

UNIT 3 – HAIR RAISING RESOURCE SUGGESTION**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TITLES	PAGE #
LIST OF SUGGESTED WEBSITES	2
STEREOTYPES & PREJUDICE	
1 Discrimination a Short Story of the History of Hair in the Workplace	3-4
2 Do Gentlemen Prefer Blonds	5-6
3 Gingerism is Real	7-8
4 Hairstyles and Politics	9-10
5 Having a Blond Moment	11-13
6 Student Suspended for Blue Hair	14
7 Women and Hair in the Military	15-17
MALE HAIR STEREOTYPES	
8 Baldness Study Shows People are Clinging to Stereotypes	18
9 Guys with Shaved Heads Seem Tougher	19-20
10 Is There a Problem with Bearded Men	21-22
11 Men With Shaved Heads Look More Dominant	23-24
AFRICAN AMERICAN HAIR	
12 Black Women and Hairstyle: Cases of Discrimination	26-26
LOOKISM	
13 Effects of Beauty - N.Y. Times	27-29
14 Looking Good: The Psychology and Biology of Beauty	30-34
15 Lookism at Work	35
16 No One Wants to Admit They're Ugly	36-37
17 You are Judged by Your Appearance	38-40

Research: Brief list of suggested websites and sources for names

1. [DISCRIMINATION: A SHORT HISTORY OF HAIR IN THE WORKPLACE](#)
2. [DO GENTLEMEN PREFER BLONDS?](#)
3. [GINGERISM IS REAL](#)
4. [HAIRSTYLES AND POLITICS: 2015](#)
5. [HAVING A BLOND MOMENT](#)
6. [STUDENT SUSPENDED FOR BLUE HAIR](#)
7. [WOMEN AND HAIR IN THE MILITARY](#)
8. [BALDNESS STUDY SHOWS PEOPLE ARE CLINGING TO STEREOTYPES](#)
9. [GUYS WITH SHAVED HEADS SEEM TOUGHER](#)
10. [IS THERE A PROBLEM WITH BEARDED MEN?](#)
11. [MEN WITH SHAVED HEADS LOOK MORE DOMINANT](#)
12. [HAIRSTYLES OF BLACK WOMEN: CASES OF DISCRIMINATION](#)
13. [EFFECTS OF BEAUTY: N.Y. TIMES](#)
14. [LOOKING GOOD: THE PSYCHOLOGY AND BIOLOGY OF BEAUTY](#)
15. [LOOKISM AT WORK](#)
16. [NO ONE WANTS TO ADMIT THEY'RE UGLY](#)
17. [YOU ARE JUDGED BY YOUR APPEARANCE](#)

1 - Discrimination: a short history of hair in the workplace

Stephen Simpson 21 June 2011

The principles revisited in the High Court decision of [SG v St Gregory's Catholic Science College \[2011\] EWHC 1452 HC](#) (on the BAILII website), where it was found that a school's policy banning cornrow hairstyles indirectly discriminated against a schoolboy, apply in a workplace context too. We've combed the archive to bring you the bare facts about hair in the workplace.

Note: A subscription is required to access the XpertHR law reports below.

1. Early 80s. After the introduction of the Race Relations Act 1976, it didn't take long for race discrimination cases to start arriving. The leading cases of the early 80s were:

- [Panesar v The Nestle Co Ltd \[1980\] IRLR 64 CA](#), in which the Court of Appeal found that an indirectly discriminatory rule forbidding beards in a chocolate factory was justifiable for hygiene reasons; and
- the non-employment case of [Mandla and another v Lee and others \[1983\] IRLR 209 HL](#), in which the House of Lords found that the refusal of a headmaster to accept as a pupil a Sikh boy who wore a turban was indirect race discrimination.

2. Applying Panesar and Mandla. The 80s and 90s saw a succession of tribunal cases applying these leading cases. These included:

- [Singh v British Rail Engineering Ltd 29 July 1985 EAT](#) (a requirement for railway repair workers to wear protective headgear was justifiable on health and safety grounds, notwithstanding that it discriminated against Sikhs); and
- [Johnson-Croft v Mezzo Ltd \[1997\] IT/2202467/96](#) (a black job applicant who refused to change her hairstyle was not unlawfully discriminated against on the ground of race).

3. Sex discrimination cases appear. The 90s saw a number of sex discrimination claims on the basis of employers applying different rules for men and women. These included:

- [Lloyd v Computer Associates \[1992\] IT/46822/91](#) (a ponytailed man who was dismissed from his job for refusing to have his hair cut was not discriminated against); and
- [Gatehouse v Stretton Leisure Ltd \[1994\] IT/13370/93](#) (a woman who was warned that she would have to look for a new job if she didn't alter her hairstyle was unlawfully discriminated against).

4. Rastafarians not a racial group. In [Dawkins v Department of the Environment sub nom Crown Suppliers PSA \[1993\] IRLR 284 CA](#), a case about a Rastafarian's hairstyle, the Court of Appeal found that Rastafarians were not a "racial group" within the Race Relations Act 1976.

5. Court of Appeal clarifies law on "conventional" appearance. In 1996, the Court of Appeal in [Smith v Safeway plc \[1996\] IRLR 456 CA](#) confirmed that a dress and appearance policy that requires employees to adopt a "conventional" appearance, but that has different rules for men and women (for example, in relation to hair-length), is not discriminatory against men.

6. More hairy issues before the tribunals in 2000. Employers were accused of discriminating against employees in the reported cases of:

- [Pell v Wagstaff and Wheatley Hotel \[2000\] ET/2801882/99](#) (a male job applicant was discriminated against on the ground of his sex when he was turned down for a job because he refused to cut his long hair); and
- [Erogbogbo v Vision Express UK Ltd \[2000\] ET/2200773/00](#) (a black employee who lost her job because of her hairstyle was discriminated against on the ground of race).

7. Religious discrimination legislation introduced. The introduction of legislation prohibiting religious discrimination in the workplace, which came into force on 2 December 2003, made it easier for staff who have a particular hairstyle because of their religious or philosophical beliefs to bring claims of discrimination. Some of the earliest authorities on religious discrimination involved hair issues, including:

- [Mohmed v West Coast Trains Ltd EAT/0682/06](#) (a Sikh employee whose religious beliefs require that his beard be kept at a minimum of one fist's length was not discriminated against when he was told to trim it); and
- [Harris v NKL Automotive Ltd and Matrix Consultancy UK Ltd EAT/0134/07](#) (a requirement to have tidy hair did not indirectly discriminate against a Rastafarian who wore his hair in dreadlocks).

8. Harassment cases make the headlines. In recent years, there have been a number of high-profile harassment cases, including:

- [a Muslim police officer likened to Osama Bin Laden because of his beard who was awarded £11,000](#) (on the Daily Telegraph website);
- [a teacher's unsuccessful attempt to argue that he was harassed because of his baldness, which he claimed is a disability](#) (on the BBC website); and
- [a finding of discrimination when it was suggested that a toy helicopter be landed on an employee's turban.](#)

9. Recent case law. The most recent appeal case to deal with hair in the workplace is [Dansie v Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis EAT/0234/09](#). In that case, the Employment Appeal Tribunal held that it was not sex discrimination against a male trainee police officer to require him to get his hair cut.

10. Are employers on top of this issue? [XpertHR's 2011 dress codes survey](#) found that one dress code in five restricts beards and/or moustaches for men. Two organisations reported that they have restrictions on hairstyles.

2- Do Gentlemen Prefer Blondes? By Gad Saad Ph.D.

Blond women: Approached more frequently judged more harshly.

There are many everyday expressions that speak to specific physical attributes. These include: tall, dark, and handsome; fiery redhead; bad hair day; and bedroom eyes. Of all appearance-based sayings [stereotypes](#), perhaps none are as ubiquitous as those associated with blonde hair. Many titles of products of popular culture include references to blonde hair including the classic 1953 movie "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes" (starring Marilyn Monroe and Jane Russell), and Rod Stewart's 1978 smash album titled "Blondes Have More Fun."

As a Canadian, I must mention *Platinum Blonde*, a Torontonion New Wave group whose claim to fame was in part shaped by their massive blond coiffure. Returning to the various "blonde" stereotypes, is there any truth to these widely held beliefs? Do men truly have a preference for blondes? Are blondes judged differently along a wide range of traits?

In a recent [article](#) published in the *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, Viren Swami and Seishin Barrett conducted two studies to: (1) determine whether the same woman would be differentially approached by men at one of three nightclubs as a function of whether she was a brunette, blonde, or redhead (hair color was manipulated using dye); (2) gauge whether photos of the same woman sporting the latter three hair colors (the confederate of study 1) would yield different evaluations by men along the following ten traits: physical attractiveness, sexual promiscuity, [intelligence](#), [introversion](#), [neuroticism](#), approachability, competency, arrogance, neediness, and temperamentality. The two studies were conducted in the greater London (England) area. Studies 1 and 2 consisted of 120 and 126 male participants respectively. Here are the main findings.

