "cultural syndromes" by which people differ. Similar to Hofstede's dimensions, Triandis differentiates collectivism and individualism by whether individuals view themselves as part of a collective or view themselves as independent of collectives. However, Triandis and Gefland (1998) further delineate the IC constructs into horizontal and vertical dimensions. The horizontal patterns emphasize equality, while the vertical patterns emphasize hierarchy. Triandis uses these dimensions in combination with the IC dimensions to better explain the cultural variation that occurs within the IC social pattern.

For example, both Sweden and the United States are Individualistic countries; although the cultures are still relatively distinct. Triandis explains this difference by making a further distinction: the United States has a vertical individualistic (VI) culture, whereas Sweden has a horizontal individualistic (HI) culture. More specifically, people in HI cultures such as Sweden want to be unique and distinct from their groups, but are not interested in achieving status or becoming distinguished. In contrast, individuals in VI

cultures are interested in acquiring status and becoming distinguished, and they will do so

by competing with other individuals (Triandis & Gefland, 1998). These delineations are

comparable to Hofstede's dimension of power distance. Rather than defining horizontal

and vertical as a different dimension (as Hofstede does with power distance), Triandis

incorporates them into the IC dimension and argues that further definition of this

dimension is important to better understanding cultural differences. So although the

research conducted by Triandis has generally supported one of Hofstede's dimensions

(IC), it has further delineated the constructs to better understand cultural differences.

More recently, a large-scale study of the relationship of culture to conceptions

of leadership was conducted (House et al., 2004). The Global Leadership and

Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) research program investigated practices

and values at three different levels: industry, organization, and society, and sought to

identify relationships among societal-level variables, organizational practices, and leader

behavior and attributes. Collecting data from 62 different cultures, the GLOBE project

extended Hofstede's work on cultural variation and organizational attitudes and values by

developing new dimensions of cultural variation. Specifically, the GLOBE project

resulted in nine different cultural dimensions: performance orientation, assertiveness,

future orientation, humane orientation, institutional collectivism, in-group collectivism,

gender egalitarianism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance. Thus, the results

indicated some similar cultural patterns to Hofstede's dimensions. For example, power

distance in the GLOBE study significantly correlated with Hofstede's power distance.

Additionally, a comparison of GLOBE's in-group collectivism and Hofstede's

individualism shows that the same countries, for the most part, classified as

individualistic in Hofstede's (1980) dataset are still considered individualistic in the

GLOBE dataset. This implies that the IC rankings have been remarkably stable over the

last 30 years. In addition, the GLOBE study also identified a second individualism

dimension, institutional collectivism, which is conceptually similar to Triandis' work

combining both individualism and power distance.

The existence of different cultural dimensions, such as those described

previously, could contribute to potential problems (i.e., adjustment and success

difficulties) for those sojourners crossing cultural boundaries. For example, if a sojourner

is living in a country with a very different culture (e.g., collectivist living in an

individualistic country), the sojourner must not only adjust to the new assignment (i.e.,

school, work, volunteering), but also to the new culture in general (e.g., display rules of

emotion, nonverbal communication, language). This could potentially prolong the time it

takes to adjust and perhaps impair the sojourner's overall success. Despite the potential

problems, the globalization of society is leading more individuals to sojourn in other

countries. Understanding what influences sojourners' adjustment is important to their

success and to the success of the organization to which they are committed.

Sojourner Adjustment

Increased international trade and the rise of multinational corporations (MNC)

have led to an increased demand for work sojourners who will successfully complete

their international assignments (Black et al., 1999). Likewise, globalization has led to a

growing number of student and volunteer sojourners choosing to study/work in a country

and culture different from their own. Without a doubt, sojourners are important to the

U.S. economy and their success is vital to the organizations for which they work or study.

However, many sojourners come from home cultures that are drastically dissimilar to the

host culture in which they temporarily reside. In fact, almost 57% of international

students in the U.S. come from Asian countries (Institute of International Education,

2004), which tend to be more collectivistic in nature than the United States (Hofstede,

1980). Therefore, having to adjust to the cultural differences that exist between the home

and host cultures may make the adjustment one has when leaving home even harder.

Many researchers have referred to the differences between one's home and

host cultures as examples of *cultural distance* (e.g., Feldman & Tompson, 1993;

Mumford, 1998; Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy, 1992; 1993) or *cultural novelty*

(Black & Gregersen, 1991; Black et al., 1991; Parker & McEvoy, 1993). Cultural

distance refers to the extent to which a sojourner's home and host culture are similar or

dissimilar to each other. It implies that the more dissimilar (or the greater culturally

distant) a sojourner's home and host culture are, the more difficult their adjustment may

be. Likewise, cultural novelty refers to the extent to which aspects of the sojourner's host

culture are or are not novel in comparison to their home culture. It suggests that the more

novel aspects of the host culture are (because the culture is different from one's home

culture), the more difficult adjustment may be. For example, a student from a collectivist

culture, such as Japan, may have more adjustment difficulties in an individualistic

country like the United States than a student from a country such as Norway, whose

culture is more similar to the US than Japan. For those sojourners who have greater

cultural distance or novelty, poorer adjustment may occur.

Some researchers have investigated the extent to which cultural distance plays a role in sojourner adjustment. For example, Hechanova-Alampay and colleagues (Hechanova-Alampay, Beehr, Christiansen, & Van Horn, 2002) followed both domestic and international student sojourners as they relocated to a new environment. They found that international sojourners experienced greater adjustment difficulties upon entry and after three months in the new environment than did the domestic sojourners. So, although all sojourners go through a period of adjustment, sojourners remaining in their home country may have relatively less adjustment to experience than those entering a new country because there is less cultural distance between their home and host cultures.

Other researchers have found that sojourners from different cultures vary in the degree to which they experience certain adjustment problems (Church, 1982). For example, early studies with Scandinavian sojourners in the United States (Lysgaard, 1955; Scott, 1956; Sewell & Davidsen, 1961) found that student sojourners had little adjustment difficulties, whereas other studies have shown that students from Asia, Japan, India, and Africa go through considerable adjustment difficulties when studying in the United States (Adelegan & Parks, 1985; Bennett, Passin, & McKnight, 1958; Constantine, Anderson, Berkel, Caldwell, & Utsey, 2005; Deutsch, 1970; Lambert & Bressler, 1956; Puritt, 1978). Scandinavian countries are more closely related to the United States on some cultural dimensions (e.g., individualism), and therefore, these students may have fewer cultural differences to adjust to than students from more culturally dissimilar countries such as Japan, India, and Africa.

More recent research has specifically looked at the relationship between adjustment and cultural distance. Waxin (2004) investigated French, German, Korean,

and Scandinavian expatriate managers in India and found that culture of origin had a moderating effect on adjustment and its antecedents. More specifically, it was found that the more cultural distance between each of the European countries and India, the less adjustment occurred by the expatriates. Other researchers have also found that cultural novelty (i.e., cultural distance) is negatively associated with expatriate adjustment (Gregersen & Stroh, 1997; Parker & McEvoy, 1993; Stahl & Caligiuri, 2005). Likewise, Ward and Kennedy (1993) found similar results with student sojourners. Specifically, cultural distance was found to be a predictor of sociocultural adaptation. Malaysian and Singaporean students studying in New Zealand (i.e., large cultural distance) experienced more social difficulties than did Malaysian students in Singapore (i.e., less cultural distance). Taken together, these studies suggest that the amount of cultural distance between one's home and host culture may influence a sojourner's adjustment.

An additional factor that may affect a sojourner's adjustment in the host country is tenure (Church, 1982). Those individuals who have spent more time in the host culture are likely to have a better understanding of the culture and the host nationals with whom they are interacting. This enhanced understanding may lead to an increased ability to perceive what is "appropriate" in the host culture and to adjust their behaviors to appropriately fit with those of the host culture. Several researchers have found an association between tenure or past experience and sojourner adjustment (e.g., Parker & McEvoy, 1993; Stahl & Caligiuri, 2005; Takeuchi, Tesluk, Yun, & Lepak, 2005; Ward & Kennedy, 1993). For example, Stahl and Caligiuri (2005) found that expatriate sojourners' time on the assignment was significantly and positively related to nonwork adjustment. Likewise, Ward and Kennedy (1993) found that length of residence of

student sojourners was related to their adjustment.

Cultural distance and tenure are two factors that may influence a sojourner's adjustment in their host country. Adjusting well to the new culture is important because uprooting oneself from one's home and moving to another place can be stressful and challenging. In fact, many sojourners go through culture shock (Oberg, 1960), which is a negative and unpleasant reaction to the experience of entering a new culture that includes psychological and physical strain, sense of loss and deprivation, confusion, and surprise. Oberg felt that culture shock "is precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse" (p. 177) such as customs, gestures, words, or facial expressions. Culture shock is likely to be experienced more severely when the cultural distance between home and host culture is large (Mumford, 1998). Brislin and Yoshida (1994) found that, in addition to the sense of loss and confusion normally felt with culture shock, many international student sojourners also felt intense feelings of anxiety, disappointment relating to unmet expectations about the host country, and a sense of isolation due to the alienation of family and friends. Feelings and experiences such as these could lead to poor adjustment and ultimately result in premature termination of the work or academic position. Therefore, it is important for the sojourner to adjust successfully to the new environment and culture.

However, life for sojourners is not always negative; it also leads to many positive or desired outcomes. Sojourners have reported an increased appreciation of the home culture; more favorable or objective views of the host culture; broader worldview or perspective; a reduction of ethnocentrism, intolerance, and stereotypes; increased cognitive complexity; and greater personal awareness, self-esteem, confidence, and

creativity (Church, 1982). Because such positive outcomes are possible and reported by

sojourners, it is important for successful adjustment to take place to reduce the negative

outcomes that are also commonly reported.

Furthermore, adjustment could have major implications for a sojourners'

success in their new position. In fact, several researchers have found that adjustment is

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) and negatively related to the sojourners' intention to return to their home

country early (Forster, 1997; Gregersen & Black, 1990; Takeuchi, Yun, & Tesluck, 2002;

Tung, 1981). Adjustment has even been linked to performance after major influences

such as job satisfaction have been accounted for (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005). An

inability to adjust is considered "one of the chief determinants of early returns" (Sinangil

& Ones, 2002, p. 431), and those who remain maladjusted on the assignment may be

inefficient or ineffective in their performance. Thus, as the sojourner engages in the new

assignment, successful adjustment may have important implications for sojourners as

well as organizations.

Models of International Adjustment

Many models and theories of sojourner adjustment have been developed over

the years (e.g., Aycan, 1997; Berry, 1997; Black & Stephens, 1989; Black et al., 1991;

Brislin, 1981; Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1978; Searle & Ward, 1990). Although

each may add something unique to the knowledge of sojourner adjustment, most theories

have some aspects in common; particularly, most have a psychological, interpersonal,

and work component.

Aycan (1997) developed a theoretical model of acculturation for work sojourners in which the final stage of the acculturation process involves psychological and adjustment outcomes. According to Aycan, adjustment and performance are considered the "two most critical criteria of 'expatriate success'" (p. 5) and successful adjustment is a crucial element in good performance. Thus, he contended that adjustment should be one of the main concerns when sending a sojourner abroad. Aycan considers expatriate adjustment to be a multifaceted phenomenon consisting of psychological, socio-cultural, and work-related adjustment. *Psychological adjustment* refers to the psychological well-being one feels in the new environment. Specifically, it deals with the satisfaction one feels with different aspects of life. *Socio-cultural adjustment* refers to "one's progress on becoming fully effective in the new society by meeting the requirements of daily life and engaging in harmonious tendering interpersonal relations with members of the host society" (p. 7). Lastly, *work adjustment* involves adequate job performance, demonstrated by behaviors resulting in efficient completion of job tasks, and positive attitudes toward the job experience.

Aycan (1997) describes the acculturation process which results in these adjustment outcomes as influenced by many different factors. Such factors include the training the sojourner receives, attitudes that the parent and host organizations hold toward the sojourner's assignment, the expectations and attitudes of the sojourner, and the socialization of the sojourner into the host unit. Additionally, factors such as the perceived cultural distance, appraisal of the experience (e.g., conflicts, uncertainties, and perceived acceptance), coping strategies, and family adjustment all influence the amount

of culture shock a sojourner goes through and how alienated they feel in their new environment. Taken together, Aycan contends that these are some of the factors that may influence the extent to which a sojourner undergoes successful psychological, socio-cultural and work adjustment.

In a similar manner, Searle and Ward (1990) empirically investigated sojourner adjustment during cross-cultural transitions and also postulated that both psychological and sociocultural adjustment occurs. Malaysian and Singaporean sojourners studying in New Zealand completed a questionnaire examining aspects of psychological and sociocultural adjustment. Results indicated that, although somewhat interrelated, sociocultural and psychological adjustment should be regarded as conceptually distinct factors. Each factor was predicted by different sets of variables. For example, expected difficulty, cultural distance and depression were the most powerful predictors of sociocultural adjustment. Life changes, extraversion, social difficulty, and satisfaction with host nationals combined to better predict psychological adjustment. Although many researchers have theorized that these different facets of adjustment exist, Searle and Ward were able to empirically validate the notion that sojourners do experience two forms of adjustment: sociocultural and psychological adjustment.

In both of the models discussed above sociocultural and psychological adjustment are pinpointed as key components to successful sojourner adjustment. Several other researchers have also highlighted these components, as well as the work adjustment component discussed by Aycan (1997), as vital aspects of a sojourner's adjustment experience (Brislin, 1981; Hammer et al., 1978). Although each of these models is supported and appears theoretically sound, Black and colleagues (Black et al., 1991;

Black & Stephens, 1989) model of sojourner adjustment has been the most influential and often cited theory on sojourner experiences (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005).

The Black et al. (1991) model takes a multifaceted approach to sojourner adjustment. Adjustment is defined as the degree of psychological comfort or absence of stress a sojourner has with various aspects of a host culture (Black & Gregersen, 1991). First, Black et al. (1991) propose a variety of anticipatory antecedents that may influence the extent to which sojourners successfully undergo this adjustment (Figure 1). For example, receiving appropriate training, previous experience, and developing accurate expectations of the new international setting before leaving may make adjustment to the host culture easier and quicker.

