

Author: Ramaker, Ashley A.

Title: *The Impact of the Halo Effect in Online Dating*

The accompanying research report is submitted to the University of Wisconsin-Stout, Graduate School in partial completion of the requirements for the

Graduate Degree/ Major: Master of Science Applied Psychology

Research Advisor: Sarah Wood, Ph.D.

Submission Term/Year: Spring 2020

Number of Pages: 36

Style Manual Used: American Psychological Association, 6th edition

- I have adhered to the Graduate School Research Guide and have proofread my work.
- I understand that this research report must be officially approved by the Graduate School. **Additionally, by signing and submitting this form, I (the author(s) or copyright owner) grant the University of Wisconsin-Stout the non-exclusive right to reproduce, translate, and/or distribute this submission (including abstract) worldwide in print and electronic format and in any medium, including but not limited to audio or video. If my research includes proprietary information, an agreement has been made between myself, the company, and the University to submit a thesis that meets course-specific learning outcomes and CAN be published. There will be no exceptions to this permission.**
- I attest that the research report is my original work (that any copyrightable materials have been used with the permission of the original authors), and as such, it is automatically protected by the laws, rules, and regulations of the U.S. Copyright Office.
- My research advisor has approved the content and quality of this paper.

STUDENT:

NAME: Ashley Ramaker

DATE: 05/06/2020

ADVISOR: (Committee Chair if MS Plan A or EdS Thesis or Field Project/Problem):

NAME: Sarah Wood

DATE: 05/06/2020

This section for MS Plan A Thesis or EdS Thesis/Field Project papers only

Committee members (other than your advisor who is listed in the section above)

1. CMTE MEMBER'S NAME: Chelsea Lovejoy **DATE:** 05/06/2020
2. CMTE MEMBER'S NAME: Elizabeth Buchanan **DATE:** 05/06/2020
3. CMTE MEMBER'S NAME: **DATE:**

This section to be completed by the Graduate School

This final research report has been approved by the Graduate School.

Director, Office of Graduate Studies:

DATE:

Ramaker, Ashley A. *The Impact of the Halo Effect in Online Dating*

Abstract

Online dating has become a popular way to date, but many couples are not staying together. One factor that may influence success of relationships formed online is the halo effect. To examine this, 114 participants viewed one of four online dating profiles that varied based on attractiveness and gender then made ratings of the individual in the profile on a number of characteristics including attractiveness. Ratings of a conversation between the profiled individual and a potential dating partner were also given. The participants who saw a more attractive profile gave higher ratings on the other personality characteristics indicating a halo effect. There was not a difference in interpersonal attraction for the participants who saw a more or less attractive person in the profile and a potential dating partner. The results of this study indicate the presence of the halo effect in online dating. Future directions indicate studying the self-fulfilling prophecy in an online dating setting.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to Dr. Sarah Wood for advising me through this research process. I would not have been able complete it without you. Thank you for all of the support!

Thank you to the members on my committee: Dr. Chelsea Lovejoy and Dr. Elizabeth Buchanan. Thank you for the feedback and being a part of my committee.

I would like to thank my family and friends for giving me continuous encouragement throughout my thesis project.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Chapter I: Introduction	6
Online Communication.....	6
Halo Effect	8
Impression Formation	10
The Present Study.....	11
Chapter II: Methodology	14
Participants.....	14
Measures & Materials.....	14
Demographics and Mate Preference	14
Dating Profiles	14
Halo Effect.....	15
Interpersonal Attraction.....	15
Procedure	15
Chapter III: Results	17
Table 1: Demographics.....	17
Table 2: T-test of Halo Effect Variables.....	19
Chapter IV: Discussion	20
Limitations & Future Research	21
References	24
Appendix A: Demographics and Mate Preference	32
Appendix B: Profile of Target	33

Appendix C: Halo Effect Scale.....	34
Appendix D: Interpersonal Attraction Scale	35
Appendix E: Conversation Between Partners	36

Chapter I: Introduction

The online dating industry is a multibillion-dollar industry (Mantel, 2015). There are over 1,500 dating apps on which couples can meet (Stewart, 2016). In 2018, the divorce rate per 1,000 total population is 2.9 in the United States (CDC, 2017). While the divorce rate is low currently, the marriage rate in the United States is also low. In 2018, the marriage rate in the United States is 6.5 per 1,000 total population. Comparatively, Paul (2014) found that couples who met online were three times more likely to divorce and also more likely to experience pre-marital breakup than those who met offline. Given the large number of people using these online services, it's important to understand why relationships formed this way are so much more likely to end in a breakup. The purpose of this study is to examining if the halo effect is present in an online dating environment.

Online Communication

Online dating is a newer form of meeting people. The first form of online dating was computer matchmaking. Computer matchmaking began in 1959 when two Stanford University students, Jim Harvey and Phil Fialer, created a program that allowed participants to be matched based on similarities (Gillmor, 2007). Computer matchmaking evolved as computers and the internet became more accessible (Finkel, Eastwick, Karney, Reis, & Sprecher, 2012). The first online dating site, Match, began in 1995. It allowed users to create a profile and search other profiles (Stern, 1999). While online dating began on desktop computers, there are now mobile apps that are dedicated to online dating. One of the most popular mobile dating apps, Tinder, was created in 2012 (Silva, Koch, Rickers, Kreuzer, & Topolinski, 2019). This creates more accessibility because the apps are downloaded onto phones and carried around wherever people go. Typically, however, app-based services provide a profile with a narrow set of information. A

dating partner will make judgements about suitability based on a photograph and a few words of descriptive information.

