



Published in final edited form as:

Body Image. 2013 March ; 10(2): 226–231. doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2013.01.002.

Prevalence and correlates of pubic hair grooming among low-income Hispanic, Black, and White women

Andrea L. DeMaria, PhD, MS^{1,2,a} and Abbey B. Berenson, MD, MMS, PhD²

¹Department of Health and Human Performance, College of Charleston, Charleston, SC, USA

²Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Women's Health and Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX, USA

Abstract

The purpose of this paper was to describe pubic hair grooming behaviors (shaving, waxing, trimming or dyeing) and the extent to which grooming was related to demographic characteristics and sexual history among low-income Hispanic, Black, and White women. Data were collected from 1,677 women aged 16 to 40 years between July 2010 and August 2011 as part of a larger study. Participants completed a cross-sectional written survey. Multivariable analyses were used to identify correlates of pubic hair grooming. Being a current groomer was associated with being White, a younger age, under or normal weight, having a yearly household income > \$30,000, and having 5 or more lifetime sexual partners. Overall, we discovered pubic hair grooming was extremely common among women of varying demographics. It is important for health and research professionals to understand pubic hair grooming practices so they can address behavioral and clinical concerns.

Keywords

pubic hair; vulva; vagina; body image; low-income women

Hair removal, often promoted as a means of femininity and attractiveness, first became normalized at the end of the World War II era, and has continued to be the ideal for beauty and social advancement for women (Labre, 2002). Most initiate hair removal, including hair surrounding the genitals, to conform to social norms and continue to do so for reasons related to femininity, sexuality, cleanliness and attractiveness (Labre, 2002; Smolak & Mumen, 2011; Tiggeman & Hodgson, 2008). Although normative pubic hair grooming is considered a contemporary trend, the decorating, sculpting, and removal of pubic hair has been practiced for medical, artistic, and cultural reasons for centuries (Ramsey, Sweeney, Fraser, & Oades, 2009). Pubic hair removal is carried out by both males and females, but tends to be more frequent among women, and shows a great range of variability between different populations (Boroughs, Cafri, & Thompson, 2005; Martins, Tiggemann, & Churchett, 2008; Ramsey et al., 2009; Smolak & Mumen, 2011; Tiggeman & Hodgson, 2008).

Despite total pubic hair removal being considered a modern *norm*, a recent Internet study conducted in the United States found it was more common than not for women to have some

Correspondence: Abbey B. Berenson, MD, MMS, PhD, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Texas Medical Branch, 301 University Blvd, Galveston, Texas 77555-0587, abberens@utmb.edu, Telephone: 409-772-2417, Fax: 409-747-5129.

^aDr. DeMaria was a postdoctoral fellow at UTMB at the time of data collection. She has since joined the faculty at the College of Charleston.

hair on their genitals (Herbenick, Schick, Reece, Sanders, & Fortenberry, 2010). Women who engaged in total pubic hair removal were significantly younger, more likely to have received cunnilingus in the past four weeks, and had a more positive genital self-image and sexual function index scores (Herbenick et al., 2010). Hair removal may be due to female hygiene practices (Demirci, Dogan, Erkol, & Deniz, 2008), or for aesthetic or sexual reasons, such as to increase visual exposure or improve appearance of the genitals (Demirci et al., 2008; Martins et al., 2008; Ramsey et al., 2009). Yet, evidence for these assumptions is lacking, especially among a demographically diverse sample.

A study conducted in Australia noted that discussions in various media outlets (e.g., magazines, television shows) have focused on styles of pubic hair and grooming methods (Tiggemann & Hodgson, 2008). Numerous products and techniques are available, including: shaving (razor/electric), trimming with scissors, depilatory cream, waxing, sugaring, threading/plucking, dyeing/bleaching, electrolysis (the only permanent method of hair removal), and laser (Dendle, Mulvey, & Pyrlis, 2007; Porche, 2007). Whereas shaving has proven the most common method of hair removal, waxing is the most common method of extensive removal (Trager, 2006).

