

Cross-cultural study on emotion regulation

Dr. Anita Sheerha^{1*}, Kshitij A. Kumbhare²

ABSTRACT

Emotions are several subjectively experienced, affect-laden states, the ontological status of each being established by a label, and the meaning of which is arrived at by simple consensus. Emotions are the cornerstones of our social worlds, affecting our interaction with others in countless ways. The following research seeks to explain different patterns of emotional regulation in a cross-cultural context. Culture provides meaning to the intent and the demonstrated behavior. The study has established significant differences amongst two cultures: collectivistic and individualistic using various questionnaires. In this cross-cultural study, variables like expressive suppression, negative emotions, emotional clarity, impulse strength of emotions, goal-directedness, and acceptance of emotional responses are studied. The study makes use of quantitative methods to establish the relationships between the variables and the cultural contexts of the participants (N=60). Significant differences were observed between the two cultures and the possible reasons for their existence have been explored.

Keywords: *Cross-Cultural Study, Emotional Regulation, Individualistic Culture, Collectivistic Culture, Quantitative Analysis*

Culture is defined as a collective programming of the mind which distinguishes between the members of one group or category (Hofstede, 1991). It is a set of attitudes, values, beliefs, and behaviors which are shared by a group of people, but different for each individual, communicated from one generation to the next (Matsumoto, 1996). Culture provides meaning to the intent and the demonstrated behavior. One important distinction between cultures is their degree of individualism or collectivism, which are culture level constructs on the opposite ends of a continuum (Singelis, 1994; Triandis, 2009; Zhang and Mittal, 2007). Individualistic cultures emphasize the agency of the individual, his self-reliance, and freedom of choice. Furthermore, it values the emotional independence and rights of an individual, who is seen as an independent and autonomous being. In contrast, collectivistic cultures emphasize group goals, seeing the individual as a component of the group rather than an isolated individual being. It values conformity and promotes ingroup harmony while stressing the duties and obligations of the individual to the group (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1995; McCarty & Shrum, 2001).

¹Psychologist, Counselling Psychology, Rajasthan University, India

²Psychologist, Counselling Psychology, Rajasthan University, India

*Responding Author

Received: December 15, 2020; Revision Received: February 27, 2021; Accepted: March 23, 2021

Triandis (1995; 1996) classified individualism and collectivism in a framework of horizontal (emphasizing equality) and vertical (emphasizing hierarchy) cultures. According to him, people in horizontal individualism perceive all people to equal in status, whereas vertical collectivism believes that difference in the status of the people is inherent in a group and must be accepted (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995; Triandis, 1995).

Emotion

Different schools have defined emotions differently. However, emotions lie at the center of social experience, providing one with meaning in their lives. Indeed most of what one does in social life, as well as how one does it, is influenced and informed by emotions and the activating social conditions that generate them (Lazarus 1991). They are deeply embedded in the social context, reflecting and shaping the processes.

Two important theories of emotion exist in literature. The basic emotion theory suggests that human beings have a set of emotions that are universal and innate, each of which evolves for adaptive value in the body and brain to deal with fundamental human tasks. Each emotion has a distinct physiological profile and unique expression (Ekman, 1992). However, James Russell (1980) proposed a circumplex model of emotions. This model states that emotions are not distinct categories but rather vary along the two independent, bipolar dimensions where emotions have fuzzy edges and are related to other emotions in proportion to their distance in emotional space.

Cultural Differences in Emotional practices

Mesquita et al. utilized the multi-dimensional theories of emotions and distinguished between the emotional practices—the actual emotions that people experience and express—and the potential emotional responses that people are capable of having in principle. Cultural differences in emotions are inherent in emotional practices. Cultural models include the beliefs as well as social practices that underwrite what is moral, imperative, and desirable. However, cultural models do not assume that all people in a cultural group are homogenous. As individuals in any culture will engage the model in different ways, their individual experiences will differ as well (Bruner, 1986).

Individualistic and collectivistic cultures both have distinct cultural beliefs and practices, which correspond to differences in the ways they experience, understand, and show emotions. For example, in individualistic cultures self-expression is highly valued, which makes them less prone to emotional regulation. However, collectivistic cultures emphasize moderation and self-control for maintaining harmony within the group, hence they tend to restrain from showing emotions in public (Hofstede, 2001).

