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Although considerable research on the effects of sexual objectification of women in visual media (magazines, television, music videos) has demonstrated its potentially harmful effects on women, little research has been done regarding the possible effects of listening to sexually objectifying music. The current study investigated the short-term effects of listening to sexually objectifying music lyrics on state self-objectification, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, and negative affect. Participants included fifty-seven college women who were exposed to two songs with either neutral or sexually objectifying lyrics.

A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to compare the levels of dependent variables in the experimental condition to those in the control condition. Findings suggested that women in the control condition scored higher on self-objectification (on one of two measures) and self-surveillance. However, no condition differences were found for the other measure of self-objectification or the other dependent variables. I also tested whether the relation between condition and the dependent variables was moderated by trait self-objectification, self-esteem, or internalization of the thin ideal. Moderation analyses revealed several moderating effects of these variables. Only individuals with low trait self-objectification reported more state-self-objectification after listening to the objectifying lyrics. Findings suggested that women who reported average or high levels of thin ideal internalization were sensitive to condition effects on self-surveillance while those low on thin ideal internalization were not. Similarly, individuals in the experimental condition who were high on internalization of the thin ideal experienced higher levels of body shame after listening to objectifying music lyrics than women with low or average
internalization of the thin ideal. The results indicate that being even briefly exposed to sexually objectifying lyrics can have negative consequences for women. Limitations, implications, and directions for future research are discussed.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been fortunate enough to have a wonderful support system that has allowed me to get this far in my academic career and my life despite some obvious challenges. I would first like to thank my advisor, Dr. Eric Dubow, for his support and flexibility throughout the research process. Eric, being able to count on you to get back to me with drafts almost immediately saved me significant anxiety and allowed me to work more efficiently, and I will always be grateful that you encouraged me to do the research I was passionate about. The other members of my thesis committee, Dr. Dara Musher-Eizenman and Dr. William H. O’Brien also deserve thanks for their thoughtful insights and suggestions which led to a richer and more well-developed study. I would also like to acknowledge the important role of my undergraduate mentor and professor Dr. Glen Spielmans. Glen, without your direction and encouragement, I would likely not even have pursued graduate school. You inspired confidence in me and I will forever be thankful for that.

I am grateful to have found a program like the one here at BGSU. I have felt a sense of belonging and community that I never expected. I am thankful for all of the wonderful faculty, staff, and students who have contributed to this sense of community, especially my cohort. Love you guys! I must give a special shout-out to one person in particular, Sabrina Gonzales, for being present with me physically and emotionally during an incredibly tough time last year.

Of course I need to thank all the people back home who have been rooting for me from day one. Mom, Dad, the fact that you never gave up on me even when I probably deserved it means so much to me. I may have made you miserable for a few years back in the day, but I’m trying to make it up to you by making you proud now. There are honestly too many things to thank you for to list here; just know that you are appreciated more than you can imagine. I also
want to recognize my best friend, BreAnn Thomas, for always being genuinely excited about each of my successes – sometimes even more excited than I was myself. Together forever, never apart, maybe in spirit, but never in heart. There are dozens more friends and family that have played important roles in my happiness and success, and I am so grateful to you all.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to express thanks to my son, Cameron. Cam, you have made so many sacrifices, some willing and some not so much, in order for me to achieve my goals. You have accompanied me on this journey in a way that no one else has, for better or for worse, and I love you all the more for it. I believe in you so much and can’t wait to see what happens when it’s time for you to follow your dreams, too.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Consumption of Young Adults</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectification Theory</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical Evidence for Objectification Theory</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of Objectifying Media</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television and Magazines</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Games</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Videos</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyrics</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of Music Lyrics on Other Outcomes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Moderators of the Influence of Objectifying Media</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Self-objectification</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization of Appearance Ideals</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHOD</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Stimuli</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures – Session One</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Means, Standard Deviations, and Frequencies of Demographic Variables by Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Hypothesized Moderator Variables by Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Correlations among the Dependent and Hypothesized Moderator Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Condition Effects, Means, and Standard Deviations for the Dependent Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Predicting Dependent Variables with Trait Self-Objectification as the Hypothesized Moderator of Condition Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Predicting Dependent Variables with Self-Esteem as the Hypothesized Moderator of Condition Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Predicting Dependent Variables with Thin Ideal Internalization as the Hypothesized Moderator of Condition Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moderating effect of trait self-objectification on state self-objectification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderating effect of thin ideal internalization on self-surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderating effect of thin ideal internalization on body shame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Music is an integral part of the lives of Americans, especially teens and young adults. Data from marketing companies indicate that older teenagers and young adults spend a great amount of time listening to music on a variety of devices (Nielsen, 2013; Nielsen, 2014). Research suggests that the lyrics of popular music are fraught with themes of objectification, in which women are valued for their physical characteristics and how they can be used by men (Bretthauer, Zimmerman, & Banning, 2006; Hust, Rodgers, & Ran, 2013). These lyrics can send negative messages to women about themselves, their bodies, and their worth.

The potential effects of objectifying lyrics on women can be best understood through objectification theory, a framework created by Frederickson and Noll (1997) to understand the effects of living in a society that sexually objectifies the female body. When women begin to internalize this view of themselves as objects to be evaluated and gazed upon, this is called self-objectification. Self-objectification has many potential consequences, according to objectification theory. It may result in fewer mental and physical resources available for tasks and for awareness of inner body experiences. The accumulation of these negative experiences could contribute to the development of psychological symptoms (Fredrickson & Noll, 1997).

There is a significant amount of empirical support for objectification theory (e.g. Fredrickson, Roberts, Noll, Quinn, & Twenge, 1998; Hebl, King, & Lin, 2004; Noll & Fredrickson, 1998). The relationship between objectifying media and concepts related to self-objectification (i.e. body surveillance, body shame, appearance anxiety) has been demonstrated in many studies, although much of the research remains in the domain of visual media. These findings are cause for concern because self-objectification has been shown to be correlated with disordered eating, depression, sexual dissatisfaction, and a variety of other negative outcomes.
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(Calogero & Thompson, 2009; Carr & Syzmanski, 2011; Peat & Muehlenkamp, 2011).

Although very little research has been conducted on the relationship between objectifying lyrics and the self-objectification of women, numerous studies have revealed that lyrics can have an impact on attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors. For example, research has shown that lyrics can affect aggression, sexual behavior, and attitudes towards others (Anderson, Carnagey, & Eubanks, 2003; Greitmeyer, Hollingdale, & Traut-Mattausch, 2012; Martino et al., 2006).

In the research on visual media and self-objectification, person characteristics including self-esteem, internalization of the thin ideal, and trait self-objectification have been found to moderate the relationship between objectifying media and several outcome factors related to self-objectification (Bartholomew, & Pearce, 2011; Gay & Castano; 2010; Tiggemann, 2003; Thøgersen-Ntoumani, Ntoumanis, Cumming).

In this thesis, I will review the music consumption of young adults with a focus on objectification in the music lyrics. Next, I will describe objectification theory, and I will summarize the empirical literature on the effects of objectifying media. Then, I will focus more specifically on the effects of music lyrics on various outcomes (e.g., aggression, sexual behavior, attitudes toward women). I will then discuss possible factors that might moderate negative effects of objectifying music lyrics. Next, I will present the results of my laboratory study examining the potential moderating effects of trait self-objectification, internalization of the thin ideal, and self-esteem on the relation between exposure to sexually objectifying music lyrics and state self-objectification, body surveillance, body shame, appearance anxiety, and negative affect. Finally, I will summarize limitations of the study and discuss implications for theory and interventions.
Music Consumption of Young Adults

Music has always played an important role in American culture. With the advent of new technology and ease of access, it is becoming even more pervasive. More than 240 million individuals tune into the radio every week, including approximately 90% of adults aged 18-24. Millennials spend an average of 11.5 hours listening to the radio every week, whether it is on a car radio or a radio app for their phone or computer (The Nielsen Company, 2014). 68% of the U.S. population streamed music online in 2013, and this rate continues to rise. Individuals also report listening to music on YouTube, iTunes, and CD’s (The Nielsen Company, 2013).

Data indicates that teens and young adults represent the largest subgroup of music consumers, and that music listening becomes more popular as teens get older, with 15-18 year olds listening to the most music of individuals from the ages of 8 to 18, with a large percentage of teens listening demonstrating a preference for pop music. Although information on the total amount of listening time varies, it is clear that music consumption is on the rise for this age group (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010). A 2013 report by Nielsen reported that teen consumers listen to approximately 5.8 hours of music per week (The Nielsen Company, 2013), and a 2010 report by the Kaiser Family Foundation reported that teens between the ages of 15 and 18 listen to an average of 3.03 hours of music per day (Rideout et al., 2010). Even young people who do not actively seek out music are likely hear it while shopping, watching movies or television, or playing video games.

Due to this ubiquitous nature of music in our culture, it is important to understand what messages the lyrics are sending. A content analysis of 5 consecutive years (1998 to 2003) of the top 20 most popular songs according to the Billboard Hot 100 charts identified six predominant themes in popular music. The themes included men and power, sex as the top priority for males,
females defined by having a man, sexual violence, females not valuing themselves, and the objectification of women (Bretthauer et al., 2006).

Of the total sample of 120 songs, 22 of them (18.3%) included lyrics that objectified women. There was significant overlap between the categories that many of the songs fit into, and 19 were categorized as Pop music, 19 as R&B/Hip Hop, 10 as Rap, and 2 as Latin. Songs that were identified as containing themes of objectification valued women’s’ physical characteristics, and went into detail about the body parts of women. In these lyrics, “women were viewed as objects to comment on, look at, touch, hit, and eat” (Bretthauer et al., 2006, pg 40).

In this analysis, male artists were far more likely to perform songs that contained messages about objectifying women, but women were also found to objectify themselves in their lyrics (Bretthauer et al., 2006). In a different content analysis which explored the contradictory messages found in the songs of female rappers, the author found high rates of self-objectification. These objectifying lyrics were often rapped by the same artists who also sent messages of empowerment and female agency, and sometimes these two contradictory messages were even contained within the same song (Oware, 2009).

In a more recent content analysis, the authors used lyrical stanzas instead of songs as the unit of analysis. This particular research investigated the content of songs from the Billboard Hot 100 Chart for 2010 by randomly sampling five of the top 25 songs from every week of the year. 2% of the total stanzas included lyrics focused exclusively on female sexual body parts such as buttocks or breasts (Hust et al., 2013).

It is evident that the lyrics conveyed by the most popular music are laden with messages that objectify and therefore devalue women. In just the five years investigated by Bretthauer et al. (2006), there was a trend towards less covert lyrics that were consequently less open to
multiple interpretations. This suggests that music lyrics may continue to become even more
direct and explicit.

**Objectification Theory**

Objectification theory is a framework created by Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) to better understand the effects of living in a society that sexually objectifies the female body. The current culture socializes girls and women to treat themselves as objects to be looked at and evaluated. Women in Western society experience “being treated as a body (or collection of body parts) valued predominantly for its use to (or consumption by) others” (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

The commonplace practice of sexual gazing is a major, yet subtle way in which sexual objectification is manifested. In fact, the English language even provides specific words for this, including “ogle” and “leer”. The potential for sexual objectification is inherent in the sexual gaze, and it is carried out in one or more of three ways. It can occur through actual interpersonal encounters, through media representations of these types of encounters, and through media that highlights women’s bodies and body parts, in which the viewer implicitly becomes responsible for the sexual gaze (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

The result of recurrent objectifying treatment and experiences is that women and girls begin to internalize an observer’s perspective of themselves. Therefore, objectification serves to teach females to view themselves as objects to be gazed upon, evaluated, and used by others. The adoption of this view of the self is called self-objectification (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Self-objectification is commonly assessed through self-report questionnaires or projective tests that measure how much a person values observable physical attributes, without regard to the satisfaction one feels with their own physical appearance.
This self-objectification can lead to chronic and habitual appearance monitoring, which is most often referred to in the literature as self-surveillance or body surveillance. This is a kind of self-consciousness that takes the form of increased awareness of and hyper vigilance to the body’s outward physical appearance. In the context of objectification theory self-surveillance can be considered a strategy for determining how one can expect to be treated by others, rather than vanity (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Self-surveillance is usually measured using a self-report questionnaire that assesses the extent to which a person thinks about how his or her body looks rather than how it feels.