Study 1: (approaches at a nightclub, as reported in Table 1 of the article)

	Blonde	Brunette	Redhead
Nightclub 1	26	16	4
Nightclub 2	15	12	8
Nightclub 3	19	14	6
Total	60	42	18

The proportions are statistically different from one another ($p < .001$) in the posited manner (i.e., blondes were approached more frequently than brunettes and redheads).

Advertisement

Study 2: (key statistically significant findings, as reported in Table 2 of the article)

Brunette: Scored higher than the two other hair colors on physical attraction, intelligence, competence, and arrogance. Scored higher than the redhead on approachability.

Blonde: Scored higher than the two other hair colors on neediness.

Redhead: Scored higher than the two other hair colors on temperamentality. This seems to be a manifestation of the "fiery redhead" stereotype.

No differences along sexual promiscuity, introversion, and neuroticism.

As the authors point out, it is difficult to reconcile the results of the two studies into a coherent storyline. For example, in study 1, the blonde confederate was the most frequently approached but was judged as less attractive than the brunette in study 2. Furthermore, the blonde was judged as being as approachable as the brunette and redhead, so this could not explain the findings of study 1. That men approached the blonde confederate more frequently cannot be attributed to an ascription of greater sexual promiscuity to the blonde given that study 2 found no differences along that particular [trait](#). Bottom line: It would appear (at least within this restricted sample) that blonde women might be approached more frequently in a nightclub but are generally judged more harshly along a wide range of traits. Hair color preference is likely driven by individual idiosyncrasies as well cross-cultural differences (i.e., this is a preference that is minimally if at all rooted in evolutionary principles notwithstanding the fact that some researchers have argued that lighter hair is associated with youthfulness, a trait universally fancied by men). For a discussion of hair cuts from an evolutionary perspective, readers might wish to check out my 2007 academic book [The Evolutionary Bases of Consumption](#), as well as my 2011 trade book

Gad Saad, Ph.D., is a professor of marketing at Concordia University and the author of *The Evolutionary Bases of Consumption* and *The Consuming Instinct*.

3 - Gingerism is Real by Ally Fogg

If [Tim Minchin is right](#), only a ginger can call another ginger ginger. By the same token, perhaps only a ginger can effectively rebut the argument that so-called gingerism should be considered a form of discrimination, or even a hate-crime, equivalent to racism or homophobia. That case has been made often, most recently by [Nelson Jones in the New Statesman](#), who in a blog post last week detailed a depressing litany of murders, assaults and suicides that have been linked to anti-redhaired prejudice.

Every one of those cases makes horrible reading – a heart-breaking tragedy for those involved, and a grim reminder of humanity's capacity for unprovoked cruelty and aggression. Violent and sadistic bullying of all sorts is abhorrent, regardless of a person's age or circumstances. When it is sparked by something as seemingly random and inescapable as hair-colour, body shape or imperfect facial features, it seems especially brutal and cruel. I also fully endorse Minchin's beautiful line: "Sticks and stones may break your bones, but words can break your heart".

Some have gone further, arguing that the UK's uniquely aggressive gingerism is indeed a form of racism, rooted in anti-Celtic, specifically anti-Irish, prejudice and therefore related to centuries-old matters of imperialism, religious bigotry and war. There may be some truth in that, but those roots are now buried as deep as the recessive genetic mutations in our MC1R proteins. Other forms of oppression are not only current, they are woven into the very fabric of our society.

I'm a proud ginger and I've been abused, insulted and even, as a child, assaulted and bullied for it. I wouldn't wish that on anyone, but I'm pretty sure I have never been denied a job or the lease on a flat because of my complexion. I haven't been stopped and searched by police 25 times within a year because I am ginger, or casually assumed to be a threat, a criminal or a terrorist. I am not confronted by political parties and movements, some with democratically elected representatives, which would like to see me deported from the country or granted second-class citizenship.

Likewise, no one has been putting up posters recently calling for me to be executed for gingeriness. There are no respected religious leaders telling me that my very existence is sinful and that I'm heading for an eternity in hell. Nobody wishes to bar me from marrying my partner, wherever and however we choose, because she has (peculiarly, I will be the first to admit) fallen in love with a ginger.

For that matter, if we ever did get married, neither she nor I have grown up in a world where I could be raped with impunity as the effective property of the non-ginger party. Nobody would have ever denied me a mortgage under my own name, as happened during our parents' generation, or asked to talk to the non-ginger of the house about technical or mechanical matters. I haven't heard any politicians or newspaper headlines, this week or any other, assume that if one of us stays at home to look after the kids [it will inevitably be the redhead](#).

Racism, sexism and homophobia are not just woven into the fabric of our history, they are living dynamics in our culture, even in our economy. They are, to greater or lesser extents, systematic and institutional in most aspects of life and the struggles to remove them are intrinsic to wider political battles over the very nature of our society, public policy and economic system. In that light, I would not hesitate to add disablism to the list of systematic oppressions.

After finally breaking free of the shackling language of "cripples" and "invalids" and securing the legal rights to access work and social participation, disabled people now face a twin-pronged, coordinated attack from politicians and press, who demonise them as scroungers and malingerers while snapping thread after thread of the safety net which keeps many out of abject poverty, squalor and indignity. That is institutional discrimination and oppression of the most shameful kind. To even suggest redhaired people face similar issues is insulting, verging on the obscene.

Anti-ginger prejudice and bullying is real and harmful, but the idea that it equates to these systems of oppression is fundamentally flawed. It assumes that all forms of prejudice and discrimination are equal and occurring in the same context when they really do not. It assumes that all forms of discrimination are the products of individual bigotry and irrational prejudice rather than structural and institutional divides.

The real danger in arguing that gingerism is just as harmful as racism, sexism, disablism or homophobia is that when you say those words, what some people will choose to hear is that racism, sexism, disablism or homophobia are just as superficial, just as trivial, just as much of a joke, as gingerism.

4 - Hairstyles and Politics: The Second 2015 GOP Debate by Katie Lascaleia

One week ago, eleven Republican presidential hopefuls crowded the stage at the Ronald Reagan National Library in Simi Valley, California for the ultimate CNN-engineered political showdown. Tensions arose, tempers flared, and facts went flying, making for a perfectly entertaining evening. In a particularly memorable moment, Donald Trump fired a shot at Rand Paul's physical appearance, claiming, "I never attacked him on his look, and believe me, there's plenty of subject matter right there."

Trump is right— there *is* plenty of subject matter in the front-running candidates' appearances, particularly in their notable and highly individual hairdos. Thus, this debate analysis will focus on the important intersection of state and style.

It is only fair to kickstart this larger analysis with a discussion of one of America's most infamous heads of hair. Donald Trump's strands are, first and foremost, a truly indefinite shade of yellow. Discerning Trump's hair color is much like nailing down his politics: you always come away with a different answer than before. Images of a younger Trump indicate that he was, indeed, blond as a child, but today the adjective "blond" seems an inadequate word choice compared to other celebrities' descriptors of "corn," "beige," and, best of all, "unsavory salmon."

Beyond his questionable choice in hair dye, Trump sports an extraordinarily unique blowdried comb-over look. Several sources, including a woman whom Trump allowed to touch the comb-over, confirm that despite how ridiculous it looks, his hair is his own. But that does not explain why he chooses to style his "unsavory salmon" locks as he does. Is it to hide the fact that he is balding? Is it to establish a personal trademark? Is it because he does not want to give up the hairstyle he wore in his younger years? Again, the discussion around Trump's hair mirrors his presidential campaign thus far: just because it is real and here to stay does not mean we still don't have a lot of unanswered questions.

Carly Fiorina's current hairstyle seems cool, calm, and collected, but much like her road to candidacy, has a history of ups and downs. Back in 2009, Fiorina survived a bout of cancer, losing her hair in chemotherapy. Since then, she has sported ten different colors and cuts (by my unofficial count) to reach the style she has today. Her political past has fluctuated too: by now, her term as Hewlett-Packard's CEO from 1999-2005, which she promotes as one of her strongest assets, is widely regarded as, to put it gently, a pretty rough time for the company.

However, on Wednesday, she did not have a single hair out of place, literally and figuratively. Her 'do was carefully straightened and tastefully parted to the side, a composed look that paralleled her performance that evening. She managed to coolly deflect Trump's attack of her appearance while arguing passionately about issues like Planned Parenthood, legalized marijuana, and diplomatic relations with Russia. Her successful execution earned her 22,000 new Twitter followers and now second place in the Republican primary polls. As the campaign gets more intense, it will be interesting to see if she, and her hair, will remain under control.

"Marco Rubio is balding. Will it cost him the presidency?!?" is, indeed, a real *Washington Post* headline. This may sound like clickbait, and it is: the study cited in the *Post* found that the lack of balding men in higher American political office is probably *not* due to voter bias. This is good news for Mr. Rubio, however, we should not overlook how his head of hair on Wednesday night reflects his overall political trajectory.

