Negotiating Emotions Across Cultures
Kellogg Culture & Negotiation Conference

Batja Mesquita
Center for Social and Cultural Psychology, University of Leuven
Negotiating Emotions

All everyday attempts at influencing and/or changing other people’s emotions.
MOTHER OF DIDI (3 YRS OLD, TAIWAN)

Didi walks towards the researcher’s camcorder, and is about to touch it

“Hey, Didi! what did mommy just tell you? You do not listen...does mommy have to spank you?

You really don’t listen......”

“We do not want you here. Stand back there.”

Didi cries

“Look how ugly your face is, you don’t want to be in the film that ugly”

Didi's sister: “Ugly monster...you should feel ashamed”
NEGOTIATING EMOTIONS

1

Emotions are social engagements

2

Across cultures, different types of social engagements are valued

3

We negotiate with others to achieve culturally valued social engagements
CHAPTER ONE:

EMOTIONS WE VALUE
EMOTIONS WE VALUE

Autonomy
Self-Focused
Self-Enhancement

Independence

Relatedness
Perspective-taking
Self-criticism

Interdependence

(Markus & Kitayama, 2001; Kitayama et al., 1997)
CULTURALLY VALUED EMOTIONS ARE PREVALENT

Positive emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engaging</th>
<th>Disengaging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engaging</th>
<th>Disengaging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kitayama, Mesquita, & Karasawa, JPSP, 2006)
CULTURALLY VALUED EMOTIONS PREDICT WELL-BEING

(Kitayama, Mesquita, & Karasawa, JPSP, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged Emotions</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Emotions</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMOTIONS WE VALUE

- Independence
- Helping
- Capacity
- Tradition

Own Goals
- Loyalty
- Success
- Religion
VALUES IN SITUATION

In this situation it was impossible for me to set my own goals.

☐ A Bit True
☐ True
☐ Totally True

In this situation I was able to set my own goals.

☐ A Bit True
☐ True
☐ Totally True

☐ N/A
EMOTIONS WE VALUE

Rank Order Emotional Situations

1. Self-Direction
2. Loyalty
3. Succeeding
4. Capacity
5. Tradition
6. Helping
7. Religion

Study 1
Study 2

Spearman Rank Order correlation
$r = .93$

(Leersnyder & Mesquita, in prep)
EMOTIONS WE VALUE

(De Leersnyder, Koval, Kuppens & Mesquita, 2017).

Study 1 Study 2

LOYALTY
HELPING OTHERS
TRADITION
RELIGION

SELF-FOCUSED VALUES

OTHER-FOCUSED VALUES

TIMES MORE LIKELY
ENGAGING
DISENGAGING

SUCCEEDING CAPACITY INDEPENDENCE OWN GOALS

*** **

*
CHAPTER TWO:

PROMOTION OF EMOTIONS WE VALUE
## Promotion of Emotions We Value

(Boiger, Mesquita, Uchida, & Barrett, 2013)

### PROMOTION OF EMOTIONS WE VALUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>![Up Arrow]</td>
<td>![Down Arrow]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>![Down Arrow]</td>
<td>![Up Arrow]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROMOTION OF EMOTION NORMS: STUDY ONE

INTERVIEWS
“Remember a situation in which you felt angry or ashamed.”

DAILY EXPERIENCE
“What did you just experience?”

SITUATION QUESTIONNAIRE
20 anger & 20 shame situations from each culture

Q: How frequent?  Q: How much anger/shame?

(Boiger, Mesquita, Uchida, & Barrett, PSPB, 2013)
SAMPLE SITUATION FOR ANGER

“Ryan went to college away from home and came to see his family over the holidays. Whenever Ryan started talking about something of which he felt proud, his father changed the topic to his younger brother’s football career.”
PROMOTION OF EMOTION NORMS: US AND JAPAN

Anger

U.S. Students

Japanese Students

BETA WEIGHTS

Interaction: $b = .17, t = 6.92^{***}$

Shame

$b = -.04, t1 = 1.95^*$

(Boiger, Mesquita, Uchida, & Barrett, 2013)
## Study Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Couples</th>
<th>Median Female Age</th>
<th>Median Male Age</th>
<th>Median Female Age</th>
<th>Median Male Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgians</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDY TWO

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

Conflict topics in the relationship (adapted from CPI)

Relationship satisfaction (CSI-16): \( \alpha_{JP}=.95, \alpha_{JB}=.96 \); autonomy/relatedness

INTERACTION (LAB)

Neutral > Conflict topic > Positive ending

“Conversation like at home”

10 min (recorded partners frontally / overview)
VIDEO-MEDIATED RECALL

Played video of partner / participant (PiP)

Video stopped every 30 sec

Rated intensity of 12 emotions
INTERACTIONS GRAVITATE TOWARDS VALUED EMOTIONS

Note. Green cells show attractor states inductively derived by winnowing for an H-proportion drop ≥ .30 (Hollenstein, 2012). Red boxes show emotional states that were significantly more common in the respective culture.

(Boiger, Kirchner, Schouten, Uchida, & Mesquita, in prep)
CULTURAL FIT PREDICTING RELATIONAL OUTCOMES/IDEALS

Calculated correlation of individual SSG with culture-average (proportion of events per cell)

(Boiger, Kirchner, Schouten, Uchida, & Mesquita, in prep)
INTERACTIONS GRAVITATE TOWARDS VALUED EMOTIONS

FEMALE PARTNER

Aloof
Annoyed
Hurt
Resigned
Embarrassed
Worried
Guilty
Afraid-hurt
Amae
Strong
Calm
Empathy

MALE PARTNER

Empathy
Calm
Strong
Amae
Afraid-hurt
Grim
Worried
Embarrassed
Resigned
Hurt
Annoyed
Aloof

Couple

r (Fisher-Z) = 0.34

Calculated correlation of individual SSG with culture-average (proportion of events per cell)

(Boiger, Kirchner, Uchida, & Mesquita, in prep)
EXPERIENCING CULTURALLY FITTING EMOPTIONS IS BENEFICIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BELGIUM</th>
<th>JAPAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couple Satisfaction Index</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Support</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy for Partner</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations with fit index (Fisher-z transformed correlations between individual and cultural average SSG).
Across cultures, social interactions produce systematically different affect/emotions
The most prevalent states — the states to which our interactions return — are culturally valued.
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