

Emotional Expressions in the United States and Japan

Fumiyo Araki

Richard L. Wiseman

*California State University,
Fullerton*

*California State University,
Fullerton*

Abstract

The cultural effect on the levels of emotional expression was investigated using Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimension of individualism-collectivism. The study focused on the United States and Japan as individualistic and collectivistic cultures, respectively, and the emotional expression of anger. Two pilot studies were conducted to develop a self-report questionnaire. The questionnaire in the main study consisted of three anger-eliciting scenarios and was completed by 111 Euro-American students from a U.S. university and 103 Japanese students from a university in Japan. The results revealed that when anger was elicited by an ingroup member and expressed to the same ingroup member, the American levels of expression were significantly higher than the Japanese levels of expression. When anger was elicited by an ingroup member and expressed to another ingroup member, the American levels of expression were significantly higher than the Japanese levels of expression.

As Frijda (1986) stated, "people not only have emotions, they also handle them" (p. 401). People regulate how they feel about certain emotional events (control of feeling) and how they behave or respond to emotional events (control of emotional expression). When persons encounter situations where the other communicator controls his/her emotions in a different way than they would predict, misunderstanding occurs. If persons can predict why and how communicators control their emotions, misunderstandings should be reduced. Because "communication is effective to the extent that we are able to minimize misunderstandings" (Gudykunst, 1991, p. 24), investigating emotional expression and control is one step toward increasing effective communication.

People control their emotional expressions in order to act appropriately according to cultural norms, i.e., a sense of propriety and feelings of shame and guilt (Frijda, 1986). For example, in the United States it is considered shameful for a boy to cry in public, and he is often criticized for acting like a girl. The norms governing emotional expressions are influenced by one's culture. These cultural norms have been referred to as "display rules" by Ekman and Friesen (1969).

This study investigated the cultural differences in emotional expressions, as well as the effects of cultural differences in group orientations (ingroup-outgroup communication)

on emotional expression. When focusing on group orientation, Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimension of individualism-collectivism is highly applicable because this continuum explains how the role of the group differs in each culture (e.g., group harmony is more emphasized in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic cultures). It also explains the attitudinal differences of people toward groups in each culture (e.g., people in collectivistic cultures draw a clearer line between an ingroup and an outgroup than in individualistic cultures).

Cultural Variations in Emotional Expressions

Individualism-Collectivism

There is evidence that culture influences how we express and control our emotions. For example, Ekman (1972) provided a neuro-cultural theory of facial expressions of emotion utilizing display rules. The model explains cultural differences as well as universal determinants of facial expressions. When comparing several cultures and their influences, a concept or framework that is common to each culture is needed to increase the generalizability of the findings on how cultures influence emotional expression. In this paper, cultural influence on emotional expressions is explained by Hofstede's (1980) dimension of individualism-collectivism.

Individualistic cultures emphasize the independence of each individual, and in such cultures personal needs and interests are valued more than group goals. In individualistic cultures people have more ingroups, making the ties between a person and her/his ingroups unstable. People in individualistic cultures are better at meeting and getting along with outsiders and forming new ingroups. On the other hand, in collectivistic cultures "individuals may be induced to subordinate their personal goals to the goals of some collective, which is usually a stable ingroup" (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988, p. 324). In collectivistic cultures, there are fewer ingroups and they tend to be more stable than in individualistic cultures. Members of collectivistic cultures make a clear distinction between an ingroup and an outgroup, so "cooperation is high in an ingroup but is unlikely when the other person belongs to an outgroup" (Triandis *et al.*, 1988, p. 325). Thus, the behavior of members of collectivistic cultures can be highly individualistic toward outgroup members.

People in all cultures manipulate their behavior, including emotional behavior, depending on with whom they are communicating (ingroup or outgroup) (Triandis *et al.*, 1988). However, the difference between one's behavior toward ingroup and outgroup members is more differentiated in collectivistic than in individualistic cultures. Thus, there should be a cultural difference in emotional behavior between individualistic cultures and collectivistic cultures when we take into account the concept of self-ingroup and self-outgroup communication. In other words, in collectivistic cultures there should be greater difference between self-ingroup communication and self-outgroup communication than in individualistic cultures.

Ingroup and Outgroup Communication

An ingroup in collectivistic cultures is illustrated by one's family, friends, and other people concerned with one's welfare (Triandis, 1972). Wheeler, Reis, and Bond (1989)

stated that ingroups in collectivistic society are few in number. Triandis *et al.* (1988) described that ingroups in collectivistic cultures are mainly "family and friends." However, Triandis *et al.* (1988) suggested that the definition of an ingroup can depend on the situation. For example, employees of Nissan refer to themselves as "we" (ingroup) while Toyota is referred to as "they" (outgroup). Yet, employees in both companies become "we" (ingroup) when discussing the share of the market versus American automakers (Triandis *et al.*, 1988).

