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Abstract
Emotional expressions play an important role in coordinating social interaction. We review research on two critical processes that underlie such coordination: (1) perceiving emotions from emotion expressions and (2) drawing inferences from perceived emotions. Broad evidence indicates that (a) observers can accurately perceive emotions from a person’s facial, bodily, vocal, verbal, and symbolic expressions and that such emotion perception is further informed by contextual information. Moreover, (b) observers draw consequential and contextualized inferences from these perceived emotions about the expresser, the situation, and the self. Thus, emotion expressions enable coordinated action by providing information that facilitates adaptive behavioral responses. We recommend that future studies investigate how people integrate information from different expressive modalities and how this affects consequential inferences.
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Introduction
Imagine it is your first day at work and you barely know anyone. Because you could not find your way in the new building, you are unfortunately late to the first meeting. When rushing into the room, one person gets up, frowns at you, growls, and then yells that you should sit down and be quiet. In light of these expressions, you may rightfully conclude that the person is angry [1]. Furthermore, the fact that this particular person expressed anger tells you that the person is probably higher up in the organizational hierarchy [2] and is no one to mess around with [3]. Moreover, you learned the hard way that, in your team, being late to meetings is inappropriate [4], leading you to feel rejected [5]. In response, you show a controlled smile, look downward, blush, and moan, that is, express embarrassment [1]. This expression tells most of your new teammates that you actually are a person who respects social norms [6], soothing the situation. However, one teammate misinterprets your averted gaze as disinterest [7], bringing you your first enemy already on the first day at work.

The example illustrates that emotions play a pivotal role in human interactions: When people express emotions, observers perceive these emotions and draw inferences. However, people may express their emotions in a multitude of ways, and the emotions they express may not be the emotions that observers perceive. Furthermore, any expressed emotion can lead to diverse inferences in observers about the expresser, the situation, and the self. Hence, the pathway from emotion expression via emotion perception to ensuing inferences is bumpy and curvy. Our goal is to review research illuminating this pathway (for an overview, see Figure 1).

Emotion and emotion perception
Understanding emotion perception and ensuing inferences requires defining what emotions are. Most theories agree that emotions are synchronized changes in multiple components in response to a (socially) relevant stimulus (e.g. Refs. [8,9]). Specifically, when a person encounters a relevant challenge or opportunity, this changes the person’s feelings, cognitions, physiology, motivation, and expressive behaviors in a coordinated fashion. For instance, when someone holds the person back from pursuing a goal, the person may feel hostile, have aggressive thoughts, get sweaty hands, be motivated to hit the other, and frown. Collectively, these changes represent anger [1].
If emotions manifest in various components, observers can also perceive emotions from the components a particular emotion includes. However, only expressive behaviors are immediately perceivable by observers. A person’s feelings, cognitions, physiology, and motivation often defy direct observation. Therefore, most studies on emotion perception asked participants which emotion a certain (nonverbal) expression represents. One of the response options would be denoted correct as per theoretical considerations and/or expert judgments.

Initial research on emotion perception based on this paradigm focused primarily on facial expressions. Influential studies indicated that people from different, even remote cultures can correctly label still pictures of faces as showing one of a limited set of emotion expressions—anger, disgust, fear, happiness, sadness, and surprise (e.g. Refs. [10,11]). A large meta-analysis of cross-cultural studies corroborated that people can perceive emotions from facial expressions [12]. More recent evidence extends these earlier investigations. Observers also accurately recognized facial expressions of emotions as diverse as amusement, contentment, embarrassment, or pride [13].

Beyond facial expressions, observers can also use nonfacial expressions to perceive a person’s emotion. For instance, participants recognized emotions from a person’s bodily changes (for a recent review, see Ref. [14]), from vocalizations such as gasps, screams, or sighs [15–17], from changes in the voice such as pitch, loudness, or speech rate ([18,19], for a recent meta-analysis on vocalizations and changes in the voice, see Ref. [20]), or from specific forms of touching such as squeezing, hugging, or stroking [21]. Notably, the recognition of emotions from vocal or bodily expressions applies to various emotions and is not limited to a small selection [22]. In digital communication, observers also recognized a person’s emotion from emoticons [5,23], written statements [24,25], or even typos in emails [26]. Collectively, research on facial, bodily, vocal, verbal, and symbolic expressions indicates that observers can perceive emotions of another person via diverse channels.