Once in the host country, Black et al. (1991) contend that adjustment undergone by sojourners is comprised of three specific facets of international adjustment: (1) *general* (comfort associated with various non-work factors such as general living conditions, local food, transportation, entertainment, facilities, and health care services in the host country); (2) *interaction* (comfort associated with interacting with host country nationals both inside and outside of the work/academic environment); (3) *work/academic* (comfort associated with the assignment job or tasks). More specifically, they propose that these three facets of adjustment are influenced by variables related to five main factors: individual (e.g., perception skills), job (e.g., role conflict), organizational culture (e.g., social support), organizational socialization (e.g., socialization tactics), and nonwork factors (e.g., culture novelty). These three facets of adjustment have been empirically supported in sojourner literature (e.g., Black & Stephens, 1989; Hechanova-

Alampay et al., 2002) and have been found to be positively related to performance and intent to stay in the host country (Caligiuri, 1997) and negatively related to the premature termination of the sojourners' assignment (Gregersen & Black, 1990).

Although this conceptualization was originally designed for expatriate sojourners, it has been found to be structurally equivalent as a measure of cross-cultural adjustment for student sojourners (Robie & Ryan, 1996). A shortened version of the Black and Stephens (1989) scale, reflecting the three facets of international adjustment: general, interaction, and work, was given to both international students studying in the United States and American expatriates in Taiwan and Belgium and found to statistically fit both samples relatively well. This indicates that adjustment may have similar dimensions across the different sojourning groups.

Many propositions in Black et al.'s (1991) theoretical model of international adjustment have been supported (Shaffer, Harrison, & Gilley, 1999; Bhaskar-Shrinvas et al., 2005) and it is considered a good fit for many types of sojourners (Robie & Ryan, 1996). Yet there may be one aspect of adjustment that is missing or not highlighted enough in the model, as well as in other models of international adjustment. The way in which sojourners have to adjust *emotionally*, including perceiving emotion within themselves and others as well as rules for displaying emotion, may be very important to their success in the host country.

Within the Black et al. (1991) framework, there are several aspects of international adjustment that may involve aspects of emotion (bolded in Figure 1). For example, Black and colleagues identify perception skills as one of the individual-level variables that may influence the degree to which a sojourner is able to adjust when in the

host country. Specifically, they contend that perception skills help individuals understand what is appropriate and inappropriate in the host country. Thus, the greater the perception skills, the easier it will be for such sojourners to understand and correctly interpret the host culture, increasing the degree of adjustment. Because differences across cultures do exist in various aspects of emotion (e.g., expression, display rules), such perception skills may be needed to correctly perceive and evaluate what the cultural norms are for displaying one's emotions in the host country. Any cultural differences in emotional expression or emotional behavior may affect a sojourner's adjustment and success in a host country, especially if the aspects of emotion are very different from those emotional aspects of the home culture.

In addition, another individual-level variable that may be influenced by cultural differences in emotion is relation skills. Black et al. (1991) posit that relation skills are those necessary for "the fostering of relationships with host nationals" (p. 294). Research shows that sojourners, especially international students, who form fewer relationships or spend less time with host nationals have lower adjustment while abroad (Church, 1982). Presumably, it may be important in developing relationships to understand the nature of emotional display in the host culture so that miscommunication and conflict can be avoided. Thus, aspects of emotion may play a role in the adjustment process through the nature of its relationship with individual factors such as perception and relation skills.

Moreover, if such differences in emotional display do exist between a sojourner's home and host culture, cross-cultural training may be more beneficial if it included aspects of the differences in appropriate and inappropriate emotional behavior.

That is, training sojourners on the emotional display rules of their host country before going abroad could provide them with more accurate expectations of the host culture. According to the Black et al. (1991) framework, having more accurate expectations increases anticipatory adjustment, which in turn affects the degree of in-country adjustment that a sojourner has.

In sum, emotion is a variable that may play a role in international adjustment. In the framework developed by Black et al. (1991), training in how aspects of emotion differ across cultures (or in the host country) may be useful for sojourners to have before going abroad. Additionally, once abroad, it could be important for sojourners to be able to perceive and evaluate the cultural norms surrounding emotion and emotional display in the host country as well as use such norms to facilitate good relationships with host country nationals. Thus, perception skills would be useful tools for identifying what is appropriate or inappropriate emotional display and relation skills could help sojourners make and maintain meaningful relationships. Although it appears that emotion could play a large role in the experiences if sojourners, few researchers have discussed how these emotion and the cultural differences that exist in emotion affect a sojourner's adjustment.

Early Research in Cross-cultural Differences in Emotion

Most of the early research on cross-cultural differences in emotion focused on facial expressions of emotion. Many researchers over the years have debated whether facial expressions of emotions are universal and biological in nature or culture-specific (e.g., Darwin, 1965; Ekman, 1972; Izard, 1971; Kitayama & Markus, 1994; Mesquita & Frijda, 1992; Russell, 1994). Early studies conducted in the 1960's and 70's (Ekman,

1972; 1973; Ekman & Friesen, 1971; Ekman, Sorenson, & Friesen, 1969; Friesen, 1972;

Izard, 1971) found support for the existence of universal facial expressions for six

Figure 1
Framework of International Adjustment

Individual

| Training | Previous experience |

Accurate expectations

Anticipatory Adjustment

Organization

Selection
Mechanisms
and Criteria

Individual

Self-efficacy
Relation Skills
Perception Skills

Organizational Socialization

Socialization Tactics
Socialization Content

Job

Role Clarity
Role Discretion
Role Novelty
Role Conflict

Mode of Adjustment

Degree of Adjustment
Work Adjustment
Interaction Adjustment
General Adjustment

Organization Culture

Organization Culture
Novelty
Social Support
Logistical Help

Nonwork

Culture Novelty
Family-Spouse
Adjustment

Black, J. S., Gregersen, H.B., & Mendenhall, M. (1991). Toward a comprehensive model of international adjustment. *Academy of Management Journal, 16*, 291-317.

discrete emotions: surprise, fear, anger, disgust, sadness, or happiness. For example, these studies found that almost all samples of participants from a variety of literate and preliterate cultures (i.e., United States, Japan, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Borneo, New Guinea, Africa, England, Germany, Spain, France, Switzerland, Greece, India, and Turkey) identified facial displays as depicting the same emotions at above chance levels. This led some researchers to believe that some discrete emotions and accompanying facial displays were universal. However, several alternative explanations have been formed for these results (e.g., Russell, 1994; Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002), which do not support the universality of emotion. For example, Russell (1994) identified several methodological and interpretative problems in the early studies of recognition of facial expression of emotion. Likewise, other researchers have proposed that emotions are both biological and socio-cultural (Kitayama & Markus, 1994; Mesquita & Frijida, 1992) and the early studies on emotion recognition demonstrate aspects of both universality and cross-cultural differences in emotion.

In particular, the early findings also demonstrated cultural differences in recognition rates of the emotions in the different samples. For example, while 85% of American participants agreed on the judgment of the photo depicting fear, only 54% of Japanese participants showed the same agreement (Ekman, 1972). Likewise, Izard (1971) found significant differences in the photo judgment task among the different cultural samples as well. In his research, Africans had significantly lower agreement on the emotional categories than any other cultural group and were ultimately taken out of some analyses due to what was thought to be methodological issues (i.e., not tested in native language). Similarly, the Japanese were significantly different from all Western cultural

groups (except the Greek) on the agreement of the facial pose and corresponding emotion. In contrast, no differences were found between most Western groups (American, English, German, French, Swiss, and Swedish). Additionally, differences due to culture were found for some emotions (i.e., disgust-contempt and fear), but not others (i.e., anger-rage, enjoyment-joy). Other studies found cultural differences in agreement and recognition rates of emotional expressions as well (e.g., Ekman, et al., 1969; Ekman & Friesen, 1971). The cultural differences found in these studies imply that although universals in emotion may exist, culture plays a large role in how the emotions are expressed and recognized across cultures.

Although these studies suggest cultural influences in emotional expression, the way in which culture does so was not directly examined. However, in a joint effort Ekman (1972) and Friesen (1972) provide evidence that differences in emotional expression can be attributed to culture. American and Japanese participants watched a stressful film clip alone and then again in the presence of an experimenter. The facial expressions they displayed while watching the film clips were videotaped and coded by separate viewers. These recordings indicated that both Japanese and American participants exhibited the same negative facial expressions when alone. However, when the experimenter was present, there was a substantial difference in their facial displays, with the Japanese participants showing more positive and less negative emotions than the Americans when watching the film. It appeared that differences in cultural norms were requiring many Japanese to mask their negative feelings with a polite smile, while the Americans were able to continue showing their negative expressions. Ekman and Friesen referred to these variations as differences in cultural display rules.

Display rules refer to rules which 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). Display rules direct how a person is to display their emotion in a given situation, and these rules may differ across cultures. They may help to explain why, if certain emotions are universal, all cultures do not recognize them at the same rates or display them at the same times. With regards to the results discussed above, the difference in expression between American and Japanese participants may be the product of differences in display rules. Considering that the U.S. and Japan are dissimilar on cultural dimensions (e.g., Individualism-Collectivism, Power Distance), it is also likely that their cultural rules concerning how to regulate one's emotions are dissimilar as well. Thus, Japanese may learn through cultural display rules not to express negative feelings in the presence of others, while in American culture this inhibition of emotion is not as important.

In sum, these early studies provided support for both universal aspects of emotion as well as differences in emotion attributable to cultural influences. They demonstrate that even if individuals experience the same emotions, culture may influence them to regulate or display their emotions differently. These findings have direct implications for sojourners studying or working in a country with a culture very dissimilar to their own. If a sojourner finds him or herself immersed in a culture that expects them to emotionally behave differently than they are used to, it may directly affect the ease with which they adjust and become comfortable in their new environment. This, in turn, may affect the likelihood that they will succeed in their assignment.

Although few researchers have applied this area of work to sojourner research, these early studies (e.g., Ekman, 1972; Friesen, 1972, Izard, 1971) did ignite further investigation into how and in what ways culture plays a role in human emotions. This area of research is still being investigated today as the cultures of the world are interacting more with one another through increased international academics, global trade, multinational businesses, travel, and volunteerism. These instances of cross-cultural contact enhance the need for understanding cultural differences in emotion and could be particularly useful in the study of sojourners' adjustment and emotional issues they might face.

Modern Research On Cultural Differences In Emotion

Ekman and colleagues made significant contributions to cross-cultural research on emotional expression and paved the way for future research in this area. Much of this new research focuses not only on cross-cultural differences according to nation, but also on broader cultural dimensions such as those described by Hofstede and other cultural researchers (Triandis, 1995; Matsumoto, 1990; 1991). Several researchers have discussed and investigated how culture, according to cultural dimensions, could influence emotional behavior and how emotional behavior then would differ cross-culturally (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Matsumoto, 1989; Matsumoto, 1990; Mesquita & Walker, 2003; Schimmack, 1996). Many of the studies done recently have dealt primarily with the differences found between individualist and collectivist cultures (IC). These studies suggest that variations in different aspects of emotion can be explained by differences according to cultural dimensions, as well as cross-national cultural differences.

For example, one recent study attempted to replicate and extend the Ekman (1972) and Friesen (1972) study, but differentiated the participant groups by psychological, not national (i.e., Japanese or American) culture (Matsumoto & Kupperbusch, 2001). Participants classified as either idiocentric or allocentric (i.e., the individualistic and collectivistic tendencies measured on the individual level) were videotaped watching either a positive or negative film clip. They viewed the clip both alone and with an experimenter present and their emotional expressions were judged by a separate group of decoders. Additionally, participants gave self-report ratings of their emotional experience, an element which was lacking in the original study. Results supported the original findings by Ekman (1972) and Friesen (1972); there were not differences according to culture in the experience of emotion, but idiocentrics (i.e., individualistic persons) and allocentrics (i.e., collectivistic persons) did differ in how they displayed their emotions in the presence of others. More specifically, it was found that when allocentrics viewed the negative films with an experimenter present they showed less negative and more positive emotions than when viewing the negative film alone. This demonstrates that individuals who are more collectivistic in nature may inhibit their emotional responses in the presence of others to a greater extent than those who are more individualistic in nature.

Researchers have begun to take an interest in several different aspects of emotional expression and how they differ according to cultural dimensions. In particular, emotional experience, intensity, and emotional expression have been researched, primarily looking at differences between nations that vary according to IC dimensions of culture. Moreover, display rules continue to be investigated to see how they would affect

one's emotional response in different social situations.

In one study, Matsumoto and colleagues (Matsumoto, Kasri, & Kooken, 1999) investigated the cultural differences in judgments of expression intensity and subjective experience of emotions. They used participants from a traditionally collectivistic culture (Japan) and a traditionally individualistic culture (United States) as indicated in Hofstede's (1980) research. Participants were shown slides of American and Japanese 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 (IC) 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 the Japanese participants did. However, the Japanese perceived greater intensity than 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. Being a collectivist culture, 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**.** Therefore, the Japanese may understand that one is experiencing an emotion, but 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).

In another study, Stephan and colleagues (Stephan et al., 1996) investigated differences in emotional expression of Costa Rican (collectivist) and American (individualistic) students. In particular, the study asked participants to rate how comfortable they would feel expressing different emotions to a family member if the family member had caused them to feel each specific emotion. Additionally, they were asked how they would feel expressing the same emotion to a stranger if the stranger had caused the emotional feeling. It was found 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), which is representative of individualistic cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Additionally, American participants felt more comfortable than Costa Ricans expressing negative emotions overall, regardless of the social situation. Surprising to researchers, the Americans felt more comfortable expressing emotions that reflected an interdependent concept of self as well (e.g., sympathetic, grateful, fearful of angering others, apologetic). Whereas Americans did not feel as comfortable expressing emotions to strangers as family members, Costa Ricans expected that they would feel equal levels of comfort in the two situations. However, they felt less comfortable in expressing their emotions overall. Similar to other studies (Matsumoto & Kupperbusch, 2001), these results suggest that Costa Rican's, like other collectivist cultures (i.e., Japan), may have more cultural display rules regarding the overall expression of emotion in comparison to Americans. Namely, it could be that they are expected to have better control over the expression emotion regardless of the valence of the emotion or the social context surrounding them.

