Running head: Perceptions of Experienced and Expressed Happiness

Perceptions of Experienced and Expressed Happiness

Elissa Chin

Carnegie Mellon University

Abstract

It was hypothesized that expressions of happiness within same-race dyads (consisting of two Caucasian students or two Asian students) would be perceived as more authentic than would expressions of happiness within mixed race dyads. The rationale was that expressions of happiness received from a member of a different race might be perceived as driven by politeness and a desire not to appear racially biased. Thus they might be discounted as evidence of true happiness. Such discounting was not expected to occur when expressions of happiness were received from a same race partner. These hypotheses were tested in two studies. In the first study, participants read a scripted interaction between pairs of Asian students, pairs of Caucasian students, or mixed pairs and judged the extent to which expressed happiness likely reflected true happiness. In a second study, participants actually participated in a five-minute videotaped interaction with a participant of the same race or with a participant of a different race. Later, in private, they indicated how much happiness they and their partner expressed, how much happiness they actually experienced in the interaction, and how much happiness they *believed* their partner experienced. Neither study yielded clear support for the original hypotheses. However, the second study did yield some compelling results relevant to perceptions of expressed and felt happiness. Specifically, participants consistently reported that: a) They, themselves, felt more happiness than they expressed (i.e. they suppressed happiness); b) In contrast, they reported that their partner expressed more happiness than that partner actually felt (i.e. they believed the partner was exaggerating happiness); and c) Whereas these results were evident for both Asians and Caucasians, there was a significant interaction such that these tendencies were more pronounced

among Caucasians than they were among Asians. Results are interpreted in terms of: a)

the fundamental attribution error, and b) tendencies toward individualism in Western

cultures and collectivism in Eastern cultures.

This research originally was designed to test hypotheses about when expressions of happiness would be taken at face value and thus would be likely to promote relationship development versus when expressions of happiness would be doubted and thereby less likely to promote relationship development. I suspected that expressions of happiness upon meeting another person ordinarily are taken as evidence of interpersonal interest and, as such, are likely to promote relationship development. I further suspected that in cross-race relationships, expressions of happiness upon meeting the other person might be perceived as due to politeness and a desire not to appear biased. As such, these expressions might be discounted and therefore be less likely to promote relationship development. Ultimately, little support for these ideas was obtained. However, because these ideas *were* the impetus to my research and, as such, guided the design of my studies, they are developed in this introduction to my thesis.

Expression of Emotions as Social Interest

Emotions are basic to our interactions with others. When happy, we often laugh, smile and speak with positive intonations. When sad, we are more likely to sigh, and speak softly with lower intonations. In our interactions with others, emotions serve as navigators for both us and others to better understand each other. They display our current mood states (Buck, 1984), and allow us to infer others' attitudes, thoughts and interests (Fridlund 1991a, 1994). Specifically, if upon meeting us, another person seems pleased in the sense that he or she smiles or conveys happiness through tone of voice or behavior, we assume that that person likes us and we are encouraged to pursue the interaction. If, however, upon meeting us, the other expresses little happiness or worse,

boredom or irritation, we assume that that person is not interested in pursuing further social interaction and we will, ourselves, back off from pursuing such interaction.

Yet our expression of emotion is also subjected to a set of culturally defined display rules that mandate "deintensifying, intensifying, neutralizing, or masking an affect display" based on specific social situations and social roles (Ekman, Sorenson, & Friesen, 1969). For example, depending on one's culture, it is acceptable, if not expected, to cry at funerals and to laugh at funny jokes and to change one's expressions based on audience, such as when addressing young children or colleagues. Literature on display rules demonstrates that individuals feel obligated to express emotions in line with specific situations, such as when a stranger tells an unfunny joke, one must smile out of politeness – and sometimes, one ends up smiling longer than one would naturally spend laughing or reacting to an inherently funny joke (Zaalberg et. al, 2004). As displayed emotions tend to intensify in the presence of and communication with others (Chovil, 1991; Chapman, 1973, 1975), the expression of appropriate emotions, especially when interacting with strangers in social situations, becomes an important aspect to understand.

Imagine a commonplace scenario of two individuals meeting for the first time. As members of these interactions display positive emotions, what are they really thinking and feeling? In truth, accurately reading each other's expressed emotions is a very difficult task in this situation. Each member of the discussion *might* be expressing heartfelt happiness in meeting one another. However, because each member might also be following a display rule of smiling, nodding in agreement and delivering social graces such as, "Nice to meet you" and "Hi, how are you?" , the real meaning behind a smile or laugh may become ambiguous. Both individuals could be trying to communicate interest

in one another, *or* conversely, both could be sizing each other up, strategically presenting

or suppressing their own emotions and making attributions of behavior to their

personality from this first impression (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993). Judging the

expression of happiness as either genuine or forced depends on one's own attributions.

Not only does this involve drawing upon an individual's previous experiences, but also

one's given situation.

   I suspected an important factor that would make the meaning of expressed

happiness ambiguous would be whether a person feels that he or she is stigmatized in

some fashion. Stigmatized individuals are marked by some type of disgrace depending

on the social or cultural situation and can include individuals with physical deviances

such as visible scars, being a woman in a "man's world," and being a pejoratively

perceived minority against the majority, such as African Americans or homosexuals.

Despite the existence of stigmas, the vast majority of the population knows that one is not

supposed to judge a book by its cover. That is, one *should* not behave negatively toward

a handicapped person or a member of a minority group. If one does so, one risks being

labeled as biased or prejudiced, and situates oneself in direct opposition to social norms

(Crandall, Eshleman & O'Brien, 1994). Furthermore, one subjects the self to feelings of

guilt and shame after failing to suppress prejudice (Monteith, 1993, 1996; Monteith,

Devine, & Zuwerink, 1993; Plant & Devine, 1998). Thus, whereas considerable

literature suggests that people feel uncomfortable around stigmatized persons and may

restrict motor movement, eye contact and interaction time (Commer & Piliavan, 1972),

they also know that they ought not to do this. Thus, they may also force some

expressions of pleasure and happiness lest they reveal their prejudices. It is, therefore,

my contention that people often feel compelled to express pleasure upon meeting members of stigmatized groups (Allen, 1975), *and also that members of such groups realize this and are thus likely to discount such expressions of pleasure.* If this is true, I predicted, cross-race (relative to same race) interactions might be characterized by actors reporting expressing more positive emotion than they feel and by observers believing that actors do report more happiness than they feel.

Masking True Emotions

In the case of interacting with stigmatized individuals, what purposes might masking one's true emotions serve? Whereas one might label this as solely a superficial social grace, according to the ecological perspective, suppressing one's negative emotions can actually serve as a socially motivated tool, or in this case, a self-protective social measure. By displaying interest in what another individual is saying, regardless if one is truly interested or not, one comes across as an attentive, pleasant and caring person, and reinforces a positive self-image. Social reinforcement theorists would argue that displaying an affinity towards another increases reciprocal liking and elicits one's own positive feelings of self-worth (Lott & Lott, 1960; Segal, 1974). Research has shown that from even two seconds of observation of a person's non-verbal behavior, accurate impressions are formed (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993). Thus, in a situation of meeting someone for the first time, individuals' motivations to project a positive impression of themselves ought to enhance public displays of positive non-verbal and verbal behavior. This is opposed to appearing apathetic, of having no inflection in voice and expressing no happiness in one's body language – surely, one would feel uncomfortable with speaking to this person and infer he is far from interested in the

interaction. Successful interactions reinforce positive feelings and a positive image of the self.

Accordingly, just as one desires to be liked, one assumes other people do not like to feel disliked or undesirable. Masking negative emotion protects the other individual from feeling hurt that one is not very happy to meet the other. Furthermore, it protects oneself from experiencing feelings of negative discomfort when knowing one has hurt another person's feelings (Pataki & Clark, in press). Hence, even if one is not particularly happy to meet another person, one tries to facilitate interactions so as to reduce feelings of awkwardness or dislike, regardless of how brief or extended the interaction is.

