

5-1-2013

Beauty and Wages: The Effect of Physical Attractiveness on Income Using Longitudinal Data

Vesna Gvozdenodic
Honors College, Pace University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/honorscollege_theses



Part of the [Economics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gvozdenodic, Vesna, "Beauty and Wages: The Effect of Physical Attractiveness on Income Using Longitudinal Data" (2013). *Honors College Theses*. Paper 128.

http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/honorscollege_theses/128

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Pforzheimer Honors College at DigitalCommons@Pace. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors College Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Pace. For more information, please contact rracelis@pace.edu.

Beauty and Wages: The Effect of Physical Attractiveness on Income Using Longitudinal Data

By: Vesna Gvozdenovic

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the effect physical attractiveness has on an individual's yearly income. Unlike previous studies on beauty and the labor market, this study employs longitudinal data obtained from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health, 1994-2008), which contains interviewers' ratings of the respondent's physical attractiveness and personality attractiveness. This data is used to regress yearly income on a variety of variables that can also influence an individual's income, such as gender, age, race, BMI, personality attractiveness, education, and physical health. These factors are used to adjust for the income differentials related to looks. Results confirmed that physical attractiveness correlates positively with yearly income, although, surprisingly, the least attractive exhibited the highest yearly incomes. Larger incomes are also associated with maleness, Caucasian race, higher ages, greater personality attractiveness ratings, more education, and good physical health.

I. Introduction

Is it worth taking a second glance at yourself in the mirror before leaving the house? Could an additional five minutes in front of the mirror primping yourself increase the amount of money you make? In today's society, whether you're a graduating college student or aspiring to advance your career, looking good pays off in the labor market.

Current literature has led to this research in determining whether looks have a significant impact on an individual's earnings, maybe a bigger impact than education, in the labor market. This is validated by evidence that beauty is rewarded in jobs where physical attractiveness is not vital, such as CEOs and lawyers. It is not only necessary for graduates entering the labor market, but for employees, as well, to understand the importance of appearance as it affects productivity and profitability.

Section II summarizes previous research conducted pertaining to the effects of beauty on income. Section III displays the hypothesis and the descriptions of the variables in the model. Section IV describes the data used to conduct this research. Section V presents and analyzes the results of the econometric models. Finally, the main conclusions of this study are presented in Section VI.

II. Literature Review

Economist and creator of "pulchroconomics", the economics of beauty, Daniel Hamermesh, verifies that better-looking people are better off in his book, Beauty Pays: Why Attractive People Are More Successful. He demonstrates how society favors the beautiful and how they experience

indisputable benefits in all aspects of life, including working more productively and profitably. Among other benefits, they are more likely to be employed, and receive more substantial pay. Over a lifetime, an attractive person working in America might on average earn \$230,000 more than a very plain one. “Beauty is scarce, and economics is about the impacts of scarcity”; as a result, attractive people earn more, marry better, and enjoy an abundance of positive discrimination.

Similarly, erotic capital—a combination of beauty, style, social skills, and charm—is as vital in today’s workplace as intelligence or skill states Catherine Hakim in her book, *Erotic Capital: The Power of Attraction in the Boardroom and the Bedroom*. Hakim argues that “attractiveness and beauty have real value”, making it a significant factor in determining success, not only for women, but for men as well. Her results reveal that in Western societies, “erotic capital can boost earnings, all else equal, somewhere between 10 to 20 percent”. It is not a surprise then that attractiveness, when compared to other factors, seems to be equal value in economic terms of raising income to educational qualifications.

Although it makes sense to invest in looking good and being presentable, Hamermesh’s and Hakim’s research has led to the conclusion that it is advantageous to invest in the compatible qualities of charm and exceptional social skills. It is not necessarily all about physical beauty; it’s often social charm, social skills, and social intelligence—the ability to relate to others. Thus, it is then possible that other factors, other than beauty, such as an individual’s personality, education, and physical characteristics, may have effects on an individual’s wage.