In individualistic cultures the ingroup is defined as people who are similar to oneself in social class, race, beliefs, attitudes, and values (Triandis, 1972). Ingroups in individualistic cultures cover a much broader spectrum than in collectivistic cultures. Wheeler *et al.* (1989) explained that people in individualistic cultures may consider their work group, the neighbors, and clubs as ingroups in addition to family and friends. According to the results of Triandis *et al.*'s (1988) study, Japanese (collectivistic culture) have an "inner ingroup" (parent, close friends), "outer ingroup" (close relative, coworker, neighbor), and an outgroup (person hardly known, person from another country). Whereas Americans (individualistic culture) have a wider "inner ingroup" (parent, close friend, close relative, coworker), a small "outer ingroup" (neighbors), and an "outgroup" that is treated basically the same as "outer ingroup."

Because there seems to be variability in the conceptualization of ingroups in different cultures it is necessary for us to take this into consideration when we conceptualize ingroups and outgroups. In this paper, ingroup is conceptualized as the common groups that are considered to be inner ingroups in both collectivistic and individualistic cultures, namely, family and close friends. Outgroup members will be operationalized as mere acquaintances or strangers.

Cultural Differences in Emotion

Theoretical frameworks to explain cultural differences in emotion have been provided by Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988a). They utilized Hofstede's (1980) dimensions to compare cultural variability and several aspects of emotion to the results provided by previous research. They focused on attitudes toward emotion, antecedents of emotion, and reactions to emotion. In analyzing attitudes toward emotion, they found some cultural differences could be explained with the individualism-collectivism construct. Originally, the respondents in Izard's (1971) study were asked several questions concerning attitudes toward emotion: which emotion do you understand best?, which emotion do you prefer to experience?, etc. Although the data in Izard's (1971) study indicated an interaction between culture and emotion in all the questions, he did not provide a theoretical interpretation.

According to Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988a), the more individualistic the culture is, the less people experience anger, and the less people prefer to experience interest. Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988a) explained that Izard's (1971) findings are consistent with the characteristics of individualistic and collectivistic cultures. They stated that emotional independence is expected in individualistic cultures, while in collectivistic cultures, emotional dependence is expected. In explaining the negative relationship between individualism and the desire to experience interest, they stated that it may be due to filling a void. Since people in collectivistic cultures emphasize order and duty, they feel a need to

engage in activities that are of interest, rather than being out of obligation. Lastly, Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988a) found that nonvocal reactions (i.e., face, body parts, and whole body) and verbalization were correlated positively with individualism. Thus, the more individualistic the culture, the greater people's nonvocal reactions and verbalizations of the emotion are. According to Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988b), those findings are consistent with characteristics of the individualism-collectivism dimension. Verbal communication is stressed in individualistic cultures, while in collectivistic cultures verbal communication is not emphasized and is often indirect. In addition, in collectivistic cultures, a receiver's ability to decode subtle nonverbal cues is emphasized. People in individualistic cultures value a sender's ability to convey messages explicitly (Okabe, 1983). In other words, in individualistic cultures, more explicit nonvocal reactions sent by an encoder are expected than in collectivistic cultures. Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988a) stated that most comparisons of nonverbal communication between individualistic and collectivistic cultures suggest that people in individualistic cultures use nonverbal displays in reaction to emotional experiences more than people in collectivistic cultures. Based upon the Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey's (1988a) analysis, it can be concluded that the individualism-collectivism constructs explain cultural differences in attitudes toward emotion, antecedents of emotion, nonvocal reactions, and verbalizations of emotion. They also tested whether there was a relationship between verbal control and individualism-collectivism, however, their results showed no significant association.

One possible reason why verbal control was not associated with individualism-collectivism is that the data that Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988a) analyzed did not include distinctions between self-ingroup and self-outgroup communication. The face-concern and speech act would differ depending on the group memberships of the people involved in the communication. Thus, it is important to integrate ingroup/outgroup communication with individualism-collectivism when investigating emotional expression and control. A cultural difference correlated with individualism-collectivism might be better discerned if ingroup/outgroup communication is considered.

There have been some inroads in the analysis of the interaction between individualism-collectivism construct and ingroup/outgroup communication in explaining emotional expressions. Matsumoto (1989) tested whether the perception of emotion and the dimensions of individualism-collectivism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance were correlated. Perception of emotion was operationalized with three types of data: the percentage of members of each culture correctly identifying the emotional expression, the mean intensity level attributed to each of the expressions, and the amount of variability associated with the intensity ratings of each expression. There were no significant correlations between the cultural dimensions and the correct judgments of emotions or the cultural dimensions and the variability index of perception. On the other hand, there was a positive correlation between individualism and judgments of the intensity of negative emotions, i.e., people from individualistic cultures tended to make more intense ratings on negative emotions than people from collectivistic cultures. The dimension of individualism-collectivism seems to explain the cultural differences in the perception of emotion, namely, the intensity of negative emotions.

Matsumoto (1991) provided a theoretical framework to better understand the cultural differences in emotional expressions. He applied the cultural dimensions of individualism-collectivism and power distance to the social distinctions of ingroup-outgroup and status. His argument was that in collectivistic cultures emotional displays of the members who maintain and facilitate group cohesion, harmony, or cooperation are fostered to a greater degree than in individualistic cultures.

