

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234112869>

Duchenne smiles and the perception of generosity and sociability in faces

Article in *Journal of Cultural and Evolutionary Psychology* · November 2007

DOI: 10.1556/JEP.5.2007.1-4.11

CITATIONS

80

READS

2,664

3 authors:



Marc Mehu

Webster Vienna Private University

64 PUBLICATIONS 2,552 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Anthony C. Little

University of Bath

264 PUBLICATIONS 18,856 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Robin Dunbar

University of Oxford

794 PUBLICATIONS 62,636 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

DUCHENNE SMILES AND THE PERCEPTION OF GENEROSITY AND SOCIABILITY IN FACES

MARC MEHU^{*1}, ANTHONY C. LITTLE^{1,2}, AND ROBIN I. M. DUNBAR¹

¹British Academy Centenary Research Project, School of Biological Sciences, University of Liverpool, Crown Street, Liverpool L69 7ZB, UK

²Department of Psychology, University of Stirling

Abstract: Although Duchenne smiles have been shown to have a social signal value, there is limited evidence as to whether this effect generalises to most positive attributes, or whether it is restricted to a particular social domain. As opposed to non-Duchenne smiles, Duchenne smiles involve the activity of facial muscles in the eye region (*orbicularis oculi*). The hypothesis that Duchenne and non-Duchenne smiles produce different responses in receivers was tested in a face perception experiment. People were asked to rate neutral and smiling faces on ten attributes: attractiveness, generosity, trustworthiness, competitiveness, health, agreeableness, conscientiousness, extroversion, neuroticism, and openness to experience. Results showed that the type of smile had a stronger impact on the ratings of generosity and extroversion. The difference between neutral and smiling was larger when faces showed a Duchenne than a non-Duchenne smile, though the effect of smile type on attributions of generosity appeared to be restricted to male faces. Therefore the Duchenne marker shows some specificity to judgements of altruism and sociability.

Keywords: facial expression, duchenne smile, generosity, extroversion, evolution

1. INTRODUCTION

The idea that smiles can be categorised in different types can be traced back to the physiological studies conducted by the anatomist DUCHENNE de BOULOGNE. DUCHENNE (1862) noticed that emotionally motivated smiles often involve facial activity in the eye region, *orbicularis oculi*, whereas deliberate smiles include the sole

* Address for correspondence: Marc Mehu, Department of Psychology, University of Geneva, 40, Boulevard du Pont d'Arve, CH-1205 Geneva, Switzerland. E-mail: marc.mehu@pse.unige.ch, Tel.: +41(0)22 3799206

activation of the *zygomaticus major*. The latter pulls the lip corner obliquely up and back, and deepens the furrow running from the nostril to the lip corner. The former lifts the cheek upwards and pushes the skin toward the eye, thereby narrowing the eye opening sometimes causing crow's feet wrinkles to appear at the outer corner of the eye (EKMAN and FRIESEN 1982). These careful observations led to the adoption of *orbicularis oculi*'s activity as one of the main features used to differentiate between spontaneous and deliberate smiles (EKMAN and FRIESEN 1982; FRANK, EKMAN and FRIESEN 1993), and the former took the appellation 'Duchenne smile' to honour the early work of the French anatomist.

Interestingly, the observable variations between Duchenne and non-Duchenne smiles were shown to produce different effects in perceivers, with Duchenne smiles having a more positive impact on social judgements than non-Duchenne smiles. For example researchers found associations between Duchenne smiles and positive attributions by observers (O'SULLIVAN et al. 1992 cited by FRANK et al. 1993). It is unclear, however, what these positive attributions were about. In another study, people showing enjoyment smiles (i.e. Duchenne smiles) were judged as being more expressive, natural, outgoing, sociable, relaxed, and were deemed to feel and act more pleasant than when they showed non-enjoyment smiles (FRANK et al. 1993). LAFRANCE and HECHT (1995) also found evidence that a person showing a Duchenne smile can be judged as more likeable and diplomatic. Although these studies suggest that the Duchenne smile has a signal value, an emphasis on emotional expression has regularly been preferred to investigations of social function (maybe with the exception of LAFRANCE and HECHT 1995). Furthermore these studies often failed to specify particular areas in which the Duchenne smile could be functional (e.g. mate choice, cooperation, etc.). Overall there appears to be very limited data concerning the effect of Duchenne and non-Duchenne smiles on person perception.

