

Contents

<i>List of Figures and Tables</i>	vii
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	x
<i>Preface</i>	xvii

Part I Introduction

1 Mutual and Partaken Bliss: Introducing the Science of Bodily Beauty <i>Adrian Furnham and Viren Swami</i>	3
--	---

Part II Methodological Critiques

2 Waist-to-Hip Ratios and Female Attractiveness: Comparing Apples, Oranges, and Pears <i>Donald H. McBurney and Sybil A. Streeter</i>	15
3 The Volume-Height Index as a Body Attractiveness Index <i>Jintu Fan</i>	29
4 Methodological Issues in Studies of Female Attractiveness <i>Melissa Bateson, Piers L. Cornelissen, and Martin J. Tovée</i>	46

Part III Attractiveness Research Across Cultures

5 An Evolutionary Perspective on Male Preferences for Female Body Shape <i>Isabel Scott, Gillian R. Bentley, Martin J. Tovée, Farid Uddin Ahamed, and Kesson Magid</i>	65
6 Masculinity, Culture, and the Paradox of the Lek <i>Douglas W. Yu, Stephen R. Proulx, and Glenn H. Shepard</i>	88
7 Healthy Body Equals Beautiful Body? Changing Perceptions of Health and Attractiveness with Shifting Socioeconomic Status <i>Martin J. Tovée, Adrian Furnham, and Viren Swami</i>	108

Part IV Theory Development: Evolutionary Perspectives

- 8 The Shaping of Women's Bodies: Men's Choice of Fertility or Heat Stress Avoidance? 131
Dorothy Einon
- 9 Interpersonal Metaperception: The Importance of Compatibility in the Aesthetic Appreciation of Bodily Cues 159
Kerri L. Johnson and Louis G. Tassinary
- 10 Mate Preferences in Social Cognitive Context: When Environmental and Personal Change Leads to Predictable Cross-Cultural Variation 185
Leif D. Nelson, Terry F. Pettijohn II, and Jeff Galak

Part V Theory Development: Sociocultural Perspectives

- 11 The Roles of Stereotypes and Group Norms on Perceptions of Bodily Attractiveness 209
Tom Hildebrandt and Janet D. Latner
- 12 Feminism and Body Image 236
Linda Smolak and Sarah K. Murnen
- 13 The Impact of Western Beauty Ideals on the Lives of Women: A Sociocultural Perspective 259
Rachel M. Calogero, Michael Boroughs, and J. Kevin Thompson
- Index* 299

1

Mutual and Partaken Bliss: Introducing the Science of Bodily Beauty

Adrian Furnham and Viren Swami

Beauty is Nature's coin, must not be hoarded,
But must be current, and the good thereof
Consists in mutual and partaken bliss.

~ John Milton, *Comus*

It was no easy decision that Paris had to make. According to Ovid's *Heroides*, Paris had been resting against a tree in the valleys of Mount Ida, when he was startled by the sudden appearance of Hermes and, in his wake, the three goddesses: Hera, Athena, and Aphrodite. There had been an 'incident' at the banquet celebrating the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, to which Eris, Goddess of Discord, had been left uninvited. Angered by the snub, Eris turned up anyway and threw a golden Apple of Discord into the proceeding. On the apple was a most simple inscription: *Kallisti*, 'for the fairest one.' Only, the three goddesses, Hera, Athena, and Aphrodite, each claimed the apple as their own.

Zeus, mighty Zeus – king of the Gods, ruler of Mount Olympus, god of the sky and thunder – was reluctant to favour any claim himself, and instead gave the task to Paris, a mere mortal. And so, as Hermes tells him, Paris is to be 'the final judge of beauty.' He must decide which of the three goddesses 'has such beauty/that will conquer the other two.' No, it was no easy decision that Paris had to make. 'My frightened heart took comfort, I became bold/enough to study each one of them./All were worthy; I sighed because only one/could win.'

To sway him in his decision, each of the three goddesses used their powers to bribe Paris. Hera offered to make him king of Europe and Asia; Athena offered wisdom and skill in war. But the decision was no

easier: 'How could I choose between power and/a courageous heart?' Finally, Aphrodite – 'she who causes love' – offered Paris the love of the world's most beautiful woman, Helen of Sparta. Aphrodite is effortlessly beautiful, sexual, and charming, and her gift is well-received: Paris awards her the Apple of Discord, at once earning the love of the beautiful Helen and the enmity of the Greeks (Paris' subsequent abduction of Helen from Sparta is the mythological basis for the Trojan War).

In a sense, the Judgement of Paris might be seen as the prototypical beauty contest: the contest which Eris initiates sets the three goddesses against each other, vying for the approval of Paris. But it is a contest in which Aphrodite, Goddess of Love, holds the upper hand: not only is she physically beautiful herself, but she also offers Paris the hand of the most beautiful mortal, Helen of Sparta. But the mythologised Judgement of Paris also serves a different purpose: it highlights the importance of physical beauty, or at least, the fact that human beings have always taken an interest in the beauty of others (although, of course, in the Judgement of Paris, it is a specific beauty that is being judged – the beauty of women).

But the interest does not end there: a consistent theme throughout the history of beauty has been a quest for its secrets. Attempting to define and explain what makes an object or individual beautiful has consumed some of the world's greatest minds. Pythagoras and the ancient Greeks, for example, attempted a mathematico-aesthetical explanation of beauty, when they argued that it just was a matter of having the right proportions. And because these proportions – or 'golden ratios' – were universal, the secret to beauty was the same whether we consider the human face or the dimensions of a building or even music and literature (Armstrong, 2004; Eco, 2004; Swami, 2007).

So convincing was the Pythagorean explanation of beauty that it remained virtually unchallenged until the late 18th century. Leonardo da Vinci, for instance, is said to have designed the proportions of *Mona Lisa* according to Pythagorean notions of beauty; certainly, there can be no denying that his *Vitruvian Man* conformed to quite precise measurements of the human body which he considered ideal. But da Vinci was not alone in doing so: architects and writers, artists and designers, all subscribed to the Platonic thesis that there is an ideal, objective beauty that can be understood and perceived by all individuals. So long as an object has the right proportions, everyone will agree that in it is contained the essence of beauty.

Beginning in the late 18th century, however, a different idea of beauty began to be raised by philosophers like David Hume and Edmund

Burke, for whom beauty was subjective to the individual. Hume's (1757: 208–209) thesis on beauty is often held up as a paradigmatic example of this notion:

Beauty is no quality in things themselves; it exists merely in the mind which contemplates them; and each mind perceives a different beauty. One person may even perceive deformity, where another is sensible to beauty... To seek in the real beauty, or deformity, is as fruitless an enquiry, as to pretend to ascertain the real sweet or real bitter. According to the disposition of the organs, the same object may be both sweet and bitter; and the proverb has justly determined it to be fruitless to dispute concerning tastes.

For philosophers like Hume, the subjective nature of beauty meant that it could only be understood once individual feelings and emotions had been taken into account. Beauty had firmly been placed in the proverbial eye of the beholder.

The psychology of beauty

The psychological sciences are relative late-comers to these debates. The widespread belief that beauty is idiosyncratic, combined with the maxim that 'beauty is only skin-deep,' ensured that the topic of human beauty remained in psychology's blind spot until recently. After all, if beauty was a matter of personal taste, if each of us has her or his own unique idea of what constitutes beauty, then it makes any scientific analysis of such preferences extremely difficult. Moreover, if beauty is only skin-deep – and, by extension, if we should not judge a book by its cover – then beauty becomes a triviality to be explained away (Langlois et al., 2000).

This is especially true between cultures, where it was thought there was little consensus in judgements of attractiveness and hence no consistent effect of physical beauty on social judgements, interactions and behaviours. In 1871, for instance, Charles Darwin published his *Descent of Man*, in which he amassed an impressive array of evidence highlighting cross-cultural and historic differences in beauty practices. Whether it was 'breasts hanging down to the belt' or 'obliquity of the eye' or 'teeth... stained black, red and blue' (quoted in Swami, 2007), Darwin believed that there existed great variability in idealised beauty from one culture to the next.

Then, in 1966, Walster, Aronson, Abrahams, and Rottmann advertised a 'computer dance,' in which participants would ostensibly be paired on a blind date by a super-computer based on their similarity. In

reality, the experimenters paired the participants in a random manner, except that no man was paired with a taller woman. During the dance, participants were asked to rate their date, with Walster et al. (1966) expecting personalities, intelligence or other such variables to be the best predictors of liking. Instead, what they found was that the more attractive participants were favoured as dates over less attractive participants, and overall, physical attractiveness was the best predictor of mutual liking. Indeed, six months after the dance, partners who were similar in terms of physical attractiveness were more likely to still have been dating.

Walster et al.'s (1966) serendipitous finding was the catalyst for interest in physical attractiveness within the psychological sciences. A great many studies began to document the important, though often surreptitious, role that physical attractiveness plays in our daily lives (see Patzer, 2002; Swami & Furnham, 2007). Our first impressions of strangers, for example, are based almost entirely on non-verbal cues (Baron, Byrne, & Branscombe, 2006), particularly physical appearance (Park, 1986). When we meet someone for the first time, we tend to focus on information that we believe will provide cues about that person's personality, principles, and values – which typically means categorising individuals based on their looks.

Over the years, numerous studies and reviews of the literature have shown that physical attractiveness and appearance has a predictable effect on the judgements that people make about others (Dion, 1974; Dion, Berscheid, & Walster, 1972; Eagly, Ashmore, Makhijani, & Longo, 1991; Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977). In general, we imbue attractive individuals with perceived positive qualities – including social competence, intelligence, dominance and psychological adjustment – and we shower them with more positive social interactions in a wide variety of everyday domains (Eagly et al. (1991).

These inferences are not only directed at adults: attractive babies tend to receive greater attention (kissing, cooing, smiling, eye contact, even cuddling) from their mothers and nurses than less attractive babies (Corter et al., 1978; Langlois, Ritter, Roggman, & Vaughn, 1991; Stephan & Langlois, 1984). In school, attractive children are more popular than unattractive children (Kleck, Richardson, & Ronald, 1974; Langlois & Styczynski, 1979) and even teachers assume that attractive students are more likely to be academically successful than less attractive students (Adams, 1978; Clifford & Hatfield, 1973). In college, too, attractive students are more likely to receive better grades, regardless of the quality of their work (cf. Landy & Sigall, 1974).

