Heterosexual Romantic Preferences: The Importance of

Physical Attractiveness and Humour

Duane Emerson Lundy

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts in Psychology

Lakehead University

May, 1994

ProQuest Number: 10611410

ProQuest.

ProQuest 10611410

ISBN   0-315-97057-X

Canada

Acknowledgements

Abstract

Previous research on human mate preferences has found that individuals, especially males, regard physical attractiveness as a very important attribute in potential mates. In contrast, humour, which has also been found to be important, has received scant attention. This study looked at the effects of physical attractiveness and humour on the desire for future interaction in increasingly intimate heterosexual relationships. Physical attractiveness and humour were manipulated using photos of opposite-sex stimulus persons and interview transcripts, respectively. Given that physical attractiveness has been associated with other desirable traits, and that humour may be associated with positive traits such as intelligence and social confidence, subjects' perceptions of the stimulus persons were also assessed through a person-perception questionnaire of socially desirable and undesirable personality traits. Males were found to emphasize high physical attractiveness more than females for sex, dating, and a serious relationship. Humorous individuals were rated as more desirable than nonhumorous individuals for a serious relationship and marriage, but only when these individuals were physically attractive. Physically attractive individuals were perceived to be more

Virtuous (loyal, loving, sincere, passionate, and forgiving) than physically unattractive individuals, and humorous individuals were perceived to be less Ornery (humourless, noncheerful, prejudiced, narrow-minded, cold, and hostile) than nonhumorous individuals.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Introduction

> Each of us owes our very existence to the
> attraction that once existed between a man and a
> woman...
>   Ellen Berscheid

It would be difficult to dispute the fact that most human beings devote a great deal of time and energy to various forms of romantic endeavour. Moreover, most of us probably have a relatively good idea about what we would ideally prefer in a prospective partner. Much research in psychology has focused on which particular attributes individuals tend to value in potential partners. One such attribute which has consistently been shown to be one of the most highly valued is physical attractiveness (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986).

There is also some evidence that humour may be another highly valued attribute (e.g., Hansen, 1977; Simenauer & Carroll, 1982), but it still has been relatively ignored in psychological research. When humour has been implicated in a few studies, it has never been the central focus of attention, but just one of many attributes investigated (e.g., Goodwin, 1990). Yet in all of these studies subjects have mentioned humour as being an important attribute they look for in a romantic partner.

Another focus in this area has been on gender differences in partner preferences. That is, do males and females differ in what they feel is important in a prospective partner? There has been a great deal of evidence that males value physical attractiveness more than females (e.g., Hill, 1945; Smith, Waldorf, & Trembath, 1990). Humour, however, has not been investigated.

This research investigates gender differences in heterosexual romantic preferences based on physical attractiveness and humour. The relevant research findings on these attributes are reviewed below along with a discussion of general issues and problems in the area of romantic preferences research, as well as a detailed description of the methodology and statistical analyses utilized.

One issue that should be mentioned at the outset is the difference between romantic preferences and romantic choices, because these terms are often confused or mistakenly used synonymously. People may know what their ideal preferences would be, but these may often not be realized in real-world interaction. One possibility is that one does not possess the characteristics (e.g., social skills, physical attractiveness, etc.) necessary to achieve one's ideal; another is that one cannot find what one believes to be

a reasonable approximation to one's ideal, so one ends up settling for someone below one's initial hopes or expectations. Alternatively, the fear of being rejected may lead one to approach only others whom one thinks one has a chance of attaining (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986). The main point is that choices may often not coincide with preferences. The research here is an investigation of romantic preferences.

Research Findings: Physical Attractiveness

Research spanning many decades has generally found that males place a greater emphasis on physical attractiveness in potential partners than do females (Hill, 1945; Langhorne & Secord, 1955; McGinnis, 1958; Nevid, 1984; Buss & Barnes, 1986; Smith, et al., 1990), and this difference has been obtained in many different countries (Buss, 1989; Buss & Angleitner, 1989). Only very few studies have found no gender differences along this dimension (e.g., Hatfield, Aronson, Abrahams, & Rottman, 1966, as cited in Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986; Curran & Lippold, 1975). Moreover, a meta-analysis found support for this gender difference across five research paradigms, which included both platonic and romantic liking (Feingold, 1990). Thus, overall there is strong evidence that males place a higher priority on physical attractiveness than do females.

One problem with almost all studies on physical

attractiveness is that no experimental manipulation of the mate characteristics under investigation was carried out. Instead, subjects were usually asked to list, rate, or rank order what they believe to be their preferences. As well, actual mate characteristics such as physical attractiveness and status were not viewed by subjects, i.e., subjects were not confronted with real examples of the independent variables such as through photographs and status descriptions. It is arguable that exposure to real instances of these qualities provides a closer correspondence with mate preferences as they would be developed in everyday interaction (Lundy, 1992). Feingold (1990) cites three studies which are exceptions to this problem, where physical attractiveness was directly manipulated (Byrne, London, & Reeves, 1968; Stroebe, Insko, Thompson, & Layton, 1971; Rosenbaum, 1986). However, the dependent variables in these studies were not specifically related to romantic preferences, but were based on the IJS (Interpersonal Judgment Scale) liking-working composite, i.e., confined mainly to platonic preferences (see Feingold, 1990).

In an attempt to improve on the situation, Sprecher (1989) attempted to manipulate attractiveness and status by using forms completed by individuals who supposedly witnessed 20-30 minute interactions with the

stimulus persons, and then evaluated them in terms of physical attractiveness and status. The weakness of this method is that subjects were not confronted with actual examples of the attributes under investigation (e.g., photos depicting physical attractiveness). Instead, they had to rely on how other people evaluated how attractive the stimulus persons were and how much status they had by conjuring up an instance of the attribute in memory. It's the difference between trying to imagine a beautiful person, and perceiving beauty directly.

It was not until Townsend and Levy (1990) that a study directly manipulated physical attractiveness in the same sample. Attractiveness was manipulated using photos, and socioeconomic status was also manipulated, using biographical descriptions. This study was also relatively unique in that questions were asked about different levels of relationships (see below).

Generally, the most pertinent dependent variable when investigating preferences in an experimental paradigm is, arguably, asking subjects about their desire for future interaction with particular stimulus persons (indicated on a Likert scale), e.g., "Would you like to go on a date with this person?". Townsend and Levy (1990) asked such questions at differing levels of commitment, such as a casual conversation, a date, sex

only, and marriage. This was enlightening because gender differences were not the same at the various levels of commitment. No gender differences were found at the first two levels (conversation and a date) although the effect of attractiveness on female responses reached its pinnacle at these levels. The largest gender differences were observed in a sex-only relationship (coitus). The effect of physical attractiveness on male responses peaked here. From these findings, it becomes obvious that future studies need to incorporate these differing levels of intimacy into the methodology, as gender differences in preferences appear to vary at the different levels.

Overall, in terms of potential partner physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status (SES), Townsend and Levy (1990) came to three conclusions: (1) as sexual involvement and marital potential increase in relationships, so do the effects of a potential partners' SES on female willingness to enter such relationships; (2) high SES "...can equalize the acceptability of less physically attractive men and raise their acceptability to a level only inferior to that of the most physically attractive, high status man" (p. 160); and (3) "a man therefore would have to be very handsome or very ugly for his physical attractiveness to be a decisive determinant of his..."

(p. 160) acceptability to females; however, such extremes in attractiveness do not apply to most men, so SES and willingness to provide resources may be the decisive factor in female preferences.

Lundy (1992) used a similar experimental manipulation using photos and status descriptions. However, only one type of relationship, a long term relationship involving children, was investigated. Some evidence was found for the typical gender patterns, but the findings were more complex. It was found that although females and males equally devalued low attractiveness in potential partners, males valued high attractiveness in a potential partner significantly more than females.

Two other related methods which have been used to study romantic preferences are investigating the placement of personal ads (Smith et al., 1990), and examining the attributes of those who are most often preferred by clients at videodating services (Green, Buchanan, & Heuer, 1984; Davis, 1990). The general finding in these studies is again a greater emphasis on physical attractiveness by males than by females.

There are both inherent advantages and disadvantages with these methods. One advantage is that the preferences espoused by these subjects have real consequences for them, i.e., they are generally

supposed to go on dates with their preferences. Moreover, these people are at the dating service of their own accord. Thus, it is safe to assume that they would take their choices seriously, and there is a lower chance that the subjects' preferences would be made in order to look good to the experimenter(s), which is a potential problem in self-reports (Feingold, 1992). A disadvantage is that these are not random samples and may not be representative of the general population because it is possible that people who join dating services are consistently different from others. For example, they may be more liberal, desperate, etc.

Previous research has also found evidence for a physical attractiveness stereotype or halo effect: physically attractive people are perceived to be higher in other socially desirable attributes, such as kindness, sociability, sexual warmth, happiness, and likability (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986; Myers, 1987). The present research will investigate how physical attractiveness affects how potential romantic partners are perceived in terms of various personality characteristics.

In sum, gender differences in preferences for physical attractiveness in potential mates have been found consistently with males indicating a stronger preference than females. However, direct manipulation

of physical attractiveness in this context, such as through the use of photographs, has been rare. In addition, varying levels of relationships have not usually been investigated.

Research Findings: Humour

There has been a relative paucity of research on the relationship between humour and romantic preferences. The first relevant study conducted was by Hewitt (1958), who found that, of 392 students at one American College, 90% of male students and 81% of female students indicated that a sense of humour was crucial to them in a dating partner, and 83% of males and 87% of females indicated that a sense of humour was crucial to them in a marriage partner. No statistical analyses were conducted, however, so it is not possible to draw any conclusions about gender differences in terms of significance levels. It would be safe to conclude, however, that a sense of humour seems to be very important to a great majority of students, at least at this college. Hence, it is surprising that this study did not spawn more research in this area.

Studies generally have not investigated the role of humour in romantic preferences directly. There has been an abundance of research on humour appreciation, but little on preferences for potential partners to possess a sense of humour. For instance, Murstein

(1985) found a high similarity in humour appreciation among existing couples. Appreciating humour, however, is much different from generating humour (Thorson & Powell, 1993).