No matter what smiling is meant to express, the mere suggestion that it expresses something beneficial to the sender makes the possibility of social manipulation an appealing option for nature to select for (BROWN and MOORE 2002). The degree of control that individuals gained over their face (SHERWOOD et al. 2004; SHERWOOD et al. 2005) and the effect of smiling on trait perception (LAU 1982; OTTA, ABROSIO and HOSHINO 1996; MEHU 2006) set forward the obvious problem that people could smile purposefully and claim specific traits whenever a relevant situation presents itself. This might have created a selection pressure for individuals who were particularly sensitive to smiling, as they became increasingly vulnerable to exploitation by socially skilled individuals. Consequently, the evolution of cognitive structures responsible for the control of facial behaviour might also have led to cognitive counter strategies based on a better discrimination between the various forms smiles appeared to take. Social responses to faces should therefore be expected to vary with the type of smile shown by these faces.

Cooperation between unrelated individuals is a sphere in which exploitation by free-riders could be particularly detrimental (DUNBAR 1999). Indeed, consistent failures from the partner to retaliate favours could quickly eliminate the benefits

expected from a cooperative relationship. ROBERT TRIVERS (1971) suggested that the possibility to identify individuals likely to reciprocate in the future would be an important solution to the issue of commitment between unrelated individuals. In that respect, prospective altruist-detection would be particularly adaptive because it would help avoid interactions with cheaters *before* exploitation could occur (BROWN and MOORE 2000). In support to that claim, computer simulations showed that a partner preference is ecologically reasonable and allows for the evolution of cooperation (COOPER and WALLACE 1998).

Recent research also suggests that smiling could act as a signal that facilitates the identification of cooperative partners (SCHARLEMANN et al. 2001; BROWN and MOORE 2002; BROWN, PALAMETA and MOORE 2003). This follows an earlier emphasis by some authors on the role of pro-social emotions in the resolution of commitment problems (TRIVERS 1971; HIRSHLEIFER 1987; FRANK 1988). According to these models, the non-verbal cues related to positive emotions are seen as honest signals of altruistic dispositions because, as a result of their contingency with physiological processes, they are not easy to fake (HIRSHLEIFER 1987; ZAHAVI 1987; FRANK 1988; GRAFEN 1990; ZAHAVI and ZAHAVI 1997). The findings that some forms of smiles, but not others, are consistently associated with positive emotions (EKMAN, FRIESEN and O'SULLIVAN 1988; EKMAN, DAVIDSON and FRIESEN 1990; SURAKKA and HIETANEN 1997) suggest that the Duchenne smile is a good candidate for the advertisement of altruistic intentions and dispositions (BROWN and MOORE 2002; BROWN et al. 2003).

In addition to traits that are directly relevant to cooperation, the Duchenne smile could advertise general dimensions of human personality such as agreeableness, conscientiousness, extroversion, neuroticism, and openness to experience. According to evolutionary theory, basic personality traits would represent the social background to which people have to adapt (BUSS 1991). These traits could therefore provide crucial information to answer adaptive questions such as whom to rely on, whom to mate with, or whom to include in social alliances (*ibid.*). Given that personality traits could represent information adaptive to receivers, one should expect the judgement of such traits to depend on the presence of subtle behavioural cues. Interestingly, extrovert individuals have been shown to display higher frequencies of Duchenne smiles in response to humorous stimuli than introverts (RUCH 1993), indicating that this behaviour could signal sociability.

Only a few studies reported associations between personality attributions and smiling. For example, the frequency of smiling displayed by targets while reading a standard text was significantly correlated with ratings of extroversion, agreeableness, emotional stability (the opposite of neuroticism), and openness to experience (BORKENAU and LIEBLER 1995). This suggests that people who smile a lot are rated more positively on most personality dimensions (with the exception of conscientiousness). In addition, OTTA and colleagues (1994) showed that smiling faces received higher ratings on extroversion. Unfortunately these studies did not show whether personality judgements are affected by Duchenne smiles. The present

study investigates whether a link can be drawn between Duchenne smiling and the five major personality dimensions. Moreover, the potential role of smiling in courtship (MOORE 1985; GRAMMER 1989) leads to the question of whether Duchenne smiles have an impact at all on attractiveness and health judgements.