But, of course, it is in adulthood that the pervasive effects of physical attractiveness truly become evident. Attractive individuals are more likely to date and marry (Kalick, Zebrowitz, Langlois, & Johnson, 1998; Udry & Eckland, 1984), and they are also more likely to be helped by strangers in the event of an accident (Benson, Karabenick, & Lerner, 1976; Sroufe, Chaikin, Cook, & Freeman, 1977; Swami, Chan, Wong, Furnham, & Tovée, in press). In the courtroom, attractive defendants benefit from more lenient sentencing than less attractive defendants and are less often perceived as guilty (Castellow, Wuensch, & Moore, 1990; Darby & Jeffers, 1988; Kulka & Kessler, 1978; Solomon & Schopler, 1978; Stewart, 1980, 1984). And compared with less attractive individuals, attractive people are more likely to be hired for jobs (Dipboye, Arvey, & Terpstra, 1977; Swami et al., in press) and receive higher starting salaries (Dipboye, Fromkin, & Wiback, 1975).

The social and evolutionary psychologies of beauty

In short, then, a wealth of evidence suggests that, despite the exhortations of received wisdom and age-old maxims, physical beauty has both an immediate and predictable effect on social interactions (Langlois et al., 2000). Within psychology, two relatively distinct bodies of work have developed in an attempt to answer the question of 'why' attractive individuals are perceived and treated more positively. The first of these stems from social psychological and anthropological work, which highlights the social and cultural contexts in which attractiveness judgements are formed and acted upon. Specifically, this view suggests that a great deal of social learning must take place when it comes to defining standards of attractiveness, and that both individual proclivities and subcultural ideals play important roles in defining what we find attractive.

On the other hand, some psychologists have taken an evolutionary approach to physical attractiveness, arguing that some aspects of perceptions of beauty may be influenced by our common biological heritage. This approach can be traced back to the publication of Don Symons' *Evolution of Human Sexuality* in 1979, in which he applied an explicit evolutionary framework to the science of physical attractiveness. Symons' work inspired a great many other researchers to approach the topic of human beauty from a fresh perspective and, in the past two decades especially, research guided by an evolutionary framework has intensified dramatically (see Swami & Furnham, 2007).

Yet, with very few exceptions, evolutionary and social perspectives on human physical attractiveness have rarely been combined within a

more general theoretical framework. In a recent account, Swami and Furnham (2007) lamented this fact, and argued that neither an evolutionary nor a social psychological approach in isolation is sufficient to understand the science of human beauty. Of course, the different paths taken by social and evolutionary psychologists in attempting to understand human beauty stems from their different perspectives. The point remains, however, that in isolation neither perspective can account for the myriad of different factors that affect our attraction to others.

Body beautiful

This, then, is the primary aim of the present volume: we have brought together seminal work from evolutionary and sociocultural perspectives, which explore the questions of *what* our attractiveness preferences are and *why* we find certain others physically attractive. The research and theoretical contributions presented in this volume offer a fresh perspective to understanding the perception of attractiveness, within evolutionary, cognitive, social, motivational, and cultural contexts. The only caveat we introduce is that these contributions focus specifically (though not exclusively) on the human body. The simple reason for this is that much psychological research has been devoted to human facial attractiveness, to the detriment of bodily beauty (see Rhodes & Zebrowitz, 2002).

As might be expected, the human body is an important site of beauty practices (Swami, 2006), and the focus on bodily beauty is not alien to either evolutionary or sociocultural researchers. In terms of the former, for instance, a great deal of research time and expertise has been spent on defining the characteristics of ideal feminine and masculine beauty (see Swami & Furnham, 2007). This body of work has focussed quite specifically on the female waist-to-hip ratio as an index of women's bodily beauty (McBurney & Streeter, Chapter 2), arguing that because a low waist-to-hip ratio was correlated with women's health and fertility in evolutionary history, men should find such ratios attractive today.

Others agree that it is useful to study the human body, but disagree as to the utility of the waist-to-hip ratio as an index of women's physical attractiveness. Fan (Chapter 3) presents the volume-height index as a more accurate predictor of both women's and men's attractiveness, whereas Bateson and colleagues (Chapter 4) take issue with the way in which women's attractiveness has been studied. Instead, they find that overall body weight may be a more important – and accessible – factor in defining what it means to be beautiful, at least for women. The most important conclusion to emerge from these chapters, however, is

that there is unlikely to be a single defining characteristic of attractiveness (Fan, Chapter 3; Bateson, Cornelissen, & Tovée, Chapter 4); rather, body shape, body weight and possibly other characteristics (e.g., the leg-to-body ratio, skin tone and so on; Swami, Eion, & Furnham, 2006; Smith, Cornelissen, & Tovée, 2007) all contribute to men's and women's physical attractiveness.

Another important conclusion to emerge from these chapters is that there is great cross-cultural variability in what is perceived as an attractive body. Scott et al. (Chapter 5) examine ideals of body weight in Bangladesh and Britain, and describe how such ideals may be intricately linked with differences in socioeconomic status. Similarly, Tovée, Furnham, and Swami (Chapter 7) document shifting patterns of body weight ideals in South Africa and Britain, and show how this is associated with similarly changing patterns of what is perceived as healthy body weights. Finally, Yu and colleagues (Chapter 6) show how, in a population of Matsigenka Amerindians, mate choice varies within the same individual depending on the sociocultural role of the potential mate. In short, these chapters highlight the way in which socioeconomic and cultural contexts interact with evolved biology to alter perceptions of an attractive body.

The contributions to this volume also make important theoretical advancements in our understanding of human beauty. Eion (Chapter 8) questions whether attractiveness ideals really do reflect an evolved mechanism for choosing fertile mates; rather, she suggests that there may be alternative adaptive explanations for such ideals, which evolutionary perspectives will need to incorporate. Other chapters highlight the importance of incorporating more inclusive perspectives on human physical attractiveness: Johnson and Tassinari (Chapter 9) explore how body shapes affect evaluative social judgements, whereas Nelson, Pettijohn, and Galak (Chapter 10) examine the cognitive and motivational states that give rise to predictable variation in attractiveness ideals.

An important final contribution of this volume comes from the explicitly sociocultural perspective taken by some researchers (Hildebrandt & Latner, Chapter 11; Smolak & Murnen, Chapter 12; Calogero, Boroughs, & Thompson, Chapter 13). These chapters, which focus on research conducted in the West, highlight the many different ways in which social learning and political contexts influence ideals of attractiveness. Importantly, these chapters also explicate the ways in which an unhealthy pursuit of such ideals can sometimes result in 'normative discontent,' including body image and eating disorders. These are topics

of study that are rarely considered within the evolutionary psychological scheme, and their discussion here serves to highlight key aspects of the literature in which a combined perspective will be fruitful.

Attempts to provide definitive answers to the persistent quest for human beauty have typically relied on either *objective* or *subjective* perspectives. The dominant paradigm for some years now, derived from evolutionary psychology, argues that there are objective criteria of attractiveness which most, if not all, individuals perceive and agree upon, because these were shaped by their common evolutionary history. However, we believe that the pendulum is now swinging back: most contemporary accounts of attractiveness have highlighted the way in which both sociocultural and evolutionary pathways influence the construction and reconstruction of beauty ideals.

Rather than there being consistent ideals of beauty across individuals or cultures, any true understanding of beauty must analyse the way in which individuals incorporate, either consciously or otherwise, biological and subcultural ideals of attractiveness (Swami & Furnham, 2007). The chapters in this book highlight these themes and illustrate the productive nature of work that combines different perspectives within a single over-arching perspective. As the contributors to this volume argue, bodily attractiveness is a complex phenomenon, which in turn requires comprehensive methods of research and analysis. Certainly, this is a premise known to artists and novelists, such as Giovanni Ruffini:

The perception of the beautiful is gradual, and not a lightning revelation; it requires not only time, but some study.

References

- Adams, G. R. (1978). Racial membership and physical attractiveness effects on preschool teachers' expectations. *Child Study Journal*, 8, 29–41.
- Armstrong, J. (2004). *The secret power of beauty*. London: Penguin.
- Baron, R., Byrne, D., & Branscombe, N. (2006). *Social psychology*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Benson, P. L., Karabenick, S. A., & Lerner, R. M. (1976). Pretty pleases: The effects of physical attractiveness, race, and sex on receiving help. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 12, 409–415.
- Castellow, K. S., Wuensch, K. L., & Moore, C. H. (1990). Effects of physical attractiveness of plaintiff and defendant in sexual harassment judgements. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 16, 39–50.
- Clifford, M. M., & Hatfield, E. (1973). Research note: The effects of physical attractiveness on teacher expectations. *Social Education*, 46, 248–258.

- Corter, C., Trehub, S., Boukydis, C., Ford, L., Celhoffer, L., & Minde, K. (1978). Nurses' judgements of the attractiveness of premature infants. *Infant Behavior and Development, 1*, 373–380.
- Darby, B. W., & Jeffers, D. (1988). The effects of defendant and juror attractiveness on simulated courtroom trials and decisions. *Social Behavior and Personality, 5*, 547–562.
- Darwin, C. (1871). *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex*. London: Murray.
- Dion, K. K. (1974). Children's physical attractiveness and sex as determinants of adult punitiveness. *Developmental Psychology, 10*, 772–778.
- Dion, K. K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24*, 285–290.
- Dipboye, R. L., Arvey, R. D., & Terpstra, D. E. (1977). Sex and physical attractiveness of raters and applicants as determinants of resumé evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62*, 288–294.
- Dipboye, R. L., Fromkin, H. L., & Wiback, K. (1975). Relative importance of applicant sex, attractiveness and scholastic standing in evaluation of job applicant resumes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*, 39–43.
- Eagly, E. 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*, 109–128.
- Eco, U. (2004). *On beauty: A history of a Western idea* (Trans. A. McEwen). London: Secker and Warburg.
- Hume, D. (1757). *Four dissertations. IV: Of the standard of taste*. London: Millar.
- Kalick, S. M., Zebrowitz, L. A., Langlois, J. H., & Johnson, R. M. (1998). Does human facial attractiveness honestly advertise health? Longitudinal data on an evolutionary question. *Psychological Science, 9*, 8–13.
- Kleck, R. E., Richardson, S. A., & Ronald, L. (1974). Physical appearance cues and interpersonal attraction in children. *Child Development, 45*, 305–310.
- Kulka, R. A., & Kessler, J. D. (1978). Is justice really blind? The influence of litigant physical attractiveness on juridical judgements. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 8*, 366–381.
- Landy, D., & Sigall, H. (1974). Beauty is talent: Task evaluation as a function of the performer's physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29*, 299–304.
- Langlois, J. H., & Styczynski, L. (1979). The effects of physical attractiveness on the behavioral attributions and peer preferences in acquainted children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 2*, 325–341.
- Langlois, J. H., Ritter, J. M., Roggman, L. A., & Vaughn, L. S. (1991). Facial diversity and infant preferences for attractive faces. *Developmental Psychology, 27*, 79–84.
- Langlois, J. H., Kalakanis, L. E., Rubenstein, A. J., Larson, A. D., Hallam, M. J., & Smoot, M. T. (2000). Maxims and myths of beauty: A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 390–423.
- Milton, J. (1637/2000). *Comus, or Re-formations of a maske*. Online publication at: <http://www.mith.umd.edu/comus/final/>. Retrieved January 29, 2007.
- Ovid (5 BC/1990). *Heroides* (Trans. H. Isbell). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Park, B. (1986). A method for studying the development of impressions of real people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 907–917.
- Patzer, G. L. (2002). *The power and paradox of physical attractiveness*. Boca Raton, FL: BrownWalker Press.

