

# The Most Prevalent Biases in Today's World, in Judging Others, their Impact, and Effective Modern Prevention Techniques

Sara M.F.M. Abu-Youssef

PH.D student, Business Administration, Arab Academy for Science, Technology, and Maritime Transport  
Alexandria, Egypt

MSc. Equivalency, Business Administration, Faculty of Commerce Alexandria University  
Alexandria, Egypt

MBA, Arab Academy for Science, Technology, and Maritime Transport  
Alexandria, Egypt

**Abstract:- While judging others, individuals utilize many, many shortcuts (biases/perceptual errors) (Robbins, and Judge, 2011).**

**These biases do in fact create dilemmas for people. There are a myriad of biases. This research paper examines the ensuing rampant types of biases: 1. Selective Perception, 2. The Halo Effect, 3. The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good Bias, along with the ramifications they have on various people, situations, in addition to effective modern-day bias prevention techniques.**

**Educators are afflicted by the Halo bias (Keeley et al, 2013). Halo bias arises when a rater's assessment concerning one facet of the educator has an effect on the rest of that individual's ratings (Keeley et al, 2013). For instance, if a student adores a professor's character, she judges him/her as being a great communicator as well (Keeley et al, 2013).**

**The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good bias materializes when ratees' CV caliber is identical, and employers are partisan in their opinion of applicants' fitness for a job due to the diverse levels of applicants' physique and facial allure (Cristofaro , 2017).**

**Keywords:- Biases, Perception, Perceptual Errors, What-is-Beautiful-is-Good Bias, Halo Effect Bias, Selective Perception Bias, Effective Modern Prevention Techniques, Human Resource Management, and Organizational Behavior.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

The means by which individuals arrange and explain their faculties' impressions to impart interpretation to their environment is termed perception (Robbins, and Judge, 2011). Google delineates perception as: 1. The capability to observe, listen, or become cognizant of something through the faculties. Google also defines perception as: 2. The manner, in which something is observed, looked at, assimilated, or figured out (48).

### A. Importance

What is the usefulness of being cognizant of biases, examining, and knowing the means to conquer them (Robbins, and Judge, 2011) ? The general public employs a myriad of shortcuts (biases/perceptual errors) when assessing people (Robbins, and Judge, 2011) .It is noteworthy to acknowledge that: these biases do create woes for people (Robbins, and Judge, 2011) .Apprehending these biases/perceptual errors/shortcuts can be beneficial in pinpointing when they could eventuate in mammoth distortions (Robbins, and Judge , 2011).

Why is perception significant in the de facto universe (Robbins, Judge, 2011) ? Perception is consequential as people's conduct depends on their understanding of how things are (Robbins, Judge, 2011). Perception does not depend on actuality itself (Robbins, Judge, 2011). In terms of behavior, the universe as it is perceived is the universe that matters (Robbins, Judge, 2011).

It is very noteworthy to draw attention to the fact that, what an individual perceives may be largely dissimilar from the objective truth (Robbins, Judge, 2011). As an illustration, management approaches likewise have entire and all-

encompassing consequences on company perception and dispute situations (15).

There are a multitude of biases. This research paper will examine the subsequent frequent forms of biases: 1. Selective Perception, 2. The Halo Effect, 3. The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good Bias, in addition to the repercussions they have on manifold people, situations, etc., and 4. Effective modern-day bias prevention techniques.

### *B. Selective Perception*

Selective perception is the first bias that the present researcher discusses in this article. Selective perception is a perceptual mechanism whereby an individual solely notices what he/she longs for and pays no heed to other perceptions, or vantage points (Sincero, S.M., 2013). Any aspect that causes an event, commodity, or individual to be different will boost the chances that people will notice it (Robbins, and Judge, 2011).

### *C. Halo Effect:*

Next, Halo Effect is the second bias discussed in this research paper. The Halo Effect was originated in 1920 by Edward Thorndike, an American Psychologist (Kanhere, A.M., 2017).

The halo effect manifests when – according to one aspect, such as, smartness, sociableness, or looks- people construct a comprehensive impression about an event, person, or commodity (Kanhere, A.M., 2017). As a demonstration of the above point, in advertising, a commodity is largely presumed better whenever it is recommended by a powerful person (Kanhere, A.M., 2017).

### *D. The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good Bias*

The third bias discussed in this research paper is the what-is-beautiful-is-good bias. The “What is Beautiful is Good” bias, as Karen Dion –a psychologist- and fellow workers designated it in a preminent 1972 study, is an application/sub-type of the wide-ranging “Halo Effect” (Graham, R., 2017). What does the “What-is-Beautiful-is-Good” bias mean? (Graham, R., 2017) Straightforwardly expressed, individuals are predisposed to believe that good-looking people are really superior people, even in domains that are not associated with pulchritude (Graham, R., 2017).

## **II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND DISCUSSION**

The literature review discusses and is sub-divided into 4 sections: 1. Selective Perception Bias. 2. Halo Effect Bias. 3. The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good-Bias and 4. Effective modern bias prevention techniques.

## **III. SELECTIVE PERCEPTION BIAS**

It is unachievable for people to apprehend all that they look at; individuals are just capable of discerning some particular stimuli, not every stimulus (Robbins, Judge, 2011). This predilection explicates the reason a boss can reproach certain people and not others who are behaving similarly wrong, or the cause of people having higher chances of spotting automobiles that are identical to theirs (Robbins, Judge, 2011). People partake in selective perception as they are incapable of noting all that is happening around them (Robbins, Judge, 2011).