Matsumoto and colleagues (Matsumoto, Takeuchi, Andayani, Kouznetsova, &

Krupp, 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. Additionally they

completed an individual measure of individualism-collectivism to assess the degree to

which differences in display rules between nations could be attributed to individualism

and collectivism. Russians and South Koreans were found to be the most collectivistic;

Americans and Japanese were the most individualistic. Results indicated that cultural

differences in display rules did exist and some of those differences could be attributable

to the IC dimension. For example, 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 with those individuals with

whom one is interacting. 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, the authors reasoned this could be due to the

individualistic nature of the culture, where uniqueness and autonomy are emphasized.

Therefore, one may want to control his or her emotions in the presence of strangers in

order 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, Yoo,

Hirayama, & Petrova, 2005).

In addition to the cultural variation in perception of emotional displays and cultural variation in how and to whom one displays emotions, more specific behavior differences have also been noted. In one study, Japanese respondents reported much fewer hand and arm gestures and whole body activity than did Americans in situations when anger, sadness, fear, and happiness were experienced (Scherer, Matsumoto, Wallbott, & Kudoh, 1988). Additionally, Matsumoto, Kudoh, Scherer, and Wallbott (1988) reported that American subjects experience their emotions longer than Japanese subjects and Americans reported feeling emotions more intensely than the Japanese. Furthermore, Americans reported more physiological, verbal, and nonverbal reactions than the Japanese. And when asked what they would do to cope with various emotional events, significantly more Japanese reported that no action was necessary. Although many of the same emotions were said to be experienced in the same situations, culture was clearly playing a part in how those emotions were experienced and how one responded to the emotions. Likewise, Scherer and Wallbott (1994) also found cultural variation in behavioral emotional responses and regulation, but relatively stable and universal biopsychological emotional responses such as heart rate.

Taken together, these studies demonstrate that there are several aspects of emotional behavior that are influenced by culture. Perceptions of emotional intensity, outward emotional expression, and emotional behavior in social situations were all shown to be influenced by culture. These findings highlight how important, yet challenging, it may be for sojourners to adjust emotionally to their host culture. It seems that in a sense, culture defines the situations where emotions should be expressed, which emotions are to be expressed, to what extent those expressions are acceptable, and in what manner.

Mesquita (2001) said that "emotions themselves can be seen as cultural practices that promote important cultural ideas" (p. 73). If culture plays such a role in the experience and behavior of emotions, then understanding the cultural differences that exist across cultures could be very important for a sojourner temporarily living in another culture.

Emotions and Sojourner Adjustment

The studies described previously have demonstrated that culture plays a role in how a person responds to the experience of different emotions in different social situations, as well as how one perceives the emotions displayed by others. What may be considered an appropriate response to an emotion (i.e., display rule) in an individualistic culture may not be appropriate in a collectivist culture. In fact, according to Cole, Bruschi, and Tamang (2002) emotions are adaptive processes that involve appraisals of situations and the readiness to act to preserve one's well-being. However, the action one takes regarding his or her emotional experience is learned through socialization (Saarni, 1999) and therefore is likely to vary according to culture. Because of this, it may be important for sojourners' adjustment and success to recognize that these differences in appropriate emotional responses exist.

As discussed previously, leaving one's home country to work or study in a country and culture unlike one's own can be beneficial for sojourners (Church, 1982). However, adjustment for sojourners can also be difficult at times resulting in negative consequences such as culture shock, academic challenges, strained relationships with family and co-workers abroad, financial problems, poor health, loneliness, and interpersonal conflicts (Baker & Siryk, 1986; Church, 1982; Forster, 1997; Oberg, 1960; Ying, 2005). The dissimilarity between the home and host cultures can contribute to

adjustment difficulties and, as many researchers have noted, cultural differences

regarding emotions do exist. Therefore, it is important to take emotion into consideration

when investigating cross-cultural adjustment. Yet few researchers have incorporated

emotion into their models of adjustment (e.g., Aycan, 1997; Black et al., 1991; Guzman

& Burke, 2003) or into sojourner literature in general (Tan, Hartel, & Strybosch, 2005),

although some are beginning to do so (Matsumoto et al., 2001; Tan et al., 2005).

For example, Matsumoto and colleagues (Matsumoto et al, 2001; Matsumoto

et al., 2003) have developed and validated a measure of intercultural adjustment designed

specifically for Japanese sojourners, but gaining support for use with other populations.

This measure recognizes that contexts surrounding intercultural adjustment are "seeped

with emotion, often negative" (Matsumoto et al., 2001, p. 485). To successfully adjust, it

would be important for sojourners to regulate these negative emotions in order to avoid

conflict and not let the negative affect overcome one's cognitions and motivations. For

this reason, they argue that emotion regulation could be the "gatekeeper skill" that is

necessary for successful intercultural adjustment. A further necessity in adjustment, they

argue, is monitoring the behaviors and reactions of one's self and others around one's

self.

To exemplify their argument, Matsumoto and colleagues have identified

important ways emotion is embedded into cultural adjustment. Namely, that it is

important for a sojourner to recognize his or her emotions and regulate them in order to

assist in adjustment and avoid conflict. The way in which a person responds in an

emotionally arousing situation could have important implications for their social

relationships and social adjustment. For example, if one begins to cry every time he or

she feels frustration or sadness regarding a work or academic situation, tension could arise between the peers and coworkers and/or with the superiors. In addition, the action one takes in regards to an emotional experience could regulate the emotions in other people (Eid & Diener, 2001). If one emotionally responds to upsetting events, this could influence the emotions of the other people in social situations. Therefore, as Matsumoto et al. (2001) have pointed out, it may be important to monitor both one's own and other's behaviors and reactions to avoid confusion or conflict.

However, if a sojourner does not understand the culturally appropriate way to express emotions, it may be difficult to properly regulate their own. Conflict and/or miscommunication may arise from the misinterpretation of emotional expression or from the inappropriate display in an emotionally stimulating situation. Additionally, in academic or professional settings, the "appropriate" emotional display may differ between the two persons involved as a function of the culture from which they come. Moreover, as several of the studies indicated, there are cultural differences in display rules and expression of emotion to different social targets (e.g., strangers, family members, colleagues), as well as differences in how emotions are expressed to members of each sex (Matsumoto et al., 1998; Matsumoto et al., 2005, Stephan et al., 1996). Therefore, it is important for sojourners to understand that cultural differences in emotional behavior may exist between their home and host cultures and to understand the cultural norms regarding how to display emotions in the culture that surrounds them. Success often involves knowing how to behave appropriately; therefore it is important for people crossing cultural boundaries to understand the culturally acceptable way to display emotion in different situations. In addition, understanding the differences between one's

home and host culture may help a sojourner develop better social skills and relationships, which are key to overall adjustment (Aycan, 1997).

The Present Study

The present study sought to investigate the extent to which sojourners are able to perceive the differences in the appropriate emotional display in work settings (i.e., display rules) between their home and host cultures and to see how this perception affects their adjustment. Investigating this relationship could be useful for organizations that involve sojourners such as academic, business, and non-profit organizations, by identifying what contributes to successful adjustment in a host country. Further research could be beneficial in selection and training activities for expatriates going to work abroad or for international students studying in a foreign country. For instance, cross-cultural training has been found to facilitate expatriate adjustment (Waxin & Panaccio, 2005), and incorporating cultural differences in emotional response and expression into cross-cultural training may increase the success of the training program.

Although many researchers have begun investigating the differences in emotion that exist across cultures, the large majority of these studies have simply investigated the cultural differences across nations: Few have focused on how these differences affect people temporarily living in a foreign culture. Thus, it is important to investigate the emotional display of sojourners who are temporarily residing in a country with a culture different from their own. The present study focused on differences in emotion that exist across cultures for one specific type of sojourner; international students. Specifically, international student sojourners reported how they feel they *should* display emotion in a given work-related situation both in their home and host cultures.

Then, the responses were compared to those given by American participants, whose responses were used to create a baseline measure of the display rules that exist in the host culture for the different emotionally-arousing situations. Additionally, the extent to which international student sojourners accurately perceive the appropriate display of emotion in their host culture was compared to the extent to which they have adjusted.

Central to this study was investigating whether or not understanding the differences in emotional display rules across individualistic and collectivistic (IC) cultures affects sojourner adjustment. Of the many similarities and differences apparent in the work on cultural dimensions, one dimension that is consistently discussed is some variation of IC. This dimension has been used in psychological and organizational research most often to investigate and explain differences that are occurring in different cultural samples (House et al., 2004). Because the IC dimension is the most recognized and empirically supported aspect of culture, this study focused on that dimension. Identifying how sojourners varying on the IC dimension of culture differ in their emotional responses could make important contributions to sojourner and emotion literatures. Additionally, it would also be beneficial to discover whether or not they are able to perceive the differences that exist and how these perceptions (or lack thereof) influence sojourner adjustment. Therefore, based on previous research on cross-cultural differences in emotion, which has found that differences exist across cultural dimensions in perceptions of emotional intensity, outward emotional expression, and emotional display in social situations (e.g. Ekman, 1972; Friesen, 1972; Matsumoto et al. 1998), I hypothesized that:

H1: Differences in emotional display rules exist between individualist and collectivist cultures.

Additionally, because previous research found that greater cultural distance between a sojourner's home and host setting may lead to greater adjustment difficulties (e.g., Hechanova-Alampay et al., 2002; Stahl & Caligiuri, 2005), and because it was argued herein that the ability to perceive emotional display rules may be part of the adjustment process, I hypothesized that:

H2: The greater the cultural distance between sojourners' home and host countries on the individualism-collectivism dimension of culture, the less accurate they will be in correctly identifying the host country display rules for different emotionally arousing situations.

Furthermore, because it has been found that individuals who have spent more time in the host culture experience better adjustment (Ward & Kennedy, 1993; Stahl & Caligiuri, 2005), it is therefore likely that they will also have a better understanding of the culture and the host nationals with whom they are interacting. Thus, I hypothesized that:

H3: Tenure will be positively related to accuracy in identifying the host culture display rules for emotionally arousing situations.

Lastly, I examined the effect of emotional display rule knowledge on sojourner adjustment. Thus far models of sojourner adjustment have largely neglected emotion as a factor that may influence the adjustment process (e.g., Black et al., 1991). However, previous research has shown that cross-cultural differences in emotion exist (e.g., Ekman, 1972; Friesen, 1972). Therefore, it may be important to consider the role emotions may play when individuals cross cultural boundaries. It has been argued herein that the ability

to accurately recognize differences in emotion between one's home and host culture may influence a sojourner's successful adjustment for a variety of reasons (e.g., conflict, communication, social relationships). Therefore, I hypothesized that:

> H4: The ability to accurately identify the way host country natives display emotion in an emotionally-arousing situation will be positively related to adjustment for student sojourners.

Method

Participants

All graduate students (approximately 795 international students and 1739 American students) from a large, rural mid-western university were sent an email asking for their voluntary participation in the study. After an initial email and 3 follow-up emails were sent[1], 92 international students, representing 40 different countries, submitted the web-based version of the survey, resulting in an 11.6% response rate. This sample generally reflects the international student population at Ohio University and a breakdown of the key variables (i.e., adjustment, cultural distance, tenure, and individualism) by country can be seen in Table 1. The response rate for American sample was 12.9% with 225 participants submitting the web-based version. Data from two individuals were excluded because they were international students who completed the surveys posted on the American website. One international participant chose to take the paper-and-pencil version of the study, but the data was excluded because the primary survey was not completed. The only significant differences found between the American and International student samples on any of the demographic variables were for graduate

---

[1] No significant differences between the initial and follow-up emails were found in responses to the primary measure, the Display Rule Assessment Inventory.

program/level (M.S. or PhD), living situation, and the questions pertaining to with whom

one spends free time. The means for all demographic variables for both the American and

international student samples can be found in Table 2. Sixty percent of the participants in

the International student sample were male and 40% were female[2]. The international

students sample had a mean age was 29.83. Fort-nine percent of the sample was enrolled

in a masters program; 51% of participants were in doctoral programs. Tenure in the U.S.

ranged from 1.5 months to ten years, with an average tenure of 32 months. Additionally,

the majority of the sample was either single (63%) or married (32%). The American

sample had a mean age of 28.66 years and 72% of participants were enrolled in masters

programs and 28% were enrolled in doctoral programs. Sixty-four percent of American

participants were single and 29% were married.

---

[2] Due to an error in the web-based version of the survey gender was not included in the first wave of data collection resulting in 35 missing values for the International sample and 159 missing values for the American sample.