- Rhodes, G., & Zebrowitz, L. A. (Eds.) (2002). *Facial attractiveness: Evolutionary, cognitive and social perspectives*. Westport, CO: Ablex.
- Smith, K. L., Cornelissen, P. L., & Tovée, M. J. (2007). Color 3D bodies and judgements of human female attractiveness. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *28*, 48–54.
- Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 656–666.
- Solomon, M. R., & Schopler, J. (1978). The relationship of physical attractiveness and punitiveness: Is the linearity assumption out of line? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *4*, 483–486.
- Sroufe, R. A., Chaikin, A., Cook, R., & Freeman, V. (1977). The effects of physical attractiveness on honesty: A socially desirable response. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *3*, 59–62.
- Stephan, C. W., & Langlois, J. H. (1984). Baby beautiful: Adult attributions of infant competence as a function of infant attractiveness. *Child Development*, *55*, 576–585.
- Stewart, J. E. (1980). Defendant's attractiveness as a factor in the outcome of criminal trials: An observational study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *10*, 348–361.
- Stewart, J. E. (1984). Appearance and punishment: The attraction-leniency effect in the courtroom. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *125*, 373–378.
- Swami, V. (2006). The influence of body weight and shape in determining female and male physical attractiveness. In M. V. Kines (Ed.), *Body image: New research* (pp. 35–61). New York: Nova Biomedical Books.
- Swami, V. (2007). *The missing arms of Venus de Milo: Reflections on the science of physical attractiveness*. Brighton: The Book Guild.
- Swami, V., & Furnham, A. (2007). *The psychology of physical attraction*. London: Routledge.
- Swami, V., Einon, D., & Furnham, A. (2006). An investigation of the leg-to-body ratio as a human aesthetic criterion. *Body Image*, *3*, 317–323.
- Swami, V., Chan, F., Wong, V., Furnham, A., & Tovée, M. J. (in press). Weight-based discrimination in occupational hiring and helping behaviour. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*.
- Symons, D. (1979). *The evolution of human sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Udry, J. R., & Eckland, B. K. (1984). Benefits of being attractive: Differential payoffs for men and women. *Psychological Reports*, *54*, 47–56.
- Walster, E., Aronson, V., Abrahams, D., & Rottmann, L. (1966). Importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *4*, 508–516.

Index

- Abrahams, D., 5–6
Adams, G. R., 6, 194
 Hicken, M. and Salehi, M., 223
Age, 81, 248–9, 279–80
Aguilera, Christina, 265
Aiello, L., 134, 145, 147, 149
al-Katanani, Y. M., and
 Hansen, P. J., 146
 Paula-Lopes, F. F. and
 Hansen, P. J., 146
Aberson, C. L., Swan, D. and
 Emerson, E. P., 172
Alexander, R. D., Hoodland, J.L. and
 Howard, R. D., 134
Allen's rule, 145, 149
Allport, G. W., 162
 and Vernon, P. E., 163
Altabe, M., 276
Ambady, N., Hallahan, M. and
 Conner, B., 172
American Psychiatric Association,
 236, 240
American Society for Aesthetic
 Plastic Surgery, 284
American Society of Plastic
 Surgeons, 87, 236, 287
Andersen, A. E. and DiDomenico, L.,
 272
Anderson, C., John, O.P. *et al*, 210
Anderson, D. A. and Wadden, T. A.,
 221
Anderson, J. L., Crawford, C. B. *et al*,
 67, 69, 78, 110, 186, 188, 194,
 201, 278
Anderson-Fye, E. P., 239
Andersson, M., 88, 135
Annis, N. M., Cash, T. F. and
 Hrabosky, J.L., 224
Armstrong, J., 4
Aronson, E., Wilson, T.D. *et al*, 15
Asch, S. E., 159
Ashmore, R. D. and Longo, L. C., 210
attractiveness, biologically based
 explanations, 251–2
 and BMI, 23, 25, 31, 109
 and body shape, 161
 and health, 118–22
 historical/cultural factors, 29–30, 42
 and interpersonal metaperception,
 168–71
 male body, 39–42
 and overall body proportions,
 29–30, 43
 perceptions of, 122
 positive effects, 122
 strengths/weakness of, 161
 and VHI, 34–41
 and WHR, 15, 17–18, 21, 30–2,
 41–2, 109–11, 160–1
Aubrey, J. S., 247
Bagley, C. R., Conklin, D. N. *et al*, 220
Bailey, J. M. and Zucker, K. J., 172
Bailey, R. C. and Katch, V. L., 147–8,
 150
Baker, J. L., Michaelsen, K. F. *et al*, 67
Baker, N. V., Gregware, P. R. and
 Cassidy, M. A., 139
Baker, R. R. and Bellis, M. A., 136, 143
Baker-Sperry, L. and Grauerholz, L.,
 266, 281
Bangladeshi migrants, android body
 shape, 71
 changing preferences, 78, 80
 data collection, 71–3
 demographic information, 71
 and education, 81
 and effects of different stimuli, 82
 exposure effects, 78–9, 81–2
 health, fertility, wealth markers,
 79–81
 high WHR in, 71
 and length of stay/age at
 migration, 81

- Bangladeshi migrants, android body shape – *continued*
 and media influence, 81
 and mental modeling, 78, 79, 81–2
 participants, 70
 research on, 70–82
 resident/migrant differences, 78–9
 results of study, 72–8
 socioeconomic factors, 70–1
 use of photographic images, 71–2
- Banner, L., 262
- Barber, N., 81, 131, 132, 142, 144, 194, 278
- Barbie doll, 271
- Barclay, A. M., 131
- Barclay, C. D., Cutting, J. E. and Kozlowski, L. T., 163
- Baron, R. A., and Byrne, D., 15
et al, 6
- Bartky, S., 260, 273
- Bauer, K. W., Yang, Y. W. and Austin, S. B., 223
- Beagon, M., 141
- Bearman, S. K., Martinez, E. and Stice, E., 217
- beauty, and children/students, 6
 computer experiments, 5–6
 cross-cultural variability, 9
 effect of social learning/political contexts on perception, 9–10
 in eye of the beholder, 5
 and first impressions, 6
 and Judgement of Paris, 3–4
 philosophical view, 4–5
 positive qualities, 6
 psychology of, 5–7
 Pythagorean explanation, 4
 quest for secret of, 4
 social/evolutionary psychologies of, 7–8
 and study of human body, 8–9
- beauty ideal, and age, 279–80
 and disfigurement/disability, 280
 and non-white populations, 276–9
 and pregnancy, 280–1
 Westernized, 275
- beauty ideals, and below-normal weight, 264–5
 and biological reality, 270
 and broad shoulders, 264
 and buttocks, 264
 and children, 271
 and Chinese foot binding, 283
 and corseting, 261–2
 definition, 261
 and discrepancy, 270–2
 exposure to, 266–7
 as fat/full, 261
 and flapper era, 262–3
 and full-breasted women, 263
 and gender differences, 273
 and the Gibson Girl, 262
 and giraffe-necked women, 283
 history of, 260–6
 and internalisation of thin ideal, 267–9
 internalized, 282
 and mass media, 263
 and the media, 271–2
 and million dollar legs, 263
 and muscularity, 265
 negative consequences of promoting, 266–9
 as oppressive, 281–5
 and plastic surgery, 284
 and self-objectification, 274–5
 and sexual objectification, 273–5
 and social comparison theory, 272
 and socioeconomic rewards, 283–4
 and steel engraving lady, 262
 and subordination of women, 283
 and surgical procedures, 271
 and thinness, 263–6
 and voluptuous woman, 262
 and WHR/BMI, 265
- Becker, A. E., 239, 271, 277
 Burwell, R. A. *et al*, 277
 and Fay, K., 239
 and Hamburg, P., 271
- Beckerman, S., 92, 103
- Bem, S. L., 162, 168
- Benson, P. J., and Campbell, *et al*, 7, 176
- Benyshek, D. C. and Watson, J. T., 68
- Berger, J., 274

- Bergman's rule, 149
- Bernardi, L., 120
- Berscheid, E. and Reis, H. T., 192
- Bhargava, A., 67
- Birkhead, T., 135, 136
- Björntorp, P., 66, 161, 173, 188
- Blacker, J., 119
- Block, R. A., Hess, L. A. *et al*, 144
- Blumberg, P. and Mellis, L. P., 220
- Blurton Jones, N. G., 139
- bodily cues, additional, 162–3
 and bodies in balance, 162
 and body motion, 163,
 164, 168
 cognitive approach, 161
 and interpersonal metaperception,
 163–77
 and multiple social judgements,
 162, 166
 and sex categorization,
 164–8
 and weight, 160–1
 and WHR, 160–1
- body dissatisfaction, 215–17, 240,
 242, 249, 259–60
- body image, changing, 236–7
 and cosmetic surgery, 236
 cost of problems, 249–50
 definition, 236
 development of, 236
 gender reactions to, 236–7
 male preferences, 131–2
 preferences as hardwired/
 flexible, 69
 prevention programmes, 250–1
- body mass index (BMI), 47–8,
 238, 241
 alternatives to, 48
 and attractiveness, 23, 25,
 31, 109
 as body fatness measure, 65
 and health, 66–7
 and health outcomes, 26, 31
 and image manipulation, 49–60
 and interpersonal metaperception,
 177
 and mate value, 66–7
 and waist-to-hip ratio, 16, 19,
 25–6, 27
- body proportions, android/gynoid
 considerations, 67–9, 71
 classical Greek concept, 29–30
 cross-cultural preferences, 69–70,
 121
 historical/cultural differences, 30
 and influence of media, 121
 and local variations, 69
 optimal, 68–9
 scanning technology, 32–4
 WHR/BMI as important cues, 30–2,
see also body mass index;
 volume height index;
 waist-to-hip ratio
- body shape, gynoid/android, 237–8
- Bond, C. F. and Kenny, D. A., 210
- Bond, S. and Cash, T., 276
- Bongaarts, J. and Potter, R. G., 139, 140
- Bordo, S., 242, 245, 260
- Borgia, G., 90
- Boroughs, M., Cafri, G. and
 Thompson, J. K., 287
- Botta, R., 285
- Bowker, A., Gadbois, S. and
 Cornock, B., 274
- Bowman, C. A. and Jaeger, P. T., 280
- Bradshaw, D., 120
- breasts, and beauty ideal, 263
 ethnic differences, 145–6
 and heat stress, 145–8, 149–50
 and lactation, 142
 male attraction to, 132, 142, 145–8
 as sign of puberty, 145
 size of, 142, 149–50
- Brewis, A. A., and McGarvey, S. T., 70
 McGarvey, S. T. *et al*, 278
- Brody, S., 54
- Brown, P. J. and Konner, M. J., 110,
 188, 278
- Brown, W. M., Cronk, K. *et al*, 163
- Brownell, K. D., 270
 and Napolitano, M. A., 212
- Brownmiller, S., 284
- Bruce, H., 139
- Bryant-Waugh, R., 236
- Brylinsky, J. A. and Moore, J. C., 221
- Buckingham, G., DeBruine, L. M. *et al*,
 78
- Bulik, C. and Tozzi, F., 241, 244

