

Facial appearance affects science communication

Ana I Gheorghiu^a, Mitch Callan^a, and William J Skylark^{b,1}

^aDepartment of Psychology, University of Essex, Colchester, CO4 3SQ, UK; ^bDepartment of Psychology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 3SQ, UK

This manuscript was compiled on April 7, 2017

First impressions based on facial appearance predict many important social outcomes. We investigated whether such impressions also influence the communication of scientific findings to lay audiences – a process which shapes public beliefs, opinion, and policy. First, we investigated the traits that engender interest in a scientist's work, and those that create the impression of a "good scientist" who does high-quality research. Apparent competence and morality were positively related to both interest and quality judgments, whereas attractiveness boosted interest but decreased perceived quality. Next, we had members of the public choose real science news stories to read or watch and found that people were more likely to choose items that were paired with "interesting-looking" scientists, especially when selecting video-based communications. Finally, we had people read real science news items and found that the research was judged to be of higher quality when paired with researchers who look like "good scientists". Our findings offer novel insights into the social psychology of science, and indicate a new source of bias in the dissemination of scientific findings to broader society.

Science communication | Impression formation | Social cognition

Public discourse and policy are increasingly shaped by scientific research, and scientists are increasingly encouraged to communicate directly with the public [1, 2]. Newspaper and television interviews, science festivals, dedicated websites, and on-line videos are just some of the channels by which researchers describe their work to non-expert audiences [3]. These communications shape people's beliefs about the physical and social world, and correspondingly influence personal decision-making and government action [4, 5].

However, contrary to traditional conceptions of the scientific process as a dispassionate sifting of evidence [6], extraneous variables can influence whether a given piece of research is widely-discussed and believed or ignored and discredited. People's selection and evaluation of science communications are swayed by the use of imagery [7], clarity of expression [8], and inclusion of jargon [9]. These stylistic features interact with the recipient's preconceptions and social context to influence the spread and impact of a scientist's work [10, 11].

We investigated whether science communication is also affected by the scientist's facial appearance. People form an impression of an individual's personality, character, and abilities within a few hundred milliseconds of viewing their face [12]. These impressions predict important social outcomes in domains including law [13], finance [14], and politics [15]. Different traits are important in different domains [16], but there is good agreement between individuals and cultures about the extent to which a face signals core social traits such as trustworthiness, competence, and sociability [17, 18]. However, these inferences generally have poor validity, meaning that facial appearance is an important source of bias even when more diagnostic information about a person is available [19, 20].

Given the potency of face-based impressions and the suscep-

tibility of science communication to extraneous presentational factors, we hypothesized that a scientist's face will influence 2 key components of the science communication process: selection (which research the public chooses to find out about), and evaluation (the opinions they form about that research). There is a long tradition of research into scientist stereotypes [21–23], including evidence that people have a sense of what a scientist “looks like” [24], but the facial features that shape the public's selection and evaluation of science communications have not previously been examined.

We focussed on 3 core socio-cognitive traits: competence (encompassing, for example, intelligence and skill), sociability (e.g., likeability and friendliness), and morality (e.g., trustworthiness and honesty). These factors capture the basic dimensions on which people evaluate groups and individuals [25–28], and all 3 are germane to science communication. Facial competence predicts positive outcomes in many domains [29], and although some depictions of scientists emphasize elements of incompetence (e.g., absent-mindedness; [21]) intelligence and skill are central to both competence [27] and scientist stereotypes [22], suggesting a positive effect of apparent competence on successful science communication. Trust is important both to effective communication and to the scientific process [6, 30, 31], and trustworthy-looking scientists may enjoy greater research success [32]. However, face-based inferences about morality have surprisingly weak effects in other domains where trust is important, such as politics [15, 33, 34], so their impact on science communication is an open question. Finally, although science is a social enterprise [6, 31], scientists are often perceived as solitary and socially-awkward [22, 23]. Thus, while apparent sociability may be desirable in a communicator/educator [35], it might also weaken the perception that a researcher is a “good scientist” and hence diminish the public's regard for their work (cf [33]). A similar logic applies to facial attractiveness, whose influence we also examined: attractiveness is valued in communicators [35] but does not

Significance Statement

The dissemination of scientific findings to the wider public is increasingly important to public opinion and policy. We show that this process is influenced by the facial appearance of the scientist. We identify the traits that engender interest in a scientist's work and the perception that they do high-quality work, and show that these face-based impressions influence both the selection and evaluation of science news. These findings inform theories of person perception and illuminate a potential source of bias in the public's understanding of science.