Emotional display is influenced more by the context and the target of the emotion in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic cultures (Matsumoto, 1991). For example, when negative emotion is a reaction to persons in the ingroup it would be inappropriate to show the negative emotion in the ingroup. To do so would jeopardize the group harmony valued in collectivistic cultures. When the same emotion occurs in public, it is also inappropriate to display the emotion because of the negative ramifications to the group or individuals. To display such emotion in public makes the group or individuals lose face. However, when negative emotion is a reaction to persons in a rival group (i.e., outgroup), it would be appropriate to show the emotion in the ingroup because it should foster ingroup cohesion.

Matsumoto (1991) also noted that people in individualistic cultures are more likely to express positive emotions (and not display negative emotions) to members of the outgroup than people in collectivistic cultures. When a member of an individualistic culture communicates with an outgroup member, it is viewed more as one-to-one relationship than self-outgroup relationship. Individualistic cultures foster expression of cohesion-producing emotions among outgroup members, while collectivistic cultures foster less cohesion-producing emotions with outgroup members.

The difference in the amount of emotional behavior displayed between ingroups and outgroups in individualistic cultures should be larger than in collectivistic cultures, because individualistic cultures encourage greater variance in emotional expressions. There is a wider range of emotional display in individualistic cultures than in collectivistic cultures. Matsumoto (1991) provided simple hypothetical data on the degree to which anger would be expressed from American (individualist) and Japanese (collectivist) to friends (ingroups) and strangers (outgroups): "Americans may express anger at a level of 7.0 to their friends, but only 2.0 to strangers. The Japanese may express anger at a level of 5.0 to friends, but only 3.0 to strangers" (p. 133).

Matsumoto's (1991) analysis of emotional expressions as influenced by individualism-collectivism and ingroup-outgroup communication is convincing. However, one of his propositions seems contradictory to the explanation of individualism-collectivism and ingroup-outgroup orientations, namely, that there is a greater variation of emotional expressions in individualistic cultures than in collectivistic cultures. This proposition seems inconsistent with collectivistic cultures' vast behavioral differences between ingroup and outgroup emotional expressions. The hypothetical data Matsumoto (1991) provided could be modified accordingly: Americans may express anger at a level of 6.0 to their friends, and 6.0 to strangers. The Japanese may express anger at a level of 4.0 to friends, and 6.0 to strangers.

Gudykunst and Kim (1992) agreed with Matsumoto's (1991) conclusion that people in individualistic cultures express more positive emotions to members of outgroups than do the people in collectivistic cultures. However, Gudykunst and Kim (1992) "disagree with Matsumoto's conclusion regarding negative emotions" (p. 176), they "believe that members of collectivistic cultures are more likely to express negative emotions with members of outgroups than are members of individualistic cultures" (p. 177). Collectivistic cultures' orientations of "do whatever you can get away with" (Triandis *et al.*, 1988, p. 325) applies to the negative emotional expression towards members of the outgroup. Members of outgroups in collectivistic cultures often are treated as "nonpersons." In other words, people in collectivistic cultures can be highly individualistic when it comes to members of outgroups (Triandis *et al.*, 1988).

Group Memberships of the People in Emotional Communication

There should be differences between collectivistic and individualistic cultures in positive and negative emotional expressions (Gudykunst & Kim, 1992; Matsumoto, 1991). The implications and future hypotheses that Matsumoto (1991) proposed can be extended. Matsumoto (1991) pointed out the importance of ingroup and outgroup communication behavior, however he did consider the situation where the person whom the emotion is about (the elicitor of the emotion) and the person to whom the emotion is expressed (the target of the emotional expression) are different.

For example, Pat and his/her family are considered ingroup in the example. Pat is angry at his/her father (ingroup member). Pat is expressing his/her anger about father to mother (another ingroup member). Thus, in this example, the person whom the emotion is about (father) and the person to whom the emotion is expressed (mother) are different. Another example in which the elicitor of the emotion differs from the target of the emotional expression is as follows. Pat got angry at a stranger because the stranger cut into a line in front of her/him in a cafeteria. Pat is expressing his/her anger about the stranger (outgroup member) to Pat's close friend (ingroup member).

In sum, the important issues that should be considered when comparing cultural influence on emotional expressions are: individualism-collectivism and self-ingroup self-outgroup communication. The elicitor of the emotion (ingroup or outgroup) should be regarded as well as the target of the emotional expression (ingroup or outgroup). In the present study, the target of the emotional expression was limited to ingroup members only. The following examination of the research on emotion in Japan and the U.S. should further our understanding of these dynamics.

Research on Emotion in Japan and the United States

Cross-cultural research on emotions has compared Japan and the United States in terms of antecedents of emotion and reactions to emotion. In Friesen's (1972) study, both cultural universals and differences of the display of emotion were reported. The researchers showed stress-inducing films and neutral films to American and Japanese subjects, and cross-culturally compared the facial expressions of the subjects who watched the films. When the subjects in each culture watched the films alone the subjects from both cultures showed virtually the same facial responses, supporting the universality of facial expressions. However, when a scientist was present while the subjects watched the stress-

inducing film for the second time, Japanese subjects masked negative emotional expressions with smiles more than American subjects. This study was one of the first to report cultural differences in controlling facial expressions and to support the notion that the display of negative emotion is a violation of social rules in collectivistic orientation.

