

Be Careful Where You Smile: Culture Shapes Judgments of Intelligence and Honesty of Smiling

Individuals

Kuba Krys¹, C.-Melanie Vaclair², Colin A. Capaldi³, Vivian Miu-Chi Lun⁴,
Michael Harris Bond⁵, Alejandra Domínguez-Espinosa⁶, Claudio Torres⁷, Ottmar V. Lipp⁸, L.
Sam S. Manickam⁹, Cai Xing¹⁰, Radka Antalíková¹¹, Vassilis Pavlopoulos¹², Julien Teyssier¹³,
Taekyun Hur¹⁴, Karolina Hansen¹⁵, Piotr Szarota¹, Ramadan A. Ahmed¹⁶, Eleonora Burtceva¹⁷,
Ana Chkhaidze¹⁸, Enila Cenko¹⁹, Patrick Denoux¹³, Márta Fülöp²⁰, Arif Hassan²¹,
David O. Igbokwe²², İdil Işık²³, Gwatirera Javangwe²⁴, María Malbran²⁵,
Fridanna Maricchiolo²⁶, Hera Mikarsa²⁷, Lynden K. Miles²⁸, Martin Nader²⁹, Joonha Park³⁰,
Muhammad Rizwan³¹, Radwa Salem³², Beate Schwarz³³, Irfana Shah³⁴, Chien-Ru Sun³⁵,
Wijnand van Tilburg³⁶, Wolfgang Wagner³⁷, Ryan Wise²³, Angela Arriola Yu³⁸

¹ Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

² Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), Cis-IUL, Lisboa, Portugal

³ Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Canada

⁴ Department of Applied Psychology, Lingnan University, Hong Kong

⁵ Department of Management and Marketing, Faculty of Business, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong

⁶ Psychology Department, Iberoamerican University, Mexico City, Mexico

⁷ Institute of Psychology, University of Brasilia, Brazil

⁸ School of Psychology and Speech Pathology, Curtin University, Australia

⁹ Department of Psychiatry, JSS University, Karnataka, India

- ¹⁰ Department of Psychology, Renmin University of China, China
- ¹¹ Department of Communication and Psychology, Aalborg University, Denmark
- ¹² Department of Psychology, University of Athens, Greece
- ¹³ Département Clinique du Sujet, Université Toulouse Jean Jaurès, France
- ¹⁴ Department of Psychology, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea (South Korea)
- ¹⁵ Faculty of Psychology, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland
- ¹⁶ Faculty of Arts, Menoufia University, Egypt
- ¹⁷ Faculty of Sociology, Saint-Petersburg State University, Russia
- ¹⁸ Department of Social Sciences, Free University of Tbilisi, Tbilisi, Georgia
- ¹⁹ University of New York Tirana, Albania
- ²⁰ Institute for Cognitive Neuroscience and Psychology, Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
Hungary
- ²¹ Department of Business Administration, International Islamic University Malaysia,
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
- ²² College of Leadership Development Studies, Covenant University, Cnaanland, Ota, Ogun
State, Nigeria
- ²³ Istanbul Bilgi University, Turkey
- ²⁴ Department of Psychology, University of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe
- ²⁵ Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Educación, Universidad Nacional de La Plata,
Argentina
- ²⁶ Department of Education, University of Roma Tre, Italy
- ²⁷ Faculty of Psychology, University of Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

- ²⁸ School of Psychology, University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom
- ²⁹ Department of Psychological Studies, Universidad ICESI, Colombia
- ³⁰ Nagoya University of Commerce and Business, Japan
- ³¹ Department of Health Sciences & Health Policy, University of Luzern, Switzerland
- ³² Silver School of Social Work, New York University, United States
- ³³ Department of Applied Psychology, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland
- ³⁴ Department of Psychology, University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan
- ³⁵ Department of Psychology, National Chengchi University, Taiwan
- ³⁶ School of Psychology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom
- ³⁷ Department of Social and Economic Psychology, Johannes Kepler University in Linz, Austria
- ³⁸ Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines-Diliman, Philippines

Author Note

We thank all the supporting team-members involved in the translation procedures and data collections. Research was supported by the Polish NCN grant 2011/03/N/HS6/05112 (K.K.) and Chinese NNSF grant 31200788 (C.X).

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Kuba Kryś, Institute of Psychology of Polish Academy of Sciences, Jaracza 1, 00-378 Warsaw Poland, kuba@krys.pl

Be Careful Where You Smile: Culture Shapes Judgments of Intelligence and Honesty of Smiling

Individuals

Kuba Krys¹, C.-Melanie Vaclair², Colin A. Capaldi³, Vivian Miu-Chi Lun⁴,
Michael Harris Bond⁵, Alejandra Domínguez-Espinosa⁶, Claudio Torres⁷, Ottmar V. Lipp⁸, L.
Sam S. Manickam⁹, Cai Xing¹⁰, Radka Antalíková¹¹, Vassilis Pavlopoulos¹², Julien Teyssier¹³,
Taekyun Hur¹⁴, Karolina Hansen¹⁵, Piotr Szarota¹, Ramadan A. Ahmed¹⁶, Eleonora Burtceva¹⁷,
Ana Chkhaidze¹⁸, Enila Cenko¹⁹, Patrick Denoux¹³, Márta Fülöp²⁰, Arif Hassan²¹,
David O. Igbokwe²², İdil Işık²³, Gwatirera Javangwe²⁴, María Malbran²⁵,
Fridanna Maricchiolo²⁶, Hera Mikarsa²⁷, Lynden K. Miles²⁸, Martin Nader²⁹, Joonha Park³⁰,
Muhammad Rizwan³¹, Radwa Salem³², Beate Schwarz³³, Irfana Shah³⁴, Chien-Ru Sun³⁵,
Wijnand van Tilburg³⁶, Wolfgang Wagner³⁷, Ryan Wise²³, Angela Arriola Yu³⁸

¹ Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

² Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), Cis-IUL, Lisboa, Portugal

³ Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Canada

⁴ Department of Applied Psychology, Lingnan University, Hong Kong

⁵ Department of Management and Marketing, Faculty of Business, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong

⁶ Psychology Department, Iberoamerican University, Mexico City, Mexico

⁷ Institute of Psychology, University of Brasilia, Brazil

⁸ School of Psychology and Speech Pathology, Curtin University, Australia

⁹ Department of Psychiatry, JSS University, Karnataka, India

- 1
2
3
4 ¹⁰ Department of Psychology, Renmin University of China, China
5
6
7 ¹¹ Department of Communication and Psychology, Aalborg University, Denmark
8
9
10 ¹² Department of Psychology, University of Athens, Greece
11
12 ¹³ Département Clinique du Sujet, Université Toulouse Jean Jaurès, France
13
14 ¹⁴ Department of Psychology, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea (South Korea)
15
16 ¹⁵ Faculty of Psychology, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland
17
18
19 ¹⁶ Faculty of Arts, Menoufia University, Egypt
20
21
22 ¹⁷ Faculty of Sociology, Saint-Petersburg State University, Russia
23
24 ¹⁸ Department of Social Sciences, Free University of Tbilisi, Tbilisi, Georgia
25
26
27 ¹⁹ University of New York Tirana, Albania
28
29 ²⁰ Institute for Cognitive Neuroscience and Psychology, Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
30
31 Hungary
32
33 ²¹ Department of Business Administration, International Islamic University Malaysia,
34
35 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
36
37
38
39 ²² College of Leadership Development Studies, Covenant University, Cnaanland, Ota, Ogun
40
41 State, Nigeria
42
43
44 ²³ Istanbul Bilgi University, Turkey
45
46
47 ²⁴ Department of Psychology, University of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe
48
49
50 ²⁵ Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Educación, Universidad Nacional de La Plata,
51
52 Argentina
53
54
55 ²⁶ Department of Education, University of Roma Tre, Italy
56
57
58 ²⁷ Faculty of Psychology, University of Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 28 School of Psychology, University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom

5
6
7 29 Department of Psychological Studies, Universidad ICESI, Colombia

8
9 30 Nagoya University of Commerce and Business, Japan

10
11 31 Department of Health Sciences & Health Policy, University of Luzern, Switzerland

12
13
14 32 Silver School of Social Work, New York University, United States

15
16 33 Department of Applied Psychology, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland

17
18
19 34 Department of Psychology, University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan

20
21 35 Department of Psychology, National Chengchi University, Taiwan

22
23
24 36 School of Psychology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom

25
26 37 Department of Social and Economic Psychology, Johannes Kepler University in Linz, Austria

27
28
29 38 Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines-Diliman, Philippines

30
31
32
33
34
35
36 Author Note

37
38 We thank all the supporting team-members involved in the translation procedures and
39 data collections. Research was supported by the Polish NCN grant 2011/03/N/HS6/05112 (K.K.)
40 and Chinese NNSF grant 31200788 (C.X).
41
42
43
44

45 Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Kuba Kryś, Institute of
46 Psychology of Polish Academy of Sciences, Jaracza 1, 00-378 Warsaw Poland, kuba@krys.pl
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

Smiling individuals are usually perceived more favorably than non-smiling ones - they are judged as happier, more attractive, competent, and friendly. These seemingly clear and obvious consequences of smiling are assumed to be culturally universal, however most of the psychological research is carried out in WEIRD societies (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic) and the influence of culture on social perception of nonverbal behavior is still understudied. Here we show that a smiling individual may be judged as less intelligent than the same non-smiling individual in cultures low on the GLOBE's uncertainty avoidance dimension. Furthermore, we show that corruption at the societal level may undermine the prosocial perception of smiling – in societies with high corruption indicators, trust toward smiling individuals is reduced. This research fosters understanding of the cultural framework surrounding nonverbal communication processes and reveals that in some cultures smiling may lead to negative attributions.

Keywords: smile, social perception, honesty, intelligence, corruption, uncertainty avoidance, culture, agency, communion

1
2
3
4 Be Careful Where You Smile: Culture Shapes Judgments of Intelligence and Honesty of Smiling
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Individuals

It is commonly recognized that it is good to smile – Louis Armstrong sang that when you smile the world smiles with you, and various trainers and guidebooks advise smiling because it improves interpersonal communication. These lay beliefs are supported by numerous studies demonstrating that smiling individuals are perceived as happier (Otta, Lira, Delevati, Cesar, & Pires, 1994), more attractive, communal, competent (Hess, Beupré, & Cheung, 2002; Matsumoto & Kudoh, 1993), likable (Palmer & Simmons, 1995), approachable and friendly, and that a smile from another promises a safe and satisfying interaction (Miles, 2009).

Cultures may shape different scripts for social behavior and as a consequence, different logics of nonverbal behavior and its social perception (Matsumoto, 2006; Leung & Cohen, 2011). In the past few decades, increasingly more psychological research has been carried out in non-WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic; Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010) societies indicating difficulties to replicate results from psychological experiments across cultures (Smith, Fischer, Vignoles, & Bond, 2013). Although psychologists broadly recognize the interrelationship between culture and behavior, and the sub-discipline called cross-cultural psychology is flourishing, interactions between culture and social perception of nonverbal behavior still remain understudied. One example of this lack of cross-cultural study is the assessment of cultural variation of traits attributed to smiling individuals that goes beyond East-West cultural comparisons (Hess, Blairy, & Kleck, 2000). Rychlowska and collaborators (2015) were among the first to address this pointing to the importance of heterogeneity vs. homogeneity of cultures in predicting the endorsement of smiling.

Although numerous studies confirm that positive perceptions of smiling individuals seem

1
2
3
4 to be universal, anecdotal evidence suggests that in some cultures the opposite may be true. For
5
6 example, a well-known Russian proverb says ‘Улыбка, без причины - признак дурачины’
7
8 (*smiling with no reason is a sign of stupidity*). The Norwegian government humorously explains
9
10 nuances of Norwegian culture by indicating that when a stranger on the street smiles at
11
12 Norwegians, they may assume that the stranger is insane (EURES, 2010). British authors of a
13
14 popular guidebook about Poland warn tourists that smiling at strangers is perceived by Poles as a
15
16 sign of stupidity (Bedford, Fallon, & McAdam, 2008). Even Charles Darwin (1872/1998) wrote
17
18 about “the large class of idiots who are ... constantly smiling” (p. 199).
19
20
21
22

23
24 Previous studies have tested this counterintuitive phenomenon in different countries
25
26 (Krys, Hansen, Xing, Szarota, & Yang, 2014; Krys et al., 2015). However, these studies included
27
28 only a small number of cultures (seven) compared to the much broader cross-cultural experiment
29
30 reported here, which was conducted in 44 cultures. Cross-cultural comparisons involving that
31
32 many different cultures allow for multilevel and country-level analyses, and are necessary to
33
34 reliably identify cultural factors that are related to the differential social perception of the most
35
36 often encountered facial expression, viz., the smile.
37
38
39
40

41 Meanings Attributed to Smiles

42
43 Smiles are highly diverse in their types and in their possible meanings. They are used to
44
45 communicate a range of different psychological signals, including positive emotions, social
46
47 intentions, or a person’s social status (Matsumoto & Willingham, 2009). Past research has
48
49 offered a number of distinctions among smiles. The utility of one of the most popular
50
51 distinctions, viz. Duchenne vs. non-Duchenne smiles (Duchenne, 1862), has been recently
52
53 questioned because there is evidence that the use of the Duchenne marker of a ‘true’ smile is not
54
55 universal, but rather limited to certain cultures (Abe, Beetham, & Izard, 2002; Thibault,
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Levesque, Gosselin, & Hess, 2012). In their simulation of smiles model, Niedenthal, Mermillod,
5
6 Maringer, and Hess (2010) focus on the perception of smiles and suggest that the distinction
7
8 between Duchenne and non-Duchenne smiles may be largely superseded by a distinction based
9
10 on the functions of smiles, which may be derived from (and mapped onto) identifiable brain
11
12 systems that represent different meanings of smiling.
13
14

