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ABSTRACT

Although the sexual objectification of women in the media is widespread, there are limited experimental studies that have examined the short-term effects of exposure to sexually objectifying television (e.g., reality shows like *Jersey Shore*) through the lens of Objectification Theory. Objectification of men in the media is increasing as well but there are few studies on how men are affected by witnessing their own gender’s objectification. My dissertation filled these gaps by assessing levels of negative affect, state self-objectification, state self-surveillance, and state body concerns (shame and appearance anxiety) after exposure to a one-minute video clip of either men making sexually objectifying comments about women’s bodies (the female experimental condition) or women making sexually objectifying comments about men’s bodies (the male experimental condition).

Analyses of variance were conducted to compare the levels of these dependent variables in the experimental condition to those of the same gender control condition (which also consisted of watching a video clip but without objectifying verbal commentary). Other dependent variables of interest included the participants’ ratings of personality traits of the actors stating the objectifying comments. I also assessed for moderation of the relationship between condition and dependent variables by trait self-objectification and internalization of the thin-ideal or muscular-ideal using hierarchical multiple regression. To test the mediational pathways hypothesized in Objectification Theory, both state self-objectification and self-surveillance were examined as mediators of the condition effects.
In support of my hypotheses, both men and women in the experimental conditions had higher levels of negative affect compared to men and women in the control conditions. The participants in the experimental conditions also rated the actors stating the verbal objectifying commentary as having lower positive personality traits and higher negative personality traits compared to control condition participants. In support of my hypothesis, greater internalization of the muscular- and thin-ideals served as a risk factor for heightened self-surveillance after a brief exposure to objectifying media. The results of my dissertation support some of the components of Objectification Theory and reveal that even a brief exposure to televised objectifying media can have consequences for both women and men.
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INTRODUCTION

Sexual objectification of women and girls is a societal problem that occurs throughout American culture and individuals’ interpersonal experiences. Increasingly, women and girls have been portrayed in the media in an objectifying manner, prompting the American Psychological Association (APA) to examine how sexualization of girls and women affects their psychological health (APA, Task Force on the Sexualization of Girls, 2007). According to this report, sexual objectification is defined as making someone “into a thing for others’ sexual use, rather than seen as a person with the capacity for independent action and decision making” (APA, 2007, p. 2). Objectification Theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) has attempted to consolidate areas of research on women’s experience of objectification and its consequences in order to articulate the processes by which individuals are negatively affected. This theory posits that sexual objectification (either experiencing it directly or witnessing others being objectified in the media) is related to many psychological consequences (depression, disordered eating, sexual dysfunction) as a result of women engaging in self-objectification (i.e., internalizing an outsider’s view of sexual objectification of women).

Although objectification of women in the media is widespread, and there has been support for Objectification Theory from correlational studies, there are currently no studies that have tested the short-term effects of exposure to sexually objectifying television on state self-objectification. Similarly, although some studies have begun the examination of how viewing objectified females in the media affects men’s self perceptions or mood (e.g., body self-consciousness: Aubrey & Taylor, 2009; hostility and anxiety: Johnson, McCreary, & Mills, 2007), no known studies have assessed the effects of exposure to televised male sexual objectification on men. I addressed these gaps in the literature in this dissertation by conducting
an experiment in which I showed televised sexual objectification of men to male college students
and televised sexual objectification of women to female college students. I assessed the short-
term effects of this exposure on variables drawn from Objectification Theory (Fredrickson &
Roberts, 1998). Finally, moderators of the experimental effects were explored, based on previous
research on the media portrayal of the thin-ideal and as postulated by Objectification Theory.
Prior to describing the research study, I will review how women and men are portrayed in the
media; the correlates and effects of media use specific to these portrayals; and the theories used
to account for how these portrayals affect individuals (Objectification Theory and Social-
Cognitive Information-Processing Model).

How Women and Men Are Objectified in the Media

Magazines

A thorough analysis of the messages and themes conveyed by media is essential to
understand how media portraying objectification affects men and women. Extant research has
analyzed three popular media outlets for depictions involving sexual objectification of women
and men: magazines, video games, and television.

Magazines have been examined by focusing on the nature of advertisements, article
headlines, and the content of articles. Over the past several decades, the way women have been
portrayed in advertisements has changed (Plous & Neptune, 1997; Sullivan & O’Connor, 1988).
For example, women were previously shown in domestic or caretaker roles (as mother or
housewife); then, in more recent decades, women have been shown as working outside the home
to a greater extent.

However, in addition to their being depicted in more career roles, advertisements have
also increasingly portrayed women as sexual objects to sell products. In the most current content
analysis of magazine advertisements, Stankiewicz and Rosselli (2008) found that in their sample of 2,000 advertisements, women were portrayed as sexual objects in 52% of advertisements with women. By type of magazine, Stankiewicz and Rosselli found that this percentage was highest in men’s magazines (76%) and in adolescent girls’ magazines (64%).

In addition to women’s being depicted as sexual objects in advertisements, the actual content and photographs shown in “lad magazines” (Maxim and Stuff) also objectify women. For example, Krassas, Blauwkamp, and Wesselink (2003) found that men and women were rarely shown in photographs together in these types of men’s magazines. The authors also found that women were portrayed as sex objects in 81% of the photographs of women. Men were depicted as sexual objects as well, but much less often (33%). As a measure of objectification, Krassas et al. used face exposure (especially relative to body part exposure) of men and women in the photographs. A feature of objectifying images is that women’s bodies are reduced down to parts (showing only legs or chest), without their faces displayed. Women were often shown with their face fully or partially covered in 15.5% of photographs with partial nudity, whereas only 3.4% of photographs of male partial nudity had fully or partially covered faces.

Based on the review of magazine content analyses, women are consistently portrayed as sexual objects. Further, this portrayal is not limited to men’s magazines. It has also been found that advertisements in women’s and female adolescents’ magazines also portray women as sex objects (Davalos, Davalos, & Layton, 2007). One study also revealed that men are also portrayed as sex objects, but to a lesser extent than women (Krassas et al., 2003).

**Video Games**

Like magazines, video games portray women as sexual objects but also present men in a stereotypical manner. For example, Dill and Thill (2007) found that nearly 60% of female
characters were portrayed as sexualized, whereas male characters were shown sexualized 1% of the time. However, in terms of sex role stereotypes, male video game characters were portrayed as hypermasculine and aggressive. Burgess, Sterger, and Burgess (2007) found that on video game covers, women were portrayed as busty or super-busty (49%) and men were portrayed as muscular or super-muscular (26%). Furthermore, these authors found that 25% of non-primary role females were shown as super-busty, which was more common than non-primary males shown as super-muscular (approximately 5%). Female characters were also more likely to be used as “eye candy” (pleasing to look at) than male characters. Again, consistent with the content analyses of magazines, both men and women are objectified in the media, but to differing degrees.

Television

Like the results of the content analyses of magazines and video games, numerous studies also reveal that the sexual objectification of women occurs across television show genres and in television advertisements. However, television content analyses also provide information on the messages conveyed about the importance of appearance for women, attitudes about one form of sexual objectification—sexual harassment, and gender role stereotypes. Regarding the importance of appearance for women, Fouts and Burggraf (2000) analyzed 36 prime-time television comedies and found that 66% of central female characters were underweight in these shows, and the heavier the woman, the more common negative comments were made about her weight. Similarly, 80% of negative comments made by males about women’s appearances were followed by audience reaction of laughter, “oohs,” and giggles. Based on these findings, Fouts and Burggraf suggested several implications: criticizing a woman’s appearance will be reinforced by laughter; it is acceptable to laugh when someone makes a comment about an
overweight woman; and women who are depicted as overweight are not desired by or attractive to men.

In terms of sexual objectification, Montemurro (2003) analyzed situation comedies to determine the degree to which sexist images were presented. For all shows, an average of 3.30 incidents of gender harassment occurred per 22-minute episode, indicating that gender harassment made up a sizable portion of the comedic material in these shows.

Finally, stereotypes about gender roles have been found to be frequently depicted on television. Ward (1995) found that almost 30% of interactions (dialogues among television characters) contained statements related to sexuality (with some television shows with as many as 50%). More interestingly, though, are the common messages conveyed in these sexual statements. Most comments about sexuality focused on the male sexual role (31%). These comments reflected that “men value and select women based on their physical appearance,” which was most often evidenced by males commenting on female bodies. Another part of the male sexual role conveyed that “sex is a defining act of masculinity,” as evidenced by depicting men as sex-driven and ready for sex at any time.

To conclude, content analyses of media have overwhelmingly found that women are portrayed as sexual objects. In video games, men are also portrayed in stereotyped ways: as hyper-masculine (e.g., muscular) and aggressive; in magazines, men are also objectified. Beyond images of women and men, television programs also convey sexual stereotypes, such as men are sex-driven and ready for sex at any time, as well as the importance of appearance for women in attracting men.

The Correlates and Effects of Sexually Objectifying Media

Correlational Studies
In examining the effects of sexually objectifying media, three methods of study have been pursued: correlational, longitudinal, and experimental. In correlational studies, researchers examine the association between media exposure to objectifying portrayals and a variety of variables at one point in time. A limitation of correlational studies is that they do not provide information on causality or direction of effects. Nonetheless, they offer information on key relations that aid in understanding how media may affect us and suggest approaches relevant to the design of experimental and longitudinal studies. Most correlational studies examined the relation between exposure to sexually objectifying media and either attitudes about sexuality and gender roles or beliefs about one’s own body appearance (e.g., body dissatisfaction, drive for thinness, dieting, etc.). I will describe the correlational studies that are specific to beliefs about one’s own body appearance, as these are the primary variables of interest in my dissertation.

Underscoring studies on how media exposure relates to body image is the important concept of thin-ideal internalization, which is the belief that being thin is of utmost importance and that those who internalize this view engage in behaviors to meet this ideal. Although not all thin-ideal media portray objectification of women, these media images do convey a message that a woman’s value is based on her appearance and meeting a cultural ideal. This is especially true for Caucasian women. For example, Harrison (2003) found that in her sample of Caucasian men and women, exposure to television portraying women who meet the thin-ideal significantly related to ideal preferences of a smaller waist, smaller hips, and medium bust for women only (but not overall body size). There was no association between viewing thin-ideal images of women and ideal female body preferences for men. However, for both men and women, exposure to thin-ideal women in the media was associated with higher approval of surgical body alteration procedures for women.
Similar correlates have been found in a sample of female adolescents (primarily Caucasian). Grabe and Hyde (2009) found that self-objectification negatively mediated the relation between exposure to videos (that objectify women) and body esteem. In other words, greater exposure to music videos that objectify women related to higher self-objectification, which in turn related to lower body esteem. Self-objectification positively mediated the relation between exposure to females objectified in music videos and current dieting status and anxiety. So, greater exposure to music videos depicting objectified females related to higher self-objectification, which in turn related to higher anxiety and being on a diet. Thus, these authors show that self-objectification is one mechanism through which media exposure associated with body dissatisfaction.

It appears that media exposure can also relate to body image variables in both women and men. Morry and Staska (2001) examined how magazine preferences related to body dissatisfaction, disordered eating, and self-objectification. Not surprisingly, the authors found that reading female beauty magazines was significantly associated with self-objectification ($d = 0.54$) for women, which was mediated by internalization of the thin-ideal. Different from the previously described studies, Morry and Staska found that for males, internalization of the muscular-ideal significantly related to feelings of fatness (mediating the relation between reading fitness magazines and feelings of fatness). Reading fitness magazines was significantly associated with disordered eating for men ($d = 0.63$). These results show that there are significant relations between media exposure and male body image, an area that needs further research. Additionally, Morry and Staska’s (2001) results indicate the importance of assessing the internalization of the muscular or thin-ideal when examining associations between media exposure and body image (a proposed moderator variable that I assessed in my dissertation).
To sum, the review of the research on exposure to objectifying media (television, music videos, and magazines) and its relation to body image indicates that, primarily for white female adolescents and women, greater exposure to media that objectify women is associated with higher body dissatisfaction and lower body esteem. One study found that this relation also holds true for men (Morry & Staska, 2001), with total exposure to fitness magazines (that portray/objectify muscular men) relating to disordered eating in men. Finally, the relations between media exposure and the body image variables are partially explained by internalization of the thin-ideal for women and the muscular-ideal for men as well as trait self-objectification (in women; supporting Objectification Theory). Although these correlational studies have implications for the role of media, the following longitudinal studies are more suggestive of the direction of the effect.

Longitudinal Studies

There have been only three longitudinal studies on the long-term effects of exposure to sexually objectifying media, all based on data from the same sample of participants (Aubrey, 2006a; Aubrey 2006b; Aubrey & Taylor, 2009). Structural equations modeling was used in these studies, with the effects of time 1 variables controlled. These longitudinal studies provide some evidence that extent of exposure to sexually objectifying media may precede some of the theorized effects as posited by Objectification Theory. Briefly, these longitudinal studies found that exposure to sexually objectifying television (of both men and women combined, not separately examined by sex) at time 1 predicted increases in trait self-objectification of women and men from time 1 to time 2 and also predicted increases in body surveillance of men from time 1 to time 2. These longitudinal studies generally indicate precedence of media exposure to
self-objectification for both men and women, suggesting possible causality. However, the next set of studies provides a more definitive argument for causality.

**Experimental Studies**

Experimental studies in which objectified men and women are portrayed via different forms of media have focused on three types of outcomes: negative beliefs about women (gender stereotypes) or sexual attitudes/beliefs; body image (without assessing self-objectification); and self-objectification and associated body perceptions. Similar to the review of correlational studies, I will be focusing on experimental studies that examine the variables relevant to my dissertation (body image and self-objectification) and whose conditions involved exposing participants to same-sex objectified individuals. These experimental studies will be examined separately by the effects of objectified images of men on male participants and objectified images of women on female participants.

**Body image and the effects of viewing objectified images of men.** Magazine content and magazine advertisements are the experimental stimuli most often used to prime body-related cognitions. The following studies examined how viewing photographs or print advertisements of objectified men affected body image in men.

Aubrey and Taylor (2009) were interested in how men were affected by depictions of male models. Men in the male fashion model condition reported significantly lower appearance-related motivation for exercise, compared to the control condition. The authors attributed the lower appearance-related motivation for exercise to how the male fashion models were portrayed in lad magazines. Typically, these models do not show muscles and are fully clothed, unlike the models in men’s health and fitness magazines. Aubrey and Taylor (2009) suggest that perhaps
showing men images of the muscular-ideal would be more effective in increasing body dissatisfaction.

To test the effects of showing men images of muscular objectified men, Johnson, McCreary, and Mills (2007) showed advertisements of muscular males (with chest or torso revealed: objectified male condition) and products (with no humans: control condition) to college men. No effect of condition was found for drive for muscularity or negative affect in the objectified male condition. Despite being shown images of muscular men with their chests revealed, men in this condition were not adversely affected. Thus, in both the studies by Johnson et al. (2007) and Aubrey and Taylor (2009), images of male models and muscular men did not increase body image variables such as appearance anxiety, appearance-related motivation for exercise, drive for muscularity, and negative affect. This contrasts with the effects of viewing media portrayals of objectified women on female participants’ body image and self-objectification.

**Self-objectification and the effects of viewing objectified images of women.** Two experimental studies show support for the effects of media portrayals of objectified women on self-objectification and its body image correlates in samples of female participants. Harper and Tiggemann (2008) conducted the first study on media (magazine advertisements) effects on self-objectification, as measured by the Twenty Statements Test, in female college students. The Twenty Statements Test requires participants to list 20 characteristics about themselves (“I am _________”) which are then coded as appearance-based (e.g., pretty, hot, attractive, thin) or non-appearance-based (e.g., physical competence, traits, emotions). If more appearance-based statements are made than non-appearance-based, then the person is considered to be experiencing state self-objectification. Two sets of stimuli were used: advertisements of women
portraying the thin-ideal alone in the advertisement and advertisements of a man looking at or touching the thin-ideal woman. These advertisements were used to test for differences between advertisements with only a thin-ideal woman and advertisements with a thin-ideal woman who was blatantly experiencing the “male gaze,” or male attention. Harper and Tiggemann expected larger effects for the condition that included a male objectifying the thin-ideal woman, because it would prime female participants to “take a third person perspective of their own body,” or self-objectify, and vicariously experience the objectification (651). First, Harper and Tiggemann compared the thin-ideal conditions to the product control condition. Participants in the thin-ideal conditions had significantly higher (more negative) levels of state self-objectification ($d = 0.46$), negative mood ($d = 0.59$), and body dissatisfaction ($d = 0.77$) than participants in the product control condition. Weight-related appearance anxiety, but not appearance anxiety unrelated to weight, was affected by the condition ($d = 0.46$).

