Effects of cultural tightness-looseness and social network density on expression of positive and negative emotions : a large-scale study of impression management by Facebook users

Liu, Pan; Chan, David; Qiu, Lin; Tov, William; Tong, Victor Joo Chuan

2018

Liu, P., Chan, D., Qiu, L., Tov, W., & Tong, V. J. C. (2018). Effects of cultural tightness–looseness and social network density on expression of positive and negative emotions : a large-scale study of impression management by Facebook users. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44(11), 1567-1581. doi:10.1177/01461672187709993

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/137053>

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218770999>

© 2018 The Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc. All rights reserved. This paper was published by SAGE Publications in *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* and is made available with permission of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc.

Downloaded on 26 Apr 2023 19:12:45 SGT

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Effects of Cultural Tightness-Looseness and Social Network Density on Expression of
Positive and Negative Emotions:
A Large-Scale Study of Impression Management by Facebook Users

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 2

Abstract

Using data from 13,789 Facebook users across U.S. states, this study examined the main effects of societal-level cultural tightness-looseness and its interaction effects with individuals' social network density on impression management (IM) in terms of online emotional expression. Results showed that individuals from culturally tight (vs. loose) states were more likely to express positive emotions and less likely to express negative emotions. Meanwhile, for positive emotional expression, there was a tightness-looseness by social network density interaction effect. In culturally tight states individuals with dense (vs. sparse) networks were more likely to express positive emotions, while in culturally loose states this pattern was reversed. For negative emotional expression, however, no such interaction was observed. Our findings highlight the influence of cultural norms and social network structure on emotional expressions as IM strategies.

Keywords: impression management, emotional expression, cultural tightness-looseness, social network density

1
2
3 1 **Effects of Cultural Tightness-Looseness and Social Network Density on Expression of**
4
5 2 **Positive and Negative Emotions:**
6
7 3 **A Large-Scale Study of Impression Management by Facebook Users**
8

9 4 Research has shown that how people interact socially with others and maintain good
10 5 relationships with others is important to their social well-being (Bloomberg, Meyers, &
11 6 Braverman, 1994). During social interaction, individuals often adopt impression management
12 7 (IM) strategies to establish and uphold a desired personal image based on their social roles, in
13 8 accordance with social norms (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). In recent decades, as online
14 9 interactions have become an important part of daily life, IM behaviors previously observed in
15 10 face-to-face interaction have also manifested in computer-mediated communication (Walther,
16 11 Van Der Heide, Kim, Westerman, & Tong, 2008).

17 12 The extant studies on IM are focused on how the deployment of IM strategies varies
18 13 across persons (e.g., personality; Rosenberg & Egbert, 2011) or institutions (e.g.,
19 14 organizational culture; Bolino, Long, & Turnley, 2016), and relatively few studies have
20 15 explored how IM behaviors may vary across societal cultures such as across nations or
21 16 provinces within a nation (Bolino et al., 2016).

22 17 The prevalence of IM is likely to depend on social norms, which vary across societies.
23 18 An important research question that has not received sufficient attention is how IM strategies
24 19 are adopted and used in different societal contexts with regard to cultural norms. Thus, he
25 20 current research investigates how IM behaviors are influenced by cultural norms at the
26 21 societal level. Specifically, we examined IM behaviors in the expression of emotion by
27 22 Facebook users across states in the U.S. and how such expressions may be moderated by the
28 23 level of cultural tightness-looseness in each state. Findings from this research may advance
29 24 our knowledge of impression management in social media and extend to a better cross-
30 25 cultural understanding of individuals' daily communication in general.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 4

Impression Management and Online Emotional Expression

Impression management (IM) is a self-regulatory process in which a person adjusts his or her behavior or appearance to influence the perceptions of other people about him or her (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Individuals use IM strategies to present themselves to others in a way that satisfies their needs and goals, which is usually based on their social roles, in accordance with social norms and what they perceive as others' preferences and values.

Past research has found that IM strategies may be acquisitive or protective (Arkin, 1981). Acquisitive IM aims to seek approval and promote a desirable image by presenting positive aspects of oneself, whereas protective IM aims to avoid disapproval and rejection from the audience by concealing negative aspects. IM behaviors are pervasive in everyday interactions and important in developing social relationships and gaining social support. Understanding how individuals adopt and apply IM strategies plays an important role in advancing our knowledge of the interpersonal processes (Leary & Kowalski, 1990).

With the rise of social media, online interactions have become an important part of daily life, and IM behaviors are pervasive in computer-mediated communication (CMC). According to the hyperpersonal interaction model (Walther, 1996), CMC lacks non-verbal cues such as facial expressions and gestures available in face-to-face communication, and therefore it allows individuals to easily manipulate their self-presentation to create a desirable self-image. Users of social networking sites (SNSs), such as Facebook, have been found to selectively choose physically more attractive photos as their profile pictures (Walther, Van Der Heide, Kim, Westerman, & Tong, 2008) and use photos with others to create an active social image (Zhao, Grasmuck, & Martin, 2008).

Moreover, studies show that social media users selectively disclose their emotional experiences and that IM is a source of motivation for selective disclosure. In particular, users prefer to display significantly more positive relative to negative emotions on Facebook than

in real life (Bazarova, Taft, Choi, & Cosley, 2013; Lin, Tov, & Qiu, 2014). This is consistent with findings that positive emotional expressions often yield a good impression of one's emotional well-being (Ekman & Friesen, 1975), while negative emotional expressions can lead to an impression of low self-control and weak emotion regulation capability (Gross, Richards, & John, 2006). The frequency of positive emotion words was about twice as much as that for negative emotion words (Liu, Tov, Kosinski, Stillwell, & Qiu, 2015). Importantly, it is found that positive emotional expression was related to users' IM concerns (Bazarova, 2012; Lin et al., 2014) rather than their actual well-being (Liu et al., 2015).

The research reviewed above suggests that Facebook users apply both acquisitive (i.e., expressing more positive emotions) and protective (i.e., expressing fewer negative emotions) IM strategies to enhance and optimize their self-representation. Therefore, in the current research, we examined individuals' online impression management in terms of the frequency of positive and negative emotional expression in Facebook status updates.

Culture, Tightness-Looseness, and Emotional Expression

Culture is one of the most important but complex concepts in the social sciences. Decades of culture studies have given hundreds of definitions to this concept. Hofstede and colleagues (2010, p. 6) defined culture as “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others”. Triandis (1994) defined culture as a system of shared practices, beliefs, norms, and values that are socially transmitted. Scholars have proposed various cultural dimensions that differentiate human societies, such as individualism-collectivism in Hofstede's six-dimension model of national culture (Hofstede et al., 2010).

The complexity of the culture concept stems from the fact that culture itself has many layers. For example, Hofstede and colleagues contend that there are six layers of culture, including nation/country, regional/ethnic/religious/linguistic affiliation, gender, generation,

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 6

1 social class, and organization/corporation (Hofstede et al., 2010). Among them, the national,
2 or more aptly, the societal level of culture refers to the set of knowledge, beliefs, customs,
3 and norms shared among a population of a sovereign nation or a district within a nation, e.g.,
4 provinces in China (Talhelm et al., 2014) or states in the U.S. (Harrington & Gelfand, 2014;
5 Vandello & Cohen, 1999). For example, individualism-collectivism varies across countries
6 (Hofstede et al., 2010), with China being recognized as a typical collectivistic culture and the
7 U.S. a typical individualistic culture. However, there are often important cultural differences
8 within nations. Talhelm et al. (2014) found that southern China is more collectivistic and
9 northern China is more individualistic. Vandello and Cohen (1999) also reported prominent
10 differences in individualism-collectivism across U.S. states. Societal culture is probably the
11 most prevalent level in popular lay perceptions and empirical academic studies of cultural
12 differences. Note that the current research also focuses on societal culture as we attempt to
13 examine the role of cultural variation across U.S. states in impression management.

14 Culture has a powerful influence on behavioral patterns and thinking styles. One
15 important influence of culture on daily life is on the display rules that guide emotional
16 expressions. For example, Japanese smiled more than Americans did in front of
17 experimenters after viewing stressful films even though they expressed similar negative
18 emotions when they were alone (Friesen, 1972). Olympic athletes from Eastern cultures
19 expressed their emotions less than those from Western cultures after their matches
20 (Matsumoto, Willingham, & Oltmanns, 2009). These display rules are part of social norms that
21 help people manage their self-expression in specific situational contexts and in accordance
22 with their social roles (Hwang & Matsumoto, 2012).

23 Tightness-looseness is a cultural dimension that measures the strength of social norms
24 in a society and the degree to which deviations from these norms are tolerated. Pelto (1968)
25 introduced cultural tightness as an emphasis on the adherence to social norms among

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 7

1 traditional societies. According to Pelto (1968), tight societies like the Pueblo Indians and
2 Japanese have clearly articulated norms and impose severe sanctions on deviants, whereas
3 loose societies such as the Thais lack formality and order in general and have high tolerance
4 of deviant behaviors. Triandis (1989, 1994) proposed three conditions critical for the
5 development of cultural tightness: geographic isolation, dense population, and cultural
6 homogeneity. In particular, first, geographic isolation decreases people's exposure to other
7 cultures and thus helps to reinforce the existing norms within their own culture, leading to
8 enhanced cultural tightness. Second, when a given residential area is more crowded, the need
9 for behavioral regulation increases in order to reduce friction and avoid conflict. Therefore,
10 dense population is likely to be associated with high cultural tightness. Third, in a society
11 where people are more similar in ethnicity, language, and religion, it is easier to reach
12 agreement on social norms. On the contrary, societies that are more diverse and
13 heterogeneous tend to tolerate deviations and dissimilarities.

14 In 2006, Gelfand and colleagues advanced the theory of tightness-looseness and
15 argued for the utility of the construct for explaining societal variation at multiple levels.
16 According to Gelfand et al. (2006), cultural tightness-looseness consists of two key
17 components: the strength of social norms (number and clarity) and the degree of sanctioning
18 (intolerance for deviance from norms). This cultural dimension emphasizes how the external
19 influence of norms and constraints accounts for cross-cultural differences in behaviors,
20 making it theoretically distinct from the more common cultural dimensions (e.g.,
21 individualism-collectivism) that focuses mainly on variation in personal characteristics and
22 internal values¹.

