


Cultural Display Rules of Emotional Expressions in Greek students

(Part of the Multinational study of Cultural Display Rules of Emotional Expressions by D. Matsumoto & S. Yoo)

Dona Papastylianou

Democritus University of Thrace, Greece

Some important concerns beyond DRAI

- Greece: every year traffic accidents lead to death 2500 (age of 18 –25) holding the 1st place in Europe, due to self-destructive behavior (?)
 - Preventive programs in Schools aiming to improve verbal/non-verbal communication and emotional expression
- 

Values, differentiation and emotional expression

- J.Georgas (family values, since late 80s till today),
- H.Triandis (on values, allocentric – idiocentric) (1968, 1986, 1994)
- S. Schwartz (on values) (1994, 1996).
- Crossing over to autonomy and emotional relatedness – core need for balanced development-(C. Kagitcibasi, 2005) refers to differentiation (aim set by M. Bowen (1976) psychotherapist and emotional expression.

The aims of the Greek presentation

- Gender differences in the display rules of the expression of four emotions → anger, happiness, sadness, fear
 - in male and female university students
 - by male and female university students in a private or in a public setting

The aims of the Greek presentation

- Gender differences in the display rules of emotions to male and female interactants / targets
- Gender differences in the display rules of emotions to male - female of high status vs. male - female of equal/medium status.
- Gender differences in the display rules of emotions regarding setting, gender of interactant and status (male - female of high status vs. male - female of equal/medium status).

Method

1. Measures

- DRAI (Display Rule Assessment Inventory-modified version of DRAI, Matsumoto, 1998)
- ERQ (Emotional Regulation Questionnaire, Gross & John, 2001)

Method

2. Sample = 163 Greek students

- 72% Christians

- Gender: Males: 71, Females : 89
Missing :3

- Mean Age: 21.2 years old (SD=2,2)

- Sample – students from: Thrace University, Athens University and Ioannina University

Method

Schools / Depts of University:

- Human and Social Sciences (Law, Philosophy, Psychology, Social Welfare, Education)
- Health sciences (Medical School)
- Economics and Management

Results

- 1. ERQ (Emotional Regulation Questionnaire)**
Factor Analysis (Principal Component Analysis)
 - **Factor 1** : Items: 7, 1, 8, 10, 3, 5 ("Positive re-appraisal"), 24.7% variance explained
 - **Factor 2** : Items: 6, 4, 2, 9 ("Control emotions"). 20.6% variance explained *

* Rotation varimax

Rotated Component Matrix

	Component	
	1	2
ERQ7 - When I want to feel more positive emotion, I change the way I'm thinking about the situation.	.781	
ERQ1 - When I want to feel more positive emotion (such as joy or amusement), I change what I'm thinking about.	.688	
ERQ8 - I control my emotions by changing the way I think about the situation I'm in.	.684	
ERQ10 - When I want to feel less negative emotion, I change the way I'm thinking about the situation	.673	
ERQ3 - When I want to feel less negative emotion (such as sadness or anger), I change what I'm thinking about.	.583	
ERQ5 - When I'm faced with a stressful situation, I make myself think about it in a way that helps me stay calm.	.301	
ERQ6 - I control my emotions by not expressing them.		.795
ERQ4 - When I am feeling positive emotions, I am careful not to express them.		.727
ERQ2 - I keep my emotions to myself.		.678
ERQ9 - When I am feeling negative emotions, I make sure not to express them.		.517

Results

2. Pearson Correlation

The two components, X the four emotions (anger, happiness, sadness, fear).

Correlations

		ERQ - positive reappraisal	ERQ –Control emotions	Anger	Fear	Happiness	Sadness
ERQ - positive reappraisal	Pearson Correlation	1	.031	.011	.026	-.066	.126
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.704	.900	.760	.431	.131
	N	148	148	145	145	145	145
ERQ –control emotions	Pearson Correlation		1	.215	.120	.070	.141
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.	.009	.152	.400	.091
	N		148	145	145	145	145

Results

3. Checking for sex differences depending on the Setting
 - a. Overall no differences were observed between the sexes in terms of display rules of emotions.