Thus, previous literature supports that by masking emotion, one reinforces a positive self-image and avoids appearing biased or offensive to the stigmatized individual. This explains why Blascovich (2001) found a stark contrast between participants' self-reports of not feeling nervous during interactions with stigmatized individuals with elevated levels of cardiovascular measures suggesting nervousness (Blascovich, 2001). From the viewpoint of stigmatized individuals, other researchers have argued that one's perception of his or her stigma is exaggerated and thus, expectations of others' changed behaviors might even elicit such behavior (Kleck & Strenta, 1980). On the other hand, Pataki and Clark (2003) found that when male participants were led to believe they would meet an unattractive woman, they self-reported expressions of greater happiness than what they were privately feeling. Furthermore, in their second study, Pataki and Clark (2003) demonstrated that when asked to imagine meeting an attractive male, unattractive females also accurately

perceived men's inflation of happiness in meeting them as opposed to attractive females, who actually tended to believe that men were suppressing the amount of happiness upon meeting them. Extending these phenomena to race, when participants in a student's previous senior honors thesis (Pierre, 2003) read a vignette detailing two African American and Caucasian females' interaction, they perceived the characters' display of happiness over-amplified privately felt happiness. However, when participants read the same interaction, only held between characters with different names and among same races, participants perceived no significant discrepancies between public displays of happiness and truly felt happiness. The premise that social norms of politeness and non-prejudice control expression of emotion remains very salient to both stigmatized and non-stigmatized individuals when meeting each other for the first time.

Theories of Attribution

Three predominant theories exist on how stigmatized individuals interpret others' behavior towards them. One theory is *attributional ambiguity*, which asserts that stigmatized individuals pinpoint others' reactions to their stigmas as significantly impacting others' behavior, decisions and judgment. As a method of preserving self-esteem and mood, stigmatized individuals attribute feedback to others' prejudice and not to one's performance or ability (Crocker & Major, 1989). They also globalize their attribution of having received prejudice not only in negative experiences, but also in positive experiences, believing that they were treated more favorably because of their stigmatized status. Crocker and Major's theory of attributional ambiguity implies that individuals believe their stigma pervasively affects others' motivation to appear favorably and consequently, warrants a discounting of others' behaviors towards them.

Another predominant theory is the *personal/group discrimination discrepancy* in which individuals claim that discrimination occurs more frequently at group rather than at individual levels as another method to preserve self-esteem. This relates to the *attributional minimizing* perspective, which Ruggiero and Taylor's research (1997) suggests that individuals would prefer to attribute negative feedback to state self-esteem rather than social self-esteem, and hence discount their stigmatized status as affecting others' behavior towards them. Their research furthers that Asian Americans especially attribute negative results to themselves as mediated by their culture's emphasis on modesty.

Where do Asian Americans Stand?

A larger question this thesis examines is whether Asian Americans are regarded as a stigmatized race. Studies consistently demonstrate that negatively held stereotypes towards African Americans emerge when primed, and that Caucasians experience some discomfort when interacting with African Americans (Sayoc-Parial, 2002; Judd et. al, 2001; Kozel & Gitter, 1968). However, the degree to which Asian Americans are stigmatized remains unclear. As a group, Asian Americans have reported experiencing less racism than African Americans, although they have also self-reported higher levels of discrimination than Caucasians, and in terms of intelligence and social attributes (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003; Oyserman & Sakamoto, 1997). Yet others are quick to point out that Asian Americans do receive discrimination but it is oftentimes discounted due to the model minority myth (Lee, 2003). Another factor to consider is that Asian Americans wider presence in universities than other minority groups might lead to a greater chance of interaction between racial groups. Moreover, simple racial make-up of schools can

lead to greater feelings of comfortableness around others of different races, even if they do not necessarily interact (Carlson, Wilson & Hargrave, 2003). Still, racial groups commonly flock together (Hamm, 2000) and more accurately read in-group members' facial expressions and find in-group members to be more sociable as opposed to out-group members (Beaupre & Hess, 2003). The only clear evidence we do have is that across race, individuals, including the Asian American group, tend to report having experienced higher levels of ore racism if they have lower self-esteem (Asamen & Berry, 1987).

A prior study conducted by another Carnegie Mellon Honors student, Gaëlle Pierre, found clear evidence for much the same hypothesis as set forth in my thesis. That is, people reading about same (Caucasian-Caucasian; African American-African American) versus mixed (Caucasian-African American; African American-Caucasian) interactions were more likely to judge expressed happiness as authentic. Her explanation was that in mixed race interactions, participants will believe lower happiness is felt (given the stigma for African Americans among Caucasians and the knowledge of that stigma among African Americans) relative to that which is expressed (due to norms of politeness and the political inappropriateness of reacting to racial biases). If Asian Americans are stigmatized, I should observe similar effects. If they are not, such effects may not emerge.

Present Studies

The present studies focused on the expression of emotion across racial groups and more specifically whether Asian Americans share similar experiences with African Americans in stigmatization. Because most research has focused on evaluation based

settings, little is known about simple, casual interactions between individuals. The present study follows up on Pierre's (2003) senior honors thesis which involved having participants rate two individuals' expressions of happiness in a vignette. Whereas the characters were either both Caucasian, African American, or belonging to one of each race in Pierre's study, in this study I used Asian American characters instead of African American characters, and provided images of the dialogue's characters to prime for salience. I hypothesized that expressed happiness would be rated as slightly higher than privately felt happiness in the cross-race condition, while in same-race interactions, displayed and experienced happiness would be rated as approximately equal. However, in relation to African American and Caucasian interactions, the discrepancies between privately felt and publicly expressed happiness in Asian American-Caucasian interactions would be much subtler.

The second study measured happiness in semi-structured, same-sex interactions between members of the same race or different races. Perceptions of happiness were measured through questionnaires. Again, based on Pierre's findings (2003), I hypothesized that both Asians and Caucasian participants would perceive higher levels of expressed happiness than experienced happiness in cross-race interactions whereas in same-race interactions, expressed and experienced happiness would be approximately equal.

In sum, this research aimed to measure whether expressions of happiness change when interacting with someone of the same race as opposed to interacting with someone of another race. We hypothesized that people would perceive the expression of emotions in cross-race interactions, and not same-race interactions, to be motivated by a positive,

non-biased self-image, and thus rate displayed happiness as greater than one's experienced happiness.

Methods

Study 1

Methods & Overview

Participants were asked to read a one-page dialogue of two roommates meeting for the first time and were given a corresponding photograph of the roommates standing together. Afterwards, the participants filled out a brief questionnaire entitled "First Impressions" and were asked their age, race and sex. The characters' race in the vignette served as the dependent variable, as the conditions varied by having either both Asian, both Caucasian, or one Caucasian and one Asian actors as distinguished by an ethnic name and appearance in the photograph. The photographs corresponding to each condition were based from four photographs, one of each girl. With the aid of Adobe Photoshop, the same picture of each girl was arranged to appear as though they were naturally standing next to one another. This experiment used a 2 way ANOVA design, accounting for race of the participant and the same-race or mixed-race condition.

Participants

Five research assistants (two Caucasian females, two Asian females, 1 Asian male) recruited 85 Asian (30 female, 21 male) and Caucasian participants (22 female, 12 male) primarily from college campuses, a workplace and a local high school. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 78, with a mean age of 27 and a median age of 21. One Hispanic-Native American participant was excluded from the data analysis because she did not fit into the Asian or Caucasian category.

Stimulus Materials

The stimulus materials consisted of one of four pictures supposedly depicting female roommates and a scripted, one page interaction with notes supposedly describing these two females' first encounter with one another upon discovering that they would be roommates at college.

The pictures depicted two women from waist up. Four volunteers (two Asian women and two Caucasian women) volunteered to be depicted in these photographs. They stood side by side for these pictures against a neutral background. Pictures included either: a) the two Asian students; b) the two Caucasian students; or c) one of two combinations of an Asian and a Caucasian student. The actual pictures used are included in Appendix A of this thesis.

