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Emotion Display rules

Cultural display rules
Determined the management of emotional expressions in different social circumstances
- Display rules vary across cultures.
  (Ekman, 1972; Friesen 1972; Matsumoto et al. 1998, 2005; Matsumoto, 1993)

Organizational display rules
Norms about which emotion role occupants ought to display
- Societal norms
- Occupational norms
- Organizational norms
  (Rafaeli and Sutton, 1987, 1989)

Integration of cultural / organizational display rules
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Goals of study

Emotions
- Anger
- Happiness

Targets
- Manager
- Coworker
- Subordinate
- Customer
- Service rep

Countries
- USA
- Israel
- Singapore
- France

As a comparison
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Research overview

Does a different **culture** mean different display rules
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Display rules in customer service

Should customer service representative express anger?

In the West: NO

Disney

Flight attendants

Convenience stores

Pubs
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Cultural differences in emotion display

- In some cultures - less emotions expression.
- In other cultures - explicit and direct showing of emotions.
- Some eastern cultures considered as less emotional expressive than western cultures (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998)

Collectivism-Individualism

Power distance

Values
Survey based study

Main Measure
- Display rules at work (Adapted from Matsumoto et al., 2005)

Sample of undergrads
- Israel (N=108)
- USA (N=109)
- Singapore (N=120)
- France (N=91)
The survey

What do you believe you should do
If you are interacting with a coworker
and you feel angry?

Express

Suppress
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The survey

What do you believe you should do if you are interacting with a customer and you feel angry?

Express

What do you believe you should do if you are interacting with a customer and you feel happy?

Suppress
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Globalization of service culture and its display rules

- Competition in free global market
- Customer orientation
- In CRM customer = Profit

Tokyo
Disneyland

Service training
In Malaysia

Call centers in
India

Global service competencies

Disneyzation of society (Byrman, 1999)

Customer service culture is spreading all over the world
Differences in anger display rules toward Customer versus other targets

- Service culture is part of global culture
- Service culture dictates anger suppression in interactions with customers

→

H1:

- Equal anger suppression norms toward customers in different countries.
- Difference in anger suppression norms towards other targets.
Hypotheses Frame Work

- General cultural anger expression norms
- Service culture anger expression norms
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Analysis of differences between countries

The effects of country, target person and interaction were significant
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Anger display rules towards targets in different countries

H1 supported – Differences with all targets but customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target person</th>
<th>USA: 1</th>
<th>USA: Israel</th>
<th>USA: Singapore</th>
<th>USA: France</th>
<th>Israel: 1.89</th>
<th>Israel: .69</th>
<th>Israel: 5.75**</th>
<th>Israel: 5.11***</th>
<th>Israel: .69</th>
<th>Singapore: .36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.5.75**</td>
<td>5.11***</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service rep.</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2.35*</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>2.60***</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>1.76*</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3.78***</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values in the table are odds ratios (OR)
OR=1 → No difference
OR≠1 → Difference
*p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.0001
Singapore is considered to be more collectivistic than USA, Israel and France (House, 2001; Hofstede, 1991)

Singapore is less affective than USA, Israel and France

H2: Stronger anger suppression norms to all organizational targets in Singapore than in other countries.
More anger suppression in Singapore?

Anger Suppression Norms: USA VS Spore

% Anger Suppression

Service Rep.  Manager  Subordinate  Coworker

Target Person

USA  Singapore

H2 was not supported
Anger Display rules in Singapore and US are similar

Values in the table are odds ratios (OR)
OR=1 → No difference
OR≠1 → Difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Person</th>
<th>USA: Singapore</th>
<th>Israel: Singapore</th>
<th>Singapore: France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service rep.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>5.75**</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.35*</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.60***</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker</td>
<td>1.76*</td>
<td>3.78***</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.0001
Cultural differences in display rules
Israel versus other countries

- Israel “Dugri” Speech (Katriel, 1986)
- Power distance in Israel is the lowest (Hofstede, 1991)
- H3: Weaker anger suppression norms in Israel then in US, France and Singapore
Less anger suppression in Israel?

