6

Understanding Emotional Labor at the Cultural Level

Sharon H. Mastracci and Ian Tyler Adams

The wide range of policies demanding multinational attention and the problems that brought them about include the globalization of financial markets, global climate change, internal and cross-border conflicts displacing tens of millions of people (UNHCR 2018), and international trade, among others. Understanding the effects of culture on human behavior is more crucial than it has ever been. Cultural worldviews are ideological belief systems that individuals use to both shape and explain their own and others' behavior (Matsumoto 2006). Expressions of emotion are an essential part of the daily work in organizations that are comprised of meaning-making jobs, so public sector work is on center stage. In this chapter, we explore the effect of cultural norms on several dimensions to emotional labor: emotive displays toward others, how people manage their emotive state, and how others "read" emotive displays and respond to them.

Organizational behavior research in the private sector reveals that culture affects individuals' appraisals of situations and this leads to differential expression of emotions (Matsumoto et al. 1988; Mauro et al. 1992; Roseman et al. 1995). Cultures differ in norms surrounding emotional

S. H. Mastracci (✉)
Department of Political Science, University of Utah,
Salt Lake City, UT, USA
e-mail: Sharon.mastracci@poli-sci.utah.edu

I. T. Adams
West Jordan, UT, USA
e-mail: ian.adams@utah.edu

M. E. Guy et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Perspectives on Emotional Labor in Public Service*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24823-9_6

expression, and they differ in their display rules (Matsumoto 1990, 1993; Matsumoto et al. 1998, 2005). This chapter begins by discussing definitions of culture and the common elements across definitions. We then discuss Hofstede's IBM studies and Project GLOBE: Two of the most well-known and often-cited organizational behavior studies involving survey respondents in dozens of countries. We then discuss research considerations unique to examining human behavior at the level of culture, including reductionism and ecological fallacy. Additional cross-national comparative research projects focusing on the workplace are also discussed. For instance, Mesquita (2001) introduces emotion explicitly into culturally-comparative research. And Matsumoto et al. (2005) examine display rules and emotion regulation, while surface acting lurks throughout Hofstede's research, particularly when he extends into Confucian cultures with their emphasis on face saving (Hofstede and Bond 1988). Emotions and culture are then examined, including analyses of our data by country and data from other multinational research projects including Project GLOBE, Hofstede et al., and additional data sources such as the World Values Survey, the Chinese Values Survey, and the World Economic Forum. We conclude with a summary of our analyses and a discussion of unanswered questions that arise.

Perhaps ominously, our first question pertains to a fundamental definition: What is culture? Although no consensus definition of culture exists among social scientists, research projects focusing on culture advance working definitions from which to operate. Together, these definitions produce a multifaceted concept of culture. First, culture is social: Some concept of membership is fundamental to any definition of it. Second, culture involves sharing: Some set of attitudes or beliefs is transmitted among the members of a culture. In Project GLOBE, Chhokar, Brodbeck, and House emphasize both the social nature of culture and how it at once includes and excludes: Culture is "a set of parameters of collectivities that differentiate the collectivities from each other in meaningful ways. The focus is on the 'sharedness' of cultural indicators among members of the collectivity" (Chhokar et al. 2007, 3). In his IBM studies, Geert Hofstede consistently draws an analogy between the sharing aspect of culture and computer software, with our physical selves being the hardware: Culture is "the collective programming of the mind" that distinguishes group members from one another (Hofstede 1980, 13). This programming is transmitted via societal institutions including the family, school, and social networks: "National cultures are part of the mental software we acquire during the first ten years of our lives in the family, the living environment, and at school, and they contain most of our basic values" (Minkov and Hofstede 2011, 14). The software consists of beliefs about the world and is transmitted

via language. "The collective level of mental programming is shared with some but not with all other people; it is common to people belonging to a certain group or category, but different among people belonging to other groups or categories" (Hofstede 1980, 15). The content of collective programming includes "shared attitudes, beliefs, categorizations, expectations, norms, roles, self-definitions, values, and other such elements of subjective culture found among individuals whose interactions were facilitated by *shared* language, historical period, and geographic region" (Triandis 1993, 156, emphasis original).

Universal aspects of collective programming are inherited while unique aspects are learned. Culture characterizes a group of people: "Culture is to a human collectivity what personality is to an individual" (Hofstede and Bond 1988, 21). While individuals can be more uptight or relaxed, so too can cultures be tight (Singapore) or loose (Brazil) in terms of enforcing norms through societal sanctions and number of police per capital, for example (Gelfand 2018).

Time and location are additional elements of culture: "*Language*, *time*, and *place* are important in determining the difference between one and another culture, since language is needed to transmit culture and it is desirable to have the same historical period and geography to do so efficiently" (Triandis 2001, 908, emphasis original). In Project GLOBE, House et al. (2004) also underscore the role of time and generation in their definition of culture. They make clear that culture is comprised of shared motives, values, beliefs, identities, and interpretations of significant events, all of which result from common experiences of members of collectives and are transmitted across age generations.

Brewer and Venaik define culture simply as "a 'pattern' or 'configuration' of characteristics that is shared by a group of people" (2014, 1080). Likewise, Matsumoto and Yoo emphasize sharing and underscore the importance of those elements to shape members' behaviors: "A shared system of socially-transmitted behavior that describes, defines, and guides people's ways of life" (2007, 336). Culture promotes group survival: "Culture is to society what memory is to individuals" (Kluckhorn 1954, 921) and "includes what has worked in the experience of a society that was worth transmitting to future generations" (Triandis 2001, 908).

Although there is no consensus definition of "culture," the common elements that appear across most definitions include beliefs, values, norms, attitudes, and meanings that lead to behaviors which are shared among a group of individuals. Examples of what is shared among an identifiable group of people range from the intangible to the observable, including race and ethnicity: "The most parsimonious operationalizations of societal

culture consist of commonly experienced language, ideological belief systems (including religion and political belief systems), ethnic heritage, and history" (House et al. 2004, 15). And emotional expressions are also part of what is observable and tangible about an identifiable group of people: "Emotional expressions carry information about nationality or culture beyond the information conveyed by permanent differences between cultural groups in their members' physiognomy of facial features, apparel, or other static features" (Marsh et al. 2003, 375). Recognizing in-group members of one's culture is crucial to sustaining a sense of community or society and language is crucial to identifying group status as well as to transmitting that group's values and beliefs through music, stories, and rituals.

In sum, a culture is a group of people who are characterized by shared beliefs, attitudes, and norms, who may or may not be identifiable by observable physical characteristics. These group of people live and perhaps work in close enough proximity to one another to facilitate sharing beliefs, attitudes, and norms, and must possess some means by which to share the defining elements of their culture. Shared language is the most common means by which elements of culture are transmitted, but emotions also communicate information. Moreover, these group of people live and/or work together at a particular point in time such that sharing norms, practices, beliefs, and attitudes—among other elements of culture—is feasible. Emotive expression is also among a culture's defining characteristics. Before we discuss emotions and culture, however, we review two of the most well-known multi-country research projects in organizational behavior: Hofstede's IBM studies and Project GLOBE. We then consider challenges unique to research on human behavior as it is affected by culture, such that the concept is more stable than "I'll know it when I see it" yet flexible enough to apply to multiple groups of people.

The IBM Studies and Project GLOBE

Hofstede's IBM studies (Hofstede et al. 2010) and Project GLOBE (House et al. 2004) are perhaps the most well-known, large-scale projects comparing work and organizations across multiple countries. Geert Hofstede examined responses to workplace surveys on values and beliefs administered to IBM employees in its offices around the world. Surveys were administered in 1968 and 1972, resulting in more than 116,000 responses from 40 countries. Around the same time, Hofstede et al. (2010) also gathered information from managers participating in international management development courses in several countries to augment the results from the

IBM employee surveys. Employing factor analyses to reduce the data into a tractable number of main categories, Hofstede produced four dimensions of culture: Individualism (Collectivism), Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity (Femininity), and Power Distance. Hofstede concluded that many national differences in work-related values, beliefs, norms, and self-descriptions, as well as many societal variables, could be explained in terms of their associations with four major dimensions of national culture: Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity, and Power Distance (Minkov and Hofstede 2011, 11). Dimensions of culture denote the boundaries between them. Hofstede (1980) claimed that his four dimensions were consistent with the results of 38 previous multi-country comparative studies conducted to date.