Some social contexts increase women’s awareness of others’ perspectives of their bodies, and other contexts protect women from the negative results of self-objectification. Of course all women do not experience or respond to sexual objectification in the same manner. Due to ethnic, sexuality, or other individual differences, women can be expected to experience self-objectification to varying degrees. However, even women who are less likely to self-objectify may still be subject to the effects of self-objectification in certain sexually objectifying circumstances. In this way, self-objectification can be considered both trait-like and state-like (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

According to objectification theory, there are many potential consequences of self-objectification. Frederickson and Roberts (1997) posited that self-objectification and the resulting habitual self-monitoring can lead to shame, anxiety, reduction in peak motivational states or flow, and reduction of awareness of internal bodily states. Body shame often results from failing to meet cultural standards of beauty, which are unrealistic and unattainable for most women. Appearance anxiety can come from the potential for exposure to negative appearance evaluation, as well as personal safety concerns related to appearance and dress (e.g. worries
about sexual assault or harassment). “Flow,” also referred to as a “peak motivational state” is when a person is completely immersed in a challenging mental or physical task; flow is understood to be a valuable and enjoyable experience, which can be disrupted by a person’s own self-consciousness, or by an outside agent who calls attention to the body’s appearance or functions. Finally, women who self-objectify may have less awareness of their internal bodily states because their perceptual resources are being depleted by their hyper vigilance to external bodily appearance. The accumulation of these negative experiences may contribute to a number of harmful psychological outcomes, including depression, sexual dysfunction, and disordered eating (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

Empirical Evidence for Objectification Theory

There exists a great deal of research in support of objectification theory. Several experimental studies have been conducted that demonstrate that placing individuals in objectifying situations can induce self-objectification and influence perceptions as well as behaviors. In seminal series of experiments, Fredrickson et al. (1998) pretested subjects on a measure of trait self-objectification, then manipulated state self-objectification by putting the participants in either a swimsuit or a sweater, and then had them complete questionnaires to measure body shame. Behavioral measures were taken by way of a food taste test, in which participants were given a package of cookies and sweet beverage to see how much they would eat, and a timed math test in which participants answered word problems drawn from a practice Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT).

The first experiment found that state self-objectification predicted body shame, which in turn predicted restrained eating. However, state self-objectification itself did not directly relate to restrained eating, meaning that a true meditational effect was not found. Another important
finding was that state self-objectification and trait self-objectification interacted in such a way that those who tried on the swimsuit and were high on trait self-objectification experienced the most body shame; so trait self-objectification was a moderator of the relation between state self-objectification and body shame. The second experiment established gender differences in regard to the effects of self-objectification. Trying on swimwear produced state self-objectification in both women and men, but only in women did this then produce body shame. Also, women, but not men, performed worse on the math test when they wore a swimsuit, adding credence to the idea that self-objectification does indeed draw upon women’s mental resources (Fredrickson et al., 1998).

Several subsequent studies have used the swimsuit vs. sweater scenario to test objectification theory/manipulate state self-objection (Hebl et al., 2004; Green et al. 2014; Quinn, Kallen, Twenge, & Fredrickson, 2006; Tiggemann & Andrew, 2012). For example, Hebl et al. (2004) replicated and extended the study by Fredrickson and colleagues by using a more diverse sample in order to test the generalizability of previous findings. Subjects were of Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, and Asian American descent. All participants exposed to the objectifying situation, regardless of ethnicity, experienced more state self-objectification, increased body shame, lower test performance, and restrained eating. In a similar study, Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, and Asian women experienced increased body shame as well as decreased performance on an attentional task after self-objectification was induced by wearing a swimsuit (Quinn et al., 2006).

Some studies have attempted to manipulate self-objectification in a way that more closely mirrors the real-life experiences of women. Tiggemann and Boundy (2008) attempted to experimentally impose self-objectification by strategically placing mirrors, scales, and magazine
covers in the room with participants, as well as by giving participants an appearance-based compliment. The objectifying environment induced self-objectification only in those women who scored high on a measure of trait self-objectification. Interestingly, the appearance compliment resulted in a more positive mood in all participants, but also produced body shame for those with high trait self-objectification (Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008). In another study, subjects were videotaped by either a male (high state self-objectification) or a female experimenter (low state self-objectification), and later had to watch the video of themselves with the experimenter. Although there was no effect on actual performance on a cognitive task, there was an interaction between trait self-objectification and condition on response latency times. Those scoring high on trait self-objectification had longer response latencies when they had a male experimenter. This effect only held when the level of the task was difficult (Gay & Castano, 2010). Taken together, these studies show the importance of trait self-objectification as a moderator between state self-objectification and outcomes.

Several correlational studies have found evidence in support of the more long-term negative outcomes proposed by objectification theory (Calogero & Thompson, 2009; Noll & Fredrickson, 1998; Peat & Muehlenkamp, 2011; Slater & Tiggemann, 2010; Szymanski & Henning, 2007; Tiggemann & Williams, 2012). In the first study conducted to test a meditational model of disordered eating based upon objectification theory, it was proposed that body shame would mediate the relationship between self-objectification and disordered eating. There was a significant correlation found between self-objectification and body shame ($\beta = .5, p < .01$) and between body shame and bulimic symptoms ($\beta = .46, p < .01$). Although it was found that body shame mediated the relationship between self-objectification and disordered eating, there was also a small but significant direct relationship between self-objectification and bulimic symptoms.
(β = .18, p < .01). This same pattern of results was found when the outcome variables representing disordered eating were anorexic symptoms and dietary restraint. (Noll & Fredrickson, 1998).

Calogero and Thompson (2009) posited a multiple mediation model whereby internalization of the thin ideal would predict surveillance and body shame; body surveillance would predict body shame and low sexual self-esteem; body shame would predict low sexual self esteem; and both body shame and low sexual esteem would lead predict lower sexual satisfaction. Results of a path analysis found that the internalization of the thin ideal was positively correlated with body surveillance (β = .42, p < .001) which then predicted increased body shame (β = .34, p < .001), which in turn predicted lower sexual self-esteem (β = -.21, p < .05) and lower sexual satisfaction (β = -.29, p < .05) There were also direct relationships found between body surveillance and sexual satisfaction (β = -.21, p < .05) and between internalization and body shame (β = .42, p < .001) (Calogero & Thompson, 2009).

Szymanski and Henning (2007) hypothesized that the effects of self-objectification on depression would be mediated by habitual body monitoring, flow, body shame, and appearance anxiety. Their results showed that self-objectification led to habitual body monitoring (β = .52, p < .05), which decreased flow experiences (β = -.26, p < .05), increased body shame (β = .4, p < .05), increased appearance anxiety (β = .51, p < .05), and these three factors were all related to increased depression (βs= -.27, .28, .20, respectively). There was no direct effect of self-objectification on depression. One finding from this study that was inconsistent with objectification theory is that no relationship was found between self-objectification and internal awareness or internal awareness and depression. Other studies on the phenomenon of internal awareness have yielded mixed results (i.e. Muehlenkamp & Saris-Baglama, 2002; Myers & Crowther, 2008), possibly because of differing ways of measuring/defining the construct
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(physical bodily states vs. emotional or interoceptive awareness).

Effects of Objectifying Media

Television and Magazines. Numerous studies support the notion that objectifying media can impact self-objectification as well as other psychological outcomes, as suggested by objectification theory. Many of these studies focus on visual media, with some of the first research being conducted about magazines and television. Morry and Staska (2001) investigated the mediating role of awareness and internalization of societal ideals on the relationship between exposure to fitness and beauty magazines and self-objectification, body shape dissatisfaction, and eating problems. The study found that reading beauty magazines predicted self-objectification ($\beta = .24, p < .05$) and eating problems ($\beta = .23, p < .05$), and that the extent to which a person had internalized cultural societal ideals mediated this relationship (Morry & Staska, 2001).

Sufficient research exists that suggests that objectifying magazine and television content does not always work in the same way to affect outcomes. For example, Tiggemann (2003) found that exposure to TV and magazines with sexually objectifying content was related to body dissatisfaction, but that only for magazines did internalization of appearance ideals serve as a mediator. However, in another mediational model developed by Aubrey (2007), it was discovered that in the relationship between exposure to sexually objectifying TV/magazines and outcomes including body shame, appearance anxiety, and body image self-consciousness during physical intimacy, body surveillance was a partial mediator. However, a direct relationship was found only between self-objectifying television and appearance anxiety, and body image self-consciousness (Aubrey, 2007).

One longitudinal study found that exposure to objectifying television at year one
predicted increased trait self-objectification in year two for women ($r = .19$, $p < .05$), and interestingly that trait self-objectification led to a decrease in exposure to objectifying television at time two, suggesting that those with higher self-objectification may avoid objectifying TV shows. Exposure to objectifying magazines did not produce these same effects, and neither exposure to magazines or television led to an increase in body surveillance for women (Aubrey 2006a).

In a more recent study of adolescents, Vandenbosch and Eggermont (2014a) hypothesized that viewing sexualizing television would predict the internalization of appearance ideals and self-objectification, which would both be correlated with body surveillance, and that all three would in turn predict the acceptance of gendered sexual roles. The model was invariant across gender. They found that watching sexual sitcoms at Time 1 predicted the internalization of appearance ideals ($\beta = .55$, $p < .005$) and self-objectification ($\beta = .89$, $p < .005$) at Time 2. In further support of objectification theory, the internalization of appearance ideals ($\beta = .23$, $p < .001$), and self-objectification ($\beta = .03$, $p < .05$) at time 2 were correlated with body surveillance at time 2. Only the internalization of appearance ideals at Time 2 was related to the acceptance of gendered sexual roles. In another study using the same survey data, the researchers investigated the effects of reading sexualized magazines, and found a similar pattern of results (Vandenbosch & Eggemont, 2014b).

Many experimental studies on these forms of media have also been undertaken (Aubrey, Henson, Hopper, & Smith, 2009; Harper & Tiggemann, 2008; Harrison & Fredrickson, 2003; Hopper & Aubrey, 2011). In a study by Harper and Tiggemann (2008), when participants viewed advertisements that featured a thin idealized woman, they experienced more state self-objectification, appearance anxiety, negative mood, and body dissatisfaction. In a novel
experiment by Harrison and Fredrickson (2003), subjects viewed videos of female athletes in lean sports (those that have a focus on weight and body shape) vs. non-lean sports. In white females, state self-objectification increased only after exposure to the lean athletes, while African American females saw an increase in self-objectification after being exposed to the non-lean athletes.

**Video Games.** There has been very little research done on the effects of video gaming on objectification variables, and the studies that do exist have shown mixed results. In a study in which participants embodied a sexualized or a non-sexualized avatar and performed certain simple tasks in an immersive virtual environment, those who donned the sexualized character experienced more body-related thoughts than those who did not (Fox, Bailenson, & Tricase, 2013). However, in a study by Morawitz (2007), playing a sexualized character did not have an effect on body esteem or self-objectification in women when compared to those who played a non-sexualized character. However, the tasks that the subjects undertook as their character may have contributed to these differing results; becoming engaged in playing an adventurous video game may have detracted from the sexualized nature of the character while performing simple motions with the avatar such as turning the head did not.

**Music Videos.** Another form of media which contains a large amount of sexual objectification is music videos, and studies have shown them to have deleterious effects on women and on attitudes towards women (Aubrey, Hopper, & Mbure, 2011; Grabe & Hyde, 2009; Kistler & Lee, 2009; Tiggemann & Slater, 2004; Ward, 2002). Ward (2002) found that women who watched more music videos were more likely to view women as objects. In a correlational study, Grabe and Hyde (2009) hypothesized that self-surveillance would mediate the relationship between watching music videos and several body-related, negative outcomes.
They found a direct correlation between music television viewing and current dieting status ($\beta = .24$, $p < .001$), anxiety ($\beta = .23$, $p < .01$), and math confidence ($\beta = -.15$, $p < .01$). Further, self-surveillance partially mediated the relationship between music television viewing and these variables, and between music television viewing and body esteem and depression.

**Lyrics.** Only two studies on the effects of objectifying lyrical content and its relationship to self-objectification, self-surveillance, and associated negative psychological outcomes currently exist in the literature, and the results are mixed. A recent dissertation by Volgman (2013) found that the amount of time spent listening to rap/hip hop music was not significantly correlated with levels of self-objectification, self-surveillance, depression, or disordered eating. However, responses to open-ended questions indicated that music may influence young women’s mood as well as how they feel about their appearance.

An honors thesis project conducted by Nikodym (2013) exposed participants to one song with either objectifying or neutral hip hop lyrics. In the first experiment, in which the songs were widely popular and played nationwide, there was an increase in self-objectification for those who heard the objectifying lyrics compared to those who had heard neutral lyrics. However, there were no differences between conditions on measures of body shame, self-surveillance, or depression. The second and third study used songs that were by local artists and not known to the participants. In the second study, which consisted of a largely white sample, there was no relationship between lyrical content and any of the measures, including positive and negative affect, which replaced the depression measure from the previous study. Study three replicated study two, except used all African-American participants. With this sample, there was an increase in self-objectification only (Nikodym, 2013).

The previous research regarding the effects of lyrics on self-objectification and related
variables was disadvantaged by certain limitations that may have reduced the chances of finding significant results. The cross-sectional study undertaken by Volgman (2013) asked only about the individuals’ listening habits with regards to rap and hip hop music, and did not specify what type of lyrics the music they listened to contained. Therefore, we cannot know the extent to which these individuals were exposed to objectifying rap lyrics as compared to non-objectifying rap lyrics. Two of the three studies conducted by Nikodym (2013) were limited by small sample sizes (N=39, N=22, respectively). Another potential confounding factor was that the participants answered questions about the music while listening to the songs, which may have impacted their ability to fully commit their attention to the lyrics of the song. The combination of these limitations in additions to mixed findings suggest that more investigation into this topic is warranted.

**Effects of Music Lyrics on Other Outcomes**

Although little research exists on the effects of music in the absence of visual media on self-objectification variables, there is ample evidence that certain lyrical content found in several genres can impact thoughts, feelings, and behaviors.

