

<https://doi.org/10.32999/2663-970X/2026-16-2>

UDC [159.922.1-055.2:316.474]:331.104.2

Female Attractiveness Style Characteristics in Promoting Successful Professional Interaction

Стильові особливості жіночої атрактивності в забезпеченні успішності професійної взаємодії

Received: August 29, 2026

Accepted for publication: October 26, 2026

Published online: October 30, 2026

Anzhela Myshenina*

PhD student,

Department of Theory and Methods of Practical
Psychology,
South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University
named after K. D. Ushynsky, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6900-0155>

Oleksii Chebykin

Doctor of Psychological Sciences, Full Professor,
Professor,
Department of Theory and Methods of Practical
Psychology,
South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University
named after K. D. Ushynsky, Ukraine
Full Member (Academician),
National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of
Ukraine, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7905-2708>

Анжела Мишеніна*

аспірантка,

кафедра теорії та методики практичної
психології,
Південноукраїнський національний
педагогічний університет
імені К. Д. Ушинського, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6900-0155>

Олексій Чебикін

доктор психологічних наук, професор,
професор,
кафедра теорії та методики практичної
психології,
Південноукраїнський національний
педагогічний університет
імені К. Д. Ушинського, Україна
дійсний член (академік),
Національна академія педагогічних наук
України, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7905-2708>

Abstract

The aim was to establish associations between manifestations of female attractiveness style and communicative comfort, a subjective psychological indicator of successful professional interaction, and to identify the individual psychological correlations of these manifestations with regard to the partner's gender and the formality of the situation. **Methods.** Participants were 200 employed women aged 20–41 years ($M = 30.02$; $SD = 6.09$). They completed a modified female attractiveness scale, a communicative comfort questionnaire, and measures of interpersonal orientations, formal-dynamic properties of temperament, emotional maturity, and motivational attitudes. Data were analyzed using Spearman's rank correlation, the Friedman test, and the Kruskal-Wallis test.

Анотація

Мета – встановити зв'язки між вираженістю стильових проявів жіночої атрактивності та комунікативним комфортом як суб'єктивно-психологічним показником успішності професійної взаємодії, а також визначити індивідуально-психологічні кореляції цих проявів з урахуванням статі партнера та формальності ситуації. **Методи.** У дослідженні взяли участь 200 працюючих жінок віком від 20 до 41 року ($M = 30.02$; $SD = 6.09$). Застосовано модифіковану шкалу жіночої атрактивності, опитувальник комунікативного комфорту та методики діагностики міжособистісних орієнтацій, формально-динамічних властивостей темпераменту, емоційної зрілості й мотиваційних установок. Статистичне опрацювання охоплювало кореляційний аналіз за Спірменом, критерії

* Corresponding Author: angelika.mishen@gmail.com

*Автор-кореспондент: angelika.mishen@gmail.com

Results. Among the $n = 145$ participants, those classified as having a dominant or mixed style, a mixed style was most prevalent (61.4%). All five style indices were significantly associated with overall communicative comfort. The strongest associations were found for gentle and vibrant manifestations ($r_s = .53$ for both indices). Gentle, vibrant, formal, and intellectual manifestations were positively associated with comfort in all four contexts. Associations for manipulative manifestations were weaker, and their correlation with comfort in formal interactions with men was not significant. Communicative comfort differed across contexts defined by partner gender and interaction formality ($\chi^2(3) = 19.43$; $p < .001$). The highest mean rank was recorded for informal interactions with women, and the lowest for formal interactions with men. Style-group differences were found only for comfort in interactions with women ($H = 13.09$; $p = .023$), the formal-style group had the highest mean rank and the manipulative-style group had the lowest. Gentle manifestations were primarily associated with empathic and prosocial characteristics; vibrant manifestations – with social activity and external emotional expressiveness; formal manifestations – with emotional maturity, social plasticity, and work orientation; intellectual manifestations – with introexpressiveness and result orientation; and manipulative manifestations – with authoritarianism, power orientation, and flexibility of social behavior. **Discussion and conclusions.** Female attractiveness style manifestations were associated with communicative comfort and individual psychological characteristics. Contextual differences in comfort indicated the relevance of the partner's gender and interaction formality. The findings support treating style manifestations primarily as continuous self-presentation tendencies and considering them in psychological counseling and communicative competence development programs.

Keywords: self-presentation, interpersonal orientations, temperament, emotional maturity, motivational attitudes, partner gender, formal and informal situations.

