

THE INTERPERSONAL SEXUAL OBJECTIFICATION SCALE

Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale

A Senior Honors Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for graduation

with distinction in Psychology in the undergraduate colleges

of the Ohio State University

by

Angela L. Denchik

The Ohio State University

June 2005

Project Advisor: Professor Tracy L. Tylka, Department of Psychology

Abstract

Research exploring objectification theory (B.L. Fredrickson & T.A. Roberts, 1997) is abundant, yet there is not an instrument available that assesses women's perceived frequency to which they encounter interpersonal sexual objectification. Therefore, such a measure, the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale (ISOS), was developed and evaluated via three independent samples of college women. Study 1 ($N = 327$) supported the construct validity of the ISOS, as it was strongly related to another form of sexism (i.e., sexist discrimination), and was slightly-to-moderately related to constructs represented in objectification theory (i.e., self-objectification and its common forms [body surveillance, internalization of the thin-ideal, body comparison], appearance anxiety, and body shame). Study 2 ($N = 79$) supported the ISOS's discriminant validity, as it was negligibly related to impression management and unrelated to self-deceptive enhancement. Study 3 ($N = 131$) demonstrated that its scores were consistent over a three-week period. All studies supported the internal consistency reliability of its scores. The ISOS should prove useful in future research on interpersonal sexist objectification and exploring the constructs of objectification theory.

Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale

Several scholars (e.g., Bell-Dolan, Foster & Christopher, 1995; Bargad & Hyde, 1991; Nolen-Hoeksema & Girgus, 1994; Striegel-Moore, Silberstein, & Rodin, 1986) have questioned why women report significantly more symptoms of depression, disordered eating, and sexual dysfunction than do men. One explanation for why women unduly experience these symptoms involves the widespread societal devaluation of women. In particular, women are often sexually objectified within their interpersonal relationships and via media outlets; this objectification places them at increased risk for experiencing psychological distress (Brownlow, 1997; Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Tylka & Hill, 2004). One theory that provides a framework for explaining the psychological consequences sexual objectification has on women is objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

The authors of objectification theory have asserted that sexual objectification occurs when a woman's body, body parts, and sexual functions are separated from her as a person and therefore exists for the use and pleasure of others. According to Fredrickson and Roberts (1997), women can experience sexual objectification in many everyday activities, such as interactions with friends, family, strangers, and acquaintances. Indeed, interpersonal and social encounters present many possibilities for sexual objectification of women. Sexual objectification is proposed to lead to a negative impact on women, because as women experience the various forms of sexual objectification, they begin to perceive themselves as objects, and this can lead to a variety of negative psychological health consequences (Frederickson & Roberts, 1997). Specifically, an immediate consequence of sexual objectification is self-objectification, or women's treatment of their own bodies as objects to be looked at and evaluated. Women who self-objectify constantly monitor their physical appearance and view their bodies as existing for the pleasure of others. In turn, self-objectification is related to elevated levels of body shame (i.e., negative emotions associated with not meeting cultural expectations of the

ideal body) and appearance anxiety in women (Noll, Fredrickson, Roberts, Quinn & Twenge, 1998), which then can lead to decreases in psychological well-being, such as depression, eating disorders, and sexual dysfunction.

Given that sexual objectification both directly and indirectly predicts negative orientation to the body and psychological distress, its role in objectification theory is fundamental. However, this variable often is excluded when testing the objectification theory framework. Despite this fact, objectification theory as it applies to women's psychological distress has been heavily researched. Most of this research focuses on how self-objectification can predict negative health consequences such as disordered eating (e.g., Morry & Staska, 2001; Noll & Fredrickson, 1998; Tiggemann & Slater, 2001; Tylka & Hill, 2004) and depression (Noll et al., 1998). Several studies have adequately tested aspects of objectification theory; however, none have tested the perceived interpersonal sexual objectification construct (Noll & Fredrickson, 1998; Tiggeman & Lynch, 2001; Tylka & Hill, 2004). Scholars have either excluded this construct from their model (i.e., Noll & Fredrickson, 1998; Tiggemann & Lynch, 2001) or they have included only an indirect measure of sexual objectification (i.e., pressure for thinness; Tylka & Hill, 2004). Whereas this research has provided much needed insight with regard to how self-objectification influences psychological health, adequate testing of the objectification theory framework is limited because a measure of sexual objectification is not included within the model.

In fact, to the author's knowledge, a measure designed specifically to assess interpersonal sexual objectification has not been developed and psychometrically evaluated. Incorporation of such a measure into objectification theory research could facilitate the exploration of how perceived interpersonal sexual objectification is associated with women's psychological health. Inclusion of such an instrument would facilitate more complete investigations of the objectification theory framework.

Given the above, the present study sought to develop and explore the psychometric properties of a measure of interpersonal sexual objectification, the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale (ISOS). In the following three studies, the development and preliminary psychometric evaluation of the ISOS is discussed. In particular, the reliability (internal consistency, test-retest) of its scores and its construct (convergent, concurrent, and discriminant) validity evidence are explored. This measure could be used to add incrementally to the research exploring sexual objectification in general and the constructs of objectification theory in particular. In the following sections, the rationales for why the ISOS should be related to measures of sexist discrimination, self-objectification, appearance anxiety, and body shame, and should not be related to impression management are provided.

Sexist Discrimination

Women often are devalued and face discrimination in their interactions with significant others and acquaintances. Klonoff and Landrine (1995) conceptualized these instances of discrimination as sexist events, which can range from subtle (e.g., being treated with lack of respect, not receiving credit for their work, being the object of another's gaze, being whistled at while walking down the street) to blatant (e.g., sexual harassment, physical abuse, rape, sexual assault; Landrine & Klonoff, 1997). These events often are very widespread, intertwined within women's lives, and believed to have a greater negative impact on women's physical and mental health than general life stressors because they are highly personal and attack an essential quality of the self that cannot be changed (Landrine & Klonoff, 1997). Sexist discrimination minimizes women's importance in society and their internal attributes. Sexist discrimination can take many forms, one of which is interpersonal sexual objectification, as women are treated differently due to the fact that they are women (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Landrine, Klonoff, Gibbs, Manning, & Lund, 1995). Their inner characteristics, such as their personalities and intellect, are minimized and their physical appearance is evaluated and

criticized. Due to the fact that interpersonal sexual objectification is considered a form of sexist discrimination, the ISOS should be strongly related to sexist discrimination.