The largest amount of research on the effects of lyrics has been done on aggression (Anderson, Carnagey, & Eubanks, 2003; Brummert Lennings & Warburton, 2010; Fischer & Greitemeyer, 2006; Mast & McAndrew, 2011). In a seminal study by Anderson and colleagues (2003), a series of experiments investigated the effects of violent lyrics on several measures of aggression. After listening to just one violent song, subjects in the experimental group experienced an increase in aggressive cognitions and feelings of hostility when compared to the control group who heard a non-violent song. These results were consistent across gender, genre, artist, and pre-test level of trait hostility (Anderson et al., 2003).
Fischer and Greitemeyer (2006) attempted to determine whether listening to misogynous song lyrics would have an impact on aggressive behavior towards women. Participants listened to two songs with either misogynous or neutral lyrics, and then were asked to administer chili sauce to a confederate as a behavioral measure of aggression. Subjects also completed measures of aggressive cognitions. Males who listened to the misogynous lyrics acted more aggressively towards a female than a male confederate, made more negative attributions towards women, and had increased feelings of vengeance compared to the control group (Fischer & Greitemeyer, 2006).

Research exists on other negative outcomes of lyrics, as well (de Anda, X., & Goodfriend, 2013; Martino et al., 2006; Rudman & Lee, 2002; Wester, Crown, Quatman, & Heesacker, 1997; Ybarra, Strasburger, & Mitchell, 2014). For example, in one experimental study, exposure to misogynous and sexually violent gangster rap lyrics increased adversarial beliefs towards women, but did not have an effect on other attitudes towards women including sex role stereotyping or attitudes about the roles of women in several domains (Wester et al., 1997). One longitudinal study of a large, diverse sample of adolescents measured media use and sexual knowledge attitudes and behavior over three time points. The authors found that teens who were exposed to more degrading sexual lyrical content were more likely to have later initiated intercourse and advanced in their noncoital activity such as making out and genital touching. These effects remained even when 18 other predictors of sexual behavior were controlled for. Nondegrading sexual content was not found to predict changes in sexual behavior (Martino et al., 2006). Unfortunately, this study was confounded by the fact that it is likely that these individuals were also watching accompanying music videos for these artists, and so it is difficult to determine whether the lyrics themselves were the cause of the changes in future
behavior, or whether the videos played an important role.

Some research has attempted to elucidate whether lyrical content can also produce positive outcomes (Greitemeyer, 2009; Greitemeyer et al., 2012; Jacob, Guguen, & Boulbry, 2010). In the first experimental research on the effects of exposure to pro-gender equality and anti-misogyny media content, participants were assigned to listen to two songs with pro-equality lyrics or two songs with neutral lyrics. Results suggested that exposure to lyrics with a pro-equality, antimisogyny message led to more positive attitudes towards women as well as an increase in pro-female behavior (Greitemeyer et al., 2012). Another study found that listening to lyrics with overall prosocial content increased empathy, accessibility of prosocial thoughts, and prosocial behavior as measured by monetary donation (Greitemeyer, 2009).

**Potential Moderators of the Influence of Objectifying Media**

As noted in some of the studies already described, there are several variables that may moderate the relationship between objectifying media and outcomes such as self-objectification, body shame, and body surveillance. The three most relevant to my proposed laboratory study are self-esteem, trait self-objectification, and the internalization of appearance ideals. I will summarize the literature regarding the potential moderators I will be exploring in my laboratory study.

**Trait Self-objectification.** Several studies suggest that the level of trait self-objectification a person possesses may make them more or less susceptible to the effects of being exposed to an objectifying situation or objectifying media (Fea & Brannon, 2006; Fredrickson et al., 1998; Gay & Castano, 2010; Henderson-King, Henderson-King, & Hoffman, 2001; Johnson et al., 2013; Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008). Henderson-King et al. (2001) exposed participants to advertisements and other images from popular magazines. The control group saw neutral images,
mostly non-human, non-food objects, while in the experimental group over half of the images were of female models who met the current cultural ideals of attractiveness. It was discovered that women in the experimental group who placed a high level of importance on physical attractiveness to their self-concept fared the worst on measures of feelings of sexual attractiveness, overall attractiveness, and weight concern (Henderson-King et al., 2001).

In another study, participants were told during the session that they were being evaluated based on their appearance and were then queried about their personal interests, supposedly to understand their personality. They were then given either a neutral, character-based, or appearance-based compliment by the experimenter. Those individuals who received either the character or the appearance compliment saw a decrease in negative mood over subjects who received a neutral compliment, but this effect only held for those high on trait self-objectification (Fea & Brannon, 2006).

**Internalization of Appearance Ideals.** Additionally, the internalization of cultural ideals of beauty is a common variable of study in objectification research. Objectification theory posits that body shame results from a perceived failure to meet cultural standards of beauty (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997), and therefore the extent to which a person has internalized these appearance ideals could potentially moderate the adverse effects of exposure to objectifying media. Several studies have shown that when women are exposed to images of women of a certain body type, the extent to which they have internalized cultural standards of beauty can affect how the images impact their experience of body image, affect, and appearance-related anxiety (Brown & Dittmar, 2005; Diedrichs & Lee, 2011; Dittmar, Halliwell, & Stirling, 2009; Dittmar & Howard, 2004). For example, higher internalization of the thin ideal led to higher body focused anxiety when women were exposed to 10 advertisements featuring thin models as
opposed to 10 advertisements featuring no models. Interestingly, this effect held whether the exposure was long (10 seconds each) or short (150 ms each) (Brown & Dittmar, 2005).

In a study that explored whether using different sized models could promote positive body image, participants were exposed to images of average-sized models, thin models, or no models. For participants with low levels of internalization of appearance ideals, there was no effect for condition on body image. However, for those who scored high on internalization, viewing the average sized models increased positive body image in comparison to viewing the thin models, and even in comparison to viewing no models (Diedrichs & Lee, 2011).

Self-esteem. Several researchers have investigated the role of self-esteem as a protective factor against or risk factor for the adverse effects of sexual objectification (Aubrey, 2006b; Aumend, 2007; Breines, Crocker, & Garcia, 2008; Tiggemann, 2003; Thøgersen-Ntoumaniet al., 2011; Tylka & Sabik, 2010). For example, in a two wave panel design, Aubrey (2006b) explored self-esteem as a possible protective factor and found that for those with high levels of self esteem, there was no relationship between exposure to sexual objectifying magazines and television at Time 1 and trait self-objectification at Time 2. However, those with low levels of self-esteem were negatively affected by exposure to the objectifying media, experiencing a significant increase in trait self-objectification at Time 2.

In an experiment by Thøgersen-Ntoumaniet al. (2011), female students enrolled in sports and exercise science courses were randomly assigned to wear either tight revealing exercise clothes or baggy exercise clothes. The results revealed that women who believed themselves to be relatively unattractive were less adversely affected by the objectifying condition if they had high self-esteem. Those who judged themselves to be unattractive and also possessed low self esteem were more likely to experience increased depression, anger, feelings of fatness,
and decreased body satisfaction (Thøgersen-Ntoumaniet et al., 2011).

Overall, the findings of these studies indicate that levels trait self-objectification, internalization of appearance ideals, and self-esteem may moderate the effects of sexually objectifying media on state self-objectification and a number of appearance-related variables.

Hypotheses

It is expected that female participants who are exposed to lyrical content that sexually objectifies women will experience an increase in state self-objectification, state body surveillance, appearance anxiety, and negative mood. This is based on objectification theory and empirical evidence indicating that many forms of media that contain sexual objectification (magazines, television, music videos) can produce these effects in women, in addition to empirical evidence suggesting that lyrics can affect other outcomes (attitudes and behaviors).

Further, it is expected that trait-self-objectification, self-esteem, and the internalization of appearance ideals will moderate the relationship between the condition and the outcome variables. Specifically, it is expected that those participants with higher trait self-objectification, greater internalization of appearance ideals, and lower self-esteem will be most strongly affected by condition.
METHOD

Participants

In total, 181 female participants completed at least one part of the study, with 57 participants (23 control, 34 experimental) completing both the first and second session (see Table 1 for a breakdown of the demographic characteristics by condition). There were no significant differences between individuals who completed the first session only and those who completed both the first session and the second session on any demographic variables (i.e., age, year in school, race, BMI, parent education, perceived weight status, or weight-loss status). In terms of the hypothesized moderator variables, there was a significant difference found between the groups on self-esteem, but no differences between the groups on trait self-objectification or internalization of the thin ideal.

Procedures

The study consisted of two sessions. First, female undergraduate students from Bowling Green State University were recruited from Psychology classes, and received experimental credit which was offered and/or required in these classes. Individuals who chose to participate in the 2-session study were compensated with 2 hours of experimental credit. Students signed up for the study through the Psychology SONA Online Experimental system, where a summary of the experiment was posted (Appendix A). To avoid potential confounds that could arise from demand characteristics, a cover story was given in the summary of the study, stating that the experiment would examine the relationship between music preferences and a variety of personality characteristics and attitudes. After providing informed consent (Appendix B), participants completed the first session of the study online, which consisted of questionnaires assessing demographic variables and the proposed moderator variables. In order to match
questionnaires from the first and second sessions, participants provided the last four digits of their cell phone number followed by the day of the month they were born and the first three numbers of the address of their last residence before coming to college, which served as a unique identification number that was recorded on both surveys and used to match data from the first and second sessions. This maintained confidentiality (non-name-linked data on surveys) for the participants. After completing the first session, participants were awarded .5 experimental credits automatically and then redirected to the Psychology SONA Online Experimental system where they were able to sign up and choose a time to complete the second session of the study, which took place at the Psychology building.

During the second session, all participants took the online survey alone or with one other participant. After entering information that generated their unique ID, each participant was randomly assigned to condition by the survey software. The experimental condition consisted of listening to 2 songs containing sexually objectifying lyrical content, which included “Country Girl (Shake it for Me)” by Luke Bryan and an alternate studio version of “Do What You Want” by Lady Gaga featuring Christina Aguilera. The control condition consisted of listening to 2 songs with neutral, non-objectifying lyrics, which included “Someone Else Calling You Baby” by Luke Bryan and “Applause” by Lady Gaga.

Before the experiment, participants reviewed and signed a paper copy of the consent document, then participants from both conditions were read a script by the experimenter (Appendix C) describing the protocol and were told that, as the recruitment posting indicated, the experiment sought to understand the relationship between music preferences and a number of personality characteristics and attitudes. Participants were also told that it was important to pay attention to the lyrics because questions would be asked afterwards to evaluate certain aspects of
the music, including lyrical content. The stimulus material was presented individually (on the computer, using headphones) to the participants and then participants completed online questionnaires on the computer. Experimenters were in the same room but were instructed to face away from the participant to prevent the feeling of being observed. After completion of the measures, the participants were debriefed as to the true nature of the experiment (Appendix D), and provided with a thank you letter containing resources in case they experienced any emotional discomfort as a result of their participation in the study (Appendix E). Finally, the participants were awarded 1.5 credits for their participation in the second session of the study.

**Selection of Stimuli**

In order to ensure that popular songs with wide impact were chosen, the selection criteria for the objectifying songs included being nominated for the teen choice awards or being in the top ten of Billboard Hot 100 list in the last 5 years. The author chose a number of songs meeting this criteria that were potentially objectifying, and then coded them to find the songs that were the highest in objectification (based on a coding system devised by the author, see Appendix F). Two other graduate students each took half of the lyrics and coded them independently to determine interrater reliability (percent agreement = .96). Any discrepancies were discussed and resolved by all three coders. Each of the chosen objectifying songs was then paired with a “neutral song”, or one containing no objectifying lyrics based on the same coding system. These pairs of songs were matched on genre, artist, and as closely as possible, tempo.

The written lyrics of the songs used as stimuli can be found in Appendix G.
Measures- Session One

Demographic Variables. A number of demographic variables were assessed for descriptive purposes and/or to control for possible covariates (Appendix H). These variables included age, BMI, race, year in school, level of parent education, weight loss status, and perceived weight status (underweight, overweight, etc.). BMI (Body Mass Index) for each participant was calculated using their reported heights and weights.

Hypothesized Moderator Variables

Trait Self-objectification. The Trait Self-Objectification Questionnaire (Noll & Fredrickson, 1998) measured the degree to which individuals value their own bodies in terms of appearance versus competence (Appendix I). Each of the 12 items identifies a different body attribute; half are observable and appearance-based, and the other half are unobservable and competence-based. Participants were asked to rank each attribute in order of its importance to their self-concept (from 0= least impact to 9=most impact). 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 was done for the ranks of the physical appearance body attributes (e.g., sex appeal, weight, physical attractiveness). The sum of the physical competence attribute ranks was then subtracted from the sum of the physical attractiveness attribute ranks, resulting in a score between -25 and +25. Scores higher than zero indicate valuing observable physical appearance qualities above valuing one’s unobservable physical competence, indicating a higher level of self-objectification. The SOQ was shown in previous studies to be positively correlated with appearance anxiety (r =.52) and body dissatisfaction (r =.46), and unrelated to body mass (r =.02) (Fredrickson et al., 1998). Standard estimates of internal reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) are not possible due to the rank-ordered format of this measure.
**Internalization of Thin Ideals.** The Internalization Sub-Scale of the Sociocultural Attitudes toward Appearance Questionnaire -3 (SATAQ-3, Thompson, van den Berg, Roehrig, Guard, & Heinberg, 2004) was used to measure internalization of sociocultural beliefs of attractiveness (Appendix J). The 8 items in this subscale assessed the extent to which participants accept the body ideals portrayed in the media (e.g., “I tend to compare my body to TV and movie stars,” and “Photographs of thin women make me wish that I were thin.”) Items are rated on a 5-point scale (0=completely disagree to 4=completely agree), with higher scores indicating higher internalization of thin ideals. This measure was found to be significantly correlated with the Ideal Body Internalization Scale (.53), as well as the Drive for Thinness (.55) and Body Dissatisfaction (.32) subscales of the Eating Disorder Inventory. Internal consistency for the scale was found to be between .89 and .96 in a previous study (Thompson et al., 2004) and was .96 in the current study.

