6-2019

Cross-cultural media effects research

Jinhee KIM

Kimin EOM
Singapore Management University, kimineom@smu.edu.sg

Kim, J., & Eom, K. (2019) Cross-cultural media effects research. In M. B. Oliver, A. A. Raney, & J. Bryant (Eds.), *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research (4th ed.)* (pp. 419-434). New York: Routledge.

Cross-Cultural Media Effects Research

Jinhee Kim, Pohang University of Science and Technology, South Korea

Kimin Eom, Singapore Management University, Singapore

Despite the substantial development of media effects research, one critical dimension, cultures, has not been actively examined. Most of the theoretical accounts have been derived from Western thought systems, and relevant empirical studies have been conducted mostly in the U.S. or Western Europe. Except for the areas of advertising and health campaigning, very little media effects research has used a cross-cultural framework. In this chapter, we review scholarly work that compares and contrasts portrayals of media messages and their uses/effects/processes of one culture with those from a different culture. Cultures are often equated with national groups, but concept of cultures are diverse, and ambiguities are inevitable. With these caveats in mind, we first introduce three central theoretical frameworks that have guided cross-cultural research, then overview the pertinent prior research on media effects. Subsequently, we point out key challenges to be addressed and suggest new directions. We hope this chapter provides general guidelines that will facilitate cultural inquiry in media effects research.

Theoretical Frameworks of Cross-Cultural Research

Individualism vs. Collectivism

Individualism vs. collectivism is one of the most widely studied dimensions to explain cultural variation (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Individualistic cultures place greater value on personal rather than group goals. Therefore, individuals are encouraged to express their feelings, thoughts, and needs to strive for success and well-being of themselves. Strong individualistic cultures are usually observed in developed Western countries such as the

U.S., Canada, Australia, and the UK. In contrast, collectivistic cultures place more emphasis on achieving in-group rather than personal goals. Prosperity and well-being of in-groups are prioritized, so people are expected to adjust personal needs to achieve the collective goals. Around the world, collectivistic cultures are found more frequently than individualistic cultures. Much research has focused on East Asian cultures, such as China, Japan, and Korea as collectivistic societies to emphasize the contrast between individualistic vs. collectivistic culture (Heine, 2016; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988).

These individualism and collectivism are reflected across a variety of elements that compose a society, and they generate distinct patterns of ideas, situations, practices, institutions, and products. Individuals constantly engage in cultural systems, so their psychological tendencies are also culturally shaped. Evidence has documented a wide range of differences in psychological tendencies between individuals in individualistic vs. collectivistic cultural contexts (see Heine, 2016; Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 2010 for reviews). Broadly speaking, this body of research that compares individualistic cultures with collectivistic cultures has been conducted with two main frameworks: how the two cultural systems shape distinct ways of viewing (a) the self and (b) objects and events in the world.

Independent vs. Interdependent Self-Views

Research suggests that people in individualistic vs. collectivistic cultural contexts develop different ways of seeing themselves. In individualistic cultures, the self is considered as an entity separate, distinct, or independent from others. In this view, internal attributes such as one's own thoughts, attitudes, and emotions form a core that defines the self. This model of the self that is grounded in personal self is referred to as the *independent view of self*. In contrast, in collectivistic cultures, the self is considered as an entity connected to, related to, or

interdependent with in-group members. Thus, social roles and relationships with others are key defining aspects of self-identity. This model of the self that is grounded in social relationships is referred to as the *interdependent view of self* (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; 2010 for reviews on the distinct views of self).

Importantly, the independent vs. interdependent models of self lead to divergent *models of agency* (i.e., implicit guidelines for how to act) that underlie significant cultural differences in psychological and behavioral tendencies (Markus & Kitayama, 2003). In independent models of self, internal attributes are viewed as primary determinants of action and behavior (Kashima, Siegal, Tanaka, & Kashima, 1992). Thus, personal attitudes are strongly predictive of decision-making and behavior (Eom, Kim, Sherman, & Ishii, 2016; Savani, Markus, & Conner, 2008), and people feel uncomfortable when their behavior does not match attitudes (Heine & Lehman, 1997). People with independent self-views experience negative health and well-being outcomes when they are not able to express their emotions freely (Soto, Perez, Kim, Lee, & Minnick, 2011). For these people, choice is a means to express own internal attributes, so having personal choice is an essential factor to fulfill intrinsic motivations (Iyengar & Lepper, 1999).

In contrast, in interdependent models of self, behaviors that correspond to social roles and norms are strongly emphasized, and social norms are often predictive of decision-making and behavior more strongly than personal attitudes (Eom et al., 2016; Savani, Morris, & Naidu, 2012). People with interdependent self-views are not necessarily uncomfortable with the inconsistency between attitudes and behavior. Instead, they feel uncomfortable when their decisions for others do not reflect the others' attitudes and preferences (Hoshino-Browne et al., 2005). Suppressing emotions is not negatively associated with health and well-being among interdependent individuals (Soto et al., 2011), and a lack of personal choice is not necessarily

demotivating or depressing (Iyengar & Lepper, 1999).

Analytic vs. Holistic Thinking

People in different cultures also develop divergent ways they see objects and events. In individualistic cultures, people tend to view the world as if it is composed of independent objects, whereas in collectivistic cultures, people hold a holistic view that all elements in the world are interconnected. Such cultural differences in a basic worldview are manifested in distinct cognitive styles in domains such as attention, memory, attribution, and categorization. These culturally varied cognitive styles are referred to as *analytic vs. holistic thinking* (Nisbett, Peng, Choi, & Norenzayan, 2001 for a review).