Rubio's balding leaves his hair thick around the edges and sparser in the middle: likewise, he is strong in foreign policy and generally quite articulate, but also has a repertoire of cringe-worthy moments, like when he hit a kid in the face with a football. In fact, during his opening statement in the debate, Rubio pulled out a water bottle in reference to the awkward drink he took on live national television two and a half years ago, a joke that fell pretty flat with both the live audience and the viewers back home. While still a strong candidate at fourth place in the Republican polls, Rubio has some patches he still needs to work out.

Clearly, there exists a strong correlation between candidate's hairstyle and their politics; just as all individuals sport their own style, each of these candidates offers a different approach to political leadership. The holistic analysis of these presidential hopefuls remains important as the polls continue to fluctuate every day. The GOP front-runner may come away winning by just a hair.

5 - Having a Blond Moment by Kristi L. Jobson

I am not dumb. Let me just get that out there, right off the bat. Most likely, neither is the girl down the dining hall table from you eating her cereal. For that matter, the chick you always sit three seats away from isn't dumb. And believe it or not Jessica Simpson probably isn't either.

I don't necessarily assume that you consider us dumb—but there's a good chance you do. Not because we are unintelligent—but because we're blonde.

Sure, laugh it up. Blonde discrimination—what a joke. But really it's not all that funny. Especially when you're on the receiving end.

Yeah, I realize there are plenty of other problems society has to deal with—racism, elitism, sexism—and the thought of adding “blondism” to the list seems annoying and superfluous. I'm sure the most progressive of Social Studies concentrators feels he or she has better world issues to talk about in tutorial.

But blonde discrimination is real—even, and especially, at a place like Harvard.

Quick experiment. Think of five blondes everybody knows. First five that come to mind for me are Marilyn Monroe, Britney Spears, Hillary Clinton, Lisa Kudrow and Barbie. Four out of five of these women are famous for playing dumb.

Perhaps you're not convinced that blonde discrimination is a big deal. Here's some things to think about. According to the Budapest Sun, blonde jokes are set to be banned after close to 100,000 people in Hungary signed a petition calling for an end to blonde discrimination in the workforce and all walks of life. On thefacebook.com, the “Women against Blonde Discrimination” group counts 84 members. The “dumb blonde” stereotype has hit the academe. Tel Aviv's public library held a symposium on dumb blondes two years ago. This past summer, an Australian grad student won a grant—\$17,000 a year for three years—to get to the root of the dumb-blonde myth. You can even purchase apparel from a line of clothes called “A smart blonde” (which, I know, is meant to be empowering, but really, do we need the qualifier?). Carol Channing made a career out of playing a dumb blonde. “I didn't have to be bright,” she said in an interview in Ladies Home Journal in 1955. “All I had to do was be blonde.”

Supposedly, blondes are dumb, annoying, superficial, sexually easy and fake. Most of these stereotypes are geared towards women. I remember learning in Science B-29 that we tend to admire people who look like us. If you grew up watching Cher sigh confusedly in “Clueless” and Jessica Simpson make daily blunders to canned laughter on “Newlyweds,” are you maybe then left thinking that the best way to get attention is to pretend like you only care about your nails? Or do you go out of your way not to act silly at all?

“Blondes at Harvard are under a lot of pressure to be always smart,” says Caroline Cecot '06. “I sometimes feel as if I cannot be goofy in front of people I do not know well for fear that they will interpret my goofiness as dumbness in all areas of life, including academics.”

According to asmartblonde.com, nine percent of women are natural blondes. Far more sport blonde hair, however—maybe that's why people think of blondes as fake. If they're faking their hair color, maybe they're also faking that happy face to see you smile? (Dolly Parton once quipped that she's not offended by “all the dumb-blonde jokes because I know I'm not dumb.

I'm also not blond.") But even for those artificial blondes, should hair really be a reason to judge?

It's interesting that being "blonde" is even part of my identity at all, but it has affected my time at Harvard. Blonde Harvard students are regarded as intellectually inferior and unconcerned with the world around them, only interested in socializing and sexual promiscuity. Blondes are regarded as cheerful and nice—people seem surprised to meet a blonde that is forceful or demanding. Our peers unconsciously associate bloneness with affluence and privilege, and thus regard blondes' opinions as naïve and ill-informed. People assume that I'm downright silly because of my hair color—and I wonder if I cater my behavior to their expectations.

Nowhere have I noticed this more than in the classroom. One fellow blonde (who asked not to be named) said that a friend once asked her if she tried to speak a lot in section to compensate for her "big boobs and blonde hair." You can go ahead and say that this is all in my head, but I feel that my ideas—whether it be on Marx or Shakespeare—are taken less seriously because of my appearance. Even in conversations with friends, my opinions are sometimes cast aside.

"I've definitely had experiences where people seem surprised at my ability somehow, as if they didn't expect me to be good at something because of the way that I look—particularly when it comes to driving, directions, etc.," says Annie S. Day '06.

Probably every Harvard blonde has experienced the inevitable Elle Woods comparison. "The most common thing I hear when I tell someone I go to Harvard is something like, 'Oh my god you're like that girl in Legally Blonde!'" says Elizabeth A. Ulyot '08.

Poor Reese Witherspoon, who, if you've ever seen *Election*, you know is one of the more gifted actresses of our age, will be forever tied to the pink-clad sorority girl who finds herself (eyes wide and blinking) at Harvard Law School. Besides making a killing at the box office, the movie inspired CBS to create a TV special on blonde attorneys who went to Harvard.

According to every random half-stranger who finds out I go to Harvard, Elle is the prototype for successful blonde women everywhere. Seeing as she wins a court case because of her extensive knowledge of hair care products, it's a little disturbing that Elle's story has been taken as proof that "blondes can be smart, too."

However, Elle's experience at Harvard, cartoonish though it is, could be considered typical. She's ridiculed by her classmates, who assume she's materialistic and dim-witted, dismissed by teachers as air-headed, and chosen for a prestigious job because her future employer assumes she's easy.

Being written off as stupid and purely sexual? Yeah, Elle, I feel you.

She wins because she's underestimated. Which is one of the assets of being blonde, really—no one thinks you've got what it takes to get anywhere.

You're not threatening.

My freshman year an editor at the Harvard Crimson told me I should go into investigative journalism. "Really?" I said, thinking he'd really liked my piece on visiting politicians at the IOP.

“Yeah, totally,” he replied. “You look silly, young, and innocent. You could totally play dumb and people you interview would assume they could tell you anything, ’cause you’d never remember anyway.”

It’s not so much an insult as an observation. That summer, I worked at a local newspaper, and my editor told me to go into police reporting because I looked “harmless” and “distracted.”

Okay, so kinda cool, people underestimate me, and I can take advantage of that. I could twirl my hair around my finger and chew my pen and say, “Oh really, ma’am, like, whoa, so who do you think, like, killed him?” and get my story.

But I really wish that weren’t the case.

It shouldn’t be surprised that a blonde has brains under her flaxen tresses. Smart blonde isn’t an oxymoron, nor should there be need for a qualifier at all. I realize that the dumb blonde bimbo stereotype has been present for decades in America, but it really shouldn’t be present at a place that likes to call itself liberal, intellectual and progressive, like Harvard.

Alright, I’m done now. You can call me hypersensitive, you can call me reactionary. Just don’t call me dumb.

Kristi L. Jobson is a Social Studies concentrator in Lowell House. She once highlighted her hair.

6 – Student Suspended for Blue Hair

RICHMOND--The American Civil Liberties Union of Virginia filed suit today in Richmond Federal District Court seeking reinstatement of a Surry County High School sophomore who was suspended on April 28 for coming to school with his hair dyed blue.

The ACLU is asking the court to order the Surry County School Board to allow the student to return to school immediately and to provide a means for him to make up work lost as a result of the suspension. The lawsuit also charged that school officials refused to give complete assignments to the student so that he could keep up with his school work from home.

Surry County High School student Kent McNew had been attending school since dyeing his hair blue last December. According to papers filed with the court, although there have been no incidences of disruption caused by Kent's hair, Surry County High School officials suspended Kent under a new policy banning unusual hair colors. The policy was apparently adopted by the Surry County School Board in reaction to Governor Jim Gilmore's call for a crackdown on student expression in the wake of the tragic shootings last month at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado.

In a letter sent to the parents of Kent McNew on the same day as the suspension, Assistant Superintendent Alvin W. Wilson wrote: "The school administration has ruled that students who wear unusual or unique hair colors, such as blue or green, are to be removed from school until such time as their hair is a normal color...In view of the circumstances that have occurred recently, the governor expressed that unusual activities/appearances should not be ignored."

"Schools should be safe places for everyone," said ACLU of Virginia Executive Director Kent Willis. "The ACLU believes it is possible to make policies that effectively address concerns about school safety and still honor students' constitutional rights."

"The Surry County policy, which is completely unrelated to school safety and clearly infringes on students' rights, ignores both of these important guiding principles," he added.