Emotional Regulation

Emotional regulation refers to the process of dampening, intensifying, maintaining emotions, depending on the individual's goals. People may increase or decrease their positive and negative emotions. This process can be conscious or unconscious. Furthermore, one must not make prior assumptions that any particular form of emotional regulation is either good or bad (Thompson & Calkins, 1996). In contrast, emotional regulation processes can make things better or worse depending on the context.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated to identify the difference between the experience of emotions in individualistic and collectivist cultures with respect to their cultural values and norms.

- H1:** There would be a significant difference between individualistic and collectivistic cultures on cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression dimensions of the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ).
- H2:** There would be a difference in the expression of emotion in both cultures.
- H3:** There would be a significant difference between both the cultures on the Negative expressivity of the Berkeley Expressivity Scale.
- H4:** Individualistic cultures would be more impulsive than collectivistic cultures.
- H5:** Collectivistic cultures express more positive emotions than negative emotions.
- H6:** Both the cultures would differ on non-acceptance of emotional responses.
- H7:** Collectivistic cultures would score higher on difficulties in engaging goal-directed behavior on the DERS.
- H8:** There would be a significant difference between both the cultures on the lack of emotional clarity of the Difficulties in Emotional Regulation Scale (ERS).

METHODOLOGY

Sample

This study uses a random sampling method. The sample included 60 students from the University of California, Berkeley, and the University of Delhi. It included equal gender representation with 30 male and 30 female participants. This study is cross-cultural in nature; hence the participants belonged to six different countries India, Pakistan, Japan, Hong Kong, America, Germany, Australia, and Denmark. All participants belonged to the upper-middle class socioeconomic status and proficient in the English language. All participants between the ages of 18 to 24 years.

Tools Used

- 1. Emotional Expressivity Scale (EES: Kring, Smith and Neale, 1994):** This is a 17 item self-report measure that uses a 6 point Likert scale where high scores correlate to higher emotional expression. It assesses the extent to which people outwardly display their emotions. It differentiates among people based on the facets of affect intensity, expressivity, and personality (extraversion and neuroticism). High scores on the EES correspond to higher emotional expression.
- 2. Difficulties in Emotional Regulation Scale (DERS: Gratz and Roemer 2004):** This is a 36 item self-report measure that identifies the difficulties faced by a person in emotional regulation. It employs 6 facets of emotional regulation, namely, *lack of acceptance of emotions; inability to engage in goal-directed behavior when distressed; impulse control difficulties; limited access to strategies for effective regulation; lack of awareness of emotions; and lack of clarity of emotions*. Items are scored on a 5 point Likert scale and a total score is obtained. The higher values of the total score correspond to higher difficulty in emotional regulation.
- 3. Berkeley Expressivity Questionnaire (BEQ: Gross and John 1995):** This is a 16 item self-report measure that utilizes a 7 point Likert scale. The questionnaire measures three expressivity factors: *positive expressivity, negative expressivity, and impulse strength*. The positive expressivity subscale consists of four items that measure the degree to which a person tends to express positive emotions. The negative expressivity subscale has 6 items that measure the degree to which a person

Cross-cultural study on emotion regulation

tends to express negative emotions. The *impulse strength* subscale measures how strongly a person feels compelled to act on his sudden urges. However, this subscale was not considered while deriving our hypotheses.

- 4. Emotional Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ: Gross and John, 1995):** This is a 10 item self-report measure that uses a 7 point Likert scaling system. It assesses the individual differences in two emotion regulation strategies: expressive suppression and cognitive reappraisal. *Expressive suppression* is a response focused emotion regulation strategy that involves voluntary suppression of outward expression of emotions by reducing the facial expression and controlling positive and negative feelings of emotion. *Cognitive reappraisal* involves changing the trajectory of our emotional response by reinterpreting the meaning of the emotional stimulus.

Procedure

In this study, the data was collected by personally contacting randomly selected college students. All ethical considerations of data collection were followed. Their informed consent was taken and a congenial rapport was formed. They were informed of the honesty required from them and assured them of the absolute confidentiality of their responses. Basic instructions for completing each of the tests were delivered. All queries regarding the items were solved and sufficient assistance was provided in completing the tests. After completion of the tests, they were scored according to the procedure described in the respective test manual.