AIG, MC, and WJS designed the studies. AIG ran the studies. AIG and WJS analyzed the data. AIG, MC, and WJS wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: wjm22@cam.ac.uk

predict research success [32], and may even be detrimental to having one's work taken seriously by the public (cf [34]).

Facial competence, morality, sociability, and attractiveness are therefore plausible influences on both the selection and evaluation stages of science communication, but the existence, loci, direction, and magnitude of their effects are open questions that the current work sought to address.

Results

Studies 1 and 2: Which facial traits are important to science communication?

In Study 1, we randomly sampled the faces of scientists from Physics ($N = 108$) and Genetics/Human Genetics ($N = 108$) departments of 200 US universities. One group of participants rated these faces on a variety of social traits (e.g., "How intelligent is this person?") as well as Attractiveness and perceived Age. Two other groups of participants indicated how interested they would be in finding out more about each scientist's research (Interest judgments) or how much the person looked like a someone who conducts accurate and important research (Good Scientist judgments). Study 2 was a replication of Study 1, using larger samples of faces and participants and more social traits. The faces were a representative sample from the Biological Sciences ($N = 200$) and Physics ($N = 200$) departments of UK universities.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis established that the trait ratings comprised 3 factors: competence ($\alpha_{Study1} = .92$, $\alpha_{Study2} = .91$), sociability ($\alpha_{Study1} = .95$, $\alpha_{Study2} = .95$), and morality ($\alpha_{Study1} = .95$, $\alpha_{Study2} = .92$) (see Appendix SI). Interest judgments and Good Scientist judgments were reliable and correlated, but were distinct constructs (Study 1: $\alpha_{Int} = .72$, $\alpha_{Good} = .89$, correlation between mean judgments for each face $r = .182$, $p = .008$; Study 2: $\alpha_{Int} = .75$, $\alpha_{Good} = .89$, $r = .279$, $p = .001$).

Separate mixed-effects regression analyses predicted Interest judgments and Good Scientist judgments from facial traits (competence, morality, sociability, and attractiveness), scientist demographics (gender, age, discipline, and ethnicity [white vs non-white, [36]]), and participant-level variables (age, gender, and level of science engagement) with all predictors entered simultaneously. Science engagement was measured with a custom questionnaire and is a potentially important source of variation in people's overall interest in scientists' communications that might modulate the strength of superficial, appearance-based cues [9]. We analysed the two studies separately, and pooled the data to get an overall estimate of effect size. (None of the effects were modulated by study; see Appendix SI).

Interest in a scientist's work was more pronounced among participants with higher science engagement (Figure 1, left panel). More importantly, interest was related to the facial traits of the scientist: people were more interested in learning about the work of scientists who were physically attractive and who appeared competent and moral, with only a weak positive effect of apparent sociability. In addition, interest was somewhat stronger for older scientists and slightly lower for females than for males, with little difference between white and non-white scientists and no consistent effects of participant gender or age.

Judgments of whether a scientist does high-quality work were positively associated with his or her apparent competence and morality, but negatively related to both attractiveness and

perceived sociability (Figure 1, right panel). In addition, older scientists and non-white scientists were judged more likely to do good-quality work, but there was little overall effect of the scientists' gender or of participant-level predictors.

In sum, scientists who appear competent, moral, and attractive are more likely to garner interest in their work; those who appear competent and moral but who are relatively unattractive and apparently unsociable create a stronger impression of doing high-quality research. We found similar results in an additional study that used a standardized face-database rather than scientists (see Appendix SI).

Studies 3 and 4: Interest in a scientist's work.

