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Abstract

The aim of this study was to investigate the role of photos and language errors in assessing interpersonal attraction in online dating. To investigate this, an experiment with a 2 (language errors, without language errors) x 3 (attractive photo, unattractive photo, no photo) design was conducted. In this experiment, 234 respondents evaluated online dating profiles on physical, social and romantic attraction, reliability, intelligence, and the intention to date the profile owner. Results showed that the attractiveness of the photo had a positive effect on the physical attraction, social attraction, romantic attraction, and the intention. The absence of a photo had only a negative effect on the physical attraction. Furthermore, the results showed that language errors had a negative effect on physical, social and romantic attraction, reliability, intelligence, and the intention to date the profile owner. The findings show that both visual and textual cues play an important role in assessing the attractiveness of others in online dating.
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1. Introduction

Over the past decade, online dating has become a well-known and popular strategy to find a romantic partner. Research shows that the fastest growing way for potential partners to meet is by online dating. Moreover, 22% of the couples that met in 2009 met online (Rosenfeld & Thomas, 2012) and 74% of the singles in the US have signed up for a dating site (Xia, Tu, Ribeiro, Jiang, Wang, Chen, Liu & Towsley, 2014). Reasons for the popularity of online dating are the technological changes that have made dating through the Internet available and efficient, the growing computer literacy and Internet dating becoming more socially acceptable (Sautter, Tippet & Morgan, 2010).

One of the most important advantages of online dating is that people can strategically manage their self-presentation. This strategic self-presentation gives online daters the opportunity to highlight their positive attributes and conceal the negative ones (Elisson, Heino & Gibbs, 2006). Furthermore, online dating users can revise and improve their profile before uploading it on the dating site, which is not possible in a face-to-face setting (Ellison, Heino & Gibbs, 2006; Fiore, Taylor, Medelsohn & Hearst, 2008). Since the goal of online dating is to find and attract a potential partner, online daters take advantage of this increased control over the self-presentation as it increases the likelihood of attracting a potential partner (Elisson, Heino & Gibbs, 2006).

Earlier studies on online dating mainly focus on impression formation and the impact of different aspects of a profile on the attractiveness of the user. Results show that physical attraction is the most important indicator of romantic and social attraction in online settings (Kanters, 2012). These results are consistent with offline romantic relationship formation, where physical attraction also has been shown to be the strongest predictor (Poulsen, Holman, Busby & Carroll, 2012). Having an attractive photo is one of the most important factors of the attractiveness of an online dating profile (Fiore, Taylor, Mendelsohn and Hearst, 2008). Furthermore, dating profiles without profile pictures have been shown to be less appealing, as people are less likely to view these profiles and contact the profile owners (Whitty & Carr, 2006; Hancock & Toma, 2009). However, even though it has been shown that an attractive photo is important for online dating success, it has not been investigated whether an unattractive photo or no photo at all has a more negative effect on the online dating success.

Besides the profile photo, studies show that the free-text component of an online dating profile is also greatly influences perceived attractiveness of the profile owner. However, no research has investigated how language use on online dating profiles may
influence impression formation. Studies have shown that language use can severely affect impression formation. According to Harm (2008), language errors have a negative effect on the valuation of the credibility of a text and its writer, regardless to the type of error. These results are supported by Van Diest (2011), who conducted a study on the impact of language errors on online advertisements. Results showed that online advertisements with language errors seem less reliable. Furthermore, Van Dongen (2010) found that language errors have a negative effect on the reaction of the reader. The errors negatively affected the attractiveness and comprehensibility of the text and resulted in a poorer evaluation of the senders’ competency and reliability. However, most of the studies concerning language errors are focused on the effect on the comprehensibility, attractiveness, reliability or credibility of the text. Little is known about the effect of language and spelling errors on the image and attractiveness of online dating profile owners.

In sum, both photo attractiveness and language use could be important factors in assessing the attractiveness of a profile owner. However, up to now, few studies have investigated the effect of the attractiveness and the absence of profile photos on the attraction in online dating. Moreover, no studies have investigated the effect of language errors on impression formation in online dating. Finally, no studies have investigated the combination of both photos and language errors to assess which factor is more important in determining the attractiveness of a profile owner. Therefore the goal of this study is to answer the question: ‘what is the effect of photos and language errors in online dating profiles on the attractiveness of the profile owner and how do these factors interact with each other?’

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Interpersonal attraction

A common used concept to describe whether someone likes another person is interpersonal attraction (McCroskey & McCain, 1974). According to McCroskey and McCain (1974), physical attraction and social attraction are two important dimensions of interpersonal attraction. First, studies on interpersonal attraction and partner preferences also show the importance of physical attraction. Curran (1973) shows that the degree to which a person is perceived as physically attractive by a date, is the most important predictor of interpersonal attraction. Furthermore, studies on Internet dating show that the perception of a partner’s
physical attractiveness is strongly related to interpersonal attraction (Walster, Aronson, Abrahams, & Rottman, 1966, Brislin & Lewis, 1968, Tesser & Brodie, 1971). Moreover, when people are asked about the most important characteristics of a romantic partner, physical attractiveness is one of the most mentioned characteristics (Steen, 2003). Second, social attraction relates to the attraction to a person’s personality. Research shows that people attach great importance to personality when considering a romantic relationship (Regan, Levin, Sprecher, Christopher & Cate, 2000). Finally, romantic attraction is also important when seeking for a date, since it measures to what extent someone is considered a potential partner (Foster, Witcher, Campbell & Green, 1998).

Besides these dimensions of attraction, there are two more factors that determine attraction to a person. First, several studies indicate that honesty is one of the most desired characteristics in a romantic partner (Steen, 2003; Weber & Ruch, 2012). This indicates that people find it important that their romantic partner is reliable. Second, people look for partners with high general intelligence (Miller, 2000). Buss (1985, in Figueredo, Sefcek & Jones, 2006) supports this assumption, as his study shows that besides ‘kind and understanding’, ‘intelligent’ is the most important characteristic people look for in a partner. A more recent study also shows that intelligence is of significant value when searching for a romantic partner (Regan, Levin, Sprecher, Christopher & Gate, 2008).

In summary, people will be more attracted to potential partners with high general intelligence, high perceived physical attraction, social attraction and romantic attraction, and with characteristics that show reliability (Walster, Aronson & Abrahams, 1966; Byrne, Ervin & Lamberth, 1970; Miller, 2000; Regan, Levin, Sprecher, Christopher & Gate, 2008; Whitty, 2008; Luo & Zhang, 2009). Interpersonal attraction can therefore be explained as a multidimensional construct consisting of physical attraction, social attraction, romantic attraction, reliability and intelligence.

2.2 Self-presentation and impression formation on online dating sites

Online dating refers to the use of the Internet to interact and meet with potential romantic partners. In order to do so, people can make use of online dating sites. When using a dating site, online daters will face three different stages. First, they will have to create a profile which contains a free-text component in which users can give a description of themselves, photos, some demographic information, information about appearance, and information about interests and lifestyle (Fiore & Donath, 2004; Xia, Ribeiro, Chen, Liu & Towsley, 2013).
Next, users can search for profiles of other online daters. Most online dating services provide two different ways to search for a potential partner. First, online daters can use a search functionality. This search functionality allows users to search for specific profiles based on descriptors such as age, education, weight and religion. Furthermore, some online dating sites offer a matching functionality. This functionality compares profiles on the descriptions and pairs them. In this way, users will receive profiles from other users that might be potential partners (Fiore & Donath, 2004; Xia, Ribeiro, Chen, Liu & Towsley, 2013). Finally, when users found other users in which they are interested, they can contact them through online tools like private messages or chat (Fiore & Donath, 2004). If the interest is mutual, the online daters can interact with each other, online and eventually face-to-face.

Online dating profiles are checked and analyzed by a large group of other online daters – the potential partners. Therefore, online daters will be highly motivated to control their self-presentation (Ellison, Heino & Gibbs, 2006). According to theories such as the social presence theory (Short, Williams & Christie, 1976) and the lack of social context cues hypothesis (Siegel, Dubrovsky, Kiesler & Mcguire, 1986), people are not able to form relationships through computer-mediated communication because of the absence of social presence and missing nonverbal cues. However, later researcher suggest the contrary. Walther (1992) argues with his social information processing theory that people are adaptive and are able to compensate for the absence of nonverbal cues and decreased awareness of social context that is part of online communication.

