Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology

Navigating Intercultural Misunderstandings: An Examination of Emotion Brokering

Sivenesi Subramoney, Eric Walle, Alexandra Main, and Dalia Magaña

Navigating Intercultural Misunderstandings: An Examination of Emotion Brokering

Sivenesi Subramoney[1], Eric Walle[1], Alexandra Main[1], and Dalia Magaña[2]
[1] Psychological Sciences, University of California, Merced
[2] Literatures, Languages, and Cultures, University of California, Merced

Objectives: Communication difficulties are inevitable when individuals interact with members of a different culture. The experience of such communication barriers may be particularly salient for those from immigrant families who need to navigate multiple cultures. Youth from immigrant families are known to serve as cultural brokers to help their families navigate communication with those in the host culture. Most brokering research has examined language brokering (i.e., interpreting language for others). An unstudied brokering process and the focus of the present research is emotion brokering: the interpretation of emotion norms for others. In this investigation, we examined the occurrence of emotion brokering for close family members in a sample of Latinx college students. *Method:* We conducted an exploratory survey to identify situations where participants perceived intercultural emotion-based misunderstandings and reported emotion brokering (Study 1). We then employed a more focused survey to further understand the contexts in which individuals brokered emotions (Study 2). *Results:* Results revealed that many participants encountered intercultural emotion-based misunderstandings and experienced brokering emotions (Studies 1 and 2). Furthermore, the findings illustrated the typical contexts and emotions involved in the emotion brokering experience. *Conclusions:* The findings provide insight into a distinct form of cultural brokering. In addition, findings illustrate how cultural variation in emotion impacts daily social interactions.

Public Significance Statement
Little is known about how individuals help social partners understand the emotions of someone from another culture (i.e., emotion brokering). Our research documents experiences of emotion brokering among Latinx college students, who reported helping relatives, particularly parents, understand the emotions of other individuals. Findings inform the literature on cultural brokering and illustrate how cultural variation in emotions may manifest in daily social interactions.

Keywords: culture and emotion, cultural brokering, intercultural communication, immigration

Individuals often rely on social partners to help them navigate novel social interactions (García-Sánchez & Orellana, 2022; Lazarevic et al., 2014). The bulk of research on this topic has been in the context of immigration, where youth help their families navigate their new society by engaging in cultural brokering (Lazarevic et al., 2014). A particularly important, yet to date unstudied, form of cultural brokering may occur when social partners have different norms on the experience and expression of emotions (Kitayama et al., 2006), a process we term emotion brokering. The present investigation used a qualitative descriptive approach to examine Latinx college-aged students' experience of emotion brokering for close family members and the contexts in which the brokering occurred.

Cultural Brokering

Youth from immigrant families play a crucial role in helping their families through acculturation (i.e., the process in which they adapt to the language, customs, and social norms of their new environment; Berry et al., 2006). The term brokering is used to describe the range of activities and social interactions youth engage in to assist family members. Cultural brokering is typically used as an umbrella term to refer to negotiating interactions between individuals from different cultural groups (Kam & Lazarevic, 2014). Similar intercultural learning processes exist in the adult literature. This includes the role of specialized training sessions to facilitate intercultural interactions in workplace settings (see Morris et al., 2014), such as understanding the practices (Butterfield et al., 2005) and communication styles (Sanchez-Burks et al., 2007) prevalent in different cultures. These intercultural learning processes, however,

Sivenesi Subramoney ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8947-439X

Sivenesi Subramoney played a lead role in formal analysis, project administration, and writing–original draft and an equal role in conceptualization, investigation, and methodology. Eric Walle played a lead role in supervision and writing–review and editing and an equal role in conceptualization, formal analysis, investigation, and methodology. Alexandra Main played a supporting role in formal analysis, investigation, and supervision and an equal role in writing–review and editing. Dalia Magaña played a supporting role in conceptualization, investigation, and supervision and an equal role in writing–review and editing.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sivenesi Subramoney, Psychological Sciences, University of California, Merced, 5200 North Lake Road, Merced, CA 95343, United States. Email: ssubramoney@ucmerced.edu

focus on the perspective of the individuals learning new cultural norms rather than the perspective of the broker who helps another learn new cultural norms.

The developing child may be thrust into helping others navigate such cultural differences regularly. For example, cultural brokering may involve the child mediating a discussion between a parent and a teacher on applying to schools in the United States. The form of cultural brokering that has been most extensively studied is language brokering. Generally, language brokering refers to the translation and interpretation of linguistic information (Tse, 1995). For example, language brokering could involve translating and interpreting English for parents at parent–teacher conferences, ordering food at a restaurant, or making large purchases (López et al., 2019).

To date, research on the role of emotions in cultural brokering has primarily considered those experienced by the broker during linguistic interpretation (Kam, 2011; López et al., 2019). However, it is plausible that emotions themselves can be misinterpreted between social partners and necessitate brokering. Growing evidence suggests that brokering involves more than linguistic misunderstandings, with research documenting brokering of other information, such as procedural (Lazarevic et al., 2014) and media norms (Katz, 2010). Despite increased knowledge of cultural brokering, little is known about whether brokering can also involve interpreting emotions for others.

The Construct of Emotion Brokering

Our investigation introduces the study of emotion brokering. Building on the various forms of cultural brokering, we propose that individuals engage in the process of emotion brokering, helping others navigate interactions between social partners who hold different norms in the expression and experience of emotions. We propose that emotion brokering may be distinct from language brokering in terms of the root of the miscommunication. Specifically, whereas language brokering involves assisting in linguistic communication, emotion brokering involves assisting in emotion communication (which may be nonverbal).[1] For example, whereas language brokering may involve explaining what a server at a restaurant is saying, emotion brokering may involve explaining whether the server is angry, why the server is angry in that given situation, or why the server is expressing their anger in that specific way. Although emotion brokering may occur between individuals differing in various ways (e.g., cultural, generational, or familial), brokering in the context of the immigrant experience is likely a fruitful context to investigate this construct.

We utilize a functionalist view of emotion in which emotions are defined as the process of "establishing, maintaining, or disrupting the relations between the person and the internal or external environment, when such relations are significant to the individual" (Campos et al., 1989, p. 395). This approach emphasizes the interpersonal nature of emotions, where emotion expressions communicate vital information to social partners (Campos et al., 2011). From this perspective, misunderstanding another's emotions involves misinterpreting their relationship with their environment or social partner. Such misinterpretations are inevitable in many social relationships but are especially likely to occur when social partners are unfamiliar with each other's cultural framework. Thus, emotion brokering is a contextually bound process where the broker relays pertinent emotional and cultural knowledge to help another (i.e., a brokeree)

understand a target's affective state. Our perspective of emotion brokering is, therefore, similar to cultural brokering (Kam & Lazarevic, 2014), where the broker's goal is not to provide a literal translation of an event but rather involves the broker conveying information in a manner that is sensitive to the dynamics of an interpersonal relationship. Thus, we view emotion brokering as the process of "navigating a misunderstanding" to help encapsulate the broad and flexible nature of the construct and not restrict emotion brokering to labeling or identifying a specific component of an emotion (e.g., facial expressions) for a social partner.

Culture and Emotion

Emotion brokers facilitate interactions between individuals who hold culturally different emotion norms. Importantly, when individuals from different cultures engage, there may be communication gaps related to difficulties in identifying another's expression, understanding another's experienced emotion, and understanding the norms around another's emotion expressivity.