Around the time the IBM data were gathered, researchers from ten Asian and Pacific universities administered the Chinese Values Survey (CVS) to 100 students at each of their institutions. When data from the IBM studies and CVS "were compared, it appeared that all four dimensions identified in the IBM material, in addition to a fifth … were also present in the student data" (Hofstede and Bond 1988, 15). Hofstede and Bond (1988) applied the four-dimension model of culture to Asian countries to capture this fifth cultural dimension and to explore the potential effects of rapid economic growth in that region. They reveal a dimension they initially labeled Confucian Dynamism, which was later generalized to Future Orientation. The original IBM studies failed to capture Future Orientation: "The dimension is composed precisely of those elements that our Western instruments had not registered … it took the Chinese Values Survey—an Eastern instrument—to identify this dimension" (Hofstede and Bond 1988, 19).

An important and influential outcome from this extension of the IBM studies was the emergence of East/West comparisons in cross-cultural comparative research. Uncertainty Avoidance did not emerge in the Chinese Values Survey (CVS) data and it was found to be a distinctly Western construct. Conversely, Future Orientation was not captured at all in Hofstede's original study but only arose in CVS data: "There is a philosophical dividing line in our world that separates Western from Eastern thinking … Western thinking is analytical, while Eastern thinking is synthetic" (Hofstede and Bond 1988, 19–20).

Taras et al. (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of 598 studies that employ Hofstede's (1980) original four cultural dimensions: Individualism/Collectivism, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Masculinity/Femininity. The authors compare the explanatory power of these four dimensions to that of individual characteristics on organizationally-relevant outcomes: "Amounts

of variance explained by cultural values are as much as (and sometimes more than) that explained by individual differences such as the Big Five personality traits and general mental ability with respect to specific outcomes … such as organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational identification, team-related attitudes and perceptions, receptivity to certain leadership styles and feedback seeking" (Taras et al. 2010, 429). They find that Individualism vs. Collectivism is the most studied of Hofstede's five cultural dimensions, and the East/West divide is mirrored by a very similar split between East/synthetic/Collectivist and West/analytic/Individualist.

Later in this chapter, we revisit this philosophical dividing line between East and West and examine whether emotional labor is more stressful to respondents in the Individualistic West than those in the Collectivist East because the latter culture rewards sensing the affect of others and attuning to others in order to promote interpersonal harmony. Initially, Hofstede defined Masculinity and Individualism as single scales where high index values indicated Masculine and Individualist cultures, respectively, and low index values indicated Feminine and Collectivist cultures, respectively. Project GLOBE created separate scales for masculinity and femininity, and Individualism and Collectivism. Furthermore, Project GLOBE specified two types of Collectivism.

The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) project surveyed 17,000 middle managers from 951 organizations operating in 62 societies in three private-sector industries: Telecommunications, financial services, and food processing. The first volume (House et al. 2004) reported results from these surveys. Project GLOBE modified two of the four dimensions originally revealed in the IBM studies, included the fifth cultural dimension added by Hofstede and Bond and then created two new cultural dimensions: Humane Orientation and Performance Orientation. In total, nine cultural dimensions are quantified and used as independent variables: Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance, Institutional Collectivism, In-Group Collectivism, Gender Egalitarianism, Assertiveness, Future Orientation, Performance Orientation, and Humane Orientation.

Project GLOBE divides Hofstede's Collectivism dimension into Institutional and In-Group Collectivism. Institutional Collectivism is "the degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action" (House et al. 2004, 12). In-Group Collectivism is "the degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations or families" (House et al. 2004, 12). Project GLOBE divides Hofstede's Masculinity/Femininity dimension into Gender Egalitarianism and Assertiveness.

Gender Egalitarianism is "the degree to which an organization or society minimizes gender role differences while promoting gender equality" (House et al. 2004, 12). Assertiveness is "the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies are assertive, confrontational, and aggressive in social relationships" (House et al. 2004, 12).

GLOBE's two new dimensions, Performance Orientation and Humane Orientation, capture the extent to which organizations and societies "reward performance improvement and excellence" and "encourage and reward individuals for being fair, altruistic, friendly, generous, caring, and kind to others," respectively (House et al. 2004, 13). Project GLOBE sought primarily to employ these nine dimensions as independent variables to explain variations in different types of leadership styles in organizations. Other dependent variables included measures of national income and well-being.

The second volume (Chhokar et al. 2007) profiled 25 individual countries and included results from follow-up "focus groups, in-depth ethnographic interviews, media analysis, participant observation, and unobtrusive measurement" (2007, 24). Concerning theories of organizational leadership, Project GLOBE sought to integrate motivation theories with theories on what cultures value—mainly Hofstede (1980)—and theories on organizational performance. Their central contribution to the literature on organizational leadership is to advance their Culturally Endorsed Implicit Theory of Leadership (CLT), which states that the behaviors encouraged and rewarded by a culture predict "organizational practices and leader attributes and behaviors that are most frequently enacted and most effective in that culture" (House et al. 2004, 17). Among the fifteen propositions emanating from their theory of leadership—not detailed here—arguably the most influential was their observation that leadership theories developed and tested in one culture may not effectively predict leadership behavior in a different culture, thereby expanding Markus and Kitayama's (1991) work to an explicit focus on leadership. Project GLOBE sought a "country-specific understanding of culture and leadership" (Chhokar et al. 2007, 2).

Another important contribution of Project GLOBE was the separate articulation of values and practices. Values relate to preferences about what ought to be, and practices capture behaviors. Survey responses were elicited on both "what is" and "what should be" to capture organizational practices day-to-day separately from what ought to be and what is aspired. This way, the extent to which practices diverge from—or align with—values can be captured, as well. Individual responses are aggregated to the level of culture. For most cultures, cultural boundaries are the same as national political boundaries, but given the central role of language to transmitting "What

We Do" and "What *We* Value," a few countries are divided into multiple cultures: English- and French-speaking parts of Canada are examined separately, as are three regions in Switzerland. Language was not the only difference to lead to separating countries into cultures: In Germany and South Africa, historical definitions of the "We" prompted researchers to subdivide those countries into multiple cultures. Unique historical aspects of East and West Germany led those regions to be analyzed separately, and indigenous and white samples from South Africa were likewise examined separately.

Project GLOBE produced a wide range of results related to leadership, culture, and values. For leadership, Project GLOBE identified nearly two dozen attributes, such as Decisiveness and Foresightedness, as universally desirable: "Ninety-five percent of the societal average scores for these attributes were larger than 5 on a 7-point Likert scale" (House et al. 2004, 39). Eight leadership attributes were found to be universally undesirable, including Irritability and Ruthlessness. Many attributes were found to be culturally contingent: "They are desirable in some cultures and undesirable in others" (House et al. 2004, 40). Ambitious leaders are not valued in all countries, nor are democratic workplaces. In certain cultures, leaders are expected to maintain steep hierarchies and divisions among ranks in organizations. In some cultures, reluctant leaders are valued, and open ambition is not rewarded.

Project GLOBE finds evidence to support the Culturally Endorsed Implicit Theory of Leadership, which emerges as six separate leadership styles: Charismatic/Value-Based, Team Oriented, Participative, Autonomous, Humane-Oriented, and Self-Protective. Charismatic/Values-Based leadership is highly endorsed among English-speaking, Individualist countries and least endorsed in the Middle East. Team-Oriented leadership is favored across the board and receives the highest ratings in Latin American countries. Participative leadership is favored in Germanic Europe, but not in the Middle East. Humane-Oriented leadership is highly endorsed among respondents in Southern Asia but is considered paternalistic and undesirable in Nordic Europe. Autonomous leadership is valued in Eastern Europe but not in Latin America. Self-Protective leadership is generally not endorsed and is considered an impediment to outstanding leadership.