Matsumoto, Kudoh, Scherer, and Wallbott (1988) examined the degree of cultural similarity and specificity in emotional experience and reactions in Japan and the U.S. concerning seven emotions: joy, anger, shame, guilt, fear, sadness, and disgust. The data analyzed in this study were a part of a larger study conducted by Wallbott and Scherer (1986). There was considerable agreement across both cultures concerning the evaluation of antecedents. For example, the data suggested that joy- and guilt-eliciting situations were generally more expected in both cultures than other situations eliciting the other five emotions. In contrast, there were cultural differences in reactive and expressive aspects of emotion. For example, American subjects generally reported more expressive and verbal reactions to the emotions than Japanese subjects.

In Matsumoto *et al.*'s study (1988), no cultural differences in control of emotion were found. People in both cultures agreed that they control sadness, shame, and guilt the greatest degree, while they control fear, anger, and disgust less, and joy the least. This finding was inconsistent with the theoretical expectation suggesting there would be a difference in control of emotion between Japanese and Americans. Matsumoto *et al.* (1988) explained that the emotional control process might be learned so early and well, that in the college student samples the control process occurs unintentionally. Therefore, subjects unknowingly control their emotions and consequently the cultural differences in actual verbal and nonverbal reactions appear (e.g., Americans show more verbal reactions than Japanese).

It is reasonable to consider that there is a cultural difference in control of emotion between Japan and the U.S. associated with the individualism-collectivism dimension and its influence on ingroup and outgroup communication. The possible reason why no cultural differences were found in Matsumoto *et al.*'s (1988) study was because the researchers did not consider situational variables (e.g., the target of the emotion, whether the communication took place in ingroup or outgroup). The relevant questions asked in the study were: did you try to hide or control your feelings so that nobody would know how you really felt (not at all; a little; very much; not applicable)? When you are angry at a close friend how much would you hide the feeling to him/her? How much would you hide the feeling to other close friends? Some differences between Japan and the U.S. should be discerned. Thus, it is necessary to relate the questions to individualism-collectivism and ingroup and outgroup communication as well as to account for situational variables as the elicitor of the emotion (ingroup or outgroup), the target of the emotional expression (ingroup or outgroup), and whether the elicitor and the target are different persons.

Scherer, Wallbott, Matsumoto, and Kudoh (1988) studied the antecedents and control of emotional reactions in U.S., Japanese, and European cultures. Several cultural differences were found. First, while the natures of antecedent events (i.e., what kinds of incidents elicit a certain kind of emotion) of the American and European samples are somewhat similar, ones of the Japanese samples differed greatly from American and

European samples. For example, the U.S. students reported about 60% of anger situations due to problems in their relationships (i.e., ingroups), however, anger situations due to the behavior of strangers (i.e., outgroups) for them was limited to only 15%. On the other hand, more than half of the anger situations were produced by the behavior of strangers in Japan. The researchers explained the possible reason for the cultural difference was the difference in social norms. They stated that the behavior in relationships with known others is highly structured in Japan, which makes it less likely for them to express anger in the relationships. However, it does not necessarily mean that Japanese do not get angry at the people in those relationships. It is possible that Japanese samples tended not to disclose about ingroup anger in the questionnaire due to social desirability. Thus, it cannot be concluded that anger-eliciting situations are mostly with strangers in Japan.

Second, Scherer *et al.* found no significant cultural difference in the control of verbal and nonverbal emotional reactions between Americans and Japanese. If ingroup and outgroup communication were considered as variables, differences might have been discerned. The cultural differences in emotion-eliciting situations (e.g., anger eliciting situations) may have contributed to the inability to find cultural differences. Half of the anger-eliciting situations for Japanese were reported as strangers' behavior, thus, it is expected that Japanese responses for control of verbal behavior were related to those stranger situations. Since almost 60% of the anger-eliciting situations reported by Americans were problems in relationships with known others, Americans are expected to give responses regarding the relationship situations.

An explanation of the lack of cultural differences between the U.S. and Japan may be that the Japanese do not control their verbal reactions to anger about strangers because strangers are treated as "nonpersons." To investigate the cultural difference in control of verbal reaction and group orientations, anger-eliciting situations in a questionnaire need to take into consideration the group memberships (an ingroup or outgroup member) of the elicitor of the emotion and the target of the emotional expression.

Research Hypotheses

Expression of negative emotions is directly related to maintaining or destroying cohesion in the ingroup, so that cultural differences in expressions of negative emotions are expected due to the cultural difference between group orientations. In addition, according to Scherer *et al.*'s (1988) research, positive emotional expression is not as controlled as negative emotional expression universally, suggesting that negative emotions are more culturally influenced than positive emotions. The expression of negative emotion will be the specific focus of this study. Further, the present study will focus on the strong and intense negative emotion of anger. The independent variables are culture, the elicitor of the emotion (ingroup or outgroup member), and the target of the emotional expression (ingroup or outgroup member). The dependent variable is the amount of the emotional expression of anger.

