Jordan Medical Journal

JORDAN MEDICAL JOURNAL

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Behind Body Shaming and Colorism: Unveiling the Psychosocial Variations through Body Shapes and Skin Tones

Aseel AlSaleh¹, Waqar Husain², Hadeel Ghazzawi³*, Adam Amawi⁴, Khaled Trabelsi^{5,6}, Ammar Achraf ^{7,8}, Haitham Jahrami^{9,10}

- ¹ Department of Family and Community Medicine, College of Medicine and Medical Sciences, Arabian Gulf University, Manama, Bahrain
- ² Department of Humanities, COMSATS University Islamabad, Islamabad Campus, Park Road, Islamabad, Pakistan
- Nutrition and Food technology Department,
 School of Agriculture, The University of Jordan
 Department of Movement Sciences and Sports
- Training, School of Sport Sciences, The University of Jordan
- ⁵ High Institute of Sport and Physical Education of Sfax, University of Sfax, Sfax 3000, Tunisia ⁶ Research Laboratory: Education, Motricity, Sport and Health, EM2S, LR19JS01, University of Sfax, Sfax 3000, Tunisia Jordan
- Department of Training and Movement
 Science, Institute of Sport Science, Johannes
 Gutenberg-University Mainz, Mainz, Germany
 Research Laboratory, Molecular Bases of
 Human Pathology, LR19ES13, Faculty of
 Medicine of Sfax, University of Sfax, Sfax
 3000. Tunisia
- ⁹ Government Hospitals, Manama, Bahrain
 ¹⁰ Department of Psychiatry, College of Medicine and Medical Sciences, Arabian Gulf University, Manama, Bahrain

*Corresponding author: h.ghazzawi@ju.edu.jo

Received: October 2, 2024
Accepted: February 2, 2025

DOI:

https://doi.org/10.35516/jmj.v59i3.3323

Abstract

Background: The pursuit of physical attractiveness is universal across cultures and driven by the desire to avoid the detrimental psychosocial consequences of body shaming and colorism. Previous research on body dissatisfaction has focused primarily on anxiety. The aim of the present study was to explore the impact of body shape and skin tone on sociality, emotionality, morality, religiosity, spirituality, personality, psychosocial wellness, and psychosocial illness.

Methods: The study was a large-scale nationwide investigation. It involved 14 phases in which a total of 10,127 participants, comprising both men and women, were recruited from Pakistan and Bahrain. Body shape was classified into three categories: muscular/curved, fat/chubby, and slim/thin. Skin tones were categorized as fairly white, pale white, light brown, and dark brown. The data were collected using demographic questionnaires and 21 psychological scales.

Results: Muscular men and curvy women exhibited elevated self-esteem, positive emotions, and virtuous traits, albeit with reduced forgiveness levels. Curvy women demonstrated heightened engagement in beautification practices. Fat/chubby individuals showcased heightened religious intelligence but also endorsed traits like infidelity, neuroticism, and anxiety. They displayed deficits in social intelligence and hope. Slim/thin counterparts displayed creativity but also higher levels of charismaphobia. Fairly white individuals showcased self-esteem, creativity, and love capacity, yet reported sexual frustration. Pale white individuals displayed traits like heterosexuality, neuroticism, and charismaphobia, with low courage and teamwork. Light brown individuals exhibited justice, social intelligence, and humor, alongside charismaphobia. Dark brown individuals demonstrated prudence but attitudes toward infidelity, with low transcendence and openness.

Conclusion: The study offers new insights into the complex connections of body shapes and skin tones with various psychosocial factors, marking a significant contribution to scientific knowledge. The findings of this study would enable psychologists, psychiatrists, cosmetic-dermatologists, and other relevant practitioners to adequately associate different aspects of psychology with different body shapes and skin tones.

Keywords: Attractiveness, beauty, body shaming, body shape, colorism, skin tone.

□ NOTE: Please verify and correct in-text citation formatting (e.g., use [1], [22–24]).

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of beauty is a timeless aspect of human culture, that is observed across diverse societies worldwide [1]. Beauty is a quality within an object that evokes a pleasurable experience in the observer, indicating that anything can be beautiful if it pleases the senses [2]. Within the framework of psychology, beauty has been viewed differently. The evolutionary viewpoint emphasizes the role of certain physical attributes that result in social recognition, aligning with the principle 'survival of the fittest' [3]. These attributes, particularly those related to human reproduction, create and can lead to physical attraction, reproductive and sexual activities [4]. Social psychologists broaden the context, asserting that beauty, especially for women, holds significant importance in social recognition, linking to positive traits such as intelligence, social competence, friendliness, likeability, and leadership skills [5]. Beauty is also perceived in terms of inner qualities and essence, suggesting an intricate connection between facial and inner beauty [6–8]. □ SUGGESTION: Consider splitting the following sentence to improve clarity and flow.

Culturally defined standards of beauty and attractiveness exhibit considerable variation, evolving over time. Historical trends reveal shifting ideals, from the preference for fuller figures in the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries to the demand for athletic bodies in the early twentieth century [9,10]. Contemporary expectations differ for men and women. Almost all men are expected to be physically and socioeconomically strong in attracting women [11–18]. Specific beauty standards for women

vary globally and are influenced by cultural norms and ecological conditions [12,13,16,19–21]. Preferences related to facial features, body shape, skin color, and adiposity further underscore the complexity of beauty ideals [1,22–24]. The media also plays a crucial role in shaping these ideals [25–27].

Body shaming and colorism are pervasive issues that have significant psychological for individuals. consequences Social appreciation is an integral part of overall psychosocial health [28,29]. Body shaming refers to the act of negatively judging and criticizing someone's body, often based on appearance, size, weight, or shape. On the other hand, colorism is a form of discrimination that favors lighter skin tones over darker ones, often within the same racial or ethnic group. Both phenomena can lead to profound psychological impacts, affecting self-esteem, body image, and overall mental well-being. Individuals subjected to such criticism often experience heightened levels of stress and anxiety. Constant negative remarks about one's body can lead to body dissatisfaction, which in turn can contribute to the development of eating disorders, depression, and low self-esteem [30]. Research has shown that body shaming can also lead to social withdrawal, as individuals may avoid social situations to evade judgment and criticism, further exacerbating feelings of isolation loneliness [31,32]. Additionally, colorism can have detrimental effects on mental health. People experiencing colorism may internalize societal biases, leading to feelings of inadequacy and self-hate [33]. Lighter-skinned individuals might develop a superiority complex, while darker-skinned individuals often face social exclusion and discrimination, leading to lower self-esteem and a diminished sense of self-worth [34]. Colorism can also stereotypes perpetuate and prejudice,

contributing to a hostile social environment and hindering interpersonal relationships. Physical attractiveness, therefore. serves as fundamental human characteristic that influences various psychosocial attributes [4]. individuals Attractive eniov societal acceptance and are perceived as more positive, intelligent, helpful, friendly, and less likely to engage in criminal activities [35,36]. These perceptions employment extend to opportunities, wages, and even dating preferences, illustrating the pervasive impact of physical attractiveness on social interactions [37-45]. Women often conform to societal standards, associating beauty attractiveness with social recognition [12,46].

Research on the psychological aspects of beauty and attraction has been limited to investigating the adverse effects of body shaming on mental health [30,47,48] such as body dissatisfaction [31,49] charismaphobia [50,51]. The objective of the present study was to explore body shapes and skin tones with aspects other than anxiety or mental disorders. The study involved 14 consecutive phases in which the associations of body-shape and skin-tone were explored with sociality (social intelligence, & social engagement), emotionality (emotional intelligence, positive emotional effects, & negative emotional effects), sexuality (sexual intelligence, sexual frustration, infidelity, romantic readiness, body-esteem, & sexual orientation i.e. heterosexuality, homosexuality, bisexuality), morality (moral intelligence, virtues and character strengths i.e. wisdom and knowledge, courage, humanity, justice, transcendence, temperance, creativity, curiosity, judgment and open mindedness, love of learning, perspective, bravery, perseverance, honesty, zest, capacity to love and be loved, kindness, social intelligence, teamwork. fairness, leadership, forgiveness and mercy,

and humility, prudence, selfmodesty regulation. appreciation of beauty & excellence, gratitude, hope, humor, and spirituality), religiosity religiousness (religious intelligence), spirituality (spiritual intelligence), personality (big-five personality traits, veiling, & beautification i.e. tattooing, body piercing, jewelry, makeup, perfume), psychosocial wellness (psychosocial health, & self-esteem), life satisfaction, and psychosocial illness (depression, anxiety, stress, generalized anxiety disorder, obsessivecompulsive disorder, narcissistic personality disorder, & charismaphobia).

2. METHODS

The present study was exploratory in nature. It was carried out in 14 phases to explore the variables discussed earlier.

2.1 Participants

The series of 14 phases involved 10,127 conveniently selected participants from Pakistan and Bahrain. The participants included men (3524), women (5420), married (4049), unmarried (6078), muscular/curvy (3627), fat/chubby (2705), slim/thin (3795), fairly white (2190), pale white (3884), light brown (2580), and dark brown (1473). The age of the participants ranged between 16 and 85 years with a mean age of 28 years. Further details on the participants for each of the 14 studies can be found in tables 1 and 2.

2.2 The Instruments

The instruments used in the studies included emotional intelligence scale [52], social intelligence scale [53], sexual intelligence scale [54], religious, moral and spiritual intelligence scale [55], the multidimensional scale of sexuality [56], big-5 inventory [57], character strengths rating form [58], positive & negative affect schedule [59], charismaphobia scale [51], depression, anxiety, and stress scale [60], the GAD-7 [61], the obsessive-compulsive

inventory [62], narcissistic personality inventory [63], sexual frustration scale [64], satisfaction with life scale [65], self-esteem scale [66], body-esteem scale [67], attitudes towards infidelity scale [68], extramarital sexual permissiveness scale [69], extramarital behavioral intentions scale [70], and romantic

readiness scale [71]. All the scales used in the study were declared reliable and valid by their developers. The studies also used demographic information—questionnaires—to—obtain information on age, marital status, body-shape, skin-tone, veiling, tattooing, body piercing, wearing jewelry, makeup, and perfume.

