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This research examined the effects of appearance discrimination toward men as regards employment decisions and the extent to which the degree of interviewer self-monitoring influences these decisions. Past research has indicated that discrimination does indeed occur for women, but no empirical research has been conducted on male discrimination in which hair length has been manipulated. Specifically, length of hair (shoulder length, approximately 1 inch, and balding) was manipulated for potential job applicants. These conditions were examined across different types of jobs (traditionally conservative, neutral, and traditionally liberal). Several hypotheses are offered, with most focused on the concept that those scoring high in self-monitoring will base decisions on the "fit" of the applicant appearance to the type of job, whereas those scoring low on self-monitoring will base their decisions more on the qualifications of the applicant. Results indicate that male appearance discrimination does not occur and that employer levels of self-monitoring have no impact on hiring decisions.
The Effects of Interviewer Self-Monitoring on Male Appearance Discrimination in Employment Decisions

In a perfect world personnel issues such as hiring decisions, salary decisions, and performance appraisal would be based on rational, impartial decisions. Further, such decision making would be based on education, employment history, letters of recommendation, and/or job competence. Unfortunately, humans are the ones that make these personnel decisions and they often may unfairly discriminate, whether it is realized or not.

Discrimination may come in a variety of forms. A person or group of persons may discriminate because of age, gender, race, handicap, attractiveness, or appearance. Some forms of discrimination are protected by law. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (1964) deals with discrimination in employment. According to this law it is illegal to discriminate in employment with regard to race, sex, religion, color, or national origin. In addition, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA, 1967) prohibits age discrimination. In 1990 the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA, 1990) was passed making it unlawful to discriminate against those with a disability or handicap. Unfortunately, not all forms of unfair discrimination have laws that discourage their occurrence. Attractiveness and appearance are examples of basis for discrimination that are not covered by any existing law or laws. Therefore, they can, and often do affect personnel decisions within the workplace without any thought to their appropriateness.
While these forms of discrimination may not cause legal action to be taken against an organization, they may result in the selection of a less qualified applicant due to his/her "fit" with the stereotype that a position may have. This result, in turn, may cause productivity losses to the organization. Additionally, an applicant, armed with knowledge, can adjust his appearance to prevent attention from focusing on qualification-irrelevant characteristics.

Attractiveness and appearance are both outward characteristics. They are easily observable immediately by another person when involved in a social interaction or simply when presented with an image of a person (Locher, Unger, Sociedade, & Wahl, 1993). When these characteristics become salient in the mind of an observer, they evoke a stereotypic image. The observer then incorporates all of the specific information that may be contained within that stereotype for that kind of person. This information then becomes part of the basis for a judgment, regardless of how it relates to the current personnel or employment decision (Pingitore, Dugoni, Tindale, & Spring, 1994).

Drogosz and Levy (1996) found that more attractive applicants are given higher ratings across jobs with differing levels of masculinity. These types of biases seem to occur at all different experience levels of management. More attractive candidates, particularly men, are preferred over less attractive candidates. These biases decrease as the experience level of the manager increases, but are present regardless of experience level (Marlowe, Schneider, & Nelson, 1996). Further, higher levels of attractiveness seem to have a positive effect on promotion decisions (Morrow, McElroy, Stamper, & Wilson, 1990), particularly when previous performance of the candidates being considered is mediocre (Chung & Leung, 1988). With these issues in mind, it then becomes quite
relevant to investigate these job-irrelevant attributes that may in fact influence judgments made in the hiring and promotion of employees.

Dion, Berscheid, and Walster (1972) asserted that a person’s physical appearance (or attractiveness) and gender are the personal characteristics that are the most obvious in any social interaction. Further, there is a general preference for hiring physically attractive people (e.g., Cann, Siegfried, & Pearce, 1981; Dipboye, Arvey, & Terpstra, 1977; Dipboye, Fromkin, & Wiback, 1975; Gilmore, Beehr, & Love, 1986; Quereshi & Kay, 1986). It would seem that there is a “what is beautiful is good” ideology within the minds of most Americans (Cash, Gillen, & Burns, 1977). People believe that attractive persons have more socially desirable traits and can and do achieve greater levels of personal and professional success than can an unattractive person. Also, physically attractive individuals have been reported to be perceived as more intellectually competent than are less attractive individuals (Jackson, Hunter, & Hodge, 1995). The wearing of eyeglasses has been found to have no effect on perceived level of intelligence but causes decreased levels of perceived attractiveness (Lundberg & Sheehen, 1994). Nykodym and Simonetti (1987) found that physical appearance ranked eighth out of twenty factors that are considered by individuals to be organizational survival and success factors. Even in decisions made in court, attractiveness has an effect. Those individuals rated higher on levels of attractiveness are given shorter sentences than those rated lower (Stewart II, 1985).