**Self-esteem.** The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) was used to evaluate participants’ global self-esteem (Appendix K). It represents a continuum of self-worth, including items that are only endorsed by those with low self-esteem and items that are only endorsed by those with high self-esteem. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with 10 items (e.g., “I think that I have a number of good qualities”) on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 4 = strongly agree). Half of the items were reverse coded, then item ratings were summed to create one score of self-esteem, with higher scores indicating greater self-esteem. Previous research found internal consistency coefficients ranging from .77 to .88. (Rosenberg, 1965). Internal consistency for the current study was .89. This measure has been found to be positively correlated with optimism (.61) and life satisfaction (.61), and negatively
correlated with depressive symptoms (Greenberger, Chen, Dmitrieva, & Farrugia, 2003).

**Items to Disguise the Nature of the Study.** Various items were presented in the first session to disguise the true nature of this study. As described previously, the study was advertised as a measure of music preferences and related attitudes and personality characteristics. In the informed consent, participants were advised that “A number of variables that are related to music preferences and listening habits will be assessed including demographic variables (sex, race, height, weight, etc.).” Also, distractor items including questions about music content, empathy, altruism, locus of control, and attitudes about feminism (Appendices L, M, N, O, and P, respectively) were interspersed among the other questionnaires to draw attention away from the actual variables measured.

**Measures – Session Two**

**Dependent Variables**

**State Self-objectification.** The modified Twenty Statements Test (Fredrickson et al., 1998) was used to measure state self-objectification (Appendix Q). It requires participants to list 20 characteristics about themselves (“I am_”) which were then coded by the author as appearance-based (e.g., pretty, hot, attractive, thin) or non-appearance-based (e.g., physical competence, traits, identities, emotions). A second coder coded a random sample of statements to determine interrater reliability. Directions to complete 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 right now. 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. A higher proportion of appearance-based statements are indicative of higher state self-objectification. This measure has demonstrated sensitivity to experimental manipulation in
previous objectification research, and interrater reliabilities for this measure have been found to be high in previous research (e.g. Hebl et al., 2004, Quinn et al., 2006) as well as in the current study, in which the percent agreement between raters was .99.

Instructions for the Self-Objectification Questionnaire (Noll & Fredrickson, 1998), used in part one of the study to measure trait self-objectification were modified in order to provide an additional measure of state self-objectification (Appendix R). Participants were asked to rank the same ten attributes according to how important each was to their self-concept right now. Scoring was the same as for the trait measure. Satisfactory reliability estimates were found for a previously modified state version (Calogero & Jost, 2011), and for the current study the correlation between the sums of competence and appearance ranks were -1.00, suggesting good reliability.

**State Self-surveillance.** A modified version of the Surveillance Sub-Scale of the Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (McKinley & Hyde, 1996) was used to measure the momentary state of self-surveillance (Appendix S). Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement right now (from strongly agree to strongly disagree) with seven statements (e.g. I am thinking more about how my body feels than how my body looks), and were also allowed to choose NA if the item did not apply to them (counted as missing). Items that represent lack of self-surveillance were reverse scored. Scores were summed and then divided by the number of nonmissing items, resulting in an average scale score. Higher scores represent a higher level of state self-surveillance. Internal consistency for the original scale was .79 for undergraduate women, and .73 for the current study. This scale has been found to be significantly correlated with appearance orientation (.64) and public body consciousness (.46) (McKinley & Hyde, 1996).
**Body Shame.** The 7-item Body Shame subscale of the Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (McKinley & Hyde, 1996) was used to assess state body shame (Appendix T). Previous studies have shown that seemingly stable trait body shame measures can be affected by experimental manipulation (Fredrickson et al., 1998; Hebl et al., 2004). However, instructions were slightly modified so that it was clear to participants that they were answering based on their thoughts and feelings *right now*. The items (e.g. “I would be ashamed for people to know what I really weigh”) were rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. As with the surveillance subscale of the OBCS, participants are also allowed to choose NA if the item did not apply to them. An average scale score was derived by summing all scores and then dividing by the number of nonmissing items. This subscale was found to be negatively correlated with Body Esteem (-.51) (McKinley & Hyde, 1996). Internal reliability in a previous state adaptation was .81 (Martins, Tiggemann, & Kirkbride, 2007), and was .85 in the current study.

**Appearance Anxiety.** The 16-item Social Appearance Anxiety Scale (Hart et al., 2008) was used to measure anxiety about the possibility of negative evaluation by others due to one’s overall appearance, including body shape (e.g. “I am concerned people will find me unappealing because of my appearance”, see Appendix U). Instructions were slightly modified such that participants indicated how well the characteristic described them *right now* on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). Responses were summed to derive a total score of social appearance anxiety, with higher scores indicating greater appearance anxiety. This scale was found to be positively correlated with self-esteem (.50), fear of negative evaluation (.60), and state anxiety (.63). Internal consistency was .95 in a previous study (Hart et al., 2008) and .94 in the current study.
**Negative Affect.** The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) was used to measure negative mood after the stimuli presentation (Appendix V). Participants were given a list of 20 words (e.g. “proud”, “distressed”) that reflect either positive or negative affect, and are asked to indicate the extent to which each word reflects how they feel right now, using a 5 point Likert-type scale (1=very slightly or not at all; 5=extremely). Scores for each of the subscales (Positive Affect and Negative Affect) are achieved by summing responses. Internal consistency for the Negative Affect subscale of the PANAS was found to be acceptable (.84, .87) by Watson, Clark, & Tellegan (1998) and in the current study (.87). Measures of general distress, depression, and state anxiety were found to be positively correlated with the Negative Affect subscale (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988).

**Items to Disguise the Nature of the Study.** As in the first session, a number of items were inserted into the session two survey to further disguise the true nature of this study. For example, following the questions about music content, participants will read the following statement to further conceal the nature of this study: “There are many factors that influence people’s preferences for music, for example, mood. In order to control for these factors, please answer the following questions” (similar to Dittmar et al., 2009). Also, distractor items (including items related to music, empathy, altruism, autonomy and sociotropy, and subjective vitality) will be inserted among the questionnaires to draw attention away from the actual variables measured (see Appendices W, X, Y, Z, AA, and AB, respectively).
RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Baseline differences between individuals assigned to the two conditions were examined for the demographic variables (age, year in school, BMI, race, relationship status and length, music listening habits, parent education, perceived weight status, and weight loss status) and hypothesized moderator variables that were assessed during the first session on the study (trait-self-objectification, self-esteem, and internalization of the thin ideal). T-tests, chi-square tests, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used. There were no significant differences between the conditions on any demographic variables (p’s > .05, see Table 1) or moderator variables (p’s > .05, see Table 2).

Descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations were calculated for all measures (i.e., demographic measures, hypothesized mediators, and outcome variables). Next, bivariate correlations were computed for the outcome variables (the two self-objectification measures, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, negative affect) and the hypothesized moderator variables (trait-self-objectification, self-esteem, and internalization of the thin ideal) (Table 3) for the purposes of potential data reduction. Although the analyses indicated that appearance anxiety was significantly and moderately correlated with body shame ($r = .56, p < .01$) and body surveillance ($r = .52, p < .01$), and the correlation between body surveillance and body shame was .49 ($p < .01$), as these variables are considered to be unique constructs, each was retained separately in further analyses.

Bivariate correlations were computed to determine whether there were significant correlations between continuous demographic variables and the dependent variables. Reported BMI was significantly correlated with body shame ($r = .34, p < .05$). Then, analyses of variances
(ANOVAs) and t-tests were computed to determine whether there were significant differences in the categorical dependent variables. Results indicated that there was a significant effect of weight loss status on body shame \( F(2,54) = 6.07, p < .01 \). Results also revealed a significant effect of perceived weight status on negative affect \( F(3,53) = 3.35, p < .05 \), body shame \( F(3,53) = 5.66, p < .01 \), and appearance anxiety \( F(3,53) = 8.42, p < .001 \). Finally, results indicate that race had a significant effect on appearance anxiety \( t(55) = 3.25, p < .01 \), and state self-objectification as measured by the SSOQ \( t(55) = 2.40, p < .05 \). Entering these variables into the primary analyses, however, did not change the significance of any main effect findings for condition or interactions of condition with the hypothesized moderator variables. In addition, recall that there were no condition differences in these demographic or background variables. Therefore, I did not include the covariates in the main analyses.

**Primary Analyses**

**Hypothesis 1:** I hypothesized that there would be a main effect of condition on each of the outcome variables (i.e., self-objectification, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, negative affect), with the means of the dependent variables for the experimental (objectifying) condition being higher than those of the control condition. To test this hypothesis, a MANOVA was computed for the set of dependent variables.

In support of my hypothesis, there was a significant overall multivariate condition effect \( F(6,49) = 2.55, p < .05 \). In terms of the univariate results, significant condition effects were found for the Twenty Statements Test (TST) \( F(1,55) = 5.94, p < .05 \) and for self-surveillance \( F(1,55) = 6.94, p < .05 \). Specifically, for the Twenty Statements Test, women in the experimental condition completed the statement “I am...” with a higher proportion of appearance-based statements \( M=.07, SD=.06 \) than women in the control condition \( M=.03, \)
Similarly, women in the experimental condition reported higher levels of self-surveillance ($M=4.39$, $SD=1.03$) than women in the control condition ($M=3.62$, $SD=1.14$). Contrary to my hypothesis, there were no condition effects found for the State Self-Objectification Questionnaire, appearance anxiety, body shame, or negative affect ($p$’s > .05, see Table 4).

**Hypothesis 2-4:** I hypothesized that the effect of condition on the outcome variables would be moderated by the following variables: Trait-self-objectification, self-esteem, and internalization of appearance ideals. Specifically, I anticipated that women with high levels of trait self-objectification who were in the experimental condition would have higher levels of the outcome variables (self-objectification, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, negative affect) than women with low levels of trait self-objectification in the experimental conditions and all women in the control condition (Hypothesis 2). I also predicted that women with low levels of self-esteem who were in the experimental condition would have higher levels of the outcome variables than women with high self-esteem in the experimental conditions and all women in the control condition (Hypothesis 3). Finally, I expected that women with high internalization of the thin ideal will have higher levels of the outcome variables than women with low internalization of the thin ideal in the experimental condition and all women in the control condition (Hypothesis 4).

To test these hypothesized moderating effects, a series of hierarchical moderated multiple regressions was computed for each outcome variable and each hypothesized moderator separately (for a total of 18 regressions (Cohen & Cohen, 1975). Prior to computing these analyses, condition was coded as control=0 and experimental=1, and each moderator variable was mean centered by subtracting the mean score from each participant’s score. Centering these
variables reduces multicollinearity among them without changing the significance of the relation of the interaction to the outcome variables (Holmbeck, 2002). In the regression analyses, in Step 1, the main effects of condition and a hypothesized moderator (e.g., trait self-objectification, self-esteem, or internalization of the thin ideal) were entered. In Step 2, the interaction term of condition x proposed moderator was entered. As main effects for condition were reported in the previous section, in these analyses, I only report main effects for the hypothesized moderator variables, and more importantly, condition x hypothesized moderator interaction effects.

Six regressions were computed in testing Hypothesis 2 (that trait self-objectification would moderate condition effects), one for each dependent variable: the two state self-objectification measures, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, and negative affect (see Table 5). Only one main effect for trait self-objectification was found: higher levels of trait self-objectification predicted higher levels of state self-objectification as measured by the SSOQ. In addition, there was a significant interaction effect between condition and trait self-objectification on state self-objectification (SSOQ).

Based on Holmbeck’s (2002) approach, the significant interaction between condition and trait self-objectification was further investigated to establish the nature of the moderating effect. Regressions were computed at three levels of the moderator, trait self-objectification: 1 SD below the mean, at the mean, and 1 SD above the mean. The unstandardized regression coefficients from the regressions provided the simple slope of the regression line predicting the outcome variable at each level of the moderator.

A visual depiction of the interaction can be found in Figure 1. For participants with low trait self-objectification, there was a significant condition effect on state self-objectification (SSOQ). For participants with average or high trait self-objectification, there was no significant
condition effect on self-objectification (SSOQ). As such, the hypothesis that participants with high levels of trait self-objectification in the experimental condition would have significantly higher levels of state self-objectification than participants in the experimental condition with average or low levels of trait self-objectification was not supported.

Six regressions were computed in testing Hypothesis 3 (that self-esteem would moderate condition effects), one for each dependent variable: the two self-objectification measures, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, and negative affect (see Table 6). Only one main effect for self-esteem was found: lower levels of self-esteem predicted higher levels of appearance anxiety.

Six regressions were computed in testing Hypothesis 4 (that thin ideal internalization would moderate condition effects), one for each dependent variable: the two self-objectification measures, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, and negative affect (see Table 7). Three main effects for thin ideal internalization were found: higher levels of thin ideal internalization predicted higher levels of appearance anxiety, body shame, and self-surveillance. In addition, there were significant interaction effects between condition and internalization of the thin ideal on body shame and self-surveillance.