The interaction was described in the form of a play including notes on the background of the students before the beginning of the dialogue, their actual dialogue, and comments on smiles and laughter that accompanied the interaction. This scripted interaction was identical in all conditions with the exception that the students were referred to by two Asian names (I-Ting and Mei), two Caucasian names (Sara and Emily), or a combination of an Asian and a Caucasian name (I-Ting and Sara, Emily and Mei). A copy of the actual script is included as Appendix B.

Finally, a questionnaire was attached to these materials. The crucial questions asked participants to state the extent to which they believed that each participant was truly happy and the extent to which they believed that each participant was expressing happiness. The actual questionnaire utilized may be found in Appendix C.

Results

I had originally hypothesized that participants would view interactions between cross-race interactions as expressing more happiness than truly felt happiness, whereas in same-race interactions no differences between types of happiness would be found. A two-way ANOVA was performed for effects of participant's race (Asian or Caucasian) and the condition (same-race or cross-race vignette) on the over-expression of happiness.

For each participant observer, I calculated the difference between the amount of happiness they believed participants in the interaction actually felt and the amount of happiness they believed those participants were expressing. The mean for those difference scores in the Mixed Race condition and in the Same Race conditions are presented in Table 1 below. Note that positive and higher numbers convey that participants believe the target persons expressed *more* happiness than they actually felt. Negative and higher numbers suggest that participants believe the target persons are suppressing the amount of happiness they truly feel.

TABLE 1: <u>Perceived Expression of Happiness in Same and Cross-Race Conditions</u>
<u>Condition by Participant Race</u>

		Caucasian-Caucasian	Asian-Asian	Caucasian/Asian
Participant race	Caucasian	2.29 (N = 7)	-0.33 (N = 6)	1.21 (N = 14)
	Asian	1.06 (N =15)	0.78 (N = 9)	1.05 (N = 17)
	Total	1.27 (N = 22)	0.33 (N = 15)	1.13 (N = 31)

I had predicted that these numbers would be more positive in the Mixed Race condition than in the Same Race condition. However, a one-way ANOVA on these data

(with three conditions, Mixed Race, Same Race/Caucasian, and Same Race/Asian) revealed no significant differences between conditions, F (2,65) = 1.06, p>.35).

Study 1 Discussion

Our results did not support Pierre's hypothesis or findings (2003) that individuals perceive expressions of happiness differently in cross-race and same-race interactions. Because the methodology of this questionnaire study was nearly identical to that of Pierre (2003), and was even perhaps even sounder given the addition of actual photographs which presumably made target persons' race very salient, it seems very unlikely that our lack of results relative to Pierre's significant results were due to use of a weaker or more flawed methodology.   Thus, it seems worth speculating upon other possible reasons for our failure to replicate her results.

The most obvious difference between the two studies is that the groups in Gaëlle Pierre's study were Caucasians and African Americans whereas in my study the groups were Caucasians and Asians.   Thus, my lack of results might be attributed to Asian Americans not being considered a stigmatized group by itself. If neither Caucasian nor Asian individuals consider Asians to be stigmatized, then the possibility of people strategically presenting happiness to one another in mixed groups may never have occurred to our participants.   This provides a simple, straightforward explanation for my lack of results.

In other words, the lack of results in this study leads to the conclusion that Asian Americans, as well as Caucasians, do not discount interactions or emotions of the two racially disparate groups as less genuine.   Whereas a photograph was shown to prime race, this further suggests to participants that seeing an Asian individual and a Caucasian

individual together as roommates is not an unusual or rare occurrence. It is well known that prejudice or bias becomes especially apparent when it is primed for.

Second, the results could be viewed as tapping into the view that Caucasians have a positive stereotype of Asian Americans as hard-working and successful (Ho et. al, 2002) as well as less threatening social attributes, such as being docile or submissive (Oyserman & Sakamoto, 1997). Studies demonstrate that at implicit levels, Caucasians have more negative than positive associations of African Americans, such as associations with danger, guns and violence (Judd et. al, 2004; Wittenbrink et. al, 1997).

A second possibility is that the particular participants, both Asian and Caucasian, who were recruited for this study have such extensive contact with one another (in the academic and professional settings in which they reside), that they are relatively unaware of and unreactive to one another's race, whereas this might not to the case in other, more segregated populations. Many of the participants were drawn from the CMU student body, which consists of about 65 percent Caucasian and 30 percent Asian students. Thus, all students inevitably have a great deal of cross-group contact with one another. African American students, by contrast, are rare at CMU, making up about 3 percent of the population. Perhaps people do strategically present emotions to true, small, minorities and true, small minorities suspect such strategies, whereas this does not occur with a minority group is quite substantial in size in a given location. This too might account for my lack of significant findings and Pierre's significant findings.

Despite whatever reason might account for my lack of results and Pierre's contrasting significant results, the findings must be viewed carefully in terms of several limitations. The population surveyed was either receiving or had already received a

higher education. Because Asian Americans are typically present on university campuses, especially larger, urban or technical ones, it is likely most individuals have had contact with this racial group. Furthermore, nearly all participants had a high socioeconomic status. Thus, it is unclear whether the same results would be found in areas with a low Asian-American population or low economic status. Last, one additional element was changed in the dialogue. Originally, if the second actor was African American, Pierre (2003) had her state she belonged to an organization called "Black Awareness" whereas if she was Caucasian, she stated she belonged to an organization called "Awareness." To make both racial groups more equitable in terms of personal interests, and to test simply race and not ethnic pride, the organization "Awareness" was used in all four conditions. It is possible that the addition of "Asian American Awareness" would have created a greater perception of difference by overtly stating one's race and implying the organization's purpose, and because one could not necessarily have a group called "White Awareness." Thus, it is possible Pierre's results (2003) were exaggerated by uneven conditions, and mediated more by interest than by a straightforward interaction.

In conclusion, our hypothesis for Study 1 was unsupported, suggesting that where Asian Americans might be a statistical minority, it is not a minority that is stigmatized or to which happiness is strategically presented.

Study 2

A second study was designed to test the same hypothesis as tested in Study 1. That is, Study 2, like Study 1 was designed to test the hypothesis that, in mixed race settings (relative to same race settings), people would present more happiness to a partner

than they actually felt and would perceive that a partner would do the same. The primary

purpose of Study 2 was to move away from using a vignette methodology and to examine

people's feelings and expressions of happiness in same and mixed race interactions *in*

which they were actual participants. In considering this study, it is important to note that

this study was planned, designed and carried out simultaneously with Study 1. Thus, the

originally hypotheses were based on the same theoretical ideas as were those set forth for

Study 1. The failure to obtain results in Study 1 was not taken into account in setting

forth hypotheses for Study 2.

The plan for Study 2 was to move to true interactions which actually involved

participants. The design was simple. Students were recruited to participate in a simple

ten minute discussion with another student. They would discuss an assigned topic with

either a person of their own race or a person of a different race. Afterwards they would

be separated and asked to rate the amount of happiness they felt while actually interacting

with the other person, the amount of happiness they believed the other person felt while

during the interaction, the amount of happiness they believe they expressed to the other

person during the interaction, and the amount of happiness the other person expressed to

them. This plan would allow me to test the following hypotheses:

1. Participants in mixed race interactions would say that both they and their partner

    expressed more happiness than they actually felt.

2. Participants in same race interactions would say that both they and their partner

    accurately expressed the happiness they actually felt during the interaction.

I also collected videotapes of each person during these interactions. I plan to code these for actual expressed happiness but given the time needed to do so carefully, I will not be using ratings of the videotapes in this report of my thesis.

Method & Overview

Since Pierre (2003) found that race affects perceptions of genuine and forced happiness in same-race and cross-race first interactions from the reading of a vignette, a laboratory based experiment was designed to see whether such findings transferred to actual interactions.