Фрідмана і Краскела-Волліса. **Результати.** Серед $n = 145$ учасниць, для яких визначено домінуючий або змішаний стиль, переважав змішаний стиль (61.4%). Усі п'ять стильових індексів були статистично значущо пов'язані із загальним комунікативним комфортом. Найтісніші зв'язки встановлено для м'яких і яскравих проявів ($r_s = .53$ для обох індексів). М'які, яскраві, формальні й інтелектуальні прояви мали додатні зв'язки з комфортом у кожному з чотирьох контекстів. Для маніпулятивних проявів зв'язки були слабшими, а кореляція з комфортом в офіційній взаємодії з чоловіками не досягла статистичної значущості. Комунікативний комфорт відрізнявся залежно від поєднання статі партнера та формальності взаємодії ($\chi^2(3) = 19.43$; $p < .001$). Найвищий середній ранг зафіксовано для неформальної взаємодії з жінками, найнижчий – для офіційної взаємодії з чоловіками. Відмінності між стильовими групами встановлено лише за комфортом у взаємодії з жінками ($H = 13.09$; $p = .023$), де найвищий середній ранг мала група формального стилю, найнижчий – група маніпулятивного стилю. М'які прояви були пов'язані переважно з емпатійними та просоціальними характеристиками; яскраві – із соціальною активністю й зовнішньою емоційною виразністю; формальні – з емоційною зрілістю, соціальною пластичністю та орієнтацією на працю; інтелектуальні – з інтроекспресивністю й орієнтацією на результат; маніпулятивні – з авторитарністю, орієнтацією на владу та гнучкістю соціальної поведінки. **Дискусія і висновки.** Підтверджено зв'язок стильових проявів жіночої атрактивності з комунікативним комфортом та індивідуально-психологічними характеристиками. Контекстні відмінності комфорту засвідчили значення статі партнера та формальності взаємодії. Результати обґрунтовують доцільність аналізувати стильові прояви передусім як безперервні тенденції самопрезентації та враховувати їх у психологічному консультуванні й програмах розвитку комунікативної компетентності.

Ключові слова: самопрезентація, міжособистісні орієнтації, темперамент, емоційна зрілість, мотиваційні установки, стать партнера, офіційні та неформальні ситуації.

Introduction

In this article, female attractiveness is not equated with physical attractiveness. It is viewed as a psychological characteristic of self-presentation, manifested in emotional, communicative, cognitive, and social-role-based ways of organizing interaction. Physical attractiveness is only one aspect of the broader phenomenon of attractiveness, although it has historically been the most studied manifestation. The classic study by Dion et al. (1972) demonstrated that attractive individuals are more often attributed socially desirable traits. Further meta-analytic generalizations confirmed the existence of this effect and demonstrated its dependence on the assessment situation, the evaluator's characteristics, and the characteristics of the person being evaluated (Eagly et al., 1991; Langlois et al., 2000). However, studies of physical attractiveness do not exhaust the psychological mechanisms of self-presentation and subsequent interpersonal interaction.

In professional settings, the effects of physical attractiveness have been studied particularly extensively. It has been linked to more favorable evaluations of candidates, career opportunities, remuneration, and recommendations for professional promotion (Hosoda et al., 2003; Nault et al., 2020). At the same time, a systematic review by I. Kukkonen et al. (2024) showed that the effects of attractiveness vary depending on gender, field of activity, and specific professional context. This provides grounds for viewing attractiveness as a characteristic whose significance is determined by the context of interaction, the demands of a professional role, and the features of social evaluation (Kukkonen et al., 2024; Popovych et al., 2022).

The evaluation of women in professional settings can be framed by conflicting expectations regarding warmth, competence, confidence, and the normative appropriateness of behavior. Role congruity theory explains that negative reactions can arise when gender stereotypes do not align with perceptions of the requirements of a professional or leadership role (Eagly & Karau, 2002). In particular, Johnson et al. (2010) found that attractiveness could hurt women applying for positions typically associated with

masculinity. At the same time, M. Menegatti et al. (2021) considered competence and morality in addition to attractiveness when evaluating female candidates. The findings of C. Edge and G. Bacci (2025) also showed that women's experiences of professional visibility, inclusion, and self-worth in the workplace are linked to gender-based social expectations. The professional significance of attractiveness should be analyzed within the broader context of self-presentation, role norms, and interpersonal interaction.

In this regard, a promising approach is to shift from viewing attractiveness as an external feature to analyzing it as a means of self-presentation in social interaction. According to the two-component model of impression management, self-presentation encompasses the motivation to influence how others perceive a person, as well as the selection of means by which an individual constructs their own image in a specific situation (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). In research on professional image, self-presentation is likewise understood as a combination of visual, behavioral, and communicative components through which a professional is perceived in workplace interaction (Marchenko, 2016). In social evaluation, the dimensions of warmth and competence are particularly important, as they constitute the basic coordinates for how people and social groups are perceived (Cuddy et al., 2008). In the work by O. Chebykin and A. Klenchu (2012), attractiveness is viewed as a complex characteristic encompassing the emotional-communicative, cognitive, behavioral, and external manifestations of personality.