Self-Objectification

According to objectification theory, experiences with interpersonal sexual objectification (e.g., having your body gazed at or being made aware that your body is an object for others to look at) may likely lead women to internalize the objectification, making them preoccupied with their body's appearance (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Calogero, 2004). In other words, interpersonal sexual objectification can lead directly to self-objectification, which entails assuming the perspective of an observer rather than relying upon their own internal perspective (e.g., focusing on personality and intellect). If a woman self-objectifies, she scrutinizes and judges her body. There are different ways self-objectification can be expressed, such as body surveillance (i.e., habitual monitoring of the body), internalization of the thin-ideal stereotype, and body comparison (Fredrickson, Roberts, Noll, Quinn, & Twenge, 1998; McKinley & Hyde, 1996; Parsons & Betz, 2001; Tiggeman & Slater, 2001; Tylka & Hill, 2004). An example of body surveillance is when women constantly examine themselves in a mirror and spend their energies dwelling on their appearance. Internalization of the thin-ideal stereotype occurs when women believe that the thin ideal societal prototype is the most (and only) desirable body shape (Heinberg, Thompson, & Stormer, 1995). Body comparison occurs when women focus on comparing their body parts to other women (Fisher, Dunn, & Thompson, 2002), and thus treat their own bodies as well as other bodies as objects to be scrutinized and aesthetically evaluated. Therefore, one way to determine whether the ISOS shows evidence of validity is to determine whether it is related to these various forms of self-objectification.

Body Shame and Appearance Anxiety

In addition, interpersonal sexual objectification can both directly and indirectly (i.e., through

self-objectification) impact women's negative attitudes toward their bodies (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Tylka & Hill, 2004). Directly experiencing sexual objectification encourages women to feel shameful towards their bodies as well as anxious about their appearance, as their bodies are the targets of the objectification (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

Interpersonal sexual objectification can also indirectly impact body shame and appearance anxiety through self-objectification. The most direct consequence of self-objectification occurs when women compare themselves to the cultural thin-ideal stereotype (Tylka & Hill, 2004). Because this stereotype is impossible for most women to obtain, these women often decide that they do not meet the thin-ideal standard, and consequently experience body shame. Women experiencing body shame tend to attribute the negativity towards their whole self, rather than solely their body (Lewis, 1971; McKinley & Hyde, 1996). This generalized shame is a result of women being socialized to think of their self worth as equal to their external appearance (McKinley & Hyde, 1996). Body shame often is associated with morals, and this connection between moral values and body values makes the perceived failure of not attaining the thin-ideal physique of a woman all that more significant. Another proposed consequence of self-objectification is appearance anxiety, or constantly worrying about one's appearance and others' evaluation of it (Dion, Dion & Keelan, 1990). Dion et al. (1990) found that women experience this appearance anxiety more than men and attributed this finding to the societal sexual objectification of women and women's internalization of this objectification. Consequently, because interpersonal sexual objectification is directly and indirectly associated with body shame and appearance anxiety, the ISOS should be related to these constructs.

Socially Desirable Responding

According to Paulhus (1994), socially desirable responding can take two major forms, self-deceptive enhancement and impression management. Self-deceptive enhancement reflects the

tendency to give honest but inflated self-descriptions, whereas impression management represents the intentional offering of inflated self-descriptions to an audience (Paulhus, 1994). Because impression management involves overt behaviors, any distortion is presumably a conscious lie (Sackeim, Gur, & Saucy, 1978). People who score high on social desirability over-report their performance of a wide variety of desirable behaviors and under-report undesirable behaviors. As a result, the ISOS should be either unrelated or negligibly related to these forms of socially desirable responding.

STUDY 1

The purpose of Study 1 was to conduct an initial examination of the ISOS's internal consistency reliability and construct validity. As interpersonal sexual objectification is a form of sexist discrimination, it is hypothesized that the ISOS will be strongly related to sexist discrimination; this will demonstrate evidence of convergent validity. Furthermore, because objectification theory asserts that interpersonal sexual objectification will lead to self-objectification, body shame, and appearance anxiety (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997), it is hypothesized that the ISOS should be related to self-objectification and its forms (i.e., body surveillance, internalization of the thin-ideal, body comparison), body shame, and appearance anxiety. These findings would further support the construct validity of the ISOS.

Method

Participants

Three hundred and twenty seven college women from the Marion and main campuses of The Ohio State University (OSU) participated in Study 1. Women at the main campus of OSU signed up to participate via the Psychology Department's organized research program (i.e., REP), and women at the Marion campus were recruited in their general and upper-level psychology classes. Participants from the main campus, composed of 276 women, identified themselves mostly as Caucasian (88.7%),

followed in frequency by Asian American (6%), Latina (3%), African American (1%), Native American (1%), and other (.3%) The mean age was 18.45 years. Participants from the Marion campus, totaling fifty-one, identified themselves mostly as Caucasian (96%) followed by African-American (4%). The breakdown of the participants' school status was: first-year (84.4%), sophomore (11.6%), junior (2.1%), senior (1.2%), and post-baccalaureate (0.6%). The women labeled their socioeconomic statuses as follows: upper class (2.4%), upper-middle class (47.7%), middle class (44.3%), and working class (4.3%).

Measures

Development of the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale (ISOS). The development of the ISOS was rational. Its items (see Appendix A) were created to reflect aspects of interpersonal sexual objectification identified by Fredrickson and Roberts (1997). Consistent with the tradition of assessing sexist events (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995), items were created that explored interpersonal sexual objectification over women's lifetime (i.e., lifetime subscale) and specifically over the past year (recent subscale). Forty-six items (23 per each subscale) initially were created to reflect this construct. A group consisting of a counseling psychologist who has interest in discrimination and psychometric instrument development and two graduate students in counseling psychology wrote these items. This group met and discussed each item, revising it for clarity and determining whether it contributed uniquely to the measure. This process resulted in the rewording of nine items and the deletion of four items that were redundant in content with four of the remaining items. Following initial item generation, the group sought feedback from a counseling psychologist who has interest in sexual objectification and psychometric instrument development to assess face validity; she believed that the items accurately reflected the content domain. This final measure was piloted on 35 undergraduate college women, and the women indicated that each item was easy to read. Scores for these items were

found to be internally consistent for the lifetime ($\alpha = .89$) and recent ($\alpha = .87$) subscales. Therefore, each item was retained without additional modification. The ISOS items are rated along a 5-point scale (i.e., 1 = *never*, 2 = *rarely*, 3 = *occasionally*, 4 = *frequently*, 5 = *almost always*), and subscale items are summed to obtain overall subscale scores. Higher scores reflect higher interpersonal sexual objectification. For the present study, alpha was found to be .90 for the lifetime subscale and .87 for the recent subscale.