We next investigated whether facial appearance affects people's choices about which science to engage with by pairing the titles of real science-news stories with faces that had received low or high Interest judgments in Studies 1 and 2. By counterbalancing the assignment of faces to articles, we tested whether facial appearance biases people's selection of science news stories. Study 3 examined whether the effects of face-based impressions were moderated by the scientist's gender, academic discipline, and communication format (text versus video); Study 4 explored the distinct contributions of facial competence and attractiveness, and the moderating influence of participant demographics.

In Study 3, members of the public were told that they would read an article or watch a video in which a scientist describes his or her work. On each trial, participants chose which one of four items they would like to read/watch. Two of the titles were paired with "uninteresting" faces and two with "interesting" scientists, selected from those with the lowest and highest Interest judgments in Study 1. The article titles were taken from real news items published on ScienceDaily.com, and pre-rated to be of similar, moderate interest to the public (see Appendix SI). The page layout mimicked the selection of science news items or blogs on popular websites. All participants made four choices, one for each combination of the scientist's gender and research discipline (Biology vs Physics), on the understanding that they would subsequently watch/read their chosen items.

Choices were coded according to whether the participant selected an article paired with a "low" face (coded 0) or a "high" face (coded 1). A mixed-effects logistic regression predicted choices from format (text vs video), discipline, scientist-gender, and their interactions, as well as participant age, gender, and science-confidence. (The complexity of the design meant we did not include interactions between experimental and participant-level variables for this study.) The choice proportions and regression coefficients are plotted in Figure 2.

Participants were more likely to choose research that was paired with a photo of an interesting-looking scientist, as indicated by the significant intercept term. This bias was present both for male and female scientists, physics and biology news stories, and both video and text formats (all $ps < .001$). The effect was more pronounced for videos than written articles, and was stronger for Biology than for Physics, although the effect of discipline depended on the scientist's gender (for males, $B_{Disc} = -0.338$, $p < .001$; for females, $B_{Disc} = 0.014$, $p = .893$). Finally, female participants were more swayed by the scientist's appearance than were male participants, and the effect of facial appearance diminished with participant




Fig. 1. Regression coefficients for Studies 1 and 2, and pooled across studies. All predictors were standardized. Error bars show 95% Wald confidence intervals; coefficients with CIs that exclude zero are highlighted in black. P_Age, P_Female, and P_Sci = participant age, gender, and science-engagement.

age.

Study 4 built on the finding that competence and attractiveness were two key predictors of Interest judgments in Studies 1 and 2 by varying the attractiveness and competence of the scientists in a 2x2 within-subject design. Participants were asked to imagine that they were browsing a website hosting videos of scientists describing their research. Each trial presented one putative video, comprising a Biology article title taken from Study 3 paired with a male scientist's photo taken from those scoring in the bottom or top octile on competence and attractiveness in Study 2. (The ecological stimulus sample meant that the resulting manipulation of attractiveness was weaker than that of competence; see Appendix SI). Participants rated how likely they would be to watch the video, completing one trial per cell of the design. A mixed-effects regression predicted interest ratings from competence, attractiveness, and their interaction, along with participant age, gender, science engagement and their interactions with the facial traits.

Interest judgments were higher for participants with high science engagement and for older participants (Figure 2). More importantly, interest was positively related to the facial competence of the scientist. There was also evidence that participants were more likely to select articles that were paired with attractive faces, but the effect was small, most likely because the manipulation was weaker. None of the participant-level variables moderated the effects of facial traits.

Taken together, these studies show that facial appearance affects the public's selection of science news stories.

Studies 5 and 6: Evaluation of a scientist's work. Finally, we tested the consequences of face-based impressions for the public's appraisal of a scientist's work. We paired articles from news websites with faces that did or did not look like "Good

Scientists": Study 5 examined the moderating effects of the scientist's discipline and gender; Study 6 dissected the contributions of apparent competence and physical attractiveness, and examined the moderating influence of participant demography.

In Study 5, participants were told that they would read articles from a new magazine section comprising profiles of people discussing their interests and work. The articles were adapted from news websites (e.g., newser.com) so as to be of similar length and clarity and to be expressed in the first person – such that a scientist is describing his or her own work to a general audience. Participants read two articles, each presented with a photo of its putative author – one with a high Good Scientist rating in Study 1 and one with a low rating. The scientists' gender and discipline (Biology vs Physics) were varied between subjects. After two additional articles that profiled athletes, participants rated the quality of the two pieces of research. A mixed-effects regression predicted quality judgments from face type, discipline, scientist gender, and their interactions, as well as participant age, gender, and science-engagement.