Other evidence challenges the conclusion that emotion perception is straightforward. As a first challenge, studies on emotion perception may be limited in that they used high-intensity, stylized expressions. In real life, however, people oftentimes do not express an emotion fully, even if they experience it strongly [27,28], and cultures differ in how people express emotions (e.g. Ref. [29]). Furthermore, recognition accuracy was reduced when studies used real vocal [30] or facial expressions [31,32]. Countering this challenge, however, evidence suggests that in intense situations, people frequently express emotions in prototypical ways. For instance, children expressed prototypical surprise when confronted with a scary face in an online game [33]. Moreover, participants still recognized even realistic, multimodal expressions at least above chance level [34], and other features that make an expression more realistic, such as dynamic as compared with static displays, also increased recognition accuracy [35].

As a second challenge, studies on emotion perception, especially earlier studies, suffered from methodological limitations (for an early critique, see Ref. [36]).
participants are offered a fixed number of emotion labels to indicate which emotion they perceive in a particular expression, successful recognition may be higher than it is in real life, where emotion perception is not aided by the availability of limited options (e.g. Ref. [37]). Relatedly, when repeatedly choosing among a set of emotion labels to assign to emotion expressions, participants may try to assign every label at least once. This process can artificially increase recognition accuracy if only labels of to-be-presented expressions occur in the study. Supporting this logic, when exploiting this elimination explanation, participants assigned common emotion labels to an expression that actually does not represent an emotion, assigned made-up (i.e. nonexisting) labels to different expressions, or assigned actual emotion labels to unpredicted emotions [38]. Moreover, when choosing among a set of emotion expressions to assign to a common story that also includes the emotion label, the story and emotion label are confounded. This confound can also artificially increase recognition accuracy. Indeed, participants assigned the same emotion expression to multiple stories that mentioned different, plausible emotion labels, leading to seeming evidence that the same expression can represent multiple emotions [39]. Finally, when participants from a remote culture could freely label expressions with emotion terms, they labeled them with terms that matched the expression’s valence, yet they rarely used the predicted discrete emotion terms, rendering it unclear whether they accurately perceived the specific emotions ([40], but see also [41]). Thus, it may be that frequently applied methods steered evidence in favor of accurate emotion perception.

As a third challenge, characteristics of the observer affect emotion perception. For instance, participants from some cultures did not recognize Western emotions (e.g. Ref. [42]), observers’ social rank affected their emotion perception differently (for a review, see Ref. [43]), and higher recognition accuracy is a defining feature of people higher in emotional intelligence [44]. Moreover, people were less accurate in recognizing the emotions of outgroup members [12,20], ascribed fewer secondary emotions (e.g. shame) to them [45], misperceived their embarrassment as disinterest [7], or perceived their emotions as less intense [46].

In sum, research implies that it is possible, yet challenging, to perceive emotions. Perceiving emotions is challenging most likely because the expression and recognition of emotions are highly contextualized [47,48]. Two lines of research support this conclusion. First, a recent large-scale study indicates that many emotion expressions occur in specific contexts across the globe, although each expression can occur in different contexts, and the same context can lead to different expressions ([49], but see also [50]). Second, when observers perceive facial emotion expressions, they also encode surrounding contextual information [51]. The combination of facial expressions and contextual information then collectively informs emotion recognition, and contextual information may sometimes even be of primary importance for observers’ judgments [52,53]. Thus, we think it is fair to conclude that observers can recognize emotions from different expressions, yet it is important to consider the context in which these expressions are embedded. If context-ualized emotion perception is indeed possible, the next question is which inferences people draw from these expressions.

Inferences drawn from perceived emotions

After perceiving an emotion, observers infer additional information from the emotion expression. Broadly speaking, emotion expressions serve as (social) information that observers use emotion expressions to draw inferences about characteristics of (a) the expresser, (b) the situation, and/or (c) the self, which can all influence observers’ behavior [54,55]. Observers accomplish this process, in part, because they reverse engineer the emotional episode. Specifically, from emotion expressions, observers conclude which feelings, cognitions, or motivations the expresser had (e.g. Refs. [56–61]), allowing them to draw further inferences [3]. Just as emotion perception itself, also the three kinds of inferences observers draw critically depend on the context.

First, observers infer characteristics of the expresser. For instance, from a facial expression of anger, participants reverse engineered a cognition involved in anger, namely that the expresser wants to urgently remove an obstacle, predicting observers’ inferences of higher aggressiveness [3]. In other contexts, such as in working groups, the expression of anger instead led observers to infer higher competence [2], especially when anger was expressed mildly and when the expression occurred in a context in which it was appropriate [62]. In other studies that go beyond anger, observers concluded that a person who expressed pride is self-interested and therefore inferred that the expresser supports meritocracy [63]. Furthermore, observers concluded that a person who expressed embarrassment cares about social norms and therefore inferred that the expresser is prosocial [6]. Moreover, in an emergent leadership situation, observers concluded that a person who expressed contempt or compassion is more intelligent and therefore a more suitable leader [64].