According to the hyperpersonal model (Walther, 1996), CMC can even exceed face to face (FtF) communication by providing communicators the ability to more strategically manage their self-presentation through the asynchronicity and editability in the online environment. Online daters also profit from the asynchronicity and editability of online profiles. Asynchronicity includes, among other things, the time-lag between the creation of the profile and posting the profile online. This asynchronicity allows online daters to construct their self-presentation carefully and thoughtfully. Editability refers to, inter alia, the opportunity that online daters have to review and revise their profile and messages until they are satisfied with the result. The asynchronicity and editability give online daters the opportunity to optimize their self-presentation, which is beneficial to the goal of online dating: attracting potential partners (Ellison, Heino & Gibbs, 2006). According to Whitty (2008), online daters do indeed make use of this editability as they experiment with their photos and description in the free-text component on their profile. Furthermore, the studies conducted by McKenna, Green and Gleason (2002) support the hyperpersonal theory, as the
results show that people are able to form intimate and stable relationships through CMC. Moreover, the results showed that people like each other better when they met online than in a FtF situation (McKenna et al., 2002). Walther (1996) explains how CMC can lead to more intimate relationships using the social identity model of deindividuation effects (SIDE). The SIDE predicts that because of the smaller amount of cues that are available in CMC than in FtF communication, people are more sensitive to the available cues and form impressions based on minimal cues. Moreover, people often attribute more positive characteristics to others online because of this smaller amount of cues.

Fiore et al. (2008) conducted a study on online dating sites and investigated which components of the online dating profiles are most important to impression formation. The results showed that the attractiveness and other qualities of the photo was the most important predictor of the perceived attractiveness of the profile owner. However, the results showed that the photo was not the only important component. The free-text component also showed to be of significant importance in predicting the perceived attractiveness of the profile owner. Therefore, the most important elements in forming impressions of others in online dating are the profile photo and profile text.

**2.3 The effect of photos on attraction**

Profile photos are the images in an online dating profile that show the physical appearance of the profile owner (Hancock & Toma, 2009). The physical attractiveness of a person is the most important predictor of interpersonal attraction (Curran, 1973). Although physical attractiveness can be evaluated using photographs and verbal descriptions (Toma & Hancock, 2010), the photo has been shown to be the most important element to evaluate the physical attractiveness (Fiore et al., 2008; Hancock & Toma, 2009). In online dating, the profile photo is a core component of self-presentation and is often shown first (Hancock & Toma, 2009). Furthermore, people value the importance of presenting a good physical image over other characteristics in the online environment (Whitty, 2008). Therefore, when a profile photo depicts a physically attractive person, it leads to higher interpersonal attraction towards the profile owner (Byrne et al., 1970). Moreover, physically attractive individuals are more positively evaluated, receive more responses from potential romantic partners, are more likely to be liked by others and have more dates (Walster et al., 1966; Dion, Berscheid & Walster, 1972; Cooper & Sportolari, 1997; Hitsch, Hortacsu & Ariely, 2005). Furthermore, physically attractive people are also assumed to possess more socially desirable characteristics and
higher intelligence than unattractive people (Dion, Berscheid & Walster, 1972; Feingold, 1992; Langlois et al., 2000; Kanazawa, 2011). Lastly, judgments of attractiveness and reliability based on faces have shown to be highly correlated (Todorov, Mende-Siedlecki & Dotsch, 2013). These studies indicate that physically attractive photos not only will result in a more positive evaluation of the physical attraction of the profile owner, but also in a more positive evaluation of the romantic and social attraction, reliability and the intelligence of the profile owner.

The goal of online dating is to attract potential partners and eventually start dating offline. In order to achieve this, one needs to show a certain behavior, namely the behavior to contact the potential partner. According to the theory of planned behavior (TPB), behavioral intentions are reliable predictors of future behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Furthermore, the intentions are affected by the attitudes towards the behavior. Therefore, we expect that the attractiveness of a photo will not only influence the different dimensions of the interpersonal attraction of the profile owner, but also the intention to date the profile owner.

H1 Compared to a profile owner with an unattractive profile picture, a profile owner with an attractive photo will be perceived as more (a) physically, (b) socially, (c) romantically attractive, (d) reliable, (e) intelligent, and the intention to date the profile owner will be higher.

However, a profile photo is not always available in an online dating profile. It appears that the absence of a photo has a negative effect in online dating, as research shows that people are more likely to look at a dating profile and contact the profile owner if the profile contains a photo (Fiore et al., 2008; Hancock & Toma, 2009). However, up to now, it is unknown what the effect of no photo is in comparison with an attractive or unattractive photo. According to the uncertainty reduction theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975), people want to reduce uncertainty in their interaction with other people. To reduce this uncertainty, people need to form impressions of the other person. When there are fewer cues available in an interaction, uncertainty will be high. In online dating, the free-text component and the profile photo are the most commonly used cues to reduce the uncertainty. When the profile photo is not available, the online dater has fewer cues available to base an impression on than when the photo is available. Therefore, uncertainty about the other person will be higher when the profile photo is missing. According to the uncertainty reduction theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975), a higher level of uncertainty leads to a lower level of liking. This indicates that
uncertainty due to the absence of a photo has a negative effect on interpersonal attraction. However, physical attractiveness has been shown to be the most important predictor of interpersonal attraction (Curran, 1973). This indicates that both the unattractiveness of a photo and the absence of a photo negatively affect the interpersonal attraction. Therefore, we expect that the interpersonal attraction – physical, social, romantic attraction, reliability, and intelligence – and the intention to date a profile owner are lower when the profile does not contain a profile photo than when the profile contains an attractive photo.

H2 Compared to a profile owner with an attractive profile photo, a profile owner without a profile photo will be perceived as less (a) physically, (b) socially, (c) romantically attractive, (d) reliable, (e) intelligent, and the intention to date the profile owner will be lower.

However, so far, it is unclear which factor – unattractiveness or absence of a photo – has a larger effect on the interpersonal attraction. This leads to the question: “What has a more negative effect on the interpersonal attraction of the online dating profile owner: an unattractive photo or a missing photo?”

2.4 Language proficiency and language errors

According to Fiore et al. (2008), the profile photo is not the only important component of online dating profiles with regard to impression formation. The quality of the free-text component has also been shown to be of significant importance. The free-text component in online dating is related to language proficiency, which refers to a person’s ability to use language in speaking, listening, writing and reading (Jones, 2006). In online dating, the ability to write can be reflected by the free-text component and language errors can be seen as a lack of language proficiency.

Concerning language proficiency, a distinction can be made between linguistic competence and performance (Chomsky, 1965 in Sterling, 1983). Linguistic competence refers to the knowledge of language whereas performance refers to the use of that knowledge. The distinction made by Chomsky suggests that language errors can be a result of two issues: a lack of linguistic competence and a poor use of knowledge. When people make language errors because they do not know how the word should be spelled, this is a result of a lack of linguistic competence. However, language errors made because of a lack of attention or
confusion in memory are a result of poor performance (Sterling, 1983). Van Dongen (2010) observed language errors on online discussion fora and made a distinction between language errors made out of ignorance and language errors made out of carelessness. This distinction bears resemblance to the distinction of Chomsky and Sterling. Language errors made out of ignorance can be seen as a result of a lack of linguistic competence. The language errors made out of carelessness resemble the lack of performance, especially the corresponding lack of attention. According to Wing and Baddeley (1980), a distinction in language errors can be made between slips and convention errors. Slips refer to correctable errors that are often attributed to carelessness or inattention on the part of the writer. Convention errors however, refer to errors made in words the writer does not know how to spell: the writer will consistently misspell these words, unless the right spelling is explained to him/her (Wing & Baddeley, 1980). This distinction is similar to the distinction made by Van Dongen (2010). In this study, both kinds of language errors – slips and convention errors – are included.

So far, little research has been conducted on the effects of language and spelling errors and the few studies that did, focused mainly on the comprehensibility, the reliability, the credibility and the attractiveness of the text (Kloet et al., 2003; Harm, 2008; De Roo, 2010; Van Dongen, 2010; Van Diest, 2011). Furthermore, the studies were based on informative or persuasive texts with a focus on the content of the text instead of the sender and its attractiveness. A few studies took the image of the sender in consideration, which showed that the negative effect of language errors influenced the credibility of the writer and the sources that were mentioned, even if the texts only contained one language error (e.g., Harm, 2008).

2.5 The effect of language errors on attraction

Language proficiency may influence perception of attraction of online dating profile owners. According to the language expectancy theory (Burgoon, Denning & Roberts, 2002), people develop expectations and preferences with regard to the language that others use. Where the expectations are a function of cultural and sociological norms, the preferences are a function of cultural and societal values about what good communication should be like. When someone uses language or message strategies that are not congruent with the cultural and societal norms and values, the expectations will be negatively violated. These negative violations will result in no behavioral change or a behavioral change in the opposite direction than intended by the communicator (Dillard & Pfau, 2002). On online dating sites, the
intentions of the writer are to attract potential partners. Therefore, the language expectancy theory gives reason to suppose that language errors will negatively affect the overall perceived attraction of the profile owner. This expectation can be supported by the study conducted by Lange et al. (2013), which showed that language proficiency plays a significant role in mate choice, as verbal proficiency affects the attractiveness of the potential partner.

Furthermore, according to Rusman et al. (2013), people assess the reliability of others in online profiles on the basis of, inter alia, language use and language proficiency. Although this study was focused on online collaboration, the results imply that people will evaluate others as less reliable when the information in the profile shows a lack of language proficiency.

