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1. Making Observations and Generating Questions

The authors are basing their experiment on the previous research regarding forming relationships. Previous research suggests that physical closeness and proximity will increase the likelihood of a relationship forming. Research also suggests that similarity and communication patterns affect the likelihood of a relationship forming. The authors want to test these factors through online dating, where some of these factors may be compromised.

1. Formulating a Hypothesis

Through this study, the authors hypothesized a couple of things. They predicted that facial attractiveness and self-described ambition would affect both gender’s evaluations of a potential dating partner. For men, the authors predicted that attractiveness would play a larger role rather than ambition when it came to their evaluations. This prediction is based on the association between reproductive capability and physical attractiveness. The authors predicted the opposite for women. They believe that ambition will be slightly more important for women rather than men when it comes to a potential partner. They believe this stems from the traditional sex roles of the man being the dominant one of a pair. An ambitious woman may make a man feel intimidated and his position of authority may feel threatened.

1. Testing the Hypothesis

The independent variables of this study were physical attractiveness and self-ambition. The authors chose a group at random of 116 heterosexual individuals. The authors slip the participants up into four different groups. Each participant viewed a profile that was either more ambitious or less ambitious biography or a profile that had a more attractive or less attractive profile photo.

According to the study, more facially attractive profiles received higher likeability rates than profiles with low attractiveness. The same results were found when it came to ambitiousness. Profiles that had more ambitious biographies received higher likability ratings than profiles with biographies with lower ambition. These findings were the same with both genders. Men were attracted to more ambition rather than less ambition. Women were attracted to more attractive profiles rather than less attractive profiles.

1. Drawing Conclusions

The hypothesis of the authors was confirmed through the study. Both men and women rated a profile higher when a profile seemed more ambitious or more physically attractive. The prediction that physical attractiveness would have a greater effect on interpersonal attraction for men was not supported. The prediction that ambition would have a greater interpersonal attraction for women was also not supported. The authors provide a few explanations for the results of the study. For the aspect of facial attractiveness, the authors offer an evolutionary theory. Physical attractiveness is a sign of good health reproductive capabilities. Ambition can be explained by a socioeconomic model. Ambition is an indicator of financial success, which can be appealing to both sexes. The authors also offer a trait perspective to explain why ambition was so popular among the test group. Ambition has been found to be a very appealing trait among people. It shows potential to succeed in life and bring great success. Someone with a lack of ambition can seem like a slacker and likely to fail at life. This is why high ambition may seem more appealing to a person rather than low ambition. Their research was consistent with previous studies. The authors believed that their research offered support for gender congruence. There were no major differences between the preferences of males and females found in the study. This indicates gender congruence when it comes to mate preferences. The sexual strategies theory offers and explanation to this. Both genders look for a mate that will bring them reproductive success. A limitation of this study was that the whole test was only a simulation. It is impossible to know if the results would be different if different age groups, sexual preferences, or profiles were used without conducting more experiments.