# The Beard Culture: Analysing Youngster's Preferences and Perceptions in Odisha

Prof. Debasish Rout<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Somabhusana Janakiballav Mishra<sup>2</sup>, Prof. Debabrata Sahoo<sup>3</sup> and Tejaswini Kantha<sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Amity Global Business School, Bhubaneswar, INDIA <sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Amity Global Business School, Bhubaneswar, INDIA <sup>3</sup>Lecturer in Management, DAV School of Business Management, Bhubaneswar INDIA <sup>4</sup>Student, BBA, Xavier University, Bhubaneswar INDIA

<sup>2</sup>Corresponding Author: sombapuni@gmail.com

Received: 26-03-2024

Revised: 12-04-2024

Accepted: 28-04-2024

#### ABSTRACT

"We never know who we're influencing, when, or why. "not until the present gets consumed by the future." in the words of stephen king, "we realise when it's too late."

"Today's youth are not just following beard trends; they're embodying a cultural shift towards masculinity and selfexpression."- a book called "the beard trend phenomenon: understanding cultural influences on youth".

In this digital world, where you can get updates on every celebrity and role model you follow, trends can have a strong influence on your thoughts process, beliefs, and guide your behaviour according to it. Not only that, but recent trends have the power to influence our culture and societal norms as well, making it important to understand the physiology behind it.

This article discusses the preferences and perceptions of youth in odisha being motivated to grow beards and continuously tailor them according to trends. It lists every valid argument that could be influencing young people's decision to join the beard craze. Starting with psychological elements, religious or even sports superstition, and the effect of top celebrities, everything is described in detail here.

*Keywords--* Facial Hair, Beard, Perception, Preference, Youngsters, Odisha

### I. INTRODUCTION

According to Dr. Emily Smith, Professor of Sociology at Stanford University, Biologically, the brain of adolescent people is still developing and very flexible, which means it is adaptable and fluid to change. This enables them to learn and adapt to new situations, technology, and trends more quickly than adults whose brains are more fixed in their ways. This is true for all current recent trends, such as getting a tattoo, wearing baggy clothes, or growing a pointed pointy beard.

Adolescence is a period of formation of individual nature and identity. During this phase, one explores

different cultures, values and develop a personal belief system. But before arising on a rigid belief of themselves, they come across various figures, say politician, celebrities, they're on friends for guidance and start considering them as their role model (Erik Erikson, (1968)).

Adolescents' brains are also distinguished by increased receptivity to novelty and incentives and decreased sensitivity to possible hazards. In search of excitement and social benefits, teenagers may explore new activities and become more receptive to peer pressure because of this combination. (Sarah-Jayne Blakemore, (2018)).

While the beard trend started in London around 2010, with older celebrities making beard to look presentable while aging. The full beard trend was brought in my Ranveer Singh in his look in movies like "Gunday". Other Indian celebrities like Virat Kohli and Shahid Kapoor also played a role in promoting beard styling. Cricketer Virat Kohli's sharp cut beard popularized the trend among young men (GQ India, (2017)). As they experience the transformation of puberty, many young men may feel a sense of pride and accomplishment in cultivating their facial hair as a symbol of their maturation.

Not just this, beard trend also brought a wave of new start up ideas like Bombay Shaving Company was also backed by Colgate-Palmolive, in addition to the British multinational consumer products firm Reckitt Benckiser. 2020 noticed Marico acquire Beardo, and Emami increased its investment in the male grooming start-up "The Man Company". One of the first brands to enter the men's beard market was Beardo, which spotted the trend early on. According to its former co-founder Ashutosh Valani, the male market will continue to expand if men are open to the concept of grooming and personal appearance (The Times of India, (2019)).

83% of Sikh men and 64% of Muslim men in India have beards, with many Sikh men considering it to be a religious need. Such beard influence can be due to not just influence of others or trends but also by beliefs of religion and superstitions. In cultures like, for Muslim there is a popular concept of "Sunnah" is all the things that were once done by Muhammad as per this this Prophet had a bread, then the modern Muslim follows it (Harjot Oberoi, (1994)).

In 1699, Sikh spiritual leader Guru Gobind Singh believed Sikh shall not use the razor, Hinduism believes beard is a symbol of masculinity, wisdom, and knowledge. Beard is considered as beard as a storehouse of energy and information (W.H. McLeod, (1975)).

Several superstitions consider shaving off one's beard as an offence that cannot be forgiven. In Indian custom and folklore, moustaches play a crucial role in determining caste hierarchies, occupations, and public perceptions of law enforcement.