Though online dating is relatively new, it is widely used. According to Statista (2019), approximately 33.9 million U.S. users in 2018 were utilizing online dating services. And, the way we communicate online is different from the way we communicate face-to-face (Schiffirin, Edelman, Falkenstern, & Stewart, 2010). Schiffirin et al. (2010) found that individuals perceived online communication to be less useful than face-to-face communication for maintaining relationships. On the other side, online communication can contribute to the growth and maintenance of relationships (Clark & Green, 2013). Online dating has allowed people to start new friendships and relationships, as well as marriages. In 2019, 30% of United States adults have used a dating site or dating app (Anderson, Vogels, & Turner, 2020).

While we see the formation of relationships in online communication, the consequences of meeting online may be detrimental to a relationship (Couch, Liamputtong, & Pitts, 2012). Risks to online dating include lying and deceit, sexual violence, emotional vulnerability, physical violence, and encountering dangerous and untrustworthy people (Couch et al., 2012). Additionally, these risks of online dating can lead to separation of relationship partners. For example, 32% of individuals who were married met their partners online compared to 67% who were married from meeting offline (Paul, 2014). The reliance on the halo effect may be affecting these relationships. When forming first impressions, these impressions of others can affect the way people act towards others (Lammers et al., 2016). If one does not avoid this bias, this could lead to inaccurate and unfair impressions of others.

Halo Effect

The halo effect can be defined as the way people incorrectly attribute characteristics to other people (Goffin, Balke, & Wagner, 2003). The halo effect occurs when people assign positive or negative characteristics, traits, or personal qualities to a person after observing one positive or negative quality of that person (Kahneman, 2011; Larose & Standing, 1998). For example, we perceive celebrities as successful and attractive; we also see them as intelligent, kind, and funny (Cherry, 2020). Thorndike (1920) coined the term halo effect and researched how one quality of the same man influenced a number of different traits. He discovered the ratings were affected by a tendency to think of a person as generally good or bad.

It has been well established that the halo effect can be driven by the physical attractiveness of an individual (Dion, Berscheid, & Walster, 1972). The attractiveness halo effect, also known as “beautiful-is-good” or “physical attractiveness stereotype”, is the tendency to attribute positive qualities towards attractive individuals (Dion et al., 1972). This stereotype has been demonstrated in a number of studies. In one study, a picture of an attractive woman was paired with no description, a positive description, or a negative description. The researchers found that a positive description accompanied with the picture of the woman resulted in a more positive personality rating (Lammers, Davis, Davidson, & Hogue, 2016). Similarly, a meta-analysis of the attractiveness stereotype found people are inclined to attribute positive qualities to more attractive people (Eagly, Ashmore, Makhijani, & Longo, 1991). Also, in the meta-analysis, ratings of social competence (interpersonal skills or traits and outcomes of such skills) were affected most by attractiveness and unattractiveness, followed by ratings of intelligence, power, dominance, and well-being. Since most online dating apps provide a picture of a person in the

profile first, the more attractive people in online dating profiles could be seen as having more positive personality or positive qualities.

The attractiveness halo effect can also be found in intelligence and academic performance. As assumed if you are more beautiful, you will have higher intelligence and academic performance. Moore, Filippou, and Perrett (2011) found faces that were manipulated to look highly intelligent were rated higher in perceived intelligence and attractiveness. While the authors attempted to control for the attractiveness halo, this was unsuccessful and those who were deemed as more attractive were rated higher in perceived intelligence. Likewise, Talamas, Mavor, and Perret (2016a) found high correlations between perceptions of facial attractiveness and perceived intelligence, perceived conscientiousness, and perceived academic performance. In a different study, Talamas, Mavor, and Perret (2016b), showed that ratings of children's faces were strongly correlated to perceived intelligence and perceived attractiveness.

The attractiveness halo effect occurs in various settings such as employment interviews (Crissy & Regan, 1951; Watkins & Johnston, 2000) and political candidate elections (Herrmann & Shikano, 2016). Starting with employment interviews, physical attraction and resume quality was studied in the selection process (Watkins & Johnston, 2000). Individuals with a high quality resume were rated more positively than with those with a mediocre resume. But, average or mediocre resumes with an attractive photo were more likely to be offered an interview. Additionally, participants rated headshots in both student candidates running in university elections and politicians running in a state election (Herrmann & Shikano, 2016). The halo effect was demonstrated in students running in university elections, suggesting that those who are attractive are more competent.