Demographics. Students were asked to fill out an information page composed of questions about their background (see Appendix K).

Sexist discrimination. The Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE; Klonoff & Landrine, 1995; see Appendix B) contains 20 items that assess perceived frequency of sexist discrimination. Items are rated along a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*the event never happened*) to 6 (*the event happened almost all the time*). A sample item is, “How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employer, boss, or supervisors because you are a woman?” Each item is completed twice to assess the frequency of perceived sexist events in the participant’s life and within the past year. Items are summed to obtain subscale scores (i.e., SSE-Lifetime, SSE-Recent); each subscale has a possible range of scores from 20 to 120. Higher scores indicate greater perceived sexist discrimination. The internal consistency reliability of its scores has been supported among samples of college women (Fischer et al., 2000). For the present study, alpha was .91 for the SSE-Lifetime subscale scores and .91 for the SSE-Recent subscale scores. Supporting its construct validity, Klonoff and Landrine (1995) found that scores on SSE-Lifetime and SSE-Recent were related positively to the reported frequency of daily hassles. Fischer et al. (2000) reported either nonsignificant or negligible correlations between SSE scores and social desirability, thus supporting its discriminant validity.

Self-objectification. The first measure of self-objectification, the Self-Objectification

Questionnaire (Noll & Fredrickson, 1998; see Appendix C), consists of twelve items ranging from weight to physical fitness level where participants rank how important a trait is to their physical self-concept. Each attribute is given one number from 1 to 12, each item receiving only one number with 1 being the most important to 12 being the least important. It has been found to demonstrate evidence of construct validity, as it is related to body shame (Noll & Fredrickson, 1998). Because it is a rank-ordered measure, alpha could not be conducted on its items.

Participants' level of body surveillance, a specific form of self-objectification, was measured using the 8-item body surveillance subscale of the Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (OBC; McKinley & Hyde, 1996; see Appendix D). Items (e.g., "During the day, I think about how I look many times") are rated along a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Its items are averaged to arrive at a total subscale score. McKinley and Hyde (1996) reported that the body surveillance scores were internally consistent, stable over a 2-week period, and demonstrated evidence of construct validity. For the present study, alpha was .87 for the surveillance subscale scores.

The Internalization subscale of the Sociocultural Attitudes Toward Appearance Questionnaire (SATAQ-I; Heinberg et al., 1995; see Appendix E) also was used to measure a specific form of self-objectification: internalization of the thin-ideal stereotype. Its 8 items assess internalization of the society's emphasis on appearance in general and on thinness in particular (e.g., "I believe that clothes look better on thin models"). Items are rated on a scale ranging from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 5 (*completely agree*). The items are averaged with higher scores indicating greater internalization of the thin-ideal stereotype. Its items were internally consistent in previous samples of college women (e.g., $\alpha = .88$; Heinberg et al., 1995). Factor analyses have indicated that all 8 items load highly on one factor, supporting its unidimensionality, and its relation with the Ideal Body Stereotype Scale (Stice,

Nemeroff, & Shaw, 1996) supports its convergent validity (Tylka & Subich, 2004). In this study, the alpha of the SATAQ-I scores was .93.

The Body Comparison Scale (Fisher & Thompson, 1998; see Appendix F) was the third measure of self-objectification. It contains 25 items measuring how often one compares specific body sites (e.g., nose, lips, hair, waist, thighs, etc.), as well as overall body shape, to other individuals of the same sex. Item responses range from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*) and are averaged to arrive at a total score. Higher total scores reflect greater body comparison. Its scores have been shown to be internally consistent and demonstrate evidence of construct validity (Sabik & Tylka, in press). For the present study, alpha of the BCS scores was .93.

Body shame. Participants' level of body shame was measured using the 8-item body shame subscale of the Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (OBC; McKinley & Hyde, 1996; see Appendix G). Items (e.g., "I feel ashamed of myself when I haven't made the effort to look my best") are rated along a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Its items are averaged to arrive at an overall subscale score. Body shame subscale scores have been found to be internally consistent, stable over a 2-week period, and related to measures of negative body image (McKinley & Hyde, 1996). For the present study, alpha for its scores was .85.

Appearance anxiety. Dion et al.'s (1990) 14-item brief version of the Appearance Anxiety Scale (AAS; see Appendix H) was used to assess the degree to which participants report incident of anxiety about their bodies. Items (e.g., "I wish I were better looking") are rated along a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*almost always*). The items were averaged to yield a total score, with a higher total score interpreted as a higher degree of appearance anxiety. Researchers have found this version of the AAS to have internally consistent scores ($\alpha = .86$), its scores are stable over a 2-week period ($r = .89$), and that it is strongly related to public self-consciousness, and audience anxiety (Dion

et al., 1990). For the present study, the alpha was .94 for its scores.

Procedure

Participants were each given the packet of measures described above, were informed of the purpose of the study, instructed on what they will be asked to do (see Appendix I), and told that they can leave at any time without penalty. After obtaining their informed consent, participants filled out the surveys in a classroom setting used as a research laboratory, which took approximately 25 minutes. The measures were counterbalanced to control for order effects. Participants received general psychology course credit for their involvement.

Results and Discussion

Women who did not complete at least 90% of any measure were not included in the data set. Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the measures are included in Table 1. Correlations of .10 were considered small, correlations of .30 were considered moderate, and correlations of .50 were considered large (Cohen, 1992). Correlations below .20 may be statistically significant (due to large sample size $N = 327$), but not necessarily practically significant.

