16 Cultural Dialects
Nonverbal Behavior and Person Perception

Elsie J. Wang, Negin R. Toosi, and Nalini Ambady

In our everyday interactions, we are frequently called upon to make judgments and categorizations of other individuals. When meeting someone for the first time, for example, we form an impression of that person almost instantly. These immediate judgments about other individuals are sometimes surprisingly accurate. At other times, however, our first impressions turn out to be inaccurate and can lead to misunderstandings. Research on person perception has suggested that the information we glean from others can be affected by factors such as appearance (e.g. Albright, Malloy, Dong, Kenny, & Fang, 1997; Zebrowitz & Montepare, 2005; Zebrowitz, Montepare, & Lee, 1993), stereotypes (e.g. Eberhardt, Davies, Purdie-Vaughns, & Johnson, 2006; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Maddox & Gray, 2002), and culture (e.g., Ambady, Koo, Lee, & Rosenthal, 1996; Marsh, Elfenbein, & Ambady, 2003; Matsumoto, 1989, 1992). Although the role of culture in person perception has become increasingly important, given the rapid increase in globalization and cross-cultural exposure, it has been relatively underexamined. In this chapter, we review some of our experimental findings on culture and person perception in the area of nonverbal behavior, including affect and gestures. We then shift our focus to discuss trait inferences and seek to examine the effects of culture on making trait inferences based on external cues.

NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR

Nonverbal behavior is the term used to describe behaviors that do not include spoken, written, or signed language. Nonverbal communication is a subset of nonverbal behavior and consists of the ways in which we communicate without language, whether consciously or nonconsciously. Examples of nonverbal communication include facial expressions of emotion and physical gestures, both of which are a rich source of information about an individual. In this section we will focus first on facial expressions of emotion, exploring universal aspects and cultural differences in emotion recognition across cultures. Cultural differences in emotion recognition have led to the formulation of a dialect theory of emotion, which we discuss in detail. Second, we will briefly explore the production and recognition of gestures across cultures. In both cases, we discuss the role of expertise and exposure, which influence judgmental accuracy.

Emotion Recognition

Facial expressions of emotion are ubiquitous in daily life, and the ability to decode and understand these emotions allows for successful social interactions. Researchers have long been interested in the study of emotion, resulting in an extensive body of work on understanding facial affect (e.g., Darwin 1872/1965; Ekman, 1972, 2003; Tomkins, 1962). In addition to the production and recognition of facial emotions, the universality of emotion expressions across cultures has also been widely studied (Ekman & Friesen, 1969, 1971; Izard, 1977). Early research investigating constants for

emotion across cultures found comparable judgment for emotions between members of a preliterate culture and members from a literate Western culture, suggesting that the facial behavior associated with emotion is not culture specific or language bound (Ekman & Friesen, 1971). Other cross-cultural research has demonstrated universal recognition of facial expressions from literate cultures (Boucher & Carlson, 1980; Ekman, 1972). Thus, these studies have found evidence of similarity in emotion judgments between cultures, leading to the theoretical model positing the universality of emotional expression and recognition (Ekman & Friesen, 1971; Ekman, 1972; and see Matsumoto's chapter in this volume).

Most of these studies on the cross-cultural expression and understanding of emotion, however, did not seek to investigate whether there were any differences across cultures, "because the researchers were interested at that time in exploring agreement, not disagreement" (Matsumoto & Assar, 1992, p. 86). Despite outstanding support for the universality of emotions, more recent research has demonstrated that cross-cultural differences in the recognition of emotions do indeed exist (e.g., Elfenbein & Ambady, 2003a).