While the removal of body hair is one of the most common beauty practices, it has been the focus of little research (Labre, 2002). Although some studies have examined pubic hair grooming behaviors (specifically hair removal) among large groups of women of various ages (e.g., Herbenick et al., 2010; Tiggemann & Hodgson, 2008), little information exists on these behaviors among a large sample of racially diverse, low-income women. Based on the current literature (e.g., Herbenick et al., 2010; Tiggemann & Hodgson, 2008), we hypothesized that White women were more likely to remove or groom their pubic hair than minority women; however, this relationship has not been thoroughly explored. The purpose of this study was to describe pubic hair grooming behaviors (shaving, waxing, trimming or dyeing) and the extent to which grooming was related to demographic characteristics and sexual activity in a large sample of low-income Hispanic, non-Hispanic Black, and non-Hispanic White women.

Method

Sample

Data for the current study were collected as part of a larger study addressing general health behaviors. Women were recruited from one of three publicly funded reproductive health clinics in the Texas Gulf Coast region between July 2010 and August 2011. All women within the age range (16 to 40 years old) who presented for an appointment in one of the three clinics were eligible to participate. When approached, women were told their participation was voluntary, they would be answering questions related to health behaviors, and the written survey would take between 30 and 45 minutes to complete. Those who agreed to participate were reimbursed \$5 for their time and effort.

To assure women completed the written questionnaire only once during the duration of the data collection period, study personnel maintained a cumulative database containing the names of those who had already participated. Overall, 2,270 women were enrolled in the larger study, while 387 women declined. Hispanic women were significantly more likely to decline participation than Black or White women (19.5% vs. 10.9% vs. 10.1%; $p < .01$). Moreover, those who refused participation were slightly older than those who did not (27.9 years vs. 26.3 years; $p < .01$; 95% *CI*[-2.27, 0.91]). All procedures and protocols were approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Texas Medical Branch.

Measures

Participants completed a self-administered cross-sectional written survey instrument (Spanish or English). Analyses for this paper were limited to questions related to demographic characteristics, acculturation, sexual history, body esteem, and pubic hair grooming.

Demographic characteristics and acculturation level—Demographic characteristics included: race/ethnicity, age, marital status, education, weekly hours worked, and household income. Among Hispanics, acculturation was measured by asking if they were born in the US and using the Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (SASH) (Marin, Sabogal, Marin, & Perez-Stable, 1987). The SASH is a 5-item scale (e.g., Language you speak at home, Language you speak with your friends) with a 5-point response scale ranging from 1 (*Only Spanish*) to 5 (*Only English*). Item scores are averaged to create an acculturation mean score. Those with an average of 2.99 or less were classified as less acculturated, and those with an average score of 3.00 or more were classified as more acculturated. For this study, the SASH yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .98, indicating very good internal consistency (DeVellis, 2003).

Sexual history—Sexual history was assessed by asking participants a series of questions pertaining to age at first sexual intercourse (defined as penetration of the vagina by the penis) and sexual behavior during the past 30 days over their and lifetime. Specifically, participants were asked: 'How old were you when you had sexual intercourse for the first time?', 'How many sexual partners have you had in the last 30 days?', and 'How many sexual partners have you had in your lifetime?'

Body Esteem—Body esteem was measured using an adapted version of the Body Esteem Scale (BES) (Franzoi & Shields, 1984). The BES measures attitudes toward different dimensions of body esteem by focusing on specific body aspects (e.g., sex organs, body hair, weight) (Franzoi, 1994). Data collected on the BES were both valid and reliable (Franzoi, 1994; Franzoi & Herzog, 1986; Franzoi & Shields, 1984). The original scale consisted of 35 items; however, a shorter, 22-item scale was used for the purposes of this study (excluding items such as physical stamina, muscular strength, and width of shoulders, as they did not pertain to this particular study). Participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale of 1 (*Strongly Negative*) to 5 (*Strongly Positive*). A total scale score was developed by computing a sum of all 22 responses, as suggested by the authors, with higher scores indicating a greater body esteem (Franzoi & Shields, 1984). For the current sample, the BES yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient equal to .96, indicating very good internal consistency (DeVellis, 2003).

Pubic hair grooming behavior—Pubic hair grooming was assessed by asking participants a series of questions pertaining to method, frequency, knowledge, and purpose of pubic hair grooming. For example, participants were asked: 'Do you currently shave, wax, trim, or dye your pubic hair?', 'How often do you shave, wax, trim, dye your pubic hair?', and 'Why do (or did) you shave, wax, trim, or dye your pubic hair?' For each question, participants were asked to select from a list of response options, depicted in Table 2. Participants were also asked 'At what age did you begin shaving, waxing, trimming, or dyeing your pubic hair?' Of the 2,270 women who were enrolled in the larger study, data were collected on pubic hair grooming from 1,677 participants. Those who did not answer these questions were excluded from analyses.