Individuals were led to believe they would participate in a videotaped discussion on parent-child relationships for approximately 10 minutes. Participants were randomly assigned to same-sex dyads of either the same or different race. This was accomplished by having them sign up for the study generally rather than for a specific time slot. They were asked at the point of sign-up to indicate their race if they felt comfortable doing so. Almost all participants did so. After signing up, each participant was randomly assigned to participate with another participant of the same race or with another participant of a different race. Once assignments were made, appropriate pairings were made and participants were called to schedule a specific time for participation.

Participants arrived at the research session expecting to have an interaction with another person whom they did not know discussing parent-child relationships. Two participants were scheduled for each time slot. Prior to and after the discussion, the participants were placed in separate rooms and did not interact with each other or see one another. Prior to the discussion, participants simply knew the length of the discussion, the sex of the other participant through reference, and that sample topics would be

provided, although the sample topics were for optional use. At this time they filled out some preliminary questionnaires about their desire to engage in a discussion on parent-child relationships, different aspects about their relationships with their parents, current mood and their desire to meet the other person.

Participants were then brought to a comfortably-designed room to carry out the discussion behind closed doors. In the room, two cushioned chairs directly faced one another. A video camera was situated behind each chair. Participants were seated in a chair and told that they could begin the discussion whenever they pleased. After providing these minimal instructions the experimenter left and participants were left to introduce themselves to one another and to start the discussion which they were informed would be taped and which was taped.

After the discussion and taping concluded, participants were again led to separate rooms. Once in the room, they were once again asked to fill out a questionnaire. A copy of this questionnaire is included as Appendix E. The four questions of relevance to the present paper asked: "How happy were you feeling during the discussion?", "How much happiness did you publicly express while talking to the other person?", "How much happiness did the other person publicly express while talking to you?", and "How much happiness do you think the other person privately felt in meeting you?" Participants' responses were based on a Likert Scale, from 1, "not very much happiness", to 7, "a great deal of happiness." To see whether happiness was being perceived as over-expressed or suppressed, private happiness was subtracted from public happiness for both participants' reports of one's own happiness and the partner's happiness. A positive number indicated an over-expression of happiness, that is, an individual displayed greater amounts of

happiness than he or she actually felt. A negative number indicated suppression of happiness, that is, an individual was internally feeling greater happiness than he or she was externally showing.

This study used on a 2 (self, other rating) x 2 (participant's race) x 2 (partner's race) repeated measures design.

Participants

Seventy-four undergraduate introductory psychology students participated either for course credit or money. All students were randomly paired with a partner of the same sex and of either the same or a different race. (However, data from seven pairs of participants were excluded from the analysis because at least one of the partners was not Asian or Caucasian. Additionally, one pair of female Caucasian participants' data was deemed unusable because they were well acquainted with one another.) Thus, 29 pairs of participants (9 Caucasian-Caucasian, 11 Asian-Asian, 11 mixed) were included in the final analyses. None of the participants whose data were included in the analyses knew the other participant well prior to the experiment. Mostly all groups had had absolutely no contact with one another. Three groups of participants recognized each other. However, as they indicated on the questionnaire and to the experimenter, they had barely interacted prior to the study; thus, their data were retained for the analyses. No participants were suspicious of the cover story.

Results

Consider first the hypothesis that both partners' expressed happiness would exceed felt happiness in cross-race but not in same race interactions. For each participant

observer, I calculated the difference between the amount of happiness they reported actually having felt in the interaction and the amount of happiness they expressed. I also calculated the difference between the amount of happiness they believed their partner felt in the interaction and the amount of happiness they perceived the other to express. In both cases, positive and high numbers indicate that they felt more happiness than they expressed or, in other words, that they were suppressing happiness. Negative and lower numbers indicate that they express more happiness than they felt or, in other words, that they were exaggerating happiness. The means for those difference scores in the Mixed Race conditions and in the Same Race conditions are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2: Expressions of Happiness in Same and Cross-Race Interactions

for Self and Other

		Asian	Caucasian
		-.89 (N = 18)	-.63 (N = 11)
Caucasian Participant	Self	.5 (N = 11)	.37 (N = 22)
	Other	0 (N = 11)	-.2 (N = 18)
Asian Participant	Self	.27 (N = 11)	.18 (N = 18)
	Other		

*Negative numbers indicate that happiness is being suppressed;
positive numbers indicate that happiness is being over-expressed

As can be seen, the pattern of means did not support the original hypotheses that people who engaged in mixed as opposed to same race interactions would report expressing more happiness than they felt and that they would perceive the same to be true for their partners. Confirming this lack of support for the original hypothesis, a one-way ANOVA showed no differences between the three conditions depicted in the table ($F_{1,58} = .616$, $p > .44$).

Some unexpected and interesting findings.   Whereas no support was found for the original hypotheses, 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVAs (with Target of Judgment: Self vs. Other; Race of Participant: Asian vs. Caucasian; and Race of Partner: Asian vs. Caucasian as independent variables, and differences in felt versus expressed happiness as the dependent variable), did yield two quite interesting results. First, a main effect was found across self-other perceptions ($F_{1,58} = 21.07$, $p < .0001$). When judging others' happiness, participants believed their partner was inflating his or her own real happiness (Means = +.44, +.21 for Caucasians and Asians respectively), whereas when judging one's own happiness, participants believed they were suppressing their levels of happiness (Means = -.79, -.15 for Caucasians and Asians respectively). Furthermore, a significant interaction between ratings of public and private happiness and the participant's race was discovered ($F_{1,58} = 6.51$, $p < .013$) such that the difference between Asians' ratings of perceived expressed and perceived experienced happiness between self and other ($M_{self} = -.15$, $M_{other} = +.21$) were significantly smaller than Caucasian's ratings of perceived happiness between self and other ($M_{self} = -.79$, $M_{other} = +.44$). This main effect and interaction is shown in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3:   <u>Perceived Suppression and Strategic Expression of Happiness</u>

		Rater is	
		Caucasian	Asian
Who is rated?	Self	-.79 (N = 29)	-.15 (N = 33)
	Other	.45 (N = 29)	.21 (N = 33)

*Negative numbers indicate that happiness is being suppressed;
positive numbers indicate that happiness is being over-expressed

Discussion

As did Study 1, Study 2 yielded no clear support for my initial hypotheses.   I

cannot be sure why little support was obtained for those hypotheses, but the fact that no

support was obtained in a second study using a different methodology does cast serious

doubt on the original hypotheses as they pertain to Asian/Caucasian interactions.   Again

I would speculate that the lack of results may be due to there not being a negative

stereotype of Asians and/or of groups with whom majority group members have a great

deal of contact with on a day to day basis.

<u>People claim they express *less* happiness than they actually feel whereas partners

express *more* happiness than they feel</u>. Whereas I obtained little support for my initial,

overall, hypotheses, my second study yielded some striking results. In particular,

following a naturalistic five minute discussion with another person, participants

overwhelmingly reported that they had expressed less happiness to the other person than

they actually experienced. In other words, participants reported refraining from

expressing the level happiness that they truly felt. In sharp contrast, they again overwhelmingly reported believing that their partner was expressing more happiness than that partner truly felt.

Why might these effects have occurred? One explanation focuses upon what is likely to be most salient to a person experiencing emotion and to a person observing someone else who is experiencing emotion. Consider what is salient to a person who is actually experiencing an emotion such as happiness first. A person *experiencing* happiness has direct access to his or her own feelings (as manifested in internal visceral states and private, happy, thoughts). At the same time, that person does *not* directly observe his or her own expressions of emotion (as manifested on the face and in bodily postures) unless he or she is looking in a mirror. For such a person, internal feelings and thoughts including, perhaps, automatic afferent feedback from facial and bodily expressions (i.e. the experience of emotion) may be far more salient that external expressions of emotion. This may lead people experiencing emotion to judge that they are experiencing more emotion than they are actually expressing. Note also that if a person experiencing emotion is trying to suppress that emotion, he or she has access to that information and any such effort should lead the person to state that he or she is likely experiencing more happiness than he or she is expressing. This may contribute to a tendency to report that one is experiencing more happiness than one is expressing.