Internal Consistency Reliability

In order to establish the internal consistency reliability of the ISOS lifetime and recent scores, we used Cronbach's alpha. Alpha was .90 for the lifetime subscale items and .87 for the recent subscale items. These values support the internal consistency reliability of the ISOS's subscale scores.

Convergent Validity

Pearson r correlations were calculated between the Schedule of Sexist Events and the ISOS to test the hypothesis that the two scales are strongly related, as they assess similar constructs. We specifically posited that the lifetime subscales for each the ISOS and SSE, and the recent subscales for each the ISOS and SSE, would be highly correlated. As predicted, higher ISOS lifetime scores were

strongly related to SSE lifetime scores ($r = .54$), and higher ISOS recent scores were strongly related to SSE recent scores. These results provide preliminary support for convergent validity of the ISOS.

Additional Construct Validity Evidence

Pearson r correlations between the total scores of the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Questionnaire and the other study measures were computed in order to test the hypothesis that interpersonal sexual objectification (i.e., ISOS subscale scores) would be related to other constructs included within objectification theory (i.e., self-objectification, body shame, and appearance anxiety). For exploring the relation between ISOS scores and self-objectification, the ISOS was slightly-to-moderately related to overall self-objectification ($r = .18$ for the lifetime subscale and $r = .19$ for the recent scale), body surveillance ($r = .26$ for the lifetime subscale and $r = .35$ for the recent subscale), internalization of the thin-ideal stereotype ($r = .36$ for the lifetime subscale and $r = .42$ for the recent subscale), and body comparison ($r = .31$ for the lifetime subscale and $r = .35$ for the recent subscale). The ISOS was moderately related to body shame ($r = .26$ for the lifetime subscale and $r = .30$ for the recent subscale), but only slightly related to appearance anxiety ($r = .13$ for the lifetime subscale and $r = .19$ for the recent subscale). Overall, these relationships suggest additional support for the construct validity of the ISOS subscales.

STUDY 2

The purpose of Study 2 was to determine whether the ISOS was related to socially desirable responding. The ISOS should not be strongly related to a measure of socially desirable responding; if this finding is supported, discriminant validity would be garnered for the ISOS subscales.

Method

Participants

College women ($N = 79$) from The Ohio State University main campus participated in Study 2.

Women ranged in age from 18-37 years ($M = 19.29$, $SD = 2.43$), and most identified themselves as Caucasian American (74.7%), followed in frequency by African American (12.7%), Latino (3.8%), Asian American (3.8%), Native American (3.8%), and multiracial (1.3%). A large majority of the participants were first-year students (68.4%), and the remaining participants were sophomores (15.2%), juniors (10.1%), seniors (2.5%), post-baccalaureate students (1.3%) and 2.5% indicated “other” without further elaboration. Many women described themselves as middle class (51.9%), and upper-middle class (31.6%), whereas fewer women labeled themselves as working class (8.9%) and upper class (6.5%).

Measures

The ISOS, described in detail in Study 1, was used in Study 2.

The other measure used in Study 2 was the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding Version 6 (BIDR-6; Paulhus, 1994; see Appendix J). The BIDR-6 is a 40-item measure of the tendency to give socially desirable responses. It contains two relatively independent subscales: self-deceptive enhancement (SDE; 20 items), which measures the tendency to give honest but inflated self-descriptions, and impression management (IM; 20 items), which measures the tendency to give intentionally inflated self-descriptions and to consciously conceal socially undesirable behaviors (e.g., swearing, eavesdropping, littering). BIDR-6 items are rated along a 7-point scale ranging from *not at all true* to *very true*. After appropriate items are reverse-scored, one point is added for each “6” or “7” item response, and responses are summed to arrive at total subscale scores. Higher scores reflect greater self-deceptive enhancement and impression management. The SDE subscale scores yield mediocre to adequate internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .65 - .75$) and are somewhat consistent over a 5-week period ($r = .66$), and it is related to other measures of desirable responding (Paulhus, 1994). The IM scores yield adequate internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .75 - .80$) and are consistent over a 5-

week period ($r = .77$), and it is related to other measures of desirable responding (Paulhus, 1994). For the present study, alpha was .66 for the SDE scores and .75 for the IM scores.

Procedure

Participants were asked to fill out the ISOS and BIDR-IM and BIDR-SDE scales, which were presented in counterbalanced order. Women were informed of the purpose of the study (see Appendix I) and told that they can leave at any time without penalty. After obtaining their informed consent and assuring the anonymity of their responses, participants filled out the surveys. They received general psychology course credit for their involvement.

Results and Discussion

Women who did not answer more than 90% of the items were not included in this study. Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the measures are included in Table 2. As indicated in Table 2, the ISOS was not significantly related to self-deceptive enhancement ($r = .05$ for the lifetime subscale and $r = .15$ for the recent subscale). The ISOS was not significantly related to impression management; these relations ($r = .21$ for both the lifetime and recent subscales) were not substantial in size as a result of small sample size ($N = 79$). Results indicate slight practical significance. Overall, the finding that the ISOS subscales were not related to self-deceptive enhancement and impression management provides some evidence for the ISOS's discriminant validity. Alpha was .91 for both the ISOS lifetime and recent subscale scores, further yielding evidence of the internal consistency reliability of these scores.

STUDY 3

Evaluating the temporal stability of the ISOS is necessary. Therefore, Study 3 was conducted to assess the test-retest reliability of its scores.

Method

Participants

A total of 131 women (mean age = 21.58 years, $SD = 6.47$; range 18-47 years) enrolled in general psychology courses at The Ohio State University main campus and Marion campus participated in Study 3. Women at the main campus, totaling 117, (90.3%) identified themselves as Caucasian American, followed in frequency by African American (5%), Asian American (2%), Latina (.9%), Native American (.9%), and other (.9%). Participants from the Marion campus, totaling fourteen, identified themselves as Caucasian American (100%). Most women were first-year students (55%) and the remaining participants were sophomores (16.8%), juniors (9.2%), seniors (15.3%), and post-baccalaureate students (3.8%). Most women reported their socioeconomic status as middle class (56.5%) and upper-middle class (37.4%), whereas fewer women endorsed working class (5.3%) and upper class (0.8%) labels.