Table 1: Psychosocial factors with a summary of the significantly higher scores based on body-shape and skin-tone

Develope 1 1 F	C1 14	*	C1* *P* -13	T C-
Psychosocial Factors		icantly Higher Scores		y Lower Scores
	Body-Shape	Skin-Tone	Body-Shape	Skin-Tone
SOCIALITY				
Social Intelligence			Fat/Chubby	
Social Engagement			Tavenuoby	
Social Engagement				
EMOTIONALITY				
Emotional Intelligence				
Positive Emotional Effects	Muscular/Curvy			
Negative Emotional Effects		Dark Brown		
SEXUALITY				
Sexual Intelligence				
Body-Esteem	Muscular/Curvy	Fairly White		
Sexual Frustration		Fairly White		
Heterosexuality		Pale White		
Homosexuality		Dark Brown		
Bisexuality		Dark Brown		
Attitudes toward Infidelity	Fat/Chubby	Dark Brown		
Extramarital Behavioral Intentions	Fat/Chubby	Light & Dark Brown		
Extramarital Sexual Permissiveness	Fat/Chubby	Dark Brown		
Romantic Readiness	·			
MORALITY				
Moral Intelligence				
Wisdom and Knowledge				
Courage				Pale White
Humanity				
Justice	Muscular/Curvy	Light Brown		
Temperance	Muscular/Curvy			
Transcendence	Slim/Thin			Dark Brown
Creativity	Slim/Thin	Fairly White		
Curiosity				
Judgment and Open mindedness				
Love of learning	Slim/Thin			
Perspective		Light Brown	Fat/Chubby	
Bravery		Light & Dark Brown	Fat/Chubby	
Perseverance				
Honesty			Fat/Chubby	
Zest				
Capacity to love and be loved	Slim/Thin	Fairly & Pale White		
Kindness				
Social Intelligence	Muscular/Curvy	Light Brown		
Teamwork			Fat/Chubby	Pale White
Fairness			Fat/Chubby	
Leadership			Fat/Chubby	Fairly White

Psychosocial Factors	Signif	icantly Higher Scores	Significantly Lower Scores				
	Body-Shape	Skin-Tone	Body-Shape	Skin-Tone			
Forgiveness and Mercy		Fairly & Pale White	Muscular/Curvy				
Modesty and Humility							
Prudence	Muscular/Curvy	Dark Brown					
Self-regulation							
Appreciation of beauty & excellence		Fairly White					
Gratitude							
Норе			Fat/Chubby				
Humor		Light Brown					
Religiousness and spirituality		Light Brown					
RELIGIOSITY							
Religious Intelligence	Fat/Chubby						
	·						
SPIRITUALITY							
Spiritual Intelligence							
PERSONALITY							
Extraversion		Fairly White					
Agreeableness		Light & Dark Brown					
Conscientiousness	Slim/Thin	Dark Brown					
Neuroticism	Fat/Chubby	Pale White & Light Brown					
Openness	j			Dark Brown			
Tattooing							
Body piercing (women only)	Curvy						
Jewelry (women only)	Curvy	Fairly White & Light Brown					
Makeup (women only)	,	, ,					
Perfume (women only)	Curvy						
Veiling (women only)	,						
3/							
PSYCHOSOCIAL WELLNESS							
Psychosocial Health							
Life Satisfaction							
Self-Esteem	Muscular/Curvy	Fairly White					
	ĺ	<u> </u>					
PSYCHOSOCIAL ILLNESS							
Depression							
Anxiety							
Stress		Pale White					
Charismaphobia	Slim/Thin	Light Brown					
Generalized Anxiety Disorder	Fat/Chubby	<u> </u>					
Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder							
Narcissistic Personality Disorder							

Notes: The body-shapes and skin-tones mentioned against each variable represent the significantly higher scores as compared to their counterparts. Empty spaces mean no significant variations found.

Table 2: Variations based on body-shape

Tubic M. Variations based on body Shape															
Variable		Muse	cular / Cur	·vy	Fa	t / Chubby	7	S	lim / Thin			_	η^2		
variable	α	M	SD	%	M	SD	%	M	SD	%	J	p			
STUDY 1 (N=953; Men=36	$STUDY\ 1\ (N=953;\ Men=364;\ Women=589;\ Married=55;\ Unmarried=898;\ Age=16-80,\ \bar{x}=21;\ Muscular/Curvy=318;\ Fat/Chubby=108;\ Slim/Thin=527)$														
Social Intelligence	.748	38.230	8.060	68.27	36.620	8.519	65.39	38.805	7.545	69.29	3.555	0.029	0.003		
Emotional Intelligence	.748	67.774	13.158	64.55	66.102	13.648	62.95	68.123	11.426	64.88	1.213	0.298	-		
Positive Emotional	.716	31.484	9.194	62.97	29.528	10.042	59.06	29.461	9.184	58.92	4.973	0.007	0.010		
Effects															
Negative Emotional	.788	25.626	10.312	51.25	27.676	11.204	55.35	26.192	9.885	52.38	1.636	0.195	-		
Effects															
STUDY 2 (N=140; Men=85	; Wome	n=55; Marr	ied=83; Ui	nmarried=	=57; Age=1	6-80, <i>x</i> =39	; Muscul	ar/Curvy=4	9; Fat/Chu	bby=39;	Slim/Thin=	52)			
Religious Intelligence	.822	62.592	4.444	89.42	65.308	4.187	93.30	62.808	5.084	89.73	4.487	0.013	0.061		
Spiritual Intelligence	.734	34.082	3.780	81.15	35.897	3.424	85.47	34.385	3.861	81.87	2.891	0.059	-		
Moral Intelligence	.780	24.204	1.871	86.44	24.154	2.466	86.26	24.039	2.497	85.85	0.069	0.933	-		

					-				/701		1	ı		
Variable	α	Muse	cular / Cui SD	°vy %	M Fa	t / Chubby SD	%	M	SD	%	f	p	η^2	
STUDY 3 (N=168; Men=76	5; Wome										Slim/Thin=	67)		
Life Satisfaction	.856	22.750	6.053	65.00	20.784	6.705	59.38	22.574	6.919	64.50	1.194	0.305	-	
STUDY 4 (N=385; Men=0;	Women	=385; Marr	ried=87; U	nmarried=	=298; Age=	17-49, $\bar{x}=2$	25; Muscu	ılar/Curvy=.	158; Fat/C	hubby=1	01; Slim/Th	nin=126)		
Sexual Intelligence	.859	38.949	8.541	69.55	35.574	9.308	63.53	35.976	9.343	64.24	1.194	0.305	-	
Sexual Frustration	.940	16.671	8.188	41.68	13.911	7.151	34.78	13.897	6.251	34.74	1.194	0.305	-	
Heterosexuality	.845	2.456	1.917	49.12	3.257	1.747	65.14	2.722	1.991	54.44	2.891	0.059	-	
Homosexuality	.874	0.570	1.361	11.40	0.297	0.922	5.94	0.405	1.037	8.10	0.069	0.933	-	
Bisexuality	.882	0.715	1.437	14.30	0.624	1.392	12.48	0.460	1.184	9.20	0.518	0.597	-	
Tattooing	-	2.089	0.726	52.23	2.000	0.663	50.00	2.111	0.596	52.78	0.848	0.429	-	
Body piercing	-	2.070	1.041	51.75	1.554	0.985	38.85	1.913	1.081	47.83	7.634	0.001	0.038	
Jewelry	-	2.722	0.851	68.05	2.327	0.763	58.18	2.579	0.852	64.48	6.991	0.001	0.035	
Makeup	-	2.620	0.826	65.50	2.406	0.815	60.15	2.468	0.756	61.70	2.516	0.082	-	
Perfume	-	3.462	0.771	86.55	3.277	0.814	81.93	3.159	0.843	78.98	5.104	0.006	0.026	
STUDY 5 (N=324; Men=3.	l; Wome	n=293; Mar	ried=60; l	Inmarried	d=264; Age	$=16-62, \bar{x}=$	24; Musc	cular/Curvy=	=102; Fat/0	Chubby=6	80; Slim/Th	nin=142)		
Psychosocial Health	.742	86.128	6.986	71.77	84.813	7.368	70.68	86.085	6.877	71.74	1.014	0.364	-	
Depression	.940	31.657	11.225	56.53	33.088	12.378	59.09	30.711	11.654	54.84	1.057	0.349	-	
Anxiety	.929	26.255	9.564	46.88	28.288	11.807	50.51	25.359	10.274	45.28	2.013	0.135	-	
Stress	.952	33.637	11.262	60.07	35.125	13.079	62.72	32.099	12.594	57.32	1.591	0.205	-	
Stress .952 33.65/ 11.262 60.0/ 35.125 13.0/9 62.72 32.099 12.594 57.32 1.591 0.205 - STUDY 6 (N=2920; Men=1080; Women=657; Married=1094; Unmarried=1826; Age=16-75, \(\bar{x}=28 \); Muscular/Curvy=1021; Fat/Chubby=1007;														
S1UD1 6 (N=2920; Men=1080; Women=657; Married=1094; Unmarried=1826; Age=16-75, x=28; Muscular/Curvy=1021; Fat/Chubby=1007; Slim/Thin=892)														
Charismaphobia	.937	64.449	19.258	67.84	57.600	18.119	60.63	67.284	17.632	70.83	70.840	0.000	0.046	
Self-Exhibition	.832	10.744	3.496	71.63	9.592	3.607	63.95	10.855	3.222	72.37	40.346	0.000	0.027	
Narcissistic Trends	.771	9.785	3.358	65.23	8.954	3.515	59.69	10.119	3.148	67.46	30.929	0.000	0.021	
Media Consumption	.902	17.398	6.443	69.59	15.710	6.484	62.84	18.231	6.232	72.92	38.827	0.000	0.026	
Charismaphobic Anxiety	.957	26.522	10.694	66.31	23.344	10.034	58.36	28.079	9.757	70.20	53.999	0.000	0.036	
STUDY 7 (N=1003; Men=2	77; Wom	en=926; Ma	arried=315	; Unmarr	ried=688; A	ge=16-69,	$\bar{x}=25$; Mi	uscular/Cur	vy=367; Fa	ıt/Chubby	=332; Slin	n/Thin=3	04)	
Generalized Anxiety	.873	9.267	5.624	44.13	11.012	5.878	52.44	9.934	5.616	47.30	8.233	0.000	0.016	
Disorder														
Obsessive-Compulsive	.887	27.332	13.714	37.96	28.892	13.562	40.13	27.849	14.001	38.68	1.148	0.318	-	
Disorder														
Narcissistic Personality	.654	3.534	2.570	22.09	3.572	2.569	22.33	3.309	2.567	20.68	0.967	0.381	-	
Disorder														
STUDY 8 (N=879; Men=20	61; Wom	en=618; Ma	urried=293	; Unmarr	ied=586; Ag	ge=17-75,	$\bar{x}=32$; Mi	uscular/Cur	vy=422; Fa	ıt/Chubby	=130; Slin	n/Thin=32	27)	
Self-Esteem	.846	25.297	6.824	63.24	21.669	5.428	54.17	21.309	6.379	53.27	39.704	0.000	0.083	
Body-Esteem	.925	132.059	18.194	80.04	120.323	17.935	72.92	126.274	16.439	76.53	25.346	0.000	0.055	
STUDY 9 (N=555; Men=13	38; Wom	en=417; Ma	arried=101	; Unmarr	ied=454; Ag	ge=16-60,	$\bar{x}=23$; Mi	uscular/Cur	vy=113; Fa	ıt/Chubby	=142; Slin	n/Thin=3	90)	
Extraversion	.715	23.805	4.217	59.51	24.092	5.220	60.23	24.339	5.403	60.85	0.463	0.630	-	
Agreeableness	.772	33.221	3.979	73.82	33.416	3.774	74.26	33.556	4.340	74.57	0.275	0.759	-	
Conscientiousness	.773	28.443	3.349	63.21	28.759	3.902	63.91	29.637	4.408	65.86	4.463	0.012	0.016	
Neuroticism	.758	28.142	5.149	70.36	29.007	5.388	72.52	27.423	5.626	68.56	4.103	0.017	0.015	
Openness	.750	35.571	4.429	71.14	35.021	3.596	70.04	35.555	3.347	71.11	1.148	0.318	-	
STUDY 10 (N=278; Men=	139; Wor	nen=139; M	1arried=27	8; Unmar	ried=0; Age	$e=18-62, \bar{x}$	=34; Mus	scular/Curvy	=147; Fat	/Chubby=	=18; Slim/T	Thin=113))	
Wisdom and Knowledge	.867	25.320	7.914	56.27	23.780	9.735	52.84	27.160	7.113	60.36	2.583	0.077	-	
Courage	.883	20.380	7.342	56.61	16.940	6.949	47.06	20.750	5.672	57.64	2.536	0.081	-	
Humanity	.820	16.070	5.454	59.52	14.560	6.455	53.93	16.880	4.284	62.52	1.952	0.144	-	
Justice	.750	16.560	4.484	61.33	13.440	3.222	49.78	15.730	3.328	58.26	5.458	0.005	0.038	
Temperance	.700	24.150	2.487	67.08	22.330	2.567	62.03	23.900	2.427	66.39	4.357	0.014	0.031	
Transcendence	.741	32.690	3.434	72.64	30.500	6.465	67.78	33.110	2.923	73.58	4.290	0.015	0.030	
Creativity	-	4.390	2.182	62.71	4.890	2.867	69.86	5.520	2.163	78.86	8.319	0.000	0.057	
Curiosity	-	5.360	1.696	76.57	5.220	1.768	74.57	5.680	1.733	81.14	1.338	0.264	-	
Judgment and Open	-	5.410	1.759	77.29	4.830	2.007	69.00	5.360	1.615	76.57	0.920	0.400	-	
mindedness														
Love of learning	-	4.620	2.277	66.00	4.440	2.706	63.43	5.420	2.141	77.43	4.451	0.013	0.031	
Perspective	-	5.540	1.606	79.14	4.390	1.243	62.71	5.180	1.283	74.00	5.821	0.003	0.041	
Bravery	-	5.460	1.885	78.00	3.890	1.231	55.57	5.070	1.492	72.43	7.442	0.001	0.051	
Perseverance	-	4.610	2.277	65.86	4.220	2.625	60.29	4.790	1.882	68.43	0.608	0.545	-	
Honesty	-	5.170	2.481	73.86	4.220	2.211	60.29	5.680	2.067	81.14	3.743	0.025	0.026	
Zest	-	5.140	1.560	73.43	4.610	1.461	65.86	5.210	1.385	74.43	1.273	0.282	-	