Attractiveness usually refers to the innate beauty of a person, whereas appearance is something that may be manipulated or changed rather easily. The stereotype or schema of an individual’s characteristics can bias decisions made regarding the target individual.
Taller men (an aspect of attractiveness) receive higher starting salaries and are more likely to advance in corporate training programs than are shorter men (Cann, 1991). Jackson and Ervin (1992) asserted that height is not so much an asset for tall men as being short is a liability. Research has also shown that bad posture can negatively affect attractiveness judgements (Osborn, 1996). Cash (1990) found that balding men are generally perceived less favorably than non-balding men. They were found to be less physically, personally, and socially desirable. Research has also shown that beardedness has an affect on the perceptions of personality characteristics of males, although it is not conclusive in direction (Pellegrini, 1989). In general, the more attractive a person is perceived to be, the more likely he/she will be chosen as an emergent leader (Cherulnik, 1995), and leaders within a group are often seen as more physically attractive (Goktepe & Schneier, 1989).

Zebrowitz, Tenenbaum, and Goldstein (1991) assert that the effects of attractiveness depend on the nature of the job, or its gender type, as well as the applicant’s level of attractiveness. Attractive women tend to be evaluated more favorably for feminine but not for masculine jobs, but attractive men are evaluated more favorably for both types of jobs. Research has even shown that first names influence attractiveness perceptions, although more so for females than for males (Erwin, 1993). In sum, a variety of research has been undertaken to explore the depth of workplace biases, stereotypes, and discrimination. However, the bulk of this research has focused only on women or has not specifically looked at male appearance discrimination.

Kyle and Mahler (1996) speculated that a variety of physical appearance-related characteristics may affect personnel decisions, especially when the applicant is female.
Specifically, they examined the effect of hair color and cosmetic use on judgments about a female applicant’s ability for a professional position holding attractiveness constant. The same woman was used for all conditions (applicant with red, blonde, or brunette hair by cosmetic use, no cosmetic use) by taking photographs of the same woman in all of the possible combinations of conditions. Kyle and Mahler hypothesized that the applicant would receive the highest ratings and starting salary when depicted with brunette hair and the lowest when depicted with blonde hair. Also, when the applicant was wearing cosmetics she would be assigned a lower starting salary and would be seen as less capable than when not wearing cosmetics (physically unattractive females have been found to be preferred over attractive females for managerial or professional positions (Cann et al., 1981)). The results of Kyle and Mahler’s study were in agreement with the hypotheses. Female applicants were seen as more capable and assigned a higher beginning salary when the pictured woman was not wearing cosmetics (Kyle & Mahler, 1996). Also, the pictured woman was rated more capable and was given a higher salary when she was shown with brunette hair rather than red or blonde hair. These results make the issues involving discrimination even more complex. Not only is the attractive person at an advantage over the unattractive but also a specific type of attractive person may be given advantage over other attractive applicants.

A question that needs to be addressed is what exactly is the force or construct that is driving this type of discrimination or bias. Arvey and Campion (1982) noted that “research investigating the characteristics of the interviewer and the subsequent impact on interviewee ... perceptions is sorely lacking” (p. 308). They further stated that as regards research on interviews, “... one is almost struck by the complete lack of attention
which has been paid to the person-perception literature by researchers ... perhaps even ignoring the fact that the phenomenon under investigation is essentially a perceptual process” (p. 312). One of these important interviewer characteristics may indeed be self-monitoring.

Self-monitoring theory tries to explain the way that individuals use information that is available in the environment to aid in their own behavioral response (Snyder, 1974). Persons with high self-monitoring generally try to be the type of person called for by a particular situation (Snyder, Berscheid, & Matwychuk, 1988). He or she is sensitive and responsive to cues from individuals and situations regarding the behavioral appropriateness of their actions. More importantly, they also tend to carry this concern with their own appearance and behavior over to images conveyed by people that they may be associated with. Low self-monitors are not as concerned with tailoring their behavior to fit a particular situation. They are more concerned with appearing and behaving in a manner that is consistent with their own attitudes and dispositions. This practice is also carried over to individuals with whom they may associate (Snyder et al., 1988).

Snyder et al. (1988) examined the influence that self-monitoring may have on personnel selection decisions. Two studies were conducted that involved the appearance of applicants. The first study found that high self-monitors were more likely to select attractive but less qualified candidates than were low self-monitors. Also, low self-monitors were more likely to select unattractive, but more qualified applicants. The second study examined the appropriateness of candidate attire in selection decisions. High self-monitors were more likely to select those with an unsuitable personality but
appropriate appearance for a sales position. Low self-monitors reported that personality information was more important in making their decisions. High self-monitors felt that photographs were the most important criteria for making their decisions. Similar results were found for a camp counselor position. In sum, high self-monitors were more likely to choose an applicant who "looked" the part, but low self-monitors more generally chose an applicant who "was" the part.