Hypothesis 1

People in collectivistic cultures emphasize ingroup cohesion more than people in individualistic cultures. In collectivistic cultures, directly expressing negative emotion about an ingroup member to the same person endangers ingroup harmony. Thus, members of

collectivistic cultures are expected to control and suppress expressions of anger in such situations more than people in individualistic cultures. Thus, Hypothesis 1 can be posited as:

Hypothesis 1: When anger is held against a member of the ingroup and is expressed to the same person (Situation 1 in Figure 1 on the next page) American levels of expression of anger will be higher than Japanese levels of expression of anger.

Hypothesis 2

In collectivistic cultures, if a person directly expresses anger about an ingroup member (person A) to another ingroup member (person B), it will harm A's face towards B. Consequently, this endangers ingroup harmony. The person will attempt to control and possibly conceal the expression of the emotion to B. On the other hand, since other's face is not the main concern in individualistic cultures, a person from these cultures will openly express anger to B. Given this explanation, Hypothesis 2 is generated.

[figure 1 not available in web format]

Hypothesis 2: When anger is held against a member of the ingroup and is expressed to another member of the ingroup (Situation 2 in Figure 1), American levels of emotional expression of anger will be higher than Japanese levels of emotional expression of anger.

Hypothesis 3

In collectivistic cultures, outgroup members are treated as nonpersons and people can be highly individualistic toward outgroup members (Triandis *et al.*, 1988). Thus, a person does not have to save an outgroup member's face. Ingroup cohesion is reinforced when a person expresses negative emotions about an outgroup member to an ingroup member. The level of expression of anger about an outgroup member to an ingroup member will be high. In individualistic cultures, the distinction between ingroups and outgroups is not as clear as it is in collectivistic cultures. In other words, ingroup members and outgroup members are treated more similarly. This line of reasoning produces Hypothesis 3: *Hypothesis 3:* Across the three emotion-eliciting scenarios, there will be a larger difference between the level of expression of anger elicited by an ingroup member and the level of expression of anger elicited by an outgroup member for Japanese than for Americans (the difference between Situation 2 and 3 in Figure 1).

In collectivistic cultures, outgroup members are treated as nonpersons with no face-concerns for them, whereas there are great face-concerns for ingroup members. Thus, the level of anger expression will be higher when the anger is against an outgroup member and is expressed to an ingroup member than when the anger is against an ingroup member and is expressed to another ingroup member. In individualistic cultures, people tend to be

concerned primarily with their own face, thus, the group membership of the people in the communication should not influence the level of anger expression.

(Image not available online.
For image, contact ICS editor)

Methods

Instrument

A self-report questionnaire was used as an instrument of data collection. While there are problems that limit the validity of self-report data, those problems can be minimized in a carefully designed research study (Hampel, 1984). One of the problems of self-reports is that the respondents might not be conscious of a particular behavior asked in the question (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977). That is, respondents might not remember what they did in the situation in the past, so they answer the question based on their implicit theory without true introspection. In such cases, the data obtained tend to reflect socially desirable responses that are believed to be plausible by the respondents. Ericsson and Simon (1980) suggested that the possibility of this problem could be reduced by asking questions about a particular behavior promptly after the behavior occurs. In the present study, the self-report questionnaire contains anger-eliciting scenarios that are common and realistic. Respondents are asked about their behavior in such scenarios while they imagine themselves as actors in the scenarios. Thus, this research design facilitates the respondents' role-playing and their awareness of the reasons for their projected behavior.

Another problem in self-reports derives from the fact that people often act mindlessly: people follow the appropriate script without being conscious of what they are doing (Langer, 1978). Hampel (1984) stated that "a subject can give an accurate verbal report of mindless behavior if both the behavior and the report are controlled by the same script or rules" (p. 149). In other words, while people do not behave mindfully, they have access to what they do. Even if the respondents mindlessly behave in response to the scenarios in the questionnaire (i.e., they do not know why they behave that way), they are able to give an accurate verbal report of what behavior they would demonstrate. Therefore, the self-report questionnaire should yield credible and generalizable findings.

Pilot Study 1

The first pilot study was completed in order to determine what kind of anger-eliciting ingroup and outgroup situations occur in daily communication across cultures. The respondents were asked to briefly describe anger eliciting situations that have occurred in ingroup and outgroup contexts. Ingroup members are defined as a family and close friends, and outgroup members are defined as a mere acquaintance or a stranger. After describing each situation, the respondents rated the intensity of the anger they felt. There were three anger-eliciting conditions that were common in ingroup and outgroup situations reported in both American and Japanese data. The three situations were (1) a person copies homework without permission, (2) a person breaking an appointment, and (3) a person letting a third person borrow a rented object without permission of the owner (e.g., a book). Japanese respondents indicated slightly higher intensities experienced than American respondents. However, the sample size was too small to draw any significant conclusion.

