Attractiveness and Income for Men and Women in Management[1]

IRENE HANSON FRIEZE,[2] JOSEPHINE E. OLSON, AND JUNE RUSSELL

Department of Psychology and
Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business
University of Pittsburgh

It is commonly believed that attractive people are more successful, but the empirical support for this belief is mixed. A number of role-playing, laboratory studies have demonstrated that more attractive men are more often hired, but the laboratory data for women are less consistent. Few studies have explored the effects of attractiveness on actual hiring and starting salaries for men or women. Even less work has been done on the impact of attractiveness once on the job. It was predicted that there would be positive effects for attractiveness and that the effects would be stronger as people worked longer on their jobs. To test this prediction, a sample of 737 male and female MBA graduates from the years between 1973 and 1982 was used to explore how facial attractiveness relates to starting and later salaries. Results indicated that more attractive men had higher starting salaries and they continued to earn more over time. For women, there was no effect of attractiveness for starting salaries, but more attractive women earned more later on in their jobs. By 1983, men were found to earn $2600 more on the average for each unit of attractiveness (on a 5-point scale) and women earned $2150 more. Implications for research in this area are discussed.

Does physical appearance relate to one's success in business? Is the impact greater at the time of hiring or later in one's career? Are the effects of attractiveness equally important for men and women? This paper addresses these questions in a study of MBA graduates and their careers after leaving graduate school.

There is good reason to suspect that attractiveness will affect hiring, salary, and career success. In general, people tend to be favorably biased toward those who are good-looking (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986). And, as in other social situations, we respond differently to attractive and unattractive individuals in a work setting. There is much discussion in

[1]Portions of this paper were presented at the 1989 Academy of Management Meetings in Washington, D.C. This study was supported in part by funding from the Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business and the Office of Research at the University of Pittsburgh.

[2]Requests for reprints should be addressed to Irene H. Frieze, Department of Psychology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1991, **21**, 13, pp. 1039-1057.

popular media of bias in hiring such that attractive people or those who "look the part" are given greater job preference (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986).

Laboratory studies provide a general confirmation for the hypothesis that attractive people are more likely to be hired for a variety of jobs, although the findings are not entirely consistent. The large majority of the role-playing, laboratory studies have relied on photographs selected as attractive or unattractive in their manipulation of appearance. In one of the early and widely cited studies, Dipboye, Arvey, and Terpstra (1977) had undergraduate students rate resumes for a trainee job in sales management. Photographs that varied in attractiveness were attached to the resumes. The resumes also varied in the level of applicant qualification for the job. Attractive candidates and males were more often recommended for hiring and were given higher salary ratings by the role-playing undergraduate students. The attractiveness effects were greatest for the unqualified applicants. When asked to choose only one candidate, the highly-qualified, attractive male was the most often selected. However, the next most often selected candidate, especially by women raters, was the highly-qualified, *unattractive* female applicant. Such data demonstrate the effects of attractiveness and possible interactions with sex for initial hiring decisions.

Other laboratory studies have replicated the Dipboye et al. findings of positive effects for attractiveness in hiring decisions and for later decisions about promotions (Gifford, Ng, & Wilkenson, 1985; Gilmore, Beehr, & Love, 1986; Heilman & Stopeck, 1985; Riggio & Throckmorton, 1988). Such studies have identified two important moderators of such effects: sex of the candidate and type of job. In one study demonstrating these moderating variables, Heilman and Saruwatari (1979) asked college students to role play personnel decisionmakers for a large insurance company. A significant three-way interaction suggested that the attractive males were always rated higher, but being attractive was beneficial only for the women applying for a clerical rather than a managerial position. Looking at the managerial job, since this is of most relevance for the research reported in this paper, the attractive male candidate and the unattractive female candidate were rated as having equally good qualifications. The unattractive male was rated as least qualified and least hireable, at least for the managerial position.

Heilman and Saruwatari (1979) indicated that the effects of attractiveness were due largely to underlying beliefs about the feminity or masculinity of the person that had been assumed on the basis of their

physical appearance. Attractive males were seen as more masculine than unattractive males. Unattractive women were also seen as more masculine than attractive women. The attractive males and unattractive females were rated as more motivated, unemotional, and decisive than their same-sex counterparts. Since these are thought to be desirable qualities for a manager, it is not surprising that these candidates were the most preferred for the managerial job.

Although laboratory studies have been very important in developing an understanding of the process by which being good-looking may lead to being hired or promoted, they are necessarily limited by their very artificiality. In the real world, people choose what jobs to apply for and manipulations to produce candidates varying noticeably in physical appearance are not possible. The question then becomes one of seeing if attractiveness effects can be shown to operate in actual workplaces.