In individualistic cultures, analytic thinking is prevalent. People tend to focus on focal objects and perceive the objects as existing independently from their contexts. Descriptions of a scene or event tend to be centered on focal objects rather than on backgrounds, and people's performance in recognition tasks is not critically affected by changes in backgrounds (Masuda & Nisbett, 2001). People in individualistic cultures see themselves as an independent agent who acts based on internal attributes, so they apply the same view to understanding other actors. Thus, analytic thinkers tend to explain actors' behaviors in terms of their dispositional characteristics rather than in situations that may lead actors to behave in particular ways (Morris & Peng, 1994). Because analytic thinkers use abstract rules and logical reasoning to understand events in the world, they view change as occurring in linear and irreversible ways (Ji, Nisbett, & Su, 2001), and try to resolve contradiction by determining the truth (Peng & Nisbett, 1999; Spencer-Rodgers, Williams, & Peng, 2010).

In contrast, holistic thinking is prevalent in collectivistic cultures. People in these cultures tend to perceive objects as existing in interrelation with their contexts. Thus, holistic thinkers are

more likely to describe a scene or event in terms of how focal objects relate to their background, and changes in backgrounds significantly reduce accuracy in recognition tasks by people in collectivistic cultures (Masuda & Nisbett, 2001). People in collectivistic cultures see themselves as an interdependent agency whose action occurs on the basis of particular contexts, so holistic thinkers tend to refer others' behaviors to the surrounding situations rather than to dispositional characteristics (Morris & Peng, 1994). Because holistic thinkers believe that the world is continually in flux and inter-connected in complex ways, they view change as occurring constantly, reversely, and unpredictably (Ji et al., 2001), and tend to embrace contradiction (termed *naïve dialecticism*) (Peng & Nisbett, 1999; Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2010).

Prior Cross-Cultural Research in Media Effects: An Overview

This section overviews research that has explored distinct cultural portrayals in mediated messages and cultural members' responses to these messages. Whereas numerous previous studies have examined the portrayals primarily in advertisements, recent studies have expanded their scope to news stories, Facebook, and blogs. Relevant studies have also explored how members of different cultures respond to these messages in the domains of persuasion, goal-oriented media-message consumption, and message processing.

Cultural Portrayals in Media Messages

Various mediated messages are cultural artifacts (Morling & Lamoreaux, 2008). Scholars believe that these messages provide a natural context to examine various cultural practices, ideas, or beliefs that may represent cultural members' taste. Accordingly, numerous cross-cultural quantitative content analyses have been conducted on the basis of the three theoretical frameworks that were just explained.

Using the dimension of individualism vs. collectivism, Han and Shavitt (1994) found

that Korean advertisements depicted collectivistic values (e.g., harmonious relationship, group goals), whereas U.S. advertisements portrayed individualistic values (e.g., freedom, independence). Relatedly, Kim and Markus (1999, Study 4) also reported that values of conformity (e.g., "*Seven out of ten people are using this product*") were prevalent in Korean advertisements, whereas values of deviance (e.g., "*The Internet is not for everybody. But then again, you are not everybody*") were prevalent in U.S. advertisements.

Scholars have also explored how the independent vs. interdependent self-views are depicted in mediated messages. For example, an analysis of Olympic news stories featuring medalists revealed that U.S. stories focused on athletics' personal strength, personal style, or their competitors, whereas Japanese stories emphasized athletics' background, previous success and failure, or close supporters (Markus, Uchida, Omoregie, Townsend, & Kitayama, 2006). Likewise, an analysis of facial expressions captured on public figures' official posed photos showed that U.S. leaders expressed more smiles and particularly, *excited* smiles than Chinese leaders, suggesting that expressing culturally valued emotions (i.e., arousing positive affect) may allow independent cultural members to fulfill their interpersonal goal of influencing (vs. adjusting to) others and asserting their needs using some form of action (Tsai et al., 2016).

Using the dimension of analytic vs. holistic thinking styles, Huang and Park (2013) showed that regardless of users' city locations, the profile pictures of Taiwan Facebook users depicted more background and less face area, whereas U.S. American Facebook users presented more face and less background. The distinct thinking styles are also reflected in news stories. Morris and Peng (1994) showed that U.S. news articles attributed the cause of Chinese mass murder targeting U.S. Americans to a Chinese murderer's dispositions (e.g., psychological problems), whereas Chinese news articles attributed the same case to situations (e.g., pressures in

Chinese society). This finding was also replicated when the two newspapers reported a U.S. American murderer targeting U.S. Americans.

Because cultures can be continuously changing, a longitudinal framework can be used. For example, Twenge and her colleagues (2010, 2013) showed increasing individualized trends in the U.S. by examining new-born babies' unique (vs. common) names from 1880 to 2007 and prevalent use of I, my, me, myself (vs. we, our, ours, ourselves) in books published from 1960 to 2008. Additionally, given the unprecedented growth of online messages (e.g., blogs) that also reflect various cultural practices and values, future research may also consider analyzing the messages by using computer-based techniques, such as using searchers of collocates to quantify mixed emotions (e.g., Grossmann, Hyunh, & Ellsworth, 2016, Study 1).

Effects, Uses, and Processes of Media Messages in a Cross-Cultural Context

Effective persuasion outcomes. The most productive area of research into cross-cultural media effects examines persuasion involving advertisements and health campaigns. One of the central arguments and findings from this line of research is that if cultural portrayals of persuasive messages match receivers' cultural orientations, the persuasion effects tend to be amplified. For example, U. S. Americans reported favorable attitudes toward news websites that included each individual's unique news interest, whereas Chinese reported favorable attitudes toward news websites that reminded the participants of their group membership (Li & Kalyanaraman, 2013). Similarly, persuasive messages that feature health physicians who emphasize patients' overall vitality vs. a relaxed lifestyle were preferred by patients who value excited vs. calm affect respectively by heightening perceived trustworthiness (Sims, Tsai, Koopmann-Holm, Thomas, & Goldstein, 2014). Arousing rather than non-arousing positive affect tends to be valued in the U.S. rather than in East Asia (Tsai, Knutson, & Fung, 2006).