Culture and Emotion Expression

Cultural differences in emotion expressivity can profoundly impact communication between social partners from different cultural backgrounds. For example, there is evidence that individuals have an in-group advantage in recognizing another's emotional expression. Notably, prior research found that the in-group advantage was the strongest for emotion expressions that are characteristically elicited during social interactions (e.g., anger, contempt) compared to emotions that typically have nonsocial elicitors (Elfenbein et al., 2007). Misrecognizing the communicative intent of a social partner can also lead to communication difficulties. For instance, although smiles are often thought to signal positive communicative intent in European American contexts, there is variation in smiles interpreted by individuals from different cultural backgrounds (Rychlowska et al., 2015). Smiling may be perceived negatively, particularly in contexts with low uncertainty avoidance (i.e., countries with high levels of social unpredictability; Krys et al., 2016). Thus, even slight cultural variation in the manner and meaning of an emotion expression may impact social interactions.

Culture and Emotional Experience

Cultural value systems inform how individuals relate to the world and their social partners (Mesquita & Boiger, 2014), thereby impacting the frequency and quality of emotions that individuals experience. A lack of familiarity with another individual's worldview may result in difficulties in understanding how and why a particular situation may be personally significant to them (Main et al., 2017). Research conducted among immigrant groups has established that first-generation immigrants typically report emotion patterns more similar to other immigrant individuals from their cultural group than

---

[1] Emotion brokering may occur due to a misunderstanding of another's intent or a more general lack of understanding of cultural norms. Additionally, our investigation focuses on the broker's perception and attempts to rectify a misunderstanding, though we cannot conclude the broker's accuracy in perceiving such a misunderstanding. We thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing out the possible differences in the nature and accuracy of such misunderstandings.

to members of the host culture (De Leersnyder, 2017; De Leersnyder et al., 2011). These findings suggest that recent immigrants and members of the host culture may show less convergence in how they appraise emotion-eliciting events (Butler, 2015) or, rather, may be experiencing different emotion-eliciting situations. Thus, when social partners hold different ideas on what emotions typically mean in their context, they may have difficulties appreciating another individual's emotional perspective.

Culture and Expressivity Norms

Cultural value systems inform the emotions that are socially normative in any particular culture (Boiger et al., 2013), thereby influencing if and how emotions are expressed. Social harmony and warmth in relationships are typically endorsed in Latino cultural contexts (i.e., *simpatía*; Ruby et al., 2012). There is evidence that individuals in Latino cultures especially endorse positive emotion expression (known as convivial collectivism or expressive interdependence; Kitayama et al., 2022; Senft et al., 2021), but consider negative emotion expression undesirable. Miscommunication may arise among individuals unfamiliar with others' cultural values. For instance, individuals who endorse *simpatía* and convivial collectivism may expect social interactions to feature friendliness and expressions of positive emotion (Senft et al., 2021; Triandis et al., 1984). However, expectations of friendliness may lead to negative experiences when individuals try to navigate systems in their new cultural context. For example, research in U.S. health care settings has demonstrated that Latinos report unfriendly encounters where health practitioners appear rude and stressed out (Magaña, 2020). These differences in expressivity norms may have a cumulative effect on communication between social partners from different cultural groups and may be especially impactful among minoritized individuals.

Overall, prior findings demonstrate that cultural value systems inform how emotions are experienced and expressed. These findings may have implications when individuals migrate from one cultural context to another. Specifically, intercultural communication difficulties may arise when social partners hold different norms on the expression and experience of emotions.

Emotion Acculturation

Culturally based emotion patterns may adapt when individuals from different cultural backgrounds interact. Emotion acculturation refers to the process where emotion patterns change due to exposure and contact with a new cultural context (De Leersnyder, 2017). Specifically, there is evidence that immigrant individuals' emotion patterns become more like those reported by members of the host culture. Evidence for emotion acculturation has been established in multiple contexts, including among adults living in the United States (De Leersnyder et al., 2011). Studies demonstrated that emotion acculturation (i.e., greater emotional similarity with members of the host culture) is predicted by having a higher generation status, spending more time in the host culture, and having greater social contact with members of the host culture (De Leersnyder, 2017; De Leersnyder et al., 2011). Thus, it is likely that emotion acculturation occurs through social interactions with members of the host culture. Although emotional acculturation provides evidence that individuals can acquire new emotion patterns, the mechanisms by which emotion acculturation occurs remain poorly

understood, and how social partners help others navigate new emotion norms is yet to be formally investigated.

Importance of Examining Brokering Among Latinx Populations

Although the process of brokering emotions is not restricted to immigrant families, emotion brokering may be particularly relevant to immigrant families living in the United States, including Latinx populations. Latinx individuals from immigrant families may encounter distinct emotion models among their heritage culture compared to the dominant culture in the United States (Senft et al., 2023). In addition, although there is extensive heterogeneity within Latinx populations (Harwood et al., 2002; Senft et al., 2023), cultural values of familism are commonly emphasized in Latino households. Familism values include providing and receiving support from the family and obligations to assist the family (Knight et al., 2010). Youth who endorse familism are more likely to engage in behaviors that assist their families (Zhao et al., 2022). As a result of these cultural factors, Latinx youth routinely take on additional family responsibilities compared to their nonimmigrant peers to help their parents adapt to the host society. Investigating additional forms of brokering, including emotion brokering, would provide crucial insight into how individuals and families navigate cultural variations in emotions in daily life.

Overall Aims

This investigation examined emotion brokering across two studies. Study 1 identified instances where participants helped a relative navigate emotion-based intercultural misunderstandings. Study 2 extended these findings by investigating the contexts of emotion brokering and distinguishing experiences of emotion and language brokering.

Study 1

An open-ended survey investigated instances of intercultural misunderstandings and emotion brokering for close family members among Latinx college students. We used thematic coding to identify different types of reported emotional misunderstandings.

Method

Participants

Fifty-five self-identified Latinx participants (M_{age} = 19.91 years, SD = 1.42 years; 60% female) completed a survey of questions on intercultural emotion-based misunderstandings and emotion brokering. The majority of the sample (73%, n = 40) were born in the United States, with at least one parent born outside the United States; 15% (n = 8) were U.S.-born participants, with two U.S.-born parents; and 13% (n = 7) were participants who were born outside the United States. Participants reported their maternal highest level of education as follows: 49% (n = 27) did not complete high school, 35% (n = 19) had a high school diploma, 11% (n = 6) completed college, and 5% (n = 3) did not respond.

The study was conducted at a Hispanic-serving university (an institution with at least 25% Hispanic/Latinx undergraduate students enrolled full-time) located in the San Joaquin Valley of California. Fifty-five percent of the undergraduate population identify as Latinx, and 72.2% speak a language other than English at home.

Participants received course credit as compensation for completing the study.

Materials and Procedure

Participants first completed a demographic survey. Next, participants were asked to describe an intercultural emotion-based misunderstanding and whether they engaged in emotion brokering. Given that other forms of cultural brokering predominately occur for family members, we were interested in experiences where the brokeree (i.e., the person who misunderstood the target's emotion) was a family member (referred to as a parent/relative).

The prompts were as follows:

1. Describe an instance where you understood the emotion expressed by a person with a different cultural background to you but your parent/relative did not.

   ii) Did you have to help your parent/relative navigate that situation, and if so, how did you do this?

2. Describe an instance where you knew the culturally appropriate response to an emotion expressed by a person with a different cultural background to you but your parent/relative did not.

   ii) Did you have to help your parent/relative navigate that situation, and if so, how did you do this?

Employing an open-ended survey and qualitative methodology allowed us to gather knowledge on participants' unique experiences of emotion brokering without assumptions about the specific emotion labels participants may use or contexts in which brokering may occur. Participants were prompted to provide as much detail as possible regarding their experiences, such as their location, the people they were with, the emotion expressed, their age, and what they were doing. All study procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of California, Merced. Participants provided informed consent before completing the survey.

