Honors Projects   Psychology

2004

Development of a New Measure of Men's Objectification of Women: Factor Structure Test Retest Validity

Paul Curran '04
Illinois Wesleyan University

Recommended Citation

Curran '04, Paul, "Development of a New Measure of Men's Objectification of Women: Factor Structure Test Retest Validity" (2004). *Honors Projects*. 13.
https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/psych_honproj/13

Development of a New Measure of Men's Objectification of Women:

Factor Structure and Test Retest Validity

Paul Curran

Illinois Wesleyan University

\

Committee Members:

Dr. John Ernst, chair

Dr. Linda Kunce

Dr. Dave Hibbard

Dr. Lew Detweiler

Abstract

Objectification involves treating individuals on the basis of their external rather than internal features. This study focused on the continued construction and development of an individual difference measure of men's objectification of women. Our measure was meant to quantify and define the idea of objectification. The first part of this study (Zolot, 2003), completed last year, created the initial item pool of 66 items and a four-factor structure for our measure. In this study we refined our measure based on previous factor analysis and added new items in order to extend and clarify these factors and test ideas about sexual objectification. We investigated the reliability of both the 41 items in our measure and the reliability of our measure over time with a sample of college-aged men. Through this we have produced a 22 item measure with an internal consistency of 0.92 and a test-rest reliability correlation of r (35) = 0.88, p < 0.01, and a condensed 12 item measure with an internal consistency of 0.86 and a test-rest reliability correlation of r (35) = 0.88, p < 0.01. Factor analysis on both of these forms has given us three subscales of objectification: internalized sexual objectification, disempathy and commenting about women's bodies, and insulting unattractive women. A proposed test of construct validity is also discussed.

Development of a New Measure of Men's Objectification of Women:

Factor Structure and Test Retest Validity

Fredrickson and Roberts (1997), in their paper proposing objectification theory,

defined objectification as "any action that separates a woman's body, body parts, or

sexual functions from her person, reduces her to the status of a mere instrument, or

regards her as if her body were capable of representing her" (p. 175). This definition,

clearly, only takes into account men's objectification of women, although objectification

can be further generalized to include women's objectification of men and self-

objectification. These ideas can be encompassed by defining objectification as the act of

treating individuals on the basis of their external rather than internal features. This

definition also helps to generalize objectification to a larger behavior and also includes

sexual objectification, as opposed to keeping it a separate entity. This sexual

objectification appears to have been studied only at the extreme, when it becomes sexual

harassment, but has not been included in studies of generalized objectification, where we

believe it also exists. While studies on objectification such as those by Fredrickson and

Roberts have been recently conducted, there is an apparent lack of any measure of

objectification other than scales of self-objectification.

This lack of a measure of objectification was addressed by Zolot (2003), who set

out to develop and test a measure of men's objectification of women. She was able to

develop an initial item set and factor structure, but what is still needed is further

refinement of items and factor structure as well as tests of test-retest reliability and

construct validity. Through this development, our ultimate goal is to investigate the three

main components necessary for measure development: internal reliability, test-retest

reliability, and construct validity (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). In her initial test of internal reliability, Zolot (2003) developed such a measure, finding results that fell into four factors, with (α=0.89) for the complete list of items. Four factors of objectification found by Zolot were labeled: (1) those who objectify see objectification as a natural and entertaining behavior, (2) there is a distinction made between the face and the body when men objectify women, (3) insulting unattractive women is a part of this behavior, and (4) disempathy and crudeness both play roles in objectification. These four subdomains of objectification provide an effective way to reflect on the existing literature of objectification.

