The effect of smiles on social rejection in a natural fundraising context

Daniel Pinazo

Corresponding author

Department of Evolutionary, Educational, Social Psychology and Methodology, Jaume

I University, Av. Sos Baynat, s/n, 12071- Castelló de la Plana (Spain).

Tel. +34 964 729715. Fax. +34 964 729267. E-mail: pinazo@psi.uji.es

Lorena Ribes

Postgrade student in Social Pscyhology. Local coordinator of the team of collectors of a NGO sponsored by the UN
Department of Evolutionary, Educational, Social Psychology and Methodology,

Jaume I University, Castellón, Spain

Abstract

Objective:

The aim of the present study is to explore the effect of intentional smiling on social rejection in a natural fundraising context.

Method:

Two studies analyze the effect of smiling on passerby conduct, as well as related influence mechanisms. First, 1298 passersby were approached by two fundraisers, one male and one female; in half of their attempts to engage the passersby the fundraisers approached with a friendly smile, whereas in the other half they did not smile. Data were collected on the frequency of rejections and

acceptances of contact with the fundraiser. Second, 1157 approaches were made to analyze the effect of smiling on types of rejection.

Results:

Results suggest that the likelihood of the interaction being accepted is greater with a smiling than a non-smiling approach.

Conclusions:

Hostile rejections appear to be an effect of the positive impression smiling gives in a self-interested setting. Practical and theoretical implications are discussed.

Introduction

Fundraising through F2F is an increasingly important source of income for transnational NGDOs (Bennet, 2013; Mitchell, 2014; Prakash & Gugerty, 2010). The fundraiser's aim is to convince the passerby to stop and listen to their message on behalf on the NGDO. The fundraiser's job is demanding because of the very high proportion of rejections to their requests for interaction. In this setting, fundraisers have to modify

their emotional expressions in order to reduce rejections and increase acceptances (Bitner, Booms, & Tetreault, 1990; Hochschild, 1983), and among these expressions, smiling is one of the resources that can help the most in having their request for interaction accepted. Although it is well known that smiling can influence the receiver's attitude to the sender (Centorrino, Djemai, Hopfensitz, Milinski, & Seabright, 2015; Mehu, Little, & Dunbar, 2008), there has been little research into its influence in natural interactions (Nagle, Brodsky, & Weeter, 2014), and specifically in self-interested settings when smiling forms part of the job.

The thesis of the present study is that smiling, despite the context, sustains its positive halo effect on the passerby. However, this does not necessarily entail a positive experience for the fundraiser. The aim of this study is to observe the effect of smiling on the nature of social rejection in natural interactions, an aspect for which there is little evidence in the literature as to date, research has focused more on the positive than on the negative effects of smiling.

The effect of smiling in the fundraising setting

A smile can convey a trusting affective state that predisposes the passerby to stop and listen to the fundraiser's message (Brown & Moore, 2002; Grandey & Diamond, 2010; Kim & Yoon, 2012; Pugh, 2001; Wang & Groth, 2014). The receiver's response depends on the meaning he or she attributes to the smile (Ambadar, Cohn, & Reed, 2008). The most likely meanings are that the smiling person is friendly, and that he or she wishes to approach the receiver. However, the context may induce a meaning to the smile independent of the personal meaning attributed to the fundraiser. In a natural context of interaction dominated by the instrumentality of the smile the fundraiser's desire to approach might even prompt a more hostile response from the receiver. A

smile inviting the pedestrian to accept the fundraiser's approach conflicts with their desire to avoid the approach.

Previous research has associated smiling in a genuine context, with attributions of friendliness, attraction, trust and, in general, with a positive 'halo effect' that helps when approaching another person (Centorrino, Djemai, Hopfensitz, Milinski & Seabright, 2014; Cohn & Ekman, 2005; Krumhuber, Manstead, & Kappas, 2007; Krumhuber & Manstead, 2009; Mehu, Little, & Dunbar, 2008; Reed, Zeglen, & Schmidt, 2012; Seidel, Habel, Kirschner, Gur, & Derntl, 2010; Zhan, Wang, and Shi, 2016). The belief that a smile eases the approach and encourages trust in the fundraiser is the reason smiling is used as a way to minimize rejections. There is recent evidence that positive emotional expression forced by context has performance costs (Hideg & Van Kleef, 2017; Kalokerinos, Greenaway, Pedder, & Margetts, 2014;) However, there is little evidence about the effect of intentional smiling on accepting an invitation to hear a message requesting altruistic support.

Smiling and passerby rejection

One explanation of why the effect of smiling favors passerby acceptance is linked to the the principle of reciprocity, based on the norm that we must treat others as they treat us, in the belief that reciprocal exchanges encourage social harmony and individual well-being (e.g. Gleason, Lida, Bolger, & Shrout, 2003). The effect of smiling can be to prompt the return of friendliness by accepting the interaction. People are sensitive to welcoming gestures from others. Smiling can evoke in the passerby a transitory state of emotional well-being that increases the attraction toward the smiling fundraiser (Cunningham, Barbee, & Pike, 1990; Golle, Mast & Lobmaier, 2013; Mueser, Graum, Sussman , & Rosen, 1984). In exchange, the fundraisers expect to receive the same in return, if not a smile then at least a friendly gesture. This is perhaps a good reason to

expect that pedestrians who receive a smile will offer at least a moment of their time to listen to the fundraiser's message. According to the principle of reciprocity, approaching pedestrians with a smile might increase the likelihood of them accepting the interaction. However, it would not explain their rejections. The connotation of rejection itself is one of causing harm to both the other and to the balance of the interaction (Chen, Poon, & Bernstein, 2014), because of the effect of reciprocity, the pursuit of equity, and the notion that the response on receiving a gift is to reciprocate with another gift (Bolton & Ockenfels, 2000; Heerey & Crossley, 2013).