Thematic Coding. Situations describing misunderstandings of emotion cultural norms were then coded according to the aspect of emotions that relatives misunderstood. The coding phases followed the guidelines outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). The familiarization phase involved immersion in the responses by reading the responses multiple times. Potential themes were then selected and reviewed by the lead and senior authors. The process of theme identification concluded when researchers were satisfied that the coding scheme represented the patterns that emerged in the data. Reliability was conducted with 23% of responses to determine intercoder agreement on the themes of participants' responses. The reliability coder was a trained bicultural research assistant. The Kappa value was substantial for the themes ($k = .70$). Three core themes were identified:

1. *Misunderstanding of expressive communication.* This theme captured responses where the relative misinterpreted or failed to interpret communicative cues of emotion. This included instances where the relative misunderstood or was unable to ascertain the valence of another's affect (i.e., thinking someone was experiencing negative affect when the participant did not interpret the same). Although this

theme captured many instances involving facial expressions, misunderstandings also included behaviors, body language, and vocalizations.

2. *Misunderstanding of emotion elicitor.* This theme involved misunderstanding the elicitor of the emotion due to limited knowledge of contextual factors that resulted in the emotional experience. Responses included descriptions where relatives understood another's emotion (e.g., knowing someone is angry) but failed to appreciate the event or behavior that was personally significant. This theme also captured reports of an event or behavior the relative deemed significant but was not significant for someone of a different cultural group.

3. *Misunderstanding of emotion regulation.* This theme entailed responses from the participant in which the relative did not understand the social norms for how an emotion was expressed. Instances often involved descriptions of relatives thinking an emotion was up-regulated or down-regulated in a way that they deemed inappropriate for the context.

Next, responses were coded for valence (positive, negative, no valence) expressed by the target, according to the broker (i.e., the participant's perspective). The no-valence category was applied when a clear emotion misunderstanding occurred, but the participant did not specify the valence of the target's affect.

Finally, responses were coded for whether the participant engaged in emotion brokering. Emotion brokering was assessed by asking participants to report whether and how they helped their parent/relative navigate the situation. Emotion brokering was operationalized as any description of an attempt by the participant to help their relative navigate the emotion misunderstanding.

Results

Summary

Fifty-five participants responded to either of the two questions about an instance of an intercultural misunderstanding (Q1: $n = 53$ responses, Q2: $n = 47$ responses). Across both questions, 23 responses (42% of participants) described situations involving an intercultural emotion-based misunderstanding (Q1: $n = 20$, Q2: $n = 12$). In cases where participants responded to both questions, there was significant overlap in the content of the response to each question. Thus, both questions were merged and analyzed together.

The remaining responses were excluded from analyses because participants did not recall witnessing an intercultural emotion-based misunderstanding (e.g., "I don't recall experiencing this"; Q1: $n = 14$, Q2: $n = 16$), the statements that were too vague to identify specifics of the situation (e.g., "Yes I had to tell my parents to relax and I'll explain it to them later"), or the statements describing intercultural misunderstandings had no clear description of a misunderstanding of affect (Q1: $n = 19$, Q2: $n = 19$).

Experience of Emotion Brokering

Across all identified intercultural emotion-based misunderstandings, the majority of participants reported helping their relative

navigate the situation ($n = 19$; 83%). Although most scenarios described a parent as the brokeree ($n = 15$; 79%), some participants described brokering for other family members (e.g., grandmother, aunt). Most instances of brokering involved negative emotions ($n = 12$; 63%), followed by situations coded as unvalenced ($n = 4$; 21%), and positive emotions ($n = 3$; 16%).

Brokering typically involved a verbal explanation to the relative relevant to the specific theme, such as providing the relative with the communicative intent of an expression (e.g., "All I did was explain to my mom what she was actually doing and how she was trying to manipulate her"), information on the emotion eliciting situation (e.g., "I explained the situation and told my mom to imagine being in her place and asking her how she'd feel"), and norms on how emotions are expressed according to social norms (e.g., "I explained how we may keep feelings in but others tend to express it externally").

Thematic Coding of Emotion Brokering Experiences

Below, we summarize the three thematic situations where participants reported that their relatives misunderstood the emotions expressed by someone from a different culture.

Misunderstanding of Emotion Expression. The majority ($n = 11$; 58%) of reported intercultural emotion-based misunderstandings involved the brokeree misunderstanding the communicative expression of someone from a different cultural background. For example, participant "AA," a 20-year-old Mexican American female, recalled an instance where her mother interpreted a facial expression as showing negative affect (reported by the participant as "disrespect"):

> One time I went with my mom to return some jeans and the cashier had a serious face the entire time. My mom thought that was completely disrespectful, but I'm used to it. I see it everywhere. I did tell my mom that it's normal to see that because it's not a sign of disrespect. It could be that she's shy.

Misunderstanding of Emotion Elicitor. Instances where the participants' relatives did not understand the emotion elicitor (i.e., the brokeree identified another's emotion but did not understand why it was being experienced) were the second most prevalent theme ($n = 4$; 21%). Participant "AB," a 21-year-old Mexican American female, described an instance involving intergenerational misunderstanding between her friend and the participant's great-grandmother:

> Once I had a friend visiting my home while my great-grandma was present. My friend was very upset over something. Upon attempting to explain the emotion to my great-grandmother I had to give examples she could relate to [to] help her understand what I was referring to.

Misunderstanding of Emotion Regulation. Descriptions where the brokeree misunderstood the regulation of an emotion (i.e., the relative identified another's emotion but did not understand why the individual upregulated or downregulated the emotion) were reported in four instances (21%). The following example provided by "AC," a 21-year-old Mexican American female, described a relative misunderstanding of emotion regulation norms:

> For individuals [to] express worry in the dominant culture, many tend to tell their "business" to many. In my personal cultural heritage, it is common to keep privacy and worry to yourself. As we saw a parent in despair explaining her life story to everyone, I saw how my parents

disagreed. I explained how we may keep feelings in but others tend to express it externally.

Discussion

This exploratory investigation provided evidence for experiences of intercultural emotion misunderstandings and emotion brokering for close family members among Latinx college students. The experience of emotion brokering was common in this sample, suggesting that emotion brokering is an important interpersonal process in facilitating intercultural social interactions. In addition, descriptions indicate that experiences of intercultural misunderstandings and emotion brokering often occurred with parents rather than other family members. The analyses identified three distinct situations where relatives misunderstood emotion norms, and participants consequently engaged in emotion brokering. Specifically, individuals brokered emotions when their relatives misunderstood the communicative intent of another's emotion, the elicitor of an emotion, and how an emotion expression was regulated.

However, Study 1 also raised questions relating to emotion brokering. First, most reported emotion brokering experiences (63%) involved negative affect. This may indicate that emotion brokering is more frequent when negative emotions are expressed. The greater prevalence of negative emotions in the responses could result from negative affect having greater social significance and consequences on interpersonal dynamics, thus eliciting more frequent emotion brokering to mediate such situations. Alternatively, participants may have simply recalled instances involving negative emotions, as prior research indicates that events that elicit negative emotions are recalled more frequently than events eliciting positive emotions (Scherer & Tannenbaum, 1986). Prompting participants to separately recall positive and negative emotion misunderstandings would address this issue.

Second, a portion of participants reported situations where their relatives misunderstood cultural practices or language but did not mention a misunderstanding of emotion. We propose three possible explanations for this pattern of results. First, participants' responses may not have provided sufficient detail of the emotion misunderstandings to be coded. Second, participants may have misinterpreted what encompassed misinterpreting an emotion and instead provided instances of brokering language or other cultural barriers. Third, participants may have provided responses based on the emotions they felt when interpreting language rather than situations where the emotion was the source of the misunderstanding. Thus, the prompts used in this study may not have been clear to participants, thus limiting our ability to capture responses on instances of emotion brokering.