Next consider what is salient to a person who is observing another person (who may or may not be experiencing emotion). An observer has no direct access to what a target is actually feeling. The observer does not know what that person's internal thoughts or feelings are. The observer only has access to what he or she can see – facial

expressions, bodily postures, tone of voice, laughs, and what is actually said. In other words the observer only has access to the expression of emotion. As long as there are any expressions of happiness at all, those expressions may "engulf the field" for the observer. This may cause the observer to judge that the expressions are real. Because observers also know that there are norms of politeness in social interaction which dictate that we should treat one another pleasantly (Pataki & Clark, in press), observers may even decide that people are expressing *more* happiness than they truly feel.

The explanation just set forth as to why observers draw conclusions which are overly dependent upon actual expressions of emotion is consistent with a great deal of social psychological work on what is known as the fundamental attribution error. That is, attribution theorists have long pointed out that we have a different perspective when we observe others than when we are the actor (Jones & Nisbett, 1971; Jones, 1976; Storms, 1973). When we watch another person act, that person and his or her behavior, including emotional expressions, occupy the center of our attention and so seem to cause whatever happens. We tend to draw conclusions from what our attention is focused upon – in this case, expressions of happiness.

Cultural differences. I observed not only a main effect of being an actor versus observer in judgments of whether people were suppressing or exaggerating feelings of happiness in their open expression, but also a significant interaction with whether the participants were Asian or Caucasian. Specifically, whereas members of both groups were likely to report that they were suppressing emotions whereas their partner was not only suppressing but might be exaggerating expressions of happiness, these effects were greater among Caucasians than they were among Asians. Why might this be the case?

The simplest explanation and one that fits with a now burgeoning literature on differences between Western and Eastern cultures, depends upon the concepts of "individualism" and "collectivism." There is now considerable evidence and agreement that people in Western cultures tend to be individualistic (i.e. they think of themselves as individuals who are separate from other individuals) whereas people in Asian cultures tend to be collectivistic (i.e. they think of themselves as a part of a larger social whole) (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). If this is so, then Caucasian students may well draw sharp distinctions between themselves and their partner whereas Asian students may be less prone to do so. That being said, Caucasian students may *not* use their own thoughts and judgments as a template for guessing what the partner may be feeling and doing (e.g. feeling happiness and suppressing it somewhat). In contrast, Asian students may have a somewhat greater tendency to use their own thoughts and judgments as a template for what the partner may be thinking and doing. If so, this could moderate the overall effects of perspective on judgments of felt emotion versus expressed emotion as is discussed in the section above. If such moderation did occur (but did not entirely wipe out the perspective effect) this could account for the significant interaction between the group identity of participants (i.e. Caucasian versus Asian) that I observed in my overall analyses.

General Discussion

Evaluation of my original hypotheses. From the findings of Study 1 and Study 2, we can tentatively conclude that race does not play a significant role in Asians' and Caucasians' interpreting their own felt and expressed happiness. Whereas it was disappointing that my original hypotheses were unsupported, from the lack of results

from Study 1 and from the unexpected results from Study 2, we can better understand the

relationship between culture, race and perceptions of self and others in interactions.   My

work when taken together with the work of Pierre (2003) suggests that whereas being an

African American and/or a member of a very small minority may lead people to

strategically present happiness which may then be discounted, being an Asian and/or a

member of a large minority may not lead to such consequences. Before any firm

conclusion can be drawn, however, more work is needed.

Whereas the findings shed light on when race and culture affect our perceptions,

there were certainly design and sample limitations within both studies. After drawing

insight from the second study's findings, Study 1, the questionnaire based study, should

have asked regarding participants' perceptions nervousness and ideally, should have been

video or audio based to hopefully streamline understanding the survey. Furthermore, in

ideal conditions, Study Two should have studied participants in more natural settings,

such as when waiting for an experiment to begin, and more generally, when not within

the university setting.

Interesting, unexpected findings. The most interesting results obtained in my

thesis work actually were not anticipated. That is, I found that participants in Study 2

consistently reported that they were experiencing more happiness than they had

expressed and that their partner was expressing more happiness than they were

experiencing. In other words, people seemed to believe that they were suppressing

happiness whereas partners were exaggerating happiness. I have chosen to interpret this

as evidence that people place a great deal of weight on their internal experiences and fail

to place sufficient weight on what others may perceive in them. In contrast, in having no

access to others' internal experiences, people appear to place greater weight on others' outward expressions of emotion than to their possible inner experiences of emotion.

Of course there are other possible interpretations of these findings. For instance, another interpretation of the finding that participants claim that they suppressed emotion may be that they actually do so. Specifically, it may be socially protective to express less happiness than you feel upon meeting another lest you seem too interested in a relationship with you and they reject you. If this is so, perhaps participants are accurately describing their experienced relative to their expressed happiness. Similarly, another interpretation of the finding that participants believe that the other is expressing more happiness than is felt is that that too is a self-protective device. If one believes the other "is only being polite" one will not too readily assume partner social interest in the self (and one may be less likely to be hurt later on if the apparent social interest evaporates).

A cultural difference. A second unexpected, but interesting, effect which emerged is a race or cultural one. Specifically, whereas all participants said that they suppressed happiness whereas the other exaggerated happiness, this difference was greater among my Caucasian participants than it was among my Asian participants. This finding actually fits nicely with a now growing literature on a particular type of Western versus Eastern cultural difference. That is, people from Western cultures appear to be far more individualistic whereas those from Eastern cultures are more collectivistic. This may account for why Caucasians evidenced a greater difference between self and other judgments than did Asians.

Future directions. It would seem most fruitful to follow up on the interesting, unexpected findings I obtained. First in order, are some additional analyses of data I

already have from Study 2 which are relevant to my unexpected findings but which I have not yet had time to analyze. For instance, I have data on felt and expressed nervousness. I would like to analyze these in a similar manner to my analyses of felt and expressed happiness. If my initial interpretation of the happiness findings is correct, then I should find that participants claim to feel more nervousness than they expressed and to judge that partners express more nervousness than they feel. If the results fall in that pattern, I would judge one's own felt emotions more generally to be more accessible to participants than one's own public expressions whereas a partner's public expressions of emotion, more generally, are more accessible to participants than their partner's experienced emotions.

Of course other results are possible. For instance, it is possible that participants will say they expressed more nervousness than they felt and that partners felt more nervousness than they expressed. If so, my entire interpretation will change. I will then think that participants wish to claim that they are more happy and less nervous than they appear and that others are less happy and more nervous than they appear. This could be due to a simple self-serving bias driving people to present themselves in a more positive light than that in which they present others.

It is also the case that I have not yet coded the actual videotapes for expressed happiness. I plan to do that, having objective observers rate just how much happiness participants in Study 2 actually did express. This will provide an objective baseline again which participants own claims and perceptions of partners can be judged. I will be able to answer questions about whether people are, in fact, more accurate in judging others' emotions than their own. Such a finding would support my "point of view" interpretation

of my results. A lack of such a finding would undermine those speculations.   It also

remains a possibility that examinations of actual expressed emotions will yield effects of

race that I was unable to detect by using only self-reports.

References

Ambady, N. & Rosenthal, R. (1993). Half a minute: Predicting teacher evaluations from thin slices of nonverbal behavior and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Social Psychology, 64*, 431-441.

Asamen, J.K. & Berry, G.L. (1987). Self-concept, alienation, and perceived prejudice: Implications for counseling Asian Americans. *Journal of Multiculturalism & Development, 15*, 146-160

Beaupre, M.G. & Hess, Ursula. (2003). In my mind, *we* all smile: A case of in-group favoritism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39*, 371-377.

Allen, B.P. (1975). Social distance and admiration reactions of "unprejudiced" Whites. *Journal of Personality, 43*, 709-726.

Blascovich, J., Mendes, W., Berry, H., Lickel S., Lickel, B., & Kowai-Bell, N. (2001). Perceiver threat in social interactions with stigmatized others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 253-267

Buck, R. The Communication of Emotion. New York: Guilford Press, 1984

Carlson, C.I., Wilson, K.D., Hargrave, J.L. (2003). The effect of school racial composition on Hispanic intergroup relations. *Journal of Personal and Social Relationships, 20*, 203-220.