For instance, men in the East India Company army thought that clean-shaven British invaders were untrustworthy and that moustaches were a symbol of manliness (Awadh in Revolt, (1984).

In India, a man with a beard is also viewed as the representation of the common man. A lot of politicians and philosophers have adopted this style to represent the country's simplicity and culture. Our first bearded prime minister, Chandra Sekhar, widely used this picture, as did our two other bearded prime ministers, Manmohan Singh and Inder Gujral. (The Business Standard, (2024)).

# II. LITERATURE REVIEWS

Addison, W. E. (1989) investigated that in terms of power, dominance, aggression, and masculinity, bearded males scored noticeably higher.

Łukasz Jach, Marcin Moroń, Peter K. Jonason (2017) found out guys who have noticeable facial hair may wish that other guys had less, as this makes their own facial hair display stand out among other men in the setting. Conversely, males with light stubble would prefer that other guys have less facial hair than they do, as they believe this to be more appealing to women.

Carre' JM, McCormick CM, Mondloch CJ. (2009) have inferred that the human face is a treasure trove of information about a person's inner condition and past life stages. The ratio of facial width to height is a sizeindependent sexually dimorphic characteristic. Aggression assessments by people without formal training evaluating their own-race faces were positively correlated with the ratio as well as with actual aggressive conduct.

Johnson, V. S., Hagel, R., Franklin, M., Fink, B., & Grammer, K. (2001) have indicated that women's preferences for masculine features in men's faces are connected to women's hormone status as ambiguous and contentious, despite being frequently cited as compelling proof that sexual selection has affected human facialattractiveness judgments.

Kenny CT, Fletcher D. (1973) have opined that intersexual and intrasexual selection refer to rivalry between members of the same sex and decision made by the other sex, respectively, in sexual selection. When intrasexual and intersexual selection pressures combine to support a certain characteristic, this is known as reinforcing directional selection.

Neave N, Shields K. (2008) have findings that say the way that women perceive male sociosexual traits can be greatly influenced by the presence of facial hair on men. The research is a little ambiguous, though; some studies claim that having facial hair has a good impact, while others find that it has a more negative one.

Dixson AF, Halliwell G, East R, Wignarajah P, Anderson MJ. (2003) have stated that A remarkably androgen-dependent secondary sexual characteristic in humans is the beard. According to Darwin, beards originated in our ancestors because women chose to wear them as a very appealing manly accessory. Since then, some have suggested that the development of beards was a statement of masculine authority and prestige.

Reed, J. A., & Blunk, E. M. (1990) have inferred that people's perceptions of men's sociosexual characteristics are significantly influenced by their facial hair. Women viewed faces with thick facial hair as the most appealing, whereas clean-shaven faces, light facial hair, and heavy beards were viewed as less attractive. Men, on the other hand, thought that people with long beards and thick stubble were the most attractive, closely followed by those who were clean-shaven and had light stubble. Both men and women gave full beards the best ratings for health and capacity to parent.

B J W Dixson, D Sulikowski, A Gouda- Vossos, M J Rantala & R C Brooks. (2016) found out in their research that when evaluating long-term relationships, beardedness may be seen appealing as an indication of intra-sexual formidability and the ability to directly benefit females.

Tiddeman, B., Burt, M. & Perrett, D. (2001) are of the opinion that applications for altering facial images along perceived dimensions (such age, gender, race, or health) can be found in forensics, psychology, and medicine, among other fields.

Wong, B. & Candolin, U. (2005) argued that when considering both direct and indirect fitness gains, the impact of competition on mate choice is determined by whether it leads to the selective sex achieving a high breeding value for overall fitness. If certain fitness gains are associated with male competitive abilities while others are not, trade-offs between them may arise. Furthermore, mating with competitive males may have different time and/or space costs and rewards.

#### **III. OBJECTIVES**

The following are the study's objectives: 1. To ascertain how young people in Odisha, across all demographic groups, perceive the beard trend. 2. To investigate how young people in Odisha see beards considering celebrity culture.

## IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this investigation, a sample size of 216 people was used. All respondents provided information online via a standardized questionnaire. To evaluate the hypotheses, an ANOVA and t-test were performed. ANOVA and t-test were performed through excel to know the perception of youngsters across different age groups. A post-hoc test was also conducted through excel to know which age group's perception significantly differs from the other groups. A ttest was also performed to know the perception of youngsters across gender and locations. A logistic regression was performed through STATA to know how perception of youngsters is influenced by different factors.

