

Results and Discussion

Our data was analyzed in order to quantify the impact of a person's attractiveness on his or her perceived qualifications for a job. In terms of overall qualifications, it seemed that people, in general, were more likely to hire the more attractive candidate over the less attractive candidate. In terms of educational qualifications, people tended to rate the applicants similarly. Yet, with respect to work experience, the results were mixed.

In Tables 1 and 2, it can be seen that in terms of overall qualifications, people rated the attractive female higher than the unattractive female. This finding was statistically significant ($t(27) = -2.36, p = .01$). This means that there is only a 1% chance that the difference between the averages of the two women's ratings was due to chance. Subjects also rated the attractive male as more qualified than the unattractive male. This was also statistically significant ($t(25) = -2.77, p = .005$). This is even stronger than the previous comparison. The attractive male was rated much higher than the unattractive female ($t(24) = -3.75, p = .0005$). This means that there is a 99.95% chance that this was not due to chance variations. In other words, people are more likely to hire an attractive male over an unattractive female. The last comparison that was statistically significant was between the attractive male and the attractive female. The attractive male received significantly higher job qualification scores than the attractive female ($t(25) = -1.69, p = .05$). This data indicates that the attractive male is considered the most qualified, more so than the attractive female, unattractive male and the unattractive female. The attractive female was considered more qualified when compared to the unattractive female,

but the results between the attractive female and the unattractive male were not statistically significant. The reason for the variations in ratings in this category may be that qualification is a very subjective category. It is difficult to decide how qualified an applicant is in general. These results were very different from the results found when comparing the perceived educational qualifications of the applicants.

In terms of education, there were no statistically significant differences between the applicants (see tables 3 and 4). However, there was one result approaching statistical significance between the unattractive female and the attractive male. People tended to consider the attractive male as better educated than the unattractive female. In general the applicants were rated similarly in terms of educational qualifications. One possible explanation for this is that education level is more objective than the other categories. It is more difficult to dispute hard facts like alma maters, degrees and grade point averages than it is to dispute amount of work experience and overall qualifications.

With respect to work experience, there were many comparisons that were statistically significant (see tables 5 and 6). The attractive male had significantly higher scores than the unattractive male ($t(25) = 2.49, p = .009$), meaning that there is only a 0.1% chance that this is due to chance variation. The attractive male received significantly higher scores than the unattractive female ($t(24) = -1.94, p = .03$). The attractive male was also rated higher than the attractive female ($t(25) = -1.85, p = .03$).

It is interesting to note that the only category in which the unattractive female and the attractive females' scores were significantly different was in overall qualifications. Their scores did not have statistically significant differences in work experience or education. Therefore, this is probably due to the original theory that an attractive female is more likely to be hired for a teaching position than an unattractive female based solely on her looks. There is a general opinion, however, and most individuals would say, that qualifications are far more important for a teaching position than looks. It is also interesting to note that the attractive male was rated higher in terms of work experience than the unattractive male. There was not a statistically significant difference in their ratings in terms of education, yet still, the attractive male was considered to be more qualified overall than the unattractive male. In general, the attractive male came out on top in every category. Most people would rather hire a man than a woman. This supports our original hypothesis. Even though we had an attractive woman as an applicant, she was still less likely to be hired than the attractive man. In general, the population still believes that men are more qualified and capable of completing jobs than are women. Also, the more attractive the male, the more qualified he appears to be. If the study were to be replicated, it would be helpful to use more random sampling techniques. All of the subjects in this experiment were parents of Rowland Hall-St. Mark's students. They all had this in common. If the subjects were truly an accurate representation of the American population, then the results would have had greater external validity. In the future, it would be interesting to follow up this study with other similar studies. For example, it would be very exciting to see how race affects

employment, or how a certain facial expression in a picture may affect employment. Other ideas for future research might include a study that determines whether having a certain accent in an interview setting might affect someone's chances of being employed; or whether wearing a certain type of clothing might affect employment.

All of the results found in the study seem to support the original hypothesis that attractive people are more likely to be hired for teaching positions than unattractive people, even if their qualifications are the same. Also, a man is more likely to be hired than a woman is. Because the resumes were identical for each applicant, we can only assume that the pictures were the only factor that influenced the difference in ratings.