Weight and age in both men and women are susceptible to the halo effect. Thinner or normal weight men were seen as more attractive, enthusiastic, and perceived occupational success (Wade, Fuller, Bresnan, Schaefer, & Mlynarski, 2007). Compared to men who were heavier or overweight, these men were seen as less attractive but were rated higher in “intelligence, friendliness, trustworthiness, parenting skills, and mate potential” (Wade et al., 2007, p. 322). Wade & DiMaria (2003) studied if the weight of women with different races would effect ratings of attractiveness, life success, and personality. Thinner women were generally rated higher in attractiveness than heavier women. The halo effect can also be seen in different age groups. Larose and Standing (1998) discovered the attractiveness halo effect can occur in older adults, suggesting the bias happens across the lifespan. The older individuals who were more attractive were attributed with positive personality characteristics.

Impression formation. The halo effect has been shown to affect impression formation. Impression formation is a process that takes bits of information, such as personality traits or behaviors, to create a combined impression (Asch, 1946). For example, Asch (1946) studied how priming participants with positive words first, compared to priming them with negative words first to describe someone, affected impression formation. The individuals described using positive words first were seen as having a more favorable impression. While these findings primed the participants with words first, the halo effect can influence an overall impression of an individual by the attractiveness of a picture. In regard to the halo effect, Surawski and Ossoff (2006) studied whether attractiveness of a politician’s voice influenced impression formation when visual information is available as well. The participants saw a photo of a politician and listened to a voice recording at the same time. The politicians with high physical attractiveness and low vocal attractiveness were rated significantly less attractive, competent, trustworthy, and

had less leadership ability than the politicians with high physical attractiveness and high vocal attractiveness, due to the difference in vocal attractiveness. While this result suggests vocal attractiveness can play a role in impression formation, physical attractiveness takes precedent. Goldman, Cowles, & Florez (1983) studied the halo effect when the speaker and audience had initial information about a central trait of the other, either being warm or cold. When students and the speaker have mutual information about each other, either being warm or cold, the evaluation of the speaker will be positive or negative, accordingly. These findings show the halo effect is important while forming impressions.

Impression formation has also been studied in an social media context (Silva, Koch, Rickers, Kreuzer, & Topolinski, 2019; Sritharan, Heilpern, Wilbur, & Gawronski, 2010). Tinder users are perceived as less trustworthy than in the dating app users of Parshnip and Facebook users based on first impressions (Silva et al., 2019). This result suggests different dating apps can influence how an impression is formed. In a different study, female participants formed impressions of a potential partner from an online dating profile (Sritharan et al., 2010). They answered questions based on deliberate evaluations regarding a likability questionnaire and spontaneous evaluations regarding quickly making judgments on the attraction of the potential partner. Facial attractiveness influenced spontaneous evaluations compared to deliberate evaluations (Sritharan, Heilpern, Wilbur, & Gawronski, 2010). While the halo effect influences impression formation in this context, the online dating profile also influences how one makes an impression.

The Present Study

The attractiveness halo effect has been researched within online dating profiles (Brand, Bonatsos, D’Orazio, & DeShong, 2012). Women rated men’s online dating profiles based on the

profile photos and profile texts. The profile texts included headlines and an introductory text. The researchers found overall attractiveness of the profile photo was positively related to the overall attractiveness of the profile texts. They also found attractiveness of the profile texts predicted confidence of the profile texts. Similarly, men and women rated a fake online dating profile that did not match the profile owner (Bak & Köln, 2010). Each male and female was exposed to only one profile that was either an attractive or unattractive photo of the opposite gender. The researchers found that an attractive photo lead to better ratings in personality traits of the person in the profile.

This study focuses on examining online dating and the halo effect by having the participants evaluate an online communication between two other people. The goal will be to demonstrate that the limited information contained in an online dating profile can in fact create some potentially false beliefs driven by the halo effect. This will be assessed by measuring ratings of a set of characteristics and traits of a person presented in an online dating profile. Using a measure of interpersonal attraction, participant perceptions of the interaction between the person in the dating profile and one of their 'matches' will be assessed. While it won't be possible to directly determine how someone responds to the false beliefs (e.g., whether they confirm the beliefs), this strategy may provide limited insight on some aspects of the self-fulfilling prophecy, namely that a specific belief is formed and that it influences perceptions of behaviors. The following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Participants who view the more attractive profile will make higher ratings on the personality measure indicating a halo effect.

Hypothesis 2: It is expected that participants who view the more attractive profile will perceive a stronger level of interpersonal attraction between the target and potential partner.

Chapter II: Methodology

The methodology intended to research the presence of the halo effect in an online dating setting.

Participants

Participants were 114 undergraduate students at a small Midwestern University. There were 51 males, 62 females, and 1 non-binary/third gender. The average age of the participants was 20.49 ($SD = 3.55$). Participants were students in psychology courses enrolled in the Psychology Department Participant Pool and received course credit for participation.

Measures & Materials

The measures and materials included demographic and mate preference questions, online dating profiles, a halo effect measure, and an interpersonal attraction measure.

Demographics and mate preference. Four questions were asked. The questions asked the participant of their age, gender, relationship status, and preference of gender in a dating partner. See Appendix A for demographic questions and mate preference question.