The importance of designing culture-specific health campaign messages to reduce reactance has been also reported. For example, safe-sex messages that pose a direct threat to the independent self (e.g., "*I felt ashamed and sad*" by failing to use condoms) rather than the interdependent self (e.g., "*My partner felt ashamed and sad*" by failing to use condoms) induced unfavorable attitudinal outcomes for European Americans, whereas the responses to the two types of messages did not differ for Asian Americans (Ko & Kim, 2010, p. 63). The finding suggests that European Americans may have applied defensive processing when they encounter self-threat messages. Indeed, when European Americans had a chance to restore their positive self-views by receiving a bogus positive feedback in other domains of health, the reactance disappeared.

Media Message selection and gratification. Media scholars have examined goal-oriented message consumption based on theories of uses and gratifications (Rubin, 2009) and of mood management (Zillmann, 2000). This body of work has focused on message consumption as a means of fulfilling viewers' *personal* goals that may include seeking pleasure, meaningfulness, information utility, and personal control, or seeking to validate one's own personality, among many others (Bryant & Vorderer, 2006). Cultural variables, however, have been neglected in this research domain. Accordingly, *cultural* goals (e.g., maintaining relationship harmony in collectivistic cultures, increasing one's personal control over a task in individualistic cultures) that may be triggered by prominent cultural ideas have not been identified clearly.

Examination of prior research that explored personal goals suggests that the results may be qualified by cultural variables. For example, need for affect as a personality trait was identified to predict meta-levels of enjoyment and appreciation regarding serious dramas that induce mixed-affect (Bartsch, Appel, & Storch, 2010); however, cultural variables, such as

interdependent self-views may further increase the gratifications. Similarly, pleasure-seeking was identified as a central state goal to select messages when viewers experience negative affective states due to failure (Zillmann, 2000). However, pleasure-seeking is seen as unhealthy and undesirable in Asian cultures (Schimmack, Oishi, & Diener, 2002; Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2010). Likewise, regaining a sense of control (e.g., rationalization rather than self-blame) was identified as a central goal to derive enjoyment from TV messages when viewers experience regret due to cheating on a partner (Nabi, Finnerty, Domschke, & Hull, 2006). However, perceived control is often discretionary, and perceived relationship harmony with close in-group members is a central cultural goal in Asian cultures (Kitayama, Karasawa, Curhan, Ryff, & Markus, 2010). Consequently, future research would benefit from considering cultural concepts to expand prior theoretical frameworks of uses and gratifications and mood management.

Media message processing. The three theoretical frameworks explained have also been applied to understand individuals' ways of processing various mediated message. Notably, the processing of advertising messages has been explored using the framework of holistic vs. analytic thinking styles. For example, after seeing print advertisements, Chinese were less likely than U.S. Americans to recall and generate thoughts regarding focal products; however, members of the two cultures did not differ in their thoughts about the context of the advertisements (e.g., an office setting) (Feng & Firth, 2014). Similarly, responses to negative information regarding brand publicity (e.g., a serious malfunction) were also affected by the thinking styles (Monga & John, 2008). Specifically, holistic thinkers considered *both* external contexts and internal objects, and therefore were less likely than analytic thinkers to change their pre-existing beliefs about a brand in response to negative publicity.

Self-serving bias that results from self-enhancement tendencies is prominent,

particularly in Western cultures (Heine, Lehman, Markus, & Kitayama, 1999), so scholars have also wondered whether *third-person effects* are moderated by cultures (Cho & Han, 2004; Hong, 2015; Lee & Tamborini, 2005). The third-person effects is a tendency for individuals to perceive stronger media-message influence on others than on the self, particularly for harmful and undesirable messages (Perloff, 1999). Research on cross-cultural third-person effects conducted in South Korea and the U.S. reported that the magnitude of the effects tended to be weakened among Koreans (Cho & Han, 2004) and by collectivism measured at individual levels (Lee & Tamborini, 2005). Moreover, the *first*-person effects from perceiving desirable messages was stronger among U.S. Americans rather than among Koreans (Cho & Han, 2004). The moderating effect of cultures appeared to occur because, for East Asians, self-enhancement is not a salient motivation, and social distance between the self and others tends to be small. Future research may measure these relevant variables and test their potential mediation effects.

Challenges and Future Directions

This section addresses several challenges in cross-cultural research, which include conceptual ambiguity of cultures, difficulty in establishing causality, response biases, and non-invariant measures. However, recent developments also show potentials to overcome these challenges. Accordingly, we also suggest several future directions that may encourage scholars to pursue this line of research and to expand the scope of prior media-effects theories. Finally, we discuss implications of emerging media technologies for cross-cultural media-effects research.

Operationalizing Culture

Culture is a broad system in which meanings, practices, and mental processes and responses are loosely organized and often causally connected (D'Andrade, 2001; Kitayama, 2002). Given its inherent complexity, operationalizing culture is a challenging task, so cross-

cultural research inevitably relies on the use of proxies for culture. The most common way of operationalizing culture is to use *groups of people* who belong to certain shared contexts by which they are more likely to be exposed to similar cultural ideas, values, and practices. Various social categories have been used to operationalize culture, such as nationality (e.g., American vs. Japanese; Heine et al., 1999), social class (e.g., working vs. middle class; Stephens, Markus, & Townsend, 2007), religious affiliation (e.g., Protestants vs. Jews; Cohen & Rozin, 2001), and region within a nation (e.g., U.S. southerners vs. northerners; Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle, & Schwarz, 1996).

The biggest challenge in operationalizing culture as a particular group of people is that individuals within a group can differ significantly. One approach that may minimize this challenge is to measure cultural values and traits directly at the individual and psychological level by using attitudinal self-report surveys (e.g., Singelis, 1994). However, such attitudinal responses may not adequately capture a broad system such as culture. Some critics contend that culture is not just in the head but exists as particular patterns of reality and social contexts beyond internalized attitudes at the individual level (D'Andrade, 2001; Kitayama, 2002).