Hansen (1977) asked subjects to rank order characteristics desired in a date versus a mate. "Has sense of humour" was overall ranked third out of 33 possibilities for a date and ninth out of 33 for a mate. Laner (1977) conducted a comprehensive study using gay/bisexual and heterosexual male and female subjects. In terms of the percentage of each group that ranked sense of humour in the top half of their priority order for a permanent partner, the following results were obtained: 37.5% for straight males, 39% for straight females, 29% for gay/bisexual males and 42% for gay/bisexual females. The only difference between groups which was significant was that the percentage for gay/bisexual females was greater than the percentage for gay/bisexual males. In both of these 1977 studies, humour revealed itself to be an important attribute to many subjects.

Simenauer and Carroll (1982) asked subjects, "What sort of man/woman turns you off and what sort of man/woman turns you on" (p. 58). It was found that sense of humour was overall ranked higher, as a "turn-on", than any other attribute, and "more than 85

percent of women and 80 percent of men claim sense of humor to be a very important or at least a somewhat important attraction" (p. 60).

Green et al. (1984), using a videodating service sample, looked at member preferences based on objectively rated profile sheets of other members. They found no significant differences in popularity for members rated higher in terms of humour. The investigation of humour by these authors was not without weakness, however. There was not enough information given about what type or types of humour were present in the profile sheets. This is important because certain types of humour may be more closely related to romantic preferences in general, and there may be gender differences in what type of humour is preferred.

Research by Cunningham (1989) only peripherally touched on humour as a factor in romantic attraction. In one facet of this research, various opening lines were used by confederates on patrons in Chicago singles bars. One type of line used was called "cute-flippant", which contained an element of humour, but these lines would have been perceived as obnoxious or offensive by some subjects, e.g., "Bet I can outdrink you", "You remind me of someone I used to date". This may help to explain the finding that this type of line

as a whole was relatively less effective in eliciting positive responses compared to other types of lines used. There were no preratings of how humorous these lines were, which would be necessary to know to what extent humour was a factor in these lines. Nonetheless, interesting gender differences were obtained with the line "You remind me of someone I used to date". Only 31% of female patrons positively responded to this (in terms of engaging in conversation), while 100% of male patrons responded positively. However, these percentages dropped to 17% and 52% respectively in another experiment where Cunningham had university students rate the likelihood that they would talk to a member of the opposite sex given a written scenario of a singles bar. Whether this difference is due to the different subject pools, different methods, or due to the fact that what people say they will do in a given situation can be much different than what they will do in that situation can be highly discrepant, remains to be investigated.

Goodwin (1990) conducted two studies which included an investigation of humour. In the first study, honesty and humour were found to be the most preferred attributes in a boyfriend/girlfriend when subjects were asked to rate the importance of a list of potential attributes on bipolar scales. No gender

differences were found on these attributes. In the
second study, dating agency members were also found to
prefer honesty and humour most highly in a
boyfriend/girlfriend on bipolar scales, and again there
were no gender differences on these two dimensions.
The author concluded that a "kind-considerate-honest-
humorous" mate is the most highly valued.

Kenrick, Sadalla, Groth, and Trost (1990) looked
at a number of possible mate characteristics including
humour at four different levels of involvement: a
single date, sexual relations, steady dating, and
marriage. In terms of specific dependent variables,
"Participants were asked to give the minimum and
maximum percentiles of each characteristic that they
would find acceptable in a partner at each level of
involvement" (p. 103). In terms of the characteristic
"a good sense of humor", average female minimum
percentile standards ranged from 52.37 for a date to
64.37 for marriage, while average male minimum
standards ranged from 52.59 to 61.67. This means that
the subjects preferred a prospective marriage partner
to be above average in terms of the quality of their
sense of humour (e.g., the sixty-first percentile for
males). The minimum standards for humour seem quite
high as compared to other attributes in general, since
the average for all attributes combined (24 in total)

ranged from 35.00 for dating to 56.89 for marriage. Even more impressive is the fact that not a single other attribute had a consistently higher minimum standard than humour, and most were consistently lower. The only significant gender difference for humour occurred for sexual relations, where females had a more stringent minimum standard than did males; that is, females, to a greater extent than males, wanted prospective sexual partners to be higher in humour in relation to the general population. In addition, humour became more important as the level of commitment of the relationship increased. Thus, here is another study that seems to suggest that humour is considered to be a very serious matter when considering potential mates.

Recently, Hampes (1992) conducted a correlational study to investigate the relationship between intimacy and humour. However, intimacy is not directly related to romantic preferences, and why Hampes used the term "humour" is unclear. To measure humour he used the Situational Humour Response Questionnaire (SHRQ; Deckers & Ruch, 1992), which measures the likelihood that subjects would laugh in different situations. However, exactly what the SHRQ measures has been questioned. For example, the relationship between laughter and humour is not clear. Lefcourt and Martin

(1986, as cited in Deckers & Ruch, 1992), for example, noted that humour is not always accompanied by laughter, and laughter can occur in the absence of humour. The nervous laughter manifested by some subjects in Milgram's (1965) obedience experiments is a good example of laughing in the absence of humour. In much earlier research, Stump (1939) cites the work of Scofield (1921) who found that laughter as measured by a pneumograph did not correlate well with judgments of humorous situations. Another consideration is that the SHRQ does not tap an individual's ability to generate humour, which is arguably the most important dimension of humour that would be conducive to romantic attraction. In short, then, Hampes did not actually investigate humour per se but investigated laughter.

Overall, then, there is a relatively small, but growing body of evidence suggesting that humour is important to people in a romantic context. However, humor has never been experimentally manipulated to measure its actual effect on a subject's attraction to another individual. This implies that subjects have never been presented with an actual _instance_ of humour to see how it _affects_ them. Subjects have only previously had to try and think about what attributes are important to them.

Feingold (1992) argues that gender differences in

preferences for physical attractiveness (and status) have been predicted because of their relation to survival and reproduction. In contrast, he believes that humour has essentially no effects on the survival of offspring; thus, no gender differences have been predicted. This may be a large part of the reason why humour has been relatively ignored by researchers: it may be that evolutionary and societal theories about gender differences have provided much of the impetus for research on attractiveness and status. The possibility that humour could somehow be related to survival and reproduction, at least indirectly, should not, however, be prematurely dismissed. For example, it is possible that humour may be indicative of other qualities, such as intelligence, or social confidence, or that humour helps to allay anxiety allowing one to perform various life activities more effectively. It would be profitable to examine such possibilities in the near future.

Summary

In conclusion, relatively consistent gender differences have been obtained in regard to romantic preferences based on physical attractiveness, with males emphasizing attractiveness more than females. These results have been garnered using different methodologies, such as questionnaire studies, analysis

of newspaper advertisements, and experimental manipulations. Most studies, however, did not consider the effect of physical attractiveness on different levels of relationships. In addition, the possible interaction between physical attractiveness and humour has not been investigated. Furthermore, evidence has been found that humour is a very important attribute to males and females, but it has never been manipulated directly.

Present Study

This research investigates the effects of humour and physical attractiveness on the desire for future interaction with an opposite-sex person within five relationships of increasing levels of intimacy: a date, sex, a serious relationship, marriage, and marriage with children. Humour was experimentally manipulated (e.g., via humorous and nonhumorous interview transcripts), to measure its effect on desire for future interaction, and to investigate possible gender differences. One possibility is that females may appreciate humour in a member of the opposite sex more than would a male, and that this gender difference may vary as a function of the intimacy of the relationship between them. Physical attractiveness was manipulated using photographs. The relative importance of humour versus attractiveness was investigated, e.g., will a

physically attractive person be deemed desirable regardless of his/her level of humour or vice versa? As well, possible interactions between physical attractiveness and humour were explored. For example, maybe a keen sense of humour readily compensates for less than average attractiveness. Finally, a measure of person-perception consisting of personality variables was used to investigate how subjects perceived the stimulus persons as a function of their physical attractiveness and humour. A pilot study was first conducted to develop adequate materials for the main study, as described below. For both the main and pilot studies, only subjects who reported their sexual orientation to be heterosexual or bisexual were included in the data analyses, given that the research question bears upon opposite-sex romantic preferences.

Methodology

Pilot Study

The objectives of the pilot study were to test and select personality items, responses to questions, and photos for use in the main study. The personality items were developed into a person-perception questionnaire to assess the degree to which subjects in the main study perceived the stimulus person to possess desirable and undesirable personality traits. The photos and responses were used to manipulate physical

attractiveness and humour, respectively.

Subjects. Pilot data were collected using 22 male and 22 female Lakehead University, second-year psychology undergraduate volunteers. These second-year subjects were used because they were similar in educational level to the first and second-year psychology students that were used in the main study. The average age of the pilot subjects was 24.23 years ($\underline{SD}$ = 5.71). All of them reported their sexual orientation as heterosexual. Hence, all 44 subjects were included in the statistical analyses.

Materials and procedure. In keeping with the first objective, which was to develop a person-perception questionnaire for the main study, pilot subjects had to rate 44 personality items on a 7-point scale for degree of desirability in a potential romantic partner (see Questionnaire 1 in Appendix 1). Items used in this questionnaire were based on a pool of 110 personality-trait words that had been previously rated for social desirability in a study by Bochner and Van Zyl (1984). From these, 22 of the most socially desirable and 22 of the least socially desirable words were presented to the pilot subjects. From these pilot ratings, the 10 most and 10 least romantically desirable words were used in a person-perception questionnaire in the main study (see Questionnaire B in

Appendix 2). Descriptive statistics of these words are given in Table 1.

The second objective for the pilot study was to develop an interview transcript for the humour manipulation in the main study. The pilot subjects rated on a 4-point scale pairs of responses to 15 questions on how humorous they were (see Questionnaire 2 in Appendix 3). A higher rating indicated that the subject found the response to more humorous. Each of the 15 questions in the pilot study had two responses. One response was designed to be humorous, while the other response was more serious in tone. The humorous responses were obtained from books and audio recordings in public circulation (Allen, 1976, 1981, 1986; Burns, 1980).

From the subjects' ratings, four pairs of responses were selected for use in the main study transcript. The choice of responses was determined by taking the four humorous responses (e.g., "Last time I drank I tried to hijack an elevator to Cuba.") whose average humour ratings differed from the average humour ratings of their alternative nonhumorous responses (e.g., "Last time I drank I did some very embarrassing things."). The humorous responses were incorporated into an ostensible interview transcript that was used in the humorous condition and the nonhumorous responses

into a similar interview transcript for the nonhumorous condition (see Appendix 4).