#### V. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) test conducted to ascertain if there are statistically significant differences between the means of perception of three or more age groups is represented by Table 1 and 2.

The output is interpreted as follows:

**H0:** There is no significant difference in the mean perceptions of youngsters between 3 different age groups.

Given the modest p-value (9.5E-11), there is compelling evidence to refute the null hypothesis. We reject the null hypothesis because the p-value is smaller than the significance level, which is usually 0.05. There is enough data to draw the conclusion that the mean perception of at least two of the age groups differ significantly. The conclusion is that there are significant variations between group averages is further supported by the fact that the variance between groups (131.5093) is significantly bigger than the variance within groups (543.5278).

SUMMARY Groups Count Sum Average Variance 13 - 19 392 5.444444 72 2.729264 20 - 25 72 363 5.041667 1.871479 26 - 35 72 261 3.625 3.054577

| Table 2: ANOVA      |          |     |          |          |         |          |
|---------------------|----------|-----|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Source of Variation | SS       | df  | MS       | F        | P-value | F crit   |
| Between Groups      | 131.5093 | 2   | 65.75463 | 25.76821 | 9.5E-11 | 3.038264 |
| Within Groups       | 543.5278 | 213 | 2.551774 |          |         |          |
|                     |          |     |          |          |         |          |
| Total               | 675.037  | 215 |          |          |         |          |

 Table 1: Anova: Single Factor

Now a post-hoc test is performed to know which age group is significantly different from the others.

The null hypothesis (H0) is that there is no significant difference between the mean perceptions of the two age groups.

In Table 3, the p-value (0.030634) for a one-tailed test is less than the significance level (usually 0.05), indicating evidence in favour of rejecting the null hypothesis and accepting the alternative. However, for a two-tailed test it is not rejected. It is evident form Table 3 that 20-25 age group has a smaller mean as compared to

13-19 age group. In Table 4, the p value (4.98E-07) for a one-tailed test and (9.95E-07) for a two-tailed test is less than 0.05. Hence it is clear that the mean perception for 20-25 and 26-35 age groups differs significantly. In Table 5, the p value (3.17E-09) in a one-tailed test and (6.34E-09) in a two-tailed test is less than 0.05. So, clearly it is evident that mean perception of 26-36 age group differs significantly from other two groups. Adult population have a negative perception towards facial hair whereas teen and young adults have a positive perception.

| Table 5. t-Test. Failed Two Sample for Means |          |          |  |
|--|----------|----------|--|
|  | 13 - 19  | 20 - 25  |  |
| Mean   | 5.444444 | 5.041667 |  |
| Variance                                     | 2.729264 | 1.871479 |  |
| Observations                                 | 72       | 72       |  |
| Pearson Correlation                          | 0.30329  |          |  |
| Hypothesized Mean Difference                 | 0        |          |  |
| df   | 71       |          |  |
| t Stat                                       | 1.901693 |          |  |
| P(T<=t) one-tail                             | 0.030634 |          |  |
| t Critical one-tail                          | 1.6666   |          |  |
| P(T<=t) two-tail                             | 0.061269 |          |  |
| t Critical two-tail                          | 1.993943 |          |  |

| Table 3: t-Test: Paired | Two Sample for Means |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
|-------------------------|----------------------|

| Table 4: t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means |          |          |
|--|----------|----------|
|  | 20 - 25  | 26 - 35  |
| Mean   | 5.041667 | 3.625    |
| Variance                                     | 1.871479 | 3.054577 |
| Observations                                 | 72       | 72       |
| Pearson Correlation                          | -0.02283 |          |
| Hypothesized Mean Difference                 | 0        |          |
| df   | 71       |          |
| t Stat                                       | 5.357042 |          |
| P(T<=t) one-tail                             | 4.98E-07 |          |
| t Critical one-tail                          | 1.6666   |          |
| P(T<=t) two-tail                             | 9.95E-07 |          |
| t Critical two-tail                          | 1.993943 |          |

| <b>Table 5:</b> t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Mean | Fable 5: t-Test: Paired T | wo Sample f | for Means |
|--|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|
|--|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|

| Table 5. (Test. Tailed Two Sample for Means |          |          |  |
|---|----------|----------|--|
|   | 13 - 19  | 26 - 35  |  |
| Mean  | 5.444444 | 3.625    |  |
| Variance                                    | 2.729264 | 3.054577 |  |
| Observations                                | 72       | 72       |  |
| Pearson Correlation                         | 0.053658 |          |  |
| Hypothesized Mean Difference                | 0        |          |  |
| df  | 71       |          |  |
| t Stat                                      | 6.598623 |          |  |
| P(T<=t) one-tail                            | 3.17E-09 |          |  |
| t Critical one-tail                         | 1.6666   |          |  |
| P(T<=t) two-tail                            | 6.34E-09 |          |  |
| t Critical two-tail                         | 1.993943 |          |  |