X7 * 11		Muse	cular / Cui	rvy	Fa	t / Chubby	7	S	lim / Thin				,
Variable	α	M	SD	%	M	SD	%	M	SD	%	f	p	η^2
Capacity to love and be	-	5.400	1.529	77.14	5.720	2.164	81.71	6.180	1.477	88.29	7.943	0.000	0.055
loved													
Kindness	-	5.350	2.564	76.43	4.830	2.854	69.00	5.910	2.098	84.43	2.564	0.079	-
Social Intelligence	-	5.320	1.972	76.00	4.000	1.970	57.14	4.800	1.554	68.57	5.714	0.004	0.040
Teamwork	-	4.890	2.291	69.86	3.780	1.927	54.00	4.480	1.626	64.00	3.126	0.045	0.022
Fairness	-	5.470	1.737	78.14	4.720	1.873	67.43	5.810	1.540	83.00	3.705	0.026	0.026
Leadership	-	6.200	1.433	88.57	4.940	0.802	70.57	5.440	1.541	77.71	12.297	0.000	0.082
Forgiveness and Mercy	-	5.920	1.241	84.57	6.170	1.543	88.14	6.400	1.098	91.43	5.059	0.007	0.035
Modesty and Humility	-	6.440	1.014	92.00	6.060	1.305	86.57	6.310	1.061	90.14	1.256	0.286	-
Prudence	-	5.950	1.265	85.00	5.000	1.495	71.43	5.520	1.317	78.86	6.264	0.002	0.044
Self-regulation	-	5.850	1.305	83.57	5.110	1.779	73.00	5.670	1.353	81.00	2.546	0.080	-
Appreciation of beauty & excellence	-	6.400	1.077	91.43	6.060	1.211	86.57	6.590	0.951	94.14	2.533	0.081	-
Gratitude	-	6.400	1.071	91.43	6.000	1.815	85.71	6.490	1.087	92.71	1.432	0.241	-
Норе	-	6.540	0.967	93.43	5.830	1.790	83.29	6.420	0.989	91.71	3.788	0.024	0.027
Humor	-	6.680	1.277	95.43	6.330	1.680	90.43	6.800	1.095	97.14	1.152	0.317	-
Religiousness and spirituality	-	6.660	0.990	95.14	6.280	1.320	89.71	6.810	1.090	97.29	2.212	0.111	-
STUDY 11 (N=1348; Men=	=1034; W	Vomen=350;	Married=	1348; Un	married=0;	Age=18-8	5, $\bar{x}=39$;	Muscular/C	urvv=517;	Fat/Chub	bbv=464; S	Slim/Thin=	=403)
Attitudes toward Infidelity	.875	49.708	16.841	59.18	52.690	17.650	62.73	49.325	17.325	58.72	5.192	0.006	0.007
Extramarital Behavioral Intentions	.958	25.331	10.806	72.37	26.153	10.560	74.72	23.690	11.299	67.69	5.679	0.003	0.008
Extramarital Sexual Permissiveness	.974	12.516	4.279	78.23	12.750	4.403	79.69	11.826	4.761	73.91	4.926	0.007	0.007
STUDY 12 (N=572; Men=6); Wome	n=572; Mar	ried=86; l	Inmarried	l=486; Age	=18 - 61, x̄=	24; Musc	ular/Curvy	=147; Fat/	Chubby=	116; Slim/1	Thin=309,)
Veiling (women only)	-	0.517	0.501	51.70	0.483	0.502	48.30	0.521	0.500	52.10	0.255	0.775	-
STUDY 13 (N=324; Men=	140; Wor	nen=184; N	farried=11	4; Unmar	ried=210; A	Age=16-60	$\bar{x}=26; N$	Iuscular/Cu	rvy=130; I	at/Chubb	by=77; Slin	n/Thin=1	17)
Romantic Readiness	.956	95.446	31.772	56.81	94.805	30.209	56.43	89.880	30.694	53.50	1.113	0.330	-
Romantic Readiness for	.963	59.200	17.975	70.48	57.571	15.955	68.54	55.504	15.950	66.08	1.493	0.226	-
Partner													
Romantic Readiness for Stranger	.983	36.246	22.672	43.15	37.234	21.434	44.33	34.376	21.213	40.92	0.441	0.644	-
STUDY 14 (N=242; Men=5	99; Wom	en=143; Ma	arried=26;	Unmarrie	ed=216; Ag	$e = 16-76, \bar{x}$	=23; Mus	scular/Curv	v=72; Fat/	Chubby=.	54; Slim/Ti	hin=116)	
Social Engagement	.774	87.651	18.275	52.17	86.770	16.631	51.65	86.278	17.594	51.36	0.133	0.875	-

2.3 Procedure

The studies received approval from the Departmental Ethic Review Committee at COMSATS University Islamabad, Pakistan. The data collection procedures strictly adhered to the principles outlined in the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its subsequent revisions. Prospective participants recruited online. Prior to their involvement, participants were provided with comprehensive information about the study's objectives. Their consent to participate was obtained. Furthermore, participants were guaranteed the confidentiality of their data and were sincerely thankful for their valuable contributions to the research.

2.4 Analysis

The collected data were entered and organized using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences. The data were cleaned to have better homoscedasticity and avoid possible multicollinearity. To assess the reliability of the instruments, Cronbach's alpha was calculated. The primary statistical analysis employed in this study was ANOVA, which was used to examine the variance among individuals with different body shapes and skin tones.

3. RESULTS

Results of the 14 phases of the present study were summarized (Table 1) and compared on the basis of body shape (Table 2) and skin tone (Table 3). Muscular men and curvy women reflected significantly higher levels of self-esteem (Muscular/Curvy=63.24%, Fat/Chubby=54.17%, Slim/Thin=53.27%; p=0.000; η 2=0.083), body-esteem (Muscular/Curvy=80.04%,

Fat/Chubby=72.92%, Slim/Thin=76.53%; p=0.000; η2=0.055), positive emotional effects (Muscular/Curvy=62.97%,

Fat/Chubby=59.06%, Slim/Thin=58.92%; p=0.007; η2=0.01), justice (Muscular/Curvy=61.33%,

Fat/Chubby=49.78%, Slim/Thin=58.26%; p=0.005; η2=0.038), temperance (Muscular/Curvy=67.08%,

Fat/Chubby=62.03%, Slim/Thin=66.39%; p=0.014; η 2=0.031), and prudence (Muscular/Curvy=85%, Fat/Chubby=71.43%, Slim/Thin=78.86%; p=0.002; η 2=0.044). On the other hand, they also reflected significantly lower levels of forgiveness & mercy (Muscular/Curvy=84.57%,

Fat/Chubby=88.14%, Slim/Thin=91.43%; p=0.007; η 2=0.035). In terms of beautification, curvy women were involved significantly more body piercing (Curvy= 51.75%, Fat/Chubby=38.85%, Slim/Thin=47.83%; p=0.001; η 2=0.038), wearing jewelry (Curvy= 68.05%, Fat/Chubby=58.18%, Slim/Thin=64.48%; p=0.001; η 2=0.035) and perfume (Muscular/Curvy=86.55%, Slim/Thin=78.98%; Fat/Chubby=81.93%, $p=0.006; \eta 2=0.026).$

Fat/chubby men and women reflected significantly higher levels of religious intelligence (Muscular/Curvy=89.42%, Fat/Chubby=93.3%, Slim/Thin=89.73%; p=0.013; η2=0.061). On the other hand, they also reflected significantly higher levels of attitudes toward infidelity (Muscular/Curvy=59.18%,

Fat/Chubby=62.73%, Slim/Thin=58.72%; p=0.006; η2=0.007), extramarital behavioral

intentions (Muscular/Curvy=72.37%, Fat/Chubby=74.72%, Slim/Thin=67.69%; p=0.003; η 2=0.008), extramarital sexual permissiveness (Muscular/Curvy=78.23%, Fat/Chubby=79.69%, Slim/Thin=73.91%; p=0.007; η 2=0.007), neuroticism (Muscular/Curvy=70.36%,

Fat/Chubby=72.52%, Slim/Thin=68.56%; p=0.017; η 2=0.015), and generalized anxiety disorder (Muscular/Curvy=44.13%, Fat/Chubby=52.44%, Slim/Thin=47.3%; p=0.000; η 2=0.016). Moreover, they reflected significantly lower levels of social intelligence (Muscular/Curvy=68.27%,

Fat/Chubby=65.39%, Slim/Thin=69.29%; p=0.029; η2=0.003), perspective (Muscular/Curvy=79.14%,

Slim/Thin=74%; Fat/Chubby=62.71%, p=0.003; $\eta 2 = 0.041$), bravery (Muscular/Curvy=78%, Fat/Chubby=55.57%, Slim/Thin=72.43%; p=0.001; $\eta 2 = 0.051$), honesty (Muscular/Curvy=73.86%, Slim/Thin=81.14; Fat/Chubby=60.29%, p=0.025; $\eta 2 = 0.026$), teamwork (Muscular/Curvy=69.86%, Fat/Chubby=54%, Slim/Thin=64%; p=0.045; $\eta 2=0.022$), fairness (Muscular/Curvy=78.14%,

Fat/Chubby=67.43%, Slim/Thin=83%; p=0.026; η2=0.026), leadership (Muscular/Curvy=88.57%,

Fat/Chubby=70.57%, Slim/Thin=77.71%; p=0.000; η2=0.082), and hope (Muscular/Curvy=93.43%,

Fat/Chubby=83.29%, Slim/Thin=91.71%; p=0.024; η2=0.027).

Slim/thin men and women reflected significantly higher levels of transcendence (Muscular/Curvy=72.64%,

Fat/Chubby=67.78%, Slim/Thin=73.58%; p=0.015; η2=0.03), creativity (Muscular/Curvy=62.71%,

Fat/Chubby=69.86%, Slim/Thin=78.86%; p=0.000; η2=0.057), love of learning

(Muscular/Curvy=66%, Fat/Chubby=63.43%, Slim/Thin=77.43%; p=0.013; η 2=0.031), capacity to love & beloved (Muscular/Curvy=77.14%, Fat/Chubby=81.71%, Slim/Thin=88.29%; p=0.000; η 2=0.055), and conscientiousness (Muscular/Curvy=63.21%,

Fat/Chubby=63.91%, Slim/Thin=65.86%; p=0.012; η 2=0.016). On the other hand, they also reflected significantly higher levels of charismaphobia (Muscular/Curvy=67.84%, Fat/Chubby=60.63%, Slim/Thin=70.83%; p=0.000; η 2=0.046).

