

114. Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R. L. (2009). Physical attractiveness. In I. B. Weiner & W. E. Craighead (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Psychology*, 4th Edition. (pp. 1242-1243). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

PHYSICAL ATTRACTIVENESS

Elaine Hatfield and Richard L. Rapson

University of Hawai'i

Physical attractiveness has been defined as "That which represents one's conception of the ideal in appearance; that which gives the greatest degree of pleasure to the senses" (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986, p. 4).

Artists, philosophers, and scientists have long speculated as to the nature of beauty. In the 5th century B.C., for example, the Greek philosopher Aristotle proposed that the Golden Mean, a perfect balance, was a universal ideal.

In recent years, social and evolutionary psychologists, looking at the world through a Darwinian lens of sexual selection, have attempted to identify cultural universals in attractiveness. They have found that people throughout the world appear to prefer men and women's faces that are (1) symmetrical, (2) average, and (3) sexually dimorphic.

Symmetry: Theorists have argued that facial asymmetries indicate a poor genetic heritage, since they may be caused by genetic mutations, pathogens, toxins, and other stressors. Ergo: symmetry should signal youth, health, and reproductive fitness. Although some researchers have found that people do prefer symmetrical faces (see Marquardt, 2002), most evolutionary biologists find only weak evidence for such a preference (see Gangestad & Scheyd, 2005).

Average faces. When social scientists ask people to compare individual faces with average faces, they generally find that people prefer the latter. In one study, for example, Judith Langlois and L. A. Roggman (1990) assembled photographs of men and women's faces. Then, using video and computer techniques, they generated a series of composite faces. Inevitably, people found the composites to be more appealing than *any* individual face.

Sexually dimorphic faces: Evolutionary theorists argue that men and women should prefer faces of those who are at the peak of their reproductive fitness. Women, for example, generally prefer men whose faces signal mature power (for example, they prefer masculine faces with a firm jaw and a broad chin). Men prefer women who possess faces that signal lush, adult sexuality (for example, they prefer thick hair, dewy skin,

large eyes, small noses, small chins, and full sensual lips) (see Gangestad & Scheyd, 2005; Rhodes & Zebrowitz, 2002). Women also prefer men with robust bodies; men prefer women with a low waist-to-hip ratio—a characteristic associated with fertility and health.

EVIDENCE THAT PEOPLE ARE BIASED IN FAVOR OF THE PHYSICALLY ATTRACTIVE

Scientists find that most people, most of the time, are biased in favor of the good-looking. The Greek philosopher Sappho contended that “what is beautiful is good.” Today, scientists have come to a fuller understanding of just how, where, when, and why physical appearance is important. There seem to be four steps in the stereotyping process:

1. Most people know that it is not fair to discriminate against the unattractive (they would be incensed if others discriminated against *them*).
2. Privately, most people take it for granted that attractive and unattractive people are different. Generally, they assume that what is beautiful is good and what is unattractive is bad.
3. Most people treat good-looking and average people better than they treat the unattractive.
4. As a consequence, a self-fulfilling prophecy occurs. The way people are treated shapes the kinds of people they become. (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986, p. 36)

There is evidence that people *do* perceive attractive and unattractive people differently. In a classic experiment, social psychologists showed college students yearbook photographs of men and women who varied markedly in appearance and asked them about their first impressions of the people depicted. Young adults assumed that handsome men and beautiful women must possess nearly all the virtues. The good looking were assumed to be more sociable, outgoing, poised, interesting, exciting, sexually responsive, kind, nurturing, warm, modest, strong, and sensitive than their homely peers. They were also expected to have happier and more fulfilling lives.

Not only do people think that the attractive are special, but they also treat them that way. Clinicians spend more time with good-looking clients. Teachers reward more attractive students with better grades. Executives are more likely to hire and promote good-looking men and women and to pay them higher salaries. The good-looking are more likely to receive assistance when they are in trouble. Attractive criminals are less likely to get caught, to be reported to the authorities, to be found guilty, or to receive strict sentences than are others.