Pilot Study 2

Based upon the results from the first pilot study, three scenarios were developed by the researcher. The second pilot study assessed the believability and realism of the scenarios. A self-report questionnaire designed by the researcher contained three anger-eliciting scenarios that were reported in the first pilot study. Namely, the "copying homework incident," "breaking promise incident," and "subleasing incident" were utilized in the questionnaire. Each scenario was modified minimally, altering only a few words to fit one of the three conditions: (1) the elicitor of anger was an ingroup member and the anger was expressed to the same ingroup member (In-Same), (2) the elicitor of anger was an ingroup member and the emotion was expressed to another ingroup member (In-Another), and (3) the elicitor of anger was an outgroup member and the anger was expressed to an ingroup member (Out-In). For example, the "copying homework incident" was converted to an In-Same scenario, an In-Another scenario, and an Out-In scenario. The nine scenarios were randomly distributed across three forms of the questionnaire to minimize any possible order effects. To minimize gender effects, gender neutral names were used in the scenarios.

After reading each scenario respondents were asked three questions about the scenario to assess the believability of the scenario: (1) Would Pat's (Chris', or Sydney's) behavior make you angry? (2) Is this scenario believable? and (3) Is this scenario realistic? Respondents were further asked if they would express their anger to a certain person in the situation. In addition, respondents were asked to rate how much they would express or suppress the emotion in the situation. To investigate if there are reasons why respondents express or suppress their anger based on ingroup and outgroup orientations, respondents were asked why they would express or suppress anger and what they would say or do in the situation.

High percentages (64 to 100 percent) of the respondents from both cultures indicated that anger was elicited by the behavior of a certain person in each situation. Further, about 64 to 100 percent of the respondents across the two cultures indicated that the scenarios were believable and realistic. However, only about 33 percent of American respondents indicated as realistic the situation where an outgroup member subleases a rented book and the anger was expressed to an ingroup member.

There were no cultural differences in the reasons and the kinds of expressions of anger. In addition, no one mentioned ingroup-outgroup behavioral differences related to face-concerns and speech acts as reasons for emotional expression and suppression. Since overall believability of the three scenarios was high all three scenarios were deemed usable in the main study.

Main Study

The purposes of the main study were to assess the effects of ingroup and outgroup communication on the levels of the expressions of anger reported by members of American and Japanese cultures. The questionnaire contained the scenarios that were rated believable and realistic by the subjects in the second pilot study.

Sample. One hundred and eleven (46 males, 65 females, 1 unknown) Euro-American students enrolled at a university in western United States and 103 (52 males, 50 females, 1 unknown) Japanese students in a medium size Japanese university participated in the study.

The mean age of American respondents was 24.6 (sd=6.32), and the mean age of Japanese respondents was 20.4 (sd=0.92).

Questionnaire. The three scenarios used in the second pilot study were used in the self-report questionnaire. As in the second pilot study, each scenario was adapted to one of the three conditions: In-Same, In-Another, or Out-In. Gender neutral names were used in the scenarios in order to minimize gender effects. Further, the nine scenarios were randomly distributed across three forms of the questionnaire. The scenarios as well as the questions were translated into Japanese by the bilingual, bicultural researcher, and were back-translated into English by another bilingual, bicultural professional. In the Japanese version of the questionnaire, gender neutral last names were used to obtain more realism. A comparison of the original English version of the questionnaire and the back-translated version of the questionnaire revealed no differences.

Measurement. After reading each scenario, respondents were asked to indicate their levels of agreement to three statements about the amount of their emotional expression. Respondents rated 1 if they strongly disagreed with the statement, 2 if they disagreed with the statement, 3 if they were neutral, 4 if they agreed with the statement, or 5 if they strongly agreed with the statement.

Results

The overall reliability of three statements on the level of emotional expression was quite high (standardized item alpha=.84). In order to determine if there was a significant cultural difference in the level of expression, t-tests were calculated. An ANOVA was used to analyze if there was an interaction effect of culture and group situation on the level of expression. Two out of three hypotheses were supported in this study. In addition, there were no significant relationships among gender, age, and the levels of emotional expression.

Hypothesis 1

Based on the reported cultural difference in ingroup attitudes, it was expected that American levels of expression of anger would be higher than Japanese levels of expression of anger when anger was elicited by an ingroup member and was expressed to the same person. The results indicated American respondents' levels of expression were significantly higher than Japanese respondents' levels of expression (American mean=3.76, Japanese mean=3.48, $t = -2.23$, $df=207$, $p<.03$). Thus, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported.

According to post-hoc analysis, however, some situational variations on the effect of emotional expression were found. First, in the "copying homework incident" situation, the American respondents' levels of expression were significantly higher than the Japanese respondents' levels of expression (American mean=3.48, Japanese mean=2.98, $t=-2.07$, $df=64$, $p<.04$). Second, in the "breaking promise incident" situation, the American respondents' levels of expression were higher than the Japanese respondents' levels of expression, though the difference was not significant (American mean=3.45, Japanese mean=3.04, $t=-1.77$, $df=73$, $p=ns$). Third, in the "subleasing incident" situation, the Japanese respondents' levels of expression were significantly higher than the American respondents' levels of expression (American mean=3.13, Japanese mean=3.75, $t=2.57$,

df=70, $p<.01$). These findings suggested that each scenario has different effects on the emotional expression levels in the two cultures.