In an extension of this research, Sheets and Bushardt (1994) examined the influence of self-monitoring on gender related biases in personnel selection decision making. Both a within and between subjects design were used in which participants compared and evaluated job candidates' resumes. With both research designs Sheets and Bushardt found that high self-monitors would offer higher starting salaries to applicants that fit the gender type of the position. No differences were found between high and low self-monitors regarding the likelihood of selecting the candidate for hire. While no differences were found between high and low self-monitors concerning probability of hiring using either strategy, Sheets and Bushardt contended that this lack of selection difference between the two types of self-monitors may be due to the "societal condemnation of overt discrimination" (p. 381).

With the results of these two studies in mind, it would appear that self-monitoring can indeed have a profound effect on decisions made by interviewers. An awareness of such a potential source of bias is invaluable to an organization. Training departments could examine those individuals who are involved in selection decisions in order to determine their level of self-monitoring. Undoubtedly, outward appearance and attractiveness may be important to certain positions within an organization, possibly even a business
necessity. However, these factors need not be taken into consideration in all employment decisions. Training should be offered to make those individuals responsible for personnel selection aware of their possible source of bias and attempt to eliminate it from selection decisions. Snyder et al. (1988) stated that studies (and organizations) “... have overlooked possible systematic differences between decision makers in their personal orientation toward personnel selection as well as the job appropriateness of the candidates’ appearances, an appearance-based factor that may be orthogonal to attractiveness” (p. 978). With this lack of research in mind it would seem that an examination of male appearance discrimination with regard to length of hair is in order. Although hair length may seem like a rather trivial area to address, Arvey and Campion (1982) suggested that research regarding the selection interview should continue to focus on “... relatively small components of the interview and interview process” (p. 312).

The Present Study

This investigator will examine appearance and its interaction with self-monitoring in discrimination in hiring decisions. Three types of jobs were used: conservative, neutral, and liberal. Based upon previous research (Locher, Unger, Sociedade, & Wahl, 1993; Pingitore, Dugoni, Tindale, & Spring, 1994) it was believed that by using jobs that fell within each of these “classifications,” certain stereotypic information would become salient to the observer and that in itself would influence the hiring decisions of the high self-monitor. As with previous research, the dependent variables will be probability of hire and starting salary.

The following hypotheses are offered:
Hypothesis 1: For the conservative position, medium-haired applicants will be given a higher rating than long-haired or balding applicants.

Hypothesis 1a: For the conservative position, high self-monitors will evaluate the long-haired applicant lower than will the low self-monitors with regard to potential to hire and starting salary.

Hypothesis 1b: For the conservative position, high self-monitors will evaluate the medium-haired applicant higher than will the low self-monitor with regard to potential to hire and starting salary.

Hypothesis 1c: For the conservative position, high self-monitors will evaluate the balding applicant lower than will the low self-monitor with regard to potential to hire and starting salary.

Hypothesis 2: For the neutral position, balding applicants will be evaluated lower than long- or medium-haired applicants.

Hypothesis 2a: For the neutral position, high self-monitors will evaluate the balding applicant lower than will the low self-monitor with regard to potential to hire and starting salary.

Hypothesis 3: For the liberal position, long-haired applicants will be evaluated higher than medium-haired or balding applicants.

Hypothesis 3a: For the liberal position, high self-monitors will evaluate the long-haired applicant higher than will the low self-monitors with regard to potential to hire and starting salary.
Hypothesis 3b: For the liberal position, high self-monitors will evaluate the medium-haired applicant lower than will the low self-monitor with regard to potential to hire and starting salary.

Hypothesis 3c: For the liberal position, high self-monitors will evaluate the balding applicant lower than will the low self-monitors with regard to potential to hire and starting salary.

Hypothesis 4: High self-monitors will evaluate the medium-haired applicant higher in the conservative position than in either the neutral or liberal position.

Hypothesis 4a: High self-monitors will evaluate the long-haired applicant higher in the liberal position than in either the neutral or conservative position.
Method

Participants

Two hundred sixty-four undergraduate students from introductory psychology courses participated in the research. Participants completed the study either as part of their course requirement or received extra credit for their participation. Of those surveyed, 60.6% were female. Participants ages ranged from 17 to 58 with a mean age of 24.30. The race of participants was 86.4% white, 9.5% African-American, and the remaining 4.1% belonging to another ethnic group or not reporting their ethnic background. Thirty three percent of participants reported that they have had previous hiring experience. Participants were randomly assigned to the experimental conditions.

Materials and Apparatus

A color photograph depicting the male “job applicant” in one of the three experimental conditions was projected onto a screen using a laptop computer and a projector.