Table 1

Means For Key Demographic Variables By Home Country

Home Country	N	Adjustment	Tenure	Cultural Distance	Individualism
Germany	2	5.73	62	0.61	1.85
France	2	5.67	15	0.60	-0.01
Romania	2	5.60	20	2.47	-0.56
Sudan	1	3.93	20	2.47	-0.56
India	13	5.45	39	2.58	-0.12
St. Vincent	1	4.79	8	NA	NA
Ukraine	2	4.46	13.5	2.47	-.01
Japan	2	4.46	22	1.46	1.00
Kenya	2	5.25	50	3.02	-0.56
Colombia	3	4.74	11.5	3.27	-0.81
Venezuela	2	5.61	33	3.12	-0.66
Australia	1	5.57	8	-0.05	2.98
Korea	1	5.79	120	2.98	-0.52
Tanzania	1	3.42	18	3.02	-0.56
China	11	4.30	40.9	3.17	-0.70
Switzerland	1	6.00	112	0.25	2.20
Israel	2	5.04	34.5	1.32	1.14
Philippines	1	6.78	35	3.37	-0.92
Brazil	2	5.61	21.75	2.16	0.31
Turkey	5	5.33	22.75	2.82	-0.36
Uzbekistan	1	5.64	20	2.47	-0.01
Malawi	1	2.21	8	3.02	-0.56
Nicaragua	1	5.29	19	2.45	0.01
Russia	1	4.14	7	2.65	-0.19
Thailand	2	4.64	37	3.07	-0.61
Indonesia	5	4.54	21.83	3.20	-0.74
Antigua	1	3.69	NA	NA	NA
Mexico	1	3.71	NA	2.84	-0.38
Italy	2	5.07	9	1.00	1.46
Barbados	1	4.57	NA	NA	NA
Haiti	1	4.79	NA	NA	NA

Home Country	N	Adjustment	Tenure	Cultural Distance	Individualism
United Kingdom	1	4.57	NA	-0.11	2.57
Egypt	1	5.79	NA	2.58	-0.11
Argentina	1	5.50	NA	2.26	0.20
South Africa	1	5.14	NA	1.32	1.14
Laos	2	4.54	7	3.09	-0.63
Nigeria	2	4.46	15	2.94	-0.48
Saudi Arabia	1	3.50	72	3.09	-0.63
Taiwan	1	5.64	7	2.48	-0.17
Bangladesh	1	4.00	8	3.05	-0.59

Design

The present study utilized correlational analyses to test the primary hypotheses. The independent variables were individualism, tenure, cultural distance, and accuracy of host culture display rule. The dependent variables included emotional display rule, accuracy of host culture display rule, and adjustment. Additionally, for exploratory purposes, a 2 x 2 x 3 x 7 mixed-factorial design was used, which utilized multivariate statistics. The between subjects factors were sample (American or international student) or culture (home or host). The within-subjects factors included emotion, target (supervisor, coworker, subordinate), and sex of the target. The dependent variable was the display rule score.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Demographic Variables

	International Students		American Students	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Age	29.83	5.01	28.66	6.99
Marital Status	1.42	0.65	1.473	0.80
Living Situation*	2.62	1.14	2.90	1.22
Income	3.02	0.81	2.90	0.89
Class level*	3.77	2.36	2.64	2.05
Lived outside home country	1.61	0.49	1.71	0.46
% Free Time (Americans)*	24.87	25.19	74.42	28.44
% Free Time (International)*	30.70	26.91	14.00	19.02
% Free Time (home culture)	26.58	28.09		
Tenure	32.00	25.03		
Times in U.S.	1.55	2.68		
Staying in host country	1.52	0.50		
Exposure to host country	3.45	1.29		
Mean adjustment	4.97	0.94		
General adjustment	4.82	1.01		
Interaction adjustment	4.83	1.27		
Work Adjustment	5.52	1.03		
Cultural Distance	2.52	0.83		
Individualism	-0.03	0.87	2.46	0.00

 * Significant difference exists between international and American student sample.

Measures

        Display Rules. An adapted work-related version of the Revised Display Rule

Assessment Inventory (DRAI; Matsumoto et al.; 2005) was used for this study (Appendix

A). The DRAI was designed to assess one aspect of emotion regulation, display rules,

which govern behavioral responses to emotionally arousing situations. The questionnaire

asks participants about their behavioral responses when in different work-related social

contexts to seven discrete emotions (anger, contempt, disgust, fear, happiness, sadness,

and surprise). These seven emotions are argued to be universal in some lines of research

(e.g., Ekman, 1972) and are often used when researching emotion. Specifically,

participants were asked to imagine interacting with a target person (i.e. supervisor,

coworker, or subordinate) from a work environment. They were asked to imagine that

they feel each of the emotions toward the target person with whom they are interacting.

International student participants were then asked to report how they feel they *should*

respond while experiencing the emotion in each situation in both their home culture and

the host culture they are currently living in (the United States). Specifically, they were

asked whether they should; (1) express the emotion more intensely than they feel it, (2)

express the emotion as they feel it, (3) express the emotion, but with less intensity than

they feel it, or (4) express no emotion. Therefore, on this scale, higher numbers indicate

less display of emotion. The rating format was altered slightly from the original DRAI by

eliminating two response options (i.e., express the feeling, but together with a smile to

qualify one's feelings; and smile only, with no trace of anything else, in order to hide

one's true feelings) making the responses more ordinal in nature. Additionally, the

American participants were asked how they *should* respond in the given situation (on the

same scale) without reference to culture. Although asking the participants what they

would do may better assess actual adjustment, asking them what they *should* do is the

first step in assessing their understanding of cultural display rules. Additionally, because

this study was particularly interested in sojourners' work environment, emotion-eliciting

workplace situations were adapted from the original version, which used a variety of

social contexts, for use in this study. No psychometric properties are available for the

version of the DRAI from which this measure was adapted.

      Adjustment. The adjustment measure (Appendix B) was adapted from Black

and Stephens' (1989) international adjustment scale and is intended to assess the extent to

which a sojourner has adjusted to the host culture. It was originally designed for work

sojourners (i.e., expatriates), but has been found to fit well with student sojourner

samples as well (Robie & Ryan, 1996; Hechanova-Alampay et al., 2002). The scale

consists of 14 items measuring three facets of cross-cultural adjustment (General,

Interaction, and Work). The work adjustment facet of the scale was re-worded to reflect

academic adjustment. The general adjustment factor measures issues associated with

adjustment such as living/housing conditions, food, shopping, cost of living, recreation

facilities, and health care facilities. Interaction adjustment measures adjustment to

socializing with host nationals, interacting with host nationals on a day-to-day basis,

interacting with them outside of work and speaking with host nationals. The academic

adjustment facet measures adjustment to specific school-related responsibilities,

performance standards and expectations, and graduate assistantship (TA, GA, RA)

responsibilities. Responses were given on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1

(not adjusted at all) to 7 (very well adjusted). Alpha coefficients for the original scale

were .82 (General Adjustment), .89 (Interaction Adjustment), and .91 (Work Adjustment;

Black & Stephens, 1989)[3].

       In addition to the Black and Stephens' international adjustment scale,

International student participants were asked four additional questions to assess their

adjustment (adapted from Caligiuri, 1997): 1) I rarely think of returning home to my

home country before finishing my academic program; 2) Completing my academic

studies in this program is a top priority for me; 3) I hope I will be asked to return home

early; 4) If I could ultimately stay and live here in my host country, I would. Responses

were given on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7

(strongly agree).

       Individualism-Collectivism and Cultural Distance. Participants were given an

individualism score based on their home country's IC ranking in the Hofstede (2001) and

its (reverse coded) ranking GLOBE's In-group Collectivism dimension (House et al.,

2005) reports. These scores were then standardized and averaged to form the overall

individualism score for the study. A higher individualism score indicates a more

individualistic culture, whereas a lower score indicates a more collectivistic culture.

Using these individualism scores, the cultural distance between each international

student's home country and the host country (the U.S.) was calculated. Cultural distance

is the individualism score of the participants' home country subtracted from the

individualism score for the United States.

---

[3] Although this instrument is generally broken up into the three factors, all three factors were significantly correlated to one another (all > 0.56) and the reliability of the combined scale was high (0.81). Moreover, the results did not differ substantially when using the single factor versus three separate factors. Thus, only the single factor results are reported here.

Demographic Items. All participants were asked to provide several demographic characteristics (Appendix C) including country of origin, age, gender, marital status, household situation, graduate student status, class level, degree program or major, whether or not they have lived outside their home country (and if yes, location and length of stay), the amount of time spent socializing with Americans, and the amount of time spent socializing with International students.

In addition to these demographic questions, the international student participants were asked the amount of time they spent socializing with people from their home country, number of months they have been living in the U.S. (tenure), how many times they had traveled to the U.S. prior to moving there, native language, other languages proficient in, whether or not they are planning to stay in the U.S. after completing their academic studies, and how exposed they were to American culture before moving to the U.S.

Procedure

A focus group of graduate students from six countries (i.e., Taiwan, Russia, Ukraine, Bulgaria, Japan, and Malaysia) completed all measures and identified potential problem areas that international students may have when participating in the study. Several minor adjustments were made to the measures and procedure based on suggests from this focus group.

All graduate students were sent a mass email from the director of graduate studies (Appendix D) with a request for their participation in a fellow graduate student's thesis study. Within the email separate links were provided for American and International students, as well as the option to take a paper-and-pencil version of the

surveys. If the graduate students chose to participate, they would click on the link

provided, which connected them with the survey packet. The participants reviewed the

consent form online, which explained that their answers were confidential and that their

names, if provided, would be replaced by an identification number. The international

student participants received all measures. The American students received all but the

host version of the DRAI, the adjustment measures, and several of the additional

demographic questions[4]. The final page of the web-survey was a statement debriefing the

participants on the purpose and hypotheses of the study.

A follow-up email was sent to all graduate students, yet the subject line and

email were targeted at recruiting international student participation.[5] A second follow-up

email was sent as a final attempt to recruit participation through emails sent out by the

director of graduate studies; again targeting both international and American students[6].

Finally, a fourth and final email was sent by personally emailing individual students. A

list of all graduate students (N=100) with permanent addresses outside the U.S. was

attained from the Registrar's office. From this list, six individuals were excluded because

their email addresses were deemed problematic (e.g., entered school 20 years earlier or

more). Ninety-four students were sent an email request to participate in the study.

Additionally, a list of all graduate students with U.S. permanent addresses was also

obtained from the Registrar's Office. An additional 248 individuals were contacted to

---

[4] Due to technical and formatting problems, gender was not included in the demographics section in this wave of data collection. In this wave, surveys were submitted by 35 international students and 159 American students.
[5] While gender was now included in this wave of data collection, formatting problems arose again and several other demographics variables did not appear in this wave of data collection. For the international student survey age, tenure, number of times in U.S., native language, other languages, and program were not included. For American students, country, age, amount of free time socializing with Americans, and program were not included. Surveys were submitted by 24 international students and 38 American students.
[6] 10 International students and 17 American students submitted surveys.

participate in the study. These individuals were contacted based on the criterion that their names could be foreign. Such students selected either the American or international student survey depending on what their nationality actually was[7].

Results

As discussed above, a total of four emails were sent requesting participation, yet no significant differences between the participants were found. Thus, the data sets were collapsed across the waves and all analyses utilize this combined data set. Data analysis reported in the following section consists of first evaluating the psychometric properties of the primary measures used in the present study. This is followed by the results of the hypotheses and an exploratory analysis of the comparison of responses on the DRAI between American and international students, as well as international students home and host DRAI responses.

Psychometric Properties And Preliminary Analyses

International Adjustment Scale. Black and Stephens' (1989) adjustment scale was used to determine the extent to which international students had adjusted to the host (American) culture. The internal consistency reliability for the overall adjustment scale (14 items) was .89. The alphas for the three facets of adjustment were .81 for general adjustment, .87 for interaction adjustment, and .64 for work adjustment. These alphas are consistent with previous research done using this scale (e.g., Black & Stephens, 1989; Parker & McEvoy, 1993). A table of the means and correlations with other key variables can be found in Table 3. The additional four adjustment items included in the demographics section (e.g., "I hope I will be asked to return home early") did not

---

[7] Based on this email request 23 International students and 11 American students submitted surveys.

increase the reliability of the adjustment scale. Thus, to be consistent with the literature, only Black and Stephen's international adjustment scale was used in subsequent analyses.

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelation Matrix for Key Variables

	M	SD	Min	Max	1	2	3
1. Mean Adjustment	4.97	0.94	2.21	6.79	--	-.025*	0.14
2. Cultural Distance	2.52	0.83	-0.11	2.52		--	-0.07
3. Tenure	32	25.03	1.50	120			--

* p < .05

   Display Rule Assessment Inventory (DRAI). The DRAI (Matsumoto et al., 2005) was utilized to assess the way in which American and international student participants report how they should display their emotions in work-related contexts. Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs), using a 2-way mixed model (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979), were computed to determine the consistency of display rule ratings within each individual among the different emotional situations. The *ICC* is similar to Cronbach's alpha except that it is not stepped up for the number of observations. For the home portion of the DRAI, the *ICC* was .38 for the international students and .34 for the American student sample. Additionally, the *ICC* for international students' responses on the host portion of the DRAI was .41. These values indicate that the displays of emotion reported by each participant were somewhat stable across the scenarios, though individuals also displayed a substantial amount of variation between scenarios.

Analysis of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Differences exist in emotional display rules between individualist and collectivist cultures. Correlations between individualism and display rule scores were used to determine whether differences exist in the way individuals from collectivistic and individualistic cultures report they should display their emotions in the work-related contexts. As can be seen from Table 4 there are significant negative correlations for the emotions of anger and happiness. This indicates that the more individualistic a culture is, the more acceptable it is to display the emotions of anger and happiness in the work context.

To further investigate the relationship between individualism and emotional display, correlations between individualism and the emotions with each of the workplace targets were also examined. Significant relationships were found between individualism and the degree to which one should display the emotions of anger, contempt, disgust, and happiness when interacting with a supervisor. Again this suggests that the more individualistic a culture, the more acceptable it is to express these emotions in the presence of a supervisor. Likewise, similar relationships were found between individualism and the display of anger and happiness when interacting with a coworker, and the display of happiness when interacting with a subordinate. Thus, hypothesis one was partially supported. There is a relationship between individualism and display rule, but the relationship depends on the emotion and context.

Table 4

Correlations of Emotion DR and Emotion X Target and Individualism

	Individualism
Anger DR	-0.133*
Contempt DR	-0.047
Disgust DR	-0.097
Fear DR	-0.033
Happiness DR	-0.167**
Sadness DR	-0.040
Surprise DR	-0.079
Supervisor-anger	-0.188**
Supervisor-contempt	-0.122*
Supervisor-disgust	-0.175**
Supervisor-happiness	-0.214**
Coworker-anger	-0.144*
Coworker-contempt	-0.044
Coworker-disgust	-0.059
Coworker-happiness	-0.117*
Subordinate-anger	-0.016
Subordinate-contempt	0.032
Subordinate-disgust	-0.019
Subordinate-happiness	-0.112*

Note. Fear, sadness, and surprise are excluded from the table because no significant correlations were found with any of the targets.
$p < .05$; ** $p < .01$[8]

---

[8] Using the Holm adjustment to correct for the number of tests, all correlations reported as significant at the $p < .05$ level (*) are no longer significant.

