**Supplementary file for MS**

“A contextualized emotion perception assessment relates to personal and social well-being”

**Study 1**

 **Study Protocol**

1. ECR-R (Fraley et al., 2000)

2. Self-construal scale (Singelis, 1994)

3. "How satisfied are you with your life?" 1 item Question

4. Friends and Family parts of the Intragroup Marginalization Inventory (Castillo et al., 2007).

5. The State Attachment Scale (Gillath et al., 2009)

6. Shifting emphasis on the self or the other I – we – two paragraphs (Brewer & Gardner, 1996)

 Participants were randomly assigned in one of the two conditions

 2 items from Singelis individualism scale as manipulation check

7. Self-other interest scale (Gerbasi & Prentice, 2013) 17 items

8. Well-being (Diener et al. 2009) – 8 items

9. Risk avoidance (from STRAQ-1 Vergara et al., 2019)

10. 3-item loneliness scale (Hughes et al., 2004)

11. Short Assessment of Contextualized Emotions-Faces, 20 items (Kafetsios & Hess, 2022)

12.Demographics (including the MacArthur scale of Subjective Social Status, Adler et al. 1994)
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Figure S1

Example of ACE –Faces



For copy right reasons only an example image is provided for each test. Interested authors can ask for permission to use the material.

Figure S2

*Residuals versus predicted values plots of ACE accuracy (a) and ACE bias (b)*

 

1. (b)

Table S1

*Study 1 Multilevel summary statistics*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | Variance | % of variance Within Countries  |
|  |  | Between-Countries | Within-Countries |  |
| Well-being | 41.693 | 7.467 | 57.068 | 88.45 |
| Life satisfaction | 6.705 | .114 | 3.644 | 97.03 |
| Loneliness | 5.305 | .079 | 2.926 | 97.37 |
| ACE accuracy | 3.358 | .027 | .301 | 91.77 |
| ACE bias | 1.837 | .024 | .150 | 86.21 |
| Hit rates | .395 | .005 | .026 | 83.87 |

Table S2

*Main descriptives for each data collection site*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | *N* | Language | % Fem. | Age | SES | Accuracy | Bias | Hit rates |  | Acc Bias | WB |  | LS |  | Alone |  |
|  |  |  |  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *R* | 39.30 | 8.58 | 6.73 | 1.91 | 5.00 | 1.54 |
| China | 211 | Chinese | 66.80 | 19.84 | 1.75 | 5.86 | 2.89 | 0.52 | 1.83 | 0.41 | .30 | .14 | 0.47 | 43.04 | 7.06 | 7.17 | 1.70 | 5.08 | 1.67 |
| Spain | 181 | Spanish | 54.70 | 28.94 | 4.31 | 5.97 | 3.47 | 0.56 | 1.82 | 0.43 | .43 | .17 | 0.07 | 42.82 | 6.94 | 7.18 | 1.73 | 4.87 | 1.45 |
| Germany | 211 | German | 82.90 | 25.63 | 9.34 | 6.34 | 3.51 | 0.54 | 1.72 | 0.36 | .51 | .17 | 0.32 | 42.54 | 7.00 | 6.76 | 1.75 | 5.47 | 1.73 |
| Greece | 215 | Greek | 76.30 | 27.51 | 9.16 | 5.74 | 3.46 | 0.54 | 1.78 | 0.38 | .44 | .16 | 0.29 | 46.13 | 6.95 | 7.29 | 2.23 | 5.09 | 1.69 |
| India | 154 | English | 61.70 | 29.22 | 9.78 | 6.39 | 3.37 | 0.59 | 2.12 | 0.54 | .28 | .16 | 0.20 | 41.34 | 8.36 | 6.45 | 2.11 | 5.38 | 1.90 |
| Ireland | 146 | English | 67.10 | 27.89 | 10.69 | 6.09 | 3.40 | 0.52 | 1.86 | 0.41 | .38 | .17 | 0.11 | 42.55 | 6.93 | 6.78 | 1.68 | 5.43 | 1.70 |
| Italy | 308 | Italian | 69.50 | 23.80 | 7.27 | 6.11 | 3.26 | 0.53 | 1.72 | 0.33 | .42 | .17 | 0.30 | 35.97 | 8.41 | 6.60 | 1.93 | 4.95 | 1.60 |
| Japan | 187 | Japanese | 54.00 | 20.42 | 3.16 | 6.54 | 3.27 | 0.57 | 2.20 | 0.44 | .25 | .14 | 0.41 | 39.36 | 7.02 | 6.41 | 1.94 | 5.59 | 1.91 |
| Poland | 193 | Polish | 65.80 | 22.90 | 4.56 | 5.55 | 3.33 | 0.57 | 1.71 | 0.33 | .45 | .16 | 0.18 | 39.46 | 8.37 | 6.05 | 1.93 | 5.69 | 1.70 |
| Turkey | 207 | Turkish | 68.60 | 20.30 | 2.14 | 6.64 | 3.43 | 0.59 | 1.82 | 0.33 | .43 | .15 | 0.33 | 45.06 | 7.41 | 6.69 | 2.19 | 5.28 | 1.86 |
| USA | 229 | English | 56.80 | 28.99 | 9.44 | 5.11 | 3.38 | 0.55 | 1.73 | 0.38 | .40 | .17 | 0.35 | 42.74 | 7.66 | 6.36 | 1.87 | 5.82 | 1.71 |
| UK | 198 | English | 84.30 | 19.31 | 2.37 | 5.26 | 3 .52 | 0.52 | 1.75 | 0.34 | .44 | .16 | 0.17 | 39.30 | 8.58 | 6.73 | 1.91 | 5.00 | 1.54 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2,440 |  | 67.70 | 24.41 | 7.81 | 5.97 | 3.35 | 0.57 | 1.82 | 0.41 | .40 | .17 | 0.33 | 41.71 | 7.96 | 6.70 | 1.93 | 5.31 | 1.73 |