Language may also affect perceptions of intelligence. Development of language is dependent on the mental development (Boyle, 1987). Moreover, aspects of language use like clear and easy-to-understand communication have been shown to be associated with high ratings of perceived intelligence (Murphy, 2007). Therefore, we expect that language errors will result in a lower rating of perceived intelligence. Moreover, since research shows that intelligence and physical attractiveness are positively related, we expect that language errors will negatively affect the physical attractiveness of the profile owner (Langlois et al., 2000).

These expectations are supported by studies conducted on language errors. Van Dongen (2010) showed that both language errors – slips and convention errors – negatively affected text appreciation. Furthermore, the results of the study conducted by Harm (2008) showed that language errors negatively affect the credibility of the sender. Summed up, these studies indicate that language errors will negatively affect the perceived physical attraction, social attraction, romantic attraction, reliability, intelligence of the profile owner and the intention to date the profile owner. Therefore, we pose the following hypothesis:

H3 Compared to a profile owner with a profile with language errors, a profile owner with a profile without language errors will be perceived as more (a) physically attractive, (b) socially attractive, (c) romantically attractive, (d) reliable, (e) intelligent, and the intention to date the profile owner will be higher.

Finally, we propose that language errors will have a larger impact on impression formation when a photo is missing in the online dating profile. According to the hyperpersonal theory (Walther, 1996), people form through computer mediated communication (CMC) more
extreme impressions than through face-to-face communication. Because of the absence of cues in CMC, people will be more sensitive to the cues that are available. In online dating, the most important components to form an impression of someone are the profile photo and free-text component. When the photo is missing, the amount of available cues decreases. The hyperpersonal theory (Walther, 1996) indicates that online daters will be more sensitive to the cues in the free-text component when the photo is missing. Therefore, we expect that language errors will have a stronger effect on the different constructs of interpersonal attraction when the online dating profile has no photo than when the profile has a photo.

H4 There will be a more negative effect of language errors on the intention to date the profile owner and on the perceived (a) physical attraction, (b) social attraction, (c) romantic attraction, (d) reliability, (e) intelligence of the profile owner when the profile does not contain a photo, than when the profile does contain a photo.

This study was conducted to test four hypotheses. Firstly, we expect that a profile owner will be perceived as more attractive when the profile contains an attractive photo than an unattractive photo. Second, we expect that the absence of a profile photo will negatively affect the interpersonal attraction of the profile owner and the intention to date the profile owner. Furthermore, this study was conducted to test the hypothesis that language errors will negatively affect the attractiveness of the profile owner and that this effect will be bigger when a profile photo is absent. To investigate these hypotheses, an experiment consisting of an online survey was conducted.

3. Method

This study was part of a larger study conducted together with another student. The larger study includes profiles for the three photo conditions (no photo, unattractive photo and attractive photo) and the four language error conditions (no errors, slips, convention errors and both errors). This study focuses on the effect of the photos and the effect of language errors in general. Therefore, with regard to the language errors, only the profiles without language errors and with both language errors were included in this study. This means that
only half of the data from the larger study has been used in this study. For research on the two kinds of language errors – slips and convention errors – see Van Gils (2014).

### 3.1 Respondents

In total, 234 respondents, 104 males and 130 females, participated in this experiment. All of the respondents were aged between 18 and 34 ($M = 23.44$, $SD = 2.98$). 49.1% of the respondents was single (58 male, 57 female). The highest level of current or completed education was distributed as follows: high school (6.0%), MBO (7.7%), HBO (29.5%) and university (56.8%). Only 44 of the respondents (18.8%) indicated to have experience with online dating. Those respondents were member of a dating site during the experiment (13) or they had been a member in the past (31).

### 3.2 Design

This experiment had a $3 \times 2$ design, in which the independent variables were the type of photo (without photo, attractive photo, unattractive photo) and spelling (without language errors and with both language errors). The dependent variables in this experiment were social attraction, romantic attraction, physical attraction, reliability, intelligence and intention.

The profiles were fictive and exclusively made for this experiment. The profile consisted of three elements, namely a free-text component, a photo, and the name and age of the profile owner. As each of the respondents evaluated four profiles, four different texts were designed. Each respondent rated profiles depending on sexual preference, so both male and female profiles were generated. The texts were the same for both the male and the female profiles; only the name was adapted to the gender. Each of the texts consisted of approximately 10 sentences, in which some information about the fictive profile owner – such as hobbies and characteristics – was given. Although the content of the four texts differed, the texts consisted of the same elements and did not differ in key elements. The texts finished with a call to action, in which the profile owner informs the reader that a message would be appreciated. For an overview of the four texts, see appendix I.

Spelling was manipulated as follows. For each of the four texts, we created a version without language errors, a version with four slips, a version with four convention errors, and a version with both errors (two of each). To determine which language errors are slips and which are convention errors, a pre-test was conducted. In this pre-test, a split-run test with 72
short sentences each containing one language error, were presented to 79 respondents. The selected errors in this pre-test were based on language errors that were found by observing real online dating profiles. The respondents scored the errors on a six-scale in which 1 represented a clear slip and 6 a clear convention error. If the respondents believed that the sentence did not contain a language error, they selected this option and left the six-scale blank. The language errors were then sorted on average rating of error type. The ten errors that were evaluated most clearly as slips (M = 1.19, SD = .77; M = 1.24, SD = .85; M = 1.24, SD = .82; M = 1.27, SD = .81; M = 1.27, SD = 1.06; M = 1.31, SD = .94; M = 1.34, SD = .91; M = 1.38, SD = .87; M = 1.39, SD = .92, M = 1.43, SD = .90) were selected for the experiment, as well as the ten errors that were evaluated most clearly as convention errors (M = 5.27, SD = .93; M = 5.18, SD = 1.21; M = 5.14, SD = 1.24; M = 5.12, SD = 1.34; M = 4.98, SD = 1.42; M = 4.89, SD = 1.05; M = 4.88, SD = 1.28; M = 4.64, SD = 1.40; M = 4.57, SD = 1.30; M = 4.48, SD = 1.26). The errors that were evaluated most clearly as slips were mostly errors that were caused by reversal of letters or extra letters. The errors that were evaluated most clearly as convention errors were all misspellings in both verbs, adverbs and nouns. For the questionnaire that was used for this pre-test and an overview of the selected language errors, see appendix II.

Type of photo was manipulated as follows. We designed profiles without photo, with an attractive photo and with an unattractive photo. To present different profiles to each respondent, four attractive photos and four unattractive photos had to be selected. In order to determine which photographs should be included in the experimental material, another pre-test was conducted. In this pre-test, twenty photographs of women and twenty photographs of men collected from a Belgian dating site were rated on attractiveness by 58 people on a scale from 1 (very unattractive) to 10 (very attractive). These 58 people only evaluated the photographs of either men or women, dependent on the gender they were most attracted to. This resulted in 29 evaluations of each photograph. The photos were then sorted on average rating of attraction. For women, the four photos that scored the lowest on attraction (M = 1.72, SD = 1.25; M = 1.76, SD = 1.12; M = 1.97, SD = 1.21; M = 2.31, SD = 1.34) and the four photos that scored the highest on attraction (M = 7.90, SD = 1.15; M = 6.90, SD = 1.76; M = 6.62, SD = 1.66; M = 6.48, SD = 1.72) were selected for the experiment. For men, the four photos that scored the lowest on attraction (M = 2.38, SD = 1.35; M = 2.52, SD = 1.24; M = 2.86, SD = 1.25; M = 2.90, SD = 1.84) and the three photos that scored the highest on attraction (M = 8.83, SD = .93; M = 8.34, SD = 1.20; M = 6.59, SD = 1.30) were selected for the experiment. Because only three of the male photos were rated higher than a 6, another
photo had to be selected and evaluated by women. After confirmation from several women that this fourth man was attractive, the photo was also selected for the experiment. Examples from the selected photos are shown in figure 1. For the questionnaire that was used for this pre-test and a complete overview of the selected photos, see appendix III.

![Figure 1](image1.png)  
**Figure 1** Examples of the selected photos for the male profiles: on the left an attractive photo, on the right an unattractive photo.

The respondents that evaluated the profiles without photo saw profiles with the cartoon presented in figure 2.

![Figure 2](image2.png)  
**Figure 2** Male (left) and female (right) cartoons for the profiles without photo.

The combination of the free-text component and the photo resulted in a profile as presented in figure 3. This profile presents an attractive male and includes both of the language errors: two slips and two convention errors.
3.3 Procedure

The experiment was conducted through an online survey which was distributed via social media. First, the respondents were asked to read a short introduction to the experiment. In this introduction, the respondent was informed to carefully read the four profiles. Furthermore, the introduction text informed the respondent that the questionnaire would take approximately ten minutes and that any information about the respondent would be processed anonymously and with confidentiality. After that, some demographic information – age, gender, educational level, experience with online dating sites and sexual preference – about the respondents was questioned. Next, the respondents were randomly assigned view either profiles without photo, profiles with an unattractive photo or profiles with attractive photos. Respondents were shown profiles of men or women depending on their sexual preference. Within every group, respondents evaluated four profiles with different profile texts, which were randomly presented. Every respondent evaluated a profile without errors, with convention errors, with slips and with both errors. After each of the profiles the respondent was asked to evaluate the person presented in the profile.