Measure

The ISOS, described in detail in Study 1, was used in Study 3. For the first administration, its mean was 54.32 ($SD = 11.03$) for the lifetime subscale and 50.19 ($SD = 13.27$) for the recent subscale. For the second administration, its mean was 53.45 ($SD = 12.93$) for the lifetime subscale and 47.95 ($SD = 14.30$) for the recent subscale.

Procedure

Women were recruited via verbal announcements of the experiment given in their general psychology classes or through a description of the experiment on the psychology department webpage. For each administration, the women were asked to write a code (consisting of the first two letters of their mother's maiden name and the last two digits of their phone number) on their questionnaire. This code permitted the experimenter to match participants' initial and follow-up responses. After we

ensured the confidentiality of their responses and obtained their consent to participate, they completed the ISOS in a classroom used as a research lab. They also completed the ISOS three weeks later in the same setting. Participants received course credit for their participation.

Results and Discussion

Results indicate adequate stability of the ISOS subscale scores over a three-week period ($r = .82$ for the lifetime subscale and $r = .88$ for the recent subscale). In addition, alphas for the first ($\alpha = .90$ for both subscale scores) and second ($\alpha = .94$ for the lifetime and $\alpha = .95$ for the recent subscale scores) administrations provided further evidence of the internal consistency reliability of the ISOS's scores.

Overall Discussion

Numerous studies (e.g., Noll & Fredrickson, 1998; Tiggemann & Lynch, 2001; Tiggemann & Slater, 2001; Tylka & Hill, 2004) have provided empirical support for some of the constructs embedded in objectification theory, demonstrating that self-objectification of one's own body is associated with negative attitudes towards the body and psychological distress. However, these studies do not include a measure of women's perceived interpersonal sexual objectification, which is necessary for a more comprehensive examination of the theory. Until now, a measure of interpersonal sexual objectification has not been proposed. The present study contributed to filling this gap in the literature by developing and psychometrically evaluating such a measure. Collectively, the results from three independent samples of women indicated that the ISOS has excellent psychometric support, as its scores were internally consistent and stable over a 3-week period, it demonstrated evidence of convergent validity via its strong relationships to sexist discrimination, and it yielded additional construct validity via its relations to overall self-objectification and its forms (i.e., body surveillance, internalization of the thin-ideal stereotype, body comparison), body shame and appearance anxiety.

The ISOS would be useful for researchers in their examination of models of objectification theory. Adequate reliability and validity of measure scores are needed to meet the assumptions of many statistical designs (e.g., path analysis, latent variable structural equation modeling, hierarchical multiple regression, longitudinal analyses), and the psychometric evidence garnered for the ISOS scores supports the use of these analyses with this measure. The ISOS is easy to administer and score, and requires only a few minutes to complete. These appealing features would facilitate its incorporation within research questionnaire packets and implementation within clinical settings. Practitioners, to better understand their clientele, could then apply research done using the ISOS. The way women interpret sexual objectification is vastly important in being able to develop psychological well-being. Practitioners can use this information to help promote coping skills to deal with sexual objectification and its negative consequences. Research using the ISOS can be used in a variety of settings like private practice, college counseling centers, and elementary and high schools.

Limitations and Future Research

Evidence of the reliability and validity of the ISOS should be considered tentative, as additional psychometric investigation is imperative. Only samples of college women were used to investigate its psychometric properties. Most of these women were young-adult, Caucasian, first-year students, and middle to upper-middle class. It is important to determine whether the ISOS yields reliable and valid scores with other samples of women, such as women of color, older women, lesbians, and community women not in college.

Second, the present study used self-report measures that are susceptible to erroneous responding, as they rely on participants' accurate recollections and perceptions of events. Women's perceptions of what constituted an instance of interpersonal sexual objectification were investigated, and actual levels of interpersonal sexual objectification were not measured. According to Moradi and

Subich (2004), a variety of individual difference (e.g., race, knowledge about prejudice, affect) and contextual (e.g., the intensity and impact of the event) variables determine peoples' judgments about what constitutes an instance of sexism. Such variables may have impacted our findings. Future research, therefore, could explore the relations between actual levels of interpersonal sexual objectification and measures of self-objectification, body shame, and appearance anxiety. However, it is important to mention that the purpose of the ISOS is to measure the perception of interpersonal sexual objectification. How a woman interprets this objectification, regardless of its actual degree or intent, is crucial to examine.

Future studies might also examine whether third variables moderate or buffer the relationship between interpersonal sexual objectification and self-objectification. Certainly, not all women who perceive high levels of interpersonal sexual objectification within their environment self-objectify and experience body shame and anxiety. Perhaps some variables such as feminist consciousness may protect women who perceive high levels of interpersonal sexual objectification from engaging in self-objectification and feeling shame and anxiety toward their bodies. Other variables, such as negative affect, may place women experiencing high levels of interpersonal sexual objectification at an even increased risk for engaging in self-objectification and holding negative body attitudes. Perceptions of women may be very different for women of color depending on her specific ethnic identity. It would be useful to learn what, if any difference, this may be.

The ISOS is broken down into recent events, and life events. Future research might look at the ISOS recent results as a more powerful predictor of psychological stress. This may be a more accurate perception based on a woman's last year of perceived interpersonal sexual objectification.

Last, it is recommended that a factor analysis is conducted on the ISOS subscales to determine whether it has distinct factors. Such factors, if found, would be useful to examine separately in

research on objectification theory.