Table 3: Variations based on skin-tone

		Fairly White			1	Pale White		L	ight Brown		Dark Brown					
Variable	α	М	SD	%	M	SD	%	М	SD	%	М	SD	%	f	p	η^2
STUDY 1 (N=953; Men=364; W	Vomen=58	89; Married=.	55; Unmarri	ed=898; A	$ge=16-80, \bar{x}=$	21; Fairly V	Vhite=177;	Pale White=	242; Light B	rown=437	Dark Brown	=97)		L		
Social Intelligence	.728	39.186	8.151	69.98	38.087	7.854	68.01	38.378	7.491	68.53	37.505	8.838	66.97	1.135	0.334	-
Emotional Intelligence	.748	68.034	13.022	64.79	67.789	12.496	64.56	67.725	11.663	64.50	67.515	13.325	64.30	0.043	0.988	-
Positive Emotional Effects	.716	29.610	9.763	59.22	30.033	9.102	60.07	30.147	9.283	60.29	31.381	9.295	62.76	0.773	0.509	-
Negative Emotional Effects	.788	26.017	11.090	52.03	25.413	9.637	50.83	25.895	10.077	51.79	29.588	9.822	59.18	4.243	0.005	0.013
STUDY 2 (N=140; Men=85; Wo	STUDY 2 (N=140; Men=85; Women=55; Married=83; Unmarried=57; Age=16-80, x=39; Fairly White=24; Pale White=37; Light Brown=60; Dark Brown=19)															
Religious Intelligence	.822	62.833	4.833	89.76	62.838	4.729	89.77	63.600	4.727	90.86	64.790	4.744	92.56	0.863	0.462	-
Spiritual Intelligence	.734	34.458	3.978	82.04	34.027	3.819	81.02	36.000	4.346	85.71	36.000	4.346	85.71	1.201	0.312	-
Moral Intelligence	.780	25.042	2.136	89.44	23.973	2.511	85.62	23.867	2.228	85.24	24.105	1.941	86.09	1.638	0.183	-
STUDY 3 (N=168; Men=76; Women=92; Married=73; Unmarried=95; Age=16-80, x=33; Fairly White=30; Pale White=49; Light Brown=59; Dark Brown=30)																
Life Satisfaction	.856	23.582	7.431	67.38	23.531	5.690	67.23	20.576	6.836	58.79	22.100	5.938	63.14	2.377	0.072	-
STUDY 4 (N=385; Men=0; Won	nen=385;	Married=87	Unmarried	=298; Age	$=17-49, \bar{x}=25$; Fairly Wh	ite=125; Pa	ale White=15	9; Light Bro	wn=64; Do	urk Brown=37	9)				
Sexual Intelligence	.859	38.840	9.256	69.36	35.717	8.216	63.78	38.281	8.415	68.36	35.027	12.112	62.55	2.377	0.072	-
Sexual Frustration	.940	16.328	7.804	40.82	13.774	6.164	34.44	15.234	7.417	38.09	15.784	10.182	39.46	2.970	0.032	0.023
Heterosexuality	.845	2.352	2.013	47.04	3.132	1.842	62.64	2.730	2.023	54.60	2.730	2.023	54.60	4.096	0.007	0.031
Homosexuality	.874	0.408	1.056	8.16	0.277	0.934	5.54	0.641	1.373	12.82	0.946	1.699	18.92	4.179	0.006	0.032
Bisexuality	.882	0.792	1.547	15.84	0.390	1.102	7.80	0.609	1.190	12.18	0.919	1.706	18.38	2.860	0.037	0.022
Tattooing	-	2.112	0.805	52.80	2.069	0.586	51.73	1.953	0.486	48.83	2.162	0.764	54.05	1.047	0.372	-
Body piercing		1.920	1.044	48.00	1.918	1.055	47.95	1.730	1.170	43.25	1.730	1.170	43.25	0.461	0.709	-
Jewelry	-	2.704	0.862	67.60	2.415	0.740	60.38	2.703	0.885	67.58	2.568	1.015	64.20	3.446	0.017	0.026
Makeup		2.672	0.831	66.80	2.459	0.753	61.48	2.391	0.769	59.78	2.432	0.929	60.80	2.515	0.058	-
Perfume	-	3.416	0.764	85.40	3.314	0.820	82.85	3.188	0.906	79.70	3.189	0.776	79.73	1.462	0.225	-
STUDY 5 (N=324; Men=31; Wo	men=293	; Married=6); Unmarrie	d=264; Ag	$e=16-62, \bar{x}=2$	4; Fairly W	hite=35; Pe	ale White=15	7; Light Bro	wn=96; Do	ark Brown=36	5)				
Psychosocial Health	.742	86.143	6.942	71.79	86.503	6.855	72.09	84.719	7.585	70.60	85.139	6.193	70.95	1.417	0.238	-
STUDY5																
Depression	.940	29.600	12.008	52.86	32.809	11.722	58.59	29.222	10.855	52.18	29.222	10.855	52.18	1.431	0.234	-
Anxiety	.929	26.200	9.232	46.79	27.548	11.204	49.19	25.781	10.216	46.04	22.917	8.453	40.92	2.083	0.102	-
Stress	.952	33.771	11.634	60.31	35.198	12.615	62.85	31.760	11.561	56.71	28.944	12.604	51.69	3.318	0.020	0.030
STUDY 6 (N=2920; Men=1080;	; Women=	657; Married	l=1094; Uni	narried=18	826; Age=16-	75, x=28; F	airly White	=534; Pale V	White=1478;	Light Brow	n=605; Dark	Brown=30.	3)			
Charismaphobia	.937	63.642	19.546	66.99	61.354	18.705	64.58	67.703	17.390	71.27	60.053	19.099	63.21	19.406	0.000	0.020
Self-Exhibition	.832	10.697	3.524	71.31	10.100	3.557	67.33	9.951	3.704	66.34	9.951	3.704	66.34	12.723	0.000	0.013
Narcissistic Trends	.771	9.575	3.415	63.83	9.382	3.439	62.55	10.228	3.230	68.19	9.455	3.232	63.03	9.251	0.000	0.009
Media Consumption	.902	16.833	6.660	67.33	16.819	6.476	67.28	18.240	5.940	72.96	16.380	6.907	65.52	8.777	0.000	0.009
Charismaphobic Anxiety	.957	26.538	10.573	66.35	25.054	10.224	62.64	28.230	10.269	70.58	24.267	10.121	60.67	16.907	0.000	0.017
STUDY 7 (N=1003; Men=77; W	Vomen=92	26; Married=.	315; Unmari	ried=688; .	4ge=16-69, x	=25; Fairly	White=168	; Pale White	=489; Light	Brown=22.	5; Dark Brow	n=121)				
Generalized Anxiety	.873	9.762	5.722	46.49	10.464	5.694	49.83	9.889	5.669	47.09	9.050	6.052	43.10	2.276	0.078	-
Disorder																
Obsessive-Compulsive	.887	28.589	15.201	39.71	28.481	13.133	39.56	26.008	13.804	36.12	26.008	13.804	36.12	1.209	0.305	-
Disorder																igsquare
Narcissistic Personality	.654	3.494	2.769	21.84	3.470	2.545	21.69	3.453	2.581	21.58	3.537	2.377	22.11	0.032	0.992	-
Disorder								<u> </u>			<u> </u>					
STUDY 8 (N=879; Men=261; W	Vomen=61	8; Married=	293; Unmari	ried=586; .	$4ge=17-75, \bar{x}$	=32; Fairly	White=240	; Pale White	=275; Light	Brown=13	4; Dark Brow	n=230)	1	1	1	
Self-Esteem	.846	25.609	6.694	64.02	21.066	6.148	52.67	23.231	6.354	58.08	23.513	6.898	58.78	20.810	0.000	0.067
Body-Esteem	.925	134.579	17.139	81.56	122.453	16.674	74.21	128.770	18.061	78.04	128.770	18.061	78.04	20.882	0.000	0.067
STUDY 9 (N=555; Men=138; W	Vomen=4	7; Married=	101; Unmari	ried=454; .	$4ge = 16-60, \bar{x}$	=23; Fairly	White=218	; Pale White	=146; Light	Brown=16	l; Dark Brow	n=30)	1	1	1	
Extraversion	.715	25.078	4.826	62.70	23.333	5.885	58.33	23.571	4.448	58.93	24.733	5.901	61.83	4.487	0.004	0.024
Agreeableness	.772	33.507	3.807	74.46	33.848	4.706	75.22	35.267	3.393	78.37	35.267	3.393	78.37	4.369	0.005	0.023