*Note:* SSS: Subjective socio-economic status. WB = well-being, LS = Life satisfaction, LN = Loneliness

**Study 2**

A. In the first phase of the study. a series of online questionnaires were completed in the University XXX online Platform. Before completing the questionnaires. participants were informed of the aim of the study and given a participant consent form. The order of the questionnaires is shown below.

1. Socioeconomic Status (SES)
	1. MacArthur Scale of Subjective Socioeconomic Status (Adler et al., 2000).
	2. Parental educational status (see Kraus et al., 2012).
2. The Individualism-Collectivism Scale (INDCOL. Singelis et al., 1995).
3. Empathy Scale (EQ; Muncer & Ling. 2006).
4. The Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR. Breannan et al., 1998).
5. Faces part of the MSCEIT (Mayer. Salovey. Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test. Mayer et al., 2003).
6. Big Five Inventory-2-Short (Hřebíčková et al.. 2020; Soto & John. 2017).
7. Agency and Communion Scale (Li et al., 2007).
8. The Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ. Gross & John. 2003).
9. Three-Item Loneliness Scale (Hughes et al., 2004).
10. A short version of the Assessment of Contextualised Emotions (ACE-Faces. Kafetsios & Hess. 2022).

After the participants had completed all the questionnaires. we divided them into dyads based on the same gender and asked them to come to the laboratory of the Psychology Department of the University of XXX

B. Participation in a laboratory task. The laboratory task consisted of four subtasks.

* B1. Completion of the following questionnaires:
1. The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI-X1. Spielberger et al., 1970).
2. Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (Rosenberg. 1965).
3. The Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB. Diener et al., 2009).
* B2. Emotion elicitation task (Levenson et al., 1991). Participants were individually asked to describe different situations from their lives and to show their facial expression (i.e., how they felt in that situation) while being recorded by a camera. A total of four emotional situations were requested in a fixed order: anger. sadness. disgust. and happiness.
* B3. Table talk with the participant’s dyad member. Participants had a short conversation with the other person in their dyad using the talk-table method (Gottman et al., 1977). A warm-up phase was conducted before the recorded conversation. In this phase. each participant selected a question from a bowl placed in front of them. In the recorded conversation. both a sad and a happy situation were described. The sequence began with the first participant describing the happy situation. followed by the second participant describing the sad situation. The first participant then continued with the sad situation and the second participant concluded the conversation by describing the happy situation.
* B4. Completion of two additional questionnaires on perceptions of interaction quality.
1. The single-item Inclusion of Other in the Self (IOIS. Aron et al..,1992).
2. The Quality of Social Interaction Rating (part of the Rochester Social Interaction Record. RIR. Nezlek, 1993).