Body mass index—Height and weight were objectively measured by clinic personnel and obtained from electronic medical records. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated on all

participants and classified into one of two categories: normal weight (BMI < 25 kg/m²) or overweight/obese (25 – BMI).

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics, using chi-square and ANOVA, were utilized to analyze participant characteristics. This analysis included an evaluation of three racial group categories: Hispanic, Black, and White. Those women who did not self-identify with one of these races were excluded from the model ($n = 34$). A multivariable logistic regression analysis was conducted to identify correlates of pubic hair grooming, comparing those who currently groomed to those who did not. Individual variables were screened prior to inclusion, with candidate variables indicating $p < .20$ included in the initial model. All analyses were performed using SPSS 19 (Chicago, IL).

Results

Overall, 30.8% ($n = 517$) self-identified as Hispanic, 42.6% ($n = 714$) as Black, and 26.6% ($n = 446$) as White (Table 1). Of the Hispanic participants, 58.6% ($n = 303$) were classified as less acculturated and 35.4% ($n = 183$) were classified as more acculturated, based on the SASH (Marin et al., 1987). The majority of Hispanic participants (65.4%; $n = 338$) were born outside of the US. The mean age of participants was 26.0 years ($SD = 6.13$; range = 16 to 40). Of the 1,677 participants, 351 (20.9%) were 16 – 20 years old, 930 (55.5%) were 21 – 30 years old, and 396 (23.6%) were 31 – 40 years old.

Sexual behavior during the last 30 days varied, with 74.5% ($n = 1,249$) of participants indicating having one partner. Sexual debut varied across racial groups, with Whites initiating sex at an earlier age than Hispanics and Blacks. The majority of Whites (62.3%; $n = 278$) indicated having 5 or more lifetime sexual partners whereas 60.0% ($n = 310$) of Hispanics reported 1 to 2 lifetime partners. Significant differences were noted among all racial groups ($p < .01$).

The 22-item adapted BES resulted in a mean score of 77.18 ($SD = 20.93$; $n = 1,395$; range = 22 to 110). An ANOVA revealed nonsignificant differences ($p = .20$) between BES scores among women who were current groomers compared to those who were not.

The majority of Hispanics (66.2%; $n = 342$), Blacks (66.7%; $n = 476$), and Whites (86.1%; $n = 384$) were current groomers (Table 2). The mean age of grooming initiation was 17.4 years old ($SD = 4.0$). Significant differences existed across all racial groups, with Whites having the greatest proportion of current groomers ($p < .01$). Chi-square analyses indicated that Hispanic women who were more acculturated or born in the US were significantly more likely to groom than those who were less acculturated or not born in the US ($p < .01$).

The majority of women who had ever groomed indicated having used a razor and shaving cream for pubic hair grooming (77.2%; $n = 1,108$), followed by trimming with scissors (23.1%; $n = 392$) and hair removal cream (18.7%; $n = 268$). Most women indicated engaging in self-removal (90.2%; $n = 1,292$) and first learning about grooming from a friend (42.8%; $n = 717$) and a sister/aunt/mother (40.5%; $n = 680$). Women reported grooming at least once a week ($n = 642$; 45.8%), at least once a month ($n = 473$; 33.7%) and on special occasions (e.g., wearing a swimsuit, having sex, doctor's appointment) ($n = 243$; 17.3%), with Whites significantly more likely to groom more frequently than Hispanics and Blacks ($p < .01$).

Primary reasons given by women across all racial groups for pubic hair grooming were for a neater, cleaner look (84.9%; $n = 1,229$) and because pubic hair is unattractive (47.8%; $n =$

687). Among those who groomed previously, but not currently (19.9%; $n = 331$), reasons for stopping included problems with side effects (i.e., stubble, rash, bumps, ingrown hairs) (22.7%; $n = 75$), too much hassle (20.2%; $n = 67$), and not currently sexually active (6.9%, $n = 23$).