While fruitful, these operationalizations of culture as a social category or as individual values or traits complicate the task of establishing causality of cultural influence. One way to address this problem is so-called *cultural priming* (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000; Oyserman & Lee, 2008). This approach views culture as mental representations that can be situationally activated. By experimentally evoking cultural schemas in an individual's mind, the cultural priming methods allow investigation of the causal influence of culture (i.e., cultural representations) on relevant outcomes. One widely-used method is to expose participants to certain cultural icons (e.g., national flags, famous people, landmarks) to activate the

corresponding cultural representations (e.g., Hong et al., 2000). The pronoun-circling task is another frequently used method. In this task, participants are instructed to search and circle the first-person singular (e.g., I, me, or mine) or plural pronouns (e.g., we, us, or ours) in given stories to activate individualistic or collectivistic orientations, respectively (Gardner, Gabriel, & Lee, 1999).

One important complication regarding the measurement of culture is that culture is a dynamic and changing system (Kashima, 2014). Ecological changes in population density, resource availability, or climate can induce significant cultural change and variation (see Varnum & Grossmann, 2017 for a review). For example, individualistic practices and values have increased over the past decades in many societies around the world, partly as a consequence of increasing socioeconomic development (Santos, Varnum, & Grossmann, 2017). Moreover, recent rapid globalization and active intercultural exchange are driving many societies and individuals to become multicultural (Morris, Chiu, & Liu, 2015). How to take the dynamic nature of culture into account will be a critical task in operationalizing culture and examining cultural influence.

Identifying Mediators and Moderators Involving Cultural Differences

Mediators. Cross-cultural scholars often collect data from more than two national groups and explore the differences (e.g., average scores) between the groups. In this context, mediators must be identified and measured, otherwise observed differences in responses may be misattributed to cultural influence, whereas they are actually a result of unconsidered factors (i.e., "cultural attribution fallacy," Matsumoto & Yoo, 2006, p. 235). Accordingly, cross-cultural studies that use the framework of group comparison often measure possible underlying mediators to explain the observed cultural group differences.

Several mediators have been identified, and among them, Hofstede's individualism vs.

collectivism dimension measured at individual level has been used widely. For example, Koreans reported more support for the censorship of harmful messages—a behavioral component of the third-person effects—than U.S. Americans did, and this cultural difference was mediated by collectivism (e.g., emphasis on in-group members' well-being) (Hong, 2015). Similarly, Korean viewers showed a greater preference for contradictory entertainment messages that induce laughing and crying than U.S. viewers did, and this difference was mediated by naïve dialecticism from holistic thinking style (Kim, Seo, Yu, & Neuendorf, 2014). Furthermore, European Americans had a greater preference for maximized pleasure and minimized pain than Chinese Americans did, and this difference was mediated by the degree of valuing independence (vs. interdependence) (Sims et al., 2015). However, these mediators are often measured at individual levels and thus tend to reflect cultural members' *internalized* values or beliefs, which are also akin to the operationalization of cultures explained.

In particular, when cultural values are measured as guiding principles at individual levels, results have often been the opposite of the expected cultural differences. For example, U.S. Americans rather than Chinese may endorse higher values on humility, whereas Chinese rather than U.S. Americans may endorse higher values on personal choice (Peng, Nisbett, & Wong, 1997). The authors claimed that cultural members may often endorse values based on social comparison processes (e.g., valuing "respect for the elderly" compared to acquaintances) and values that are deprived in a given culture. This insight suggests that perceived consensus in a given culture may explain cultural influence better than internalized personal views do (Chiu, Gelfand, Yamagishi, Shteynberg, & Wan, 2010). Indeed, cultural differences in compliance behaviors were mediated more by the extent to which cultural members believe that collectivistic behaviors (e.g., consulting one's family before making an important decision) are prevalent in

their own culture than by personal values endorsing collective behaviors (Zou et al., 2009). Future research would benefit from exploring perceived consensual (vs. personal) values as possible explanatory mechanisms.

Moderators. Factors that moderate cultural influence on relevant outcomes should be identified because cultural differences are not necessarily uniform. Under certain circumstances, cultural differences are obtained in accordance with specified knowledge structures, but under other circumstances these differences can disappear or even reverse (Choi, Choi, & Norenzayan, 2004). Several research has attempted to identify factors that moderate cultural influence. For instance, collectivistic appeals featured on advertisements increased purchase intention more for Koreans than for U. S. Americans, particularly when advertisements featured shared products (e.g., furniture); however, this cultural difference disappeared when advertisements featured non-shared products (e.g., toothbrushes) (Han & Shavitt, 1994). Similarly, Koreans were more likely than U. S. Americans to prefer contradictory entertainment messages that induce both laughing and crying, but this difference was larger for positively-valenced messages (e.g., comedy) than for negatively-valenced ones (e.g., sad films) (Kim et al., 2014).

Expected cultural differences can even be reversed. For example, U.S. Americans vs. Chinese formed favorable attitude toward beer advertisements that feature other-focused ("*Relaxing near the fire with best friends*") vs. ego-focused ("*Celebrating life's accomplishments*") appeals (Aaker & Williams, 1998, p. 245). Regarding these opposite results of the hypothesized cultural difference, the authors claimed that other-focused vs. ego-focused appeals may have been perceived as novel in the U.S. vs. China. Accordingly, each cultural member may have had great motivation to further elaborate on these messages, and as a result may tend to generate favorable thoughts. Findings that either limit or are opposite to the expected

cultural differences may inform us that a dynamic approach to culture is necessary. Consequently, researchers should consider the range of applicable domains or situations that can trigger cultural knowledge strongly (Chiu & Hong, 2006).

Methodological Challenges

Cross-cultural research involves numerous methodological challenges (Matsumoto & van de Vijver, 2011). This section focuses on response bias and measurement non-equivalence.

Response biases. Systematic differences in responses to measurement items can distort the true responses. Three response biases are commonly reported (Grossmann & Na, 2014): *moderacy* (participants' tendency to provide middle points particularly in Asian cultures, such as rating "4" on a 7-point scale), *extremity* (participants' tendency to provide extreme end-points particularly in Western cultures, such as rating "1" or "7" on a 7-point scale), and *acquiescence* (Asian participants' tendency to agree with all measurement items due to prevalent holistic thinking style).