Scoring provided the raw score for each of the variables being studied. These scores were analyzed using inferential statistics. The t-test was used to determine the differences in the emotional regulation shown by people from individualistic cultures and collectivistic cultures. The relationship between different variables was identified using Pearson's product-moment correlation.

RESULTS

Hypothesis 1 (Difference in Expressive Suppression & Cognitive Reappraisal): Using ERQ the mean for individualistic cultures was found to be 12.86, while the collectivistic cultures showed a mean of 16.96. The t value for expressive suppression came to be 8.52 with 48 degrees of freedom and the t value for cognitive reappraisal was 3.30 with 48 degrees of freedom, significant at 0.01 and 0.05.

Hypothesis 2 (Difference in Emotional Expression): Using EES for emotional suppression, the individualistic cultures and collectivistic cultures showed t value of 6.14 with 48 degrees of freedom.

Hypothesis 3 (Difference in Negative Expressivity): Using BEQ the mean for individualistic cultures was found to be 29.62, while the collectivistic cultures showed a mean of 20.66. The t value for negative expressivity came to be 3.89 significant at 0.01 and 0.05.

Hypothesis 4 (Difference in Impulsivity): Using BEQ the mean for individualistic cultures was found to be 28.82, while the collectivistic cultures showed a mean of 13.9. The t value for impulsivity came to be 4.44 significant at 0.01 and 0.05.

Hypothesis 5 (Positive and Negative emotions of collectivistic): Using BEQ for the positive and negative emotions of the collectivistic cultures, the t value was 7.30 significant at 0.01 and 0.05.

Cross-cultural study on emotion regulation

Hypothesis 6 (Difference in non-acceptance of emotional responses): Using DERS the mean for individualistic cultures was found to be 21.96, while the collectivistic cultures showed a mean of 20.24. The t value for non-acceptance of emotional responses came to be 3.23 significant at 0.01 and 0.05.

Hypothesis 7 (Difference in goal-directed behavior): Using DERS the mean for individualistic cultures was found to be 18.36, while the collectivistic cultures showed a mean of 24.02. The t value for goal-directed behavior came to be 6.86 significant at 0.01 and 0.05.

Hypothesis 8 (Difference in emotional clarity): Using DERS the mean for individualistic cultures was found to be 18.36, while the collectivistic cultures showed a mean of 24.02. The t value for emotional clarity came to be 6.86 significant at 0.01 and 0.05.

DISCUSSION

The present study examined emotional display rules and their functional meaning in relation to the specific cultural norms. The main features of culture are a homogeneous set of shared values, norms, and beliefs. Cultural differences between Western and Eastern cultures are often explained using the individualism-collectivism framework (Kâgitçibâsi, 1996). Studies have shown that different cultures socialize children to regulate their emotions in a way that fits their cultural script. For example, cross-cultural studies suggest that American mothers think that it is important to highlight their children's success, whereas Chinese mothers think that it is important for parents to discipline children (Miller, Wang, Sandel, & Cho, 2002). Such differences in parental practices may be internalized as children are socialized in each culture, leading them to regulate their own emotions in a way that is congruent with a pertinent cultural script. It is thus possible that cultural differences also exist in how adults regulate their own positive emotions. For example, after experiencing a positive event and feeling positive emotions, Easterners may be less likely than Westerners to engage in hedonistic emotion regulation. The studies have also shown that Westerners are more likely to choose a task that they excel on which leads them to have higher enjoyment as compared to Easterners (Oishi & Diener, 2003; Tsai, 2007).

People in all cultures regulate their behavior, including the display of emotions, depending on whom they are communicating with (Triandis *et al.*, 1988). However, the difference between one's behavior toward in-group and outgroup members is more differentiated in collectivistic than in individualistic cultures.

Hypothesis 1: The difference in emotional regulation of the two cultures can be attributed to the first few years of life when emotion regulation strategies, like cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression, are learned through social influence (Malatesta-Magai, 1991). These strategies are initially learned from the mother where the infant applies strategies like gaze aversion, self-soothing, self-distraction, or contact and proximity seeking from the mother, to reduce negative emotional arousal (Mangelsdorf, Shapiro, & Marzolf, 1995). Such interactions with caregivers form the basis of the child's socio-emotional development which is carried over to later stages of life. Hence, the collectivistic culture's focus on maintaining group harmony may be the reason for them showing higher suppression than individualistic cultures that believe in the outward display of emotions.