With respect to culture, Project GLOBE answers one of its central questions regarding the influence of national culture on the workplace: "Organizations mirror the societies from which they originate" (Javidan et al. 2004, 726). In fact, national culture appears to influence organizations, while industry does not. In other words, responses of middle managers in food processing, financial services, and telecommunications firms in

a particular country resembled one another more than they resembled their industry counterparts in other countries. Project GLOBE also refined two of Hofstede's four dimensions of culture—Masculinity and Collectivism—and confirmed the presence of the other three, while adding two new dimensions: Humane Orientation and Performance Orientation. House et al. conclude, however, that "cultures are not a set of independent, self-standing dimensions, but instead are formed as a confluence of cultural attributes" (2004, 729). Future research should examine which dimensions interact, and how they do so, when multiple cultures come into contact. Their results with respect to culture complicate the simpler question pursued by previous researchers on whether cultures tend toward convergence over time or not.

Finally, with respect to values, Project GLOBE produced the counterintuitive result that practices do not follow from values: "there is a negative correlation between cultural values and practices in seven out of nine cultural dimensions" (House et al. 2004, 729). This finding contradicts much of the literature on practices and values which suggests, "implicitly or explicitly that cultural practices are driven by cultural values and that there is a linear and positive relationship between them" (House et al. 2004, 729). In an attempt to explain their results, House et al. conjecture that the relationship between practices and values may be nonlinear and more complicated than previously suggested, that there may be mediating conditions between the two, or that observed practices actually inspire respondents to articulate values counter to them: "People may hold views on what *should be* based on what they observe in action" (House et al. 2004, 730, emphasis original). In other words, dismay at observed ambition and greed among business leaders and politicians might have inspired respondents to endorse shared prosperity and a more collectivist mind-set as guiding values for their society. Conversely, dismay at perceived passivity in one's culture and associating ambition with economic growth and innovation may have inspired respondents to endorse Individualism and assertiveness as guiding values for society.

In the years since Hofstede's IBM studies and Project GLOBE, there have been a few multiple-country projects examining cultural dimensions and work, including research teams led by David Matsumoto at San Francisco State University and Harry Triandis at the University of Illinois. Triandis (1989) examined aspects of Individualism/Collectivism and Matsumoto et al. (1988) focused on workplace emotions and display rules. Triandis was perhaps the earliest advocate for treating Individualism and Collectivism separately. Matsumoto was the first to recognize the salience of emotion to cultural characteristics. The vast literature borne of the Triandis and

Matsumoto research teams as well as the IBM studies and Project GLOBE has influenced our research immensely as they each articulate central challenges that arise when culture is the unit of analysis.

Culture as the Unit of Analysis

Countries or cultures as units of analysis are referred to as *ecological-level studies* (Matsumoto and Yoo 2007, 337, emphasis original) and Hofstede (1980, 31) counsels: "Cultures are not king-size individuals: They are wholes and their internal logic cannot be understood in the terms used for the personality dynamics of individuals" (Brewer and Venaik 2014, 1069). Hofstede's dimensions of national culture were comprised of aggregated individual responses, but "are meaningless as descriptors of individuals … because the variables that define them do not correlate meaningfully across individuals" (Minkov and Hofstede 2011, 12). The two levels of analysis are easily confused because, while individual responses are aggregated to generate cultural dimensions in both the Hofstede and Project GLOBE studies, the resulting dimensions pertain to the *culture*, not to the individual. For instance, while a culture is characterized as collectivist or individualist, similar traits in individuals are labeled allocentric and idiocentric, respectively. However, not everyone in a collectivist culture is allocentric, and not everyone in an individualist culture is idiocentric. Aggregating across the country or society reveals the effect of context on individual responses and produces the culture-level indicator, but it is the country or society characteristic that emerges, not an individual trait.

Causing further confusion are the instances in which societies can behave like individuals. Equating dimensions of culture to personality characteristics of individuals is one example. Another is the presence of response bias by culture, which is not unlike the phenomenon of individual response bias. Cultural response bias is "the tendency to avoid extreme ends of a scale in Asian countries or a tendency to avoid the midpoint of a scale in European cultures" (Schlösser et al. 2013, 540). Such response bias is also found among members of subcultures: African-American and Hispanic American survey respondents also tend to avoid extreme points of a scale "in congruence with a cultural hesitation to 'stick out' that results in the use of the middle of a scale" (Matsumoto and Yoo 2007, 341).

Use of multiple indicators to generate single index variable s via factor analysis helps to mitigate bias by spreading any systematic error over multiple variables, but these index variables remain relevant only to the higher

level of analysis: "A factor analysis starts from a correlation matrix; therefore, ecological (country-level) factors are different from individual factors" (Hofstede 1980, 48). Creating these index variables, or constructs, allows us to capture the effects of complex social phenomena. Constructs are "not directly accessible to observation but inferable from verbal statements and other behaviors and useful in predicting still other observable and measurable verbal and nonverbal behavior" (Levitin 1973, 492). Importantly, it is up to the researcher—relying on previous research and guided by observation—to select individual variables to collapse into more complex constructs.

The dimensions of culture identified by Hofstede in his IBM studies and House et al. in Project GLOBE were products of choices made by the respective research teams. "A construct is a complex mental idea that reflects objectively existing phenomena … constructs are not the reality itself, but are imaginary models that scholars build in order to organize their impressions of the observed reality in a way that makes sense to them, and hopefully, to others" (Minkov and Hofstede 2011, 17). Importantly, Project GLOBE modified some of Hofstede's four cultural dimensions: "*Construct* refers to the construction of conceptions or ideas by the investigator. A construct is a product of the investigator's creativity" (House and Javidan 2004, 20). The resulting nine dimensions of culture specified in Project GLOBE "are what multilevel researchers call *convergent-emergent constructs"* (Hanges and Dickson 2004, 124, emphases original):

> These constructs are *convergent* because the responses from people within organizations or societies are believed to center about a single value usually represented by scale means. They are called *emergent* because even though the origin of these constructs is a function of the cognition, affect, and personality of the respondents, the properties of these constructs are actually manifested at the aggregate or group (organization or society) level of analysis.

Because underlying elements of constructs converge around mean values, "relationships among aggregate data tend to be higher than corresponding relationships among individual data elements" (Kozlowski and Klein 2000, 8). "Elements that are used frequently become habitual. These result in customs and institutions that reflect the habits" (Triandis 1993, 163). Changes in customs and institutions and their overall constructs—dimensions of culture—over time appear to be very slow (Dorfman and House 2004). Brewer and Venaik "show that although the Hofstede and GLOBE dimensions were developed conceptually and empirically only at the national level, they are often incorrectly applied and interpreted at the individual and organizational levels … ecological fallacy

is the error of assuming that statistical relationships at a group level also hold for individuals in the group" (2014, 1064).

Conversely, Hofstede (1980, 30) warns against committing a *reverse* ecological fallacy, which "consists in comparing cultures on indices created for the individual level" (Hofstede 1980, 30). Finally, scholarly opinion concerning scale invariance in cross-cultural research remains divided. Hofstede warns: "It is a doubtful practice to use instruments developed in one country (in this case, the United States) in another cultural environment, assuming they carry the same meaning there" (1980, 22). Yet in a summary of his research, Hofstede's collaborators disagree and conclude: "Concerns that developing a particular instrument in one cultural environment would make it unsuitable in another environment are sometimes exaggerated" (Minkov and Hofstede 2011, 16). In the next section, we see that it likewise remains an open question among scholars of emotional labor, whether models generated in a Western individualist culture can be employed in Eastern collectivist contexts.