Findings from Study 1 indicated evidence for emotion brokering as an important process in which individuals help others navigate social interactions, as well as the need to further clarify the emotion brokering experience. First, research is needed to explore the contexts in which emotion brokering typically occurs (e.g., the location) and the specific emotions involved in each intercultural misunderstanding. Second, it is unclear whether the high representation of negative emotion brokering experiences suggests that emotion brokering occurs predominantly for negative affect. Third, participant responses indicated possible confusion between instances involving emotion brokering and other broader forms of cultural brokering. To further explore and clarify the emotion brokering construct, we conducted a follow-up study that addressed these issues.

Study 2

Study 2 employed a more focused survey to further examine the experience of emotion brokering. First, the survey contained prompts to examine the contexts (e.g., target involved, location) and emotions (perceived by both the brokeree and the broker) involved in the emotion brokering experience. Second, we investigated the distinct experiences of brokering both negative and positive emotions. Specifically, participants completed separate questions for experiences brokering negative and positive emotions. Third, we sought to disentangle the experiences of emotion brokering and language brokering. Participants were provided with clear definitions of each brokering process and responded to separate questions for each form of brokering.

Method

Participants

The sample included 122 participants (M_{age} = 20.77 years, SD = 1.85; 80% female, n = 97) who self-identified as Latinx. The majority of the sample (80%, n = 97) were born in the United States, with at least one parent born outside the United States; 16% (n = 20) were born outside the United States; and 4% (n = 5) were U.S.-born participants, with two U.S.-born parents. Participants reported their maternal highest level of education as follows: 49% (n = 66) did not complete high school, 35% (n = 38) had a high school diploma, 11% (n = 5) completed college, and 5% (n = 13) reported to not know their maternal highest level of education or reported some other highest level of education (e.g., vocation training). Participants received course credit as compensation for completing the study and attended the same institution as participants in Study 1. However, individuals who completed Study 1 were ineligible to participate in Study 2.

Procedure

The survey was administered in English using Qualtrics. Data were collected from August 2020 to December 2020. Participants were recruited through the university's research participant system. The entire survey (including questions not included in this study) took 45 min to complete. The order of item presentation was randomized for both negative and positive emotion brokering and between emotion and language brokering. All study procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of California, Merced. Participants provided informed consent before completing the survey.

Emotion Brokering Survey

Brokering Definition. We provided participants with the definition and examples of each brokering type (i.e., emotion, language). The definition aimed to draw participants' attention to the primary factor contributing to the communication gap in each brokering experience. Emotion brokering was defined as "explaining how emotions are expressed in American culture to someone who is not familiar with these norms." Language brokering was defined as "translating and interpreting language spoken by an English speaker for someone who is not fluent in English." The brokering definitions were specific to the context of immigration and thus referenced interpreting U.S. norms to a social partner.

Questions on Intercultural Misunderstanding. We asked participants separate questions on whether they encountered an intercultural misunderstanding involving negative emotions, positive emotions, or language. For example, participants were asked, "Have you ever encountered a situation where you understood the negative emotions expressed by someone from a different cultural background, but your parent did not." Given that most participants reported their parent was the brokeree in Study 1, we referred to situations involving the parent. However, participants who reported not experiencing any intercultural misunderstandings involving their parents were then asked about intercultural misunderstandings involving someone else.

Emotion Misunderstanding Context and Emotions Misunderstood. Forced-choice follow-up questions probed the context of the intercultural misunderstanding. Prompts asked participants to recall the person who misinterpreted the emotion of a social partner (i.e., the brokeree), the target (i.e., the person who the brokeree misunderstood), the cultural background of the target, and the location of the incident. An open-ended prompt probed participants to describe the intercultural emotion misunderstanding.

Follow-up questions identified the emotions involved in the misunderstanding. We asked participants to infer the target's emotions from their own and the brokeree's (i.e., the parent's) perspective. Forced-choice emotion labels included those frequently used in prior research (Kitayama et al., 2000), with additional emotion labels (e.g., awe, empathy, hopeful, disgust), and a "Select other" option. The full lists of emotion labels are provided in Table 1 (negative emotion labels) and Table 2 (positive emotion labels). Participants were provided with valance-specific emotion labels when asked to recall the target's emotion but were provided with negative and positively valenced emotion labels when asked to recall the brokeree's perception of the target emotion. Participants also rated the intensity of the misunderstood emotion. Emotion intensity options ranged on a scale of 1 (*not at all intense*) to 5 (*very intense*). Finally, an open-ended question asked participants to describe the incident in as much detail as possible.

Linguistic Misunderstanding Context. Similar forced-choice follow-up questions probed on the language brokering contexts. Specifically, prompts asked participants to recall the person who misinterpreted language (i.e., the brokeree), the target (i.e., the person the brokeree misunderstood), and the location of the incident. An open-ended prompt probed participants to describe the linguistic misunderstanding.

Brokering of Intercultural Misunderstandings. An additional question assessed whether participants brokered the intercultural misunderstanding in each situation they described. Participants were asked, "In the instance you are thinking of, did you explain/interpret the other person's emotions [language] for your parent?" Participants were then provided with an open-ended prompt to describe the brokering experience.

Last, we asked participants their ages when they first engaged in emotion brokering and language brokering. Participants selected between the following options: <6 years, 7–9 years, 10–13 years, 14–17 years, 18–21 years, and >21 years.

Coding and Analysis

Forced-choice responses (i.e., the brokeree, target, and location) were collapsed into categories. Responses for the brokeree were

Table 1

Study 2: Report of Target's Emotion When Brokering a Negative Emotion

Broker's report of target's emotion		Brokeree's report of target's emotion	
Emotion label	*N* (%)	Emotion label	*N* (%)
Anger	7 (15%)	Anger	2 (4%)
		Happiness	1 (2%)
		Irritable	2 (4%)
		Upset	2 (4%)
Ashamed	0 (0%)		
Bored	1 (2%)	Irritable	1 (2%)
Depression	2 (4%)	Depression	1 (2%)
		Embarrassment	1 (2%)
Disgust	3 (6%)	Anger	1 (2%)
		Neutral	1 (2%)
		Pride	1 (2%)
Embarrassment	6 (13%)	Anger	1 (2%)
		Disgust	1 (2%)
		Embarrassment	1 (2%)
		Empathy	1 (2%)
		Neutral	2 (4%)
Fear	4 (8%)	Fear	1 (2%)
		Other	1 (2%)
		Upset	2 (4%)
Guilt	0 (0%)		
Indebted	0 (0%)		
Ill-feelings	0 (0%)		
Irritable	7 (15%)	Anger	1 (2%)
		Bored	1 (2%)
		Irritable	1 (2%)
		Neutral	2 (4%)
		Other	1 (2%)
		Upset	1 (2%)
Relying	0 (0%)		
Resigned	1 (2%)	Upset	1 (2%)
Upset	7 (15%)	Anger	1 (2%)
		Elation	1 (2%)
		Embarrassment	1 (2%)
		Fear	1 (2%)
		Neutral	1 (2%)
		Upset	2 (4%)
Worthless	0 (0%)		
Other	10 (21%)	Anger	1 (2%)
		Empathy	1 (2%)
		Happiness	1 (2%)
		Helpful	1 (2%)
		Irritable	1 (2%)
		Neutral	1 (2%)
		Other	2 (4%)
		Upset	2 (4%)

Note. The left portion of the table indicates the emotion that the broker inferred the target was experiencing. The right portion of the table indicates the emotion that the brokeree inferred the target was experiencing. For example, there were seven instances where the broker inferred "anger" and the brokeree inferred "happiness" in the target. Instances where the broker and broker infer the same emotion label included situations where the emotion-based misunderstanding took place irrespective of the emotion category (i.e., instances involving misunderstanding an emotion elicitor or regulation of an emotion).

categorized as the parent (i.e., mother, father, both parents), relative (i.e., other family members), and other (any other person, including a friend or stranger). Responses for the target were collapsed into the following categories: stranger, neighbor, institutional agent (i.e., teacher, doctor, lawyer, priest, landlord, government official, bank

official), employee (i.e., server, salesperson), family or friend (i.e., relative, participant's friend, parent's friend), or other/unspecified. The brokering location was collapsed into the following categories: home (i.e., participant's own home or another person's home), school (i.e., school/university/college), or other public location (i.e., on the street, restaurant, government office, hospital, doctor's office, bank, parent's work, religious space).