2. METHOD

Twenty-five males and 25 females were photographed and their pictures were used as stimuli in a face perception experiment. Faces were from a Caucasian sample and had no extreme distinctive feature such as jewellery, dyed hair, or severe skin or teeth condition. Two pictures were taken for each individual: a picture showing a neutral face and a picture showing a smiling face. Each of the smiling face was coded using the most recent version of the Facial Action Coding System (EKMAN, FRIESEN and HAGER 2002), by two certified coders blind to the ratings given to faces (reliability 0.75). Smiles were classified into Duchenne and non-Duchenne with respect to the criterion used by EKMAN and FRIESEN (1982), i.e. the co-occurrence of 'AU 6' (*orbicularis oculi*) and 'AU 12' (*zygomaticus major*) indicated the presence of the Duchenne type.

Neutral and smiling faces were then rated by independent judges on separate Likert scales ('1': not at all, '4': neutral, '7': very much) for ten different attributes: attractiveness, generosity, trustworthiness, competitiveness, health, agreeableness, conscientiousness, extroversion, neuroticism, and openness to experience. These attributes were presented to participants in a random order, and the 50 stimulus faces within each category were also arranged in a random order. Because the meaning of the Big Five personality traits might not be evident to lay people, adjectives related to each dimension were used to clarify their meaning. For example, it was explained that a person who would be highly neurotic would be nervous, worrying, and highly strung; whereas someone who would not be neurotic at all would be calm, at ease, and relaxed.

The panel of judges consisted of 58 people (29 males, 29 females) ranging in age from 19 to 35 year old ($M = 27.8$, $SD = 3.6$). Judges were all Caucasian and had no connection to the people depicted on the pictures. Participants were asked to rate the 50 stimulus faces on the ten dimensions mentioned above. Each judge was randomly assigned to either the control or the experimental condition, respectively neutral or smiling, and each condition included an equal representation of men and women. Judges rated the ten dimensions in a single block of trials.

A score representing the change in perception was computed for each stimulus face by subtracting the score given to the neutral version from the score given to the smiling version of the face. The score difference between the two conditions was therefore considered as an indicator of the effect of smiling. The effect of Duchenne smiles on ratings of personal attributes was analysed in a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ repeated measure ANOVA, with sex of faces and type of smile as between-subject factors, and sex of

judges as a within-subject factor. The score differences between neutral and smiling for each type of judgements (10) were entered in the analysis as separate dependent variables. Effect sizes were calculated with the Effect Size Generator for Windows version 2.3 (DEVILLY 2004).

3. RESULTS

Overall, the model showed that the impact of smiling on social judgements was affected by 'smile type', $F(10, 37) = 4.05, p = 0.001$, and by 'sex of judges' $F(10, 37) = 6.29, p < 0.001$. The impact of smiling on the judgements of attractiveness, generosity, competitiveness, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism was greater for male than for female raters. Overall, the sex of faces did not affect the change between ratings of neutral and smiling faces, $F(10, 37) = 1.31, p = 0.26$. Multivariate tests did not reveal significant interactions between variables: 'smile type' \times 'sex of faces', $F(10, 37) = 1.64, p = 0.13$; 'smile type' \times 'sex of judges', $F(10, 37) = 1.32, p = 0.32$; 'smile type' \times 'sex of faces' \times 'sex of judges', $F(10, 37) = 0.86, p = 0.57$.

Univariate tests showed that the effect of smile type was not generalised to the judgements of all dimensions. There was a main effect of smile type on the degree of change in ratings of generosity and extroversion, indicating that the difference between neutral and smiling was significantly larger when the face showed a Duchenne rather than a non-Duchenne smile (*Fig. 1*). Note that when Bonferroni correction was applied and the level of significance reduced to 0.005 (0.05 divided by 10 univariate tests), all F -values became non-significant. Means, standard deviations, and effect sizes are presented in *Table 1*.