### *A. Pivotal Illustrations Regarding Selective Perception Affecting Diverse, Eclectic Management/Leadership Styles, And Employees*

There are a manifold of pivotal illustrations regarding how selective perception affects workers, managers, corporations, marketing, and profits. These consequences are discussed below:

### *B. Selective Perceptions of Varied Managers/Leadership Styles*

#### 1) Perceptions of Managers Who are Lenient

If a manager is lenient, he/she may be perceived as not adequately noticing what the staff does (15).

#### 2) Perceptions of Managers Who Are Greatly Detail-Oriented

On the other hand, a manager may be very detail-oriented and pusillanimous that he/she is perceived as not having sufficient faith that her/his employees are competent at performing their jobs (15). The aforesaid may compel a loss of morale and enthusiasm from those who aren't self-driven; the latter may induce contempt among those who are (15).

### *C. Selective Perceptions of Various Workers and Their Circumstances*

#### 1) Perceptions of Employees Who Were Jobless For a Prolonged Period of Time,

#### 2) Perceptions of Employees Who Work Remarkably Painstakingly, and

#### 3) Perceptions of Employees Who Don't Expend Heaps of Effort

A supplementary example whereby one's perception may be greatly dissimilar from the detached reality is the situation of an employee who was jobless for numerous months—or who may have a private matter that compels him to perform the job super strenuously (15). In addition, severe personal dilemmas, such as death or divorce, have a way of coming across into people's work lives (15).

For example, Sophia may be recommencing employment after a prolonged period of being jobless (11). It is largely conceivable that she has unpaid mortgage bills (11). Being

grateful for being employed and considering herself better off after suffering from a lengthy calamity, Sophia may have difficulty perceiving the reason that another staff member, Lisa, doesn't work laboriously, and isn't grateful to a greater extent for what she has (15). As a result, Sophia may perceive Lisa as slothful (15).

#### D. Selective Perception Impact on Advertising and Business

Consumers may be captivated by some advertisements and not other advertisements in consonance with their existing idea in relation to the brand name, causing advertisers to experience complications from selective perception (50).

Proof of selective perception in advertising studies was found at the beginning of the 1960's by Seymour Smith, a renowned advertising analyst (50). According to Smith, selective perception is a method whereby people permit in, or percolate out, advertising information they notice or auscultate (43). They engage in the precedent due to their second nature, presuppositions, mind-set, accustomization, utilization, and first choice, etc. (Nowak, and Smith, 1970s). People who are contemplating purchasing a brand name or have a preference for certain brands or purchase a brand, notice advertising to a greater extent than those individuals who are detached from the brand. (50).

## IV. HALO EFFECT

Halo effect is another commonplace bias in the present day, and it is the second one discussed in this paper. The designation *halo effect* was devised when exploring appraisal of battalion officers by their bosses and other officers (Graf et al., 2016). Thorndike unearthed that interrelations among ratings of a person on various qualities (e.g., rectitude, leadership, savviness, etc.) were greater than they ought to be, indicating that assessors reach conclusions from qualities to the other qualities or deem characteristics from a general thought of the evaluatee (Cooper, 1981).

Around one hundred years afterwards, Kahneman (2011) expressed the halo effect as the predilection to like (or detest) everything regarding an individual—along with elements one has not noticed in that person, and elucidated that people are apt to hyperbolize the assessment uniformity to support straightforward and understandable informative descriptions.

The bias of having a penchant for creating ratings uniform over separate measures, in spite of, or even contrary to information at one's disposal, is one aspect that is apt to be constant throughout different delineations (Belle et al, 2017). Thus, in public administration studies (e.g., Battaglio, 2015), the halo effect has been depicted as arising when assessors sanction a score on a single measure (for example, turning up tardily to one's job) to affect scores on subsequent measures (e.g., speaking with clients, handling filing, etc.) (Battaglio, 2015).

#### A. Halo Effect Influence on Performance Assessment

The Halo effect also has performance assessment effects (Belle et al, 2017). For instance, assessors swayed by halo error are likely to carry over their impression (particular, or across-the-board) of each person assessed from one realm to another by administering constantly poor, lofty or (Belle et al., 2017) or mediocre scores across performance elements, despite the reality that assesseees are apt to display momentous respective assets and shortcomings on dissimilar performance elements (Borman, 1975).

Corroboration is available that assessors' overall notion of assesseees sway the scores of particular knowledge, skills, and abilities (e.g., Lance, LaPointe, & Stewart, 1994) and that ratings on one aspect extend to a another aspect (e.g., Bechger et al., 2010; Dennis, 2007).

Halo effects in performance appraisal have been predicated in environments as different as learners assessing university professors (e.g., Jacobs & Kozlowski, 1985), laborers of an assembly business evaluating juniors, their own selves, and colleagues (e.g., Holzbach, 1978); and police station chiefs and deputies evaluating the performance of their non-temporary police officers (e.g., King, Hunter, & Schmidt, 1980);

Belle, Cantarelli, and Bellardinelli (2017) implemented dual artefactual field tests on a sample of 600 governmental workers and directors. Results reveal that Halo effects regularly biased performance scores (Belle et al, 2017). More competence on one performance element prompted partakers to grant a greater score on a different performance element (Belle et al, 2017). The halo effect was adjusted by the scorer's gender (Belle et al, 2017).