Photograph Development. A photograph of a male approximately 30 years old with brown hair and no facial hair was taken and scanned into a computer image. Brown hair was chosen because it is the most common hair color for males. The photograph was manipulated using Adobe PhotoDeluxe. The photograph was altered in order to increase the “job applicant’s” hair length to approximately shoulder length. Another picture was
created in which the applicant is balding on the top of his head.

In a pilot study the attractiveness of the “job applicant’s” original picture was measured in order to ascertain a base line level of attractiveness. Approximately ten of the researcher’s colleagues examined the photograph and were asked to rate the applicant’s attractiveness. The consensus was that the applicant was of average attractiveness.

Position Development. In order to determine the three jobs used for the research, a second pilot study was conducted. Thirty positions were selected from the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) that the researcher felt represented stereotypical liberal, neutral, and conservative occupations. The job descriptions for the positions were rewritten and given to 20 graduate students and faculty at the university where the research took place. These participants were asked to read each job description and score the position on a 7-point scale (1 = conservative, 7 = liberal). The position of pharmacist was selected as the conservative position with a mean score of 1.65 (sd = .67). The position of graphic designer was selected as the liberal position with a mean score of 5.89 (sd = 1.14). Finally, the veterinarian position was selected as the neutral position with a mean score of 3.74 (sd = 1.59). Each position was also scored on a 7-point scale regarding gender type (1 = feminine, 7 = masculine), prestige, dependence, and social interaction. Means and standard deviations for these ratings are displayed in Table 1.

As can be seen by examining Table 1, each position scored similarly with respect to the specified characteristics. Because of this similarity, as well as the variation on the degree of conservativism/liberalism, these three positions were chosen for use in the study. The job descriptions used for the study can be found in Appendix A.
Table 1

Comparison of Positions Selected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Pharmacist M</th>
<th>Pharistol M</th>
<th>Veterinarian M</th>
<th>Veterinarian SD</th>
<th>Graphic Designer M</th>
<th>Graphic Designer SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Type</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on Others</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resume Development. Once the three positions were chosen, this researcher created resumes that matched the requirements of the specified positions. Approximately 20 graduate students rated the extent to which the resume of the applicant fulfills the requirements contained in the job description. The mean scores for the pharmacist, veterinarian, and graphic designer were 3.93 (sd = .96), 4.30 (sd = .82), and 3.88 (sd = .91) respectively. The resumes used may be seen in Appendix B.

Self-Monitoring Scale. Snyder’s Self-Monitoring Scale was administered to all participants (see Appendix C). The Self-Monitoring Scale has a reported Kuder-Richardson internal consistency reliability of .70, and a test-retest reliability of .83 (Snyder, 1974). Further information concerning psychometric properties of this scale are available in Snyder. Following Gangestad and Snyder’s (1985) recommendation,
participants scores were dichotomized into groups of high and low self-monitors (scores of eleven or higher were considered high self-monitors).

Procedure

Participants were run in groups between 10 and 50. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. Each participant received a packet containing an informed consent form (Appendix D), a resume for each “applicant” for one of the three preselected positions, a copy of the Self-Monitoring Scale, and a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix E) when they arrived for the study. The appearance variable (hair length) was fully crossed with job type (degree of conservatism). One of the three photographs was projected via projector attached to a laptop computer for each group of participants. In this manner, groups were randomly assigned to the appearance variable (hair length) and individual participants were randomly assigned to job type (degree of conservatism). Participants were told that they were reading the resume of an applicant for the specified position and rating that individual. They were additionally told that their ratings would be compared to the ratings of actual personnel officers within a large job placement firm.

The applicant’s probability of being hired was rated between 0% to 100%, and participants also assigned a starting salary between $30,000 and $50,000 (see Appendix F). A debriefing statement was distributed to each professor in which data collection was conducted in one of their classes. The professor was instructed to distribute this information to any student that had participated in the research study. These statements included the intent of the research as well as a summary of findings.
Results

The independent variables in the present study consisted of the type of job examined (conservative, neutral, liberal) and length of hair of the applicant (long, medium, balding). Participants were categorized, based on their scores, as either being high or low self-monitors. The dependent variables consisted of the probability of hiring the applicant and the starting salary assigned. Group means are shown in Table 2. For all t-tests, Levene's test for equality of variances was used and appropriate results are presented.