No significant differences were found between the thin-ideal conditions, meaning that whether the woman was presented alone in the advertisement or with at least one other male, there were similar levels of state self-objectification, appearance anxiety, depression, and body dissatisfaction. Harper and Tiggemann concluded that the vicarious experience of objectification can be primed with or without a male presence lending support to the powerful effect of the thin-ideal. Further, state self-objectification was not a mediator of the condition effects on appearance anxiety, depression, and body dissatisfaction. A limitation of this study, addressed by Harper and Tiggemann, is that the images used were not rated on how objectifying they were. It could be that the experimental conditions were not significantly different in levels of objectification. If this is true, perhaps female participants diverted their attention to the thin-ideal model and were not attending to the presence of the male in the advertisement. My
dissertation follows up on the recommendations of Harper and Tiggemann by having participants rate the level of objectification depicted in my stimuli during the pilot study portion of my project.

Daniels (2009) examined how viewing non-objectified images and objectified images of women athletes and models affected adolescent females’ and adult females’ self-objectification. In this study, state self-objectification was measured by the Twenty Statements Test. Daniels hypothesized that seeing non-objectified female athletes would affect participants in that they would report fewer appearance-based traits in the Twenty Statements Test and more physicality statements than participants in other conditions because these female athletes embody positive physical traits and do not portray their sexuality. Results indicated that participants in the non-objectified athlete condition reported more physicality statements than participants in other conditions ($d = 0.48$). Participants in both sexualized conditions (objectified images of female athletes and objectified images of models) reported significantly more beauty statements compared to participants in the nonsexualized conditions ($d = 0.55$).

Exposure to magazine photographs of thin-ideal women (Harper & Tiggemann, 2008) and objectified female athletes and models (Daniels, 2009) affected levels of state self-objectification in women and adolescent females. Based on these experimental studies, it seems that more research is needed to examine how other types of media may trigger state self-objectification. For example, other media (specifically non-print stimuli: television programming, internet websites, and televised content from the internet) are more popular than print magazines. For this reason, it would be particularly informative to assess how these types of media trigger state self-objectification. Further, although showing male participants objectified images of men did not impact body image variables, it is possible that other forms of
objectification of men in the media could elicit greater appearance concern and self-objectification. Finally, moderators of the short-term effects of showing media that depict objectification of men and women need more systematic examination, especially given the small to moderate effect sizes found in the previous studies.

**Theoretical Background on How Viewing Sexual Objectification Affects Individuals**

**Objectification Theory**

In the literature on the correlates and effects of viewing sexually objectified women in the media, two main theories account for different ways in which individuals are affected. These theories, Objectification Theory and the social-cognitive information-processing model, each provide frameworks for understanding how the media affect individuals. These theories have overlapping concepts, but generally differ in the types of outcomes of media effects that are studied.

First, Objectification Theory hypothesizes that sexual objectification (either experiencing it directly or witnessing others being objectified in the media) is related to many psychological consequences (depression, disordered eating, sexual dysfunction) as a result of women engaging in self-objectification (i.e., internalizing an outsider’s view of sexual objectification of women).

Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) described their Objectification Theory as a framework for understanding how sexual objectification contributes to the “lived experiences and mental health risks of girls and women” (p. 174). According to Fredrickson and Roberts, sexual objectification is defined as “the experience of being treated as a body (or collection of body parts) valued predominantly for its use to (or consumption by) others” (p. 174). The authors recognized that not all women experience or react to sexual objectification in the same way but there is a “shared social experience” (p. 175).
Specific to understanding media effects, Fredrickson and Roberts indicated that the sexually objectifying gaze (a type of sexual objectification where women are leered at or ogled) is present in the media in both advertisements and in portrayals of social interactions. Because mass media frequently depict sexual objectification, “it is likely to affect most girls and women to some degree, no matter who their actual social contacts may be” (p. 177).

The main process through which experiencing sexual objectification contributes to potential outcomes for women is that, over time, women begin to internalize an outsider’s view of themselves, which Fredrickson and Roberts term as “self-objectification.” This self-objectification is experienced as the degree to which women see themselves as objects or “sights to be appreciated by others” (p. 180). An important component of self-objectification is a type of self-consciousness referred to as “habitual monitoring of the body’s outward appearance” (p. 180).

Objectification Theory predicts that experiencing sexual objectification relates to shame, anxiety, and awareness of internal bodily states. Fredrickson and Roberts posited that it is because of sexual objectification that there is higher prevalence of depression, eating disorders, and sexual dysfunction in women, compared to men. It is important to note that Fredrickson and Roberts do not believe these affected areas are inevitable for women. Instead, the authors posited that their framework “acknowledges both relatively stable individual differences across women, as well as powerful situation-specific effects in the experiences of objectification and its consequences” (p. 181). For example, some women may continually, throughout the day, be aware that others could evaluate their appearance (referred to as “trait self-objectification”), whereas other women may not realize this unless they enter a social context where they are
reminded of their appearance (e.g., through sexual comments made about their bodies or another person’s body). The latter is referred to as “state self-objectification.”

In research on the effects of media on self-objectification, the Twenty Statements Test typically is administered as a measure of state self-objectification (e.g., Harper & Tiggemann, 2008; Daniels, 2009). Other studies have also used modified versions of the Self-Objectification Questionnaire (SOQ) or the Surveillance subscale of the Objectified Body Consciousness (OBC) scale (Calogero, 2010). The instructions for the SOQ are modified to assess state self-objectification: rank order the importance of the following attributes to your own physical self-concept “right now.” Items from the Surveillance subscale have also been modified to measure state self-objectification (e.g., “Right now, I am thinking about how I look”; Calogero, 2010, p. 35). Both the Twenty Statements Test and the Self-Surveillance subscale were used to measure state self-objectification in the present study.

It is through experiencing these effects of self-objectification that mental health problems for women may occur. The authors further posited that mental health consequences can also result directly through an experience of sexual objectification (on the more extreme end of the spectrum: sexual abuse, rape, battering, and, in some cases, sexual harassment). Keep in mind, however, that this theoretical framework was designed to address the effects related to self-objectification.

The cumulative effects of self-objectification were used by Fredrickson and Roberts to explain gender differences in depression, sexual dysfunction, and eating disorders. In terms of depression, experiences of shame and anxiety regarding not meeting a standard of appearance or in fear of physical safety can contribute to a sense of learned helplessness, where women attribute their failings to internal causes (“I’m not good enough,” “I am incapable,” etc.). It is
through learned helplessness that Fredrickson and Roberts connected the effects of self-objectification and depression: “the extent to which a women’s body generates feelings of helpless, it can also induce depression” (p. 188). Especially when making social comparisons to representations of women in the media, it becomes even more unrealistic for women to meet that standard of appearance.

According to Fredrickson and Roberts, women’s self-objectification can also be associated with sexual difficulties (specific to heterosexual relationships), such as experiencing less subjective sexual pleasure and fewer orgasms during sexual intercourse. Fredrickson and Roberts explained that women are “experiencing self-conscious body monitoring, body shame and anxiety, and relative inattention to internal bodily states” (p. 190). With focus directed to how the body looks and not how the body feels, women are distracted from being “mentally present” during sexual intercourse.

Regarding eating disorders, Fredrickson and Roberts posit two possibilities of the relation between self-objectification and dysfunctional eating patterns. First, the authors suggested, by not knowing how the body will be evaluated and by internalizing an outsider’s view of one’s body, women engage in unhealthy eating practices to attempt to look like an object valued by society and lessen their negative feelings associated with not meeting this ideal (these unhealthy eating practices occur on a continuum from dieting to diagnosable eating disorders).

So far, the majority of studies testing Objectification Theory focus on how sexual objectification affects women. Although Fredrickson and Roberts proposed Objectification Theory to capture the experiences of women living in an objectifying culture, recent research has extended this theory to the experiences of men (Parent & Moradi, 2011). For example, Strelan and Hargreaves (2005) found that male self-objectification was significantly negatively
correlated with self-esteem and body image satisfaction. Further, Strelan and Hargreaves (2005) found that men who reported exercising to improve their appearance also endorsed higher levels of self-objectification. However, given that the rise in prevalence of objectifying images of men is a relatively new phenomenon, no experimental studies have tested if Objectification Theory applies to men. I addressed this limitation in my dissertation.

Social-Cognitive Information-Processing Model

The social-cognitive information-processing (SCIP) model elucidates the short-term and long-term psychological processes that occur following exposure to media. These processes underlie how state self-objectification may be primed, as well the long-term outcomes associated with media socialization. Because my dissertation is examining the short-term effects, only the short-term processes will be discussed here. Short-term processes of the SCIP model account for behavioral, emotional, and cognitive changes that occur immediately, but briefly, after exposure to media (Dubow, Huesmann, & Greenwood, 2007). One process most relevant to how state self-objectification is affected is priming, or the activation of an idea, emotion, or concept embedded in a person’s memory (with or without awareness of it; Dubow et al., 2007). Because the human mind “acts as an associative network” (p. 409), when concepts are primed, they also activate thoughts, emotions, and behaviors associated with that concept. In terms of viewing images of sexualized or idealized female bodies, it is theorized that these images “activate an unrealistically high standard of physical appearance that primes unfavorable actual-ideal comparisons among viewers” (emphasis added, Greenwood & Lippman, 2010, p. 658). Further, these thoughts of not meeting the beauty ideal or sexy ideal are associated with feelings (e.g., shame and disgust) that may affect immediate behaviors.
It is through priming of these thoughts about importance of sexiness or appearance and actual-ideal comparisons whereby state self-objectification and internalization of the thin-ideal are triggered for women. For men, the same process is theorized to occur, although less frequently, with some researchers speculating that viewing aggressive or muscular models could prime thoughts regarding strength and concerns about body size (Greenwood & Lippman, 2010).

To summarize, according to the SCIP model, priming is a short-term underlying process of how viewing media affects individuals’ thoughts, emotions, and behaviors specific to viewing sexually objectified images. Equally important to the SCIP model are the moderators of influence: not all media consumers are affected by these short-term processes to the same extent.

**Moderators of influence.** Five moderators of media effects, according to Dubow et al. (2007), are: the user’s motivations; the user’s characteristics; attributes of media content; the viewing context; and cultural factors. For example, regarding user’s characteristics, if people believe that what they see on television is what actually occurs in reality (“perceived realism”), then they are more likely to be affected by television portrayals. Examples of other user characteristics specific to my dissertation that have been found to moderate the effects of objectification are trait self-objectification and internalization of the thin-ideal or muscular-ideal.

Regarding trait self-objectification, women with high trait self-objectification experienced the most state self-objectification and body shame when receiving an appearance-based compliment in an objectifying environment (Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008). Although this study did not have women viewing objectified images of women, the experiment involved in-vivo objectification, which is conceptually similar to viewing media objectification of women (as posited by Objectification Theory). Thin-ideal internalization in women has been found to moderate media effects on body image disturbance (Dittmar, Halliwell, & Stirling, 2009; Dittmar
& Howard, 2004; Halliwell & Dittmar, 2004). For example, when women are shown advertisements of thin models, there is a stronger effect of condition on body-focused negative affect for women who endorse higher internalization of the thin-ideal (Dittmar et al., 2009). Likewise, Morry and Staska (2001) found that internalization of the muscular-ideal for men was an important variable to assess in studying predictors of male body dissatisfaction. In their correlational study, internalization of the muscular-ideal acted as a mediator variable. That is, overall exposure to media was significantly associated with internalization of the muscular-ideal, which was then significantly associated with feelings of fatness. Because internalization of the muscular-ideal is considered a stable trait and not influenced by a short-term manipulation, I did not test for mediation. However, in exploratory analyses, I examined if internalization of the muscular-ideal acts in a similar manner as internalizing the thin-ideal and tested for moderation.

Based on the empirical and theoretical support, it is likely that these variables (trait self-objectification and thin-ideal or muscular-ideal internalization) would act as moderators of the effects of showing media that objectify men and women on state self-objectification and other body image variables.

**Current Study and Hypotheses**

The purpose of the present study was to address questions on how and under what conditions does viewing sexually objectifying media, specifically videos of interpersonal objectification, affect individuals? To address these aims, my study consisted of two experimental conditions: male participants were shown a video clip of women objectifying men and female participants were shown a video clip of men objectifying women. Because previous research has primarily used photographic images of models portraying the thin-ideal to elicit
state self-objectification, this study investigated if the same effects occur in witnessing media
depictions of social interactions where female/male targets are objectified by verbal commentary.

First, I predicted, consistent with Objectification Theory and empirical evidence, that
there would be a condition effect on state self-objectification, with men seeing a video clip of
men being objectified and women seeing a video clip of women being objectified reporting
higher levels of state self-objectification and self-surveillance than same-sex participants in the
control (no objectification) condition (Hypothesis 1). Similarly to previous studies examining
short-term effects of viewing images of objectified women and in line with Objectification
Theory, I also predicted that a similar condition effect would occur for the following variables
described in Objectification Theory: negative affect, state body shame, and state appearance
anxiety.

The second aim of this study was to test for moderator effects of the relation between
condition and the proposed short-term effects (e.g., negative affect, state self-objectification,
self-surveillance, state body shame, and state appearance anxiety). The following moderators
were examined: trait self-objectification, internalization of the thin-ideal, and internalization of
the muscular-ideal. These moderators were chosen based on empirical evidence indicating that it
is under certain conditions (e.g., high levels of trait self-objectification and high internalization
of the thin-ideal) when exposure to sexually objectifying media affects individuals’ state levels
of negative affect, self-objectification, self-surveillance, body shame, and appearance anxiety.
Although internalization of the muscular-ideal has been found to mediate the relation of overall
media exposure and feelings of fatness in males, I sought to test if this variable acts as a
moderator in the manner that the thin-ideal internalization acts for female participants. Thus, I
predicted that trait self-objectification (Hypotheses 2) and thin-ideal or muscular-ideal
internalization (with the muscular-ideal moderating the condition effects for men and the thin-ideal moderating the condition effects for women; Hypotheses 3 and 4) would significantly moderate the relation between condition and state levels of the dependent variables. That is, significant condition effects would occur only for participants endorsing higher trait self-objectification and higher internalization of gender-specific sociocultural ideals.

A third aim of this study was to test for mediation of the effect of condition on individuals’ levels of body shame, appearance anxiety, and negative affect by state self-objectification and self-surveillance. According to Objectification Theory, it is through self-objectification that the effects of observing sexually objectifying images occur (e.g., self-objectification and self-surveillance are the mediators). That is, I predicted that the effect of condition would predict higher levels of state self-objectification and self-surveillance, which would then be significantly associated with higher self-reports of the aforementioned dependent variables (Hypothesis 5).

Finally, for exploratory purposes, participants were given a list of nine negative and positive personality traits (e.g., trustworthy, likable, rude, vulgar) on which to rate the actors who are shown stating the objectifying comments (or non-objectifying comments in the control condition) in order to see if perceptions of the actors would differ based on condition. I predicted that there would be a significant main effect of condition, with the mean of the dependent variable of negative personality traits for the experimental (objectifying) condition being significantly higher than that of the control condition and the mean of the dependent variable of positive personality traits for the experimental condition being significantly lower than that of the control condition.
METHOD

Overview of the Study Design

The study consisted of two sessions. First, participants were recruited through Sona (the Bowling Green State University Psychology Department’s online research experiment management system) and signed up for this 2-session study (see Appendix A: Sona Posting). After providing informed consent (see Appendix B: Informed Consent), participants completed a pre-test survey online that consisted of questionnaires assessing demographic variables and the proposed moderator variables described previously. To match pre- and post-experiment surveys, participants provided the last four digits of their cellular phone number as a unique identification number that was recorded on their surveys and linked to their email address on a separate spreadsheet available only to the experimenter. This protected the confidentiality of the participants and allowed for random assignment to conditions in the second session. The participants, after completing the survey, received $.5 credit and then were given a password to sign up for the second session of the study through Sona.

During the second session, data from participants was collected in groups ranging from 2 to 12 same-sex participants. That is, group testing in the second session was gender-specific (a male-only group and a female-only group). Male and female participants were randomly assigned to either the experimental condition or a control condition. For male participants, the objectifying experimental condition was a video clip of two women sexually objectifying men. For female participants, the objectifying experimental condition was a video clip of two men sexually objectifying women. The control condition for the females and males depicted the same actors as depicted in the respective experimental conditions. The scripts for the experimental and control conditions were identical except that the objectifying comments were not made in the
control condition (see Appendix C for the scripts). Likewise, the scripts were nearly identical for both men and women, except that the objectifying comments were specific to typical comments made about the respective gender. For all conditions, the videos were set at a college house party and only the two main characters who were making objectifying comments about the opposite sex were shown (with no depiction of the objectified persons).

Before they were shown the stimuli, participants were read a script by the experimenter (that was consistent for each condition) describing the protocol and were told that, as the recruitment posting indicated, “This is a study on perceptions of friendships among college students. You recently completed surveys that provided basic demographic information.” They were also told that it was important to remain quiet and pay attention to the interactions displayed because questions would be asked after the movie about these friends’ interactions (Appendix D: Study Manipulation Script). The stimulus videos were shown on individual computers in a computer lab in the Psychology Building. Three-fold posters surrounded the computer monitor so that other participants would not be able to see another condition’s stimulus video and so that participants would have their responses to the surveys private. The participants listened to the videos through headphones connected to the individual computers. After viewing the video, participants completed another online survey (the post-test questionnaires) at their computers. After completion of the measures, the participants were debriefed as to the true nature of the experiment (Appendix E: Debriefing Script and Appendix F: Debriefing Form). The debriefing script was adapted from Mills (1976). Finally, the participants were awarded 1.0 credit for their participation in the second session of the study.