Using t-tests, it was found that in all four cases the response which was humorous in tone was rated significantly more humorous than the corresponding response which was more serious in tone ($p < .001$ in all cases). Table 2 gives the means, standard deviations, and mean rating differences between the humorous and nonhumorous pairs. The mean of the four humorous responses taken together was 2.68 and the mean of the four nonhumorous responses was 1.08. Recall that this was a 4-point rating scale where 1 was nonhumorous, 2 was mildly humorous, 3 was moderately humorous, and 4 was extremely humorous (see Appendix 3). Thus, the humorous responses were on the whole perceived as mildly to moderately humorous.

To ensure that there was no gender difference in humour ratings on these humorous responses as a whole, the overall difference between the humorous and nonhumorous responses for the four questions combined were compared between males and females using a full-factorial 2 (humour) X 2 (gender) ANOVA. No significant differences were found for any of the effects including gender.

The third objective of the pilot study was to select male and female photos which were high and low

in physical attractiveness for the main study. Pilot

subjects rated 28 black and white photographs of

opposite-sex persons on a 7-point Likert scale in terms

of physical attractiveness. Each photo measured 5 1/2

X 7 cm. and featured the face and shoulders of a

person. These photos were taken from yearbook and

newspaper photos in Southern Ontario (see Questionnaire

3 in Appendix 5). Higher ratings indicated that the

subjects found the individuals in the photos to be more

physically attractive. From these ratings, one high

and one low attractive photo of each gender were chosen

for use in the main study to manipulate the physical

attractiveness of the stimulus person.

The particular photos used in the high and low

attractiveness conditions in the main study were chosen

on the basis of their mean ratings by the pilot

subjects. A higher rating indicated greater perceived

attractiveness. Ideally, male and female low-

attractive photos should both have means around 2.5 and

standard deviations of less than 1.00. Similarly,

ideal high attractive photos should have means around

5.5 and standard deviations of less than 1.00. These

means are equivalent distances from the middle of the

7-point rating scale, 1.5 away from the midpoint of 4,

so that the low and high attractiveness manipulations

are comparable. Means any more extreme than this are

not ideal because mildly to moderately attractive individuals are obviously more common in the general population, so this more closely approximates the everyday interaction of physical attractiveness and humour in romantic attraction.

It was found that the high attractive male photo ($\underline{M}$ = 5.41, $\underline{SD}$ = .91) was not rated differently from the high attractive female photo ($\underline{M}$ = 5.68, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.04), $\underline{t}$(42) = .916, $\underline{p}$ > .05, and the low attractive male photo ($\underline{M}$ = 2.86, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.28) was not rated differently from the low attractive female photo (these two photos had the exact same mean and standard deviation). · However, the high attractive male photo was rated as more attractive than the low attractive male photo, $\underline{t}$(42) = 7.62, $\underline{p}$ < .0001, and the high attractive female photo was rated as more attractive than the low attractive female photo, $\underline{t}$(42) = 8.82, $\underline{p}$ < .0001.

Overall, for both attractiveness and humour, in relation to the scales used, the high and low attractive photos and the high humour responses chosen fell in between the moderate and mild range on the scales; that is, mildly to moderately attractive, mildly to moderately unattractive, mildly to moderately humorous, and mildly to moderately nonhumorous, respectively.

The experimental pilot session started off with a

discussion of the rationale and procedure of the study
with the subjects (see Appendix 6). Subjects were then
given a booklet consisting of Questionnaires 1, 2, and
3 to complete. Questionnaire 1 contained the
personality-trait words, Questionnaire 2 contained the
humorous and nonhumorous responses, and Questionnaire 3
contained the photos of individuals who were of the
opposite sex of the subjects. Subjects were also given
a page of questions regarding their age, gender, and
sexual orientation (see Appendix 7). The information
on age and gender was used for statistical purposes.
Information on sexual orientation was used to ensure
that only heterosexual and bisexual subjects were
included in the analyses because the research was
investigating opposite-sex romantic preferences. At
the end of the pilot study the participants were given
a chance to ask questions and to request results of the
main study upon its completion.

Main Study

The main study examined the effects of physical
attractiveness and humour on opposite-sex romantic
preferences within five different types of
relationships of varying intimacy. How the stimulus
person was perceived was also explored.

Subjects. Subjects were 61 male and 71 female
Lakehead University undergraduate volunteers randomly

assigned to one of the four conditions defined by a 2
(physical attractiveness: high/low) X 2 (humour:
high/low) experimental design.

Materials. As previously described, facial
attractiveness was manipulated using one low and one
high attractive photograph of each gender. The male
photos were comparable to the female photos in that the
mean rating of the high attractive male photo was not
significantly different from the mean rating and
standard deviation of the high attractive female photo,
and the same was true for the low attractive male and
female photos (see results of pilot study below).

The ostensible interview transcript with the
stimulus person which was used to manipulate humour,
had either a humorous or nonhumorous tone to it (see
Appendix 4). The transcript consisted of a series of
questions each followed by a response. The humorous
transcript contained humorous responses while the
nonhumorous transcript contained serious responses.
These responses were selected from the pilot study as
previously mentioned. On the top-left corner of each
transcript was a photo of the stimulus person. Hence,
the combination of attractive and unattractive photos
of male and female stimulus persons with humorous and
nonhumorous interviews produced a total of eight
transcripts:

(i)   a humorous transcript with a high attractive male
      photo

(ii) a humorous transcript with a low attractive male
      photo

(iii) a nonhumorous transcript with a high attractive
      male photo

(iv) a nonhumorous transcript with a low attractive
      male photo

(v)   a humorous transcript with a high attractive
      female photo

(vi) a humorous transcript with a low attractive female
      photo

(vii) a nonhumorous transcript with a high attractive
      female photo

(viii) a nonhumorous transcript with a low attractive
       female photo

Dependent variables were measured with the use of
two questionnaires. The first dependent variable,
degree of attraction, was assessed by Questionnaire A:
Desire for Future Interaction that asked for subjects
to rate on a 7-point scale their desire for future
interaction with the stimulus person, within five
levels of increasing intimacy: dating, sex, serious
relationship, marriage, and marriage with children (see
Appendix 8). This questionnaire was based on one used
by Townsend and Levy (1990) in their investigation of

the role of physical attractiveness and status in mate preferences.

At the bottom of Questionnaire A, there were questions on the age and sexual orientation of the subjects. Information on age was for statistical purposes. The information on sexual orientation, as in the pilot study, was used to ensure that only heterosexual and bisexual subjects were included in the statistical analyses because the research focus was on opposite-sex romantic preferences.

The second dependent variable, person-perception, was assessed by Questionnaire B consisting of 20 items measuring desirable and undesirable personality traits (see Appendix 2). Subjects were asked to indicate on a 7-point scale the degree to which they thought that each trait applied to the stimulus person. These 20 items were chosen from a larger pool of 44 items that were rated for romantic desirability in the pilot study.

The final measure in the main study was Questionnaire C, a post-experimental questionnaire (see Appendix 9). It consisted of eight main questions with subquestions which were designed to detect subjects who may have been suspicious of the true objectives of the study, so that they could be excluded from the statistical analysis.

Procedure. Subjects were run in groups ranging in number from 2 to 10 individuals per session by a male experimenter. Each session lasted about 30 minutes. Introductory psychology subjects received a one-percent credit added to their course grade for their voluntary participation.

Each session started off with subjects being given a consent form to sign (see Appendix 10). This included information on the nature and procedure of the study as well as on confidentiality and voluntary participation. The study was presented as one investigating how people react to another person based on limited information about that person. Subjects were then asked to read one of the eight versions of the ostensible interview transcript. After that, the subjects were asked to complete Questionnaire A assessing their desire for future interaction with the stimulus person within increasing intimate levels of relationships, Questionnaire B which taps into person-perception, and Questionnaire C which was the post-experimental questionnaire. A debriefing form and an opportunity for subjects to request a summary of the results of the study concluded the experimental session (see Appendix 11).

Results

Sample Size and Age

A total of 71 female and 61 male undergraduates in first- and second-year psychology courses participated in the research. Of these, a total of 13 females and 7 males were excluded from the data analyses for the following reasons:

1. Four female subjects and three male subjects were found by two independent judges to be suspicious of the study according to their responses on the post-experimental questionnaire (Appendix 9). Each judge viewed all these questionnaires separately, and categorized each subject as either "suspicious" or "not suspicious". Subjects who were categorized by both judges to be suspicious were excluded from the statistical analyses. Any discrepancy between the judges' ratings were discussed, and a mutual decision about suspiciousness was reached.

2. Subjects over the age of 30 were excluded in order to keep the sample homogeneous and to avoid any differences in romantic preferences that may arise as a function of age. Four males, with ages ranging from 31 to 50, and four females, with ages ranging from 31 to 50, were excluded as a result of this criterion.

3. To achieve relatively equal cell sizes, two subjects were randomly deleted from each of two

cells which had 17 subjects. These were the female/high attractiveness/high humour and female/low attractiveness/high humour cells. As a result, cell sizes ranged from 12 to 15.

4. One female subject failed to complete several questionnaires and was therefore excluded from the analysis.

Thus, a total of 112 subjects consisting of 54 males and 58 females were included in the statistical analyses. Subjects ranged in age from 17 to 29 years with a mean of 20.38. The mean age was 20.74 years for males and 20.05 years for females. A two-tailed t-test showed that there was not a significant difference in age between males and females, $t(110) = 1.92$, $p > .05$. A breakdown of cell sizes are presented in Table 3. Most of the subjects reported their sexual orientation to be heterosexual, while only one male and one female reported to be bisexual. Thus, no subjects were deleted on the basis of sexual orientation, as this research investigates opposite-sex romantic preferences.