Dating profiles. Four pictures were obtained from the FACES database, a website that contains naturalistic face images of men and women in varying adult age groups with six different facial expressions (Ebner, Riediger, & Lindenberger, 2010). The people were recruited through a modeling agency in Berlin, Germany. The majority of the population in Berlin, Germany is Caucasian which is a reason why the faces are exclusively Caucasian. All faces did not contain glasses, beards, tattoos, piercings, or makeup. The pictures were taken in full color with a neutral background and gray shirt. The faces chosen displayed a happy expression and were in the young adult age group (19-31). The attractive and unattractive pictures were chosen based on a validation study of ratings for attractiveness. Two highly attractive pictures and two

unattractive photos were chosen of each gender. Once the pictures were chosen, the pictures were made to look like online dating profiles. Name, age and biography about the target person was kept consistent for each profile. See Appendix B.

Halo effect. The halo effect was measured by a semantic differential scale consisting of ten characteristics including attractiveness (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957). An example item was “To what degree is the target person (Alex), from intelligent to unintelligent.” See Appendix C for scale.

Interpersonal attraction. To determine whether a halo effect would influence participants’ perceptions of the targets’ behavior, a measure assessing the level of perceived attraction between two conversation partners was included. Interpersonal attraction was measured using an adapted interpersonal attraction scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). There were three items adapted to the third person from McMrowskey and McMain’s (1974) interpersonal attraction scale, four items adapted from Whitchurch, Wilson, and Gilbert’s (2010) romantic attraction scale, three items adapted from Montoya and Horton’s (2004) interpersonal attraction scale, and two items adapted from Campbell’s (1999) romantic attraction scale. One item was added about the potential partners willingness to disclosure personal information to each other. One item was added about the extent to which the potential partners seem to like each other. The Cronbach’s alpha score for the adapted interpersonal attraction scale is ($\alpha = 0.43$). See Appendix D for scale.

Procedure

All study materials were presented in an online survey format using Qualtrics survey software. Before taking the online survey, the participants were provided information about the study and asked to give consent. The participant specified their age, gender, and relationship

status. To assign the participant to a condition, participants were asked if they preferred to date males, females, or did not have a preference between males or females. Participants who indicated they preferred to date men were assigned to a condition that featured a male dating profile. Those who indicated they preferred to date women were assigned to a condition that featured a female dating profile. Those who indicated they had no gender preference for dating were randomly assigned to either a male or female dating profile. All participants were randomly assigned to attractiveness condition.

After the participant was assigned a profile, the participants saw the profile they were assigned to. The profile contained a picture of the target person and a short description. The online dating profile was designed to look similar to the layout and amount of information seen on widely used dating apps. The description contained the name, age, and a short biography about the person. After viewing the profile, the participants rated the person in the profile on attractiveness and completed the halo effect scale. Next, the participants saw images of a brief conversation between the person in the profile and a potential dating partner designed to look like a real text exchange about setting up a time to meet in person (see Appendix E for full conversation). The participant answered an interpersonal attraction scale about how they perceived the conversation between the pair. The participants were then debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Chapter III: Results

There were 51 males, 62 females, and 1 non-binary/third gender, for a total of 114 participants. The average age of the participants was 20.49 ($SD = 3.55$). Of these, 57 participants were in a relationship, 56 were single, and 1 participant was married. There were 60 participants that preferred a male as a romantic partner, 46 participants that preferred females as a romantic partner, and 8 participants that had no preference of a romantic partner. To prepare the data for analysis, composite scores were made for each variable (halo effect scale and interpersonal attraction scale). For the halo effect scale, negative items were recoded, and all the items were averaged to create a composite score. For the interpersonal attraction scale, the items were averaged to create a composite score.

Table 1

Demographics

Variable	Mean	SD	Frequency
Age	20.49	3.55	
Gender			
Males			51
Females			62
Non-binary/third gender			1
Relationship Status			
In a relationship			57
Single			56
Married			1

Note. N=114

A manipulation check was used to verify that the participants perceived the high attractiveness profile picture as higher in attractiveness than the low attractiveness profile photos. An independent samples t-test was conducted to explore the manipulation check. In this sample, the high attractive profile picture ($M = 3.12$, $SD = .857$) was rated significantly higher in attractiveness than the low attractive profile picture ($M = 1.98$, $SD = .691$), $t(112) = 7.64$, $p < .001$. Cohen's d reflected a large effect ($d = 1.48$), [95% CI: .847, 1.44].

To test Hypothesis 1 an independent samples t-test was conducted comparing halo effect scale ratings between those who saw the attractive vs. unattractive photo. In this sample, the high attractive profile picture ($M = 3.59$, $SD = .386$) was rated significantly higher in the halo effect than the low attractive profile picture ($M = 3.27$, $SD = .506$), on the halo effect scale $t(110) = 3.83$, $p < .001$. To further investigate the halo effect, a t-test was conducted on the individual characteristics of the halo effect and the level of attractiveness of the profile. The high attractive profile picture was rated significantly higher in intelligence, security, and emotional stability than the low attractive profile picture.