Factor 1 – Natural and Entertaining Behavior

The factor of natural and entertaining behavior found by Zolot (2003) can be reflected in items such as: "Commenting on a woman's physical features is all in fun," and "I think watching women is entertaining." One of the general findings of many studies on objectification was that men tend to view comments as more joking or harmless and women tend to view comments as more harassing. It has even been suggested that harassment can be seen as "the result of a simple lack of knowledge (of ignorance)" (Quinn, 2002, p. 399), or "simultaneously as a form of play and as a potentially powerful site of gendered social action" (Quinn, 2002, p. 394). This idea of a "lack of knowledge (of ignorance)" is perhaps one of the more feasible underlying causes of objectification found in objectification research and can be seen in many cases. In one such case study detailed by Gervasio and Rudkdeschel (1992), "the individual male harasser often initially protests that the particular victim was 'too sensitive about a remark that means nothing.'" (p. 209) The fact that men often see objectification as a

natural social action often viewed as completely harmless also ties into this point, and agrees with Zolot's findings, that objectification of women is seen by the men that do it as a natural and entertaining behavior.

The idea of 'lack of knowledge of ignorance' can also be applied to self-objectification in the sense that a person who self-objectifies may not be aware of the damage that is being done. Our society is designed in such a way that a woman's body is seen more as the center of others' attention, an idea seen and conveyed in many television and paper advertisements (Franzoi, 1995). There is a sense in society that beauty is good, and that it is somehow a marker of other aspects of the self. This, it seems, is very close to getting at just exactly what objectification is, to make an analogy, judging a book by its cover. Dion, Berscheid, and Walster (1972) showed that attractive people are thought to have higher scores in personality traits such as strength, honesty, and intelligence when compared with less attractive people. Leventhal and Krate (1977) showed that attractive people are also judged less harshly on some crimes when compared to less attractive people. Alicke, Smith, and Klotz (1986) showed that attractiveness in either face or body also positively influenced ratings of intelligence and sociability. Even more so, attractiveness in the face positively influenced ratings of morality. In each of these cases the person had their internal characteristics judged solely on the basis of their external characteristics, fitting our idea of objectification. More than this it is something that is done without thought, also fitting into the idea that objectification is viewed as something that is perfectly natural.

Factor 2 – Insulting Unattractive Women

The factor of insulting unattractive women can be seen in the items "I have made comments to friends about women who I find unattractive," and "It is okay to insult a friend's sister if she is ugly." Despite the idea that beauty and attractiveness equate other positive characteristics and the fact that this plays into objectification, not all objectification is focused on attractive people. Gardner (1980) recalled one woman's story of an objectifying experience; "A woman walking past a crew of Manhattan construction workers on a windy day sees a worker punch his buddy illustratively on the arm and then hears him call to her, 'Lookit your hair! His hair looks better than yours!'" (Gardner, 1980, p.336) This kind of objectification does not seem to fit well with the stereotypical view of objectification being comments such as "nice legs" or "nice ass" (Gervasio & Rudkdeschel, 1992), and instead is meant as more of an insult. Many of the previous examples could be viewed by the perceiver, if not the target, as a compliment. This independence of attraction for objectification is an important point to make.

The prospect of insulting unattractive women shines a different light on the idea of objectification by making it clear that it can have harmful consequences on those which it is focused. This is not to say that non-insulting comments carry no harm, but that harm of insults is simply easier to see. While it has been shown that objectification can affect things such as eating and math scores (Fredrickson, Roberts, Noll, Quinn, and Twenge, 1998), the effect of insults may be more easily noticeable. In the case of the construction worker insulting the hair of a passer by, Gardner has more of the story to tell. "She wheels and faces the speaker, speechless and hurt; it is clear from the expression on the speaker's face that he knows he has hurt her, that he did not mean to,

and that he does not know what to do. But he thinks of a way: seizing a third buddy, he says to the woman, 'I didn't mean you, I was talking about him.' He was not." (Gardner, 1980, p. 336) This idea goes back to the idea that men simply do not know what they do not know, in this case the fact that objectification is not harmless. Quinn (1980) shows this through a series of interviews with men who have sexually harassed women in their workplaces when she asks them to try to imagine the incident from the woman's perspective. "In imagining themselves as women, the men remembered the practice of girl watching. None, however, were able to comfortably describe the game of girl watching from the perspective of a woman and maintain its (masculine) meaning as play." (Quinn, 1980, p. 397)