In the study of organizational behavior, scholars explain how culture affects organizations through either a structural approach or a values approach. From the values approach, dimensions of culture shape organizational cultures by endorsing and fostering particular leadership traits and these culturally-endorsed traits prove successful and are repeated in that society: "Collective meaning that results from the dominant cultural values, beliefs, assumptions, and implicit motives endorsed by societal culture results in common leadership and implicit organization theories held by members of the culture" (House et al. 2004, 18). Butler, Lee, and Gross further emphasize the endogeneity of values: "Cultural practices embody cultural values, but those values are simultaneously reinforced by daily practices" (2007, 31). A structural explanation examines a society's laws and institutions: "The level and degree of governmental regulation, development of the industry within a society and national economic system are just a few of the many factors that affect the ways in which a given industry is enacted in a given society" (Dorfman 2004, 50).

From either the values or the structural approach, a society's culture is reproduced in its organizations through the daily behaviors and decisions of organization members (Dickson et al. 2004, 77):

> Eventually, people will no longer be consciously aware of the fact that there are other ways of perceiving the world or of responding to situations; the culturally-congruent schema have become chronic … in this way, a direct societal effect is created, in that the shared expectations of the society lead directly to patterns of behavior practices and values that characterize organizations in that society.

The influence of culture on organizations—as captured by Hofstede's five dimensions or GLOBE's nine—has been of enduring interest to cross-cultural scholars, although Individualism/Collectivism is the single most studied dimension. Evidence of culture in organizational practices is found in mission statements and objectives: "The most parsimonious operationalizations of organizational culture consist of commonly used nomenclature within an organization, shared organizational values, and organizational history" (House and Javidan 2004, 16). Common questions include how culture affects decision-making: "National culture constrains rationality in organizational behavior and management philosophies in practices, and in society at large" (Minkov and Hofstede 2011, 13).

Although the effects of culture on organizational performance are of interest to scholars as well, Project GLOBE finds cultural dimensions do a better job explaining variance in leadership styles across countries than explaining performance. Furthermore, they find organizations in a particular country to be more similar to one another than organizations in the same industry across countries. In other words, organizations resemble their compatriots more than they resemble their competitors in other countries.

In addition to the cultural dimensions of Hofstede or GLOBE, cultural tightness/looseness also determines the explanatory power of cultural dimensions (Gelfand et al. 2006). This dimension is related to the Hofstede and GLOBE dimensions and adds the extent to which members of a society are sanctioned for violating cultural norms. By adding theory related to the enforcement of cultural norms, Gelfand et al. (2006) expand the frameworks created by Hofstede and GLOBE and develop those theories further. Likewise, we expand both comparative organizational behavior theory and emotional labor theory by applying the latter to the former: "The best proof of the reliability of the dimension scores is their validity in explaining related but outside phenomena according to some kind of theory or logic" (Hofstede 1980, 14). The nature of culture as a unit of analysis guides the selection of analytical approach, as well. Taras, Kirkman, and Steel recommend structural equation modeling to examine how dimensions of culture modify antecedents and consequences of organizational phenomena because "culture is an inherently multilevel construct" (Taraset al. 2010, 434). Accordingly, much of the research on the effects of culture on the antecedents and consequences of emotional labor has employed multilevel models (Lee 2018; Mastracci and Adams 2018).

The data featured in this Handbook were gathered following a strategy of matched samples. The subculture in each country from which we match samples is the public-sector workforce, and we obtain sufficient numbers

of observations in each country to facilitate comparison: "Cross-national research can only be done on *matched samples*, similar in all respects except nationality. These samples should, moreover, be of sufficient size—at least 20 and preferably 50 per country" (Hofstede 1980, 14, emphasis original). Matching across countries on this subculture allows us to compare organizational behavioral variables cross-culturally: "When we compare cultural aspects of modern nations, we should try to match for subculture … make the samples very narrow, so that we draw from similar subcultures but in different countries" (Hofstede 1980, 38). By sampling narrowly and focusing on individuals who currently or have had paid working experience in government, our samples are "equivalent enough" and our comparisons are valid and meaningful across countries: "Equivalence in cross-cultural research can be defined as a state or condition of similarity in conceptual meaning and empirical method between cultures that allows comparisons to be meaningful … for cross-cultural comparisons to be valid and meaningful, they have to be 'equivalent *enough*'" (Matsumoto and Yoo 2007, 339, emphasis supplied). In the next section, we examine our data for which culture is the unit of analysis. We begin with a discussion of the literature linking emotion and culture.

Emotion and Culture

The interaction between emotion and culture is addressed in a small body of literature that covers a range of topics from display rules (Matsumoto 2006) recognizing others' emotions (Elfenbein and Ambady 2002), appraisal of one's own emotions (Roseman et al. 1995; Russell 1991) and emotional expression (Van de Vliert 2007). Emotion is implied throughout Hofstede's IBM studies and Project GLOBE. In their meta-analysis of nearly 600 studies employing Hofstede's dimensions of culture, Taras et al. note that "the relationship between cultural values and emotions was stronger than that with the other outcomes on three of four dimensions" (2010, 429). Other outcomes include absenteeism, feedback seeking, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, organizational identification, receptivity to certain leadership styles, team-related attitudes and perceptions, and turnover. Links between cultural values and emotions were stronger than links between dimensions of culture and all of these other behaviors of individuals within organizations. Emotion, therefore, emerges as an essential factor in cross-cultural comparison research on organizations because its relationship with Individualism/Collectivism, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Masculinity/Femininity is stronger than the relationships of

Hofstede's cultural dimensions and nearly a dozen other behaviors of individuals in organizations. Matsumoto and Yoo locate the roots of social scientists' studies of emotions and culture in the natural sciences (2007, 332, emphasis original):

> Most modern-day studies of emotion and culture are rooted in the work of Darwin, who in *The Expression of Emotion in Man and Animals* (1872) suggested that emotions and their expressions had evolved across species and were evolutionarily adaptive, biologically innate, and universal across human and nonhuman primates … We also know, however, that people modify their expressions on the basis of *cultural display rules* … Today, the existence of both universality and cultural display rules is well accepted in mainstream psychology.

In the late nineteenth century, Charles Darwin put forth the idea that emotions and emotional expressions, like physical traits, allowed human and nonhuman primates to adapt and evolve. Matsumoto and Yoo (2007) leave room for societies to create and shape norms surrounding emotional displays, as well. In these ways, emotion and emotional expressions are part nature and part nurture. The "nature" effect on emotive expression is both internal and external, meaning that the effect is due to both biology and climate: "Self-expression is higher in wealthy countries with harsh climates (cold or hot) than in countries with temperate climates, whereas self-expression is lower in poor countries with harsh climates than in poor countries in temperate climates" (Triandis and Gelfand 2012, 504; see also Van de Vliert 2007). Emotions arise from biological conditions as deviations from homeostasis (Damasio 1994), signaling that something is wrong or something is right (i.e., Hobbes' pleasures and pains). Maintaining homeostasis through emotional fine-tuning makes emotions evolutionarily adaptive.

The "nurture" effect on emotional expression is the subject of research on recognizing one's own and others' emotions and on organizational and cultural display rules. Cultural display rules indicate how one is supposed to behave in various contexts. Emotion work is the day-to-day effort to feel, or at least appear to feel, appropriate to one's context: Happy at weddings, sad at funerals, concerned about a friend in trouble, and supportive of a loved one's decision. Sometimes that requires no effort, other times it does, but in all cases, emotion *work* is done for the benefit of personal relationships. Emotional *labor*, in contrast, is the effort to feel or appear to feel context-appropriate on the job in accordance with occupational display rules. It is

done for the benefit of the employer to conform to professional expectations and to keep the customer happy.

Organizational and occupational display rules invoke emotional labor. When it comes to emotional labor and culture, however, "much of what we know about emotional labor comes from one specific cultural context" (Mesquita and Delvaux 2013, 251). Display rules are foundational to emotional labor, for it is a norm about appropriate behavior that invokes the demand for emotional labor. Individuals in organizations can modify their emotive behaviors to comport with display rules through deep acting or surface acting. In other words, they can authentically express the emotion they are feeling, or they can pretend by expressing an emotion that they do not actually feel.