Univariate tests also revealed a three-way interaction effect between 'smile type', 'sex of judge', and 'sex of face', on the difference between neutral and smiling for generosity scores $F(1, 49) = 4.53, p = 0.04$, indicating that the effect of smile type on generosity ratings could depend on the sex of the face and judge. As shown in *Fig. 2*, male *faces* were rated by men as being significantly more generous when showing a Duchenne smile ($M = 0.91, SD = 0.53$) than when showing a non-Duchenne smile ($M = 0.17, SD = 0.62$), $t(23) = 3.19, p = 0.004, d = 1.27$. Ratings of generosity given by female *judges* to male smiling faces were marginally affected by smile type, $t(23) = 1.84, p = 0.08, d = 0.74$. Finally, the effect of smile type on generosity ratings seemed to be restricted to male *faces* and was non-significant for female *faces*, $t(23) = 1, p = 0.33$.




Figure 1. Average differences in judgements between neutral and smiling faces in relation to the type of smile. atr: attractiveness, gen: generosity, tru: trustworthiness, cpt: competitiveness, hlt: health, agr: agreeableness, cst: conscientiousness, ext: extroversion, neu: neuroticism, opn: openness to experience

Table 1. Average increases due to smiling in relation to smile type (non-Duchenne vs. Duchenne). Standard deviations are in brackets. ^(*) $p < 0.05$, ^(**) $p = 0.01$. When Bonferroni correction is applied and the significance level divided by the number of tests (i.e. $p < 0.005$), F -values are all non-significant

Attributes	Non-Duchenne, $N = 26$	Duchenne, $N = 24$	$F(1,49)$	d
Attractiveness	0.45 (0.43)	0.53 (0.53)	0.60	0.16
Generosity	0.19 (0.53)	0.62 (0.60)	7.10 ^(**)	0.75
Trustworthiness	0.15 (0.50)	0.15 (0.52)	0.41	0.01
Competitiveness	0.26 (0.39)	0.16 (0.39)	0.63	0.27
Health	0.43 (0.38)	0.42 (0.40)	0.01	0.03
Agreeableness	0.31 (0.65)	0.52 (0.66)	1.36	0.31
Conscientiousness	0.26 (0.48)	0.03 (0.43)	2.62	0.49
Extroversion	0.25 (0.77)	0.78 (0.86)	5.17 ^(*)	0.65
Neuroticism	-0.14 (0.60)	-0.29 (0.61)	0.64	0.24
Openness	0.14 (0.58)	0.35 (0.42)	2.09	0.42




Figure 2. Impact of smile type on the difference between neutral and smiling for judgements of generosity in relation to the sex composition of the dyad (face-judge)

Table 1 shows that several effects are of small to moderate size, suggesting that the impact of Duchenne smile on social judgements could reflect a halo effect. Indeed, it should not be excluded that the relationship between judgements led to comparable increases in ratings of faces showing Duchenne smiles. This possibility was tested using Principal Component Analysis, as it allows the extraction of components that could lie behind the relationship between social judgements.

Two components were extracted that explained 69.8% of the variance (Table 2). Variables that showed loading values equal to or higher than 0.5 were retained for subsequent analysis. Two dimensions representing both components were created by averaging the absolute values of the individual variables. The effect of the Duchenne smile on these two dimensions was investigated using Student *t*-test. There was no effect of Duchenne smile on any of the components, component 1: $t(48) = -1.17, p = 0.25$; component 2: $t(48) = 1.47, p = 0.15$.

Table 2. Summary of the Principal Component Analysis performed on the ten attributes under study. Eigen values for each component are given in brackets. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy = 0.83. Bartlett's test of sphericity $\chi^2 = 375.04$, $p < 0.001$

Attributes	Component 1 (5.64)	Component 2 (1.34)
Attractiveness	0.63	0.14
Generosity	0.84	-0.14
Trustworthiness	0.86	0.27
Competitiveness	0.50	0.52
Health	0.85	0.03
Agreeableness	0.94	-0.08
Conscientiousness	0.17	0.88
Extroversion	0.82	-0.27
Neuroticism	-0.72	0.24
Openness	0.84	-0.20

A last set of analyses was performed to control for the possibility that people who showed Duchenne smiles might share other characteristics that could influence social judgements. In other words, judgements of faces showing Duchenne smiles could have been biased by features inherent to people who are likely to show that type of smile. The neutral versions of faces that showed Duchenne smiles were compared to the neutral versions of faces that showed non-Duchenne smiles in a series of Student *t*-tests performed on the 10 judgement types. As shown in *Table 3*, ratings attributed to neutral faces did not differ with the type of smile displayed by these faces in the smiling condition.