The design was a 2 (physical attractiveness: high/low) X 2 (humour: high/low) X 2 (subject gender: male/female). The data obtained on desire for future interaction was analyzed using a 2 X 2 X 2 MANOVA with gender, physical attractiveness, and humour as

independent variables, and each level of intimacy (dating, sex, long-term relationship, marriage, marriage with children) as dependent variables. Any significant multivariate effects were followed up with a discriminant analysis, and Hotelling's T^2 tests were conducted to identify any group differences on the dependent measures taken collectively. For the 22-item person-perception measure, a principal components analysis (PCA) with a varimax rotation was performed to identify items which measured similar constructs. The orthogonal components derived from the PCA were then analyzed in separate 2 X 2 X 2 ANOVA's. Prior to any analysis, certain issues relating to the cleaning of the data and assumptions were examined as described below.

Pre-analysis Issues

Missing data. A check for missing data was carried out for all items on all dependent measures. With one exception where a female subject from the attractiveness/high humour condition had extensive missing data on all measures, all participants had complete data. As noted earlier, this one subject was excluded from subsequent analyses.

Univariate outliers. A check for univariate outliers was carried out for all variables that were used in ANOVA's and MANOVA's. Within-cell univariate

outliers defined as those with z-scores greater than plus or minus three for each dependent variable were identified. Four outliers were found on four different person-perception items, and these came from the following conditions: three from the male subject/high attractive/low humour condition and one from the male subject/low attractive/low humour condition. These outlier scores were recoded to a standard score of plus or minus three to reduce their influence on the analyses while still preserving their deviancy (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989).

Multivariate outliers. An examination for multivariate outliers was done for variables that were used in the MANOVA's. Influential within-cell multivariate outliers were investigated using two indices, the Mahalanobis' distance and Cook's D. If an observation has a Mahalanobis' distance greater than a critical value, and its Cook's D is greater than one, then it is defined as an influential outlier and is deleted from the analyses (Stevens, 1986). The critical value for a Mahalanobis' distance is based on a chi-square distribution with p < .001, and the degrees of freedom equal to the number of predictors. This investigation revealed that three cases had values of Cook's D greater than one; however, no outliers were found according to the Mahalanobis' distance. In

keeping with Steven's (1986) recommendation, these cases were examined for anomalies (e.g., relating to procedure, experimental setting) that may make them different from the other observations in their groups. No anomalies were found and these cases were kept in subsequent analyses.

Assumptions for multivariate analyses. Assumptions for the MANOVA were investigated in the following ways: (a) The assumption of multivariate normality, which is difficult to test, was partially checked through normal and detrended expected normal probability plots obtained from SPSS MANOVA for each dependent variable; (b) homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices was tested by Box's M from the SPSS MANOVA programme; (c) the assumption of linearity was investigated through within-cell bivariate scatterplots of the dependent measures (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). Given that it was not feasible to check every possible combination of bivariate plots for every cell, a random selection of bivariate plots was looked at. It was found that none of the MANOVA assumptions were violated. The test statistic for Box's M was $F(75, 10538) = .261$, $p > .05$.

Main Analyses

Humour manipulation check. One of the personality variables on Questionnaire B, "humourless", served as a

manipulation check for humour. It was expected that the high humour condition would yield lower humourless ratings than the low humour condition, such that subjects would rate the stimulus person in the high humour condition to be less humourless compared to individuals in the low humour condition. This is precisely what occurred, as the mean for the high humour condition on this variable ($\underline{M}$ = 2.22) was significantly lower than the mean for the low humour condition ($\underline{M}$ = 3.56), $\underline{t}$(110) = 4.67, $\underline{p}$ < .001. The effect size was .17, and the power was .97. There were no gender differences on this variable in either the high humour, $\underline{t}$(53) = .091, $\underline{p}$ > .05, or low humour conditions, $\underline{t}$(55) = 1.20, p > .05. Thus, it can be inferred that males and females did not perceive the level of humour of stimulus persons within each humour condition differently.

Desire for future interaction. Correlations among the five items in Questionnaire A, which assessed desire for future interaction within 5 levels of increasingly intimate relationships, were examined. As can be seen in Table 4, all the items were significantly correlated with each other. Correlations ranged from .54 to .93, indicating high associations among all items, $\underline{p}$ < .01. Given that these items are multiple measures and they are correlated, a 2 X 2 X 2

MANOVA was used with the five levels of interaction as dependent variables, and gender, physical attractiveness, and humour as independent variables. The Pillai's test statistic was used to determine multivariate significance. Significant findings were followed up with a discriminant function analysis, calculation of centroids, canonical correlations, and Hotelling's T^2 tests. The results of this MANOVA are summarized in Table 5. Descriptive statistics of the five relationship items can be found in Table 6.

A main effect for physical attractiveness was found (see Table 5). The squared canonical correlation was .40, indicating a medium effect size (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Thus, physical attractiveness explained 40% of the variance in subject responses. Structure loadings from the discriminant function analysis revealed that the dependent variable which discriminated primarily between the high and low physical attractiveness group was sex (.83), followed by dating (.66), serious relationship (.66), and finally marriage (.43). Marriage with children did not discriminate between these groups (.29). Group centroids revealed that individuals high in physical attractiveness (3.33) were rated as more desirable for sex, dating, a serious relationship, and marriage than individuals low in physical attractiveness (1.74).

A main effect for gender was also found (see Table 5). The squared canonical correlation was .18, indicating a small effect size. Thus, 18% of the variance in subjects' responses was accounted for by subject gender. The structure loading (.59) from the discriminant function analysis revealed that the gender difference was explained mostly by the dependent variable sex. None of the other relationship levels contributed to the gender difference: marriage with children (-.27), marriage (-.24), a serious relationship (-.06), and a date (-.03). Group centroids showed that it was males (centroid = .90) who evidenced a stronger desire for a sexual relationship with the stimulus person than did females (centroid = .01).

The MANOVA also yielded two significant interaction effects, a gender by attractiveness interaction and a humour by attractiveness interaction. The squared canonical correlation was .21, indicating a small effect size. Therefore, the gender by attractiveness interaction effect accounted for 21% of the variance in subjects' responses. The levels of relationships which discriminated between the four groups of subjects defined by the interaction effect were primarily sex (.93), a date (.66), and a serious relationship (.52). Marriage with children (.28) and

marriage (.23) did not discriminate well between the groups. A Hotelling's T^2 Test was used to identify any significant multivariate pairwise means comparisons among the four groups of subjects. It was found that males rated high attractive females as more desirable in relationships involving sex, dating, and commitment (i.e., a serious relationship) than low attractive females, $F(5, 48) = 16.86$, $p < .001$. Males also rated high attractive females as more desirable in the aforementioned relationships than females rated high attractive males, $F(5, 51) = 7.06$, $p < .001$. Centroids for the four groups were 3.97 for male subjects/high attractive stimulus persons, 2.37 for female subjects/high attractive stimulus persons, 2.05 for female subjects/low attractive stimulus persons, and 1.65 for male subjects/low attractive stimulus persons.

The attractiveness by humour interaction effect had a squared canonical correlation of .13, indicating a small effect size. Thus, this interaction effect accounted for 13% of the variance in subjects' responses. The levels of relationships which discriminated between the four groups of subjects defined by this interaction effect were primarily serious relationship (-.44), and marriage (-.44). Dating (-.20), sex (-.12), and marriage with children (-.12) did not discriminate between groups.

Hotelling's T^2 Tests revealed which multivariate pairwise comparisons among the four groups of subjects were significant. High attractive, high humour individuals were rated as more desirable than high attractive, low humour individuals, $F(5, 51) = 2.53$, p < .041, but low attractive, high humour individuals were not rated differently from low attractive, low humour individuals, $F(5, 49) = .98$, p < .44. In contrast, attractiveness had an effect at both levels of humour; that is, high attractive, high humour individuals were rated as more desirable than low attractive, high humour individuals, $F(5, 49) = 8.83$, p < .001, and high attractive, low humour individuals were rated as more desirable than low attractive, low humour individuals, $F(5, 51) = 3.55$, p < .008. Centroids for the four groups were -1.89 for the high attractive-high humour condition, -0.82 for the high attractive-low humour condition, -0.66 for the low attractive-low humour condition, and -0.21 for the low attractive-high humour condition.

Person-perception. An exploratory principal components analysis (PCA) was performed on the 20 person-perception items in order to find out if certain items tended to measure similar dimensions. If such is the case, the 20 items could then be consolidated into their few underlying dimensions which would be used in

subsequent analyses. When doing the data reduction analyses, it is a general rule to have at least five cases for each observed variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). In this study, there were 112 subjects for 20 person-perception items, so this rule was observed.

In the PCA, four components were extracted with a varimax rotation. A four factor solution was chosen based on the scree criterion, and the percentage of variance accounted by the factors. A varimax rotation was decided upon for ease of interpretability in subsequent analyses. The first component was composed of the following items : humourless, cheerful, prejudiced, broad-minded, cold, and hostile. It was decided to call this component Ornery. Following the guidelines where a Cronbach's alpha of at least .70 is required for an adequate internal consistency (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1982), this component was found to have good internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha = .84). The second component, labelled Virtuous, was made up of these items: loyal, loving, sincere, passionate, and forgiving. This component also had good internal reliability (alpha = .82). The third component, Antisocial, which had marginal internal reliability (alpha = .68), contained the items, honest, friendly, dirty, uncooperative, deceitful, and cruel. The fourth component, with an adequate internal reliability (alpha

= .74), was made up of the items, stupid, intelligent, and unreliable, and was named Intellectually Deficient. Table 7 presents the loadings of the items on the four components.

An mean score was calculated for each subject on each of the four components by averaging the raw scores of items within each component. Separate ANOVA's were run on the four components as dependent measures. An examination for within-cell univariate and multivariate outliers was carried out. None, however, were identified.

Thus, four 2 X 2 X 2 ANOVA's were run with the components as separate dependent variables. On the first component, Ornery, there was a main effect for humour, $F(1, 104) = 4.98$, $p < .028$. Group means revealed that the low humour condition ($M = 3.59$) garnered higher scores on Ornery than the high humour condition did ($M = 3.37$).

On the second component, Virtuous, there was a main effect for physical attractiveness, $F(1, 104) = 9.63$, $p < .002$. Group means showed that the high attractiveness condition ($M = 4.76$) yielded higher scores on the Virtuous component than the low attractiveness condition did ($M = 4.28$). There was also a gender by attractiveness by humour interaction on Virtuous, $F(1, 104) = 4.43$, $p < .012$. A Tukey Test

showed that males rated high attractive, low humour stimulus persons (M = 5.21) as more virtuous than low attractive, low humour stimulus persons (M = 4.26). There were no significant results in the ANOVA's on the other two components, Antisocial or Intellectually Deficient. Descriptive statistics on the four components are presented in Table 8.