Since better-looking people experience benefits in all aspects of life, do they consistently earn higher wages as well? Hamermesh and Biddle (1993) were the first to develop a theory of sorting across occupations based solely on looks and deriving its implications for testing for the

source of earnings differentials in relation to looks. Most recent studies have only used longitudinal studies or surveys that focus on how physical characteristics such as body mass, height, weight, physical disability, and facial attractiveness affect an individual's wage (Averett and Korenman, 1993; Loureiro, Sachside, and Mendonca, 2009; Scholz and Sicinski, 2011). However, Hamermesh and Biddle (1993) use three surveys (the 1977 Quality of Employment, the 1971 Quality of American Life, and the 1981 Canadian Quality of Life) that contain interviewers' ratings of the respondents' physical attractiveness and a variety of mechanisms to measure earnings. This is the only study, to date, that provides evidence of a penalty for plainness and a premium for beauty. They also conducted a separate study to investigate the effect of beauty on the wages of lawyers to prove that this premium and penalty exist across varied occupations.

Body mass (kg/m²) of individuals of 23 to 31 year olds drawn from the 1988 NLSY is used to investigate income, hourly pay differentials, and marital status (Averett and Korenman, 1993). Obese women have lower family income, lower hourly wages, lower spousal income, and are less likely to be married than women in the recommended BMI range. The same evidence was found to be true for underweight men, but obese men only suffer from lower wages. Scholz and Sicinski (2011) show that there is a statistically positive correlation between facial attractiveness and earnings, but there is no link between facial attractiveness and direct measures of cognitive skills (IQ or high school rank) or between facial attractiveness and measures of health. Physical appearance is an easier concept to empirically measure and appears to affect an individual's wage in the Brazilian economy. There is overwhelming empirical evidence that physical appearance affects wage discrimination (Loureiro, Sachside, and Mendonca, 2009).

In contrast to the studies between physical appearance and earnings, Hamermesh and Biddle (1993) studied the effects of beauty in the labor market. Evidence reveals that standards of beauty are both commonly agreed upon and stable over one's working life (Hatfield and Sprecher, 1986). Results from a study using three distinct sets of household data display better-looking people receiving higher pay, while less attractive people earning less than average wages. In addition, the impact of a person's looks on his or her earnings is independent of occupation (Hammermish and Biddle, 1993). Their tests conclude that there exists a penalty for plainness of 5-10%, which is slightly larger than the beauty premium. These penalties and premiums reflect effects of beauty in all of its aspects, not just one of its many factors such as height, weight, complexion, facial structure, etc.

In a separate study, Hamermesh and Biddle (1998) showed that the plainness penalty and the beauty premium exist across all occupations by investigating the influence of beauty on the wages of lawyers. Using data collected from the same law school for graduating classes of 1971-78 and 1981-88, a panel of 4 observers rated the student's photographs in each class on a scale of 1 to 5, where "5" represents the most attractive. The beauty premium found for attorneys increases with age. Five years after graduating, a male lawyer with a beauty rating of one rank above average had approximately 10 percent higher earnings than a male lawyer with a rating of one rank below average.

There is consistent agreement on what constitutes beauty and the impact it has in the labor market (Hatfield and Sprecher, 1986). Further research has led to the conclusion that "within a culture at a point in time there is tremendous agreement on standards of beauty, and these standards change quite slowly" (Hamermesh and Biddle, 1993). We all tend to have

similar, but undefined standards, so if you think someone is beautiful or ugly, most others will hold an opinion within a close range to that.

Skin tone does not equate to beauty, but some employers and customers may treat it similarly to beauty. There is a large body of literature dedicated to documenting earnings differentials by gender and even by race and ethnicity in the United States. Corcoran and Duncan (1979) are one of many researchers who have found that women earn less than men and most racial/ethnic minority groups earn less than whites. In Greenman's and Xie's (2008) study, statistical interaction between minority status and being female is consistently positive. Their results have shown that for both sexes, the highest-earning groups are the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Indians, while the lowest-earning group is Native American. While only 4 out of 18 minority groups have higher than whites among men, the corresponding figure is 9 out of 18 for women. Greenman and Xie also found out that while Blacks, most Hispanic groups, and Native Americans all have considerably lower earnings than whites, several Asian groups have considerably higher earnings. Women in every group have lower average earnings than men. As mentioned, evidence suggests that female and male beauty/ugliness and an individual's race might be treated differently in the labor market, so any empirical study must analyze men, women, and race separately.