Table 3. Average scores given to neutral versions of faces that show non-Duchenne and Duchenne smiles in the smiling condition. Standard deviations are in brackets. All *t*-values are non-significant

Attributes	Non-Duchenne, $N = 26$	Duchenne, $N = 24$	<i>t</i> (48)	<i>d</i>
Attractiveness	3.26 (0.86)	3.08 (0.62)	0.82	0.23
Generosity	4.12 (0.70)	3.94 (0.52)	0.99	0.28
Trustworthiness	4.14 (0.62)	4.05 (0.45)	0.56	0.16
Competitiveness	4.06 (0.64)	4.07 (0.51)	-0.06	0.02
Health	4.29 (0.67)	4.39 (0.55)	-0.60	0.17
Agreeableness	4.03 (0.77)	3.91 (0.53)	0.59	0.17
Conscientiousness	4.41 (0.72)	4.34 (0.50)	0.43	0.12
Extroversion	3.86 (0.76)	3.79 (0.61)	0.36	0.10
Neuroticism	3.95 (0.53)	3.99 (0.50)	-0.28	0.08
Openness	4.10 (0.67)	4.00 (0.48)	0.64	0.18

4. DISCUSSION

The present study showed that the effect of smiling on person perception was potentiated by the presence of the Duchenne marker. This supports the proposal that the Duchenne smile has a social signal value (FRANK et al. 1993; BROWN et al. 2003). Interestingly, the influence of smile type appeared to be stronger for the ratings of extroversion and generosity. The effect sizes associated with generosity (0.75) and extroversion (0.65) were in the range between 0.5 and 0.8, which represents moderate to strong effect (COHEN 1988). These results underline the importance of the Duchenne smile in the evaluation of sociability and altruism. Interestingly, the impact of the Duchenne smile on generosity ratings could be restricted to the judgement of male faces.

The finding that the Duchenne smile could be specific to judgements of sociability and altruism is further supported by the absence of effect of smile type on the component underlying the relationship between the dimensions under study. If the impact of Duchenne smiles mirrored a halo effect on positive attributes, we should have observed an effect of smile type on a factor representing these attributes. The tests based on the principal component analysis failed to substantiate that claim, indicating that the effect of Duchenne smiles does not necessarily generalise to a range of positive attributes but could be specific to sociability and altruism. Besides, the possibility that judgements were influenced by other features associated with the likelihood to produce Duchenne or non-Duchenne smile was ruled out. Ratings given to neutral faces on the ten dimensions were not affected by the type of smile that these faces displayed in the smiling condition.

The Duchenne smile poorly influenced judgements of attractiveness, trustworthiness, and health. In fact, attractiveness and health ratings might depend more on structural/non-transient features, such as face shape (LITTLE et al. 2001) or skin health (JONES et al. 2004) than on dynamic features and be therefore insensitive to subtle facial movements. Alternatively, the fact that faces used in this study were, on average, rated as relatively non-attractive (mean score of attractiveness on the Likert scale was below 4, see *Table 3*) might have hindered the effect of the Duchenne smile on attractiveness ratings. Indeed, it has been shown recently that social interest (expressed through a smile) from unattractive individuals can be aversive while social interest from attractive individuals is attractive to others (JONES et al. 2006).

The absence of effect of Duchenne smiles on ratings of trustworthiness suggests that judgements of this trait might be more resistant to the influence of subtle facial cues. Trustworthiness ratings might also depend on acquaintance and past experience with the sender. The effect of smiling on trustworthiness could also vary with the context in which the rating is made (LAFRANCE and HECHT 1995). It is possible that our stranger-to-stranger situation had a detrimental effect on trustworthiness attributions.