Development of Stimuli
To develop the stimuli, I recruited undergraduate students from psychology classes through in-class recruitment (see Appendix G for In-class recruitment script). Those who volunteered went to a classroom in the Psychology Building to participate in a pilot study to help evaluate the possible experimental stimuli (presented as scripts that were read by the participants on their own in a randomized order; see Appendix H: Pilot Stimuli Scripts). Participants were then asked to complete questionnaires assessing their perceptions of the level of objectification in each condition, the realism of the scenarios and the words used in the scripts, and the level of attractiveness of the actors who would be acting in the videos (see Appendix I: Pilot Study Survey and Appendix J: Focus Group Questions).

**Rating of the Scripts.** In the pilot study, 42 participants (11 males, 31 females) read the scripts and completed questionnaires. First, males and females rated the scripts on the level of objectification, on a scale from 1 (not at all objectifying) to 10 (extremely objectifying). The males rated the experimental condition as highly objectifying \((M = 8.82, \text{SD} = 1.08)\) and the females rated the experimental condition as highly objectifying as well \((M = 8.32, \text{SD} = 1.11)\). There were no differences between males and females in the ratings of objectification of the experimental scripts \((p = .21)\). Males \((M = 2.82, \text{SD} = 2.82)\) and females \((M = 1.87, \text{SD} = 1.84)\) also indicated that the control condition script was not at all objectifying (with no significant difference between their ratings, \(p = .21\)). Importantly, both experimental conditions were rated as significantly more objectifying than the control condition (males: \(t(10) = 6.06, p < .01\); females: \(t(30) = 18.79, p < .01\)).

Next, participants rated how realistic the scripts were (on a scale from 1, not at all realistic, to 10, extremely realistic) compared to what they see in the media (e.g., television) and compared to their own college life experiences. Both males \((M = 8.18 \text{ SD} =1.25)\) and females
(M = 7.87, SD = 1.75) rated the experimental condition scripts as highly realistic compared to what they see in the media (with no significant differences between their ratings, p = .59). Likewise, males (M = 7.91, SD = 1.45) and females (M = 7.29, SD = 2.13) rated the experimental condition scripts as highly realistic compared to what they have experienced in their own lives (with no significant differences between their ratings, p = .38). Regarding the control condition script, men and women rated them as moderately realistic compared to what they see in the media (males: M = 5.63, SD = 2.42; females: M = 5.35, SD = 2.21) and highly realistic compared to what they see in their own lives (males: M = 7.09, SD = 2.43; females: M = 7.32, SD = 2.02). No significant differences were found between males and females on their ratings of the control condition script (p’s > .73).

Participants were then asked to rate how “current” the words used and how “relevant” the topics discussed in the scripts were (from 1, not at all current/relevant, to 10, extremely current/relevant). Both males (M = 8.82, SD = 1.08) and females (M = 7.45, SD = 1.95) rated the words used and topics discussed in the experimental condition scripts as highly current/relevant (with males reporting that the words used and topics discussed as more current/relevant compared to females; t(40) = 2.20, p < .05). Regarding the control condition script, men and women rated the words used and topics discussed as highly current/relevant (males: M = 7.82, SD = 2.18; females: M = 8.03, SD = 1.91). No significant difference was found between males and females on this rating of the control condition script (p = .76).

Participants came together as a group and commented on the first draft of the scripts to help determine whether the comments were realistic, whether they thought the scripts reflected objectification on television and in the media, and whether the wording of the current scripts sounded natural to peers their age. Based on the focus groups, revisions to the scripts were
made. The piloted scripts differed from the final version of the scripts in two minor ways. First, the control condition script originally consisted of a male and a female having a conversation about a football game. Several participants reported that the conversation between the male and female did not seem realistic in that they felt it seemed rare that a male and female would talk about football as friends. It was also decided that having the presence of the opposite sex in the control condition would confound comparisons made. As such, the piloted control condition was modified to have two members of the same sex engaging in conversation.

Additionally, some of the objectifying comments made in the experimental condition scripts were not seen as current lingo (e.g., “I wouldn’t throw him out of bed,” “You know what they say about guys with big hands”) and were innuendos or comments that may not be understood by all participants (e.g., “He’s so tall—I wonder if everything is proportional,” “f-me pants,” and “Whoa, Kim Kardashian look-a-like”). Therefore, these comments were revised to be current and clear statements reflecting objectification.

Ratings of the actors. In addition to rating the scripts, the participants rated the attractiveness (on a scale from 1, not at all attractive, to 6, very attractive) and body sizes of the actors (from 1, very muscular to 6, very thin) and actresses (from 1, very curvaceous to 6, very thin). Male participants rated the appearance of the actresses and female participants rated the appearance of the actors. Males ($M = 4.05, SD = 0.72$) and females ($M = 3.17, SD = 0.80$) rated the actors as average attractiveness (males rated the actresses as significantly more attractive than the females rated the male actors; $t(27) = 2.96, p < .01$). Males ($M = 3.91, SD = 0.38$) and females ($M = 3.42, SD = 0.43$) rated the actors as having an average body size as well (males rated the actresses as more thin than the females rated the male actors; $t(27) = 3.14, p < .01$).
As a final validity check, the stimuli watched by the participants in the main study were also rated by the participants at the end of the post-test. As expected, males (\(M = 7.00, SD = 2.29\)) and females (\(M = 8.20, SD = 2.20\)) in the experimental condition rated the stimulus videos as more objectifying than males (\(M = 3.12, SD = 2.00\)) and females (\(M = 4.07, SD = 2.49\)) in the control condition (\(t(194) = -12.36, p < .01\)).

In addition to rating the level of objectification of the stimulus videos, participants were asked to rate the perceived attractiveness (from 1, not at all attractive, to 6, very attractive) of the women or men that the actors or actresses in the videos were commenting on (who are never depicted). In the experimental condition, the actors were making objectifying comments about an opposite sex individual at a party they were attending. In the control condition, the actors were making comments about how a person of the opposite sex looked like one of their cousins (no objectifying comments were made) at a party they were attending. Males (\(M = 4.95, SD = 1.31\)) and females (\(M = 4.81, SD = 1.20\)) rated the person the actors were commenting on in the experimental condition as more attractive than the males (\(M = 3.56, SD = 1.28\)) and females (\(M = 3.98, SD = 1.25\)) rated this person in the control condition (\(t(192) = -5.94, p < .01\)).

**Participants**

A total of 308 participants completed at least one part of this study, with 200 participating in both the pre-test and post-test (with \(n=8\) unmatched post-test participants). There were no significant differences between participants who completed the pre-test only and participants who completed both the pre-test and post-test on the following demographic variables: sex, race, sexual orientation, relationship status, year in college, mother education level, father education level, BMI, and age. There were no significant differences between these groups on either hypothesized moderator variables: trait self-objectification and internalization of the thin-
Of these 200, four participants were excluded from the analyses because they either knew the actors in the stimulus materials (n=1), did not speak English as a first language (i.e., could not comprehend some of the measures; n=1), or had unusable data (due to obvious inconsistencies in their responding; n=2).

It is important to note that 37 participants (16 males: 6 control, 10 experimental; 21 females: 6 control, 15 experimental) reported, when prompted to describe the purpose of the study, that the study was about body image (with no one reporting that this study was examining objectification, the true purpose). As such, analyses were computed with and without these participants. There were no differences in the major findings and, consequently, I will report the results from the sample including these participants. The final sample (n=196) consisted of 81 men (experimental condition: 38; control condition: 43) and 115 women (experimental condition: 60; control condition: 55). See Table 1 for a breakdown of the demographic characteristics by gender and condition.

**Measures—Pre-test**

**Demographic variables.** A variety of demographic variables were assessed, including: age, sex, height, weight, race, relationship status, sexual orientation (from Hill & Fischer, 2008), parent level of education, and year in college. The height and weight provided by participants were used to calculate Body Mass Index (BMI: kg/m²). See Appendix K for the demographics questionnaire. These variables were assessed for descriptive purposes and to control for possible covariates.

**Trait self-objectification.** The Self Objectification Questionnaire (SOQ; Noll & Fredrickson, 1998, Appendix L) was used to assess trait self-objectification. Participants were asked to rank 10 body attributes on level of importance to their physical self-concept (from 0= muscular-ideal.
least impact to 9=most impact). Two sums were calculated based on these body attributes: physical competence and physical appearance. The ranks assigned to each body attribute that reflects physical competence (e.g., physical energy level, physical fitness level) were summed for a total physical competence score. The same calculation was conducted for the ranks of the physical appearance body attributes (e.g., sex appeal, weight, physical attractiveness). Then, the sum of the physical competence attribute ranks was subtracted from the sum of the physical attractiveness attribute ranks, giving a score that could range from -25 to +25. Scores greater than zero indicate valuing physical appearance qualities in valuing one’s physical self-concept (and thus, indicating higher levels of trait self-objectification). Because the scale for this measure is ordinal, internal reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) could not be calculated. However, it is suggested to report the correlation between the rankings of the physical competence and physical appearance to get an estimate of the reliability of the SOQ (Calogero, 2011). In previous research, the correlation between the two sets of rankings has been large and in the expected negative direction ($r = -.81, p < .01; \text{Hill \& Fischer, 2008}$). In the current study, a correlation of exactly –1.00 was found ($p < .01$), suggesting good internal consistency. The SOQ has satisfactory construct validity and has been found to correlate with the Appearance Anxiety Questionnaire ($r = .52, p < .01$) and Body Image Assessment ($r = .46, p < .01; \text{Noll, 1996; Noll \& Fredrickson, 1998}$).

**Internalization of cultural standards of attractiveness.** I used both the original version (for female participants) and the Morry and Staska (2001) revision (for male participants) of the Internalization subscale of the Sociocultural Attitudes Toward Appearance Questionnaire (SATAQ-I; Heinberg, Thompson, & Stormer, 1995; see Appendix M). The original version of this subscale assesses the extent to which women internalize the thin-ideal.
This subscale consists of 8 items (α = .88; Heinberg et al., 1995; α = .89 in the current study) and includes items such as “Women who appear in TV shows and movies project the type of appearance that I see as my goal” and “Photographs of thin women make me wish that I were thin.” Morry and Staska (2001) revised this subscale to assess the extent to which men internalize the muscular-ideal. This revised scale (also 8 items; α = .78, Morry & Staska, 2001; α = .80 in the current study) includes items “Clothes look better on muscular/fit models” and “I wish I looked like a bodybuilder” (Morry & Staska, 2001). Items on both versions are rated on a 5-point scale (0=completely disagree to 4=completely agree), with higher average scores indicating higher internalization of thin- or muscular-ideals. The construct validity for the SATAQ Internalization subscale is good; this subscale correlates with the Eating Disorders Inventory Drive for Thinness subscale at r = .61 (p < .01; Heinberg et al., 1994).

**Items to disguise the nature of the study.** Similar to previous research testing of the short-term effects of viewing media images intended to prime self-objectification or body dissatisfaction, various items were inserted into the pre-test to disguise the true nature of this study. As described in the study design, this study was advertised as a measure of perceptions of friendships. In the informed consent prior to the pre-test, participants were informed, “A number of variables that are related to how you perceive friendships and social interactions between males and females will be assessed including demographic variables (sex, race, height, weight, etc.).” Also, distracter items were inserted within questionnaires to draw attention away from the actual variable measured (see Appendix N for the items created to disguise the true nature of the study).

**Measures—Post-test**
**Items to disguise the nature of the study.** Various items were inserted into the post-test questionnaires to further disguise the true nature of this study. For example, on the top of the post-test survey, participants read the following to further conceal the nature of this study, “There are many factors that influence people’s perceptions, for example, mood. In order to control for these factors, please answer the following questions” (similar to Dittmar et al., 2009). Like in the pre-test survey, distracter items were inserted within questionnaires to draw attention away from the actual variable measured. There were ten questions regarding the video content and perceptions of friendships created by the author, including: “How long do you think that the friends in the video knew each other,” “Would you consider that these friends are ‘best friends’ in the way they were interacting,” “How often do you think these friends hang out with each other,” “What are some qualities that you look for when you are friends with someone” (see Appendix N). Finally, at the end of the study, participants were asked to state in their own words what they thought the specific purpose of this study was (similar to Dittmar et al., 2009).

**Negative affect.** The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) was used to assess mood immediately before and after the stimuli presentation. According to Watson et al. (1988), the PANAS taps into state ratings of positive affect (PA) and negative affect (NA), which reflect two separate dimensions. Participants are given a list of 20 words, 10 of which assess PA and 10 of which assess NA. Instructions for the PANAS are, “This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you feel this way right now, that is, at the present moment. Use the following scale to record your answers.” The 5-point scale ranges from “very slightly or not at all” (1) to “extremely” (5). The subscale scores were computed by summing the ratings given to the 10
items that make up each subscale (see Appendix O). The PANAS has been found to have acceptable internal reliability for a college age sample (PA: $\alpha = .89$, NA: $\alpha = .85$; Watson et al., 1988) and in the current study (PA: $\alpha = .89$, NA: $\alpha = .82$). Also, the Negative Affect subscale has good construct validity and correlates with other measures of mood (e.g., Beck Depression Inventory, $r = .56$, $p < .05$; Hopkins Symptom Checklist: $r = .65$, $p < .05$; and State Anxiety Inventory: $r = .51$, $p < .05$; Watson et al., 1988).

**State self-objectification.** The modified Twenty Statements Test (Fredrickson, Roberts, Noll, Quinn, & Twenge, 1998; Appendix P) was used to measure state self-objectification. The Twenty Statements Test requires participants to list 20 characteristics about themselves (“I am __________”), which are then coded as appearance-based (e.g., pretty, hot, attractive, thin) or non-appearance-based (e.g., physical competence, traits, emotions). Instructions for this measure were based on Fredrickson et al.’s (1998) modification: “Please take a moment to think about how you feel about yourself and your identity at this moment. In the twenty blanks below please make twenty different statements about yourself and your identity that complete the sentence ‘I am.’ Complete the statements as if you were describing yourself to yourself, not to somebody else.” The italicized portion was added in by the author. Participants’ data were considered “incomplete” if fewer than 10 of the 20 blanks were completed. These individuals’ state self-objectification scores were considered as missing and thus not analyzed in the results. Appearance-based comments were summed to provide a total state self-objectification score, with higher scores indicating a greater level of state self-objectification. A second coder coded a random sample of the statements (from the beginning, middle, and end of the list of 20 statements) across multiple participants. Of the 100 statements coded by this second coder,
100% matched to the original coder’s ratings as either appearance-based or not appearance-based.

**Self-surveillance.** I modified the state adaptation (Martins, Tiggemann, & Kirkbride, 2007; α not reported) of the Self-Surveillance subscale of Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (McKinley & Hyde, 1996) to measure state self surveillance (higher scores indicating higher state levels of self surveillance; Appendix Q). This subscale consists of 7 items (e.g., “I am worrying about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look good,” “I am thinking about how I look,” and “I am not comparing how I look with how other people look” (reverse-coded)) and participants indicate their agreement with the statements, *right now*, on a scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The total score on this scale was computed by summing responses to the items. In the current study, this scale had adequate internal reliability (α = .70). The self-surveillance subscale has been found to have good construct validity and to be related to the Appearance Orientation subscale of the Multi-dimensional Body Self Relations Questionnaire (r = .63, p < .001) and the Public Body Consciousness Scale of the Body Consciousness Questionnaire among college women (r = .46, p < .001; McKinley & Hyde, 1996).

**State body shame.** The state adaptation (Martins, Tiggemann, & Kirkbride, 2007) of the Body Shame subscale of Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (McKinley & Hyde, 1996) was used to measure state body shame (higher scores indicating higher state levels of body shame; Appendix R). This subscale consists of 8 items (e.g., “Ashamed for people to know what I really weigh”) and participants indicate their agreement with the statements, *right now*, on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The total score on this scale was computed by summing responses to the items. Previous studies have found this subscale to be internally
consistent for both men and women (women: $\alpha = .85$; Kozee, Tylka, Augustus-Horvath, & Denchik, 2007; men: $\alpha = .77$; Parent & Moradi, 2011). Because one item did not correlate with the items on this scale (“Right now I feel that it is ok that I am not exercising as much as I should”), this item was dropped in the current study, leading to a 7-item scale ($\alpha = .83$). The body shame subscale has been found to have good construct validity and to be related to the Body Esteem Scale ($r = -.46, p < .001$; McKinley & Hyde, 1996).

**State appearance anxiety.** The state subscale of the Physical Appearance State and Trait Anxiety Scale (Reed, Thompson, Brannick, & Sacco, 1991) was used to measure appearance anxiety (Appendix S). This subscale consists of 7 weight-related (e.g., hips, thighs) and 8 non-weight related (e.g., nose, chin) body sites on which participants rate how “anxious, nervous, or tense” they feel “right now” on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 4 (exceptionally so). For the present study, only the weight-related items were used ($\alpha = .87$). Higher scores indicate higher state levels of weight-related appearance anxiety. The weight-related appearance anxiety subscale has been found to have adequate construct validity and to correlate with the Eating Disorders Inventory subscales of Body Dissatisfaction ($r = .74, p < .05$) and Drive for Thinness scale ($r = .62, p < .05$).