There is growing awareness of the social stigma attached to being over or under weight. An individual's weight, or BMI, may be an important factor in an employer's hiring decision because of the higher risk of illness with being over or under weight, or because those people are viewed by society as being unattractive. Maranto and Stenoien (2000) used data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experience of Youth to find wage discrimination on weight-based wage penalties for young men and women. It was found that mildly obese (20%

over standard weight) white women experience greater wage penalties than black men experience for weight that is 100% over standard weight. Men do not experience wage penalties until their weight exceeds 100 pounds. According to Averett and Korenman (1993), Americans, especially women, experience great social and psychological pressure with respect to body size. A study conducted by Register and Williams (1990) reported mean hourly wage differences of -16% for obese women and +7% for obese men, compared to women and men who aren't obese. These results can be interpreted as evidence of discrimination against obese women. John Cawley (2004) found that the only group for which weight consistently lowered wages is white females. His results show that typical white women weighing 64 pounds more than white females of average weight, have wages about 9 percent lower. According to these studies, it can be argued that income might be negatively correlated with body mass, because of factors that affect productivity, such as health or self-esteem.

As stated, beauty differs by gender and race, but it also by age. Studies have demonstrated that the looks of younger people are rated on average more favorably than those of older people. In Hamermesh's book, individuals, who were specifically asked to adjust for people's ages were incapable of rating older people's looks as highly as those of younger people. Older people in the labor market are on average rated as less good-looking than their younger co-workers. But, older people, generally around age 55 or so, usually earn more than younger people in the same occupation, industry, and location. The impacts of beauty on earnings rise with experience.

Personality attractiveness might just be as important as physical attractiveness to income differentials. Nyhus and Pons (2004) used data from the DNB Household Survey (DHS) to test the extent to which certain personality traits are rewarded in the labor market and contribute

towards explaining the large unexplained differences in earnings. Their results show that emotional stability is positively associated with the wage of both men and women, while agreeableness is significantly associated with lower wages for women only. Duncan and Dunifon (1998) claim that families pass on certain “soft” skills, such as motivation and discipline that are ultimately observed and rewarded by employers. Results from empirical studies made by Bowles, Gintis, and Osborne (2001) demonstrate reward for personal characteristics that a person might think irrelevant in the labor market. For example, height, obesity, domestic cleanliness, and beauty have been found to be strong predictors of earnings. There is also a possibility that some of these variables are used by employers as indicators of traits that they think may influence work performance, such as self-control and conscientiousness. This study incorporates personality attractiveness as one of its factors because there is a wide use of personality tests by employers for personnel selection. Since employers find personality valuations useful, personality traits may affect productivity or have the incentive-enhancing quality described by Bowles et al.

This study also controls for unmeasured intellectual ability, which may also have a significant effect on wages. In a study conducted by Judge, Hurst, and Simon (2009), education has a greater effect than good looks when it came to their effect on people’s level of income, so it is worthwhile to include education in this study. On the other hand, Hamermesh and Biddle showed that even within occupations where you would think looks don’t matter, they do. For example, better-looking professors get higher teaching evaluations and even better-looking economists get elected to offices in the professional society. It is important to realize that beauty has significant effects in many occupations because it alters the choices people make about what occupation to pursue. “Beauty affects who works at what, and how much they earn”, declared

Hamermesh in his book. Within each occupation, you find some individuals who are good-looking and those who are not. Within most occupations, the better-looking individuals earn more.

III. Theoretical Analysis

To test the hypothesis of the effect of physical attractiveness on income, this study tests the following equation, including additional variables such as age, race, BMI, personality attractiveness, physical health, and education:

$$\text{Yearly income} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Race} + \beta_2 \text{Gender} + \beta_3 \text{Physical attractiveness} + \beta_4 \text{BMI} + \beta_5 \text{Age} + \beta_6 \text{Personality attractiveness} + \beta_7 \text{Physical health} + \beta_8 \text{Education} + \varepsilon$$

All the variables used in this study are described in Table 1. Some observations should be made in relation to Table 1. The dummies for race, which include black, asian, white, american_indian, were formed to enhance the discrimination. For example, from empirical evidence, it is assumed that non-white individuals are discriminated against in relation to white individuals. The value one for these variables refers to the individuals of that particular race. The same holds for the variable sex, where the value one refers to individuals who are female. It was anticipated that there would be a negative correlation between the variables for black, asian, american_indian, and female and income per year. The dummies for race, as in other studies, seek to verify if race has some effect on the wage. It is common to find a negative sign for non-white individuals. The same applies to the variable sex. A number of studies point to the existence of a penalty wage for women (Phelps, 1972).