15
16 Niedenthal et al. (2010) describe three types of smiles that have important and discrete
17
18 functions, namely, enjoyment, affiliative, and dominance smiles. Humans (and some other
19
20 primates) smile spontaneously during experiences of pleasure or success (Ekman, 2009) and this
21
22 expression is called the enjoyment smile. Affiliative smiles are those that signal positive social
23
24 intentions and are essential for the creation and maintenance of social bonds; personal enjoyment
25
26 does not have to accompany affiliative smiles. The third group of smiles—dominance smiles—
27
28 reflect social status or control, and may include scheming smiles, critical smiles, and proud
29
30 smiles which have different physical attributes than affiliative and enjoyment smiles (Niedenthal
31
32 et al., 2010). Chang and Vermeulen (2010) claim that affiliative and enjoyment smiles cannot be
33
34 discriminated from each other on the basis of physical markers - their meaning may be derived
35
36 only from contextual information. Rychlowska and collaborators (2015) delivered evidence that
37
38 the above distinctions may be cross-culturally identified, and documented that heterogeneity and
39
40 homogeneity of cultures (i.e., the extent to which a country's present-day population descended
41
42 from migration from numerous vs. few source countries over a long period of time) may predict
43
44 the endorsement of affiliative and dominance smiles, respectively.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The present research focuses on the attributions given to affiliative and enjoyment smiles
54
55 presented in still photographs in order to uncover the cultural variation of meanings attributed to
56
57 the most commonly expressed smiles. Limiting the scope of the current research in this way
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 avoids the problems related to differences in cultural scripts that may influence the attributions to
5
6 dominance smiles. We examined perceptions of honesty and intelligence attributed to smiling
7
8 individuals because these traits reflect the big two of social perception (Abele & Wojciszke,
9
10 2013; Bakan, 1966). Among academic psychologists, there seems to be a consensus about two
11
12 fundamental dimensions of social judgments, though these basic dimensions are named
13
14 differently and have slightly different meanings. For example, Abele and Wojciszke (2014) call
15
16 them agency and communion, whereas Fiske, Cuddy, and Glick (2006) use the labels warmth
17
18 and competence. These dimensions reflect the logic of evolutionary pressure and help us
19
20 determine whether ‘others’ are friend or foe (communion/warmth/honesty) and whether ‘others’
21
22 have the ability to enact their friendly or hostile intentions (agency/competence/intelligence).
23
24
25
26
27

28 Cultural Predictors of Smile Perception

29
30
31 Descriptive accounts of general cultural differences have been available for a long time,
32
33 but empirical assessments of cross-cultural variability have only emerged relatively recently
34
35 (Hofstede, 2006; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004; Lueng & Bond, 2004). In
36
37 our research we tested two predictions related to cultural variation. First, we tested the relation
38
39 between cultural uncertainty avoidance (UA; House et al., 2004) and the social perception of
40
41 smiling vs. non-smiling individuals with regards to intelligence. Societies that rank high on UA
42
43 socialize their members to alleviate the unpredictability of future events, whereas in societies that
44
45 rank low on UA, the future is judged to be relatively unpredictable and there are fewer societal
46
47 guidelines on how to behave (House et al., 2004). As argued elsewhere (Krys et al., 2014), in
48
49 cultures low on UA, social conditions are regarded as uncertain, so expressing certainty through
50
51 smiling (Hareli & Hess, 2010) can be perceived as inconsistent behavior and people who exhibit
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 inconsistency may be evaluated as unintelligent (Weisbuch, Ambady, Clarke, Achor, & Weele,
5
6
7 2010).

8
9
10 The second hypothesis tests whether ‘corruption corrupts smiling’. We predicted that the
11
12 more corrupt a society is, the less trust should be granted to a smile. On the one hand, a smile is
13
14 the most common signal of positive intentions. In fact, a smile conveys a message that even a
15
16 newborn baby understands and infants start smiling as early as three months old (Wörmann,
17
18 Holodynski, Kärtner, & Keller, 2014). The smile is perhaps the most commonly observed
19
20 affiliative signal (Mehu & Dunbar, 2008). A smile facilitates the establishment and maintenance
21
22 of social bonds, and helps to coordinate social interactions (Fridlund, 2002). All the above
23
24 suggest that smiling evolved as a universal signal of honesty and functions as a social glue
25
26 (Centorrino, Djemai, Hopfensitz, Milinski, & Seabright, 2015). On the other hand, this social
27
28 glue may be counterfeited without difficulty because smiling is a signal that can be easily
29
30 produced (Méhu, 2011). In particular circumstances, some smiles may be expressed to benefit
31
32 the signaller and may be deceptive (Ekman & Friesen, 1982).
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Therefore, we predicted that the ease of producing a smile may in some conditions lead to
40
41 lower trust in this signal and one of the pre-conditions of scepticism about a smile’s honesty is
42
43 excessive corruption in society. In highly corrupt societies, individuals are exposed to relatively
44
45 frequent unfair or untruthful behaviors and, thus, scepticism about the positive intentions
46
47 underlying a smile may be well-grounded and justified. Hence, in our second hypothesis we offer
48
49 the novel prediction that the higher the corruption index of a country, the more smiling
50
51 individuals will be perceived as dishonest. In other words, we empirically tested whether
52
53
54
55
56 ‘corruption corrupts’ the evolutionary social glue of the smile.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Past research has shown that social judgements of smiling and non-smiling individuals
5
6 may also be affected by gender-related expectations (Hess, Adams, & Kleck, 2009). Gender
7
8 stereotypes and beliefs about emotional expressiveness can lead to different standards when men
9
10 and women evaluate the nonverbal behavior of other men and women (Krumhuber, Manstead, &
11
12 Kappas, 2007). Women tend to smile more than men (LaFrance, Hecht, & Paluck, 2003; Hall,
13
14 1984) and there is a greater expectation for them to do so (Brody & Hall, 2008). Therefore, the
15
16 gender of the assessor and poser were included as control variables in all analyses. The
17
18 contributions of these control variables will be reported, though a detailed discussion of this
19
20 contribution is beyond the scope of the current paper.
21
22
23
24

25 26 Method

27
28 To provide a systematic analysis of the social perception of smiling individuals, we asked
29
30 participants in 44 cultures to rate photos of smiling and non-smiling individuals on traits
31
32 assessing honesty and intelligence.
33
34