Factor 3 – Display of Disempathy and Crudeness

The factor of disempathy and crudeness can be seen in items such as "It doesn't bother me when men around me make crude comments about women loud enough for them to hear," and "Women should be used to hearing the men around them comment on their bodies." The findings of Quinn (1980) show that men often simply do not know the harm they are causing. This shows that it is not necessarily the meaning of a man who objectifies to cause harm to the woman he is objectifying. Indeed, it may be true that most men who objectify simply have not, or are not capable of, empathizing with the women they are objectifying. As suggested by Zolot (2003), this idea of disempathy is perhaps one of the more promising ways in which to attempt to stop objectification. Quinn (1980) showed that men who have sexually harassed women show different responses when asked to describe the incident from first their perspective and then the woman's perspective. It has also been shown that when men are forced to empathize

they respond significantly higher than women in terms of helping behaviors (Oswald, 2000), thus supporting the idea that empathy can affect behavioral situations. It would be reasonable to assume that this also might be the case for objectification, as disempathy is perhaps a large cause of men's objectification of women, and distinct from a perspective in which a man knows the consequences of his actions and still continues to choose not to empathize. This second case, where a man is completely aware of the consequences of his actions, would be more simply crudeness or lack of respect, the idea of Zolot's (2003) third factor of disempathy and crudeness.

Factor 4 – Distinction Between Face and Body

The factor of distinction between face and body can be seen in the items "The first thing I notice about a woman is her body," and "I am more likely to notice or flirt with a woman with an attractive face than one with an attractive body." Objectification of the face, perhaps in the same way as objectification of the unattractive, seems to deviate slightly from the standard model of objectification put forth by Fredrickson and Roberts (1998). Their definition of objectification speaks only of the separation of body from being, and not about face specifically separated from body. Many studies have been done on attractiveness of bodies of women, including a study by Singh and Young (1995) which showed that "Female figures with slender bodies, low waist-to-hip ratios, and large breasts were rated as the most attractive, feminine looking, healthy, and desirable for casual and long-term romantic relationships." (p. 483) Also, almost all of the comments that were rated as sexual harassment or sexual objectification in the study by Gervasio and Rudkdeschel (1992) had to do with the woman's body, and never specifically her face.

In the opposite way, the idea of face-ism has become more and more prominent in our culture, and centers on the "greater facial prominence of depictions of men in the media versus women, and the greater emphasis on the whole body of women" (Nelson, 1996, p. 203). It could be seen, then, perhaps, that much as with the case of how men potentially view objectification as 'all in fun,' women view these comments about their faces in a similar manner, seeing them as less objectifying in relation to comments about aspects of their bodies. It could also be the case, as well, that there simply is not as much objectification of women's faces as there is objectification of women's bodies. Both, however, are still objectification in the sense that they are the separation of a woman's appearance from her personality.

The rationale of Zolot (2003) was consistant with this first idea, that men are more likely to objectify the body as opposed to the face. However, the results of factor analysis produced a factor that was not a tendency toward face or body, but a distinction between them. The two items that loaded on this last factor seemed to be contradictory: "I would compliment a woman's looks if she had a very attractive face, but a not so ideal body," and "I would compliment a woman's looks if she had a very attractive body, but a not so ideal face." This factor was the weakest of Zolot's four factors, and will hopefully be better defined through our revisions.

Proposed Factor 5 – Sexual Objectification

The factor of sexual objectification can be seen in items such as "When I see a woman walking down the street, it is easy for me to imagine what she's like during sex," and "When I'm with female friends, I sometimes wonder what they would look like naked." While sexual objectification has received relatively little study, sexual

harassment had been a frequent topic of study, such as in the studies of Quinn (2002), Gervasio and Rudkdeschel (1992), and Gardner (1980). Both Benson and Thompson (1982), and Maihoff and Forrest (1983), found that most sexual harassment is actually verbal behavior. This is opposed to rape and coercion, which had been the main focus of much sexual harassment research. Sexual harassment is words or actions directed at the victim, whereas sexual objectification can be words or comments directed at another person about the victim, or internalized to the imagination. This sexual objectification of the imagination also ties in to the use of pornography, as discussed by Katz (2000). He argues that "the commodificaton of people's bodies, domination and submission…are common issues of sexual objectification" (p. 248). Katz also argues that the use of pornography is not only harmful to those that it objectifies, but also to those that engage in the behavior, as it distances themselves from actual women and the pursuit of actual women.