**Traits of the actors.** Participants were given a list of nine traits on which to rate the actors in order to see if perceptions of the actors would differ based on condition (see Appendix T). Participants were given the following statement, “Please rate, on a scale from 1 to 10 (with 1 being 'not at all' to 10 being 'very much') how much you believe the individuals in the video were…” with the following traits: likable, honest, rude, loyal, trustworthy, vulgar, intelligent, humorous, and pleasant. These items were drawn from Anderson’s (1968) study on personality-trait words related to likability of individuals. The items were combined and averaged to create
two subscales: positive qualities (7 items: likable, honest, loyal, trustworthy, intelligent, humorous, and pleasant) and negative qualities (2 items: vulgar and rude). The Cronbach alphas were acceptable for these two scales (positive qualities: $\alpha = .87$; negative qualities: $\alpha = .85$).
RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Baseline differences between individuals assigned to the different conditions were examined using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and chi square tests, for the demographic variables (age, year in college, race, parent education level, BMI, perceived BMI category, sexual orientation, relationship status, and dieting status) and hypothesized moderator variables that were assessed during the pre-test (trait self-objectification and internalization of the thin- or muscular-ideal). These analyses were computed separately by sex. For females, there were no significant differences between the conditions on the following demographic variables: age, race, BMI, year in college, sexual orientation, perceived BMI, parent education, relationship status, and dieting status ($p$’s > .05; see Table 1). Likewise, there were no significant demographic differences in the hypothesized moderator variables ($p$’s > .05; see Table 1).

However, for the men, there were condition differences by race and BMI. Specifically, there were significantly more Caucasian men in the experimental condition ($\chi^2(5) = 15.16, p < .05$). Additionally, men in the control condition had significantly higher BMIs than men in the experimental condition ($t(72) = 2.18, p < .05$; see Table 1). To control for these condition differences, BMI will be entered as a covariate in later analyses if it is found to relate to any of the dependent variables. To determine if race impacted the major findings, analyses were computed with and without non-Caucasian males. The pattern of findings did not change, and there was only one significant baseline difference between Caucasian men ($n = 59$) and non-Caucasian men ($n = 16$). Non-Caucasian males had significantly higher BMIs ($M = 27.09, SD = 7.10$) compared to Caucasian males ($M = 24.77, SD = 5.28$). Because the major findings did not
change, no male participants will be excluded based on ethnicity. However, race will be entered as a covariate in the main analyses to control for this difference by condition for males.

Next, for data reduction purposes, bivariate correlations among the dependent variables (negative affect, state self-objectification, self-surveillance, state body shame, and state appearance anxiety) and among the hypothesized moderator variables (trait self-objectification and internalization of the thin- or muscular-ideal) were computed (see Tables 2 and 3, respectively). These analyses indicated that appearance anxiety and body shame were significantly correlated ($r = .58, p < .01$). Thus, I standardized and averaged these scores to create a combined variable (state body concerns) for use in subsequent analyses. Correlations between the hypothesized moderator variables were modest, so they were retained as separate variables.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was computed to determine if there were significant demographic differences (e.g., sex, sexual orientation, relationship status, dieting status, and race) in the dependent variables (i.e., negative affect, state self-objectification, self-surveillance, and state body concerns) and hypothesized moderator variables (i.e., trait self-objectification and internalization of the thin- or muscular-ideals; see Table 4). This analysis indicated a significant overall effect for sex ($F(6, 128) = 2.68, p < .05$) and race ($F(6, 128) = 2.36, p < .05$). An examination of the univariate tests indicates a significant effect of sex on state body concerns ($F(1, 133) = 12.21, p < .01$; see Table 4) and on internalization of ideals ($F(1, 133) = 6.76, p < .05$). Univariate tests also indicated a marginally significant effect of race on negative affect ($F(1, 133) = 3.90, p < .10$). Based on these findings, sex and race will be entered as covariates in the main analyses.
Bivariate correlations were examined to determine if there were significant correlations between the continuous demographic variables and outcome and hypothesized moderator variables (see Table 5). BMI and perceived BMI correlated significantly with state body concerns \((r = .31, p < .01\) and \(r = .50, p < .01\), respectively). BMI also significantly correlated with internalization of the thin-ideal \((r = -.21, p < .05\), as did year in college with internalization of the thin-ideal \((r = -.21, p < .05\). Because BMI correlates with the dependent variable, state body concerns, it will be analyzed as a covariate in that ANCOVA. Given that it significantly correlates with perceived BMI, \(r = .72, p < .01\), it is unnecessary to control for perceived BMI in the main analyses.

**Primary Analyses**

**Hypothesis 1:** There will be a main effect of condition and main effect of sex on the following variables (henceforth referred to as the dependent variables): negative affect, state self-objectification, self surveillance and state body concerns. To test this hypothesis, four 2 x 2 (sex by condition) analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) were computed for each dependent measure (with race entered as a covariate in each ANCOVA and BMI entered in the state body concerns ANCOVA). I predicted that there would be a significant main effect of condition for each ANCOVA, with the means of the dependent variables for the experimental (objectifying) condition being significantly higher than those of the control condition. I also predicted that there would be a main effect for sex, with women reporting higher levels of the dependent variables, compared to males, regardless of condition.

In the first ANCOVA, with negative affect as the dependent variable, there was a significant condition effect \((F (1, 181) = 6.02, p < .01\); see Table 6). Both men and women in the experimental condition \((M = 3.94, SD = 4.52\) and \(M = 4.79, SD = 5.57\), respectively) had
significantly higher levels of negative affect than men and women in the control condition ($M = 2.38, SD = 4.10$ and $M = 2.78, SD = 3.91$, respectively). Contrary to my hypothesis, there was no significant sex effect ($F (1, 181) = 1.07, p = .30$). Likewise, no significant interaction effect was found ($F (1, 181) = 0.29, p = .59$).

Next, an ANCOVA was computed with state self-objectification as the dependent variable (controlling for race; see Table 6). Contrary to the hypothesis, there was neither a condition effect ($F (1, 177) = 0.13, p = .72$) nor a sex effect ($F (1, 177) = 0.21, p = .65$). Likewise, there was no significant interaction effect ($F (1, 177) = 2.10, p = .15$).

An ANCOVA was computed with self surveillance as the dependent variable (see Table 6). Contrary to the hypothesis, there was neither a condition effect ($F (1, 179) = 1.63, p = .20$) nor a sex effect ($F (1, 179) = 0.17, p = .68$). Likewise, there was no significant interaction effect ($F (1, 179) = 3.69, p = .06$).

Finally, an ANCOVA was computed with state body concerns as the dependent variable (see Table 6). Also contrary to my hypothesis, there was no condition effect ($F (1, 176) = 0.01, p = .93$). In support of my hypothesis, there was a sex effect ($F (1, 176) = 21.96, p < .01$), with women having higher levels of state body concerns ($M = 0.23, SD = 0.88$) than men ($M = -0.33, SD = 0.80$). No significant interaction effect was found ($F (1, 176) = 0.99, p = .32$). A significant covariate effect for BMI was found ($F (1, 176) = 22.10, p < .01$).

**Hypotheses 2 and 3:** The effect of condition on the dependent variables will be moderated by the following variables: trait self-objectification, internalization of the thin-ideal (females), and internalization of the muscular-ideal (males). Trait self-objectification and internalization of the thin- (females) or muscular-ideal (males) are hypothesized to moderate the relation between condition and the dependent variables in these four hypotheses. I predicted
that women and men with high levels of trait self-objectification exposed to the experimental condition will have significantly higher levels of the dependent variables (negative affect, state self-objectification, self-surveillance, and state body concerns) than participants in the control condition (high or low in trait self-objectification) and participants in the experimental condition with low levels of trait objectification (Hypothesis 2). I also expected that women and men with high levels of thin- (females) or muscular- (males) ideal internalization in the experimental condition will have significantly higher levels of the dependent variables than participants in the control condition (high or low in ideal internalization) and women and men in the experimental condition with low levels of internalization (Hypothesis 3).

To test these moderating hypotheses, a series of hierarchical moderated multiple regressions were computed for each criterion variable (Cohen & Cohen, 1975; for a total of 8 regressions). In Step 1, covariates (race in each regression and BMI in the regressions predicting state body concerns), sex, condition, and hypothesized moderator variable (trait self-objectification or internalization of ideals (thin-ideal for women or muscular-ideal for men) was entered. In Step 2, the two interaction terms (sex x condition and condition x hypothesized moderator) was entered. Finally, in Step 3, a three-way interaction term was entered (sex x condition x hypothesized moderator variable). If both a 2-way and 3-way interaction was found, only the 3-way interaction was examined.

Interaction terms were calculated after centering the hypothesized moderator variables (the control condition was coded as ‘0’ and the experimental condition was coded as ‘1’). To center the hypothesized moderator variables, the mean of the scores of the hypothesized moderator variable was subtracted from each individual score. By centering the values,
multicollinearity among the variables is reduced, without changing the significance of the relation of the interaction to the dependent variables (Holmbeck, 2002).

In testing Hypothesis 2 (trait self-objectification would moderate condition effects), four regressions were examined, one for each dependent variable: negative affect, state self-objectification, self surveillance, and state body concerns as the dependent variables of interest (see Table 7). Pertaining to negative affect, in Step 1, the block of variables of race, sex, condition, and trait self-objectification accounted for 9.0% of the variance in negative affect (see Table 7). A significant main effect was found for condition with individuals in the experimental condition having higher levels of negative affect. In Step 2, the interaction of sex and condition and trait self-objectification and condition did not account for a significant increase in variance explained. Finally, in Step 3, the three-way interaction term of sex, condition, and trait self-objectification also did not contribute to an increase in the variance explained in negative affect. As such, the hypothesis that trait self-objectification would moderate the condition effect on negative affect was not supported. Rather, the results show that regardless of level of trait self-objectification, being exposed to objectifying stimuli was associated with increased negative affect.

Next, trait self-objectification was examined as a hypothesized moderator of condition on state self-objectification. In Step 1, the block of variables of race, sex, condition, and trait self-objectification accounted for a non-significant 3% of the variance in state self-objectification (see Table 7). In Step 2, the interaction of sex and condition and trait self-objectification and condition also did not account for a significant percentage of variance explained. Finally, in Step 3, the three-way interaction term of sex, condition, and trait self-objectification did not contribute to the variance explained in state self-objectification. As such, the hypothesis that trait self-
objectification would moderate the condition effect on state self-objectification was not supported.

For the third regression, trait self-objectification was examined as a moderator of the relation between condition and self-surveillance. In Step 1, the block of variables of race, sex, condition, and trait self-objectification accounted for a significant 10.0% of the variance in self-surveillance (see Table 7). A significant main effect was found for trait self-objectification, with higher levels of trait self-objectification relating to higher self-surveillance. In Step 2, the interaction of sex and condition and trait self-objectification and condition did not account for a significant increase in variance explained. Finally, in Step 3, the three-way interaction term of sex, condition, and trait self-objectification did not contribute to an increase in the variance explained in self-surveillance. As such, the hypothesis that trait self-objectification would moderate the condition effect on self-surveillance was not supported.

Finally, trait self-objectification was examined as a moderator of the relation between condition and state body concerns (Table 7). In Step 1, the block of variables of race, BMI, sex, condition, and trait self-objectification accounted for a significant 31.0% of the variance in state body concerns (see Table 7). Significant main effects were found for BMI, sex, and trait self-objectification, with higher BMIs, being a female, and higher trait self-objectification relating to higher state body concerns. In Step 2, the interaction of sex and condition and trait self-objectification and condition did not account for a significant increase in variance explained. Finally, in Step 3, the three-way interaction term of sex, condition, and trait self-objectification did not contribute to an increase in the variance explained in state body concerns. As such, the hypothesis that trait self-objectification would moderate the condition effect on state body concerns was not supported.
**Hypothesis 3.** In testing Hypothesis 3 (internalization of ideals would moderate condition effects), four regressions were performed, one for each dependent variable: negative affect, state self-objectification, self-surveillance, and state body concerns (see Table 8). Pertaining to negative affect, in Step 1, the block of variables of race, sex, condition, and internalization of ideals accounted for a significant 7.0% of the variance in negative affect (see Table 8). Significant main effects were found for condition with individuals in the experimental condition showing higher levels of negative affect. In Step 2, the interaction of sex and condition and internalization of ideals and condition did not account for a significant increase in variance explained. Finally, in Step 3, the three-way interaction term of sex, condition, and internalization of ideals also did not contribute to an increase in the variance explained in negative affect. As such, the hypothesis that internalization of ideals would moderate the condition effect on negative affect was not supported.

Next, internalization of ideals was examined as a moderator of the relation between condition and state self-objectification. In Step 1, the block of variables of race, sex, condition, and internalization of ideals accounted for a non-significant 4% of the variance in state self-objectification (see Table 8). A significant main effect was found for internalization of ideals with individuals reporting higher internalization of ideals having higher levels of state self-objectification. In Step 2, the interaction of sex and condition and internalization of ideals and condition did not significantly contribute to the variance. In Step 3, the three-way interaction term of sex, condition, and internalization of ideals contributed to a significant 2% increase in the variance explained in state self-objectification.

Following Holmbeck (2002), this significant three-way interaction was examined further to determine the nature of the moderating effect. Regressions were computed, separately by
gender, at two levels of the hypothesized moderator: 1 SD below the mean and 1 SD above the mean. The unstandardized regression coefficients from the regressions are used to illustrate the simple slope of the regression line predicting the dependent variable at each level of the hypothesized moderator.

A graphic display can be found in Figure 1 (females) and Figure 2 (males); slopes depicted on the figures were based on the standardized regression coefficients. For females with high internalization of the thin-ideal, there was no significant condition effect on state self-objectification (slope not significantly different from zero). For females with low internalization of the thin-ideal, there was a marginally significant condition effect on state self-objectification ($p < .10$). This was opposite to the predicted relation. For males, regardless of level of internalization of the muscular-ideal, there was no significant relation between condition and state self-objectification (the slopes of the lines were not significantly different from zero). As such, the hypothesis that women and men with high levels of thin- (females) or muscular- (males) ideal internalization in the experimental condition would have significantly higher levels of state self-objectification than participants in the control condition (high or low in ideal internalization) and women and men in the experimental condition with low levels of internalization was not supported.

Internalization of ideals was also examined as a moderator of the relation between condition and self-surveillance. In Step 1, the block of variables of race, sex, condition, and internalization of ideals accounted for a significant 17.0% of the variance in self-surveillance (see Table 8). A significant main effect was found for internalization of ideals with individuals identifying as higher internalization of ideals having higher levels of self-surveillance. In Step 2, the interaction of sex and condition and internalization of ideals and condition accounted for a
significant increase in variance explained (4%), with both interaction terms reaching significance. Finally, in Step 3, the three-way interaction term of sex, condition, and internalization of ideals did not contribute to an increase in the variance explained in self-surveillance.

The nature of the significant two-way interaction was investigated and a graphic display can be found in Figure 3 (slopes depicted on the figures were based on the standardized regression coefficients). For individuals with high levels of internalization of the thin- or muscular-ideal, there was a significant effect of condition on self-surveillance, with individuals in the experimental (objectifying) condition having higher levels of self-surveillance than individuals in the control condition (regardless of sex). For individuals with lower levels of internalization of the thin- or muscular-ideal, there was no significant effect of condition on self-surveillance. As such, the hypothesis that internalization of ideals would moderate the condition effect on self-surveillance was supported.

Finally, internalization of ideals was examined as a moderator of the relation between condition and state body concerns (Table 8). In Step 1, the block of variables of race, BMI, sex, condition, and internalization of ideals accounted for a significant 31.0% of the variance in state body concerns (see Table 8). Significant main effects were found for BMI, sex, and internalization of ideals, with higher BMIs, being female, and higher internalization relating to higher state body concerns. In Step 2, the interaction of sex and condition and internalization of ideals and condition did not account for a significant increase in variance explained in state body concerns. Likewise, in Step 3, the three-way interaction term of sex, condition, and internalization of ideals did not contribute to an increase in the variance explained in state body concerns.
concerns. As such, the hypothesis that internalization of ideals would moderate the condition effect on state body concerns was not supported.

**Hypothesis 4: State self-objectification and self-surveillance will mediate the effect of condition on the dependent variables.** To test for mediation, I used SPSS macros (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). These macros use a boot-strapping procedure and provide results of the Sobel test. Additionally, these macros compute confidence intervals around the indirect effect (the path from the condition through the mediator variable to the dependent variables) that were examined to verify significant mediation (e.g., if 0 does not fall within the confidence interval, then there is significant mediation).