Hypothesis 2: The difference in the outward expression of both cultures is the result of the difference in the significance attached to antecedent events. Individualistic cultures value and promote the uniqueness, separateness, and autonomy of each individual (Markus &

Cross-cultural study on emotion regulation

Kitayama, 1991). Therefore, the expression of emotions is seen as an individual right and is encouraged (Anderson et.al, 2003). On the other hand, collectivistic cultures promote the suppression of emotions that are contrary to the collective mood of the group. This kind of approach difference makes both the cultures vary in the expression of their emotions.

Hypothesis 3: Powerful negative emotions like anger, contempt, and disgust are expressed differently in cultures. The individualistic cultures value individual expression and consider the display of anger to be functional as long as it is expressed appropriately in social settings (Eid & Diener, 2001; Stearns & Stearns, 1986). In collectivistic cultures, however, the expression of anger is seen as a threat to authority and harmony of the group and is therefore discouraged (Miyake & Yamazaki, 1995). The results obtained in this study support this hypothesis as there was a considerable difference in the negative expressivity of students from individualistic was higher than that of students from collectivistic cultures.

Hypothesis 4: The study shows a considerable difference between the impulsivity levels of students from individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Individualistic cultures scored significantly higher on this scale than collectivistic cultures. The reason for this may be due to the fact that individualistic cultures are more openly expressive and emphasize on freedom of expression. Therefore, they have lesser motivation to control their impulses and regulate their emotions in public. Furthermore, individualistic cultures see themselves as independent and emphasize authenticity and consistency across multiple social situations (Noon & Lewis, 1992). In contrast, collectivistic cultures emphasize the appropriateness of their behavior in any situation rather than consistency. This difference should lead to a significant difference in the display of emotions.

Hypothesis 5: The collectivistic cultures showed a significant difference in the display of positive and negative emotions. The negative emotions were heavily suppressed, whereas the positive emotions were openly expressed. Matsumoto (1990) suggested that expression or suppression of emotions depended on how they affected the harmony and cohesion of the group. Therefore, the context and target group prove to be very important while displaying emotions. For example, showing negative emotions in an ingroup setting will jeopardize group harmony whereas positive emotions are more likely to strengthen social bonds. Therefore, all negative emotions are suppressed in ingroup settings. Furthermore, it was also found that Japanese subjects were more likely than American subjects, to mask negative emotions with a smile when in the presence of a scientist (Friesen, 1972). This shows how emotion is regulated by members of collectivistic cultures in the presence of an out-group member.

Hypothesis 6: The individualistic cultures are high on non-acceptance of emotional responses due to the fact that individualism emphasizes personal freedom and achievement. Individualist cultures award social status to personal accomplishments such as important discoveries, innovations, great artistic or humanitarian achievements, and all actions that make an individual stand out. Collectivism, in contrast, emphasizes the consolidation of individuals in a larger group. The items for this dimension were along the lines of “when I’m upset, I feel guilty for feeling that way”, “when I’m upset, I feel ashamed with myself for feeling that way”, when I’m upset, I become angry with myself for feeling that way”, etc. Such thoughts make one feel uncomfortable and unmotivated. Since people from individualistic cultures are highly motivated for actualization and believe in innovation, such feelings of shame, guilt, irritation, etc. these feelings are not easily accepted.

Cross-cultural study on emotion regulation

Hypothesis 7: Collectivistic societies are characterized by extended primary groups such as the family, neighborhood, or occupational group in which members have diffuse mutual obligations and expectations based on their status or rank. . In collectivistic cultures, people are not seen as isolated individuals. People see themselves as interdependent with others (e.g., in their in-group), where responsibility is shared and accountability is collective.

Oyserman et al. (2002) point out that the central ingredient of collectivism is the assumption that groups bind and mutually obligate individuals. Triandis further asserts that in collectivistic societies, group goals take precedence over individual goals. Collectivistic cultures stress values that serve the in-group by subordinating personal goals for the sake of preserving the in-group. However, people from individualistic cultures are part of lesser in-groups are more focused on their personal goals rather than group goals. Herefore, it is easier for them to be focused on their goals and engage in corresponding behavior.