In one of the rare studies of actual hiring, Raza and Carpenter (1987) asked eight industrial interviewers to make ratings of job applicants as part of their regular duties. In this study, there were significant correlations between attractiveness and general "employability" for both male and female job applicants. But, for ratings of "hireability" for the specific job, the correlation with attractiveness was significant only for male applicants. Through path analysis, they demonstrated that, at least for their data, physical attractiveness affects liking, which in turn affects the hiring decision.

A few studies have examined the impact of attractiveness once on the job. In an unpublished study using national survey data, Quinn (1978, cited in Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986) found that "strikingly handsome" or "good-looking" men earned more than "average" looking men, who in turn earned more than "quite plain" or "homely" men. A similar tendency was found for attractive women to earn more. Dickey-Bryant, Lautenschlager, Mendoza, and Abrahams (1986) used yearbook pictures of men in a military service academy and related them to the military ranks of the men 12 years later. For this sample of male pictures, there was no relationship overall between the attractiveness of the pictures and the rank obtained. For those still in the military service, there was actually a small negative correlation. But, for those who had left the service, there was a small, nonsignificant positive correlation. However, the authors cautioned against overinterpretation of the lack of results since there was little variance in the military ranks obtained.

In a field study of actual employees that did find effects of attractiveness, Ross and Ferris (1981) used data on the height, weight, and

attractiveness of male accountants working for a public accounting firm. Photographs were used to assess facial attractiveness. None of these appearance variables were found to affect salary. However, the taller and more facially attractive men were judged by their superiors as being more likely to be made partners in the firm. Ross and Ferris suggested that the more subjective forms of evaluation, such as the supervisor ratings of partner potential, were most affected by the appearance of the person.

Our own earlier work has also shown some attractiveness effects, at least for men. In a study using the larger sample of MBAs from which this current study is drawn, Frieze, Olson, and Good (1990) assessed the effects of height and weight on starting salaries and later salaries of MBA students. These data showed that being currently overweight (a measure of unattractiveness) had a significantly negative effect on male salaries, but not on female salaries. Height had a significantly positive effect on men's salaries but not on women's. Furthermore, the effects of height and weight were greater for their later salaries than for their starting salaries. However, this earlier study utilized data on current weight, not weight at the time of hiring. These appearance variables in Frieze et al. were also based on self-reports of the people themselves, not on "objective" external ratings.

An important theoretical and practical question is why these attractiveness effects occur. Research by Snyder (1984) may give us the answer. Snyder, in an extensive review of social-psychological research, has shown us that our assumptions and beliefs about someone affect the way we respond to that person. A very important determinant of our initial interactions and reactions to someone is his or her physical appearance (Miller, 1988; Snyder, 1984). It is often assumed that physically attractive persons have more socially pleasing personalities than the unattractive and that they will be more professionally successful (Dermer & Thiel, 1975; Dion, Berscheid, & Walster, 1972). Whereas we think of attractive people as having a number of positive traits, unattractive individuals are perceived as socially deviant and as having other negative characteristics (e.g., Moore, Graziano, & Millar, 1987; Unger, Hilderbrand, & Madar, 1982). Because of these beliefs, we tend to be more positive in our interactions with others of either sex who are attractive (Snyder, 1984).

Snyder goes on to argue that we are greatly affected by the way in which others treat us. If others are supportive and warm to us, because they see us as having positive qualities, we are in turn encouraged to act

in a more self-confident, friendly manner. Thus, the positive expectations of others create a self-fulfilling prophecy. Snyder's "beliefs create reality" theory would predict the effects of attractiveness should be greater over time. If some people react to more attractive individuals in a more positive way, and the attractive people, in turn, respond to this with socially desirable behavior (e.g., Goldman & Lewis, 1977), such individuals should then be seen in a more positive light by other people as well as by those who had initially viewed them favorably. And, the positive characteristics of the attractive individuals may be objectively greater.

As reported above, the effects of physical appearance have been most studied in laboratory settings. In this type of controlled environment, attractiveness effects can be isolated from other confounding factors. In the real world, true performance and ability affect evaluations (Jussim, 1989). Furthermore, more subtle processes may be operating. For example, Spencer and Taylor (1988) have found that in laboratory studies, students make different attributions about the good and bad performances of attractive and unattractive individuals. Such effects need to be studied in actual work environments.

As this review of previous research has shown, attractiveness does not always operate in the same way for women as for men in simulated work environments, nor in the actual workplace. The beneficial effects are more consistently found for men and may also depend on the type of job. And the underlying assumptions about the personalities of attractive women may not always be parallel to those of attractive men (Heiman & Saruwatari, 1979; Heilman & Stopeck, 1985; Jackson & Cash, 1985). In some cases, laboratory studies have shown negative effects of attractiveness for women's being hired or promoted, but such effects have not been replicated in field studies.