35 36 Participants and Selection of Cultures

37
38 Data were gathered from a total of 5,216 respondents in 44 cultures across six continents.
39
40 After removing individuals with at least one missing answer on the measures of intelligence or
41
42 honesty, the final sample that was analysed consisted of 4,519 participants. In Table 1, we
43
44 present demographic characteristics for all national samples. The gender distribution was 56.5%
45
46 female and 43.5% male. The mean age of participants was 22.36 years ($SD = 5.50$). Participants
47
48 were students from a variety of different disciplines who were recruited at each author's
49
50 university. All data were collected from 2011-2015.
51
52
53

54
55 We managed to collect data in forty-two out of the sixty-two cultures involved in the
56
57 GLOBE project (House et al., 2004). We also collected data in Norway (for which practices on
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the GLOBE dimensions were calculated by Warner-Söderholm, 2010) and in Pakistan (ranked
5 high on the corruption dimensions, which relates to our second hypothesis). We aimed to collect
6 data from at least 120 individuals in each analysed culture (some authors, however, collected
7 more and other authors collected fewer).
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 Materials

15
16 All participants were asked to provide basic demographic information on their gender,
17 age, student status, religion, and father's highest degree. Individuals were also asked about their
18 ethnicity and nationality in cultures where the team leaders decided that asking about this
19 information was not controversial. The main part of the questionnaire had participants rate eight
20 faces, four smiling and four non-smiling, that were balanced for gender and represented different
21 ethnicities (four European American, two African American and two Indian, see Figure 1; the
22 need for ethnic diversity is stressed by Matsumoto & Kudoh, 1993) on a 7-point Likert-type
23 scale (1 = *trait doesn't fit at all* to 7 = *trait fits perfectly*) measuring intelligence (i.e., *intelligent*,
24 *dumb*, *smart*, and *stupid*) and honesty (i.e., *honest*, *false*, *authentic*, and *unnatural*).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Questionnaires in cultures that joined the project later also included five items from Rosenberg's
39 self-esteem scale (1965), three items from Dunton and Fazio's motivation to control prejudiced
40 reactions scale (1997), and three additional attributes (i.e., *attractiveness*, *friendliness*, and
41 *familiarity*) using the aforementioned 7-point scale. The current report is of the data provided by
42 all participants. Photographs of the same persons posing neutral and smiling expressions were
43 taken from the Center for Vital Longevity Face Database (Minear & Park, 2004). The
44 questionnaire, in the form of a small booklet, started with the following instructions: "Research
45 shows that people can quite accurately evaluate others based on their looks. Can you help us and
46 rate some faces?". Photographs were organised into two sets, with targets who were smiling in
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 one set presented as non-smiling in the other (Figure 1). Half of the participants received one set,
5
6 the other half received the other set. Photographs in each set were randomized. In a pre-test
7
8 carried out among 183 Polish students, smiling faces, were assessed as more joyful, $t(173) =$
9
10 $18.43, p < .001, d = 1.40$, and affiliative, $t(182) = 9.22, p < .001, d = .68$, than non-smiling faces,
11
12 but did not differ in dominance, $t(176) = .25, p = .80, d = .02$. Materials were originally written
13
14 in Polish and English and were translated from English into languages of each country where the
15
16 study was carried out. Following best practices (Brislin, 1970), team leaders in each culture were
17
18 asked to follow the back-translation procedure to establish linguistic equivalence. The original
19
20 material, including the manual for collaborating researchers, is available from the first author in
21
22 English.
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 For each participant, we calculated the average ratings given to smiling and non-smiling
30
31 target individuals across the traits associated with the intelligence and honesty dimensions. Next,
32
33 an effect size (i.e., Cohen's d) for the differences between ratings for smiling and non-smiling
34
35 individuals was calculated for each dimension in each culture. Thus, we obtained two measures
36
37 for each culture: a Cohen's d for intelligence and a Cohen's d for honesty.
38
39
40

41 Results

42
43 To test our two predictions, we separately examined cross-cultural differences in ratings
44
45 given to smiling and non-smiling individuals on the intelligence and honesty dimensions. The
46
47 results are summarised in Figures 2 and 3.
48
49

50
51 As predicted, smiling was not consistently perceived as a signal of intelligence across all
52
53 cultures. Although smiling did lead to attributions of higher intelligence in 18 out of the 44
54
55 cultures, we identified six cultures where individuals were perceived as significantly less
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 intelligent when smiling. Moreover, we found no significant difference in the intelligence ratings
5
6 of smiling vs. non-smiling individuals in 20 cultures.
7
8

9 This result supports our prediction that social perception of the intelligence of smiling
10 individuals varies across cultures, and in some cultures, smiling may even lead to attributions of
11 lower levels of intelligence (we observed a significant two-way culture*smile interaction, $F(43,$
12 $4425) = 5.9, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .05$; for detailed summary of results of ANOVA analyses, including
13 gender of participant and gender of target, see Table 2). As predicted, the key to understanding
14 this variability was not in geography (e.g., neighbouring countries like China and Japan or
15 Germany and France are on different ends of the distributions) nor in economic factors, but in
16 cultural dimensions (for detailed correlation and regression analyses, including economic factors,
17 at the cultural level examine Table 3). The predicted correlation between Cohen's d (i.e., the
18 difference in rated intelligence of smiling and non-smiling individuals) and UA practices was
19 high, $r = .63, p < .001$, and remained strong after controlling for economic factors ($\beta = .65, p <$
20 $.001$). UA practices remained a significant predictor even when controlling for the heterogeneity-
21 homogeneity of 28 cultures in our study that had heterogeneity-homogeneity data available
22 (Rychlowska et al., 2015; $\beta = .67, p < .001$). Consistent with predictions, multilevel analyses
23 revealed a significant cross-level interaction between facial expression and UA in the prediction
24 of intelligence attributions (for details of these analyses see Table 4).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 We also found support for our second hypothesis. Although smiling individuals were
49 perceived as more honest than non-smiling individuals in almost all analysed cultures (37 out of
50 44), there was cultural variability in the size of the effect (we observed a significant two-way
51 culture*smile interaction, $F(43, 4425) = 4.5, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .04$; for a summary of ANOVA
52 analyses see Table 2). Moreover, this cultural variability was related to societal corruption levels
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(see Table 3). The correlation between a smile's honesty bonus and three different corruption indices: Corruption Perceptions Index (Transparency International, 2010a), Global Corruption Barometer – Paying Bribe sub-dimension (Transparency International, 2010b), and Index of Economic Freedom – sub-index Freedom from Corruption (The Heritage Foundation, 2010), was significant and relatively high ($.59 > r > .51$, $p < .01$) and remained significant after controlling for socio-economic factors ($\beta = -.48$, $p = .04$). Corruption remained a significant predictor even when controlling for the heterogeneity-homogeneity of 28 cultures in our study that had heterogeneity-homogeneity data available (Rychlowska et al., 2015; $\beta = -.64$, $p < .001$). Multilevel analyses revealed an interaction between facial expression and corruption index in the prediction of honesty judgments (see Table 4). As predicted, greater corruption levels decreased trust granted toward smiling individuals.