Hypothesis 2

It was expected that American levels of expression of anger would be higher than Japanese levels of anger when anger was elicited by an ingroup member and was expressed to another ingroup member. The results indicated that the American respondents' levels of expression were significantly higher than the Japanese respondents' levels of expression (American mean=3.47, Japanese mean=3.04, $t=-3.12$, $df=212$, $p<.002$). Thus, hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

A post-hoc analysis of the situational effects on emotional expression was computed. First, in the "copying homework incident" situation, the American respondents' levels of expression were slightly higher than the Japanese respondents' levels of expression, however, the difference was not significant (American mean=3.88, Japanese mean=3.68, $t=-.94$, $df=71$, $p=ns$). Second, in the "breaking promise incident" situation, the American respondents' levels of emotional expression were higher than the Japanese respondents' levels of emotional expression, though the difference was not significant (American mean=3.82, Japanese mean=3.46, $t=-1.54$, $df=64$, $p=ns$). Third, in the "subleasing incident" situation, the American respondents' levels of emotional expression were significantly higher than the Japanese respondents' levels of emotional expression (American mean=3.51, Japanese mean=2.84, $t=-2.88$, $df=73$, $p<.005$).

Hypothesis 3

It was expected that there would be a larger difference between the level of emotional expression when anger was elicited by an ingroup member and was expressed to another ingroup member (In-In situation) and the level of emotional expression when anger was elicited by an outgroup member and was expressed to an ingroup member (Out-In situation). The mean of the Japanese respondents' levels of emotional expression in the first situation (In-In situation) was 3.04, and the mean of the Japanese respondents' levels of emotional expression in the subsequent situation (Out-In situation) was 3.45. The mean of the American respondents' levels of emotional expression in the first situation (In-In situation) was 3.47 and the mean of the American respondents' levels of emotional expression in the subsequent situation (Out-In situation) was 3.56. An ANOVA tested the interaction effect of the independent variables, the cultures and the group situations (In-In and Out-In), on the level of emotional expression. There was not a significant interaction effect ($F=2.65$, $df=1/445$, $p=ns$). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Discussion

Hypothesis 1

It was expected in the first hypothesis that when anger was held against a member of the ingroup and was expressed to the same person, American levels of expression of anger will be higher than Japanese levels of expression of anger. This hypothesis was partially supported.

As reviewed earlier, Matsumoto, Kudoh, Scherer, and Wallbott (1988) reported the similar findings regarding reactive and expressive aspects of the seven emotions that included anger. American subjects generally reported more expressive and verbal reactions

to the emotions than Japanese subjects. The present findings are plausible with the cultural dimension, individualism-collectivism, and its relation to ingroup-outgroup orientations. In collectivistic cultures, directly expressing negative emotion about an ingroup member to the same person endangers ingroup harmony. On the other hand, in individualistic cultures, where ingroup harmony is not emphasized, honestly expressing negative emotions is valued.

A post-hoc analysis revealed some cultural variations in the levels of emotional expressions in each situation. The most unexpected finding was that the Japanese respondents' levels of expressions were significantly higher than the American respondents' levels of expressions in the "subleasing incident" scenario. One of the possible reasons for the Japanese respondents' high levels of anger expression might be due to the nature of the anger eliciting scenario. There have been some cultural differences in antecedents of anger reported. For example, according to Scherer *et al.* (1988), in the U.S. of all the anger eliciting situations reported in the study, 20 percent were injustice situations. However, in Japan injustice situations account for only 4 percent of anger situations.

It can be said that people in Japan rarely experience injustice situations as antecedents of anger, whereas such situations are commonly experienced among people in the U.S.. The "subleasing incident" scenario is considered to be an injustice situation, in which the person engages in a faulty behavior by letting someone borrow a rented book. Since it is rare, the "subleasing incident" scenario might have elicited greater intensity of anger than usual for the Japanese respondents. The intensity of anger might be so high for the Japanese respondents that they are no longer concerned with the fact that expressing anger would endanger their ingroup harmony. For that reason, the Japanese respondents might have indicated significantly higher level of anger expressions than the American respondents.

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis predicted that when anger was held against a member of ingroup and was expressed to another member of the ingroup, American levels of expression of anger would be higher than Japanese levels of expression of anger. The results partially supported the hypothesis. The findings revealed that individualism-collectivism with an integration of ingroup-outgroup communication can explicate cultural differences in the expressions of anger. In collectivistic cultures, when anger is elicited by an ingroup member to openly express the anger to another ingroup member harms ingroup harmony because it endangers the face of the elicitor. Thus, the anger expression would be suppressed. In individualistic cultures, in the same situation people tend not to be concerned about others' face and ingroup harmony is not as emphasized as in collectivistic cultures. Consequently, people tend to explicitly express their anger in ingroup situations. The findings in the present study are consistent with Matsumoto's (1991) hypothesis: "Americans may express anger at a level of 7.0 to their friends, but only 2.0 to strangers. The Japanese may express anger at a level of 5.0 to friends, but only 3.0 to strangers" (p. 133). According to the post-hoc analysis, the only situation in which there was a significant cultural difference in the levels of anger expression was the "subleasing incident" scenario. As noted above, the "subleasing incident" scenario probably did not trigger the same intensity of anger for American and Japanese respondents.