In a letter faxed to Wilson last Thursday, the ACLU asked the school to reinstate Kent voluntarily in order to avoid a lawsuit. Wilson did not reply.

A hearing on the matter has been set for June 3, 1999.

"Irrational policies unrelated to school safety or educational objectives, such as banning unusual hair colors," Willis said in the letter, "create distrust of school officials at the very time we most need to have confidence their leadership."

The ACLU is filing the lawsuit on behalf of Kent McNew and his mother Phyllis Smith. McNew and Smith are represented by ACLU cooperating attorney Victor M. Glasberg of Glasberg & Associates in Alexandria and Richard Ferris, Associate Director of the ACLU of Virginia.

7 - Women and Hair in the Military By Lisa Ferdinando

WASHINGTON (Army News Service, Sept. 16, 2014) -- The Army published revisions to Army Regulation 670-1, its policy for "Wear and Appearance of Army Uniforms and Insignia," which included changes to female hairstyles and tattoos standards.

The revisions, dated Sept 15, were effective immediately.

The service determined in a review that authorized hairstyles announced earlier this year limited female Soldiers' hair grooming options. The policy authorizes temporary, two-strand hair twists for women, and includes a number of updates to hairstyles for women. Dreadlocks or locks remain an unauthorized hairstyle.

As for tattoos, the new regulation allows enlisted Soldiers who have "grandfathered" tattoos to be considered for officer candidate school or warrant officer appointment without needing an exception to the policy.

A training package for Army leaders and Soldiers is available online at <http://www.armyg1.army.mil/hr/uniform/>.

The Army plans to continue its long-standing practice of conducting perpetual reviews of its policies. In fact, Soldiers are encouraged to submit a DA Form 2028 to recommend changes. Requests with significant wear or policy changes should be endorsed through the Soldier's senior level chain of command to the Army G-1.

"Wearing of the uniform as well as our overall military appearance should be a matter of personal pride for Soldiers," Sgt. Maj. of the Army Raymond Chandler said. "Our commitment to the uniform and appearance standards is vital to your professionalism."

"Every Soldier has the responsibility to know and follow these standards. Leaders at all levels also have the responsibility to interpret and enforce these standards, which begins by setting the appropriate example," Chandler added. "Your actions help to ensure we continue to be trusted and revered by the American people we serve."

FEMALE HAIRSTYLES

The Army began reviewing its policies on female hairstyles soon after releasing the March 28, 2014, version of the regulation. In conjunction with the service's review, the Department of Defense also requested a review in light of concerns that the hairstyle policies were too restrictive for African American women.

This review included feedback from a panel of Soldiers comprised of the various demographics represented in the U.S. Army. Subsequently, Army officials believe the updated policy gives female Soldiers more options while maintaining a professional appearance.

The new regulation allows female Soldiers to have temporary twists or two pieces of hair neatly twisted together. Twists, cornrows and braids can be up to 1/2 inch in diameter. The previous maximum was a diameter of approximately 1/4 inch.

The Army removed the requirement that no more than 1/8 of an inch of scalp could show

between braids. The Army requires braids, twists and cornrows worn against the scalp be uniform in appearance and have the same general size of spacing between them.

Previously, the Army required that the ends of hair in braids be secured with inconspicuous rubber bands. The reference to rubber bands was removed, now the ends just have to be secured inconspicuously.

Braids and cornrows worn against the scalp previously had to be worn in a straight line from the front and go all the way to the back of the head. Now, the language has been changed to say the braids need to follow the natural direction of the hair when worn back or in the natural direction using one part in the hair.

Styles, such as braids, cornrows, or twists worn against the scalp may still stop at one consistent location of the head. When such styles are worn loosely or free-hanging, they must encompass the whole head.

While dreadlocks or locks are still not authorized, their definition has been changed to remove the words "matted and unkempt."

Another change includes increasing the allowable size of a bun, measuring from the scalp out, from three inches to three-and-a-half inches.

The allowable amount of bulk of hair remains two inches.

The shortest hair a female Soldier can have is 1/4 inch from the scalp, which can be tapered to the scalp along the hairline. There is no maximum length a female Soldier's hair can be, as long as it is within regulation and can be worn up to meet the guidance for bulk and bun size.

The new rules clarify that braids, cornrows and now twists can be worn in a ponytail during physical training; it also specifies that wigs, which were previously authorized, cannot be worn to cover up an unauthorized hairstyle.

No matter what the authorized hairstyle, it must allow for the Soldier to be able to properly wear all types of headgear and protective equipment.

TATTOOS

As part of efforts to maintain the professional appearance of the force, the Army dialed back the number, size and placement of tattoos in the March regulation.

Previously authorized tattoos were "grandfathered" in, but Soldiers hoping to become an officer had to get an exception to the policy.

The updated regulation takes into account that previously authorized tattoos should not prevent a Soldier from becoming an officer, but that candidates are to be evaluated based on the whole Soldier concept, or all characteristics of a Soldier.

The rest of the regulation from March remains in place, including the restriction on sleeve tattoos and allowing no more than four tattoos below the elbows or knees. Tattoos below the knees or elbows must be smaller than the size of the Soldier's palm with fingers extended. Permanent ink or branding on the face, neck, and hands, as well as tattoos that can be deemed

extremist, indecent, sexist or racist in nature remain banned.

OTHER CHANGES

The regulation provides additional clarification that Soldiers who entered the Army with body mutilation prior to March 2014 may request an exception to Army G-1.

Another change of note is that Soldiers can wear a "Next of Kin" lapel pin on their Army service and dress uniforms. The pin is for the immediate family of military members who were killed on duty, outside of combat operations.

Soldiers are already authorized to wear the "Gold Star" lapel pin, which is for the immediate family of service members who were killed in combat.

8 – Baldness Study Shows People are Clinging to Stereotype by Max Nisen

A recent study highlighted by the Wall Street Journal claims that baldness may lead to business success.

The research by Wharton's Albert Mannes found that bald men were viewed as more masculine, dominant, taller, and stronger than those with thinning or full heads of hair.

What's interesting in the study is how that effect works.

Going bald doesn't make men more attractive, the study found that it actually makes them considerably less so, which runs against other studies that correlate attractiveness with success.

So what's behind it? Part of it is our inherent stereotypes of power.

People associate masculinity and age with dominance.

The study found that baldness makes people look an average of four years older. Shaved heads are more common in traditionally masculine professions like the military, increasing the effect.

The study shows that as much as we try to avoid stereotypes, they still have an unconscious effect on how we perceive people and behave.

9 – Guys with Shaved Heads Seem Tougher by Cari Nierenberg

Sometime in his late 30s, after his hair had been thinning for several years, Dr. Albert Mannes decided to shave what was left of his mane. He then noticed a curious thing: "Strangers were more standoffish, more deferential," he recalls.

"I found that people treated me differently once I started shaving my head, which made me wonder whether my experience was unique," says Mannes.

This led [Mannes, a lecturer at the Wharton School](#), at the University of Pennsylvania, to design three experiments that tested other people's perception of men with shaved heads. His findings appear in the journal *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.

[All three studies found similar results](#): A man's shorn scalp was linked with dominance. In other words, men with shaved heads were perceived as powerful by others.

It seems that closely cropped or bald domes have a certain manly swagger to them that project a powerful look.

In the first study, 59 college students looked at 25 photographs of men enrolled in a business school program. Ten of the men had shaved heads while the rest wore their hair in various styles and lengths.

Volunteers rated the photos of men with shorn scalps as more dominant, meaning they looked more powerful, influential, and authoritative than those with a full head of hair.

In a second experiment, 344 adults were shown photographs of four different men. One photo was of the man's real hair and a second shot of him had been digitally altered to remove all of it.

Adults rated men with the digitally shaved heads as more dominant than his coiffed counterpart, an effect researchers say was largely due to perceiving men with shorn scalps as having more confidence and masculinity.

In addition, men without much hair were viewed as nearly an inch taller and 13 percent stronger than men with plenty of it. Although a shaved head had its advantages, men were rated as less attractive and looking nearly four years older than guys with full heads of hair.

Why is a nearly barehead perceived as more dominant? Mannes offers three explanations.

For one, he points to stereotypes. "Shaved heads are found in American culture in traditionally masculine professions, such as the military, law enforcement, and sports," Mannes explains.

A second is that a man who shaves his head is viewed as unconventional. And there's some evidence that the powerful are less inhibited about violating conventional norms, he says.

Finally, Mannes suggests that since "Society places such a high aesthetic value on hair, it takes confidence for a man to dispense with it."

In a third experiment, no photographs were used and more than 500 adults rated their perception of a man based solely on a written physical description of him. All volunteers read the exact same profile except for the description of his hair, which portrayed him as having thick brown hair, thinning brown hair, or a shaved head.

The man described as having a shaved head was rated highest in dominance, masculinity, leadership potential, and strength. The guy with thick tresses scored higher for attractiveness than a shorn scalp and slightly higher on confidence.

The dude with thinning hair scored the lowest on every trait except for norm violation.