H3 partially supported - Less anger suppression in Israel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Singapor</th>
<th>France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service rep.</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td>5.75**</td>
<td>5.11***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>2.35*</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>2.60***</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>3.78***</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values in the table are odds ratios (OR)

OR=1 → No difference
OR≠1 → Difference

*p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.0001
Analysis of differences within each country

Target person

Emotion Display Rules
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Analysis of differences within each country

H4: Within each country anger suppression norms differ between targets
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Anger suppression rules within each country

Score Statistics For Type 3 GEE Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>USA Chi-Square</th>
<th>Israel Chi-Square</th>
<th>Singapore Chi-Square</th>
<th>France Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subj. is working</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. is/was Service employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>8.21**</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. is/ was Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>4.62*</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month abroad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race / Ethnicity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01 (df=6)</td>
<td>.02 (df=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target person**

44.92***  75.15***  50.16***  50.33***

*p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.0001

H4 supported - Within each country anger suppression norms differ between targets
Anger expression to managers versus other targets

- Anger expression = blaming other person
- Individuals in lower status positions express anger less than those in higher status positions (Gibson & Schroeder, 2002; Ridgeway & Johnson, 1990; Sloan, 2004)

H5: Within different countries stronger anger suppression norms towards managers than towards other organizational targets.
Anger expression to managers versus other organizational members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td>2.03***</td>
<td>6.88***</td>
<td>2.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>6.69***</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>5.91***</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>2.52***</td>
<td>8.33***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values in the table are odds ratios (OR)

OR=1 → No difference
OR≠1 → Difference

H5 supported – more suppression towards managers
Anger expressions toward customers versus service reps.

- Service culture encourages customer orientation
- The outcome of a service encounter should be a satisfied and happy customer.

→

- **H6a:** Within different countries stronger anger suppression norms towards customers than towards service reps.
Anger expressions toward customers versus customer service rep.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Customer</td>
<td>6.29***</td>
<td>51.44***</td>
<td>15.96***</td>
<td>6.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Service rep.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>4.48***</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manager</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subordinate</td>
<td>12.77***</td>
<td>29.96***</td>
<td>21.13***</td>
<td>15.97***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coworker</td>
<td>6.88***</td>
<td>6.69***</td>
<td>1.72***</td>
<td>2.56***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values in the table are odds ratios (OR)

OR=1 → No difference
OR≠1 → Difference

H6a supported – more anger suppression with customer than with service rep.
Anger expressions toward customers versus other targets

H6b: Within different countries stronger anger suppression norms towards customers than towards other targets.
Anger expressions toward customers versus other targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1. Customer</td>
<td>6.29**</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>12.77***</td>
<td>15.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Service rep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.03**</td>
<td>2.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Manager</td>
<td>2.03**</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>8.68***</td>
<td>8.08***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Coworker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1. Customer</td>
<td>51.44***</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>29.96***</td>
<td>33.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Service rep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Manager</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
<td>7.54***</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Coworker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Service rep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Manager</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>5.91***</td>
<td>4.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Coworker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1. Customer</td>
<td>6.33***</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>15.97***</td>
<td>15.97***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Service rep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.52**</td>
<td>2.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Manager</td>
<td>8.33***</td>
<td>31**</td>
<td>8.19***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Coworker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values in the table are odds ratios (OR)

OR=1 → No difference

OR≠1 → Difference

H6b partially supported – More anger suppression towards customer than towards most of the targets.
Summary

- There is globalization of anger expressions with customers
- In a global economy customers become managers
- Categorization of east-west, individualism-collectivism do not explain emotional display rules at work.
- Analysis of discrete emotions
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Thank You!
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Anger versus happiness

Emotion expression toward organizational members over targets

General suppression norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>76.86</td>
<td>58.16</td>
<td>69.18</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>79.56</td>
<td>28.28</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td>33.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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