It was hypothesized that state self-objectification would mediate the effect of condition on negative affect. As shown in Table 9, state self-objectification did not mediate the effect of condition on negative affect (95% CI = -0.11; 0.11). It was also hypothesized that state self-objectification would mediate the effect of condition on state body concerns. There was neither a significant direct effect of the condition nor indirect effect found via state self-objectification (95% CI = -0.03; 0.03; see Table 9). Thus, this hypothesis was not supported.

Finally, it was hypothesized that self-surveillance would mediate the effect of condition on negative affect and state body concerns. As shown in Table 10, self-surveillance did not mediate the effect of condition on negative affect (95% CI = -0.15; 0.40). It was also hypothesized that self-surveillance would mediate the effect of condition on state body concerns. There was neither a significant direct effect of the condition nor indirect effect found via self-surveillance (95% CI = -0.09; 0.15; see Table 10). Thus, this hypothesis was not supported.

**Exploratory Analyses**
In exploratory analyses, two 2 x 2 (sex by condition) analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) (with race entered as a covariate in each ANCOVA) were computed for the dependent measures of perceptions of the actors (positive and negative personality traits). I predicted that there would be a significant main effect of condition for each ANCOVA, with the mean of the dependent variable of negative personality traits for the experimental (objectifying) condition being significantly higher than that of the control condition and the mean of the dependent variable of positive personality traits for the experimental condition being significantly lower than that of the control condition.

In the first ANCOVA, with negative personality traits as the dependent variable, there was a significant condition effect ($F(1, 182) = 110.25, p < .01$; see Table 11). Both men and women in the experimental condition ($M = 11.52, SD = 4.72$ and $M = 14.30, SD = 4.52$, respectively) perceived the actors to have significantly higher levels of negative personality traits than men and women in the control condition ($M = 5.79, SD = 3.23$ and $M = 6.56, SD = 4.32$, respectively). There was a significant sex effect ($F(1, 182) = 8.23, p < .01$), as well. Females rated the male actors as having higher levels of negative personality traits, compared to the males’ ratings of the female actors. There was no significant interaction effect ($F(1, 182) = 2.85, p = .09$).

In the second ANCOVA, with positive personality traits as the dependent variable, there was a significant condition effect ($F(1, 181) = 37.00, p < .01$; see Table 11). Both men and women in the experimental condition ($M = 32.94, SD = 11.28$ and $M = 29.23, SD = 11.31$, respectively) perceived the actors to have significantly lower levels of positive personality traits than men and women in the control condition ($M = 43.17, SD = 9.60$ and $M = 39.00, SD = 11.51$, respectively). There was a significant sex effect ($F(1, 181) = 5.27, p < .05$), as well;
female participants rated the actors as having lower levels of positive personality traits compared to the male participants. There was no significant interaction effect ($F(1, 181) = 0.07, p = .79$).
DISCUSSION

In the present study I examined if exposing college students to media depicting interpersonal objectification would affect their levels of the following dependent variables: negative affect, state self-objectification, self-surveillance, and state body concerns. I also examined how trait self-objectification and the internalization of sociocultural ideals (e.g., thin-ideal for women and muscular-ideal for men) moderated the effects of the exposure to the objectifying media. Finally, I examined if state self-objectification and self-surveillance were mediators of the relation between condition and the other dependent variables. For exploratory purposes, I examined the effects of exposure to interpersonal objectification on participants’ perceptions of the positive and negative personality traits of the actors (who were either making the objectifying comments or making non-objectifying comments). In this discussion, I will (1) discuss the findings, (2) compare the findings to related findings in the literature, and (3) draw implications. Last, I will provide a summary of limitations and the implications for theory and intervention.

**Hypothesis 1**

I predicted that there would be a main effect of condition (with individuals in the experimental condition receiving higher means on these variables compared to means of individuals in the control condition) and a main effect of sex (with women receiving higher means on these variables compared to means of men) on the dependent variables: negative affect, state self-objectification, self-surveillance, and state body concerns.

In support of my hypotheses, I found a condition effect on negative affect: men and women in the experimental condition had higher levels of negative affect than men and women in the control condition. This effect has been previously found for women with a different type
of media, print advertisements of objectified models (Harper & Tiggemann, 2008). However, my results contribute to the literature in that the experimental stimuli did not portray members of the same sex. Rather, negative affect was elicited by viewing media where members of the opposite sex were making objectifying comments verbally about non-viewable women (or men). Thus, simply by watching a one-minute conversation between two males stating objectifying comments about women, the female participants experienced higher levels of negative affect.

One limitation of previous research is the paucity of studies examining how men are affected by women objectifying other men. I found that, similar to the effect found with the female participants, men who saw women making objectifying comments about men (not in view) had higher levels of negative affect compared to participants in the control condition. Thus, as posited by Objectification Theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1998) and in line with studies applying Objectification Theory to men (Parent & Moradi, 2011), I found that men are just as likely as women to experience negative affect after viewing objectification of their gender. Although some may argue that men are not objectified as frequently as women, I have found that when they are exposed to objectifying comments, men also experience heightened levels of negative affect.

To follow up on specifying the emotions assessed by “negative affect,” an exploratory analysis indicated that the negative affect terms fall into three categories: terms reflecting anger/being upset (e.g., irritable, distressed, upset, hostile); terms reflecting anxiety (scared, nervous, jittery, and afraid); and terms reflecting shame (guilty, ashamed). The analyses testing the first hypothesis were re-run with negative affect parcelled into three negative affect subscales (one reflecting anger/upset, another for anxiety, and the third, for shame). These analyses indicated that the condition effect remained significant only for negative affect subscale of
upset/anger terms and was non-significant for anxious terms and shame terms. This suggests that the stimuli elicited more feelings of hostility than those of anxiety and shame. So, it seems that being exposed to people making objectifying comments induced feelings of anger. Thus, this suggests that participants may be less likely to internalize the objectification (e.g., self-objectify or experience body shame and appearance anxiety), given that there anger is directed towards the person making the objectifying comments.

Contrary to my hypotheses, there was no condition effect on state self-objectification, self-surveillance, or state body concerns. This was surprising given Harper and Tiggemann’s (2008) study supporting Objectification Theory. Specifically, Harper and Tiggemann found that showing females advertisements of women portraying the thin-ideal led to higher levels of state self-objectification, body dissatisfaction, and weight-related appearance anxiety (2008). Also, Daniels (2009) found that female adolescents exposed to objectified images of female models and female athletes also experienced higher levels of state self-objectification, compared to participants in the control condition. Given the divergence between my findings and those of recent studies, one plausible factor differentiating my study is the stimuli designed to depict objectification. As mentioned, Harper and Tiggemann (2008) and Daniels (2009) used images of thin-ideal models as the “objectifying” condition. However, in the present study, no images of women portraying the thin-ideal were shown to female participants and no images of men portraying the muscular-ideal were shown to male participants. It has been argued that internalization of body ideals is a key component that should be incorporated into studies evaluating Objectification Theory (Moradi & Huang, 2008). In other words, it might be that the effects of viewing objectifying media on state body concerns require social comparison and showing women or men that exemplify the thin- or muscular-ideal. Alternatively, it may be that
already being susceptible to comparing oneself to cultural standards of beauty (i.e., internalizing the thin- or muscular- ideal to a greater extent than others) is a prerequisite for experiencing increases in state self-objectification or self-surveillance. Finally, it is possible that these other dependent variables, that are reflective of internalizing the objectification, were not heightened because the condition elicited angry or upset feelings, and not anxiety or shame.

Regarding the main effect of sex, I found that, in support of my hypothesis, women had higher levels of state body concerns than men, regardless of condition. It is well supported that women have higher levels of body shame and appearance concerns than men (Fredrickson & Roberts, 2008). However, contrary to the hypotheses, no other main effects of sex were found for negative affect, state self-objectification, or self-surveillance. In other words, men and women did not differ on these dependent variables.

Objectification Theory posits that the prevalence rates of depression are higher in women and that women experience greater levels of self-objectification due to the ubiquity of objectifying images of women in the media. However, because the present study used an experimental design, and I, in turn, measured state (transient) levels of these variables, it could be that the gender differences purported by Objectification Theory do not apply to state inductions of negative affect or self-objectification when both men and women receive nearly identical, gender-specific exposure to objectification. If this is the case, there are implications of this to our understanding of how men are affected by the media. Although Objectification Theory is specific to women, and there is still a higher prevalence of objectifying images of women in the media (compared to those of men), it is clear from my study that men are not immune to the effects of media depicting women objectifying men.

**Hypothesis 2**
I predicted that the effect of the condition on the dependent variables would be moderated by trait self-objectification. In other words, I predicted that women and men with high levels of trait self-objectification exposed to the experimental condition would have significantly higher levels of the dependent variables (negative affect, state self-objectification, self-surveillance, and state body concerns) than participants in the control condition (high or low in trait self-objectification) and participants in the experimental condition with low levels of trait objectification. Based on hierarchical moderated multiple regressions, contrary to my hypothesis, trait self-objectification did not moderate the effect of condition on any of the dependent variables.

These findings differ from those of previous research, where women with high trait self-objectification experienced the most state self-objectification and state body shame (but not negative affect) when receiving an appearance-based compliment (in-vivo objectification) in an objectifying environment (Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008). Similar to what was described in the previous hypothesis, it could be that increases in the dependent variables of state body concerns and state self-objectification require images (not just objectifying language) of thin-ideal women or muscular men (and thus for participants to engage in social comparison). Although higher levels of trait self-objectification indicate placing more value on body appearance than physical competence, the propensity for social comparison was lessened by my experimental stimuli. Specifically, Tiggemann and Boundy (2008) placed participants in an objectifying environment (a room with mirrors and a scale) where they received an appearance-based compliment, thus increasing the likelihood for females who were high in trait self-objectification to experience heightened levels of body shame and state self-objectification. In other words, the component of
engaging in social comparison may not have been elicited in the current study because no images were presented in which to compare.

It is also important to mention that the mean trait self-objectification score differed from the scores in other studies examining this variable. In the present sample, the mean trait self-objectification score for female participants was -0.91 ($SD = 12.22$) and, for male participants, it was -3.31 ($SD = 11.65$). Negative scores indicate generally not valuing physical appearance characteristics over physical competence traits. In previous studies, where trait self-objectification has been a significant moderator of condition effects, authors reported sample trait self-objectification means closer to zero (e.g., $M = -0.05$; Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008), with larger standard deviations (e.g., $SD = 15.72$; Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008). Thus, one additional possibility for the null moderation is that trait self-objectification scores had less variance and were generally lower than those in comparable studies.

Finally, trait self-objectification did not moderate the effect of condition on negative affect. Across levels of trait self-objectification, seeing members of the opposite sex objectify individuals of the same gender made participants feel negative. Regardless of whether one values appearance over physical competence (i.e., whether one exhibits trait self-objectification), individuals who hear objectifying comments experience greater negative affect compared to individuals who do not hear objectifying comments. So, although trait self-objectification has been found to correlate with a variety of mental health issues (e.g., Moradi & Huang, 2008), lower levels of it do not appear to protect individuals from feeling negative after witnessing objectification.

**Hypothesis 3**
I predicted that the effect of condition on the dependent variables would be moderated by internalization of the thin-ideal (females) and internalization of the muscular-ideal (males). In other words, I expected that women and men with high levels of ideal internalization in the experimental condition would have significantly higher levels of the dependent variables than participants in the control condition (high or low in ideal internalization) and women and men in the experimental condition with low levels of internalization. Based on hierarchical moderated multiple regressions, in support of this hypothesis, internalization of the thin- or muscular-ideal moderated the relation between condition and self-surveillance. For individuals with high levels of internalization of the thin- or muscular- ideal, there was a significant effect of condition on self-surveillance, with individuals in the experimental (objectifying) condition having higher levels of self-surveillance than individuals in the control condition (regardless of sex). For individuals with lower levels of internalization of the thin- or muscular- ideal, there was no significant effect of condition on self-surveillance.

These findings are supported by previous research showing that thin-ideal internalization in women has been found to moderate media effects on body image disturbance, such as body-focused negative affect (Dittmar, Halliwell, & Stirling, 2009; Dittmar & Howard, 2004; Halliwell & Dittmar, 2004). Likewise, Morry and Staska (2001) found that internalization of the muscular-ideal for men was an important variable to assess in studying predictors of male body dissatisfaction. Self-surveillance is a more face-valid measurement of self-objectification with items including, “I am thinking about how I look” and “I am worrying about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look good.” It makes sense that men and women who are inclined to compare themselves to models and actors (and strive to look like them) would be at risk for being in a state of self-surveillance after hearing objectifying comments.
Two major implications can be drawn from this significant moderation finding. First, both males and females who were high in internalization of the muscular- and thin-ideals, respectively, experienced greater self-surveillance than men and women with lower internalization of these ideals or those in the control condition. This finding supports the contentions of others that certain mechanisms proposed by Objectification Theory are relevant to men (Parent & Moradi, 2011). Just as it is true for the female participants in this study, when male participants witness women making objectifying comments about other men, the participants who highly internalize the muscular-ideal report higher levels of self-surveillance, or greater concern over their appearance to others.

Another implication of this moderation is that having lower internalization of these ideals buffers against experiencing self-surveillance after exposure to objectification. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that reducing individuals’ internalizations of sociocultural ideals via prevention or intervention might ameliorate or protect against the short-term effects of objectifying media on self-surveillance.

Contrary to my hypothesis, however, internalization of ideals did not moderate the effect of condition on negative affect, state self-objectification (as measured by the Twenty Statements Test), or state body concerns. As with the proposed moderator of trait self-objectification, regardless of whether one strives to look like our culture’s ideals of beauty, seeing members of the opposite sex treat others like objects makes participants feel worse than participants who do not see objectification. As such, because of this null finding, it appears that the negative affect experienced by men and women in the experimental condition may not be attributed to failing to meet societal expectations of beauty. Rather, it seems more likely that the negative affect
experienced could have been primed with the thought of being objectified or that one could be treated like an object, which appears to be aversive to both men and women.

Specific to state self-objectification, it is surprising that there was a significant condition effect on self-surveillance (moderated by internalization of the thin- or muscular-ideal) but not on state self-objectification. It appears, based on their weak correlation, that self-surveillance and state self-objectification capture different aspects of self-objectification. On the one hand, self-surveillance taps into one’s current concern with one’s appearance to others, whereas the Twenty Statements Test captures how one defines himself or herself at the present moment. In other words, for the Twenty Statements Test, the more comments that an individual makes about his or her appearance (body shape, body size, and attractiveness), the more likely he or she is experiencing a state of self-objectification. So, self-surveillance captures how much one is concerned about their appearance in the eyes of others, and the Twenty Statements Test captures how much one is considering their appearance to be how one identifies (in terms of his or her self-concept). As such, it could be that regardless of whether one strives to meet the sociocultural ideals of beauty, hearing objectifying comments made about another person does not affect the characteristics one generates about oneself.

Finally, internalization of the thin- or muscular-ideal did not moderate the relation between condition and state body concerns. However, previous research has found that internalization of the thin-ideal moderated the effect of condition on body-related negative affect (Dittmar et al., 2009). A potential explanation for the null finding in my dissertation is that I did not show participants the women or men who were the targets of the objectifying comments. In Dittmar et al.’s (2009) study, women were shown advertisements with thin models. It is also important to note that the objectifying comments made by the men in the experimental condition
did not refer to the target’s body weight; rather, they were focused on her sexual characteristics. This could be another reason why the experimental condition did not affect state body concerns.

**Hypothesis 4**

I predicted that state self-objectification and self-surveillance would mediate the effect of condition on the dependent variables. Contrary to my hypothesis, neither state self-objectification nor self-surveillance mediated the effect of condition on the dependent variables. One of the main premises of Objectification Theory is that it is through self-objectification that the negative effects (negative affect, body shame, appearance anxiety, etc.) of experiencing objectification or viewing objectification in the media occur. It could be that these pathways hold true only in longitudinal studies measuring *trait* self-objectification.

When it comes to short-term effects of viewing objectifying media, priming, supported by Objectification Theory and the previously described Social Cognitive Information Processing (SCIP) theory, may better account for the mechanism through which participants experienced negative affect and self-surveillance. This has been supported by previous research (Harper & Tiggemann, 2008), wherein state self-objectification did not mediate the effect of viewing images of women portraying the thin-ideal on appearance anxiety, depression, and body dissatisfaction.

As such, one implication of this null finding is that perhaps trait self-objectification, rather than state self-objectification, may be better suited for explaining the long-term associations between experiencing or viewing objectification and the outcome variables, as longitudinal studies do support *trait* self-objectification as a mediating variable (e.g., Aubrey, 2006a; Aubrey 2006b; Aubrey & Taylor, 2009). In turn, priming, posited by both the SCIP model and Objectification Theory, explains the short-term effects of viewing objectification in
this study. That is, individuals in the experimental condition were primed to have thoughts (e.g., thoughts related to self-surveillance: “members of the opposite sex comment on the bodies of other men/women in a sexualized manner; thus, they could comment on mine”) and emotions (e.g., anger, anxiety, sadness, irritability) after viewing objectifying media that were otherwise not primed in the minds of individuals in the control condition. This could also explain how higher levels of state body concerns were not found in the experimental condition because thoughts related to body size were not primed with the current study’s stimuli (because it lacked same-gender individuals with which to compare).