Discussion

Consistent with previous research (e.g., Hill, 1945; Buss, 1989; Townsend & Levy, 1990), physical attractiveness had an effect on male subjects' desire for future interaction with potential partners. However, female subjects were not affected by the degree of physical attractiveness of potential partners. Specifically, males rated more physically attractive females as more romantically desirable than less physically attractive females for the following types of relationships: sex, followed by a date, a serious relationship, and marriage.

This gender difference did not occur at low attractiveness, in that males and females did not differ in their desirability ratings of low attractive persons. It is interesting to compare this finding to that of Lundy (1992), who looked at only one type of relationship, a long term relationship involving children. As mentioned earlier, this previous study

found that males and females equally devalued low attractiveness, but males more highly valued high physical attractiveness than did females. A similar pattern was found here in that there was no gender difference at low attractiveness, but male responses were more positive than female responses at high attractiveness. The distinction, however, is that in the present study, this gender difference occurred at three different relationship levels.

In addition, it was found that physical attractiveness interacted with humour. Persons high in physical attractiveness were found to be more romantically desirable if they were humorous than if they were not humorous. This effect occurred at the relationship levels of a serious relationship and marriage. On the other hand, if one was relatively low in physical attractiveness, exhibiting a sense of humour did not help one to be more desirable to the opposite sex.

Evidence was found here for the presence of a halo effect, or physical attractiveness stereotype. Specifically, individuals high in physical attractiveness were rated by subjects to be more virtuous (i.e., loyal, loving, sincere, passionate, and forgiving) than were individuals low in physical attractiveness. It was also found that when a female

was nonhumorous, males rated her as more virtuous if she was attractive than if she was unattractive. In contrast, females were not affected by physical attractiveness; they rated a high attractive male the same as a low attractive male when he was not humorous. This provides evidence of a halo effect in a romantic context, that is, when subjects were asked to consider a person as a potential romantic partner in relationships of increasing levels of intimacy.

It is therefore possible that there is a link between this physical attractiveness stereotype for males on the virtuous component and the male emphasis placed on high physical attractiveness in potential romantic partners. The perception of virtuous qualities in high attractive females by males could either be a cause of the male desire for high physical attractiveness or it could be an effect of this desire. Subsequent research needs to investigate more closely male and female perceptions of personality characteristics in potential romantic partners.

Some evidence was also found here for a <u>humour</u> stereotype or halo effect. Humorous individuals were rated by subjects to be less ornery than nonhumorous subjects. The component ornery was made up of humourless, noncheerful, prejudiced, narrow-minded, cold, and hostile. Thus, it appears that exhibiting a

sense of humour leads others to perceive personality characteristics beyond simply how cheerful the person is; they also see the person as less prejudiced, more openminded, more interpersonally warm, and less hostile. It will be interesting to see whether or not this finding is replicated in future studies.

Interestingly, there was no overall effect of humour on subjects' desire for future interaction. That is, regardless of physical attractiveness, individuals in the high humour condition were not seen as more romantically desirable than individuals in the low humour condition. The effect size for humour was very small (.053). Thus, one possibility is that an inadequate sample size can account for not finding an effect for humour; if there was a humour effect the sample size may not have been large enough to detect it. This possibility is supported by the fact that the power for humour was only .36. Alternatively, the low value of the correlation coefficient may accurately reflect that the effect size of humour is small.

One question that then arises is, what was the strength of the humour manipulation? There was not an absence of an experimental manipulation of humour because there was evidence that subjects did perceive the high humour condition as more humorous than the low humour condition. In terms of the 7-point rating scale

utilized, subjects in the high humour condition tended
to disagree moderately that the stimulus person was
humourless, whereas subjects in the low humour
condition tended to neither agree nor disagree that the
stimulus person was humourless. This suggests that the
stimulus person in the low humour condition was seen to
be neutral (i.e., neither humorous nor humourless),
whereas the stimulus person in the high humour
condition was perceived to be moderately humorous.
Nevertheless, the effect size for the humour
manipulation was small (.17).

Perhaps the effect of a stronger humour
manipulation on romantic preferences could be
investigated by using jokes, anecdotes, etc. that are
rated as more humorous than the ones used here. This
is difficult to do as there is individual variation in
what people find humorous. Also, to investigate the
effect of humour, it may be profitable to keep the
level of physical attractiveness constant. Stimulus
persons of average physical attractiveness could be
used while humour is manipulated. This is because
manipulating attractiveness may dilute the effects of
humour on romantic preferences.

One must also consider the context in which humour
was manipulated (i.e., use of an interview transcript
in this study), and also the way its effects on

romantic preferences were measured (i.e., self-reports on desire for future interaction in this study). It may be that humour increases one's romantic desirability only in certain contexts. For example, humour may work best in a social interaction between a male and a female. An interview transcript may seem too contrived to some people. A few subjects in the high humour condition indicated in the post-experimental questionnaire that they were not sure if the interview was real. Future studies could try manipulating humour in other ways. For instance, a romantic setting scenario could be created where a humorous or nonhumorous male-female dialogue in a nightclub takes place. Alternatively, one could manipulate humour behaviourally, such as in a more naturalistic study using humorous and nonhumorous confederates. In addition, one could measure preferences in behavioural terms, such as in the Cunningham (1989) singles bar study where subjects' actual reactions to opening lines were observed.

Another consideration is the possibility that different types of humour have different effects on romantic preferences. Various authors have mentioned such humour types as incongruity-resolution, intellectual, nonsense, sexual, aggressive, out-group disparagement, cruel, self-disparagement, defensive,

puns, and teasing (Goldstein & McGhee, 1972; Cashion, Cody, & Erickson, 1986; Ruch & Mehl, 1987; Vinton, 1989; Ziv, 1988). Unfortunately, no precise, systematic categorization of humour types has been attempted. This study utilized two instances of a form of self-disparaging humour, one instance of joking about one's parents, and one instance of joking about a previous romantic partner (see Appendix 4). One could argue that all four instances involve putting oneself down, or at least pretending to put oneself down. The last two instances are more indirect ways of doing this. It is possible that the finding that humour overall did not have an effect on subject desirability ratings was due to the self-deprecating nature of the humour. It may be that presenting oneself in such a negative way leads others to perceive the person negatively. However, it is also possible that putting oneself down in a humorous way makes one appear secure with oneself, because of the ability to joke about oneself (e.g., false modesty). These opposing possibilities need to be investigated further.

Future research should investigate further the perception of positive and negative personality factors in a romantic context. More research is required to discover if the findings of this study are valid regarding the four factors, Ornery, Virtuous,

Antisocial, and Intellectually Deficient. Another avenue of interest related to this would be the degree of overlap between attitudes and behaviour in a romantic context. For instance, are the attributes, or the combination of attributes (components), that people say they want in potential partners actually the same as what they end up being attracted to and choosing? Do people know what it is they're being attracted by, or is it less than a conscious decision process?

In conclusion, physical attractiveness and humour were experimentally manipulated to gauge their effect on romantic partner preferences in a variety of relationships, and on the perception of various personality characteristics. Evidence was found in this study that physical attractiveness has a strong effect on romantic preferences, but only on male preferences. Humour, which was of a self-deprecating nature, had an effect on subjects' desire to enter a serious relationship or marriage, but only when physical attractiveness was high. Individuals who were physically attractive or humorous were perceived to possess more positive personality traits. High physical attractiveness led subjects to perceive potential partners as more virtuous, while low humour led subjects to perceive potential partners as more ornery. The potential for future research in this area

is considerable.

References

Allen, W. (1976). <u>Without Feathers.</u> New York: Warner Books.

Allen, W. (1981). <u>Side Effects.</u> New York: Ballantine Books.

Allen, W. (Speaker). (1986). <u>Standup Comic</u> [Record]. New York: Casablanca Film Works, Inc.

Bochner, S., & Van Zyl, T. (1984). Desirability ratings of 110 personality-trait words. <u>The Journal of Social Psychology, 125</u>(4), 459-465.

Burns, G. (1980). <u>The Third Time Around.</u> Toronto: Longman Canada Limited.

Buss, D. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. <u>Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12</u>(1), 1-49.

Buss, D., & Angleitner, A. (1989). Mate selection preferences in Germany and the United States. <u>Personality and Individual Differences, 10</u>(12), 1269-1280.

Buss, D., & Barnes, M. F. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50</u>, 559-570.

Cashion, J. L., Cody, M. J., & Erickson, K. V. (1986). "You'll love this one...": An exploration into joke-prefacing devices. <u>Journal of Language and</u>

Social Psychology, 5(4), 303-312.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). Applied Multiple
Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral
Sciences, Second Edition. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence
Erlbaum Associates.

Cunningham, M. R. (1989). Reactions to heterosexual
opening gambits: Female selectivity and male
responsiveness. Personality and Social Psychology
Bulletin, 15(1), 27-41.

Curran, J. P., & Lippold, S. (1975). The effects of
physical attractiveness and attitude similarity on
attraction in dating dyads. Journal of
Personality, 43, 528-539.

Davis, S. (1990). Men as success objects and women as
sex objects: A study of personal advertisements.
Sex Roles, 23, 43-51.

Deckers, L., & Ruch, W. (1992). The Situational Humour
Response Questionnaire (SHRQ) as a test of "sense
of humour": a validity study in the field of
humour appreciation. Personality and Individual
Differences, 13(10), 1149-1152.

Feingold, A. (1990). Gender differences in effects of
physical attractiveness on romantic attraction: A
comparison across five research paradigms.
Journal of Personality and Social
Psychology, 59(5), 981-993.

Feingold, A. (1992). Gender differences in mate

selection preferences: A test of the parental

investment model. Psychological Bulletin,

112(1), 125-139.

Goldstein, J. H., & McGhee, P. E. (1972). An annotated

bibliography of published papers on humor in the

research literature and an analysis of trends:

1900-1971. In J.H. Goldstein, & P. E. McGhee

(Eds.). The Psychology of Humor. New York:

Academic Press.