- Buller, D. J., 160
 Burke, Edmund, 5
 Burley, N., 135, 144
 and Johnson, K., 136
 Buss, D. M., 15, 65, 121, 131, 132,
 134, 136, 143, 185, 186, 189, 226,
 237, 260, 279
 Abbott, M. *et al*, 225, 239
 and Barnes, M., 200
 and Kenrick, D. T., 188, 202
 Schmidt, D. P., 226
- Cafri, G., Blevins, N. and Thompson,
 J. K., 286
 and Thompson, J. K., 265
 Thompson, J. K. *et al*, 240
- Calder, A. J. *et al*, 176
 Caldwell, D., 262
 Callaghan, C. A., 283
 Calle, E. D., Rodriguez, C. *et al*, 120
 Calogero, R. M., 247, 274
 Davis, W. N. *et al*, 274
 Davis, W. N. and Thompson, J. K.,
 246, 268–9
- Campbell, Mary, 263
 Caradas, A. A., Lambert, E.V. and
 Charlton, K. E., 121
 Casanova, E. M., 276, 277
 Cash, T. F., 268
 Kehr, J. A. *et al*, 122
 Morrow, J. A. *et al*, 285
 and Pruzinsky, T., 243
- Cashdan, E., 81
 Castellow, K. S. *et al*, 7
 Cattarin, J. A., and Thompson, J. K.,
 224
 Thompson, J. K. *et al*, 268
- Cavalli-Sforza, L. L. and Cavalli-Sforza,
 F., 145, 150
 Chagnon, N., 139
 Chai, R. C., Allred, L. J. *et al*, 211
 Chan, F., 7
 Chang, J., 283
 Chantelau, E. and Gede, A., 144
 Charlton, K. E., Brewitt, P. and
 Bourne, L. T., 121
 Chen, E. Y., 161
 and Brown, M., 221
 child sexual abuse (CSA), 248
 children, 135, 136, 138–9, 143–4,
 221–3, 224, 259
 Clastres, P., 109
 Clauser, C. E., Tebbetts, I. O. *et al*, 168
 Clay, I., Randall, S. *et al*, 146
 Clifford, M. M., 211
 and Hatfield, E., 6
 climate, 145–7, 149
 Clutton–Brock, T. H., 136
 and Parker, G. A., 134, 135
 Cohan, G., 120
 Coon, C. S., 145
 Cordain, L., Miller, J. and Mann, M.,
 68
 Cordero, P. J., Wetton, J. H. and
 Parkin, D. T., 89–90
 Corter, C. *et al*, 6
 Cotton, S., Fowler, K. and
 Pomiankowski, A., 91
 Cowley, G., 161
 Cramer, P. and Steinwert, T., 221
 Crandall, C. S., 218, 219, 222
 and Eshleman, A., 219
 Crane, A. R., 273
 Cronin, H., 134, 135
 cue compatibility model *see*
 interpersonal metaperception
- Cunningham, E. J. A. and Russell, A.
 F., 89
 Cunningham, M. R., 187, 189, 191,
 192
 Roberts, A. R. *et al*, 186, 192
 Cusumano, D. L. and Thompson, J.K.,
 267
 Cutting, J. E., 163
 Moore, C. and Morrison, R., 163
 Proffit, D. R. and Kozlowski, L. T.,
 163
- 3D body images, 32
 3D body scanning technology, 32–4
 Danel, D. and Pawtowski, B., 88
 Darby, B. W. and Jeffers, D., 7
 Darmon, N., Ferguson, E. L. and
 Briend, A., 121
 Darwin, C., 88, 133, 185, 186
 Darwin, Charles, 6
 Daubenmeier, J. J., 248
 David, P., Bjorksten, T. *et al*, 90

- Davidoff, J., Davies, L. and Roberson, D., 103
- Davis, Bette, 192
- Davison, K. K. and Birch, L. L., 223, 224
- Dellinger, K. and Williams, C. L., 267
- Department of Health, 65, 67, 71, 112
- DeRidder, C. M., Bruning, P.F. *et al*, 30, 66
- DeWall, N. C. and Baumeister, R. F., 200
- Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Mental Disorders (DSM IV)*, 264–5
- Diamond, J., 198
- Dillaway, H., 279
- Dion, K. K., 6, 122
- Berscheid, E. and Walster, E., 122, 267
- Dipboye, R. L., Arvey, E. D. *et al*, 7
- Fromkin, H. L. *et al*, 7
- Dittmar, H. and Howard, S., 268
- division of labour, 136–9
- Donelson, S. M. and Gordon, C. C., 168
- Doty, R. M., Peterson, B. E. and Winter, D. G., 196
- Dressler, Marie, 192
- Duffy, D. L., Bentley, G. E. *et al*, 89
- Durkin, S. J. and Paxton, S. J., 272
- Dutt, R. H., 146
- Dworkin, A., 283
- Dworkin, S. and Wachs, F. L., 280
- Eade, J. A. and Momen, R., 70
- Eagly, A. H., 238, 240, 241
- Ashmore, R. D. *et al*, 6, 131, 209, 210, 211, 267, 268
- and Wood, W., 239
- Wood, W. and Diekman, A. B., 238, 239
- Wood, W. and Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., 238
- eating disorders, 239, 240, 241, 250, 263, 270
- Eating Disorders Inventory (EDI), 241
- Eck, B. A., 273
- Eco, U., 4
- Edmunds, L. D., 221
- Edwards, J. L. and Hansen, P., 134, 146
- Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I., 163
- Einon, D., 9
- Eisenberg, M. E. *et al*, 224
- Ellison, P. T., Lipson, S. F. *et al* (1993a), 68
- Panterbrick, C. *et al*, 68
- Ellison, Rodgers, J., 136
- Ember, C. R., Ember, M. *et al*, 110
- Engeln-Maddox, R., 268
- Englis, B. G., Solomon, M. R. and Ashmore, R. D., 266
- Enlow, D. M., 187
- Environment, 110–11, 123
- Environmental Security Hypothesis (ESH), 186, 189–96, 200
- at individual level, 193
- based on American actresses popularity, 191–2
- and beauty pageant contestants, 195
- and decision-making, 196
- development of, 189, 191
- evolutionary prediction ranges, 191
- and eye-size, 194
- and female body features, 193–4
- and female facial feature preferences, 193
- historical/cultural contexts, 191
- and influence of social/economic conditions, 192
- and male actors, 192–3
- and popular song performers, 195–6
- and prediction of fluctuations, 191
- relative preferences, 191
- summary of investigations, 190
- support for, 194–5
- testing of, 191–2
- and threat/uncertainty, 196
- and WHR, 194–5
- Etcoff, N., Orbach, S. *et al*, 259
- Euler, H. A. and Weizel, B., 139
- Evans, J. P. and Magurran, A. E., 88
- Evans, P. C., 268
- evolution, viable route, 142–4

- evolutionary approach, 7–8, 15, 46, 65, 88, 176
- evolutionary model, 186, 201
- evolutionary psychology, 91, 103, 110, 119, 123, 237–42
and female attractiveness, 237–8
feminist critiques, 238–41
and genetic theories, 241–2
and mate selection, 237
- evolutionary theory, 225
integration with sociocultural theory, 226–7, 228
- Extra-pair matings (EPM), 88, 89, 91, 100–2
- Fabricatore, A. N., Wadden, T. A. and Foster, G. D., 220
- Faces, 144
neonate/mature, 187–8
- Fairburn, C. G. and Welch, S. L., 281
- Faith, M. S., Leone, M. A. *et al*, 222
- Fallon, A. E., 263, 264, 283
and Rozin, P., 160
- Fan, J., Dai, *et al*, 32
Liu, F. *et al*, 25, 32, 48, 57, 109
Yu, W. and Hunter, L., 32
- Faravelli, C., Giugni, A. *et al*, 248
- Feet, 144, 148–9
- Feingold, A., 192, 209, 211
- feminism, and body image prevention programmes, 250–1
and critical perspective of culture, 251
critiques of evolutionary psychology, 238–41
and definitions of femininity, 245
and male attractiveness, 240–1
and Objectification Theory, 245–6, 252
and parenting, 239–40
and psychological theory, 245–6
role of, 251
and sexual subordination, 245
and sociocultural theory, 244
and status, 238–9
- Fessler, D. M. T., Nettle, D. *et al*, 144
- Festinger, L., 214, 272
- Field, A., Austin, S. B. *et al*, 236
- Fietz, J., 135
- Fikkan, J. and Rothblum, E.D., 219
- Fingeret, M., Gleaves, D. H. and Pearson, C. A., 213
- Fisher, H. E., 131
- Fisher, R. A., 88
- Fisherian sexy sons, 89
- Flannery-Schroeder, E. and Chrisler, J. C., 259
- Flegal, K. M., Carroll, M. D. *et al*, 285
- Folsom, A. R., Kaye, S. *et al*, 30
- Fonda, Jane, 264
- Ford, C. S. and Beach, F. A., 132, 185, 187
- Ford, L., 6
- Forestell, C. A., Humphrey, T. M. *et al*, 18
- Foster, G. D., Wadden, T. A. *et al*, 220
- Fouts, G. and Burggraf, K., 223
- Frable, D. E. S., 163
- Frame, S., Moore, J. *et al*, 144
- Franks, T. and Goodrick-Meech, A., 280
- Frederick, D. A., Peplau, L. A. and Lever, J., 273
- Fredrickson, B. L., and Roberts, T. A., 246, 273, 274
Roberts, T. A. *et al*, 245, 247, 274, 275
- Freedman, R., 271
- Freese, J. and Meland, S., 109
- Friedland, S. L., Larkin, E. K. *et al*, 225
- Friedman, K. E., Reichman, S. K. *et al*, 224
- Frisch, R. E., 188
- Frumkin, R. M., 163
- Furnham, A., 7–8, 9, 67
and Alibhai, N., 16, 69, 121, 131
and Baguma, P., 121, 186, 188
Dias, M. and McClelland, C., 31, 161
Lavancy, M. *et al*, 19, 21
Lavancy, M. and McClelland, A., 110
McClelland, A. *et al*, 80
McClelland, A. and Omer, L., 69
Moutafi, J. and Baguma, P., 110
and Nordling, R., 110
Petrides, K.V. and Constantinides, A., 49, 110
and Reeves, E., 21
Swami, V. and Shah, K., 110