One explanation for cultural differences in emotion recognition suggests that these differences are due to different display and decoding rules between cultures. In some cultures, for example, it may be considered inappropriate to reveal anger in public, or impolite to acknowledge another person's sadness. These rules regulate the social norms regarding the appropriateness of emotion displays, and as a result, affect the identification of emotional expressions (Ekman, 1972; Matsumoto, 1989, 1992). Cultural differences in emotion recognition have also been attributed to differences in language. The words used to describe particular emotions vary in both intensity and meaning across cultures, and some languages may be better at expressing emotional concepts than others (Harre, 1986; Matsumoto & Assar, 1992; Mesquita, Frijda, & Scherer, 1997). A final explanation for cultural differences in emotion recognition centers on the familiarity among members of a particular cultural group with their cultural displays, leading to an advantage in recognizing the emotions of in-group members. This explanation of familiarity suggests that the cultural differences we observe may result from stylistic differences across cultures rather than social pressures or norms (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002b).

An in-group advantage has been demonstrated in emotion recognition, such that individuals better recognize emotional expressions displayed by members of their own culture than by members of other cultures (c.f., Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002a, 2003a; Elfenbein, Mandal, Ambady, Harizuka, & Kumar, 2002). This in-group advantage has been shown across many different studies and cultures in a meta analysis (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002a). Results revealed that although emotions were universally recognized at above-chance levels, there was an increase in accuracy when judging emotional expressions for members of a cultural in-group. Results from the meta-analysis suggest that display and decoding rules do not fully explain cultural variation in emotion recognition. In addition, the findings suggest that there indeed may be linguistic and conceptual factors contributing to the increased accuracy in the recognition of in-group emotions.

The finding of an in-group advantage in emotion recognition suggests that cultural differences in emotion expression might be a result of different cultural "dialects" prevailing within the "more universal grammar of emotion" (Tomkins & McCarter, 1964, p. 127). Perhaps the cultural differences leading to an in-group advantage are contained in the emotional expressions themselves. A dialect theory suggests that along with a universal language of emotion, there may also be cultural dialects that are exhibited in the subtle differences in how emotions are expressed between cultures, and that these cultural dialects go beyond cultural norms or display rules dictating when and how to display emotion (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2003a).

Support for the dialect theory of communicating emotion can be found in a recent study examining the expression and recognition of posed facial expressions (Elfenbein, Beaupré, Lévesque, & Hess 2007). In the study, individuals from the Canadian province of Quebec and the west-central African country of Gabon were asked to pose for a set of emotional expressions. These emotional expressions from both cultural groups were later coded, and results showed reliable cultural

differences, such that dialects emerged in the activation of facial muscles for the same posed emotions. In a second part of the study, both standardized faces designed to eliminate dialects and the nonstandardized posed expressions from the previous study were shown to another group of participants. The results of the second study showed an in-group advantage for emotion recognition of the nonstandardized emotion expressions. Taken together, these findings provide support for the dialect theory of emotions, highlighting the subtle differences in the expression of emotions that occur between different cultures.

Extending the linguistic analogy, we also have evidence of nonverbal "accents," arising from subtle cultural variations in expressiveness. In a study investigating facial emotion recognition, Marsh and colleagues (2003) found that American participants were able to successfully identify Japanese nationals from Japanese Americans in standardized images of emotional expressions. These results suggest that although facial expressions of emotion may fall under basic universal prototypes, subtle cultural differences exist in the appearance of these emotions that can convey cues as to nationality and culture, beyond physiognomic and other static features.

Fluency in reading nonverbal dialects arises from exposure. In the previously mentioned meta-analysis, the in-group advantage was found to be smaller for groups with greater levels of exposure to one another (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002a). Increased familiarity and greater cultural contact is also associated with better emotion recognition (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2003b). In the first of two experiments, Elfenbein and Ambady examined emotion recognition for Chinese and American participants who differed in their level of cultural exposure to China and the U.S. (Chinese in China, recent Chinese immigrants to the U.S., second-generation Chinese immigrants born in the U.S., and non-Chinese U.S. citizens). Findings showed that increased cultural exposure led to greater speed and accuracy in the recognition of emotions. The second experiment replicated the cultural exposure effects for Tibetans living in China and Africans living in the U.S. Tibetans living in China were more accurate at identifying facial expressions of emotions for Chinese targets than for American targets, and Africans living in America showed the reverse pattern, thus demonstrating the role of exposure in improving accuracy of emotion recognition.