Research that was paired with the photo of a "good scientist" was judged to be higher quality, and this effect was unaffected by the scientist's gender and discipline (Figure 3). In addition, quality judgments were higher for physics articles than for biology articles, and higher among participants who were more engaged with science.

Study 6 used the same 2x2 factorial manipulation of competence and attractiveness as Study 4. Participants read 4 physics news stories, each paired with a male face from one cell of the design. They were subsequently shown the face-article pairings one at a time and asked to imagine that they had been selected to judge how much each piece of research deserved to win a prize for excellence in science. The data were analysed




Fig. 2. The top panels show the choice data from Study 3 (left panels) and interest ratings from Study 4 (right panels); the bottom panels plot the corresponding regression coefficients, where Int = intercept; Phys = Physics news item; Fem = Female scientist; Vid = Video format; P_Age, P_Fem, P_Sci = participant's age, gender, and science-engagement (all standardized). Error bars show 95% Wald confidence intervals; coefficients with CIs that exclude zero are highlighted in black.

in a mixed-effects regression with the same predictors as Study 4.

More competent-looking scientists were judged more deserving of the prize (Figure 3). There was only a very weak negative effect of attractiveness, and no competence x attractiveness interaction. (As for Study 4, the weak effect of attractiveness is likely due to the relative weakness of the manipulation due to stimulus constraints; see Appendix SI). In addition, older participants and female participants judged the scientists' work to be more prize-worthy than did younger/male participants, but participant variables did not modulate the effects of facial traits.

Discussion

The traits that engender initial engagement with a scientist's work are distinct from, and sometimes opposite to, those that encourage the belief that the scientist does high-quality research. People reported more interest in the research of scientists who appear competent, moral, and attractive; when judging whether a researcher does "good science", people again preferred scientists who look competent and moral, but also favoured less sociable and more physically-unattractive individuals. Notably, these socio-cognitive traits "trumped" the influence of age, gender, and ethnicity – variables that are the primary focus of much work on stereotypes and bias [37, 38] – implying an underlying source of influence that has received little attention in public discourse or academic studies of scientist-stereotypes.

Our results further demonstrate the centrality of apparent competence and morality to social outcomes [29, 39], and support the idea that sociability and morality are distinct

components of social warmth [25, 40]. The conflicting effects of attractiveness on Interest and Good Scientist judgments indicate that, while the stereotypical scientist may be an impartial truth-seeker with limited personal appeal [23, 31], people partly treat science communication as a form of entertainment, where emotional impact and aesthetic appeal are desirable qualities [41]. Presumably, it is pleasant to look at attractive researchers even if they do not fit one's conception of a top-notch scientist – a suggestion that is consistent with evidence that good-looking academics receive higher teacher evaluations but do not enjoy greater research success [32].

These face-based impressions affected both the selection and evaluation of science news: people preferentially chose communications that were paired with scientists who looked "interesting", and judged real science news stories more favourably when they were paired with faces that looked like "good scientists". These results held for male and female researchers, for biology and physics news stories, for text- and video-based communications – a breadth which implies that real-world metrics of communication success (e.g., webpage views or social media feedback) will be positively correlated with the apparent competence of practising academics.

Although appearance can be an accurate signal of a person's disposition or abilities [42], this is limited to specific circumstances and traits [19] and the same face can produce radically different impressions [43]. Thus, the fact that the same piece of research is evaluated differently when arbitrarily paired with different faces means that facial cues are a potential source of bias in science communication. This bias was not always large, but it is practically significant given the current scale of web-based media production and dissemination, where the 60% preference for "interesting-looking" scientists found




Fig. 3. The top panels show the mean quality-ratings from Study 5 (left panels) and Study 6 (right panels); the bottom panels show the corresponding regression coefficients, where HiFace = researcher looks like a "good scientist"; Phys = Physics news item; Fem = Female scientist; P_Age, P_Fem, P_Sci = participant's age, gender, and science-engagement (all standardized). Error bars show 95% Wald confidence intervals; coefficients with CIs that exclude zero are highlighted in black.