Within the framework of the author's operationalization, styles of female attractiveness are defined as relatively stable modes of self-presentation that combine, to varying degrees, emotional, communicative, cognitive, and social-role manifestations. The gentle style reflects an orientation toward a supportive, benevolent, and emotionally safe form of interaction; the vibrant style – expressiveness, energy, and social visibility; the formal style – role-appropriate behavior, conformity to norms, and emotional restraint; the intellectual style – analytical thinking, reasoned argumentation, and substantive dialogue; and the manipulative style – the instrumental use of self-

presentation strategies to influence the course of interaction. This approach allows us to analyze attractiveness as a system of psychologically significant ways of organizing social behavior.

Communicative comfort – a subjective feeling of psychological safety, mutual understanding, emotional coherence, and the acceptability of the interaction – was used as a criterion for the success of professional interaction in this study. Given the situational dependence of social evaluation, role expectations, and the gender-specific nature of professional interaction, the relationships between attractiveness styles and communicative comfort may differ depending on the partner's gender and the formality of the situation (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Johnson et al., 2010; Nault et al., 2020). Therefore, this study analyzed four contexts: interactions with men and women in formal and informal settings.

A previous publication within this research project focused on the general and component-specific manifestations of female attractiveness and their relationships with the comfort of social and communicative interaction in a professional setting (Myshenina & Chebykin, 2025). This article presents a separate analysis of style indices of attractiveness, their connections with temperamental, emotional, interpersonal, and motivational characteristics, as well as the contextual specificity of communicative comfort. Thus, the relationships of individual female attractiveness styles with psychological characteristics and communicative comfort across different contexts of professional interaction remain insufficiently studied.

Research hypotheses: 1) the expression of female attractiveness style tendencies would be associated with communicative comfort as an indicator of successful professional interaction; 2) communicative comfort would differ across professional interaction contexts defined by the combination of the partner's gender and the formality of the situation; 3) female attractiveness style manifestations would be associated with individual psychological characteristics.

The aim was to establish associations between female attractiveness style manifestations and communicative comfort, a subjective psychological indicator of successful professional interaction,

and to identify the individual psychological correlations of these manifestations with regard to the interaction partner's gender and the formality of the situation.

Methods

Participants. The study involved 200 women aged 20 to 41 years ($M = 30.02$; $SD = 6.09$) who engaged in professional activities that involved regular social and communicative interaction. Of the participants, 38.0% worked in education, 28.0% in the service sector, 15.5% in communications, 12.5% in medicine, and 6.0% in management; 62.5% had higher education. Participants were recruited through women's clubs, volunteer organizations, and an online Google Forms survey distributed via Telegram, Instagram, and Facebook. The sample size was determined by the actual number of completed protocols obtained from the participants.

Variables. Female attractiveness was operationalized through five style indices – gentle, vibrant, formal, intellectual, and manipulative – and a categorical indicator of a dominant or mixed style. Communicative comfort was represented by indicators of comfort in interactions with men and women in formal and informal situations, integral indicators based on the partner's gender and the formality of the situation, and an overall indicator. Individual psychological characteristics were operationalized through indicators of interpersonal orientations, formal-dynamic properties of temperament, emotional maturity, and motivational attitudes. The relationships under study were correlational.

Procedures and Instruments. Style manifestations of female attractiveness: A modified version of the Female Attractiveness Scale (Chebykin & Klenchu, 2012) was used. The original scale contains 25 items. An additional scoring procedure was used to obtain indices of the gentle, vibrant, formal, intellectual, and manipulative styles. The indices were calculated as the mean scores for the items corresponding to each style. The style with the highest mean score was identified as dominant. If the difference between the leading styles did not exceed .30 points, the style was classified as mixed. Style was determined only for participants with a

medium or high level of overall attractiveness. The scale modification procedure, its psychometric characteristics, and the procedure for determining attractiveness levels are described in a previous publication within the project (Myshenina & Chebykin, 2025).

Communicative comfort: The author-developed questionnaire "Assessment of the Influence of Gender Characteristics on Professional and Social Interaction" (Myshenina & Chebykin, 2025) was used. Four questions assessed comfort in interactions with men and women in formal and informal situations using a four-point scale ranging from 1 ("difficult") to 4 ("quite comfortable"). Four contextual indicators, four integral indicators, and one overall indicator were calculated.