Gestures

Gestures are a type of nonverbal behavior that can be produced with or without speech. Co-verbal behaviors, such as hand movements made during conversation, normally occur during speech and can serve as cross-modal primes that aid in the retrieval of words from lexical memory (Krauss, 1998; Krauss & Chiu, 1997). In contrast, symbolic gestures are often produced silently and can be understood without accompanying speech (Ekman & Friesen, 1969). These types of gestures, also known as emblems, serve to further the shared understanding of concepts and are the focus of this section.

Cultural differences in gestures have been widely documented, and the meaning of symbolic gestures can differ from one culture to another. For example, in American culture, giving another individual the "thumbs-up" gesture helps to communicate success or approval. However, the same "thumbs-up" sign could be interpreted as a very rude gesture in Persian culture. These differences suggest that symbolic gestures are not universal and can be culture specific (Archer, 1997; Kendon, 1992). The symbolic gestures used by specific cultures can seem "completely arbitrary unless one knows the culturally specific code on which they are modeled" (Poortinga, Schoots, & van de Koppel, 1993, p. 42). As a result, it is not surprising that research examining cross-cultural differences in gestures has demonstrated an in-group advantage for the recognition of gestures displayed by cultural in-group members (Wolfgang & Wolofsky, 1991).

As in the case of emotion, cultural exposure affects fluency in understanding gestures, indicating effects of nonverbal dialects. In an effort to examine the relationship between cultural adjustment and gesture recognition, Molinsky, Krabbenhoft, Ambady, and Choi (2005) developed the "gesture recognition task" to assess the ability of native and non-native individuals to distinguish between real and fake gestures. Those who performed better on the recognition task had spent more time within the

foreign setting, rated themselves as high on intercultural communication competence, and were rated by natives as more interculturally competent. Findings also showed that performance on the gesture recognition task was positively associated with the level of perceived motivation to learn about the foreign culture. These results suggest that cultural adaptation and adjustment play an important role in the learning of culture-bound gestures and can be influenced by an individual's motivation.

Cross-cultural research on nonverbal accents has been extended to include gestures in addition to facial expressions of emotion. Specifically, Marsh, Elfenbein, and Ambady (2007) found that American participants who were asked to view images of American and Australian nationals walking or waving in greeting were able to accurately determine the nationalities of the targets. In the study, individuals were videotaped while performing simple behaviors such as walking across a room or facing the camera while waving hello as though greeting a person. Photographic stills were captured from the video showing the target individual in midstride or with their hand at the apex of the wave. These images provided sufficient information to allow participants to identify target nationality at above-chance levels. Because using the hand to wave in greeting is a widely prevalent gesture, the findings of the study suggest that the phenomena of nonverbal accents extend beyond the face and include other social behaviors. Thus, it is possible that many behaviors that convey social information can be subtly and distinctively accented.

Furthermore, the accuracy of nationality judgments correlated with the extent to which targets were perceived to conform to cultural stereotypes. In addition to distinguishing between nationalities, participants also distinguished Americans and Australians in terms of how targets displayed personality traits that corresponded with group stereotypes (i.e., Americans appear more dominant and Australians appear more likeable). When seen walking, Americans were rated as more dominant than Australians. When waving, Australians were perceived as more likeable than Americans. The traits associated with these actions may provide information about social group membership. In fact, analyses showed that the more likeable and less dominant Australians were perceived, the more accurately their nationality was judged. The reverse was not true for Americans, suggesting that these cultural stereotypes may be used primarily in distinguishing out-group members (Marsh et al., 2007). In sum, there appears to be a complex relationship between cultural differences, nonverbal behavior, and stereotypes.

The interpretation and understanding of gestures across cultures depends heavily on the amount of exposure one has to that particular culture. Cultural exposure can help facilitate the acquisition of knowledge that is oftentimes required to discern gestures or other social information. It also appears that the recognition of gestures across cultures supports the dialect theory, suggesting that nonverbal accents exist not only for emotional expressions but for other forms of nonverbal behaviors as well. Taken together, these findings speak to the importance of culture in everyday, ongoing person perception.