"Men with thinning hair may improve their self-esteem and how they are perceived by others by shaving," Mannes suggests.

He advises men who are getting sparse on top "to stop fighting Mother Nature and try the shaved look."

10 – Is There a Problem with Bearded Men? By Robert Burriss Ph.D.

Australian psychologists have discovered that men who grow beards are more sexist than their clean-shaven peers. The researchers had men in the United States and India complete a brief survey about sexist attitudes. Next, they divided the men into two groups—one of clean-shaven men; the other, mustachioed, goateed, and bushy-bearded.

They then compared the sexism scores of men with no facial hair to those of men with any kind of facial hair—and the hairy men scored higher on measures of hostile sexism but not benevolent sexism.

Hostile sexist attitudes include the idea that women are inferior to men. Men who score high on measures of hostile sexism more strongly agree with statements such as “Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash,” or “Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.”

Benevolent sexism is characterized by protective paternalism and complementary gender differentiation, and support for statements such as “Women should be cherished and protected by men.”

Writing in the journal *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, the researchers argued that other variables cannot fully explain away the relationship between hirsuteness and sexism. According to co-authors Julian Oldmeadow and Barnaby Dixson:

“After controlling for nationality, age, education level, relationship status, and sexual orientation, men with facial hair scored significantly higher on hostile sexism than clean shaven men. Furthermore, hostile sexist attitudes and nationality were the only significant predictors of whether or not men chose to grow facial hair.”

Indian men in the participant group, 86% of whom had facial hair, scored higher on sexism than American men (65% of whom had facial hair). Higher levels of education were associated with more benevolent sexism but less hostile sexism.

A Mask of Masculinity

The researchers speculate that men who already hold sexist views may *choose* to grow out their beards because a hairy face highlights the differences between the sexes: “Facial hair may appeal to hostile sexist males because it maximizes facial masculinity and augments perceived dominance.” Previous research has shown that men driven to develop a more muscular physique also hold more sexist attitudes.

Another possibility is that wearing facial hair *causes* men to adopt sexist attitudes. In studies, bearded men are generally rated as more masculine, mature, dominant, and aggressive. These social perceptions may lead men with beards to behave according to established masculine norms, and more readily endorse hostile sexist attitudes.

Dixson’s previous research on male facial hair has shown that men who are clean-shaven or who wear light stubble are considered more attractive than men with beards, and that the current trend for bushy or “hipster” beards may be on the way out due to “negative-frequency-

dependent sexual selection,” which describes how traits can plummet in appeal when we encounter them more often.

Reference

Oldmeadow, J. A., & Dixson, B. J. (in press). The association between men’s sexist attitudes and facial hair. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*.

11 – Men with Shaved Heads Look More Dominant by Stephanie Pappas

A full head of hair on a man has long been associated with vitality and virility — think of the Biblical hero Samson, whose strength was in his tresses. But new research suggests that when balding sets in, men might do better to just shave it off.

Call it the Bruce Willis effect: men with shorn heads are seen as more dominant, confident and masculine than men with hair, according to a new study published online in July in the journal *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. A shaved head does strike a blow against a man's perceived attractiveness, however. So study researcher Albert Mannes, a lecturer at the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, advised against picking up the razor unless natural balding is already underway.

In that case, Mannes told LiveScience, "there's little downside to at least trying the look."

A dominant hairstyle

Mannes was inspired by personal experience to research shaved heads. About 10 years ago, he said, he adopted the shorn look himself.

"Strangers started treating me differently," Mannes said. "They were a little more standoffish and, in some cases, deferential, and I was surprised by that."

A number of studies have examined the characteristics that lead people to perceive dominance, from height and posture to eye color (brown, apparently, is more dominant than blue). Most of these traits are fixed, Mannes said, but hair is particularly interesting because it's malleable.

In a series of three studies, Mannes asked participants to rate men with different hairstyles on a number of different traits, such as dominance, attractiveness, age and physical strength. In the first study, 59 female university students saw pictures of 25 men, both black and white. Ten of the men had shaved heads, while the others had various hair lengths, but no visible signs of balding. The shorn men were consistently ranked as more dominant, the study found.

The last two studies relied on panels of adult Americans recruited online. In the first, 367 adults rated eight photographs of the same men from the first study. Half of the participants saw original photos with hair, and the other half saw photos that had been doctored so the men's heads looked shaved. Dominance, masculinity, age, height, physical strength and confidence were all ranked higher in the shaved versions. In fact, shaved men were viewed as nearly an inch taller and 13 percent stronger than their counterparts who had hair. They were also seen as less attractive, however.

Finally, Mannes dispensed with photographs altogether. In the last study, 588 adults read a description of a normal man. In one version, the man was described as having a full head of hair. In another, he had naturally thinning hair, and in a third, he had shaved his head. Again, the shorn man was seen as more dominant, more masculine and stronger, while the naturally balding man was ranked lowest in desirable traits. [10 Crummy Hereditary Conditions]

Men of action

In large part, these perceptions likely stem from cultural stereotypes, Mannes said.

"In the U.S., especially over the last 10 years, the shaved-head look has become very prominent in traditionally masculine professions," he said. "The military, of course, law enforcement and, these days, professional athletes sport the look a lot."

Hollywood action stars, from Bruce Willis to Jason Statham, also make shaved heads look tough, Mannes said. In other countries, such as the United Kingdom, he warned, the look might be more associated with skinhead culture and thus appear less desirable.

A shaved head may also signal that a man is confident enough to give up his hair, Mannes said. Because a full head of hair is valued in our culture, the choice to voluntarily shave suggests that the person is secure enough not to need that trait, he said.

"They're willing to dispense with this symbol of beauty and power," he said.

Does that mean women should shave their heads, too? Not necessarily, Mannes said, though sending out signals of dominance and confidence could be as simple as adding a few out-there accessories.

"I do think it has other implications for women, like [that] unconventional dress or funky eyeglass frames may send signals about how confident you are as a person," Mannes said.

12 – Hairstyles of Black Women Cases of Discrimination by Sheryl Estrada

It's 2015, yet the natural hair and hairstyles of Black women continues to be taboo in mainstream society in the U.S. and abroad. At the workplace, during travel and even at leisure, Black women face an additional layer of discrimination.

Transportation Security Administration (TSA)

When Malaika Singleton, Ph.D., a neuroscientist employed by the California State Senate at the time, began a 2013 trip to London as a U.S. delegate to the G8 Dementia Summit little did she know her "sisterlocks" hairstyle, a form of dreadlocks, would be an issue.

TSA agents at both the Los Angeles International Airport and the Minneapolis St. Paul International Airport grabbed and squeezed her natural hair from top to bottom.

She contacted the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California. In 2014 the ACLU filed an administrative complaint on her behalf to challenge TSA's discriminatory hair searches. Ironically, in 2012, a similar complaint was also filed on behalf of Novella Coleman, a Black woman and Staff Attorney with the nonprofit organization; she represented Singleton.

[The ACLU announced March 26](#) that an agreement was reached with the TSA. The agency agreed to conduct trainings for TSA agents throughout the country, with special emphasis on hair pat-downs of Black female travelers. TSA will also monitor all the airports "for consistent implementation of TSA and DHS policies and to detect the existence of a racially discriminatory impact."

"I hope that this agreement and the proposed trainings will lead to a more equitable treatment of all travelers throughout the U.S., regardless of their ethnic or cultural background or how they wear their hair," Singleton said in a statement.

Madisons New York Grill and Bar

In Montreal, Quebec, Canada, 19-year-old Lettia McNickle, who has worked as a hostess at a Canadian franchise of Madisons New York Grill and Bar on Drummond Street since October, said she came to work one day in March with a braided hairstyle on the side of her head, and has not received any shifts since.

According to CBCNews, McNickle said her manager reprimanded her in front of fellow employees saying her hairstyle was not acceptable.

"I obviously wanted to know what it was she didn't like specifically about the hairstyle, so the [next] day I asked her, 'What is it that's wrong with my hair?' And she said, 'We don't want that kind of look here at the restaurant,'" McNickle said on *CBC Daybreak*.

Her boss sent her home. McNickle filed a discrimination complaint against the restaurant with the Quebec Human Rights Commission, through the Centre for Research Action on Race Relations (CRARR), a nonprofit also in Quebec.

“I think it’s important for businesses to know that it’s important to be aware of the fact that even with a grooming policy or even a policy about appearance, one can still discriminate against minorities or minority women if this policy has a negative effect based on their race or ethnicity,” Fo Niemi of CRARR told DiversityInc.

He said CRARR looked at case precedents from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) in the U.S., as this is the first case of its kind in Canada.

[In a statement](#), Madisons New York Grill and Bar said the incident did not involve race or discrimination and apologized if the situation caused harm to McNickle or her friends and family. However, it also states, “As in any organization, there is an internal protocol to follow and a dress code to respect to guarantee that our customers’ experience is ideal.”

CRARR stated that they also have yet to see a written standard grooming policy from the restaurant.