References

- Archer, D., Iritani, B., Kimes, D. D., & Barrios, M. (1983). Face-ism: Five studies of sex differences in facial prominence. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 45*, 725-735.
- Bargad, A., & Hyde, S. (1991). Women's studies: A study of feminist identity development in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 181-201.
- Bell-Dolan, D. J., Foster, S. L., & Christopher, J. S. (1995). Girls' peer relations and internalizing problems: Are socially neglected, rejected, and withdrawn girls at risk? *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 24*, 463-473.
- Brownlow, B. S. (1997). *The relationship between objectification, body image disturbances, and disordered eating: Investigating race, socioeconomic status, acculturation, and self-objectification as mediators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Duke University.
- Calogero, R. M. (2004). A Test Of Objectification Theory: The Effect Of The Male Gaze On Appearance Concerns In College Women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*, 16-21.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 155-159.
- Dion, K. L., Dion, K. K., & Keelan, J. P. (1990). Appearance anxiety as a dimension of social-evaluative anxiety: Exploring the ugly duckling syndrome. *Contemporary Social Psychology, 14*, 220-224.
- Fischer, A.R., Tokar, D.M., Mergl, M.M., Good, G.E., Hill, M.S., & Blum, S.A. (2000). Assessing women's feminist identity development: Studies of convergent, discriminant, and structural validity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*, 15-29.
- Fisher, E., Dunn, M., & Thompson, J. K. (2002). Social comparison and body image: An investigation of body comparison processes using multidimensional scaling. *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology, 21*, 566-579.

- Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 173-206.
- Fredrickson, B. L., Roberts, T., Noll, S. M., Quinn, D. M., & Twenge, J. M. (1998). That swimsuit becomes you: Sex differences in self-objectification, restrained eating, and math performance. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 75*, 269-284.
- Heinberg, L. J., Thompson, J. K., & Stormer, S. (1995). Development and validation of the sociocultural attitudes towards appearance questionnaire. *International Journal of Eating Disorders, 17*, 81-89.
- Klonoff, E.A., & Landrine, H. (1995). The Schedule of Sexist Events: A measure of lifetime and recent sexist discrimination in women's lives. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*, 439-472.
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E.A. (1997). *Discrimination against women: Prevalence, consequences, remedies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Landrine, H., Klonoff, E.A., Gibbs, J., Manning, V., & Lund, M. (1995). Physical and psychiatric correlates of gender discrimination: An application of the Schedule of Sexist Events. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*, 473-492.
- Lewis, H. B. (1971). Shame and guilt in neurosis. *Psychoanalytic Review, 58*, 419-438.
- McKinley, N. M., & Hyde, S. (1996). The objectified body consciousness scale: Development and validation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*, 181-215.
- Moradi, B., & Subich, L.M. (2004). Examining the moderating role of self-esteem in the link between experiences of perceived sexist events and psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 50-56.
- Morry, M. M., & Staska, L. (2001). Magazine exposure: Internalization, self-objectification, eating attitudes, and body satisfaction in male and female university students. *Canadian*

Journal of Behavioural Science, 33, 269-279.

- Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Girgus, S. (1994). The emergence of gender differences in depression during adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 424-443.
- Noll, S. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). A mediational model linking self-objectification, body shame, and disordered eating. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 623-636.
- Parsons, E. M., & Betz, E. (2001). The relationship of participation in sports and physical activity to body objectification, instrumentality, and locus of control among young women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 25, 209-222.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1994). *Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding reference manual for BIDR Version 6*. Vancouver, British Columbia, University of British Columbia.
- Sabik, N., & Tylka, T. L. (in press). Do feminist identity styles moderate the relationship between perceived sexist events and disordered eating? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*.
- Sackeim, H. A., Gur, R. C., & Saucy, M. C. (1978). Emotions are expressed more intensely on the left side of the face. *Science*, 202, 434-436.
- Stice, E., Nemeroff, C., & Shaw, H. E. (1996). Test of the dual pathway model of bulimia nervosa: Evidence for dietary restraint and affect regulation mechanisms. *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology*, 15, 340-363.
- Striegel-Moore, R. H., Silberstein, L. R., & Rodin, J. (1986). Toward an understanding of risk factors for bulimia. *American Psychologist*, 41, 246-263.
- Tiggemann, M., & Lynch, E. (2001). Body image across the life span in adult women: The role of self-objectification. *Developmental Psychology*, 37, 243-253.
- Tiggemann, M., & Slater, A. (2001). A test of objectification theory in former dancers and non-dancers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 25, 57-64.

Tylka, T. L. & Hill (2004). Objectification theory as it relates to disordered eating among college women. *Sex Roles, 51*, 719-730.

Tylka, T. L., & Subich, M. (2004). Examining a multidimensional model of eating disorder symptomatology among college women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 314-328.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations among the Measures of Study 1 (N = 327)

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. ISOS-Lifetime	----									
2. ISOS-Recent	.74**	----								
3. SSE-Lifetime	.54**	.39**	----							
4. SSE-Recent	.43**	.53**	.81**	----						
5. Self-Objectification Quest.	.18**	.19**	.14*	.15**	----					
6. OBC-Body Surveillance	.26**	.35**	.12*	.22**	.40**	----				
7. SATAQ-Internalization	.36**	.42**	.19**	.26**	.35**	.63**	----			
8. Body Comparison Scale	.31**	.35**	.34**	.37**	.25**	.52**	.60**	----		
9. OBC-Body Shame	.26**	.30**	.18**	.25**	.20**	.58**	.57**	.42**	----	
10. Appearance Anxiety Scale	.13*	.19**	.10	.16**	.28**	.63**	.55**	.47**	.64**	----
<i>M</i>	52.15	52.35	39.50	36.60	7.79	4.86	3.42	2.81	3.90	2.87
<i>SD</i>	10.31	11.68	12.13	12.31	18.83	1.02	.95	.63	.90	.84

Note. ISOS = Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale, SSE = Schedule of Sexist Events, OBC = Objectified Body Consciousness Scale, SATAQ = Sociocultural Attitudes Toward Appearance Questionnaire

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations among the Measures of Study 2 (N = 79)

Measures	1	2	3	4
1. ISOS-Lifetime	----			
2. ISOS-Recent	.75**	----		
3. BIDR-Self deceptive enhancement	.05	.15	----	
4. BIDR-Impression management	.21	.21	.40**	----
<i>M</i>	54.42	52.72	3.58	6.47
<i>SD</i>	11.44	12.46	2.20	3.15

Note. ISOS = Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale, BIDR = Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$.

Appendix A

Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale (ISOS)

Please think carefully about your life as you answer the questions below. For each question, read the question and then answer it twice: answer once for what your ENTIRE LIFE (from when you were a child to now) has been like, and once for what the PAST YEAR has been like. Then circle the appropriate answer.

How often have you been whistled at while walking down a street?