Beyond cultural variability, we found that participant and target gender were important factors that influenced the social perception of smiling vs. non-smiling individuals (see Table 2). For intelligence perception, we observed a significant two-way participant gender*smile interaction, indicating that smiling increases ratings of intelligence more among women ($t[2551] = 7.80$, $p < .001$, $d = .15$, $M_{\text{Non-smileFemale}} = 4.71$, $SD_{\text{Non-smileFemale}} = .75$, $M_{\text{SmileFemale}} = 4.83$, $SD_{\text{SmileFemale}} = .77$) than among men ($t[1960] = 3.37$, $p = .001$, $d = .08$, $M_{\text{Non-smileMale}} = 4.54$, $SD_{\text{Non-smileMale}} = .76$, $M_{\text{Smile_Male}} = 4.61$, $SD_{\text{Smile_Male}} = .78$). Two remaining two-way interactions regarded perceptions of honesty. A significant participant gender*smile interaction indicated that smiling increases ratings of honesty more for female assessors ($t[2551] = 22.66$, $p < .001$, $d = .45$, $M_{\text{Non-smileFemale}} = 4.48$, $SD_{\text{Non-smileFemale}} = .71$, $M_{\text{SmileFemale}} = 4.83$, $SD_{\text{SmileFemale}} = .73$) than for male assessors ($t[1960] = 13.73$, $p < .001$, $d = .31$, $M_{\text{Non-smileMale}} = 4.40$, $SD_{\text{Non-smileMale}} = .67$, $M_{\text{SmileMale}} = 4.64$, $SD_{\text{SmileMale}} = .72$). Finally, a significant target gender*smile interaction revealed

1
2
3
4 that non-smiling women were assessed as more honest than non-smiling men ($t[4518] = 12.76, p$
5 $< .001, M_{\text{Non-smile_Female}} = 4.55, SD_{\text{Non-smile_Female}} = .86, M_{\text{Non-smile_Male}} = 4.36, SD_{\text{Non-smile_Male}} = .89$),
6
7
8 but smiling men and women were found to be equally honest ($t[4518] = 1.40, p = .16$,
9
10
11 $M_{\text{Smile_Female}} = 4.77, SD_{\text{Smile_Female}} = .89, M_{\text{Smile_Male}} = 4.74, SD_{\text{Smile_Male}} = .91$).

13 Discussion

14
15
16 In sum, the data illustrate that the perception of smiling individuals is culturally
17
18 diversified and that, in some cultures, this generally positive nonverbal signal may have negative
19
20 associations. In addition, this research indicates that corruption at the societal level may weaken
21
22 the meaning of an evolutionary important signal such as smiling and undermine its
23
24 trustworthiness. Our results also show that the gender of the assessor and target have an
25
26 important influence on the social perception of smiles, which may be related to socialization
27
28 processes and strong stereotypical expectations for women to be more communal and to smile
29
30 (LaFrance, Hecht, & Paluck, 2003). Across cultures, smiling increased attributions of
31
32 intelligence and honesty more for female assessors than for males and target gender affected
33
34 attributions of honesty in non-smiling targets, but not for smiling targets. These effects of
35
36 participant and target gender on smile perception did not affect the interactions of culture and
37
38 smiling, however, which are the focus of the current report.

39
40
41 Although the results are statistically significant, causal inferences need to be drawn with
42
43 caution because the relationships indicated in our research are mainly correlational. Another
44
45 limitation of the presented research is that the samples may not be fully representative of the
46
47 cultures they come from (i.e., predominantly university students were recruited to participate).
48
49 Furthermore, the situational context, which was not manipulated here, may also play an
50
51 important role in the perception and judgment of smiles (Niedenthal et al., 2010). Lastly, future
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 studies are needed to examine the potential influence of participant ethnicity as attributions may
5
6 differ across in-group and out-group faces. The role of smile intensity is also another ripe area
7
8 for future research (see Kraus & Chen, 2013 for instance).
9