Hypothesis 8: The students from collectivistic cultures showed significantly less emotional clarity than those from individualistic cultures. The reason for this may stem from the collectivistic culture's strong emphasis on maintaining group harmony even at the cost of personal freedom of expression. Any deviation from these norms may lead to negative sanctions by the group and also induce a sense of shame or guilt in the individual. To avoid this, the individual may feel obliged to constantly mask their real emotions. Over a long period of time, this constant masking may make it difficult for the individual to effectively identify and distinguish between emotions which eventually leads to confusion and lack of emotional clarity.

CONCLUSION

In the present study, an attempt was made to explain the cross-cultural differences in emotional regulation. For this purpose, a sample consisting of youth, from the age group of 18-24yrs, was chosen from different cross-cultural contexts. This section briefly summarizes the finding.

The conclusion is as follows:

1. There is a significant difference between individualistic and collectivistic cultures on expressive suppression and cognitive reappraisal.
2. There is a significant difference between individualistic and collectivistic cultures on their expression of emotion.
3. There is a significant difference between individualistic and collectivistic cultures in their ways of expressing negative emotions.
4. Individualistic cultures are more impulsive in their acts than collectivistic cultures.
5. Collectivistic cultures suppress negative emotions more and express more positive emotions than individualistic cultures.
6. Individualistic cultures show more difficulties in the acceptance of emotional responses than collectivistic cultures.
7. The collectivistic cultures depicted more difficulties in engaging in goal-directed behavior than individualistic culture.
8. Collectivistic cultures showed a higher degree of lack of emotional clarity than individualistic cultures.

Implications

Expressive suppression is important in controlling emotions that may be seen as inappropriate in public settings. However, excessive suppression of emotions can lead to damaging effects on your mind and body. Emotion suppression, which essentially is

Cross-cultural study on emotion regulation

avoidance of emotion, is a coping strategy that many people employ mistakenly thinking it is healthy or the right thing to do. Expression suppression of negative emotions at a high-level lead to increased risk for cardiovascular disease (Brosschot and Thayer, 1998). The results of this study also showed that people from collectivistic cultures have lower emotional clarity, which could be caused by their suppression of emotions in order to maintain group harmony, and they lose conscious awareness of their feelings. Workshops that help in increasing mental and emotional wellbeing, through meditation or positive psychology practices, can be introduced to such individuals.

Another finding in the study suggests that when an individual involves themselves in cognitive reappraisal activity, they are less likely to behave impulsively to a situation. This is one of the needs in all types of culture to reduce impulsive actions which may lead to crimes. It could be introduced in society through awareness programs or workshops which focus upon rational thinking and patience.

The difficulty of goal-directed behavior in collectivistic cultures could be because of any disharmony in the group that leads to distraction and reduced motivation to achieve their goal. Such individuals must be taught to recognize their individual value, which is separate from the group they belong to. Focused, directed, and holistic training programs can definitely alter emotional responses that are faulty. This study can be implicated in designing the curriculum of such/similar endeavors.

This study can be implicated in issues concerning emotional regulation, cross-cultural understanding of varied patterns of learned emotional regulatory processes.

Limitations

The present study took quite a small sample of a specific age group for study which may not be generalizable to a larger population. Furthermore, the use of random sampling also does not guarantee the homogenous nature of the sample. The use of questionnaires may also have limited the responses of the test-taker. Even though the study uses samples from various countries which may have different subcultural practices, these practices were not accounted for. The study was limited to only certain aspects of what constitutes culture even though other aspects of the cultural framework may have an effect on emotional regulation. Personality factors and individual differences were also not taken into account in this study.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, M. N., & Kanyana, M. (1996). Derriere les “gris-gris”, un univers africain...divin [Behind the charm, an African universe of gods]. *Regards Africains*, 38, 20–22.
- Brosschot, J. F., & Thayer, J. F. (1998). Anger inhibition, cardiovascular recovery, and vagal function: a model of the link between hostility and cardiovascular disease. *Annals of behavioral medicine: a publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*, 20(4), 326–332. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02886382>
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Eid, M., & Diener, E. (2001). Norms for experiencing emotions in different cultures: Inter- and intranational differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(5), 869–885. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.5.869>
- Ekman, P. (1992). Are There Basic Emotions? *Psychological Review*, 99(3), 550–553. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.99.3.550>