It should be noted that the effect sizes associated with some of the differences between the impacts of Duchenne and non-Duchenne smiles were low to moderate. For example, the effects of Duchenne smile on ratings of competitiveness and conscientiousness were low and moderate, respectively (*Table 1*). This suggests that for these two dimensions, the Duchenne marker might have dampened the increase due to smiling. Low effect sizes were also observed for the judgements of agreeableness, openness to experience, and neuroticism, indicating that the Duchenne smile might have an effect, although small, on the ratings of these dimensions. The effect of smiling on agreeableness and openness judgements was, to some extent, more positive for faces with Duchenne smiles than for faces with non-Duchenne smiles. On the other hand, the negative impact of smiling on judgements of neuroticism was a little larger for faces showing the Duchenne marker than for faces without the Duchenne marker (*Table 1*). All in all the analysis of effect sizes indicates that Duchenne smiles might have a modest impact on the ratings of major personality traits other than extroversion.

The influence of smile type on the judgement of extroversion suggests that the Duchenne smile could be a signal of sociability. This is at odds with a traditional conception of facial expression that construes Duchenne smiles as emotional expressions devoid of communicative value, as opposed to voluntary movements seen as social expressions of cultural display rules (EKMAN 1997). If this view was correct, non-Duchenne smiles should have produced larger increases in extroversion ratings than Duchenne smiles because people showing so called 'social smiles' should be perceived as being more extrovert. Our finding suggests that the distinction between emotional smiles and social smiles might be mistaken, as we showed that people with Duchenne smiles (emotional smiles) were judged as being more sociable. In support to this, RUCH (1993) had shown that extroverts tend to exhibit more Duchenne smiles than introverts, whereas smiles solely based on *zygomaticus major* did not vary as a function of extroversion. The Duchenne smile might therefore be more social than once thought, an interpretation that fits recent proposals that emotional displays could be better understood as social adaptations (SCHMIDT and COHN 2001; PARR, WALLER and FUGATE 2005).

The question of how people who were asked to pose for a smile managed to show emotional display raises two important points. First, people could vary in their ability to produce Duchenne smiles when asked to smile. Although the Duchenne smile can be difficult to fake (EKMAN and FRIESEN 1982), a data base of 105 posed smiles was once found to contain no less than 67% of Duchenne smiles (KANADE, COHN and TIAN 2000). This could be the result of an ability to control facial behaviour that is typical of great apes and humans (SHERWOOD et al. 2004). The present paper shows that such ability could be adaptive, as it positively affected social judgements. Second, people might have reacted to the photographing situation in a positive way and have experienced positive emotions while doing so. It is possible that people with a pro-social attitude displayed it to the experimenter in the form of Duchenne smiles. The propensity to experience positive emotions in a social situation

that involved providing a service (participating to an experiment, accepting being photographed, etc.) could have been socially rewarded with positive social judgements. This implies that a smile might communicate the sender's pro-social stance toward the receiver (in our case the photographer).

Another important finding was that the Duchenne smile could be particularly adaptive in cooperative contexts. Duchenne smiles produced a much greater impact on generosity ratings than non-Duchenne smiles, supporting the assumption that the Duchenne marker is involved in the detection of altruism (BROWN et al. 2003). It is impossible to conclude from the present data that perceivers accurately detected genuine dispositions to altruism. However, because positive judgements of generosity by receivers could lead them to invest resources in a coalition (ROBERTS 1998), our data suggest that Duchenne smiling could provide a net advantage in cooperative interactions. For example, coupling the performance of an altruistic act with a Duchenne smile could enhance the recipient's judgement of the sender's generosity and thereby inflate the sender's value as a social partner.

The association between Duchenne smiles and generosity received support in a recent study that showed a connection between self-reported altruism toward a friend and the frequency of Duchenne smiles during an interaction involving the sharing of material resources with that friend (MEHU, GRAMMER and DUNBAR, *in press*). Ultimately, the Duchenne smile could be used to forward a reputation for being generous; as such a reputation has been shown to accrue reproductive benefits (GURVEN et al. 2000). Future research should concentrate on the role of Duchenne smiles in the context of direct and indirect reciprocity.

Finally, the effect of smile type on ratings of generosity appeared to be specific to male faces and it was particularly strong in male dyads. The interaction between smile type, sex of face, and sex of judges on generosity ratings suggests three interesting conclusions. First, men could be particularly vulnerable to sensory exploitation by women in the context of generosity advertisement. Indeed, men gave significantly higher scores of generosity to female smiling faces, regardless of the type of smile. On the other hand men became surprisingly more selective when they judged generosity in other men. The second conclusion is that males, more than females, could benefit (in terms of social judgement) from displaying Duchenne smiles when advertising generous dispositions. Given that the Duchenne marker is a facial movement that is difficult to produce on purpose (EKMAN and FRIESEN 1982; EKMAN et al. 2002), the present results suggest that men could have been subject to higher selective pressures from receivers in the evolution of altruism-based relationships. Finally, women's judgements of generosity seem to be more resistant to non-Duchenne smiles than men's, only when these judgements are made on female faces. All in all, it is likely that the Duchenne smile plays an important role in the advertisement of generosity within same-sex dyads.