23 During the past decade, Gelfand and colleagues have conducted a series of empirical
24 studies using multiple approaches to show that tightness-looseness is a critical cultural
25 dimension that may account for differences across societies in various fields (Gelfand et al.,

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 8

2006; Gelfand et al., 2011; Harrington & Gelfand, 2014; Li, Gordon, & Gelfand, 2017). For example, societies that are vulnerable to ecological and man-made threats, such as natural disasters, diseases, and territorial conflicts, tend to have tight cultures with strong norms to coordinate social actions for survival (Gelfand et al., 2011). Cultural tightness-looseness is also reflected in prevailing institutional practices, everyday situational constraints, and individual psychological processes. Tight cultures tend to have more media restrictions, fewer civil and political rights, and more severe punishment in the justice system compared to loose cultures (Harrington & Gelfand, 2014). In everyday social situations (e.g., job interview, movies, workplace), tight (vs. loose) cultures have clearer rules and a narrower range of behaviors (e.g., eat, laugh, argue) that are considered appropriate. Individuals in tight cultures have higher self-regulatory strength including cautiousness, impulse control, and self-monitoring compared to those in loose cultures (Gelfand et al., 2011).

Given that tight cultures tend to punish deviations from social norms, we predicted that individuals from tight cultures tend to exhibit a higher degree of IM during social interactions compared with those from loose cultures. Based on this prediction and previous research findings that expressing more positive emotions and fewer negative emotions are common IM strategies on Facebook (Bazarova et al., 2013), we hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1. Individuals in tight cultures will be more likely than those in loose cultures to express positive emotions.

Hypothesis 2. Individuals in tight cultures will be less likely than those in loose cultures to express negative emotions.

Tightness-Looseness, Social Network Density, and Emotional Expression

Existing IM research has shown that individuals’ use of IM strategies depends on the partners with whom they interact. In particular, individuals exhibit more IM when their interaction partners are more valuable to them. For example, people are highly motivated to manage their self-image when interacting with someone who is powerful or of high status (Swencionis & Fiske, 2016), and they may also tend to ingratiate themselves with their bosses and teachers rather than with their friends (Kowalski & Leary, 1990). In social networking sites like Facebook, users’ interaction partners consist of many types, such as family, friends, and acquaintances. Users often do not direct their messages to a particular group of individuals, making their postings available to their whole social network. The publicness, non-directness, and mixture of social circles involved in the communication process make Facebook a complex environment for social interaction (Bazarova et al., 2013).

An important characteristic of social networks, including those on Facebook, is social network density. It represents how closely members in a social network are connected to each other (Burt, 2000) and indicates the quality of interpersonal relations in the network (Hogan, 2009). In a dense social network, members tend to have close relationships and be highly familiar with each other (Burt, 2000; Hogan, 2009); they are also more likely to receive social support (Skowronski, Gibbons, Vogl, & Walker, 2004) and long-term assistance from each other (Walker, Wasserman, & Wellman, 1993). In contrast, members in a sparse social network tend to be mere acquaintances from diverse social circles, often embodying distinct social roles (Burt, 2000).

Previous studies have suggested that people from different cultures value network density to varying degrees. For example, individuals who have a large and sparse social network are considered “foolish” or “naïve” in Ghana (Adams & Plaut, 2003). One explanation is that, in a crisis-prone society like Ghana, a small but dense social network with

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 10

close friends is more useful than a large sparse network with mere acquaintances given that close friends are more reliable than mere acquaintances in fighting threats for survival (Oishi & Kesebir, 2012).

As societies with high probability of threats tend to have tight cultures to coordinate social actions for survival (Gelfand et al., 2011), it is likely that individuals in tight cultures value dense social networks more than sparse ones. In contrast, individuals in loose cultures may value sparse networks (with mere acquaintances) more than dense networks (with close friends) because of the “strength of weak ties” (Granovetter, 1973, 1974). For example, Granovetter (1974) found that most individuals obtained a job through someone who they had known for less than one year, and those who got their job through weak ties were paid more and more satisfied with their job than those who got a job through close friends. This suggests that weak ties can be more valuable than close friends when facing less threatening problems because the information and support they provide have a broader range. Since individuals in loose cultures have a low probability of fighting threats and crisis (Gelfand et al., 2011), they are likely to favor sparse social networks to provide them with diverse information and resources that may be helpful in highly specific, non-threatening situations. Therefore, we expected that individuals from loose (tight) cultures would tend to value their sparse (dense) social networks more.

Given that individuals exhibit a higher degree of IM when facing more valuable interaction partners (Kowalski & Leary, 1990), Facebook users from tight (vs. loose) cultures should exhibit a higher degree of IM (i.e., expressing more positive and fewer negative emotions) in dense (vs. sparse) social networks. Therefore, we predicted that for positive as well as negative emotions, the direction of the relationship between social network density and frequency of emotional expression is dependent on cultural tightness-looseness according to the following nature of interaction.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 11

Hypothesis 3. There will be a cultural tightness-looseness by social network density interaction effect on positive emotional expression such that:

Hypothesis 3a. In tight cultures, individuals with *dense* social networks will be more likely than those with sparse social networks to express positive emotions; whereas

Hypothesis 3b. In loose cultures, individuals with *sparse* social networks will be more likely than those with dense social networks to express positive emotions.

Hypothesis 4. There will be a cultural tightness-looseness by social network density interaction effect on negative emotional expression such that:

Hypothesis 4a. In tight cultures, individuals with *dense* social networks will be less likely than those with sparse social networks to express negative emotions; whereas

Hypothesis 4b. In loose cultures, individuals with *sparse* social networks will be less likely than those with dense social networks to express negative emotions.

The Current Research

To summarize, this study investigates the main effects of societal-level cultural tightness-looseness as well as its interaction effects with individuals' social network density on impression management (as reflected in their emotional expression on Facebook).

First, our hypotheses regarding the main effects of cultural tightness-looseness on impression management are based on two lines of research in literature. On the one hand, past research has indicated that expressing positive emotions more frequently and negative emotions less frequently are found to be common IM strategies on Facebook and the adoption and application of IM strategies conform to social norms in social media (Bazarova, 2012; Bazarova et al., 2013); on the other hand, according to the theory of cultural tightness-looseness, tight (vs. loose) cultures encompass stronger social norms and greater intolerance

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 12

of deviance from these norms (Gelfand et al., 2006). Therefore, we expected that compared to those from loose cultures, individuals from tight cultures would adopt and apply more IM strategies on Facebook, i.e., to express positive emotions more frequently (**Hypothesis 1**) and negative emotions less frequently (**Hypothesis 2**).

Second, our hypotheses regarding the interaction effects between cultural tightness-looseness and social network density on impression management are also based on previous IM research findings and the theory of cultural tightness-looseness. On the one hand, it has been shown that IM strategies tend to be used in social interaction with partners that are considered more valuable (Kowalski & Leary, 1990). On the other hand, how valuable a certain type of interaction partners is (e.g., strong ties vs. weak ties) may vary across cultures. Specifically, a dense social network that consists of strong ties (e.g., family and close friends) is more likely to provide mutual social support (Skowronski et al., 2004) and long-term assistance (Walker et al., 1993), which is particularly important in tight cultures that value homogeneity in a society and cooperation to fight threats and crisis (Gelfand et al., 2011); in contrast, weak ties in a sparse social network that consists of mere acquaintances or even strangers tend to provide more information and more diverse resources (Granovetter, 1973), which may be critical to those in loose cultures who value heterogeneity and tolerate deviant ideas and behaviors (Gelfand et al., 2011). Therefore, we expected that in tight cultures, individuals with dense social networks would employ more IM strategies on Facebook than those with sparse social networks. Specifically, those in tight cultures would express positive emotions more frequently (**Hypothesis 3a**) and negative emotions less frequently (**Hypothesis 4a**). In contrast, in loose cultures, individuals with sparse social networks would be more likely to employ IM strategies on Facebook than those with dense social networks. Again, the greater deployment of IM would manifest in more frequent expressions of positive

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 13

emotions (**Hypothesis 3b**) and less frequent expressions of negative emotions (**Hypothesis 4b**)—primarily among those with sparse (rather than dense) networks.

We tested our hypotheses in a large-scale study with 13,789 Facebook users from different U.S. states. Through such a large sample, we were able to offer strong tests of the role of cultural tightness-looseness in online impression management. Emotional expressions and social network density were measured with Facebook status updates and users’ existing friend list, thereby serving as natural records of individuals’ daily expressions and social media profile. State-level cultural tightness scores were obtained from Harrington and Gelfand (2014, p. 2), which has been proven a valid and reliable index to account for the wide variation across U.S. states in many fields such as ecological and historical conditions, substance abuse, discrimination rates, resistance towards immigration, etc. We highlight that compared to traditional research methods using survey or experimental approaches, the current measurements eliminate demand characteristics and similar forms of invalidity in data collection.

In our analyses below, we controlled for the potential confounding factors that are conceptually distinct from cultural tightness-looseness but may be empirically related to IM and emotional expression. First, we controlled for social network size, which is distinct from social network density (Borgatti, Jones, & Everett, 1998) and is closely related to emotional sharing on social media (Lin et al., 2014).

Cultural tightness-looseness is just one aspect of complex social systems, which encompass a variety of characteristics at the societal level. Therefore, we also controlled for a set of state-level socio-demographic variables, including racial minority percentage, educational attainment, personal income level, and homicide rate per state. In addition, state-level residential mobility, i.e., the extent to which individuals change their residence (Oishi,

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 14

2010), was also tested as a control variable given its close relationship with social networking strategies (Oishi & Kesebir, 2012).