Rejections, regardless of the smile, are the norm in fundraising activities. Pedestrians who assume the context to be self-interested and regard the smile as false in this setting feel no obligation to return an attitude of friendliness. The effect of smiling, because of the norm of reciprocity, would be to activate more interactions than when no smile is given. However this norm may be reversed if the context of smile is perceived to be false. Approaching a passerby with what is perceived to be a false intention may be interpreted as an attempt to manipulate, and can arouse reactance. Reactance to an attempted manipulation would explain why the interaction is rejected. Psychological reactance is a motivational response to a perceived threat to behavioral freedoms (Brehm, 1966). Pedestrians would react in this way because they perceive an attempt to undermine their individual freedom to support the NGDO. In this case pedestrians give more weight to the self-interested setting than to the non-verbal communication, and therefore the rejection of interaction will not differ according to whether the approach is made with a smile or not.

Social rejection is a negative experience for the person who receives it, but a consistent finding in the research is that rejection is also unpleasant for the person doing the rejecting (Chen, Poon, & Bernstein, 2014; Ciarocco, Sommer, & Baumeister, 2001;

Poulsen & Kashy, 2012; Richman & Leary, 2009). Despite the setting, the passerby may feel under pressure to be friendly to someone who approaches them with a smile. If our perception is that the fundraiser wants to manipulate us, yet we feel obliged to be friendly in response to their smile, we are faced with a cognitive inconsistency.

Deliberately ignoring a person takes a considerable effort; it is difficult and ego-depleting for the rejector (Williams, Bernieri, Faulkner, & Gada-Jain, 2000). It is possible that the way the fundraiser's approach is rejected depends on how this tension is cognitively resolved. According to cognitive dissonance theory, people want to maintain a mental state of coherence (Festinger, 1957). Hence, if the passerby wants to reject the fundraiser but feels obliged to respond in a friendly manner to their friendly smile, this tension can be dissipated by accepting the interaction; however if the passerby decides to reject the interaction they will express their displeasure in doing so, since rejecting a friendly person requires there to be an unpleasant motive associated with the fundraiser to justify the rejection. In this pattern of thoughts, the coherent conduct would be a more unpleasant or hostile rejection, such as not looking the fundraiser in the eye and ignoring them, or responding with a disparaging or angry gesture, rather than a simple refusal to interact.

The fundraiser's behaviour is always nice, consequently there is no reason to be hostile. However, some passer-bys are more hostile than others. One reason to be hostile is to feel awkward as they feel there is an attempt to be engaged by fundraisers. Hostility arises from the need to defend oneself from a perceived threat. Any threat that might arise from this interaction is subjective. Rejecting somebody makes us feel awkward but it gets even worse if we believe that we are not supposed to reject this person. The smile reinforces this belief. This effect may increase acceptance but when

the engagement is totally unwanted, rejection becomes more difficult resulting in hostility.

The aim of the present study is to examine the effect of intentional smiling on social rejection or acceptance in a situation of self-interest. In the first study we compare the effect of smiling by observing whether it coincides with the explanation of the norm of positive reciprocity (more interactions will be accepted with a smile than without one), or whether the effects coincide with psychological reactance (more interactions will be rejected with a smile than without one). In the second study we analyze whether the fundraisers' request for interaction is associated with the nature of the rejection, and the relation between the rejection and smile. Following the cognitive dissonance hypothesis we expect that the smiling approach will provoke a more negative rejection than the non-smiling approach.

Method

This research was approved by the Universitat Jaume I's institutional review board (IRB) and performed with approved protocol and informed consent process (2436). Confidentiality of personally-identifiable information has been maintained for privacy safeguards. The data were analyzed anonymously. Consent was informed. We obtained a verbal consent.

Two studies were carried out with the two fundraisers. In the first study the aim was to determine the effect of smiling on the results of obtaining a favorable response (acceptance) or an unfavorable response (rejection) in the request for interaction. The second study analyzed the type of rejection in relation to the smile.

Study 1

Experiment 1 was designed to study the effect of smiling on the frequency of acceptances or rejections of natural interactions between fundraisers and pedestrians.

This fieldwork was designed to provide information with which to contextualize the second study. We analyze whether the pattern of rejections and acceptances coincides with the norm of reciprocity or that of psychological reactance.

Collaboration was sought from two fundraisers working for an international NGDO operating in the Spanish city where the university is located. One fundraiser was male (age 38) and the other female (age 34).

The fundraisers were chosen for their proven competence in meeting set targets over the previous months. The NGDO requires fundraisers to recruit a minimum of 20 supporters each month in order to continue in the job. To control for target compliance at least seven of these supporters must be recruited in the first two weeks of the month. It was considered that both fundraisers had consistently met their performance targets, showing a steady regularity in their capability for performing the task. One male and one female fundraiser were selected to control for possible gender effects.

Pilot study

The aim of this test was to ensure that the fundraisers' facial expressions were differentiated on the basis of their smile and not their gender.