- Tan, 279
 Tan, T. and Mcmanus, C., 31, 49, 69, 161
- Gagneux, P., Woodruff, D. S. and Boesch, C., 135
- Gangestad, S. W., and Buss, D. M., 187 and Simpson, J. A., 88–9, 102
 Simpson, J. A. *et al*, 89
 and Thornhill, R., 131–2
 Thornhill, R. *et al*, 89
 Thornhill, R. and Yeo, R. A., 160
- Gapinski, K. D., Brownell, K. D. and LaFrance, M., 247, 274
- Gardner, R. M., Sorter, R. G. and Friedman, B. N., 271
- Garfinkel, L., 120
- Garland, Judy, 192
- Garn, S. M., 50
 and Harper, R. V., 50
 Sullivan, T. V. and Hawthorne, V. M., 50
- Garner, D. M., 265
 Garfinkel, P. E. *et al*, 263, 264
- Garrow, J., 48
- Gaut, B. and Lopes, D. M., 29
- Gaynor, Janet, 192
- Geary, D., 139
- genetic theories, 241–2
- George, H., Cornelissen, P. L. *et al*, 50
- Gestalt psychology, 159–60
- Gigerenzer, G., Todd, P. M. and ABC Research Group, 16
- Gil, D., Graves, J. *et al*, 89
- Gilbert, D. T., Giesler, R. B. and Morris, K. A., 214
- Gilmore, D. D., 139
- Ginsberg, R. and Gray, J., 286
- Gitter, A., Lomranz, J. *et al*, 69
- Gladue, B. A. and Delany, J. J., 131
- Glamour* magazine, 283
- Gluckman, P. and Hanson, M., 68
- Gomi, A., 57
- Goodman, N., Dornbusch, S. M. *et al*, 221
- Goodman, R., 276
- Goody, J., 143
- Gordon, P., 103
- Gortmaker, S. L., Must, A. *et al*, 220
- Gottlieb, G., 242
- Grabe, S. and Hyde, J. S., 243
- Greenberg, B. S., Eastin, M. *et al*, 223
- Greenberg, M. and Morris, N., 240
- Greenleaf, C., 246
 and Weiller-Abels, K., 222
- Grilo, C. M., Wilfley, D. E. *et al*, 224
- Groesz, L. M., Levine, M. P. and Murnen, S. K., 243, 246, 266
- Grogan, S., 236
 and Richards, H., 237, 243
- group norms, and attractiveness, 210–12
 and body dissatisfaction, 213
 and body image, 213
 and development of attractiveness ideals, 228
 development of, 209, 213
 gender differences, 213
 and individual meaning, 210, 228
 mechanisms, 214
 and peer influence, 213
 and perceived threat, 214
 research on, 209–10, 212
 and social comparison theory, 214, 215–18
 social mechanisms, 212–14
- Guinness World Records*, 262
- Guthrie, R. D., 187
- Haiken, E., 283, 285
- Hanna, M. and Brown, H. C., 147
- Hargreaves, D. A. and Tiggemann, M., 266, 267
- Harmon, D., 103
- Harned, M., 248
- Harrison, K., 223, 266, 270
 and Cantor, J., 266
 and Hefner, V., 269
 Taylor, L. D. and Marske, A. L., 266, 267
- Hart, C., Newell, L. and Olsen, S., 240
- Hartz, A. J., Rupley, D. C. and Rimm, A. A., 66
- Haselton, M. G., and Gangestad, S. W., 89
 and Miller, G. R., 89
- Hasselquist, D., Marsh, J. A. *et al*, 89

- Havlicek, J., Roberts, S. C. and Flegr, J., 89
- Hawkes, K., 136, 138, 139
O'Connell, J. F. *et al*, 136, 139
- Hayworth, Rita, 192
- health, and attractiveness, 113, 118–22
between-group differences, 117–18
and BMI, 26, 31
and body size, 118, 119
and HIV/AIDS, 111, 119–20
multiple regression results, 113–17
and nutrition, 83
research methods/participants, 111–18
sex differences, 112–13
and VHI, 42
and weight correlation, 66–7
and WHR, 26
- Heap, R. B. and Flint, A. P. F., 141
- heat stress, 145–8, 149–50
- Hebl, M., King, E. and Lin, J., 245, 247, 248, 274, 276
- Heider, F., 159
- Heiman, J. D., 161
- Heinberg, L. J., 260, 272
and Thompson, J. K., 215
Thompson, J. K. and Stormer, S., 268, 269
- Henrich, J., Boyd, R. *et al*, 103
McElreath, R. *et al*, 103
- Henss, R., 17, 19, 21, 49, 50, 69, 110, 161, 172–3
- Herbozo, S., Tantleff-Dunn, S. *et al*, 266
- Herek, G. M., 172
- Hesse-Biber, S. J., 260, 275
Leavy, P. *et al*, 260, 281, 284
- Higa, M., 173
- Hildebrandt, K. A. and Fitzgerald, H. E., 187
- Hildebrandt, T. and Walker, D. C., 213
- Hill, H. and Pollick, F. E., 176
- Hill, K., and Hurtado, M., 139
and Kaplan, H., 139
- Hoffman, M. L., Janssen, E. and Turner, S. L., 133
- Holliday, T. W. and Fallesetti, A. B., 145
- Hollis, K. L., Pharr, V. L. *et al*, 133
- Holstrom, A. J., 271
- Horai, J., Naccari, N. and Fatoullan, E., 122
- Horn, M. J. and Gurel, L. M., 29
- Hosegood, V., Vanneste, A. M. and Timaeus, I. M., 120
- Hrdy, S. B., 240
and Whitten, P. L., 140, 142
- Hudson, J., Hiripi, E. *et al*, 240
- Hume, David, 4
- Hunt, S. M., McEwen, J. and McKenna, S. P., 119
- Huntingdon, E., 146
- Hurd Clarke, L., 279
- images, artificial manipulation, 49–57
and attractiveness, 46
co-variation problem, 49–50, 60
degree of distortion, 50
and index variations, 46–7
and inflating of arms/legs, 49–50
as laser-scanned, 58
line drawings, 49–50
manipulation of, 112
and mate quality, 46
natural variation, 57–8
perceptual cues/physical features distinction, 47–9
photographs, 50
plausibility/realism of, 50–1, 52, 58–9
principled manipulation, 58–60
problems with studies on, 46–7
and rationale for shape change, 50
standardisation of, 112
tests on, 51–7
as videoed, 58
and waist versus hip size, 52, 54, 56–7
- interpersonal metaperception,
accordant percepts, 168
and bodily cues, 163–77
and body motion, 168
and body shape/motion, 164–8
compatibility factors, 172
and cross-cultural research, 175, 179n4
and eye tracking, 165–7

- gynoid/android shapes, 175
 as integrative approach, 174
 line drawn versus photographic stimuli, 173
 and perceived attractiveness, 168–71
 and perceived sex/gender, 164–8
 practical implications, 172–4
 and sexual orientation, 172
 and social categories, 172
 social judgements, 163, 173–4
 theoretical implications, 174–7
 and typical/atypical perceptions, 172
 and use of animation, 168–71, 173
 and waist/hip region, 167
 WHR/Walk Motion, 168–71, 172, 178–9n3
- Irving, L. M., 266, 272
 and Berel, S. R., 285
 DuPen, J. and Berel, S., 285
- Isbell, L. A. and Young, T. P., 146
- Jabonski, N. G. and Chaplin, G., 132
- Jackson, C., 213
- James, W. P. T., Nelson, M. *et al*, 121
- Jankowiak, W., 131
- Jansen, A. and de Vries, M., 266
- Janssen, I., Craig, W. M. *et al*, 224
- Jasienska, G., Ziomkiewicz, A. *et al*, 66
- Jeffreys, S., 281, 283, 284
- Jennions, M. D. and Petrie, M., 88, 89
- Johnson, K. L., Gill, S. *et al*, 172
 and Tassinary, L. G., 165, 167, 168, 171, 175
- Johnson, O. R. and Johnson, A. W., 102
- Johnson, V. S. and Franklin, M., 131
- Jolie, Angelina, 265
- Jones, D. C., 213, 217
 and Crawford, J. K., 209, 213, 219, 226
- Jones, D. M., 131, 144, 186
- Jones, P. R. M., Hunt, M. J. *et al*, 188–9
- Jones, T. M., Quinnell, R. J. and Balmford, A., 89
- Jourard, S. M. and Secord, P. F., 263
- Jung, Cathie, 262
- Junshi, C., Campbell, T. C. *et al*, 109
- Kalick, S. M., Zebrowitz, L. A. *et al*, 7
- Kanazawa, S. and Kovar, J. L., 211
- Kaplan, H. and Hill, K., 139
- Karama, S., Lecours, A. R. *et al*, 133
- Katanani, Paula-Lopes, and Hansen, 134
- Katch, V. L. *et al*, 270
- Katzman, M. A., Hermans, K. *et al*, 239
 and Lee, S., 281
- Kaye, W., Frank, G. *et al*, 244
- Keating, C. F., Mazur, A. and Segall, M. H., 187
- Keery, H., van den Berg, P. and Thompson, J. K., 244
- Kempnaers, B., Congdon, B. *et al*, 89
- Kerrigan, D. C., Todd, M. K. and Della Croce, U., 163
- Keski-Rahkonen, A., Bulik, C. *et al*, 241, 242
- Kim, H. and Markus, H. R., 202
- King, J. C., 67
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B. and Martin, C. E., 136
- Kirkpatrick, M. and Ryan, M. J., 90
- Kirschner, M. A. and Samojlik, E., 16
- Kleck, R. E., Richardspn, S. A. and Ronald, L., 6
- Klein, D., Najman, J. *et al*, 220
- Klesges, R. C. *et al*, 220
- Klump, K., McGue, M. and Iacono, W., 241
- Knight, C., 136, 139, 141
- Koffka, K., 159
- Köhler, W., 159
- Kokko, H., Jennions, M. D. and Brooks, R., 88, 90
- Komers, P. E. and Brotherton, P. N. M., 136
- Korthase, K. M. and Trenholme, I., 187
- Kotiaho, J. S., Simmons, L. W. and Tomkins, J. L., 90
- Kotler, D. P. and Grunfeld, C., 120
- Kraemer, H., Kazdin, A. *et al*, 247
- Kramer, M. S., Coates, A. L. *et al*, 67
- Krokene, C., Rigstad, K. *et al*, 89
- Krones, P. G., Stice, E. *et al*, 215, 266
- Kruger, H. S., Puoane, T. *et al*, 120, 123