TRAIT INFERENCES

In addition to making judgments about people's emotional states or gestures, we also make judgments about their personality traits from appearance and nonverbal behavior. In this section, we will focus on cultural influences on first impressions, judgments that are made from brief impressions or "thin slice" judgments of others (Ambady, Bernieri, & Richeson, 1995).

To study these instantaneous inferences, researchers have developed a number of different experimental paradigms. In one such paradigm, participants are exposed to photographs, voice recordings, point-light or biological motion displays, and other limited stimuli, and are asked to make trait ratings. Another example is the zero-acquaintance task, a brief real-life interaction. In the zero-acquaintance task, participants are tested in groups and asked to provide trait ratings for each of the other group members, without speaking to each other (e.g., Kenny, 1991; Kenny, Albright, Malloy, & Kashy, 1994). The majority of work on person perception in trait inferences has focused on consensus—that is, the degree to which judges agree in their ratings of a target's traits, rather than

accuracy in predicting behavior. To examine the effects of culture on trait perception, trait inferences made by judges from different cultures are compared. The extent to which these inferences converge or diverge allows us to investigate how people interpret the same external cues differently based on cultural values.

In the following sections we will examine research on trait inferences relating to warmth, attractiveness, and power. We will discuss similarities and differences across cultures in how external cues such as facial maturity, age, and vocal qualities are interpreted to form first impressions on these traits and others. We will also explore potential outcomes of these cultural similarities and differences.

Warmth

Trait inferences of likeability, sociability, agreeableness, extraversion, and trustworthiness are among the most central to interpersonal interactions. These traits, which we group under the concept of warmth in person perception, seem to be especially influenced by facial expressions and attractiveness of features.

Albright and colleagues (1997) explored cross-cultural consensus in a number of trait judgments made by American and Chinese participants. They found that the variables associated with extraversion and agreeableness showed the most consensus across both groups of participants. Chinese and American judges agreed on how sociable, active, good natured, honest, and optimistic the targets appeared, whether Chinese or American. This supports earlier findings that ratings of extraversion tend to show the most consensus across groups (Ambady, Hallahan, & Rosenthal, 1995; Levesque & Kenny, 1993).

Furthermore, in the Albright et al. (1997) study, the experimenters asked participants to provide ratings of external cues including neatness of dress, smiling, eye contact, and attractiveness. Of these external cues, smiling and attractiveness were found to be highly correlated with trait ratings of extraversion and agreeableness for Americans' ratings of Chinese targets and Chinese' ratings of Americans.

Attractiveness

While attractiveness can be considered more of an external cue than a personality trait, it holds a special place in the literature because of its influence on other judgments. Research on the physical attractiveness stereotype has demonstrated that attractive people are also presumed to have other positive attributes—especially in terms of social competence (Eagly, Ashmore, Makhijani, & Longo, 1991; Shaffer, Crepaz, & Sun, 2000; Wheeler & Kim, 1997). Many studies suggest strong cross-cultural agreement in judgments of attractiveness. Consensus in attractiveness ratings has been found for Japanese and American judges rating Japanese and American faces (Matsumoto & Kudoh, 1993); American and native residents of St. Croix rating White Americans (Maret & Harling, 1985); Chinese, Indian, and English judges rating Greek faces (Thakerar & Iwawaki, 1979); Whites, Blacks, and Chinese judges rating White and Chinese faces (Bernstein, Tsai-Ding, & McLelland, 1982); and Asian, Latino, and American Black and White judges rating female faces from Asian, Black, Latino, and White backgrounds (Cunningham, Roberts, Barbee, Druen, & Wu, 1995).

This cross-cultural consensus on what makes a face attractive suggests a universal ideal of attractiveness. Whether this is due to common evolutionary influences or to the effects of specific standards of beauty being instilled across different cultures through colonialism, political influence, and mass media is unclear (for more on this topic, see Fink & Penton-Voak, 2002; Kaw, 1993; Maddox, 2004; Rhodes & Zebrowitz, 2002).