Political conservatism (vs. liberalism)—a political philosophy that emphasizes traditional institutions and maintenance of the existing order in a society—is closely related to the enforcement of social norms and thus the deployment of IM strategies in social interactions (Heywood, 2017). Similarly, collectivism (vs. individualism)—the extent to which individuals in a society define themselves as interdependent with each other (de-emphasizing the independence of the self)—is related to emotional expressivity (Matsumoto, Yoo, & Fontaine, 2008). Therefore, we also controlled for state-level political conservatism and collectivism in the current study. It is noteworthy that although cultural tightness is conceptually distinct from political conservatism (Harrington & Gelfand, 2014) and collectivism (Gelfand et al., 2011), the former construct is empirically correlated with the latter two such that many tight cultures tend to be more politically conservative and/or collectivistic (e.g., Mississippi), while many loose cultures tend to be less conservative and/or more individualistic (e.g., Oregon) (Harrington & Gelfand, 2014; Vandello & Cohen, 1999).

Method

Participants

Data for this study were obtained from the myPersonality project (<http://mypersonality.org>). This project involved a Facebook application that offered to its users psychometric tests and feedback on their scores and the data were collected from 2007 to 2012 (Kosinski, Matz, Gosling, Popov, & Stillwell, 2015). Since the original data in the myPersonality project were gathered with an explicit opt-in consent for reuse for research purposes beyond the original project and the data used in this study were secondary, anonymized, and available in the public domain, there was no need for IRB approval. We

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 15

confirmed this with our IRB in the Singapore Management University before beginning any analysis on the data. Publications by other authors using data from the myPersonality project also indicated that their university confirmed that no IRB approval was needed (e.g., Youyou, Kosinski, & Stillwell, 2015). However, in our review process, one reviewer was of the view that an IRB approval from our university was needed for this study. Therefore, we submitted an application to our university IRB, which confirmed again that our study was considered approved and exempt from further review.

In this study, we first selected participants who had granted access to their status updates and social network information (i.e., the friend list and connections between friends) and also provided U.S. location information in their profile. Next, we selected U.S. states with at least 100 participants each to ensure the representativeness of the sample for each state². This resulted in a total of 13,789 Facebook users (5,394 male, 8,334 female, and 61 with no gender indicated) from 37 states in the final analysis. A total of 13,511 users indicated their age ($M = 26.7$, $SD = 10.0$).

Focal Study Variables

Emotional Expression. Emotional expression was quantified as a percentage score, from the frequency of positive (or negative) emotional words in Facebook users' status updates using the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) software (Pennebaker, Booth, & Francis, 2007). LIWC counts the frequency of words in predefined categories that have been validated by independent judges (Pennebaker, Chung, Ireland, Gonzales, & Booth, 2007) and has been shown to be a valid text analysis tool to assess psychological attributes, behavioral activities, and emotional experiences (Tov, Ng, Lin, & Qiu, 2013). For a sample of text such as "I am happy today", LIWC will output a positive emotion score of 25% (1 of 4 words expressed positive emotion) and a negative emotion score of 0%. In the current sample of status updates, the average frequencies of positive and negative emotion words

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 16

were 4.1% ($SD = 1.4\%$) and 1.9% ($SD = 0.9\%$), respectively. These frequencies were in the same range as those reported in previous studies (Liu et al., 2015).

Social Network Density. Social network density was calculated by dividing the total number of existing connections between friends in one's friend list over the maximum number of all possible connections between these friends (Borgatti et al., 1998). The value of network density approaches "0" in extremely sparse networks where no members are connected and "1" in extremely dense networks where everyone is connected to one another. In this study, social network density per user ranged from .001 to .907 ($M = .064$, $SD = .121$).

Cultural Tightness. We obtained cultural tightness scores for U.S. states from Harrington and Gelfand (2014, p. 2), where the scores were calculated from a composite index consisting of nine items of state statistics such as "the legality of corporal punishment in schools" and "the severity of punishment for violating laws" (Cronbach's $\alpha = .84$). For the 37 states in this study, cultural tightness scores ranged from 27.37 to 78.86 ($M = 52.21$, $SD = 13.53$), with higher scores representing higher cultural tightness.

Control Variables

Social Network Size. Social network size was defined as the number of members in an egocentric network, i.e., the number of Facebook "friends" that each user has plus the user himself or herself. In this study, social network size per user ranged from 22 to 1,988 ($M = 316.7$, $SD = 286.0$).

Racial Minority Percentage. State-level racial minority percentage was indexed by the percentage of non-"White Alone" residents per state. The data were obtained from the American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates datasets (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2012) and were averaged across years from 2007 to 2012³. In this study, racial minority percentage per state ranged from 8.0% to 40.5% ($M = 22.8\%$, $SD = 9.4\%$).

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 17

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Educational Attainment.** State-level educational attainment was indexed by the
2 percentage of high school graduates or higher degree holders among residents aged 25 years
3 or over per state. The data were also obtained from the American Community Survey 1-Year
4 Estimates datasets (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2012) and were averaged across years from
5 2007 to 2012. In this study, educational attainment per state ranged from 80.3% to 91.7% (M
6 = 86.4%, $SD = 3.3\%$).

7 **Personal Income.** State-level real personal income (i.e., personal income after taking
8 into account the effects of inflation on purchasing power) was obtained from Bureau of
9 Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce (averaged data across years from 2008 to
10 2012). In this study, personal income per state ranged from 33,539.60 USD to 55,787.20
11 USD ($M = 40,671.43$, $SD = 4,308.67$).

12 **Homicide Rate.** State-level homicide rate (i.e., number of murder and nonnegligent
13 manslaughter crimes per 100,000 total population) was obtained from FBI Uniform Crime
14 Reporting (averaged data across years from 2007 to 2012). In this study, homicide rate
15 ranged from 1.5 to 11.9 ($M = 4.9$, $SD = 2.1$).

16 **Residential Mobility.** State-level residential mobility was indexed by the percentage
17 of residents aged 1 year or over who changed residence in the previous year per state. The
18 data were obtained from the American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates datasets (U.S.
19 Census Bureau, 2007-2012) and were averaged across years from 2007 to 2012. In this study,
20 residential mobility per state ranged from 10.2% to 22.0% ($M = 15.8\%$, $SD = 2.4\%$).

21 **Political Conservatism.** State-level political conservatism was calculated by
22 subtracting the percentage of self-identified liberals from the percentage of self-identified
23 conservatives in a state (Harrington & Gelfand, 2014). The data were obtained from the
24 Gallup U.S. Daily survey results (www.gallup.com) and were averaged across years from

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 18

2009 to 2012. For the 37 states in this study, political conservatism ranged from -0.1% to 36.6% ($M = 19.8\%$, $SD = 9.1\%$).

Collectivism. State-level collectivism scores were obtained from Vandello and Cohen (1999), where collectivism was measured with eight indicators such as “Ratio of people carpooling to work to driving alone” and “Percentage of households with grandchildren in them” (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .71$). For the 37 states in this study, collectivism ranged from 31 to 72 ($M = 50.9$, $SD = 10.2$).

Results

Table 1 below summarizes the state-level data on the variables in our study.

[Table 1 insert about here]

We first examined the zero-order correlations among all variables in this study (Table 2). Results showed that cultural tightness score was significantly and positively correlated with positive emotional expression at the state level, $r(37) = .496$, $p = .002$. There was also a significant negative correlation between cultural tightness score and negative emotional expression at the state level, $r(37) = -.498$, $p = .002$.

[Table 2 insert about here]

To further examine the main effects of cultural tightness and its interaction effects with social network density on emotional expression, we tested two multilevel models for positive and negative emotions, respectively. In each model, the two focal study predictors

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 19

(i.e., social network density at the individual level and cultural tightness at the state level) and the cross-level interaction term between the two predictors were entered.

Multilevel analysis requires a sample of at least 20 groups with at least 30 individuals each to achieve an acceptable level of power (Heck & Thomas, 2000). In this study, there were 13,789 individuals nested in 37 groups with 101 to 1,610 individuals per group thereby providing sufficient statistical power for the analysis. Following previous research (Hox, 2010), the individual-level predictor (i.e., social network density) was group-mean centered, while the state-level predictor (i.e., cultural tightness score) was grand-mean centered.

In the following analysis, multilevel models were tested using the Linear Mixed Models function in SPSS (IBM Corporation, New York). Note that the covariance structure was specified as “Unstructured” for maximal estimation of the random effects, and maximum step-halvings was set as 100 to ensure model convergence (more details of model specifications can be found in the Table S1 in Supplemental Material). The intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) for positive and negative emotional expression were .021 and .005, respectively.

Gamma (γ) was used as the regression coefficient symbol to represent the standardized effect size in multilevel modeling tests, which was calculated using Hox (2010)’s method (p. 22). Meanwhile, we also calculated and reported the percentage of variance accounted for by the multilevel regression models, as compared with “null” models (i.e., intercept-only models), according to Snijders and Bosker’s (1999) method using pooled variances (also see Hox, 2010, pp. 75-76).

For the analysis of positive emotional expression, the model explained 0.8% of the total variance at the individual level and 22.8% of the total variance at the state level. Cultural tightness score significantly and positively predicted positive emotional expression ($\gamma = .079$, 95% confidence interval (CI) = [.032, .126], $p = .002$), indicating that individuals

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 20

from culturally tight states were more likely to express positive emotions online than those from culturally loose states (see Table 3 below). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

[Table 3 insert about here]

For the analysis of negative emotional expression, the model explained 0.3% of the total variance at the individual level and 20.6% of the total variance at the state level. Cultural tightness score significantly and negatively predicted negative emotional expression ($\gamma = -.045$, 95% CI = $[-.072, -.017]$, $p = .003$), indicating that individuals were less likely to express negative emotions online in culturally tight than loose states (see Table 3). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was also supported.

Table 3 also showed that social network density was not significantly associated with positive emotional expression ($\gamma = .005$, 95% CI = $[-.017, .028]$, $p > .50$). However, the effect of social network density was moderated by cultural tightness score ($\gamma = .036$, 95% CI = $[-.013, .059]$, $p = .004$)⁴. The interaction effect was plotted to understand its nature, as shown in Figure 1a.