It can also be argued that sexual harassment, whether it is words or actions, is a kind of sexual objectification. "The common thread running through all kinds of sexual objectification is the experience of being treated as a body (or a collection of body parts) valued predominantly for its use (or consumption) by others." (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997, p. 174) This idea is also consistent with our idea of objectification, placing sexual objectification within the concept of general objectification, and not as a separate idea.

Purpose and Rationale

These five factors, natural and entertaining behavior, distinction between face and body, insulting unattractive women, display of disempathy and crudeness, and sexual objectification help clarify and further define objectification as well as show how

objectification is distinct from related concepts such as sexual harassment. In sum, the purpose of our study was to further develop and validate a measure of men's objectification of women. To these ends, we revised the initial set of items tested by Zolot (2003), removed and reworded some items, and created new items for Zolot's last two factors, disempathy and crudeness and distinction between face and body. These factors both lacked the number of items found in the first two factors of natural and entertaining behavior and insulting unattractive women, and new items were added in order to test the replicability of all four factors found. Also, the measure was modified in order to include new items of our proposed fifth factor of sexual objectification. Through this, we predicted a five factor model of objectification, including a replication of the four factors found by Zolot (2003) and our fifth factor of sexual objectification. We have also administered the Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale (LSH) developed by Pryor (1995), with the prediction that our factor of sexual objectification would moderately correlate with it. We predicted that the correlation would not be so large to suggest that sexual objectification, or more general objectification, is the same as potential for sexual harassment. Along with this, test-retest reliability of our measure was examined over a period of two weeks. Because we conceptualized men's objectification of women as a relatively stable characteristic testable over time, we predicted a significant correlation between individual results separated by two weeks.

Methods

Participants

Participants in our study were 65 male students at Illinois Wesleyan University. Of these participants, three of the sets of data were removed because of incompleteness.

Also, since our measure focused on men's perceptions of women on the assumption of heterosexuality, we removed the data of one homosexual participant, and one participant who declined to state his sexual preference. While it would be useful to look at effectiveness of our measure on non-heterosexual participants, we were unable to obtain enough data of this type for a meaningful analysis. In all, we were left with a total of 60 college aged participants who self-identified as male and heterosexual.

Of these 60 remaining participants, over half of them were freshmen (N=35). Almost a third were sophomores (N=19), and less than one tenth were juniors (N=4) or seniors (N=1), who were underrepresented in our sample. One participant also declined to list his year in school (N=1).

Our sample was predominantly Caucasian (N=52), and was underrepresented in terms of African Americans (N=2), Latinos (N=1), Asians (N=1), and International Students (N=1). Three students also declined to list their nationality (N=3). Our sample lived predominantly in campus housing (N=49). Eleven participants lived in either a fraternity (N=6) or off campus (N=5).

Participants were recruited in one of two ways. Most of the participants were students in general psychology that completed our study for class research credit in the Research Experience Program. The rest of our participants were recruited from one of three class sessions of abnormal psychology, and given extra credit in that class for completion of our study. All participation was optional.

Measures

For our study, participants were administered a series of measures. All participants completed both a demographics form and our measure of men's

objectification of women. In addition, those participants who completed our study in first semester were given the LDS (Hawley, Cacioppo, & Ernst, 2003), and those participants who completed our study second semester were given the Big Five Personality Measure (BFPM) developed by Costa and McCrae (1992), the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS), and the Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale (LSH) developed by Pryor (1995). The BFPM and MCSDS were not analyzed in this study. Also to be noted, female participants were administered our measure of women's objectification of men in place of our measure of men's objectification of women. Their data will not be analyzed in this study. Copies of all measures can be found in the appendices.