Participants and design

A total of 160 students with an average age of 21.2 years, 48 (30%) men, and 112 (70%) women, were invited to evaluate the impression conveyed by the fundraisers' facial expressions portrayed in a photograph. The students were randomly divided into four groups of equal sizes (smiling male fundraiser, serious male fundraiser, smiling female fundraiser, serious female fundraiser) and they were asked to evaluate which qualities could be attributed to the person they were then introduced to. The students were not aware that they were rating fundraisers. The qualities were presented in a list and the students were asked to choose between two options: yes (It is representative of

the face) or no (It is not representative of the face). The qualities were chosen in a study with a focus group of 20 students who were asked to select five positive and five negative features characteristic of fundraisers working to recruit supporters for an NGDO drawing on traits from the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI, Bem, 1974). The final list was as follows: Truthful, Ambitious, Sympathetic, Kind, Selfish, Competitive, Willing to discuss, Cold, Hard, Friendly.

Results

Firstly, we analysed if the faces were more frequently associated to a specific feature connected to a gender (Table 1). Chi-squared shows that 'assertivity' ($\chi^2(1)=8068$, *p*=.005, *Cramer's V*=.227) and 'attractiveness' ($\chi^2(1)=3910$, *p*=.048, *Cramer's V*=.157) are more frequently attributed to male faces ($z=1.7$ vs $z=1.6$) than to female faces ($z=-1.7$ vs $z-1.6$). Competitiveness is more often ($\chi^2(1)=7537$, *p*=.006, *Cramer's V*=.218) attributed to female ($z=1.3$) than male ($z=-2.0$) faces.

(Here Table 1)

Secondly, we analysed if faces were more frequently associated to a specific feature connected to a smiling or a serius expression (Table 2). Chi-squared shows that 'friendliness'($\chi^2(1)=56309$, *p*<.001, *Cramer's V*=.597) and 'agreeableness' ($\chi^2(1)=32790$, *p*<.001, *Cramer's V*=.456), 'willing to dialogue' ($\chi^2(1)=16942$, *p*z.001, *Cramer's V*=.325) and 'being friendly' ($\chi^2(1)=25614$, *p*<.001, *Cramer's V*=.401) are more frequently associated to smiling faces ($z_{friendliness}=3.8$, $z_{agreeableness}=2.8$, $z_{willing\ to\ dialogue}=2.0$, $z_{beingfriendly}=2.7$) than to non-smiling faces ($z_{simpatía}=-3.8$, $z_{amable}=-2.8$, $z_{dialogante}=-2.0$, $z_{amistosa}=-2.7$). In return, being 'cold' ($\chi^2(1)=16410$, *p*<.001, *Cramer's V*=.320) and 'harsh' ($\chi^2(1)=16410$, *p*<.001, *Cramer's V*=.320) are features more frequently associated ($\chi^2(1)=7.537$, *p*=.006, *Cramer's V*=.218) to non-smiling faces ($z_{cold}=2.6$, $z_{harsh}=1.5$) than to smiling faces ($z_{cold}=-2.6$, $z_{harsh}=-1.5$).

(Here Table 2)

The results show that smiling in the case of both fundraisers evokes positive impressions about them, whereas when not smiling, fundraisers are more likely to be rated as cold and hard than when smiling. However the difference is not significant in terms of being ambitious, selfish and competitive.

The fundraisers were then observed in their natural setting.

Field study

Positive attributions to the smiling facial expressions should ease interaction acceptance within a natural setting. There might be a favourable bias to the boy since his face is perceived as more attractive.

The aim of the study is to analyze, in a context of recruiting supporters, whether approaching pedestirans with a smile has a significant effect on the frequency with which the interaction is accepted.

Procedure

The fundraisers were asked to carry out their work as usual during the two-week period of the study, but with the additional task of recording the outcome of their requests for interaction. During these two weeks each fundraiser had to record 600 interactions. This figure was considered to be achievable during the fundraisers' normal working routine over the two weeks. In half of these interactions they were asked to smile to attract the passerby's attention, and in the other half of the interactions they were to approach the potential supporter without smiling. The two fundraisers were asked to continue with their work as normal so that although they tried to alternate smiling and unsmiling approaches, they were not strictly monitored in order not to compromise the spontaneity of their fundraising work. They were asked to alternate smiling approaches with non-smiling approaches, thereby creating an affective state in

the fundraiser in which the smile was a strategy and therefore somewhat forced. The fundraisers' job involves going to a certain point of the city and approaching all the members of the public passing through that area. For the study they were asked to continue with their usual routine, but alternate a smile with a neutral expression in each encounter with the public. The fundraisers were instructed to approach every person they came across without avoiding or ignoring anyone, in order to prevent any selection effect. Compliance with this instruction was monitored by the organization's coordinator, and was also checked against the diary in which they wrote down the outcomes of their interactions, divided up into various time periods. Compliance was also assessed orally. No anomalies were detected in this aspect of their behavior that suggested the need to eliminate any given day from the record. They were not asked to stop collecting data when they had reached 600 interactions, but continued until the two-week period finished.

Participants and design

A total of 1298 pedestrians were approached with an invitation to hear the fundraiser's request. 673 pedestrians received the smiling fundraiser (male fundraiser 53.5% and female fundraiser 46.5%), and 625, the non-smiling fundraiser (male fundraiser 52.8% and female fundraiser 47.2%). All the pedestrians were approached in the streets of the Spanish city in which the fundraisers normally work. The fundraiser's facial dynamics (smile vs. neutral expression) was the key independent variable. Additional independent variables were the fundraiser's sex (male vs. female) and level of competence in the fundraising work. Acceptance versus rejection was the dependent variable. The fundraisers used a basic protocol to request interaction. This included looking directly into the passerby's face, greeting them with "Hello, good morning" and

introducing their request with an expression such as "Could you please spare a moment

to listen?"