Individual psychological characteristics: Interpersonal orientations were assessed using T. Leary's Interpersonal Relations Diagnostic Test, the formal-dynamic properties of temperament were assessed using V. Rusalov's Structure of Temperament Questionnaire, emotional maturity was assessed using the Emotional Maturity Method by O. Chebykin, and motivational attitudes were assessed using O. Potemkina's method.

Organization of research. The survey was conducted individually or in small groups in rooms that ensured the confidentiality of responses. Some of the data were collected online. Completion of the full set of instruments took between 40 and 60 minutes. Only fully completed protocols were included in the statistical analysis.

Statistical analysis. Statistical processing was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 21. The median, quartiles, minimum, and maximum were calculated to describe the style indices. Mean ranks were additionally calculated for communicative comfort across different contexts. Relationships were assessed using Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient with two-sided p-values. Differences among the four related contexts of communicative comfort were examined using the Friedman test. When the overall result was statistically significant, pairwise comparisons were performed using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare the six style groups. When a statistically significant result was obtained, pairwise comparisons were performed using the Mann-Whitney U test. The

threshold for statistical significance was set at $p < .050$.

Results

The results showed that the median and quartile values of the attractiveness style indices, Me (Q1; Q3), fell within a narrow range: 2.58 (2.23; 2.92) for gentle manifestations; 2.56 (2.11; 2.89) for vibrant manifestations; 2.60 (2.00; 3.00) for formal manifestations; 2.43 (2.00; 2.86) for intellectual manifestations; and 2.50 (2.00; 3.00) for manipulative manifestations. The range of individual scores was widest for manipulative manifestations, extending from 1.00 to 4.25; for the other style manifestations, the minimum and maximum values ranged from 1.20 to 4.14. The similarity of the medians and the substantial overlap between the interquartile ranges indicate that no single style tendency clearly predominated or was universally dominant across the sample.

A dominant or mixed style was identified for $n = 145$ women with moderate or high overall attractiveness. A mixed style was found in 89 participants (61.4%), a manipulative style in 19 (13.1%), a formal style in 17 (11.7%), a gentle style in 8 (5.5%), a vibrant style in 7 (4.8%), and an intellectual style in 5 (3.4%). The prevalence of the mixed style indicates that many participants combined several modes of self-presentation, with no single mode predominating. A distinct dominant style was less common, with the manipulative- and formal-style groups being the largest among the groups characterized by a single dominant style.

Comparisons among the six style groups revealed statistically significant differences in the expression of the communicative ($H=13.23$, $p<.05$), cognitive ($H=11.67$, $p<.05$), and social-role components of attractiveness ($H=12.55$, $p<.05$). These findings indicate that the identified style groups differed in the relative expression of particular components of attractiveness.

Communicative comfort differed across interaction contexts ($\chi^2(3)=19.43$, $p<.001$). The highest mean rank was observed for informal interactions with women (2.74), followed by formal interactions with women (2.57), informal interactions with men (2.37), and formal interactions with men (2.32). However, the

pairwise comparisons did not reveal statistically significant differences ($p > .05$). Thus, the Friedman test appears to reflect small overall variations in comfort across the four contexts but does not provide evidence of statistically significant differences between specific pairs of interaction contexts.

The correlation analysis of the attractiveness style indices and communicative comfort

indicators (Tabl. 1) showed that gentle and vibrant style manifestations had the strongest positive associations with communicative comfort. Greater expression of these manifestations was associated with higher comfort in all four interaction contexts and with higher overall communicative comfort.

Table 1. Correlations Between Female Attractiveness Style Indices and Communicative Comfort ($n = 200$)

Attractiveness style index	Interaction comfort				
	Men, Formal	Men, Informal	Women, Formal	Women, Informal	Overall Comfort
Gentle	.41**	.33**	.33**	.30**	.53**
Vibrant	.36**	.37**	.35**	.31**	.53**
Formal	.24**	.22**	.30**	.19**	.37**
Intellectual	.22**	.32**	.33**	.21**	.41**
Manipulative	.06	.14*	.20**	.14*	.19**

Note: * – $p < .050$; ** – $p < .010$.

For the gentle style index, the strongest context-specific association was found with comfort in formal interactions with men. The vibrant style index showed correlations of similar magnitude with comfort in formal and informal interactions with both men and women. The formal and intellectual style indices were also positively associated with communicative comfort, although their correlations were weaker and more dependent on the interaction context. The strongest context-specific association for the formal style index was observed with comfort in formal interactions with women. The intellectual

style index was more closely associated with comfort in informal interactions with men and formal interactions with women. The manipulative style index showed the weakest associations. Its correlation with comfort in formal interactions with men was not statistically significant, whereas its correlations with comfort in the other contexts were positive but weak.