Marche Part Marche Part Marche March Marche Marche Marche Marche Marche Marche March			E	airly White	Thite Pale White				I	ight Brown		D	ark Brown				
March 1968	Variable	α			%			%			%			%	f	p	η^2
Mathematical Math	Conscientiousness	.773													4.040	0.007	0.022
Section of Minorian Register Section Sec	Neuroticism	.758	27.307	4.697	68.27	28.870	5.985	72.18	28.429	5.539	71.07	26.033	7.242	65.08	4.032	0.007	0.021
Mathematic Content	Openness	.750	34.972	3.547	69.94	36.331	3.718	72.66	34.832	3.635	69.66	37.433	2.661	74.87	8.881	0.000	0.046
Campaign	STUDY 10 (N=278; Men=139;	Women=	139; Married=	=278; Unma	rried=0; A	$ge=18-62, \bar{x}=$	34; Fairly V	White=17; I	Pale White=1	17; Light Bro	own=44; L	ark Brown=1	100)				
Professionary 1,000	Wisdom and Knowledge	.867	27.650	6.576	61.44	26.290	8.374	58.42	26.950	5.823	59.89	24.870	7.929	55.27	1.237	0.297	-
Marie Name	Courage	.883	20.350	5.776	56.53	19.090	6.386	53.03	20.830	7.560	57.86	20.830	7.560	57.86	2.921	0.034	0.031
Tempersener 1,00	Humanity	.820	17.650	4.936	65.37	16.030	5.197	59.37	17.640	3.798	65.33	15.820	5.433	58.59	1.826	0.143	-
Procession	Justice	.750	14.760	3.153	54.67	14.360	2.839	53.19	18.110	4.001	67.07	17.260	4.547	63.93	16.604	0.000	0.154
Carboniny	Temperance	.700	24.180	2.877	67.17	24.210	2.561	67.25	23.340	2.587	64.83	23.830	2.292	66.19	1.404	0.242	-
Commonsion Commons	Transcendence	.741	33.000	4.330	73.33	33.180	3.218	73.73	33.570	2.405	74.60	31.750	4.011	70.56	4.147	0.007	0.043
Marient and Cyan	Creativity	-	6.410	1.906	91.57	5.560	2.517	79.43	3.840	1.785	54.86	3.840	1.785	54.86	14.964	0.000	0.141
Ministrian Column	Curiosity	-	6.000	1.658	85.71	5.680	1.775	81.14	5.410	1.703	77.29	5.200	1.639	74.29	1.953	0.121	-
Properties Pro	Judgment and Open	-	5.650	1.412	80.71	5.200	1.777	74.29	5.430	1.336	77.57	5.460	1.845	78.00	0.647	0.586	-
Persentence	mindedness																
Processor Proc	Love of learning	-	5.180	2.270	74.00	5.150	2.369	73.57	5.270	1.933	75.29	4.480	2.276	64.00	2.097	0.101	-
Perserrance Color	Perspective	-	4.410	0.795	63.00	4.700	1.176	67.14	6.000	1.381	85.71	5.890	1.582	84.14	20.387	0.000	0.182
Mathematy Control Co	Bravery	-	4.590	0.870	65.57	4.410	1.314	63.00	5.810	1.937	83.00	5.810	1.937	83.00	21.099	0.000	0.188
Part	Perseverance	-	4.710	2.201	67.29	4.560	2.222	65.14	4.800	1.651	68.57	4.710	2.262	67.29	0.170	0.917	-
Capacity to love and be local 1.60	Honesty	-	5.820	2.270	83.14	5.180	2.325	74.00	5.800	1.875	82.86	5.180	2.504	74.00	1.142	0.333	-
No.	Zest	-	5.240	1.480	74.86	4.940	1.334	70.57	5.610	1.588	80.14	5.130	1.581	73.29	2.247	0.083	-
Mindesseria Color	Capacity to love and be	-	6.760	1.602	96.57	6.210	1.679	88.71	5.590	1.335	79.86	5.080	1.316	72.57	13.000	0.000	0.125
Second line ling ling line Corporation	loved																
Parametric Column	Kindness	-	6.180	2.325	88.29	5.550	2.497		5.240	2.503	74.86	5.240	2.503	74.86	1.442	0.231	-
Friences 6. 8.540 8.450 8.450 8.460 8.360 8.360 8.360 8.663 8.670 8.580 8.580 8.540 8.540 8.540 8.540 8.540 8.00 8.00 0.233 8.00 8.00 8.250 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.250 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.250 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.250 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.250 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.250 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.250 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.	Social Intelligence	-	4.710	1.572	67.29	4.270	1.579	61.00	6.050	1.397	86.43	5.500	1.992	78.57	15.438	0.000	0.145
Leadership	Teamwork	-	4.180	1.551	59.71	3.910	1.608	55.86	5.640	1.831	80.57	5.170	2.314	73.86	12.484	0.000	0.120
Produces and Merry Corporation Corpora	Fairness	-	5.940	1.435	84.86	5.360	1.663	76.57	5.980	1.486	85.43	5.540	1.806	79.14	1.763	0.154	-
Modesty and Humility	Leadership	-	4.650		66.43	5.090	1.390	72.71		1.577	92.86	6.550	1.104	93.57	30.861	0.000	
Production Pro	Forgiveness and Mercy	-	6.760	1.147	96.57	6.760	1.048	96.57	5.470	1.058	78.14	5.470	1.058	78.14	30.867	0.000	0.253
Self-regulation Care Car	Modesty and Humility	-						92.57			87.71			90.00			-
Appreciation of beauty &	Prudence	-				5.350					81.43		1.107	88.43	8.102		0.081
Second column	Self-regulation	-															-
Cartitude		-	6.820	0.809	97.43	6.500	1.022	92.86	6.770	0.961	96.71	6.210	1.085	88.71	4.105	0.007	0.043
Hope			6.650	1.455	05.00	6 500	1 110	02.86	6 190	1 175	99.20	6 190	1 175	99.20	2 229	0.075	
Humor - 6.470 1.328 92.43 6.870 1.087 98.14 6.910 0.984 98.71 6.460 1.438 92.29 2.667 0.048 0.029 0.032																	
Religiousness and spirituality 0.33 0.39 0.71 0.850 0.887 0.887 0.887 0.887 0.889 0.895																	0.028
STUDY II (N=1384; Men=1034; Women=350; Married=1384; Unmarried=0; Age=18-85, x̄=39; Fairty White=376; Pale White=335; Light Brown=319; Dark Brown=354) Attitudes toward Infidelity 8.75 51.742 17.705 61.60 46.585 17.439 55.46 50.636 17.044 60.28 53.138 16.376 63.26 9.255 0.000 0.020 Extramarital Behavioral 9.958 25.976 10.783 74.22 22.636 11.305 64.67 26.780 10.166 76.51 26.780 10.166 76.51 9.505 0.000 0.020 Intentions		-															
STUDY II (N=1384; Mom=1034; Women=350; Married=1384; Unmarried=0; Age=18-85, x̄=39; Fairly White=376; Pale White=335; Light Brown=319; Dark Brown=354) Attitudes toward Infidelity 875 51.742 17.705 61.60 46.885 17.439 55.46 50.636 17.044 60.28 53.138 16.376 63.26 9.255 0.000 0.020 Extramarital Behavioral Intentions .958 25.976 10.783 74.22 22.636 11.305 64.67 26.780 10.166 76.51 26.780 10.166 76.51 9.505 0.000 0.020 Intentions Bextramarital Sexual .974 12.822 4.286 80.14 11.218 4.808 70.11 12.373 4.435 77.33 13.071 4.183 81.69 11.814 0.000 0.025 Permissiveness STUDY 12 (N=572; Men=0; Women=572; Married=86; Unmarried=486; Age=18-61, x̄=24; Fairly White=114; Pale White=241; Light Brown=173; Dark Brown=417 Dark Brown=417 Veiling (women only) - 0.535 0.531 9.59 9.496 0.501 48.60 0.501 48.60 0.409 0.497	-	_	0.550	1./70	70.71	0.050	0.007	77.00	0.070	0.073	70.43	0.500	1.037	72.00	5.001	0.027	0.032
Attitudes toward Infidelity 8.75 51.742 17.705 61.60 46.585 17.439 55.46 50.636 17.044 60.28 53.138 16.376 63.26 9.255 0.000 0.020 Extramarital Behavioral 9.58 25.976 10.783 74.22 22.636 11.305 64.67 26.780 10.166 76.51 26.780 10.166 76.51 9.505 0.000 0.020 Intentions		4; Women	=350; Marrie	d=1384: Un	married=0); Age=18-85	, x=39: Fair	ly White=3	76; Pale Whi	te=335: Ligh	ht Brown=	319; Dark Br	own=354)		1		
Extramarital Behavioral No. 958 25.976 10.783 74.22 22.636 11.305 64.67 26.780 10.166 76.51 26.780 10.166 76.51 9.505 0.000 0.020 Extramarital Sexual No. 974 12.822 4.286 80.14 11.218 4.808 70.11 12.373 4.435 77.33 13.071 4.183 81.69 11.814 0.000 0.025 Permissiveness STUDY 12 (N=572; Men=0; Women=572; Married=86; Unmarried=486; Age=18-61, x̄=24; Fairly White=114; Pale White=241; Light Brown=173; Dark Brown=44. Veiling (women only) - 0.535 0.501 53.50 0.539 0.499 53.90 0.499 53.90 0.490 0.501 0.								ĺ						63.26	9.255	0.000	0.020
Intentions	,																
Extramarital Sexual Permissiveness				23.700											,		3.320
Permissiveness STUDY 12 (N=572; Man=0; Women=572; Married=86; Unmarried=86; S_2 = 18-61, x̄=24; Fairly White=114; Pale White=241; Light Brown=173; Dark Brown=441. Veiling (women only) - 0.535 0.501 53.50 0.539 0.499 53.90 0.486 0.501 48.60 0.409 0.497 40.90 1.105 0.347 - STUDY 13 (N=324; Men=140; Women=184; Married=114; Unmarried=210; Age=16-60, x̄=26; Fairly White=76; Pale White=82; Light Brown=117; Dark Brown=49 Romantic Readiness 0.956 93.211 32.319 55.48 89.296 31.094 53.15 93.812 31.846 55.84 98.878 26.914 58.86 0.985 0.400 - Romantic Readiness for 0.963 58.368 18.081 69.49 56.370 16.755 67.11 59.612 14.848 70.97 59.612 14.848 70.97 0.491 0.688 - Partner Romantic Readiness for 0.983 34.842 21.560 41.48 32.926 21.999 39.20 36.897 22.469 43.93 39.265 20.487 46.74 1.025 0.382 - Stranger STUDY 14 (N=242; Men=99; Women=143; Married=26; Unmarried=216; Age=16-76, x̄=23; Fairly White=56; Pale White=77; Light Brown=86; Dark Brown=23)	Extramarital Sexual	.974	12.822	4.286	80.14	11.218	4.808	70.11	12.373	4.435	77.33	13.071	4.183	81.69	11.814	0.000	0.025
Veiling (women only) - 0.535 0.501 53.50 0.539 0.499 53.90 0.486 0.501 48.60 0.409 0.497 40.90 1.105 0.347 - STUDY 13 (N=324; Men=140; Women=184; Married=114; Unmarried=210; Age=16-60, \$\bar{x}=26; Fairly White=76; Pale White=82; Light Brown=117; Dark Brown=49																	
Veiling (women only) - 0.535 0.501 53.50 0.539 0.499 53.90 0.486 0.501 48.60 0.409 0.497 40.90 1.105 0.347 - STUDY 13 (N=324; Men=140; Women=184; Married=114; Unmarried=210; Age=16-60, \$\bar{x}=26; Fairly White=76; Pale White=82; Light Brown=117; Dark Brown=49	STUDY 12 (N=572; Men=0; Wo	omen=572	2; Married=86	S; Unmarrie	d=486; Age	$e=18-61, \bar{x}=2$	4; Fairly W	hite=114; 1	Pale White=2	41; Light Br	own=173;	Dark Brown=	:44)				
STUDY 13 (N=324; Men=140; Women=184; Married=114; Unmarried=210; Age=16-60, x̄=26; Fairly White=76; Pale White=82; Light Brown=117; Dark Brown=49 Romantic Readiness .956 93.211 32.319 55.48 89.296 31.094 53.15 93.812 31.846 55.84 98.878 26.914 58.86 0.985 0.400 - Romantic Readiness for .963 58.368 18.081 69.49 56.370 16.755 67.11 59.612 14.848 70.97 59.612 14.848 70.97 0.491 0.688 - Partner Romantic Readiness for .983 34.842 21.560 41.48 32.926 21.999 39.20 36.897 22.469 43.93 39.265 20.487 46.74 1.025 0.382 - Stranger STUDY 14 (N=242; Men=99; Women=143; Married=26; Unmarried=216; Age=16-76, x̄=23; Fairly White=56; Pale White=77; Light Brown=86; Dark Brown=23)		-												40.90	1.105	0.347	-
Romantic Readiness 956 93.211 32.319 55.48 89.296 31.094 53.15 93.812 31.846 55.84 98.878 26.914 58.86 0.985 0.400 - Romantic Readiness for 9.63 58.368 18.081 69.49 56.370 16.755 67.11 59.612 14.848 70.97 59.612 14.848 70.97 0.491 0.688 - Partner Romantic Readiness for 9.83 34.842 21.560 41.48 32.926 21.999 39.20 36.897 22.469 43.93 39.265 20.487 46.74 1.025 0.382 - Stranger STUDY 14 (N=242; Men=99; Women=143; Married=26; Unmarried=216; Age=16-76, x=23; Fairly White=56; Pale White=77; Light Brown=86; Dark Brown=23)		Women=	184; Married=	=114; Unmai	rried=210;	Age=16-60,	x=26; Fairly	w White=76	; Pale White	=82; Light B	rown=117,	Dark Brown	=49)				
Partner Romantic Readiness for .983 34.842 21.560 41.48 32.926 21.999 39.20 36.897 22.469 43.93 39.265 20.487 46.74 1.025 0.382 - Stranger STUDY 14 (N=242; Men=99; Women=143; Married=26; Unmarried=216; Age=16-76, x̄=23; Fairly White=56; Pale White=77; Light Brown=86; Dark Brown=23)	•									T -				58.86	0.985	0.400	-
Romantic Readiness for .983 34.842 21.560 41.48 32.926 21.999 39.20 36.897 22.469 43.93 39.265 20.487 46.74 1.025 0.382 - Stranger .5TUDY 14 (N=242; Men=99; Women=143; Married=26; Unmarried=216; Age=16-76, x=23; Fairly White=56; Pale White=77; Light Brown=86; Dark Brown=23)	Romantic Readiness for	.963	58.368	18.081	69.49	56.370	16.755	67.11	59.612	14.848	70.97	59.612	14.848	70.97	0.491	0.688	-
Stranger STUDY 14 (N=242; Men=99; Women=143; Married=26; Unmarried=216; Age=16-76, x=23; Fairly White=56; Pale White=77; Light Brown=86; Dark Brown=23)	Partner																
STUDY 14 (N=242; Men=99; Women=143; Married=26; Unmarried=216; Age=16-76, x=23; Fairly White=56; Pale White=77; Light Brown=86; Dark Brown=23)	Romantic Readiness for	.983	34.842	21.560	41.48	32.926	21.999	39.20	36.897	22.469	43.93	39.265	20.487	46.74	1.025	0.382	-
	Stranger		<u> </u>									<u> </u>					
Social Engagement .774 87.470 18.748 52.07 86.763 15.778 51.64 87.944 18.404 52.35 82.391 16.492 49.04 0.630 0.596 -	STUDY 14 (N=242; Men=99; W	Vomen=1	43; Married=	26; Unmarri	ed=216; A	$ge = 16-76, \bar{x} =$	23; Fairly V	Vhite=56; I	Pale White=7	7; Light Bro	wn=86; Do	ark Brown=23	3)				
	Social Engagement	.774	87.470	18.748	52.07	86.763	15.778	51.64	87.944	18.404	52.35	82.391	16.492	49.04	0.630	0.596	-