Open-ended responses (i.e., description of the misunderstanding and emotion brokering experience) were coded to identify brokering themes identified in Study 1. Coding was completed by a trained research assistant, and reliability was assessed by the first author coding 25% of the responses. Observed κ values were .84 for negative and .72 for positive emotion brokering scenarios.

Results

Experience of Brokering

Participant responses (*N* = 109) of the age when they first engaged in emotion brokering indicated a range of initial experiences: <6 years = 19%; 7–9 years = 24%; 10–13 years = 24%; 14–17 years = 19%; 18–21 years = 12%; >21 years = 2%. Participant responses (*N* = 114) of the age when they first engaged in language brokering were as follows: <6 years = 39%; 7–9 years = 39%; 10–13 years = 16%; 14–17 years = 3%; 18–21 years = 4%; >21 years = 0%.

Of the 66 participants who described a situation in which a negative emotion was misunderstood by a relative, 48 participants (73%) reported engaging in emotion brokering. For misunderstood positive emotions, 49 out of 58 (83%) participants who reported such instances engaged in emotion brokering. Finally, 81 out of the 92 (88%) participants who reported a situation with a linguistic misunderstanding also reported engaging in language brokering. Subsequent analyses examined those instances when participants engaged in brokering.

Emotion Brokering Results

Emotion Brokering Contexts and Emotions Brokered. A summary of the results from negative and positive emotion brokering situations is provided in Table 3. The majority of reported negative emotion brokering experiences mentioned the parent as the brokeree (94%), a stranger as the target (48%), and reported an interaction that took place in a public location (60%). Additionally, the person who was misunderstood was typical of European American background (56%).

Reports of positive emotion brokering also mainly mentioned the parent as the brokeree (80%), a relative or a friend as the target (37%), and reported an interaction that took place in a public location (61%). In addition, most responses stated that the target was from a European American background (45%).

The reports of the targets' emotions when brokering emotions are summarized in Table 1 (negative emotion brokering) and Table 2 (positive emotion brokering). The most frequent labels inferred in the target by the broker for negative emotion brokering were "anger" (15%), "irritable" (15%), and "upset" (15%). The most frequent label inferred in the target by the broker positive emotion brokering was "happiness" (29%). Tables 1 and 2 also summarize the emotion labels participants reported that the brokeree inferred in the target. Notably, participants reported that the brokeree inferred a

Table 2
Study 2: Report of Target's Emotion When Brokering a Positive Emotion

Broker's report of target's emotion		Brokeree's report of target's emotion	
Emotion label	N (%)	Emotion label	N (%)
Awe	2 (4%)	Interest	1 (2%)
		Upset	1 (2%)
Caring	2 (4%)	Bored	1 (2%)
		Irritable	1 (2%)
Closeness	2 (4%)	Other	2 (4%)
Elation	4 (8%)	Anger	2 (4%)
		Closeness	1 (2%)
		Happiness	1 (2%)
Empathy	4 (8%)	Depression	1 (2%)
		Disgust	2 (4%)
		Irritable	1 (2%)
Happiness	14 (29%)	Anger	1 (2%)
		Caring	1 (2%)
		Disgust	1 (2%)
		Elation	1 (2%)
		Embarrassment	1 (2%)
		Happiness	5 (10%)
		Interest	1 (2%)
		Pride	2 (4%)
		Upset	1 (2%)
Helpful	2 (4%)	Bored	1 (2%)
		Irritable	1 (2%)
Hopeful	1 (2%)	Irritable	1 (2%)
Interest	5 (10%)	Awe	1 (2%)
		Interest	2 (4%)
		Irritable	1 (2%)
		Upset	1 (2%)
Pride	0 (0%)		
Respect	5 (10%)	Anger	1 (2%)
		Indebted	1 (2%)
		Irritable	1 (2%)
		Pride	1 (2%)
		Respect	1 (2%)
Strength	0 (0%)		
Surprise	4 (8%)	Anger	1 (2%)
		Embarrassment	1 (2%)
		Irritable	1 (2%)
		Upset	1 (2%)
Other	3 (6%)	Happiness	1 (2%)
		Ill feelings	1 (2%)
		Other	1 (2%)

Note. The left portion of the table indicates the emotion that the broker inferred the target was experiencing. The right portion of the table indicates the emotion that the brokeree inferred the target was experiencing. For example, there was one instance where the broker inferred "awe" and the brokeree inferred "interest" in the target. Instances where the broker and broker infer the same emotion label included situations where the emotion-based misunderstanding took place irrespective of the emotion category (i.e., instances involving misunderstanding an emotion elicitor or regulation of an emotion). Missing emotion label for *n* = 1 participant.

nonnegatively valence emotion in a situation where the participant brokered a negative emotion in 38% of instances. On the other hand, participants reported that the brokeree interpreted a nonpositively valanced emotion in a situation where the participant reported brokering a positive emotion in 55% of instances. Thus, a sizeable portion of participants reported situations where the brokeree

misperceived the social partner's emotional valence, particularly misperceiving positive emotions as negative.

In addition to the emotion labels assigned to the target, participants also rated the target's emotion intensity (according to their perspective and the brokeree's perspective). On average, participant ratings of the emotion intensity of the target in negative emotion brokering situations were similar for themselves and the brokeree (broker's rating of negative emotion intensity: $M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.92$; brokeree's rating of negative emotion intensity: $M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.90$). However, participants reported that the brokeree perceived emotions of higher intensity in positive emotion brokering situations (broker's rating of positive emotion intensity: $M = 2.92$, $SD = 0.93$; brokeree's rating of positive emotion intensity: $M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.10$).

Emotion Brokering Themes. There were 43 open-ended responses to emotion brokering negative emotions and 44 open-ended responses to brokering positive emotions. Open-ended responses were coded to identify the emotion brokering theme.

Misunderstandings based on the emotion expression (negative emotion: $n = 30$, 70%) were the most common among the sample for negative emotion brokering. The second most common theme when brokering negative emotions was misunderstandings of the emotion elicitor ($n = 9$, 21%). Reports that the brokeree misunderstood how an emotion was regulated were the least frequent theme when brokering negative emotions ($n = 4$, 9%).

Misunderstandings based on the emotion expression ($n = 28$, 64%) were also most common among the sample for positive emotion brokering. The second most common theme when brokering positive emotions was misunderstandings about how an emotion was regulated ($n = 10$, 23%). Reports that the brokeree misunderstood the emotion elicitor were the least frequent theme when brokering positive emotions ($n = 6$, 14%).

Language Brokering Results

We also assessed the contexts in which participants reported language brokering. Interestingly, although language brokering most frequently occurred for a parent (77%), a sizeable portion of participants (23%) described a situation where they brokered language for someone other than the parent. A majority (44%) of language brokering situations involved institutional agents (e.g., teachers), with few reports of brokering for a stranger or a neighbor, and most language brokering situations took place in public locations (70%).

Discussion

The findings from Study 2 provide additional clarity on the construct of emotion brokering. Specifically, we gleaned the experience, contexts, and emotions involved when participants broker negative and positive emotions. Furthermore, participants' descriptions of emotion brokering were distinct from their experiences of brokering language.