The outcomes of experiments 1 and 2 conducted by Belle et al, (2017) affirmed that governmental workers instructed to score the job successes of made-up assistant were undoubtedly biased by halo effects. In experiment 2, the average score on social competence - one performance facet - was greater when raters were induced to grant a greater rating to the assistant on precision, another performance facet. Intriguingly, Belle et al.'s (2017) outcomes revealed proof of the halo effect for only women surveyed.

Recently, Battaglio (2015) persuasively expressed that one of the paramount matters of performance appraisal is the mistakes and biases of scorers. Seeing that each and every performance appraisal is dependent on human inclusion, mistakes and bias are perpetual menaces to correct assessment. Empirical studies in domains such as Behavioral Economics (e.g., Furnham & Boo, 2011; Kahneman, 2011), and Applied Psychology (e.g., Thorsteinson, Breier, Atwell, Hamilton, & Privette, 2008) have extensively conveyed that cognitive biases may systematically impact scorers' rating of scorees' performance.

Hence, Halo effects have regularly been evidenced to influence the performance ratings that scorers assign to evaluatees (Belle et al, 2017). Analogously, halo errors are frequently encompassed amidst the exceedingly everyday rating mistakes (e.g. Battaglio, 2015; Bechger, Maris, & Hsiao, 2010).

#### *B. Halo Effect Impact on Professor Assessment*

Along with the Halo effect having repercussions on performance evaluation, it also has consequences for professor evaluation (Keeley et al,2013).Halo effects appear when a rater's viewpoint about one facet of the teacher shapes the rest of that individual's ratings (Keeley et al,2013). For instance, if a student likes a faculty member's personality style, she evaluates him/her as being a competent communicator too (Keeley et al, 2013).

The halo effect could be sufficiently puissant to transform perceptions of familiar or obvious characteristics (for example, we might assess an amicable person as being exceedingly good-looking in comparison with those who just looked at a photograph) (Keeley et al, 2013).

As a result, a professor with a jolly and cordial personality may recompense for his evident or possible flaws as a teacher. In any case, it is obvious that halo effects can impact people's assessments of others—including professors by means of student evaluations of professors (Keeley et al, 2013).

## **V. THE-WHAT-IS-BEAUTIFUL-IS-GOOD BIAS**

The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good bias is the third bias discussed in this research paper, and one of the most widespread biases in the present-day. Innumerable studies have evidenced that people judge beautiful individuals to be more amiable, more healthful, more capable, and brighter than all other people; and people utilize even the most minuscule discrepancies in beauty to form these judgments (Graham, Ruth, 2017).

#### *A. The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good Bias Consequences in Contemporaneous Life*

The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good bias has a multitude of far-reaching consequences in life. For instance, studies all through the preceding decades have substantiated that beautiful people are more likely to be granted bank loans, earn more than their ordinary-looking workmate, and are less likely to be declared guilty by a jury (Graham, R. 2017).

#### *B. The What-Is-Beautiful-Is-Good Bias Consequences on Families*

The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good bias also has repercussions for families. The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good Bias is omnipresent to the degree that even mothers, the emblems of unequivocal love, have been evidenced to favor their more good-looking children (Graham, R. 2017).

#### *C. The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good Bias Effect in the Arts*

Movies also present manifestations of the What-is-Beautiful-is-Good bias (Kanhere, A., 2017). An impeccable illustration of the What-Is-Beautiful-Is-Good bias occurs in cinema and motion pictures (Kanhere, A., 2017). Excluding a few examples, films have always portrayed their star role characters/protagonists to be stunning and handsome (Kanhere, A., 2017). These film lead characters are represented as being the archetype of brightness, exceptional leadership capabilities, confidence, intercommunication abilities, and au courant with the most recent technological innovations (Kanhere, A., 2017).

#### *D. The What-Is-Good-Is-Beautiful Bias Universality Corroboration*

Generic additional scenarios substantiate that the universality of the What-Is-Beautiful-Is-Good-Bias does not solely pertain to human beings, but to objects as well. (Kanhere, A., 2017).There are multitudinous illustrations which affirm this (Kanhere, A., 2017).

For exemplification, presume a person is contemplating eating at a brand-new restaurant (Kanhere, A., 2017). Imagine she has two different restaurants in mind. In every single case, she is likely to select a restaurant with a superior appearance and superior backdrop (Kanhere, A., 2017).Thus, it is perpetually taken for granted that the caliber of servicing and cuisine is terrific if the restaurant is beautiful and vice versa (Kanhere, A., 2017).

Further examples of the What-Is-Beautiful-is-Good bias in mundane life are:

1. It is anticipated that a person wearing business smart garments is affluent (Kanhere, A., 2017).
2. It is thought that an individual with a childlike visage is veracious (Kanhere, A. 2017).

#### *E. The What-Is-Beautiful-Is-Good Bias Influence on Politics and Politicians*

Politics and politicians are also affected by the What-is-Beautiful-is-Good bias (Palmer and Peterson, 2015). In Palmer and Peterson's (2015) research, they scrutinized whether appearance conjointly plays a part in how we happen to comprehend politics. As a test, they employed the American National Election Study (ANES) survey data, which contained the interviewer's nonobjective scores of respondents' semblance and perceived political erudition (Palmer and Peterson, 2015).