3.4 Measures

The six dependent variables – social attraction, physical attraction, romantic attraction, reliability, intelligence and intention – were measured with 22 items. All 22 items were randomly presented to the respondents. The respondents were asked to evaluate the items on a
seven point-scale, in which (1) represented *completely disagree*, and (7) *completely agree*. For an overview of the complete questionnaire, see appendix IV.

### 3.3.1 Social attraction
The variable perceived social attraction was measured through three items, retrieved from McCroskey, McCrosky & Richmond (2006): “I think this person is pleasant to be around”, “I think that I could be good friends with this person”, and “I think that this person and I could become friends”. The three items formed a one-dimensional scale with a Cronbach’s alpha of .89.

### 3.3.2 Physical attraction
The perceived physical attraction was also measured through four items retrieved from McCroskey, McCroskey & Richmond (2006). Those four items are: “I think this person is handsome”, “I think this person is attractive”, “I think this person looks good”, and “I think that this person has a beautiful face”. The four items formed a one-dimensional scale with a Cronbach’s alpha of .97.

### 3.3.3 Romantic attraction
The variable perceived romantic attraction was measured by using the following four items retrieved from Campbell (1999): “I do not feel attracted to this person”, “I would not like to go out with this person”, “I would not want a relationship with this person”, and “A relationship with this person would not feel good”. The four items formed a one-dimensional scale with a Cronbach’s alpha of .82.

### 3.3.4 Reliability
The four items to measure the perceived reliability of a profile owner was retrieved from Mellema (2012). The four items are: “I think this person is trustworthy”, “I think this person is sincere”, “I think this person is honest”, and “I think this person has integrity”. The four items formed a one-dimensional scale with a Cronbach’s alpha of .90.

### 3.3.5 Intelligence
Warner and Sugarman (1996) developed a scale for intellectual evaluation. This scale consists of five semantic differential items: Unintelligent/Intelligent, Ignorant/Knowledgeable, Incompetent/Competent, Irresponsible/Responsible, and Foolish/Sensible. For the variable
intelligence, three of the five items from Warner and Sugarman (1996) were used: “I think this person is competent”, “I think this person is ignorant”, and “I think this person is intelligent”. The three items formed a one-dimensional scale with a Cronbach’s alpha of .81.

3.3.6 Intention
The variable intention was measured through four items: “I would like to chat with this person”, “I would like to know more about this person”, “I would like to meet this person”, and “I do not need to meet this person in real life”. The four items formed a one-dimensional scale with a Cronbach’s alpha of .92.

3.5 Data analysis
Before the data could be analyzed it needed to be restructured. Every respondent evaluated four profiles. The data were restructured in such a way that each assessed profile represented a unique case in the database. Therefore, instead of 234 sets of evaluated profiles, the database now consists of 936 evaluated profiles. For this study, half of the profiles – only the profiles without language errors and with both language errors – were used for the analysis. This resulted in 468 evaluated profiles. After the data were restructured, the negatively worded items were reversed, so that a high score on an item indicated the same kind of response on every item. Next, a factor analysis was conducted to investigate which items measure the same concept. After that, the internal consistency of the six sets of items as groups was measured using Cronbach’s alpha. As a result, the 22 items were divided among the six variables, as described in the section ‘measures’.

4. Results

A 2 x 3 factorial ANOVA of language errors (without language errors, with language errors) and photos (no photo, unattractive photo and attractive photo) on the six variables of attraction – romantic attraction, social attraction, physical attraction, reliability, intelligence and intention – was conducted.
4.1 The effect of photos on perceived attractiveness

Hypothesis 1 posed that, compared to a profile owner with an unattractive profile picture, a profile owner with an attractive photo will be perceived as more physically, socially and romantically attractive, reliable, and intelligent, and the intention to date the profile owner will be higher. Furthermore, hypothesis 2 posed that, compared to a profile owner with an attractive profile photo, a profile owner without a profile photo will be perceived as less physically, socially, romantically attractive, reliable, and intelligent and the intention to date the profile owner will be lower. Furthermore, we asked the question: “What has a more negative effect on the interpersonal attraction of the online dating profile owner: an unattractive photo or a missing photo?” To investigate this, a factorial ANOVA was conducted.

Table 1 shows the perceived attractiveness of the profile owner in relation to the type of photo in the profile. There were no significant differences between the three photo conditions no photo, unattractive photo and attractive photo for reliability \( F(2, 462) = 1.10, p = .335, \eta_p^2 = .005 \) and intelligence \( F(2, 462) = 2.58, p = .077, \eta_p^2 = .011 \): the respondents scored the profiles in the three photo conditions the same on reliability and intelligence.

Furthermore, the factorial ANOVA showed that there was a significant effect of photos on social attraction \( F(2, 462) = 37.42, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .139 \). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey test indicated that the mean score of the unattractive photo condition \( (M = 3.75, SD = 1.39) \) was significantly lower than the attractive photo condition \( (M = 4.87, SD = 1.20) \) and the no photo condition \( (M = 4.64, SD = 1.24) \). The mean score of the attractive photo condition and the no photo condition did not significantly differ.

There was also a significant effect of photos on physical attraction \( F(2, 462) = 208.56, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .474 \). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey test indicated that the mean score of the unattractive photo condition \( (M = 2.44, SD = 1.11) \) was significantly lower than the attractive photo condition \( (M = 5.09, SD = 1.38) \) and the no photo condition \( (M = 4.15, SD = 1.09) \). Furthermore, the post hoc comparisons indicated that the mean score of the attractive photo condition was significantly higher than the no photo condition.

There was a significant effect of photos on romantic attraction \( F(2, 462) = 53.66, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .189 \). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey test indicated that the mean score of the unattractive photo condition \( (M = 2.91, SD = 1.43) \) was significantly lower than the attractive photo condition \( (M = 4.33, SD = 1.30) \) and the no photo condition \( (M = 3.98, SD =
The mean score of the attractive photo condition and the no photo condition were not significantly different.

There was a significant effect of photos on intention \(F(2, 462) = 88.60, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .277\). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey test indicated that the mean score of the unattractive photo condition \((M = 2.56, SD = 1.08)\) was significantly lower than the attractive photo condition \((M = 4.25, SD = 1.48)\) and the no photo condition \((M = 4.07, SD = 1.38)\). The mean score of the attractive photo condition and the no photo condition were not significantly different.

**Table 1** Perceived attraction in relation to the type of photo (mean score on a seven point-scale in which (1) represents very unattractive and (7) very attractive).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No photo (n=146)</th>
<th>Attractive photo (n=154)</th>
<th>Unattractive photo (n=168)</th>
<th>(\eta^2_p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social attraction</td>
<td>4.64&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.87&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.75&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attraction</td>
<td>4.15&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.09&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.44&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic attraction</td>
<td>3.98&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.33&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.91&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>4.91&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.81&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>4.46&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.48&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>4.07&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.26&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.56&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, the profiles with an attractive photo scored higher on perceived social, physical and romantic attraction and the intention to date the profile owner than the profiles with an unattractive photo. However, the photo conditions did not differ in perceived reliability and intelligence. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was partly confirmed. Furthermore, the profiles with an attractive photo scored only higher on physical attraction in comparison to the profiles without photo. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was largely not confirmed. Lastly, the results show that the profiles with an unattractive photo scored lower on perceived social, romantic and physical attraction and the intention to date the profile owner than the profiles without photo. Therefore, an unattractive photo has a more negative effect on the interpersonal attraction than a missing photo.
4.2 The effect of language errors on perceived attractiveness

Hypothesis 3 posed that, compared to a profile owner with a profile with language errors, a profile owner with a profile without language errors will be perceived as more physically attractive, socially attractive, romantically attractive, reliable, and intelligent, and the intention to date the profile owner will be higher. To investigate this, a factorial ANOVA was conducted.

Table 2 shows the perceived attractiveness of the profile owner in relation to the type of language errors in the profile. There was a significant negative effect of language errors on the social attraction of the profile owner \( F(1, 462) = 32.53, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .066 \). When a profile contains no language errors, the profile owner will be perceived as more socially attractive \((M = 4.72, SD = 1.31)\) than when a profile does contain language errors \((M = 4.08, SD = 1.36)\). Second, there was a significant negative effect of language errors on the physical attraction \( F(1, 462) = 18.22, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .038 \). A profile owner will be perceived as more physically attractive with a profile without language errors \((M = 4.08, SD = 1.62)\) than with a profile with language errors \((M = 3.61, SD = 1.63)\). Third, language errors negatively affected romantic attraction \( F(1, 462) = 27.32, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .056 \). A profile owner will be perceived as more romantically attractive with a profile without language errors \((M = 4.01, SD = 1.44)\) than with a profile with language errors \((M = 3.41, SD = 1.42)\).