Cross-cultural scholars have employed multiple ways of standardizing participants' raw scores to minimize these biases (e.g., adjusting an item score by using an individual's mean and standard deviation of the given scale; reviewed in Fischer, 2004); however, this standardization may not fully remove these biases. For example, Tsai et al. (2006) reported no substantial differences between raw and standardized scores when comparing responses of Hong Kong Chinese to those of European Americans. Furthermore, many scholars who use standardizations do not theoretically discuss *why* the obtained differences between cultural groups measure bias rather than meaningful differences (Fischer, 2004). Indeed, these biases may represent a substantial cultural influence (Matsumoto & Yoo, 2006).

To minimize these biases (if any), researchers may explore the relationships between variables by treating cultures as a moderator, rather than by considering the average-score differences between cultural groups (Bond & van de Vijver, 2011; Grossman & Na, 2014). Self-report measures alone may be susceptible to response biases, so researchers must acknowledge and address the potential effects of response biases. Future cross-cultural research may also benefit from including open-ended responses, participant observations or archival data when they are accessible.

Measurement equivalence. Cross-cultural research should be also able to establish the equivalence of most aspects of research, including sampling, conceptual meanings, and empirical methods. Researchers often use back-translations (Brislin, 1970) to ensure conceptual equivalence of translated questionnaire items and original ones; however, these procedures alone do not fully ensure the comparability of measurements.

Three psychometric steps that are hierarchically nested (i.e., configural, metric, and scalar invariance) have been suggested to ascertain measurement equivalence (Kühne, 2013). Odağ, Hofer, Schneider, and Knop (2016) showed these three steps regarding hedonic and eudaimonic motivations underlying entertainment consumption in samples of respondents from Turkey and Germany. First, the pattern of factor structures should be similar across cultures. For example, six indicators of the factor of hedonic motivation and six indicators of the factor of eudaimonic motivation should be loaded in a way that is intended and similar in the two cultures. This structural similarity can be estimated by conducting a multi-group confirmatory factor analysis that considers the cultural group's baseline model. Configural invariance is achieved when the results reveal acceptable fit statistics.

Second, loading coefficients of indicators that belong to a given factor should be similar

across cultures. This metric invariance can be estimated by constraining the loadings to be equal across cultural groups, and by using a chi-square test to compare the constraint model to the baseline model. Metric invariance is achieved when the chi-square test is non-significant, although Cheung and Rensvold (2002) have different views. Some scholars (e.g., Byrne, Shavelson, & Muthen, 1989) further argue that achieving *full* metric invariance is very challenging, and thus if at least two loading coefficients onto one factor are invariant across cultures, partial metric invariance is achieved.

Third, intercept values of indicators of a given factor should be also similar across cultural groups (i.e., scalar invariance). For example, if both Koreans and U.S. Americans are truly satisfied with themselves, they should provide the similar rating for the item, "*On the whole, I am satisfied with myself*." However, because of self-criticism (vs. self-enhancement) and moderation tendency, Koreans may provide low ratings even if they are truly satisfied with themselves. Cross-cultural researchers often report that scalar invariance tends not to be achieved, and researchers seem to agree that scalar invariance is *not* necessary to achieve measurement invariance (Boer, Hanke, & He, 2018).

Although these measurement-invariance procedures have been recommended in cross-cultural research, few studies have used them (Boer et al., 2018). Similarly, media-effects scholars have just started assessing measurement invariance in cross-cultural research (e.g., Odağ et al., 2015). Boer et al. (2018) suggested that even if researchers cannot achieve measurement invariance, they can still obtain insight into the pertinent topic, and this insight may generate future scrutiny.

Implications for Emerging Media Technologies

The rapid growth of emerging media technologies presents great potential to connect

individuals from various cultural backgrounds. However, cultural differences observed in prior studies have also been found in technology products, services, and practices. This observation suggests that existing cultural differences are maintained and perhaps even amplified. For example, one study that explores social network characteristics of Facebook users in 49 nations revealed that individualism scores at national level were positively associated with users' ego-centric characteristic (Na, Kosinski, & Stillwell, 2015). Specifically, in individualistic cultures, the self was located in the center of the social network, and other members around the self were able to be connected one another only through the self. Furthermore, Koreans were less likely than U.S. Americans to present themselves positively on Facebook (Lee-Won, Shim, Joo, & Park, 2014) because Koreans readily accept negative aspects of the self (Heine et al., 1999). A social networking service platform itself can dictate global users' behavior based on its cultural origin (Qiu, Lin, & Leung, 2013). Specifically, Chinese users residing in Singapore tended to engage in benevolent in-group sharing when they used Renren (the "Facebook of China"), whereas the same users tended to engage in positive self-presentation when they used Facebook.

Although this line of studies is valuable in expanding applicable domains of cultural differences, media effects research should assess whether emerging media environments challenge or complement established cultural differences. For this purpose, we suggest three directions for future research.

First, given the great emphasis on enhanced social connections with emerging technologies in human-computer interaction literature, cross-cultural frameworks focusing on interdependence may be utilized in non-cross cultural technology environments. For example, U.S. game players with interdependent self-view tended to form heightened para-social interaction with their virtual avatar on the Wii game screen by developing a sense of self-

presence (i.e., equating the players' avatar with the actual-self) (Jin & Park, 2009). Because interdependence that focuses on "we" can be also primed temporally, a study of serious games that require cooperation or role-playing that involves other players may implement priming procedures to examine whether they produce effective outcomes, such as increasing healthy diet or pro-social behavior of the gamers.

Second, despite easy access to a large volume of transnational entertainment messages as a result of Internet streaming services (e.g., Netflix), little research has been conducted regarding global audiences after the seminal work on *Dallas* (Liebes & Katz, 1993). Fans of global hit films (e.g., *Harry Potter*) or localized entertainment (e.g., Korean/Japanese TV dramas or films) across nations can be located, and researchers may explore how various cultural backgrounds of these viewers may affect interactions with fictional characters (e.g., para-social interaction) and evaluations of transnational entertainment (e.g., enjoyment and appreciation). For example, viewers from Mexico (collectivistic culture) assessed Harry Potter's social attributes (e.g., selfless, helpful) more strongly than did viewers from Germany (individualistic culture), though the same difference was also found in ego-attributes (e.g., decisive, self-confident) (Schmid & Klimmt, 2011). Future research would benefit from exploring global audience's selection, interpretation, and evaluations of transnational media messages and cultural differences and similarities in these processes.