Fairly white men and women reflected significantly higher levels of body-esteem (Fairly White=81.56%, Pale White=74.21%,

Light Brown=78.04%, Dark Brown=78.04%; p=0.000; η2=0.067), self-esteem (Fairly White=64.02%, Pale White=52.67%, Light

Brown=58.78%; Brown=58.08%, Dark 000.0=q $\eta 2 = 0.067$), creativity (Fairly White=91.57%, Pale White=79.43%, Light Brown=54.86%, Dark Brown=54.86%; p=0.000; $\eta 2=0.141$), capacity to love & beloved (Fairly White=96.57%, Pale White=88.71%, Light Brown=79.86%, Dark Brown=72.57%; p=0.000; $\eta 2 = 0.125$), forgiveness & mercy (Fairly White=96.57%, Pale White=96.57%, Light Brown=78.14%, Dark Brown=78.14%; p=0.000; η2=0.253), appreciation of beauty & excellence (Fairly White=97.43%, Pale White=92.86%, Light Brown=96.71%, Brown=88.71%; Dark p=0.007; $\eta 2=0.043$), and extraversion (Fairly White=62.7%, Pale White=58.33%, Light Dark Brown=61.83%; Brown=58.93%, p=0.004; $\eta 2=0.024$). On the other hand, they also reflected significantly higher levels of sexual frustration (Fairly White=40.82%, Pale White=34.44%, Light Brown=38.09%, Dark Brown=39.46%; p=0.032; η 2=0.023). In terms of beautification, fairly white women grouping with light brown women were involved significantly more in wearing jewelry (Fairly White=67.6%, White=60.38%, Light Brown=67.58%, Dark Brown=64.2%; p=0.017; η 2=0.026).

Pale white men and women exhibited significantly greater levels of heterosexuality (Fairly White=47.04%, Pale White=62.64%, Light Brown=54.6%, Dark Brown=54.6%; p=0.007; η 2=0.031), neuroticism (Fairly White=68.27%, Pale White=72.18%, Light Brown=71.07%, Brown=65.08%; Dark p=0.007; η 2=0.021), and charismaphobia (Fairly White=66.99%, Pale White=64.58%, Light Brown=71.27%, Dark Brown=63.21%; p=0.000; η 2=0.02). Moreover, they also reflected significantly lower levels of courage (Fairly White=56.53%, Pale White=53.03%, Light Brown=57.86%, Dark Brown=57.86%; p=0.034; η 2=0.031), and

teamwork (Fairly White=59.71%, Pale White=55.86%, Light Brown=80.57%, Dark Brown=73.86%; p=0.000; η2=0.12).

Light brown men and women reflected significantly higher levels of justice (Fairly White=54.67%, Pale White=53.19%, Light Brown=67.07%, Dark Brown=63.93%; p=0.000; $\eta 2=0.154$), perspective (Fairly White=63%, Pale White=67.14%, Light Dark Brown=84.14%; Brown=85.71%, p=0.000; η 2=0.182), social intelligence (Fairly Pale White=61%, Light White=67.29%, Brown=86.43%, Brown=78.57%; Dark p=0.000; $\eta 2 = 0.145$), humor (Fairly White=92.43%, Pale White=98.14%, Light Brown=98.71%, Dark Brown=92.29%; p=0.048; η 2=0.028), and religiousness & spirituality (Fairly White=90.71%, White=97.86%, Light Brown=98.43%, Dark Brown=92.86%; p=0.029; η 2=0.032). On the other hand, they also reflected significantly higher levels of charismaphobia (Fairly White=66.99%, Pale White=64.58%, Light Dark Brown=63.21%; Brown=71.27%, $p=0.000; \eta 2=0.02).$

Dark brown men and women reflected significantly higher levels of prudence (Fairly White=77.29%, Pale White=76.43%, Light Brown=81.43%, Dark Brown=88.43%; p=0.000; $\eta 2=0.081$), and consciousness (Fairly White=65.77%, Pale White=64.81%, Light Brown=63%, Dark Brown=67.78%; p=0.007; $\eta 2=0.022$). On the other hand, they also reflected significantly higher levels homosexuality (Fairly White=8.16%, Pale White=5.54%, Light Brown=12.82%, Dark Brown=18.92%; p=0.006; $\eta 2 = 0.032$), bisexuality (Fairly White=15.84%, Pale White=7.8%, Light Brown=12.18%, Dark Brown=18.38%; p=0.037; $\eta 2=0.022$), attitudes toward infidelity (Fairly White=61.6%, Pale White=55.46%, Light Brown=60.28%, Dark Brown=63.26%; p=0.000; $\eta 2=0.02$), and extramarital sexual permissiveness (Fairly White=80.14%, Pale White=70.11%, Light Brown=77.33%, Dark Brown=81.69%; p=0.000; $\eta 2=0.025$). Moreover, they also reflected significantly lower levels of transcendence (Fairly White=73.33%, Pale White=73.73%, Light Brown=74.6%, Dark Brown=70.56%; p=0.007; η 2=0.043), and White=69.94%, openness (Fairly Pale White=72.66%, Light Brown=69.66%, Dark Brown=74.87%; p=0.000; η2=0.046).

4. **DISCUSSION**

The findings provide new insights into the connections between body-shape different psychosocial factors. Muscular men curvv exhibited notably and women heightened self-esteem, body-esteem, positive emotional states, and virtues associated with justice, temperance, and prudence. However, this group demonstrated a decreased inclination toward forgiveness and mercy. Interestingly, curvy women exhibited greater tendencies toward beautification practices such as body piercing, wearing jewelry, and perfume application. contrast. individuals fat/chubby characterized as exhibited elevated religious intelligence but were also marked by attitudes endorsing infidelity, inclinations. heightened extramarital neuroticism, and symptoms indicative of generalized anxiety disorder. They also displayed diminished social intelligence, perspective, bravery, honesty, teamwork, fairness, leadership, and hope. Slim/thin counterparts demonstrated heightened levels of transcendence, creativity, love of learning, and conscientiousness. Paradoxically, they also exhibited elevated levels charismaphobia, reflecting an intriguing psychological duality.

The findings of the present studies also

revealed new insights into the associations between skin-tone and several psychosocial factors. Fairly white individuals projected higher levels of body-esteem, self-esteem, creativity. and capacity for Additionally, they demonstrated appreciation for beauty and excellence, extraversion, and forgiveness & mercy. However, this group also reported heightened sexual frustration. In terms of beautification, fairly white women displayed an affinity for wearing more jewelry than did their counterparts. Pale white individuals displayed higher levels of heterosexuality, neuroticism. and charismaphobia, coupled with reduced teamwork courage and orientation. Conversely, individuals light brown exhibited superior levels of justice, perspective, social intelligence, humor, and religiousness & spirituality. Nonetheless, they also reported heightened levels of charismaphobia. Finally, dark individuals displayed heightened prudence and conscientiousness. However, they also exhibited elevated levels of homosexuality, bisexuality, attitudes supporting infidelity, and extramarital sexual permissiveness. They displayed diminished levels also of transcendence and openness.

discoveries unveiled the aforementioned studies cannot be empirically grounded in purely scientific terms, as the influences of diverse body shapes or skin tones do not originate from the biological or neurological aspects of human physiology. Nevertheless, when viewed through the lens of social sciences, the groundbreaking insights gathered from these studies possess significant potential to paint a comprehensive portrait of human psychology linked to body shape and skin tone. These findings contribute substantially to the existing frameworks of body shaming and colorism,

concepts that underpin prevalent prejudices discrimination among individuals. Studies on body shaming highlight the detrimental impact of societal attitudes and behaviors toward individuals based on their body shape or size. Research in this area has shown that body shaming can lead to negative psychological and emotional consequences, including low self-esteem, body dissatisfaction, depression, anxiety, charismaphobia, and eating [18,30,47,48,50,51,72–75]. Society tends to associate thinness with positive moral traits such as discipline, self-control, and moral uprightness, while individuals with larger body shapes are sometimes unfairly perceived as lacking in these virtues [76]. Individuals with larger body shapes, in particular, often face weight-based stigma and discrimination, known as weight bias, which can contribute to poor mental health outcomes [76]. This biased perception can lead to social discrimination and prejudice against individuals with larger bodies, impacting their social interactions and overall well-being. Social media platforms have been identified as significant contributors to body shaming, with constant exposure to idealized body images leading to increased body dissatisfaction and self-criticism [30,32]. On the other hand, colorism, a form of discrimination based on skin tone within the same racial or ethnic group, can also have various social implications, including biases in education, employment, and relationships. Studies have shown that individuals with darker skin tones are often subjected to social stereotypes, which can affect how they are perceived terms in of intelligence, competence, and social skills [33,77]. Furthermore, societal beauty standards, which often favor lighter skin tones, can affect self-perception and confidence.

Individuals who have a positive body image, regardless of their body shape, tend to have better emotional well-being. A positive body image is associated with higher selfesteem, self-acceptance, and overall life satisfaction [78,79]. Cultivating a positive image involves accepting appreciating one's body for its functionalities and capabilities rather than focusing solely on appearance. Research suggests that empowering individuals to critique media messages, fostering self-acceptance, and promoting a diverse representation of body shapes and sizes can mitigate the negative effects of body shaming [74,80]. Adequate levels of social, emotional, and sexual intelligence [54] can help societies in combating with body shaming and colorism.

4.1 Limitations and recommendations

Apart from engaging with a substantial sample size of 10,127 individuals across 14 comprehensive studies, the present paper presents findings from only one culture. To attain a more comprehensive and universally applicable understanding of the psychosocial factors related to body-shape and skin-tone, it recommended that future is strongly researchers replicate these studies within a multicultural framework. By examining diverse cultural contexts and perceptions, can significantly enrich scholars comprehension of these phenomena, offering a more detailed and globally relevant perspective. The impact of body shaming and colorism on human psychology underscores the urgent need for societal change and increased awareness. Addressing these issues requires a collective effort to challenge societal norms, promote body positivity, and embrace diversity in all its forms. fostering inclusive environments and promoting self-acceptance, society mitigate the psychological consequences of body shaming and colorism, fostering a healthier and more compassionate community.