[Figure 1 insert about here]

Specifically, for culturally tight states, social network density was positively correlated with positive emotional expression. Simple slopes analysis showed that the standardized slope for culturally tight states (1 SD above the mean of the cultural tightness scores among the 37 states) was .044 (95% CI = $[-.011, .076]$, $p = .008$). This indicated that in culturally tight states, individuals with dense social networks were more likely than those with sparse social networks to express positive emotions. Thus, Hypothesis 3a was supported.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 21

1 In contrast, for culturally loose states, social network density was negatively
2 correlated with positive emotional expression. Simple slopes analysis showed that the
3 standardized slope for culturally loose states (1 SD below the mean) was $-.033$ (95% CI =
4 $[-.063, -.002]$, $p = .035$). This indicated that in culturally loose states, individuals with sparse
5 social networks were more likely than those with dense social networks to express positive
6 emotions. Thus, Hypothesis 3b was also supported.

7 Social network density was not significantly associated with negative emotional
8 expression ($\gamma = .006$, 95% CI = $[-.018, .029]$, $p > .50$). Furthermore, the interaction between
9 cultural tightness score and social network density was not significant ($\gamma = -.006$, 95% CI =
10 $[-.030, .017]$, $p > .50$). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

11 To rule out the potential influence of confounding factors (individual-level social
12 network size and state-level racial minority, educational attainment, personal income,
13 homicide rate, residential mobility, political conservatism, and collectivism), we also tested
14 16 pairs of extended multilevel models, with each pair respectively predicting positive and
15 negative emotional expression after controlling for one of the eight confounding variables.

16 Results showed that after controlling for social network size, racial minority,
17 educational attainment, personal income, homicide rate, residential mobility, or collectivism,
18 cultural tightness score was still associated with higher levels of positive emotional
19 expression (all $ps < .015$) and lower levels of negative emotional expression (all $ps < .022$),
20 again supporting Hypotheses 1 and 2. However, after controlling for political conservatism,
21 cultural tightness score was not significantly associated with either positive emotional
22 expression ($p = .086$) or negative emotional expression ($p > .50$). In contrast, political
23 conservatism was positively associated with positive emotional expression ($\gamma = .155$, $p <$
24 $.001$) but was unrelated to negative emotional expression ($p = .170$). We discussed this result
25 in detail in the Discussion (also see Table S8 in the Supplementary Materials).

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 22

1 The interaction effect between cultural tightness score and social network density on
2 positive emotional expression remained significant (all $ps < .023$) after controlling for the
3 eight confounding variables, respectively. In particular, for culturally tight states (1 SD above
4 the mean), social network density was positively correlated with positive emotional
5 expression (all $ps < .036$ after controlling for social network size, racial minority percentage,
6 homicide rate, residential mobility, collectivism, and political conservatism, respectively; ps
7 = .073 and .056 after controlling for educational attainment and personal income,
8 respectively). Thus, Hypothesis 3a was still supported generally. In contrast, for culturally
9 loose states (1 SD below the mean), the association between social network density and
10 positive emotional expression was negative (all $ps < .045$). Thus, Hypothesis 3b was also
11 supported. Finally, the interaction effect of cultural tightness score by social network density
12 on negative emotional expression was not significant. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not
13 supported as previously.

14 To further verify the robustness of our findings, we conducted a supplementary
15 analysis using OLS (ordinary least squares) regression models in SPSS with the PROCESS
16 macro, which is a well-established and widely used method to test moderator effects (Hayes,
17 2013). The 50 U.S. states measured in Harrington and Gelfand (2014, p. 2) had a median
18 cultural tightness score of 49.15, ranging from 27.37 (California) to 78.86 (Mississippi).
19 Therefore, we defined tight states as those with a cultural tightness score in the top 50%
20 (above 49.15) and loose states in the bottom 50% (below 49.15). For the 37 states in our
21 study, this resulted 7,014 users from 17 loose states (Arizona, California, Colorado,
22 Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana,
23 Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin) and 6,775 users from
24 20 tight states (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana,
25 Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 23

1 Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and Virginia). Accordingly, cultural tightness score was
2 converted into a dichotomized variable (loose culture vs. tight culture). We then conducted
3 separate OLS hierarchical multiple regression analyses to test the moderator hypotheses for
4 predicting positive and negative emotional expressions, respectively. All variables were
5 standardized before entering the regression models.

6 Results showed that cultural tightness significantly and positively predicted positive
7 emotional expression ($\beta = .057$, 95% CI = [.040, .074], $p < .001$) and also provided negative
8 prediction for negative emotional expression ($\beta = -.034$, 95% CI = [-.050, -.017], $p < .001$),
9 indicating that compared to those in culturally loose states, individuals in culturally tight
10 states were more likely to express positive emotions and less likely to express negative
11 emotions. Thus, these results from the OLS regression analysis replicated the support for
12 Hypotheses 1 and 2 in the previous multilevel model analysis.

13 Meanwhile, a significant interaction effect of cultural tightness by social network
14 density was found on positive emotional expression ($\beta = .027$, 95% CI = [.010, .043], p
15 = .002). Simple slopes analysis showed that social network density was positively correlated
16 with positive emotional expression for culturally tight states (simple slope $\beta = .028$, 95% CI
17 = [.003, .053], $p = .026$), but it was negatively correlated with positive emotional expression
18 for culturally loose states (simple slope $\beta = -.025$, 95% CI = [-.048, -.003], $p = .030$). This
19 result replicated the findings from the previous multilevel model analysis, which again
20 supported Hypothesis 3. In contrast, the interaction effect of cultural tightness by social
21 network density on negative emotional expression was not significant ($\beta = .005$, $p > .50$).
22 Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported as previously.

23 To sum up, results from the OLS regression analysis where cultural tightness-
24 looseness was treated as a dichotomous variable at the individual level replicated the findings

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 24

from the previous multilevel model analysis in which cultural tightness-looseness was operationalized as a continuous variable at the state level.

Discussion

In this study, we examined the effects of state-level cultural tightness-looseness and individual-level social network density on individuals' impression management using large-scale data on emotional expressions on Facebook. As predicted in Hypotheses 1 and 2, our results showed that individuals from culturally tight (vs. loose) states in the U.S. were more likely to express positive emotions and less likely to express negative emotions. Our prediction of a cultural tightness-looseness by social network density interaction effect on positive emotional expression (as specified in Hypothesis 3) was also supported. In particular, individuals from culturally tight states were more likely to express positive emotions in dense social networks (supporting Hypothesis 3a), whereas individuals from culturally loose states were more likely to express positive emotions in sparse social networks (supporting Hypothesis 3b). However, contrary to our prediction in Hypothesis 4, we did not find a cultural tightness-looseness by social network density interaction effect on negative emotional expression. Specifically, social network density was not significantly related to negative emotional expression in either tight or loose states.

The present findings provide several theoretical contributions and practical implications for cross-cultural studies on emotional expression and impression management in social media.

Cultural Influence of Tightness-Looseness on Emotional Expressions

First, the current research provides fairly robust evidence that cultural tightness-looseness may influence how individuals express emotions in their online communications in social media. While individuals may manage impressions by expressing positive emotions

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 25

rather than negative emotions on Facebook, those from tight (vs. loose) states in the U.S. were more likely to express positive emotions and less likely to express negative emotions in social media. This suggests that individuals from tight (vs. loose) cultures may use more IM strategies to project and maintain a positive image in their online social communities.

Previous research has suggested that social media users tend to adopt IM strategies to establish and uphold a positive self-image online (e.g., Cunningham, 2013). This includes the usage of acquisitive and protective IM strategies (Arkin, 1981; Leary & Kowalski, 1990), by overexpressing positive emotions and refraining from disclosing negative emotions, respectively (Bazarova et al., 2013). Facebook, unlike many traditional online discussion boards, is a semi-public communication platform where users often use their authentic identity and their connections on Facebook may include family, friends, colleagues, and other individuals in their social network. Therefore, the posting of status updates is to be viewed by the users' contacts in real life, which may further motivate users to maintain a positive self-image on Facebook. Past studies have shown that Facebook users tend to selectively disclose more positive than negative emotions (Bazarova et al., 2013; Lin et al., 2014). In an auxiliary analysis, the present study found that the usage frequency of positive emotional words (4.1%) was about twice as that of negative emotional words (1.9%).

Taken together, overexpressing positive emotions but concealing negative emotions is a prevalent IM strategy for presenting and maintaining a positive self-image among Facebook users. Such prevalence has become a social norm on online communication platforms (Bazarova et al., 2013; Lin et al., 2014). According to the theory of cultural tightness-looseness (Gelfand et al., 2006), tight (vs. loose) cultures emphasize explicit and stringently enforced social norms and have less tolerance for deviant behaviors. Consequently, individuals from tight cultures are more likely to regulate their behaviors in compliance with social norms and, in the case of emotional expressions on social media, more heavily adopt

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 26

IM strategies such as disclosing more positive emotions and fewer negative emotions than individuals from loose cultures. Therefore, the current findings provide empirical evidence for the effects of cultural tightness-looseness on IM.

Moderator Effects of Tightness-Looseness on Emotional Expressions

The current research reveals the pattern of IM in social media in terms of online emotional expression as a function of both cultural tightness-looseness and social network density. The precise nature of the effect of social network density on emotional expression is dependent on cultural tightness-looseness and the valence of the emotion.

Specifically, in culturally tight states, individuals with dense social networks tended to express positive emotions more frequently than those with sparse social networks (solid line in Figure 1a); in culturally loose states, this pattern was reversed such that individuals with dense social networks tended to express positive emotions less frequently than those with sparse social networks (dashed line in Figure 1a). In contrast, the expression of negative emotion did not covary with network density in either tight or loose states.

Previous research has shown that emotional displays depend on both cultural environment (e.g., individualism-collectivism) and social context (e.g., interpersonal relationship). For example, members of collectivistic cultures tend to express more positive emotions and fewer negative emotions to in-group (versus out-group) members. In contrast, members of individualistic cultures tend to express more negative emotions and fewer positive emotions to in-group members than out-group members or strangers (Matsumoto, 1990). Researchers have argued that in-group and out-group social networks may have different meanings to individuals from individualistic versus collectivistic cultures.