From Table 6, it is evident that in both the onetailed and two-tailed tests, the t-statistic is significantly greater than the critical t-value, showing a significant difference between the mean perceptions of the male and female groups. The mean perception values of male and female mentioned in the table is 5.111111 and 4.027778 respectively. This implies that the mean perceptions of the two groups (Male and Female) differ significantly.

| Table 6: t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means |          |          |  |
|--|----------|----------|--|
|  | Male     | Female   |  |
| Mean   | 5.111111 | 4.027778 |  |
| Variance                                     | 2.641745 | 3.111371 |  |
| Observations                                 | 108      | 108      |  |
| Pearson Correlation                          | 0.187984 |          |  |
| Hypothesized Mean                            |          |          |  |
| Difference                                   | 0        |          |  |
| df   | 107      |          |  |
| t Stat                                       | 5.206817 |          |  |
| P(T<=t) one-tail                             | 4.68E-07 |          |  |
| t Critical one-tail                          | 1.659219 |          |  |
| P(T<=t) two-tail                             | 9.37E-07 |          |  |
| t Critical two-tail                          | 1.982383 |          |  |

| <b>Fable 6:</b> t-Test: Paired Two San | nple for Means |
|--|----------------|
|--|----------------|

In table 7, the p value for one tail and two tail tests are 7.75E-05 and 0.000155 respectively. This implies that there is a significant difference between the perception of Rural and Urban respondents. While youngsters in rural areas are not exposed to media but those in urban areas are.

Table 7: t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means

|                              | Rural    | Urban   |
|------------------------------|----------|---------|
| Mean                         | 4.138889 | 5       |
| Variance                     | 3.503894 | 2.46729 |
| Observations                 | 108      | 108     |
| Pearson Correlation          | 0.130321 |         |
| Hypothesized Mean Difference | 0        |         |
| df                           | 107      |         |
| t Stat                       | -3.92254 |         |
| P(T<=t) one-tail             | 7.75E-05 |         |
| t Critical one-tail          | 1.659219 |         |
| P(T<=t) two-tail             | 0.000155 |         |
| t Critical two-tail          | 1.982383 |         |

To find out what aspects are significantly influencing young people's perceptions of beard faces, a logistic regression is conducted. There were 216 observations in all. The likelihood ratio chi-square test and the p-value are related. Because of the extremely low pvalue (0.0000) in this instance, the entire model is considered statistically significant. The pseudo-R-squared value for this model is 0.4496, meaning that 44.96% of the response variable's variability is explained by the model. Table 8 lists the coefficients connected to the various perceptual categories. When all other variables are held constant, each coefficient shows how the log-odds of the response variable change with a one-unit rise in the corresponding perception category.

The statistical importance of every coefficient is shown by the z statistic and P > |z| values. When the corresponding coefficient has a lesser p-value, which is usually less than 0.05, it is considered statistically significant. All of the coefficients in Table 8's output, with the exception of Y. Adult, whose p-value is 0.069, seem to be statistically significant.

| Table 6: Logistic regression |                      |       |       |  |  |  |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|--|--|--|
| Number of obs. $= 216$       |                      |       |       |  |  |  |
| LR chi2(6)                   | LR chi2(6) =134.64   |       |       |  |  |  |
| Prob > chi2                  | Prob > chi2 = 0.0000 |       |       |  |  |  |
| Pseudo R^2                   | = 0.4496             |       |       |  |  |  |
| Log Likelihood = -82.399808  |                      |       |       |  |  |  |
| Perception                   | Coef.                | Z     | P> z  |  |  |  |
| Teen                         | 1.521745             | 2.52  | 0.012 |  |  |  |
| Y.Adult                      | 1.303932             | 1.82  | 0.069 |  |  |  |
| Adult                        | 0.588965             | 2.01  | 0.044 |  |  |  |
| Gender                       | 3.522081             | 4.87  | 0.000 |  |  |  |
| Area                         | 2.139655             | 2.93  | 0.003 |  |  |  |
| Celebrity                    | 6.326237             | 5.78  | 0.000 |  |  |  |
| Cons                         | -7.20138             | -4.94 | 0.000 |  |  |  |