The brand vice-president for the Canadian franchises of the Madisons chain, Gilles Pépin, said because business is down McNickle has not been given any shifts, and she is not fired.

Niemi explained that if the Quebec Human Rights Commission concludes discrimination occurred the plaintiff must be compensated, including lost wages and moral damages, within 30 days. “[The fines] are meant to be remedial not punitive,” he said.

DiversityInc Staff Writer Michael Nam contributed to this article.

13 – Effects of Beauty Found to Run Surprisingly Deep by Jane E. Brody

MINNEAPOLIS STUDIES of physical attractiveness show that people do, in fact, judge a book by its cover, often with dramatic effects on those being judged. The findings suggest that expectations based on physical attractiveness can become self-fulfilling prophecies that may strongly influence the course of a person's life.

The studies show that people known (or supposed) to be physically attractive are invested by others with a host of desirable characteristics, such as warmth, poise, sensitivity, kindness, sincerity and the potential for social, marital and occupational success. And according to Dr. Ellen Berscheid, professor of psychology at the University of Minnesota, these beliefs about physically attractive people, and the preferential treatment that grows out of them, can have lasting effects on an individual's personality, social life, and educational and career opportunities.

Dr. Berscheid said the importance of physical attractiveness is growing and will continue to grow as increases in geographic mobility, frequent job changes and divorce subject more people to "onetime" or "few-time" interactions with others, in which they are judged on the basis of first impressions.

The psychologist, who has been studying the effects of physical attractiveness for the last 15 years, said the findings "give new dimensions to Freud's statement that 'Anatomy is destiny.'" (Freud's proposition referred originally only to physical differences between men and women.) Contrary to democratic notions that "all men are created equal," the findings imply that a person's physical appearance can make a profound difference in his or her life.

"It is clearly a myth that 'Beauty is only skin deep,'" Dr. Berscheid said, adding that both the lay public and American psychologists have long resisted the idea that attractive people are favored. "That our physical appearance should make an important difference in our lives is not a fact that makes most of us very comfortable," she observed.

"Genetic determinism is anathema to Americans, who want to believe everyone is born equal, with an equal chance for a happy life," Dr. Berscheid remarked in an interview here. "It's simply not so. The most important factors governing success in life are genetically determined: appearance, intelligence, sex and height." She cited a continuing study at the University of Minnesota of identical twins who had been reared apart. The study, she says, is showing that "genetically identical children turn out to be very similar even though they grow up in very different environments."

The preferential treatment of physically attractive people starts right after birth, Dr. Berscheid noted, and continues throughout childhood, adolescence and into adulthood. These are among the more telling research findings, all of which involved normal-looking people of varying degrees of attractiveness:

Newborn infants who are independently rated as attractive tend to be held, cuddled and kissed more than unattractive babies, according to preliminary findings by Dr. Judith Langlois of the University of Texas at Austin. On the other hand, mothers of unattractive babies tend to offer them more frequent and varied stimulation, perhaps helping their mental development.

Nursery school children who were rated by adults as physically attractive were found to be more popular with their school friends, in a study by Karen Dion at the University of Minnesota.

College students paired as dates at a "computer dance" preferred others who were physically attractive; the partners' intelligence, social skills and personality had little to do with the students' reaction to their dates, a Minnesota study by Elaine Hatfield Walster and her associates showed. "These results gave the lie to what people had said was important to them in previous studies," the researchers concluded.

Another study at Western Illinois University of paired college students who agreed to complete five dates revealed, contrary to expectation, that as the number of dates increased, attractiveness became a more important factor in determining if the partner was liked.

Young adults asked to describe the personalities of people depicted in head-and-shoulder photographs said that those who were physically attractive would be "more sensitive, kind, interesting, strong, poised, modest, sociable, outgoing, exciting and sexually warm and responsive persons," according to Dr. Dion, who is now at the University of Toronto. The attractive people were also thought to "capture better jobs, have more successful marriages and experience happier and more fulfilling lives" than the less attractive. On only one measure, being a better parent, were the attractive not rated as superior.

In a study at the University of Minnesota, men and women whose telephone conversations were recorded were informed that they were talking either to a physically attractive person or to someone who was not attractive. The taped conversations were later evaluated by judges who were unaware of the setup.

"A woman who was talking to a man who believed that she was physically attractive was judged, on the basis of her verbal behavior alone, to be more poised, more sociable, more vivacious, than was a woman who was talking to a man who believed her to be physically unattractive," Dr. Berscheid reported. And the men who thought they were talking to a physically attractive woman were judged by outside observers, again on the basis of their conversations only, to be more sociable, sexually warm, interesting, independent, bold, outgoing, humorous and socially adept.

As women become more independent socially and economically, Dr. Berscheid sees them placing a greater emphasis on the attractiveness of men, "who are now in the 'meat market' just like women have always been." She cited the recent advent of male centerfolds and male nude dancers as examples of women's interests in how men look.

Another factor has been the importance women today place on love as a criterion for choosing a mate. In 1967 only 24 percent of women questioned said they would marry only if they were in love, but a decade later 80 percent said "being in love" was a necessary condition for marriage.

"When romantic love becomes an important factor in social choice, physical attractiveness becomes important also," Dr. Berscheid told a symposium on the psychological aspects of facial form last year. The symposium brought together plastic surgeons, dentists and others who produce facial changes that often affect patients more powerfully than the functional defects they correct.

Sometimes patients react badly - "with pain and bewilderment" - to significant improvements in their appearance, Dr. Berscheid told the meeting at the University of Michigan. This reaction could result from the realization that we are not just loved for ourselves but for what we look like, she suggested.

Dr. Berscheid believes there is a hazard inherent in denying the impact of physical attractiveness: "Unattractive children who are unpopular may wrongly attribute their lack of popularity to some flaw in their character or personality," she says. Such an error, she believes, could result in lasting and painful scars.

In her own family, Dr. Berscheid says, she was regarded as less attractive than her beautiful sister who, unlike Ellen, was not encouraged in intellectual pursuits. "It was deemed essential for me to go to college, but the emphasis for my sister was placed on her good looks and her native intelligence was never developed," she recalled.

"We can't yet answer the questions most people ask: What is good about being ugly? What is bad about being beautiful? It could be that being beautiful inhibits the development of the person's other potentials. We need to study the effects of attractiveness on the development of other talents and qualities."

14 – Looking Good: The Psychology and Biology of Beauty

by **Charles Feng**

Human Biology, Stanford University

feng@jvi.org

In ancient Greece, Helen of Troy, the instigator of the Trojan War, was the paragon of beauty, exuding a physical

brilliance that would put Cindy Crawford to shame. Indeed, she was the toast of Athens, celebrated not for her kindness or her intellect, but for her physical perfection. But why did the Greek men find Helen, and other beautiful women, so intoxicating?

In an attempt to answer this question, the philosophers of the day devoted a great deal of time to this conundrum. Plato wrote of so-called "golden proportions," in which, amongst other things, the width of an ideal face would be two-thirds its length, while a nose would be no longer than the distance between the eyes. Plato's golden proportions, however, haven't quite held up to the rigors of modern psychological and biological research -- though there is credence in the ancient Greeks' attempts to determine a fundamental symmetry that humans find attractive.

Symmetry is attractive to the human eye

Today, this symmetry has been scientifically proven to be inherently attractive to the human eye. It has been defined not with proportions, but rather with similarity between the left and right sides of the face. Thus, the Greeks were only partially correct.

By applying the stringent conditions of the scientific method, researchers now believe symmetry is the answer the Greeks were looking for.

Babies spend more time staring at pictures of symmetric individuals than they do at photos of asymmetric ones. Moreover, when several faces are averaged to create a composite -- thus covering up the asymmetries that any one individual may have -- a panel of judges deemed the composite more attractive than the individual pictures.

Victor Johnston of New Mexico State University, for example, utilizes a program called FacePrints, which shows viewers facial images of variable attractiveness. The viewers then rate the pictures on a beauty scale from one to nine. In what is akin to digital Darwinism, the pictures with the best ratings are merged together, while the less attractive photos are weeded out. Each trial ends when a viewer deems the composite a 10. All the perfect 10s are super-symmetric.

By applying the stringent conditions of the scientific method, researchers now believe symmetry is the answer the Greeks were looking for.

Scientists say that the preference for symmetry is a highly evolved trait seen in many different animals. Female swallows, for example, prefer males with longer and more symmetric tails, while female zebra finches mate with males with symmetrically colored leg bands.

The rationale behind symmetry preference in both humans and animals is that symmetric individuals have a higher mate-value; scientists believe that this symmetry is equated with a

strong immune system. Thus, beauty is indicative of more robust genes, improving the likelihood that an individual's offspring will survive. This evolutionary theory is supported by research showing that standards of attractiveness are similar across cultures.

According to a University of Louisville study, when shown pictures of different individuals, Asians, Latinos, and whites from 13 different countries all had the same general preferences when rating others as attractive -- that is those that are the most symmetric.