Palmer and Peterson (2015) strengthened the ANES outcomes with a dyad of survey experimentations where people assessed haphazardly designated possible political discourse partners. Their results demonstrated that more comely individuals are viewed as more apt to be solicited by others for political information, more well-informed and more compelling (Palmer, and Peterson, 2015)

Furthermore, more stunning individuals (even the comparatively uninformed) are more apt to declare endeavoring to convince others (Palmer, and Peterson, 2015). These discoveries have ramifications for the political judgments citizens form, comprehension of the method by which citizens determine political virtuosos, and the possibilities for the amplification of inaccuracies (Palmer, and Peterson, 2015).

The findings of Palmer and Peterson's (2015) observational and experiential studies add another element to the social power of physical semblance—perceived ability in the political realm, as individuals would appear to be more apt to attribute knowledge to more beautiful people, even with proof of the opposite, in addition to being much more ready to solicit these individuals and agree with their recommendations pertaining to politics.

With attraction to politics at a premium amidst citizens, political virtuosos hold influential places in political dialogues, as the uninformed are believed to depend on their more-informed acquaintances and comrades to assist in overcoming their informational deficiencies when obligated to de facto reach decisions about political stuff (Palmer and Peterson, 2015).

It is more probable that other citizens rely on good-looking individuals as sources of political knowledge and perceive them as much more convincing in comparison to less beautiful people, aware of zilch about their de facto political savvy (Palmer and Peterson, 2015). Given the importance populations assign to an engrossed and informed electorate, and the inclination of the less acquainted to refer to those they believe to be authorities to diminish gaps in information, the what-is-beautiful bias indicates that plenty of citizens, when finding out information, might be misguided (Palmer and Peterson, 2015).

The ultimate outcome is that the not as highly informed have their political cosmos perceptions molded and their voting choices strongly influenced by those they perceive to be trustworthy (Palmer and Peterson, 2015). Large numbers of inadequately informed individuals may in essence be misled as they attempt to improve their political awareness if those perceptions of expertness are wrong views affected by a person's outward semblance (Palmer and Peterson, 2015)

The heart of evidence Palmer and Peterson 's (2015) research extends to insinuate the confirmation of these standard considerations. Not just are more beautiful individuals viewed as more informed, they are as well apt to a greater extent to endeavor to convince other people, notably when they have insufficient knowledge.

#### *F. The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good Bias Impact on Employee Selection Decisions and Employment*

Moreover, employee selection decisions and employment are also affected by the What-is-Beautiful-is-Good bias. (Cristofaro, M. 2017). Specifically, by means of social media, employers presently have the liberty to view a job applicant's complete shape, and arising out of this they acquire a first impression of their character, which then impacts their decisions (Cristofaro, M., 2017).

To compile information about job applicants for selection decisions (SDs), employers have recourse to relatively novel media (e.g. LinkedIn, and Facebook) (Davison et al., 2012). Amid this data compilation, human comportment is to regard personal photographs (Mashable, 2011) and derive impressions about candidates' characters (Kinnunen and Parviainen, 2016; Meriläinen et al., 2015).

This updated method of amassing applicants' information has been spreading: employers who utilize social networks for their selection procedure have surged from 45 percent (2008) to 96 percent (2015) (Jobvite, 2015). This mode arises out of people's growing propensity to exhibit personal information; no to mention complete figure photographs (KPCB, 2014) – that are not present in CVs, and are unquestioningly weighed by employers to measure candidates' suitability (Cristofaro, M., 2017).

From the 1960s, job applicants' perceived character and facial appeal have been the paramount variables analyzed in recruitment methods (Paustian-Underdahl and Slattery Walker, 2016). For example, Judge et al. (2009) put forward a model that associates job applicants' facial appeal to some pivotal measures (for employers) of applicants' character. These academicians determined that facial appeal has a constructive impact on candidates' income, through the interceding influences of their core assessments – a combined variable that operates as a very important foreboder of job performance and job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2000).

In actuality, the more alluring the face of candidates is, the greater the better perception of their character and the greater the earnings (Cristofaro, M., 2017) are. The objectification happens when individuals are predisposed to judge themselves and other people based on corporal semblance (Harrison and Fredrickson, 2003); those impressions therefore have consequences on people's conduct, i.e., operating as biases (Cristofaro, M., 2017).

Cristoforo's (2017) research followed the objectification theory to analyze the impact of corporal allure on the perception of individual temperament that is crucial for employers and candidates' hiring scores. Cristoforo's (2017) study was directed at elucidating the reasons for when other circumstances are equivalent, some individuals are assessed as more self-assured or efficient, leading to being regarded as more employable.

An empirical probe that comprised of expert employers who appraised six possible candidates for an administrative post was implemented (Cristofaro, M., 2017). Partakers were requested to assess corporeal allure (utilizing the construct of objectification), facial appeal, core appraisals and hiring marks of six candidates for an administrative post; then, a model of moderated mediation was tried (Cristofaro, M., 2017).

Notably, having recourse to Judge et al.'s (2009) earlier framework, a model of moderated mediation was examined in which employers' perception of candidates' core assessments mediates the relationship between their objectification and ascribed hiring points, while their perceived facial allure moderates the impact of objectification on core assessments.

Cristofaro's (2017) research advanced that employers' perception of job applicants' core assessments mediates the relationship between objectification (meaning corporal allure) and the ascribed hiring marks, while facial appeal magnifies or lessens the impact of objectification on core assessments.