Results

We performed a binary regression analysis to assess the effect of the variables

'fundraiser's gender' and 'smile' on 'acceptance'. The results showed that smiling has

an effect on recruiting pedestrians to support NGDOs (B = -0.343, SE = .137, Exp(B) =

0.710, p=.012) but the fundraiser's gender has no effect (B = 0.229, SE = .136, $Exp(B)$ =

1.26, p=.092). These results suggest that not smiling predicts more frequent rejection

than smiling, regardless of the fundraiser's gender.

Finally, there is a significant difference in the sex of the people approached for

recruitment (χ^2(1)=74.995, p<.001), as the fundraisers approached more women

(N=805) than men (N=493). There is also a difference between the sex of the passers-by

that the fundraisers were more likely to approach (χ^2(1)=6.992, p=.008, $Cramer's$

V=.073), in that the male fundraiser approached more female pedestrians than expected

(N=451, z=1.1) than male pedestrians (N=239, z=-1,4), whereas the female fundraiser

approached more male pedestrians than expected (N=254, z=1.5) than female

pedestrians (N=354, z=-1.2).

Approaching a pedestrian with a smile may lead to a higher percentage of

recruitments in the interactions. However, the number of rejections is very high and

although the effect is significant, it is weak, which suggests that smiles are very

frequently received with a rejection. The number of rejections suggests that

psychological reactance and negative reciprocity are relevant to pedestrians' responses.

However, the hypothesis of reactance is weakened by the finding that the frequency of

acceptance is higher with the smiling approach, whereas for rejections there are no

differences between the smiling and non-smiling approaches. This suggests that positive

reciprocity predominates in acceptances, and negative reciprocity prevails in rejections. The next study analyses the pedestrians' rejection response. Specifically, we focus the analysis on the hostility of the rejections.

Study 2

In this second study, we assess whether there were differences in the types of rejection people made according to whether the fundraiser smiled or not. In this case the fundraisers were asked to approach the same number of women as men.

Procedure and design

The same procedure was used as in the previous study, but in this case the fundraisers were asked to record only the rejections. In addition, an external observer standing near the fundraisers watched the pedestrians' responses and noted down their gestures when they rejected the interaction. Data were collected from a total of 1157 interactions, of which 587 were made with a smile (male fundraiser=283; female fundraiser=304) and 469 with a neutral facial expression (male fundraiser=171; female fundraiser=298). Rejections were divided into two types: 1. interaction rejected without looking at the fundraiser (more hostile interaction); 2. interaction to express lack of interest, looking at the fundraiser.

Results

The binary regression analysis to evaluate the effect of the variables 'fundraiser's sex', 'smile' and 'passerby's sex', on the 'type of rejection' yields a significant model, $\chi^2(3, N= 1,157) = 219,69$, $p<.001$, and explains between .173 (Cox and Snell R^2) and .246 (Nagelkerke R^2) of the dependent variable. The results demonstrated an effect of smiling on the hostility of the rejection ($B = -0.41$, SE = .14, $Exp(B) = 0.66$, $p=.004$), an effect of the fundraiser's sex on the hostility of the rejection ($B = 2.09$, $SE = .16$, $Exp(B)$

= 8.09, $p<.001$), and an effect of the 'pedestrian's sex' ($B = 0.32$, $SE = .16$, $Exp(B) = 1.38$, $p=.027$).

When rejections are cross-checked with smiling, pedestrians are more likely to be hostile, and avoid looking at the fundraiser during rejection when the fundraiser smiles than when he or she does not smile (Table 3).

(Here Table 3)

The rejections of the male fundraiser were less hostile, as passers-by were more likely to look the fundraiser in the eye as they rejected approaches from the male fundraiser than when they rejected approaches from the female fundraiser (Table 4)

(Here Table 4)

Female pedestrians tended to reject the interaction with the fundraiser in a less hostile manner than male pedestrians (Table 5)

(Here Table 5)

The fundraisers approached more women (N=729) than men (N=428, ($\chi^2(1)=78.307$, $p<.001$). We observed that the fundraisers smiled when approaching women more frequently (N=390; $z=1.0$) than men (N=197, $z=-1.4$; $\chi^2(1)=6.020$, $p=.014$, Cramer's V=.072). However, there were no differences between the fundraisers in their selection of men or women pedestrians ($\chi^2(1)=2.631$, $p=.105$, Cramer's V=.048)

Rejection without looking at the fundraiser is more hostile, implying a more unpleasant avoidance of interaction with the fundraiser. The results show that this is the most frequent type of response to the smiling fundraiser. The differences in the frequency of approaches to women do not influence the effect smiling has on the hostility of the rejection because women are more likely to reject in a friendly manner. These results are consistent with the theory of cognitive dissonance, indicating that the passerby's response to the fundraiser's request for interaction is a reaction prompted by

the tension between the perception of the fundraiser as manipulative and at the same time as a person who is smiling; when this tension is present it is resolved with a more hostile gesture than when it is absent.

General Discussion

The present study shows that smiling in a self-interested setting has a significant impact on the way the receiver rejects the request for interaction. The main objective of the study was to explore the effects of contextual false smiling on rejection in a natural work interaction. The results show that smiling is effective in modulating the pedestrian's response, but the effect is not always positive. In fact, hostile rejections seem to be an effect of the positive impression of smiling in a self-interested, false setting.

Smiling encourages acceptance, but does not prevent rejection, and indeed triggers more hostile rejections. The research suggests that smiling usually enhances others' pleasure (e.g., Paulhus, Bruce & Trapnell, 1995). Pleasure caused by a smile seems to be what elicits a more hostile response from the passerby. The results can be explained as an attempt to avoid violating the norm of reciprocity. Looking directly at a person who approaches you in a friendly, smiling manner, and making an excuse to reject them is an unpleasant experience (it contradicts the norm of reciprocity), and involves an emotional cost that is avoided by lowering one's gaze or being more hostile.