**Exploratory Analyses**

I predicted that there would be a main effect of condition on perceptions of negative and positive personality traits of the actors wherein participants in the experimental condition would rate the actors less favorably (higher negative traits and lower positive traits) compared to the ratings of participants in the control condition. In support of this prediction, men and women in the experimental condition perceived the actors to have both higher negative personality traits and lower positive personality traits than men and women in the control condition. There was also a main effect of sex, where women rated the male actors less favorably than the men rated the female actors, regardless of condition. These results are in line with previous research that has found that female participants who witness sexism (i.e., are not the targets of cat-calls but witness a man making a cat-call to another woman) report more negative feelings toward men in general (Chaudoir & Quinn, 2010). This finding also parallels research on women’s likability of and short-term sexual attraction toward men who vary in sexist beliefs (Bohner, Ahlborn, & Steiner, 2010). Specifically, it has been shown that women find men who exhibited hostile sexism as less likable and less sexually attractive than men who were non-sexist (Bohner et al.,
Similar to the other null-findings for gender differences in the previously described hypotheses, men in the experimental condition found the women as less likable than the men in the control condition.

Another exploratory analysis not described in the Results section tested whether the perceived personality traits of the actors served as a mediator between condition and negative affect. Indeed, the condition effect on negative affect was explained by perceived negative personality traits of the actors (effect = 1.90; bootstrapped standard error = 0.60; 95% CI = 0.79; 3.16). In other words, the exposure to verbal objectification related to greater negative affect through an increase in perceived negative personality traits of the actors. Most likely, participants felt greater dislike for the actors, which then led to an increase in negative affect in general.

One implication is that these exploratory findings provide evidence against the common belief that making objectifying comments about an opposite sex individual is innocuous. For both men and women, this is certainly not the case. To further support this implication, future research could include measurement of behavioral intentions toward the person making the objectifying comments or the likelihood of dating or romantically pursuing the actors/actresses in the videos. It would be expected, given the lower positive personality traits and higher negative personality traits, that participants in the experimental condition would be less likely to report interest in dating the actors making the objectifying comments. Overall, the exploratory results provide incentive for both men and women who are single to not objectify the opposite sex if they are seeking a romantic partner.

**Limitations and Implications for Theory and Intervention**
One limitation of the present study is the applicability of the findings to diverse populations. First, the sample consisted of college students, the majority of whom identified as Caucasian and heterosexual. Although this experimental study provides the first evidence of the effects of viewing media where only verbal objectification is displayed, it should be replicated in other samples including younger adolescents and adults. Likewise, although statistical power precluded examining whether sexual orientation and race moderated the condition effects, it would be informative for future research to consider using different types of interpersonal objectification (e.g., showing two homosexual men commenting on the appearance of another man or showing two African-American males commenting on the appearance of an African-American female).

Another limitation of this study is that the effects that were found are considered short-term or transitory. Thus, it is not known how long participants experienced negative affect or self-surveillance. Future research could consider measuring the dependent variables at more than one time point after viewing the stimuli. In addition, coping strategies after viewing the objectifying stimuli were not assessed. It would be informative for intervention to assess coping strategies used by the individuals in the experimental condition.

Notwithstanding these limitations, there are implications for theory (e.g., Objectification Theory), that can be drawn from my dissertation. Objectification Theory posits that witnessing others being objectified in the media falls under the umbrella of sexually objectifying experiences that are related to many psychological consequences (depression, disordered eating, sexual dysfunction) as a result of women engaging in self-objectification (i.e., internalizing an outsider’s view of sexual objectification of women). However, while supported in correlational and longitudinal studies, this mediation model (viewing objectifying media leads to greater self-
objectification, which then predicts greater levels of these negative outcomes) was not supported in the current experimental study where only verbal objectification was displayed. It is possible that priming, supported by both Objectification Theory and the SCIP model, is the general process by which participants experienced these short-term effects.

Despite the null mediation finding, viewing objectification did elicit more negative affect in the experimental condition, as well as self-surveillance for individuals high in internalization of the thin- or muscular-ideal. Thus, although the mediational pathway proposed by Objectification Theory was not supported, some of the proposed dependent variables were found to be affected by condition.

There are some possible explanations for why certain aspects of Objectification Theory were not supported in my study. First, my results are consistent with Objectification Theory in that exposure to verbal objectification elicited negative affect and self-surveillance. However, it is not clear whether the stimuli elicited emotions specific to the injustice toward women (or men) being objectified or whether the stimuli caused negative affect specific to a negative evaluation of the actors making the objectifying comments. In other words, it is not known whether participants simply experienced greater negative affect solely due to looking negatively upon the actors.

Furthermore, in addition to not being able to pinpoint the psychological process that contributed to the emotional arousal, it is also possible that social comparison is a key component of Objectification Theory that was not elicited with the stimuli in the present study. Previous studies have shown images of models portraying the thin-ideal or muscular-ideal, whereas in my dissertation, no images were shown (it was solely verbal commentary). Future studies should continue to elucidate the processes of objectifying media effects by considering
the role of internalization of sociocultural ideals and other social comparison tendencies and identifying whether engaging in social comparison is a prerequisite for these effects.

This study also has implications for intervention. First, college men and women who saw a one minute video clip of interpersonal objectification experienced greater negative affect than participants in the control condition. Likewise, for men and women who reported high internalization of the thin- or muscular-ideal, these individuals reported higher levels of self-surveillance compared to participants in the control condition and compared to men and women with low levels of internalization. These findings indicate that even after a brief exposure to verbal objectification, there is a negative impact of objectifying media on its viewers. Although video clips from objectifying television, movies, and music videos were not shown, the stimuli were rated as realistic in comparison to what the participants saw on television shows like Jersey Shore. Further, given that such a brief exposure to the objectifying stimuli had a significant effect, what can be said about the effects of watching objectifying media for longer periods of time? With adolescents and young adults spending upwards of 40 hours per week consuming media (Rideout et al., 2010), it is possible that individuals could more frequently or more consistently experience negative affect and self-surveillance if they consume media that depicts sexual objectification verbally and visually.

Given this implication, and its parallel to other media effects identified in the literature (e.g., violent video games and aggression), steps should be taken to elucidate the effects of objectifying media to those who consume the most media and who may be most at risk for such effects. In other words, adolescents and young adults should be made aware of these effects and learn techniques to either be more critical of media that depict objectification or to avoid this type of media if they are particularly susceptible to self-surveillance. Similarly, intervention
could address internalization of the thin- or muscular-ideal, as this variable was found to
strengthen the relation between condition and self-surveillance. As previously mentioned, taking
preventative measures to reduce internalization of the sociocultural ideals may buffer youth from
experiencing self-surveillance when exposed to objectifying media.

Finally, another implication is the absence of gender differences in the condition effects.
Although women are more frequently objectified in the media than are men, the prevalence of
male objectification is rising (Daniel & Bridges, 2010). In accord, men’s desire for attaining the
muscular-ideal has also been more apparent, especially among college-aged men (Parent &
Moradi, 2011). With these shifts, and the results of my dissertation, it is clear that boys and
young men should receive similar prevention efforts as girls and young women. For example,
critiquing media’s narrow definition of masculinity and its portrayal of toned, muscular bodies as
attainable ideals could serve to protect young men from experiencing self-surveillance as a result
of seeing male objectification in the media.
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APPENDIX A

Sona Posting

**Study name:** Perceptions of friendships among college students

**2-Part Study:** This is a 2-part study. After completing the first part of the study online, you can sign up for the second session that should occur approximately one week after you completed the online survey.

**Description:** This study is being done to examine the perceptions of friendships among college students having social interactions in a variety of environments. A number of variables that are related to how you perceive friendships and social interactions between males and females will be assessed including demographic variables (sex, race, height, weight, etc.). You will be asked to participate in two sessions, an online survey (Part 1) and watching a video and completing another survey in the Psychology Building (Part 2). For Part 1, you will be asked to complete an online survey that should take no more than one half hour. For Part 2, you will schedule to come to the Psychology Building approximately one week later. During this session, you will be randomly assigned to watch a 5 minute video clip of college students having interactions with each other at a house party. Following the video, you will complete another set of questionnaires. This session will take approximately 60 minutes. You will receive a half credit for your participation in Part 1 and an additional full credit for you participation in Part 2.

In order to meet eligibility criteria, you must be 18 years of age or older. If you have any questions or comments about this study, you may contact the investigator, Sarah Domoff, by phone at 203-788-2510 or by email at sdomoff@bgsu.edu.

**Duration:** 30 minutes (Part 1) and 60 minutes (Part 2)

**Credits:** 0.5 Credit for completion of Part 1 and 1 Credit for completion of Part 2

**Researcher:** Sarah Domoff

**Participant Sign-Up Deadline:** 24 hours before the first session is to occur

**Participant Cancellation Deadline:** 24 hours before the study is to occur

**HSRB Approval Code:** 283352
APPENDIX B

Informed Consent

Investigator:  Sarah Domoff, M.A.

Description:  The purpose of this research study is to examine individual differences in the perceptions of friendships among college students. I am completing this study for my Dissertation Project in the Department of Psychology. You must be at least 18 years old to participate.

Summary of Involvement:  This study will ask you to attend two different sessions. During the first session, you will complete several questionnaires. This session will take approximately 30 minutes and you will complete this online. A number of variables that are related to how you perceive friendships and social interactions between males and females will be assessed including demographic variables (sex, race, height, weight, etc.) during this session. Other questions related to your perceptions will also be measured (e.g., how you feel about your body size and your appearance). After submitting your survey online, the researcher will send you an email with an invitation code to sign up on Sona for the second portion of the study to occur approximately one week after you completed the online survey. During the second session, you will be asked to watch a 5-minute video clip in a room in the Psychology Building. Although other participants will be present, you will watch this video clip alone (with a pair of headphones) at a partitioned computer to prevent others from seeing your responses. You will then complete another set of questionnaires. This session will take approximately one hour. You will receive a 0.5 credit for attending the first session and 1.0 credit for your participation in the second session. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary.

Potential Risks:  The anticipated risks to you in this study are no greater than those normally encountered in daily life.
**Benefits:** This study may benefit you by increasing your awareness of how you perceive interpersonal interactions and how overhearing conversations affect you. This study may benefit society by increasing knowledge about the impact of one’s experiences on reactions to conversations among individuals.

**Confidentiality:** Information you provide will remain confidential and your identity will not be revealed. All of your responses will be linked only through ID number and only the principal investigator running the study will have access to them. Your responses will be reviewed by ID number and will not be connected to your name in any way. Identifying information for the purpose of assigning SONA credit is kept in a separate database and is not linked to your responses. Because the Internet is not 100% secure in terms of privacy, please remember to not leave the partially completed survey open or unattended if completing it on a public computer, and to clear the browser page history and cache when finished with the survey.

For the second part of the experiment, confidentiality will be protected in several ways. First, you will watch the stimulus video and complete the post-test survey individually, at a partitioned computer, alone, in a reserved computer lab in the Psychology Building. Dividers (large 3 fold poster boards) will be placed around the computer screens to block anyone from seeing your responses or the videos that are shown.

**Right to Withdraw:** Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you can refrain from answering any questions without penalty or explanation. You are free to withdraw consent and end participation in the study at any time. You have the right to have all questions concerning the study answered by the researcher and may request a copy of the results of the study. Deciding to participate or not will not impact your grades or class standing or relationship to the institution. Your rights as a participant will be reminded to you before your participation in part 2 of the experiment. Further, a copy of this consent will be reviewed with you during part 2 of the experiment, before your participation.
Contact Information: If you have any questions or comments about this study, you may contact Sarah Domoff by phone at 203-788-2510 or by email at sdomoff@bgsu.edu or the advisor for this project, Eric Dubow, at edubow@bgsu.edu (phone at 419-372-2556). You may also wish to contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Board, by phone at 419-372-7716, or by email at hsrb@bgsu.edu.

1. Your completion of this online survey indicates your voluntary consent to participate in this research investigation. You may refuse to participate in this investigation or withdraw your consent and discontinue participation in this study. If you are eligible to participate and wish to give your consent and continue, please select the response option below and click on the "Next" button; you will then be directed to the survey. If you prefer not to participate please close this browser window. *This question is required

- [ ] I have been presented with and have read the statement of risks and benefits of participating in this project and I agree to participate.
APPENDIX C

Condition Scripts

Female Experimental Condition

Man 1: Hey Bro!

Man 2: What’s up? I didn’t think you were coming!

Man 1: I wouldn’t miss this fun. This party is awesome!! Did you see the corn hole outside? Let’s get next round.

Man 2: We’re all set, I already called next game. Ugh, I’ve needed a break from all these classes. I pulled two all-nighters last week. Don’t ever take Martin for bio. He sucks.

Man 1: I’m not worried about that—I’m never going to take bio. My philosophy class is killing me though. The professor does not make sense and makes us read probably a 100 pages each week.

Man 2: That sounds rough. At least our psychology class is interesting though. {A passerby catches Man 2’s attention}. Oh, look at that chick!

Man 1: Wow, talk about a perfect ass. I wouldn’t mind some alone time with that! (men look for 5 sec).

Man 2: Damn, she’s hot. Look at that rack.

Man 1: Yeah, that body is sexy.

Man 2: I’d totally do her. Well, as long as she has a nice cooch!

Man 1: Hahaha, you’re hilarious, but did you see that chick in our class the other day? The shorter girl with the really nice ass? Now that looked good!

Man 2: Oh yeah, definitely.

Man 1: I’m going to be looking for that ass tonight!

Man 2: Hahaha.

Man 1 {continues laughing}.

Man 2: Haha. I’m gonna get another drink.

Man 1: I’ll come with you—we can see if it’s our turn at cornhole.

Man 1 and 2 laughing as they exit.
Female Control Condition

Man 1: Hey bro!

Man 2: What’s up? I didn’t think you were coming!

Man 1: I wouldn’t miss this fun. This party is awesome!! Did you see the cornhole outside? Let’s get next round.

Man 2: We’re all set, I already called next game. Ugh, I’ve needed a break from all these classes. I pulled two all-nighters last week. Don’t ever take Martin for bio. He sucks.

Man 1: I’m not worried about that— I’m never going to take bio. My philosophy class is killing me though. The professor does not make sense and makes us read probably a 100 pages each week.

Man 2: That sounds rough. At least our psychology class is interesting though. {A passerby catches Man 2’s attention}. Oh, look at that girl!

Man 1: Wow, she looks just like your cousin. Literally, your cousin’s twin! (men look for 5 sec).

Man 2: Damn, she does. Look at her hair too.

Man 1: And she has the same clothing style.

Man 2: I’d completely think that was her.

Man 1: Speaking of look-a-likes, I think our psychology prof looks like my uncle. Now that’s weird.

Man 2: That’s funny. I’ve heard I have a twin on campus too.

Man 1: I’m going to be looking for him now!

Man 2: Hahaha.

Man 1 {continues laughing}.

Man 2: Haha. I’m gonna get another drink.

Man 1: I’ll come with you—we can see if it’s our turn at cornhole.

Man 1 and 2 laughing as they exit.
Male Experimental Condition

Woman 1: Hey girl!

Woman 2: What’s up? I didn’t think you were coming!

Woman 1: I wouldn’t miss this fun. This party is awesome!! Did you see the corn hole outside? Let’s get next round.

Woman 2: We’re all set, I already called next game. Ugh, I’ve needed a break from all these classes. I pulled two all-nighters last week. Don’t ever take Martin for bio. He sucks.

Woman 1: I’m not worried about that—I’m never going to take bio. My philosophy class is killing me though. The professor does not make sense and makes us read probably a 100 pages each week.

Woman 2: That sounds rough. At least our psychology class is interesting though. {A passerby catches Woman 2’s attention}. Oh, look at that dude!

Woman 1: Wow, talk about a perfect body. I wouldn’t mind some alone time with that! (women look for 5 sec).

Woman 2: Damn, he’s hot. Look at his chest.

Woman 1: Yeah, that body is sexy.

Woman 2: I’d totally do him. Well, as long as he has a nice package!

Woman 1: Hahaha, you’re hilarious, but did you see that dude in our class the other day? The tall guy with the really nice ass? Now that looked good.

Woman 2: Oh yeah, definitely.

Woman 1: I’m going to be looking for that ass tonight!

Woman 2: Hahaha.

Woman 1 {continues laughing}.

Woman 2: Haha. I’m gonna get another drink.

Woman 1: I’ll come with you—we can see if it’s our turn at cornhole.

Woman 1 and 2 laughing as they exit.
Male Control Condition

Woman 1: Hey girl!

Woman 2: What’s up? I didn’t think you were coming!

Woman 1: I wouldn’t miss this fun. This party is awesome!! Did you see the cornhole outside? Let’s get next round.

Woman 2: We’re all set, I already called next game. Ugh, I’ve needed a break from all these classes. I pulled two all-nighters last week. Don’t ever take Martin for bio. He sucks.

Woman 1: I’m not worried about that—I’m never going to take bio. My philosophy class is killing me though. The professor does not make sense and makes us read probably a 100 pages each week.