A visual depiction of these interactions can be found in Figures 2 and 3, respectively. First, for participants with high internalization of the thin ideal, there was a significant condition effect on body shame. No significant condition effect was found for participants with low or average levels of thin ideal internalization. Second, for participants with average and high internalization of the thin ideal, there was a significant condition effect on self-surveillance. For participants with low thin ideal internalization, there was no significant condition effect on self-surveillance.
In the present study, I sought to expand upon previous research in the area of objectification, particularly that of exposure to sexually objectifying media. I focused specifically on the relation between objectifying music lyrics and women’s perceptions of themselves, as this topic has received only a cursory examination in the current literature. It is important to understand the impact of objectifying music lyrics on women as research indicates that this medium is very popular, teens and young adults are the largest subgroup of music consumers (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010), and that a significant number of popular songs contain sexually objectifying lyrics (Bretthauer et al., 2006). I examined whether listening to sexually objectifying popular music lyrics would affect the following dependent variables: self-objectification, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, and negative affect. I also examined how trait self-objectification, self-esteem, and the internalization of sociocultural ideals moderated the effects of the exposure to the objectifying media. In this discussion, I will elaborate on the results of the study by reviewing each of the major hypotheses, including the results that were obtained, how these findings compare to past research, and the implications of each finding. Finally, I will provide a summary of the limitations of this study and implications for theory and interventions, including directions for future research.

**Hypothesis 1**: I hypothesized that there would be a main effect of condition on each of the outcome variables (i.e., the two self-objectification measures, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, negative affect), with the means of the dependent variables for the experimental (objectifying) condition being higher than those of the control condition.
In support of my hypothesis, I found a condition effect for the Twenty Statements test: women in the experimental condition made more appearance-based statements in response to the prompt “I am______” than women in the control condition. This finding is consistent with results from studies using the classic “swimsuit test” (Quinn et al., 2006; Hebl et al., 2004). My results, using sexually objectifying music lyrics as the stimulus, contribute to the literature in that they demonstrate that a visual representation of the self, or any visual image at all, is not necessary to make women more likely to describe themselves in appearance-based ways.

In further support of my hypothesis, I found a condition effect for self-surveillance: women in the experimental condition reported higher levels of surveillance that women in the control condition. This is in line with a previous study which found that imagining oneself in a bathing suit compared to a sweater led to greater self-surveillance (Tiggemann & Andrew, 2012). It makes sense that listening to lyrics that place women’s bodies as the center of attention could also lead to an increased awareness of and vigilance to one’s own body.

Contrary to my hypothesis, there were no condition effects found for the State Self-Objectification Questionnaire, appearance anxiety, body shame, or negative affect. This is unexpected, as several studies have found condition effects for these variables. In terms of state self-objectification as measured by the SSOQ, a previous study by Calogero and Jost (2011) found that women exposed to a list of certain sexist ideologies reported higher levels of state self-objectification than women who read nonsexist ideologies. These stimuli were different from those used in the present study. It may be that being reminded of how society places women in a position of inferiority creates a greater change in which personal attributes women place more value on than does listening to two songs containing objectifying music lyrics. It is important to note that the SSOQ and the TST were not found to be significantly correlated to one
another, which suggests that the measures are tapping into different constructs. The TST may be measuring immediate priming effects, while the SSOQ may be measuring how much a person’s appearance is integral to the value she places on herself. Further, as the SOQ was originally designed to measure a trait variable, it may be less sensitive to condition effects than the TST.

There are several possible reasons for the null findings with regards to appearance anxiety. An experimental study by Harper and Tiggemann (2008) found that appearance anxiety was influenced by exposure to thin ideal magazine images. However, those authors only found a significant condition effect for weight anxiety, and not for non-weight-related appearance anxiety. Therefore, it may be that a more general measure of appearance anxiety like the one used in the present study is not as sensitive to short-term exposure to objectifying conditions. Further, results from correlational studies by Szymanski and Henning (2007) and Aubrey (2007) provided evidence that body surveillance mediated the relation between self-objectification or exposure to objectification and self-surveillance. As appearance anxiety is primarily about the fear of negative evaluation based upon appearance, an alternative explanation for the null findings is that body surveillance does not lead to appearance anxiety in situations where the individual does not feel that she is being observed. In my study, the experimenters were specifically instructed to be as unobtrusive as possible.

There was no condition effect found for body shame. Objectification theory suggests that body shame often results from failing to live up to societal beauty standards. Previous studies (e.g., Tiggemann, 2003; Aubrey, 2007) have shown that objectifying media can lead to increased body shame. However, these studies investigated visual media including television and magazines. The only other experimental study examining the impact of objectifying lyrics also found no condition effect for body shame. Although it seems that listening to objectifying music
lyrics causes women to think of themselves in more appearance-based ways, and causes them to be aware of their own bodies and how they look, it may not necessarily cause them to feel shame about their own bodies. This could be related to the absence of any representation of what the woman being objectified in the song looks like, as in these songs neither artist discusses the specifics of their appearance. Perhaps different women imagine different types of women when they listen to lyrics, and some may even imagine themselves in the songs.

Results from the present study indicated that negative mood was not affected by listening to objectifying music lyrics. Although objectification theory does not directly address negative affect, previous studies have found relations between objectification and negative affect, including a thesis project by Nikodym (2013) on the effects of objectifying music lyrics. As compared to the song chosen in Nikodym’s study, although the lyrics were objectifying, they were generally positive in nature. It is possible that songs with lyrics that are both misogynistic and objectifying are more likely to cause changes in affect.

**Hypothesis 2:** I hypothesized that the effect of condition on the outcome variables would be moderated by trait self-objectification. Specifically, I anticipated that women with high levels of trait self-objectification would have higher levels of the outcome variables (i.e., the two self-objectification measures, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, and negative affect) than women with low levels of trait self-objectification in the experimental condition and all women in the control condition.

Trait self-objectification moderated the effect of condition on state self-objectification as measured by the SSOQ. However, this moderating effect was in the opposite direction from what was expected: only individuals with low trait self-objectification were affected by listening to objectifying music lyrics. It is important to note that trait self-objectification and this measure of
self-objectification (SSOQ) were basically the same measure using different wording to measure state versus trait characteristics. It appears that only individuals who started out valuing themselves in terms of competence versus appearance traits were sensitive to condition effects. Individuals who valued themselves more in terms of appearance than competence, or were likely to evaluate both types of traits fairly equally, remained at that level of self-objectification regardless of which lyrics they listened to.

Contrary to my hypothesis, results did not demonstrate that trait self-objectification moderated the effects of condition on any of the other outcome variables. This is surprising as trait self-objectification has been found in other studies to moderate condition effects on a number of variables related to objectification theory (e.g., Fea & Brannon, 2006; Fredrickson et al, 1998; Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008). One potential explanation for the differences in findings could be that none of the previously mentioned studies used objectifying media as the stimulus. Perhaps when it comes to objectifying media, there are other factors more important than a person’s trait level of self-objectification, including previous exposure to objectifying media or how much they identify with the characters represented in the media.

**Hypothesis 3:** I predicted that the effect of condition on the outcome variables would be moderated by self-esteem. Specifically, I anticipated that women with high levels of self-esteem would have lower levels of the outcome variables (i.e., the two self-objectification measures, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, and negative affect) than women with low levels of self-esteem in the experimental condition and all women in the control condition.

Contrary to my hypothesis, self-esteem did not moderate the effect of condition for any of the outcome variables. It appears that regardless of the way one feels about one’s self worth, an individual experiences the same amount of self-objectification, self-surveillance, appearance
anxiety, and negative affect when exposed to objectifying music lyrics. Although some studies have found moderating effects for self-esteem (e.g., Breines et al., 2008; Tiggemann, 2003), these studies have all used a cross-sectional design. It may be that self-esteem only moderates the effects of sexually objectifying experiences over time, and does not impact the short-term effects of objectification. Additionally, objectification theory posits that the negative effects of objectification experiences can occur regardless of how one feels about one’s body, and it appears that this is also true in regards to how a woman feels about herself overall. However, self-esteem did negatively predict appearance anxiety, body shame, and negative affect. These findings suggest that although targeting self-esteem may be a worthwhile intervention to improve the way that women think and feel, it may not be sufficient to address the effects of objectifying media.

**Hypothesis 4:** I expected that the effect of condition on the outcome variables would be moderated by thin ideal internalization. Specifically, I anticipated that women with high levels of thin ideal internalization would have higher levels of the outcome variables (i.e., the two self-objectification measures, appearance anxiety, body shame, self-surveillance, negative affect) than women with low levels of thin ideal internalization in the experimental condition and all women in the control condition.

In support of my hypothesis, there were significant interaction effects between condition and internalization of the thin ideal on self-surveillance and body shame. As a group, women who reported average or high levels of thin ideal internalization were sensitive to condition effects on self-surveillance while those low on thin ideal internalization were not. Similarly, individuals only experienced increased body shame after listening to the objectifying music lyrics when they were high on internalization of the thin ideal. It seems that subscribing to a
cultural standard of beauty where thinness is the ideal made women more susceptible to the effects of the objectifying condition. This finding is consistent with previous studies that examined how viewing images impacted women’s views of themselves (e.g., Brown and Dittmar, 2005; Diedrichs & Lee, 2011). These studies found that internalization of thin ideals moderated the effects of looking at pictures of thin models on body-related concerns. The present study contributes to the literature by demonstrating that this effect can still occur in the absence of visual stimuli. It may be that women who ascribe to the thin ideal and want to be like the thin women they see in the media are more likely to imagine a thin woman when listening to the lyrics and compare themselves to that ideal image.

Contrary to my hypothesis, thin ideal internalization did not moderate the effects of condition on appearance anxiety and negative affect. As stated previously, the measure used in the present study taps into a general anxiety about one’s appearance, and may not tap into weight-based concerns as the measures used in previous studies (e.g., Harper & Tiggemann, 2008). Therefore, it makes sense that the degree to which one ascribes to the thin ideal may not affect how that individual responds to listening to objectifying music lyrics. Additionally, participants’ experiences of negative affect were unaffected by condition and there is little reason to expect that this would be significantly altered by a person’s level of thin ideal internalization. It is important to note that regardless of condition, individuals with higher levels of thin ideal internalization also had higher scores on appearance anxiety, body shame, and self-surveillance, which provides further evidence that internalization of the thin ideal is an important construct of study in objectification research, and a possible target for intervention to reduce the negative impact of objectification in women’s lives.
Limitations of the Present Study

One clear limitation of the present study is its small sample size. Although the results of the present study confirmed multiple effects of objectification despite a small sample size, there may be effects that did not emerge as significant due to lack of power. Further, the sample was relatively homogenous. The vast majority of the sample were young Caucasian college students, and therefore the results may not be applicable to more diverse populations. The study should be replicated with different age groups, as objectification theory contends that experiences and effects of objectification may vary throughout the life course. It may also be useful to replicate this study with different cultural groups, as different standards of beauty could affect how or when a person experiences objectification.

Another limitation of the study is that it only investigated the short-term effects of listening to objectifying songs. Therefore, it is unknown how long the effects uncovered in the study may last, an interesting question which could be addressed in future research. Additionally, although theoretically the accumulation of objectifying experiences leads to long-lasting negative effects, further research would need to be undertaken to investigate whether listening to more objectifying songs has any cumulative effect.

Implications for Theory and Future Research

As stated earlier, this study provides initial evidence that non-visual objectifying media such as lyrics can have some of the same effects as visual media. This is important because the objectification theory focuses primarily on the harmfulness of visual media representations of women. However, results do suggest that the experiences may not be the same as with visual media. It is important to continue to try to understand the nuanced differences between different types of media and take caution not to assume that they are all the same. This is especially
important as this theory is almost twenty years old and the face of media has changed dramatically during that time.

My results suggest difficulty in accurately measuring self-objectification. The traditional measures used in the existing literature have serious limitations, both conceptual and practical. The first major problem is that none of the measures captures all of the important components of self-objectification. For example, the Self-Objectification Questionnaire measures how much a woman values herself in terms of her appearance versus her physical competence, but does not capture whether she internalizes an observer’s perspective of herself, or whether she sees her body as if it can represent her whole self. In terms of more practical challenges, the rank-ordered nature of the SOQ can be difficult for participants to deal with; previous literature has indicated that 25% percent of participants do not fill out this measure correctly, often giving more than one item the same rank. Further, the participants are asked to rank attributes from 0-9, with nine being the most important, which differs from traditional ranking systems where 1 is the best or highest rank. Although the survey software I used prevents people from choosing more than one rank for an item, respondents still may have experienced confusion when ranking the items.

The Twenty Statements Test has been conceptualized as a state measure of self-objectification, and should therefore correlate highly with the state version of the SOQ, if they indeed are measuring the same thing. However, in my study these two measures were not significantly correlated, suggesting that they might be tapping into different constructs. As most studies have not utilized both measures, and those that have did not report correlations between these measures, further investigation of the differences and similarities between what these two measures are tapping into is indicated. An additional problem with the TST is that it includes instructions that may steer individuals away from making appearance-based statements about
themselves by asking participants to make statements about themselves and their identity. Using the word identity may prime individuals to think about their various group or role identities (e.g., student, mother) rather than personal characteristics. Future research could examine whether the way the directions are worded affects the statements that individuals make about themselves.