Fourth, the language errors negatively affected the reliability \( F(1, 462) = 23.44, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .048 \). When a profile contains no language errors, the profile owner will be perceived as more reliable \((M = 5.04, SD = .99)\) than when a profile does contain language errors \((M = 4.59, SD = 1.03)\). Fifthly, the language errors had a negative effect on the intelligence of the profile owner \( F(1, 462) = 118.24, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .204 \). When a profile contains no language errors, the profile owner will be perceived as more intelligent \((M = 4.92, SD = 1.02)\) than when a profile does contain language errors \((M = 3.85, SD = 1.13)\). Finally, language errors also negatively affected the intention \( F(1, 462) = 45.67, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .090 \). A profile owner will be perceived as more romantically attractive with a profile without language errors \((M = 3.98, SD = 1.55)\) than with a profile with language errors \((M = 3.20, SD = 1.40)\). Language errors had a significantly negative effect on all the variables of perceived attraction. However, the estimated effect sizes as shown in Table 2 indicate that the effect of language errors is the largest on intelligence \((\eta^2_p = .204)\). Therefore, hypothesis 3 was confirmed.
### Table 2

Perceived attraction in relation to the type of language errors (mean score on a seven point-scale in which (1) represents very unattractive and (7) very attractive).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No language errors (n=234)</th>
<th>Both errors (n=234)</th>
<th>(\eta^2_p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social attraction</td>
<td>4.72^a</td>
<td>4.08^b</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attraction</td>
<td>4.08^a</td>
<td>3.61^b</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic attraction</td>
<td>4.01^a</td>
<td>3.41^b</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>5.04^a</td>
<td>4.59^b</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>4.92^a</td>
<td>3.85^b</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>3.98^a</td>
<td>3.20^b</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Interaction effect of photos and language errors

Hypothesis 4 posed that there will be a more negative effect of language errors on the intention to date the profile owner and on the perceived physical, social, romantic attraction, reliability, and intelligence of the profile owner when the profile does not contain a photo, than when the profile does contain a photo.

The factorial ANOVA showed that the interaction between language errors and photos was significant for romantic attraction, \(F(2,1,462) = 3.42, p < .05\). A post-hoc t-test showed that there was no significant effect in the scores for the language errors (\(M = 2.80, SD = 1.51\)) and no language errors (\(M = 3.01, SD = 1.34\)) conditions for the unattractive photo condition; \(t(166) = 0.99, p = .325\) (table 3 and figure 4). Language errors did have a significant negative effect on romantic attraction for the no photo condition \([t(144) = 5.12, p < .001]\) and the attractive photo condition \([t(152) = 3.38, p < .005]\).

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No language errors (n=234)</th>
<th>Both errors (n=234)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No photo (n=146)</td>
<td>4.46^a</td>
<td>3.50^b</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive photo (n=154)</td>
<td>4.67^a</td>
<td>3.98^b</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattractive photo (n=168)</td>
<td>3.01^a</td>
<td>2.80^a</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interaction between language errors and photos was not significant for social attraction \([F(2,1,462) = 1.95, p = .144]\), physical attraction \([F(2,1,462) = 0.21, p = .811]\), reliability \([F(2,1,462) = 0.68, p = .509]\), intelligence \([F(2,1,462) = 0.75, p = .472]\), and intention \([F(2,1,462) = 1.99, p = .138]\).

Finally, we compared the effect of language errors on the dependent variables separately for the no photo condition. Language errors had a negative effect on all of the six variables of attraction for the condition without photo (table 4 and figure 5). Furthermore, table 4 shows that the estimated effect sizes (\(\eta_p^2\)) for the no photo condition are larger than the effect sizes for the attractive photo and unattractive photo condition. These results tentatively show that language errors have a more negative effect all dimensions attraction when the profile contains no photo than when a profile does contain a photo. Therefore, we have tentative confirmation of the fourth hypothesis.
Table 4  Effect of language errors on the six variables of attraction for the profiles without photo, with an attractive photo, and with an unattractive photo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No language errors (n=234)</th>
<th>Both errors (n=234)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>( \eta_p^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No photo</td>
<td>5.12a</td>
<td>4.16b</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive photo</td>
<td>5.17a</td>
<td>4.58b</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattractive photo</td>
<td>3.96a</td>
<td>3.54b</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No photo</td>
<td>4.44a</td>
<td>3.87b</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive photo</td>
<td>5.29a</td>
<td>4.88a</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattractive photo</td>
<td>2.65a</td>
<td>2.23b</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No photo</td>
<td>4.46a</td>
<td>3.50b</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive photo</td>
<td>4.67a</td>
<td>3.98b</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattractive photo</td>
<td>3.02a</td>
<td>2.80b</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No photo</td>
<td>5.14a</td>
<td>4.69b</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive photo</td>
<td>5.10a</td>
<td>4.51b</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattractive photo</td>
<td>4.91a</td>
<td>4.58a</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No photo</td>
<td>5.01a</td>
<td>3.91b</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive photo</td>
<td>5.09a</td>
<td>3.87b</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattractive photo</td>
<td>4.70a</td>
<td>3.77b</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No photo</td>
<td>4.60a</td>
<td>3.54b</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive photo</td>
<td>4.66a</td>
<td>3.87b</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattractive photo</td>
<td>2.81a</td>
<td>2.31b</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5  Effect of language errors on the six variables of attraction for the profiles without photo (* = significant).
5. Discussion

5.1 The role of photos

The first aim of this study was to investigate the role of photos in online dating. Hypothesis 1 posed that profiles with an attractive photo will be perceived as more physical, social and romantic attractive, reliable and intelligent and the intention to date the profile owner will be higher than profiles with an unattractive photo. As expected from prior research (Fiore et al., 2008), an attractive photo had a positive effect on the perceived attraction of the profile owner, whereas profiles with an unattractive photo resulted in a lower score on perceived attraction of the profile owner. The attractiveness of a photo influenced physical attraction, social attraction, romantic attraction and intention. This means that a profile owner of a dating profile with an attractive photo is perceived as more physically attractive and more as a potential partner than a profile owner with an unattractive photo on the dating profile. Furthermore, people expect that becoming friends with profile owners with an attractive photo is more likely than with profile owners with an unattractive photo. This means that the attractiveness of a photo not only influences how people look at others in a romantic way, but also in a friendly way.

However, the type of photo did not affect how people perceived the reliability and intelligence of the profile owners. This means that profile owners with an attractive photo or with an unattractive photo were equally rated on intelligence and reliability. This is not what would be expected on basis of previous research which indicated that intelligence and physical attractiveness are connected (Langlois et al., 2000; Miller, 2000). If physical attraction and intelligence were indeed related, one might expect that people would perceive physically attractive people as more intelligent. Furthermore, it is not in line with the results of the study conducted by Todorov et al. (2013), which indicated that judgments of attractiveness and reliability based on faces were highly correlated. An explanation for these results is that one photo may not provide enough information to evaluate a person on intelligence and reliability. Therefore, the first hypothesis was partly confirmed.

The second hypothesis posed that profiles without photo will be perceived as less social, physical and romantic attractive, reliable and intelligent and that the intention to date the profile owner will be lower than profiles with an attractive photo. The results showed that the profiles without a photo were rated lower on physical attraction than profiles with an
attractive photo. However, the profiles without photos and with attractive photos did not significantly differ on the other five variables: social attraction, romantic attraction, reliability, intelligence and intention. Therefore, the second hypothesis was largely rejected. This is not in line with the expectations based on the uncertainty reduction theory, which stated that when less cues are available to base an impression on of another person this will increase uncertainty leading to lower levels of liking (Berger & Calabrese, 1975).

Following the second hypothesis, the question was asked which factor – unattractiveness or the absence of a photo – has a more negative effect on the interpersonal attraction in online dating. The results showed that the profiles with unattractive photos were perceived as less social, romantic and physical attractive and the intention to date the profile owner was lower than the profiles without photo. Therefore, an unattractive photo has a more negative effect on the interpersonal attraction than a missing photo.

These results show the importance of attractiveness of the profile picture. Previous research showed that dating profiles without photo are viewed and contacted less than profiles with a photo (Fiore et al., 2008; Hancock & Toma, 2009). We showed that this is greatly dependent upon the attractiveness of the profile picture. In previous research the respondents saw either a profile without a photo or a profile with a photo, with no distinction between attractive and unattractive photos. Therefore, the effect of attractiveness was averaged out in previous studies. When the attractiveness of the photo is taken into account, the results show that a profile with an unattractive photo is liked even less than no photo at all. In conclusion, it appears to be important for online daters to have an attractive photo on the dating profile in order to attract potential partners.