Research on emotional labor finds that the more genuine the smile, the better the results obtained from customers (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011; Zhan, Wang, & Shi, 2016). These studies are carried out in an industrial or service context, however. Our results suggest that positive outcomes, in a NGDO context, can be obtained from supporters or donors, even with a false smile, but the smile's false halo also elicits interactions that can undermine the fundraiser's emotional resistance.

The results presented here provide information on possible patterns of interaction between fundraiser and potential supporter when the emotional expression is presented in a context that means it is not genuine. The facial expression offers both behavioral and situational information in contexts of trust (Boone & Buck, 2003). It communicates our intentions to others (Keltner & Haidt, 1999). In general people who smile seem to be more sociable and willing to cooperate, so these signals facilitate social exchange (Scharleman, Eckel, Kacelnik, & Wilson, 2001). But in a trust context, in addition to the desire to approach, the fundraiser's smile transmits his or her commitment to the social action represented by the NGDO, particularly when the fundraiser is not paid for this activity.

People usually look at their interlocutor's face to gauge whether the imminent social intervention will be successful for them, and to determine whether they will be accepted or rejected. The high frequency of rejection, even when the fundraiser smiles, and the more negative type of rejection when smiling can leave the fundraiser with a negative impression of smiling as a strategy for modulating facial expression. Existing research suggests that the type of rejection influences subsequent motivation to respond to rejection (Richman, Martin, Guadagno, 2016). According to Richman and Leary's multimotive model (2009), when rejection is construed as chronic, people feel less motivated to continue pursuing social acceptance. Persistent rejection can make people less trusting in their approach and make it difficult for them to perceive signals of acceptance after rejection (Maner, DeWall, Baumeister, & Schaller, 2007).

The present study was carried out with experienced fundraisers; perhaps the effect would be different among novice fundraisers. Novices feel less confident in the interaction and smiling could incorporate this effect, encouraging a kinder rejection response from the passerby. In future studies we propose that an analysis of the effect of

smiling on pedestrians should include the unpleasant emotional response it causes them. The pattern of rejection observed suggests that pedestrians feel uncomfortable at having to reject a friendly person and this discomfort is manifested in a more hostile reaction to the fundraiser. The consequences this can have for fundraisers are yet to be explored, and will likely be different for novice fundraisers and experienced fundraisers. Furthermore, the effect of the smile on the potential supporter's rejection was observed here in a context of raising money for altruistic purposes; future research might analyze whether this effect occurs in the same way in other interaction contexts where rejection is an essential component (e.g. homeless people looking for assistance or TV companies trying to sell you their product).

In summary, our findings provide evidence of an aspect that has received little attention in the trust context literature. In a setting of self-interested social interaction, where the smile is contextually false, smiling helps interactions but at the same time makes rejection more unpleasant. *I should* and *I do not want to* combine to create a cognitive inconsistency that passers-by resolved with a more hostile rejection to channel this tension. Ames and Johar (2009) found that displays of positive affect augment behavior-correspondent inferences. In our study, approaching the passerby with a smiling emotional expression implied that their approach would be regarded in a more friendly manner than when no smile was offered. The reciprocal response would be to accept the interaction. But at the same time if the sender is perceived as having manipulative intentions, the inconsistency caused would be more intense. The inconsistency arises from perceiving friendliness in the gesture, but manipulation in the setting. The passersby's interpretation could be that if it is their obligation to be friendly, then it is the fundraisers' obligation to be sincere. Future research could further

explore the different ways, both positive and negative, in which smiling can affect outcomes with supporters or donors in natural settings, as well as social rejection.

Study Limitations

This study has several limitations. We did not differentiate between types of smile or the passerby's perception of the quality of the smile. A genuine smile is perceived as not forced, not under a person's voluntary control. This type of smile is attributed to essentially positive associated affective states. Our study did not control whether fundraisers were perceived to have a genuine or a forced smile. Perhaps rejections that avoided looking at the smiling fundraiser could have been affected by the passerby's perception that the smile was false, although nonetheless a friendly emotional expression. Furthermore, we did not ask the people approached for their impressions of the fundraiser or their motives for deciding whether or not to accept or reject the interaction. On the other hand, the fund-raiser may also be influenced by a potentially inviting passer-by's smile. However, the study has not taken this issue into account. A further limitation concerns the absence of external control of how the fundraisers acted, implying that both the protocol for the initial approach and the type of smile (genuine or false) were beyond the control of the research during the study period. The fundraisers controlled their own actions, such that the interactions accepted for evaluation were subject to their own criteria. Furthermore, this study did not analyze the emotional effect of rejection on either the fundraiser or the passerby.

Table 1.
ANOVA according to fundraiser's sex

	MEAN (s.d.)	d.f.	F	p	d
TRUTHFUL		1	.583	.446	.13
Male fundraiser	.27(.446)				
Female fundraiser	.33(.471)				
AMBITIOUS		1	.458	.500	.11
Male fundraiser	.27(.473)				
Female fundraiser	.32(.468)				
SYMPATHETIC		1	.614	.434	.12
Male fundraiser	.50(.503)				
Female fundraiser	.44(.499)				
KIND		1	.914	.341	.14
Male fundraiser	.55(.501)				
Female fundraiser	.48(.503)				
SELFISH		1	3.885	.050	.29
Male fundraiser	.03(.157)				
Female fundraiser	.10(.302)				
COMPETITIVE		1	.032	.859	.02
Male fundraiser	.27(.445)				
Female fundraiser	.28(.451)				
WILLING TO DISCUSS		1	.099	.753	.06
Male fundraiser	.54(.502)				
Female fundraiser	.51(.503)				
COLD		1	1.472	.227	.26
Male fundraiser	.15(.359)				
Female fundraiser	.23(.420)				
HARD		1	2.385	.124	.25
Male fundraiser	.15(.361)				
Female fundraiser	.25(.436)				
FRIENDLY		1	5.465	**.021**	**.67**
Male fundraiser	.52(.361)				
Female fundraiser	.25(.436)				
Defends the cause of the refugees		1	.028	.868	.04
Male fundraiser	.68(.471)				
Female fundraiser	.66(.476)				
Competes to get more supporters		1	2.447	.120	.04
Male fundraiser	.10(.302)				
Female fundraiser	.04(.191)				