In order to ensure that self-objectification is being measured as accurately and reliably as possible, researchers in this area of study should consider developing new measures of self-objectification that address the aforementioned challenges. Similarly, it would be beneficial for future research to identify different ways to quantify levels of sexual objectification in the media. As objectification theory focuses primarily on visual media, the theory does not provide much guidance about what content would be categorized as sexual objectification in other forms of media. Researchers are left to attempt to find parallels between visual and other forms of media and to use the overarching themes of the theory in order to determine what qualifies as sexual objectification. Although my study used a coding system devised based on the theory and had good interrater reliability, it is possible that another researcher may have different ideas of what content should be categorized as objectifying. Too much subjectivity among researchers in regards to what constitutes sexual objectification in the media makes it difficult to compare studies and know exactly what the findings mean.

**Implications for Intervention**

The results of the present study suggest a number of avenues for intervention. One possibility is for women to be more selective in their listening choices, knowing that there are potential consequences to listening to music that objectifies women. Although we do not know for sure that these effects would hold true for children or adolescents, another possible intervention would be for parents to monitor and regulate their children’s listening habits to the
extent that it is possible. Another potential intervention would be to include analysis and
discussion of music lyrics in existing media literacy interventions. As internalization of the thin
ideal was an important factor in how much individuals in the present study were affected by
listening to objectifying music lyrics, it should be targeted during these interventions. Although
self-esteem did not moderate the effects of condition, it was still an important predictor of certain
objectification variables, and therefore remains a worthy target for prevention and intervention.
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APPENDIX A. SONA POSTING

**Study name:** Music preferences, attitudes, and behaviors among female college students

**2-Part Study:** This is a 2-part study. After completing the first part online, you will sign up, based on your availability, for the second part, which will be held in the Psychology Building. Only sign up for the first part right now.

**Description:** This study is being done to examine the relationship between music preferences and a number of attitudes and behaviors in female college students. A number of variables that are related to music preferences and listening habits will be assessed including demographic variables (race, height, weight, etc.). You will be asked to participate in two sessions, a pretest (Session 1) and posttest (Session 2). For Session 1, you will be completing a set of questionnaires online. This session will take approximately 30 minutes. For Session 2, you will be scheduled to come to a room in the Psychology Building approximately one week later. During this session, you will be randomly assigned to a listen to two popular songs. Following the songs, you will complete another set of questionnaires. This session will take approximately 60 minutes. You will receive .5 credit for your participation in Session 1 and an additional 1.5 credits for your participation in Session 2.

In order to meet eligibility criteria, you must be female and 18 years of age or older. If you have any questions or comments about this study, you may contact the investigator, Maren Froemming, by phone at 651-210-0861 or by email at mfroemm@bgsu.edu.

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

**Credits:** 0.5 credits for completion of Session 1 and 1.5 credits for completion of Session 2

**Researcher:** Maren Froemming

**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:** XXXXXX
APPENDIX B. INFORMED CONSENTS

Informed Consent (Session 1)

Investigator: Maren Froemming, B.A.

Description: The purpose of this research study is to examine individual differences in the music preferences and listening habits of female college students. I am completing this study for my Master’s Thesis Project in the Department of Psychology. You must be female and at least 18 years old to participate.

Summary of Involvement: This study will ask you to participate in two different sessions. During Session 1, you will complete several questionnaires online. We anticipate your participation in this session will take no longer than 30 minutes. A number of variables that are related to music preferences and listening habits will be assessed including demographic variables (race, height, weight, etc.). After submitting your survey online, you will be prompted to sign up on SONA for the second portion of the study. During Session 2, you will be asked to listen to two popular songs in a room in the Psychology Building. Although other participants may be present, you will listen to the songs alone using headphones. You will then complete another set of questionnaires (computers will be partitioned to prevent others from seeing your responses). We anticipate that this session will take no longer than one hour. You will receive 0.5 credits for completing Session 1 and 1.5 credits for your participation in Session 2. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. Deciding to participate or not will not impact your grades or class standing or relationship to the institution.

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 understanding of how psychologists design and conduct experimental research, and some of the methods we use to understand college students’ preferences for music and listening habits. This study may benefit the field of psychology by adding to a body of knowledge about individual differences in musical preferences and experiences/effects of listening to music.

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. We recommend that you do not leave the online survey open or unattended if completing it on a public computer, as the internet is not 100% secure in terms of privacy. We also suggest that you clear the browser history and cache when finished with the survey. We hope to publish an article summarizing the overall results of this study, but no one person’s answers will be presented – only a summary of data from many participants.
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 by clicking on the X at the top right hand corner of your computer window to exit the survey. 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. You will also be provided with a copy of this consent form for your records. Deciding to participate or not will not impact your grades or class standing or relationship to BGSU. A copy of this consent will be reviewed with before your participation in the second session of the study.

Contact Information: If you have any questions or comments about this study, you may contact Maren Froemming by phone at 651-210-0861 or by email at mfroemm@bgsu.edu. You may also contact the research advisor for this project, Eric Dubow, by phone at 419-372-2556 or email at edubow@bgsu.edu. You may contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Board by phone at 419-372-7716 or by email at hsrb@bgsu.edu if you have any questions about your rights as a participant.

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 without penalty. If you choose not to participate, please exit this site by clicking the X in the upper right hand corner of this screen. By clicking the "Next" button and completing the survey, you agree that you have been presented with and have read the above statement of risks and benefits of participating in this project and you agree to participate. You will not be allowed to continue to the survey if you do not provide consent.
Informed Consent (Session 2)

Investigator: Maren Froemming, B.A.

Description: The purpose of this research study is to examine individual differences in the music preferences and listening habits of female college students. I am completing this study for my Master’s Thesis Project in the Department of Psychology. You must be female and at least 18 years old to participate.

Summary of Involvement: This study will ask you to participate in two different sessions. During Session 1, you will complete several questionnaires online. We anticipate your participation in this session will take no longer than 30 minutes. A number of variables that are related to music preferences and listening habits will be assessed including demographic variables (race, height, weight, etc.). After submitting your survey online, you will be prompted to sign up on SONA for the second portion of the study. During Session 2, you will be asked to listen to two popular songs in a room in the Psychology Building. Although other participants may be present, you will listen to the songs alone using headphones. You will then complete another set of questionnaires (computers will be partitioned to prevent others from seeing your responses). We anticipate that this session will take no longer than one hour. You will receive 0.5 credits for completing Session 1 and 1.5 credits for your participation in Session 2. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. Deciding to participate or not will not impact your grades or class standing or relationship to the institution.

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 understanding of how psychologists design and conduct experimental research, and some of the methods we use to understand college students’ preferences for music and listening habits.

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. The signed consent document will not be linked to your responses and will be kept in a locked drawer in a locked office. For security purposes, make sure to close the survey when you are finished. The browser history and cache will be cleared following the experiment. We hope to publish an article summarizing the overall results of this study, but no one person’s answers will be presented – only a summary of data from many participants.
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. You will also be provided with a copy of this consent form for your records. Deciding to participate or not will not impact your grades or class standing or relationship to the institution.

Contact Information: If you have any questions or comments about this study, you may contact Maren Froemming by phone at 651-210-0861 or by email at mfroemm@bgsu.edu. You may also contact the research advisor for this project, Eric Dubow, by phone at 419-372-2556 or email at edubow@bgsu.edu. You may contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Board by phone at 419-372-7716 or by email at hsr@bgsu.edu if you have any questions about your rights as a participant.

Voluntary Consent: I agree to voluntarily participate in this study and I am at least 18 years old.

Participant’s Name (print) Age Date Signature

Investigator’s Name Date Signature
APPENDIX C. STUDY MANIPULATION SCRIPT

Hi (everyone), it’s time to get started. Please turn off your cell phone(s), not just on vibrate, but fully silent so there will be no distractions.

This study seeks to understand the relationship between music preferences, listening habits, and a number of personality characteristics and attitudes. First, you will be listening to two popular songs on the computer, which will take between 8 and 10 minutes. It is important for you to listen closely to the songs because questions will be asked pertaining to the songs later. After listening, you will take a survey. If at any point during the study you have questions or concerns raise your hand and a researcher will assist you. It is important that you hear and pay attention to the songs. Please raise your hand if you are having trouble hearing or following the music. At this time please click the link to begin the survey.
APPENDIX D. DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

The Short Term Effects of Listening to Sexually Objectifying Music Lyrics: A Test and Extension of Objectification Theory

Dear study participants:

Thank you for participating in this research study. We wanted to tell you a little more about the study to give you a better understanding of what we hope to learn. You were told that the purpose of the study was to examine individual differences in the music preferences of college students.

The true focus of this study was to investigate the immediate effect of listening to sexually objectifying music lyrics on your perceptions and attitudes about your body and appearance. The actual purpose of this study was withheld until now in order to prevent participant(s) from answering questions in a way that they believed were socially acceptable rather than giving their spontaneous or natural opinions, thoughts, and beliefs.

This study is important because the sexual objectification of women and girls is prevalent in the media today, including in the lyrics of popular music. Further, experiencing sexual objectification and witnessing it in the media has been found to be related to individuals internalizing this view of themselves which can lead to a number of negative consequences, including dissatisfaction and anxiety regarding their physical appearance. We hope that this study will enhance our understanding of the effects of media exposure on women’s attitudes and inform future interventions to reduce the internalization of sexual objectification that can potentially impact millions of individuals.

It is our hope that you found this study interesting and we greatly appreciate your participation. If you know anyone else who may participate in this study in the future, we ask that you not explain to them the true focus of the study, as it may bias their responses. At the end of the study, the real purpose will be explained to them as it was to you.

If you have further questions about this study or would like to withdraw from the study, please email the Principal Investigator, Maren Froemming, B.A. at mfroemm@bgsu.edu or call her at 651-210-0861. 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 hsrb@bgsu.edu.

Sincerely,

Maren Froemming
Department of Psychology
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, Maren Froemming, B.A. at mandroem@bgsu.edu or call her at (651) 210-0861. 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 hsrb@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,

Maren Froemming
Department of Psychology
APPENDIX F. CODING GUIDE

Lyrics will be provided for each song. The unit of analysis we will be using is the line of lyrics. For each line of lyrics, you will be identifying whether objectification is present or absent.

The presence of objectification in the lyrics will be operationalized using the following categories and definitions:

**Body focus:** Directly mentioning or referring to body parts other than the face (i.e. “I like big butts and I can not lie”)

**Gaze:** Mentioning women being looked at/checked out by spectators (i.e. “the whole club was lookin at her”)

**Depersonalization:** Relating or comparing women or body parts to non-human objects or animals, including food (i.e. “You remind me of my jeep, I wanna ride it”)

**Possession:** Discussing a woman or a woman’s body as if it is something that can be owned or possessed (i.e. “Chills up that spine, that ass is mine”)

**Disposability:** Treating women as something disposable, especially after sex (i.e. “You know I thug 'em, fuck 'em, love 'em, leave 'em”)

**Commodity:** Referring to women/women’s bodies as something to be bought/paid for (i.e. “A couple of grands, I got rubber bands, my paper planes making her dance”)

**Decoration:** Implying that women/women’s bodies are there to make men look better (i.e. “you look good on my arm”)

If more than one instance of objectification is present in a line, please code only the first instance. In order to resolve any possible disagreements among coders, you will need to write the number of the line for each instance of objectification you identify.

After you have completed the coding table, you will be asked to add up all the lines that contain objectification and enter the total. This number will represent the total amount of objectification for the song, and will be used to find the songs that are highest in objectification.
Coding Guide: Continued

Name of Song

Artist

For each line of lyrics, identify if any of the following indications of objectification are present. If so, enter the line number into the table underneath the corresponding category. If not, you do not need to do anything for that line; simply continue to the next. If more than one instance of objectification is present in a line of lyrics, code only the first instance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body focus</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
<th>Possession</th>
<th>Disposability</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Decoration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please add up the number of lines that contain any objectifying lyrics and enter the total here: ____

On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being the least objectifying and 10 being the most objectifying, how sexually objectifying do you feel this song is overall? ____

On a scale of 1-10, how positive do you feel the message of this song is overall? ____
Control Condition: Someone Else Calling You Baby by Luke Bryan

I saw a truck backin' outa your drive
You were sitting in the passenger side
Messin' with the radio, you had your sun glasses on.
I pulled over 'cause I couldn't believe
Two weeks ago that was you and me
Riding down these old back roads, singing our songs
Now everybody 'round our towns been whisperin'
A tear in your eye says I should have been listenin'

Baby is someone else calling you baby
It's driving me crazy
This bein' in the dark
Goodbye's ain't ever easy
So break it to me hard
If you're over my love girl
Lay it on my heart
Don't try to save me
Is someone else calling you baby?

You wanted time and you wanted your space
So I backed off, did whatever it takes
Never really thought you were that ready for moving along
Now I ain't leaving 'till I hear you say what's goin' on
It'll be what it will be, it's either him or me
Give me the word and girl I'm gone

Baby is someone else calling you baby
It's driving me crazy
This bein' in the dark
Goodbye's ain't ever easy
So break it to me hard
If you're over my love girl
Lay it on my heart
Don't try to save me
Is someone else calling you baby?