5.2 The role of language errors

The second aim of this study was to investigate the effect of language errors on perceived attraction. Although none of the previous studies on language errors investigated the attractiveness of the writer, our third hypothesis posed that language errors would negatively affect the attractiveness of the writer. Results showed that language errors had a negative effect on all six variables that measure the perceived attraction of a profile owner. As research indicated that aspects of language like clear and easy-to-understand communication are associated with high ratings of perceived intelligence (Murphy, 2007), it is explicable that language errors result in a lower score on perceived intelligence. Furthermore, the language expectancy theory (Burgoon, Denning & Roberts, 2002) predicts that language errors will
result in an overall lower rating of attractiveness. The results indicate that people perceive others as less intelligent and reliable due to language errors. Furthermore, people are perceived as less physically attractive even though language errors are no physical cues. Being friends or romantic partners with people that make language errors is also less likely according to the participants. Altogether, then, for people hoping to attract a potential partner through online dating, it appears to be important to make sure the free-text component of the dating profile is free of language errors.

5.3 Combination of photo and language errors

The fourth hypothesis posed that language errors will have a more negative effect on the interpersonal attraction of profile owners when the profile does not contain a profile photo. Results show that there was an interaction effect of photos and language errors on the perceived romantic attraction. Moreover, the results show that the perceived romantic attraction of profile owners with an unattractive photo is not affected by language errors. This could indicate that if someone is perceived as unattractive due to an unattractive photo, other negative cues will not affect the attractiveness anymore. Romantic attraction involves the desire of people to date or be in a relationship with someone. Apparently, when someone has an unattractive photo, people already decide not to have the desire to date that person and other cues like language errors will not influence this decision any further. Furthermore, for the other five variables – social and physical attraction, reliability, intelligence and intention – no interaction effect was found. This indicates that for these five variables language errors do not have a different effect for the three photo conditions.

However, results from our final analysis does show that all of the six variables, language errors negatively affected the attractiveness of profile owners that did not include a photo in their profile. Furthermore, the effect sizes for each of the variables are bigger for the no photo condition than for the other two conditions. This indicates that language errors affect the attractiveness more when a profile does not contain a photo than when a profile does contain a photo. Therefore, support can be found for the fourth hypothesis. In conclusion, it seems that language errors are of greater importance for impression formation when there are fewer cues available.
5.4 Implications

5.4.1 Scientific implications
So far, only a few studies (Fiore et al., 2008; Kanters, 2010; Mellema, 2012) investigated the influence of different dating profile characteristics on perceived attraction. However, those studies looked at actual and perceived similarity as determinants of social and romantic attraction (Kanters, 2010), the attractiveness of different components of a profile in relation to the overall attractiveness of the profile (Fiore et al., 2008), and the different types of information – self-generated, other-generated and system-generated – that people use to form impressions on online dating sites (Mellema, 2012). Furthermore, a large part of the studies on online dating focused on self-disclosure, uncertainty reduction strategies and deception in online dating environments (Gibbs et al., 2006; Toma et al., 2008; Hancock & Toma, 2009).

Although Fiore et al. (2008) indicated that the free text component of a dating profile is of importance concerning the perceived attraction of the profile owner, none of the studies on online dating focused on this component. This study was the first to examine the effect of textual cues on perceived attraction in the online dating environment. The results show that textual cues play a significant role in the evaluation of attraction in online dating, as language errors negatively affect the physical attraction, social attraction, romantic attraction, reliability, intelligence of a profile owner and the intention to date the profile owner. Thus, the textual components of an online dating site profile do significantly affect the impression formation of a profile owner.

These results also have implications that go beyond the online dating context. So far, little research has been conducted on how language errors affect the evaluation of a writer. Moreover, none of the studies on language errors examined the effect on the perceived attraction or intelligence of the writer. Similar as in the findings of Van Dongen (2010), Harm (2008) and Van Diest (2011), this study shows that language errors negatively affect the reliability of the writer. This study is also the first to reveal a link between language errors and perceived intelligence. However, the findings are in line with the results of the study of Murphy (2007), which show that language and perceived intelligence are related. In all, this study shows that use of language not only affects assessment of the written text but also severely affects impressions formed of the author.

Furthermore, this study is the first to reveal that language errors have a negative effect on how attractive – physically, romantically and socially – someone appears. This indicates that the physical attraction of someone is not only determined by visual cues like photos, but
also by textual cues. We showed that the intention to become romantically involved with someone via an online dating site is also affected by language errors. It is likely that language errors will also affect attraction in other contexts. For example, language errors in application letters may also severely affect the perceived attraction and competence of job candidates.

In addition, this study is the first to distinguish between attractive and unattractive photos and to compare those with no photo. The results show a significant difference of perceived attraction between profiles with an attractive photo and with an unattractive photo. However, the results also show that the profiles without photo and with an attractive photo only differ in the perceived physical attraction of the profile owner. This indicates that the negative effect of the absence of a photo is smaller than expected on the basis of previous research (Fiore et al., 2008; Hancock & Toma, 2009). Furthermore, earlier studies did not investigate the effect of the attractiveness of a photo on the perception of reliability and intelligence. The results of this study show that the perceived reliability and intelligence of a profile owner are not affected by the absence of a photo or the attractiveness of a photo. This could indicate that one single photo does not provide enough information to evaluate a potential partner on all the important dimensions, as intelligence and reliability are important aspects of interpersonal attraction.

5.4.2 Practical implications
This study shows that visual cues are important predictors of perceived attraction on online dating sites. An attractive photo significantly increases the extent to which a profile owner will be perceived as attractive and the intention the reader will have to contact the profile owner. Therefore, online daters should carefully select their photos in order to attract a potential partner.

Furthermore, this study shows that spelling also has a significant effect on the perceived attraction in online dating. Language errors negatively affect the perceived attraction. Therefore, online daters should check their profile text on language errors in order to attract a potential partner. The results of this study are in line with a study conducted by the website Singlessite.nl (2010), which investigated the biggest annoyances among online daters. The study of Singlessite.nl revealed that language errors are the second largest annoyance on online dating sites. This study shows that language errors are not only annoying, they also negatively affect the attraction and people are less likely to contact a profile owner that makes language errors. Furthermore, many websites that give online daters advice state that one should avoid making language errors. However, these advices on the Internet are not
scientifically substantiated. With the results of this study, those advices can now be scientifically substantiated.

The results of this study also lead to a recommendation to the online dating industry. Online dating sites should include a spellchecker to help prevent language errors. Online dating sites could also offer users the opportunity to make use of a paid service, in which profile texts are checked and improved by language professionals.

5.5 Limitations and future research

Though this study offers more and new information about attractiveness in online dating settings than previous research, there might be some limitations to the findings. First, the respondents did not actually go online to search for a romantic partner. Furthermore, half of the respondents were already in a relationship. Therefore, the respondents might not be interested in dating any of the persons presented in the profiles. This could have influenced the results of this study. If the respondents were motivated to evaluate others – potential partners – the results probably would have been stronger. Furthermore, the participants in this study were with an average age of 23 substantially younger than the majority of the online daters, as research shows that the most active online daters are between 30 and 50 years old (Valkenburg & Peter, 2007). Future work should focus on older people that are interested in finding a potential partner through online dating.

Second, according to previous research (Fiore et al., 2008; Hancock & Toma, 2009) it is more difficult to attract potential partners through a dating profile without a photo. However, this study indicates that people are more likely to attract potential partners through profiles without photo than profiles with an unattractive photo. Possibly, these results are a result of the between groups design of the experiment. As people only saw one type of photos, the people that only saw profiles without photo missed cues to properly judge the profile owners. Therefore, they rated the profile owners neutrally: they did not have any physical cues and therefore they were possibly not able to determine if the profile owner was a potential partner or not. This corresponds to previous research which indicated that physical attraction is the most important factor to evaluate someone as a potential romantic partner (Walster, Aronson & Abrahams, 1966; Kanters, 2012). Therefore, it might be wise to conduct this study in a more realistic setting in order to retrieve more reliable results about the effect of the absence of a photo.
Although online dating has become a popular strategy to find a romantic partner, little research has been conducted on the effect of different components on the dating profile on the perceived interpersonal attraction of the profile owner. Therefore, many recommendations can be made for future research. This study focused on the effect of the absence of a photo and the attractiveness of a photo on the perceived attraction of the profile owner. Since the visual cues are proven to be the most important predictor of attraction, future research should investigate the effect of other aspects of photos. These aspects may include the clarity of the photo or black and white photos versus color photos. Furthermore, the effect of glasses on the attraction of a profile owner could be investigated. In this study, the photos that were rated as unattractive included relatively many bespectacled people. This could mean that glasses negatively affect a person’s physical attractiveness. Furthermore, glasses have been shown to positively influence the perceived intelligence and honesty of a person presented in a photograph (Thornton, 2010). Future work should therefore focus on the effect of glasses in the environment of online dating.