in the Video condition of Study 3 would amount to tens or hundreds of thousands of extra views. Indeed, the effect was particularly strong for video communications, and the rising use of video media such as TED talks means that face-based judgments are likely to play an increasing role in shaping the public's engagement with scientific research. Moreover, although people with greater science-engagement reported more interest in scientists' work, engagement did little to moderate the effects of facial appearance on the selection and evaluation of science communications, indicating a pervasive bias that may not readily be rectified by improving motivation or education.

Our results show that science is a social activity whose outcomes depend on facial appearance in ways that may bias public attitudes and government actions regarding key scientific issues such as climate change and biotechnology. Moreover, because effective communication is increasingly important to scientists' career progression [44], face-based biases may influence not just which scientists' work gains popularity or acceptance among the public, but also which scientific research is actually conducted, and by whom.

Materials and Methods

Ethical approval was granted by the University of Essex Faculty of Biology Research Ethics Committee. Participants gave informed consent and were given links to the original sources of the science news stories. The data are available via the University of Cambridge Data Repository. Studies 4 and 6 were pre-registered on the Open Science Framework (osf.io/ev794; osf.io/fterb). Additional information about participants, stimuli, procedures, and results is provided in Appendix SI.

Participants. Participants in Study 1 who provided trait ratings for the Scientist face set were members of the University of Essex

(United Kingdom) participant panel and participated in the lab; all other participants were members of the US population recruited via an on-line platform [45]. At the end of all studies participants provided demographic information and completed a questionnaire to measure their engagement with science (e.g., "I am knowledgeable about science", "I find scientific ideas fascinating").

Design and Procedure. Trial order/block order/stimulus locations and assignment of participants to conditions were randomized. Assignment of news items to faces and conditions were counterbalanced. Unless otherwise noted, all studies presented stimuli sequentially.

Studies 1 and 2. The Study 1 faces were a random sample of profile pictures from the websites of the Physics and Genetics/Human Genetics departments of the top 200-ranked US universities [46], cropped and edited to have a grey background and uniform height (130 pixels). Study 2 used 400 faces randomly sampled from the Biological Sciences and Physics departments of UK universities in proportion to the number of scientists from each institution submitted to the UK's 2014 Research Excellent Framework, cropped and standardised to 150 pixels height and presented against their original background [47].

Participants made judgments on a 9-point scale (1="not at all", 9 = "extremely"). In Study 1, 54 participants each rated the faces on traits related to competence (competence, intelligence), sociability (likability, kindness), and morality (trustworthiness, honesty), [48] as well as judging the attractiveness of the faces and estimating the face's age in years (values below 16 and above 100 were discarded). Each dimension was judged in a separate block. The face set was divided into two subsets (54 biologists and 54 physicists per subset); 27 participants judged each subset. Two separate groups of participants indicated for all 216 photos "How interested would you be in finding out more about this person's research?" ($N = 27$) or "How likely is it that this person is a good scientist?" ($N = 27$), with the latter defined as "someone who conducts accurate scientific research which yields valid and important conclusions".

In Study 2, 762 participants rated all faces on one of 12 social traits related to competence (competent, intelligent, capable, effective), morality (trustworthy, honest, moral, fair), and sociability (likeable, friendly, warm and sociable), or judged attractiveness;

a further 68 judged age. Participants could skip a face if they recognized it. Two separate groups provided Interest judgments ($N = 103$) and Good Scientist judgments ($N = 103$); each participant judged one of 6 sets of 200 faces.

In both studies, two independent judges rate the ethnicity (white vs non-white) of the photos, with a third judge resolving discrepancies.

Studies 3 and 4. Study 3 ($N = 849$) used the titles of 8 Biology and 8 Physics news stories selected from a pre-rated pool. For each scientist-gender, the 4 lowest and 4 highest-scoring faces on the "Interest" dimension were selected from the Study 1 stimuli. To boost the plausibility of the cover story, participants in the video condition completed an audio check at the start of the session. Study 4 ($N = 408$) used the 4 Biology titles from Study 3 with the least-extreme interest pre-ratings. On each trial, one of two faces instantiating the relevant attractiveness-competence combination was randomly presented. Ratings were on a 7-point scale.

