

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

EFFECTS OF ATTRACTIVENESS, DELAY, AND DISTINCTIVENESS ON FACE RECOGNITION

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Psychology

at Massey University, Palmerston North

Jennifer J. Barbour

1999

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effects of attractiveness and delay on facial recognition. Distinctiveness was also examined in a second experiment. It was hypothesised that faces that were rated highly attractive or unattractive would be more memorable over time. Furthermore, a positive relationship between attractiveness and distinctiveness was expected.

In Experiment 1, 25 males and 25 females rated the facial attractiveness of 78 standardised photographs. These ratings were used to select three sets of 20 target faces for a standard facial recognition task, each set representing a different level of attractiveness: high, medium, and low. The recognition test was administered either 10 min or 28 days after the study phase, participants being randomly assigned to each combination of delay and attractiveness in 2 (Delay) x 3 (Attractiveness) between-groups design. There were main effects for both attractiveness and delay on recognition accuracy but the expected interaction between these two variables did not eventuate.

Experiment 2 was conducted to examine the relationship between attractiveness and distinctiveness ratings. A further 25 males and 25 females rated the facial distinctiveness of the 78 photographs used in Experiment 1. A strong curvilinear relationship was shown to exist between attractiveness and distinctiveness with the least attractive faces being rated the most distinctive

and the moderately attractive faces the least distinctive. On the basis of the present results taken in conjunction with previous findings, it was concluded that facial distinctiveness is a major variable in face recognition studies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my thesis supervisor, Dr. John Podd, for being generous with his time, providing a great deal of helpful discussion, and proof-reading earlier drafts of this thesis.

I would also like to thank Dr. John Spicer, Dr. Ross Flett, and Nick Kazantzis for their help with several statistical issues. I also appreciate the efforts of various members of the School of Psychology Workshop who helped arrange and prepare for experimental sessions.

A special thanks also goes to Jacinda Dalziell for voluntarily giving up her time to help with experimental preparation and data processing. Similarly, appreciation goes to Ian Barbour and Geordie McCallum for proof-reading earlier drafts.

This research was carried out with the support of the Massey University Graduate Research Fund and the School of Psychology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii
List of Tables	xi
List of Figures	xiii
INTRODUCTION	
Overview	1
Prologue	2
Brief History of Face Recognition Research	4
Memory for Faces	5
Typical Recognition Study	7
Delay	10
Research Findings	11
Facial Attractiveness	13
Research Findings	14
EXPERIMENT 1: FACIAL ATTRACTIVENESS & FACE RECOGNITION	
ATTRACTIVENESS RATINGS	
Method	
Participants	19
Materials & Design	19
Apparatus	20
Procedure	21
Results	22

FACIAL RECOGNITION STUDY

Method

Participants	25
Design	25
Apparatus	26
Procedure	27
Study Phase	27
Test Phase	28
Recognition Measures	29

Results & Discussion

Hits	29
False Alarms	32
Changes in Recognisability	34
Validity Check on d'	37
Criterion Changes	39

EXPERIMENT 2: FACIAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Introduction

Facial Distinctiveness	43
Research Findings	44
Facial Distinctiveness & Attractiveness	46

Method

Participants	49
Materials & Design	50
Procedure	50

Results & Discussion	51
----------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	----

GENERAL DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

.....	57
Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	59
Conclusion	61

REFERENCES 65

APPENDICES

Appendix A 75
Appendix B 81
Appendix C 85
Appendix D 91
Appendix E 97

LIST OF TABLES

	<i>Page</i>
Table 1: Attractiveness ratings means (<i>M</i>) and standard deviations (<i>SD</i>) for each of the 78 stimulus photographs for males and females combined	23
Table 2: Means and standard deviations for hits	30
Table 3: ANOVA summary for hits	31
Table 4: Means and standard deviations for false alarms	33
Table 5: ANOVA summary for false alarms	34
Table 6: Means and standard deviations for d'	35
Table 7: ANOVA summary for d'	36
Table 8: Means and standard deviations for A'	38
Table 9: ANOVA summary for A'	39
Table 10: Means and standard deviations for response criterion	40
Table 11: ANOVA summary for response criterion	41
Table 12: Distinctiveness ratings means (<i>M</i>) and standard deviations (<i>SD</i>) for each of the 78 stimulus photographs for males and females combined	52

LIST OF FIGURES

	<i>Page</i>
Figure 1: Experimental design. Both attractiveness and delay were between-subjects factors. The number of participants for each combination of the two factors is also shown	26
Figure 2: Scatter-plot of the relationship between facial attractiveness and distinctiveness for each of the 78 faces	53
Figure 3: Curvilinear relationship between facial attractiveness and distinctiveness for the 78 faces. The linear, quadratic, and cubic, components of the relationship are shown, these three components accounting for all the variation	54