Chapman, A. J. (1973). Social facilitation of laughter in children. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9*, 528 –541.

Chovil, N., & Fridlund, A. J. (1991). Why emotionality cannot equal sociality: Reply to Buck. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 15*, 163-167.

Comer, R.J. & Piliavin, J.A. (1972). The effects of physical deviance upon face-to-face interaction: The other side. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology,*23, 33-39.

Crandall, C.S., Eshleman, A., & O'Brien, L.T. (2002). Social norms and the expression and suppression of prejudice: The struggle for internalization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82,* 359-378.

Crocker & Major (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review, 96,* 608-630.

Ekman, P., Sorenson, E.R. & Friesen, W.V. (1969). Pan-cultural elements in facial displays of emotion. *Science, 164,* 86-88.

Frable, D., Platt, L., & Hoey, S. (1998). Concealable stigmas and positive self-perceptions: Feeling better around similar others. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 74,* 909-922.

Fridlund, A. J. (1991a). Evolution and facial action in reflex, social motive, and paralanguage. *Biological psychology, 32,* 3-100.

Hamm, J.V. Do birds of a feather flock together? The variable bases for African American, Asian American, and European American adolescents' selection of similar friends. (2000). *Developmental Psychology, 36,* 209-219.

Ho, E.A., Sanbonmatsu, D.M., & Akimoto, S.A. (2002). The effects of comparative status on social stereotypes: How the perceived success of some persons affects the stereotypes of others. *Social Cognition, 20,* 36-57.

Oyserman, D., Sakamoto, I. (1997). Being Asian American: Identity, cultural constructs, and stereotype perception. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 33,* 435-453.

Jakobs, E., Manstead, A., Fischer, A.H. (1999). Social motives and emotional feelings

as determinants of facial displays: The case of smiling. *Personality & Social*

Psychology Bulletin, 25, 424-435.

Jones, E.E., & Nisbett, R.E. (1971*). The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions*

of the causes of behavior. Morristown N.J.: General Learning Press.

Jones, E.E. (1976). How do people perceive the causes of behavior? *American Scientist,*

64, 300-305.

Judd, C.M., Blair, I.V., Chapleau, K.M. (2004). Automatic stereotypes vs. automatic

prejudice: Sorting out the possibilities in the Payne (2001) weapon paradigm.

Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40, 75-81.

Kleck, R.E. & Strenta, A. (1980). Perceptions of the impact of negatively valued

physical characteristics on social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, 39, 5, 861-873.

Kozel, N.J. & Gitter, A.G. (1968). Perception of emotion: Differences in mode of

presentation, sex of perceiver, and race of expresser, *CRC Report,* 18, 36.

Lee, Richard. (2003). Do ethnic identity and other-group orientation protect against

discrimination for Asian Americans? *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50,* 133-

141.

Lott, B.E. & Lott, A.J. (1960). The formation of positive attitudes towards group

members. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61,* 297-300.

Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition,

emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224-253.

Monteith, M.J., Devine, P.G. & Zuwerink, J.R. (1993). Self-directed versus other-

directed affect as a consequence of prejudice-related discrepancies. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 64, 198-210.

Pataki, S.P. & Clark, M.S. (*in press,* 2003). Self presentations of happiness: Sincere,

polite, or cautious? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.*

Pierre, G.C. (2003) Inferring social interest from happiness in interpersonal interactions.

Unpublished senior honors thesis, Carnegie Mellon University.

Plant, E.A. & Devine, P.G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without

prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 811-832.

Reid, L.D. & Radhakrishnan, P. (2003) Race matters: The relation between race and

general campus climate. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 9*, 263-

275.

Ruggiero, K.M & Taylor, D.M. (1997). Why minority group members perceive or do not

perceive the discrimination that confronts them: the role of self-esteem and perceived

control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 373-389.

Sayoc-Parial, M.C. (2002). The impact of interracial interactions on cardiovascular

reactivity and behavior. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The*

Sciences & Engineering, 62, 5930.

Segal, M.W. (1974). Alphabet and attraction: An unobtrusive measure of the effect of

propinquity in a field setting. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 30*, 654-

657.

Storms, M.D. (1973). Videotape and the attribution process: Reversing actors' and

observers' points of view. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2*, 165-175.

Strangor, C., Swim, J.K., Van Allen, K.L., Sechrist, G.B. (2002). Reporting

   discrimination in public and private contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social*

   Psychology, 82, 69-74

Wittenbrink, B., Judd, C.M., Park, B. (1997). Evidence for racial prejudice at the implicit

   level and its relationship with questionnaire measures. *Journal of Personality and*

   Social Psychology, 72, 262-274.

Zaalberg, R.; Manstead, A., & Fischer, A.H. (2004). Relations between emotions,

   display rules, social motives, and facial behaviour. *Cognition and Emotion, 18,* 183-

   207.

APPENDIX A

Condition 1: Asian-Asian

I-Ting Lin   Mei Wong

Condition 2: Caucasian-Caucasian

Emily Hart   Sara Moore

Condition 3: First actor is Asian, second actor is Caucasian

I-Ting Lin   Sara Moore

Condition 4: First actor is Caucasian, second actor is Asian

Emily Hart   Mei Wong

APPENDIX B

Condition 1: Both actors are Asian

We are interested in looking at different forms of expressions during interactions. Please read the excerpt from an interaction involving two students assigned to be roommates:

Mei Wong, a new college freshman, arrived at her assigned dorm early in the day and has already settled into her room. She has just returned from a late lunch with her parents, who just left to start their long drive home to Connecticut. She is lying on her bed when her new roommate, I-Ting Lin, walks in.

I-Ting:	*(sitting down on remaining free bed and looking a bit nervous but making herself smile)* Hi – I'm I-Ting and you must be Mei, right? Great to meet you.
Mei:	Yes. I got in this morning so I already picked my side of the room *(returns the smile and laughs in a friendly manner).*
I-Ting:	*(nodding)* Oh... that's fine. Where are you from?
Mei:	Connecticut and you?
I-Ting:	New York. See, my parents didn't want to drive that long *(rolling her eyes)* so they shipped my stuff and I took the plane. Now I've got to figure out where my stuff was delivered. Otherwise, you'll be seeing a lot of me in this outfit. *(They both laugh)*
Mei:	So why did you pick this school?
I-Ting:	I think I want to go into Business Administration and they have a program that seems good here. And, of course, this place accepted me. I also wanted to go to a school that was big -- one with more than just a few other students like me. So why did you pick it?
Mei:	English.
I-Ting:	I could never be an English major, I absolutely hate writing papers *(laughs)*. *(Then, smiling)* I hope that no one in a business course even thinks about making me write a paper!
Mei:	*(nods)* Well, I'm used to it. I was on the yearbook committee and I was a member of a group called Awareness. Whenever they had something to write, they asked me. Did you do any activities in high school?
I-Ting:	I was a cheerleader my last year. Believe me, my parents would have preferred me to be on the yearbook staff and in a group called Awareness. They considered cheerleading to be a little too lightweight. *(with a smile)* I'll just tell them my new roommate will be a good influence.
Mei:	Are you thinking of getting a job here?
I-Ting:	I think I might. It would be good to have extra money so I won't have to keep asking my parents for money *(laughs)*. I hope it won't interfere with my schoolwork though. Are you thinking of getting one?
Mei:	No, but I'm sure you'll get a job easily and I'm sure you can handle it *(smiles)*.
I-Ting:	Have you talked to anyone else on the floor?
Mei:	No. I haven't had a chance.
I-Ting:	Maybe we should go introduce ourselves.
Mei:	*(sighs)* Yea, I guess we should.

CONDITION 2: Both actors are Caucasian

We are interested in looking at different forms of expressions during interactions. Please read the excerpt from an interaction involving two students assigned to be roommates:

Sara Moore, a new college freshman, arrived at her assigned dorm early in the day and has already settled into her room. She has just returned from lunch with her parents, who just left to start their long drive home to Connecticut. She is lying on her bed when her new roommate, Emily Hart, walks in.