Table 2

T-test of Halo Effect Variables

Variables	High Attractiveness		Low Attractiveness		<i>t</i>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Intelligence	3.68	0.64	3.10	0.92	3.93**
Warm	3.84	0.65	3.67	0.80	1.22
Openness	3.68	0.91	3.59	0.93	0.52
Conscientious	3.29	0.71	3.14	0.74	1.04
Extraverted	3.44	1.04	3.06	1.23	1.78
Agreeable	3.45	0.65	3.35	0.75	0.79
Secure	3.48	0.62	2.96	0.84	3.75**
Emotionally Stable	3.63	0.79	2.94	0.83	4.54**
Respectful	3.78	0.66	3.57	0.87	1.43

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

To test Hypothesis 2 an independent samples t-test was conducted to examine differences in interpersonal attraction ratings between those who saw the attractive vs. unattractive photo. Unexpectedly, there was not a significant difference in attraction ratings between those who saw the attractive vs. unattractive profile photo, $t(110) = 1.74, p = .085$.

An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine if there was a difference between the participants who are single or who are coupled (in a relationship or married) and the attractiveness of the person in the profile. The participants who are single did not rate the person in the profile significantly more attractive than the participants who are coupled, $t(112) = 0.31, p = .754$.

Chapter IV: Discussion

The aim of this study was to explore the halo effect in male and female online dating profiles. To examine this, participants were asked to rate the attractiveness and personality characteristics of an online dating profile and to answer questions based on the interpersonal attraction between the person in the profile and a potential dating partner. As predicted, participants rated the more attractive profiles higher in the halo effect measure than the less attractive profiles. Specifically, those who were considered more physically attractive in an online dating profile were perceived to be more intelligent, secure, and emotionally stable than those who were considered less physically attractive. This result showed there is a halo effect within online dating. This finding is consistent with previous research predicting those who are more attractive are perceived as more intelligent (Moore et al., 2011; Talamas, Mavor, & Perret 2016a; Talamas, Mavor, & Perret 2016b). Further, the evolutionary view on physical attractiveness suggests that perceptions and preferences of mate serve to guide biological and socially functional behaviors (McArthur, & Baron, 1983). From this perspective mate preferences are often influenced by physical characteristics, such as attractiveness, that are associated with health and thus increase chances of gene survival. Both ideas suggest that people are motivated to think well of individuals higher in physical attractiveness.

There was not a significant difference of profile attractiveness on ratings of interpersonal attraction between the conversation partners as hypothesized. In other words, the profiles that were more attractive did not have higher ratings of interpersonal attraction between the potential dating partner than the less attractive profiles. One reason there may not be a difference is because the participants were rating the interpersonal attraction between two other people. Rather than between the person in the profile and the participant.

The results suggest that the halo effect is likely to be at play in online dating contexts. Similarly, to the previous literature on the halo effect in this context (Bak & Köln, 2010; Brand et al., 2012). And while these results can't speak directly to how this halo effect influences people's interactions with their own potential dating partners, it does suggest that there may be some circumstances in which the halo effect colors people perceptions of interest.

Limitations & Future Research

There are a few limitations in this study that should be noted. One limitation is the small sample size. Due to a short data collection time at a small university, there was a limited number of people who took the survey. This small sample size also hinders generalizability. Future research should allow for a longer data collection period. Also, future research should open the survey up to a larger population.

A second limitation is based on the photos of the profiles. The four pictures that were chosen were of the same ethnicity, hair color, and eye color. While all profiles were held constant, a participant may prefer a person of a different ethnicity, hair color, or eye color than what they saw. This may have limited the level of attractiveness they chose when rating a profile. Future research should include more diversity in the online dating profiles.

A third limitation was not being able to directly assess the self-fulfilling prophecy. In the context of online dating, one potential result of the halo effect is a self-fulfilling prophecy (Brand et al., 2012; Eagly et al., 1991). A self-fulfilling prophecy occurs in situations where initial false beliefs become true (Merton, 1948). The self-fulfilling prophecy effect happens, such that a person, known as the perceiver, has a false belief about another person, known as the target (Madon, Willard, Guyll, & Scherr, 2011). Second, the perceiver acts towards the target in a way that reflects this false belief. Third, the target confirms the original false belief by responding to

the treatment they received. For example, we perceive attractive people to have more socially desirable traits or characteristics such as intelligence (Brand et al., 2012). We may treat the attractive person as more intelligent, and the attractive person may behave in ways that confirm the person is more intelligent.

The self-fulfilling prophecy has been found in romantic relationships and supports the idea that people do indeed form beliefs about a stranger based on limited information, such as physical attractiveness, and these beliefs influence their behavior (Snyder et al., 1977). Men who interacted with a woman they considered physically attractive appeared “more sociable, sexually warm, interesting, independent, sexually permissive, bold, outgoing, humorous, obvious, and socially adept” (Snyder et al., 1977, p. 663) than men who interacted with a woman they didn’t consider physically attractive. The halo effect could be helping these men form the false beliefs. Also, the self-fulfilling prophecy is present in romantic and sexual desire in opposite-sex friends (Lemay & Wolf, 2016). Perceivers who had romantic desire towards their opposite-sex friends, overestimated how much their friends desired them in return. The perceivers who desired their friend engaged in relationship initiation behaviors which resulted in the friend confirming these behaviors. Further, the self-fulfilling prophecy, if engaged in this context could have real consequences for people’s relationship satisfaction, among other things. One challenge when designing the method was determining how to measure the self-fulfilling prophecy in this context. The self-fulfilling prophecy was included because studying the halo effect and interpersonal attractiveness could lead to showing the self-fulfilling prophecy in this context. Setting up a situation which would allow for interactions between participants or between participants and a confederate could be a way to explore this further. This way, an initial false belief and the fulfillment of the false belief could be measured.