Table 1 presents the definition of the variables implemented in this study. The dependent variable, *incomeyr*, is measured in terms of the yearly income received by the employee from personal earnings before taxes, that is, wages or salaries, including tips, bonuses, and overtime pay, and income from self-employment. The variable *edulevel* was derived by asking each respondent the highest level of education that he/she has achieved to date. Responses included 8th grade or less, high school graduate, vocational/technical training (after high school), a bachelor's degree, some graduate school, a master's degree, a doctoral degree, and post baccalaureate professional education. The variable *birthyr4* represents each Wave IV respondent's year of birth and the variable *iy4* represents each Wave IV respondent's year that he/she was interviewed. Subtracting variable *birthyr4* from variable *iy4* derived the variable *age*. It is expected that there would be a positive correlation between education and income per year, as well as, age and income per year.

Additional dummy variables were generated for the categories of physical attractiveness, personality attractiveness, and physical health of respondents used in the study. For the physical attractiveness dummies, each respondent was rated on a scale of 1 to 5 on how physically attractive he/she is, with a rating of 1 as very unattractive, 2 as unattractive, 3 as about average, 4 as attractive, and 5 as very attractive. For the personality attractiveness dummies, each respondent's personality was rated on a scale of 1 to 5 on how attractive his/her personality is, with a rating of 1 as very unattractive, 2 as unattractive, 3 as about average, 4 as attractive, and 5 as very attractive. For the physical health dummies, each respondent described his/her physical health on a scale from 1 to 5, with a rating of 1 as excellent, 2 as very good, 3 as good, 4 as fair, and 5 as poor. It was hoped that there would be a positive correlation between a high rating in

physical and personality attractiveness and income per year, and a negative relationship between a high rating of physical health and income per year.

Another variable used in this study involves an additional measure of physical appearance, mainly linked to obesity and low weight. In order to measure obesity, the Body Mass Index (BMI) is used. This indicator can be used to define different degrees of obesity and verify if the person's weight is lower than the norm, or in other words, if the respondent's weight is inconsistent with his/her height, waist and sex. The BMI is the ratio between weight and height squared. It is predicted that there would be a negative relationship between BMI that is higher or lower than the norm and income per year.

Table 1: Definition of Variables

Variables	Description
incomeyr	Income per Year
iy4	Year of Interview in Wave IV
birthyr4	Birth Year of Respondent in Wave IV
age	Age of Respondent (iy4 minus birthyr4)
sex	Dummy that assumes value 1 if female and 0 otherwise
race	Race of Respondent
black	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the individual is Black or African American and 0 otherwise
asian	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the individual is Asian or Pacific Islander and 0 otherwise
white	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the individual is white and 0 otherwise
american_indian	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the individual is American Indian or Alaska Native and 0 otherwise
bmi	BMI
physatt	Physical Attractiveness
very_unattractive	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the individual is rated a 1 in physical attractiveness and 0 if the physical attractiveness of the individual is rated a 2,3,4, or 5
unattractive	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the individual is rated a 2 in physical attractiveness and 0 if the physical attractiveness of the individual is rated a 1,3,4, or 5
about_average	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the individual is rated a 3 in physical attractiveness and 0 if the physical attractiveness of the individual is rated a 1,2,4, or 5
attractive	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the individual is rated a 4 in physical attractiveness and 0 if the physical attractiveness of the individual is rated a 1,2,3, or 5