This leads us to the following hypotheses:

1. There will be a general positive effect of attractiveness on initial salaries and later salaries.
2. The effects of attractiveness will be greater for those on the job for some time than for those first being hired.
3. The effects of attractiveness will be greater for men than for women.

The study reported here tests these hypotheses and attempts to clarify our existing knowledge about the role of attractiveness in the

workplace in several ways. First, we look at actual working people, with real salary data. Our sample is an alumni group of MBA graduates over a 10-year period, beginning with 1973 graduates. Second, we control in a general way for job area by using a group of MBA graduates, most of whom are working in managerial or other business-related occupations. As noted above, effects vary across different types of jobs in laboratory studies. Third, we use more experienced individuals as raters rather than relying on undergraduate students. Other studies have questioned the validity of using undergraduate raters and have found that they do not agree with more experienced personnel staff (Gifford et al., 1985; Gilmore et al., 1986). In our research, the raters were asked to rate photos of our sample taken from their MBA picture books. One dependent variable is starting salary after earning the MBA, adjusted for inflation. We also look at later salary, specifically the salary these MBAs were earning in 1983.

Method

Attractiveness Ratings

Photos of 737 MBAs (452 men and 285 women) were rated for facial attractiveness on a 5-point scale from 1 = very unattractive to 5 = very attractive. The photographs were in picture books of full-time MBA students taken at the beginning of their matriculation in an MBA program at a large Middle Atlantic university. About 3/4 of an inch by 1 inch in size, these photos show head and shoulders of the MBAs dressed in business attire.

There were four raters, two men and two women. One of the men was a management consultant in his forties with 15 years of previous experience. The other three were graduate students in their twenties and thirties, with two to eight years of prior business experience. The raters had no familiarity with the MBAs being rated, the MBAs were identified only by number, and no other information was available to the raters. The four ratings were averaged for each MBA photo. The alpha reliability coefficient for all raters over the entire sample was .78. For the pictures of men, the alpha over the four raters was .76 and for the pictures of women, .81. Test-retest reliability correlations ranged from .73 to .82. Such values are consistent with reliabilities published in other studies employing attractiveness ratings (e.g., Dickey-Bryant, et al., 1986; Riggio & Throckmorton, 1988).

Career and Salary Information

In the spring of 1984, a questionnaire was sent to 2047 of the 1973 to 1982 graduates of the three MBA programs (full-time, part-time and executive) at this Middle Atlantic university. After two follow-up mailings we received 1433 questionnaires giving us a response rate of 70%. In this study we used only the 737 full-time MBA students for whom we had photographs. The women tended to be slightly younger and to have graduated more recently than the men. The median age of the men at the time of the survey was 31 and the median year of graduation was 1978; for women, the median age was 30 and the median year of graduation was 1979. Because some of these men and women were not working full time at the time of the survey or had missing data, the actual numbers used in the later regression analyses are less than 737.

In the questionnaire, the MBAs were asked a variety of questions about their jobs, including years of work experience before and after their MBA, their starting and current (1983) salaries, and type of job they held. They were also asked a number of demographic questions including their sex, height, and weight. This information was then matched to the attractiveness ratings for the 737 MBAs.

Results

Tests of Hypotheses

Our first prediction was that there would be a positive effect of the average attractiveness ratings on the starting and later salaries of MBAs. We tested this by estimating regression equations to explain starting salaries and 1983 salaries of the MBAs. Since starting salaries varied from 1973 to 1983, a period of substantial inflation, we adjusted the nominal starting salary reported on the basis of the Consumer Price Index for the year of the starting salary. This allowed us to obtain equivalent starting salaries in 1983 prices. We hypothesized that facial attractiveness might have differential effects on men and women's salaries. To test whether the salary relationships for men and women were the same or different, we applied an F test known as the Chow Test (Chow, 1960, described in Koutsoyiannis, 1977) to the residuals of the salary regressions (both starting and 1983 salaries) for men and women estimated separately and together. At the 95% confidence level, the results indicated the salary relationships for men and women were

different. We therefore estimated separate regressions for men and women.