- Kruger, J., 197
- Kuh, D. and Schlomo, Y.B., 67
- Kulka, R. A. and Kessler, J. D., 7
- Kunzle, D., 261
- Kushner, R. F. and Foster, G. D., 225
- Ladies Home Journal*, 264
- Lahti-Koski, M., Pietinen, P. *et al*, 65, 66, 67
- The Lancet*, 261
- Landy, D. and Sigall, H., 6
- Langlois, J. H., Halakanis, L. *et al*, 225
- Kalakanis, L. *et al*, 242
- Ritter, J. M. *et al*, 6
- and Roggman, L. A., 160
- and Styczyński, L., 6
- Lanska, D. J., Lanska, M. J. *et al*, 65, 66, 161, 188
- Larkin, J., and Pines, H., 220
- and Rice, C., 250
- Laslett, P., 139
- Lassek, W. D. and Gaulin, S. J. C., 26
- Latner, J. D., and Schwartz, M. B., 221
- Stunkard, A. J. and Wilson, T. G., 209, 222
- Lawrence, J. W., Fauerbach, J. A. *et al*, 280
- Laws, A., King, A. *et al*, 161
- Lawson, M. C., 222
- Le Grange, D., Louw, J. *et al*, 121
- Telch, C. F. *et al*, 121
- Lee, J., 261, 274
- Lee, K. J., Byatt, G. and Rhodes, G., 176
- and Perrett, D. I., 176
- Leifer, M., 280
- Leit, R. A., Pope, H. G. and Gray, J. J., 243
- Lerner, M. J. and Mikula, G., 139
- Lerner, R. M. and Korn, S. J., 222
- Levine, D. and Wrighton, K., 139
- Levine, M. P., and Harrison, K., 266
- Murnen, S. K. *et al*, 246
- and Piran, N., 285
- and Smolak, L., 243, 250, 260, 269, 285
- Lewin, R., 134, 145
- Lewis, M. B. and Johnston, R. A., 176
- Lewis, R. J., Cash, T. F. *et al*, 221
- Ley, C. J., Lees, B. and Stevenson, J. C., 66
- Lieberman, M., Gauvin, L. *et al*, 218
- Lin, C. A., 246, 273
- Lin, L. F. and Kulik, J. A., 215, 216
- Lindstrom, K. M., Krakower, D. *et al*, 89
- Lippa, R., 160, 173
- Lopez, E., Blix, G. G. and Blix, A. G., 276
- Lorber, J., 281
- Lorenz, K., 187
- Lovejoy, M., 276
- Lublin, A. and Wolfenson, D., 133, 144, 146
- Luo, Y., Parish, W. and Laumann, E., 236
- Lyubomirsky, S. and Ross, L., 214
- McCabe, M. P. and Ricciardelli, L. A., 213, 215, 217, 269
- McCarthy, M., 266
- McCreary, D. R., and Sasse, D. K., 243
- Saucier, D. and Courtenay, W., 241, 243
- McGraw, K. J., 92, 100
- McHugh, M., Koeske, R. and Frieze, I., 242
- McIntosh, W. D., Murray, J. D. *et al*, 196
- Schwegler, A. F. and Terry-Murray, R. M., 196
- Mackenzie, I. Z., Cooke, I. and Annan, B., 144
- McKinley, N. M., 247, 249, 269
- and Hyde, J. S., 246, 247, 248, 274
- McVey, G., Lieberman, M. *et al*, 250
- Maddox, G. L., Back, K. W. and Liederman, V. R., 221
- Mahalik, *et al*, 243, 245
- Maiman, L. A., Wang, V. L. *et al*, 220
- Maisey, D. M., Vale, E. L. E. *et al*, 279
- Makkar, J. K. and Strube, M. J., 276
- male attractiveness, and acquisition of a mate, 88
- and body dissatisfaction, 240
- evolutionary psychological explanations, 88
- and female selection process, 89–90

- gay/straight differences, 241
 and good-genes explanation, 89
 importance of, 240
 and lek paradox, 90–3
 and mixed-mating strategy, 88, 91
 and muscular ideal, 241, 286–7
 non-human studies, 89–90
 traits, 88
 variations in, 88
 VHI indicators, 39–42
- male preferences, adaptive or flexible,
 65, 68–9
 and breasts, 132, 142, 145–8
 cross-cultural studies, 65–70
 evolutionary rationale, 65
 explanations for, 132–3
 and faces/feet, 144, 148–9
 and fertility, 68–9, 82–3,
 132–3
 and local conditions, 69–70, 82
 logic of choice, 136–42
 and low WHR, 66, 69
 and mate value relationship, 68–9,
 82–3
 migrant Bangladeshi pilot study,
 70–82
 and nutritional stress, 69
 and reasons for arousal, 150–2
 and resource availability, 82
 and sexual selection, 133–5
 and skin colour, 144
 and status, 131
 and weight, 66–7
 youthful/pretty women, 131–2,
 143–4, 149–50
- Mann, A. E., 109
- Mansfield, Jayne, 263
- Manson, J. E., Willet, W. C. *et al*, 66,
 120
- Markham, A., Thompson, T. and
 Bowling, A., 272
- Markson, E. W., 279
- Marlowe, F. W., 136
 Apicella, C. L. and Reed, D., 16, 66,
 81, 110
 and Wetsman, A., 16, 67, 69, 70,
 121, 175, 178
- Martikainen, P. *et al*, 119
- Martin, R. D., Willner, L. A. and
 Dettling, A., 134
- mate choice, and between-sex
 competition, 227
 and between-sex flexibility, 227
 and body weight, 120, 188,
 189, 201
 and body-shape preferences, 103
 and cross-cultural variation, 100,
 102–3, 187, 202
 cultural factors, 91–2
 and cultural/evolutionary gaps,
 201–2
 and direct/indirect benefits, 88, 90–1
 and directional selection, 90
 and environmental security
 hypothesis, 189–96, 200
 evolutionary model, 186, 201
 and extra-pair matings, 88, 89, 91,
 100–2
 and financial wealth, 197–8
 and food resources, 198–9
 gender differences, 199
 historical context, 186
 and ideal mate, 186–9, 197
 and immunocompetence/
 masculinity theory, 89–90
 judgement-based differences, 197–9
 and long-term pairing, 88, 91
 and male attractiveness, 88–93
 and male predictability, 199–200
 and masculine versus effeminate,
 88, 91, 92
 and Matsigenka study, 92–102
 and metacognitive processes, 200–1
 and parental preferences, 99, 102
 and physiological condition, 90
 and resource scarcity, 186, 197–9,
 200–1
 and selection processes, 227
 theory, 225–6
 and theory integration, 226–7, 228
 underlying psychology of, 200–2
 and universal ideal, 185,
 186–7, 189
 variability in, 186
 and WHR preferences, 109, 176,
 188–9
 and women's faces, 187–8

- Matschiner, M. and Murnen, S. K., 245
- Matsigenka study, 175
and correcting for pseudo-replication, 94
and extramarital liaisons, 92
interviews, 93–4
kinship system, 102
location of, 93
and masculine versus feminised faces, 98, 99–100, 101–2
and mixed-mating strategy, 101–2
and parental influence, 92, 98, 99
Penton-Voak model, 96–9
preferred marriage partner, 92
results, 94–6
sample size, 99
- Mauro, R. and Kubovy, M., 176
- Mazur, A., 243, 262
- Mazzeo, S., Landt, M. *et al*, 241
- Meindl, R. F., 144
- Menstruation, 139–42
- Metaperception, 159–60, *see also* interpersonal metaperception
- Milinski, M., 88, 90
- Milkie, M., 285
- Miller, G. F., 131, 133, 135, 225
- Milton, K., 109
- Miner-Rubino, K., Twenge, J. M. and Fredrickson, B., 246, 274
- Misra, A. and Vikram, N. K., 71
- Mixed-mating strategy, 88, 91, 96–9, 101–2
- Mohanty, C., Prasad, R. *et al*, 67
- Molloy, B. L. and Herzberger, S. D., 276
- Monroe, Marilyn, 263
- Mook, D. G., 19
- Moradi, B., Dirks, D. and Matteson, A., 274
- Morgan, K. P., 284
- Morris, A., Cooper, T. and Cooper, P. J., 264
- Morris, D., 131, 283
- Morse, S. and Gergen, K. J., 214
- Muehlenkamp, J. J. and Saris-Baglama, R. N., 246, 247
- Murdock, G. P., 136, 147
- Murnen, S. K., and Smolak, L., 248, 273
- Smolak, L. *et al*, 273
- Murry, M. P., Kory, R. C. and Sepic, S. B., 163
- Myers, A. and Rosen, J. D., 224
- Møller, A. P., 136
and Alatalo, R. V., 88
and Ninni, P., 90
- Nagel, K. L. and Jones, K. H., 260
- Nathanson, A. I. and Botta, R. A., 285
- National Eating Disorders Association (NEDA), 271
- Neisser, U., 160
- Nelson, L. D., and Morrison, E. L., 110, 186, 197, 198, 199, 200
Sherman, D. K. and Kim, H. S., 198–9
- Neumark-Sztainer, D., Falkner, N. *et al*, 222
Story, M. and Harris, T., 222
- Newcomer, S. D., Zeh, J. A. and Zeh, D. W., 89
- Newman, C., 161
- Nisbett, R. E., Peng, K. *et al*, 201–2
and Wilson, T.D., 197
- Noll, S. M. and Frederickson, B. L., 246, 247, 274
- Non-white populations, 276–9
- Norton, K. I., Olds, T. S. *et al*, 212, 271
- obesity, consequences of weight bias, 223–5
and interpersonal consequences, 223–4
psychological consequences, 224
and quality of life/health, 224–5
and social stigma, 219–25
and transmission of weight bias, 223
and weight bias against adults, 219–21
and weight bias against children, 221–3, *see also* weight
- Objectification Theory, and age, 248–9
and beauty ideals, 273–5
and body dissatisfaction, 249
correlation studies, 246–7
empirical support for, 249