In conclusion, the present research showed that the impact of smiling on the judgements of personality traits, mainly extroversion and generosity, could be affected by the type of smile. Smiles with an emotional basis (Duchenne smiles)

produced more positive judgements than smiles solely based on the *zygomaticus major*, indicating that people are sensitive to subtle behavioural cues when making personality judgements.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Dr A.–C. Wegria, for research support, and Dr B. Waller for help with FACS coding. Thanks should also go to two anonymous reviewers for useful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- BORKENAU, P. and LIEBLER, A. (1995): Observable attributes as manifestations and cues of personality and intelligence. *Journal of Personality*, 63, 1–25.
- BROWN, W. M. and MOORE, C. (2000): Is prospective altruist-detection an evolved solution to the adaptive problem of subtle cheating in cooperative ventures? Supportive evidence using the Wason selection task. *Evolution and Human Behaviour*, 21, 25–37.
- BROWN, W. M. and MOORE, C. (2002): Smile asymmetries and reputation as reliable indicators of likelihood to cooperate: an evolutionary analysis. In S. P. Shohov (Ed.), *Advances in Psychology Research*, (vol. 11, pp. 59–78). Huntington, New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- BROWN, W. M., PALAMETA, B., and MOORE, C. (2003): Are there non-verbal cues to commitment? An exploratory study using the zero-acquaintance video presentation paradigm. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 1, 42–69.
- BUSS, D. M. (1991): Evolutionary Personality Psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 42, 459–91.
- COHEN, J. (1988): *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences (2nd ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- COOPER, B. and WALLACE, C. (1998): Evolution, partnerships and cooperation. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 195, 315–29.
- DEVILLY, G. J. (2004): *The Effect Size Generator for Windows: version 2.3 (computer programme)*. Centre for Neuropsychology, Swinburne University, Australia.
- DUCHENNE de BOULOGNE, G. B. (1862): *The mechanism of human facial expression* (R. A. Cuthbertson, Trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- DUNBAR, R. I. M. (1999): Culture, honesty and the free-rider problem. In R. I. M. Dunbar, C. Knight, and C. Power (Eds), *The Evolution of Culture*, (pp. 194–213). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- EKMAN, P. (1997): Should we call it expression or communication? *Innovations in Social Science Research*, 10 (4), 333–44.
- EKMAN, P. and FRIESEN, W. V. (1982): Felt, false and miserable smiles. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 6 (4), 238–52.
- EKMAN, P., FRIESEN, W. V., O’SULLIVAN, M. (1988): Smiles when lying. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (3), 414–20.
- EKMAN, P., DAVIDSON, R. J., and FRIESEN, W. V. (1990): The Duchenne smile: emotional expression and brain physiology: II. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58 (2), 342–53.