The external cue of attractiveness is associated with personality traits, such that more attractive people often receive higher ratings on other positive characteristics. In the previously described study of trait inferences conducted by Albright and colleagues (1997), cross-cultural ratings of

attractiveness for Chinese and American targets were significantly correlated with ratings on traits associated with extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and intelligence.

However, other researchers argue that there are cultural differences in the specific traits associated with attractiveness, depending on which traits are valued in each culture. Wheeler and Kim (1997) found that Korean raters provided different character attributions for attractive Korean faces than Americans rating American faces. While Americans would rate attractive faces as higher in personal dominance and potency, Koreans associated attractiveness with higher levels of integrity and concern for others. Shaffer et al. (2000) followed up on this work by asking Taiwanese and American participants to rate attractive and unattractive faces from both cultures. The faces were rated on qualities that reflected communal and individualistic values. Results showed that participants from both cultures rated attractive faces more positively, but there were differences in attributions of specific qualities. For example, American participants associated attractiveness in American faces more strongly with positive individualistic attributes than with communal attributes, but they associated attractive Taiwanese faces more strongly with communal attributes. Thus, the pattern of American ratings depended on the culture of the target. On the other hand, Taiwanese participants associated attractiveness for both groups with more positive communal and individualistic traits. A closer examination showed that the Taiwanese participants who rated themselves as more traditional attributed more communal traits to attractive Taiwanese targets than did participants who rated themselves as more modernized, but both groups still attributed positive individualistic traits more to attractive faces (Shaffer et al., 2000).

These findings suggest that while there are similarities and cultural differences in the standards people use to make trait attributions based on attractiveness, there exists a remarkable influence of cross-cultural exposure on these processes.

Power

Personality traits associated with the concept of power, such as dominance and competence, have also been a major topic of study. Researchers have looked at cues from facial expressions and features to age-related information to try to understand what determines ratings of power.

In an early study, Keating et al. (1981) sought to examine which facial expressions convey dominance in eight countries: Thailand, Brazil, Colombia, Spain, Kenya, Zambia, West Germany, and the U.S. Participants viewed faces posed with either slightly smiling mouths or neutral ones, or displaying lowered or raised brows. When asked which faces seemed more dominant, participants from most cultures selected neutral faces (not smiling), but it was predominantly the U.S. and European samples that associated lowered brows with dominance.

The relative maturity of facial features also affects trait inferences. Low facial maturity, also known as baby-facedness, refers to features such as round faces, big eyes, high foreheads, and small chins. Zebrowitz and Montepare (2005) found that individuals who were perceived as more baby-faced were also seen as less competent than their equally attractive peers with more mature faces. In a study examining perceptions of facial maturity across cultures, McArthur and Berry (1987) found that Korean and American students agreed in their ratings of the facial maturity of target persons, and attributed more childlike psychological characteristics to the baby-faced targets than to the more mature-faced ones. They argued that this consensus may be due to factors that are analogous across all cultures and adaptive to the species. People across all cultures possess the same innate reactions to babies, and so baby-face features evoked similar responses regardless of culture.

Although responses to babies and baby-faced adults may show a universal pattern, power trait inferences based on age differ across cultures. Montepare and Zebrowitz (1993) showed point-light biological motion displays of male and female Americans from the ages of 5 to 70 to Korean and American judges. Whereas Americans' ratings of dominance showed a decrease with age, Koreans' ratings did not. This suggests that for trait inferences of dominance, age can lead to different inferences depending on the culture.

The influence of culture is also apparent in trait inferences of power and dominance made based on vocal information. Peng, Zebrowitz, and Lee (1993) studied impressions based on voices of Americans and Koreans. The voices differed in loudness, speed, and tenseness, and were rated by three different groups: Koreans in Korea, Americans in the U.S., and Koreans in the U.S. Results showed that loudness conveyed power for all judges, but inferences based on vocal rate and tenseness differed across cultures. A fast rate of speech and a relaxed tone of voice conveyed power and competence to Americans, but not to Koreans. The authors argue that because faster speech is associated with youthfulness, this difference between the two cultures may be the result of different values placed on seniority and attitudes toward older people.