C. Online completion of the ACE dyad task. Participants received an email in which they were firstly instructed to fill in the ACE-dyads (an ACE generic online task). ACE). which were formed as a modification of the ACE-Faces measure. Participants were asked to rate the emotional expression of the central person on a seven-point scale. considering the same seven emotions used in the ACE-Faces procedure. The difference is that the participant's dyad partner is the central person in the photos. The photos of the central person were obtained from a video recorded during the emotion elicitation phase. The Recognition service provided by Amazon Web Services (Kretch & Banker. 2024) was used to identify images with the desired emotional expression. Each ACE dyad contains a total of 20 stimuli. Participants only completed the ACE dyad. which included the photo of the person they were interacting with.

D. Diary study. After completing the ACE-dyad. participants were asked to complete the Rochester Interaction Record (RIR; Wheeler & Nezlek, 1977) on ten consecutive days to rate each interaction (lasting at least 10 minutes) they had during the day. In addition to when and with whom. they rated the interaction on 17 seven-point scales measuring the quality and emotional intensity of that interaction. If the participant had not sent a record after 24 hours. they were reminded of the study by an automated message. If participants failed to complete the records. an automatic reminder email was sent. After 10 days of participation in the diary study. each participant received an online package containing the results of some completed questionnaires. an individual 25-second demonstration of their video recordings analysed with Noldus FaceReader software. their heart rate graph during the interaction and two infographics on the meaning of heart rate and emotional expressions. These materials were provided as a further thank you for participating in such a study.

Table S3

*Study 2*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. ACE accuracy
 | .79 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. ACE Bias
 | .501\*\* | .96 |  |  |  |
| 3. Hit rates | -.054 | -.529\*\* | .71 |  |  |
| 4. Msceit Faces  | -.135\* | -.579\*\* | .335\*\* | .75 |  |
| 5. Gender | -.066 | .145\* | -.041 | -.168\*\* | - |
| 6. Age | .011 | -.028 | .135\* | .034 | .024 |

*Note:* N = 272-279 \* *p* < .05. \*\*\* *p* < .001
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**Table S4**

*Descriptives and zero-order correlations among main study variables*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 1 Gender | - | .057 | .058 | -.024 | -.074 | .121\* | -.018 | -.143\*\* | .201\*\* | -.092 | .041 | -.127\* |
| 2 Parental education |  | - | .266\*\* | -.330\*\* | .033 | .072 | -.006 | .010 | .111\* | -.006 | .061 | .080 |
| 3 SSS |  |  | - | -.410\*\* | .160\*\* | .147\*\* | -.067 | -.032 | .180\*\* | .053 | .098 | .009 |
| 4 SES |  |  |  | - | -.083 | -.087 | .029 | -.009 | -.184\*\* | .017 | -.049 | -.116\* |
| 5 ACE accuracy |  |  |  |  | .79 | .476\*\* | -.017 | -.121\* | .075 | .088 | -.058 | .138\* |
| 6 ACE Bias |  |  |  |  |  | .96 | -.527\*\* | -.517\*\* | .088 | .037 | -.086 | .173\*\* |
| 7 Hit rates |  |  |  |  |  |  | .72 | .284\*\* | -.015 | -.063 | -.006 | -.145\*\* |
| 8 MSCEIT faces |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .75 | -.071 | .001 | -.007 | -.089 |
| 9 Vert. individualism |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .81 | -.091 | .203\*\* | .153\*\* |
| 10 Horiz. collectivism |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .72 | -.183\*\* | .352\*\* |
| 11 Horiz. individualism |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .59 | -.186\*\* |
| 12 Vert. collectivism |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .63 |
| Mean | 1.287 | 3.789 | 6.078 | 2.905 | 5.192 | 2.329 | 0.428 | 44.547 | 4.772 | 6.503 | 6.451 | 4.461 |
| SD | 0.453 | 1.331 | 1.330 | 0.757 | 0.755 | 0.575 | 0.161 | 7.762 | 1.399 | 1.061 | 0.982 | 1.177 |