The majority of participants were classified as overweight ($n = 1,047$; 62.4%), with a mean BMI of 28.86 ($SD = 8.03$; range = 14.3 to 97.0). Black women were significantly more likely to be overweight than White women ($p < .01$).

A multivariable logistic regression model was estimated to examine the relationship between grooming status (current groomer vs. not a current groomer), demographic variables, and sexual behaviors. Variables that met the screening criteria for inclusions were race/ethnicity, age, BMI, 12 month combined household income, last grade completed in school, and number of lifetime sexual partners. The Hosmer-Lemeshow test showed the model had good fit ($\chi^2 = 10.333$; $df = 8$; $p = .242$; $r = .07$).

Model results indicated that Hispanics ($OR 0.465$; 95% $CI [0.312, 0.693]$; $p < .01$) and Blacks ($OR 0.328$; 95% $CI [0.232, 0.462]$; $p < .01$) were significantly less likely than Whites to be current pubic hair groomers (Table 3). Those aged 21 to 30 years were significantly more likely ($OR 1.528$; 95% $CI [1.146, 2.036]$; $p = .05$) to be groomers than those aged 31 to 40 years. Women with a BMI classification of overweight or obese were significantly less likely ($OR 0.724$; 95% $CI [0.555, 1.945]$; $p < .01$) to be current groomers than those who were classified as underweight or normal weight. Individuals with an annual household income of \$30,000 or more were significantly more likely ($OR 1.935$; 95% $CI [1.247, 3.003]$; $p < .01$) to groom than those who make less than \$30,000. Those who had 5 or more lifetime sexual partners ($OR 1.664$; 95% $CI [1.184, 2.337]$; $p < .01$) were significantly more likely to be groomers than those who indicated 1 or 2 lifetime partners, suggesting that sexual behavior correlates with grooming behavior.

Discussion

This study sought to identify correlates of pubic hair grooming among women of varying demographics. Our findings, similar to past studies (e.g., Herbenick et al., 2010; Tiggemann & Hodgson, 2008) suggest it is more common than not for women to engage in pubic hair grooming. Additionally, women tended to continue grooming once starting the behavior, as indicated by a relatively low incidence of women who had groomed in the past, but did not currently do so.

Compared with Hispanics, White and Black women were more likely to groom, and initiated grooming at a younger age. Moreover, Hispanic women were significantly more likely to use wax as a grooming mechanism than both Blacks and Whites. The fact that the majority of all women were likely to self-groom, yet how one groomed varied across racial groups, suggests that future research should target grooming technique differences across racially diverse women, rather than attitude toward and frequency of pubic hair grooming. This is especially important, as little research has focused on the social and psychosocial determinants of pubic hair removal among a racially diverse sample of women. Because there are documented racial/ethnic differences regarding body image development and ideals (Gillen & Lefkowitz, 2011), it can be assumed that these differences also exist among other ideals, such as hair, and should be further investigated.

Younger women, in general, were more likely to groom, especially those aged 21 to 30 years, which could reflect the growing amount of media coverage surrounding the topic as well as an increase in the number of facilities promoting and providing pubic hair removal services (Herbenick et al., 2010). Additionally, younger women may be more likely to

groom due to lack of a regular sex partner. This is supported by the finding that not being sexually active was indicated as a reason for stopping grooming.

In contrast to the study by Tiggemann and Hodgson (2008) that reported waxing as the most common method of pubic hair removal, we found that shaving, an inexpensive means of hair removal, was common among this sample of low-income women. Depending on the type of razor (sharp/dull) and lubricant used (soap/cream/gel/none), these women could be at risk for clinical side effects, such as folliculitis or ingrown hairs, as suggested by the number of women who indicated stopping grooming due to negative side effects. Thus, healthcare providers should examine the genitalia for these issues when performing a well-woman exam. Gynecological visits could provide safe contexts for women to talk with professionals about grooming (e.g., purpose, methodology, frequency) and current health issues (e.g., irritation, infection) surrounding their grooming practices. Further research is needed in order to quantify the number of women who experience adverse health outcomes from pubic hair removal, as well as the frequency of discussions pertaining to the behavior with their healthcare providers.