The authors also examined the effects of cultural exposure by comparing the ratings made by Koreans living in the U.S. Like Americans, they associated faster speech with competence for American voices. Like Koreans but unlike Americans, they did not associate faster speech with power for American voices. For Korean voices, on the other hand, Koreans in the U.S. did associate slower speech with power. Thus, exposure to different cultural value systems does seem to alter interpretations of physical stimuli as indicators for personality traits, depending on the nature and duration of the exposure.

Outcomes

Across different cultures, there are universal and culturally specific aspects of how people use external cues to evaluate personality traits. These trait evaluations may also differentially predict outcomes across cultures.

Not much previous work has examined these issues, but a recent study from our laboratory explored the relationship between trait inferences across cultures and outcomes in the realm of politics. In a series of studies, American and Japanese participants rated winners and losers of races for seats in the U.S. Senate and the Japanese Diet based on their facial appearance. Participants rated the faces of candidates on facial maturity, competence, dominance, likeability, and trustworthiness. The first three variables were combined to form a new variable entitled "Power," while the latter two were combined to form a new variable entitled "Warmth." Results revealed that consensus on the ratings between the Americans and the Japanese was high, but the ascribed traits differentially predicted electoral outcomes in each culture. Winners in the U.S. Senate races were rated high on Power but low on Warmth, whereas winners of seats in the Japanese Diet were rated as high on both Power and Warmth (Rule et al., under review). These results suggest that trait attributions based on facial appearance can predict outcomes such as electoral success differentially across cultures.

In summary, the findings from cross-cultural research on trait inferences in person perception seem to indicate that while there is consensus on a number of external features, the inferences made based on these features, and the associated outcomes, may vary significantly across cultures. At the same time, the influences of cultural change and exposure on these processes remind us that culture is not static, nor are we.

CONCLUSION

Culture shapes us; it shapes our ways of understanding the world and other people at a very basic level. From expressing and identifying emotions, to decoding gestures, to inferring personality traits based on external cues, each of these has aspects that are consistent across cultures—implying that some aspects of person perception are indeed universal in scope. However, other aspects of the person perception process are guided by cultural values and beliefs. This notion is perhaps best illustrated by an anecdote from an English language instructor detailing his experience with the ubiquitous "Thai smile":

> When confronting the Thai owner of a language school with administrative problems, complaints... were met by a beaming smile and little else. I took this to mean lack of concern or an attempt to trivialize or ignore the problem. I left the discussion upset and angry by what appeared to be the owner's offhand attitude to my problems. It was only later when another native speaking English teacher, with considerably more experience of Thailand, explained that a smile meant an apology and the fact that the following day all my complaints had been addressed, that I fully understood the situation. (Baker, 2003, p. 11)

In this example, Baker learns that a smile carries a broader range of meanings in Thai culture than in his own culture, and experiences firsthand how culture influences person perception. Misunderstandings may arise during initial intercultural contact, but our research suggests that increased exposure to individuals from other backgrounds increases accuracy in perception. In sum, successful person perception across cultures requires a deep and nuanced understanding of the diversity and the richness of the subtle nonverbal dialects and cultural frames of members of other cultures.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Work on this chapter was supported by a NIH R01 MH070833-01A1 grant to N.A.

REFERENCES

Albright, L., Malloy, T. E., Dong, Q., Kenny, D. A., & Fang, X. (1997). Cross-cultural consensus in personality judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 558–569.

Ambady, N., Bernieri, F. J., & Richeson, J. A. (1995). Toward a histology of social behavior: Judgmental accuracy from thin slices of the behavioral stream. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 32.* (pp. 201–271). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Ambady, N., Hallahan, M., & Rosenthal, R. (1995). On judging and being judged accurately in zero-acquaintance situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 518–529.