Candidates' facial appeal has been confirmed in Cristofaro's 2017 study to operate as a moderator in the relationship between objectification and core assessments. Results demonstrate that this relationship and the impact on the ascribed hiring marks are mainly more acute when the candidate is immensely ranked from a facial appeal viewpoint (Cristofaro, M., 2017). If job applicants are evaluated as having little facial beauty and are greatly objectified, they are perceived as having a superior temperament than candidates with little facial beauty and inferior objectification. (Cristofaro, M., 2017).

Just as hypothesized, job applicants' personal temperaments (i.e. core assessments) behaved as a mediator between objectification and the hiring rank ascribed to job applicants (Cristofaro, M., 2017), confirming the earlier presumptions found on the heretofore recognized associations between facial beauty and core evaluations (Judge et al., 2009).

The outcomes predominantly emphasize that the objectification impacts the mediator (core assessments) which sequentially influences the attributed hiring rank to job applicants (Cristofaro, M., 2017). This model explicates by what means the employers' perception of candidates' objectification affects their impressions of the ratees' dispositions that are for the most part viewed as preferable for the corporation (Cristofaro, M., 2017)

This outcome expounds the method being the reason for the biasing part that is played by candidates' objectification in selection decisions as postulated by contemporary written matter (Pan et al., 2013).

This development buttresses earlier suppositions that candidates with more facial appeal have a better chance of

being hired, considering that they are perceived as very assured of their own skills (Jackson, 1983). Nevertheless, having uttermost attractiveness – from a face and body viewpoint – could be detrimental to employers' perception of their core assessments (Cristofaro, M., 2017).

Essentially, proof states that job applicants who are greatly objectified and have a lot of facial beauty are perceived – by employers – as having reduced core assessment grades compared to candidates who are barely objectified and have a high degree of facial beauty (Cristofaro, M., 2017).

This reversed repercussion of the facial allure and objectification variables, when the two come to a summit, is at variance with the popular notion of what-is-beautiful-is-good (Dion et al., 1972), and has been elucidated as the supposed "beauty is beastly effect" (Heilman and Saruwatari, 1979; Johnson et al., 2014), by which stunning people are regarded (by raters) as inadmissible for some jobs, on account of their exorbitant beauty prompting employers to perceive their inner temperament as not corresponding to the job demands.

Beauty therefore acts conforming to the two systems of the beauty-is-beastly and what-is-beautiful-is-good effects (Cristofaro, 2017). These two effects do not preclude each other but are integrative, conditional on the connected marks of those variables (Cristofaro, M., 2017).

Hence, the biasing means of candidates' total beauty (corporal and facial) affects the perceived core temperament traits (Cristofaro, M., 2017).

#### *G. Cautions regarding the What-Is-Beautiful-Is-Good Bias*

There are some cautions though. Beautiful persons may be more in all likelihood permitted more loans and lessened rates of interest; however studies assert they're just as likely to not pay back the loans, which implies that there are spheres where more impartial types of evaluation would be valuable (Graham, R., 2013).

## **VI. EFFECTIVE CONTEMPORARY BIAS PREVENTION TECHNIQUES**

Prejudices through the medium of Halo effect are customarily disclaimed, yet they are in fact present (Kanhere, A.M., 2017). Some facile mechanisms to sidestep being swayed by biases are listed underneath (Kanhere, A.M., 2017):

1. Don't at any time presuppose that the initial impression is the lifelong impression, which is principally pertinent in the job situation where a candidate's disposition is understood based on her semblance and stylishness (Kanhere, A.M., 2017). The veracity is that a number of a person's finest and most admirable traits can only be recognized through frequent communication and work involvement (Kanhere, A.M., 2017)

Companies may utilize procedures such as intelligence tests, stress interview techniques, and background checks to judge a candidate's intellect and disposition (Kanhere, A.M., 2017). It is wise to obtain numerous ratings from various supervisors and compute a mean performance grade during managing a staff member's promotion (Kanhere, A.M., 2017).

2. It is evermore terrific to keep in mind that the halo bias arises only when the primary object becomes indistinct (Kanhere, A.M., 2017). Do not under any condition conjecture anything at all when the principal object or character can't be plainly perceived (Kanhere, A.M., 2017). Ultimately, not everything that twinkles is a diamond, and not everything that gleams is gold. A clear alert mind will benefit you in forming the most excellent judgment (Kanhere, A.M., 2017).

3. Transitorily, experts are commencing to come up with feasible fixes to the what-is-beautiful-is-good bias (Kanhere, A.M., 2017). Some experts have advocated taking advantage of high tech to fight the bias via methods such as blind interviews that eliminate appeal from job interviews (Kanhere, A.M., 2017). There's reassuring corroboration from psychology that awareness-enhancement has a function too (Kanhere, A.M., 2017).

4. Additional specific training for student raters is in all likelihood necessary to improve the significant variability in evaluation of teachers (Keeley et al., 2013).

5. In furtherance of performance scores to lack systematic errors, J. S. Bowman (1999) contended that governmental employees must be trained if they are to be proficient at judging other people's performance, and must be put on guard about cognitive biases typical of human nature.

The palpable practice to prevent biases is to have various raters judge contradistinctive performances of the same contender (see also Hoyt, 2000). One judge called attention to the fact that assessment centers are especially germane, as numerous judges are frequently employed to evaluate contender performance across manifold tasks so one is capable of forming types of data matrices (Bechger et al, 2010).