Similarly, in the current study, individuals from tight versus loose cultures may adopt different IM strategies to maintain their self-image online because they have different concerns when expressing emotions in different social networks. On the one hand, tight

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 27

1 cultures highly value the compliance of social norms and have low tolerance of deviant
2 behaviors (Gelfand et al., 2006; Peltó, 1968). In addition, violation of social norms may bring
3 more severe consequences in a dense than sparse social network, given that close contacts in
4 dense social networks are likely to be viewed as more valuable than acquaintances in tight
5 cultures. Therefore, for individuals from tight cultures, maintaining a positive image within a
6 dense social network is a key concern.

7 On the other hand, loose cultures define wider latitude for proper behavior and are
8 more permissive of deviations from social norms (Gelfand et al., 2006; Peltó, 1968).
9 Therefore, unlike those from tight cultures, individuals from loose cultures may not only
10 focus on whether their behaviors are violating the social norm such as maintaining a positive
11 self-image online. Instead, they may also value what they can get from disclosing emotions to
12 an audience. According to previous findings on the strength of weak ties (Granovetter, 1973,
13 1974), contacts in a sparse social network tend to be acquaintances with diverse social roles
14 and resources and may be more likely to provide social support that one needs to solve minor
15 problems.

16 Negative emotional expression was not related to social network density in either
17 tight or loose cultures. This may be related to the nature of the two types of emotions.
18 Disclosing positive emotions generally helps to establish a good impression. In contrast,
19 disclosing negative emotion can be damaging to one's self-image in some instances (Gross et
20 al., 2006); but may also help one attract attention and receive social support (Skowronski et
21 al., 2004). Perhaps the social consequences of negative emotional expression differ in tight
22 versus loose cultures. Although tight cultures tend to *punish* deviations from social norms,
23 they do not necessarily *reward* compliance. Thus, in such a cultural context, protective IM
24 strategies (e.g., avoiding disapproval) may be deployed more uniformly across social
25 contexts. As a result, whether social networks are dense or sparse, negative emotional

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 28

expression is less frequent compared with loose cultures. In contrast, the consequences of negative emotional expression may be more varied in loose cultures. People may be harmed or helped when they expressed negative emotion regardless of social network density.

Implications for Making Better Use of Social Media in Psychological Studies

The present findings on emotional expressions have high ecological validity. Using social media data, the current study involves a large-scale dataset where emotional expressions through actual daily communications were retrieved from a sample of over thirteen thousand participants in a natural setting (i.e., coded from everyday status updates on Facebook). Hence, this study may offer greater generalizability than studies of emotional expression in laboratory experiments or survey questionnaires.

Over the past decade, social media have not only become an important part in daily life but also a powerful research tool for the social sciences (Kosinski et al., 2015). Previous research has shown that activities in social media serve as effective markers of individuals' personality traits, psychological states, and behaviors in real life. For example, Facebook likes predicted a variety of users' private attributes such as gender, race, religion, and personality (Kosinski, Stillwell, & Graepel, 2013), and the prediction of personality was even more accurate than human judgments (Youyou et al., 2015). Here, we presented an initial attempt to study IM through online emotional expressions and the findings argued for the importance of jointly considering both culture (i.e., cultural tightness) and social network structure (i.e., network density).

The present study sheds some light on the characteristics of computer-mediated communication and provides practical implications on how user-generated content on social media can be utilized for studying individuals' behavioral patterns. Given the increasing importance of social media in people's daily life, it is hoped that, beyond the specific findings on IM and emotions, the research methods used in this study and the findings obtained will

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 29

1 help open up new and fruitful avenues of research on individual and cultural variables that
2 may influence other attitudes and behaviors expressed in social media communications.

3 **Robustness of the Current Findings**

4 We highlight that the present findings were replicated after controlling for the
5 potential confounding effects of individual's social network size and various state-level
6 factors including racial minority percentage, educational attainment, personal income,
7 homicide rate, residential mobility, and collectivism. Although the main effects of cultural
8 tightness disappeared after controlling for political conservatism, the cultural tightness by
9 social network density interaction effect on positive emotional expression remained
10 significant. In addition, the findings were replicated in OLS regression models where cultural
11 tightness was dichotomized and treated as an individual-level characteristic instead of being
12 operationalized as a state-level context variable in the multilevel models. Taken together,
13 these replicated results demonstrated the robustness of our findings regarding the main
14 effects of cultural tightness on both positive and negative emotional expression as well as its
15 interaction effects with social network density on positive emotional expression.

16 **Limitations and Future Directions**

17 The main effects of cultural tightness on emotional expression were no longer
18 significant after controlling for political conservatism. In addition, cultural tightness was
19 highly correlated with political conservatism among the 37 U.S. states in our study ($r(37) =$
20 $.862, p < .001$), which is consistent with Harrington and Gelfand (2014, p. 3)'s study ($r(50) =$
21 $.720, p < .001$). From the perspective of statistical analysis, a high correlation between two
22 predictor variables in the regression analysis runs the risk of multicollinearity and
23 undermining the statistical significance of a predictor variable (Allen, 1997), which might
24 apply to our analyses when both cultural tightness and political conservatism were included
25 in the same regression analysis.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 30

1 However, despite the high correlation between cultural tightness and conservatism
2 and the high likelihood that the two are mutually reinforcing (Harrington & Gelfand, 2014),
3 the two constructs differ in important ways. Tightness-looseness refers to an external social
4 reality and is independent of any single individual. It reflects the relative strength of social
5 norms and degree of behavioral constraint versus latitude in a social system as a whole
6 (Gelfand et al., 2006). In contrast, conservatism is an individual-level set of beliefs consisting
7 of personal attitudes and values such as preserving social institutions, and emphasizing
8 stability and continuity (Heywood, 2017). Moreover, tightness-looseness and conservatism
9 correlate differently with other constructs. For example, as shown in Table 2, cultural
10 tightness was not correlated with residential mobility ($r(37) = .085, p > .50$) whereas there
11 was a significant positive correlation between conservatism and residential mobility ($r(37) =$
12 $.344, p = .037$). These results provided discriminant validity evidence that the two constructs
13 are distinct although correlated.

14 The analysis of positive emotional expression provides additional discriminant
15 validity evidence for conservatism and cultural tightness. Conservatism, but not cultural
16 tightness, was associated with higher levels of positive emotional expression. In contrast,
17 cultural tightness, but not conservatism, moderated the effects of network density on positive
18 emotional expression (see Table S8). Past research suggests that political conservatism (at the
19 individual level) is associated with traits indicative of politeness (Hirsh, DeYoung, Xu, &
20 Peterson, 2010). Such traits include pleasantness and nurturance—which are concerned with
21 respecting and pleasing others. Such traits may be more directly related to positive emotional
22 expression than cultural tightness—which refers more to a cultural system in which norms
23 are strongly enforced. However, nothing in the concept of politeness implies *to whom* one
24 should be polite—which may explain why cultural tightness and not conservatism moderates
25 the relation between social network density and positive emotional expression. The

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 31

1 distinction between conservatism and cultural tightness deserves more attention—preferably
2 in a wider sample of societies outside of the U.S.

3 Another limitation of this study is its correlational design precluded a rigorous test of
4 possible causal mechanisms that may underlie the effects of cultural tightness and social
5 network density. Future research including experimental design studies could test these
6 potential causal mechanisms.

7 Finally, in our study, LIWC coding of emotional expressions from Facebook status
8 updates is unable to distinguish between emotional expressions in the private sphere (e.g.,
9 “I’m lonely and bored”) and those about subjects in the public sphere (e.g., “I hate the
10 President of my university, cause he is an embezzler”)⁵. The two types of emotional
11 expressions may reflect different psychological meanings (e.g., reflecting individual
12 differences in personality) and indicate different behavioral outputs (e.g., drinking problems
13 vs. street protests), which could be distinctively influenced by cultural tightness. With more
14 advanced text analysis tool or method that can differentiate between emotional expressions in
15 the private sphere and those in the public sphere, future studies could examine the boundary
16 conditions or moderators for the effects of cultural tightness on people’s emotional
17 expression and impression management.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 32

Footnotes

¹ We note that cultural tightness is a distinct construct from authoritarianism.

According to Adorno et al. (1950), authoritarianism (or called the authoritarian personality) is considered a complex culmination of several attitudes, consisting of nine traits such as conventionalism and authoritarian submission. Feldman and Stenner (1997) developed a four-item scale of the authoritarianism emphasizing values such as respect for elders, obedience, good manners, and being well-behaved. From the definition and measurement of authoritarianism, it can be seen that authoritarianism tends to focus on individual-level values and thus is theoretically distinct from cultural tightness, which “describes an external social reality that exists independent of any one individual and reflects the relative strength of norms and degree of behavioral constraint versus latitude in a social system as a whole” (Harrington & Gelfand, 2014, p. 3). We thank the anonymous reviewer for raising this important issue.

² We first identified 14,702 U.S. Facebook users who indicated their hometown country as the U.S. or, if hometown country was not provided, indicated their current country as the U.S. Among these U.S. users, we used their hometown state as the cultural background or their current state if hometown state was not available. After excluding the states that have fewer than 100 users each, a final sample of 13,789 users from 37 U.S. states was included in the current study.

³ Since the Facebook data from the myPersonality database were collected from 2007 to 2012 (<http://mypersonality.org>), we made efforts to locate all data collected in that period and used average data across years between 2007 and 2012 whenever available.

⁴ Following the equation in Hox (2010, p. 22), the standardized regression coefficient of the cross-level interaction term was calculated by multiplying the unstandardized regression coefficient with the standard deviation (SD) of the interaction term divided by the

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 33

SD of the outcome variable (i.e., positive emotional expression). This standardized regression coefficient ($\gamma = .036$) points to the change of positive emotional expression per SD change in the interaction term. We also tested the interaction effect by first standardizing the predictors (i.e., group-mean centered social network density and grand-mean centered cultural tightness) before they were entered into the multilevel models and obtained the standardized regression coefficient for the cross-level interaction term, $\gamma = .052$, 95% CI = [.019, .086], $p = .004$. This points to how much the effect of social network density on positive emotional expression changes per SD change in cultural tightness.