10
11 Despite these limitations, this cross-cultural study illuminates surprising nuances of up-
12
13 to-now seemingly clear and obvious processes of smile perception. Although numerous studies
14
15 suggest that smiling individuals are perceived favourably, we document that the same person
16
17 may be judged as less intelligent when smiling than when posing a neutral expression in some
18
19 cultures. This has important practical implications, for example, in the context of globalization
20
21 and job applications. In many countries it is still common to submit photographs on one's CV.
22
23 Knowing whether a smile is interpreted positively (i.e., as a sign of competence and
24
25 trustworthiness) or negatively may be crucial knowledge for international applicants (also see
26
27 Ruben, Hall, & Schmid Mast, 2014).
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 Furthermore, this study advances theory about nonverbal behavior in important ways. By
35
36 recognizing processes underlying the two cultural dimensions used in perceiving smiles, we
37
38 indicate that those seemingly counter-intuitive findings reflect on highly functional strategies in
39
40 their own cultural context (also see Matsumoto, 2006). Expressing certainty in uncertain social
41
42 conditions may not be the best way of signalling intelligence (Hypothesis 1), and signalling
43
44 unconditional trust in untrustworthy settings may be risky (Hypothesis 2). Our research
45
46 underscores the importance of the cultural framework in understanding nonverbal
47
48 communication processes and reveals that although positive traits are usually attributed to
49
50 smiling persons, perception of this common nonverbal signal may have unexpected negative
51
52 implications in some cultures.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Abe, J., Beetham, M. & Izard, C. (2002). What do smiles mean? An analysis in terms of
8
9 differential emotions theory. In A. Millicent (Ed.), *The smile: Forms, functions, and*
10
11 *consequences* (pp. 83–110). New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.
12
13
14 Abele, A. & Wojciszke, B. (2013). The Big Two in social judgment and behavior. *Social*
15
16 *Psychology, 44*, 61-62.
17
18
19 Abele, A. & Wojciszke, B. (2014). Communal and agentic content in social cognition. A dual
20
21 perspective model. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 50*, 195-255.
22
23
24 Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
25
26
27 Bedford, N., Fallon, S., & McAdam, M. (2008). *Lonely Planet – Destination Poland*. Oakland,
28
29 CA: LPP.
30
31
32 Brislin, R. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural*
33
34 *Psychology, 1*, 185-216.
35
36
37 Brody, L., & Hall, J. (2008). Gender and emotion in context. In M. Lewis, J. Haviland-Jones, &
38
39 L. Feldman Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 395–408). New York: Guilford
40
41 Press.
42
43
44 Chang, B., & Vermeulen, N. (2010). Re-thinking the causes, processes, and consequences of
45
46 simulation. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 33*, 441-442.
47
48
49 Centorrino, S., Djemai, E., Hopfensitz, A., Milinski, M. & Seabright, P. (2015). Honest
50
51 signalling in trust interactions: Smiles rated as genuine induce trust and signal higher
52
53 earnings opportunities. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 36*, 8-16.
54
55
56 Darwin, C. (1872/1998). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals*. Oxford: Oxford
57
58 University Press.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Duchenne, C. (1862). *The mechanism of human facial expression*. Jules Renard.
5
6
7 Dunton, B., & Fazio, R. (1997). An individual difference measure of motivation to control
8
9 prejudiced reactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 316-326.
10
11 Ekman, P. (2009). Lie catching and microexpressions. In C. Martin (Ed.), *The philosophy of*
12
13 *deception* (pp. 118-133). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
14
15
16 Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. (1982). Felt, false, and miserable smiles. *Journal of Nonverbal*
17
18 *Behavior*, *6*, 238–252.
19
20
21 EURES. (2010). *Living and working in Norway*. Retrieved from
22
23 [http://www.eures.dk/JobSeeker/Landeinfo-og-](http://www.eures.dk/JobSeeker/Landeinfo-og-jobdatabaser/Norden/Living_and_working_in_Norway_%28engelsk%29.aspx)
24
25 [jobdatabaser/Norden/Living_and_working_in_Norway_%28engelsk%29.aspx](http://www.eures.dk/JobSeeker/Landeinfo-og-jobdatabaser/Norden/Living_and_working_in_Norway_%28engelsk%29.aspx)
26
27
28 Fiske, S., Cuddy, A., & Glick, P. (2006). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and
29
30 competence. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, *11*, 77-83.
31
32
33 Fridlund, A. (2002). The behavioral ecology view of smiling and other facial expressions. In A.
34
35 Millicent (Ed.), *The smile: Forms, functions, and consequences* (pp. 45-82). New York:
36
37 The Edwin Mellen Press.
38
39
40 Hall, J. (1984). *Nonverbal sex differences: Communication accuracy and expressive style*.
41
42
43 Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
44
45
46 Hareli, S., & Hess, U. (2010). What emotional reactions can tell us about the nature of others: An
47
48 appraisal perspective on person perception. *Cognition and Emotion*, *24*, 128-140.
49
50
51 Henrich, J., Heine, S., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral*
52
53 *and Brain Sciences*, *33*, 61-83.
54
55
56 Hess, U., Adams, R., & Kleck, R. (2009). The categorical perception of emotions and traits.
57
58 *Social Cognition*, *27*, 319-325.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Hess, U., Beaupré, M., & Cheung, N. (2002). To whom and why – cultural differences and
5
6 similarities in the function of smiles. In A. Millicent (Ed.), *The smile: Forms, functions,*
7
8 *and consequences* (pp. 187–216). New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.
9
10
11 Hess, U., Blairy, S., & Kleck, R. (2000). The influence of expression intensity, gender, and
12
13 ethnicity on judgments of dominance and affiliation. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 24,*
14
15 265-283.
16
17
18 Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and*
19
20 *organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
21
22
23 House, R., Hanges, P., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and*
24
25 *organizations. The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
26
27
28 Kraus, M., & Chen, T. (2013). A winning smile? Smile intensity, physical dominance, and
29
30 fighter performance, *Emotion, 13*, 270-279.
31
32
33 Krumhuber, E., Manstead, A., & Kappas, A. (2007). Temporal aspects of facial displays in
34
35 person and expression perception: The effects of smile dynamics, head-tilt, and gender.
36
37 *Journal of Nonverbal Behaviour, 31*, 39–56.
38
39
40 Kryś, K., Hansen, K., Xing, C., Espinoza, A., Szarota, P., Morales, M. (2015). It is better to
41
42 smile to women: Gender modifies perception of honesty of smiling individuals across
43
44 cultures. *International Journal of Psychology, 50*, 150-154.
45
46
47 Kryś, K., Hansen, K., Xing, C., Szarota, P., & Yang, M. (2014). Do only fools smile at
48
49 strangers? Cultural differences in social perception of intelligence of smiling individuals.
50
51 *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 45*, 314-321.
52
53
54 LaFrance, M., Hecht, M., & Paluck, E. (2003). The contingent smile: A meta-analysis of sex
55
56 differences in smiling. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 305–334.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (2004). Social axioms: A model of social beliefs in multi-cultural
5 perspective. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. San
6 Diego, CA: Academic Press.
7
8
9
10
11 Leung, A., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within- and between-culture variation: Individual differences
12 and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and*
13 *Social Psychology, 10*, 507–526.
14
15
16
17
18
19 Matsumoto, D. (2006). Culture and nonverbal behavior. In V. Manusov & M. Patterson (Eds.),
20 *The SAGE handbook of nonverbal communication* (pp. 219–235). Thousand Oaks:
21 SAGE.
22
23
24
25
26 Matsumoto, D., & Kudoh, T. (1993). American-Japanese cultural differences in attributions of
27 personality based on smiles. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 17*, 231-243.
28
29
30
31 Matsumoto, D., & Willingham, B. (2009). Spontaneous facial expressions of emotion of
32 congenitally and noncongenitally blind individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social*
33 *Psychology, 96*, 1-10.
34
35
36
37
38 Miles, L. (2009). Who is approachable? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 262–
39 266.
40
41
42
43 Méhu, M. (2011). Smiling and laughter in naturally occurring dyadic interactions: Relationship
44 to conversation, body contacts, and displacement activities. *Human Ethology Bulletin, 26*,
45 10-28.
46
47
48
49
50 Méhu, M., & Dunbar, R. (2008). Naturalistic observations of smiling and laughter in human
51 group interactions. *Behaviour, 145*, 1747–1780.
52
53
54
55 Minear, M., & Park, D. (2004). A lifespan database of adult facial stimuli. *Behavior Research*
56 *Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 36*, 630–633.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Niedenthal, P., Mermillod, M., Maringer, M., & Hess, U. (2010). The Simulation of Smiles
5
6 (SIMS) Model: Embodied simulation and the meaning of facial expression. *Behavioral*
7
8 *and Brain Sciences, 33*, 417–433.
9
- 10
11 Otta, E., Lira, B., Delevati, N., Cesar, O., & Pires, C. (1994). The effect of smiling and of head
12
13 tilting on person perception. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 128*,
14
15 323–331.
16
17
- 18
19 Palmer, M., & Simmons, K. (1995). Communicating intentions through nonverbal behaviors.
20
21 *Human Communication Research, 22*, 128–160.
22
- 23
24 Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton
25
26 University Press.
27
- 28
29 Ruben, M., Hall, J., & Schmid Mast, M. (2014). Smiling in a job interview: When less is more.
30
31 *Journal of Social Psychology, 155*, 107-126.
32
- 33
34 Rychlowska, M., Miyamoto, Y., Matsumoto, D., Hess, U., Gilboa-Schechtman, E., Kamble, S.,
35
36 ... Niedenthal, P. (2015). Heterogeneity of long-history migration explains cultural
37
38 differences in reports of emotional expressivity and the functions of smiles. *PNAS, 112*,
39
40 E2429-E2436.
41
- 42
43 Smith, P., Fischer, R., Vignoles, V., Bond, M. (2013). *Understanding social psychology across*
44
45 *cultures. Engaging with others in a changing world*. London: SAGE.
46
47
- 48
49 The Heritage Foundation (2010). *Index of Economic Freedom*. Retrieved from
50
51 <http://www.heritage.org/index/download>
52
- 53
54 Thibault, P., Levesque, M., Gosselin, P., & Hess, U. (2012). The Duchenne marker is NOT a
55
56 universal signal of smile authenticity: But it can be learned! *Social Psychology, 43*, 215-
57
58 221.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Transparency International. (2010a). *Corruption Perceptions Index*. Retrieved from
5
6 <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2010/results>
7
8