Additionally, Nurudeen et al. (2015) corroborate the atop idea. Performance assessments from a lone source like a patient, subordinate, or supervisor can have deep-seated errors, counting the halo effect (Nurudeen et al., 2015). Feedback from numerous sources has been a fundamental part of performance assessments in copious industries for decenniums (Nurudeen et al, 2015). This technique gathers feedback from numerous individuals having different roles in a person's employment environment and helps to produce an exhaustive perspective on performance (Nurudeen et al, 2015).

Lately, as a method to measure medical practitioner performance, hospitals have employed multisource feedback (Nurudeen et al, 2015). Multisource feedback, frequently alluded to as 360 degree feedback, has been included in the-

certification procedure in various nations (Nurudeen et al, 2015). A more thorough performance evaluation is thereby acquired, hence diminishing bias, by asking feedback from many people in a medical practitioner's employment environment inclusive of subordinates, superiors, and colleagues (Nurudeen et al, 2015). The outcome of the information collected has been employed as a technique to guide professional development and to audit worker betterment as time passes (Nurudeen et al., 2015).

## VII. CONCLUSION

This current researcher studies the following prevalent kinds of biases: 1. Selective Perception, 2. The Halo Effect, 3. The What-is-Beautiful-is-Good Bias, and the consequences they have on different people, and situations, in addition to effective contemporary bias avoidance methods. Selective perception occurs, for example, when people who are thinking about buying a brand, or have a desire for specific brands, or buy a brand, spot advertising related to that brand to a higher degree than those people who are neutral about the brand (50).

The halo effect bias take place, for example, if a student loves a professor's personality style, she evaluates him/her as being a superb communicator too (Keeley et al., 2013). Furthermore, one might evaluate a cordial person as being incredibly good-looking compared to those who just viewed a photo (Keeley et al., 2013).

The halo effect also has a significant effect on academic grades. Malouff, Emmerton, and Schutte's (2013) research outcomes produced the earliest empirical proof, according to their knowledge, of halo bias in assistants evaluating college-student work and academics. The bias brought about by the vocal presentation led to a four-marks difference in scores on a zero- to- one hundred scale on the penned composition, a difference of near fifty percent of a grade level (Malouff et al., 2013). The impact was average in scope (Malouff et al., 2013), per Cohen's (1988) guideline. Malouff et al.'s (2013) outcomes augment empirical proof defending conclusions from a research that utilized correlational modeling to uncover halo effects in the evaluation of psychology-students' performance included (Dennis, 2007). Pragmatically, a bias outcome of this degree is sufficiently massive to be disturbing to both students and professors (Malouff et al, 2013).

Halo effect also affects companies. Smith, Read, and Lopez-Rodriguez's (2010) study indicates that shoppers may strongly form deductions about company corporate social responsibility performance (CSR) according to really minimal information. Smith, Read, and Lopez-Rodriguez's (2010) results have crucial policy and managerial ramifications. It has significant consequences for company CSR strategy, particularly what actions are undertaken and how they are implemented.

Subhani's (2012) research demonstrated that when we see an individual who is beautiful, a definite perception of great thoughts takes place as an automatic response, in accordance with the what-is-beautiful-is-good bias. Countless research papers have evidenced that we assess beautiful people to be more cordial, healthier, more competent, and more intelligent than everyone else (Graham, Ruth, 2017). For illustration, research papers all through the prior decenniums have proven that beautiful people have higher chances of being granted bank loans, earn more than their normal-looking colleagues, and have smaller chances of being found guilty by a jury (Graham, R. 2017). It is more likely that people depend on good-looking individuals as experts about political knowledge and perceive them as a lot more convincing in comparison to ordinary-looking people, aware of nada about their real political knowledge (Palmer and Peterson, 2015).

The what-is-beautiful-is-good bias also affects employment decisions. Via social media, employers currently have the freedom to view a job applicant's complete figure, and according to this they establish a first impression of their character, which then affects their decisions (Cristofaro, M., 2017). Subhani's (2012) study demonstrated the power of beauty on the hiring decisions by managers at certain levels (Subhani, 2012). Many research papers have proved that within job settings, applicants who are physically appealing are granted more favorable treatment over the physically unappealing [Beehr & Gilmore, 1982; Marlowe, Schneider, & Nelson, 1996]. If job applicants are scored as having meager facial beauty and are immensely objectified, they are perceived as having a marvelous temperament compared to candidates with scant facial beauty and low-grade objectification (Cristofaro, M., 2017).

The what-is-beautiful-is-good bias is so prevalent that it even affects medical career decisions. Maxfield, Thorpe, Desser, Heitkamp, Hull, Johnson, Koontz, Mlady, Welch, and Grimm's (2019) research outcomes offer initial proof of bias against obese and facially unappealing applicants in radiology resident choosing. Beauty and obesity were as powerful as universal medical school performance metrics in choosing applicants for interviews (Maxfield et al, 2019).

Some experts have endorsed benefitting from high tech to combat biases through methods procedures such as blind interviews that remove beauty from job interviews (Kanhere, A.M., 2017). Research results offer experimentation-based empirical backing to endorse to college-student groups and professionals that professors keep students nameless during non-objective evaluation when that is possible (e.g., Kahneman, 2011; National Union of Students, 2012;). Recently, as a technique to grade medical practitioner performance, hospitals have utilized 360 degree feedback (Nurudeen et al. 2015), which has been included in the re-certification procedure in many nations (Nurudeen et al., 2015).