The primary reason given by our respondents for pubic hair grooming was for a neater, cleaner look followed by a belief that pubic hair is unattractive. This agrees with past findings (Tiggemann & Hodgson, 2008; Toerien & Wilkinson, 2004) and suggests a negative attitude toward one's pubic hair. However, body esteem was not significantly predictive of grooming status, suggesting how a woman feels about her body does not relate to whether or not she grooms her pubic hair. How a woman feels about her genitals, however, may relate to her grooming behaviors (Herbenick et al., 2010)

As the number of women requesting elective genital surgeries is increasing (Liao & Creighton, 2007), it is important for researchers and clinicians to understand preceding behavioral indicators of genital self-image, possibly including pubic hair grooming. Specifically, women who groom may be more likely to consider more extreme genital alterations or be more likely evaluate the appearance of their genitals in a way not otherwise possible when hair is present. Thus, women concerned about their genital appearance may be more likely to engage in future elective cosmetic genital surgeries. Moreover, these discussions could also be used by professionals as screening mechanisms for potential future health issues for their patients. Further research is needed in order to ascertain an association between pubic hair grooming, genital self-image, and other risky genital behaviors. If this is the case, grooming discussions may also be directed toward education on vulva appearance or counseling referrals.

Limitations

This study had several limitations. First, it was limited to low-income women seeking reproductive health care at family planning clinics in the Texas Gulf Coast region and thus our findings may not be applicable to other demographically and geographically different populations. Specifically, low-income women may be limited in the mechanisms used to remove or groom pubic hair and may engage in behaviors due to affordability and convenience. Additionally, age of sexual debut and number of lifetime sexual partners among our participants differs from other sexuality-based studies, thus our study may not be representative of the general population. The measurement tool was not designed to solely investigate pubic hair grooming or sexual behaviors, but rather was nested in a questionnaire examining health behaviors (e.g., nutrition, risky behaviors, depression). Therefore, correlates examined were based on convenience.

Given that survey questions covered intimate topics, it is difficult to determine the accuracy of responses. Questions related to pubic hair grooming were located near the end of the

questionnaire, and may have been missed, skipped, or not completed due to the length of the survey. To keep the survey as brief as possible, several pubic hair grooming behaviors (shaving, waxing, dyeing, trimming) were lumped together, thus, behaviors could not be individually assessed. Finally, due to the cross-sectional nature of the study, it is unknown whether these women will continue to groom with age or change in lifestyle.

Despite these limitations, our work adds to the literature because it is the first to examine pubic hair grooming behaviors among a large, racially diverse group of women of various ages. Data demonstrate that demographically diverse women are engaging in various grooming behaviors, and therefore, this topic warrants additional attention from both researchers and clinicians.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Dr. Ophra Leyser-Whalen for her assistance with the editing process as well as her insightful thoughts that helped shape the discussion.

Sources of financial support

Federal support for this study was provided by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development (NICHD) as follows: (K24HD04365, P.I., Berenson). Dr. DeMaria was a National Research Service Award postdoctoral fellow supported by NICHD institutional training grant (T32HD055163, P.I., Berenson). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NICHD or the National Institutes of Health.

References

- Boroughs M, Cafri G, Thompson KJ. Male body depilation: Prevalence and associated features of body hair removal. *Sex Roles*. 2005; 52:637–644.
- Demirci S, Dogan KH, Erkol Z, Deniz I. Is daily shaving of axillary and pubic hair a feature of suicide in the Muslim community? *The American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology*. 2008; 29:330–333. [PubMed: 19259019]
- Dendle C, Mulvey S, Pyrlis F, Grayson ML, Johnson PD. Severe complications of a “Brazilian” bikini wax. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2007; 45:e29–e31. [PubMed: 17599301]
- DeVellis, RF. *Scale development: Theory and applications*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2003. Retrieved from: <http://www.sagepub.com/books/Book234290>
- Franzoi SL. Further evidence of the reliability and validity of the body esteem scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 1994; 50:237–239. [PubMed: 8014247]
- Franzoi SL, Herzog ME. The body-esteem scale: A convergent and discriminant study. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1986; 50:24–31. [PubMed: 16367445]
- Franzoi SL, Shields SA. The body-esteem scale: Multidimensional structure and sex differences in a college population. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1984; 48:173–178. [PubMed: 6726603]
- Gillen MM, Lefkowitz ES. Gender and racial/ethnic differences in body image development among college students. *Body Image*. 2012; 9:126–130. [PubMed: 21983339]
- Herbenick D, Schick V, Reece M, Sanders S, Fortenberry D. Pubic hair removal among women in the United States: Prevalence, methods, and characteristics. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*. 2010; 7:3322–3330. [PubMed: 20646183]
- Labre MP. The Brazilian wax: New hairlessness norm for women. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*. 2002; 26:113–132.
- Liao LM, Creighton SM. Requests for cosmetic genitoplasty: How should healthcare providers respond? *British Medical Journal*. 2007; 334:1090–1092. [PubMed: 17525451]
- Marin G, Sabogal F, Marin BV, Perez-Stable EJ. Development of a short acculturation scale for Hispanics. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 1987; 9:183–205.