No, goodbye ain't ever easy
So break it to me hard
If you're over my love girl
Lay it on my heart
Don't try to save me
Is someone else calling you baby?
No, don't try to save me
Is someone else calling you baby?
Is someone else calling you baby?

Control Condition: Applause by Lady Gaga

I stand here waiting for you to bang the gong
To crash the critics saying, "is it right or is it wrong?"
If only fame had an IV, baby could I bear
Being away from you, I found the vein, put it in here

I live for the applause, applause, applause
I live for the applause-plause, live for the applause-plause
Live for the way that you cheer and scream for me
The applause, applause, applause

Give me that thing that I love (Turn the lights on)
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch (Make it real loud)
Give me that thing that I love (Turn the lights on)
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch (Make it real loud)

(A-P-P-L-A-U-S-E) Make it real loud
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch
(A-P-P-L-A-U-S-E) Make it real loud
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch

I've overheard your theory
"Nostalgia's for geeks"
I guess sir, if you say so
Some of us just like to read

One second I'm a kunst
Then suddenly the kunst is me
Pop culture was in art
Now, art's in pop culture in me

I live for the applause, applause, applause
I live for the applause-plause, live for the applause-plause
Live for the way that you cheer and scream for me
The applause, applause, applause

Give me that thing that I love (Turn the lights on)
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch (Make it real loud)
Give me that thing that I love (Turn the lights on)
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch (Make it real loud)

(A-P-P-L-A-U-S-E) Make it real loud
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch
(A-P-P-L-A-U-S-E) Make it real loud
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch

Ooh touch, touch ooh
Touch, touch now ooh ooh ooh ooh

I live for the applause, applause, applause
I live for the applause-plause, live for the applause-plause
Live for the way that you cheer and scream for me
The applause, applause, applause

Give me that thing that I love (Turn the lights on)
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch (Make it real loud)
Give me that thing that I love (Turn the lights on)
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch (Make it real loud)

(A-P-P-L-A-U-S-E) Make it real loud
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch (Make it real loud)
(A-P-P-L-A-U-S-E) Make it real loud
Put your hands up, make 'em touch, touch

A-R-T-P-O-P

Experimental Condition: Country Girl (Shake It For Me)

Got a little boom in my big truck
Gonna open up the doors and turn it up
Gonna stomp my boots in the Georgia mud,
Gonna watch you make me fall in love

Get up on the hood of my daddy's tractor,
up on the toolbox it don't matter
down on the tailgate girl i can't wait
to watch you do your thing

Shake it for the young bucks sittin' in the honky-tonks
For the rednecks rockin' 'till the break of dawn
for the d.j spinning that country song
c'mon c'mon c'mon
Shake it for the birds
shake it for the bees
shake it for the catfish swimming down deep in the creek
for the crickets
and the critters
and the squirrels
shake it to the moon
shake it for me girl

Country girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me

Country girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me

Somebody's sweet little farmer child
she got it in her blood to get a little wild
pony tail and a pretty smile
roped me in from a country mile
so come on over here and get in my arms
spin me around this big ol' barn
tangle me up like grandma's yarn
yeah yeah yeah

Shake it for the young bucks sittin' in the honky-tonks
For the rednecks rockin' 'till the break of dawn
for the d.j spinning that country song
c'mon c'mon c'mon

Shake it for the birds
shake it for the bees
shake it for the catfish swimming down deep in the creek
for the crickets
and the critters
and the squirrels
shake it to the moon
shake it for me girl

Country girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me
Country girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me

Now dance like a dandelion
In the wind, on the hill underneath the pines
Yeah move like the river flow
Feel the kick drum down deep in your toes

All I wanna do is get to holdin' you
and get to knowin' you
and get to showin' you
and get to lovin' you 'fore the night is through
Baby you know what to do!

Shake it for the young bucks sittin' in the honky-tonks
For the rednecks rockin' 'till the break of dawn
for the d.j spinning that country song
c'mon c'mon c'mon

Shake it for the birds
shake it for the bees
shake it for the catfish swimming down deep in the creek
for the crickets
and the critters
and the squirrels
shake it to the moon
shake it for me girl

Country girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me

Country girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me

Country girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me

Country girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me

Country girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me
girl shake it for me
Experimental Condition: Do What You Want by Lady Gaga ft. Christina Aguilera

Huh oh
Yeah yeah
Huh oh
Whoa woa
Oh

I
I feel good
I walk alone
But then I trip over myself and I fall, I
I stand up
And then I'm OK
But then you print some shit that makes me want to scream

So do what you want, what you want with my body
Do what you want, don't stop, let's party
Do what you want, what you want with my body
Do what you want, what you want with my body

Write what you want, say what you want 'bout me
If you're wondering, know that I'm not sorry
Do what you want, what you want with my body
What you want with my body!

You can't have my heart and you won't use my mind but
Do what you want with my body
Do what you want with my body
You can't stop my voice 'cause
You don't own my life but
Do what you want with my body
Do what you want with my body

My bones hurt from all the show hmm
But I don't feel the pain 'cause I'm a pro I
I sink in and then I'm okay eh,'Cause my body belongs to you when I'm on stage eh

So do what you want, what you want with my body
Do what you want, don't stop, let's party
Do what you want, what you want with my body
Do what you want, what you want with my body

Write what you want, say what you want 'bout me
If you're wondering, know that I'm not sorry
Do what you want, what you want with my body
What you want with my body!

You can't have my heart and
You won't use my mind but
Do what you want with my body
Do what you want with my body
You can't stop my voice 'cause
You don't own my life but
Do what you want with my body
Do what you want with my body

Sometimes I'm scared I suppose
If you ever let me go
I would fall apart (apart)
If you break my heart
So just take my body
And don't stop the party (ey!)

You can't have my heart
And you won't use my mind but
Do what you want with my body
Do what you want with my body
You can't stop my voice 'cause
You don't own my life but
Do what you want with my body
Do what you want with my body

Do what you want with me
What you want make it ?
What you want will make us cleaner
What you want with my body
Do what you want with me
What you want with my body
Do what you want with me
What you want with my body, world
Help me now
What you want with my body (world)(what you want with my body)
Do what you want with my body
APPENDIX H. SESSION 1: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your age? ________ years

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

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

4. 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

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

6. 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: __________

7. 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)

8. 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)

9. What is your height? Feet___________ Inches___________

10. What is your Weight? Pounds___________

11. 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

12. Do you consider yourself
   a. Underweight
   b. Normal/Average Weight
   c. Overweight
   d. Obese
APPENDIX I. SESSION 1: 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 entering the ranks in the rightmost column.

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

9 = greatest impact
8 = next greatest impact
1 = next to least impact
0 = least impact

When considering your physical self-concept...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. what rank do you assign to <em>physical coordination</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. what rank do you assign to <em>health</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. what rank do you assign to <em>weight</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. what rank do you assign to <em>strength</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. what rank do you assign to <em>sex appeal</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. what rank do you assign to <em>physical attractiveness</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. what rank do you assign to <em>energy level (e.g., stamina)</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. what rank do you assign to <em>firm/sculpted muscles</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. what rank do you assign to <em>physical fitness level</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. what rank do you assign to <em>measurements (e.g., chest, waist, hips)</em>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J. SESSION 1: SOCIOCULTURAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS APPEARANCE
QUESTIONNAIRE 3: INTERNALIZATION SUBSCALE

Please read each of the following items and choose 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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I would like my body to look like the people who are on TV.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I compare my body to the bodies of TV and movie stars.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I would like my body to look like the models who appear on magazines.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I compare my appearance to the appearance of TV and movie stars.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I would like my body to look like the people who are in the movies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I compare my body to the bodies of people who appear in magazines.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I wish I looked like the models in music videos.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I compare my appearance to the appearance of people in magazines.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I try to look like the people on TV.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K. SESSION 1: THE ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. For each statement, please choose the answer that best reflects how you feel about yourself.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At times I think I am no good at all.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel that I am a person of worth, or at least on an equal plane with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I take a positive attitude towards myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L. SESSION 1: DISTRACTOR ITEMS (MUSIC)

We are interested in your music listening habits and preferences. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

1. How much time do you spend per day listening to music?
   a. Less than 1 hour
   b. 1-2 hours
   c. 3-4 hours
   d. 4-5 hours
   e. More than 5 hours

2. How do you listen to music? (check all that apply)
   a. On my computer, laptop, or tablet
   b. On my personal listening device (e.g. ipod)
   c. On online radio
   d. On traditional radio
   e. On my phone
   f. On video service like YouTube
   g. On a home audio system (CD, vinyl, etc.)

3. What genres of music do you frequently enjoy? (check all that apply)
   a. Alternative
   b. Classic
   c. Country
   d. Hard Music
   e. Jazz
   f. R & B
   g. Rap
   h. Soundtrack
   i. Latin
   j. Rock
   k. Electronic
   l. Other ____________

4. Where do you listen to music most frequently?
   a. Work
   b. School
   c. Home
   d. Other

5. How much of an impact does music have on your mood?
   a. No impact
b. A little impact  
c. A fair amount of impact  
d. A large impact  

6. Which of the following reasons do you listen to music? (check all that apply)  
a. I use it as background noise  
b. It motivates me  
c. I use it to reflect what I am already feeling  
d. It helps me study  
e. It makes me feel better when I am feeling down  
f. To dance to  
g. I enjoy it as an art form  
h. Learning another language  

7. Have your overall musical preferences changed in the last 4 years?  
a. Yes  
b. No
APPENDIX M. SESSION 1: DISTRACTOR ITEMS (EMPATHY)

The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. For each item, indicate how well it describes you by choosing the appropriate letter on the scale at the top of the page: A, B, C, D, or E. When you have decided on your answer, fill in the letter next to the item number. READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY BEFORE RESPONDING. Answer as honestly as you can. Thank you.

ANSWER SCALE:

A  B  C  D  E
DOES NOT DESCRIBE ME VERY
AT ALL WELL

1. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both. _______
2. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person. _______
3. When I watch a good movie, I can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character. ____
4. I tend to lose control during emergencies. ______
5. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in his shoes" for a while. ______
6. When I am reading an interesting story or novel, I imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me. ______
7. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces. ______
8. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place. ______
 usando la siguiente escala, seleccione la categoría que se ajuste a la frecuencia con la que ha llevado a cabo las siguientes acciones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>More than once</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have helped push a stranger's car that was broken down or out of gas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have given directions to a stranger.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have made change for a stranger.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have given money to a charity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have given money to a stranger who needed it (or asked me for it).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O. SESSION 1: DISTRACTOR ITEMS (LOCUS OF CONTROL)

For each question select the statement that you agree with the most.

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
   b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
    b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying in really useless.
11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability. Luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There really is no such thing as "luck."

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as a local level.
APPENDIX P. SESSION 1: DISTRACTOR ITEMS (ATTITUDES TOWARDS FEMINISM)

For each of the following statements, please choose the answer that best reflects how you feel about feminism and the women’s movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The leaders of the women's movement may be extreme, but they have the right idea.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There are better ways for women to fight for equality than through the women's movement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More people would favor the women's movement if they knew more about it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The women's movement has positively influenced relationships between men and women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The women's movement is too radical and extreme in its views.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The women's movement has made important gains in equal and political power for women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Feminists are too visionary for a practical world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feminist principles should be adopted everywhere.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Feminists are a menace to the nation and the world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am overjoyed that women's liberation is finally happening in this country.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Q. SESSION 2: TWENTY STATEMENTS TEST

Please take a moment to think about how you feel about yourself and your identity right now. 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. ____________________________
18. ____________________________
19. ____________________________
20. ____________________________
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”) right now, to that which has the least impact on your physical self-concept (rank this as a “0”) right now.

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 entering the ranks in the rightmost column.

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

9 = greatest impact  
8 = next greatest impact  
1 = next to least impact  
0 = least impact

When considering your physical self-concept right now…

| 1. …what rank do you assign to **physical coordination**? |  
| 2. …what rank do you assign to **health**? |  
| 3. …what rank do you assign to **weight**? |  
| 4. …what rank do you assign to **strength**? |  
| 5. …what rank do you assign to **sex appeal**? |  
| 6. …what rank do you assign to **physical attractiveness**? |  
| 7. …what rank do you assign to **energy level (e.g., stamina)**? |  
| 8. …what rank do you assign to **firm/sculpted muscles**? |  
| 9. …what rank do you assign to **physical fitness level**? |  
| 10. …what rank do you assign to **measurements (e.g., chest, waist, hips)**? |  

Write your ranks below ↓
APPENDIX S. SESSION 2: OBJECTIFIED BODY CONSCIOUSNESS SCALE, SELF-SURVEILLANCE SUBSCALE

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am thinking about how I look.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think more about how my body feels than how my body looks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am not comparing how I look with how other people look.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am worrying about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am not worrying about how I look to other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am more concerned with what my body can do than how it looks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX T. SESSION 2: OBJECTIFIED BODY CONSCIOUSNESS SCALE, BODY SHAME SUBSCALE

For each item, please choose the number that represents how strongly you agree or disagree with that statement *right now*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not Applicable</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. When I can't control my weight, I feel like something must be wrong with me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel ashamed of myself when I haven't made the effort to look my best.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel like I must be a bad person when I don't look as good as I could.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would be ashamed for people to know what I really weigh.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I never worry that something is wrong with me when I am not exercising as much as I should.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When I'm not exercising enough, I question whether I am a good enough person.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Even when I can't control my weight, I think I'm an okay person.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When I'm not the size I should be I feel ashamed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX U. SESSION 2: SOCIAL APPEARANCE ANXIETY SCALE

For each item, please indicate how well each statement describes you *right now*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all well</th>
<th>Somewhat well</th>
<th>Reasonably well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Extremely well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I feel comfortable with the way I appear to others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I feel nervous when having my picture taken.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I get tense when it is obvious people are looking at me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am concerned people would not like me because of the way I look.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I worry that others talk about flaws in my appearance when I am not around.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I am concerned people will find me unappealing because of my appearance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am afraid that people find me unattractive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I worry that my appearance will make life more difficult for me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I am concerned that I have missed out on opportunities because of my appearance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I get nervous when talking to people because of the way I look.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I feel anxious when other people say something about my appearance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I am frequently afraid I would not meet others’ standards of how I should look.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I worry people will judge the way I look negatively.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I am uncomfortable when I think others are noticing flaws in my appearance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I worry that a romantic partner will/would leave me because of my appearance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I am concerned that people think I am not good looking.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V. SESSION 2: POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE AFFECT SCHEDULE

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then enter 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>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very slightly or not at all</td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>quite a bit</td>
<td>extremely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guilty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irritable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ashamed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jittery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX W. SESSION 2: DISTRACTOR ITEMS (MUSIC)

We are interested in how you perceived the {first, second} song that you heard. Please answer these questions to the best of your ability.