Table Q. I agistic magnession

# VI. CONCLUSION

There is enough data to draw the conclusion that the mean perception of at least two of the age groups differ significantly. The conclusion is that there are significant variations between age group averages which is further supported by the fact that the variance between groups (131.5093) is significantly bigger than the variance within groups (543.5278). It is also evident from the study that the perception of male and female youngsters varies significantly. They perceive facial hair in different ways. Similarly, we have enough proof that mean perception of rural and urban youngsters also vary significantly. The combination of predictor variables in the logistic regression analysis significantly predicts the result. Perception (Positive or negative) is affected by gender, location, and celebrity. It might be necessary to do additional research to comprehend the fundamental processes causing these variations.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Addison, W. E. (1989). Beardedness as a factor in perceived masculinity. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 68, 921–922.
- 2. Buss, D. M. & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50*, 559–570.
- Carre' JM, McCormick CM & Mondloch CJ. (2009). Facial structure is a reliable cue of aggressive behavior. *Psychol Sci.*, 20, 1194–1198.
- 4. Dixson AF, Halliwell G, East R, Wignarajah P & Anderson MJ. (2003). Masculine somatotype and hirsuteness as determinants of sexual

attractiveness to women. Arch Sex Behav., 32, 29–39.

- Johnson, V. S., Hagel, R., Franklin, M., Fink, B. & Grammer, K. (2001). Male facial attractiveness. Evidence for hormone-mediated adaptive design. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 22*, 251–267.
- Kenny CT & Fletcher D. (1973). Effects of beardedness of person perception. *Percept Mot Skills*, 37, 413–414.
- 7. Little, A., Jones, B., Penton-Voak, I., Burt, D. & Perrett, D. (2002). Partnership status and the temporal context of relationships influence human female preferences for sexual dimorphism in male face shape. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, B, 269,* 1095–1100.
- Łukasz Jach, Marcin Moroń & Peter K. Jonason. (2017). Men's facial hair preferences reflect facial hair impression management functions across contexts and men know it. *Arch Sex Behav*, 52(6), 2465–2473. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-023-02595-6.
- 9. Muscarella, F. & Cunningham, M. R. (1996). The evolutionary significance and social perception of male pattern baldness and facial hair. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 17*, 99–117.
- 10. Neave N & Shields K. (2008). The effects of facial hair manipulation on female perceptions of attractiveness, masculinity, and dominance in male faces. *Pers Indiv Differ.*, 45, 373–377.
- 11. Pancer SM & Meindl JR. (1978). Length of hair and beardedness as determinants of personality impression. *Percept Mot Skills*, 46, 1328–1330.
- 12. Reed, J. A. & Blunk, E. M. (1990). The influence of facial hair on impression formation. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *18*, 169–176.

- 13. Schmidt KL & Cohn JF. (2001). Human facial expressions as adaptations: evolutionary questions in facial expression research. *Yearb Phys Anthropol*, *44*, 3–24.
- 14. Trotter M & Duggins OH. (1948). Age changes in head hair form from birth to maturity. 1. Index and size of of hair of children. *Am J Phys Anthropol*, *6*, 489–506.
- Vick SJ, Waller BM, Parr LA, Smith Pasqualini MC & Bard KA. (2007). A cross-species comparison of facial morphology and movement in humans and chimpanzees using the Facial Action Coding System (FACS). J Nonverbal Bahav, 31, 1–20.
- 16. Wogalter MS & Hosie JA. (1991). Effects of cranial and facial hair on perceptions of age and person. *J Soc Psychol*, *131*, 589–591.

- 17. Wood DR. (1986). Self-perceived masculinity between bearded and non-bearded males. *Percept Mot Skills, 62*, 769–770.
- B J W Dixson, D Sulikowski, A Gouda- Vossos, M J Rantala & R C Brooks. (2016). The masculinity paradox: facial masculinity and beardedness interact to determine women's ratings of men's facial attractiveness. *European Society for Evolutionary Biology, 29*(2016) 2311– 2320.
- 19. Tiddeman, B., Burt, M. & Perrett, D. (2001). Prototyping and transforming facial textures for perception research. *Comput. Graph. Appl. IEEE*, 21, 42–50.
- Wong, B. & Candolin, U. (2005). How is female mate choice affected by male competition? *Biol. Rev.*, 80, 559–571.