very_attractive	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the individual is rated a 5 in physical attractiveness and 0 if the physical attractiveness of the individual is rated a 1,2,3, or 4
persatt	Personality Attractiveness
persv_unattractive	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the personality attractiveness of the individual is rated a 1 and 0 if the personality attractiveness of the individual is rated a 2,3,4, or 5
persunattractive	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the personality attractiveness of the individual is rated a 2 and 0 if the personality attractiveness of the individual is rated a 1,3,4, or 5
persabt_avg	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the personality attractiveness of the individual is rated a 3 and 0 if the personality attractiveness of the individual is rated a 1,2,4, or 5
persattractive	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the personality attractiveness of the individual is rated a 4 and 0 if the personality attractiveness of the individual is rated a 1,2,3, or 5
persv_attractive	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the personality attractiveness of the individual is rated a 5 and 0 if the personality attractiveness of the individual is rated a 1,2,3, or 4
edulvl	Highest Level of Education Achieved
physhealth	Physical Health of Respondent
exc_health	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the physical health of the individual is rated a 1 and 0 if the physical health of the individual is rated a 2,3,4, or 5
vgood_health	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the physical health of the individual is rated a 2 and 0 if the physical health of the individual is rated a 1,3,4, or 5
good_health	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the physical health of the individual is rated a 3 and 0 if the physical health of the individual is rated a 1,2,4, or 5
fair_health	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the physical health of the individual is rated a 4 and 0 if the physical health of the individual is rated a 1,2,3, or 5
poor_health	Dummy that assumes value 1 if the physical health of the individual is rated a 5 and 0 if the physical health of the individual is rated a 1,2,3, or 4

IV. Empirical Testing

This study differs from prior related papers because it uses longitudinal data, to conduct multiple cross-sectional regressions to investigate the effect of beauty on wages, from The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health, 1994-2008). The data uses a sample of adolescents in grades 7-12, in the United States, who have been followed into young adulthood with four in-home interviews, when the sample was aged 24-32. Not only does this study examine the effects of body mass, physical health, and physical attractiveness on an individual's income, but also the impact education, race, and personality attractiveness have on a

person's income. No prior paper investigates these additional variables to the extent of analyzing their effects on income outcomes.

This database was obtained by interviewing a sample of 20,745 adolescents from 80 high schools over four periods. This sample was dispersed across the nation with respondents in all 50 states. From September 1994 until April 1995, in-school questionnaires were administered to students in these schools. Each school administration occurred on a single day within one 45- to 60- minute class period. The in-school questionnaire provided measurement on the school context, school activities, future expectations, and a variety of health conditions. Rosters of all enrolled students in each school were also obtained. The in-home sample provides a nationally representative sample of 12,105 American adolescents in grades 7 to 12. From answers provided on the in-school survey, additional samples based on ethnicity (Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Chinese) and disability were drawn.

Wave III was conducted as a follow-up interview with original Wave I respondents as they entered the transition to adulthood. Wave III data collection was conducted nationwide between August 2001 and April 2002. Interviews on 15,197 respondents who were now aged 18-26 were completed. When adolescents finish high school, they enjoy greater independence and begin to explore new lifestyles. Therefore, their social contexts change and their experiences broaden. Wave III data captures these experiences by focusing on the areas of young adult life that individuals enter during the transition to adulthood and their well-being in these areas: labor market, higher education, relationships, parenting, and civic participation. This study continued to collect data on health that was measured at earlier waves, including repeated measures of diet, physical activity, mental health and depression, and injury. Physical measurements of height and weight were also obtained. Wave III contains new data specific to the late adolescent, such as

personal income, wealth, and debt. The high school transcripts of Wave III sample were also collected.

In Wave IV, a fourth in-home interview was conducted in 2008 with the original Wave I respondents. 15,701 original respondents were re-interviewed from the sample of adolescents first interviewed in 1994 and 1995. At the time of the interview, the Wave IV participants were 24 to 32 years old and settling into young adulthood. Wave IV data collection obtained longitudinal survey data on the social, economic, psychological, and health circumstances of the respondents. The Wave IV survey added new questions and sections that were more relevant to the lives of young adults, which included information about change in physical and mental health status and risk taking, social, and antisocial behavior. Survey questions were expanded on educational transitions, economic status and financial resources and strains, eating habits and nutrition, and physical activities. A list of the "Big 5" personality dimensions was added, as were indicators of social and occupational stressors. Wave IV collected information on the dates and circumstances of key life events occurring in young adulthood, including an educational history of dates of degrees and school attendance and various employment events, including the date of first and current jobs, with information on occupation, industry, wages, hours, and benefits. After obtaining the answers from Waves I, III, and IV, an adjustment was made in the database: only the surveys which were completely filled in for all three waves were used. This reduced the sample size to 6,504 observations.