Goodwin, R. (1990). Sex differences among partner

preferences: Are the sexes really very similar?

Sex Roles, 23, 501-513.

Green, S.K., Buchanan, D.R., & Heuer, S.K. (1984).

Winners, losers, and choosers: A field

investigation of dating initiation. Personality

and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10(4), 502-511.

Hampes, W.P. (1992). Relation between intimacy and

humor. Psychological Reports, 71, 127-130.

Hansen, S. L. (1977). Dating choices of high school

students. The Family Coordinator, 26(2), 133-

138.

Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1986). Mirror, Mirror.

The Importance of Looks in Everyday Life. New

York: SUNY Press.

Hewitt, L. E. (1958). Student perceptions of traits

desired in themselves as dating and marriage partners. <u>Marriage and Family Living</u>, <u>Nov.</u>, 344-349.

Hill, R. (1945). Campus values in mate selection. <u>Journal of Home Economics</u>, <u>37</u>, 554-558.

Kaplan, R. M., & Saccuzzo, D. P. (1982). <u>Psychological Testing - Principles, Applications, and Issues</u>. California: Wadsworth, Inc.

Kenrick, D. T., Sadalla, E. K., Groth, G., & Trost, M. R. (1990). Evolution, traits, and the stages of the parental investment model. <u>Journal of Personality</u>, <u>58</u>(1), 97-117.

Laner, M. R. (1977). Permanent partner priorities: Gay and straight. <u>Journal of Homosexuality</u>, <u>3</u>(1), 21-39.

Langhorne, M. C., & Secord, P. F. (1955). Variation in marital needs with age, sex, marital status, and regional composition. <u>Journal of Social Psychology</u>, <u>41</u>, 19-37.

Lundy, D. E. (1992). <u>Sex differences in human mate preferences: Facial attractiveness versus status and resources</u>. Unpublished bachelor's thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto.

McGinnis, R. (1958). Campus values in mate selection. <u>Social Forces</u>, <u>36</u>, 368-373.

Milgram, S. (1965). Some conditions of obedience and

disobedience to authority. Human Relations, 18,
57-76.

Murstein, B. I. (1985). Humor and interpersonal
attraction. Journal of Personality Assessment,
49(6), 637-640.

Myers, D. G. (1987). Social Psychology, 2nd Edition.
New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Nevid, J. S. (1984). ·Sex differences in factors of
romantic attraction. Sex Roles, 11, 401-411.

Ruch, W., & Hehl, F. J. (1987). Personal values as
facilitating and inhibiting factors in the
appreciation of humor. Journal of Social Behavior
and Personality, 2(4), 453-472.

Simenauer, J., & Carroll, D. (1982). Singles: The New
Americans. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Smith, J. E., Waldorf, V. A., & Trembath, D. L. (1990).
"Single white male looking for thin, very
attractive...". Sex Roles, 23(11-12), 675-685.

Sprecher, S. (1989). The importance to males and
females of physical attractiveness, earning
potential, and expressiveness in initial
attraction. Sex Roles, 21, 591-607.

Stevens, J. (1986). Applied Multivariate Statistics
for the Social Sciences. Hilldale, N.J.: Lawrence
Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Stump, N. F. (1939). Sense of humor and its

relationship to personality, scholastic aptitude,

emotional maturity, height, and weight. <u>The</u>

<u>Journal of General Psychology</u>, <u>20</u>, 25-32.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1989). <u>Using</u>

<u>Multivariate Statistics, Second Edition</u>. New

York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.

Thorson, J. A., & Powell, F. C. (1993). Sense of humor

and dimensions of personality. <u>Journal of</u>

<u>Clinical Psychology</u>, <u>49</u>(6), 799-809.

Townsend, J.M., & Levy, G.D. (1990). Effect of

potential partners' physical attractiveness and

socioeconomic status on sexuality and partner

selection. <u>Archives of Sexual Behavior</u>, <u>19</u>(2),

149-164.

Vinton, K. L. (1989). Humour in the workplace: Is it

more than telling jokes. <u>Small Group Behavior</u>,

<u>20</u>(2), 151-166.

Ziv, A. (Ed). (1988). <u>National Styles of Humor</u>.

Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Table 1

Romantic Desirability Ratings of 10 Most and 10 Least

Desirable Trait Words

Most desirable words			Least desirable words		
Word	M	SD	Word	M	SD
Loving	6.80	.46	Cruel	1.20	.79
Honest	6.75	.49	Unreliable	1.32	.74
Passionate	6.64	.57	Humourless	1.32	.86
Loyal	6.52	1.02	Deceitful	1.34	.91
Friendly	6.41	.54	Dirty	1.36	.61
Cheerful	6.34	.57	Hostile	1.36	.72
Sincere	6.30	.76	Cold	1.39	.69
Intelligent	6.18	.81	Stupid	1.50	.79
Forgiving	6.18	.81	Prejudiced	1.50	.82
Broad-minded	6.07	.90	Uncooperative	1.66	.96

Note. N = 44.

Table 2

Pooled Pilot Subject Ratings of Humorous and

Nonhumorous Responses Chosen for the Main Study

Humour items[a]	Humorous response		Nonhumorous response		Difference[b]	t-test
	M	SD	M	SD		
Q10.	2.93	.95	1.23	.57	1.70	10.18[*]
Q12.	2.43	1.00	1.00	.00	1.43	9.49[*]
Q13.	2.61	.99	1.11	.32	1.50	9.56[*]
Q15.	2.73	.95	1.00	.00	1.73	12.08[*]

Note. N = 44.

a See Appendix 2 for contents of humour items.

b Difference = humorous response rating - nonhumorous response rating.

* $p < .001$.

Table 3

Cell sizes in Main Study

		High humour	Low humour
Male subjects	High attractiveness	13	15
	Low attractiveness	12	14
Female subjects	High attractiveness	15	14
	Low attractiveness	15	14

Note. N = 112.

Table 4

Correlations Among the Desire for Future Interaction

Items

	Date	Sex	Serious relationship	Marriage	Marriage with children
Date					
Sex	.74				
Serious relationship	.78	.67			
Marriage	.63	.55	.72		
Marriage with children	.58	.54	.65	.93	

Note. N = 112.

Table 5

Summary Table for MANOVA as a Function of Subject
Gender, Stimulus Person Physical Attractiveness, and
Stimulus Person Humour on Five Levels of Desire for
Future Interaction

Source	df	F	p
Subject gender (G)	5	4.28	.001
Stimulus attractiveness (A)	5	13.57	.001
Stimulus humour (H)	5	1.11	.359
G X A	5	5.21	.001
G X H	5	1.27	.281
A X H	5	3.00	.015
G X A X H	5	.85	.515

Note. N = 112.

Table 6

Within-cell Means (and Standard Deviations) for the

Five Types of Relationships on the Desire for Future

Interaction (DFI) Questionnaire

Gender of subject	DFI	High attractiveness		Low attractiveness	
		High humour	Low humour	High humour	Low humour
Male	1	5.23(1.23)	5.27(1.28)	3.00(1.41)	2.93(1.07)
	2	4.92(1.32)	5.33(1.45)	2.17(1.27)	2.14(0.95)
	3	4.69(1.49)	4.40(1.45)	2.17(1.40)	2.64(0.93)
	4	3.46(1.61)	3.53(1.51)	1.92(1.16)	2.29(1.14)
	5	2.77(1.48)	3.73(1.53)	1.92(1.16)	2.29(1.20)
Female	1	4.60(1.40)	4.21(1.31)	3.60(1.60)	4.14(1.29)
	2	3.47(1.19)	2.93(1.38)	2.47(1.36)	2.86(1.61)
	3	4.07(1.22)	3.79(1.31)	2.80(1.47)	3.57(1.60)
	4	3.93(1.49)	3.00(1.47)	2.40(1.76)	3.14(1.79)
	5	3.53(1.68)	2.86(1.41)	2.67(1.88)	3.14(1.79)

Note. N = 112. The DFI items are defined as follows: 1 = date, 2 = sex, 3 = serious relationship, 4 = marriage, 5 = marriage with children.

Table 7

Components and Loadings from the Principal Components

Analysis (PCA) on Person Perception Items

Component and items	% of variance	Factor loadings
Component 1 (Ornery)	31.8	
Humourless		.78
Cheerful		-.74
Prejudiced		.71
Broad-minded		-.69
Cold		.68
Hostile		.66
Component 2 (Virtuous)	12.1	
Loyal		.75
Loving		.74
Sincere		.68
Passionate		.63
Forgiving		.63
Component 3 (Antisocial)	8.1	
Honest		-.70
Friendly		-.66
Dirty		.66
Uncooperative		.52
Deceitful		.44
Cruel		.36
Component 4 (Intellectually Deficient)	7.4	
Stupid		.89
Intelligent		-.78
Unreliable		.57

Note: N = 112.

Table 8

Within-cell Means (and Standard Deviations) for the

Four Components from the Principal Components Analysis

(PCA)

Gender of subject	PCA[a]	High attractiveness		Low attractiveness	
		High humour	Low humour	High humour	Low humour
Male	1	3.23(0.36)	3.56(0.47)	3.42(0.37)	3.69(0.44)
	2	4.69(1.01)	5.21(0.66)	4.32(0.79)	4.26(0.53)
	3	3.41(0.52)	3.40(0.67)	3.67(0.49)	3.51(0.42)
	4	4.05(0.47)	3.60(0.51)	3.89(0.56)	3.67(0.49)
Female	1	3.38(0.45)	3.67(0.58)	3.46(0.70)	3.44(0.58)
	2	4.76(0.90)	4.36(0.94)	3.97(1.06)	4.59(0.54)
	3	3.29(0.38)	3.49(0.44)	3.37(0.49)	3.43(0.46)
	4	3.58(0.67)	3.64(0.74)	3.76(0.75)	3.55(0.62)

Note. N = 112.