Ambady, N., Koo, J., Lee, F., & Rosenthal, R. (1996). More than words: Linguistic and nonlinguistic politeness in two cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 996–1011.

Archer, D. (1997). Unspoken diversity: Cultural differences in gestures. *Qualitative Sociology, 20*, 79–105.

Baker, W. (2003, December). Should culture be an overt component of EFL instruction outside of English speaking countries? The Thai component. *Asian EFL Journal, 5*, Article 5. Retrieved on November, 27, 2007, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/dec_03_sub.wb.php

Bernstein, I. H., Tsai-Ding, L., & McClellan, P. (1982). Cross- vs. within-racial judgements of attractiveness. *Perception and Psychophysics, 32*, 495–503.

Boucher, J. D. & Carlson, G. E. (1980). Recognition of facial expression in three cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 11*, 263–280.

Cunningham, M. R., Roberts, A. R., Barbee, A. P., Druen, P. B., & Wu, C. (1995). "Their ideas of beauty are, on the whole, the same as ours": Consistency and variability in the cross-cultural perception of female physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 261–279.

Darwin, C. (1965). *The expressions of the emotions in man and animals.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1872).

Eagly, A, H., Ashmore, R. D., Makhijani, M. G., & Longo, L. C. (1991). What is beautiful is good, but...: A meta-analytic review of research on the physical attractiveness stereotype. *Psychological Bulletin, 110*, 109–128.

Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P.G., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., and Johnson, S.L. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science,17*, 383–386.

Ekman, P. (1972). Universals and cultural differences in facial expressions of emotion. In J. Cole (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Ekman, P. (2003). *Emotions Revealed.* New York: Henry Holt.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1969). The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: Categories, origins, usage and coding. *Semiotica, 1*, 49–98.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1971). Constants across cultures in the face and emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17*, 124–129.

Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2002a). On the universality and cultural specificity of emotion recognition: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 203–235.

Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2002b). Is there an in-group advantage in emotion recognition? *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 243–249.

Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2003a). When familiarity breeds accuracy: Cultural exposure and facial emotion recognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 276–290.

Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2003b). Universals and cultural differences in recognizing emotions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 12*, 159–164.

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

Elfenbein, H. A., Mandal, M. K., Ambady, N., Harizuka, S., & Kumar, S. (2002). Cross-cultural patterns in emotion recognition: Highlighting design and analytical techniques. *Emotion, 2*, 75–84.

Fink, B., & Penton-Voak, I. (2002). Evolutionary psychology of facial attractiveness. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 11*, 154–158.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 878–902.

Harré, R.M. (Ed.). (1986). *The social construction of emotions*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Izard, C. E. (1977). The emotions and emotion contrstucts in personality and culture research. In R. B. Cattell, *Handbook of modern personality theory,* (pp. 496–510). New York: Wiley.

Kaw, E. (1993). Medicalization of racial features: Asian American women and cosmetic surgery. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly, 7*, 74–89.

Keating, C. F., Mazur, A., Segall, M. H., Cysneiros, P. G., Divale, W. T., Kilbride, J. E., et al. (1981). Culture and the perception of social dominance from facial expression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40*, 615–626.

Kendon, A. (1992). Some recent work from Italy on quotable gestures (emblems). *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 2*, 92–108.

Kenny, D. A. (1991). A general model of consensus and accuracy in interpersonal perception. *Psychological Review, 98,* 155–163.

Kenny, D. A., Albright, L., Malloy, T. E., & Kashy, D. A. (1994). Consensus in interpersonal perception: Acquaintance and the big five. *Psychological Bulletin, 116,* 245–258.

Krauss, R. M. & Chiu, C.-y. (1997). Language and social behavior. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindsey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology,* Vol. 2. (pp. 41–88). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Krauss, R. M. (1998). Why do we gesture when we speak? *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 7*, 54–60.

Lévesque, M. J., & Kenny, D. A. (1993). Accuracy of behavioral predictions at zero acquaintance: A social relations analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 1178–1187.