Hypothesis 2: The greater the cultural distance between sojourners' home and host countries on the individualism-collectivism dimension of culture, the less accurate they will be in correctly identifying the host country display rules for different emotionally arousing situations. To analyze this hypothesis an accuracy score was computed. Specifically, the absolute difference between each international student's responses and the host country nationals' responses to what one should do in emotionally-arousing situations in the host culture was calculated. The sum of these absolute differences (across all emotions and situations) was then divided by the total number of responses offered, yielding an overall accuracy score. This was also done with each of the seven emotions, yielding accuracy scores for each emotion. To specifically analyze the hypothesis, overall accuracy, as well as the accuracy of each emotion, was correlated with cultural distance. The cultural distance calculation was found by subtracting the individualism score of each participant's home culture from the American individualism score, yielding the distance between one's home culture and American culture.

A significant correlation between accuracy and cultural distance was found for surprise in the hypothesized direction, but not for any other emotion (see Table 5). Thus, for surprise, it was found that the more cultural distance from the host American culture, the less accurate individuals are in recognizing how they should display surprise in American culture. However, for the remaining six emotions, the hypothesis was not supported.

Table 5

Correlations of Accuracy with Cultural Distance and Adjustment

	Overall CD	Adjustment	Tenure
Overall accuracy	0.112	-0.119	-0.061
Anger accuracy	0.106	0.018	-0.068
Contempt accuracy	0.078	0.014	-0.076
Disgust accuracy	-0.002	-0.002	-0.137
Fear accuracy	-0.038	-0.056	-0.070
Happiness accuracy	-0.080	-0.170	0.011
Sadness accuracy	0.063	-0.023	0.000
Surprise accuracy	0.246*	-0.146	0.016

$* p < .05; ** p < .01$

Hypothesis 3: Tenure will be positively related to accuracy in identifying the emotional display rules of the host culture. To analyze Hypothesis three, accuracy scores (as described for Hypothesis two) were correlated with tenure and the number of months one has been in the U.S. (see Table 5). No significant correlations were found; thus, Hypothesis three was not supported.

Hypothesis 4: The ability to accurately identify the way host country natives display emotion in an emotionally-arousing situation will be positively related to adjustment for student sojourners. To analyze Hypothesis four, accuracy scores were correlated with adjustment (see Table 5). No significant relationships were found; therefore, the hypothesis was not supported.

Exploratory Analyses: The "Guest" Effect

Exploratory analyses were conducted to explore the differences in display rules between Americans, international students in their home cultures as well as in their host

cultures. First, it seemed important to investigate the differences between what American

participants deem the appropriate display of emotion in U.S. culture and how that

differed from what international students report as the way to display their emotions in

their home cultures. Second and more importantly, I wanted to understand what

international students thought one should do in the U.S. (host) cultures and compare this

to both what they felt they should do in their home cultures, and what Americans actually

said one should do in the U.S. culture.

A 2 (sex of the target) x 3 (target position: supervisor, subordinate, coworker)

x 7 (emotion) x 2 (sample: American, international) repeated-measures analysis of

variance was conducted to explore the differences in emotional display between

Americans and international students in their home cultures. Sex (of the target), target's

position, and emotion were the within-subject factors and sample (international or

American) was used as the between-subjects factor. The dependent variable was the

display rule score. Sphericity was violated because Mauchley's test found significant

within-subject effects for all main effects including sex ($W = 1.00$), target ($W = .969$,

$p<.05$), and emotion ($W = .267$, $p<.05$), as well as all interactions except sex by target,

including sex by emotion ($W = .403$, $p<.05$), target by emotion ($W = .098$, $p<.05$), and

sex by target by emotion ($W = .224$, $p<.05$). Thus, the Greenhouse-Geisser correction

was used for all significant effects.

A main effect was found for position of target, $F(1.94, 558.92) = 61.90$, $p <$

.001, indicating that emotional response differed between supervisor, coworker, and

subordinate. Additionally, a main effect was found for emotion, $F(4.08, 1173.83) =$

207.56, $p < .001$, indicating that the pattern of emotional display differed for at least one

of the emotions. These main effects were qualified by several significant interactions. A significant sex by emotion interaction was found, $F(12, 3456) = 19.65$, $p < .001$, indicating that the pattern for emotional display differs as a function of the emotion experienced and the sex of the target with whom one is interacting. Furthermore, a significant target by emotion interaction was also found, $F(8.00, 2303.00) = 20.23$, $p < .001$, indicating that the pattern of display varies as a function of the emotion experienced and the target person. Finally, a significant three-way interaction was found between sex, target, and emotion, $F(9.63, 2771.97) = 3.01$, $p = .001$. This indicates that the pattern of display varied as a function of sex of the target, the target person present, and the emotion experienced. The means and standard deviations for these display rules are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

A significant main effect was also found for sample, $F(1, 288) = 4.13$, $p < .05$, indicating that the display rules differ for the American and international student samples. The means show that, in general, American participants reported that more display of emotion is acceptable than what was reported by international students (see Tables 6 and 7). That is, international students reported that one should display less emotion while in their home cultures than what Americans feel is acceptable to display in their home culture. This main effect was qualified by a significant three-way interaction between sample, emotion, and target, $F(8.00, 2303.00) = 3.29$, $p < .001$. This indicates that the pattern of display differs as a function of the target present and the emotion experienced, and this pattern differs for international and American participants.

Table 6

International Student Home Culture Display Rule Means

	Supervisor		Coworker		Subordinate		Overall Emotion	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Anger								
Male	3.32	(0.74)	2.86	(0.80)	2.70	(0.88)	2.96	(0.85)
Female	3.36	(0.71)	2.99	(0.80)	2.90	(0.83)	3.08	(0.80)
Overall	3.34	(0.72)	2.92	(0.80)	2.80	(0.86)	3.02	(0.83)
Contempt								
Male	3.62	(0.59)	3.24	(0.80)	3.09	(0.91)	3.32	(0.81)
Female	3.61	(0.59)	3.24	(0.81)	3.18	(0.84)	3.34	(0.78)
Overall	3.62	(0.59)	3.24	(0.80)	3.13	(0.87)	3.33	(0.79)
Disgust								
Male	3.57	(0.58)	3.08	(0.78)	3.11	(0.90)	3.26	(0.80)
Female	3.56	(0.60)	3.19	(0.78)	3.22	(0.85)	3.33	(0.76)
Overall	3.57	(0.59)	3.13	(0.78)	3.17	(0.87)	3.29	(0.78)
Fear								
Male	3.31	(0.77)	3.35	(0.75)	3.48	(0.78)	3.38	(0.77)
Female	3.36	(0.78)	3.35	(0.79)	3.44	(0.79)	3.38	(0.79)

Table 6: continued

Overall	3.33	(0.77)	3.35	(0.77)	3.46	(0.79)	3.38	(0.78)
Happiness								
Male	2.37	(0.78)	2.23	(0.68)	2.34	(0.70)	2.31	(0.72)
Female	2.35	(0.78)	2.13	(0.75)	2.22	(0.68)	2.23	(0.74)
Overall	2.36	(0.78)	2.18	(0.72)	2.28	(0.69)	2.27	(0.73)
Sadness								
Male	3.04	(0.89)	2.77	(0.83)	3.01	(0.86)	2.94	(0.87)
Female	3.01	(0.83)	2.64	(0.88)	2.89	(0.86)	2.85	(0.87)
Overall	3.03	(0.86)	2.71	(0.85)	2.95	(0.86)	2.90	(0.87)
Surprise								
Male	2.53	(0.77)	2.41	(0.80)	2.47	(0.82)	2.47	(0.91)
Female	2.53	(0.83)	2.34	(0.80)	2.44	(0.81)	2.44	(0.90)
Overall	2.53	(0.80)	2.38	(0.80)	2.46	(0.81)	2.45	(0.91)
Overall Target								
Male	3.11	(0.86)	2.84	(0.87)	2.89	(0.91)	2.95	(0.81)
Female	3.11	(0.87)	2.84	(0.91)	2.90	(0.90)	2.95	(0.90)
Overall	3.11	(0.87)	2.84	(0.89)	2.89	(0.91)	2.95	(0.90)

Table 7

American Student Home Culture Display Rule Means

	Supervisor		Coworker		Subordinate		Overall Em.	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Anger								
Male	3.08	(0.67)	2.66	(0.65)	2.72	(0.75)	2.82	(0.71)
Female	3.08	(0.71)	2.77	(0.65)	2.80	(0.70)	2.88	(0.70)
Overall	3.08	(0.69)	2.72	(0.65)	2.76	(0.73)	2.85	(0.71)
Contempt								
Male	3.45	(0.76)	3.12	(0.84)	3.14	(0.89)	3.24	(0.84)
Female	3.41	(0.81)	3.17	(0.80)	3.20	(0.83)	3.26	(0.82)
Overall	3.43	(0.78)	3.15	(0.82)	3.17	(0.86)	3.25	(0.83)
Disgust								
Male	3.33	(0.78)	2.96	(0.83)	3.06	(0.86)	3.12	(0.84)
Female	3.33	(0.77)	3.08	(0.81)	3.16	(0.80)	3.19	(0.80)
Overall	3.33	(0.77)	3.02	(0.82)	3.11	(0.83)	3.15	(0.82)
Fear								
Male	3.38	(0.82)	3.24	(0.83)	3.36	(0.84)	3.33	(0.83)

Table 7: continued

Female	3.38	(0.77)	3.20	(0.85)	3.36	(0.82)	3.31	(0.82)
Overall	3.38	(0.79)	3.22	(0.84)	3.36	(0.83)	3.32	(0.82)
Happiness								
Male	2.17	(0.58)	2.12	(0.49)	2.19	(0.59)	2.16	(0.56)
Female	2.08	(0.57)	2.07	(0.51)	2.13	(0.57)	2.10	(0.55)
Overall	2.13	(0.58)	2.09	(0.50)	2.16	(0.58)	2.13	(0.56)
Sadness								
Male	3.07	(0.71)	2.80	(0.73)	2.94	(0.78)	2.94	(0.75)
Female	2.84	(0.74)	2.57	(0.76)	2.79	(0.75)	2.73	(0.76)
Overall	2.95	(0.73)	2.69	(0.75)	2.86	(0.77)	2.83	(0.76)
Surprise								
Male	2.50	(0.71)	2.28	(0.65)	2.47	(0.74)	2.42	(0.71)
Female	2.42	(0.68)	2.21	(0.59)	2.42	(0.72)	2.35	(0.67)
Overall	2.46	(0.70)	2.25	(0.62)	2.44	(0.73)	2.38	(0.69)
Overall Target								
Male	3.00	(0.85)	2.74	(0.82)	2.84	(0.87)	2.86	(0.85)
Female	2.94	(0.87)	2.72	(0.83)	2.84	(0.85)	2.83	(0.86)
Overall	2.97	(0.86)	2.73	(0.83)	2.84	(0.86)	2.85	(0.86)

To better understand the differences between how international students said one should respond emotionally in their home cultures and in the host American culture, a 2x2x3x7 repeated-measures analysis of variance was conducted. Culture (home or host), sex, target, and emotion were all within-subject factors and display rule score was used as the dependent variable. Thus, rather than looking at the differences between Americans and international students in their home cultures, this analysis examined the difference between international students' emotional display in their home culture with these same students' display in their host culture. Again, sphericity was violated because Mauchley's test found significant within-subject effects for main effects including target ($W = .87$, $p<.05$), and emotion ($W = .11$, $p<.05$), as well as all significant interactions, including sex by emotion ($W = .19$, $p<.05$), target by emotion ($W = .01$, $p<.05$), and target by culture ($W = .91$, $p<.05$). Thus, the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used for all significant effects.

As with the previous analysis, main effects for emotion, $F(3.38, 246.46) = 81.92$, $p < .001$, and target, $F(1.78, 129.58) = 16.46$, $p < .001$, were found. More importantly, a main effect for culture was found, $F(1, 73) = 7.67$, $p < .01$, suggesting that international students display emotions differently in their home cultures and in the host U.S. culture. An examination of the means reveals an interesting finding (see Table 8). Rather than displaying more emotion in the host culture, which would more closely resemble the U.S. display norms, international students report that one should display *less* emotion in the U.S. culture than in their home cultures. When one examines the combination of all means, it is apparent that although American display norms allow more emotion in all contexts than international students' home culture norms,

international participants still report that one should display less emotion than in their home culture and thus much less emotion than Americans report should be displayed. Taken together, these results suggest that international students may feel like "guests" in the host culture and therefore do not feel that it is appropriate to display certain emotions as a guest in the host country. Additionally, this effect does not appear related to time in the host country. That is, there are no differences in how much one should display between those who have been in the host country for less than a year and those who have been there longer.