Emily:	*(sitting down on remaining free bed and looking a bit nervous but making herself smile)* Hi – I'm Emily and you must be Sara, right? Great to meet you.
Sara:	Yes. I got in this morning so I already picked my side of the room *(returns the smile and laughs in a friendly manner)*.
Emily:	*(nodding)* Oh... that's fine. Where are you from?
Sara:	Connecticut and you?
Emily:	New York. See, my parents didn't want to drive that long *(rolling her eyes)* so they shipped my stuff and I took the plane. Now I've got to figure out where my stuff was delivered. Otherwise, you'll be seeing a lot of me in this outfit. *(They both laugh)*
Sara:	So why did you pick this school?
Emily:	I think I want to go into Business Administration and they have a program that seems good here. And, of course, this place accepted me. I also wanted to go to a school that was big -- one with more than just a few other students like me. So why did you pick it?
Sara:	English.
Emily:	I could never be an English major, I absolutely hate writing papers *(laughs)*. *(Then, smiling)* I hope that no one in a business course even thinks about making me write a paper!
Sara:	*(nods)* Well, I'm used to it. I was on the yearbook committee and I was a member of a group called Awareness. Whenever they had something to write, they asked me. Did you do any activities in high school?
Emily:	I was a cheerleader my last year. Believe me, my parents would have preferred me to be on the yearbook staff and in a group called Awareness. They considered cheerleading to be a little too lightweight. *(with a smile)* I'll just tell them my new roommate will be a good influence.
Sara:	Are you thinking of getting a job here?
Emily	I think I might. It would be good to have extra money so I won't have to keep asking my parents for money *(laughs)*. I hope it won't interfere with my schoolwork though. Are you thinking of getting one?
Sara:	No, but I'm sure you'll get a job easily and I'm sure you can handle it *(smiles)*.
Emily:	Have you talked to anyone else on the floor?
Sara:	No. I haven't had a chance.
Emily:	Maybe we should go introduce ourselves.
Sara	*(sighs)* Yea, I guess we should.

CONDITION 3: First actor is Asian, second actor is Caucasian

We are interested in looking at different forms of expressions during interactions. Please read the excerpt from an interaction involving two students assigned to be roommates:

Sara Moore, a new college freshman, arrived at her assigned dorm early in the day and has already settled into her room. She has just returned from lunch with her parents, who just left to start their long drive home to Connecticut. She is lying on her bed when her new roommate, I-Ting Lin, walks in.

I-Ting:	*(sitting down on remaining free bed and looking a bit nervous but making herself smile)* Hi – I'm I-Ting and you must be Sara, right? Great to meet you.
Sara:	Yes. I got in this morning so I already picked my side of the room *(returns the smile and laughs in a friendly manner)*.
I-Ting:	*(nodding)* Oh... that's fine. Where are you from?
Sara:	Connecticut and you?
I-Ting:	New York. See, my parents didn't want to drive that long *(rolling her eyes)* so they shipped my stuff and I took the plane. Now I've got to figure out where my stuff was delivered. Otherwise, you'll be seeing a lot of me in this outfit. *(They both laugh)*
Sara:	So why did you pick this school?
I-Ting:	I think I want to go into Business Administration and they have a program that seems good here. And, of course, this place accepted me. I also wanted to go to a school that was big -- one with more than just a few other students like me. So why did you pick it?
Sara:	English.
I-Ting:	I could never be an English major, I absolutely hate writing papers *(laughs)*. *(Then, smiling)* I hope that no one in a business course even thinks about making me write a paper!
Sara:	*(nods)* Well, I'm used to it. I was on the yearbook committee and I was a member of a group called Awareness. Whenever they had something to write, they asked me. Did you do any activities in high school?
I-Ting:	I was a cheerleader my last year. Believe me, my parents would have preferred me to be on the yearbook staff and in a group called Awareness. They considered cheerleading to be a little too lightweight. *(with a smile)* I'll just tell them my new roommate will be a good influence.
Sara:	Are you thinking of getting a job here?
I-Ting	I think I might. It would be good to have extra money so I won't have to keep asking my parents for money *(laughs)*. I hope it won't interfere with my schoolwork though. Are you thinking of getting one?
Sara:	No, but I'm sure you'll get a job easily and I'm sure you can handle it *(smiles)*.
I-Ting:	Have you talked to anyone else on the floor?
Sara:	No. I haven't had a chance.
I-Ting:	Maybe we should go introduce ourselves.
Sara:	*(sighs)* Yea, I guess we should.

CONDITION 4: First actor is Caucasian, second actor is Asian

We are interested in looking at different forms of expressions during interactions. Please read the excerpt from an interaction involving two students assigned to be roommates:

Mei Wong, a new college freshman, arrived at her assigned dorm early in the day and has already settled into her room. She has just returned from lunch with her parents, who just left to start their long drive home to Connecticut. She is lying on her bed when her new roommate, Emily Hart, walks in.

Emily:	*(sitting down on remaining free bed and looking a bit nervous but making herself smile)* Hi – I'm Emily and you must be Mei, right? Great to meet you.
Mei:	Yes. I got in this morning so I already picked my side of the room *(returns the smile and laughs in a friendly manner)*.
Emily:	*(nodding)* Oh... that's fine. Where are you from?
Mei:	Connecticut and you?
Emily:	New York. See, my parents didn't want to drive that long *(rolling her eyes)* so they shipped my stuff and I took the plane. Now I've got to figure out where my stuff was delivered. Otherwise, you'll be seeing a lot of me in this outfit. *(They both laugh)*
Mei:	So why did you pick this school?
Emily:	I think I want to go into Business Administration and they have a program that seems good here. And, of course, this place accepted me. I also wanted to go to a school that was big -- one with more than just a few other students like me. So why did you pick it?
Mei:	English.
Emily:	I could never be an English major, I absolutely hate writing papers *(laughs)*. *(Then, smiling)* I hope that no one in a business course even thinks about making me write a paper!
Mei:	*(nods)* Well, I'm used to it. I was on the yearbook committee and I was a member of a group called Awareness. Whenever they had something to write, they asked me. Did you do any activities in high school?
Emily:	I was a cheerleader my last year. Believe me, my parents would have preferred me to be on the yearbook staff and in a group called Awareness. They considered cheerleading to be a little too lightweight. *(with a smile)* I'll just tell them my new roommate will be a good influence.
Mei:	Are you thinking of getting a job here?
Emily	I think I might. It would be good to have extra money so I won't have to keep asking my parents for money *(laughs)*. I hope it won't interfere with my schoolwork though. Are you thinking of getting one?
Mei:	No, but I'm sure you'll get a job easily and I'm sure you can handle it *(smiles)*.
Emily:	Have you talked to anyone else on the floor?
Mei:	No. I haven't had a chance.
Emily:	Maybe we should go introduce ourselves.
Mei	*(sighs)* Yea, I guess we should.