Development of Items

The items for the men's objectification of women questionnaire, before our revisions, came from statistical analysis of the data found in the Zolot study (2003). Factor analysis revealed four components of men's objectification of women; the idea that men view it as a natural and entertaining behavior, the idea of insulting unattractive women, the idea of objectification is a display of disempathy or crudeness, and the idea that it is a distinction between face and body. From these categories, we kept the six highest loading items of each factor, except in the case of factors three and four, which only had five and two items load, respectively. We also kept those that had very high inter-item correlation but did not load strongly on any factor.

We then developed new items for each factor from a brainstorming session with our laboratory assistants, three males and five females, at which point we also decided to add a fifth category specifically for sexual objectification, for which we again brainstormed ideas. This yielded a final questionnaire of 41 items.

Procedure

For this study, participants were administered our questionnaire in small groups of both genders. When they arrived, they were greeted and given an informed consent form to read and sign, after which they were given a packet containing a demographics form and our measure of objectification. Those participants who completed our questionnaire during the first semester also received the LDS measure developed by Dr. Ernst for a different study, and those participants who completed our measure second semester received copies of the Big Five Personality Measure (BFPM) developed by Costa and McCrae (1992), the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS), and the Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale (LSH) developed by Pryor (1995). Participants were given as much time as needed to finish the questionnaires, and reminded that they could drop out of the study at any point, or not answer any questions that may make them uncomfortable, without penalty.

Once the participants completed the questionnaire for the first time, they were given a debriefing sheet informing them that the entire debriefing could only be administered after the second session. The second session took place two weeks later and was identical to the first for those participants who completed our measure during the second semester. For those administered our questionnaire during the first semester, the second session was identical to the first except that when the participant completed the questionnaires for the second time, they next completed the questionnaire of the opposite gender, with the instructions that they should answer as they believe the average member of the opposite gender would. This questionnaire was administered after the first had already been returned to the session administrator in order to avoid producing confounds

in the test-retest reliability results. After the second session, the participants received a full debriefing sheet. The participants did not have to fill out a second demographics form.

Results

All analysis of our data was done in SPSS version 10.0. Upon completion of collection of data for the objectification scale, an initial Cronbach's Alpha of 0.93 was found. Next, any items with extreme means, those that had a mean above 4.0 or below 2.0 on our five point scale, were eliminated through the same rules used by Zolot (2003) and originally taken from Tabachnick and Fidell (2001). Four items were eliminated in this way. After this removal our internal consistency remained at 0.93. The test-retest correlation for this thirty-seven item scale was r (35) = 0.83, p < 0.01.

Four items were also considered for removal on the basis that each had an item-total correlation below 0.20. One of these items had already been dropped on the basis of extreme means, and, upon consideration, we decided to keep the other three items. This decision was made partly because dropping these items yielded no significant rise in the alpha value of our measure. Two of these items were also expected to fit into our factor of face and body distinction and were kept because of the low number of items in our measure dealing with this idea.

In order to explore both the factor structure of the new version of the scale and compare it with Zolot's original version we conducted a series of analyses. First, we examined the factor structure of only the items retained from the Zolot scale. Second, we examined the factor structure of the Zolot items and the new items for her four factors. Third, we examined the factor structure of all items, including the Zolot items, new items

related to her original factors, and new items related to a hypothesized factor of sexual objectification. Finally, we returned to the Zolot items and conducted a new factor analysis suggested by the analysis of the new version.

One issue that arose in our factor analyses was the issue of power. As our sample was somewhat small, we did not meet the generally accepted convention of having five participants for each item of the factor analysis. Because of this, we are limited in our analyses by a chance that results stemmed from a capitalization of error. While we have taken steps to reduce the number of items and replicate the same factors, the following factor analyses should be viewed with caution.