		Sig. (2-tailed)		Gender	N	Mean
Female	Anger private – Anger in public	.000	Anger private	Female	86	3.0931
				Male	71	2.8662
			Anger in public	Female	86	3.6783
				Male	71	3.3185
	Fear private – Fear in public	.000	Fear private	Female	86	3.5790
				Male	71	3.5193
			Fear in public	Female	86	3.8474
				Male	71	3.7478
	Happiness private – Happiness in public	.000	Happiness private	Female	86	2.7790
				Male	71	2.7466
			Happiness in public	Female	86	2.9709
				Male	71	2.9337
	Sadness private – Sadness in public	.000	Sadness private	Female	86	3.2951
				Male	71	3.2186
			Sadness in public	Female	86	3.7077
				Male	71	3.5376
Male	Anger private – Anger in public	.000				
	Fear private – Fear in public	.000				
	Happiness private – Happiness in public	.000				
	Sadness private – Sadness in public	.000				

Results

- 4. Checking for differences depending on the gender of the interactant/ target

Gender			Mean	N	Sig. (2-tailed)
Female	Pair 1	Anger to man	3.5207	86	.074
		Anger to woman	3.3121	86	
	Pair 2	Fear to man	3.7701	86	.035
		Fear to woman	3.7040	86	
	Pair 3	Happiness to man	2.92	86	.014
		Happiness to woman	2.8508	86	
	Pair 4	Sadness –to man	3.5990	86	.000
		Sadness to woman	3.4575	86	
Male	Pair 1	Anger to man	3.08	71	.388
		Anger to woman	3.1177	71	
	Pair 2	Fear to man	3.6186	71	.248
		Fear to woman	3.6677	71	
	Pair 3	Happiness to man	2.8576	71	.678
		Happiness to woman	2.8395	71	
	Pair 4	Sadness –to man	3.4197	71	.324
		Sadness to woman	3.3806	71	

Results

- 5. Checking for differences depending on the status of the interactant/ target

Gender			Mean	N	Sig. (2-tailed)
Female	Pair 1	Anger-Equal /medium status interactant	3.2793	83	.013
		Anger-High status interactant (professors)	3.8809	83	
	Pair 2	Fear-Equal /medium status interactant	3.6675	86	.000
		Fear-High status interactant (professors)	3.9868	86	
	Pair 3	Happiness -Equal /medium status interactant	2.7952	86	.000
		Happiness -High status interactant (professors)	3.1842	86	
	Pair 4	Sadness -Equal /medium status interactant	3.4213	86	.000
		Sadness -High status interactant (professors)	3.8827	86	
Male	Pair 1	Anger-Equal /medium status interactant	2.9450	69	.000
		Anger-High status interactant (professors)	3.7264	69	
	Pair 2	Fear-Equal /medium status interactant	3.6047	69	.002
		Fear-High status interactant (professors)	3.8176	69	
	Pair 3	Happiness -Equal /medium status interactant	2.7733	70	.000
		Happiness -High status interactant (professors)	3.0839	70	
	Pair 4	Sadness -Equal /medium status interactant	3.2908	70	.000
		Sadness -High status interactant (professors)	3.7530	70	

Correlations

- **Regarding anger.**
- The closer the relationship of the s. with the interactant (i.e. father, mother, oldbrother) the higher the positive correlation of "should display" anger, either in private or in public setting.
- The more "distant" the relationship, (professor) the lower the correlation.

Correlations

- **Regarding fear**
- Fear “should be” expressed to parents, siblings, close friends (in this order) and less to classmates, professors.

Correlations

- **Regarding Sadness**

- (in the same trend) The students state they “should” display sadness more and in private, to mother then to father, older sisters, younger sisters and then to older brothers, less to acquaintance and least of all to professors.

Correlations

- **Regarding Happiness**
- Happiness “should be” displayed to mother more than to father, siblings following, close friends, acquaintance and least of all to professors.

Conclusions

- Closed to, protective to their family the Greek students, though expressing anger ...
- Research is needed holding their difficulties for emotional expression to out-group, investigating self-assertiveness, self-esteem and differentiation among other measures.