Analysis for Hypothesis 1 indicated that medium-haired applicants were not given significantly higher ratings than their long-haired or balding counterparts for either potential to hire, $F(2, 84) = 1.6256, p > .05$, or starting salary assignment, $F(2, 85) = .83, p > .05$. Further analyses with respect to the conservative position examined the hypothesis that high self-monitors would evaluate the long-haired applicant significantly lower than the low self-monitors with regard to potential to hire and starting salary (Hypothesis 1a). Differences were nonsignificant for both potential to hire, $t(26) = -.36, p > .05$, and starting salary, $t(26) = -.27, p > .05$. Hypothesis 1b proposed that with respect to the conservative position, high self-monitors would evaluate the medium-haired applicant significantly higher than the low self-monitors with regard to potential of hiring and starting salary. Again results for both potential to hire, $t(22) = -.34, p > .05$, and starting salary, $t(23) = .18, p > .05$, were nonsignificant. Significant results were found for Hypothesis 1c. High self-monitors evaluated the balding-haired
applicant significantly lower than the low self-monitors with regard to potential to hire, $t(33) = -1.21$, $p > .05$, and starting salary, $t(33) = -2.06$, $p < .05$.

Additional analyses examined the neutral position. Nonsignificant differences were

Table 2

Group Means Across Conditions and Self-Monitoring (SM) Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hiring Probability</th>
<th></th>
<th>Starting Salary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High SM</td>
<td>Low SM</td>
<td>High SM</td>
<td>Low SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Position</td>
<td>77.74% 12.83</td>
<td>74.11% 18.76</td>
<td>$41,290 $4,275</td>
<td>$40,088 $4,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Applicant</td>
<td>76.43% 10.82</td>
<td>69.05% 20.95</td>
<td>$41,428 $3,497</td>
<td>$38,690 $4,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-haired</td>
<td>81.67% 9.83</td>
<td>79.44% 14.74</td>
<td>$40,417 $3,680</td>
<td>$40,789 $4,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-haired</td>
<td>77.27% 16.79</td>
<td>74.71% 19.08</td>
<td>$41,591 $5,621</td>
<td>$41,029 $5,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Position</td>
<td>76.79% 20.38</td>
<td>79.82% 15.69</td>
<td>$41,379 $4,936</td>
<td>$41,409 $4,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Applicant</td>
<td>76.00% 21.19</td>
<td>85.26% 6.97</td>
<td>$42,045 $6,105</td>
<td>$42,875 $4,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-haired</td>
<td>86.00% 12.65</td>
<td>77.14% 22.68</td>
<td>$42,000 $4,048</td>
<td>$40,769 $3,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-haired</td>
<td>66.25% 23.87</td>
<td>76.82% 15.24</td>
<td>$39,687 $4,317</td>
<td>$40,455 $5,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Position</td>
<td>75.56% 18.26</td>
<td>76.17% 16.37</td>
<td>$41,346 $3,552</td>
<td>$39,375 $5,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Applicant</td>
<td>82.73% 12.72</td>
<td>72.17% 21.73</td>
<td>$42,273 $3,251</td>
<td>$39,674 $5,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-haired</td>
<td>66.67% 20.66</td>
<td>83.68% 8.31</td>
<td>$39,583 $4,306</td>
<td>$39,737 $4,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-haired</td>
<td>73.00% 20.58</td>
<td>73.33% 12.37</td>
<td>$41,389 $3,333</td>
<td>$38,611 $5,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
found for Hypothesis 2 which stated within the neutral position, balding applicants would be evaluated significantly lower than long- or medium-haired applicants for both potential to hire, $F(2, 81) = 1.66, p > .05$, and starting salary assignments, $F(2, 81) = 1.82, p > .05$. Another hypothesis (Hypothesis 2a) for the neutral position speculated that high self-monitors would evaluate the balding applicant significantly lower than the low self-monitor. Again, nonsignificant differences were found for both potential to hire, $t(27) = 1.76, p > .05$, and starting salary, $t(29) = .43, p > .05$.

Four hypotheses were offered concerning the liberal position. The first of which (Hypothesis 3) was that long-haired applicants would be evaluated significantly higher than medium-haired or balding applicant. Nonsignificant differences were found for both potential to hire, $F(2, 85) = .98, p > .05$, and starting salary, $F(2, 84) = .26, p > .05$. Nonsignificant differences were found for a second hypothesis (Hypothesis 3a) which stated that high self-monitors would evaluate the long-haired applicant significantly higher than the low self-monitors with regard to potential to hire, $t(26) = .05, p > .05$, and starting salary, $t(25) = -1.40, p > .05$. A third hypothesis (Hypothesis 3b) for the liberal position was that high self-monitors would evaluate the medium-haired applicant significantly lower than the low self-monitor for both potential to hire and starting salary. Again, nonsignificant differences were found for both, $t(5.52) = 1.97, p > .05$ and $t(23) = .08, p > .05$, respectively. A final hypothesis (Hypothesis 3c) suggested that for the liberal position high self-monitors would evaluate the balding applicant significantly lower than low self-monitors for both potential to hire and starting salary. Nonsignificant differences were found for both potential to hire, $t(32) = -1.49, p > .05$, and starting salary, $t(32) = -1.71, p > .05$. 
Two final hypotheses were offered. The first of which was that high self-monitors would evaluate the medium-haired applicant significantly higher in the conservative position than in either the neutral or liberal position (Hypothesis 4). Results indicated nonsignificant differences for probability to hire the applicant, \( F(2, 71) = .005, p > .05 \), as well as starting salary assignment, \( F(2, 70) = .94, p > .05 \). The final set of analyses examined the hypothesis that high self-monitors would evaluate the long-haired applicant significantly higher in the liberal position than in either the neutral or conservative position (Hypothesis 4a). Again, nonsignificant results were found for both probability to hire the applicant, \( F(2, 83) = .15, p > .05 \), and starting salary assignment, \( F(2, 82) = .77, p > .05 \).