Beauty beyond symmetry

However, John Manning of the University of Liverpool in England cautions against over-generalization, especially by Western scientists. "Darwin thought that there were few universals of physical beauty because there was much variance in appearance and preference across human groups," Manning explained in email interview. For example, Chinese men used to prefer women with small feet. In Shakespearean England, ankles were the rage. In some African tribal cultures, men like women who insert large discs in their lips.

Indeed, "we need more cross-cultural studies to show that what is true in Westernized societies is also true in traditional groups," Manning said in his 1999 article.

Aside from symmetry, males in Western cultures generally prefer females with a small jaw, a small nose, large eyes, and defined cheekbones - features often described as "baby faced", that resemble an infant's. Females, however, have a preference for males who look more mature -- generally heart-shaped, small-chinned faces with full lips and fair skin. But during menstruation, females prefer a soft-featured male to a masculine one. Indeed, researchers found that female perceptions of beauty actually change throughout the month.

When viewing profiles, both males and females prefer a face in which the forehead and jaw are in vertical alignment. Altogether, the preference for youthful and even infant-like, features, especially by menstruating women, suggest people with these features have more long-term potential as mates as well as an increased level of reproductive fitness.

Scientists have also found that the body's proportions play an important role in perceptions of beauty as well. In general, men have a preference for women with low waist-to-hip ratios (WHRs), that is, more adipose is deposited on the hips and buttocks than on the waist. Research shows that women with high WHRs (whose bodies are more tube-shaped) are more likely to suffer from health maladies, including infertility and diabetes. However, as is often the case, there are exceptions to the rule.

Psychologists at Newcastle University in England have shown that an indigenous people located in southeast Peru, who have had little contact with the Western world, actually have a preference for high WHRs. These psychologists assert that a general preference for low WHRs is a byproduct of Western culture.

Beauty and choosing a mate

Psychological research suggests that people generally choose mates with a similar level of attractiveness. The evolutionary theory is that by mating with someone who has similar genes, one's own genes are conserved. Moreover, a person's demeanor and personality also influences how others perceive his or her beauty.

Psychological research suggests that people generally choose mates with a similar level of attractiveness.

In one study, 70% of college students deemed an instructor physically attractive when he acted in a friendly manner, while only 30% found him attractive when he was cold and distant. Indeed, when surveyed for attributes in selecting a mate, both males and females felt kindness and an exciting personality were more important in a mate than good looks. Thus, to a certain degree, beauty truly is in the eye of the beholder.

Douglas Yu of the University of East Anglia in Norwich, England, agrees. "It's true by definition. Beauty is always judged by the receiver," he says. At the same time, he says in an email "there is inter-observer concordance, a measure of objectivity," so that individual perceptions of beauty, factoring in other characteristics such as personality and

intelligence, can often be aggregated to form a consensus opinion. One of the offshoots of Yu's work in ethnobiology was a piece in *Nature* in 1998 that showed that the hourglass-body standard of beauty in women, previously thought to be 'universally' preferred, was in fact likely swayed by advertising.

The halo effect

In society, attractive people tend to be more intelligent, better adjusted, and more popular. This is described as the halo effect - due to the perfection associated with angels. Research shows attractive people also have more occupational success and more dating experience than their unattractive counterparts. One theory behind this halo effect is that it is accurate -- attractive people are indeed more successful.

An alternative explanation for attractive people achieving more in life is that we automatically categorize others before having an opportunity to evaluate their personalities, based on cultural stereotypes which say attractive people must be intrinsically good, and ugly people must be inherently bad. But Elliot Aronson, a social psychologist at Stanford University, believes self-fulfilling prophecies - in which a person's confident self-perception, further perpetuated by healthy feedback from others - may play a role in success as well. Aronson suggests, based on the self-fulfilling prophecy that people who feel they are attractive - though not necessarily rated as such - are just as successful as their counterparts who are judged to be good-looking.

Research shows attractive people also have more occupational success and more dating experience than their unattractive counterparts.

Whatever the reason, the notion that attractiveness correlates with success still rings true. Yet beauty is not always advantageous, for beautiful people, particularly attractive women, tend to be perceived as more materialistic, snobbish, and vain.

For better or worse, the bottom line is that research shows beauty matters; it pervades society and affects how we choose loved ones. Thus, striving to appear attractive may not be such a vain endeavor after all. This isn't to say plastic surgery is necessarily the answer. Instead, lead a healthy lifestyle that will in turn make you a happier person.

Suggested Reading

Aronson, Elliot. 1999. *The Social Animal*. New York: Worth Publishers, Inc.

Cowley, Geoffrey. The biology of beauty. *Newsweek*. 1996 (127): 60-67.

Dion, Karen. 2002. Cultural perspectives on facial attractiveness. *Facial Attractiveness: Evolutionary, Cognitive, and Social Perspectives*. Eds. Rhodes, Gillian, Zebrowitz, Leslie. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Hill, C.T. et al. Breakups before marriage: the end of 103 affairs. *Journal of Social Issues*. 1976 (32): 147-168.

Langlois, J.H. et al. Maxims or myths of beauty? A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2000 (126): 390-423.

Little, A and D. Perrett. Putting beauty back in the eye of the beholder. *Psychologist*. 2002 (15): 28-32.

Manning, JT, RL Trivers, D Singh, R Thornhill. The mystery of female beauty. *Nature*. 1999 (399): 214-215.

Moller, A.P. and R. Thornhill. Bilateral symmetry and sexual selection: a meta-analysis. *American Naturalist*. 1998(151): 174-192.

Perrett, David et al. Symmetry and human facial attractiveness. *Evolution & Human Behavior*. 1999 (20): 295-307.

Tovee, MJ and PL Cornelissen. Is beauty in the eye of the beholder? *Nature*. 1998 (396): 321-322.

Zebrowitz, Leslie. 1997. *Reading Faces: Window to the Soul?* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

15 – Lookism at Work by Adrian Furnham Ph.D.

Are physically attractive people advantaged at work? Are they more likely to be selected for jobs, promoted in those jobs or given higher salaries? Does being physically attractive count more than being competent at work? Does physical attractiveness advantage females more than males; or does it depend on the job, the gender of the selector and the culture of the organisation?

Does intelligence moderate the relationship between attractiveness and work success? Is there a physiology of leadership? Can you judge the success of an organisation by the facial attractiveness of its CEO?

We know that attractive adults and children are judged to be more intellectually competent, emotionally adjusted and socially appealing. The questions are whether, when or why physical attractiveness reliably and powerfully predicts occupational outcome variables like income, career progress and performance. There are two competing theories in this literature: (1) Attractive people are better: their attractiveness is simply a marker of their ability and fitness. (2) Lookism, prejudice and discrimination unfairly (and unscientifically) link physical attractiveness and success at work.

The "what is beautiful is good" finding is so widely accepted that some organisations attempt to put in place processes and procedures which try to eliminate or reduce the possible influence of attractiveness. Some forbid the attachment of photographs to application forms; others try to ensure selection boards are made up equally of males and females; still others attempt through very strict competency-based, structured interviewing to focus on getting evaluations based only on work-based competency evidence. They all try to reduce impressionable ratings prone to halo effects.

There is plenty of evidence that physical attractiveness has manifold benefits in everyday life. First, there is cross-cultural agreement about attractiveness. Second, that both attractive children and adults are judged more positively compared to less attractive controls even by people who know them. Third, attractive people are treated more positively, and fourth they exhibit more positive behaviours. There are direct effects, though sometimes moderated by gender, age and familiarity.

Most selectors attempt to find people with the appropriate skills, aptitudes, attitudes and motivation to do the job well. It is rare to see physical attractiveness as a criterion of selection or competency. However there are certain jobs, particularly in sales, customer service, theatre, fashion or the media where physical attractiveness is seen to be a very distinct advantage and related to job performance. Hence it seems to many that it is quite reasonable, indeed desirable to take this into consideration in the selection process.

Can something be done to prevent discrimination sometimes called 'lookism' or 'facism' or 'weightism.' In most developed societies there are laws against discrimination in the work place based on sex, age, race and religion. These are often more driven by morality and ideology than scientific evidence. Many believe that physically unattractive people already carry a burden, compared to their attractive peers, that penalise them further in the work-place, which is simply unjust. Hence the call for legislation that outlaws decisions made on the basis of attractiveness.

One problem with this issue is whilst things like age and gender are objectively verifiable; judgements about attractiveness are more subjective. There is usually considerable agreement at extremes but less so in the middle of the scale. There are however both cultural and idiosyncratic correlates of physical attractiveness judgements. Moreover it is possible to separate face from body ratings of attractiveness or look at very specific features like height or hair colour. In this sense it may be difficult to defend a discrimination case where it is alleged that attractiveness discrimination has occurred.

Advertisement

There are three distinguishable theoretical/ideological positions in this area:

A. Unfair, stereotypic and warranting intervention

Some argue that the 'beautiful is good' belief is unfair, often denied and is an empirically unverified supposition and stereotype. As there is no evidence that physical attractiveness at any level (face vs. body) and/or associated with any feature (i.e. height, hair colour) is related to job performance, steps need to be taken to reduce this bias at work. Any evidence of an association between attractiveness and work performance is attributed to social processes rather than biological realities and ends up unfairly discriminating against those less physically attractive.