⁵ We thank the anonymous reviewer for raising this important point.

References

- <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/pspb>

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 35

1
2
3 1 Borgatti, S. P., Jones, C., & Everett, M. G. (1998). Network measures of social capital.
4
5 2 *Connections*, 21(2), 27-36.
6
7 3 Burt, R. S. (2000). The network structure of social capital. *Research in Organizational*
8
9 4 *Behavior*, 22, 345-423. doi:10.1016/S0191-3085(00)22009-1
10
11 5 Cunningham, C. (2013). *Social networking and impression management: Self-presentation in*
12
13 6 *the digital age*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
14
15 7 Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1975). Unmasking the face: A guide to recognizing emotions
16
17 8 from facial cues. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
18
19 9 Feldman, S., & Stenner, K. (1997). Perceived threat and authoritarianism. *Political*
20
21 10 *Psychology*, 18(4), 741-770. doi:10.1111/0162-895X.00077
22
23 11 Friesen, W. V. (1972). *Cultural differences in facial expression a social situation: An*
24
25 12 *experimental test of the concept of display rules*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
26
27 13 University of California, San Francisco.
28
29 14 Gelfand, M. J., Nishii, L. H., & Raver, J. L. (2006). On the nature and importance of cultural
30
31 15 tightness-looseness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1225-1244.
32
33 16 doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1225
34
35 17 Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L. H., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., . . . Yamaguchi,
36
37 18 S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*,
38
39 19 332(6033), 1100-1104. doi:10.1126/science.1197754
40
41 20 Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6),
42
43 21 1360-1380.
44
45 22 Granovetter, M. S. (1974). *Getting a job*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
46
47 23 Gross, J. J., Richards, J. M., & John, O. P. (2006). Emotion regulation in everyday life. In D.
48
49 24 K. Snyder, J. Simpson, & J. N. Hughes (Eds.), *Emotion regulation in couples and*
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 36

- 1
2
3 1 *families: Pathways to dysfunction and health* (pp. 13-35). Washington, DC: American
4
5 2 Psychological Association.
6
7 3 Harrington, J. R., & Gelfand, M. J. (2014). Tightness–looseness across the 50 united states.
8
9 4 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*(22), 7990-7995.
10
11 5 doi:10.1073/pnas.1317937111
12
13
14 6 Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process*
15
16 7 *analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
17
18 8 Heck, R. H., & Thomas, S. L. (2000). An introduction to multilevel models in organizational
19
20 9 and educational research. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
21
22 10 Heywood, A. (2017). *Political ideologies: An introduction* (6 ed.). London, England:
23
24 11 Palgrave Macmillan.
25
26 12 Hirsh, J. B., DeYoung, C. G., Xu, X., & Peterson, J. B. (2010). Compassionate liberals and
27
28 13 polite conservatives: Associations of agreeableness with political ideology and moral
29
30 14 values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*(5), 655-664.
31
32 15 doi:10.1177/0146167210366854
33
34
35 16 Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of*
36
37 17 *the mind* (3 ed.). New York, NY: McGrawHill.
38
39 18 Hogan, B. J. (2009). *Networking in everyday life*. (Doctor of Philosophy), University of
40
41 19 Toronto, Toronto, Canada.
42
43 20 Hox, J. (2010). *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications* (2 ed.). New York, NY:
44
45 21 Routledge.
46
47
48 22 Hwang, H. S., & Matsumoto, D. (2012). Ethnic differences in display rules are mediated by
49
50 23 perceived relationship commitment. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 3*(4),
51
52 24 254-262. doi:10.1037/a0026627
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 37

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Kosinski, M., Matz, S. C., Gosling, S. D., Popov, V., & Stillwell, D. (2015). Facebook as a
2 research tool for the social sciences: Opportunities, challenges, ethical considerations,
3 and practical guidelines. *American Psychologist*, 70(6), 543-556.
4 doi:10.1037/a0039210

5 Kosinski, M., Stillwell, D. J., & Graepel, T. (2013). Private traits and attributes are
6 predictable from digital records of human behavior. *Proceedings of the National*
7 *Academy of Sciences*, 110(15), 5802-5805. doi:10.1073/pnas.1218772110

8 Kowalski, R. M., & Leary, M. R. (1990). Strategic self-presentation and the avoidance of
9 aversive events: Antecedents and consequences of self-enhancement and self-
10 depreciation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 26(4), 322-336.
11 doi:10.1016/0022-1031(90)90042-K

12 Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and
13 two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107(1), 34-47. doi:10.1037/0033-
14 2909.107.1.34

15 Li, R., Gordon, S., & Gelfand, M. J. (2017). Tightness–looseness: A new framework to
16 understand consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 27(3), 377-391.
17 doi:10.1016/j.jcps.2017.04.001

18 Lin, H., Tov, W., & Qiu, L. (2014). Emotional disclosure on social networking sites: The role
19 of network structure and psychological needs. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 41,
20 342-350. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.09.045

21 Liu, P., Tov, W., Kosinski, M., Stillwell, D. J., & Qiu, L. (2015). Do Facebook status updates
22 reflect subjective well-being? *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*,
23 18(7), 373-379. doi:10.1089/cyber.2015.0022

24 Matsumoto, D. (1990). Cultural similarities and differences in display rules. *Motivation and*
25 *Emotion*, 14(3), 195-214. doi:10.1007/BF00995569

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 38

- 1
2
3 1 Matsumoto, D., Willingham, B., & Olide, A. (2009). Sequential dynamics of culturally
4
5 2 moderated facial expressions of emotion. *Psychological Science*, 20(10), 1269-1274.
6
7 3 doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02438.x
8
9 4 Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S. H., & Fontaine, J. (2008). Mapping expressive differences around
10
11 5 the world the relationship between emotional display rules and individualism versus
12
13 6 collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 39(1), 55-74.
14
15 7 doi:10.1177/0022022107311854
16
17 8 Oishi, S. (2010). The psychology of residential mobility: Implications for the self, social
18
19 9 relationships, and well-being. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(1), 5-21.
20
21 10 doi:10.1177/1745691609356781
22
23 11 Oishi, S., & Kesebir, S. (2012). Optimal social-networking strategy is a function of
24
25 12 socioeconomic conditions. *Psychological Science*, 23(12), 1542-1548.
26
27 13 doi:10.1177/0956797612446708
28
29 14 Pelto, P. J. (1968). The differences between “tight” and “loose” societies. *Trans-action*, 5(5),
30
31 15 37-40. doi:10.1007/BF03180447
32
33 16 Pennebaker, J. W., Booth, R. J., & Francis, M. E. (2007). *Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count*
34
35 17 (*LIWC2007*). Austin, TX: <http://www.liwc.net>.
36
37 18 Pennebaker, J. W., Chung, C. K., Ireland, M., Gonzales, A., & Booth, R. J. (2007). *The*
38
39 19 *development and psychometric properties of LIWC2007*. Austin, TX:
40
41 20 <http://www.liwc.net>.
42
43 21 Rosenberg, J., & Egbert, N. (2011). Online impression management: Personality traits and
44
45 22 concerns for secondary goals as predictors of self-presentation tactics on Facebook.
46
47 23 *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(1), 1-18. doi:10.1111/j.1083-
48
49 24 6101.2011.01560.x
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 39

1
2
3 1 Skowronski, J., Gibbons, J., Vogl, R., & Walker, W. R. (2004). The effect of social
4
5 2 disclosure on the intensity of affect provoked by autobiographical memories. *Self and*
6
7 3 *Identity*, 3(4), 285-309. doi:10.1080/13576500444000065
8
9 4 Snijders, T. A. B., & Bosker, R. J. (1999). *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and*
10
11 5 *applied multilevel analysis* (1 ed.). London, England: SAGE.
12
13 6 Swencionis, J. K., & Fiske, S. T. (2016). Promote up, ingratiate down: Status comparisons
14
15 7 drive warmth-competence tradeoffs in impression management. *Journal of*
16
17 8 *Experimental Social Psychology*, 64, 27-34. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2016.01.004
18
19 9 Talhelm, T., Zhang, X., Oishi, S., Shimin, C., Duan, D., Lan, X., & Kitayama, S. (2014).
20
21 10 Large-scale psychological differences within China explained by rice versus wheat
22
23 11 agriculture. *Science*, 344(6184), 603-608. doi:10.1126/science.1246850
24
25 12 Tov, W., Ng, K. L., Lin, H., & Qiu, L. (2013). Detecting well-being via computerized content
26
27 13 analysis of brief diary entries. *Psychological Assessment*, 25(4), 1069–1078.
28
29 14 doi:10.1037/a0033007
30
31 15 Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts.
32
33 16 *Psychological Review*, 96(3), 506-520. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.96.3.506
34
35 17 Triandis, H. C. (1994). Major cultural syndromes and emotion. In S. Kitayama & H. R.
36
37 18 Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence*.
38
39 19 Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
40
41 20 Vandellos, J. A., & Cohen, D. (1999). Patterns of individualism and collectivism across the
42
43 21 United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(2), 279.
44
45 22 doi:10.1037/0022-3514.77.2.279
46
47 23 Walker, M. E., Wasserman, S., & Wellman, B. (1993). Statistical models for social support
48
49 24 networks. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 22(1), 71-98.
50
51 25 doi:10.1177/0049124193022001004
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 40

- 1 Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication impersonal, interpersonal, and
2 hyperpersonal interaction. *Communication Research*, 23(1), 3-43.
3 doi:10.1177/009365096023001001
- 4 Walther, J. B., Van Der Heide, B., Kim, S. Y., Westerman, D., & Tong, S. T. (2008). The
5 role of friends' appearance and behavior on evaluations of individuals on Facebook:
6 Are we known by the company we keep? *Human Communication Research*, 34(1),
7 28-49. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2007.00312.x
- 8 Youyou, W., Kosinski, M., & Stillwell, D. J. (2015). Computer-based personality judgments
9 are more accurate than those made by humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy*
10 *of Sciences*, 112(4), 1036-1040. doi:10.1073/pnas.1418680112
- 11 Zhao, S., Grasmuck, S., & Martin, J. (2008). Identity construction on Facebook: Digital
12 empowerment in anchored relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(5), 1816-
13 1836. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2008.02.012

**Effects of Cultural Tightness-Looseness and Social Network Density on
Expression of Positive and Negative Emotions:
A Large-Scale Study of Impression Management by Facebook Users**

Methodology

Facebook data used in this study were obtained from the myPersonality project where a Facebook application called myPersonality was developed by David Stillwell and Michal Kosinski to enable users to take a variety of psychometric tests (Kosinski, Matz, Gosling, Popov, & Stillwell, 2015). Users gave consent before they took the tests and they had the option to grant researchers permission to download their Facebook data for research purposes¹. The datasets have been published online and are accessible to registered research collaborators² (More details can be found at <http://mypersonality.org/>).