Finally, out of concern arising from information loss due to the dichotomization of a continuous variable (self-monitoring), all analyses were repeated using self-monitoring in its raw, continuous form. Results using these correlational tests paralleled those in which self-monitoring was dichotomized.
Discussion

Based on the results of this research, it would appear that male appearance discrimination with respect to hair length is not present in employment selection and that the interviewer's level of self-monitoring does not effect his/her hiring decisions. Of all the analyses conducted, only one (Hypothesis 1c) found significant differences, although they were not in the direction hypothesized (high self-monitors actually assigned a significantly higher starting salary for bald applicants in the conservative position than their low self-monitoring counterparts). This higher salary assignment does seem somewhat counterintuitive, particularly given the results that Kyle and Mahler (1996) obtained with respect to female applicant hair color and cosmetic use. Given the number of statistical tests, it would not be surprising to find one statistical test to reach significance, regardless of direction (i.e., Type I error).

Although the overall sample size was relatively large, when examined at the individual cell level, dichotomizing with respect to self monitoring, the sample sizes are rather small (see Table 3). Future research may wish to replicate this study using a larger number of participants (preferably a minimum of thirty participants per level of self-monitoring, per cell). Also by examining Table 2, it is apparent that the standard deviations attained for all groups are rather large. If sample sizes are increased, it may reduce such a “flat” distribution of scores, allowing for more powerful analyses. In this manner it can be determined whether nonsignificant results are a function of reliable
Table 3

Sample Sizes By Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hiring Probability</th>
<th>Starting Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High SM</td>
<td>Low SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Applicant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-haired</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-haired</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Applicant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-haired</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-haired</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Applicant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-haired</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-haired</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

measurement, or that the results of this study were partially a function of error due to small sample sizes.

Another possible reason for nonsignificant results may be due to the fact that the situation in which participants completed the study may have been somewhat inappropriate. Participants completed the research in large groups in a classroom setting,
typically at the end of a class period. These two factors undoubtedly influenced the manner in which some participants completed materials. It may have been more appropriate to have had the participants go over the materials individually, within a scheduled block of time, thus allowing them to better focus on the task at hand, as well as to avoid any distractions that may be present in large group situations.

Future research may wish to focus more on jobs that have a high degree of "appearance appropriateness." For example, high exposure jobs such as sales positions may more readily elicit appearance biases. Participants may realize the need for appearance appropriateness depending on the type of product the individual is selling, allowing for greater distinctions between high and low self-monitors within their ratings.

A small number of participants asked the researcher whether or not there were any other applicants for the position. Their posing this question raises an interesting point. If participants felt that this applicant was the only one having applied for the position, they may have been more inclined to hire that person than if they were to believe that this applicant was just one of many. Future research may wish to address this point. Appearance biases may be more relevant to the decision-maker when decisions are of a relatively natural (picking the best of three candidates) than an absolute nature (design of this study).

The field of research concerning male appearance discrimination is sparse in comparison to other forms of discrimination. Although not a protected class, discrimination of this kind can lead to applicants best suited for a position being overlooked because of characteristics irrelevant to the position. As societal stereotypes change over time, this issue becomes an even more complicated one that will need to be
examined further. This study is only a small portion of what needs to be done before a clear picture of this issue can be presented. Only by examining male appearance discrimination in a variety of forms will we gain a clearer understanding of why and how often this specific form of discrimination occurs in employment selection.
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Appendix A:

Job Descriptions
Job Posting For:
High Impact Design, Inc.

Job Title: Graphic Designer

Qualifications: Degree in Graphic Design from an accredited university, ability to work with a variety of mediums, ability to communicate ideas to staff and clients, minimum of four years experience in graphic design.