9 Transparency International. (2010b). *Global Corruption Barometer*. Retrieved from
10
11 <http://www.transparency.org/gcb201011>
12
13

14 Warner-Søderholm, G. (2010). *Understanding perceptions of cultural and intracultural societal*
15
16 *practices and values of Norwegian managers* (Doctoral dissertation). University of
17
18 Reading: Reading.
19
20

21 Weisbuch, M., Ambady, N., Clarke, A., Achor, S., & Weele, J. (2010). On being consistent: The
22
23 role of verbal–nonverbal consistency in first impressions. *Basic and Applied Social*
24
25 *Psychology, 32*, 261–268.
26
27

28 Wörmann, V., Holodynski, M., Kärtner, J., & Keller, H. (2014). The emergence of social
29
30 smiling: the interplay of maternal and infant imitation during the first three months in
31
32 cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 45*, 339-361.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1
Samples' Characteristics

	coll.	anz.	fem.	fem.	age	age	intell.	hones.	intell.	hones.
	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>
Albania	119	90	50	56%	20.81	2.05	.81	.69	.14	.44
Argentina	104	80	51	64%	33.77	10.53	.76	.73	.04	-.03
Australia	120	112	86	77%	19.74	3.93	.91	.83	.24	.70
Austria	109	95	60	63%	25.57	6.35	.92	.88	.49	.56
Brazil	120	103	68	66%	23.89	5.70	.77	.71	.31	.47
Canada	117	86	49	57%	20.34	4.05	.92	.88	.20	.56
China	120	111	51	46%	23.09	4.10	.84	.85	.54	.53
Colombia	120	113	70	62%	27.66	13.46	.81	.75	.05	.69
Denmark	112	106	53	50%	23.61	2.90	.91	.81	.31	.51
Egypt	93	61	49	80%	20.79	4.45	.85	.76	.37	.53
France	120	102	61	60%	28.19	8.77	.90	.86	-.16	.23
Georgia	120	115	58	50%	25.30	10.06	.70	.69	.22	.54
Germany	81	78	36	46%	22.71	6.02	.84	.76	1.01	.43
Greece	125	120	62	52%	20.82	1.59	.85	.76	-.04	.62
Hong Kong	120	112	49	44%	20.44	1.77	.68	.76	.01	.26
Hungary	118	105	57	54%	21.28	3.79	.86	.78	.00	.41
India Karnataka	120	92	49	53%	21.15	2.77	.83	.50	-.03	-.08
India Kerala	120	104	54	52%	20.32	1.26	.79	.62	-.41	.03
Indonesia	120	120	60	50%	19.58	1.37	.75	.69	.09	.00
Iran	48	42	31	74%	21.21	4.08	.79	.70	-.40	.09
Ireland	120	104	46	44%	19.35	3.08	.88	.80	.14	.51
Israel	99	83	31	37%	26.24	5.15	.87	.84	-.12	.26
Italy	160	151	137	91%	23.12	6.14	.82	.79	.01	.56
Japan	109	103	52	51%	19.24	1.21	.82	.83	-.41	.47
Kuwait	300	298	132	44%	21.46	3.22	.71	.62	.12	.31
Malaysia	120	100	73	73%	22.81	4.34	.88	.80	.57	.55
Maldives	120	95	44	46%	24.09	2.99	.78	.55	.08	-.01
Mexico	136	105	54	51%	21.07	2.34	.91	.82	-.09	.35
Nigeria	120	112	59	53%	19.16	1.56	.83	.70	.25	.35
Norway	97	85	50	59%	22.22	3.76	.87	.70	.05	.41
Pakistan	190	137	68	50%	21.52	3.22	.78	.63	.26	.19
Philippines	120	114	83	73%	19.22	2.00	.83	.78	.35	.70
Poland	76	68	48	71%	22.69	1.81	.90	.79	-.02	.43
Portugal	120	111	62	56%	22.03	3.15	.79	.67	.25	.61
Russia	120	113	71	63%	22.33	1.87	.87	.79	-.28	.21
So. Afr. n-white	115	41	24	59%	20.93	1.82	.83	.76	-.02	.46
So. Afr. white	115	43	21	49%	20.93	1.82	.83	.76	.10	.51

South Korea	120	112	62	55%	20.81	2.25	.74	.70	-.36	.52
Switzerland	107	99	59	60%	25.04	5.62	.92	.90	.96	.91
Taiwan	68	61	37	61%	19.51	.94	.81	.78	.15	.48
Turkey	134	127	64	50%	22.57	2.71	.76	.65	.22	.36
UK	120	111	59	53%	23.82	8.99	.88	.80	.32	.62
USA	84	79	52	66%	24.06	9.81	.94	.90	.15	.50
Zimbabwe	120	120	60	50%	22.82	3.70	.66	.55	.16	.02
average	119	103	58	57%	22.44	4.15	.83	.75	.13	.40
total	5216	4519	2552	56%	22.36	5.50	.85	.79	.12	.39

Note. coll. N = N collected; anlz. N = N analyzed (all further data are presented for N analyzed); fem. N = N female; fem. % = percentage of female in a sample; intell. α = Cronbach's alpha for intelligence measure; hones. α = Cronbach's alpha for honesty measure; So. Afr. n-white/white = South Africa non-white/white samples (for South Africa we follow the GLOBE distinction).