[a] Components are defined as follows: 1 = Ornery, 2 = Virtuous, 3 = Antisocial, 4 = Intellectually Deficient

Appendix 1

Questionnaire 1:
Person-perception questionnaire for pilot study

QUESTIONNAIRE 1

Below are adjectives used to describe the attributes of people. Please read each adjective carefully. Then rate the adjective on the degree to which you would regard it as desirable in a potential romantic partner. To rate the adjectives, please use the following 7-point scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely undesirable	moderately undesirable	mildly undesirable	neither desirable nor undesirable	mildly desirable	moderately desirable	extremely desirable

ADJECTIVE	RATING	ADJECTIVE	RATING
Forgiving	_____	Cruel	_____
Honest	_____	Passionate	_____
Treacherous	_____	Quiet	_____
Broad-minded	_____	Warm	_____
Hospitable	_____	Deceitful	_____
Prejudiced	_____	Apathetic	_____
Sincere	_____	Arrogant	_____
Loving	_____	Uncooperative	_____
Humorless	_____	Cold	_____
Imaginative	_____	Jovial	_____
Friendly	_____	Capable	_____
Cheerful	_____	Snobbish	_____
Sly	_____	Stupid	_____
Helpful	_____	Clean	_____
Intelligent	_____	Loyal	_____
Quarrelsome	_____	Pompous	_____
Hostile	_____	Responsible	_____
Unreliable	_____	Unfriendly	_____
Pleasure-loving	_____	Witty	_____
Quick-tempered	_____	Revengeful	_____
Alert	_____	Dirty	_____

Appendix 2

Questionnaire B:
Person-perception questionnaire for main study

QUESTIONNAIRE B

INSTRUCTIONS: Now that you have read the transcript and visualized the interview with the help of the photo, you probably have some impression of the person. Please read the adjectives below carefully. Then, using the 7-point rating scale that follows, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that each adjective would apply to that person:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely disagree	moderately disagree	mildly disagree	neither agree nor disagree	mildly agree	moderately agree	extremely agree

ADJECTIVE	RATING		ADJECTIVE	RATING
1. Uncooperative	_____		11. Forgiving	_____
2. Dirty	_____		12. Loving	_____
3. Friendly	_____		13. Passionate	_____
4. Cruel	_____		14. Cheerful	_____
5. Unreliable	_____		15. Broad-minded	_____
6. Stupid	_____		16. Cold	_____
7. Prejudiced	_____		17. Deceitful	_____
8. Hostile	_____		18. Intelligent	_____
9. Humorless	_____		19. Loyal	_____
10. Honest	_____		20. Sincere	_____

WHEN YOU ARE FINISHED, PLEASE GO TO THE NEXT QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE NEXT PAGE.

DO NOT RETURN TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE ONCE YOU HAVE TURNED THE PAGE.

Appendix 3

Questionnaire 2:
Humour ratings questionnaire for pilot study

QUESTIONNAIRE 2

Below are a series of questions. Each question is followed by two responses, A and B. Please read each question and its two responses carefully. Then, rate EACH RESPONSE according how humourous you think it is. Perhaps one response is more humourous than the other. Perhaps they are both equally humourous or not humourous. There are no right or wrong answers. Your answer is the right answer. Please use the following 4-point scale to rate the responses:

1	2	3	4
not humourous	mildly humourous	moderately humourous	extremely humourous

RATING

Q1. WHAT DID YOU WANT TO BE WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?
RESPONSE A: I wanted to be an Olympic swimmer, but I had some problems with buoyancy.   _____
RESPONSE B: I wanted to be an Olympic swimmer, but very few people make it to that level.   _____

Q2. WHAT WAS IT LIKE GROWING UP IN THE PLACE WHERE YOU GREW UP?

RESPONSE A: It was a poor neighbourhood. Where I grew up, you practically had to steal to eat. Then you had to steal to tip.
RESPONSE B: It was a poor neighbourhood. Where I grew up, you practically had to steal to eat.   _____

Q3. WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE A BIT OF A "DREAMER" AS A CHILD?

RESPONSE A: Yeah, initially I think so. I didn't really like reality too much growing up. But eventually I realized reality was the only place to get a good piece of pizza.   _____
RESPONSE B: Yeah, initially I think so. I didn't really like reality too much growing up. But eventually I realized you have to learn to accept and enjoy it.   _____

RATING

Q4. WHAT WOULD YOU SAY IS YOUR GREATEST FAULT?

RESPONSE A: I once tried to make a list of my faults
and number one was my memory - I forget
little things sometimes.

RESPONSE B: I once tried to make a list of my faults
but could not get past: 1) Sometimes forget
my hat.

Q5. WOULD YOU SAY IT'S A BAD THING TO "THINK ALOT"?

RESPONSE A: Yes. I think one should rely less on the
mind and more on the body - the body is
much more dependable than the mind in many
ways.

RESPONSE B: Yes. I think one should rely less on the
mind and more on the body - the body is
much more dependable. It shows up for
meetings and looks good in a sports jacket.

Q6. WHY DO YOU THINK SEX IS SUCH A POPULAR ACTIVITY?

RESPONSE A: Because people are so attracted to
nakedness.

RESPONSE B: Because you don't have to get dressed for
it.

**Q7. WHAT DO YOU FEEL IS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT
PROBLEMS FACING THE WORLD TODAY?**

RESPONSE A: I would probably have to say overpopulation.
It's really getting out of hand. We are
probably already almost close to the maximum
number of people that the earth can hold.

RESPONSE B: I would probably have to say overpopulation.
It's really getting out of hand. There are
probably already more people on earth than
we need to move even the heaviest piano.

Q8. WHAT DO YOU LIKE TO DO ON YOUR BIRTHDAY?

RESPONSE A: I send telegrams of congratulations to my
parents.

RESPONSE B: I usually spend it with my family and
friends.

RATING

Q9. WHAT DO YOU THINK IS MORE IMPORTANT, MONEY OR HEALTH?

RESPONSE A: It's a difficult choice. Health is certainly
very important. But then again you can't go
into a store and tell the cashier: "Look at
my great suntan, and besides I never catch
colds", and expect them to hand over any
merchandise.   _____
RESPONSE B: It's a difficult choice. Health is certainly
very important. But then again you have to
have money for so many of life's necessities.   _____

Q10. HAVE YOU HAD ANY WHAT YOU WOULD CALL INTERESTING
ROMANTIC PARTNERS?

RESPONSE A: I once went out with a person who was
majoring in philosophy. But we had to
break up because I found it difficult to
relate to the way they viewed the world.   _____
RESPONSE B: I once went out with a person who was
majoring in philosophy. But we had to
break up because they proved I didn't
exist.   _____

Q11. WAS YOUR LAST SERIOUS RELATIONSHIP WITH SOMEONE
WHO WAS SO JEALOUS THAT THEY WOULD HIT THE
CEILING WHENEVER YOU SPEND TIME WITH SOMEONE OF
THE OPPOSITE SEX?

RESPONSE A: Actually, they were probably even more
jealous than that.   _____
RESPONSE B: Actually, they were more the type who
would a bullet through my hat.   _____

Q12. WERE YOU GENERALLY INTO ATHLETICS GROWING UP?

RESPONSE A: Not too any great extent. I had fairly
bad reflexes at times. I was once hit by
a car with a flat tire being pushed by
two guys.   _____
RESPONSE B: Not too any great extent. I had fairly
bad reflexes at times which made many
athletic activities difficult.   _____

RATING

Q13. DO YOU DRINK ALCOHOL?

RESPONSE A: Only occassionally, because my body
doesn't tolerate alcohol. Last time
I drank I tried to hijack an elevator
to Cuba.

RESPONSE B: Only occassionally, because my body
doesn't tolerate alcohol. Last time
I drank I did some very embarrassing
things.

Q14. DID YOU HAVE STRICT PARENTS?

RESPONSE A: At times they were very strict. They
sometimes gave me very early curfews.
This made it difficult to have much fun
when I went out at night.

RESPONSE B: At times they were very strict. They
gave me a 9:30 curfew on prom night.
My date and I made reservations for 5:30
and watched the organizers set up.

Q15. DO YOU THINK YOUR MOTHER AND FATHER HAD
WHAT YOU WOULD CONSIDER A SOLID RELATIONSHIP?

RESPONSE A: That's a difficult one to answer.
Generally, yes, but they had a falling
out for a while when my father lost his
job. The place where he worked invented
some gadget that did everything my father
did but better. The sad thing was that
my mother went out and bought one.

RESPONSE B: That's a difficult one to answer.
Generally, yes, but they had a falling
out for a while when my father lost his
job. The place where he worked became
more mechanized and his job became
unnecessary. My mother didn't react
very well to this.

Appendix 4

Interview transcript for main study
(A humorous transcript and a nonhumorous transcript are
presented in this appendix, respectively. Photos are
not presented in order to maintain the confidentiality
of those pictured.)

NOTE: Below is an interview transcript between the person in the photo and an experimenter. "E" stands for the experimenter and "R" stands for the person's response.

PHOTO OF
OPPOSITE-
SEX PERSON

E: Hi! How are you doing?
R: Good.

E: As we discussed before, I'm going to ask you a few questions about
       yourself just to get some idea of who you are and what you're like.
       Please answer each question openly and freely in a way that you feel
       best reflects who you are. Okay?
R: Okay.

E: If you're ready to begin, we'll get underway.
R: I'm ready.

E: How old are you?
R: Twenty-one.

E: Do you think your mother and father had what you would consider a solid
       relationship?
R: That's a difficult one to answer. Generally, yes, but they had a
       falling out for a while when my father lost his job. The place where he
       worked invented some gadget that did everything my father did but
       better. The sad thing was that my mother went out and bought one.

E: What is your current occupation?
R: I'm a third-year university student majoring in psychology.

E: Have you had any what you would call interesting romantic partners?
R: I once went out with a person who was majoring in philosophy. But we
       had to break up because they proved I didn't exist.

E: Did you grow up in Canada?
R: Yes. In a small town in Ontario.

E: Do you drink alcohol?
R: Only occassionally, because my body doesn't tolerate alcohol. Last time
       I drank I tried to hijack an elevator to Cuba.

E: Were you generally into athletics growing up?
R: Not to any great extent. I had fairly bad reflexes at times. I was
       once hit by a car with a flat tire being pushed by two guys.

E: Well, that's all there is. Thanks for your time.
R: Thanks.

NOTE: Below is an interview transcript between the person in the photo and an experimenter. "E" stands for the experimenter and "R" stands for the person's response.

PHOTO OF
OPPOSITE-
SEX PERSON

E: Hi! How are you doing?
R: Good.