Duties and Responsibilities: Designs art and copy layouts for material to be presented by visual communications media such as books, magazines, newspapers, television, and packaging: Studies illustrations and photographs to plan presentation of material, product, or service. Determines size and arrangement of illustrative material and copy, selects style and size of type, and arranges layout based upon available space, knowledge of layout principles, and esthetic design concepts. Draws sample of finished layout and presents sample to Art Director for approval. Prepares notes and instructions for workers who assemble and prepare final layouts for printing. Reviews final layout and suggests improvements as needed. May prepare illustrations or rough sketches of material according to instructions of client or supervisor. May prepare series of drawings to illustrate sequence and timing of story development for television production. May mark up, paste, and assemble final layouts to prepare layouts for printer. May photograph layouts, using camera, to make layout prints for supervisor or client. May key information into computer equipment to create layouts for client or supervisor.

Qualified applicants should forward resume to:
High Impact Design, Inc.
1717 Mockingbird Lane, Suite 204
Los Angeles, CA 90038
Job Posting For:
Whitestone Animal Hospital

Job Title: Veterinarian

Qualifications: Doctorate degree from accredited university, proven ability to diagnose and treat various types of animals (both pets and livestock), ability to communicate to individuals proper treatment and care of animals, minimum of five years experience as veterinarian.

Duties and Responsibilities: Diagnoses, and treats diseases and injuries of pets, such as dogs and cats, and farm animals, such as cattle or sheep: Examines animal to determine nature of disease or injury and treats animal surgically or medically. Tests dairy herds, horses, sheep, and other animals for diseases and inoculates animals against rabies, brucellosis, and other disorders. Advises animal owners about sanitary measures, feeding, and general care to promote health of animals. May be asked to conduct research or teach classes at local university.

Qualified applicants should forward resume to:
Whitestone Animal Hospital
142 Farmbrook Circle
Briarville, OR 76934
Job Posting For:
Good Neighbor Pharmacy

Job Title: Pharmacist

Qualifications: Pharmacy degree from an accredited university, pharmacists license, ability to supervise others, minimum four years experience as a licensed pharmacist.

Duties and Responsibilities: Compounds and dispenses prescribed medications, drugs, and other pharmaceuticals for patient care, according to professional standards and state and federal legal requirements: Reviews prescriptions issued by physician, or other authorized prescriber to assure accuracy and determine formulas and ingredients needed. Compounds medications, using standard formulas and processes, such as weighing, measuring, and mixing ingredients. Directs pharmacy workers engaged in mixing, packaging, and labeling pharmaceuticals. Answers questions and provides information to pharmacy customers on drug interactions, side effects, dosage and storage of pharmaceuticals. Maintains established procedures concerning quality assurance, security of controlled substances, and disposal of hazardous waste drugs. Enters data, such as patient name, prescribed medication and cost, to maintain pharmacy files, charge system, and inventory. May instruct interns and other medical personnel on matters pertaining to pharmacy.

Qualified applicants should forward resume to:
Good Neighbor Pharmacy
806 Rogers Road
Bateyville, TN 60857
Appendix B:

Resumes
GARY P. RILEY

336 BONNEYVILLE ROAD • LAS ANGELES, CA 90316

Objective

To obtain employment as a graphic designer with a firm dealing with different types of materials.

Experience

PENDANT PUBLISHING
Graphic Designer, 1995-1998
Designed copy layouts for over thirty books. Also was responsible for copy layout of two nationally distributed magazines for the past two years. Developed strong relationships with clients in developing publications. Worked closely with printers to develop final layouts and prepare them for printing.

WEST COAST STUDIOS
Graphic Designer, 1991-1995
Designed television commercial design concepts for a variety of products. Prepared illustrations for clients to show development and timing for television production.

Education

SACRAMENTO UNIVERSITY
Bachelor of Arts, Graphic Design, 1991

Skills

を持っている
• Excellent ability to communicate ideas to Art Director and client
• Familiarity with computer assisted design techniques
ROBERT F. SMITH

1234 Henderson St. • Wileyville, OR 74983

OBJECTIVE

To obtain employment as a veterinarian dealing both with pet and farm animals.

Experience

SMALL WONDERS VETERINARIAN CLINIC
Veterinarian, 1992-1998
Treated both pets and livestock to determine causes of ailments and prescribed appropriate medicines. Performed various surgical procedures as necessary. Conducted local workshops through clinic for public regarding animal care in order to promote awareness and overall animal health.

SMALL WONDERS VETERINARIAN CLINIC
Veterinarian Assistant, 1990-1992
Aided veterinarians at office while completing coursework for doctoral degree.

Education

EDINBAUR UNIVERSITY
Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, 1992

EDINBAUR UNIVERSITY
Bachelor of Science, Biology, 1987

Skills

♀ Experience dealing with a variety of breeds of animals
♀ Excellent ability to communicate with animal owners
♀ Experienced with surgical procedures
ERIC H. SMITHERS
13 Stephens Lane • Frankfort, TN 60634

OBJECTIVE

To obtain employment as pharmacist.