- Martins Y, Tiggemann M, Churchett L. Hair today, gone tomorrow: A comparison of body hair removal practices in gay and heterosexual men. *Body Image*. 2008; 5:312–316. [PubMed: 18586585]
- Porche DJ. Male body depilation. *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners*. 2007; 3(1):14–15.
- Ramsey S, Sweeney C, Fraser M, Oades G. Pubic hair and sexuality: A review. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*. 2009; 6:2102–2110. [PubMed: 19453886]
- Smolak L, Murnen SK. Gender, self-objectification and pubic hair removal. *Sex Roles*. 2011; 65:506–517.
- Tiggemann M, Hodgson T. The hairlessness norm extended: Reasons for the predictors of women's body hair removal at different body sites. *Sex Roles*. 2008; 59:889–897.
- Toerien M, Wilkinson S. Exploring the depilation norm: A qualitative questionnaire study of women's body hair removal. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2004; 4:69–92.
- Trager JD. Pubic hair removal—pearls and pitfalls. *Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology*. 2006; 19:117–123. [PubMed: 16624702]

Table 1

Descriptive Characteristics and Sexual Behaviors of the Entire Sample

	Hispanic (n = 517)	Black (n = 714)	White (n = 446)	p value	Phi
Age				<.01	.12
16 to 20	85 (16.4)	174 (24.4)	92 (20.6)		
21 to 30	279 (54.0)	386 (54.1)	265 (59.4)		
31 to 40	153 (29.6)	154 (21.6)	89 (20.0)		
BMI				.03	.07
Normal weight	178 (34.4)	235 (32.9)	178 (39.9)		
Overweight or Obese	331 (64.0)	463 (64.8)	253 (56.7)		
Marital Status				<.01	.53
Single, never been married	99 (19.1)	528 (73.9)	194 (43.5)		
Living together but not married or Married	351 (67.9)	88 (12.3)	158 (35.4)		
Separated, Divorced, or Widowed	62 (12.0)	84 (11.8)	86 (19.3)		
Education				<.01	.37
Currently in HS	30 (5.8)	95 (13.3)	55 (12.3)		
Didn't complete HS and not in HS now	212 (41.0)	66 (9.2)	60 (13.5)		
HS graduate or equivalent	152 (29.4)	257 (36.0)	155 (34.8)		
At least some college	112 (21.7)	295 (41.3)	176 (39.5)		
Hours worked /week				<.01	.15
0 (I do not work)	324 (62.7)	342 (47.9)	205 (46.0)		
1 to 20	46 (8.9)	81 (11.3)	49 (11.0)		
More than 20	139 (26.9)	287 (40.2)	187 (41.9)		
12mo combined household income				<.01	.16
< \$30,000	390 (75.4)	617 (86.4)	348 (78.0)		
\$30,000	74 (14.3)	42 (5.9)	73 (16.4)		
Age at first sexual intercourse				<.01	.26
Has never had sexual intercourse	2 (0.4)	22 (3.1)	4 (0.9)		
14 or younger	82 (15.9)	177 (24.8)	118 (26.5)		
15 to 17	232 (44.9)	387 (54.2)	256 (57.4)		
18 or older	200 (38.7)	123 (17.2)	66 (14.8)		

	Hispanic (<i>n</i> = 517)	Black (<i>n</i> = 714)	White (<i>n</i> = 446)	<i>p</i> value	<i>Phi</i>
# sexual partners in last 30 days				<.01	.21
0	50 (9.7)	90 (12.6)	44 (9.9)		
1	431 (83.4)	465 (65.1)	353 (79.1)		
2	15 (2.9)	66 (9.2)	19 (4.3)		
3 or more	8 (1.5)	44 (6.2)	15 (3.4)		
# lifetime sexual partners				<.01	.50
1 to 2	310 (60.0)	101 (14.1)	63 (14.1)		
3 to 4	110 (21.3)	185 (25.9)	99 (22.2)		
5 or more	507 (98.1)	396 (55.5)	278 (62.3)		