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| 1. How many times <u>IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |
| 2. How many times <u>IN THE PAST YEAR</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |

How often have you noticed someone staring at your breasts when you are talking to them?

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| 3. How many times <u>IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |
| 4. How many times <u>IN THE PAST YEAR</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |

How often have you felt like or known that someone was evaluating your physical appearance?

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| 5. How many times <u>IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |
| 6. How many times <u>IN THE PAST YEAR</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |

How often have you been called a name that is sexist, like whore, bitch, etc?

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| 7. How many times <u>IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |
| 8. How many times <u>IN THE PAST YEAR</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |

How often have you felt that someone was staring at your body?

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| 9. How many times <u>IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |
| 10. How many times <u>IN THE PAST YEAR</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |

How often have you heard someone make negative comments about your body or a body part?

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| 11. How many times <u>IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |
| 12. How many times <u>IN THE PAST YEAR</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |

How often have you had a romantic partner that seemed to be more interested in your body than in you as a person?

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| 13. How many times <u>IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |
| 14. How many times <u>IN THE PAST YEAR</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |

How often have you noticed someone leering at your body?

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| 15. How many times <u>IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |
| 16. How many times <u>IN THE PAST YEAR</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |

How often have you heard a rude, sexual remark made about your body?

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| 17. How many times <u>IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |
| 18. How many times <u>IN THE PAST YEAR</u> ? | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Almost Always |

How often have you been praised (in a sexual way) for having a nice body or body part?

19. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 20. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

How often have you been touched or fondled against your will?

21. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 22. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

How often have you been the victim of sexual harassment (on the job, in school, etc)?

23. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 24. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

How often have you been honked at when you were walking down the street?

25. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 26. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

How often have you seen someone stare at one or more of your body parts?

27. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 28. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

How often have you overheard inappropriate sexual comments made about your body?

29. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 30. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

How often have you been encouraged to change your body shape (e.g. lose weight)?

31. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 32. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

How often have you been criticized for not looking like another person?

33. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 34. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

How often have you noticed that someone was not listening to what you were saying, but instead gazing at your body or a body part?

35. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 36. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

How often have you heard someone make sexual comments or innuendos when noticing your body?

37. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 38. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

How often has someone grabbed or pinched one of your private body areas against your will?

39. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 40. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

How often has someone made a degrading sexual gesture towards you?

41. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
 42. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

Appendix B

Schedule of Sexist Events

Please think carefully about your life as you answer the questions below. For each question, read the question and then answer it twice: answer once for what your ENTIRE LIFE (from when you were a child to now) has been like, and once for what the PAST YEAR has been like. Mark your answers on the scales provided, using these rules:

- 1 = NEVER happened
- 2 = Happened ONCE IN A WHILE (<10 % of the time)
- 3 = Happened SOMETIMES (10-25 % of the time)
- 4 = Happened A LOT (26-49 % of the time)
- 5 = Happened MOST OF THE TIME (50-70 % of the time)
- 6 = Happened ALMOST ALL OF THE TIME (more than 70 % of the time)

How many times have you been treated unfairly by teachers or professors because you are a woman?

- 1. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 2. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employer, boss, or supervisors because you are a woman?

- 3. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 4. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by your co-workers, fellow students or colleagues because you are a woman?

- 5. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 6. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in service jobs (by store clerks, waiters, bartenders, waitresses, bank tellers, mechanics, and others) because you are a woman?

- 7. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 8. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by strangers because you are a woman?

- 9. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 10. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in helping jobs (by doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, case workers, dentists, school counselors, therapists, pediatricians, school principals, gynecologists, and others) because you are a woman?

- 11. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

12. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by neighbors because you are a woman?

13. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

14. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by your boyfriend, husband, or other important man in your life because you are a woman?

15. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

16. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times were you denied a raise, a promotion, tenure, a good assignment, a job, or other such thing at work that you deserved because you are a woman?

17. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

18. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been treated unfairly by your family because you are a woman?

19. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

20. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have people made inappropriate or unwanted sexual advances to you because you are a woman?

21. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

22. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have people failed to show you the respect you deserve because you are a woman?

23. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

24. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you wanted to tell someone off for being sexist?

25. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

26. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been really angry about something sexist that was done to you?

27. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

28. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times were you forced to take drastic steps (such as filing a grievance, filing a lawsuit, quitting your job, moving away, and other actions) to deal with some sexist thing that was done to you?

29. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

30. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been called a sexist name like bitch, cunt, chick, or other names?

31. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
 32. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you gotten into an argument or a fight about something sexist that was said or done to you or done to somebody else?

33. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
 34. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit, or threatened with harm because you are a woman?

35. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
 36. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How many times have you heard people making sexist jokes or degrading sexual jokes?

37. How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
 38. How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6

How different would your life have been now if you HAD NOT BEEN treated in a sexist and unfair way?

39. THROUGHOUT YOUR ENTIRE LIFE:
- | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Same as now | Little different | Different in many ways | Different in a lot of ways | Different in most ways | Totally different |
40. IN THE PAST YEAR:
- | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Same as now | Little different | Different in many ways | Different in a lot of ways | Different in most ways | Totally different |

Appendix C

Self-Objectification Scale

Rank the impact each of these body attributes has on your physical self-concept, that is, your evaluation of your own body. Rank these attributes from 1 to 12 beginning with the attribute that has the greatest impact on your physical self-concept (ranked 1) to the attribute that has the least impact on your physical self-concept (ranked 12).

- ___ Physical Coordination
- ___ Health
- ___ Weight
- ___ Muscular strength
- ___ Sex Appeal
- ___ Physical Attractiveness
- ___ Physical Energy Level
- ___ Firm or Sculpted Muscles
- ___ Physical Fitness Level
- ___ Coloring (i.e. Skin tone, eye, hair color)
- ___ Measurements (i.e. chest, waist, hips)
- ___ Stamina

Appendix D

Objectified Body Consciousness Scale-Body Surveillance Subscale

For each item, please circle the answer that best characterizes your attitudes or behaviors.