Table 2.
ANOVA according to smiling or non-smiling expression

	MEAN (s.d.)	d.f.	F	P
TRUTHFUL		1	8.487	**.004**
Smiling	.40(.493)			
Not smiling	.19(.397)			
AMBITIOUS		1	.842	.360
Smiling	.33(.471)			
Not smiling	.26(.468)			
SYMPATHETIC		1	86.382	**.000**
Smiling	.76(.428)			
Not smiling	.17(.375)			
KIND		1	40.854	**.000**
Smiling	.74(.443)			
Not smiling	.28(.453)			
SELFISH		1	.422	.517
Smiling	.05(.219)			
Not smiling	.08(.265)			
COMPETITIVE		1	.007	.936
Smiling	.28(.449)			
Not smiling	.27(.446)			
WILLING TO DISCUSS		1	18.712	.000
Smiling	.69(.466)			
Not smiling	.36(.484)			
COLD		1	18.057	**.000**
Smiling	.06(.244)			
Not smiling	.31(.466)			
HARD		1	5.970	**.016**
Smiling	.13(.333)			
Not smiling	.28(.451)			
FRIENDLY		1	30.149	**.000**
Smiling	.63(.487)			
Not smiling	.23(.422)			
Defends the cause of the refugees		1	4.853	**.029**
Smiling	.75(.436)			
Not smiling	.59(.495)			
Competes to get more supporters		1	4.869	**.029**
Smiling	.03(.157)			
Not smiling	.11(.318)			

Table 3.
Cross-table 'type of rejection' * 'smile'

			REJECTION		Total
			HOSTILE	FRIENDLY	
SMILE	YES	Count	192	395	**587**
		Expected count	173	414	**587**
		Standardized residual	1.4	-.9	
	NO	Count	149	421	**570**
		Expected count	168	402	**570,0**
		Standardized residual	-1.5	.9	
Total		Count	341	816	**1157**
		Expected count	**341,0**	**816.0**	**1157.0**

Table 4
Cross-table 'type of rejection' * 'fundraiser'

			REJECTION		Total
			HOSTILE	FRIENDLY	
FUNDRAISER	MAN	Count	56	499	**555**
		Expected count	163.6	391.4	**555**
		Standardized residual	-8.4	5.4	
	WOMAN	Count	285	317	**602**
		Expected count	177.4	424.6	**602**
		Standardized residual	8.1	-5.2	
Total		Count	341	816	**1157**
		Expected count	**341,0**	**816.0**	**1157.0**

Table 5
Cross-table 'type of rejection' * 'sex of pedestrian'

			REJECTION		Total
			HOSTILE	FRIENDLY	
PEDESTRIAN	MAN	Count	145	283	**428**
		Expected count	126.1	301.9	**428**
		Standardized residual	1.7	-1.1	
	WOMAN	Count	196	533	**729**
		Expected count	214.9	514.1	**729**
		Standardized residual	-1.3	0.8	
Total		Count	341	816	**1157**
		Expected count	**341,0**	**816.0**	**1157.0**

REFERENCES

Ambadar, Z., Cohn, J.F., & Reed, L.I. (2008). All smiles are not created equal: Morphology and timing of smiles perceived as amused, polite, and embarrassed/nervous. *Journal of No-verbal Behavior*, *33*(1), 17-34. doi: 10.1007/s10919-008-0059-5

Ames, D.R. & Johar, G.V. (2008). I'll know what you're like when i see how you feel. How and when affective displays influence behavior-based impressions. *Psychological Science, 20*(5), 586-593.

Batra, R. & Ray, M.L. (1986). Affective responses mediating acceptance of advertising. *Journal of Consumer Research, 13*, 234-249.

Bennet, R. (2013). Factors influencing the break even probabilities of agency recruited low value charity donors. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 24,* 1091-1112. doi: 10.1007/s11266-012-9314-9

Bitner, M. J., Booms, B. H., & Tetreault, M. S. (1990). The service encounter: Diagnosing favorable and unfavorable incidents. *Journal of Marketing, 54,* 71-84.

Bolton, G.E. & Ockenfels, A. (2000). ERC: A theory of equity, reciprocity, and competition. *The American Economic Review, 90*(1), 166-193. doi: 10.1257/aer.90.1.166

Boone, R.T. & Buck, R. (2003). Emotional expressivity and trustworthiness: The role of nonverbal behavior in the evolution of cooperation. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 27*, 163-182. doi:10.1023/A:1025341931128

Brehm, J. W. (1966). *A theory of psychological reactance*. Academic press.

Briggs, E., Landry, T., & Wood, C. (2007). Beyond just being there: An examination of the impact of attitudes, materialism, and self-esteem on the quality of helping behavior in youth volunteers. *Journal of Non-profit and Private Sector Marketing*, *18,* 27-45.