Third, traditional research on media-effects has focused predominantly on message or argument characteristics, but emerging technology research concerns non-contents or peripheral aspects of the target messages (e.g., interactivity) that may increase users' involvement and perceived control (e.g., Sundar, Jia, Waddell, & Huang, 2015). We suggest that this line of research can be expanded by using cross-cultural frameworks. Specifically, as a result of holistic

thinking style, East Asians may be more likely than Westerners to be influenced readily by peripheral attributes of central messages that can be regarded as equally important in the whole context. One investigation showed that East Asians were more likely than Canadians to rapidly locate the target pictorial images within a long mock webpage, suggesting that East Asians may be skillful in handling context-rich information (Wang, Masuda, Ito, & Rashid, 2012, Study 3). Consequently, prior research on formal features of emerging technologies can be tested in a cross-cultural context to examine whether existing findings obtained from Western cultures can be different in Eastern cultures.

Concluding Remarks

This chapter has introduced central theoretical frameworks of cross-cultural research, and an overview of pertinent research into media effects. Notably, areas of advertisements and health campaigns have actively examined cultural differences perhaps because the messages must reach a wide range of global audiences to be maximally effective. Media messages reflect culturally-dominant ideas, values, and practices, and East Asians and European Americans select, interpret, and evaluate these media messages through their chronically or temporarily activated cultural lenses. We hope that this chapter encourages media-effects researchers to conduct cross-cultural research in various domains that go beyond persuasion, in other collectivistic societies rather than Korea, Japan, or China, and in new cultural dimensions (e.g., tightness-looseness, Gelfand et al., 2011). We also believe that emerging media technologies that allow cultural mixes and exchanges may provide cross-cultural researchers with an exciting opportunity to expand and complement existing media-effects theoretical accounts.

References

Aaker, J. L., & Williams, P. (1998). Empathy versus pride: The influence of emotional appeals across cultures. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *25*, 241-261. doi:10.1086/209537

Bartsch, A., Appel, M., & Storch, D. (2010). Predicting emotions and meta-emotions at the movies: The role of the need for affect in audiences' experience of horror and drama. *Communication Research*, *37*, 167-190. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650209356441

Boer, D., Hanke, K., & He, J. (2018). On detecting systematic measurement error in cross-cultural research: A review and critical reflection on equivalence and invariance tests. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *49*, 713-734. doi:10.1177/0022022117749042

Bond, M. H., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2011). Making scientific sense of cultural differences in psychological outcomes: Unpackaging the Magnum Mysterium. In D. Matsumoto & F. J. R. van de Vijver (Eds.), *Cross-cultural research methods in psychology* (pp. 75-100). New York, NY: Cambridge University.

Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *1*, 185-216. doi:10.1177/135910457000100301

Bryant, J., & Vorderer, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Psychology of entertainment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Byrne, B. M., Shavelson, R. J., & Muthén, B. (1989). Testing for the equivalence of factor covariance and mean structures: The issue of partial measurement invariance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *105*, 456-466. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.105.3.456

Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *9*, 233-255. doi:10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5

Chiu, C. Y., & Hong, Y. Y. (2006). *Social psychology of culture*. New York: Psychology Press.

Chiu, C. Y., Gelfand, M. J., Yamagishi, T., Shteynberg, G., & Wan, C. (2010). Intersubjective culture: The role of intersubjective perceptions in cross-cultural research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *5*, 482-493. doi:10.1177/1745691610375562

Cho, H., & Han, M. (2004). Perceived effect of the mass media on self vs. other: A cross-cultural investigation of the third person effect hypothesis. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *14*, 299-318. doi:10.1075/japc.14.2.06cho

Choi, I., Choi, J., & Norenzayan, A. (2004). Culture and decisions. In D. J. Koehler & N. Harvey (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of judgment and decision making* (pp. 504–524). Malden, MA: Blackwell

Cohen, A. B., & Rozin, P. (2001). Religion and the morality of mentality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 697-710. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.81.4.697

Cohen, D., Nisbett, R. E., Bowdle, B. F., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Insult, aggression, and the southern culture of honor: An "experimental ethnography." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 945-960. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.5.945

D'Andrade, R. (2001). A cognitivist's view of the units debate in cultural anthropology. *Cross-Cultural Research, 35*, 242–257. doi:10.1177/106939710103500208

Eom, K., Kim, H. S., Sherman, D. K., & Ishii, K. (2016). Cultural variability in the link between environmental concern and support for environmental action. *Psychological Science*, *27*, 1331-1339. doi:10.1177/0956797616660078

Feng, Y., & Frith, K. (2014). Cultural differences in cognitive responding to ads: A comparison of young American and Chinese consumers. *Asian Journal of Communication*, *24*, 509-528. doi:10.1080/01292986.2014.918159

Fischer, R. (2004). Standardization to account for cross-cultural response bias. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *35*, 263-282. doi:10.1177/0022022104264122

Gardner, W. L., Gabriel, S., & Lee, A. Y. (1999). "I" value freedom, but "we" value relationships: Self-construal priming mirrors cultural differences in judgment. *Psychological Science*, *10*, 321-326. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00162

Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., ... & Aycan, Z. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, *332*(6033), 1100-1104. doi:10.1126/science.1197754

Grossmann, I., & Na, J. (2014). Research in culture and psychology: Past lessons and future challenges. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, *5*, 1-14. doi:10.1002/wcs.1267

Grossmann, I., Huynh, A. C., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2016). Emotional complexity: Clarifying definitions and cultural correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *111*, 895-916. doi:10.1037/pspp0000084

Han, S. P., & Shavitt, S. (1994). Persuasion and culture: Advertising appeals in individualistic and collectivistic societies. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *30*, 326-350. doi:10.1006/jesp.1994.1016

Heine, S. J. (2016). *Cultural Psychology: Third Edition*. New York, NY: Norton.

Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1997). Culture, dissonance, and self-affirmation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 389-400. doi:10.1177/0146167297234005

Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1999). Is there a universal need for positive self-regard? *Psychological Review*, *106*, 766-794. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.106.4.766

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, *10*(4), 15-41. doi:10.1080/00208825.1980.11656300

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Hong, S. C. (2015). Do cultural values matter? A cross-cultural study of the third-person effect and support for the regulation of violent video games. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *46*, 964-976. doi:10.1177/0022022115588950

Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 709-720. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.7.709

Hoshino-Browne, E., Zanna, A. S., Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. P., Kitayama, S., & Lackenbauer, S. (2005). On the cultural guises of cognitive dissonance: The case of Easterners and Westerners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*, 294-310. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.3.294

Huang, C. M., & Park, D. (2013). Cultural influences on Facebook photographs. *International Journal of Psychology*, *48*, 334-343. doi:10.1080/00207594.2011.649285

Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (1999). Rethinking the value of choice: A cultural perspective on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*, 349-366. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.76.3.349

Ji, L. J., Nisbett, R. E., & Su, Y. (2001). Culture, change, and prediction. *Psychological Science*, *12*, 450-456. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00384

Jin, S. A. A., & Park, N. (2009). Parasocial interaction with my avatar: Effects of interdependent self-construal and the mediating role of self-presence in an avatar-based console game,

Wii. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, *12*, 723-727. doi:10.1089/cpb.2008.0289

Kashima, Y. (2014). How can you capture cultural dynamics? *Frontiers in psychology*, *5*, Article 995. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00995

Kashima, Y., Siegal, M., Tanaka, K., & Kashima, E. S. (1992). Do people believe behaviors are consistent with attitudes? Towards a cultural psychology of attribution processes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *31*, 111-124. doi:j.2044-8309.1992.tb00959.x

Kim, H., & Markus, H. R. (1999). Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 785-800. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.77.4.785

Kim, J., Seo, M., Yu, H., & Neuendorf, K. (2014). Cultural differences in preference for entertainment messages that induce mixed responses of joy and sorrow. *Human Communication Research*, *40*, 530-552. doi:10.1111/hcre.12037

Kitayama, S. (2002). Culture and basic psychological processes: Toward a system view of culture: Comment on Oyserman et al. (2002). *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 89-96. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.89

Kitayama, S., Karasawa, M., Curhan, K. B., Ryff, C. D., & Markus, H. R. (2010). Independence and interdependence predict health and well-being: Divergent patterns in the United States and Japan. *Frontiers in psychology*, *1 (Article 163), 1-10*. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2010.00163

Ko, D. M., & Kim, H. S. (2010). Message framing and defensive processing: A cultural examination. *Health communication*, *25*, 61-68. doi:10.1080/10410230903473532

Kühne, R. (2013). Testing measurement invariance in media psychological research. *Journal of Media Psychology*, *25*, 153-159. doi:10.1027/1864-1105/a000096

Lee-Won, R. J., Shim, M., Joo, Y. K., & Park, S. G. (2014). Who puts the best "face" forward on Facebook? Positive self-presentation in online social networking and the role of self-consciousness, actual-to-total Friends ratio, and culture. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *39*, 413-423. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.08.007

Lee, B., & Tamborini, R. (2005). Third-person effect and Internet pornography: The influence of collectivism and Internet self-efficacy. *Journal of Communication*, *55*, 292-310. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb02673.x

Li, C., & Kalyanaraman, S. (2013). "I, me, mine" or "us, we, ours?" The influence of cultural psychology on web-based customization. *Media Psychology*, *16*, 272-294. doi:10.1080/15213269.2013.815049

Liebes, T., & Katz, E. (1993). *The export of meaning: Cross-cultural readings of Dallas*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*, 224-253. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2003). Models of agency: Sociocultural diversity in the construction of action. In V. M. Berman & J. J. Berman (Eds.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Cross-cultural differences in perspectives on the self* (Vol. 49, pp. 1–58). Lincoln: University of Nebraska.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2010). Cultures and selves: A cycle of mutual constitution. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *5*, 420-430. doi:10.1177/1745691610375557

Markus, H. R., Uchida, Y., Omoregie, H., Townsend, S. S., & Kitayama, S. (2006). Going for the gold: Models of agency in Japanese and American contexts. *Psychological Science*, *17*,

103-112. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01672.x

Masuda, T., & Nisbett, R. E. (2001). Attending holistically versus analytically: Comparing the context sensitivity of Japanese and Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 922-934. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01672.x

Matsumoto, D., & van de Vijver, F. J. (Eds.). (2011). *Cross-cultural research methods in psychology*. New York, NY: Cambridge University.

Matsumoto, D., & Yoo, S. H. (2006). Toward a new generation of cross-cultural research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *1*, 234-250. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00014.x

Monga, A. B., & John, D. R. (2008). When does negative brand publicity hurt? The moderating influence of analytic versus holistic thinking. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *18*, 320-332. doi:10.1016/j.jcps.2008.09.009

Morling, B., & Lamoreaux, M. (2008). Measuring culture outside the head: A meta-analysis of individualism-collectivism in cultural products. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *12*, 199-221. doi:10.1177/1088868308318260

Morris, M. W., & Peng, K. (1994). Culture and cause: American and Chinese attributions for social and physical events. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, *67*, 949-971. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.949

Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Liu, Z. (2015). Polycultural psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*, 631-659. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015001

Na, J., Kosinski, M., & Stillwell, D. J. (2015). When a new tool is introduced in different cultural contexts: Individualism–collectivism and social network on Facebook. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *46*, 355-370. doi:10.1177/0022022114563932

Nabi, R. L., Finnerty, K., Domschke, T., & Hull, S. (2006). Does misery love company?