Table 2
Results of Two ANOVA Analyses for Intelligence and Honesty Perception

	intelligence perception		honesty perception		<i>df</i>
	<i>F</i>	<i>η squared</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>η squared</i>	
smile	45.9***	.010	540.6***	.109	1, 4425
culture	13.3***	.115	20.3***	.165	43, 4425
PG	94.2***	.021	50.2***	.011	1, 4425
TG	24.5***	.006	78.6***	.017	1, 4425
smile * culture	5.9***	.054	4.5***	.042	43, 4425
smile * PG	6.7**	.002	11.2**	.003	1, 4425
smile * TG	1.5	.000	41.9***	.009	1, 4425
culture * PG	3.9***	.037	2.3***	.022	43, 4425
culture * TG	4.3***	.040	4.2***	.039	43, 4425
PG * TG	47.4***	.011	1.7	.000	1, 4425
smile * culture * PG	.8	.008	1.3	.012	43, 4425
smile * culture * TG	1.3	.013	1.0	.010	43, 4425
smile * PG * TG	.5	.000	1.0	.000	1, 4425
culture * PG * TG	1.7**	.016	1.1	.010	43, 4425
smile * culture * PG * TG	1.1	.011	.6	.006	43, 4425

Note. PG – participant’s gender, TG – target’s gender. Smile and gender of target as within-subjects factors, and culture and gender of observer as between-subjects factors. Significant values are shown in bold.

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3

Analysis at the Cultural Level: Correlations and Standardized Regression Coefficients

	intelligence <i>d</i>	honesty <i>d</i>
CORRELATIONS (<i>r</i>)		
CULTURAL PRACTICES (GLOBE project)		
Uncertainty avoidance	.63***	.24
Power distance	-.16	-.28
Institutional collectivism	-.14	.05
In-group collectivism	-.29	-.37*
Gender egalitarianism	-.06	.16
Assertiveness	.21	.20
Future orientation	.36*	.28
Performance orientation	.22	.11
Humane orientation	-.03	-.17
CULTURAL VALUES (Schwartz - S; Hofstede - H)		
Harmony - S	.26	.28
Embeddedness - S	-.22	-.32*
Hierarchy - S	-.34*	-.35*
Mastery - S	-.22	-.21
Affective autonomy - S	.17	.18
Intellectual autonomy - S	.24	.36*
Egalitarianism - S	.32*	.35*
Power distance - H	-.21	-.25
Individualism - H	.13	.23
Masculinity - H	.09	.23
Uncertainty avoidance - H	-.30	.00
Long term orientation - H	.02	.05
Indulgence - H	.15	.34*
SOCIAL AXIOMS (Bond & Leung)		
Dynamic externality	.06	-.36
Societal cynicism	-.13	-.29
CORRUPTION INDEXES		
Corruption perception index - ranking	-.23	-.53***
Global corruption barometer - paying bribe	-.27	-.53**
Bribe payers index	.41	.59**
Economic freedom Index - corruption	.28	.51***
SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDEXES		
GDP <i>per capita</i>	.21	.38*
GDP PPP	-.01	-.02
GINI index	-.01	-.07
Historical heterogeneity (<i>vs.</i> homogeneity)	.09	.29

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Life expectation at birth	.09	.38*
Literacy rate	-.29	.23
Military expenditures (% GDP)	-.22	-.09
Population density	-.09	-.14
Population growth	.05	-.10
Rural population (% total)	-.02	-.32*
Unemployment rate	-.13	-.08

REGRESSIONS (β)

	Model 1	
Uncertainty avoidance (GLOBE)	.65***	-
GDP <i>per capita</i>	.02	-
GINI Index	.15	-
		Model 2
Corruption perception index	-	-.48*
GDP <i>per capita</i>	-	-.02
Life expectation at birth	-	.03
Rural population (% total)	-	-.01

Note. Highly significant ($p < .01$) values are shown in bold.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4

Unstandardized Coefficients from Multilevel Linear Regression Analyses of Perceived Intelligence (Model 1 & 2) and Perceived Honesty (Model 3 & 4)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	DV: perceived intelligence		DV: perceived honesty	
	IV culture: uncertainty avoidance		IV culture: Corruption Perceptions Index	
Intercept	4.7459 (0.2719) ***	4.7399 (0.2557) ***	4.6347 (0.0688) ***	4.62484 (0.0659) ***
culture	0.0105 (0.0651)	0.0055 (0.0612)	-0.0007 (0.0008)	-0.0004 (0.0007)
smile	-0.8997 (0.1684) ***	-0.7745 (0.0907) ***	0.3419 (0.0372) ***	0.3233 (0.0226) ***
PG	-0.8322 (0.2162) ***	-0.5479 (0.1466) ***	-0.1399 (0.0455) **	-0.1099 (0.0167) ***
TG	-0.0153 (0.1684)	-0.0777 (0.0118) ***	-0.1409 (0.0372) ***	-0.1307 (0.0226) ***
culture * smile	0.2420 (0.0405) ***	0.2096 (0.0217) ***	-0.0014 (0.0005) **	-0.0017 (0.0003) ***
culture * PG	0.1489 (0.0520) **	0.0891 (0.0355) *	0.0009 (0.0006)	-
smile * PG	0.2191 (0.2596)	-	-0.0255 (0.0560)	-
culture * TG	-0.0349 (0.0405)	-	-0.0013 (0.0005) **	-0.0011 (0.0003) ***
smile * TG	0.1016 (0.2381)	-	0.1876 (0.0526) ***	0.1780 (0.0225) ***
PG * TG	0.4127 (0.2596)	-	0.0388 (0.0560)	-
culture * smile * PG	-0.0698 (0.0621)	-	-0.0009 (0.0007)	-
culture * smile * TG	-0.0146 (0.0572)	-	0.0002 (0.0007)	-
culture * PG * TG	-0.0658 (0.0621)	-	0.0003 (0.0007)	-
smile * PG * TG	-0.1263 (0.3671)	-	-0.0538 (0.0791)	-
culture * smile * PG * TG	0.0322 (0.0878)	-	0.0001 (0.0010)	-

Note. PG – participant’s gender, TG – target’s gender. For models 1 & 2, *culture* means culture-level predictor Uncertainty Avoidance; for models 3 & 4 *culture* means culture-level predictor Corruption Perceptions Index. Robust standard errors are given in parentheses.
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$



Figure 1. Photographs used in the current study. Participants assessed either the faces in the upper or those in the lower row.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 2. Cohen's *d* for the difference in intelligence ratings of smiling and non-smiling individuals across cultures. Red lines separate cultures in which smiling individuals are rated as significantly more intelligent (on the right) or significantly less intelligent (on the left).




Figure 3. Cohen's *d* for the difference in honesty ratings of smiling and non-smiling individuals across cultures. Red line separates cultures in which smiling individuals are rated as significantly more honest (on the right).