Note: \* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01.\*\*\* *p* < .001

**Table S5**

*Multilevel summary statistics*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | MMean | Variance | % of variance Within person  |
|  |  | Between-persons | Within-Persons |  |
| PA | 4.26 | .36 | .76 | 67.86 |
| NA | 1.76 | .23 | .74 | 76.29 |
| Other expressing Positive emotion | 5.62 | .41 | 1.57 | 79.29 |
| Other expressing negative emotion | 1.67 | .18 | 1.28 | 87.67 |
| Emotional support | 4.91 | .72 | 2.40 | 76.92 |
| Support satisfaction | 5.20 | .66 | 2.21 | 76.99 |
| Avoid expressing emotion  | 2.45 | .79 | 2.35 | 74.84 |

**Study 3**

1. Prior to the laboratory task. participants completed an online questionnaire containing a) a short text introducing the study. b) a participant agreement form for the questionnaires and c) a short demographic scale and d) each of the following twelve scales assigned to them in a random order (questionnaire instructions corresponded to the original published questionnaire):
2. Emotion perception subscale of the *Mayer Salovey and Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test 2.0* (MSCEIT; Mayer et al.. 2003)
3. *Situational Test of Emotion Management* for the judgement of different emotional situations (STEM; e.g., MacCann & Roberts. 2008)
4. *Wong and Law (Trait) Emotional Intelligence Scale* (Wong & Law. 2002)
5. German version of the *Toronto Alexithymia Scale* (TAS-26; Kupfer. Brosig. & Brähler, 2001) that focuses on difficulty identifying and describing emotions and on externally oriented thinking
6. 10-item version of the *Big Five Inventory*(BFI-10; Rammstedt & John, 2007)
7. *Experiences in Close Relationships Scale - revised*. a global attachment scale (ECR-R; Fraley. Waller. & Brennan. 2000; German translation by Ehrenthal. Dinger. & Schauenburg. 2006)
8. *Singelis* (1994) *Self-Construal Scale*. a measure of trait or chronic self-construal
9. "How satisfied are you with your life?"- Question
10. *Positive and Negative Affect Scale* (PANAS; Watson. Clark. & Tellegen. 1988)
11. *Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale* (e.g., Rosenberg. 1965)
12. 3-item *Loneliness Scale* (Hughes et al., 2004)
13. *Psychological Well-being Scale* (Diener et al., 2009)
14. Participants provided informed consent for the laboratory and diary task.
15. Participants were attached to electromyographic electrodes to assess mimicry during the emotion perception task (the imitation of the nonverbal behavior of others; see Hess. Philippot. & Blairy. 1999). These data will not be discussed in the present context.
16. Participants completed one of twelve orders of the ACE-faces emotion perception task (48 out of the total 144 faces. including 16 congruent. 16 non-congruent. and 16 individual. 24 male triads and 24 female triads for each of the following emotions: anger. happiness. sadness. disgust) as described in Study 3. Each presentation was interrupted 12 times with a short emotion contagion questionnaire (Hess & Blairy. 2001) which was presented in an equal probability manner for every order. The orders were not found to influence the Accuracy and Bias scores of the ACE-faces task. See Appendix 1
17. After the laboratory task. participants received instructions for the diary task as presented in the Manuscript. See Appendix 2.
18. Participants returned the diaries upon completion of the diary
19. One day after the last day of the diary task. participants completed again the well-being part of the online questionnaires mentioned above (scales 8 to 12) and were fully debriefed.
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