Hypothesis 3

It was hypothesized that there would be a larger difference between the level of emotional expression when anger was elicited by an ingroup member and was expressed to another ingroup member and the level of emotional expression when anger was elicited by an outgroup member and was expressed to an ingroup member. This hypothesis was not supported. The results indicated that there was no significant interaction effects of the cultures and the groups (In-In and Out-In). In other words, it was suggested that the difference between the Japanese levels of emotional expression when the elicitor was an ingroup member and when the elicitor was an outgroup member was similar to the difference between the American levels of emotional expression when the elicitor was an ingroup member and when the elicitor was an outgroup member. However, the Japanese difference in the levels in the two situations was slightly larger than the American difference.

The possible reason why the third hypothesis was not supported is that there were situational effects mitigating the levels of emotional expression. Even though the scenarios used in the study were created based on the data from the respondents in both American and Japanese cultures in pilot studies, a post-hoc analysis revealed that each scenario has different effects on the levels of emotional expression in each culture. This suggests that antecedents of emotion might be culturally specific. There is research to suggest the "subleasing incident" scenario might not be a culture-general (universal) antecedent of anger. Further, there might be a cultural difference in the intensity of the anger the respondents felt, which might have some influence on the level of anger expression. In the first pilot study, Japanese generally reported slightly higher intensity of anger than Americans, though the sample size was not big enough to draw a conclusion. The intensity of anger might differ in each scenario, and the difference might make people express the emotion differently.

In future studies, it is suggested that more carefully constructed scenarios be tested. It is imperative to research universal antecedent events that occur in ingroups and outgroups. Though it was attempted in the first pilot study to obtain universal antecedents, it seems that it was not successful. Extensive study about antecedents of anger with a greater number of respondents should be conducted in future. The attention should be paid to what kind of anger-eliciting situations are specific to a certain culture. For example, cultural influence on people's attitude toward anger-eliciting situations (e.g., injustice situations) should be investigated. Furthermore, the intensity of the emotion should be measured and analyzed in order to determine if there is an interaction between the reported intensity of the emotion and the level of the emotional expression.

Future research needs to continue to focus on culture and its effect on emotional communication. As Darwinian tradition supports, the experience of emotion and the expression of emotion to another person are vital to our welfare and survival (Berscheid, 1991). The study of emotional communication is an important area of study. The applications of theoretical frameworks to cross-cultural studies of emotional communication should improve our understanding of this critical form of communication and, subsequently, our insights about intercultural communication.

References

- Berscheid, E.
 1991 Emotion and interpersonal communication. In J. Blumer, J. McLeod, and K. Rosengren (Eds.), *Comparatively Speaking: Communication and Culture Across Space and Time* (pp. 77-88). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ekman, P.
 1972 Universal and cultural differences in facial expression of emotion. In J. R. Cole (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 207-83). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V.
 1969 Nonverbal leakage and cues to deception. *Psychiatry*, 32, 88-106.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Simmon, H. A.
 1980 Verbal reports as data. *Psychological Review*, 87, 215-51.
- Friesen, W. V.
 1972 Cultural differences in facial expressions in a social situation: An experimental test of the concept of display rules. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Francisco.
- Frijda, N. H.
 1986 *The Emotions*. New York: University of Cambridge Press.
- Gudykunst, W. B.
 1991 *Bridging Differences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y.
 1992 *Communicating with Strangers: An Approach to Intercultural Communication* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Ting-Toomey, S.
 1988a Culture and affective communication. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 31, 384-400.
 1988b *Culture and Interpersonal Communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hample, D.
 1984 On the use of self-reports. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 20, 140-53.
- Hofstede, G.
 1980 *Culture's Consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Izard, C. E.
 1971 *The Face of Emotion*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Langer, E.
 1978 Rethinking the role of thought in social interaction. In H. Harvey, W. Ickes, & R. Kidd (Eds.), *New Directions in Attribution Research* (pp. 35-58). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Matsumoto, D.
 1989 Cultural influences on the perception of emotion. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20, 92-105.

- 1991 Cultural influences on facial expressions of emotion. *Southern Communication Journal*, 56, 128-37.
- Matsumoto, D., Kudoh, T., Scherer, K. R., & Wallbott, H. G.
 1988 Antecedents of and reactions to emotions in the U.S. and Japan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 19, 267-86.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D.
 1977 The halo effect: Evidence for unconscious alteration of judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 250-6.
- Okabe, R.
 1983 Cultural assumptions of east and west. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intercultural Communication Theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Scherer, K. R., Wallbott, H. G., Matsumoto, D., & Kudoh, T.
 1988 Emotional experience in cultural context: A comparison between Europe, Japan, and the United States. In K. R. Scherer (Ed.), *Facets of Emotion*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Triandis, H. C.
 1972 *The Analysis of Subjective Culture*. New York: Wiley.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N.
 1988 Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 323-38.
- Wheeler, L., Reis, H. T., & Bond, M. H.
 1989 Collectivism-individualism in everyday social life: The middle kingdom and the melting pot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 79-86.
- Wallbott, H. G., & Scherer, K. R.
 1986 How universal and specific is emotional experience? Evidence from 27 countries on five continents. *Social Science Information*, 25, 763-95.