In addition to the average attractiveness ratings, other control variables were included in the regressions. These were general work experience variables which we had found in our earlier research were important economic determinants of salaries (e.g., Olson, Frieze, & Good, 1987) and which were unlikely to be correlated with attractiveness. For starting salaries, we included years of prior full-time work experience before earning the MBA and the year in which the MBA took his or her first post-MBA full-time job. The former variable allows for the fact that experienced MBAs usually attain higher starting salaries upon graduation. The latter variable allows for the possibility of linear trends in real starting salaries. For the current (1983) salary, the two work experience variables were years of full-time work experience before the MBA and years of full-time work experience after the MBA. Inclusion of the latter variable results from the observation that salaries generally rise with post-MBA work experience. A second set of regressions on current salary included the MBAs' starting salary after the MBA (not adjusted for inflation) because our earlier study showed it too had a significant effect on later salary.

Our regression results for men (Equation 1, Table 1) show, as predicted, that facial attractiveness had a positive and significant effect on a male MBA's inflation-adjusted annual starting salary. Each unit increase in his average attractiveness rating tended to raise his annual salary by $1100. Thus a man with an above-average facial rating (4) tended to earn about $2200 more than a man with a below-average rating (2). As found in our earlier work, full-time work experience prior to the MBA degree had a significantly positive effect on a man's starting salary and inflation-adjusted starting salaries declined significantly over the time period studied.

In contrast to the regression equation for men, the regression equation for women (Equation 2) indicates that the average attractiveness ratings did not have a significant effect on women's inflation-adjusted starting salaries. As in earlier studies, the two work-experience variables are significant and their coefficients are similar to those for the men, though somewhat smaller in magnitude. It should also be noted that although the overall regression equation for women's starting salaries is statistically significant ($F_{3,256} = 8.47$, $p < .001$), little of the variance in women MBAs' starting salaries is explained (Adjusted R^2 is only .08).

Overall, these results support the first hypothesis of positive effects

of attractiveness for salaries, at least for men. They also provide evidence in support of the third hypothesis that the attractiveness effects would be more consistent for men than for women and would show higher coefficients.

Our second hypothesis was that the effects of facial attractiveness on salaries would increase over time. Again, this was tested separately for men and women. The regression equation for men's 1983 salaries (Equation 3) shows that the facial attractiveness variable is significant and the magnitude of its coefficient is greater than in the equation for starting salaries. Each unit increase in a man's average attractiveness rating (as an MBA student) tended to raise his 1983 salary by $2600. Thus a man with an above average rating (4) would tend to earn $5200 more a year than a man with a below average rating (2). A man with a very high rating (5) might earn $10,000 more annually than a man with a very low rating (1). However, when nominal starting salary was added to the salary equation (Equation 5), the size of the attractiveness coefficient dropped from 2.60 to 1.67 and the significance level fell to a marginal .106. This shows that most of the effect of attractiveness on men's later salaries was due to its impact on starting salaries; nevertheless, attractive men continue to receive higher salaries over time. (Attractive men's salaries increased as a percent of average salary as well as absolutely.) Also, the starting salary coefficient itself is equal to 0.95 and is highly significant ($p < .011$), indicating in general that higher starting salaries for men mean higher later salaries. Once starting salary is controlled for, years of work experience prior to the MBA is no longer significant, but years of full-time work experience since the MBA is highly significant in both equations.

For women, attractiveness also had a significant positive effect on their later salaries (Equation 4). Each unit increase in a woman's average attractiveness rating (as an MBA student) raised her average by more than $2100 a year. Thus a woman with an above average rating (4) tended to earn $4200 more than a woman with a below average rating (2). The work experience variables are both positive and statistically significant. Adding starting salary to the women's regression equation for 1983 salaries (Equation 6) had little effect on the magnitude and significance of the attractiveness coefficient. This again indicates that women's facial attractiveness had little effect on their starting salary, but a substantial effect on their later salaries. Also, starting salary had a significant effect on women's later salary but the coefficient is smaller than for men (.40 vs. .95), and years of prior work experience still has a

Table 1

Salary Regression Coefficients for MBAs Working Full Time[1] *(in thousands of dollars per year)*

	Inflation-adjusted starting salary		1983 Salary		1983 Salary with starting salary	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Number of cases	423	260	412	219	412	219
Equation number	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Adjusted R^2	0.26	0.08	0.21	0.39	0.28	0.45
Facial attractiveness	1.13*	0.28	2.60*	2.15*	1.67	2.00*
	(2.41)	(0.45)	(2.42)	(2.71)	(1.62)	(2.65)
Work experience variables						
Year of first post-MBA job	-0.77*	-0.59*	—	—	—	—
	(8.28)	(3.67)				
Years of full-time work prior to MBA	0.92*	0.66*	0.38#	0.76*	-0.04	0.57*
	(9.73)	(4.23)	(1.88)	(4.12)	(0.21)	(3.17)
Years of full-time work since MBA	—	—	2.31*	2.38*	3.29*	2.83*
			(10.40)	(11.60)	(12.85)	(13.04)
Starting salary after MBA	—	—	—	—	0.95*	0.40*
					(6.74)	(4.78)
Constant	82.12*	70.08*	16.43	13.79*	3.67	4.84
	(11.64)	(5.44)	(4.48)	(5.09)	(0.80)	(1.52)

[1] t values in parentheses.