Negative and Positive Emotion Brokering Experience

Study 2 revealed that the prevalence of emotion brokering was similar for both negative and positive emotions. This suggests that while negative emotion brokering experiences may be more salient,

Table 3
Study 2: Descriptions of Brokering Context

Brokering context	Negative emotions (n = 48)	Positive emotions (n = 49)	Language (n = 81)
Brokeree (i.e., person brokered for)			
Parent(s)	45 (94%)	39 (80%)	62 (77%)
Relative	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	11 (14%)
Other	1 (2%)	8 (16%)	8 (10%)
Target (i.e., person who was misunderstood)			
Employee	6 (13%)	7 (14%)	22 (27%)
Institutional agent	8 (17%)	9 (18%)	36 (44%)
Neighbor	2 (4%)	5 (10%)	2 (2%)
Friend/relative	9 (19%)	18 (37%)	8 (10%)
Stranger	23 (48%)	10 (20%)	3 (4%)
Other (not specified)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (12%)
Location			
Home	10 (21%)	18 (16%)	8 (10%)
School	9 (19%)	11 (22%)	16 (20%)
Other public location (e.g., store)	29 (60%)	30 (61%)	57 (70%)
Target ethnocultural background			
European American	27 (56%)	22 (45%)	
Latinx	4 (8%)	10 (20%)	
Asian	4 (8%)	9 (18%)	
Black/African American	9 (19%)	6 (12%)	
Other	4 (8%)	2 (4%)	

participants also recall brokering positive emotions when prompted. Evidence for brokering both negative and positive emotions complements prior findings on emotion patterns among immigrants to a new culture. Specifically, studies identified greater dissimilarity between immigrants and members of the host culture for negative compared to positive emotions. However, there was evidence for emotion acculturation (i.e., the process of adapting new emotion patterns) for both negative and positive emotions (De Leersnyder, 2017; De Leersnyder et al., 2011). Likewise, our findings show that brokers report helping others navigate misunderstandings involving both negative and positive emotions.

Emotion Brokering Contexts and Emotions Brokered

Descriptions of emotion brokering in Study 2 demonstrated that this practice occurs in a variety of contexts and can involve multiple emotional experiences. This indicates that the emotion brokering process itself is likely flexible, and how emotions are brokered likely varies depending on the appropriateness of the situation.

Our findings provide initial evidence for the contextual factors typically involved when negative and positive emotions are misunderstood. While many participants recalled emotion brokering for their parents, emotion brokering also occurred for others. These findings are similar to other forms of cultural brokering (e.g., language brokering), which occurs primarily within the nuclear family (e.g., Morales & Hanson, 2005). Additionally, negative emotion brokering primarily took place in situations where a parent misunderstood a stranger. Conversely, reports of positive emotion brokering generally occurred when a parent misunderstood a friend or a relative. This suggests that the familiarity of the social partner may be an important aspect of brokering negative and positive emotions.

The emotion labels selected by participants to describe their emotion brokering experience indicated that participants brokered a variety of negative and positive emotions. Interestingly, participants reported misunderstandings both in the same valence category and in different valence categories. Participants also reported misunderstandings of the emotion intensity, particularly the relative misperceiving of the other person's emotion to be of higher intensity in situations where the participant brokered a positive emotion. Thus, emotion brokering involves interpreting both the quality and the intensity of others' emotions.

Thematic coding of both negative and positive emotion brokering showed that the most frequently reported misunderstanding involved situations where the brokeree misinterpreted another's emotional expression. Interestingly, many reports involved instances where the brokeree misperceived another's positive valence. The prevalence of expressive misunderstandings and misunderstandings involving positive emotions is interesting in light of findings on the similarities in the endorsement of positive emotion expression among Latinx cultural models (Kitayama et al., 2022; Senft et al., 2021) and dominant cultural models in the United States. (Tsai et al., 2006). Findings suggest that misunderstandings may arise regardless of the similarities in endorsing positive emotions. Brokers may play an important role in helping others interpret another's communicative expression in a manner that is sensitive to the context.

Language Brokering Contexts

Assessing language brokering in Study 2 allowed us to address potential confusion between constructs that emerged in the findings of Study 1. Providing participants with definitions and asking separate questions on each form of brokering offered participants clarity on both constructs. By giving participants an opportunity to describe other similar forms of misunderstandings, we were able to ensure participants' descriptions of emotion brokering were distinct from their descriptions of situations where emotions were not central to the misunderstanding. A large portion of the sample reported an experience where they brokered language—typical for participants from immigrant families (Tse, 1995) and expected for this sample. Importantly, the reporting of both emotion and language brokering

indicates that participants appropriately distinguished between each form of cultural brokering.

In addition to providing methodological clarity, including questions on language brokering also provided deeper insight into how the emotion brokering experience may be unique from language brokering. Participants' reports of the brokering contexts illustrate the similarities and differences in the patterns of responses for language brokering and emotion brokering. Overall, participants' descriptions of emotion (negative and positive) and language brokering mainly contained descriptions of brokering for a parent. These findings suggest that brokering primarily occurs in the context of the parent–child relationship among this sample. Importantly, a sizeable portion of participants did provide instances involving brokering for someone other than the parent, particularly when describing the experience of brokering language or positive emotions. Additionally, the majority of participants' language brokering experiences involved institutional agents (e.g., teachers), with few reports involving strangers or friends and relatives, such as in descriptions of negative and positive emotion brokering. These findings highlight the prevalence of interactions with officials and authority figures in the language brokering experience (Iqbal & Crafter, 2023). Finally, a slightly greater proportion of reports of the language brokering location were in other public locations, whereas a greater proportion of reports of emotion brokering were at home.

Overall, despite conceptual similarities between language and emotion brokering (i.e., both forms of brokering involve helping another communicate), these brokering experiences seem qualitatively distinct. For instance, descriptions of brokering contexts allude to the unique power dynamics and social interaction settings involved when language and emotion brokering occur. Our findings provide insight into the interaction dynamics and interaction goals that necessitate and increase the likelihood of some forms of cultural brokering rather than others. This highlights the importance of examining emotion brokering as a unique construct to further understand cultural brokering experiences. Furthermore, these findings suggest that each form of brokering may be qualitatively distinct emotional experiences for the broker.

General Discussion

This investigation is the first to identify the process of emotion brokering, in which individuals help others overcome perceived misunderstandings of another person's emotion. The studies provided evidence for the experience of emotion brokering for close family members in a sample of Latinx college students, as well as identified contexts and emotions involved in the emotion brokering process. More broadly, our findings extend knowledge on cultural brokering and provide insight into how cultural variation in emotions impacts the lived experience of individuals.

Emotion in Cultural Brokering

This investigation captured a previously unstudied form of cultural brokering where emotions were central to the communication barrier. Prior research has identified the role of emotions in cultural brokering, such as the emotional nature of the language brokering experience (López, 2020) and the impact of language brokering on affect-related traits (i.e., empathy; Weisskirch et al., 2021). However, our findings demonstrate that emotions can also be

the source of communication barriers between culturally different social partners.

Previous research on cultural brokering has overlooked the unique role emotions play in social communication (Campos et al., 2011; Mesquita & Boiger, 2014). Specifically, emotional experiences signal important information on how an individual appraises their environment (Frijda, 1986; Kashima et al., 2020). By brokering an emotion, the broker helps their social partner understand how an individual's cultural framework has informed their worldview and their emotional experience. Emotion brokering may play an important role in interpersonal communication, by helping social partners engage in perspective-taking of another's mental state (Main et al., 2017). More broadly, emotion brokering helps social partners learn how emotions are experienced and expressed in a different culture (Matsumoto et al., 2008). Brokering, thus, may be a form of cultural transmission where cultural information is transferred from the broker to the brokeree (e.g., Kashima et al., 2020).