Woman 2: That sounds rough. At least our psychology class is interesting though. {A passerby catches Woman 2’s attention}. Oh, look at that guy!

Woman 1: Wow, he looks just like your cousin. Literally, your cousin’s twin! (women look for 5 sec).

Woman 2: Damn, he does. Look at his hair too.

Woman 1: And he has the same clothing style.

Woman 2: I’d completely think that was him.

Woman 1: Speaking of look-a-likes, I think our psychology prof looks like my uncle. Now that’s weird.

Woman 2: That’s funny. I’ve heard I have a twin on campus too.

Woman 1: I’m going to be looking for her now!

Woman 2: Hahaha.

Woman 1 {continues laughing}.

Woman 2: Haha. I’m gonna get another drink.

Woman 1: I’ll come with you—we can see if it’s our turn at cornhole.

Woman 1 and 2 laughing as they exit.
Hi everyone, it’s time to get started. Please turn off your cell phones, not just on vibrate, but fully silent so there will be no distractions.

This is a study on perceptions of friendships among college students. You recently completed surveys that provided basic demographic information needed to describe the participants.

You will be watching 1 of 5 interpersonal interactions on your computer for approximately 5 minutes. It is important for you to watch these interactions because questions will be asked pertaining to them after the video clip is over. After showing the clip, you will take a survey. If at any point during the study you have questions and concerns raise your hand and a researcher will assist you. It is important that you hear and pay attention to the video clip. Please raise your hand if you are having trouble hearing or following the video clip. At this time please click the “play” button on your computer screen.
APPENDIX E

Debriefing Script

Oral Script for Debriefing (adapted from Mills, 1976)

Thank you very much for your participation in this study. There is more to this study than I have told you so far. Before I tell you exactly what it is, I want to explain why it is necessary in some psychological studies not to tell people all about the study at the very beginning. This is because it could affect the results so they would not be a good indication of how people react in a real-life situation. In certain studies, if we tell people what the purpose of the study is and what we predict about how they will react in certain situations, they might deliberately do what it is they think we want them to do, in order to help us out and give us the results we want. It is also possible that the opposite could happen, where participants would deliberately try not to do what we predicted would happen to show us we could not figure them out. In both situations the results would be invalid. So, can you see why in some kinds of studies we can’t tell people all about the whole purpose of the study at the beginning?

Now I would like to explain what we were actually looking at in this study. What we were really interested in is how objectification that participants observe might affect how they feel, what thoughts they have, and their behavior. We were not actually interested in your perceptions of friendships. We expect that those who see and hear members of the opposite sex making objectifying comments will have feelings and thoughts that will be more negative and self-critical and evaluative than those who see members of the opposite sex not making objectifying comments. We randomly assigned participants to two groups: one where the video depicted two men (or women) commenting on men’s bodies and one video that depicted two men (or women) not commenting on men’s bodies but rather commenting on how another person at the party looked like their cousin. You were in the ________ condition. So, you can see how if we told you that this study was actually about your reactions to the comments of the actors, it probably would have affected your spontaneous reactions. We tried really hard to make this whole situation believable so that everyone in the experiment believes that they are truly giving their perceptions of the friendships depicted. We want to be sure that we give our hypotheses a fair test because we don’t know whether they are true. If we were already certain they were correct, we wouldn’t go through all the trouble to bring participants in to test it. Do you see why we couldn’t tell you about the true purpose of the experiment beforehand? Do you have any questions so far?

I would like to emphasize that this experiment is not a test of your personality, ability, or character. There are no correct responses. We are looking for people’s natural responses. Also, we are not interested in the responses of any one individual. Instead, we are interested in how the average college student is affected by observing interpersonal objectification. In order to figure this out, we need to collect the responses of lots of participants and then average them together. What this means is that it is going to be necessary for us to ask you not to say anything about the study to anyone else. If you talked to someone else about the study, then if they participate it would be the same as if I told them at the beginning the whole purpose of the study. Their responses wouldn’t be spontaneous or natural and would not be able to be used. If this happened
enough times, then we wouldn’t have data to give us valid results and so all the data and time you provided us and all the data and time from those who already participated would be wasted. I hope you can see why it is extremely important that I have to ask you not to talk about the study with anyone. It may seem that the more I tell you about the experiment the more you may want to tell others, so it might seem that we are taking a chance in telling you all about it. My experience has actually been the opposite, that if I try to explain the experiment thoroughly and describe the reason for doing it the way we did, people are more likely to cooperate and not talk about the experiment. We also explain all this so you can get an educational experience out of this. I hope you learned something about research and experiments while participating and after this explanation. Do you have any other questions about this experiment or research on media objectification? I do hope that you will not talk about the experiment with others so that they can have the full experience that you did. Thank you again for all your help!
APPENDIX F

Debriefing Form

Dear study participants:

Thank you for participating in this research study. We hope that you found this study interesting and greatly appreciate your participation. If you have further questions about this study or would like to withdraw from the study, please email the Principal Investigator, Sarah Domoff, M.A. at sdomoff@bgsu.edu or call her at (203) 788-2510. You may also contact the research advisor for this study, Eric Dubow, at edubow@bgsu.edu or the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Board by phone at 419-372-7716 or by email at hrsb@bgsu.edu. Should you experience any emotional discomfort as a result of participating in this study, psychological treatment is available at the BGSU Psychological Services Center (PSC) in the Psychology Building, Suite 300. You can contact the PSC by telephone at 419-372-2540. Once again, we would like to thank you for participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Sarah Domoff
Department of Psychology
APPENDIX G

Script for In-Class Participant Recruitment for Pilot Study

Hi, my name is Sarah Domoff and I am a graduate student in clinical psychology here at BGSU. I am currently looking for participants to participate in a pilot study to help create experiment stimuli to reflect two scenarios that depict men and women commenting on appearances of the opposite sex (e.g., making objectifying comments). You will be asked to complete one questionnaire assessing your thoughts of the scripts that will eventually be used to create experiment stimuli in a future research project. You will also be asked to comment on the drafts of the scripts to help determine whether the material is realistic, whether you think it reflects objectification on television and in the media, and whether the wording of the current scripts sounds natural to you and your peers. We anticipate that participation will take approximately 30 minutes.

You are eligible to participate if you are at least 18 years old and a student at BGSU. The benefits of this study are experience in helping to provide feedback on stimuli that will be used in future research and the opportunity to receive research credit or extra credit in a Psychology class if your instructor allows this. The anticipated risks to you are no greater than those normally encountered in daily life.

You will be completing a short survey on your thoughts about the scripts and how realistic they are. The second half of the study will involve a discussion of the drafts of the scripts. You will be asked for your input on these scripts, to help determine whether the comments are realistic, whether you think it reflects objectification on television and in the media, and whether the wording of the current scripts sounds natural to peers your age.

Those that participate will have the chance to earn research credit or extra credit for this class. Those that are interested can sign up for the available times slots on a sign-up sheet that is going around. Thank you for your time.
APPENDIX H

Pilot Study Scripts

Control Condition Script
Woman 1: Heyy!

Man 1: What’s up? I was starting to think you weren’t coming!
Woman 1: This party is awesome!! You see the flip cup going on in the basement? I love that game, wanna do next round?
Man 1: I love flip cup too! I already wrote my name on the list! I really needed to get out. I could use a break from all these classes. I pulled like two all-nighters last week. Don’t ever take Martin for bio. He sucks.
Woman 1: I don’t think I’ll ever take bio. Oh—what are your plans for tomorrow? My friends from home will be in town and we were gonna watch the OSU game.
Man 1: Oh fun! I don’t have anything planned. We should go to B-dubs! I think they have like really cheap wings for the game. Or maybe it was a deal on drinks. Whatever—it was, I’m down! {Looks like BG football is on tv}. Oh, look at that touchdown!
Woman 1: Wow! That was an away game too. They are doing really well {woman and man look at the tv for 20 sec).
Man 1: Oh yeah, it looks like they have a good chance of winning this. Look at the score! I think we’ll win by two touch downs.
Woman 1: You think? That’s great!
Man 1: Our team’s really shaping up this season.
Woman 1: It’s too bad we didn’t go to the game!
Man 1: Hahhahaa!! Ooh look at that guy. He totally fumbled.
Woman 1: Yep—looks like if they don’t pick up their offense then we got a win!
Man 1: That’d be great if BG won tonight and OSU won tomorrow.
Woman 1: Yeah, I think they can beat Michigan. The Wolverines have a new coach.
Man 1: Yeah and their record has been sucking this season.
Woman 1: Commercial break and there’s 5 minutes left!
Man 1: I’m gonna grab another. Want one? I don’t want to miss the last couple minutes!
Woman 1: Sure--I’ll come with!

Female Experimental Condition Script
Man 1: Hey Bro!
Man 2: What’s up man, I didn’t think you were coming?
Man 1: This party is awesome!! Did you see the beer pong tables in the basement? That’s my game—let’s call next round.
Man 2: We’re all set, I already called next game. Man, I’ve needed a break from all these classes. I pulled like two all-nighters last week. Don’t ever take Martin for bio. He sucks.
Man 1: I’m not worried about that shit —— I’m never going to take bio. Dude where you watching the game tomorrow? We should go to a bar or maybe I’ll have people over. You know that OSU is gonna kill Michigan!
Man 2: Whatever—now with Tressel gone, it’s really a crap shoot. I don’t really care though—football season is here: the best part about going back to school! {A passerby catches Man 2’s attention}. Oh man, look at that girl! {pan to men ogling passerby}
Man 1: Wow, talk about a perfect ass. I wouldn’t mind tapping that! (guys look for 20 sec).
Man 2: Damn, she’s hot. Look at that rack.
Man 1: And she has those nice legs.
Man 2: I’d totally do her.
Man 1: Yo, did you see that chick in our Lit class the other day. She was wearing those tight ass pants.
Man 2: Oh yeah, those “f me pants”!
Man 1: I know right?! I’m going to be looking for her ass tonight!
Man 2: Hahaha.
Man 1 {continues laughing}.
Man 1: Yeah that is something you could really grab onto!
Man 2: Haha. I’m gonna get another beer. I’m gonna take a nice little peak at the goods on that girl!
Man 1: I’ll come with you—I could use a nice view!
Man 1 and 2 laughing as they exit.

Male Experimental Condition Script
Woman 1 and Woman 2: (the actors are excited to see each other) Ahhhh!
Woman 2: What’s up? I was starting to think you weren’t coming!
Woman 1: This party is awesome!! You see the flip cup going on in the basement? Wanna do next round?
Woman 2: You know I’m always down for flip cup! I already wrote my name on the list! I really needed to get out. I could use a break from all these classes. I pulled like two all-nighters last week. Don’t ever take Martin for bio. He sucks.
Woman 1: I don’t think I’ll ever take bio. Oh—what are your plans for tomorrow? My friends from home will be in town and we were gonna watch the OSU game.
Woman 2: Oh fun! I don’t have anything planned. We should go to B-dubs! I think they have like really cheap wings for the game. Or maybe it was a deal on drinks. Whatever—it was, I’m down! {A passerby catches Woman 2’s attention}. Oh damn, look at that hottie! {pan to women ogling passerby}
Woman 1: Wow, talk about the perfect body. I wouldn’t throw him out of bed! (women look for 20 sec).
Woman 2: Yum. Wow, look at those arms.
Woman 1: Arms! I didn’t get there yet, I’m too distracted by his ass!
Woman 2: Haha. I thought you were going to say you were distracted by something else. You know what they say about guys with big hands.
Woman 1: It would be a damn shame if a body like that came with a small package!
Woman 2: Hahahaha!! Ooh look at that guy.
Woman 1: He’s so tall. I wonder if everything is proportional!
Woman 2: Yeah and those arms. He could pick me up!
Woman 1: Wow. You’re right. I wonder what he’s doin’ later.
Woman 2: Hahaha.
Woman 1 {continues laughing}.
Woman 2: I’m gonna grab another. Want one?
Woman 1: I’ll come with you. I’m gonna get a close up of that hottie!
Woman 1 and 2 laughing as they exit.
APPENDIX I

Pilot Study Survey

Script _____:

Please read Script ____ and answer the following questions. Note: Sexual objectification is sexual material/comments that present and treat women or men as mere sexual objects, with a particular focus on one’s body parts.

1. On a scale from 1 (Not at all objectifying) to 10 (Extremely objectifying), how objectifying of women (men) do you feel this conversation is?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Not at all objectifying                      Extremely Objectifying

2. On a scale from 1 (Not at all realistic) to 10 (Extremely realistic), how realistic do you feel this conversation is, compared to what you see on television or other media (e.g., like on television shows such as *The Jersey Shore, Entourage, or Sex and the City*)?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Not at all realistic                      Extremely realistic

3. On a scale from 1 (Not at all realistic) to 10 (Extremely realistic), how realistic do you feel this conversation is, compared to what you have seen or experienced in your life (e.g., at parties or other social aspects of college life)?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Not at all realistic                      Extremely realistic

4. On a scale from 1 (Not at all current/relevant) to 10 (Extremely current/relevant), how current (relevant) are the words stated or topics discussed in this script?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Not at all current/relevant               Extremely current/relevant

5. On a scale from 1 (very curvaceous) to 6 (very thin), how would you rate actor A?
   1  2  3  4  5  6
   Very curvaceous                         Very thin
6. On a scale from 1 (very curvaceous) to 6 (very thin), how would you rate actor B?

1  2  3  4  5  6

Very curvaceous       Very thin

7. On a scale from 1 (very muscular) to 6 (very thin), how would you rate actor C?

1  2  3  4  5  6

Very muscular       Very thin

8. On a scale from 1 (very muscular) to 6 (very thin), how would you rate actor D?

1  2  3  4  5  6

Very muscular       Very thin

9. On a scale from 1 (very unattractive) to 6 (very attractive), how would you rate actor A?

1  2  3  4  5  6

Very unattractive       Very attractive

10. On a scale from 1 (very unattractive) to 6 (very attractive), how would you rate actor B?

1  2  3  4  5  6

Very unattractive       Very attractive

11. On a scale from 1 (very unattractive) to 6 (very attractive), how would you rate actor C?

1  2  3  4  5  6

Very unattractive       Very attractive

12. On a scale from 1 (very unattractive) to 6 (very attractive), how would you rate actor D?

1  2  3  4  5  6

Very unattractive       Very attractive
APPENDIX J

Focus Group Questions

Stated aloud to participants: Thank you for completing the surveys on the experimental scripts. Right now, I’d like to ask you to provide feedback on each script. I’ll be specifically eliciting feedback on the questions I have already asked you on the survey. Please discuss with me, and/or comment on other persons’ feedback, during this portion of the study. I will be typing your feedback while you talk so I can adequately record what changes you all suggest.

Following along with the questions already answered, starting with the female (male) script,

1. Did you understand the definition of objectification provided? Please refer to the extra blanks survey I’ve given you for reference.
2. Do you think, given this definition, this script reflects objectification? Do you have any suggested changes?
3. How realistic do you feel this conversation is, compared to what you see on television or other media (e.g., like on television shows such as The Jersey Shore, Entourage, or Sex and the City)? That is, is this script something you would hear on television? Why or why not?
4. What about how this script reflects real life? That is, how realistic do you feel this conversation is, compared to what you have seen or experienced in your life (e.g., at parties or other social aspects of college life)? Is there something in the script that does not seem to fit with your experiences? Why?
5. Are the terms/words used to objectify women (men) in this script current or relevant vernacular? In other words, are there more common words used when experiencing or seeing social interactions like these?

Now let’s move on to the control condition script.

1. How realistic do you feel this conversation is, compared to what you see on television or other media (e.g., like on television shows such as The Jersey Shore, Entourage, or Sex and the City)? That is, is this script something you would hear on television? Why or why not?
2. What about how this script reflects real life? That is, how realistic do you feel this conversation is, compared to what you have seen or experienced in your life (e.g., at parties or other social aspects of college life)? Is there something in the script that does not seem to fit with your experiences? Why?
3. Are the terms/words/topics in this script current or relevant vernacular? In other words, is a conversation like this common or seem natural enough to occur between friends?
APPENDIX K

Demographic Questionnaire

1. What is your age? ________ years

2. What is your sex?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Other

3. What is your sexual orientation?
   a. Exclusively heterosexual (straight)
   b. Mostly heterosexual
   c. Bisexual
   d. Mostly homosexual
   e. Exclusively homosexual (gay/lesbian)
   f. Indicate your preferred identity if none of the choices available represented your identity preference: ________________________________________

4. What is your relationship status?
   a. Single
   b. Dating (not committed)
   c. In a committed relationship

5. If in a committed relationship, how long have you been in this relationship?
   a. Less than 6 months
   b. 6 months to 1 year
   c. 1 year to 2 years
   d. Over 2 years

6. What is your year in school?
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Other: __________

7. How do you describe yourself?
   a. Caucasian/White
   b. African American/Black
   c. Asian/Pacific Islander
   d. Hispanic/Latino(a)
   e. Native American
   f. Biracial
   g. Other: __________
8. What was the last grade your mother completed in school?
   a. Less than 12th grade
   b. Graduated high school
   c. Some College
   d. Associates Degree
   e. Bachelor Degree
   f. Masters Degree
   g. Advanced graduate degree (e.g., MD, MBA, PhD, JD)

9. What was the last grade your father completed in school?
   a. Less than 12th grade
   b. Graduated high school
   c. Some College
   d. Associates Degree
   e. Bachelor Degree
   f. Masters Degree
   g. Advanced graduate degree (e.g., MD, MBA, PhD, JD)

10. What is your height? Feet_________ Inches_________

11. What is your weight? Pounds_________

12. Select the statement that best describes you.
   a. I am trying to stay the same weight
   b. I am trying to lose weight
   c. I am trying to gain weight
   d. I am not concerned about my weight

13. Do you consider yourself
   a. Underweight
   b. Normal/Average Weight
   c. Overweight
   d. Obese

14. If you consider yourself overweight or obese, how many years have you felt this way?
   a. Less than 1 year
   b. 1-2 years
   c. 3-4 years
   d. More than 5 years
APPENDIX L

Trait Self-Objectification Questionnaire

In this section we are interested in how people think about their bodies. The questions below identify 10 different body attributes. We would like you to rank order these body attributes from that which has the greatest impact on your physical self-concept (rank this a “9”), to that which has the least impact on your physical self-concept (rank this as a “0”).