Research has established a "robust sequence from surface acting to burnout" (Allen et al. 2014, 21) but that well-worn path was developed using North American—mostly US—research participants. We have reason to expect differences in emotional labor by culture based on differences between cultures in the ways that people perceive themselves in relation to others. The few cross-cultural studies of emotion regulation that exist have demonstrated that it is more stressful for people in Individualist compared to Collectivist cultures (Butler et al. 2007, 2009). People in Collectivist cultures regulate their emotions continually to attune themselves to others around them. Regulating emotion to conform to occupational display rules—engaging in emotional labor—is just an extension of day-to-day behavior. Eid and Diener observe "in China, there is a general attitude to consider emotions as dangerous, irrelevant, or illness causing. The moderation or suppression of emotions is generally highly valued in China" (2009, 883).

Broadening the argument to encompass Collectivist and Individualist countries generally, Butler et al. (2007, 44) conclude, "Asian cultures encourage norm conformity and are willing to sacrifice individual consistency in order to encourage social cohesion" because restraint of the inner self is valued far more than is expression of the inner self (Markus and Kitayama 1991). Individualist cultures, on the other hand, prioritize the expression of the inner self: "For those with independent selves, emotional expressions may literally 'express' or reveal the inner feelings, such as anger, sadness, and fear. For those with interdependent selves, however, an emotive expression may be more often regarded as a *public instrumental action* that may or may not be related directly to the inner feelings" (Markus and Kitayama 1991, 236).

In Collectivist cultures, emotion regulation is a tool to achieve and maintain harmony. "Collectivists value harmony within the in-group, whereas

Individualists accept confrontation within the in-group" (Triandis 1993, 177). Because people in Collectivist cultures are accustomed to emotional restraint in their interpersonal interactions in order to sustain harmony, work-based emotional labor "may be more automatic and require fewer cognitive resources to execute" (Butler et al. 2007, 31).

Emotion regulation in Individualist cultures is expected to exact a higher psychological cost. Individualist cultures trace their emphasis on individual liberty to the Enlightenment's triumph of man over institutions, such as the behemoth of the Catholic church in that era, and the ascendance of individual reason over institutional norms. Rousseau (1750, 6), criticizing the modern age in his romanticism of the noble savage, hails authentic self-expression as "genius" and adherence to manners and norms of behavior as nothing less than *immoral*:

> Today … a base and deceptive uniformity prevails in our morals, and all minds seem to have been cast in the same mold. Incessantly politeness requires, propriety demands, incessantly usage is followed, never one's own genius. One no longer dares to appear as he is, and in this perpetual constraint, the men who form this herd called society, placed in the same circumstances, will all do the same things unless stronger motives deter them. Therefore, one will never know well those with whom he deals … suspicions, offenses, fears, coldness, reserve, hate, betrayal will hide constantly under that uniform false veil of politeness.

Politeness, manners, social norms—all inhibit authentic expression and prevent genuine connection between people. The USA came to being amidst the Enlightenment zeitgeist and the impact of that founding context is apparent today. In Western cultures, "high levels of expressiveness are seen as signs of competence and likeability and suppressing emotional behavior is associated with increased psychological responding and reduced affiliation" (Butler, Lee and Gross 2009, 511). In other words, people in Collectivist cultures with interdependent self-construals employ emotion management on a day-to-day basis as a tool to achieve and sustain group harmony, while people in Individualist cultures with independent self-construals value authentic self-expression. Van de Vliert (2007, 157) also demonstrates a link between socioeconomic status of a culture and norms surrounding self-expression: "In poorer countries with more demanding thermal climates, lower household incomes are related to stronger endorsement of survival values at the expense of self-expression values." Day-to-day norms governing individual self-expression extend into the workplace. Work display rules are more restrictive than day-to-day interpersonal display rules.

Few of us are free from presentational expectations at work: Like dress codes and uniforms, workplace display rules standardize individuals within occupations, foster an organizational identity, and shape expectations of the customer. Emotional labor is part of the exchange of work effort for pay between employee and employer. In public service jobs, which are quintessential meaning-making jobs (Guy et al. 2008), to fail to engage in emotional labor is to fail to do the job. A police officer cannot betray anxiety or fear to suspects or victims. A social worker cannot express disgust in front of her clients. An emergency responder cannot panic or recoil from a patient's gruesome injuries as she arrives on the scene of an accident. Public service occupations are quintessential meaning-making jobs because a substantial part of the product is what the citizen feels. The symbolism embedded in public service work begins with the American flag flying in front of government buildings and extends to the insignia on uniforms worn by police officers and firefighters (Mastracci et al. 2012).

Whether in the private or public sector, emotional laborers can pursue one of two approaches: They can convince themselves that the display rules are objectively right and true (deep acting) or they can fake it (surface acting). Emotional labor research on private-sector workers shows that surface acting is more stressful and produces more negative outcomes in the form of burnout and emotional exhaustion compared to deep acting (Hulsheger and Schewe 2011). Emotional labor research on public-sector workers has revealed much about public service work. First, emotional labor is fundamental to quality public service and is undertaken during face-to-face and voice-to-voice interactions. Second, both new and long-tenured employees engage in emotional labor; neither exerts more nor less. Years on the job improves one's capacity for emotional labor, not unlike how consistent exercise improves one's capacity for physical labor. Emotional labor is not specific to an agency or department; it is located in the job and not the jobholder, and the frequency and intensity of emotional labor varies by job. Third, emotions in the workplace are *not* antithetical to professionalism or to reasoning. On-the-job emotion regulation takes skill, significant effort, is key to getting the job done, and is the very expression of professionalism. Another inheritance from the American origin in Enlightenment thinking is the divorce of emotion from reason. Results from research in neurobiology demonstrate the integral role of emotion in the reasoning process (Damasio 1994). Finally, research on emotional labor in the public sector mainly uses US samples much like its private-sector counterpart, but that is changing.

Recent research on emotional labor in public service has emerged from outside the USA: Lu and Guy (2014) survey Chinese public servants and

determine that ethical leadership moderates the effects of surface acting on job engagement. Mastracci (2017) confirms the moderating effect of ethical leadership on surface acting and burnout among new nurses in England's National Health Service. Interestingly, gender appears to matter in contexts outside the USA but not within the USA: Yang and Guy (2015) survey municipal government employees in Seoul and confirm the relationship between authentic emotive expression and job satisfaction. Faking emotion decreases job satisfaction and increases turnover intention for women but not for men. Evidence in a forthcoming publication by Yun et al. (forthcoming) similarly finds an effect of supervisor gender on the emotional labor-burnout link for subordinates, using data from Korea. Also studying Korean public servants, Wilding et al. (2014) find varying effects of the frequency and variety of emotive expressions on job satisfaction and burnout. Hsieh et al. (2016) reveal complex and counterintuitive relationships between emotional labor efficacy and job satisfaction among government workers in Taiwan. The relative absence of cross-cultural comparisons means that the effects of emotional labor—that it can lead to stress and burnout if unsupported but can also contribute to job satisfaction and fulfillment—may be generalized across national and cultural boundaries without empirical support. Differences between cultures on Hofstede's (1980) Individualism index are particularly relevant to emotional labor research (Ashkanasy and Daus 2013; Taras et al. 2010; Triandis 2001).

Matsumoto notes: "Individualism-Collectivism has been identified by several writers as a stable dimension of cultural variability" (1990, 197). The mechanism by which cultural differences manifest in individual responses to display rules is the cultural difference in self-construals (Eid and Diener 2009, 172, emphases added):

> In cultures where an *independent* self is predominant, people are expected to become independent from others and pursue and assert individual goals … people with an independent self are found in individualistic (e.g., Western) cultures more often than in collectivist ones (e.g., Eastern cultures). The *interdependent* (relational) self, on the other hand, is characterized by the belief that the self cannot be separated from others or from the social context … in collectivist cultures, in which this construal of the self is predominant, the social norm is to maintain harmony with others.