Studies 5 and 6. Study 5 ($N = 558$) used 4 biology and 4 physics news stories selected from a pre-rated set for being of similar, moderate quality, high clarity, and very seldom recognized. The faces were those with the 2 lowest and 2 highest Good Scientist scores for each gender from Study 1 (after excluding the lowest-scoring male because of conspicuous headwear). Study 6 ($N = 824$) used the 4 Physics news stories from Study 3 with the least-extreme quality pre-ratings, and the face-stimuli from Study 4.

After reading all their articles, participants were shown the title and photo for each science article and rated the rigour, importance, validity, and overall quality of the work on a 7-point scale and indicated whether they had seen the scientist (Study 6) or read about the research (Studies 5 and 6) before the experiment (recognized trials were excluded). The four judgments were averaged ($\alpha_{Study5} = 0.882$; $\alpha_{Study6} = 0.875$).

Data analysis. All analyses used mixed-effects regression [49] with maximal but uncorrelated random effects, i.e., by-participant random intercepts and random slopes for all effects that are nested within participants (Studies 1-6) and by-face random intercepts and random slopes for participant-level predictors (Studies 1 and 2). Categorical predictors were coded as: Gender (Male=0, Female=1); Ethnicity (White=0, Non-white=1); Discipline (Biology=0, Physics=1); Format (Text=0, Video=1); Face type (Low on dimension of interest = 0; High = 1). All predictors were standardized (prior to computing interaction terms). To test simple main effects in Study 2, we re-fit the model using dummy coding of the relevant predictor.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. This work was supported by ESRC studentship ES/J500045/1.