Note: It does not matter how you describe yourself in terms of each attribute. For example, fitness level can have a great impact on your physical self-concept regardless of whether you consider yourself to be physically fit, not physically fit, or any level in between.

Please consider all attributes simultaneously, and record your rank ordering by writing the ranks in the rightmost column.

**Important: Do Not Assign The Same Rank To More Than One Attribute!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 = greatest impact</th>
<th>Write your ranks below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 = next greatest impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = next to least impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = least impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering your physical self-concept…

| 1. …what rank to you assign to physical coordination? |
| 2. …what rank to you assign to health? |
| 3. …what rank to you assign to weight? |
| 4. …what rank to you assign to strength? |
| 5. …what rank to you assign to sex appeal? |
| 6. …what rank to you assign to physical attractiveness? |
| 7. …what rank to you assign to energy level (e.g., stamina)? |
| 8. …what rank to you assign to firm/sculpted muscles? |
| 9. …what rank to you assign to physical fitness level? |
| 10. …what rank to you assign to measurements (e.g., chest, waist, hips)? |
APPENDIX M
Sociocultural Attitudes Towards Appearance Questionnaire: Internalization Subscale (Females)

Please read each of the following items and circle the number that best reflects your agreement with the statement.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Women who appear in TV shows and movies project the type of appearance that I see as my goal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe that clothes look better on thin models.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Music videos that show thin women make me wish that I were thin.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not wish to look like the models in the magazines.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I tend to compare my body to people in magazines and on TV.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Photographs of thin women make me wish that I were thin.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I wish I looked like a swimsuit model.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I often read magazines like Cosmopolitan, Vogue, and Glamour and compare my appearance to the models.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sociocultural Attitudes Towards Appearance Questionnaire: Internalization Subscale (Males)

Please read each of the following items and circle the number that best reflects your agreement with the statement.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Men who appear in TV shows and movies project the type of appearance that I see as my goal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe that clothes look better on muscular/fit models.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Music videos that show muscular/fit men make me wish that I were muscular/fit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not wish to look like the models in the magazines.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I tend to compare my body to people in magazines and on TV.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Photographs of body builders make me wish that I were muscular/fit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I wish I looked like a body builder.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I often read magazines like <em>Men’s Fitness</em> and <em>Muscle and Fitness</em> and compare my appearance to the models.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N
Friendship Items

We are interested in your friendships. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

1. How many close friends do you have?
   a. 0
   b. 1-2
   c. 3-5
   d. More than 5

2. What are some qualities that you look for when you are friends with someone? Name as many as you can think of.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

3. Do you have a best friend?
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. How long have you known your best friend?
   a. Less than a year
   b. Between 1 year and 2 years
   c. Between 2 years and 5 years
   d. Over 5 years

5. Have you remained in touch with your friends from high school?
   a. Not at all
   b. Somewhat
   c. Very much so
We are interested in how you perceived the social interaction depicted. Please answer these questions to the best of your ability.

1. How long do you think that the friends in the video knew each other?
   e. Less than a year
   f. Between 1 year and 2 years
   g. Between 2 years and 5 years
   h. Over 5 years

2. Would you consider that these friends are ‘best friends’ in the way they were interacting?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don’t know

3. How often do you think these friends hang out with each other?
   a. Daily
   b. Weekly
   c. Monthly
   d. Several times a year
   e. A few times per year
   f. Once a year or less

4. Please list qualities of friendships you saw demonstrated in this video.

________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

5. How likely is it that these friends will remain in touch after college?
   a. Not at all likely
   b. Somewhat likely
   c. Very likely
   d. Unsure
APPENDIX O

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you feel this way right now, that is, at the present moment. Use the following scale to record your answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very slightly or not at all</td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ interested</td>
<td>______ irritable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ distressed</td>
<td>______ alert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ excited</td>
<td>______ ashamed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ upset</td>
<td>______ inspired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ strong</td>
<td>______ nervous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ guilty</td>
<td>______ determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ scared</td>
<td>______ attentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ hostile</td>
<td>______ jittery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ enthusiastic</td>
<td>______ active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______ proud</td>
<td>______ afraid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX P

The Twenty Statements Test

Please take a moment to think about how you feel about yourself and your identity at this moment. In the twenty blanks below please make twenty different statements about yourself and your identity that complete the sentence ‘I am.’ Complete the statements as if you were describing yourself to yourself, not to somebody else.

I am:

1. ______________________________
2. ______________________________
3. ______________________________
4. ______________________________
5. ______________________________
6. ______________________________
7. ______________________________
8. ______________________________
9. ______________________________
10. ______________________________
11. ______________________________
12. ______________________________
13. ______________________________
14. ______________________________
15. ______________________________
16. ______________________________
17. ______________________________
## APPENDIX Q

Objectified Body Consciousness Scale, Self-Surveillance subscale

For each item, please indicate the extent to which you agree with following statements *right now.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am thinking about how I look.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether they look good on me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think more about how my body feels than how my body looks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am not comparing how I look with how other people look.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am worrying about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look good.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am not worrying about how I look to other people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am more concerned with what my body can do than how it looks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX R

Objectified Body Consciousness Scale, Body Shame subscale

There are many factors that influence people’s perceptions, for example, mood and self identity. For each item, please circle the number that represents how strongly you agree or disagree with that statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Right now, I feel like I can’t control my weight; I feel like something must be wrong with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Right now, I feel ashamed of myself because I haven’t made the effort to look my best.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Right now, I feel like I must be a bad person because I don’t look as good as I could.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Right now, I feel ashamed for people to know what I really weigh.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Right now, I feel that it is ok that I am not exercising as much as I should.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Right now, I feel a good person would exercise more.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Right now, I feel that even though I can’t control my weight, I think I’m an okay person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Right now, I feel ashamed because I am not the size I should be.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX S

Physical Appearance State and Trait Anxiety Scale, State subscale

The statements listed below are used to describe how anxious, tense, or nervous you feel right now about your body.

Right now, I feel anxious, tense, or nervous about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Much So</th>
<th>Exceptionally So</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My thighs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My buttocks.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My hips.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My stomach (abdomen).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My legs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My waist.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My muscle tone.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX T

Traits of the Actors

Please rate, on a scale from 1 to 10 (with 1 being ‘not at all’ to 10 being ‘very much’) how much you believe the individuals in the video were:

a. Likable

```
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all Very Much
```

b. Honest

```
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all Very Much
```

c. Rude

```
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all Very Much
```

d. Loyal

```
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all Very Much
```

e. Trustworthy

```
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all Very Much
```
f. Vulgar

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not at all  Very Much

g. Intelligent

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not at all  Very Much

h. Humorous

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not at all  Very Much

i. Pleasant

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Not at all  Very Much
Table 1
Demographic Characteristics by Condition and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females (n=115)</th>
<th>Males (n=81)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control (n = 55)</td>
<td>Experiment (n = 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status:</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>24 (43.6%)</td>
<td>28 (48.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49 (89.1%)</td>
<td>50 (86.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White</td>
<td>41 (74.5%)</td>
<td>38 (65.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to Lose Weight</td>
<td>35 (64.8%)</td>
<td>30 (52.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18.67 (0.94)</td>
<td>18.96 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year In College</td>
<td>0.28 (0.56)</td>
<td>0.47 (0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>25.63 (5.68)</td>
<td>24.66 (5.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived BMI</td>
<td>1.38 (0.56)</td>
<td>1.31 (0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>4.84 (0.60)</td>
<td>4.81 (0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Education</td>
<td>2.82 (1.39)</td>
<td>2.78 (1.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Education</td>
<td>2.70 (1.67)</td>
<td>2.30 (1.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait S.O.</td>
<td>-1.16 (12.42)</td>
<td>-0.59 (12.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization of Ideals</td>
<td>2.11 (0.99)</td>
<td>1.99 (0.84)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>Note</sup>. S.O.= Self-Objectification.

<sup>a</sup>This continuous variable was dichotomized as 0=not heterosexual and 1=heterosexual, for ease of interpretation

<sup>b</sup><sup>χ</sup><sup>2</sup> (5) = 15.16, <i>p</i> < .05

<sup>c</sup><sup>t</sup>(72) = 2.18, <i>p</i> < .05
Table 2

*Correlations among the Dependent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
<th>Self-Surveillance</th>
<th>State Self-Objectification</th>
<th>Appearance Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Surveillance</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Self-Objectification</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>__</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance Anxiety</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Shame</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .05, ** p < .01.*

Table 3

*Correlations among the Hypothesized Moderator Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muscular-ideal</th>
<th>Thin-ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Self-Objectification</td>
<td>.23+</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ *p < .10, ** p < .01.*
Table 4

*Dependent and Hypothesized Moderator Variable Differences across Categorical Demographic Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable (Overall F)</th>
<th>Sex Sexual Orientation(^a)</th>
<th>Sexual Relationship Status</th>
<th>Dieting Status</th>
<th>Race(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.68 (6, 128)*</td>
<td>0.64 (6, 128)</td>
<td>0.74 (6, 128)</td>
<td>1.12 (6, 128)</td>
<td>2.36 (6, 128)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Affect (F)</th>
<th>1.27 (1, 133)</th>
<th>0.01 (1, 133)</th>
<th>3.61 (1, 133)*</th>
<th>0.88 (1, 133)</th>
<th>3.90 (1, 133)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Self-Objectification (F)</td>
<td>0.27 (1, 133)</td>
<td>3.61 (1, 133)*</td>
<td>0.22 (1, 133)</td>
<td>1.40 (1, 133)</td>
<td>0.08 (1, 133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Surveillance (F)</td>
<td>0.45 (1, 133)</td>
<td>0.21 (1, 133)</td>
<td>0.19 (1, 133)</td>
<td>1.16 (1, 133)</td>
<td>1.95 (1, 133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Body Concerns (F)</td>
<td>12.21 (1, 133)**</td>
<td>0.08 (1, 133)</td>
<td>0.03 (1, 133)</td>
<td>4.94 (1, 133)*</td>
<td>0.00 (1, 133)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator Variable</th>
<th>Trait Self-Objectification (F)</th>
<th>1.17 (1, 133)</th>
<th>0.33 (1, 133)</th>
<th>0.00 (1, 133)</th>
<th>0.19 (1, 133)</th>
<th>2.74 (1, 133)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internalization of Ideals (F)</td>
<td>6.76 (1, 133)*</td>
<td>0.02 (1, 133)</td>
<td>0.04 (1, 133)</td>
<td>0.00 (1, 133)</td>
<td>0.60 (1, 133)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Dichotomized as 0 (heterosexual) and 1 (not heterosexual)

\(^b\)Dichotomized as 0 (not Caucasian) and 1 (Caucasian)
Table 5

*Bivariate Correlations of the Demographic Variables with the Dependent Variables and the Hypothesized Moderator Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
<th>State S.O.</th>
<th>Self-Surveillance</th>
<th>State Body Concerns</th>
<th>Trait S.O. Thin-ideal</th>
<th>Muscular -ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.16+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in College</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived BMI</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Education</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Education</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* S.O. = Self-Objectification

\[ +p < .10, \] \[ *p < .05, \] \[ **p < .01. \]
Table 6

*Condition Effects by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=81)</th>
<th>Females (n=115)</th>
<th>F-statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control (n=43)</td>
<td>Experiment (n=38)</td>
<td>Control (n=55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M (SD)</strong></td>
<td><strong>M (SD)</strong></td>
<td><strong>M (SD)</strong></td>
<td><strong>M (SD)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>2.38 (4.10)</td>
<td>3.94 (4.52)</td>
<td>2.78 (3.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Self-Objectification</td>
<td>1.07 (1.49)</td>
<td>0.74 (1.12)</td>
<td>0.89 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Surveillance</td>
<td>19.88 (7.64)</td>
<td>22.38 (6.15)</td>
<td>23.19 (6.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Body Concerns</td>
<td>-0.33 (0.77)</td>
<td>-0.34 (0.84)</td>
<td>0.33 (0.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
Table 7
Predicting Dependent Variables with Trait Self-Objectification as the Hypothesized Moderator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
<th>State S.O.</th>
<th>Self-Surveillance</th>
<th>State Body Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>β (Step)</td>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>β (Step)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (0=Caucasian, 1=non-Caucasian)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (0=male; 1=female)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition (0=control; 1=exp.)</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Self-Objectification</td>
<td>.15+</td>
<td>-.17+</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* F (Step)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (4,140) = F (4, 136) = F (4, 138) = F (5, 136) =</td>
<td>3.36*</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.83**</td>
<td>12.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex*Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait S.O.*Condition</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* F (Step)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (6, 138) = F (6, 134) = F (6, 136) = F (7, 134) =</td>
<td>2.21*</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.17**</td>
<td>9.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex*Trait S.O.*Condition</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* F (Step)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (7, 137) = F (7, 133) = F (7, 135) = F (8, 133) =</td>
<td>1.88+</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.73*</td>
<td>8.30**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. S.O. = Self-Objectification; + p < .10. * p < .05. ** p < .01.
### Table 8

**Predicting Dependent Variables with Internalization of Ideals as the Hypothesized Moderator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
<th>State S.O.</th>
<th>Self-Surveillance</th>
<th>State Body Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Δ $R^2$</td>
<td>β (Step)</td>
<td>Δ $R^2$</td>
<td>β (Step)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (0=Caucasian, 1=non-Caucasian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (0=male; 1=female)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition (0=control; 1=exp.)</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization of Ideals</td>
<td>.15+</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ (Step)</td>
<td>$F (4, 181)$</td>
<td>$F (4, 177)$</td>
<td>$F (4, 179)$</td>
<td>$F (5, 176)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= 3.54**</td>
<td>= 1.59</td>
<td>= 9.30**</td>
<td>= 16.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex*Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization*Condition</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ (Step)</td>
<td>$F (6, 179)$</td>
<td>$F (6, 175)$</td>
<td>$F (6, 177)$</td>
<td>$F (7, 174)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= 2.89*</td>
<td>= 1.75</td>
<td>= 7.76**</td>
<td>= 11.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex<em>Internalization</em>Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ (Step)</td>
<td>$F (7, 178)$</td>
<td>$F (7, 174)$</td>
<td>$F (7, 176)$</td>
<td>$F (8, 173)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= 2.73*</td>
<td>= 2.20*</td>
<td>= 7.13**</td>
<td>= 10.08**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* S.O.= Self-Objectification  
+ $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. 

---

S.O. = Self-Objectification
Table 9

*State Self-Objectification as a Mediator of the Relation between Condition and the Dependent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Bootstrapped 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Affect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect (C’ path)</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect (via State S.O.)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(-.11; 11)(^{ns})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Body Concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect (C’ path)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect (via State S.O.)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(-.03; .03)(^{ns})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \(^{ns}\)= \( p \geq .05 \); S.O.= Self-Objectification
Table 10

*Self-Surveillance as a Mediator of the Relation between Condition and the Dependent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>s.e.</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Bootstrapped 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Affect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect (C’ path)</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect (via Self Surv.)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(-.15; .40)&lt;sup&gt;ns&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Body Concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect (C’ path)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect (via Self Surv.)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(-.09; .15)&lt;sup&gt;ns&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ns= p > .05
Table 11

The Effect of Condition on Personality Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=81)</th>
<th>Females (n=115)</th>
<th>F-statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control (n=43)</td>
<td>Experiment (n=38)</td>
<td>Control (n=55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Personality Traits</td>
<td>5.79 (3.23)</td>
<td>11.52 (4.72)</td>
<td>6.56 (4.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Personality Traits</td>
<td>43.17 (9.60)</td>
<td>32.94 (11.28)</td>
<td>39.00 (11.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01.
Figure 1. Moderating effect of internalization on state self-objectification in women.
Figure 2. Moderating effect of internalization on state self-objectification in men.
Figure 3. Moderating effect of internalization on self-surveillance.