Notes. Chi-square was used to detect group differences. Frequencies that don't add up to total reflect missing data

Table 2

Pubic Hair Grooming Behavior of the Entire Sample

	Hispanic (n = 517)	Black (n = 714)	White (n = 446)	p value	Phi
Currently groom				<.01	.19
Yes	342 (66.2)	476 (66.7)	384 (86.1)		
No, but have in past	119 (23.0)	166 (23.2)	46 (10.3)		
No	56 (10.8)	72 (10.1)	16 (3.6)		
Method (current or past)					
Razor and shaving cream	276 (66.3)	470 (79.0)	362 (85.2)	<.01	.18
Wax	116 (27.9)	70 (9.8)	48 (11.3)	<.01	.20
Hair removal cream	78 (18.8)	137 (23.0)	53 (12.4)	<.01	.11
Laser hair removal	20 (4.8)	14 (2.4)	12 (2.8)	.08	.06
Trim with scissors	84 (20.2)	153 (25.7)	95 (22.3)	.11	.06
Electrolysis	3 (0.7)	7 (1.2)	1 (0.2)	.23	.05
Pubic hair dye	9 (2.2)	13 (2.2)	12 (2.8)	.77	.02
Frequency				<.01	.27
At least once a week	191 (48.1)	189 (32.2)	262 (62.7)		
At least once a month	120 (30.2)	249 (42.4)	104 (24.9)		
Special occasions (e.g., wearing swimsuit, sex, dr. appt)	73 (18.4)	131 (22.3)	39 (9.3)		
Purpose					
Pubic hair is unattractive	177 (42.3)	270 (45.2)	240 (56.9)	<.01	.12
For a neater, cleaner look	372 (88.2)	499 (83.2)	358 (84.0)	.08	.06
Clothing styles demand it	110 (26.2)	186 (31.2)	162 (38.4)	<.01	.10
Visually please or sexually arouse partner	109 (25.8)	158 (26.5)	168 (39.5)	<.01	.13
Reduce irritation during sexual intercourse	87 (13.5)	98 (16.4)	110 (25.9)	<.01	.13
Who performs grooming				.04	.14
I do	366 (88.6)	540 (90.2)	386 (91.9)		
Friend	8 (1.9)	8 (1.3)	3 (0.7)		
Beauty salon	14 (3.4)	11 (1.8)	3 (0.7)		
Boyfriend/husband	9 (1.7)	9 (1.5)	2 (0.4)		
Mean age of initiation (M±SD)	18.35±4.34	17.52±3.68	16.40±3.87	.09	.01 ^a

Notes. Chi-square and one-way ANOVA were used to detect group differences where appropriate. Frequencies that don't add up to total reflect missing data.

^a represents η^2 value

Table 3

Multivariate Logistic Regression Results using Correlates of Grooming Behavior

	<i>p</i> value	Exp (β)	95% CI for Exp (β)
Race	<.01		
White, Non-Hispanic (reference)			
Hispanic or Latino	<.01	0.47	0.31 – 0.69
Black or African American	<.01	0.33	0.23 – 0.46
Age	.02		
16 to 20	.14	1.38	0.90 – 2.11
21 to 30	<.01	1.53	1.15 – 2.04
31 to 40 (reference)			
BMI			
Under or Normal weight (reference)			
Overweight	.02	0.72	0.56 – 0.95
12mo combined household income			
<\$30,000 (reference)			
\$30,000 or more	<.01	1.94	1.25 – 3.00
Education	<.01		
Currently in HS	.36	0.77	0.44 – 1.35
Didn't complete HS and not in HS now	<.01	0.54	0.38 – 0.77
HS graduate or equivalent	<.01	0.65	0.48 – 0.88
At least some college (reference)			
# lifetime sexual partners	<.01		
1 to 2 (reference)			
3 to 4	.48	1.13	0.80 – 1.59
5 or more	<.01	1.66	1.18 – 2.34
Constant	<.01	5.26	