- Lok C (2010) Science funding: Science for the masses. *Nature* 465(7297):416–418.
- Peters HP et al. (2008) Interactions with the mass media. *Science* 321(5886):204–205.
- Castell S et al. (2014) Public attitudes to science 2014. London: Ipsos MORI Social Research Institute.
- Scheufele DA (2014) Science communication as political communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111(Supplement 4):13585–13592.
- Satterfield JM et al. (2009) Toward a transdisciplinary model of evidence-based practice. *Milbank Quarterly* 87(2):368–390.
- Godfrey-Smith P (2003) *Theory and reality*. (The University of Chicago Press).
- O'Neill SJ, Smith N (2014) Climate change and visual imagery. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 5(1):73–87.
- Hartley J (2003) Improving the clarity of journal abstracts in psychology: The case for structure. *Science Communication* 24(3):366–379.
- Weisberg DS, Taylor JCV, Hopkins EJ (2015) Deconstructing the seductive allure of neuroscience explanations. *Judgment and Decision Making* 10(5):429–441.
- Kahan D (2010) Fixing the communications failure. *Nature* 463(7279):296–297.
- Knobloch-Westerwick S, Johnson BK, Silver NA, Westerwick A (2015) Science exemplars in the eye of the beholder: How exposure to online science information affects attitudes. *Science Communication* 37(5):575–601.
- Ballew CC, Todorov A (2007) Predicting political elections from rapid and unreflective face judgments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104(46):17948–17953.
- Zebrowitz LA, McDonald SM (1991) The impact of litigants' baby-facedness and attractiveness on additions in small claims courts. *Law and Human Behavior* 15(6):603–623.
- Rezesescu C, Duchaine B, Olivola CY, Chater N (2012) Unfakeable facial configurations affect strategic choices in trust games with or without information about past behavior. *PLoS ONE* 7(3):e34293.
- Todorov A, Mandisodza AN, Goren A, Hall CC (2005) Inferences of competence from faces predict election outcomes. *Science* 308(5728):1623–1626.
- Olivola CY, Eubanks DL, Lovelace JB (2014) The many (distinctive) faces of leadership: Inferring leadership domain from facial appearance. *The Leadership Quarterly* 25:817–834.
- Rule NO et al. (2010) Polling the face: prediction and consensus across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 98(1):1–15.
- Sussman AB, Petkova K, Todorov A (2013) Competence ratings in US predict presidential election outcomes in Bulgaria. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 49(4):771–775.
- Olivola CY, Funk F, Todorov A (2014) Social attributions from faces bias human choices. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 18(11):566–570.
- Olivola CY, Todorov A (2010) Fooled by first impressions? reexamining the diagnostic value of appearance-based inferences? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 46:315–324.
- Haynes R (2010) From alchemy to artificial intelligence: stereotypes of the scientist in western literature. *Public Understanding of Science* 12:243–253.
- Mead M, Métraux R (1957) Image of the scientist among high-school students. *Science* 126:384–390.
- Schinske J, Cardenas M, Kaliangara J (2015) Uncovering scientist stereotypes and their relationships with student race and student success in a diverse, community college setting. *CBE – Life Sciences Education* 14:1–16.
- Litterer OF (1933) Stereotypes. *Journal of Social Psychology* 4:59–69.
- Leach CW, Ellemers N, Barreto M (2007) Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 93(2):234–249.
- Brambilla M, Rusconi P, Sacchi S, Cherubini P (2011) Looking for honesty: The primary role of morality (vs. sociability and competence) in information gathering. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 41(2):135–143.
- Fiske ST, Cuddy AJ, Glick P (2007) Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 11(2):77–83.
- Wojciszke B (2005) Morality and competence in person- and self-perception. *European Review of Social Psychology* 16(1):155–188.
- Todorov A, Olivola CY, Dotsch R, Mende-Siedlecki P (2015) Social attributions from faces: Determinants, consequences, accuracy, and functional significance. *Annual Review of Psychology* 66(1):519–545.
- Fiske ST, Dupree C (2014) Gaining trust as well as respect in communicating to motivated audiences about science topics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111:13593–13597.
- Shapin S (1996) *The scientific revolution*. (The University of Chicago Press).
- Dilger A, Lütkenhöner L, Müller H (2015) Scholars' physical appearance, research performance, and feelings of happiness. *Scientometrics* 104:555–573.
- Castelli L, Carraro L, Ghitti C, Pastore M (2009) The effects of perceived competence and sociability on electoral outcomes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 45:1152–1155.
- Mattes K et al. (2010) Predicting election outcomes from positive and negative trait assessments of candidate images. *Political Psychology* 31(1):41–58.
- Mendez JM, Mendez JP (2016) Student inferences based on facial appearance. *Higher Education* 71:1–19.
- Banducci SA, Karp JA, Thrasher M, Rallings C (2008) Ballot photographs as cues in low-information elections. *Political Psychology* 29:903–917.
- Moss-Racusin CA, Dovidio JF, Brescoll VL, Graham MJ, Handelsman J (2012) Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109(41):16474–16479.
- Williams WM, Ceci SJ (2015) National hiring experiments reveal 2:1 faculty preference for women on STEM tenure track. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112(17):5360–5365.
- Goodwin GP (2015) Moral character in person perception. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 24(1):38–44.
- Goodwin GP, Piazza J, Rozin P (2014) Moral character predominates in person perception and evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 106(1):148–168.
- Milkman KL, Berger J (2014) The science of sharing and the sharing of science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 111:13642–13649.
- Bonnefon JF, Hopfensitz A, De Neys W (2015) Face-ism and kernels of truth in facial inferences. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 19(8):421–422.
- Todorov A, Porter JM (2014) Misleading first impressions: Different for different facial images of the same person. *Psychological Science* 25(7):1404–1417.
- Jensen P, Rouquier JB, Kreimer P, Croissant Y (2008) Scientists who engage with society perform better academically. *Science and Public Policy* 35(7):527–541.
- Buhrmester M, Kwang T, Gosling SD (2011) Amazon's mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 6(1):3–5.
- (2014) National university rankings. in u.s. news & world report.
- Sutherland CA et al. (2015) Personality judgments from everyday images of faces. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6:1616.
- Landy J, Piazza JR, Goodwin G (2016) When it's bad to be friendly and smart: the desirability of sociability and competence depends on morality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2015) Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67(1):1–48.