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Battaglio, P. R., Jr. (2015.). *Public Human Resource Management: Strategies and practices in the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press.
- [2]. Bechger, T. M., Maris, G., & Hsiao, Y. P. (2010). Detecting halo effects in performance-based examinations. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 34*, 607-619.
- [3]. Beehr, T., & Gilmore, D. (1982). Applicant attractiveness as a perceived job-relevant variable in selection of management trainees. *Academy of Management Journal, 25*, 607-617.
- [4]. Belle, N., Cantarelli, P., & Belardinelli, P. (2017). Cognitive biases in performance appraisal: Experimental evidence on anchoring and halo effects with public sector managers and employees. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 37*(3), 275-294.
- [5]. Borman, W. C. (1975). Effects of instructions to avoid halo error on reliability and validity of performance evaluation ratings. *Journal of applied psychology, 60*, 556-560.
- [6]. Bowman, J. S. (1999). Performance appraisal: Verisimilitude trumps veracity. *Public Personnel Management, 28*, 557-576.
- [7]. Cash, T. (1981). Physical attractiveness: An annotated bibliography of theory and research in the behavioral sciences. *Social & Behavioral Sciences Documents, 11*, 83. (MS# 2370)
- [8]. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- [9]. Dennis, I. (2007). Halo effects in grading student projects. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1169-1176.
- [10]. Cooper, W. H. (1981). Ubiquitous halo. *Psychological Bulletin, 90*, 218-244
- [11]. Cristofaro, M. (2017). Candidates' attractiveness in selection decisions: a laboratory experiment. *Baltic Journal of Management, 12*(4), 390-407
- [12]. Davison, H., Maraist, C., Hamilton, R. and Bing, M. (2012), "To screen or not to screen? Using the internet for selection decisions", *Employee Responsibility Rights Journal, Vol. 24 No. 1*, pp. 1-21.
- [13]. Dennis, I. (2007). Halo effects in grading student projects. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1169-1176.
- [14]. Dion, K., Berscheid, E. and Walster, E. (1972), "What is beautiful is good", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 24 No. 3*, pp. 285-290.
- [15]. (2017). Examples of Workplace Perception and Conflict Issues. Retrieved August 6, 2017, from: <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/examples->
- [16]. Furnham, A., & Boo, H. C. (2011). A literature review of the anchoring effect. *The Journal of Socio-Economics, 40*, 35-42.



- [17]. Gräf, M., & Unkelbach, C. (2016). Halo effects in trait assessment depend on information valence: Why being honest makes you industrious, but lying does not make you lazy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42(3), 290-310
- [18]. Graham, Ruth (2013). Who will fight the beauty bias? Retrieved October 21, 2017 from: <https://www.bostonglobe.com/ideas/2013/08/23/who-will-fight-beauty-bias/Kq3pbfOy4VRJtKrmyWBNO/story.html>
- [19]. Harrison, K. and Fredrickson, B.L. (2003), "Women's sports media, self-objectification, and mental health in black and white adolescent females", *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 53 No. 2, pp. 216-232.
- [20]. Heilman, M.E. and Saruwatari, L.R. (1979), "When beauty is beastly: the effects of appearance and sex on evaluations of job applicants for managerial and non-managerial jobs", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 360-372.
- [21]. Holzbach, R. L. (1978). Rater bias in performance ratings: Superior, self-, and peer ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 579-588.
- [22]. Hoyt, W. (2000). Rater bias in psychological research: When is it a problem and what can we do about it? *Psychological Bulletin*, 5, Issue 1, 64-86.
- [23]. Jackson, L.A. (1983), "The Influence of sex, physical attractiveness, sex role, and occupational sex-linkage on perceptions of occupational suitability", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 31-44.
- [24]. Jacobs, R., & Kozlowski, S. W. (1985). A closer look at halo error in performance ratings. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28, 201-212.
- [25]. Jobvite (2015), "2015 Jobvite recruiter nation survey", available at: [www.jobvite.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/jobvite\\_recruiter\\_nation\\_2015.pdf](http://www.jobvite.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/jobvite_recruiter_nation_2015.pdf) (accessed January 16, 2016).
- [26]. Johnson, S.K., Sitzmann, T. and Nguyen, A.T. (2014), "Don't hate me because I'm beautiful: acknowledging appearance mitigates the 'beauty is beastly' effect", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 125 No. 2, pp. 184-192.
- [27]. Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E. and Locke, E.A. (2000), "Personality and job satisfaction: the mediating role of job characteristics", *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85 No. 2, pp. 237-249.
- [28]. Judge, T.A., Hurst, C. and Simon, L.S. (2009), "Does it pay to be smart, attractive, or confident (or all three)? Relationships among general mental ability, physical attractiveness, core self-evaluations, and income", *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 94 No. 3, pp. 742-755
- [29]. Judge, T.A., Locke, E.A. and Durham, C.C. (1998), "The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: a core evaluations approach", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 83 No. 1, pp. 17-34.
- [30]. Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York City, NY: Macmillan.
- [31]. Kanhere, Anuja Marathe (2017). The Halo Effect on People. Retrieved August 9, 2017 from: <https://psychologenie.com/halo-effect-on-people>
- [32]. Keeley, J. W., English, T., Irons, J., & Henslee, A. M. (2013). Investigating halo and ceiling effects in student evaluations of instruction. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 73(3), 440-457.
- [33]. King, L. M., Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (1980). Halo in a multidimensional forced-choice performance evaluation scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 507-516
- [34]. Kinnunen, J. and Parviainen, T. (2016), "Feeling the right personality. Recruitment consultants' affective decision making in interviews with employee candidates", *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 5-21
- [35]. KPCB (2014), "Internet trends", available at: [www.kpcb.com/blog/2014-internet-trends](http://www.kpcb.com/blog/2014-internet-trends) (accessed November 25, 2015).
- [36]. Lance, C. E., LaPointe, J. A., & Stewart, A. M. (1994). A test of the context dependency of three causal models of halo rater error. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 332-340.
- [37]. Langlois, J.H., Kalakanis, L., Rubenstein, A.J., Larson, A., Hallam, M. and Smoot, M. (2000), "Maxims or myths of beauty? A meta-analytic and theoretical review", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 126 No. 3, pp. 390-423.
- [38]. Malouff, J. M., Emmerton, A. J., & Schutte, N. S. (2013). The risk of a halo bias as a reason to keep students anonymous during grading. *Teaching of Psychology*, 40(3), 233-237.
- [39]. Marlowe, C., Schneider, S. & Nelson, C. (1996). Gender and attractiveness bases in hiring decisions: Are more experienced managers less biased? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(1), p. 11-21.
- [40]. Mashable (2011), "Here's how people look at your Facebook profile – literally", available at: <http://mashable.com/2011/11/30/social-profile-eye-tracking/#f1Pxx.umgkqi> (accessed February 28, 2017).
- [41]. Maxfield, C. M., Thorpe, M. P., Desser, T. S., Heitkamp, D. E., Hull, N. C., Johnson, K. S., & Koontz, N.A., Mlady, G.W., Welch, T.J., and Grimm, L. J. (2019). Bias in radiology resident selection: do we discriminate against the obese and unattractive? *Academic Medicine*, 94(11), 1774-1780.
- [42]. Merilainen, S., Tienari, J. and Valtonen, A. (2015), "Headhunters and the 'ideal' executive body", *Organization*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 3-22.
- [43]. National Union of Students. (2012). Mark my words, not my name. Retrieved on April 29, 2013, from <http://www.nus.org.uk/cy/news/news/mark-my-words-not-my-name/>
- [44]. Nowak, Theodore and Smith, Seymour. "Advertising Works—And Advertising Research Does Too." Presentation to ESOMAR. Spain: 1970s.