Exploring the therapeutic effects of TV viewing on regretted experiences. *Journal of Communication*, *56*, 689-706. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00315.

Nisbett, R. E., Peng, K., Choi, I., & Norenzayan, A. (2001). Culture and systems of thought: Holistic versus analytic cognition. *Psychological Review*, *108*, 291-310. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.108.2.291

Odağ, Ö., Hofer, M., Schneider, F. M., & Knop, K. (2016). Testing measurement equivalence of eudaimonic and hedonic entertainment motivations in a cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *45*, 108-125. doi:10.1080/17475759.2015.1108216

Oyserman, D., & Lee, S. W. (2008). Does culture influence what and how we think? Effects of priming individualism and collectivism. *Psychological Bulletin*, *134*, 311-342. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.134.2.311

Peng, K., & Nisbett, R. E. (1999). Culture, dialectics, and reasoning about contradiction. *American Psychologist*, *54*, 741-754. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.54.9.741

Peng, K., Nisbett, R. E., & Wong, N. Y. (1997). Validity problems comparing values across cultures and possible solutions. *Psychological Methods*, *2*, 329-344. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.2.4.329

Perloff, R. M. (1999). The third person effect: A critical review and synthesis. *Media Psychology*, *1*, 353-378. doi:10.1207/s1532785xmep0104_4

Qiu, L., Lin, H., & Leung, A. K. Y. (2013). Cultural differences and switching of in-group sharing behavior between an American (Facebook) and a Chinese (Renren) social networking site. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *44*, 106-121. doi:10.1177/0022022111434597

Rubin, A. M. (2009). Uses-and-gratifications perspective on media effects. In. J. Bryant & M. B. Oliver (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 165-184). New York, NY: Routledge.

Santos, H. C., Varnum, M. E., & Grossmann, I. (2017). Global increases in individualism. *Psychological Science*, *28*, 1228-1239. doi:10.1177/0956797617700622

Savani, K., Markus, H. R., & Conner, A. L. (2008). Let your preference be your guide? Preferences and choices are more tightly linked for North Americans than for Indians. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*, 861-876. doi:10.1177/0956797617700622

Savani, K., Morris, M. W., & Naidu, N. V. R. (2012). Deference in Indians' decision making: Introjected goals or injunctive norms? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*, 685-699. doi:10.1037/a0026415

Schimmack, U., Oishi, S., & Diener, E. (2002). Cultural influences on the relation between pleasant emotions and unpleasant emotions: Asian dialectic philosophies or individualism-collectivism? *Cognition and Emotion, 16,* 705-719. doi:10.1080/02699930143000590

Schmid, H., & Klimmt, C. (2011). A magically nice guy: Parasocial relationships with Harry Potter across different cultures. *International Communication Gazette, 73,* 252-269. doi:10.1177/1748048510393658

Sims, T., Tsai, J. L., Jiang, D., Wang, Y., Fung, H. H., & Zhang, X. (2015). Wanting to maximize the positive and minimize the negative: Implications for mixed affective experience in American and Chinese contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *109*, 292-315. doi:10.1037/a0039276

Sims, T., Tsai, J. L., Koopmann-Holm, B., Thomas, E. A., & Goldstein, M. K. (2014). Choosing a physician depends on how you want to feel: The role of ideal affect in health-related decision making. *Emotion*, *14*, 187-192. doi:10.1037/a0039276

Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *20*, 580-591. doi:10.1177/0146167294205014

Soto, J. A., Perez, C. R., Kim, Y. H., Lee, E. A., & Minnick, M. R. (2011). Is expressive suppression always associated with poorer psychological functioning? A cross-cultural comparison between European Americans and Hong Kong Chinese. *Emotion*, *11*, 1450-1455. doi:10.1037/a0023340

Spencer-Rodgers, J., Williams, M. J., & Peng, K. (2010). Cultural differences in expectations of change and tolerance for contradiction: A decade of empirical research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *14*, 296-312. doi:10.1177/1088868310362982

Stephens, N. M., Markus, H. R., & Townsend, S. S. (2007). Choice as an act of meaning: The case of social class. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 814-830. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.814

Sundar, S. S., Jia, H., Waddell, T. F., & Huang, Y. (2015). Toward a theory of interactive media effects (TIME). In S. S. Sundar (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of communication technology* (pp. 47-86). Malden, MA: Wiley.

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*, 323-338. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.2.323

Tsai, J. L., Ang, J. Y. Z., Blevins, E., Goernandt, J., Fung, H. H., Jiang, D., ... & Lin, Y. (2016).

Leaders' smiles reflect cultural differences in ideal affect. *Emotion*, *16*, 183-195. doi:10.1037/emo0000133

Tsai, J. L., Knutson, B., & Fung, H. H. (2006). Cultural variation in affect valuation. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *90*, 288-307. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.2.288

Twenge, J. M., Abebe, E. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). Fitting in or standing Out: Trends in American parents' choices for children's names, 1880–2007. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *1*, 19-25. doi:10.1177/1948550609349515

Twenge, J. M., Campbell, W. K., & Gentile, B. (2013). Changes in pronoun use in American books and the rise of individualism, 1960-2008. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *44*, 406-415. doi:10.1177/0022022112455100

Varnum, M. E., & Grossmann, I. (2017). Cultural change: The how and the why. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*, 956-972. doi:10.1177/1745691617699971

Wang, H., Masuda, T., Ito, K., & Rashid, M. (2012). How much information? East Asian and North American cultural products and information search performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*, 1539-1551. doi:10.1177/0146167212455828

Zillmann, D. (2000). Mood management in the context of selective exposure theory. In M. Roloff (Ed.), *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *23,* 103–123. doi:10.1080/23808985.2000.11678971

Zou, X., Tam, K. P., Morris, M. W., Lee, S. L., Lau, I. Y. M., & Chiu, C. Y. (2009). Culture as common sense: Perceived consensus versus personal beliefs as mechanisms of cultural influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97,* 579. doi:10.1037/a0016399