4.2 Conclusion

The extensive body of research presented in this paper highlights the relationship of body shapes and skin tones with a myriad of psychosocial factors. These nuanced findings reveal that individuals with muscular physique and curvy body shapes tend to possess elevated self-esteem and positive emotions, although they might struggle with Conversely, forgiveness. fat/chubby individuals exhibit a complex blend of traits, including heightened religious intelligence but also tendencies toward infidelity and anxiety. Slim/thin counterparts demonstrate creativity but are susceptible charismaphobia, reflecting the multifaceted nature of these associations. Moreover, the diverse array of traits observed across different skin tones further emphasizes the complexity of these connections. Fairly white individuals exhibit a mix of positive qualities but also face challenges such as sexual frustration, while dark brown individuals demonstrate prudence alongside varied sexual orientations and attitudes toward infidelity. This comprehensive exploration significantly advances our understanding of

the psychosocial implications of body shapes and skin tones, offering valuable insights for future research in personality, social, and clinical psychology, as well as implications for the field of cosmetic dermatology. These findings underscore the importance of considering these factors in the context of psychological well-being, opening new avenues for research and intervention in the pursuit of holistic psychosocial health.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Funding

This study received no external funding from any source. The research was entirely self-funded, underscoring the author's dedication to independent and unbiased inquiry.

Data Availability Statement

The data relevant to this paper is available upon request. Interested parties may obtain access to the dataset by contacting the corresponding author directly. This approach ensures the privacy and confidentiality of the participants' information while facilitating academic transparency and integrity.

REFERENCES

- E.W. Cerrati, J.R. Thomas, The multicultural evolution of beauty in facial surgery, Braz. J. Otorhinolaryngol. 83 (2017) 373–374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjorl.2017.04.005.
- J. Stowell, On the origins of beauty: Aesthetics and method in the works of Charles Darwin, Cambridge Q. 46 (2017) 364–385. https://doi.org/10.1093/camqtly/bfx022.
- D.M. Buss, The Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology, Wiley Online Library, 2015.

- https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470939376.
- 4. A.L. Jones, B. Jaeger, Biological bases of beauty revisited: The effect of symmetry, averageness, and sexual dimorphism on female facial attractiveness, Symmetry (Basel). 11 (2019) 279. https://doi.org/10.3390/SYM11020279.
- J.H. Langlois, L. Kalakanis, A.J. Rubenstein, A. Larson, M. Hallam, M. Smoot, Maxims or myths of beauty? A meta-analytic and theoretical review, Psychol. Bull. 126 (2000) 390–414.

- https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.3.390.
- A.K. Heggenstaller, A. Rau, J.K. Coetzee, A. Ryen, R. Smit, Reflecting on female beauty: Cosmetic surgery and (dis)empowerment, Qual. Sociol. Rev. 14 (2018) 48–65. https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8077.14.4.04.
- G. Wang, K. Djafarian, C.A. Egedigwe, A. El Hamdouchi, R. Ojiambo, H. Ramuth, S.J. Wallner-Liebmann, S. Lackner, A. Diouf, J. Sauciuvenaite, C. Hambly, L.M. Vaanholt, M.D. Faries, J.R. Speakman, The relationship of female physical attractiveness to body fatness, PeerJ 2015 (2015) e1155. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1155.
- Q. Luo, M. Yu, Y. Li, L. Mo, The neural correlates of integrated aesthetics between moral and facial beauty, Sci. Rep. 9 (2019) 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-38553-3.
- R.M. Calogero, M. Boroughs, J.K. Thompson, The impact of western beauty ideals on the lives of women: A sociocultural perspective, in: V. Swami, A. Furnham (Eds.), Body Beautiful Evol. Sociocult. Perspect., Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, 2007: pp. 259–298. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230596887.
- Mazur, U.S. Trends in Feminine Beauty and Overadaptation, J. Sex Res. 22 (1986) 281–303. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224498609551309.
- 11. K.L. Crossley, P.L. Cornelissen, M.J. Tovée, What Is an Attractive Body? Using an Interactive 3D Program to Create the Ideal Body for You and Your Partner, PLoS One 7 (2012) e50601. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0050601.
- 12. Gullickson, Comments on Conceptualizing and Measuring the Exchange of Beauty and Status, Am. Sociol. Rev. 82 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122417724001.
- 13. D.K. Hume, R. Montgomerie, Facial attractiveness signals different aspects of "quality" in women and men, Evol. Hum. Behav. 22 (2001) 93–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(00)00065-9.
- 14. S. Jeffreys, Beauty and Misogyny: Harmful Cultural Practices in the West, 2nd ed., Routledge, 2005. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203698563.
- 15. C. Law, M.P. Labre, Cultural standards of attractiveness: A thirty-year look at changes in male images in magazines, Journal. Mass

- Commun. Q. 79 (2002) 697–711. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769900207900310.
- E.A. McClintock, Beauty and status: The illusion of exchange in partner selection?, Am. Sociol. Rev. 79 (2014) 575–604.
 https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414536391.
- 17. R.T. Ridgeway, T.L. Tylka, College men's perceptions of ideal body composition and shape, Psychol. Men Masculinity 6 (2005) 209–220. https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.6.3.209.
- T.F. Cash, L. Smolak, Body image. A Handbook of Science, Practice and Prevention, Guilford Press, 2011.

https://doi.org/10.1007/SpringerReference 223404

19. M.J. Tovée, V. Swami, A. Furnham, R. Mangalparsad, Changing perceptions of attractiveness as observers are exposed to a different culture, Evol. Hum. Behav. 27 (2006) 443–456.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2006.05.004

- 20. W. Husain, M.N. Malik, The gender-specific dynamics of charismaphobia in relation to bodyesteem and self-esteem: implications for cosmetic and psycho-dermatology, J. Ski. Stem Cell 11 (2024) e145103. https://doi.org/10.5812/jssc-145103.
- 21. W. Husain, N. Aziz, The levels of body esteem among veiled and unveiled women, FWU J. Soc. Sci. 8 (2014) 46–49.
- 22. R. Garza, R.R. Heredia, A.B. Cieslicka, Male and female perception of physical attractiveness: An eye movement study, Evol. Psychol. 14 (2016) 147470491663161.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1474704916631614.

- 23. T.J. Wade, L. Renninger, Do Skin Color, Facial Shape and Facial Width to Height Ratio (fWHR) Play a Role in Black Male Facial Evaluation?, EvoS J. 7 (2015) 22–37.
 - https://doi.org/10.59077/iaim6192.
- 24. Y.Z. Foo, L.W. Simmons, G. Rhodes, Predictors of facial attractiveness and health in humans, Sci. Rep. 7 (2017) 39731. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep39731.
- 25. J.S. Mills, A. Shannon, J. Hogue, Beauty, Body Image, and the Media, Percept. Beauty (2017). https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.68944.

- 26. L. Vandenbosch, S. Eggermont, Understanding Sexual Objectification: A Comprehensive Approach Toward Media Exposure and Girls' Internalization of Beauty Ideals, Self-Objectification, and Body Surveillance, J. Commun. 62 (2012) 869–887.
- 27. H. Widdows, F. MacCallum, The Demands of Beauty: Editors' Introduction, Heal. Care Anal. 26 (2018) 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10728-018-0360-3.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01667.x.

- 28. W. Husain, F. Ijaz, M.A. Husain, M. Zulfiqar, J. Khalique, Simplifying the understanding and measurement of mental disorders thru a comprehensive framework of psychosocial health, OBM Integr. Complement. Med. 9 (2024) 011. http://dx.doi.org/10.21926/obm.icm.2401011.
- 29. W. Husain, Components of psychosocial health, Health Educ. 122 (2022) 387–401. https://doi.org/10.1108/HE-05-2021-0084.
- 30. R.M. Perloff, Social Media Effects on Young Women's Body Image Concerns: Theoretical Perspectives and an Agenda for Research, Sex Roles 71 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-014-0384-6.
- 31. J. Fardouly, L.R. Vartanian, Negative comparisons about one's appearance mediate the relationship between Facebook usage and body image concerns, Body Image 12 (2015) 82–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2014.10.004.
- 32. J. Fardouly, P.C. Diedrichs, L.R. Vartanian, E. Halliwell, Social comparisons on social media: THE impact of Facebook on young women's body image concerns and mood, Body Image 13 (2015) 38–45.
 - https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BODYIM.2014.12.002.
- 33. M. Hunter, The Persistent Problem of Colorism: Skin Tone, Status, and Inequality, Sociol. Compass 1 (2007) 237–254. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2007.00006.x.
- 34. M.S. Thompson, V.M. Keith, The blacker the berry: Gender, skin tone, self-esteem, and self-efficacy, Gend. Soc. 15 (2001) 336–357. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124301015003002.
- 35. Y. Wang, P. Yao, G. Zhou, The Influence of Facial Attractiveness and Personality Labels on Men and

- Women's Mate Preference, Acta Psychol. Sin. 47 (2015) 108.
- https://doi.org/10.3724/sp.j.1041.2015.00108.
- Mocan, E. Tekin, Ugly Criminals, Rev. Econ. Stat. 92 (2010) 15–30. https://doi.org/10.1162/rest.2009.11757.
- 37. B.J. Dixson, G.M. Grimshaw, W.L. Linklater, A.F. Dixson, Watching the Hourglass: Eye Tracking Reveals Men's Appreciation of the Female Form, Hum. Nat. 21 (2010) 355–370. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-010-9100-6.
- 38. B.J. Dixson, G.M. Grimshaw, W.L. Linklater, A.F. Dixson, Eye-tracking of men's preferences for waist-to-hip ratio and breast size of women, Arch. Sex. Behav. 40 (2011) 43–50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-009-9523-5.
- 39. P.W. Eastwick, A.H. Eagly, E.J. Finkel, S.E. Johnson, Implicit and explicit preferences for physical attractiveness in a romantic partner: A double dissociation in predictive validity, J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 101 (2011) 993–1011. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024061.
- 40. P.W. Eastwick, E.J. Finkel, Sex Differences in Mate Preferences Revisited: Do People Know What They Initially Desire in a Romantic Partner?, J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 94 (2008) 245–264. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.245.
- 41. W. Husain, A. Gulzar, The psychosocial preferences in mate selection among Pakistanis, FWU J. Soc. Sci. 9 (2015) 29–31.
- 42. R. Kurzban, J. Weeden, HurryDate: Mate preferences in action, Evol. Hum. Behav. 26 (2005) 227–244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2004.08.0 12.
- 43. R.A. Lippa, The preferred traits of mates in a crossnational study of heterosexual and homosexual men and women: An examination of biological and cultural influences, Arch. Sex. Behav. 36 (2007) 193–208.
 - https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-006-9151-2.
- 44. S. Luo, G. Zhang, What leads to romantic attraction: Similarity, reciprocity, security, or beauty? Evidence from a speed-dating study, J. Pers. 77 (2009) 933–964.
 - https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00570.x.

- 45. J. Weeden, J. Sabini, Physical attractiveness and health in Western societies: A review, Psychol. Bull. 131 (2005) 635–653.
 - https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.5.635.
- 46. S. Kim, Y. Lee, Why do women want to be beautiful? A qualitative study proposing a new "human beauty values" concept, PLoS One 13 (2018) e0201347.
 - https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201347.
- 47. K.J. Homan, T.L. Tylka, Appearance-based exercise motivation moderates the relationship between exercise frequency and positive body image, Body Image 11 (2014) 101–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2014.01.003.
- 48. D. Neumark-Sztainer, S.J. Paxton, P.J. Hannan, J. Haines, M. Story, Does Body Satisfaction Matter? Five-year Longitudinal Associations between Body Satisfaction and Health Behaviors in Adolescent Females and Males, J. Adolesc. Heal. 39 (2006) 244–251.
 - https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2005.12.001.
- 49. J.K. Thompson, E. Stice, Thin-ideal internalization: Mounting evidence for a new risk factor for body-image disturbance and eating pathology, Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci. 10 (2001). https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00144.
- 50. W. Husain, N. Zahid, A. Jehanzeb, M. Mehmood, The psychodermatological role of cosmetic dermatologists and beauticians in addressing charismaphobia and related mental disorders, J. Cosmet. Dermatol. 21 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1111/jocd.14317.
- 51. W. Husain, Charismaphobia: diagnosis and measurement of the psychodermatological symptoms, J. Ski. Stem Cell 10 (2023) e137387. https://doi.org/10.5812/jssc-137387.
- 52. W. Husain, A. Inam, S. Wasif, S. Zaman, Emotional Intelligence: Emotional Expression and Emotional Regulation for Intrinsic and Extrinsic Emotional Satisfaction, Psychol. Res. Behav. Manag. 15 (2022) 3901–3913.
 - https://doi.org/10.2147/prbm.s396469.

igence Scale.htm.