Brown, W. M. & 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*, *11*, (pp. 59-78). New York: Nova Science Publishers

Bunderson, J.S. & Thompson, J.A. (2009). The call of the wild: Zookeepers, callings, and the double-edged sword of deeply meaningful work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(1), 32-57. doi: 10.2189/asqu.2009.54.1.32

Centorrino, S., Djemail, E., Hopfensitz, A., Milinski, M., & Seabright, P. (2015). Honest signalling in trust interactions: smiles rated as genuine induce trust and signal higher earnings opportunities. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 36*(19), 8-16. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2014.08.001

Ciarocco, N.J., Sommer, K.L., & Baumeister, R.F. (2001). Ostracism and ego depletion: The strains of silence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 1156–1163. doi: 10.1177/0146167201279008

Chen, Z., Poon, K. T**.,** Bernstein, M. J., & Teng, F. (2014). Rejecting another pains the self: The impact of perceived future rejection. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 50,* 225-233. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2013.10.007

Cohn, J. F., & Ekman, P. (2005). Measuring facial action. *The new handbook of methods in nonverbal behavior research*, 9-64

Côté, S. and Morgan, L. M. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of the association between emotion regulation, job satisfaction, and intentions to quit. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 947–962. doi:10.1002/job.174

Cunningham, M. R., Barbee, A. P., & Pike, C. L. (1990). What do women want? Facialmetric assessment of multiple motives in the perception of male facial physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 61-72.

Devine, P.G. & Plant, E.A. (2002). The regulation of explicit and implicit race bias: The role of motivations to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(5), 835–848. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.82.5.835

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row, Perterson & Company.

Fitzsimons, G.J. & Lehmann, D.R. (2004). Reactance to recommendations: When unsolicited advice yields contrary responses. *Marketing Science, 23*(1), 82–94. doi: 10.1287/mksc.1030.0033

Fleming, M., & Tappin, R. (2009). Face-to-face donor cancellation rates (attrition): establishing a benchmark. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *14*, 341–352. doi: 10.1002/nvsm.379

Gipp, N., Kalafatis, S.P., & Ledden, L. (2008). Perceived value of corporate donations: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 13*, 327-346.

Gleason, M.E.J., Lida, M., Bolger, N., & Shrout, P.E. (2003). Daily supportive equity in close relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 1036–1045.

Golle, J., Mast, F.W., & Lobmaier, J.S. (2014). Something to smile about: The interrelationship between attractiveness and emotional expression. *Cognition & Emotion, 28,* 298-310. doi**:** 10.1080/02699931.2013.817383

Gottman, J., Markman, H., & Notarius, C. (1977).The topography of marital conflict: A sequential analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39*, 461-477.

Grandey, A.A. (2003). When "The show must go on": Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal,* 49(1), 86-96. doi: 10.2307/30040678

Grandey, A.A. & Diamond, J.A. (2010). Interactions with the public: Bridging job design and emotional labor perspectives. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*, 338-350. Doi: 10.1002/job.637

Grandey, A., Diefendorff, J., & Rupp, D. (2013). Emotional labor: Overview of definitions, theories, and evidence. In A.A. Grandey, J.M. Diefendorff, & D. Rupp (Eds.), *Emotional labor in the 21st century: Diverse perspectives on emotion regulation at work*, (pp. 3–27). New York, NY: Routledge

Grandey, A., Fisk, G., Mattila, A., Jansen, K. J., & Sideman, L. (2005). Is "service with a smile" enough? Authenticity of positive displays during service encounters. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 96, 38-55. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2004.08.002

Gross, J.J. & John, O.P. 2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 348-362.

Heerey, E.A. & Crossley, H.M. (2013). Predictive and reactive mechanisms in smile reciprocity. *Psychological Science, 24*(8), 1446-55. doi: 10.1177/0956797612472203

Hess, U., Banse, R., & Kappas, A. (1995). The intensity of facial expression is determined by underlying affective state and social situation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(2), 280-288.

Hess, U. & Bourgeois, P. (2009). You smile-I smile: Emotion expression in social interaction. *Biological Psychology*, *84*, 514-520.

Hideg, I., & van Kleef, G. A. (2017). When expressions of fake emotions elicit negative reactions: The role of observers' dialectical thinking. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *38*(8), 1196-1212. doi.org/10.1002/job.2196

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Hülsheger, U.R. & Schewe, A.F. (2011). On the costs and benefits of emotional labor. A meta-analysis of three decades of research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*, 361-389.

Kalokerinos, E.K., Greenaway, K.H., Pedder, D.J., & Margetts, E.A. (2014). Don't grin when you win: The social costs of positive emotion expression in performance situations. *Emotion*, *14*(1), 180-186.

Keltner, D. & Haidt, J. (1999). Social functions of emotions at four levels of analysis. *Cognition and Emotion, 13*, 505-521

Kim, E. & Yoon, D. J. (2012). Why does service with a smile make employees happy? A social interaction model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97,* 1059–1067. doi:10.1037/a0029327

Krumhuber, E., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2009). Can Duchenne smiles be feigned? New evidence on felt and false smiles. *Emotion*, 9, 807-820. doi:10.1037/a0017844

Krumhuber, E., Manstead, A. S. R., & Kappas, A. (2007). Temporal aspects of facial displays in person and expression perception: The effects of smile dynamics, head-tilt and gender. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior,* 31, 39–56. doi: 10.1007/s10919-006-0019-x

Lau, S. (1982). The effect of smiling on person perceptions. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 117*, 63-67.

Maner, J. K., DeWall, C. N., Baumeister, R. F., & Schaller, M. (2007). Does social exclusion motivate interpersonal reconnection? Resolving the ''porcupine problem''. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 42–55.