1. I rarely think about how I look.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

2. I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether they look good on me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

3. I think more about how my body feels than how my body looks.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

4. I rarely compare how I look with how other people look.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

5. During the day, I think about how I look many times.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

6. I often worry about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look good.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

7. I rarely worry about how I look to other people.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

8. I am more concerned with what my body can do than how it looks.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

Appendix E

Sociocultural Attitudes Towards Appearance Questionnaire-Internalization subscale

For each item, please circle the answer that best characterizes your attitudes or behaviors.

1. Women who appear in TV shows and movies project the type of appearance that I see as my goal.

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Definitely agree

2. I believe that clothes look better on thin models.

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Definitely agree

3. Music videos that show thin models make me wish that I were thin.

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Definitely agree

4. I do not wish to look like the models in magazines.

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Definitely agree

5. I tend to compare my body to people in magazines and on TV.

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Definitely agree

6. Photographs of thin women make me wish that I were thin.

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Definitely agree

7. I wish I looked like a swimsuit model.

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Definitely agree

8. I often read magazines like *Cosmopolitan*, *Vogue*, and *Glamour* and compare my appearance to the models.

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Definitely agree

Appendix F

Body Comparison Scale

For the items below, please circle how often you compare these aspects of your body to those of other individuals of the same sex. NOTE: Please be sure that you read and respond to all of the questions according to how you would compare yourself to your same sex peers.

1.	Ears	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
2.	Nose	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
3.	Lips	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
4.	Hair	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
5.	Teeth	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
6.	Chin	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
7.	Shape of face	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
8.	Cheeks	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
9.	Forehead	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
10.	Upper arm	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
11.	Forearm	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
12.	Shoulders	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
13.	Chest	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
14.	Back	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
15.	Waist	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
16.	Stomach	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
17.	Buttocks	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
18.	Thighs	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
19.	Hips	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
20.	Calves	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
21.	Muscle tone of upper body	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
22.	Overall shape of upper body	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
23.	Muscle tone of lower body	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
24.	Overall shape of lower body	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
25.	Overall body	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

Appendix G

Objectified Body Consciousness Scale-Body Shame Subscale

For each item, please circle the answer that best characterizes your attitudes or behaviors.

1. When I can't control my weight, I feel like something must be wrong with me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

2. I feel ashamed of myself when I haven't made the effort to look my best.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

3. I feel like I must be a bad person when I don't look as good as I could.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

4. I would be ashamed for people to know what I really weigh.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

5. I never worry that something is wrong with me when I am not exercising as much as I should.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

6. When I'm not exercising enough, I question whether I am a good enough person.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

7. Even when I can't control my weight, I think I'm an okay person.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

8. When I'm not the size I think I should be, I feel ashamed.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

Appendix H

Appearance Anxiety Scale-Brief Version

Please indicate to what extent the statement is true or characteristic of you.

1. **I feel nervous about aspects of my physical appearance.**

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

2. **I worry about how others are evaluating how I look.**

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

3. **I am comfortable with my appearance.**

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

4. **I like how I look.**

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

5. **I would like to change the way I look.**

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

6. **I am satisfied with my body's build or shape.**

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

7. **I feel uncomfortable with certain aspects of my physical appearance.**

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

8. **I feel that most of my friends are more physically attractive than myself.**

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

9. **I wish I were better looking.**

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

10. **I am concerned about my ability to attract romantic partners.**

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

11. I feel comfortable with my facial attractiveness.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

12. I am satisfied with my body weight.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

13. I get nervous when others comment on my appearance.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

14. I am confident that others see me as physically appealing.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

Appendix I

Script given to participants:

Hello my name is Angie Denchik. I am conducting an experiment examining the reliability and validity of an instrument that I created. You will be asked to fill out information on several variables, including your experiences with others, your body attitudes, your eating habits, and your personality characteristics.

If you choose to participate, this study will take you approximately 30 minutes. Please do not write your name on the questionnaires, as this study is anonymous. Therefore, your responses will be confidential.

I ask that you respond honestly to the questions, as the validity of the study will depend on your honest answers.

At any point during the experiment, you can withdraw your participation without penalty or repercussion.

If you have questions or concerns about this research, feel free to contact me. My email is denchik.1@osu.edu. My faculty advisor is Dr. Tracy Tylka. Please feel free to also contact her if you have questions about this study. She is an assistant professor at The Ohio State University at Marion. Her phone number is 740-389-6786 x6384 and her email address is tylka.2@osu.edu.

Appendix J

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding-6

Using the scale below as a guide, write a number to the left of the statement to indicate how true each it is for you.

1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7
NOT TRUE **SOMEWHAT** **VERY TRUE**
TRUE

Self-Deceptive Enhancement subscale

- _____ 1. My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.
 _____ 2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.
 _____ 3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.
 _____ 4. I have not always been honest with myself.
 _____ 5. I always know why I like things.
 _____ 6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.
 _____ 7. Once I've made up my mind other people can seldom change my opinion.
 _____ 8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.
 _____ 9. I am fully in control of my own fate.
 _____ 10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.
 _____ 11. I never regret my decisions.
 _____ 12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.
 _____ 13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.
 _____ 14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.
 _____ 15. I am a completely rational person.
 _____ 16. I rarely appreciate criticism.
 _____ 17. I am very confident of my judgments.
 _____ 18. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.
 _____ 19. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.
 _____ 20. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.

Impression Management subscale

- _____ 21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.
 _____ 22. I never cover up my mistakes.
 _____ 23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
 _____ 24. I never swear.
 _____ 25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
 _____ 26. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
 _____ 27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.
 _____ 28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.

- _____ 29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
- _____ 30. I always declare everything at customs.
- _____ 31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.
- _____ 32. I have never dropped litter on the street.
- _____ 33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
- _____ 34. I never read sexy books or magazines.
- _____ 35. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
- _____ 36. I never take things that don't belong to me.
- _____ 37. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
- _____ 38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
- _____ 39. I have some pretty awful habits.
- _____ 40. I don't gossip about other people's business.

Appendix K

Demographic Information

Age: ____

Ethnic Identification

____ African American

____ Asian American

____ Caucasian/White

____ Native American

____ Latina

____ Other: please specify: _____

Year in School

____ Freshman-or-high school senior

____ Post-bac

____ Sophomore

____ Graduate student

____ Junior

____ Other

____ Senior

Socio-economic Identification

____ Upper class

____ Middle class

____ Upper-middle class

____ Working class