V. Econometric Results

Tables 2 and 3 present the econometric results for the income equation that appears in Section III. Table 2 shows the impacts that the variables of age, BMI, and education and the dummy variables of physical attractiveness, race, physical health and personality attractiveness have on male respondents' yearly income, while Table 3 shows these impacts on females' yearly income. My independent variables explain only a small proportion of the variation in income. The adjusted R-squared for each column ranged from .002 to .064, which means that about 0.2% to 6.4% of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables. This may be the result of the subjective nature of the dummy variables of physical attractiveness and personality attractiveness. This "subjectiveness" suggests that these variables were not measured with high reliability. Therefore, the lower the reliability, the more dampened the correlations are with the income variable. There may also be more factors acting on the income variable. Some of these factors include: marital status, size of city, region, nativity, family background, size of company, and years with the company. Incorporating these factors into the model may affect the correlations between the dummy variables and the yearly income and improve the accuracy of the study.

Column (1) in Tables 2 and 3 presents the effect of physical attractiveness on income and each dummy's coefficient, in this regression, represents the difference in income from the omitted category, which is the very unattractive category. The results in Table 2 suggest that, compared to a very unattractive man's income, an unattractive man makes \$18,831 less per year, an average-looking man makes \$13,349 less, an attractive man makes \$10,888 less, and a very attractive man makes only \$7,100 less. Thus, except for the very unattractive category, in general, higher looks are associated with higher incomes among men. Similarly, Table 3 shows that unattractive women make \$17,267 less and very attractive women make \$4,087 less yearly

than very unattractive women. As with men, except for the very unattractive category, higher looks are associated with higher wages. It is notable that the effect for men is larger in magnitude than for women. This could reflect the higher average income of men or the different occupations held by men compared to women. For example, looks may have an effect on the income of investment advisors and investment advisors tend to be male. Investors may trust good-looking advisors more than their less attractive counterparts.

Adding personality attractiveness in Columns (5) and (6) wipes out the effect and significance that looks have on income. Personality attractiveness itself is significant. This may reflect that employers actually respond to personality rather than looks. It may also be that personality and looks are highly collinear, thus making it difficult to find the separate effect of each factor. This could be true because personality strongly affects how people perceive looks.

Age and education, for both men and women, were highly statistically significant and positively associated with income. On average, each additional year of age adds about \$1,547, for men, and about \$2,315, for women, to an individual's income. Each additional year of schooling adds \$3,534, for men, and \$3,568, for women, to yearly income. Also, there was a positive relationship between physical health and income. Compared to an individual with poor health, an individual with excellent health makes about \$24,000 more in yearly income. This may be due to the fact that employers view poor health as an indicator of lower productivity. On a similar note, an individual's weight may also be of concern to an employer, but results in Tables 2 and 3 show that BMI is not statistically significant. Still, results show that a woman makes less as her BMI deviates from the norm.

The tables show that, compared to white men, Black and American Indian men make about \$5,000 less in yearly income. Asian men, on the other hand, make about \$20,000 more

than white men. Black women make almost \$10,000 less than white women, while Asian women make only \$3,250 more. This is consistent with Greenman's and Xie's results, where they found that Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans all have lower earnings than whites and several Asian groups have higher earnings.

According to the results of the regression analysis, looks have a positive effect on people's income. They follow a pattern where the better looking an individual is, the higher his or her income is, except for the least attractive category. The results for personality attractiveness follow the same pattern: the more attractive an individual's personality is, the higher his or her income is. However, the dummy variables for personality attractiveness are not as significant as the physical attractiveness dummies, especially for women.

VI. Conclusions

Beauty does affect income. A higher beauty rating can be equated with a greater yearly income. Physical attractiveness is positively correlated with yearly income up to a point where the very unattractive were exposed to have bigger incomes. Although personality attractiveness, on average, leads to higher income as well, the effect was stronger in comparison to physical attractiveness. The more years of experience, the more education, and the healthier a person is, the greater the yearly income is on average. Non-white people, excluding Asians, make less money compared with white people. This is also true in the case for women compared to men, although the income differentials are not as large.

Workers expect their employment outcomes, especially promotions and wages, to depend on factors related to productivity, such as education and experience. Yet, why do so many of

them spend time primping before going to work or to job interviews? And why do they spend so much money on clothing and other products aimed to enhance their appearance at work? The reason may be that most workers understand that it pays to be perceived as being more attractive. So, the next time you step out of the door, it might be worth taking a second look in the mirror.