With respect to self-construals, "The independent view is most clearly exemplified in some sizeable segment of American culture, as well as in many Western European cultures. The interdependent view is exemplified in

Japanese culture as well as in other Asian cultures, Latin American cultures, and many southern European cultures" (Markus and Kitayama 1991, 225). Recall that a society is individualistic while an individual with an independent self-construal is idiocentric. Triandis (2001, 914) observes: "Idiocentrics think of the self as stable and the environment as changeable whereas allocentrics think of the social environment as stable (duties, obligations) and the self as changeable (ready to fit into the environment)." We suspect that this explains why surface acting—faking it—is more stressful and more strongly linked to burnout in individualist cultures than in collectivist cultures: Feelings are part of one's identity in individualist cultures so to ignore or suppress them is to betray one's identity. "Lying is an acceptable behavior in collectivist cultures, if it saves face or helps the in group" (Triandis 2001, 917). Lying—to oneself or another—is not acceptable in Individualist cultures. Faking expression—surface acting—is more stressful in Individualist cultures than it is in Collectivist cultures and face saving is not a priority in individualist cultures as it is in Collectivist cultures.

Differences in emotional labor experiences should manifest in Individualist and Collectivist cultures. Interestingly, Matsumoto (1990) finds no differences between US and Japanese subjects when they were alone, but results confirm an anticipated East/West split when research participants are in the presence of others. This "suggests the importance of display rules as *social* phenomena" (Matsumoto 1990, 210, emphasis supplied) and therefore influenced by broader culture. Allen et al. (2014) confirm the link between display rules, emotional labor, and burnout for US service workers but not those in China. Hofstede and Bond (1988, 19–20) observe "a philosophical dividing line in our world that separates Western from Eastern thinking … Western thinking is analytical, while Eastern thinking is synthetic."

To date, comparisons across cultures—including East versus West—have examined private-sector workers. We focus on public servants in several countries due to the unique circumstances in which citizens encounter public servants and the emotional labor involved in, for instance, children's services, emergency response, and criminal justice (Guy et al. 2008; Mastracci et al. 2012). The public-sector context holds further interest because while cross-cultural comparisons of the effects of emotional labor on private sector service workers have been conducted, no such comparison in public services has been done to date.

Studying the private sector, Allen et al. find that emotive pretending leads to burnout in the USA but not in China, and that some links between surface acting and outcomes are significantly weaker in the Chinese sample

and others' relationships with the opposite direction (2014, 21–22). This important result suggests emotional labor is easier for workers in collectivist cultures compared to those in individualist cultures. Mastracci and Adams (2018) use samples of public-sector workers from five countries and find weaker relationships between surface acting and burnout in Collectivist countries compared to Individualist countries and locate inverse relationships between deep acting and burnout in Collectivist countries. The models fit well in both contexts, further suggesting that the predictions from emotional labor theory may be applied across cultures, contrary to researcher concerns arising from the parochial contexts within which emotional labor models have been developed.

In this handbook, we are able to draw conclusions about emotional labor in public service in a number of countries because we define our target population narrowly and we have a sufficient number of observations from a sufficient number of countries, according to prior research. First, our sample is defined narrowly: Individuals with current or past experience working full time for a government office or public-serving nonprofit organization. This approach is consistent with Matsumoto and Yoo, who recommend that "a sound cross-cultural comparison would entail the collection of data from multiple sites within the same cultural group" (2007, 339). While we can claim our results describe public service in each of our respective countries, we do not claim to have drawn representative samples from each country, as "it is impossible to obtain representative samples within each nation of such multicultural nations such as China, India, or the United States" (House and Hanges 2004, 97).

Second, we obtain at least 45 responses from each country because Project GLOBE researchers found that "the *average* number of respondents needed for a cross-cultural construct of a target reliability of 0.85 is 45" (Javidan et al. 2004, 725, emphasis original). We obtain approximately 200 cases per country for the purpose of analyzing the data using structural equation models (Iacobucci 2010). Third, from our subculture, which is comprised of government workers, we sample across a dozen countries. And the number of countries from which we obtained data is within the range of that recommended by Hofstede to accurately capture and describe dimensions of culture: "Ecological dimensions can more clearly be detected when we have data from more—for example, 10 or 15—societies" (Hofstede 1980, 31). Furthermore, our team is comprised of researchers who were brought up, lived, and worked in their subject countries, many of whom have also lived in more than one cultural environment. This is consistent with recommended practice as well (Hofstede 1980).

Finally, our approach to this project follows Hofstede's recommendations with respect to analyzing data from multiple cultures in that it uses "matrices of ecological correlations for a factor analysis or similar multivariate technique subsuming the original variables into dimensions which can enter laws of the greatest generality, but which are at the same time least sensitive to the uniqueness of each culture" (1980, 42). Using multi-group confirmatory factor analysis (MGCFA), we follow the approach employed in Project GLOBE to create six ecological dimensions: Power Distance, Societal Collectivism, In-Group Collectivism, Masculinity/Femininity, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Future Orientation. Recall that these six dimensions of culture are modifications and extensions of Hofstede's (1980) original four dimensions of culture.

Ten of the twelve countries surveyed in this study were also included in the Project GLOBE study and Appendix B provides a graphical display of our data against Project GLOBE data. The charts demonstrate that the two samples array themselves similarly across ecological indicators. To test whether, in fact, the samples are comparable, we conduct tests of significance. Table 6.1 provides detail of these data as well as results from difference-of-means t-tests. None of the t-statistics in any country are significantly different from zero at the 95% level—two are significant at the 90% level—indicating that the GLOBE data and our data are drawn from the same overall populations and can therefore be reliably compared.

Table 6.1 shows that the ecological dimensions for each country generally conform to expectations based on prior research. India and the Philippines rank highest on Power Distance in the current study while Taiwan, UK, and the USA rank lowest. The China and India indexes on both types of Collectivism are the highest of all countries, while Taiwan, UK, and USA are lowest on Societal Collectivism and Taiwan and Bolivia rank lowest on In-Group Collectivism. Korea ranks highest on Masculinity while the USA ranks lowest. China takes the top spot in Uncertainty Avoidance and in Future Orientation, while index scores for the USA are the lowest in both. In sum, results from t-tests that compare our surveys of public service workers compared to results reported by Project GLOBE reveal negligible differences. Only two comparisons, UK data and Australia data, reach a significance of $p \leq 0.10$. This information allows us to analyze data on emotional labor in public service using culture as the unit of analysis.

Table 6.1 Ecological dimensions by country: Current data versus Project GLOBE

	Australia	GLOBE Australia	China	GLOBE China	Bolivia	GLOBE Bolivia	India	GLOBE India	Korea	GLOBE Korea	Philippines	GLOBE Philippines
Power Distance	3.90	4.74	4.04	5.04	4.04	4.51	4.94	5.47	3.71	5.61	4.73	5.44
Societal Collectivism	4.54	4.29	5.46	4.77	4.11	4.04	5.09	4.38	4.42	5.20	4.72	4.65
In-Group Collectivism	4.86	4.17	5.90	5.80	4.42	5.47	5.61	5.92	4.43	5.54	4.93	6.36
Masculinity/ Femininity	4.21	3.40	4.25	3.05	3.81	3.55	3.93	2.90	4.73	2.50	4.17	3.64
Uncertainty Avoidance	4.55	4.39	5.05	4.94	4.21	3.35	4.85	4.15	4.52	3.55	4.69	3.89
Future orientation	5.00	4.09	5.68	3.75	4.58	3.61	5.53	4.19	4.70	3.97	5.53	4.15
t Statistic (*p* value)	1.35 (0.10)*		0.99 (0.17)		0.36 (0.36)		0.98 (0.18)		0.04 (0.48)		0.23 (0.41)	

Summary and Open Questions

Research using culture or country as the unit of analysis is much less common than individual-level analyses and poses unique challenges to researchers, including the ecological fallacy and reverse ecological fallacy problems. Individualism and Collectivism are the most studied of the dimensions of culture established by Hofstede and later reinforced in Project GLOBE. Organizational behavior research using culture or country as the unit of analysis has produced very promising results: "Researchers interested in better understanding variance in certain employee outcomes now have evidence that cultural values are just as meaningful explanatory factors as are other individual differences such as personality traits, demographics, or general mental ability" (Taraset al. 2010, 429). That is, national culture explains work-relevant outcomes just as well as demographic characteristics explain work-relevant outcomes. These characteristics include educational attainment and the so-called Big 5 personality traits: extraversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism. Emotion is a key aspect of organizational behavior explained by national culture. Our results are consistent with those of Project GLOBE, which expanded upon the work of Hofstede's IBM studies. Project GLOBE and the IBM studies are perhaps the most cited multiple-country comparisons of work experiences in the organizational behavior literature. Our contribution to this literature is to expand cross-cultural research into public service.