So far, no research has been conducted on the effect of spelling and language errors on perceived attraction in online dating. This study shows that a profile owner will be perceived as less attractive when the profile text contains convention errors and slips than when the profile contains no language errors. However, this study did not include all types of language errors. Online dating profiles not only contain convention errors and slips, but also punctuation errors and errors in syntax. Future work should explore the effect of those errors on the perceived attraction of the writer in online dating. Furthermore, this study investigated the effect of language errors in the profile text. However, online dating environments consist of more textual aspects, like chat and private messages. Future work would do well to examine the effect of language errors on the other textual aspects in online dating. Furthermore, the effect of language errors on attraction could be examined in other online environments, like social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter).

Lastly, previous research on online dating did not include the textual cues of online dating profiles. This study shows that – besides visual cues – also the textual cues play a significant role in the perceived attraction in online dating. Therefore, future research should focus on the different textual cues in online dating, like the length of a profile text or the content and its topic.
6. Conclusions

The goal of this study was to investigate the role of photos and language errors on the attraction in online dating. Results show that the attractiveness of the photo positively affects the physical attraction, romantic attraction, social attraction and intention. This indicates that people are more attracted to others that are physically attractive. However, although the profiles with an attractive photo were perceived as more attractive than the profiles with an unattractive photo, the profiles with an attractive photo scored only higher on the physical attraction than the profiles without photo. Furthermore, the results show that language errors negatively affect all of the six variables of the perceived interpersonal attraction of the profile owner and the intention to date the profile owner. This indicates that people are severely affected in their impression formation by the correct use of language. Opposed to the profiles with an attractive and unattractive photo, language errors had a significant effect on all of the six variables of attraction and the intention to date the profile owner for the profiles without a photo. Furthermore, the effects of language errors seem to be larger for the no photo condition than for the other two conditions. The results of this study sheds new light on the research on perceived attraction in online dating settings and language errors, as to both areas little research had been conducted so far.
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Appendix

I: Profile texts

Text A - No language errors
Hallo, ik ben Mark, een rustig en intelligent persoon. Ik heb niet altijd meteen een antwoord klaar, maar een goed gesprek op zijn tijd vind ik prettig. Van een avondje in de kroeg ben ik echter ook niet vies. Mijn andere hobby’s zijn reizen en koken. Ik zou graag in de toekomst meer mooie plekken op de wereld ontdekken samen met een leuk maatje. Qua eten houd ik erg van de Italiaanse en Japanse keuken.

Ik ben op zoek naar een echt leuke en lieve meid. Wat ik belangrijk vind is dat je betrouwbaar en eerlijk bent, met een gezonde dosis humor.

Ben je geïnteresseerd of mocht je meer willen weten, stuur me een berichtje!

Text A - Both kinds of language errors
Hallo, ik ben Mark, een rustig en intiligent persoon. Ik heb niet altijd meteen een antwoord klaar, maar een goed gesprek op zijn tijd vind ik prettig. Van een avondje in de kroeg ben ik echter ook niet vies. Mijn andere hobby’s zijn reizen en koken. Ik zou graag in de toekomst nog mooie plekken op de wereld ontdekken samen met een leuk maatje. Qua eten houd ik erg van de Italiaanse en Japanse keuken.

Ik ben op zoek naar een echt leuke en lieve meid. Wat ik belangrijk vind is dat je betrouwbaar en eerlijk bent, met een gezonde dosis humor.

Ben je geïnteresseerd of moet je meer willen weten, stuur me een berichtje!

Text B - No language errors
Ik zal mijzelf even kort voorstellen. Mijn naam is Peter en ik ben een echte levensgenieter. Ik zoek dan ook via deze datingsite iemand die samen met mij wil gaan genieten. Belangrijke eigenschappen zijn intelligentie en betrouwbaarheid. Andere eigenschappen die ik erg kan waarderen zijn eerlijkheid en spontaniteit, zodat niet alles van tevoren gepland hoeft te worden. Een spontane verrassing zoals uit eten gaan bij een Italiaans restaurant kan ik echt waarderen!

Ik zou graag weer samen met iemand zijn waarmee ik kan lachen en huilen. Dat soort dingen mis ik soms en daarom hoop ik hier een nieuwe liefde te ontmoeten.

Ben je geïnteresseerd, aarzel dan niet om me een berichtje te sturen!
Text B - Both kinds of language errors

Ik zal mijzelf even kort voorstellen. Mijn naam is Peter en ik ben een echte levensgenieter. Ik zoek dan ook via dit datingsite iemand die samen met mij wil gaan genieten. Belangrijke eigenschappen zijn intelligentie en betrouwbaarheid. Andere eigenschappen die ik erg kan waarderen zijn eerlijkheid en spontaniteit, zodat niet alles van tevoren gepland hoeft te worden. Een spontane verrassing zoals uit eten gaan bij een Italiaans restaurant kan ik echt waarderen!

Ik zou graag weer samen met iemand zijn waarmee ik kan lachen en huilen. Dat soort dingen mis ik soms en daarom hoop ik hier een nieuwe liefde te ontmoeten.

Ben je geïnteresseerd, aarzel dan niet om me een berichtje te sturen!

Text C - No language errors

Hoi! Mijn naam is Bas en ik ben 23 jaar oud. Ik ben opgegroeid op het platteland maar woon nu alweer een aantal jaren in de stad. Ik hou erg van reizen en ik zou graag weer een maatje ontmoeten met wie ik samen de wereld kan zien (wie weet lukt het op deze manier?). Verder vind ik het ook leuk om te sporten. Ik ben weliswaar sportief, maar een avond op de bank vind ik ook heerlijk.

Wat ik graag bij andere mensen zie is dat ze spontaan, geïnteresseerd in andermans leven, zorgzaam, en eerlijk zijn.

Ik hoop dat je een berichtje stuurt, hier krijg je altijd antwoord op!

Text C - Both kinds of language errors

Hoi! Mijn naam is Bas en ik ben 23 jaar oud. Ik ben opgegroeid op het platteland maar woon nu alweer een aantal jaren in de stad. Ik hou erg van reizen en ik zou graag weer een maatje ontmoeten met wie ik samen de wereld kan zien (wie weet lukt het op deze manier?). Verder vind ik het ook leuk om te sporten. Ik ben weliswaar sportief, maar een avond op de bank vind ik ook heerlijk.

Wat ik graag bij andere mensen zie is dat ze spontaan, geïnteresseerd in andermans leven, zorgzaam, en eerlijk zijn.

Ik hoop dat je een berichtje stuurt, hier krijg je altijd antwoord op!
Ik zal proberen mezelf hier in het kort te beschrijven, dat is nog best lastig! Ik ben dus Tim, 22 jaar oud. Mijn hobby is fotograferen, daar word ik echt blij van. Andere dingen die ik leuk vind om te doen zijn koken en fietsten. Een avond met vrienden wat drinken of een spelletje doen vind ik ook altijd leuk. Via deze datingsite hoop ik iemand – lief, leuk, spontaan en intelligent – te ontmoeten die mijn leven nog leuker kan maken.

Hopelijk ben je een beetje geïnteresseerd geraakt in mij. Mocht je wat meer van en over mij willen weten, vraag dan gerust! Ik probeer altijd een berichtje terug te sturen.

Ik zal proberen mezelf hier in het kort te beschrijven, dat is nog best lastig! Ik ben dus Tim, 22 jaar oud. Mijn hobby is fotograferen, daar word ik echt blij van. Andere dingen die ik leuk vind om te doen zijn koken en fietsten. Een avond met vrienden wat drinken of een spelletje doen vind ik ook altijd leuk. Via deze datingsite hoop ik iemand – lief, leuk, spontaan en intelligent – te ontmoeten die mijn leven nog leuker kan maken.

Hopelijk ben je een beetje geïnteresseerd geraakt in mij. Mocht je wat meer van en over mij willen weten, vraag dan gerust! Ik probeer altijd een berichtje terug te sturen.
I: Pre-test language errors

Beste,

Deze anonieme enquête is onderdeel van een masterscriptieonderzoek aan de Universiteit van Tilburg. Het invullen van deze enquête zal ongeveer 15 minuten van je tijd in beslag nemen.

Het doel van deze enquête is om duidelijk te krijgen wat voor soort taalfouten mensen maken. In deze enquête zullen een aantal zinnen getoond worden, waarin een woord is onderstreept. Wij vragen je om aan te geven of je dit woord als fout ziet en zo ja, wat voor soort fout je dit vindt. Hierin wordt onderscheid gemaakt tussen verschillende soorten taalfouten, namelijk taalfouten uit 'slordigheid' of uit 'onkunde'. Hieronder volgt een korte uitleg en bijgevoegde voorbeelden van deze verschillende fouten:

Bij een fout uit 'slordigheid' kun je denken aan een typefout, een fout die gemaakt is omdat men te snel heeft getypt. Bijvoorbeeld: "Mo half 5 begint mijn college." Hierin is 'mo' bedoeld als 'om'.

Bij een fout uit 'onkunde' kun je denken aan een fout die gemaakt is omdat de persoon de correcte taalregels niet goed hanteert. Bijvoorbeeld: "Ik vindt dat niet leuk." Hierin is 'vindt' de foute grammaticale vorm, het had namelijk 'vind' moeten zijn.