Communicative comfort indicators were also compared across the groups characterized by different dominant styles, including the mixed-style group (Tabl. 2).

Table 2. Comparison of Attractiveness Style Groups by Communicative Comfort Indicators ($n = 145$)

Attractiveness style group	<i>n</i>	Interaction comfort indicators: mean ranks				
		Overall comfort	Comfort with men	Comfort with women	Formal context	Informal context
Gentle	8	86.06	82.19	82.81	87.69	79.75
Vibrant	7	77.36	73.64	77.86	79.14	76.29
Formal	17	76.15	58.91	91.65 ^a	77.62	75.82
Intellectual	5	56.40	73.60	54.70	49.10	75.30
Manipulative	19	46.84	62.11	46.66 ^b	56.55	46.82
Mixed	89	77.40	77.11	74.83	75.17	77.06

Note: Groups marked with different superscript letters “^a” and “^b” differ significantly.

Statistically significant differences between the style groups were found only for comfort in interactions with women ($H = 13.09$; $p = .023$). The formal-style group had the highest mean rank, whereas the manipulative-style group had the lowest. The pairwise comparison confirmed a statistically significant difference between these two groups ($p = .024$). The remaining comparisons did not reach the accepted level of statistical significance.

The associations between the attractiveness style indices and individual psychological characteristics (Tabl. 3) showed that manifestations of the gentle attractiveness style were most closely related to empathic, friendly, and emotional-communicative characteristics.

Table 3. Personality Correlates of Female Attractiveness Style Indices and Overall Communicative Comfort ($n = 200$)

Indicator	Most pronounced personality correlates
Gentle style index	Introempathy ($r_s = .68$; $p < .010$); friendly interaction style ($r_s = .63$; $p < .010$); introexpressivity ($r_s = .61$; $p < .010$); social emotionality ($r_s = .59$; $p < .010$); altruistic orientation ($r_s = .54$; $p < .010$)
Vibrant style index	Social ergicity ($r_s = .58$; $p < .01$); extraexpressivity ($r_s = .53$; $p < .010$); authoritarian interaction style ($r_s = .51$; $p < .010$); tempo of mental activity ($r_s = .48$; $p < .010$)
Formal style index	Emotional maturity ($r_s = .51$; $p < .010$); social plasticity ($r_s = .49$; $p < .010$); authoritarian interaction style ($r_s = .45$; $p < .010$); work orientation ($r_s = .43$; $p < .010$)
Intellectual style index	Introexpressivity ($r_s = .43$; $p < .010$); result orientation ($r_s = .39$; $p < .010$)
Manipulative style index	Authoritarian interaction style ($r_s = .47$; $p < .010$); power orientation ($r_s = .44$; $p < .010$); social plasticity ($r_s = .42$; $p < .010$); introexpressivity ($r_s = .41$; $p < .010$); social ergicity ($r_s = .40$; $p < .010$)
Overall communicative comfort	Social plasticity ($r_s = .56$; $p < .010$); introexpressivity ($r_s = .62$; $p < .010$); extraexpressivity ($r_s = .60$; $p < .010$); introempathy ($r_s = .59$; $p < .010$); emotional maturity ($r_s = .54$; $p < .010$); friendly interaction style ($r_s = .59$; $p < .010$); altruistic orientation ($r_s = .46$; $p < .010$); work orientation ($r_s = .51$; $p < .010$); aggressive interaction style ($r_s = -.47$; $p < .010$); suspicious interaction style ($r_s = -.63$; $p < .010$)

Stronger manifestations of the gentle attractiveness style were associated with a greater ability to understand one's emotional experiences, an orientation toward friendly interaction, internally directed emotional expressivity, sensitivity to socially significant events, and an altruistic orientation. Vibrant attractiveness style manifestations were primarily associated with the dynamism of social contact. Their main correlates were social activity, outward emotional expressivity, an authoritarian orientation in interpersonal interaction, and the tempo of mental activity. This combination of characteristics corresponded to an energetic and noticeable

mode of self-presentation. Formal attractiveness style manifestations were associated with emotional regulation, behavioral flexibility, and professional orientation. Their strongest associations were found with emotional maturity, social plasticity, an authoritarian interaction style, and work orientation. Taken together, these characteristics reflected a controlled and normatively organized mode of self-presentation oriented toward the requirements of one's professional role. Intellectual attractiveness style manifestations were most notably correlated with introexpressivity and result orientation. They had fewer pronounced correlates than

the other style manifestations. The identified associations indicated a combination of internally directed processing of emotional experience and a focus on achieving a specified result. Manipulative attractiveness style manifestations were associated with social influence and the active adjustment of behavior to situational demands. Their strongest associations were found with authoritarianism, power orientation, social plasticity, internally directed expressivity, and social activity. Compared with gentle style manifestations, they were characterized by a weaker representation of empathic and prosocial characteristics and a stronger power-oriented and instrumental tendency.