Open questions remain, however, with respect to the question of cultural convergence, the unique influence of culture on human resource management (to which emotional labor most applies), the unique aspects of public service delivery that are affected by dimensions of culture, and the extent to which one can know one's own and others' emotions. First, questions remain whether work-based norms across countries are converging due to the similarities among public servants in their education and training in universities. In an earlier chapter, the role of Weberian bureaucracy was discussed as a national cultural norm that has been transmitted via professional training for public servants. Hofstede "considered education as one of the key institutions that perpetuates culture at a national level" (Taras et al. 2010, 409). Norms among countries with public servants educated in Weberian bureaucratic ideals in government instill those ideas into others—especially subordinates. Examining leadership worldwide, Project GLOBE observes that "there are some leader behaviors that are universally or near universally accepted and effective" (Dorfman 2004, 65). And governments increasingly interact as policies transcend national borders: "As cultures

interact, acculturation is likely to result in changes in some domains, such as job behaviors, and not in other domains, such as religious or family life" (Triandis 2001, 920). How governments interact and shape each other's ecological dimensions could be the focus of future research using culture or country as the unit of analysis. Questions remain as to how the exportation of Weberian ideals has been tempered by the uniqueness of each country. It is important to note that there is no single model of administration and understanding the differences is important in comparative research.

Second, emotional labor and the role of emotions in organizations are most salient to human resource management. As Hofstede and Bond argue, "conflicts are less likely to occur in technology and finance, which are relatively culture-independent, and more likely in marketing and personnel, where cultural diversity is largest" (Hofstede and Bond 1988, 19–20).

Third, and in a similar vein as the argument above that human resource management is more influenced by culture than, say, budgeting and public finance, the nature of public goods fosters interdependent relationships and not simply exchange relationships, as is observed in the private sector. It might even be established that public service organizations are inherently more Collectivist or communal (Triandis 1989) than private-sector organizations. "The prototypical Individualist social relationship is the market. You pay your money and you get something" (Triandis 1993, 160). However, definitions of private and public goods vary by culture: "Utilities are an obvious example, with some countries having government-run monopolies, others having nongovernmental monopolies, others having state or province or regional monopolies, and still others having varying forms and levels of competition" (Dorfman 2004, 76). While public service may be more Collectivist than the private sector and its exchange relationships, the very definition of public service is determined by a culture's norms and values.

The fourth and final open question moves away from culture as the unit of analysis and involves issues fundamental to the study of emotions in general. How well do we know our own emotional states, much less those of another? When researching organizations in different cultures, Hofstede notes, "We will always be subjective, but we may at least try to be 'intersubjective,' pooling and integrating a variety of subjective points of view of different observers" (1980, 15). Hofstede advises researchers to gather information from diverse sources for the purpose of capturing multiple facets of a culture. Research on emotional labor assumes survey respondents can interpret their own emotive states and others' emotions and assumes respondents are aware of display rules and how display rules affect behavior. To this, we add a cross-cultural component and assume members of

one culture can interpret embodied emotions of members of other cultures. Finally, we employ models developed using US samples and apply them in other cultural contexts without clear guidance on whether exported explanations of organizational behavior make sense in other countries. In the next chapter, we discuss emotional labor in various situational contexts, particularly the potentially communal situation involving the bond between citizen and government. We also discuss mistreatment of public servants, benevolence, and reciprocity.

References

Allen, Joseph A., James M. Diefendorff, and Yufeng Ma. 2014. "Differences in Emotional Labor Across Cultures: A Comparison of Chinese and US Service Workers." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 29 (1): 21–35.

Ashkanasy, Neal M., and Catherine S. Daus. 2013. *Emotional Labor Across Five Levels of Analysis: Past, Present, Future*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Brewer, P., and S. Venaik. 2014. "The Ecological Fallacy in National Culture Research." *Organization Studies* 35 (7): 1063–86. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0170840613517602.

Butler, Emily A., Tiane L. Lee, and James J. Gross. 2007. "Emotion Regulation and Culture: Are the Social Consequences of Emotion Suppression Culture-Specific?" *Emotion* 7 (1): 30–48. https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.1.30.

Butler, Emily A., Tiane L. Lee, and James J. Gross. 2009. "Does Expressing Your Emotions Raise or Lower Your Blood Pressure? The Answer Depends on Cultural Context." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 40 (3): 510–17.

Chhokar, J. S., F. C. Brodbeck, and R. J. House. 2007. *Culture and Leadership across the World: A GLOBE Report of In-Depth Studies of the Cultures of 25 Countries*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Damasio, Antonio R. 1994. *Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason and the Human Brain*. New York, NY: Penguin Putnam.

Dickson, Marcus W., Renee S. BeShears, and Vipin Gupta. 2004. "The Impact of Societal Culture and Industry on Organizational Culture: Theoretical Explanations." In *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*, edited by Robert J. House, Paul J. Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter W. Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta, 74–90. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorfman, Peter W. 2004. "Prior Literature." In *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies,* edited by Robert J. House, Paul J. Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter W. Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta, 49–50. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorfman, Peter W., and Robert J. House. 2004. "Cultural Influences on Organizational Leadership: Literature Review, Theoretical Rationale, and

GLOBE Project Goals." In *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies,* edited by Robert J. House, Paul J. Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter W. Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta, 51–73. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eid, Michael, and Ed Diener. 2009. "Norms for Experiencing Emotions in Different Cultures: Inter- and Intranational Differences." In *Culture and Well-Being*, edited by E. Diener, 169–202. New York, NY: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2352-0_9.

Elfenbein, Hillary A., and Nalini Ambady. 2002. "On the Universality and Cultural Specificity of Emotion Recognition: A Meta-Analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 128: 205–35.

Gelfand, Michele. 2018. *Rule Makers, Rule Breakers: How Tight and Loose Cultures Wire Our World*. New York, NY: Scribner.

Gelfand, Michele, L. H. Nishii, and J. L. Raver. 2006. "On the Nature and Importance of Cultural Tightness-Looseness." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 91 (6), 1225–44. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1225.

Guy, Mary E., Meredith A. Newman, and Sharon H. Mastracci. 2008. *Emotional Labor: Putting the Service in Public Service*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Hanges, Paul J., and Marcus W. Dickson. 2004. "The Development and Validation of the GLOBE Culture and Leadership Scales." In *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies,* edited by Robert J. House, Paul J. Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter W. Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta, 122–51. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, Geert, and Michael Harris Bond. 1988. "The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth." *Organizational Dynamics* 16 (4): 5–21.

Hofstede, Geert, G. J. Hofstede, and M. Minkov. 2010. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, Geert. 1980. *Culture's Consequences*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

House, Robert J., and Mansour Javidan. 2004. "Overview of GLOBE." In *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies,* edited by Robert J. House, Paul J. Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter W. Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta, 9–48. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

House, Robert J., and Paul J. Hanges. 2004. "Research Design." In *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies,* edited by Robert J. House, Paul J. Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter W. Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta, 95–101. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

House, Robert J., Paul J. Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter W. Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta. 2004. *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hsieh, Chih-Wei, Jun-Yi Hsieh, and Irving Yi-Feng Huang. 2016. "Self-Efficacy as a Mediator and Moderator between Emotional Labor and Job Satisfaction: A Case Study of Public Service Employees in Taiwan." *Public Performance & Management Review* 40 (1): 71–96.