A final limitation was using people who had a relationship status of single or who were coupled (in a relationship or married). Those who are dating or married may rate everyone less attractive due to a perceptual downgrading effect (Cole, Trope, & Balci, 2016).

Comparatively, those who are single may rate everyone as more attractive. A t-test was conducted to see if this limitation existed in this data set. Those who were single did not differ in ratings of attractiveness than those who were coupled.

To conclude, the results of this study contribute to the halo effect literature by demonstrating its presence in an online dating setting. Because online dating is such a big part of some people's lives, it is important to understand how common biases influence these types of interactions. Because there was no support for interpersonal attraction between partners, which might have suggested a connection to the self-fulfilling prophecy, more work is needed to explore this issue. Therefore, future research on this topic should focus more explicitly on self-fulfilling prophecy in an online dating setting. Additionally, future directions intend to look at a bigger population and diversity in profile pictures.

References

- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1983). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York, NY: Irvington.
- Anderson, M., Vogels, E. A., & Turner, E. (2020). The virtues and downsides of online dating. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2020/02/06/the-virtues-and-downsides-of-online-dating/>
- Asch, S. E. (1946). Forming impressions of personality. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *41*(3), 258-290. doi: 10.1037/h0055756
- Bak, P. M., & Köln, H. F. (2010). Sex differences in the attractiveness halo effect in the online dating environment. *Journal of Business and Media Psychology*, *1*(1), 1–7. Retrieved from <https://www.journal-bmp.de>
- Bargh, J. A., & Shalev, I. (2012). The substitutability of physical and social warmth in daily life. *Emotion*, *12*(1), 154-162. doi: 10.1037/a0023527
- Brand, R. J., Bonatsos, A., D’Orazio, R., & DeShong, H. (2012). What is beautiful is good, even online: Correlations between photo attractiveness and text attractiveness in men’s online dating profiles. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *28*(1), 166-170. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2011.08.023
- Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2017). Marriage and divorce. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/marriage-divorce.htm>
- Cherry, K. (2020). Why the halo effect influences how we perceive others. Retrieved from <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-the-halo-effect-2795906>

- Clark, J. L., & Green, M. C. (2013). Making “real” connections: The perceived reality of online interactions. *International Journal of Interactive Communication Systems and Technologies (IJICST)*, 3(1), 1-19. doi: 10.4018/ijicst.2013010101
- Clark, J. L., & Green, M. C. (2018). Self-fulfilling prophecies: Perceived reality of online interaction drives expected outcomes of online communication. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 133, 73-76. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2017.08.031
- Cole, S., Trope, Y., & Balcetis, E. (2016). In the eye of the betrothed: Perceptual downgrading of attractive alternative romantic partners. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42(7), 879–892. doi: 10.1177/0146167216646546
- Couch, D., Liamputtong, P., & Pitts, M. (2012). What are the real and perceived risks and dangers of online dating? Perspectives from online daters. *Health, Risk & Society*, 14(7–8), 697–714. doi: 10.1080/13698575.2012.720964
- Crissy, W. J. E., & Regan, J. J. (1951). Halo in the employment interview. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35(5), 338–341. doi: 10.1037/h0060581
- Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24(3), 285-290. doi: 10.1037/h0033731
- Diekmann, K. A., Tenbrunsel, A. E., & Galinsky, A. D. (2003). From self-prediction to self-defeat: Behavioral forecasting, self-fulfilling prophecies, and the effect of competitive expectations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(4), 672-683. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.672
- Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Callender, J. C. (1994). Confirming first impressions in the employment interview: A field study of interviewer behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5), 659-665. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.5.659

- Downey, G., Freitas, A. L., Michaelis, B., & Khouri, H. (1998). The self-fulfilling prophecy in close relationships: Rejection sensitivity and rejection by romantic partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(2), 545-560. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.75.2.545
- Ebner, N. C., Riediger, M., & Lindenberger, U. (2010). FACES - A database of facial expressions in young, middle-aged, and older women and men: Development and validation. *Behavior Research Methods, 42*(1), 351-362. doi: 10.3758/BRM.42.1.351
- Eagly, A. H., Ashmore, R. D., Makhijani, M. G., & Longo, L. C. (1991). What is beautiful is good, but...: A meta-analytic review of research on the physical attractiveness stereotype. *Psychological Bulletin, 110*(1), 109–128. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.110.1.109
- Finkel, E. J., Eastwick, P. W., Karney, B. R., Reis, H. T., & Sprecher, S. (2012). Online dating: A critical analysis from the perspective of psychological science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 13*(1), 3-66. doi: 10.1177/1529100612436522
- Gillmor, C. S. (2007). Stanford, the IBM 650, and the first trials of computer date matching. *IEEE Annals of the History of Computing, 29*(1), 74-80. doi: 10.1109/MAHC.2007.13
- Goffin, R. D., Jelley, R. B., & Wagner, S. H. (2003). Is halo helpful? Effects of inducing halo on performance rating accuracy. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 31*(6), 625–636. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2003.31.6.625
- Goldman, M., Cowles, M. D., & Florez, C. A. (1983). The halo effect of an initial impression upon speaker and audience. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 120*(2), 197-201. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1983.9713212

- Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (2003). A very brief measure of the big five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*(6), 504-528. doi: 10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00046-1
- Hebl, M. R., & King, E. B. (2004). You are what you wear: An interactive demonstration of the self-fulfilling prophecy. *Teaching of Psychology, 31*(4), 260-262. doi: 10.1207/s15328023top3104_7
- Herrmann, M., & Shikano, S. (2016). Attractiveness and facial competence bias face-based inferences of candidate ideology. *Political Psychology, 37*(3), 401–417. doi: 10.1111/pops.12256
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Lammers, W. J., Davis, S., Davidson, O., & Hogue, K. (2016). Impact of positive, negative, and no personality descriptors on the attractiveness halo effect. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research, 21*(1), 29–34. doi: 10.24839/2164-8204.JN21.1.29
- Larose, H., & Standing, L. (1998). Does the halo effect occur in the elderly? *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 26*(2), 147–150. doi: 10.2224/sbp.1998.26.2.147
- Lemay, E. P. Jr., & Wolf, N. R. (2016). Projection of romantic and sexual desire in opposite-sex friendships: How wishful thinking creates a self-fulfilling prophecy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 42*(7), 864-878. doi: 10.1177/0146167216646077
- Madon, S., Jussim, L., & Eccles, J. (1997). In search of the powerful self-fulfilling prophecy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(4), 791-809. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.72.4.791

- Madon, S., Smith, A., Jussim, L., Russell, D. W., Eccles, J., Palumbo, P., & Walkiewicz, M. (2001). Am I as you see me or do you see me as I am? Self-fulfilling prophecies and self-verification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(9), 1214–1224. doi: 10.1177/0146167201279013
- Madon, S., Willard, J., Gyll, M., & Scherr, K. C. (2011). Self-fulfilling prophecies: Mechanisms, power, and links to social problems. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(8), 578-590. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00375.x
- Mantel, B. (2015). Online dating. *CQ Researcher*, 25(12), 265-288. Retrieved from <http://library.cqpress.com/cqresearcher/document.php?id=cqresrre2015032000&abstract=false>
- McArthur, L. Z., & Baron, R. M. (1983). Toward an ecological theory of social perception. *Psychological Review*, 90(3), 215-238. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.90.3.215
- Merton, R. K. (1948). The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy. *The Antioch Review*, 8(2), 193-210. doi: 10.2307/4609267
- Miller, L. C., Berg, J. H., & Archer, R. L. (1983). Openers: Individuals who elicit intimate self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(6), 1234-1244. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.44.6.1234
- Moore, F. R., Filippou., D., & Perrett, D. I. (2011). Intelligence and attractiveness in the face: Beyond the attractiveness halo effect. *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology*, 9(3), 205–217. doi: 10.1556/JEP.9.2011.3.2
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). *The measurement of meaning*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

- Paul, A. (2014). Is online better than offline for meeting partners? Depends: Are you looking to marry or to date? *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, *17*(10), 664-667. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2014.0302
- Rosenfeld, M. J., & Thomas, R. J. (2012). Searching for a mate: The rise of the internet as a social intermediary. *American Sociological Review*, *77*(4), 523-547. doi: 10.1177/0003122412448050
- Schiffrin, H., Edelman, A., Falkenstern, M., & Stewart, C. (2010). The associations among computer-mediated communication, relationships, and well-being. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *13*(3), 299–306. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2009.0173
- Silva, R. R., Koch, M. L., Rickers, K., Kreuzer, G., & Topolinski, S. (2019). The Tinder™ stamp: Perceived trustworthiness of online daters and its persistence in neutral contexts. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *94*, 45-55. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2018.12.041
- Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*(9), 656-666. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.35.9.656
- Smith, A. E., Jussim, L., & Eccles, J. (1999). Do self-fulfilling prophecies accumulate, dissipate, or remain stable over time? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(3), 548-565. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.77.3.548
- Smith, A. E., Jussim, L., Eccles, J., VanNoy, M., Madon, S., & Palumbo, P. (1998). Self-fulfilling prophecies, perceptual biases, and accuracy at the individual and group levels. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *34*(6), 530-561. doi: 10.1006/jesp.1998.1363