¹ More details on the consent forms used in the myPersonality project can be found at http://mypersonality.org/wiki/doku.php?id=consent_forms

² The first and corresponding author of the present paper is a registered research collaborator of the myPersonality project and downloaded myPersonality datasets for analysis in the present study.

Figure 1. Positive and negative emotional expression as a function of cultural tightness and social network density

101x50mm (300 x 300 DPI)

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION

Table 1

Characteristics of the 37 U.S. states in the study

State	N	Age	Female %	NS ^a	ND ^a	PE ^a	NE ^a	MP ^b	EA ^b	PI ^b	HR ^b	RM ^b	PC ^b	CO ^b	CT ^b
Alabama	193	27.8	62.3	397.1	.057	4.5	1.8	30.3	82.2	37,925.0	7.1	15.6	34.7	57.0	75.5
Arizona	256	25.2	62.0	259.7	.053	4.2	2.0	21.0	84.8	34,464.2	6.2	19.9	20.0	49.0	47.6
Arkansas	171	25.7	64.1	368.6	.065	4.3	1.8	21.6	82.8	37,023.2	5.8	17.4	29.3	54.0	75.0
California	1,610	25.9	61.1	285.5	.059	4.1	1.9	37.9	80.7	38,725.2	5.3	15.9	8.3	60.0	27.4
Colorado	257	25.7	59.1	249.4	.064	4.4	2.0	15.8	89.6	40,790.2	3.0	19.4	15.0	36.0	42.9
Connecticut	146	26.5	52.8	351.2	.046	3.8	1.9	21.2	88.8	55,787.2	3.5	12.2	5.8	50.0	36.4
Florida	613	26.6	61.6	293.4	.049	4.2	1.9	23.4	85.6	38,671.4	5.7	16.5	19.3	54.0	49.3
Georgia	394	26.6	61.5	382.2	.061	4.3	1.8	38.7	84.1	37,598.8	6.2	17.0	25.8	60.0	60.3
Illinois	675	27.4	59.3	330.0	.061	4.0	1.9	27.8	86.6	41,859.4	5.8	13.4	13.0	52.0	46.0
Indiana	409	25.6	63.5	342.5	.058	4.3	1.9	14.8	86.8	38,612.8	4.9	15.6	24.0	57.0	54.6
Iowa	233	27.7	59.2	317.4	.072	4.0	2.0	8.0	90.5	43,226.6	1.5	15.6	21.7	39.0	49.0
Kansas	241	26.6	61.1	331.0	.079	4.3	2.0	14.3	89.6	44,974.2	3.7	17.5	24.4	38.0	60.4
Kentucky	214	26.6	61.0	321.2	.081	4.2	1.9	11.5	82.0	37,144.4	4.3	15.4	23.0	53.0	63.9
Louisiana	217	28.6	64.4	374.1	.048	4.5	1.7	36.6	81.8	40,702.8	11.9	14.8	32.4	72.0	65.9
Maryland	252	26.1	57.4	360.5	.062	3.9	1.9	40.4	88.3	44,823.8	7.8	13.6	8.6	63.0	45.5
Massachusetts	251	26.6	54.8	373.3	.055	3.6	2.1	18.4	89.0	48,914.0	2.6	13.4	-0.1	46.0	35.1
Michigan	648	27.1	59.2	308.0	.063	4.1	1.8	20.5	88.4	37,322.0	6.2	14.8	16.1	46.0	48.9
Minnesota	440	26.3	58.3	286.7	.130	3.9	1.8	13.2	91.7	43,728.6	1.8	14.4	14.7	41.0	47.8
Mississippi	141	27.5	58.3	480.2	.068	4.4	1.9	40.5	80.5	35,233.4	7.3	14.8	36.6	64.0	78.9
Missouri	329	26.3	64.6	291.3	.058	4.2	2.0	16.5	86.9	41,686.8	6.7	16.5	23.0	46.0	59.6

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION

Montana	108	26.9	62.0	271.9	.091	4.3	1.9	10.5	91.4	37,975.4	2.5	16.7	24.8	31.0	46.1
Nebraska	178	27.0	64.0	333.4	.075	3.8	1.9	11.4	90.2	45,791.6	3.2	17.0	24.9	35.0	49.7
Nevada	101	24.9	65.4	262.0	.047	4.2	2.0	26.4	84.1	37,043.0	5.9	22.0	16.4	52.0	33.6
New Jersey	333	27.1	54.4	343.8	.061	3.9	2.0	30.3	87.7	45,241.6	4.2	10.2	7.8	59.0	39.5
New York	764	27.3	57.7	341.2	.064	4.1	1.9	33.8	84.7	42,092.2	4.1	11.4	4.9	53.0	39.4
North Carolina	302	26.7	57.5	327.8	.072	4.3	1.8	29.9	84.3	39,297.2	5.6	16.1	23.1	56.0	60.7
Ohio	648	26.6	63.7	315.9	.061	4.1	1.9	16.6	87.9	40,995.2	4.4	14.8	20.5	45.0	52.3
Oklahoma	215	28.8	62.2	300.0	.070	4.5	1.8	25.5	85.9	41,359.4	5.8	18.4	30.6	42.0	75.0
Oregon	193	27.5	68.2	231.1	.058	4.4	1.9	14.5	89.0	36,690.4	2.2	18.2	7.3	33.0	30.1
Pennsylvania	549	28.2	59.9	328.6	.048	3.9	1.9	17.0	88.0	42,686.4	5.4	12.3	17.8	52.0	52.8
South Carolina	222	27.1	64.7	394.1	.080	4.5	1.7	32.7	83.7	35,677.8	6.8	15.5	28.2	70.0	61.4
Tennessee	289	28.6	59.0	318.8	.061	4.3	1.8	21.3	83.4	39,347.4	6.3	15.9	27.4	56.0	68.8
Texas	931	27.3	60.0	306.6	.059	4.1	1.9	26.4	80.3	40,250.6	5.1	17.9	26.1	58.0	67.5
Utah	187	25.0	65.2	285.4	.053	4.6	1.8	10.7	90.5	33,539.6	1.8	17.8	31.9	61.0	49.7
Virginia	332	26.6	61.8	344.9	.059	4.0	1.8	30.1	86.8	44,078.4	4.4	15.7	19.9	60.0	57.4
Washington	383	26.0	63.5	249.9	.072	4.2	1.8	20.6	89.8	41,775.4	2.7	17.7	7.1	37.0	31.1
Wisconsin	364	25.9	62.1	283.7	.076	4.1	1.9	12.5	89.9	41,787.4	2.8	14.5	18.9	46.0	46.9

Note: NS = Social Network Size; ND = Social Network Density; PE = Positive Emotional Expression (%); NE = Negative Emotional Expression (%); MP = Racial Minority Percentage (%); EA = Educational Attainment (%); PI = Personal Income (in dollars); HR = Homicide Rate (per 100,000); RM = Residential Mobility (%); PC = Political Conservatism (%); CO = Collectivism; CT = Cultural Tightness Score; ^a individual-level variables (values presented are the mean score of individuals in the corresponding state); ^b state-level variables (values presented are state statistics obtained from U.S. government websites or published academic articles).

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION

Table 2

Zero-order correlation between key variables in the study

	PE ^a	NE ^a	NS ^a	ND ^a	MP ^b	EA ^b	PI ^b	HR ^b	RM ^b	PC ^b	CO ^b	CT ^b
PE	—											
NE	-.218***	—										
NS	.003	-.072***	—									
ND	-.002	.001	-.365***	—								
MP	.084	-.335*	.544***	-.290	—							
EA	-.346*	.288	-.431**	.324	-.657***	—						
PI	-.730***	.345*	.100	.006	-.095	.422***	—					
HR	.299	-.422**	.479**	-.384*	.695***	-.695***	-.252	—				
RM	.516***	-.010	-.478**	-.043	-.205	-.093	-.507**	-.037	—			
PC	.694***	-.531***	.350*	.076	.023	-.381*	-.527***	.395*	.344*	—		
CO	.198	-.437**	.608***	-.358*	.721***	-.684***	-.232	.682***	-.274	.289	—	
CT	.496**	-.498**	.554***	.091	.177	-.498**	-.307	.499**	.085	.862***	.361*	—
Mean	4.1	1.9	316.7	.064	22.8	86.4	40671.4	4.9	15.8	19.8	50.9	52.2
SD	1.4	0.9	286.0	.121	9.4	3.3	4308.7	2.1	2.4	9.1	10.2	13.5
N	13,789	13,789	13,789	13,789	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	37

Note: ^a individual-level variables; ^b state-level variables; Correlation between individual-level variables was performed at the individual level ($N = 13,789$); Correlation between state-level variables or between an individual-level variable and a state-level variable was performed at the state-level ($N = 37$); * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 1

Table 3

Summary of multilevel model analyses of cultural tightness and social network density effects on positive and negative emotional expressions

	Positive Emotional Expression		Negative Emotional Expression	
Fixed Part	γ	p	γ	p
ND	.005	.624	.006	.608
CT	.079	.002	-.045	.003
ND×CT	.036	.004	-.006	.573
Random Part	Estimate	p	Estimate	p
δ_e^2	1.850	.000	0.730	.000
$\delta_{\mu 0}^2$	0.029	.001	0.002	.068
$\delta_{\mu 1}^2$	0.174	.251	0.070	.302

Note: ND = Social Network Density (individual-level); CT = Cultural Tightness Score (state-level); δ_e^2 = Residual at the individual level; $\delta_{\mu 0}^2$ = Random intercept variance; $\delta_{\mu 1}^2$ = Random slope variance of social network density; Gamma (γ) coefficients represent standardized multilevel regression coefficients.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 1

Table S1.