Mehu, M., Little, A.C., & Dunbar, R.I.M. (2008). Sex differences in the effect of smiling on social judgments: An evolutionary approach. *Journal of Social Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology, 2*(3), 103-121.

Mehu, M. & Dunbar, R. (2008). Naturalistic observation of smiling and laughter in human group interactions. *Behaviour, 145*, 1747–1780.

Mitchell, G.E. (2014). Why will we ever learn?. Measurement and evaluation in international development NGOs. *Public Performance & Management Review, 37* (4), 605-631. doi: 10.2753/PMR1530-9576370404

Mueser, K.T., Grau, B.W., Sussman, S., & Rosen, A.J. (1984). You´re only as pretty as you feel: Facial expression as a determinant of physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 469-478

Nagle, J.E., Brodsky, S.L., & Weeter, K. (2014). Gender, smiling, and witness credibility in actual trials. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 32*, 195-206.

Ostrom, E. & Walker, J. (2003). *Trust and reciprocity: Interdisciplinary lessons from experimental research.* Russell Sage Foundation: New York.

Paulhus, D. L., Bruce, M. N., & Trapnell, P. D. (1995). Effects of self-presentation strategies on personality profiles and their structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*(2), 100-108. doi: 10.1177/0146167295212001

Peace, V., Miles, L., & Johnston, L. (2006). It doesn't matter what you wear: The impact of posed and genuine expressions of happiness on product evaluation. *Social Cognition, 24*, 137–168.

Pinazo, D. & Nos-Aldas, E. (2016). Developing Moral Sensitivity through protest scenarios in international NGDOs' Communication. *Communication Research, 43*, 25-48.

Pinazo, D., Peris, R., Ramos, A., & Brotons, J. (2013). Motivational effects of the perceived image of non-governmental organisations. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *23*(5), 420-434. doi: 10.1002/casp.2140

Pope, J. A., Isely, E. S., & Asamoa Tutu, F. (2009). Developing a marketing strategy for nonprofit organizations: An exploratory study. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector marketing, 21*, 184-201.

Poulsen, J.R. & Kashy, D.A. (2012). Two sides of the ostracism coin: How sources and targets of social exclusion perceive themselves and one another. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations, 15,* 457–470.

Prakash, A. & Gugerty, M. K. (2010). Advocacy organizations and collective action: An introduction. In A. Prakash & M. K. Gugerty (Eds.), *Advocacy Organizations and Collective Action* (pp. 1-28). New York: Cambridge University Press

Pugh, S. D. (2001). Service with a smile: Emotional contagion in the service encounter. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*, 1018 –1027. doi:10.2307/3069445

Reed, L. I., Zeglen, K. N., & Schmidt, K. L. (2012). Facial expressions as honest signals of cooperative intent in a one-shot anonymous Prisoner's Dilemma game. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *33*(3), 200-209. doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2011.09.003

Richman, L. S. & Leary, M. R. (2009). Reactions to discrimination, stigmatization, ostracism, and other forms of interpersonal rejection. *Psychological Review, 116*, 365-383. doi:10.1037/a0015250

Richman, L. S., Martin, J., & Guadagno, J. (2016). Stigma-based rejection and the detection of signs of acceptance. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 7, 53-60.

Sargent, A. & Jay, E. (2004). Reasons for lapse: The case of face-to-face donors. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, *9, 171-182.* doi: 10.1002/nvsm.245

Sargent, A., & Hudson, J. (2008). Donor retention: An exploratory study of door to door recruits. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 13*, 89–101. doi: 10.1002/nvsm.301

Sargent, A., West, D., & Ford, J. (2004). Does perception matter? An empirical analysis of donor behaviour. *The Service Industries Journal, 24*, 19-36, 171-182

Scharlemann, J.P.W., Eckel, C.C., Kacelnik, A., & Wilson, R.K. (2001). The value of a smile: Game theory with a human face. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 22,* 617-640

Seidel, E. M., Habel, U., Kirschner, M., Gur, R. C., & Derntl, B. (2010). The impact of facial emotional expressions on behavioral tendencies in women and men. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *36*(2), 500. doi: 10.1037/a0018169

Solomon, M. R., Surprenant, C., Czepiel, J. A., & Gutman, E. G. (1985). A role theory perspective on dyadic interactions: The service encounter. *Journal of Marketing, 49,* 99–111. doi:10.2307/1251180

Todorov, A., Mandisodza, A.N., Goren, A., & Hall, C.C. (2005). *Science, 308,* 1623-1626.

Van Kleef, G. A. (2009). How emotions regulate social life: The emotions as social information (EASI) model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 18,* 184 – 188. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01633.x

Wang, K.L. & Groth, M. (2014). Buffering the negative effects of employee surface acting: The moderating role of employee-customer relationship strength and personalized services. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(2), 341-350. doi: 10.1037/a0034428.

Williams, K.D., Bernieri, F., Faulkner, S., Grahe, J., & N. Gada-Jain (2000). The scarlet letter study: Five days of social ostracism. *Journal of Personal and Interpersonal Loss, 5,* 19–63.

Worchel, S. & Brehm, J.W. (1970). Effect of threats to attitudinal freedom as a function of agreement with the communicator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 14*(1), 18-22. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0028620

Zhan, Y., Wang, M. and Shi, J. (2016), Interpersonal process of emotional labor: The role of negative and positive customer treatment. *Personnel Psychology,* 69, 525–557. doi:10.1111/peps.12114

The data of study 1 are en the complementary file 'study 1.csv'

The data of study 2 are in the complemery file 'STUDY 2.csv'