Maddox, K. B. (2004). Perspectives on racial phenotypicality bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 8*, 383–401.

Maddox, K. B. & Gray, S. A. (2002). Cognitive representations of Black Americans: Reexploring the role of skin tone. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 250–259.

Maret, S. M., & Harling, C. A. (1985). Cross-cultural perceptions of physical attractiveness: Ratings of photographs of Whites by Cruzans and Americans. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 60*, 163–166.

Marsh, A. A., Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2003). Nonverbal "accents": Cultural differences in facial expressions of emotion. *Psychological Science, 14*, 373–376.

Marsh, A. A., Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2007). Separated by a common language: Nonverbal accents and cultural stereotypes about Americans and Australians. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 38*, 284–300.

Matsumoto, D. (1989). Cultural influences on the perception of emotion. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 20*, 92–105.

Matsumoto, D. (1992). American-Japanese cultural differences in the recognition of universal facial expressions. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23*, 72–84.

Matsumoto, D., & Assar, M. (1992). The effects of language on the judgments of universal facial expressions of emotion. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 16*, 85–99.

Matsumoto, D., & Kudoh, T. (1993). American-Japanese cultural differences in attributions of personality based on smiles. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior,17,* 231–243.

McArthur, L. Z., & Berry, D. S. (1987). Cross-cultural agreement in perceptions of babyfaced adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18*, 165–192.

Mesquita, B., Frijda, N. H., & Scherer, K. R. (1997). Culture and emotion. In J. W. Berry, P. R. Dasen, & T. S. Sararwathi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 2. Basic processes and human development* (pp. 255–297). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Molinsky, A. L., Krabbenhoft, M. A., Ambady, N., & Choi, Y. S. (2005). Cracking the nonverbal code: Intercultural competence and the diagnosis of gestures across cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36*, 380–395.

Montepare, J. M., & Zebrowitz, L. A. (1993). A cross-cultural comparison of impressions created by age-related variations in gait. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 17*, 55–68.

Peng, Y., Zebrowitz, L. A., & Lee, H. K.(1993). The impact of cultural background and cross-cultural experience on impressions of American and Korean male speakers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 24*, 203–220.

Poortinga, Y. H., Schoots, N. H., & van de Koppel, J. M. H. (1993) The understanding of Chinese and Kurdish emblematic gestures by Dutch subjects. *International Journal of Psychology, 28*, 31–44.

Rhodes, G., & Zebrowitz, L.A. (Eds.). (2002). *Facial attractiveness: Evolutionary, cognitive, and social perspectives*. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Rule, N. O., Ambady, N., Adams, Jr., R. B., Ozono, H., Nakashima, S., Yoshikawa, S., et al. (under review). *Polling the face: Judgments of personality traits accurately but differentially predict electoral success across cultures.*

Shaffer, D. R., Crepaz, N., & Sun, C.-R. (2000). Physical attractiveness stereotyping in cross-cultural perspective: Similarities and differences between Americans and Taiwanese. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31*, 557–582.

Thakerar, J. N., & Iwawaki, S. (1979). Cross-cultural comparisons in interpersonal attraction of females toward males. *Journal of Social Psychology, 108*, 121–122.

Tomkins, S. S. (1962). *Affect imagery, consciousness, Vol. 1. The positive affects*. New York: Springer.

Tomkins, S. S., & McCarter, R. (1964).What and where are the primary affects? Some evidence for a theory. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 18*, 119–158.

Wheeler, L., & Kim, Y. (1997). The physical attractiveness stereotype has different content in collectivist cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 795–800.

Wolfgang, A., & Wolofsky, Z. (1991). The ability of new Canadians to decode gestures generated by Canadians of Anglo-Celtic background. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15*, 47–64.

Zebrowitz, L. A., & Montepare, J. M. (2005). Appearance does matter. *Science, 308,* 1565–1566.

Zebrowitz, L. A., Montepare, J. M., & Lee, H. K. (1993). They don't all look alike: Individual impressions of other racial groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 85–101.