E: As we discussed before, I'm going to ask you a few questions about
      yourself just to get some idea of who you are and what you're like.
      Please answer each question openly and freely in a way that you feel
      best reflects who you are. Okay?
R: Okay.

E: If you're ready to begin, we'll get underway.
R: I'm ready.

E: How old are you?
R: Twenty-one.

E: Do you think your mother and father had what you would consider a solid
      relationship?
R: That's a difficult one to answer. Generally, yes, but they had a
      falling out for a while when my father lost his job. The place where he
      worked became more mechanized and his job became unnecessary. My mother
      didn't react very well to this.

E: What is your current occupation?
R: I'm a third-year university student majoring in psychology.

E: Have you had any what you would call interesting romantic partners?
R: I once went out with a person who was majoring in philosophy. But we
      had to break up because I found it difficult to relate to the way they
      viewed the world.

E: Did you grow up in Canada?
R: Yes. In a small town in Ontario.

E: Do you drink alcohol?
R: Only occassionally, because my body doesn't tolerate alcohol. Last time
      I drank I did some very embarrassing things.

E: Were you generally into athletics growing up?
R: Not to any great extent. I had fairly bad reflexes at times which made
      many athletic activities difficult.

E: Well, that's all there is. Thanks for your time.
R: Thanks.

Appendix 5

Questionnaire 3:

Photo ratings questionnaire for pilot study

QUESTIONNAIRE 3

Below are several photos. Please look at each photo carefully. Then rate it according to how physically attractive you think the person in the photo is. None of the people in the photos are from Thunder Bay or the surrounding area. Please use the following 7-point scale for your rating:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely unattractive	moderately unattractive	mildly unattractive	neither attractive nor unattractive	mildly attractive	moderately attractive	extremely attractive

Photo 1 rating: _____   Photo 2 rating: _____

Photo 3 rating: _____   Photo 4 rating: _____

RATING SCALE:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely unattractive	quite unattractive	mildly unattractive	neither attractive nor unattractive	mildly attractive	quite attractive	extremely attractive

Photo 5 rating: _____   Photo 6 rating: _____

Photo 7 rating: _____   Photo 8 rating: _____

RATING SCALE:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely unattractive	quite unattractive	mildly unattractive	neither attractive nor unattractive	mildly attractive	quite attractive	extremely attractive

Photo 9 rating: _____   Photo 10 rating: _____

Photo 11 rating: _____   Photo 12 rating: _____

RATING SCALE:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely unattractive	quite unattractive	mildly unattractive	neither attractive nor unattractive	mildly attractive	quite attractive	extremely attractive

Photo 13 rating: _____   Photo 14 rating: _____

Photo 15 rating: _____   Photo 16 rating: _____

RATING SCALE:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely unattractive	quite unattractive	mildly unattractive	neither attractive nor unattractive	mildly attractive	quite attractive	extremely attractive

Photo 17 rating: _____   Photo 18 rating: _____

Photo 19 rating: _____   Photo 20 rating: _____

RATING SCALE:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely unattractive	quite unattractive	mildly unattractive	neither attractive nor unattractive	mildly attractive	quite attractive	extremely attractive

Photo 21 rating: _____   Photo 22 rating: _____

Photo 23 rating: _____   Photo 24 rating: _____

RATING SCALE:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely unattractive	quite unattractive	mildly unattractive	neither attractive nor unattractive	mildly attractive	quite attractive	extremely attractive

Photo 25 rating: _____   Photo 26 rating: _____

Photo 27 rating: _____   Photo 28 rating: _____

Appendix 6

Description of pilot study

Description of Pilot Study

This is a short pilot study. It will take only about 15 to 20 minutes of your time. It is used to test out some materials which will be used later in a main study. We would like to know what you think about the test materials so that the main study can work out better. The procedure in this pilot study is very simple. You will be given a booklet with 3 questionnaires, each with its own instructions. You will be asked to rate some adjectives on how socially desirable they are, some transcripts on how humourous they are and some photos on how physically attractive they are. If you have any questions at any time, just raise your hand.

Your participation is voluntary, meaning that you can leave the study any time you want. Your responses will be kept confidential and anonymous. If you wish, you can even get a summary of the results from the main study upon its completion.

Do you have any questions before we start?

Appendix 7

Questionnaire on age, gender, and sexual orientation
for pilot study

For statistical purposes, please specify your age, gender and sexual orientation below. All your responses are <u>totally anonymous</u> and <u>confidential</u>.

AGE: _____

GENDER (please circle one):   Male   Female

What is your sexual orientation? (Please circle the number of your responses):
1.   Heterosexual (sexually attracted to opposite sex)
2.   Homosexual (sexually attracted to same sex)
3.   Bisexual (sexually attracted to both sexes)
4.   Other (Please specify):
                                   _____

A FINAL NOTE:

We would like to thank you for your participation in this pilot study. Your responses will be extremely helpful to us. All your answers will be kept anonymous and confidential. If you have any questions, please ask the experimenter who will be very happy discuss them with you. If you wish to have a copy of the summary of the results from the main study upon its completion, please let the experimenter know. If you have any comments or suggestions, please write them below.

Appendix 8

Questionnaire A:

Desire for Future Interaction questionnaire for main
study

QUESTIONNAIRE A

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are a few questions regarding your reaction to the person in the transcript. Please assume that you are single, i.e., not dating and not married. Remember that all your responses will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous and that there is no way that they can be tracked back to you. So, please feel free to answer frankly. When answering the question, please use the 7-point rating scale below:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely undesirable	moderately undesirable	mildly undesirable	neither desirable nor undesirable	mildly desirable	moderately desirable	extremely desirable

YOUR
RESPONSE

1. To what extent would you find it desirable to go out on a date with a person like this? _____

2. To what extent would you find it desirable to have sex with a person like this? _____

3. To what extent would you find it desirable to have a serious relationship with a person like this? _____

4. To what extent would you find it desirable to marry a person like this? _____

5. To what extent would you find it desirable to marry and have children with a person like this? _____

****

Below are two questions that are strictly for statistical purposes only. Your answers together with the many other participants in the study will help us understand the results of the study in a better context.

A. What is your age? _____

B. What is your sexual orientation? (Please circle the number of your response):
   1. Heterosexual (sexually attracted to opposite sex)
   2. Homosexual (sexually attracted to same sex)
   3. Bisexual (sexually attracted to both sexes)
   4. Other (please specify): _____

Appendix 9

Questionnaire C:

Post-experimental questionnaire for main study

QUESTIONNAIRE C

INSTRUCTIONS:

On the pages that follow are a series of questions about this study. Many of them are designed to make sure that you properly understood the instructions. Others are designed to help us understand your thoughts and feelings during the experiment. This type of information is of great value in interpreting the results of psychological research. Please turn the pages one at a time. <u>DO NOT LOOK AHEAD TO QUESTIONS OTHER THAN THE ONE TO WHICH YOU ARE RESPONDING. DO NOT GO BACK TO A QUESTION ONCE YOU HAVE GONE ON TO THE NEXT ONE</u>. You may begin.

1.   What do you think is the purpose of this study?

2a. Why do you think you were asked to read the interview
     transcript?

b.   At which point in the study did this occur to you?

3a. Why do you think you were given a photo of the person in the transcript?

 b. At which point in the study did this occur to you?

4a. Do you think there was a reason that you were asked to read about this particular person rather than another?

Please circle one: YES   NO

 b. If yes, what do you think the reason was?

5a. Why do you think you were asked to complete Questionnaire A, i.e., the one which asked about how desirable it would be for you to be involved with the person in the transcript in different types of relationship?

 b. When did you come to this conclusion?

6a. Why do you think you were asked to complete Questionnaire B, i.e., the one where you had to rate the person in the transcript on several adjectives?

 b. When did you come to this conclusion?

7a. Did it ever occur to you that you were not given a true and accurate description of this study?

Please circle one: YES   NO

b. If yes, what do you think was untrue or inaccurate?

c. If yes, when during the study did these suspicions occur to you?

d. If yes, how sure are you of your suspicions? (Please circle the number on the scale below that best fits your answer)

```
   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7
very sure                                  not sure
                                           at all
```

8a. Have you ever heard or read a study of this sort?

Please circle one: YES   NO

b. If yes, what exactly have you heard or read?

c. If you have any comments or concerns regarding this study, please write them below:

Appendix 10

Informed consent form for main study

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

This is a study on how people perceive and react to others when only limited information is presented to them. You will be asked to read an interview transcript of a person accompanied by a photo of that person. After that, you will be asked for your perceptions and reactions to this person.

Your responses will be kept anonymous and confidential so that nothing can be traced back to you. In addition, it is understood that you are free to discontinue your participation in this study once the session has begun without explanation or penalty.

****

I have read the above description of the study and wish to participate in it. I understand that I am free to discontinue my participation at any point without explanation or penalty.

_____   _____
      (signed)   (witnessed)

_____
      (date)

Appendix 11

Debriefing for main study

Debriefing For the Main Study

Before you leave, I would like to say something about this study to you. This study examines how physical attractiveness and humour in a person influences others' perception and reaction to him or her, particularly in an opposite-sex relationship. Literature has indicated that a more physically attractive person tends to be perceived as having more socially desirable personality traits and people tend to be more inclined to desire future interaction with him or her in varying types of relationships.

Past research has also shown humour to be a valued characteristic in a person. However, we do not know whether humour in a person may interplay with his or her physical attractiveness to influence other people's perception or response to him or her. For instance, could a humourous person who is unattractive be as well-liked or perceived as well as a person who is attractive but has no sense of humour? This study attempts to answer this question by looking at humour and physical attractiveness in combination. Your answers to the questionnaires we gave you will help us to answer this question. Do you have any questions?

We will not know the results of the study until it has been completed. If you wish to have a copy of the results, please write your name and summer mailing address on an address label which I can give you.

One last thing before you go. I would appreciate it if you do not say anything at all about this study to anyone. This is to protect the study. If people who will be participating in this study get to hear about it, they may develop expectations which may influence their answers to the questionnaire. The entire study may be ruined and we may be forced to start all over again. So, no matter how great the temptation, could you please promise not to discuss this study with anyone to ensure its success? Do you have any questions?

Thank you for your participation. It has been extremely valuable.