* $t > 1.960$, $p < .05$.

marginal significance, $t > 1.645$, $p < .10$.

Table 2

Salary Regression Coefficients Including Height and Weight[1] *(in thousands of dollars per year)*

	Inflation-adjusted starting salary		1983 Salary		1983 Salary with starting salary	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Number of cases	423	260	412	219	412	219
Equation number	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Adjusted R^2	0.26	0.08	0.21	0.39	0.29	0.44
Physical characteristics						
Facial attractiveness	1.00*	0.13	2.31*	1.96*	1.47	1.91*
	(2.13)	(0.20)	(2.14)	(2.36)	(1.42)	(2.42)
Height in inches	0.02	0.06	0.43#	0.17	0.42#	0.14
	(0.17)	(0.32)	(1.71)	(0.81)	(1.75)	(0.70)
Overweight dichotomous variable	-2.17*	-1.93	-3.80	-1.18	-2.38	-0.40
	(2.00)	(1.20)	(1.50)	(0.60)	(0.98)	(0.21)
Work experience variables						
Year of first post-MBA job	-0.77*	-0.62*	—	—	—	—
	(8.28)	(3.81)				
Years of full-time work prior to MBA	0.95*	0.68*	0.38#	0.77*	-0.04	0.58*
	(9.73)	(4.34)	(1.90)	(4.16)	(0.21)	(3.19)
Years of full-time work since MBA	—	—	2.31*	2.39*	3.29*	2.83*
			(10.46)	(11.60)	(12.82)	(13.80)
Starting salary after MBA	—	—	—	—	0.94*	0.39*
					(6.64)	(4.69)
Constant	81.14*	69.34*	-12.93	3.58	-32.33#	-3.69
	(7.94)	(16.76)	(0.72)	(0.27)	(1.85)	(0.28)

[1] t values in parentheses.

* $t > 1.960$, $p < .05$.

marginal significance, $t > 1.645$, $p < .10$.

significant but somewhat smaller coefficient than in Equation 4. Years of full-time work experience since the MBA is again positive and highly significant. These findings for later salaries suggest that our second hypothesis, that attractiveness effects increase over time, is strongly supported for women (but only weakly for men).

Exploratory Analyses

Our data also allowed us to test for some other effects of attractiveness that were not explicitly predicted. First, we looked at other measures of attractiveness than the photographs. One might argue that height is an indicator of attractiveness for males. Height can convey dominance information, with taller males being seen as more dominant. Dominance in men is typically evaluated positively (e.g., Frieze & Ramsey, 1976). Being overweight is further proposed as a negative attractiveness indicator for both sexes (e.g., Frieze et al., 1990). How do these factors interact with facial appearance? In order to assess how these other physical characteristics affected salaries, Equations 1 to 6 were reestimated including the MBA's height in inches and a dichotomous variable for being 20% or more overweight along with the attractiveness variable (see Table 2).

Height was found to have no effect on starting salaries of male MBAs, but being overweight had a significant negative effect (Equation 7). Being 20% or more overweight reduced a male MBA's inflation-adjusted starting salary by over $2000. Height and weight had no significant effect on women's starting salaries (Equation 8).

In our earlier study of these same MBAs, but with a larger sample, we had found significant effects of height and weight for the starting salaries of men (but no effects for women) (Frieze et al., 1990).[3] However, this earlier data included part-time and executive MBAs whose "starting" job after the MBA was often the same job they had before earning the MBA. In addition, that study did not include the facial ratings. Aside from effects due to the somewhat different samples, the inconsistencies between the two studies may also reflect a splitting of the variance associated with physical factors when multiple measures are included. This can be seen by comparing the facial rating coefficients in Tables 1 and 2.

[3]We also looked for a possible ceiling effect for height to see if the effects were curvilinear, but no nonlinear effects were found.

With respect to the 1983 salaries of men (Equation 9), the height and weight coefficients were similar in magnitude to our earlier study (0.43 vs. 0.57 for height and -3.80 vs. -4.04 for being overweight). However, the significance levels of the coefficients were reduced when attractiveness ratings were included. Height is now only marginally significant ($p < .09$) and the overweight variable is no longer significant ($p < .14$). When the attractiveness rating is excluded from the regression equation, the overweight coefficient is -4.48 and the significance level is $p < .077$; there is little change in the height coefficient. When we added starting salary to the regression equation for men's 1983 salary (Equation 1), the coefficient for being overweight was further reduced in magnitude and significance, as was again the coefficient for attractiveness; the height coefficient was unchanged. This suggests that for men facial attractiveness and weight have their primary influence through their effect on starting salaries and that height's effect on salary takes place later, rather than at the initial hiring. For women, again height and being overweight had no effect on later salaries (Equations 10 and 12).