Overall communicative comfort was positively correlated with social plasticity, internally and externally directed emotional expressivity, introempathy, emotional maturity, a friendly interaction style, and orientations toward altruism and work. Negative correlations were found with aggressive and suspicious interaction styles, with the strongest for the suspicious interaction style. These correlations indicate that higher communicative comfort was associated with emotional expressivity, empathy, social flexibility, and friendliness, whereas confrontational and distrustful tendencies were associated with lower communicative comfort.

Discussion

The findings support the conceptualization of female attractiveness in professional interactions as a system of style manifestations of self-presentation. The combination of several manifestations is consistent with the view of self-presentation as the flexible regulation of impressions depending on the situation and the anticipated consequences of the interaction (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Such flexibility does not preclude authenticity but may reflect the ability to select appropriate forms of self-expression. In particular, acceptance, self-disclosure, and the validation of personally significant characteristics contribute to more authentic self-expression among women in the workplace (Zigomo et al., 2024).

The contextual variability of communicative comfort indicates its sensitivity to the partner's

gender and the formality of the situation. However, it does not suggest that a particular context rigidly determines it. This interpretation is consistent with the view of warmth and competence as fundamental dimensions of social perception and with role congruity theory (Cuddy et al., 2008; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Women's professional behavior may be evaluated simultaneously in terms of competence, friendliness, and conformity to gender expectations (Heilman et al., 2024). Additional strain may arise from the belief that women must meet a broader range of requirements than men to receive the same professional recognition (Panerati et al., 2025).

At the same time, lower comfort in a particular context should not be interpreted directly as a lack of confidence in professional competence. Women rated the competence associated with their own occupational roles more highly than men did (Zakrisson, 2023). Comfort may also depend on the anticipated reaction of the interaction partner, as people sometimes overestimate negative responses to behavior that violates gender stereotypes (Atkinson et al., 2023).

The characteristics of the professional environment are also important. The direction of gender bias depends on the gender composition of the occupation, with unfavorable evaluations more often directed toward members of the underrepresented gender (Galos & Coppock, 2023). Organizational messages concerning gender equality may also influence how women's and men's professional success is explained (Kelley et al., 2024). Future research should therefore consider the partner's status, the gender composition of the professional environment, and organizational norms.

The similarly directed associations of gentle and vibrant manifestations with communicative comfort (see Tabl. 1) may have different psychological foundations. Gentle manifestations combine friendliness, empathy, and the maintenance of predictable interactions. In the workplace, empathic behavior includes not only emotional sensitivity but also professionalism, assistance, and a responsible attitude toward colleagues (Hall et al., 2024). Vibrant manifestations facilitate active engagement in communication and help maintain interaction

dynamics, although their effectiveness depends on the situational appropriateness of emotional expressiveness. Women in leadership positions often regulate or conceal their emotions to avoid negative stereotype-based evaluations (Beharrie & Mabitsela, 2023).

Communicative comfort is not equivalent to psychological safety, although both constructs concern the ability to express oneself openly without anticipating adverse consequences. Psychological safety is associated with a supportive organizational context for professional interactions (Kyambade et al., 2024).

Formal manifestations may facilitate interaction by providing role clarity and more explicit expectations. This assumption is consistent with the finding that comfort in interactions with women was higher in the formal-style group than in the manipulative-style group (see Tabl. 2).

Manipulative manifestations should not be interpreted as unambiguously negative: their association with social plasticity may reflect an ability to adjust behavior to the situation. However, their combination with authoritarianism and a power orientation indicates a possible instrumental orientation in interactions (see Tabl. 3). The instrumental perception of others is associated with interpersonal exploitativeness and a sense of entitlement (Lachowicz-Tabaczek et al., 2025).

The findings complement research in which attractiveness in professional settings has primarily been examined in terms of physical attractiveness (Hosoda et al., 2003; Nault et al., 2020). Its professional consequences are gender- and context-dependent (Jones et al., 2024; Kukkonen et al., 2024; Kühn & Wolbring, 2024). At the same time, external cues do not always determine competence evaluations, which may depend substantially on the evaluators' characteristics (Sánchez-Gordón et al., 2025). These findings indicate that professional impressions arise from the interplay among external cues, behavioral manifestations, evaluators' characteristics, and situational demands, and incorporate judgments of attractiveness, competence, morality, and conformity to gender expectations (Menegatti et al., 2021).