Our first exploratory factor analysis was used in order to see in what manner the items of our measure clustered together. A factor analysis computes factor loadings for each item in a given set where the value of the factor loading is a correlation value between that item and each factor. It is possible for items to load on multiple factors and for the factors to be non-orthogonal and correlate with each other. All of our initial factor analyses assumed orthogonal factor structures. Also, our value for factor cutoff values was kept consistent with Zolot (2003), who used the standard cutoff of 0.45 and above from Tabachnick and Fidell (2001).

Initial Factor Analyses on Zolot's Items

Our next factor analysis was done on only those items retained from Zolot (2003), in hopes of replicating her findings of a four factor structure. A principle component analysis (PCA) factor analysis with varimax rotation and a minimum eigen value of one produced one factor that was interpretable, but the rest were unclear and often with only one item meeting the factor cutoff. We next used a factor analysis using principle axis

factoring (PAF), and forced the number of factors to four. This yielded an interpretable factor structure with three main factors and one factor with only one item. The first factor, containing eight of the twenty-one items, seemed to follow along with Zolot's factor relating to insulting unattractive women. Our factor contained all six of the items from Zolot's insulting unattractive women factor, three of those six items being the top three in our new factor. However, this factor also included two items from Zolot's natural and entertaining behavior factor, one relating to the idea that commenting about a woman's appearance is only natural, and the other (and the lowest loading in the factor at 0.48) about the idea that watching women is entertaining.

This last item, 'watching women is entertaining,' also loaded with 0.46 on the second factor, along with the six other remaining Zolot items relating to the idea that objectification is a natural and entertaining behavior. These seven items also loaded with two items from Zolot's third factor of disempathy and crudeness, the remaining items from which did not pair up well in this factor analysis. One of the items loaded on the last factor, the only item that did, and two items did not load on any factor. At the same time, however, our third factor contained the two items that made up Zolot's fourth factor, distinction between face and body. In sum, while insulting unattractive women and distinction between face and body seemed to replicate well, the factors of disempathy and natural and entertaining behavior seemed to blend together or were lost.

Factor Analyses on Zolot's Items and New Items

Our next step in factor analysis was to add in our new items that were meant to load on the four factors of Zolot. Using a PAF factor analysis and forcing four factors yielded two easily interpretable factors, one moderately interpretable factor, and one

difficult to interpret factor. The first two factors replicated the first two factors of Zolot, natural and entertaining behavior and insulting unattractive women with few exceptions where items loaded weakly on other factors or did not load at all. The disempathy and crudeness items were again spread out across several factors, and many failed to have a factor loading of greater than 0.45 on any factor. The body face distinction factor failed to hold together, as two of the items loaded on the three item third factor, one loaded on the one item fourth factor, and three loaded on the thirteen item first factor.

From this point, we added our items of sexual objectification measurement. A PCA factor analysis with no factor limitations and a minimum eigen value of one yielded ten factors, only the first five containing more than one item. From this result, we ran PAF factor analyses limiting the factors to one, two, three, four, five, and six. Of these factor analyses, the three, four, and five factor solutions seemed to be the most interpretable. The three factor solution seemed to be the best, as it contained three distinct factors, each containing at least six items, and very little loading of items on multiple factors. The results of this factor analysis can be seen in Table 1. The first factor, containing nine items, included items such as "I often imagine what women I meet on a daily basis would be like in bed," and "As soon as I see an attractive woman, I wonder what sex with her would be like." This factor contained almost all of our sexual objectification items, especially those relating to imagining women naked and imagining having sex with women. The second factor contained nine items, including "When commenting on women, it's okay to be crude," and "Commenting on a women's physical features is all in fun." This factor contained a mix of Zolot's natural and entertaining behavior factor and disempathy and crudeness factor, and seems to be somewhat of a

common ground between them. The third factor contained 6 items, including "I have made comments to friends about women I find unattractive," and "I have made jokes about ugly women." This factor contains several of our insulting unattractive women items, and one natural and entertaining behavior item. The Cronbach's alpha of this twenty-two item measure was 0.92, and the test-retest correlation was r (35) =0.88, $p<0.01$. Cronbach's alpha for our factors was found to be 0.92 for factor one, 0.84 for factor two, and 0.84 for factor three.