The inferences people draw about an expresser’s characteristics subsequently influence observers’ behavior. For instance, observers conceded more to angry counterparts in negotiations because they thought these counterparts had higher limits [25]. Notably, such heightened concessions occurred only for
Western participants; the effect reversed for Eastern participants because they perceived expressions of anger as inappropriate [65]. Beyond anger, inferences about a proud person's status [66] predicted envious observers’ tendencies to emulate or impede the expresser in a competitive context, depending on whether the proud person was perceived to attribute success to invested effort or talent [67]. Finally, the prosociality observers inferred from expressed embarrassment led them to trust and affiliate with the expresser [6].

Second, observers infer broader information about the social situation from others’ emotional expressions. For instance, when a person acted inappropriately in a group context, an expression of anger predicted inferences of social norms regarding fair and considerate behavior in the group, whereas an expression of disgust predicted inferences of social norms regarding repulsive and decent behavior [4]. Relatedly, observers construed a situation as more competitive when an interaction partner expressed anger, and they construed the same situation as more cooperative when the interaction partner expressed happiness or disappointment [68]. When group members responded to specific behaviors with anger as opposed to sadness or neutrality, observers inferred that norm-incongruent behavior occurred, which in turn predicted correct inferences of the prevalent norm [69]. As another example, third parties who observed gratitude expressed in a dyad were more likely to affiliate with the dyad members because they perceived the grateful person as responsive, especially when the person praised the benefactor and when they thought the benefactor is a morally good person [70]. Moreover, a person’s happy or sad expressions in response to a certain event positively or negatively affected observers’ attitudes toward the event, depending on whether the event was positively or negatively framed [71].

Finally, observers infer characteristics of themselves from others’ emotional expressions, which affect their (social) behaviors. For instance, emotions expressed by fellow group members affect inferences regarding group membership and ensuing behaviors [5]. When fellow group members expressed happiness, targets of the expression felt more accepted by the group, whereas when fellow group members expressed anger, targets felt rejected. When an alternative group was available, rejected persons abandoned the current group; when no alternative group was available, rejected persons conformed to the current group. Along similar lines, being the target of an expression of contempt in a business strategy simulation lowered a person’s self-esteem, predicting increased task performance as well as interpersonal aggressiveness [72]. Furthermore, baseball and soccer coaches’ expressions of happiness predicted team members’ inferences of good performance as well as better actual team performance, whereas coaches’ expressions of anger predicted team members’ inferences of bad performance as well as worse actual team performance [73].

Summary and discussion
The review allows drawing two broad conclusions regarding the pathway from emotion expression via emotion perception to inferences drawn from perceived emotions. First, observers can accurately perceive emotions from facial, bodily, vocal, verbal, and symbolic expressions. Doing so requires taking contextual information into account, such as aspects of the situation in which the emotion is embedded, characteristics of the observer, or broader cultural factors. Second, based on these perceptions, observers draw various consequential and similarly contextualized inferences. These inferences can concern an expresser’s characteristics such as traits or intentions, broader aspects of a situation such as prevalent social norms, or characteristics of the target of the expression such as whether the person is part of a group. The inferences are consequential in the sense that they, in turn, predict various (social) outcomes in fields as diverse as negotiations, leadership, or competitions, and they are contextualized in the sense that inferences observers draw from a perceived emotion may vary depending on the circumstances under which the emotion is expressed.

While reviewing the literature, we identified one avenue for future research that we deem of importance. Specifically, studies have hardly investigated how people integrate information from different expressive modalities and how this integrated perception affects consequential inferences. Even though different modalities have equivalent (social) effects on observers (e.g. Ref. [55]), it is unknown whether one or more modalities primarily determine observers’ perceived emotions, especially in a situation in which different modalities contradict each other (e.g. when a person suppresses the facial expression but still expresses an emotion in the voice). Relatedly, it is an open question whether reverse-engineered feelings, cognitions, and motivations then additively foster consequential inferences, whether they each foster different inferences, or whether they have combined effects in more complicated patterns. Such future research will further illuminate the bumpy and curvy pathway from emotion expression via emotion perception to ensuing inferences.
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