 W. Husain, Efficient Social Intelligence Scale, (2024).
 https://www.drsukoon.info/Efficient Social Intell

- 54. W. Husain, A. Kiran, U. Qasim, S. Gul, J. Iftikhar, Measuring Sexual Intelligence for Evaluating Sexual Health, Psychol. Rep. (2023). https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941231152388.
- 55. W. Husain, Development and validation of Sukoon Religious, Moral, and Spiritual Intelligence Scale, Submitt. Publ. (2023).
- 56. B.R. Berkey, T. Perelman-Hall, L.A. Kurdek, The Multidimensional Scale of Sexuality, J. Homosex.
 19 (1990) 67–88. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v19n04_05.
- 57. O.P. John, S. Srivastava, The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives, in: L.A. Pervin, O.P. John (Eds.), Handb. Personal. Theory Res., Guilford Press, New York, 1999: pp. 102–138.
- 58. W. Ruch, M.L. Martínez-Martí, R.T. Proyer, C. Harzer, The Character Strengths Rating Form (CSRF): Development and initial assessment of a 24-item rating scale to assess character strengths, Pers. Individ. Dif. 68 (2014) 53–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.03.042.
- 59. D. Watson, L.A. Clark, A. Tellegen, Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scales, J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 54 (1988) 1063–1070. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063.
- 60. P.F. Lovibond, S.H. Lovibond, The structure of negative emotional states: Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression and Anxiety Inventories, Behav. Res. Ther. 33 (1995) 335–343.
 - https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(94)00075-U.
- 61. R.L. Spitzer, K. Kroenke, J.B.W. Williams, B. Löwe, A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7, Arch. Intern. Med. 166 (2006).
 - https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092.
- 62. E.B. Foa, J.D. Huppert, S. Leiberg, R. Langner, R. Kichic, G. Hajcak, P.M. Salkovskis, The Obsessive-Complusive Inventory: Development and validation of a short version., Psychol. Assess. 14 (2002). https://doi.org/10.1037//1040-3590.14.4.485.
- 63. D.R. Ames, P. Rose, C.P. Anderson, The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism, J. Res. Pers. 40

- (2006). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2005.03.002.
- 64. W. Husain, Sexual Frustration Scale, (2024). https://www.drsukoon.info/Sexual_Frustration_Scale.htm.
- 65. E.D. Diener, R.A. Emmons, R.J. Larsem, S. Griffin, R.J.L. Sem, S. Griffin, R.J. Larsem, S. Griffin, The Satisfaction With Life Scale, J. Pers. Assess. 49 (1985) 71–75.
 - https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901 13.
- 66. M. Rosenberg, Society and the Adolescent Self-Image. Morris Rosenberg. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1965., Princeton 148 (1965) 804–804.
- 67. S.L. Franzoi, S.A. Shields, The Body Esteem Scale: Multidimensional Structure and Sex Differences in a College Population, J. Pers. Assess. 48 (1984) 173–178. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4802 12.
- 68. M. Whatley, Attitudes toward Infidelity Scale, in: David Knox, Caroline Schacht (Eds.), Choices Relationships An Introd. to Marriage Fam., 10th ed., Wadsworth Cengage Learning, Belmont, CA, 2010: p. 468.
- 69. I.L. Reiss, Reiss Extramarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale, in: T.D. Fisher, C.M. Davis, W.L. Yarber, S.L. Davis (Eds.), Handb. Sex. Meas., 3rd ed., Routledge, New York, 2013: pp. 253–254.
- 70. B. Buunk, Extramarital Behavioral Intentions Scale, in: T.D. Fisher, C.M. Davis, W.L. Yarber, S.L. Davis (Eds.), Choices Relationships An Introd. to Marriage Fam., 3rd ed., Routledge, New York, 2013: pp. 250–251.
- 71. W. Husain, Romantic Readiness Scale, (2024). https://www.drsukoon.info/Romantic_Readiness_ Scale.htm.
- 72. G. Holland, M. Tiggemann, A systematic review of the impact of the use of social networking sites on

- body image and disordered eating outcomes, Body Image 17 (2016) 100–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BODYIM.2016.02.008.
- 73. M.B. Tamburrino, Body Image: A Handbook of Theory, Research, and Clinical Practice, JAMA J. Am. Med. Assoc. 289 (2003). https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.289.14.1861.
- 74. M. Tiggemann, A. Slater, NetGirls: The internet, facebook, and body image concern in adolescent girls, Int. J. Eat. Disord. 46 (2013) 630–633. https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22141.
- 75. F.R.E. Smink, D. Van Hoeken, H.W. Hoek, Epidemiology of eating disorders: Incidence, prevalence and mortality rates, Curr. Psychiatry Rep. 14 (2012) 406–414. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11920-012-0282-Y.
- R.M. Puhl, C.A. Heuer, The stigma of obesity: A review and update, Obesity 17 (2009) 941–964. https://doi.org/10.1038/OBY.2008.636.
- 77. S.C. Herring, S. Kapidzic, Teens, Gender, and Self-Presentation in Social Media, in: Int. Encycl. Soc. Behav. Sci. Second Ed., Elsevier Inc., 2015: pp. 146–152. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.64108-9.
- 78. G. Csibra, M. Hernik, O. Mascaro, D. Tatone, M. Lengyel, Statistical treatment of looking-time data, Dev. Psychol. 52 (2016) 521–536. https://doi.org/10.1037/DEV0000083.
- 79. T.L. Tylka, N.L. Wood-Barcalow, What is and what is not positive body image? Conceptual foundations and construct definition, Body Image 14 (2015) 118–129.
 - https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2015.04.001.
- 80. E. Halliwell, P.C. Diedrichs, Testing a dissonance body image intervention among young girls, Heal. Psychol. 33 (2014) 201–204.
- 81. https://doi.org/10.1037/A0032585.

ما وراء التنمر الجسدي والتلوين: كشف التباينات النفسية والاجتماعية من خلال أشكال الجسم وألوان البشرة

أسيل الصالح1، وقار حسين2، هديل غزاوي3، آدم عماوي4، خالد الطرابلسي4,5,5 عمار أشرف8,7، هيثم جهرمي10,9

أقسم طب الأسرة والمجتمع، كلية الطب والعلوم الطبية، جامعة الخليج العربي، المنامة، البحرين أقسم العلوم الإنسانية، جامعة COMSATS إسلام آباد، حرم إسلام آباد، طريق بارك، إسلام

آباد، باكستان

³ قسم التغذية والتصنيع الغذائي، كلية الزراعة، الجامعة الأردنية

⁴ قسم علوم الحركة والتدريب الرياضي، كلية علوم الرباضة، الجامعة الأردنية

أمعهد العالي للرياضة والتربية البدنية بصفاقس 3000،
أمعة صفاقس، صفاقس معاقس معاقس معاقس أماني

⁶ مختبر البحث: التربية، الحركية، الرياضة والصحة، EM2S، ER19JS01، جامعة صفاقس، صفاقس 3000، تونس

⁷ قسم التدریب وعلوم الحرکة، معهد علوم الریاضة، جامعة یوهانس غوتتبرغ-ماینز، ماینز، ألمانیا

⁸ مختبر البحث، الأسس الجزيئية للأمراض البشرية، LR19ES13 كلية الطب بصفاقس، جامعة صفاقس، صفاقس 3000، تونس المستشفيات الحكومية، المنامة، البحرين ¹⁰ قسم الطب النفسي، كلية الطب والعلوم الطبية، جامعة الخليج العربي، المنامة، البحرين

Received: October 2, 2024
Accepted: February 2, 2025

DOI

https://doi.org/10.35516/jmj.v59i3.3323

الملخص

الخلفية والاهداف: السعي وراء الجانبية الجسدية ظاهرة عالمية عبر الثقافات، مدفوعًا بالرغبة في تجنب العواقب النفسية والاجتماعية الضارة الناجمة عن التنمر الجسدي والتلوين. ركزت الأبحاث السابقة حول عدم الرضا عن الجسد بشكل أساسي على القلق. يهدف هذا البحث إلى استكشاف تأثير شكل الجسم ولون البشرة على الجوانب الاجتماعية، والعاطفية، والأخلاقية، والدينية، والروحانية، والشخصية، والصحة النفسية والاجتماعية، والاضطرابات النفسية والاجتماعية.

منهجية الدراسة: أجريت الدراسة على نطاق واسع على مستوى وطني، وشملت 14 مرحلة شارك فيها ما مجموعه 10,127 مشاركًا من الرجال والنساء، تم تجنيدهم من باكستان والبحرين. تم تصنيف أشكال الجسم إلى ثلاث فئات: عضلي/منحني، ممتلئ/بدين، ونحيف/رفيع. أما ألوان البشرة فقد تم تصنيفها إلى: أبيض فاتح جدًا، أبيض شاحب، بني فاتح، وبني داكن. تم جمع البيانات باستخدام استبيانات ديموغرافية و 21 مقياسًا نفسيًا.

النتائج: أظهر الرجال ذوو البنية العضلية والنساء ذوات القوام المنحني مستويات مرتفعة من تقدير الذات، والمشاعر الإيجابية، مع انخفاض في مستوى التسامح. كما أظهرت النساء ذوات القوام المنحني اهتمامًا متزايدًا بممارسات التجميل. أما الأفراد الممتلئون/البدناء فقد أظهروا ذكاءً دينيًا مرتفعًا، ولكنهم كانوا أكثر عرضة للصفات مثل الخيانة العصابية والقلق، كما عانوا من ضعف في الذكاء الاجتماعي وقلة الأمل. في المقابل، أظهر الأفراد النحيفون/النحاف مستويات عالية من الإبداع ولكنهم كانوا أكثر عرضة لرهاب الكاريزما. أما بالنسبة للون البشرة، فقد أظهر الأفراد ذوو البشرة البيضاء الفاتحة جدًا مستويات عالية من تقدير الذات، والإبداع، والقدرة على الحب، لكنهم أبلغوا أيضًا عن إحباط جنسي. بينما أظهر الأفراد ذوو البشرة البيضاء الشاحبة ميولًا للجنس المغاير، والعصابية، ورهاب الكاريزما، إلى جانب انخفاض في الشجاعة والعمل الجماعي. في حين أظهر الأفراد ذوو البشرة البنية الفاتحة العدالة، والذكاء الاجتماعي، والفكاهة، ولكن مع مستويات مرتفعة من رهاب الكاريزما. أما الأفراد ذوو البشرة البنية الداكنة، فقد أظهروا الحذر تجاه مواقف الخيانة، مع انخفاض في مستوى التسامي والانفتاح.

الاستنتاجات: تقدم هذه الدراسة رؤى جديدة حول العلاقات المعقدة بين أشكال الجسم وألوان البشرة والعوامل النفسية والاجتماعية المختلفة، مما يشكل مساهمة مهمة في المعرفة العلمية. ستساعد هذه النتائج علماء النفس، والأطباء النفسيين، وأطباء الجلدية التجميلية، وغيرهم من المتخصصين على الربط بشكل أكثر دقة بين الجوانب النفسية المختلفة وأشكال الجسم وألوان البشرة.

الكلمات الدالة: التنمر الجسدي، التلوين، أشكال الجسم، ألوان البشرة، التباينات النفسية والاجتماعية، تقدير الذات، الذكاء الاجتماعي، الصحة النفسية.