VII. References

- Averett, Susan and Korenman, Sanders. "The Economic Reality of *The Beauty Myth*." *Journal of Human Resources*, Spring 1996, Vol. 31, Issue 2, pp. 304-30.
- Biddle, Jeff E. and Hamermesh, Daniel S. "Beauty, Productivity, and Discrimination: Lawyers' Looks and Lucre." *Journal of Labor Economics*, January 1998, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 172-201.
- Bowles, Samuel, Herbert Gintis, and Melissa Osborne. "Incentive-enhancing preferences: Personality, behavior, and earnings." *The American Economic Review* 91.2 (2001): 155-158.
- Cawley, John. "The Impact of Obesity on Wages." *Journal of Human Resources*, Spring 2004, Vol. 39, Issue 2, pp. 451-74.
- Corcoran, Mary, and Greg J. Duncan. "Work History, Labor Force Attachment, and Earnings Differences Between Races and Sexes." Thesis. University of Wisconsin, 1979. *Journal of Human Resources* 14.1 (2003): 3-20.
- Duncan, Greg, and Rachel Dunifon. "Soft-skills and long-run labor market success." *Research in labor economics* 17 (1998).
- Greenman, Emily, and Yu Xie. "Double Jeopardy? The interaction of gender and race on earnings in the United States." *Social Forces* 86.3 (2008): 1217-1244.
- Hakim, Catherine. *Erotic Capital: The Power of Attraction in the Boardroom and the Bedroom*. New York: Basic, 2011.
- Hamermesh, Daniel S. *Beauty Pays: Why Attractive People Are More Successful*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2011.
- Hamermesh, Daniel S., and Jeff E. Biddle. *Beauty and the labor market*. No. w4518. National Bureau of Economic Research, 1993.
- Hatfield, Elaine, and Susan Sprecher. *Mirror, Mirror: The Importance of Looks in Everyday Life*. Albany: State University of New York, 1986. Print.
- Judge, Timothy A., Charlice Hurst, and Lauren S. Simon. "Does It Pay to Be Smart, Attractive, or Confident (or All Three)? Relationships Among General Mental

- Ability, Physical Attractiveness, Core Self-Evaluations, and Income." Thesis. University of Florida, 2009. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94.3 (2009): 742-55.
- Loureiro, Paulo, Adolfo Sachsida, and Mario Cardoso Mendonca. "Links between Physical Appearance and Wage Discrimination: Further Evidence." *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities*. 1.2 (2012); 1-16.
- Maranto, Cheryl L., and Ann Fraedrich Stenoien. "Weight discrimination: a multidisciplinary analysis." *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 12.1 (2000): 9-24.
- Mobius, Markus M. and Rosenblat, Tanya S. "*Why Beauty Matters*." Manuscript, Wesleyan University, August 2004.
- Nyhus, Ellen K., and Empar Pons. "The effects of personality on earnings." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 26.3 (2005): 363-384.
- Phelps, Edmund S. "The statistical theory of racism and sexism." *The American Economic Review* 62.4 (1972): 659-661.
- Register, Charles A., and Donald R. Williams. "Wage effects of obesity among young workers." *Social Science Quarterly* 71.1 (1990): 130-141.
- Scholz, John K., and Kamil Sicinski. "Facial Attractiveness and Lifetime Earnings:." Thesis. University of Wisconsin, 2011.

VIII. Data

Table 2: The Impact of Physical Attractiveness, Age, Race, BMI, Education, Physical Health and Personality Attractiveness on Male Respondent's Income