- and experimental manipulation, 247
- and the female body, 245–6
- and feminism, 252
- prospective studies, 247–8
- and self-objectification/self-surveillance, 247–8, 274–5
- and sexist experiences, 248
- and societal standards, 246
- Objectified Body Consciousness (OBC) scale, 247
- O'Brien, K. S., Hunter, J. A. and Banks, M., 222
- Ohl, J., Shepard, G. H. Jr *et al*, 100
- O'Keefe, J. H. and Cordain, L., 109
- Ostlund, B. E., Staten, M. *et al*, 161
- Ovid, 3
- Ovulation, 139–42
- Ovulatory-shift hypothesis, 88
- Owen, P. R. and Laurel-Seller, E., 265
- Owens, I. P. F., 103
- Paradox of the Lek, 90–3
- Parducci, A., 176
- Parenting, 239–40
- Park, B., 6
- Parker, S. *et al*, 276
- Partridge, J., 280
- Partridge, L. and Halliday, T., 135
- Patzer, G. L., 6, 122
- Pawlowski, B. and Grabarczyk, M., 66, 148
- Paxton, S. J., Shultz, H. *et al*, 213, 215
- Pearce, M. J., Boergers, J. and Prinstein, M. J., 223, 226
- Pedersen, F. A., 226
- Penton-Voak, I. S., Jacobson, A. *et al*, 91
- and Perrett, D. I., 88, 91, 92, 96–9, 100–1
- Perrett, D. I. *et al*, 88
- perceptual cues, 47–9
- Perrett, D. I., Lee, K. J. *et al*, 93–4
- Peterson, R., Tantleff-Dunn, S. and Bedwell, J., 250
- Petrie, M., Schwable, H. *et al*, 89
- Pettijohn, T. F., 192
- and Jungeberg, B. J., 70, 194
- Sacco, D. F. *et al*, 193, 194, 195, 196, 199
- and Tesser, A., 186, 189, 191, 192, 193, 196, 200
- and Yerkes, M. J., 195
- Phares, V., Steinberg, A. and Thompson, J., 269
- physical cues, 159–60, *see also* bodily cues
- physical features, 47–9
- Pierce, J. W. and Wardle, J., 224
- Piran, N., 250
- and Cormier, H. C., 251
- Plaud, J. J. and Martini, J. R., 133
- Playboy* magazine, 194, 243, 264, 265
- Pliner, P., Chaiken, S. and Flett, G. L., 279
- Pliny the Elder, 141
- Polinko, N. K. and Popovich, P. M., 220
- Polivy, J. and Herman, C.P., 267
- Pollard, I. A., 146
- Pollick, F. E., Fidopiastis, C. and Braden, V., 176
- Hill, H. *et al*, 176
- Polsky, B., Kotler, D. and Steinhart, C., 120
- Pond, C. M., 149
- Mattacks, C. H., *et al*, 142, 147
- Pope, H. G. Jr, Olivardia, R. *et al*, 212, 243
- Phillips, K. A. and Olivardia, O., 212
- Powers, P.S., 80
- Pregnancy, 280–1
- Prentice, A. M., 68, 123
- Principal, Victoria, 264
- Profet, M., 141
- Provost, M. P., Kormos, C. *et al*, 89
- Przybyla, D. P. and Byrne, D., 133
- Psychology, 159
- and influence of feminist theory, 245–6
- Psychology Today*, 265
- Puhl, R. M., and Boland, F. J., 109, 279
- and Brownell, K. D., 219
- Schwartz, M. B. and Brownell, K. D., 219
- Puoane, T., Steyn, K. *et al*, 120, 123
- Putney, D. *et al*, 146

- Puwar, N., 275
 Pythagoras, 4
- Quinn, D. M., Kallen, R. W. *et al*, 275
- Rand, C. S., and MacGregor, A. M., 221
 and Wright, B. A., 222
- Reagan, P. C., 221
- Register, C. A. and Williams, D. R., 220
- Reichborn-Kjennerud, T., Bulik, C. *et al*, 240
- Rhodes, G., 161, 175
 Jeffrey, L. *et al*, 78
 and Moody, J., 176
 and Zebrowitz, L. A., 8
 Zebrowitz, L. A. *et al*, 185
- Ricciardelli, L. A. and McCabe, M. P., 236, 240, 241, 250
- Rich, J., 211
- Richardson, S. A., Goodman, N. *et al*, 221
- Richins, M.L., 266
- Rieger, G., 172
 Linsenmeier, J. A. W. *et al*, 172
- Roberts, T. A. and Gettmann, J. Y., 247, 274
- Rodin, J., Silberstein, L. and Striegel-Moore, R., 259
- Rodman, P. S. and McHenry, H. M., 147
- Roehling, M. V., 220
- Roggman, L. A., 7
- Roney, J. R., Hanson, K.N. *et al*, 89, 101
- Rose, L., 139
- Ross, L., Greene, D. and House, P., 197
- Roth, Z., 146
- Rothblum, E., 241
- Rowe, L. and Houle, D., 90
- Rozmus-Wrzesinska, M. and Pawlowski, B., 52, 54, 55, 56–7, 173
- Rubens, P. P., 109
- Rubin, L. R., Nemeroff, C. J. and Russo, N. F., 251
- Rudman, W. J. and Verdi, P., 246, 273
- Ruff, C. B., 145, 149
- Russell, Lillian, 262
- Sabik, N. J. and Tylka, T. L., 251
- Sales, S. M., 196
- Salusso-Deonier, C. J., and Markee, N. L. and Pedersen, E. L., 178
- Salzano, F. M. and Callegari-Jacques, S. M., 109
- Sands, E. and Wardle, J., 269
- Sargent, J. D. and Blanchflower, D. G., 220
- Sarlo-Lahteenkorva, S., Silventoinen, K. and Lahelma, E., 220
- Scheib, J. E., Gangestad, S. W. and Thornhill, R., 89
- Schneider, D. J., 209
- Schneider, J., 139, 143
- Schupak-Neuberg, Shaw, and Stein, 269
- Schur, E. A., Sanders, M. and Steiner, H., 259
- Schwartz, M. B., O'Neal, H. *et al*, 221
 Vartanian, L. R. *et al*, 222
- Schwartz, N., 198
 and Clore, G.L., 197
- Schwimmer, J. B., Burwinkle, T. M. and Varni, J. W., 225
- Sear, R., Mace, R. and McGregor, I. A., 139
- Searcy, W. A., 135
- Seid, R. P., 267
Seventeen, 263
- sexual arousal, reasons for, 150–2
 and sexual behaviour, 151
 and visual stimuli, 133
- sexual selection, and dimorphism, 134–5
 and female choice, 134, 135
 and female promiscuity, 135
 inter/intra distinction, 133
 and male competition, 134, 135
 and male emissions, 136
 and ornaments, 135
 simultaneous/sequential choice, 134
 theory of, 132
- Shakespeare, W., 185
- Shape* magazine, 267–8
- Shapiro, J. R., 92

- Sheldon, B. C., 89
- Sheldon, W. H., Stevens, S. S. and Tucker, W. B., 160
- Shell-Duncan, B. and Yung, S.A., 67
- Shepard, G. H., 92, 93
- Sheridan, Ann, 192
- Sherwood, L., 270
- Shields, S., 242
- Shisana, O., Rehle, T. *et al*, 120
- Short, R. V., 141
- Shuttle, P. and Redgrove, P., 141
- Sigall, H. and Landy, D., 131, 139
- Sillen Tulberg, B. and Møller, A. P., 140
- Silverstein, B., Peterson, B. and Perdue, L., 263
- Silverstein, L. R., Perdue, L. *et al*, 243, 264, 266
- Simmons, J. P. and Nelson, L. D., 201
- Simmons, R., 68
- Singh, D., 15, 16, 19, 26, 30–1, 32, 49, 69, 70, 80, 88, 108–9, 110, 131, 132, 142, 160, 161, 171, 173, 174, 185, 186, 189, 194, 211, 237–8, 279
 and Luis, S., 65, 70
 and Young, R. K., 131, 185
- Singleton, B. B. R., Cornelissen, P. L. and Tovée, M. J., 50
- Sirin, S. R., McCreary, D. R. and Mahalik, J. R., 172
- Siskind, J., 101–2
- skin colour, 144
- Skouteris, H., Carr, R. *et al*, 281
- Slater, A. and Tiggemann, M., 246, 247, 274
- Small, M. F., 134, 135
- Smith, D. M., 187
- Smith, K. L., 58
 Cornelissen, P. L. and Tovée, M. J., 9, 32, 48, 69, 109
 Tovée, M. J. *et al*, 58, 59, 118
- Smith, L. K., Lelas, J. L. and Kerrigan, D. C., 163
- Smith, S. M., McIntosh, W. D. and Bazzini, D. G., 212, 280
- Smolak, L., 259
 Levine, M. and Schermer, F., 269
 and Levine, M. P., 236, 240, 246, 248, 259
 and Murnen, S. K., 240, 248
 Murnen, S. K. and Thompson, J. K., 240
 and Stein, J. A., 237, 243
- Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D. and Berscheid, E., 6, 32
- Sobal, J. and Stunkard, A. J., 65, 66, 188, 278
- social comparison theory, 214
 and adolescents, 216–17
 in adulthood, 217
 alternatives to, 218–19
 and appearance, 216
 and attractiveness norm development, 216
 as automatic/intentional, 214
 and body dissatisfaction, 215–17
 and boyfriend status, 215–16
 consequences of, 214
 cross-sectional/experimental studies, 215–16
 and feedback, 214, 215
 and group conformity, 214
 and group membership, 218
 importance of, 214
 and individual variables, 218
 longitudinal studies, 216–18
 and parent/peer support deficit, 217
 and perceived threat, 214
 and same-sex individuals, 217
 upward/downward effects, 215, 217–18, 272
- Social Roles Theory (SRT), 238, 240, 241
- social stigma, 219–25
- sociocultural theory, 226–7
 and age, 279–80
 and beauty ideals, 260–6, 281–5
 and body dissatisfaction, 259–60
 and chronic discrepancy, 270–2
 and chronic objectification, 273–5
 and disfigurement/disability, 280
 and explanations of attractiveness, 243–4
 feminist critique, 244
 future trends/shifting focus, 285–6
 and men's body image, 286–7