- Sritharan, R., Heilpern, K., Wilbur, C. J., & Gawronski, B. (2010). I think I like you: Spontaneous and deliberate evaluations of potential romantic partners in an online dating context. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 40*(6), 1062–1077. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.703
- Stern, G. (1999). Match.com. *Link - up, 16*(6), 26. Retrieved from <https://login.ezproxy.lib.uwstout.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.uwstout.edu/docview/210189394?accountid=9255>
- Stewart, C. (2016, May 23). The dating services industry in 2016 and beyond [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://blog.marketresearch.com/dating-services-industry-in-2016-and-beyond>
- Surawski, M. K., & Ossoff, E. P. (2006). The effects of physical and vocal attractiveness on impression formation of politicians. *Current Psychology, 25*(1), 15-27. doi: 10.1007/s12144-006-1013-5
- Talamas, S. N., Mavor, K. I., & Perrett, D. I. (2016a). Blinded by beauty: Attractiveness bias and accurate perceptions of academic performance. *PLoS ONE, 11*(2). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0148284
- Talamas, S. N., Mavor, K. I., & Perrett, D. I. (2016b). The influence of intelligence on the endorsement of the intelligence–attractiveness halo. *Personality and Individual Differences, 95*, 162–167. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2016.02.053
- Thorndike, E. L. (1920). A constant error in psychological ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 4*(1), 25–29. doi: 10.1037/h0071663

Wade, T. J., & DiMaria, C. (2003). Weight halo effects: Individual differences in perceived life success as a function of women's race and weight. *Sex Roles, 48*(9), 461-465. doi:

10.1023/A:1023582629538

Wade, T. J., Fuller, L., Bresnan, J., Schaefer, S., & Mlynarski, L. (2007). Weight halo effects: Individual differences in personality evaluations and perceived life success of men as a function of weight? *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*(2), 317-324. doi:

10.1016/j.paid.2006.07.011

Watkins, L. M., & Johnston, L. (2000). Screening job applicants: The impact of physical attractiveness and application quality. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8*(2), 76-84. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00135

Weaver, J., Moses, J. F., & Snyder, M. (2016). Self-fulfilling prophecies in ability settings. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 156*(2), 179-189. doi: 10.1080/00224545.2015.1076761

Willard, J., Madon, S., Guyll, M., Spoth, R., & Jussim, L. (2008). Self-efficacy as a moderator of negative and positive self-fulfilling prophecy effects: Mothers' beliefs and children's alcohol use. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*(3), 499-520. doi:

10.1002/ejsp.429

Appendix A: Demographics and Mate Preference

Demographic questions and mate preference question.

- 1) What is your age?
- 2) What is your gender?
- 3) What is your preference of a potential partner?
- 4) What is your relationship status?

Appendix B: Profile of Target

Profile of target person.

Name: Alex

Age: 21

BIO: I could never give up mint chocolate chip ice cream (Ben and Jerry's, preferably), karaoke, musical theater, or Jeopardy.

Appendix C: Halo Effect Scale

Halo effect scale.

To what degree is the target person (Alex) on a scale of 1 (extremely), 2 (slightly), 3 (neither), 4 (slightly), and 5 (extremely):

- 1) Attractive - unattractive
- 2) Intelligent - unintelligent
- 3) Warm - cold
- 4) Open - closed
- 5) Conscientious - unconscientious
- 6) Extraverted - introverted
- 7) Agreeable - disagreeable
- 8) Neurotic - secure
- 9) Emotionally Stable – emotionally unstable
- 10) Respectful - disrespectful

Appendix D: Interpersonal Attraction Scale

Interpersonal Attraction scale.

Based on the conversation, please rate the following statements from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree:

- 1) I think Alex and Taylor could be friends
- 2) Alex and Taylor could never establish a personal friendship
- 3) I think Alex and Taylor had a friendly chat
- 4) Taylor finds Alex attractive
- 5) Alex finds Taylor attractive
- 6) Alex and Taylor like each other
- 7) Taylor would like to date Alex
- 8) Alex would like to date Taylor
- 9) Alex and Taylor are interested in a casual acquaintance
- 10) Alex and Taylor are interested in a friendship
- 11) Alex and Taylor are interested in a hook-up
- 12) Alex and Taylor are interested in an exclusive relationship
- 13) In the future, Alex and Taylor would like to meet
- 14) Alex and Taylor would like taking each other to a party
- 15) Alex and Taylor would like to get to know each other better
- 16) Alex and Taylor would disclose personal information to each other

Appendix E: Conversation Between Partners

Conversation between target (Alex) and a potential partner.

Taylor: What is your favorite karaoke song?

Alex: 500 miles by The Proclaimers. A real crowd pleaser.

Taylor: Oh yeah. My crowd pleaser is I Will Always Love You by Whitney Houston. It always gets a few whistles. I can't sing by the way.

Alex: Me neither! Totally not a requirement for karaoke. People who can actually sing ruin it.

Taylor: I agree! I hate it when some secret voice contestant goes up and just hits a song outta the park. I'm probably just jealous.

Alex: No, it's like if a major league player showed up for little league. They are wrong! You're fine.

Taylor: So, you wanna trade a few messages back and forth and then meet up?

Alex: Yes, before we get bored. Who wants to type all day.

Taylor: Do you wanna get together tomorrow?

Alex: Could we do Tuesday instead? Tomorrow I have an interview late in the afternoon and I think it'll take me a long time to get back.

Taylor: Yeah I can Tuesday, do you have a place in mind?

Alex: How about the Village Idiot? I've got more ideas if that's not convenient.

Taylor: I've been meaning to check out Village Idiot so that works for me.