Hülsheger, Ute R., and Anna F. Schewe. 2011. "On the Costs and Benefits of Emotional Labor: A Meta-Analysis of Three Decades of Research." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 16 (3): 361–89.

Iacobucci, Dawn. 2010. "Structural Equations Modeling: Fit Indices, Sample Size, and Advanced Topics." *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 20 (1): 90–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2009.09.003.

Javidan, Mansour, Robert J. House, Peter W. Dorfman, Vipin Gupta, Paul J. Hanges, and Mary Sully de Luque. 2004. "Conclusions and Future Directions." In *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies,* edited by Robert J. House, Paul J. Hanges, Mansour Javidan, Peter W. Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta, 723–32. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kluckhorn, K. 1954. "Culture and Behavior." In *Handbook of Social Psychology,* Vol. 2, edited by G. Lindzey, 921–76. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kozlowski, S. W. J., and K. J. Klein, K. J. 2000. "A Multilevel Approach to Theory and Research in Organizations: Contextual, Temporal, and Emergent Processes." In *Multilevel Theory, Research and Methods in Organizations: Foundations, Extensions, and New Directions*, edited by K. J. Klein and S. W. J. Kozlowski, 3–90. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, Hyun Jung. 2018. "Relation Between Display Rules and Emotive Behavior Strategies and Its Outcomes Among South Korean Public Service Employees." *Public Performance & Management Review* 41 (4): 723–44, https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2018.1464479.

Levitin, T. 1973. "Values." In *Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes*, edited by J. P. Robinson and P. R. Shaver, 489–502. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Lu, Xiaojun, and Mary E. Guy. 2014. "How Emotional Labor and Ethical Leadership Affect Job Engagement for Chinese Public Servants." *Public Personnel Management* 43 (1): 3–24.

Markus, H. R., and Kitayama, S. 1991. "Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation." *Psychological Review* 98 (2): 224–53.

Marsh, Abigail A., Hillary Anger Elfenbein, and Nalini Ambady. 2003. "Nonverbal 'Accents' Cultural Differences in Facial Expressions of Emotion." *Psychological Science* 14 (4): 373–76.

Mastracci, Sharon. 2017. "Beginning Nurses' Perceptions of Ethical Leadership in the Shadow of Mid Staffs." *Public Integrity* 19 (3): 250–64.

Mastracci, Sharon, and Ian Adams. 2018. "Is Emotional Labor Easier in Collectivist or Individualist Cultures? An East-West Comparison." *Public Personnel Management.* https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026018814569.

Mastracci, Sharon H., Mary E. Guy, and Meredith A. Newman. 2012. *Emotional Labor and Crisis Response: Working on the Razor's Edge*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Matsumoto, David. 1990. "Cultural Similarities and Differences in Display Rules." *Motivation and Emotion* 14 (3): 195–214.

Matsumoto, David. 1993. "Ethnic Differences in Affect Intensity, Emotion Judgments, Display Rule Attitudes, and Self-Reported Emotional Expression in an American Sample." *Motivation and Emotion* 17 (2): 107–23.

Matsumoto, David. 2006. "Are Cultural Differences in Emotion Regulation Mediated by Personality Traits?" *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 37 (4): 421–37.

Matsumoto, David, and Seung Hee Yoo. 2007. "Methodological Considerations in the Study of Emotion Across Cultures." In *Handbook of Emotion Elicitation and Assessment*, 332–48.

Matsumoto, David, Sachiko Takeuchi, Sari Andayani, Natalia Kouznetsova, and Deborah Krupp. 1998. "The Contribution of Individualism vs. Collectivism to Cross-National Differences in Display Rules." *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 1 (2): 147–65.

Matsumoto, David, S. H. Yoo, S. Hirayama, and G. Petrova. 2005. "Validation of an Individual-Level Measure of Display Rules: The Display Rule Assessment Inventory (DRAI)." *Emotion* 5 (1): 23–40.

Matsumoto, David, Tsutomu Kudoh, Klaus Scherer, and Harald Wallbott. 1988. "Antecedents of and Reactions to Emotions in the United States and Japan." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 19 (3): 267–86.

Mauro, Robert, Kaori Sato, and John Tucker. 1992. "The Role of Appraisal in Human Emotions: A Cross-Cultural Study." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 62 (2): 301–17.

Mesquita, Batja. 2001. "Emotions in Collectivist and Individualist Contexts." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 80 (1): 68–74.

Mesquita, Batja, and Ellen Delvaux. 2013. "A Cultural Perspective on Emotion Labor." In *Emotional Labor in the 21st Century*, 271–92. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Minkov, M., and Hofstede, G. 2011. "The Evolution of Hofstede's Doctrine." *Cross Cultural Management* 18 (1): 10–20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13527601111104269.

Roseman, Ira J., Nisha Dhawan, S. Ilsa Rettek, R. K. Naidu, and Komilla Thapa. 1995. "Cultural Differences and Cross-Cultural Similarities in Appraisals and Emotional Responses." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 26 (1): 23–48.

Rousseau, J. J. 1750. *A Discourse on the Moral Effects of the Arts and Sciences, Online Library of Liberty*. https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/rousseau-the-social-contract-and-discourses?q=discourse+on+the+moral+effects+of+the+arts+and+sciences#lf0132_head_057.

Russell, James A. 1991. "Culture and the Categorization of Emotions." *Psychological Bulletin* 110 (3): 426–50.

Schlösser, Oliver, Michael Frese, Anna-Maria Heintze, Musaed Al-Najjar, Thomas Arciszewski, Elias Besevegis, George D. Bishop, Mirilia Bonnes, Chris W. Clegg, and Ewa Drozda-Senkowska. 2013. "Humane Orientation as a New Cultural Dimension of the Globe Project: A Validation Study of the Globe Scale and

Out-Group Humane Orientation in 25 Countries." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 44 (4): 535–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022112465671.

Taras, Vas, Bradley L. Kirkman, and Piers Steel. 2010. "Examining the Impact of Culture's Consequences: A Three-Decade, Multilevel, Meta-Analytic Review of Hofstede's Cultural Value Dimensions." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95 (3): 405–39. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018938.

Triandis, Harry C. 1989. "The Self and Social Behavior in Differing Cultural Contexts." *Psychological Review* 96 (3): 506–20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.96.3.506.

Triandis, Harry C. 1993. "Collectivism and Individualism as Cultural Syndromes." *Cross-Cultural Research* 27 (3–4): 155–80.

Triandis, Harry C. 2001. "Individualism-Collectivism and Personality." *Journal of Personality* 69 (6): 907–24.

Triandis, Harry C., and Michele J. Gelfand. 2012. "A Theory of Individualism and Collectivism." In *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology: Volume 2*, edited by Paul A. M. Van Lange, Arie W. Kruglanski, and E. Tory Higgins, Chapter 51. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446249222.n51.

UNHCR. 2018. *Figures at a Glance*. June 19. https://www.unhcr.org/protection/resettlement/593a88f27/unhcr-projected-global-resettlement-needs-2018.html.

Van de Vliert, Evert. 2007. "Climatoeconomic Roots of Survival Versus Self-Expression Cultures." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 38 (2): 156–72.

Wilding, Mark, Kyungjin Chae, and Jiho Jang. 2014. "Emotional Labor in Korean Local Government: Testing the Consequences of Situational Factors and Emotional Dissonance." *Public Performance & Management Review* 38 (2): 316–36.

Yang, Seung-Bum, and Mary E. Guy. 2015. "Gender Effects on Emotional Labor in Seoul Metropolitan Area." *Public Personnel Management* 44 (1): 3–24.

Yun, C., Y. Lee, and Sharon H. Mastracci. Forthcoming. "The Moderating Effect of Female Managers on Job Stress and Emotional Labor for Public Employees in Gendered Organizations: Evidence from Korea." *Public Personnel Management*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026019829163.