Emotions and Culture in Everyday Interactions

Emotion brokering provides an example of how cultural differences in emotion norms manifest in everyday interactions. There is growing interest in examining the complexities and heterogeneities in cultural variation on emotions (Boiger et al., 2018; Senft et al., 2023). Such research highlights the importance of going beyond mean-level group differences when examining the cultural variation in emotions by examining the variability in emotion patterns. By employing a descriptive approach to our survey and taking no prior assumptions on individuals' cultural emotion models, we were able to capture the complex ways cultural variation in emotions impacts social communication. Our findings show that cultural differences in emotions manifest in intercultural interactions in daily life and may involve multiple social partners, including a broker.

Research on emotion brokering is particularly noteworthy given the prevalence of multicultural societies. It is increasingly common for social interactions to involve individuals from different cultural backgrounds. Intercultural interactions can present communication barriers (Sanchez-Burks et al., 2003), and close intercultural relationships may be vulnerable to unique challenges (Yampolsky et al., 2021). This makes it crucial to understand how social partners play a role in day-to-day intercultural misunderstandings. Understanding the types of intercultural relationships where emotions are brokered may broaden our understanding of how individuals navigate intercultural communication in their daily lives.

Limitations and Opportunities for Future Research

This initial investigation of emotion brokering provides many opportunities for further inquiry. In considering the limitations of the present studies, we also provide directions for future research on this topic.

Interpersonal Dynamics in Cultural Brokering

The survey methodology in this study limited the quality and depth of responses obtained from participants. Our surveys did not fully capture the complex and social nature of emotion brokering. Emotion brokering is likely a bidirectional, transactional process

that takes place in the context of a dyadic relationship (e.g., the parent–child relationship). Future research should investigate the emotion brokering process from the perspective of the brokeree (i.e., the parent). For example, it is essential to consider the extent to which the brokeree and third party agree on the accuracy of the broker's interpretation of the event. Examining emotion brokering in an experimental setting would allow researchers to consider the real-time dynamics of the emotion brokering process. Adopting methodologies that capture the interpersonal nature of the emotion process (e.g., Grumi et al., 2022) would help researchers understand how the perspective and social role of the broker and brokeree influence the emotion brokering process. For example, brokering involving a peer, parent, or elder may elicit distinct experiences and behaviors for both the broker and the brokeree. Such research could also inform research on the role of empathy in dyadic relationships and help determine how perspective-taking abilities facilitate or inhibit the brokering process.

Constraints on Generality

This study focused on a sample of Latinx college students, who are predominately from immigrant families. It is important to consider the characteristics of this study sample when interpreting these findings on emotion brokering. For example, participants' cultural values may have influenced findings on the experience and contexts of emotion brokering in this. Individuals from Latinx families who endorse high levels of familism may view emotion brokering as an aspect of family obligations (Stein et al., 2019). Future research should explore how cultural values and heterogeneity within this study sample may influence their emotion brokering experience. This line of research is particularly valuable in light of prior research that identifies how perceptions of language brokering as a norm may be protective against the poor mental health outcomes associated with language brokering (Kam, 2011).

It is also important to understand how characteristics within this sample may drive the patterns that emerged in both studies. For example, the high percentage of responses describing other forms of cultural and linguistic misunderstandings in Study 1 may reflect the familiarity with other brokering constructs in this sample. Further research on other populations is required to develop an understanding of emotion brokering. Importantly, although we examined emotion brokering among individuals from immigrant families, this construct may not be specific to contexts of acculturation. In this regard, emotion brokering and language brokering may not always be related, similar to how emotion acculturation can be unrelated to explicit forms of acculturation (De Leersnyder, 2017; De Leersnyder et al., 2011). Thus, it is also possible to explore emotion brokering in interpersonal interactions outside of migration setting. For example, emotion brokering may occur in intercultural interactions without language barriers (e.g., multicultural settings with the same *lingua franca*) or intergenerational relationships (e.g., brokering emotional norms in the parent–child relationship).

Emotion Brokering in the Context of Development

Research on the emergence and functioning of emotion brokering throughout development represents an important opportunity for study. The present investigation utilized a college-aged sample, but participants reported that emotion brokering was common throughout childhood, with 43% of participants reporting engaging in emotion brokering at 9 years or younger. Thus, as with language brokering, which has been found to occur for children before 9 years, young children also broker emotions. Emotion understanding among young children differs substantially from adults' emotion understanding; thus, understanding the experience of emotion brokering in developmental populations is particularly interesting. However, the retrospective nature of this survey limited the ability to understand how emotion brokering may play out earlier in development. There are many possibilities to explore the emotion brokering process in the context of development. For example, there is potential to examine how children's social cognitive skills (i.e., perspective-taking) and emotion knowledge are utilized when emotion brokering. Moreover, emotion brokering may be perceived differently at different ages and thus differentially elicit experiences of pride, shame, or anxiety depending on the broker's age.

Conclusion

This investigation explored the experience of emotion brokering among Latinx college students. Findings indicated that evidence for emotion brokering is primarily in the context of the parent–child relationship. Our studies demonstrate that emotion brokering may be another way that youth from immigrant families serve as cultural brokers. Additionally, our research provides insight into how cultural differences in emotions manifest in daily interactions. Given the personal and emotional labor involved in brokering, future research is needed to investigate how emotion brokering may relate to mental health. Moreover, given the novelty of the construct, further research is warranted to explore emotion brokering in other populations.

References

Berry, J. W., Phinney, J. S., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, P. (2006). Immigrant youth: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, *55*(3), 303–332. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2006.00256.x

Boiger, M., Ceulemans, E., De Leersnyder, J., Uchida, Y., Norasakkunkit, V., & Mesquita, B. (2018). Beyond essentialism: Cultural differences in emotions revisited. *Emotion*, *18*(8), 1142–1162. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000390

Boiger, M., Mesquita, B., Uchida, Y., & Feldman Barrett, L. (2013). Condoned or condemned: The situational affordance of anger and shame in the United States and Japan. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*(4), 540–553. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213478201

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Butler, E. A. (2015). Interpersonal affect dynamics: It takes two (and time) to tango. *Emotion Review*, *7*(4), 336–341. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073915590622

Butterfield, L. D., Borgen, W. A., Amundson, N. E., & Maglio, A.-S. T. (2005). Fifty years of the critical incident technique: 1954–2004 and beyond. *Qualitative Research*, *5*(4), 475–497. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794105056924

Campos, J. J., Campos, R. G., & Barrett, K. C. (1989). Emergent themes in the study of emotional development and emotion regulation. *Developmental Psychology*, *25*(3), 394–402. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.25.3.394

Campos, J. J., Walle, E. A., Dahl, A., & Main, A. (2011). Reconceptualizing emotion regulation. *Emotion Review*, *3*(1), 26–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073910380975

De Leersnyder, J. (2017). Emotional acculturation: A first review. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *17*, 67–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.06.007

De Leersnyder, J., Mesquita, B., & Kim, H. S. (2011). Where do my emotions belong? A study of immigrants' emotional acculturation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *37*(4), 451–463. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211399103

Elfenbein, H. A., Beaupré, M., Lévesque, M., & Hess, U. (2007). Toward a dialect theory: Cultural differences in the expression and recognition of posed facial expressions. *Emotion*, *7*(1), 131–146. https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.1.131

Frijda, N. H. (1986). *The emotions*. Cambridge University Press.

García-Sánchez, I. M., & Orellana, M. F. (2022). Negotiating interculturality from the margins: Translinguistic practices as affective labor in immigrant child language brokering. In M. Fatigante, C. Zucchermaglio, & F. Alby (Eds.), *Interculturality in institutions: Symbols, practices and identities* (pp. 295–311). Springer.