Creation of Twelve Item Short Format

Upon taking the top four items from these three factors in order to construct a twelve item short form measure, our Cronbach alpha value drops to 0.86. The test-retest reliability of these twelve items remains at r (35) = 0.88, $p < 0.01$. Subscale reliability was found to be 0.92 for factor one, 0.72 for factor two, and 0.84 for factor three. These results can also be seen in Table 5. A PAF factor analysis limited to three factors and using only these items replicated the factor structure of the full set of items above. The results of this factor analysis can be seen in Table 2. The correlation between the total score on our twelve item measure and twenty-two item measure is $r=0.98$, $p<0.01$.

Because of the relative success of the three factor model on the total item set, we next ran a three factor PAF solution on all of our original Zolot items, without any of our additions. This yielded three of Zolot's factors: insulting unattractive women, disempathy and crudeness, and natural and entertaining behavior. As with the three factor model on our total scale, the distinction of face and body factor was not significant.

Correlations of the LSH

After the initial analysis of these two measures, we also analyzed the scores of

participants on the LSH scale, as a means of measuring potential for sexual harassment.

Opposite of prediction, the LSH total score does not significantly correlate with our

sexual objectification factor, but instead correlates somewhat strongly with our

disempathy and commenting on women's bodies factor (r (31)=0.63, $p<0.01$). At the

same time, factor one correlates significantly with factor two and factor three, r

(60)=0.47, $p<0.01$ and r (60)=0.38, $p<0.01$ respectively, but factor two and factor three

have no significant correlation with each other. These results can be seen in Tables 3 and

4.

Discussion

Overall, the overall and subscale internal consistencies were good for both our

twenty-two item measure and our twelve item measure constructed by taking the top four

items in the three factors of a three factor forced PAF factor analysis on the thirty-seven

item measure. The test retest correlations were also good for both the twenty-two item

measure and our twelve item measure. Our measure is reliable over the time period of

two weeks, showing that objectification is, to a degree, a non-changing, individual

specific, measurable quantity. The correlation between the total score on our twelve item

measure and twenty-two item measures is almost perfect, showing that our twelve item

measure is almost the same in its measure of objectification. As the internal consistency

drops only slightly from the twelve to twenty-two item measures, and the test-retest

correlation rises, the argument could be made that our twelve item measure can be used

as a quick measure of our factors of objectification. Both also partially replicate the

results found by Zolot (2003), and seem to suggest three factors of objectification: 1) internalized sexual objectification, 2) disempathy and commenting as a natural behavior, and 3) insulting unattractive women.

For most of the factor analyses that were run three main factor solutions were most interpretable, the first of which included the majority of our sexual objectification items. The second factor included those items from Zolot's disempathy and crudeness factor that related to commenting about women, and those items from the natural and entertaining behavior factor that related to commenting and appearance. The third factor included items from the insulting unattractive women factor, mostly relating to commenting. From this, a dichotomy of reality versus imagination, or between action and surveillance, appears. Of the items that load in our first factor, all of them deal with the concept of imagination or in the act of surveillance, in items such as "I often imagine what women I meet on a daily basis would look like naked," and "As soon as I see an attractive woman, I wonder what sex with her would be like." This is contrasted by the items that load on the other two factors, such as "Women should be used to hearing the men around them comment on their bodies," and "I have made comments to friends about women I find unattractive." These items relate more to objectifying actions rather than just objectifying thoughts, where factor two pertains to the positive comments (disempathy in commenting on attractive women and flirting), and factor three pertains to the negative comments (insulting unattractive women). Despite this, factor one correlates significantly with factor two and factor three, but factor two and factor three have no significant correlation with each other. Also, opposite of predicted, the LSH total score does not significantly correlate with our sexual objectification factor, but instead

correlates moderatly with our disempathy and commenting on women's bodies factor. As predicted, the LSH total also does not significantly correlate with the insulting unattractive women factor. However, in light of the research of Benson and Thompson (1982) and Maihoff and Forrest (1983), who found that the majority of sexual harassment tends to be verbal as opposed to physical action, it is not surprising that of our three factors, factor two would be the most likely to correlate with sexual harassment. This goes back to the idea of reality versus imagination.