- sociocultural theory – *continued*
 non-white populations, 276–9
 and pregnancy, 280–1
 and promoting/pursuing cultural beauty ideals, 266–9
 and youth, Whiteness, flawlessness, 275
- socioeconomic status (SES), 110, 121, 123, 278
- Solomon, M. R. and Schopler, J., 7
- Solomon, S. E., 280
- Sommers-Flanagan, R.,
 Sommers-Flanagan, J. and Davis, B., 246
- Spears, Brittany, 265
- Spitzer, B. L., Henderson, K. A. and Zivian, M. T., 265
- Sprecher, S., Aron, A. *et al*, 131
- Sroufe, R. A., Chaikin, A. and *et al*, 7
- Stacey, P. B., 135
- Stangor, C., Lynch, L. *et al*, 162, 168
 Sechrist, G. B. and Jost, J. T., 219
- Stanish, M., 161
- Status, 238–9, 249
 and body-shape, 239
 and gender-differentiated roles, 238–9
 and marital partners, 239
 and socially pervasive roles, 238
- Steer, P., 67
- Steiner-Adair, C., Sjostrom, L. *et al*, 250
- Stephan, C. W. and Langlois, J. H., 6
- stereotypes, and attractiveness, 210–12
 definition of, 209
 and environmental pressures, 227
 and halo effects, 212
 and intelligence/achievement, 211
 and male/female Extraversion, 210–11
 and physical status, health, reproduction, 211–12
 predictive validity of, 210
 research on, 209
 and social comparison theory, 215–18
 and social competence, 210
 social mechanisms, 212–14
 and social status, 210–11
 support for validity of, 212
 and unattractiveness/negative attributions link, 227
 and WHR, 211
- Stevens, J., Kumanyika, S. K. and Kell, J. E., 276
- Stevens, S. S., 24
- Stewart, J. E., 7
- Stice, E., 217, 244, 250, 266, 269
 and Bearman, S. K., 218
 Maxfield, J. and Wells, T., 216, 266
 and Shaw, H., 285
 and Whitenton, K., 217, 266
- Stormer, S. M. and Thompson, J.K., 272
- Strahan, E. J., Wilson, A. E. *et al*, 265, 272
- Strassmann, B., 134, 140, 141, 142
- Strauss, J., Doyle, A. E. and Kreipe, R. E., 266
- Strauss, R. S. and Pollack, H. A., 223, 226
- Streeter, S. A. and McBurney, D. H., 17, 18, 19, 50, 52, 53, 110, 173
- Stromer, S. M. and Thompson, J. K., 218
- Suarez-Orozco, C. and Suarez-Orozco, M. M., 276
- Sugiyama, L. S., 66, 69, 78, 81, 110, 226
- Swaddle, J. P. and Reiersen, G. W., 102
- Swallen, K. C., Reither, E. N. *et al*, 225
- Swami, V., 4, 67, 110, 123, 261
 Antonakopoulos, N. *et al*, 110, 123, 175
- Caprario, C. *et al*, 110, 123, 175, 201
- Chan, F. *et al*, 7
- Einon, D. *et al*, 30
 and Furnham, A., 7–8, 19, 109, 112, 121, 123, 161
- Gray, M. and Furnham, A., 109
- Greven, C. and Furnham, A., 211
- Knight, D. *et al*, 110
- Neto, F. *et al*, 110, 123
 and Tovée, M. J., 16, 70, 110, 118, 122, 198, 238, 241, 251, 278, 279

- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L. *et al*, 248, 273
 Symons, D., 7, 78, 132, 133, 135, 185, 186, 188, 200
 Sypeck, M. F. *et al*, 265
- Takahata, Y., Ihobe, H. and Idani, G., 140, 151
- Tassinary, L. G. and Hansen, K. A., 16, 17, 18, 109, 161, 178
- Taylor, P. D. and Williams, G. C., 90
 Taylor, S., Fiske, S. *et al*, 162
 Taylor, S. E. and Lobel, M., 214
 Teachman, B. A. and Brownell, K.D., 221
- Thompson, J. K., 260
 and Cafri, G., 286
 Coovert, M. D. *et al*, 224
 Heinberg, L. J. *et al*, 30, 209, 216, 226, 243, 244, 260
 and Stice, E., 269, 285
 and Tantleff, S., 270
 van den Berg, P., *et al*, 267, 268, 271, 273, 281
- Thornhill, R., 88
 and Gangestad, S. W., 91
 and Grammer, K., 49, 57
- Tiggemann, M., 248, 274, 286
 and Kuring, J. K., 247, 274
 and Lynch, J. E., 247, 249, 274
 and Rothblum, E. D., 274, 283
 and Slater, A., 247, 248, 266
 and Stevens, A., 251
- Tishkoff, S. A., Reed, F. A. *et al*, 92
- Tovée, M. J., 9
 Benson, P. J. *et al*, 56
 and Cornelissen, P. L., 48, 49, 58, 69, 109, 118, 131, 142, 161, 173, 186, 279
 Cornelissen, P. L. *et al*, 31, 32
 Hancock, P. J. B. *et al*, 25–6, 32, 54, 57, 58, 72, 109, 112, 113, 118
 Maisey, D. S. *et al*, 49, 54, 56, 58, 72, 109, 112, 113, 118, 173, 177, 279
 Reinhardt, S. *et al*, 54, 56, 58, 109, 113, 118
 Swami, V. *et al*, 22, 67, 70, 110, 111, 118, 119, 120, 123, 186, 278
- Tracer, D. P., 67
- Tregenza, T. and Wedell, N., 89
 Treloar, C. *et al*, 278
 Tripartite Model of Body Dissatisfaction, 244
 Trivers, R. L., 135, 148
 Troje, N. F., 163
 Turkel, A. R., 271
 Turkheimer, E., 242
 Turner, S. L., Hamilton, H. *et al*, 266
 Tversky, B. and Baratz, D., 176
 Twiggy, 263–4
 Tylka, Y. L. and Hill, M. S., 247
- Udry, J. R. and Eckland, B. K., 7
 Unger, R. K., 160, 178
 United Nations, 139, 286
 Upfold, J. B. *et al*, 144, 146
- van den Berghe, P. L. and Frost, P., 131, 132, 144
 van der Merwe, M. T. and Pepper, M. S., 123
 vandenbergh, S. G., 185
 Varga, C. A., 120
 Vaughn, L. S., 7
 Vickers, W. T., 101
 Vikram, N. K., Misra, A. *et al* (2003), 71
 Vitzthum, V. J., Bentley, G. R. *et al*, 68
 Spielvogel, H. and Thornburg, J., 68
Vogue, 263, 264
 volume height index (VHI), 25, 48
 as body attractiveness index, 34–6, 42–3
 and fitness levels, 42
 as important visual cue, 42–3
 inconvenience of measure, 42
 and male bodily attractiveness, 39–42
 optimal, 38–9
 validation of effects, 36–8
 Voracek, M. and Fisher, M.L., 109
- Waas, P., Waldenstrom, U. *et al*, 48
 Wade, Martin, and Tiggemann, 241
 Waist-to-chest ratio (WCR), 40, 41, 43
 Waist-to-chin height (WHC), 25

- Waist-to-hip ratio (WHR), 48, 237–8
 and attractiveness, 17–18, 30–2, 160–1
 and choice of mate, 109
 correlation between measures, 30–1, 48–9
 criticism of, 16–19, 108–11
 and cultural, ethnic, national differences, 110, 111
 and cultural invariance, 178n2
 and curvaceousness, 65, 194
 and environments, 110–11
 and fertility, 15–16, 26, 66
 as first-pass filter of attractiveness, 109, 118
 front/actual measures, 48–9
 and health outcomes, 26
 and image manipulation, 49–60
 and interpersonal metaperception, 174–7
 and low BMI, 16
 optimal, 31, 189
 popularity of hypothesis, 108
 and relative importance of characteristics, 19–21
 role of, 16
 statistical analyses, 21–6
 and stereotypes, 211
 validity of, 176–7
 weight factor, 16–17
- Walker, D. W., Hale, J. R. *et al*, 146
 Wallace, R., 281
 Walster, E., Aronson, V. *et al*, 5–6
 Ward, L. M., 245
 Wass, P., Waldenstrom, U. *et al*, 16, 66
 Watterson, B., 261
 Waynforth, D., Delwadia, S. and Camm, M., 89
 Wedekind, C., Seebeck, T. *et al*, 103
 Weeden, J. and Sabini, J., 26, 121, 211
 weight, below normal, 264–5
 and bias against adults, 219–21
 bias against children, 221–3
 and bodily cues, 160–1
 consequences of bias, 223–5
 correlation with health, 66–7
 and male preference, 66–7
 and mate choice, 120, 188, 189, 201
 and obesity, 219–21, 223–5
 transmission of bias, 223
 and WHR, 16–17, *see also* obesity
- Weiner, K. E. and Thompson, J. K., 248
 Wellings, K. *et al*, 136, 143, 151
 Wertheim, E. H., Paxton, S. J. *et al*, 272
 Paxton, S. J. and Tilgner, L., 271
 Wetsman, A. and Marlowe, F., 16, 69, 70, 110, 175, 178
 Wheeler, P., 147, 148
 Whitman, W., 163
 Whitten, P. L., 136
 Wilde, O., 266
 Wilkinson, G. S. and Taper, M., 90
 Willet, W. C., Manson, J. E. *et al*, 120
 Wilson, J. M. B., Tripp, D. A. and Boland, F. J., 109
 Wiseman, C. V., Gray, J. J. *et al*, 264, 265
 Wolf, N., 267, 272, 283
 Wolfenson, D., Roth, Z. *et al*, 132–3
 Roth, Z. and Meidan, R., 144, 146
 Wong, V., 7
 Woods, L.E.P., 109
 World Bank, 70
 World Health Organization (WHO), 286
- youth, advantages of, 143
 and children, 143–4
 gender differences, 149
 male attraction to, 143–4
 and marriage, 143
- Yu, D. W. and Shepard, G. H., 16, 30, 69, 70, 92, 100, 103, 110, 178
- Zaadstra, B. M., Seidell, J. C. *et al*, 16, 30, 48, 66, 161
 Zollner, F. and Nathan, J., 185
 Zones, J. S., 261, 275
 Zulu study, 111–22