Grumi, S., Pettenati, G., Manfredini, V., & Provenzi, L. (2022). Flexibility and organization in parent–child interaction through the lens of the dynamic system approach: A systematic review of State Space Grid studies. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *67*, Article 101722. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2022.101722

Harwood, R., Leyendecker, B., Carlson, V., Asencio, M., & Miller, A. (2002). Parenting among Latino families in the U.S. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol. 4. Social conditions and applied parenting* (2nd ed., pp. 21–46). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Iqbal, H., & Crafter, S. (2023). Child language brokering in healthcare: Exploring the intersection of power and age in mediation practices. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *32*(2), 586–597. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-022-02376-0

Kam, J. A. (2011). The effects of language brokering frequency and feelings on Mexican-heritage youth's mental health and risky behaviors. *Journal of Communication*, *61*(3), 455–475. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01552.x

Kam, J. A., & Lazarevic, V. (2014). Communicating for one's family: An interdisciplinary review of language and cultural brokering in immigrant families. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *38*(1), 3–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2014.11679157

Kashima, Y., Coman, A., Pauketat, J. V. T., & Yzerbyt, V. (2020). Emotion in cultural dynamics. *Emotion Review*, *12*(2), 48–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073919875215

Katz, V. S. (2010). How children of immigrants use media to connect their families to the community. *Journal of Children and Media*, *4*(3), 298–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2010.486136

Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Kurokawa, M. (2000). Culture, emotion, and well-being: Good feelings in Japan and the United States. *Cognition and Emotion*, *14*(1), 93–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/026999300379003

Kitayama, S., Mesquita, B., & Karasawa, M. (2006). Cultural affordances and emotional experience: Socially engaging and disengaging emotions in Japan and the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*(5), 890–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.5.890

Kitayama, S., Salvador, C. E., Nanakdewa, K., Rossmaier, A., San Martin, A., & Savani, K. (2022). Varieties of interdependence and the emergence of the Modern West: Toward the globalizing of psychology. *American Psychologist*, *77*(9), 991–1006. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0001073

Knight, G. P., Gonzales, N. A., Saenz, D. S., Bonds, D. D., Germán, M., Deardorff, J., Roosa, M. W., & Updegraff, K. A. (2010). The Mexican American Cultural Values scales for adolescents and adults. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *30*(3), 444–481. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431609338178

Krys, K., Melanie Vauclair, C., Capaldi, C. A., Lun, V. M., Bond, M. H., Domínguez-Espinosa, A., Torres, C., Lipp, O. V., Manickam, L. S., Xing, C., Antalíková, R., Pavlopoulos, V., Teyssier, J., Hur, T., Hansen, K., Szarota, P., Ahmed, R. A., Burtceva, E., Chkhaidze, A., … Yu, A. A.

(2016). Be careful where you smile: Culture shapes judgments of intelligence and honesty of smiling individuals. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *40*(2), 101–116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-015-0226-4

Lazarevic, V., Raffaelli, M., & Wiley, A. (2014). Language and non-linguistic brokering: Diversity of experiences of immigrant young adults from Eastern Europe. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *45*(4), 517–535. https://doi.org/10.3138/jcfs.45.4.517

López, B. G. (2020). Incorporating language brokering experiences into bilingualism research: An examination of informal translation practices. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *14*(1), Article e12361. https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12361

López, B. G., Lezama, E., & Heredia, D., Jr. (2019). Language brokering experience affects feelings toward bilingualism, language knowledge, use, and practices: A qualitative approach. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *41*(4), 481–503. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986319879641

Magaña, D. (2020). Local voices on health care communication issues and insights on Latino cultural constructs. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *42*(3), 300–323. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986320927387

Main, A., Walle, E. A., Kho, C., & Halpern, J. (2017). The interpersonal functions of empathy: A relational perspective. *Emotion Review*, *9*(4), 358–366. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073916669440

Matsumoto, D., Yoo, S. H., & Fontaine, J. (2008). Mapping expressive differences around the world: The relationship between emotional display rules and individualism versus collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *39*(1), 55–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022107311854

Mesquita, B., & Boiger, M. (2014). Emotions in context: A sociodynamic model of emotions. *Emotion Review*, *6*(4), 298–302. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073914534480

Morales, A., & Hanson, W. E. (2005). Language brokering: An integrative review of the literature. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *27*(4), 471–503. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986305281333

Morris, M. W., Savani, K., Mor, S., & Cho, J. (2014). When in Rome: Intercultural learning and implications for training. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *34*, 189–215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2014.09.003

Ruby, M. B., Falk, C. F., Heine, S. J., Villa, C., & Silberstein, O. (2012). Not all collectivisms are equal: Opposing preferences for ideal affect between East Asians and Mexicans. *Emotion*, *12*(6), 1206–1209. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029118

Rychlowska, M., Miyamoto, Y., Matsumoto, D., Hess, U., Gilboa-Schechtman, E., Kamble, S., Muluk, H., Masuda, T., & Niedenthal, P. M. (2015). Heterogeneity of long-history migration explains cultural differences in reports of emotional expressivity and the functions of smiles. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *112*(19), E2429–E2436. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1413661112

Sanchez-Burks, J., Lee, F., Choi, I., Nisbett, R., Zhao, S., & Koo, J. (2003). Conversing across cultures: East-West communication styles in work and nonwork contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*(2), 363–372. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.363

Sanchez-Burks, J., Lee, F., Nisbett, R., & Ybarra, O. (2007). Cultural training based on a theory of relational ideology. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *29*(3), 257–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530701503184

Scherer, K. R., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1986). Emotional experiences in everyday life: A survey approach. *Motivation and Emotion*, *10*(4), 295–314. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992106

Senft, N., Campos, B., Shiota, M. N., & Chentsova-Dutton, Y. E. (2021). Who emphasizes positivity? An exploration of emotion values in people of Latino, Asian, and European heritage living in the United States. *Emotion*, *21*(4), 707–719. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000737

Senft, N., Doucerain, M. M., Campos, B., Shiota, M. N., & Chentsova-Dutton, Y. E. (2023). Within- and between-group heterogeneity in cultural models of emotion among people of European, Asian, and Latino heritage

in the United States. *Emotion, 23*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo 0001052

Stein, G. L., Cavanaugh, A. M., Castro-Schilo, L., Mejia, Y., & Plunkett, S. W. (2019). Making my family proud: The unique contribution of familism pride to the psychological adjustment of Latinx emerging adults. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 25*(2), 188–198. https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000223

Triandis, H. C., Marin, G., Lisansky, J., & Betancourt, H. (1984). Simpatía as a cultural script of Hispanics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*(6), 1363–1375. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.6.1363

Tsai, J. L., Knutson, B., & Fung, H. H. (2006). Cultural variation in affect valuation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(2), 288–307. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.2.288

Tse, L. (1995). Language brokering among Latino adolescents: Prevalence, attitudes, and school performance. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 17*(2), 180–193. https://doi.org/10.1177/07399863950172003

Weisskirch, R. S., Guan, S.-S. A., & Lazarevic, V. (2021). How language brokering relates to empathy and psychological well-being. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 38*(11), 3061–3077. https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075211020407

Yampolsky, M. A., West, A. L., Zhou, B., Muise, A., & Lalonde, R. N. (2021). Divided together: How marginalization of intercultural relationships is associated with identity integration and relationship quality. *Social Psychological & Personality Science, 12*(6), 887–897. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620962653

Zhao, C., White, R. M. B., & Roche, K. M. (2022). Familism values, family assistance, and prosocial behaviors among U.S. Latinx adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 42*(7), 914–936. https://doi.org/10.1177/02724316221078831