Society's biases give good-looking men and women a marked advantage in intimate relationships, as well. The attractive have an easier time meeting potential dates and mates, attract more appealing dates and mates, and end up with better dating and marital relationships. If, in spite of all these advantages, things go wrong, they find it easier to start anew.

What effect does such stereotyping have on men and women? It turns out that the good-looking and unattractive are not so different as people assume them to be. Self-esteem and self-concept are positively related to how good-looking people *think* they are, but not to actual appearance. In general, the personalities of the attractive and unattractive differ only slightly, if at all.

Attractive and unattractive people *do* seem to differ in one critical respect, however. The good-looking appear to be more confident in romantic and social situations and to possess more social skills than their peers. People expect the good-looking to be charming, so they treat them as if they are. As a consequence, the good-looking become more socially skilled.

This self-fulfilling aspect of physical attractiveness was demonstrated in a classic study by Mark Snyder, E. Tanke, and Ellen Berscheid (1977). Men and women at the University of Minnesota were recruited for a study on the acquaintance process. First, men were given a Polaroid snapshot and biographical information about their partners. In fact, the snapshot was a fake; it depicted either a beautiful or a homely woman. Men were then asked their first impressions of this "potential date." Those who believed they had been assigned a beautiful partner expected her to be sociable, poised, humorous, and socially skilled. Those who thought they had been assigned an unattractive partner expected her to be unsociable, awkward, serious, and socially inept. Such prejudice is not surprising; it is known that good-looking people make exceptionally good first impressions.

The next set of findings, however, was startling. Men were asked to get acquainted with their partners via a telephone call. Men's expectations had a dramatic impact on the way they talked to their partners. Men who thought they were talking to a beautiful woman were more sociable, sexually warm, interesting, independent, sexually permissive, bold, outgoing, humorous, and socially skilled than were men who thought their partner was homely. The men assigned to an attractive woman were also more comfortable, enjoyed themselves more, liked their partners more, took the initiative more often, and used their voices more effectively. In brief, men who thought they were talking to a beautiful woman tried harder.

Within the space of a telephone conversation, women (regardless of their true appearance) became what men expected them to be. Women

who were talked to as if they were beautiful soon began to sound that way. They became unusually animated, confident, and socially skilled. Those who were treated as if they were unattractive became withdrawn, lacked confidence, and seemed awkward.

The men's prophecies had been fulfilled.

A final observation: The evidence makes it clear that the good looking have an advantage. However, a careful analysis of existing data makes it clear that the relationship between appearance and advantage is not a straightforward one. The extremely attractive have only a small advantage over their more ordinary peers. What is really important is to be at least average. Alas, it is the unattractive and the disfigured who suffer the greatest social costs of prejudice.

References

- Gangestad, S. W. & Scheyd, G. J. (2005). The evolution of human physical attractiveness. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34, 523-548.
- Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1986). *Mirror, mirror: The importance of looks in everyday life*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Langlois, J. H. & Roggman, L. A. (1990). Attractive faces are only average. *Psychological Science*, 1, 115-121.
- Marquardt, S. R. (2002) See www.beautyanalysis.com.
- Rhodes, G., & Zebrowitz, L. A. (2002). (Eds.) *Facial attractiveness: Evolutionary, cognitive, and social perspectives*. (*Advances in visual cognition*, v. 1). Westport, CN: Ablex.
- Snyder, M., Berscheid, E., & Glick, P. (1985). Focusing on the exterior and the interior: Two investigations of the initiation of personal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 1427-1439.
- Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 656-666.
- Thornhill, R. and S. Gangestad, S. (1993). Human facial beauty: Averageness, symmetry and parasite resistance. *Human Nature*, 4, 237-269.

Suggested Readings

- Gangestad, S. W. & Scheyd, G. J. (2005). The evolution of human physical attractiveness. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34, 523-548.
- Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1986). *Mirror, mirror: The importance of looks in everyday life*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 656-666.

Five Key Words: Beauty, Handsomeness, Human Sexuality,
Evolutionary Psychology, Facial symmetry.