Multilevel model specifications used to generate models predicting emotional expression in SPSS

Specification	Value
Random effects covariance	Unstructured
Maximum iterations	100
Maximum step-halvings	100
Maximum scoring steps	1
Singularity tolerance	0.000000000001
Hessian Convergence	0
Log-likelihood Convergence	0
Parameter Convergence	0.000001
Method	Restricted Maximum Likelihood (REML)

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 2

Table S2.

Results of multilevel models for predicting positive/negative emotional expression after controlling for individual-level social network size

Positive Emotional Expression			Negative Emotional Expression	
Fixed Part	γ	p	γ	p
NS	-.006	.683	-.081	.000
ND	.001	.926	-.044	.005
CT	.080	.001	-.045	.004
NS×CT	.015	.303	-.011	.383
ND×CT	.045	.005	-.012	.344
Random Part	Estimate	p	Estimate	p
δ_e^2	1.847	.000	0.728	.000
$\delta_{\mu 0}^2$	0.029	.001	0.003	.069
$\delta_{\mu 1}^2$	0.290	.254	0.040	.647
$\delta_{\mu 2}^2$	0.005	.124	0.001	.445

Note: NS = Social Network Size (since the model wouldn't converge when NS was controlled for, NS was transformed using the natural logarithm function before entering the models); ND = Social Network Density (individual-level); CT = Cultural Tightness Score (state-level); δ_e^2 = Residual at the individual level; $\delta_{\mu 0}^2$ = Random intercept variance; $\delta_{\mu 1}^2$ = Random slope variance of social network density; $\delta_{\mu 2}^2$ = Random slope variance of social network size; Gamma (γ) coefficients represent standardized multilevel regression coefficients.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 3

Table S3.

Results of multilevel models for predicting positive/negative emotional expression after controlling for state-level racial minority percentage

Positive Emotional Expression			Negative Emotional Expression	
Fixed Part	γ	p	γ	p
ND	.004	.707	.005	.686
MP	.001	.955	-.023	.075
CT	.078	.002	-.045	.002
ND×MP	.022	.053	.003	.773
ND×CT	.037	.002	-.003	.782
Random Part	Estimate	p	Estimate	p
δ_e^2	1.850	.000	0.730	.000
$\delta_{\mu 0}^2$	0.030	.001	0.002	.084
$\delta_{\mu 1}^2$	0.119	.383	0.080	.463

Note: ND = Social Network Density (individual-level); MP = Racial Minority Percentage (state-level); CT = Cultural Tightness Score (state-level); δ_e^2 = Residual at the individual level; $\delta_{\mu 0}^2$ = Random intercept variance; $\delta_{\mu 1}^2$ = Random slope variance of social network density; Gamma (γ) coefficients represent standardized multilevel regression coefficients.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 4

Table S4.

Results of multilevel models for predicting positive/negative emotional expression after controlling for state-level educational attainment

	Positive Emotional Expression		Negative Emotional Expression	
Fixed Part	γ	p	γ	p
ND	.004	.705	.005	.663
EA	-.024	.386	.006	.694
CT	.068	.015	-.044	.008
ND×EA	-.021	.117	-.007	.560
ND×CT	.029	.023	-.007	.542
Random Part	Estimate	p	Estimate	p
δ_e^2	1.850	.000	0.731	.000
$\delta_{\mu 0}^2$	0.029	.001	0.002	.060
$\delta_{\mu 1}^2$	0.164	.253	0.063	.422

Note: ND = Social Network Density (individual-level); EA = Educational Attainment (state-level); CT = Cultural Tightness Score (state-level); δ_e^2 = Residual at the individual level; $\delta_{\mu 0}^2$ = Random intercept variance; $\delta_{\mu 1}^2$ = Random slope variance of social network density; Gamma (γ) coefficients represent standardized multilevel regression coefficients.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 5

Table S5.

Results of multilevel models for predicting positive/negative emotional expression after controlling for state-level personal income

Positive Emotional Expression			Negative Emotional Expression	
Fixed Part	γ	P	γ	p
ND	.004	.722	.006	.603
PI	-.080	.000	.018	.134
CT	.049	.009	-.040	.008
ND×PI	-.021	.054	-.007	.524
ND×CT	.029	.017	-.007	.566
Random Part	Estimate	P	Estimate	p
δ_e^2	1.850	.000	0.731	.000
$\delta_{\mu 0}^2$	0.012	.010	0.002	.108
$\delta_{\mu 1}^2$	0.141	.307	0.080	.375

Note: ND = Social Network Density (individual-level); PI = Personal Income (state-level); CT = Cultural Tightness Score (state-level); δ_e^2 = Residual at the individual level; $\delta_{\mu 0}^2$ = Random intercept variance; $\delta_{\mu 1}^2$ = Random slope variance of social network density; Gamma (γ) coefficients represent standardized multilevel regression coefficients.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 6

Table S6.

Results of multilevel models for predicting positive/negative emotional expression after controlling for state-level homicide rate

	Positive Emotional Expression		Negative Emotional Expression	
Fixed Part	γ	p	γ	p
ND	.005	.643	.007	.565
HR	.011	.633	-.017	.181
CT	.073	.010	-.037	.022
ND×HR	.002	.870	.011	.404
ND×CT	.035	.013	-.009	.494
Random Part	Estimate	p	Estimate	p
δ_e^2	1.850	.000	0.731	.000
$\delta_{\mu 0}^2$	0.030	.001	0.002	.080
$\delta_{\mu 1}^2$	0.197	.217	0.077	.444

Note: ND = Social Network Density (individual-level); HR = Homicide Rate (state-level); CT = Cultural Tightness Score (state-level); δ_e^2 = Residual at the individual level; $\delta_{\mu 0}^2$ = Random intercept variance; $\delta_{\mu 1}^2$ = Random slope variance of social network density; Gamma (γ) coefficients represent standardized multilevel regression coefficients.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 7

Table S7.

Results of multilevel models for predicting positive/negative emotional expression after controlling for state-level residential mobility

Positive Emotional Expression			Negative Emotional Expression	
Fixed Part	γ	p	γ	p
ND	.004	.702	.005	.637
RM	.070	.001	-.002	.868
CT	.068	.001	-.044	.003
ND×RM	-.015	.177	-.001	.897
ND×CT	.043	.001	-.006	.611
Random Part	Estimate	p	Estimate	p
δ_e^2	1.851	.000	0.731	.000
$\delta_{\mu 0}^2$	0.019	.003	0.002	.068
$\delta_{\mu 1}^2$	0.104	.449	0.054	.306

Note: ND = Social Network Density (individual-level); RM = Residential Mobility (state-level); CT = Cultural Tightness Score (state-level); δ_e^2 = Residual at the individual level; $\delta_{\mu 0}^2$ = Random intercept variance; $\delta_{\mu 1}^2$ = Random slope variance of social network density; Gamma (γ) coefficients represent standardized multilevel regression coefficients.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 8

Table S8.

Results of multilevel models for predicting positive/negative emotional expression after controlling for state-level political conservatism

	Positive Emotional Expression		Negative Emotional Expression	
Fixed Part	γ	p	γ	p
ND	.004	.699	.009	.474
PC	.155	.000	-.036	.170
CT	-.067	.086	-.012	.664
ND×PC	-.024	.294	.023	.349
ND×CT	.058	.019	-.026	.302
Random Part	Estimate	p	Estimate	p
δ_e^2	1.850	.000	0.730	.000
$\delta_{\mu 0}^2$	0.016	.004	0.002	.097
$\delta_{\mu 1}^2$	0.161	.286	0.088	.355

Note: ND = Social Network Density (individual-level); PC = Political Conservatism (state-level); CT = Cultural Tightness Score (state-level); δ_e^2 = Residual at the individual level; $\delta_{\mu 0}^2$ = Random intercept variance; $\delta_{\mu 1}^2$ = Random slope variance of social network density; Gamma (γ) coefficients represent standardized multilevel regression coefficients.

CULTURAL TIGHTNESS, NETWORK DENSITY, AND EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION 9

Table S9.

Results of multilevel models for predicting positive/negative emotional expression after controlling for state-level collectivism

	Positive Emotional Expression		Negative Emotional Expression	
Fixed Part	γ	p	γ	p
ND	.005	.622	.004	.729
CO	.004	.864	-.023	.062
CT	.077	.004	-.037	.011
ND×CO	.023	.030	.018	.094
ND×CT	.030	.010	-.008	.468
Random Part	Estimate	p	Estimate	p
δ_e^2	1.850	.000	0.731	.000
$\delta_{\mu 0}^2$	0.030	.001	0.002	.076
$\delta_{\mu 1}^2$	0.085	.491	0.037	.498

Note: ND = Social Network Density (individual-level); CO = Collectivism (state-level); CT = Cultural Tightness Score (state-level); δ_e^2 = Residual at the individual level; $\delta_{\mu 0}^2$ = Random intercept variance; $\delta_{\mu 1}^2$ = Random slope variance of social network density; Gamma (γ) coefficients represent standardized multilevel regression coefficients; The model for predicting negative emotional expression did not converge due to redundant parameters in the random effect estimation when the variance structure was specified as “Unstructured”. To enable the model to converge, we specified the variance structure as “Variance Component”, i.e., without estimating the covariance between the random intercept and the random slope of social network density.