B . An evolutionary fact and reality

Others argue that there are both good theoretical reasons and empirical evidence to suggest that various physical features are associated with psychological factors and processes which directly relate to performance at work. In this sense the 'beautiful is good' idea is more an empirical fact than a stereotype. Hence it is wise to take physical attractiveness into account in the workplace and trying to legislate against it would be extremely counter-productive.

C . An association that develops

This position holds that physical attractiveness has developmental advantages which influence an individual's personality and social behaviour. For instance, because of the 'beautiful is good' stereotype, attractive people are treated differently from unattractive people from an early age; by parents, peers and teachers and later by employers. Hence attractive people are likely to become more self-confident, assertive and socially skilled, which in turn means they become more able at work, particularly in inter-personal relations.

Where do you stand?

16 - No One Wants to Admit They're Ugly, Which Makes It Hard to Fight Beauty Bias

by Rose Evelth, smithsonian.com March 31, 2014

Being beautiful is really convenient. Studies show that good looking people get offered more money and better jobs. They're also treated better by their teachers, their students, their waiters and even their jury. Not even moms are immune: they favor their prettier babies. All of us, actually, assume beautiful people are healthier, more intelligent, nicer and more competent. And those assumptions help us feel a little bit better about the fact that these pretty people are treated better than we are.

- What's Beautiful? It Depends on What Your Eyes Have Already Beheld

But should they be? Ruth Graham at the *Boston Globe* recently explored the ways in which the law isn't really equipped to deal with "lookism." Laws protect people from discrimination based on race, sex and other qualities that are, as a rule, out of our control and not indicative of actual qualifications or skills. And yet, creating and enforcing laws that protect the less-amazing-looking is really difficult.

"There is no lobby for the homely," Graham writes. "How do you change a discriminatory behavior that, even though unfair, is obviously deep, hard to pin down, and largely unconscious—and affects people who would be hurt even to admit they're in the stigmatized category?" She outlines a few of the solutions that have cropped up in the past few years:

Tentatively, experts are beginning to float possible solutions. Some have proposed legal remedies including designating unattractive people as a protected class, creating affirmative action programs for the homely, or compensating disfigured but otherwise healthy people in personal-injury courts. Others have suggested using technology to help fight the bias, through methods like blind interviews that take attraction out of job selection. There's promising evidence from psychology that good old-fashioned consciousness-raising has a role to play, too.

According to Graham, beauty is a lot more objective than perhaps we would like it to be. Studies have shown that what people consider "beautiful" is pretty consistent, even across cultures. So if it's possible to establish who is and who isn't benefitting from so-called "lookism," what's keeping us from creating legislation to protect people who are discriminated against?

One issue is that laws don't necessarily solve the problem. Some states have laws that address discrimination against people based on weight and height. But nobody really uses them. But the biggest problem, Graham argues, is that ugly people aren't united like other lobbies. "There are no 'unattractive' lobbies," Connor Principe, a research at Pacific University, told Graham. "For that to really work, you have to have people who are willing to be recognized as unattractive." And nobody wants to join the ugly club.

Some researchers say that we might be able to tackle lookism like we tackle racism—by convincing people to admit they have a bias and to start recognizing it in their daily lives. But that'll mean changing the story we've been telling kids from very early on—that looks don't matter. Perhaps instead of stories that champion the idea that "it's what's on the inside that counts," we need some stories that are honest about our bias for beauty, or a rousing tale of a

young princess who rallies the ugly people together to fight for equal rights. Because most of us are more like the frog than the prince.

Read more: <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/its-really-hard-legally-protect-people-beauty-bias-180950331/#LYfMW9vs361Dbg3C.99> Follow us: @SmithsonianMag on Twitter

17 – You are Judged by Your Appearance by Ty Kiisel

Like it or not, you are being judged by how you look, how you dress, and how you carry yourself—and, if you're lucky, how you do your job.

I had lunch yesterday with an old friend. I've known him for over 30 years. In fact, he introduced me to my wife. Unfortunately, we don't see each other very often and hadn't sat down across the table from each other for several years.

Let me preface what I'm about to say with, "I'm comfortable with my jeans and sneakers."

Dave is a corporate attorney. He entered the restaurant immaculately dressed, although he wasn't wearing a tie. I was dressed as I usually am (I did wear what I thought was a nice button-up shirt—it was even tucked in). Dave hasn't changed much since we knew each other in our early twenties, while I am decidedly more rotund, sporting gray hair and a nearly white beard. He could pass for 10 years younger than me, although he's actually a couple of years my senior (it must be all the time he *wastes* at the gym).

As we left the restaurant together I made an off-handed comment about how I appreciated that he got "all dressed up" to have lunch with me. He didn't miss a beat, "I guess I just take our friendship more seriously than you do."

Like it or not, every day we are judged by such things. Earlier this month I read something published by [Aaron Gouveia](#) that lists seven ways your looks affect your pay. Falling short in more than one of these categories, I hope all is not lost for the frumpy, 50-something, gray-hairs who wear jeans and red sneakers to lunch meetings with old friends.

1. **Tall people get paid more money:** A 2004 study by Timothy Judge at the [University of Florida](#) found that for every inch of height, a tall worker can expect to earn an extra \$789 per year. That means two equally skilled coworkers would have a pay differential of nearly \$5,000 per year, simply because of a 6-inch height differential, according to the study.

Recommended by Forbes

2. **Fat people get paid less:** Obese workers (those who have a Body Mass Index of more than 30) are paid less than normal-weight coworkers at a rate of \$8,666 a year for obese women, and \$4,772 a year for obese men, according to a George Washington University study that cited data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth in 2004. And other studies indicate obese women are even more likely to be discriminated against when it comes to pay, hiring and raises.
3. **Blondes get paid more:** A 2010 study from the Queensland University of Technology studied 13,000 Caucasian women and found blondes earn greater than seven percent more than female employees with any other hair color. The study said the pay bump is equivalent to the boost an employee would generally see from one entire year of additional education.
4. **Workers who workout get paid more:** According to a study in the Journal of Labor Research, workers who exercise regularly earn nine percent more on average than employees who don't work out. The study from [Cleveland State University](#) claims people

who exercise three or more times a week earn an average of \$80 a week more than their slothful coworkers.

5. **Women who wear makeup make more:** Not only do people judge beauty based on how much makeup a woman is wearing, make-up adorned women also rank higher in competence and trustworthiness, according to a study funded by Procter & Gamble, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston University, and the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute. A study in the American Economic Review said women who wear make-up can earn more than 30 percent more in pay than non makeup wearing workers.
6. **Handsome people are paid handsomely:** A Yale University study from Daniel Hamermesh finds employers pay a beauty premium to attractive employees. The beautiful workers earn an average of roughly five percent more, while unattractive employees can miss out on up to almost nine percent, according to the study.
7. **If you're too pretty, it's a pity:** Generally speaking, attractive people make out when it comes to salary and hiring. But what about the exceedingly attractive among us? If you're an attractive man, don't sweat it because you always enjoy an advantage, according to a 2010 study that appeared in the Journal of Social Psychology. However, women rated as very attractive face discrimination when applying to "masculine" jobs.

Speaking with another colleague who recently purchased a new home, he shared with me some comments made by his contractor who was complaining about one of his "long-hair" subcontractors who was running late on the house across the street. He used the term "long-hair" as if to say, "Of course these guys are late, they are all long-hair slackers. *You* know about those guys who have long hair."

I enjoy riding motorcycles and some of the nicest folks I have ever met have been people I probably wouldn't have otherwise associated with if it weren't for our common interest in motorcycles. People make decisions about us based on our appearance every day. What's more, we're doing the same thing.

This morning I read something Tom Keene posted on LinkedIn about table manners, "Always interview someone over food. You can tell so much about the person that is not evident in the office."

Although he attributes the sentiment to either President Nixon or President Ford, he continues, "I have personally seen too many qualified and unfortunate people that will never get ahead because, for whatever reason, they never learned the basics of fork, fork, knife, spoon, spoon," he says.

I remember visiting my Aunt Else as a very young boy (maybe even five or six) and being reprimanded at the table several times for misusing said table by resting my elbows upon it. Additionally, she was neither a fan of chewing gum nor of my chewing it.

There is an apocryphal story about how Henry Ford liked to interview over lunch as well. He supposedly would never hire anyone who seasoned their food prior to tasting it—he felt they would make rash decisions if they "assumed" the food needed additional salt or pepper without a taste (much like my wife assumes a nice steak needs some Heinz 57 to cover up the taste of the nice steak).

As uncomfortable as it may be, we are under the microscope every day. Our employees, our colleagues, and our customers judge us by how we look, how we dress, our table manners, our grooming, and *sometimes* even how we do our job.