1. In what genre would you classify the song you heard?
   a. Alternative
   b. Classic
   c. Country
   d. Hard Music
   e. Jazz
   f. R & B
   g. Rap
   h. Soundtrack
   i. Latin
   j. Rock
   k. Electronic
   l. Other _______________________

2. If you know it, please name the title of the song.
   _______________________________________

3. If you know it, please write the name of the artist/s here.
   _______________________________________

4. In 3 sentences or less, what would you say the first {second} song was about?
   _______________________________________
   _______________________________________
   _______________________________________

5. How many times have you heard this song before?
   a. I’ve never heard this song before
   b. Once or twice
   c. Many times
   d. So many times I couldn’t count

6. Please rate how much you liked the song overall.
   a. disliked very much
   b. disliked moderately
c. disliked slightly
d. neither liked nor disliked
e. liked slightly
f. liked moderately
g. liked very much

7. Please rate how much you liked the lyrics of the song.
   a. disliked very much
   b. disliked moderately
   c. disliked slightly
   d. neither liked nor disliked
   e. liked slightly
   f. liked moderately
   g. liked very much

8. Please rate how much you liked the beat of the song.
   a. not at all
   b. very little
   c. somewhat
   d. very much

9. Regardless of how much you liked or did not like the song, did you find yourself singing along with the song in your head?
   a. Yes
   b. No

10. Did you find yourself wanting to dance to the song?
    a. Yes
    b. No

11. How popular would you say this song is/was?
    a. not at all popular
    b. slightly popular
    c. moderately popular
    d. very popular

12. Compared to the first {second} song, how much did you like the second {first} song?
    a. liked it much less
    b. liked it somewhat less
    c. liked it the same
    d. liked it somewhat more
    e. liked it much more
APPENDIX X. SESSION 2: DISTRACTOR ITEMS (EMPATHY)

The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. For each item, indicate how well it describes you by choosing the appropriate letter on the scale at the top of the page: A, B, C, D, or E. When you have decided on your answer, fill in the letter next to the item number. READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY BEFORE RESPONDING. Answer as honestly as you can. Thank you.

ANSWER SCALE:

A B C D E
DOES NOT DESCRIBE DESCRIBES
DESCRIBE ME VERY
AT ALL WELL

1. I daydream and fantasize, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me. ______
2. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me. ______
3. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other guy's" point of view. ______
4. Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems. ______
5. I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel. ______
6. In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease. ______
7. I am usually objective when I watch a movie or play, and I don't often get completely caught up in it. ______
8. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision. ______
9. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them. ______
10. I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation. ______
11. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective. ______
12. Becoming extremely involved in a good book or movie is somewhat rare for me. ______
13. When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm. ______
14. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. ______
15. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments. ______
16. After seeing a play or movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters. ______
17. Being in a tense emotional situation scares me. ______
18. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them. _____
19. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies. ______
20. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen. ______
Using the following scale, please select the category that conforms to the frequency with which you have carried out the following acts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>More than once</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Z. SESSION 2: DISTRACTOR ITEMS (AUTONOMY)

Please indicate what percentage of the time each of the statements below applies to you, by using the scale to the left of the items. Choose the percentage that comes closest to how often the items describe you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is more important that I know I’ve done a good job than having others know it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It bothers me when people try to direct my behavior or activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I prize being a unique individual more than being a member of a group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When I feel sick, I like to be left alone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If I think I am right about something, I feel comfortable expressing myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When visiting people, I get fidgety when sitting around talking and would rather get up and do something.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is more important to meet your own objectives on a task than to meet another person’s objective.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I like to take long walks by myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am not influenced by others in what I decide to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is very important that I feel free to get up and go where ever I want.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I value work accomplishments more than I value making friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I find it is of importance to be in control of my emotions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel more comfortable helping others than receiving help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It is more important to be active and doing things than having close relationships with other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If a goal is important to me I will pursue it even if it may make other people uncomfortable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. When I achieve a goal I get more satisfaction from reaching the goal than from any praise I might get.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I prefer to make my own plans, so I am not controlled by others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I don’t like to answer personal questions because they feel like an invasion of my privacy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. When I have a problem, I like to go off on my own and think it through rather than being influenced by others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. In relationships, people often are too demanding of each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I set my own standards and goals for myself rather than accepting those of other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I enjoy accomplishing things more than being given credit for them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I like to go off on my own, exploring new places—without other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I feel confined when I have to sit through a long meeting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I don’t like people to invade my privacy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The worst part about being in jail would be not being able to move around freely.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The possibility of being rejected by others for standing up for my rights would not stop me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX AA. SESSION 2: DISTRACTOR ITEMS (SOCIOTROPY)

Please indicate what percentage of the time each of the statements below applies to you, by using the scale to the left of the items. Choose the percentage that comes closest to how often the items describes you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel I have to be nice to other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being able to share experiences with other people makes them much more enjoyable for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am afraid of hurting other people’s feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I find it difficult to say “no” to other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel bad if I do not have some social plans for the weekend.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am concerned that if people knew my faults or weaknesses they would not like me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do things that are not in my best interest in order to please others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am more concerned that people like me than I am about making important achievements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I get uncomfortable when I am not sure how I am expected to behave in the presence of other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It would not be much fun for me to travel to a new place all alone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I get uncomfortable around a person who does not clearly like me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I find it difficult to be separated from people I love.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I censor what I say because I am concerned that the other person may disapprove or disagree.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I get lonely when I am home by myself at night.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I often find myself thinking about friends or family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If somebody criticizes my appearance, I feel I am not attractive to other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I like to spend my free time with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX BB. SESSION 2: DISTRACTOR ITEMS (SUBJECTIVE VITALITY)

Please rate the following items in regard to how they apply to you and your life *at the present moment*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Somewhat true</th>
<th>Very true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel alive and vital.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I don’t feel very energetic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel so alive I want to burst.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have energy and spirit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am looking forward to each new day.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel alert and awake.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel energized.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Frequencies of Demographic Variables by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variables</th>
<th>Control (n=23)</th>
<th>Experimental (n=34)</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19.76 (3.51) a</td>
<td>18.71 (1.19)</td>
<td>t = 1.62, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in college</td>
<td>1.70 (1.10)</td>
<td>1.41 (.78)</td>
<td>t = 1.14, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>26.29 (7.89)</td>
<td>24.97 (5.11) b</td>
<td>t = .75, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education c</td>
<td>4.15 (1.09)</td>
<td>3.51 (1.35)</td>
<td>t = 1.86, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily music habits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o &lt; 1 hour per day</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 1-2 hours per day</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 3-4 hours per day</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 4-5 hours per day</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o &gt; 5 hours</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o White</td>
<td>21 (91%)</td>
<td>27 (79%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Nonwhite</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Single</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
<td>14 (41%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Dating (not committed)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Committed relationship</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight loss status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Trying to stay the same weight</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Trying to lose weight</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
<td>22 (65%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Not concerned about weight</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Trying to gain weight</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived weight status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Underweight</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Normal/Average weight</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Overweight</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Obese</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NS= nonsignificant difference

a n=21.
b n=32.
c 1=Less than 12th grade 2=Graduated high school 3=Some college 4=Associates Degree 5=Bachelor Degree 6=Masters Degree 7=Advanced graduate degree
Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations of Hypothesized Moderator Variables by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized Moderator Variables</th>
<th>Control (n=23) M (SD)</th>
<th>Experimental (n=33) M (SD)</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Self-Objectification</td>
<td>2.04 (11.2)</td>
<td>2.82 (12.88)</td>
<td>F (1,54) = .05, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>3.02 (.56)</td>
<td>3.10 (.55)</td>
<td>F (1,54) = .26, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization of Thin Ideals</td>
<td>3.23 (1.31)</td>
<td>3.08 (1.32)</td>
<td>F (1,54) = .33, NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Correlations among the Dependent and Hypothesized Moderator Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Object. (TST)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Object. (SSOQ)</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance Anxiety</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Shame</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Surveillance</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized Moderator Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Self-Objectification</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization of Thin Ideals</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Condition Effects, Means, and Standard Deviations for the Dependent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Control (n=23) M (SD)</th>
<th>Experimental (n=33) M (SD)</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State S.O. (TST)</td>
<td>0.03 (.05)</td>
<td>0.07 (.06)</td>
<td>$F(1,55) = 5.94^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State S.O. (SSOQ)</td>
<td>-0.913 (13.80)</td>
<td>2.64 (13.38)</td>
<td>$F(1,55) = .93$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance Anxiety</td>
<td>2.29 (.96)</td>
<td>2.26 (1.12)</td>
<td>$F(1,55) = .10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Shame</td>
<td>3.86 (1.14)</td>
<td>4.17 (1.76)</td>
<td>$F(1,55) = .55$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Surveillance</td>
<td><strong>3.62 (1.14)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.39 (1.03)</strong></td>
<td>$F(1,55) = 6.94^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>14.74 (4.53)</td>
<td>14.76 (7.48)</td>
<td>$F(1,55) = .00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bold font denotes a significant condition effect on the dependent variable.

* $p < .05$
Table 5

Predicting Dependent Variables with Trait Self-Objectification as the Hypothesized Moderator of Condition Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>State S.O. (TST)</th>
<th>State S.O. (SSOQ)</th>
<th>Appearance Anxiety</th>
<th>Body Shame</th>
<th>Self-surveillance</th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait S.O.</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Trait S.O.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-63</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F(3,52) = 2.56</th>
<th>p = .06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F(3,52) = 5.57</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F(3,52) = .49</td>
<td>p = .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F(3,52) = .50</td>
<td>p = .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F(3,52) = 3.22</td>
<td>p = .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F(3,52) = .40</td>
<td>p = .75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bold font denotes a statistically significant effect at the p < .05 level.
Table 6

Predicting Dependent Variables with Self-Esteem as the Hypothesized Moderator of Condition Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>State S.O. (TST)</th>
<th>State S.O. (SSOQ)</th>
<th>Appearance Anxiety</th>
<th>Body Shame</th>
<th>Self-surveillance</th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-5.57</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-6.15</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-5.97</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-4.51</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>-7.67</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.84</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.48</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Model</td>
<td>R² = .11</td>
<td>R² = .09</td>
<td>R² = .42</td>
<td>R² = .12</td>
<td>R² = .19</td>
<td>R² = .30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (3,53) = 2.29</td>
<td>F (3,53) = 1.71</td>
<td>F (3,53) = 12.85</td>
<td>F (3,53) = 2.44</td>
<td>F (3,53) = 4.00</td>
<td>F (3,53) = 7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .09</td>
<td>p = .18</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td>p = .07</td>
<td>p = .01</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bold font denotes a statistically significant effect at the p < .05 level.
Table 7

**Predicting Dependent Variables with Thin Ideal Internalization as the Hypothesized Moderator of Condition Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>State S.O. (TST)</th>
<th>State S.O. (SSOQ)</th>
<th>Appearance Anxiety</th>
<th>Body Shame</th>
<th>Self-surveillance</th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$se$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$se$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin Ideal Intern.</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-3.35</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Thin Ideal</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-3.78</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Model

- $R^2 = 0.11$
- $F(3, 53) = 2.18$
- $p = .10$

- $R^2 = 0.10$
- $F(3, 53) = 1.87$
- $p = .14$

- $R^2 = 0.25$
- $F(3, 53) = 5.96$
- $p < .01$

- $R^2 = 0.25$
- $F(3, 53) = 5.97$
- $p < .01$

- $R^2 = 0.30$
- $F(3, 53) = 7.35$
- $p < .01$

- $R^2 = 0.10$
- $F(3, 53) = 1.87$
- $p = .15$

Note. Bold font denotes a statistically significant effect at the $p < .05$ level.
Figure 1. Moderating effect of trait self-objectification on state self-objectification.

Figure 2. Moderating effect of thin ideal internalization on self-surveillance.
**Figure 3.** Moderating effect of thin ideal internalization on body shame.