As noted earlier, one of the variables identified by other researchers that might affect attractiveness is the specific type of job (Bull & Ramsey, 1988; Heilman & Saruwatari, 1979; Heilman & Stopeck, 1985). Although we did not have a large range of diverse job areas and job levels in our sample, we did see if the variations in jobs that were present in our sample related to attractiveness. One question is whether more attractive people are differentially hired for some jobs more than for others. Commonly held stereotypes suggest that it is more important to be attractive for sales and less relevant for jobs that require less face-to-face contact such as data processing. We did a two-way analysis of variance of the facial attractiveness ratings by sex and by the six major job areas in which the MBAs were employed (general management, marketing/sales, accounting, finance, data processing and production/engineering). Although the average scores for marketing and finance were the highest (2.93 and 2.94 respectively) and the average score for data processing was the lowest (2.70), there were no statistically significant main effects for job area and sex and no significant interaction effects. One-way analysis of variance with Scheffe tests for each sex separately indicated none of the average facial attractiveness ratings for each job area was significantly different at the .05 level from any of the other average ratings by job area. A *t*-test on the attractiveness ratings by whether the job was line or staff also showed no significant differences for either sex. Thus, there does not appear to be significant evidence

that facial attractive affects the type of job an MBA has.

The possibility of a relationship between attractiveness and the type of industry in which the MBAs worked was also tested. We did an analysis of variance of attractiveness on seventeen industry categories (described in Olson, Frieze, & Good, 1987) and on sex. There were very marginal main effects for industry ($F_{16,635} = 1.279$, $p < .205$) but no effects for sex and no interaction effects. The industries with the highest average attractiveness ratings included: Other Heavy Industry (3.04); Mining and Construction (3.01); Consulting (2.99); and Banking (2.97). The lowest average attractiveness ratings were for: Not-for-Profit and Government (2.59); Educational Institutions (2.62); and Other Services (2.66). These results suggest a tendency for the less attractive MBAs to be employed outside mainstream business industries.

Discussion

Our data support earlier stereotype research that "beautiful is good" for managers of both sexes. We find the predicted positive effect for more attractive MBAs of both sexes to earn more once on the job, and for men to make higher starting salaries. The theoretical model proposed by Snyder (1984) that the effects should increase over time was also supported, especially for women. For both sexes, being attractive resulted in relatively higher salaries after some years on the job than it did at the time of initial hiring. We had also expected, based on previous research, that women would show less strong results than men. This was also confirmed for starting salaries but not so clearly for later salaries. Although Jussim's (1989) test of Snyder's self-fulfilling prophecy model in an educational setting yielded mixed results, our data suggest that Snyder's laboratory-based model can apply in some real world environments.

Our overall pattern of results in this study is inconsistent with some of the earlier role-playing, laboratory studies. In the real world, variables are more complex and less controlled. One explanation for the inconsistencies between our data and the findings of laboratory studies of attractiveness effects may be that the photographs that are so commonly used in the laboratory do not accurately reflect actual appearance and may be inadvertently communicating other than the intended information. Many elements go into the judgment of attractiveness of facial photographs (Cunningham, 1986; McArthur, 1982). Hatfield and Sprecher (1986) argue that laboratory manipulations of attractiveness through the

use of facial photographs may be confounding facial attractiveness with appropriateness of dress and hair styles. Attractive women may not appear business-like in some of the studies relying on photos to manipulate attractiveness. Our study used photographs of MBA students taken for the class picture book. Students were told to dress in business attire for the photos. Thus, the MBA students may have purposefully dressed in a manner more consistent with their later work appearance than they might have typically appeared as a student.

The Snyder model utilized in this research assumes that underlying beliefs about people based on their physical appearance affect their judgments and behavior toward those individuals. A crucial question, then, for future research is what those underlying beliefs are and how they specifically operate (McArthur, 1982). Some work indicates that the beliefs about attractive individuals are complex and not completely positive (Bassili, 1981). Different aspects of appearance may also carry their own stereotypes. Our earlier research data suggest that body form also affects salary, but the effects are not always consistent with one another (Frieze et al., 1990). Freeman (1985) finds that different stereotypes are associated with those who are facially attractive and those with attractive physiques. Other studies have demonstrated that there are unique stereotypes associated with being overweight (e.g., Allon, 1982; Harris, Harris, & Bochner, 1982) and with wearing glasses (Harris et al., 1982). Male baldness also affects perceptions (Cash, 1990). Further work is needed to investigate the interactive effects of various aspects of physical appearance.