- [45]. Nurudeen, S. M., Kwakye, G., Berry, W. R., Chaikof, E. L., Lillemoe, K. D., Millham, F., ... & Sato, L. (2015). Can 360-degree reviews help surgeons? Evaluation of multisource feedback for surgeons in a multi-institutional quality improvement project. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*, 221(4), 837-844.
- [46]. Palmer, C. L., & Peterson, R. D. (2016). Halo effects and the attractiveness premium in perceptions of political expertise. *American Politics Research*, 44(2), 353-382.
- [47]. Pan, J., Qin, X. and Liu, G.G. (2013), "The impact of body size on urban employment: evidence from China", *China Economic Review*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 249-263.
- [48]. Paustian-Underdahl, S. and Slattery Walker, L. (2016), "Revisiting the beauty is beastly effect: examining when and why sex and attractiveness impact hiring judgments", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 26 No. 10, pp. 1034-1058.
- [49]. (2016). Perception. Retrieved August 6, 2017, from: [https://www.google.com.eg/search?site=&source=hp&q=PERCEPTION&oq=PERCEPTION&gs\\_l=psyab.3..014.1576.5593.0.5902.18.15.3.0.0.170.1768.0j13.13.0...0..1.1.64.psyab..2.16.1794...0i131k1j0i10k1.6epgNPdrO2s](https://www.google.com.eg/search?site=&source=hp&q=PERCEPTION&oq=PERCEPTION&gs_l=psyab.3..014.1576.5593.0.5902.18.15.3.0.0.170.1768.0j13.13.0...0..1.1.64.psyab..2.16.1794...0i131k1j0i10k1.6epgNPdrO2s)
- [50]. Robbins, S.P., and Judge, T.A. (2011). *Organizational Behavior*. 14/E. New Jersey, USA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [51]. Selective Perception. Retrieved August 7, 2017, from: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Selective\\_perception](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Selective_perception)
- [52]. Sincero, Sarah Mae (2013). Selective Perception. Retrieved August 7, 2017, from: <https://explorable.com/selective-perception>
- [53]. Smith, N. C., Read, D., & Lopez-Rodriguez, S. (2010). Consumer perceptions of corporate social responsibility: The CSR halo effect. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 23.
- [54]. Solnick, S. and Schweitzer, M. (1999), "The influence of physical attractiveness and gender on ultimatum game decisions", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 79 No. 3, pp. 199-215.
- [55]. Subhani, M. I. (2012). Impact of physical attractiveness on selection and recruitment process
- [56]. Thorndike, E. L. (1920). A constant error in psychological ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4, 25-29.
- [57]. Thorsteinson, T. J., Breier, J., Atwell, A., Hamilton, C., & Privette, M. (2008). Anchoring effects on performance judgments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 107, 29-40.