Table 8

International Student Host Culture Display Rule Means

	Supervisor		Coworker		Subordinate		Overall Em.	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Anger								
Male	3.44	(0.67)	3.18	(0.78)	3.11	(0.79)	3.25	(0.76)
Female	3.46	(0.69)	3.16	(0.78)	3.18	(0.75)	3.27	(0.75)
Overall	3.45	(0.68)	3.17	(0.78)	3.15	(0.77)	3.26	(0.75)
Contempt								
Male	3.63	(0.61)	3.43	(0.71)	3.36	(0.76)	3.48	(0.70)
Female	3.62	(0.67)	3.43	(0.74)	3.38	(0.77)	3.48	(0.73)
Overall	3.63	(0.64)	3.43	(0.72)	3.37	(0.76)	3.48	(0.71)
Disgust								
Male	3.61	(0.65)	3.61	(0.78)	3.37	(0.76)	3.45	(0.74)
Female	3.65	(0.64)	3.65	(0.80)	3.44	(0.72)	3.50	(0.73)
Overall	3.63	(0.65)	3.63	(0.78)	3.41	(0.74)	3.47	(0.73)
Fear								
Male	3.44	(0.77)	3.44	(0.72)	3.55	(0.71)	3.50	(0.73)
Female	3.41	(0.78)	3.41	(0.71)	3.53	(0.71)	3.48	(0.73)

Table 8: continued

Overall	3.43	(0.77)	3.43	(0.72)	3.54	(0.71)	3.49	(0.73)
Happiness								
Male	2.42	(0.78)	2.42	(0.73)	2.41	(0.83)	2.40	(0.78)
Female	2.33	(0.81)	2.33	(0.76)	2.30	(0.77)	2.29	(0.78)
Overall	2.37	(0.79)	2.37	(0.74)	2.36	(0.80)	2.35	(0.78)
Sadness								
Male	3.12	(0.82)	2.97	(0.87)	3.14	(0.83)	3.08	(0.84)
Female	3.10	(0.88)	2.88	(0.85)	3.03	(0.85)	3.00	(0.86)
Overall	3.11	(0.85)	2.92	(0.86)	3.08	(0.84)	3.04	(0.85)
Surprise								
Male	2.64	(0.82)	2.49	(0.83)	2.58	(0.91)	2.57	(0.85)
Female	2.52	(0.83)	2.45	(0.81)	2.49	(0.87)	2.49	(0.83)
Overall	2.58	(0.82)	2.47	(0.82)	2.54	(0.89)	2.53	(0.84)
Overall Target								
Male	3.19	(0.86)	3.04	(0.88)	3.07	(0.89)	3.10	(0.88)
Female	3.15	(0.90)	3.01	(0.90)	3.05	(0.89)	3.07	(0.90)
Overall	3.17	(0.88)	3.02	(0.89)	3.06	(0.89)	3.09	(0.89)

These main effects were again qualified by several two-way interactions including an emotion by target interaction, $F(6.09, 444.77) = 13.24$, $p < .001$, and an emotion by sex interaction, $F(3.82, 278.50) = 6.52$, $p < .001$. In addition, a significant interaction was found between target and culture, $F(1.83, 133.49) = 3.36$, $p < .05$, indicating that emotional display differs as a function of the culture the international student is referring to as well as the target with whom one is interacting. An examination of the means suggests that international students generally display their emotions similarly in the home and host culture in the presence of a supervisor. Specifically, in both cultures little emotion is expressed when interacting with a supervisor. However, emotional display differs between home and host culture when interacting with a coworker or subordinate. More specifically, the means suggest that international students report displaying less emotion in the presence of these two targets in the *host* culture than in the home culture. This suggests that a "guest" effect is occurring in which international students generally feel it is appropriate for guests, like themselves, to display less emotion in the host culture.

In sum, these exploratory analyses indicate several interesting points related to the display of emotion. First, they suggest that there are differences in how emotion is displayed depending on the emotion experienced as well as the target with which one is interacting. Such differences follow similar patterns regardless of the culture from which one comes. However, several interesting patterns related to culture were also found. For example, results indicate that international students exhibit a "guest effect" in which they feel it is appropriate to display the least emotion in the host culture. This is particularly striking because international students reported displaying emotion less intensely in their

home cultures than Americans. Thus, while Americans report that it is acceptable to display more emotions than what was reported to be appropriate in international students' home cultures, the international students do not display more emotion in the host culture, rather they display less emotion!

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore how emotions are displayed in the work environment, how such emotional displays differ across cultures, and how the perception of such differences in emotional display is related to the adjustment of sojourners crossing cultural boundaries. Despite the increasing popularity of research on both emotions and cross-cultural issues in the workplace in I-O psychology, little research has been done examining cross-cultural differences in emotion. In particular, this study expanded on research investigating differences in perceptions of emotional display rules between cultures by focusing on how these differences affect people temporarily living in a different culture (i.e., sojourners). Specifically, one group of sojourners, international graduate students, reported how they *should* display their emotions in various work-related situations in both their home and host cultures. Likewise, natives of the host culture (i.e., American graduate students) indicated normative display rules.

Consistent with previous research on cross-cultural differences in emotions, the results indicated that there are differences in the display of emotion in work contexts across cultures as well as differences in the way sojourners believe they should display emotion in their home and host cultures. The results also provided some evidence that differences in normative beliefs regarding the display of emotion exist between

individualist and collectivist cultures in that more emotional display is accepted in more

individualistic cultures. Additionally, an interesting pattern developed regarding how

sojourners feel they should display their emotions in the host environment in comparison

to their home culture. In particular, the results indicate that the sojourners felt, regardless

of the emotion experienced, they should display *less* emotion in all work-related contexts

while in the host culture than they would display in their home cultures, despite the case

that the host culture, in general, accepts greater display of emotion. Finally, the study

sought to examine how the perception of emotional display rules was related to sojourner

adjustment. The results lent little support for any relationship between emotional display

and factors pertaining to adjustment, though there are several methodological issues that

may have played a role in the lack of findings. The theoretical implications of each of

these findings are discussed below as well as the limitations of the study, practical

implications, and future directions.

Cross-Cultural Differences in Emotional Display

Although cross-cultural differences in emotion have been studied for several

decades, little research has examined such differences in the workplace. The present

study found that, consistent with previous work on cross-cultural differences in emotion,

differences in emotional display in organizational settings also exist across cultures. In

particular, the results indicate that Americans think it is acceptable to display emotion

with more intensity than international students think is acceptable for them to display in

their home culture. Such findings give reason to further explore the relationship between

culture and emotional display in the workplace by examining where differences lie

according to dimensions of culture. For instance, American culture is highly

individualistic (Hofstede, 1980) whereas many of the international students came from

more traditionally collectivist cultures. Thus, differences in emotional display between

the two samples may be better understood by examining the differences on this

dimension.

Indeed, the results of the present study found some differences in the display of

emotion along the individualism-collectivism dimension of culture. Specifically, positive

relationships existed between individualism and the display of happiness and anger,

where the more individualistic the culture from which one comes, the more acceptable it

becomes to display anger or happiness in the workplace. The significant relationships

found for these two emotions are consistent with previous theoretical propositions.

According to Mesquita (2001), individualist emotions like anger and happiness are

suggested to reflect the disparity of the self and others, thus emphasizing the uniqueness

of the individual, whereas collectivist emotions (e.g., empathy; compassion) are

embedded in relationships with others. For this reason, much of the cross-cultural

research on emotion indicates that individualists express emotion with more intensity, or

display more emotion, than do collectivists when the emotions will distinguish a unique

aspect of the self.

In particular, Markus and Kitayama (1991) posit that individuals with an

independent self-construal (of which individualists cultures are theoretically made) are

more likely to experience and express ego-focused emotions (e.g., anger and pride)

because such emotions foster and create independence and "have the individual's internal

attributes (his or her own needs, goals, desires, or abilities) as the primary referent"

(Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 235). Thus, the significant findings with anger and

happiness appear consistent with Markus and Kitayama's (1991) theory: Members of individualist cultures are more apt to express ego-focused emotions such as happiness and anger, whereas members of collectivist cultures are less likely to express such emotions because they conflict with the interdependent nature of the culture.

Crossing Cultural Boundaries: The "Guest" Effect

Taken together, the above results confirm that some cultural differences in the display of emotion at work do exist. So what happens when individuals cross cultural boundaries to work or study? In recent years, researchers have begun to posit that emotions may play an important role in the expatriate and sojourner experience (Matsumoto et al., 2001; 2003; Tan et al., 2005). The results of the present study indicate that such individuals may be encountering different display rules than they are accustomed to in their home cultures, which could influence their behavior and experience abroad.

An exploratory examination of emotional display in home and host cultures revealed a unique pattern of behavior for individuals currently residing in a host culture. In particular, the international sojourners report that, regardless of the emotion experienced, they should display *less* emotion in all work-related contexts in their host culture than they would display in their home cultures. This becomes more interesting when one considers that 99% of the sample had individualism values less than American culture. Thus, for most sojourners the host American culture is more individualistic, and thus accepts more display of emotion than the sojourners' home cultures. However, the findings suggest that when sojourners study abroad, they feel they should behave like

"guests" and suppress their emotions rather than adjusting to the norms of the host culture, which would find the expression of emotion acceptable.

This conservative nature of the emotional displays illustrated in the "guest effect" may indicate that sojourners carry their more conservative cultural norms with them as they reside in a host culture, and use them to regulate their behavior, rather than the adopting the host culture's norms. However, recent work by Elfenbein and Ambady (2003) suggested that individuals are able to learn cultural norms for expressions of emotion that are different from ones own cultural norms. In particular, they found that, people tend to be more accurate in judging emotions expressed by members of their own cultural group (i.e., in-group advantage) than by members of a different cultural group, but both the accuracy and speed of judging emotions increase with more exposure to the out-group. Specifically, they found that after a period of time (i.e., 2.4 years) Chinese sojourners residing in the U.S. were better able to recognize facial expressions of members of their host culture than expressions of their in-group members from their home culture. Recall, the average tenure of my sample was 32 months. Therefore, according to these results, international students should have a good understanding of emotional expression in the host culture, and as a result it is also likely they understand the host cultures norms for displaying emotions.

Yet the results reported in the present study are not necessarily inconsistent with Elfenbein and Ambady's (2003) findings. That is, the international students may well have learned the way the *host nationals* would display their emotion, but may not feel that they should adopt the host member norms. For instance, the international students could adopt more conservative displays of emotions because of their temporary

or "guest" status in the host culture, reflecting the collectivistic culture of the sample—the sojourners want to be respectful and polite to the community in which they are involved. Alternatively, the "guest effect" may be a result of the international students viewing themselves as having lower status than the host nationals because they are temporary "guests" in the country. Previous research has found that individuals from high power distance cultures, which are likely to accept more power and status differentials, deemphasize emotion (Basabe, et al., 2000). Thus, if such a status differential is recognized and accepted by the international students, they may feel that it is unacceptable to express their emotions as they are merely temporary "guests" in the host culture.

Currently it is not known precisely why the guest effect is occurring in this study, but future research should consider expanding beyond the individualism dimension of culture to examine other dimensions of culture, such as power distance, especially when examining work-related situations. More specifically, future research should explore other dimensions of cultures (e.g., power distance and low vs. high context) as moderators of the relationship between display of emotion in home and host cultures. Such research may describe how culture plays a role in the display and regulation of emotion for individuals crossing cultural boundaries as well as how this influences other aspects of sojourner behavior.

Accuracy Of Host Culture Display Rules, Tenure And Adjustment

A main premise of the present study was that having an accurate perception of the host culture display rules would influence sojourner adjustment, which is seen as a key component to both expatriate and international student success. Consistent with

previous research, the present study found that cultural distance was related to adjustment, wherein the more culturally distant the sojourners' home and host cultures, the lower the occurrences of adjustment (e.g., Church, 1982; Ward & Kennedy, 1993). Yet, the results failed to demonstrate that accuracy in identifying host culture display of emotion is related to sojourner adjustment or factors related to adjustment.

In particular, while cultural distance was significantly related to adjustment, the relationship between cultural distance and accuracy did not exist. Perhaps, the lack of support for hypotheses 2-4 appears attributable to problems with accuracy scores, than to adjustment. In particular, accuracy was calculated by subtracting what the sojourners thought *they* should do in the U.S. setting compared to what the American's thought America's should do. Two alternative comparisons might be more appropriate predictors of adjustment. In particular, and in line with the previous discussion of the guest effect, it might be more important to determine if sojourners are aware of how natives' should act in their own countries (e.g., sojourners beliefs about how American's should act in the U.S.). Alternatively, the Americans could have been asked how they felt sojourners should act in the U.S. That is, do Americans think sojourners should act like "guests," displaying less emotion then they can display. This second measure might be difficult to accurately assess with self-report because respondents might be inclined to edit their responses to appear that they afford sojourners the same status and privileges as nationals even when they do not act this way.

Another possible limitation was with the DRAI measure from which the accuracy scores were derived. The DRAI measure used in the present study was adapted to reflect work-related situations. Additionally, two response items were excluded and

changes were made to the wording to reflect an order in intensity of the expression of emotion in an interval rating format. As a result of such changes, the variability in possible responses decreased, which could have made it more difficult to detect the differences that exist across cultures. Thus, by excluding the two latter response options, we might not have captured how the emotions are actually displayed in all cultures. Additionally, previous research suggests that there is also considerable variability in emotional expression and display rules within cultures (e.g., Matsumoto, 1993). Thus, accuracy of the host culture display rules may be difficult to detect because there may be many different display rules that exist within the host culture.

Although a significant relationship was found between cultural distance and adjustment, supporting previous literature, a restriction of range for tenure of international students in the host culture may have also contributed to the lack of relationships between both accuracy and tenure, and accuracy and adjustment. Previous research suggests that tenure with the host culture will be positively related to sojourner adjustment (e.g., Church, 1982). The belief being that the longer one spends in the host country, the more exposed and adjusted one becomes to the culture. In fact, Hechanova-Alampay et al. (2002) found that international student sojourners experience more adjustment difficulties than domestic sojourners (i.e., students relocating in their home country), especially in the first few months of their transition, but that adjustment followed a positive trajectory over time. Additionally, they found that strain, a secondary form of adjustment, peaked around three months into the sojourner's experience, and then subsided by six months into their experience.

Data for the present study was collected after most students had been in school for approximately seven months (with the average being 32 months), which could explain why no relationship was found between tenure and adjustment. That is, it is likely that less variance in adjustment existed because the participants had been in the host country long enough to adjust more successfully. In fact, 78.3% of international students reported being at least somewhat adjusted, while less than 5% reported being somewhat unadjusted or worse. Therefore, the international students' perception of the host culture display rules could also become more accurate over time, reducing the variance in accuracy scores as well. Thus, a restriction of range might account for the lack of a relationship between accuracy and adjustment or between accuracy and tenure. Further research should investigate these relationships earlier in the sojourners' experience to determine if such relationships do exist.