APPENDIX C: Questionnaires

CONDITION 1: Both actors are Asian

1. How much happiness does I-Ting express (publicly) upon meeting Mei?

Not very much happiness   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very much happiness

2. How much happiness does Mei express (publicly) in response?

Not very much happiness   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very much happiness

3. How truly happy do you suspect I-Ting is (privately) during this interaction with her new roommate Mei?

Not truly happy   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Truly happy

4. How truly happy do you suspect Mei is (privately) upon finding out that her roommate is I-Ting?

Not truly happy   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Truly happy

5. To what extent do you think I-Ting feels she has to be polite?

Not very much   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very much so

5. How polite do you think Mei feels she has to be?

Not very much   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very much so

7. How similar do I-Ting and Mei seem (interests, beliefs)?

Not very
similar   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very similar

8. How likely do you think they will be friends?

Not very
likely   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very likely

9. Which girl seems more studious? (4 = They seem equally studious)

Mei   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   I-Ting

10. Which girl seems more social? (4 = They seem equally social)

Mei   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   I-Ting

CONDITION 2:   Both actors are Caucasian

1. How much happiness does Emily express (publicly) upon meeting Sara?

Not much happiness   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Much happiness

2. How much happiness does Sara express (publicly) in response?

Not much happiness   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Much happiness

3. How truly happy do you suspect Emily is (privately) during this interaction with her new roommate Sara?

Not truly happy   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Truly happy

4. How truly happy do you suspect Sara is (privately) upon finding out that her roommate is Emily?

Not truly happy   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Truly happy

5. To what extent do you think Emily feels she has to be polite?

Not very much   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very much so

6. How polite do you think Sara feels she has to be?

Not very much   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very much so

7. How similar do Emily and Sara seem (interests, beliefs)?

Not very   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very similar
similar

8. How likely do you think they will be friends?

Not very   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very likely
likely

9. Which girl seems more studious? (4 = They seem equally studious)

Sara   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Emily

10. Which girl seems more social? (4 = They seem equally social)

Sara   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Emily

CONDITION 3:   First actor is Asian, second actor is Caucasian

1. How much happiness does I-Ting express (publicly) upon meeting Sara?

Not much happiness   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Much happiness

2. How much happiness does Sara express (publicly) in response?

Not much happiness   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Much happiness

3. How truly happy do you suspect I-Ting is (privately) during this interaction with her new roommate Sara?

Not truly happy   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Truly happy

4. How truly happy do you suspect Sara is (privately) upon finding out that her roommate is I-Ting?

Not truly happy   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Truly happy

5. To what extent do you think I-Ting feels she has to be polite?

Not very much   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very much so

6. How polite do you think Sara feels she has to be?

Not very much   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very much so

7. How similar do I-Ting and Sara seem (interests, beliefs)?

Not very
similar   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very similar

8. How likely do you think they will be friends?

Not very
likely   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very likely

9. Which girl seems more studious? (4 = They seem equally studious)

Sara   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   I-Ting

10. Which girl seems more social? (4 = They seem equally social)

Sara   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   I-Ting

CONDITION 4: First actor is Caucasian, second actor is Asian

1. How much happiness does Emily express (publicly) upon meeting Mei?

Not much happiness   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Much happiness

2. How much happiness does Mei express (publicly) in response?

Not much happiness   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Much happiness

3. How truly happy do you suspect Emily is (privately) during this interaction with her new roommate Mei?

Not truly happy   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Truly happy

4. How truly happy do you suspect Mei is (privately) upon finding out that her roommate is Emily?

Not truly happy   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Truly happy

5. To what extent do you think Emily feels she has to be polite?

Not very much   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very much so

6. How polite do you think Mei feels she has to be?

Not very much   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very much so

7. How similar do Emily and Mei seem (interests, beliefs)?

Not very
similar   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very similar

8. How likely do you think they will be friends?

Not very
likely   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Very likely

9. Which girl seems more studious? (4 = They seem equally studious)

Mei   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Emily

10. Which girl seems more social? (4 = They seem equally social)

Mei   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Emily

APPENDIX D: Study 2 Pre-Interaction Questionnaire

Questionnaire 1: Your relationship with your parent(s)

Mark an "X" relative to your response to each question. Please answer this questionnaire to the best of your ability, and as openly and honestly as possible. Remember all answers will remain anonymous.

1. How much do you want to discuss parent-child interactions right now?

Not very much |--| Very much so

2. How tired are you feeling right now?

Not very tired |--| Very tired

3. How happy are you feeling right now?

Not very happy |--| Very happy

4. How nervous are you feeling right now?

Not very nervous |--| Very nervous

5. How close would you consider your relationship with your mother?

Not very close |--| Very close   or N/A

6. How close would you consider your relationship with your father?

Not very close |--| Very close   or N/A

7. How often do you communicate with either one of your parents (either by phone, email, online, visiting)?

Not very often at all |--| Very often   or N/A

8. When you see your parents, how often do you have disagreements?

Not very often at all |---| Very often   or N/A

9. If you have a big problem (of any type), how likely would you ask them for help?

Not very often |---| Very often   or N/A

10. Generally speaking, how close would you consider your immediate family?

Not very close |---| Very close

11. How much are you looking forward to meeting the other person?

Not looking |---| Very much so
forward very much

12. How often do you speak about your parents *to friends*?

Not very often |---| Very frequently

13. How happy would you rate your childhood years in relation to home life?

Not very happy |---| Very happy

14. How would you rate the quality of your family life overall?

Not very high |---| Very high in quality

APPENDIX E: Study 2 Post-Interaction Questionnaire

Questionnaire 2: How are you feeling right now?

Use the experience you just had in briefly meeting the other study participant as a basis in answering these questions. Some of the questions might be difficult to answer, but please answer them to your best ability, and as openly and honestly as possible. Again, all answers will remain anonymous.

1. Have you ever seen the other person before?

Never   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Seen a great deal

2. Prior to this study, how well did you know the other person?

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

3. How nervous were you during the discussion?

Not very nervous   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very nervous

4. How happy were you feeling during the discussion?

Not very happy   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very happy

5. How much nervousness did you publicly express while talking to the other person?

Not very much   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   A great deal of nervousness
nervousness

6. How much nervousness did <u>the other person</u> publicly express while talking to you?

Not very much   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   A great deal of nervousness
nervousness

7. How much happiness did you publicly express while talking to the other person?

Not very much   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   A great deal of happiness
happiness

8. How much happiness did <u>the other person</u> publicly express while talking to you?

Not very much 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 A great deal of happiness
happiness

9. To what degree did you feel comfortable enough to relax and be yourself?

Not very comfortable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very comfortable

10. How much did you feel you could disclose personal information (e.g. – your relationship with your parents, childhood experiences) to the other individual?

Not much at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 A great deal of personal info

11. How attractive (physically) do you find the other person?

Not very attractive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very attractive

12. How attractive (personality, other characteristics) do you find the other person?

Not very attractive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very attractive

13. To what degree did you feel consciously obliged to be polite during the conversation?

Not very aware 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 A great deal of awareness

14. To what degree do you think <u>the other person </u>felt obliged they had to be polite?

Not very much 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 A great deal of obligation
obligation

15. How much happiness do you think <u>the other person </u>privately felt in meeting you?

Not very much 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 A great deal of happiness
 happiness

16. How much nervousness do you think <u>the other person</u> privately felt in meeting you?

Not very difficult   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very difficult

17. How difficult was it to have a discussion with the other individual?

Not very difficult   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very difficult

18. How would you rate the other person's social skills?

Not very social   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very social

19. How open would you say the other person was?

Not very open   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very open

20. How likely do you think you could become friends with the other person (i.e., say hi outside of experiment, exchange phone #s and screennames)?

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

21. How likely do you think you could become good friends with the other person (i.e., hang out together, share deep thoughts and feelings)?

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

22. How much did you trust the other individual in telling your thoughts on parent/child interaction?

Not much at all 1   2   3   4   5   6   7   A great deal of trust

How would you describe yourself? (Please list 4 words)

1._____   2._____

3._____   4._____

YOUR PARENT/CHILD DISCUSSION

As we try to better understand your conversation, please answer all questions as honestly as possible.

1. How similar do you think your relationship with your parents is to the other person's?

Not very similar   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very similar

2. Do you think you get along better with your parents than the other person?

Not very likely   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very likely

3. How difficult was it to talk to the other person about your parents?

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

4. How close did the other person seem to his/her parents?

Not very close   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very close   or N/A

5. How reserved did the other person seem in talking about his/her parent-child interactions?

Not very reserved   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very reserved

6. Please rate your impression of your Overall Parent-Child Relationship Quality (i.e. – time spent together, amount of communication, trust, self-disclosure):

Low in quality   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very high in quality   N/A

7. Please rate your impression of *your partner's* Overall Parent-Child Relationship Quality (i.e. – time spent together, amount of communication, trust, self-disclosure):

Low in quality   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very high in quality   N/A

8. How distracting were the video cameras to you during the discussion?
Not very distracting   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very distracting