Experience

RITE-AID
Pharmacist, 1993-1998
Dispensed prescribed medications for patient care. Assured accuracy and used correct formulas and ingredients to compound prescriptions. Managed other pharmacy workers. Aided customers with questions regarding their prescriptions.

REVCO PHARMACY
Pharmacy Intern, 1991-1993
Worked with licensed pharmacist to develop practical knowledge of pharmaceuticals. Aided in the mixing, packaging, and labeling of prescriptions.

Education

WRIGLEY UNIVERSITY
RPh. Pharmacy Degree, 1993

WRIGLEY UNIVERSITY
Bachelor of Science, Biology, 1990

Skills

* Experience dealing with variety of medications
* Excellent ability to provide information to customers regarding drug interactions, side effects, etc.
* Excellent computer skills related to pharmacy files and inventory.
Appendix C:

Self-Monitoring Scale
Personal Reaction Inventory

The statements on the following pages concern your personal reactions to a number of different situations. No two statements are exactly alike, so consider each statement carefully before answering. If a statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, circle the word True following the question. If a statement is FALSE or MOSTLY FALSE as applied to you, circle the word False following the question. It is important that you answer as frankly and as honestly as you can. Your answers will be kept in the strictest confidence.

1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.  
2. My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.  
3. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things others will like.  
4. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.  
5. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.  
6. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.  
7. When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues.  
8. I would probably make a good actor.  
9. I rarely need the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music.  
10. I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.  
11. I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when alone.  
12. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention.  
13. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.  
14. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.  
15. Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.  
16. I'm not always the person I appear to be.  
17. I would not change my opinions (or the way that I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.  
18. I have considered being an entertainer.  
19. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.  
20. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.  
21. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.  
22. At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going.
23. I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite so well as I should. True False

24. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end). True False

25. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them. True False
Appendix D:

Informed Consent Form
VARIABLES AFFECTING HIRING DECISIONS

You are being asked to participate in a project conducted through Western Kentucky University. The University requires that you give your signed agreement to participate in this project.

The investigator will explain to you in detail the purpose of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask him any questions you have to help you understand the project. A basic explanation is written below. Please read this explanation and discuss with the researcher any questions you may have.

If you decide to participate in the project, please sign on the bottom of this form in the presence of the person who explained the project to you. You should be given a copy of this form to keep.

The purpose of this experiment is to examine the influences of different types of information on decisions to hire potential job applicants. The research procedure involves examining a specific job description, a photograph of the applicant, and the applicant’s resume. You will then report how likely you would be to hire the applicant and you will also assign a starting salary.

There are several benefits for your participation in this experiment. One potential benefit is that you will gain exposure to the types of information that an interviewer would have when making a hiring decision. This allows you to become better prepared for your entrance into the workforce, as you will undoubtedly go through an interview procedure of some kind. Also, you may receive extra credit and/or fill a partial course credit for participating in this study. Finally, you will be aiding the researchers in completing a study.

All data collected during the experiment will remain anonymous. Data will be entered using an identification number. Individual participants will not be identified at any time.

Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

I understand that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and I believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

On the basis of the above statements, I agree to participate in this project.

______________________________  ________________
Signature of Participant        Date

______________________________  ________________
Witness                        Date

C. Patrick McDowell, Researcher  
Department of Psychology, 745-4422

THE DATED APPROVAL ON THIS CONSENT FORM INDICATES THAT THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD
Appendix E:

Demographic Questionnaire
Demographic Questionnaire

*Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible. Remember, all information will be kept completely confidential. Neither the researcher or anyone else will have any way of identifying you with this information after it has been completed. Thank you.*

1. Please write in the last four digits of your social security number. __________
2. Please write in your age on the line following this statement. __________
3. What is your gender (please circle)? **Female** or **Male**
4. Race (please write in): __________
5. Have you ever had any previous hiring experience (please circle)? **Yes** or **No**
Appendix F:

Interview Questionnaire
Questions Relating To Decision To Hire Applicant

1. After reviewing all of the information that you have been given, how likely are you to hire this person? Please circle one of the following percentages that best indicates how likely you are to hire the applicant. If you feel that your decision would fall somewhere between two of the percentages, please circle the one that you feel most closely indicates your likelihood of hiring this person.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

2. The following range of salaries represent those typically found for this type of position. If this person were to be hired, indicate the level of salary that you feel the applicant deserves, based on the information you were presented with. Please circle one of the following salaries. Again, if you feel that your decision would fall somewhere between two of the listed salaries, please circle the one that you feel most closely represents the salary level you would assign.

$30,000 $32,500 $35,000 $37,500 $40,000 $42,500 $45,000 $47,500 $50,000