As briefly discussed earlier, there is some evidence that the preference for attractive job applicants or job holders may be related to underlying assumptions being made about the masculinity or feminity of the person (Heilman & Saruwatari, 1979; Heilman & Stopeck, 1985). Other research supports this idea. In an experimental study using college students as subjects, Gillen (1981) found that more attractive males were seen as more masculine, and more attractive females were seen as more feminine. In another study to directly assess the effects of attractiveness on inferred personality, Jackson and Cash (1985) created personality profiles that varied on gender role behavior and gender. Each was accompanied by a photograph previously selected as high, moderate, or low in attractiveness. College students were asked to rate the individuals identified by each of the profiles on a variety of attributes. It was found that the more attractive males were rated as more masculine, even though separate information had been given about their

masculine role behavior. Similarly, more attractive females were rated as more feminine. This work further supports the idea that people believe that attractiveness communicates much information about personality and that the effects of physical appearance are different for men and women.

The findings of our research apply to people with MBA degrees, most of whom are employed in business jobs. How specific are these data to this type of occupation? This practical question needs to be further investigated. As discussed earlier in the paper, laboratory studies find different effects of attractiveness for different types of jobs. Perhaps a matching model operates where assumptions about the characteristics of the person are fitted to the perceived demands of the job? Some of this may occur simply on the basis of appearance. Other evidence shows appearance stereotypes of people in specific occupations (Goldstein, Chance, & Gilbert, 1984). Given the limited range of managerial jobs studied in this paper, we were unable to explore such differences.

Jackson (1983) further supports this matching idea in a field study using personnel consultants as raters. Simulated employee files were created and rated for promotions, for special training programs, and for other job requests. These files included a wallet-sized photo of the person and information about various personality traits. The masculine occupations used in the study were computer systems analyst and operations researcher. The feminine occupations were dietician and bank teller. Jackson found that for the masculine jobs, males and females described as having masculine or androgynous personality characteristics were more highly recommended for promotion and for challenging job assignments. Attractiveness had no direct effect on any of the ratings. This would support the idea that it was the assumptions about underlying personality characteristics that were being manipulated by the photos and that feminine individuals were seen as more appropriate for female jobs and masculine individuals for male jobs.

Thus, there are a number of issues that need further research relating to attractiveness and specific jobs. There is another practical and theoretical issue that might also be addressed. Not everyone is equally affected by physical appearance in responding to others (Snyder, Berscheid, & Matwychuk, 1988). These individual difference effects are important in verifying the theoretical assumptions being made about the effects of appearance. The Snyder et al. study suggests that some people are less affected by appearance overall. Other work by Cash and Kilcullen (1985) indicates that those with the highest levels of sex stereotyping

are more affected by the assumed relationship between attractiveness and femininity/masculinity and tend to be more likely to commit "beautyism."

Finally, although we do find positive effects for attractiveness in our research, and such effects translate into real differences in salary levels between more and less attractive managers, attractiveness is certainly not the only determinant of salary. As Bull and Rumsey (1988) not in their review, attractiveness effects contribute only a small proportion of variance in field and laboratory studies. Many other variables such as work experience are far more important in determining how large one's salary will be.

References

Allon, N. (1982). The stigma of overweight in everyday life. In B.B. Wolman & S. DeBerry (Eds.). *Psychological aspects of obesity: A handbook* (pp. 130-174). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Bassili, J.N. (1982). The attractiveness stereotype: Goodness or glamour? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, **2**, 235-252.

Bull, R., & Rumsey, N. (1988). *The social psychology of facial appearance.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Cash, T.F. (1990). Losing hair, losing points?: The effects of male pattern baldness on social impression formation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **20**, 154-167.

Cash, T.F., & Kilcullen, R. N. (1985). The aye of the beholder: Susceptibility to sexism and beautyism in the evaluation of managerial applicants. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **15**, 591-605.

Chow, G.C. (1960). Tests of equality between sets of coefficients in two linear regressions. *Econometrica*, **28**, 591-605. [Cited in Koutsoyiannis (1977).]

Cunningham, M.R. (1986). Measuring the physical in physical attractiveness: Quasi-experiments on the sociobiology of female beauty. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **50**, 925-935.

Dermer, M., & Thiel, D.L. (1975). When beauty may fail. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **31**, 1168-1176.

Dickey-Bryant, L., Lautenschlager, G.J. Mendoza, J.L., & Abrahams, N. (1986). Facial attractiveness and its relation to occupational success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **71**, 16-19.

Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **24**, 285-290.

Dipboye, R.L., Arvey, R.D., & Terpstra, D.E. (1977). Sex and physical

attractiveness of raters and applicants as determinants of resume evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **62**, 288-294.

Freeman, H.R. (1985). Somatic attractiveness: As in other things, moderation is best. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **9**, 311-322.

Frieze, I.H., Olson, J.E., & Good, D.C. (1990). Perceived and actual discrimination in the salaries of male and female managers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **20**, 46-67.

Frieze, I.H., & Ramsey, S.J. (1976). Nonverbal maintenance of traditional sex roles. *Journal of Social Issues*, **32**[3], 133-142.

Gifford, R., Ng, C.F., & Wilkinson, M. (1985). Nonverbal cues in the employment interview: Links between applicant qualities and interviewer judgments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **70**, 729-736.

Gillen, B. (1981). Physical attractiveness: A determinant of two types of goodness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **7**, 277-281.

Gilmore, D.C., Beehr, T.A., & Love, K.G. (1986). Effects of applicant sex, applicant physical attractiveness, type of rater and type of job on interview decisions. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, **59**, 103-109.

Goldman, W., & Lewis, P. (1977). Beautiful is good: Evidence that the physically attractive are more socially skillful. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **13**, 125-130.

Goldstein, A.G., Chance, J.E., & Gilbert, B. (1985). Facial stereotypes of good guys and bad guys: A replication and extension. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, **22**, 549-552.

Harris, M.B., Harris, R.J., & Bochner, S. (1982). Fat, four-eyed, and female: Stereotypes of obesity, glasses and gender. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **12**, 503-516.

Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1986). *Mirror, mirror.... The importance of looks in everyday life*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Heilman, M.E., & Saruwatari, L.R. (1979). When is beauty beastly: The effects of appearance and sex on evaluations of job applicants for managerial and nonmanagerial jobs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, **23**, 360-372.

Heilman, M.E., & Stopeck, M.H. (1985). Being attractive, advantage or disadvantage? Performance based evaluations and recommended personnel actions as a function of appearance, sex and job type. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **35**, 202-215.

Jackson, L.A. (1983). *Sex, attractiveness, and sex role in occupational treatment discrimination*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim, CA.

Jackson, L.A., & Cash, T.F. (1985). Components of gender stereotypes: Their implications for inferences on stereotypic and nonstereotypic

dimensions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **11**, 326-344.

Jussim, L. (1989). Teacher expectations: Self-fulfilling prophecies, perceptual biases, and accuracy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **57**, 469-480.

Koutsoyiannis, A. (1977). *Theory of econometrics* (2d ed.). New York, MacMillan.

McArthur, L.Z. (1982). Judging a book by its cover: A cognitive analysis of the relationship between physical appearance and stereotyping. In A. Hastorf & A. Isen (Eds.), *Cognitive social psychology* (pp. 149-211). New York: Elsevier North-Holland.

Miller, C.T. (1988). Categorization and the physical attractiveness stereotype. *Social Cognition*, **6**, 231-251.

Moore, J.S., Graziano, W.G., & Millar, M.G. (1987). Physical attractiveness, sex role orientation, and the evaluation of adults and children. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **13** 95-102.

Olson, J.E., Frieze, I.H., & Good, D.C. (1987). The effects of job type and industry on the income of male and female MBAs. *The Journal of Human Resources*, **22**, 532-541.

Quinn, R.P. (1978). *Physical deviance and occupational mistreatment: The short, the fat, and the ugly*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. [Cited in Hatfield & Sprecher.]

Raza, S.M., & Carpenter, B.N. (1987). A model of hiring decisions in real employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **72**, 596-603.

Riggio, R.E., & Throckmorton, B. (1988). The relative effects of verbal and nonverbal behavior, appearance, and social skills on evaluations made in hiring interviews. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **18**, 331-348.

Ross, J., & Ferris, K.R. (1981). Interpersonal attraction and organizational outcomes: A field examination. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **26**, 617-632.

Snyder, M. (1984). When belief creates reality. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, **18**, 247-305.

Snyder, M., Berscheid, E., & Matwychuk, A. (1988). Orientations toward personal selection: Differential reliance on appearance and personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **54**, 972-979.

Spencer, B.A., & Taylor, G.S. (1988). Effects of facial attractiveness and gender on causal attributions of managerial performance. *Sex Roles*, **5/6**, 273-285.

Unger, R.K., Hilderbrand, M., & Madar, T. (1982). Physical attractiveness and assumptions about social deviance: Some sex by sex comparisons. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **8**, 293-310.