- EKMAN, P., FRIESEN, W. V., and HAGER, J. C. (2002): *Facial Action Coding System*. Salt Lake City, UT: Research Nexus eBook.
- FRANK, M. G.; EKMAN, P.; FRIESEN, W. V. (1993): Behavioural markers and recognisability of the smile of enjoyment. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 64 (1), 83–93
- FRANK, R. H. (1988): *Passions within reason: the strategic role of the emotions*. New York: Norton.
- GRAFEN, A. (1990): Biological signals as handicaps. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 144, 517–46.
- GRAMMER, K. (1989): Human courtship behaviour: biological basis and cognitive processing. In A. E. Rasa, C. Vogel and E. Voland (Eds), *The sociobiology of sexual and reproductive strategies* (pp. 147–169). London: Chapman and Hall.
- GURVEN, M., ALLEN-ARAVE, W., HILL, K. and HURTADO, M. (2000): “It’s a wonderful life”: signalling generosity among the Ache of Paraguay. *Evolution and Human Behaviour*, 21, 263–82.
- HIRSHLEIFER, J. (1987): On the emotions as guarantors of threats and promises. In J. Dupré (Ed.), *The latest on the best: essays on evolution and optimality*, (pp. 307–326). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- JONES, B. C., LITTLE, A. C., BURT, D. M. and PERRETT, D. I. (2004): When facial attractiveness is only skin deep. *Perception*, 33, 569–576.
- JONES, B. C., DEBRUINE, L. M., LITTLE, A. C., CONWAY, C. A. and FEINBERG, D. R. (2006): Integrating gaze direction and expression in preferences for attractive faces. *Psychological Science*, 17 (7), 588–591.
- KANADE, T., COHN, J. F. and TIAN, Y. (2000): Comprehensive database for facial expression analysis. In: *Proceedings of the Fourth IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face Gesture Recognition (FG’00)* (pp.46–53). Grenoble, France. March 2000.
- LAFRANCE, M. and HECHT, M. A. (1995): Why smiles generate leniency. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21 (3), 207–14.
- LAU, S. (1982): The effect of smiling on person perception. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 117, 63–67.
- LITTLE, A. C., BURT, D. M., PENTON-VOAK, I. S. and PERRETT, D. I. (2001): Self-perceived attractiveness influences human female preferences for sexual dimorphism and symmetry in male faces. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, B 268, 39–44.
- MEHU, M. (2006): *An evolutionary approach to human social behaviour: the case of smiling and laughing*. PhD Thesis, University of Liverpool.
- MEHU, M., GRAMMER, K. and DUNBAR, R. I. M. (in press). Smiles when sharing. *Evolution and Human Behavior*.
- MOORE, M. M. (1985): Nonverbal courtship patterns in women: context and consequences. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 6, 237–45.
- O’SULLIVAN, M., EKMAN, P., FRIESEN, W. V. and SCHERER, K. (1992): *Judging honest and deceptive behavior*. Unpublished manuscript.
- OTTA, E., LIRA, B. B. P., DELEVATI, N. M., CESAR, O. P. and PIRES, C. S. G. (1994): The effect of smiling and of head tilting on person perception. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 128, 323–31.
- OTTA, E., ABROSIO, F. F. E., HOSHINO, R. L. (1996): Reading a smiling face: messages conveyed by various forms of smiling. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 82, 1111–21.
- PARR, L. A., WALLER, B. M. and FUGATE, J. (2005): Emotional communication in primates: implications for neurobiology. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 15, 716–20.
- ROBERTS, G. (1998): Competitive altruism: from reciprocity to the handicap principle. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London (series B)*, 265, 427–31.
- RUCH, W. (1993): Extroversion, alcohol and enjoyment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 16, 89–102.

- SCHARLEMANN, J. P. W., ECKEL, C. C., KACELNIK, A. and WILSON, R. K. (2001): The value of a smile: Game theory with a human face. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 22, 617–40.
- SCHMIDT, K. L. and COHN, J. F. (2001): Human Facial Expressions as Adaptations: Evolutionary Questions in Facial Expression Research. *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology*, 44, 3–24.
- SHERWOOD, C. C., HOLLOWAY, R. L., ERWIN, J. M. and HOF, P. R. (2004): Cortical orofacial motor representation in Old World monkeys, great apes, and humans. *Brain Behavioural Ecology*, 63, 82–106.
- SHERWOOD, C. C., HOF, P. R., HOLLOWAY, R. L., SEMENDEFERI, K., GANNON, P. J., FRAHM, H. D. and ZILLES, K. (2005): Evolution of the brainstem orofacial motor system in primates: A comparative study trigeminal, facial and hypoglossal nuclei. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 48, 45–84.
- SURAKKA, V. and HIETANEN, J. K. (1997): Contagion of emotion from the expression of genuine and false smile. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 25 (1), 78–79.
- TRIVERS, R. L. (1971): The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 46, 35–57.
- ZAHAVI, A. (1987): The theory of signal selection and some of its implications. In V. P. Delfino (Ed.), *International Symposium of Biological evolution*, (pp. 305–327). Bari: Adriatica Editrice.
- ZAHAVI, A. and ZAHAVI, A. (1997): *The Handicap Principle: a Missing Part of Darwin's Puzzle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.