The scientific novelty lies in integrating three

levels of analysis: continuous style indices, the categorical identification of a dominant or mixed style, and context-specific communicative comfort. This approach showed that continuous indices captured individual differences in communicative comfort more sensitively than assignment to mutually exclusive style groups. It also enabled style manifestations to be linked with emotional, temperamental, interpersonal, and motivational characteristics. Accordingly, style manifestations should be considered primarily as continuous individual tendencies, whereas categorical classification may serve as a complementary descriptive tool.

The practical significance of the findings lies in the potential application of the style-based approach in psychological counseling, professional development programs, and communicative competence training. Such interventions should not aim to develop a single normatively desirable style. Instead, they should focus on expanding the repertoire of self-presentation strategies, developing emotional maturity, empathy, and social plasticity, and increasing awareness of the boundaries between persuasion, leadership behavior, and instrumental control over an interaction partner.

Conclusions

1. All five female attractiveness style indices were statistically significantly associated with overall communicative comfort. Gentle, vibrant, formal, and intellectual style manifestations were positively associated with comfort across all four professional interaction contexts. The associations were weaker for manipulative manifestations, and their correlation with comfort in formal interactions with men did not reach statistical significance.

2. Communicative comfort differed across the four situations defined by the combination of the interaction partner's gender and the formality of the interaction. Informal interactions with women were the most comfortable, whereas formal interactions with men were the least comfortable.

3. Female attractiveness style manifestations were associated with different individual psychological characteristics. Gentle manifestations were associated with empathy,

friendliness, internally directed emotional expressivity, and an altruistic orientation; vibrant manifestations with social activity, outward emotional expressivity, and the tempo of mental activity; formal manifestations with emotional maturity, social plasticity, and work orientation; intellectual manifestations with introexpressivity and result orientation; and manipulative manifestations with authoritarianism, power orientation, and flexibility of social behavior. Higher overall communicative comfort was associated with greater empathy, emotional expressivity, social plasticity, and friendliness, whereas aggressive and suspicious tendencies were associated with lower communicative comfort.

Not Using AI Tools

No AI-assisted technologies were used in the writing, editing, or data analysis for this manuscript. All work is original and completed solely by the listed authors.

References

- Atkinson, C., Sandstrom, G., & Croft, A. (2023). People overestimate backlash against helpers who violate gender stereotypes: Experimental examination of a prosociality paradox. *Sex Roles*, 88, 268–289. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-023-01354-0>
- Beharrie, T. M., & Mabitsela, T. (2023). Emotional labour as experienced by women in leadership positions. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 49. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v49i0.2119>
- Chebykin, O. Ya., & Klenchu, A. M. (2012). *Psykhohihiia atraktyvnosti divchyny* [Psychology of female attractiveness]. M. P. Cherkasov. <http://dspace.pdpu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/93> [in Ukrainian].
- Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and Competence as Universal Dimensions of Social Perception: The Stereotype Content Model and the BIAS Map. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 61–149). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601\(07\)00002-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601(07)00002-0)
- Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24(3), 285–290. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0033731>
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573–598. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.109.3.573>
- Eagly, A. H., Ashmore, R. D., Makhijani, M. G., & Longo, L. C. (1991). What is beautiful is good, but . . . : A meta-analytic review of research on the physical attractiveness stereotype. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110(1), 109–128. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.110.1.109>
- Edge, C. E., & Bacci, G. (2025). ‘You feel a little bit invisible really’: A thematic analysis exploring self-perceptions and stereotypes experienced by working women aged 60 and over with a focus on lower paid roles. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, 13(2), 82–89. <https://doi.org/10.5114/cipp/192988>
- Galos, D.-R., & Coppock, A. (2023). Gender composition predicts gender bias: A meta-reanalysis of hiring discrimination audit experiments. *Science Advances*, 9(18). <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.ade7979>
- Galos, D. R., & Coppock, A. (2023). Gender composition predicts gender bias: A meta-reanalysis of hiring discrimination audit experiments. *Science Advances*, 9(18). <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.ade7979>
- Hall, J. A., Solomon, E., Clark, M., & Vicaria, I. (2024). Employees’ views on empathic behavior in the workplace: A bottom-up approach to understanding empathy. *Current Psychology*, 43, 33406–33419. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-06762-3>
- Heilman, M. E., Caleo, S., & Manzi, F. (2024). Women at work: Pathways from gender stereotypes to gender bias and discrimination. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 11, 165–192. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-110721-034105>
- Hosoda, M., Stone-Romero, E. F., & Coats, G. (2003). The effects of physical attractiveness on job-related outcomes: A meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(2), 431–462. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00157.x>