	Yearly Income					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Physically unattractive	-18830.8*** (-3.07)	-20334.2*** (-3.30)	-18056.8*** (-2.93)	-16102.3*** (-2.69)	-10364.6 (-1.46)	-8860.1 (-1.26)
Physically about average	-13349.3*** (-2.70)	-15544.9*** (-3.16)	-12928.3*** (-2.63)	-12349.3** (-2.56)	-7603.0 (-1.26)	-7569.3 (-1.28)
Physically attractive	-10888.2** (-2.18)	-12751.5*** (-2.58)	-11166.9** (-2.26)	-12006.0** (-2.47)	-8493.1 (-1.38)	-9483.0 (-1.58)
Physically very attractive	-7100.1 (-1.29)	-8215.6 (-1.50)	-7845.9 (-1.43)	-9415.3* (-1.75)	-6417.9 (-0.96)	-8587.0 (-1.31)
Respondent's age		1685.6*** (3.51)		1429.1*** (3.01)		1523.0*** (3.24)
Black		-5104.4** (-2.46)		-5339.8*** (-2.62)	-5539.1*** (-2.67)	-4959.7** (-2.44)
Asian		19333.7*** (4.01)		17474.2*** (3.65)	19302.8*** (3.96)	18928.1*** (4.00)
American Indian		-4773.9 (-0.52)		-3037.1 (-0.35)	-5382.3 (-0.60)	-216.8 (-0.02)
BMI		7.121 (0.06)	131.8 (1.08)			167.5 (1.38)
Highest level of education achieved				3725.2*** (9.63)		3342.1*** (8.51)
Excellent health			24041.4*** (2.72)			17500.9** (2.02)
Very good health			20248.2** (2.32)			14566.7* (1.71)
Good health			14234.1 (1.63)			10486.1 (1.23)
Fair health			10256.4 (1.13)			7480.4 (0.84)
Unattractive personality					-19056.8** (-2.40)	-17412.1** (-2.25)
About average personality					-13754.6** (-2.35)	-9648.6* (-1.70)
Attractive personality					-6705.7 (-1.14)	-5393.3 (-0.94)
Very attractive personality					-2991.5 (-0.48)	-2425.5 (-0.40)
Constant	46341.6*** (9.71)	-537.4 (-0.04)	24189.2** (2.31)	-15945.4 (-1.09)	51899.3*** (9.88)	-31728.1* (-1.85)
N	2340	2309	2309	2340	2340	2309
Adjusted R-squared	0.004	0.019	0.014	0.055	0.021	0.064
t statistics in parentheses * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01						

Table 3: The Impact of Physical Attractiveness, Age, Race, BMI, Education, Physical Health and Personality Attractiveness on Female Respondent's Income

	Yearly Income					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Physically unattractive	-17266.9** (-2.39)	-19021.0*** (-2.60)	-13282.3* (-1.81)	-13281.5* (-1.87)	-17332.0** (-2.05)	-10470.1 (-1.23)
Physically about average	-8100.9 (-1.49)	-10123.7* (-1.84)	-5760.2 (-1.05)	-6721.3 (-1.25)	-8511.0 (-1.22)	-4982.0 (-0.71)
Physically attractive	-5498.6 (-1.00)	-7737.5 (-1.40)	-4683.8 (-0.85)	-5231.3 (-0.97)	-6222.9 (-0.88)	-4362.5 (-0.61)
Physically very attractive	-4086.5 (-0.67)	-6085.1 (-0.99)	-4552.5 (-0.74)	-5398.4 (-0.90)	-6213.5 (-0.81)	-5812.0 (-0.76)
Respondent's age		2299.0*** (4.29)		2300.7*** (4.42)		2344.1*** (4.44)
Black		-9731.1*** (-4.30)		-8946.3*** (-4.09)	-9981.7*** (-4.49)	-8344.0*** (-3.73)
Asian		3250.4 (0.55)		700.3 (0.12)	3872.3 (0.66)	923.0 (0.16)
American Indian		-295.4 (-0.02)		2121.0 (0.16)	-504.3 (-0.04)	3778.6 (0.28)
BMI		-171.2 (-1.27)	-48.98 (-0.36)			11.39 (0.08)
Highest level of education achieved				3713.9*** (8.76)		3421.2*** (7.83)
Excellent health			23769.8** (2.44)			22594.5** (2.36)
Very good health			22456.9** (2.34)			22160.0** (2.35)
Good health			14235.2 (1.49)			16395.7* (1.74)
Fair health			9132.7 (0.92)			13127.0 (1.34)
Unattractive personality					-5263.1 (-0.54)	-3504.7 (-0.36)
About average personality					-1349.3 (-0.19)	-746.6 (-0.10)
Attractive personality					-916.3 (-0.13)	-1197.4 (-0.16)
Very attractive personality					2205.0 (0.29)	305.5 (0.04)
Constant	42260.8*** (8.03)	-15116.8 (-0.92)	23617.7** (2.02)	-44460.1*** (-2.79)	45857.2*** (7.72)	-64190.8*** (-3.34)
N	2501	2469	2469	2500	2501	2468
Adjusted R-squared	0.002	0.016	0.012	0.045	0.008	0.047
t statistics in parentheses * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01						