Cross-cultural study on emotion regulation

- Friesen, W.V. (1972). *Cultural differences in facial expression in a social situation: An experimental test of the concept of display rules*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of California, San Francisco.
- Gratz, K.L., Roemer, L. Multidimensional Assessment of Emotion Regulation and Dysregulation: Development, Factor Structure, and Initial Validation of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment* 26, 41–54 (2004).
<https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOBA.0000007455.08539.94>
- Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (1995). Facets of emotional expressivity: Three self-report factors and their correlates. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19(4), 555–568.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(95\)00055-B](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(95)00055-B)
- Gross, J.J., & John, O.P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 348-362. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348>
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, Geert (2001). *Culture's Consequences*. SAGE. ISBN 0803973241.
- Kâğıtçıbaşı, C. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kring, A., Smith, D., & Neale, J. (1994). Individual Differences in Dispositional Expressiveness: Development and Validation of the Emotional Expressivity Scale. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 66(5). 934-49.
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.66.5.934>
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Malatesta-Magai, C. (1991). *Development of emotional expression during infancy: General course and patterns of individual difference*. In K. A. Dodge&J. Garber (Eds.), *The development of emotion regulation and dysregulation* (pp. 49-68). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mangelsdorf, S. C., Shapiro, J. R., & Marzolf, D. (1995). Developmental and temperamental differences in emotion regulation in infancy. *Child Development*, 66(6), 1817-1828.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1131912>
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224>
- Matsumoto, D. (1990). Cultural similarities and differences in display rules. *Motivation and Emotion*, 14, 195–214. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00995569>
- Matsumoto, D. (1996). *Culture and Psychology*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Mccarty, J., & Shrum, L.J. (2001). The Influence of Individualism, Collectivism, and Locus of Control on Environmental Beliefs and Behavior. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 20(1), 104 - 93. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.20.1.93.17291>
- Miller, P.J., Wang, S., Sandel, T., & Cho, G. E. (2002). Self-Esteem as Folk Theory: A Comparison of European American and Taiwanese Mothers' Beliefs, *Parenting*, 2(3), 209-239, https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327922PAR0203_02
- Miyake, K., & Yamazaki, K. (1995). *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride*. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 488–504). New York: Guilford Press.

Cross-cultural study on emotion regulation

- Noon, J. M., & Lewis, J. R. (1992). Therapeutic strategies and outcomes: Perspectives from different cultures. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 65(2), 107–117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8341.1992.tb01691.x>
- Oishi, S., & Diener, E. (2003). Culture and well-being: The cycle of action, evaluation and decision. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(8), 939-949. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203252802>
- Oyserman, Daphna & Coon, Heather & Kemmelmeier, Markus. (2002). Rethinking Individualism and Collectivism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and Meta-Analyses. *Psychological bulletin*, 128(1), 3-72.
- Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 1161–1178.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(5), 580-591. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294205014>
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D., and Gelfand, M. J. 1995. Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science*, 29(3), 240-275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/106939719502900302>
- Stearns, P. N., & Stearns, C. Z. (1986). *Anger: The struggle for emotional control in America's history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Thompson, R. A., & Calkins, S.D. (1996). The double-edged sword: Emotional regulation for children at risk. *Development and Psychopathology*, 8(1), 163-182. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400007021>
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(2), 323–338. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.2.323>
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *New directions in social psychology. Individualism & collectivism*. Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (2009). *Fooling Ourselves: Self-deception in Politics, Religion, and Terrorism*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Tsai J. L. (2007). Ideal Affect: Cultural Causes and Behavioral Consequences. *Perspectives on psychological science: a journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, 2(3), 242–259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00043.x>
- Zhang, Y., & Mittal, V. (2007). The attractiveness of enriched and impoverished options: Culture, self-construal, and regulatory focus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(4), 588-598. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167206296954>

Acknowledgement

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Sheerha A. & Kumbhare K.A. (2021). Cross-cultural study on emotion regulation. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(1), 813-822. DIP:18.01.085/20210901, DOI:10.25215/0901.085