- Johnson, S. K., Podratz, K. E., Dipboye, R. L., & Gibbons, E. (2010). Physical attractiveness biases in ratings of employment suitability: Tracking down the "beauty is beastly" effect. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 150*(3), 301–318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540903365414>
- Jones, J., Manoharan, A., & Madera, J. M. (2024). Lookism in hospitality and tourism workplaces: A multilevel review and research agenda. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 123*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2024.103909>
- Kelley, K., Hipp, L., & Protsch, P. (2024). Organizational commitments to equality change how people view women's and men's professional success. *Scientific Reports, 14*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-56829-1>
- Kühn, J., & Wolbring, T. (2024). Beauty pays, but not under all circumstances: Evidence on gendered hiring discrimination from a novel experimental treatment using deepfakes. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility, 94*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2024.100992>
- Kukkonen, I., Pajunen, T., Sarpila, O., & Åberg, E. (2024). Is beauty-based inequality gendered? A systematic review of gender differences in socioeconomic outcomes of physical attractiveness in labor markets. *European Societies, 26*(1), 117–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616696.2023.2210202>
- Kyambade, M., Namuddu, R., Mugambwa, J., & Namatovu, A. (2024). I can't express myself at work: Encouraging socially responsible leadership and psychological safety in higher education setting. *Cogent Education, 11*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2373560>
- Lachowicz-Tabaczek, K., Andrzejewska, B. E., Juszkiewicz, A., & Babiak, J. (2025). Who tends to perceive other people as useful objects? The relationship between the general tendency to objectify other people and basic and dark personality traits. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology, 13*(2), 118–126. <https://doi.org/10.5114/cipp/195599>
- Langlois, J. H., Kalakanis, L., Rubenstein, A. J., Larson, A., Hallam, M., & Smoot, M. (2000). Maxims or myths of beauty? A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(3), 390–423. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.3.390>
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*(1), 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.1.34>
- Marchenko, V. S. (2016). *Formuvannia profesiinoho imidzhu suchasnoho vchytelia* [Formation of modern teacher's professional image]. *Nauka i osvita - Science and Education, 1*, 120–125. <https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-4665-2016-1-25> [in Ukrainian].
- Menegatti, M., Pireddu, S., Crocetti, E., Moscatelli, S., & Rubini, M. (2021). The Ginevra de' Benci effect: Competence, morality, and attractiveness inferred from faces predict hiring decisions for women. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.658424>
- Myshenina, A. V., & Chebykin, O. Ya. (2025). *Psykhologichni osoblyvosti proiavu zhinochoi atraktyvnosti u sotsialno-komunikatyvni vzaємodii v umovakh profesiinoi diialnosti* [Psychological characteristics of female attractiveness in social and communicative interaction in professional activity]. *Nauka i osvita - Science and Education, (2)*, 46–58. <https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-4665-2025-2-6> [in Ukrainian].
- Nault, K. A., Pitesa, M., & Thau, S. (2020). The attractiveness advantage at work: A cross-disciplinary integrative review. *Academy of Management Annals, 14*(2), 1103–1139. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0134>
- Panerati, S., Moscatelli, S., Ruggieri, D., Menegatti, M., Ciaffoni, S., Mazzuca, S., & Rubini, M. (2025). Capturing perceived gendered expectations in the workplace: Development and validation of the 'Perfection Bias' Scale. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 55*, 872–892. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.3175>
- Popovych, I., Kononenko, O., Los, O., Khrystiuk, S., & Avramenko, A. (2022). Social expectations of professionals in the socioeconomic area: Training, innovations and reforms. *Amazonia Investiga, 11*(60), 23–31. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.60.12.2>
- Sánchez-Gordón, M., Colomo-Palacios, R., Guevara-

Female Attractiveness Style Characteristics in Promoting Successful Professional Interaction



Vega, C., Quiña-Mera, A., & Hubin, A. (2025). The effect of stereotypes on perceived competence of Indigenous software practitioners: A study of dress style in professional photos. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-025-10675-5>

Zakrisson, I. (2023). Women rate the competence of their occupational role higher than men do: Evidence from two different samples. *Current*

Psychology, 42, 14542–14554. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-02730-x>

Zigomo, T., Kock, R. G., & Donald, F. M. (2024). Relational authenticity in workplace friendships. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v22i0.2288>