Als je geen fout ziet in het onderstreepte woord, vink je de antwoordoptie "Ik zie dit niet als een fout" aan.

Hartelijk dank voor je deelname!

Wat is je geslacht?

- Man
- Vrouw

Wat is je leeftijd?

__________
Hierna volgen een aantal zinnen met onderstreepte woorden. Bij ieder onderstreept woord kun je aangeven onder welke categorie je de fout vindt behoren, op een schaal van 1 tot en met 6. Hierbij staat 1 voor een heel erg duidelijke 'slordigheidsfout' en 6 voor een heel erg duidelijke 'onkundefout'.

Als je geen fout ziet in het onderstreepte woord, vink dan de optie "Ik zie dit niet als een fout" aan. Je hoeft dan niets op de schaal aan te geven.

Het gaat om jouw mening en daarom zijn er geen foute antwoorden te geven. Mocht je twijfelen over een antwoord, vul toch vooral iets in.

---

vindt

- Ik zie dit niet als fout

---

**Overview of the sentences:**

Mijn anderen hobby’s zijn koken en wandelen.

Een **interessante** jongen

Ik ben een **vrolijk** vent

Ik ben **opzoek** naar een vrouw

Eigenschap: **hard werken**

**Mijn een kopje koffie?**

Ik kan **mij zelf** beschrijven, maar...

Mijn **hobbies** zijn:

Wat ik graag bij **andere** zie: eerlijkheid
Ik zíj dat je leuk bent!
Hun vinden dat raar
Ik ben groter als haar
Hij vind dat leuk
Ik heb dat gedeelt
Vindt jij sporten ook leuk?
Verzorgd er uitzien vind ik belangrijk
Ik heb een grootte kinderwens
Ik houd van een wijds uitzicht bovenop een berg
Vaak heb ik geprobeert om iemand in de kroeg te ontmoeten, zonder resultaat
Ik heb vaker wel als niet zin om lekker te koken
Ik vind het leuk om met lekker weer te barbecuen
Ik zoek iemand met nivo
Ben zelf vrij practisch ingesteld
Ik sta open voor een goede discussie
Ik heb een full-time baan
Ik ben al viertien jaar vrijgezel
Ik probeer het een keer via dit datingsite
Ik vind dat echt boeiend
Ik zoek een intiligente, spontane meid
Ik heb altijd een antwoord klaar
Moog je meer willen weten, stuur me dan een berichtje
Lijkt het platteland je wat?
Ik ben weleenswaar sportief, maar soms ook erg lui
Ik vind iemand verassen erg leuk
Mijn anderen hobby’s zijn koken en wandelen
Ben je geïntresseerd?
Heir zijn leuke mensen om te ontmoeten.
Ik heb een voorkeur voor de Italiaanse keuken.
Ik heb een eigen bedrijf.
Dat zou mooi zijn
Ik ben op zoek naar een maatje voor het leven.
Ik heb morgne alvast plannen gemaakt.
Stuur gerust een berichtje als je meer wilt weten.
Dat hoop ik kook.
Vaak ben ik in de kroeg te vinden.
Kijk ontsnoot niet veel nieuwe mensen.
Gezellig, kiest graag, trouw en zorgzaam.
Ik speel graag gitaar.
morgen ga ik naar school.
Daarmo stop ik hiermee.
Ik kom uit Frankrijk.
Ik ging gisteren naar de stad.
Datt is leuk.
Das een leuke auto.
Op donderdag werk ik altijd.
Daarom ga ik naar huis.
Vroeger reed ik ik motor.
Ik ben heel slecht in niets doen.
Ik kijk graag naar films met een happyend.
Ik werk in de logistieke dienstverlening.
in mijn vrije tijd ben ik een genieter.
Laat een berichtje achter als wat in me ziet.
Ik onderneem vaak sportieve activiteiten.
Eerlijkheid vind ik erg belangrijk.
Mijn vorige relatie is al een tijd geleden.
De laatste tijd heb ik alleen korte relaties gehad.
Mijn naam is mark.
Ik kan me dat niet voorstellen.
Ik ben een redelijk rustig type.
Stuur gerust eens een berichtje.
In mijn vrije tijd doe ik aan fitness.
In de toekomst wil ik nog heel veel van de wereld zien.
III: Pre-test Photos

Beste,

Deze anonieme enquête is onderdeel van een onderzoek van de Universiteit van Tilburg. Het invullen van de enquête zal maximaal 5 minuten in beslag nemen.

Hartelijk dank voor je deelname.

Wat is je geslacht?

- Man
- Vrouw

Ik voel mij het meest aangetrokken tot:

- Mannen
- Vrouwen

Hierna volgen twintig foto's die op aantrekkelijkheid beoordeeld moeten worden. Bij iedere foto kun je de aantrekkelijkheid invullen op een schaal van 1 tot en met 10. Hierbij staat 1 voor erg onaantrekkelijk en 10 voor erg aantrekkelijk.
The selected attractive photos:
The selected unattractive photos:
IV: Online Questionnaire

Beste deelnemer,

Deze enquête is onderdeel van ons afstudeeronderzoek aan de Universiteit van Tilburg. In deze enquête zullen vier online dating profielen worden getoond, waarna een aantal vragen over elk profiel wordt gesteld. Wij willen je vriendelijk verzoeken om de online dating profielen aandachtig te lezen en te bekijken.

De enquête zal ongeveer 10 minuten duren. Je gegevens zullen anoniem worden verwerkt en wij zullen vertrouwelijk met de informatie omgaan.

Onder de deelnemende respondenten zal een VVV-bon van €20,- worden verloot. Als je kans wilt maken op deze prijs, vul dan onderaan de enquête je e-mailadres in.

Hartelijk dank voor je deelname!

Met vriendelijke groet,

Suzanne de Meijer en Selma van Gils

Wat is je geslacht?
- Man
- Vrouw

Wat is je leeftijd?

Wat is je hoogst afgeronde opleiding? Als je op dit moment aan een opleiding bezig bent, vul dan die in.
- Lager onderwijs (basisschool)
- Voortgezet onderwijs (VMBO, HAVO, VWO)
- Middelbaar beroepsonderwijs (MBO)
- Hoger beroepsonderwijs (HBO)
- Universiteit (WO)

Wat is je relationele status?
- Vrijgezel
- In een relatie
Sta je ingeschreven bij een online dating website?
- Ja
- Nee
- Nee, maar vroeger wel

Ik voel mij het meest aangetrokken tot:
- Mannen
- Vrouwen

---

Tim, 22

Ik zal proberen mezelf hier in het kort te beschrijven, dat is nog best lastig! Ik ben dus Tim, 22 jaar oud. Mijn hobby is fotografie, daar word ik echt blij van. Andere dingen die ik leuk vind om te doen zijn koken en fietsen. Een avond met vrienden wat drinken of een spelletje doen vind ik ook altijd leuk. Via deze datingsite hoop ik iemand – lief, leuk, spontaan en intelligent – te ontmoeten die mijn leven nog leuker kan maken.

Hopelijk ben je een beetje geïnteresseerd geraakt in mij. Mocht je wat meer van en over mij willen weten, vraag dan gerust! Ik probeer altijd een berichtje terug te sturen.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stimulus</th>
<th>Helemaal mee eens</th>
<th>Mee eens</th>
<th>Beetje mee eens</th>
<th>Niet eens, niet mee eens</th>
<th>Beetje mee eens</th>
<th>Mee eens</th>
<th>Helemaal mee eens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon aangenaam is om mee om te gaan</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat ik goed bevriend zou kunnen worden met deze persoon</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik zou graag met deze persoon willen afspreken</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon en ik vrienden zouden kunnen zijn</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon knap is</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon aantrekkelijk is</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon er goed uit ziet</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon een mooi gezicht heeft</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik voel mij niet aangetrokken tot deze persoon</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik zou niet graag een keer met deze persoon uit willen gaan</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik zou niet graag een relatie willen met deze persoon</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Een relatie met deze persoon zou me geen goed gevoel geven</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helemaal mee eens</td>
<td>Mee oneens</td>
<td>Beetje mee oneens</td>
<td>Niet eens, niet oneens</td>
<td>Beetje mee eens</td>
<td>Mee eens</td>
<td>Helemaal mee eens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik deze dat deze persoon te vertrouwen is</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon oprecht is</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon eerlijk is</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon integer is</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon competent is</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon onwetend is</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik denk dat deze persoon intelligent is</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik zou graag met deze persoon willen chatten</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik zou graag meer van deze persoon willen weten</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik zou deze persoon niet in het echt hoeven te ontmoeten</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hartelijk dank voor je deelname!

Mocht je nog vragen of opmerkingen over deze enquête hebben, laat het ons dan weten door deze hieronder te noteren.

Klik aub op de knop >> om de enquête te verzenden.