Moreover, a self-selection bias could also be occurring due to the voluntary nature of the study. International students had to choose to first read the email request for participation, and second, choose to participate and complete the survey measures. Considering the low response rate (12%), the sojourners who actually completed the measures may have been better adjusted than those who did not complete the measures. This may have affected both their adjustment scores as well as their accuracy in identifying host country display of emotion. However, the self-selection bias may be a less important issue when considering the guest effect. That is, if the international students feel they should display fewer emotions as temporary guests in the host country, then this is not likely to differ between those individuals who participated and those who

did not. Future research should aim at increasing the response rate to get a better understanding of the nature of the relationship between accuracy and display rules.

The Universality of Emotions?

Although several limitations have previously been discussed, there is an additional limitation that should be recognized. While it was an assumption of this research that the seven emotions used in the study were universal, there is research opposed to the universality theory (e.g., Russell, 1994). A more culturally determined view of emotion posits that the seven emotions are not experienced, or experienced in the same way, in all cultures. For example, Markus and Kitayama (1991) describe how negative emotions such as anger are not experienced in all cultures. No expression of anger is exhibited in Tahitian culture where people have not learned to suppress their anger, but rather "they have learned the importance of attending to others, considering others, and being gentle in all situations, and as a consequence very little anger is elicited" (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 236). Thus, ego-focused emotions such as anger are not experienced strongly, if at all.

In the present study, participants were asked to imagine they were experiencing each of the seven emotions in a specific work-related context. Yet, based on the culturally determined theory of emotions, it is possible that the seven emotions had not been experienced, or experienced in the same way, by all participants. If this is the case, reliable differences across cultures were not found because the individuals were not able to imagine what some of these work-related situations are like, or what the participants were imagining may have been different. However, this issue was not

identified by any member of the focus group when reviewing the measures nor did any participant respond with such a claim when asked for feedback on the study as a whole.

Practical Implications and Conclusion

Whether organizationally sanctioned or not, emotion is embedded in organizational contexts. Thus, organizational researchers are increasingly recognizing that the nature of emotion at work needs to be better understood, especially for those crossing cultural boundaries (Tan et al., 2005). Although this study utilized graduate students, an initial perception of the nature of emotional display at work was revealed, which could have important implications for organizations.

In particular, despite finding no effects between display of emotion and international adjustment, several interesting findings are potentially relevant to organizations. Organizations may want to train employees (both expatriates and employees in the host country) on the nature of emotional display across the IC dimension of culture; bringing attention to the notion that more display of emotion is acceptable in individualistic than in collectivist cultures. Doing so, may positively influence communication and interpersonal relationships between host country nationals and sojourners. In fact, Mendenhall and Oddou (1985) identified the ability to understand why foreigners behave the way they do as an important factor in cross-cultural adjustment. They argued that the "ability to make correct attributions about the reasons or causes of host-nationals' behavior allows the expatriate to predict how they will behave toward him/her in the future, thus reducing uncertainty in interpersonal and intercultural relations" (p. 42). Thus, training on the nature of emotional display may facilitate

understanding of foreigners' behavior and thus positively influence organizational relationships.

Meanwhile, we are not sure of the implication for training or selection criteria in terms of appropriate display rules for the expatriates without further research. In particular, one question is whether the guest effect is adaptive. Recall that the U.S. participants were only asked how they should display their emotions, not how foreign students and expatriates should display their emotions while in the host culture. Thus, it is not known whether the sojourners were actually accurate in their judgments on what to do in the host culture. Perhaps the display rule is that expatriate workers and international students should control or suppress emotions in the host (U.S.) culture and the guest effect demonstrates that international students had accurately identified such display rules. For organizations to include cross-cultural differences in display of emotion into their training programs, the nature of the display rules for such sojourners needs to be more thoroughly examined. Additionally, the guest effect should be investigated further to determine its relationship with international adjustment and expatriate success. Then organizations can seek ways to incorporate aspects of emotional display and/or regulation into both training and selection programs.

In conclusion, as the results of the present study indicate, the nature of emotions in organizational contexts is complex, especially for individuals crossing cultural boundaries. Therefore, it is important for future research to investigate not only the display of emotion in organizational contexts, but also how this behavior differs across cultures, and for individuals temporarily living and working abroad.

References

Adelegan, F. O., & Parks, D. J. (1985). Problems of transition for African students in an American university. *Journal of College Student Personnel,* 26, 504-508.

Aycan, Z. (1997). Acculturation of expatriate managers: A process model of adjustment and performance. In Z. Aycan (Ed.), *New approaches to employee management, Vol. 4: Expatriate management: Theory and research* (pp. 1-40). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Baker, R. W., Siryk, B. (1986). Exploratory intervention with a scale measuring adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*, 31-38.

Basabe, N., Paez, D., Valencia, J., Gonzalez, J. L., Rime, B., & Diener, E. (2002). Cultural dimensions, socioeconomic development, climate, and emotional hedonic level. *Cognition & Emotion, 16,* 103-125.

Bennett, J., Passin, H., & McKnight, R. K. (1958). *In search of identity: The Japanese overseas scholar in America and Japan.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46*, 1-30.

Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P., Harrison, D. A., Shaffer, M. A., & Luk, D. M. (2005). Input-based and time-based models of international adjustment: Meta-analytic evidence and theoretical extensions. *Academy of Management Journal, 48,* 257-281.

Biehl, M., Matsumoto, D., Ekman, P., Hearn, V., Heider, K., Kudoh, T., & Von, T. (1997). Matsumoto and Ekman's Japanese and Caucasian Facial Expressions of Emotion (JACFEE): Reliability data and cross-national differences. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 21*, 3-21.

Black, J. S., & Gregersen, H. B. (1991). Antecedents to cross-cultural adjustment for expatriates in pacific rim assignments. *Human Relations, 44,* 497-515.

Black, J. S., Gregersen, H. B., & Mendenhall, M. (1992). *Global assignments: Successfully expatriating and repatriating international managers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Black, J. S., Gregersen, H. B., Mendenhall, M. E., & Stroh, L. K. (1999). *Globalizing people through international assignments.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Black, J. S., Mendenhall, M. E., & Oddou, G. (1991). Toward a comprehensive model of international adjustment: An integration of multiple theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Review, 16,* 291-317.

Black, J. S., & Stephens, G. K. (1989). The influence of the spouse on American expatriate adjustment and intent to stay in Pacific Rim overseas assignments. *Journal of Management, 15,* 529-544.

Bond, M. H. (1988). Finding universal dimensions of individual variation in multicultural studies of values: The Rokeach and Chinese value surveys. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 1009-1015.

Brislin, R. W. (1981). *Cross-cultural encounters: Face-to-face interaction.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Brislin, R. W., & Yoshida, T. (1994). *Intercultural communication training: An introduction.* CA: Sage Publications.

Caligiuri, P. M. (1997). Assessing expatriate success: Beyond just "being there". In Z. Aycan (Ed.), *New approaches to employee management, Vol. 4: Expatriate management: Theory and research* (pp. 117-140). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Chinese Culture Connection. (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21*, 5-47.

Church, A. T. (1982). Sojourner adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin, 91,* 540-572.

Cole, P. M., Bruschi, C. J., & Tamang, B. L. (2002). Cultural differences in children's emotional reactions to difficult situations. *Child Development, 73,* 983-996.

Constantine, M. G., Anderson, G. M., Berkel, L. A., Caldwell, L. D., & Utsey, S. O. (2005). Examining the cultural adjustment experiences of African international college students: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 57-66.

Darwin, C. (1965). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published in 1872).

Deutsch, S. E. (1970). *International education and exchange: A sociological analysis.* Cleveland, OH: The Press of Case Western Reserve University.

Dolins, I. (1999). Global Relocation Survey: Current trends regarding expatriate activity. *Employment Relations Today, Winter*, 1-11.

Ealey, P. C., & Francis, C. A. (2002). International perspectives on emotions and work. In R.G. Lord, Klimoski, R. J., & Kanfer, R. (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace* (pp. 370-401). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Eid, M., & Diener, E. (2001). Norms for experiencing emotions in different cultures: Inter and intranational differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81,* 869-885.

Ekman, P. (1972). Universals and cultural differences in facial expressions of emotion. In J. Cole (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Ekman, P. (1973). Cross-cultural studies of facial expression. In P. Ekman (Ed.), *Darwin and facial expression* (pp. 169-222). New Your: Academic Press.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1971). Constants across cultures in the face and emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17,* 124-129.

Ekman, P., Sorenson, E. R., & Friesen, W. V. (1969). Pan-cultural elements in facial displays of emotion. *Science, 164,* 86-94.

Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2002). On the universality and cultural specificity of emotion recognition: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 203-235.

Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2003). Universals and cultural differences in recognizing emotions of a different cultural group. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 12*, 159-164.

Feldman, D. C., & Tompson, H. B. (1993). Expatriation, repatriation, and domestic geographical relocation: An empirical investigation of adjustment to new job assignments. *Journal of International Business Studies, 24*, 507-529.

Forster, N. (1997). The persistent myth of high expatriate failure rates: A reappraisal. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 8*, 414-433.

Friesen, W. V. (1972). *Cultural differences in facial expression in a social situation: An experimental test of the concept of display rules.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Francisco.

Gregersen, H. B., & Black, S. J. (1990). A multifaceted approach to expatriate retention in international assignments. *Group & Organization Studies, 15*, 461-485.

Gregersen, H. B., & Stroh, L. K. (1997). Coming home to the Arctic cold: Antecedents to Finnish expatriate and spouse repatriation adjustment. *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 635-654.

Gudykundst, W. B., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Culture and affective communication. *American Behavioral Scientist, 31,* 384-400.

Guzman, E., & Burke, M. J. (2003). Development and test of an international student performance taxonomy. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27,* 659-681.

Hammer, M. R., Gudykunst, W. B., & Wiseman, R. L. (1978). Dimensions of interculturaleffectiveness: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2*, 382-393.

Hechanova-Alampay, R., Beehr, T. A., Christiansen, N. D., & Van Horn, R. K. (2002). Adjustment and strain among domestic and international student sojourners: A longitudinal study. *School Psychology International, 23,* 458-474.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Institute of International Education. (2004). *International students in the U.S.* Taken from the World Wide Web http://opendoors.iienetwork.org.

Izard, C. E. (1971). *The face of emotion.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Kitayama, S., & Markus, H. R. (1994). *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence.* Washington, DC : American Psychological Association.

Kluckohn, C. (1951). Values and value orientation in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lambert, R. D., & Bressler, M. (1956). *Indian students on an American campus.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Lysgaard, S. (1955). Adjustment in a foreign society: Norwegian Fulbright grantees visiting the United States. *International Social Science Bulletin, 7*, 45-51.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224-253.

Matsumoto, D. (1989). Cultural influences on the perception of emotion. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 20*, 92-105.

Matsumoto, D. (1990). Cultural similarities and differences in display rules. *Motivation and Emotion, 14*, 195-214.

Matsumoto, D. (1991). Cultural influences on facial expression of emotion. *Southern Communication Journal, 56,* 128-137.

Matsumoto, D. (1993). Ethnic differences in affect intensity, emotion judgments, display rule attitudes, and self-reported emotional expression in an American sample. *Motivation and Emotion, 17*, 107-123.

Matsumoto, D., Consolacion, T., Yamada, H., Suzuki, R., Franklin, B., Paul, S., Ray, R., & Uchida, H. (2002). American-Japanese cultural differences in judgments of emotional expressions of different intensities. *Cognition and Emotion, 16,* 721-747.

Matsumoto, D., & Ekman, P. (1989). American-Japanese cultural differences in intensity ratings of facial expressions of emotion. *Motivation and Emotion, 13,* 143-157.

Matsumoto, D., Kasri, F., & Kooken, K. (1999). American-Japanese cultural differences in judgments of expression intensity and subjective experience. *Cognition and Emotion, 13,* 201-218.

Matsumoto**,** D., Kudoh, T., Scherer, K., & Wallbott, H. (1988). Antecedents of and reactions to emotions in the United States and Japan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 19*, 267-286.

Matsumoto, D., & Kupperbusch, C. (2001). Idiocentric and allocentric differences in emotional expression, experience, and the coherence between expression and experience. *Asian   Journal of Social Psychology, 4,* 113-131.

Matsumoto, D., LeRoux, J. A., Iwamoto, M., Choi, J. W., Rogers, D., Tatani, H., & Uchida, H. (2003). The robustness of the intercultural adjustment potential scale (ICAPS): The search for a universal psychological engine of adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 543-562.

Matsumoto, D., Takeuchi, S., Andayani, S., Kouznetsova, N., & Krupp, D. (1998). The contribution of individualism vs. collectivism to cross-national differences in display rules. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 1,* 147-165.

Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S. H., Hirayama, S., & Petrova, G. (2005). Development and validation of a measure of display rules knowledge: The display rule assessment inventory. *Emotion, 5*, 23-40.

Mervosh, E. M., & McClenahen, J. S. (1997). The care and feeding of expats. *Industry Week, 246*(22), 68-72.

Mesquita, B. (2001). Emotions in collectivist and individualist contexts. *Interpersonal relations and group processes, 80,* 68-74.

Mesquita, B., & Frijda, N. H. (1992). Cultural variations in emotions: A review. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 179-204.

Mesquita, B., & Walker, R. (2003). Cultural differences in emotions: A context for interpreting emotional experiences. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 41,* 777-793.

Mumford, D. B. (1998). The measurement of culture shock. *Social Psychiatry, 33*, 149-154.

Oberg, K. (1960). Cultural shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology, 7*, 177-182.

Parker, B., & McEvoy, G. M. (1993). Initial examination of a model of intercultural adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 17*, 355-379.

Puritt, F. J. (1978). The adaptation of African students to American society. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2*, 90-118.

Robie, C., & Ryan, A. M. (1996). Structural equivalence of a measure of cross-cultural adjustment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 5„* 514-521.

Russell, J. A. (1994). Is there universal recognition of emotion from facial expression? A review of the cross-cultural studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 115,* 102-141.

Saarni, C. (1999). *The development of emotional competence.* New York: Guilford Press.

Scherer, K. R., Matsumoto, D., Wallbott, H. G., & Kudoh, T. (1988). Emotional experience in cultural context: A comparison between Europe, Japan, and the United States. In K. Scherer (Ed.), *Facets of emotion: Recent research* (pp. 5-30). Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Scherer, K. R., & Wallbott, H. G. (1994). Evidence for universality and cultural variation of differential emotion response patterning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66,* 310-328.

Schimmack, U. (1996). Cultural influences on the recognition of emotion by facial expressions: Individualistic or Caucasian cultures? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27,* 37-50.

Scott, F. D. (1956). *The American experience of Swedish students: Retrospect and aftermath.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Searle, W., & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14*, 449-464.

Sewell, W. H., & Davidsen, O. M. (1961). *Scandinavian students on an American campus.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., & Gilley, K. M. (1999). Dimensions, determinants, and difference in the expatriate adjustment process. *Journal of International Business Studies, 30*, 557-581.

Shepard, S. (1997). *Managing cross-cultural transitions: A handbook for corporations, employees, and their families.* Bayside, NY: Aletheia.

Shiraev, E., & Levy, D. (2004). *Cross-cultural psychology*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Shrout, P.E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 420-428.

Sinangil, H. K., & Ones, D. S. (2002) Expatriate management. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.). *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology: Vol. 1* (pp. 424-443). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Smith, P. B., Dugan, S., & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National culture and the values of organizational employees: A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27*, 231-264.

Spreitzer, G. M., McCall, M. W., & Mahoney, J. D. (1997). Early identification of international executive potential. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 6-29.

Stahl, G. K., & Caligiuri, P. M. (2005). The effectiveness of expatriate coping strategies: The moderating role of cultural distance, position level, and time on the international assignment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 603-615.

Stephan, W. G., Stephan, C. W., & DeVargas, M. C. (1996). Emotional expression in Costa Rica and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27,* 147-160.

Takeuchi, R., Yun, S., & Tesluk, P. E. (2002). An examination of crossover and spillover effects of spousal and expatriate cross-cultural adjustment on expatriate outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 655-666.

Tan, J. A., Hartel, C. J., Panipucci, D., & Strybosch, V. E. (2005). The effect of emotions in cross-cultural expatriate experiences. *Cross Cultural Management, 12*, 4-15.

Tompson, H. B., & Tompson, G. H. (1996). Confronting diversity issues in the classroom with strategies to improve satisfaction and retention of international students. *Journal of Education for Business, 72*(1), 53-57.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & Collectivism.* San Francisco, CA: Westview Press.

Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 118-128.

Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1992). Locus of control, mood disturbance, and social difficulty during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16*, 175-194.

Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1993). Where's the "culture" in cross-cultural transition? Comparative studies of sojourner adjustment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 24,* 221-249.

Waxin, M. F. (2004). Expatriates' interaction adjustment: The direct and moderator effects of culture of origin. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 28*, 61-79.

Waxin, M. F., & Panaccio, A. (2005). Cross-cultural training to facilitate expatriate adjustment: It works! *Personnel Review, 34*(1), 51-67.

Witkin, H. A., Berry, J. W. (1975). Psychological differentiation in cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 6,* 4-87.

Ying, Y. (2005). Variation in acculturative stressors over time: A study of Taiwanese students in the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*, 59-71.

Appendix A

Work-Related Display Rule Assessment Inventory

Instructions
We are studying how people express their emotions in different situations.

Please imagine that you have finished your educational experience and you are now beginning a new job in your desired career. Each question provides a description of a situation where you are interacting with someone from your new job and you feel certain emotions toward that person. In these situations, please imagine that the supervisor is older than you are, the coworker is of your same age, and that the subordinate is younger than you are. **Please identify what you think <u>you SHOULD</u> do in your home and host culture by selecting one of the four possible responses that are listed on top of the page.**

Treat each emotion and each situation separately. Do not consider them occurring in any particular order or to be connected with each other in any way. There are no right or wrong answers, nor any pattern to the answers. Don't worry about how you have responded to any previous item or how you will respond to an item in the future. Just select a unique response for each emotion and situation on its merit. If you have difficulty selecting an answer, make your best guess; oftentimes your first impression is best. A definition for each emotion is provided for you.

Example:

> **<u>Possible Responses:</u>**
> **A** - **Express the emotion more intensely than you feel it**
> **B** - **Express the emotion as you feel it**
> **C** - **Express the emotion, but with less intensity than you feel it**
> **D** - **Express no emotion**

> What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOME culture if you are with: **a male supervisor**

> A. At *his office by yourselves* and you feel the following emotion *toward him*
> **Anger** _____

> For this question, you should think of a situation in which you would be with a supervisor in his office and you feel anger towards him and then choose how you should express your anger using the response choices listed on the top of the page.

List of Seven Emotions and their Definitions

ANGER: A feeling of displeasure resulting from injury, mistreatment, opposition, and usually showing itself in a desire to fight back at the supposed cause of this feeling.

> *Example: The person is waiting in line at the post office for a very long time. The person finally reaches the window, when the clerk announces that there is only time for one more customer. The person is then pushed aside when someone cuts in front to take the person's turn.*

CONTEMPT: A feeling or attitude of one who looks down on somebody or something as being low, mean, or unworthy.

> *Example: The person hears an acquaintance bragging about accomplishing something for which the acquaintance was not responsible.*

DISGUST: A sickening distaste, or dislike.

> *Example: The person steps in dog feces, reaches down to wipe it off, and feces get on the person's hand.*

FEAR: A feeling of anxiety and agitation caused by the presence or nearness of danger, evil, or pain.

> *Example: The person has realized that the brakes don't work while driving down a steep hill.The car approaches the end of the road, which is a cliff with no barrier. The person tries to brake and veers out of control.*

HAPPINESS: Having a feeling of great pleasure, contentment, joy.

> *Example: The person sees many close friends at a party.*

SADNESS: Having low spirits or sorrow.

> *Example: The person remembers the time last year when a young child died of a terminal illness.*

SURPRISE: To come upon suddenly, or unexpectedly.

> *Example: The person is looking at something new and unexpected.*

Please imagine that your new job is in your **HOME** country and answer each item thinking of the work environment of your home culture.

Possible Responses:		
A	-	**Express the emotion more intensely than you feel it**
B	-	**Express the emotion as you feel it**
C	-	**Express the emotion, but with less intensity than you feel it**
D	-	**Express no emotion**

1. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOME culture if you are interacting with
A male supervisor

    a. At *his office in a private meeting by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward him*

In your home culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

2. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOME culture if you are interacting with:
A female supervisor

    a. At *her office in a private meeting by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward her*

In your home culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

3. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOME culture if you are interacting with:
A male coworker

    a. At *your office by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward him*

In your home culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

4. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOME culture if you are interacting with:
A female coworker

    a. At *your office by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward her*

In your home culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

5. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOME culture if you are interacting with:
    A male subordinate (a coworker of lesser status)

    a. At *your office by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward him*

In your home culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

6. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOME culture if you are interacting with:
    A female subordinate (coworker of lesser status)

    a. At *your office by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward her*

In your home culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

Now please imagine that your new job is in your current **HOST** country. Please imagine each of the scenarios again, but now focusing on the work environment of the host country.

Possible Responses:		
A	**-**	**Express the emotion more intensely than you feel it**
B	**-**	**Express the emotion as you feel it**
C	**-**	**Express the emotion, but with less intensity than you feel it**
D	**-**	**Express no emotion**

---

7. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOST culture if you are interacting with
    A male supervisor

---

   a. At *his office in a private meeting by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward him*

In your host culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

---

8. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOST culture if you are interacting with:
    A female supervisor

---

   a. At *her office in a private meeting by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward her*

In your host culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

9. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOST culture if you are interacting with:

A male coworker

    a. At *your office by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward him*

In your host culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

10. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOST culture if you are interacting with:

A female coworker

    a. At *your office by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward her*

In your host culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

11. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOST culture if you are interacting with:
    A male subordinate (a coworker of lesser status)

    a. At *your office by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward him*

In your home culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

12. What do you believe you SHOULD do in your HOST culture if you are interacting with:
    A female subordinate (coworker of lesser status)

    a. At *your office by yourselves* and you feel the following emotions *toward her*

In your host culture	
(1) Anger	_____
(2) Contempt	_____
(3) Disgust	_____
(4) Fear	_____
(5) Happiness	_____
(6) Sadness	_____
(7) Surprise	_____

Appendix B

International Adjustment Scale

Please indicate how unadjusted or adjusted you are to each of the following aspects of your host (American) culture:

1. Living conditions (in general)

_____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
not adjusted   not very   somewhat   neither adjusted   somewhat   very well   extremely
at all   well adjusted   unadjusted   nor unadjusted   adjusted   adjusted   adjusted

2. Health care facilities

_____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
not adjusted   not very   somewhat   neither adjusted   somewhat   very well   extremely
at all   well adjusted   unadjusted   nor unadjusted   adjusted   adjusted   adjusted

3. Socializing with host nationals (Americans)

_____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
not adjusted   not very   somewhat   neither adjusted   somewhat   very well   extremely
at all   well adjusted   unadjusted   nor unadjusted   adjusted   adjusted   adjusted

4. Specific school-related responsibilities

_____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
not adjusted   not very   somewhat   neither adjusted   somewhat   very well   extremely
at all   well adjusted   unadjusted   nor unadjusted   adjusted   adjusted   adjusted

5. Food

_____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
not adjusted   not very   somewhat   neither adjusted   somewhat   very well   extremely
at all   well adjusted   unadjusted   nor unadjusted   adjusted   adjusted   adjusted

6. Housing conditions

_____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
not adjusted   not very   somewhat   neither adjusted   somewhat   very well   extremely
at all   well adjusted   unadjusted   nor unadjusted   adjusted   adjusted   adjusted

7. Performance standards and expectations at the university

_____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
not adjusted   not very   somewhat   neither adjusted   somewhat   very well   extremely
at all   well adjusted   unadjusted   nor unadjusted   adjusted   adjusted   adjusted

8. Speaking with host nationals (Americans)

_____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____   _____
not adjusted   not very   somewhat   neither adjusted   somewhat   very well   extremely
at all   well adjusted   unadjusted   nor unadjusted   adjusted   adjusted   adjusted

9. Shopping

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
not adjusted at all	not very well adjusted	somewhat unadjusted	neither adjusted nor unadjusted	somewhat adjusted	very well adjusted	extremely adjusted

10. Cost of living

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
not adjusted at all	not very well adjusted	somewhat unadjusted	neither adjusted nor unadjusted	somewhat adjusted	very well adjusted	extremely adjusted

11. Interacting with host nationals (Americans) outside of work

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
not adjusted at all	not very well adjusted	somewhat unadjusted	neither adjusted nor unadjusted	somewhat adjusted	very well adjusted	extremely adjusted

12. Entertainment/recreation facilities and opportunities

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
not adjusted at all	not very well adjusted	somewhat unadjusted	neither adjusted nor unadjusted	somewhat adjusted	very well adjusted	extremely adjusted

13. Graduate assistantship responsibilities (GA, RA, TA duties)

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
not adjusted at all	not very well adjusted	somewhat unadjusted	neither adjusted nor unadjusted	somewhat adjusted	very well adjusted	extremely adjusted

14. Interacting with host nationals (Americans) on a day-to-day basis

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
not adjusted at all	not very well adjusted	somewhat unadjusted	neither adjusted nor unadjusted	somewhat adjusted	very well adjusted	extremely adjusted

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

I rarely think of returning to my home country before finishing my academic program.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
strongly disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree

Completing my academic studies in this program is a top priority for me.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
strongly disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree

I hope I will be asked to return home early.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
strongly disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree

If I could ultimately stay in live here in my host country, I would.

strongly disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	neutral	slightly agree	moderately agree	strongly agree
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Appendix C

Personal Information

Please provide the following information about yourself. Your name will be replaced with an identification number and the database of names will be kept separately and seen only by the primary researcher.

1. Name: _____

2. Country of origin (home country): _____

3. Name of your academic advisor _____

4. Email address of your academic advisor _____

5. Name of one American student/peer you work with in the academic setting
   _____

6. Email address of this student/peer (if known) _____

7. Gender: Male _____   Female _____

8. Age: _____

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

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

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

12. Of your free time, what percentage (0-100) of the time is spent socializing with
    individuals from you home country? _____

13. Of your free time, what percentage (0-100) of the time is spent socializing with
    other international students (not from your home country)? _____

14. Number of months in the United States: _____

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

16. Native language: _____

17. Other languages you are proficient in: _____

18. 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 _____

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 _____

                         5th year _____

                         6th + year _____

17. What is your degree program/ major? _____

18. Besides your present stay in the United States, have you ever lived outside your home country? YES_____   NO_____

19. If YES, please list the country and the amount of time you spent in that country.

    Name of country   Time spent

_____   _____years _____months _____weeks

_____   _____years _____months _____weeks

_____   _____years _____months _____weeks

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

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
very exposed	moderately exposed	slightly exposed	neutral	slightly exposed	moderately exposed	very exposed

21. Are you planning on staying in the U.S. after your academic studies are completed? Y/N

Appendix D

Recruitment Email

Fellow Graduate Students:

I need your help collecting data for my Master's thesis. I am a graduate student in the psychology department here at Ohio University and am conducting research investigating cross-cultural differences in emotions in the work/school environment. In particular, I am focusing on the emotional displays of International and American graduate students at our university. If you could take 15 minutes out of your busy schedule to complete a series of short questionnaires, I would GREATLY appreciate your help.

The questionnaires pertain to your perceptions of emotional display in a variety of situations. International students, your participation is of particular importance as this research seeks to better understand emotions across cultures and to understand how emotion plays a role in international adjustment.

Again, participation will only take approximately 15 minutes and would be GREATLY appreciated. If you are willing to participate please note that there are different links for American and International students. Please be sure to click on the correct link.

American Students: Please click on the link below to begin the survey. Further instructions and form of consent will be provided.

International Students: Please click on the link below to begin the survey. Further instructions and form of consent will be provided.

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
Department of Psychology
200 Porter Hall
Office: 044L Porter Hall
Email: ng248604@ohio.edu