While factor one deals the most with sexual objectification, it also inadvertently deals more with thoughts as opposed to actions. While we had no items that separated the idea of sexual objectification from imagination, there is still a component of thoughts apart from actions in factor one. Sexual harassment, whether it is verbal or physical action, is still differentiated from thoughts in that some action must occur. While factor two and three both deal with objectifying actions, factor three focuses on the prospect of insulting unattractive women, and only factor two focuses on actions taken toward attractive women. Unattractive women can still be the victims of sexual harassment, but the LSH scale developed by Pryor (1995) focuses only on women who the respondent finds attractive. Each scenario has a sentence clearly stating this idea, for example "You find yourself very attracted to her," or "This particular woman is a stunning blonde." Our findings then show that this type of sexual harassment is more related to the problem of disempathy, and distinctly different from what we considered to be sexual objectification. What we considered to be sexual objectification seems to be more of an internalized process of thoughts and fantasies, and encompassing one of the original ideas of Zolot (2003) that objectification has a component of men's surveillance of women to it.

Overall, however, consideration must be taken as to the characteristics of our study and sample. Most notable is the fact that our sample consisted of only sixty participants. For any factor analysis, it is suggested that the number of participants needed is equal to the number of items being analyzed multiplied by five. For our thirty-seven and twenty-two item measures, this suggestion would yield a need for one hundred and eighty-five and one hundred and ten participants, respectively. Despite this, our twelve item measure, within the participant requirement for this suggestion, replicates the same factor structure as our twenty-two and thirty-seven item measures, and retains a good internal consistency and test-retest reliability.

We are also lacking a large number of participants for our test-retest reliability, as only thirty-five of the sixty returned two weeks later to take our measure again. This limits the power of our reliability, as well as the fact that it was only over a two week period. This decision of a two week separation of administration comes partly from the time constraints on our study, and a longer period between sessions would have more power in making any claims about the stability of objectification. At the same time, however, we believe that if objectification varied greatly over time we would still see a significant change over two weeks. The decision was also based on the two week period used by Serling (1995), and used by us as a standard basis of questionnaire development.

As well, only those participants who took our measure during second semester were administered the LSH scale, leaving us with only thirty-one participants for which we have scores. While this lowers the power of the correlation of the LSH scale and our subscales, the relative size and probability of the correlations was quite large.

Potential confounds also arise in the manner in which our measure was administered in relation to how Zolot's measure was administrated. Whereas Zolot (2003) administered the objectification measure to mostly sessions of only male participants, we administered two measures, one for males and one for females, in sessions containing both genders. While it is possible this may have had a small effect on the answers of some participants, all sessions were administered in rooms large enough that participants could have plenty of space between each other, as to not be able to see each others answers. At the same time, as well, all of the data analyzed by Zolot (2003) was taken in sessions where the administrator was female. Our measure was administered by either male and female administrators together, male administrators alone, or female administrators alone. Unfortunately, our data is not coded by session, and thus there is no way to tell who the administrators of any given participant were. However, on this same note, those participants who did take our measure twice often had different administrators for their second session. Taking note of this and keeping the administrator the same for these test-retest sessions could potentially raise our test-retest correlation even higher.

Of course, there is also the limitation of our sample. As stated, over half of our participants were college freshman here at Illinois Wesleyan University, leaving the groups of sophomores, juniors, seniors, and also the rest of the male population not in a small liberal arts college underrepresented. Our sample was also over 80% Caucasian, with all other ethnicities underrepresented.

In order to further develop this measure of men's objectification of women, future studies must focus on several key areas. From the limitations of our measure comes one

of the most important ways in which we can continue the development of this measure: by increasing the diversity and size of our sample. More participants, and especially those that would help the diversity of our sample, can be administered our questionnaire in order to better solidify the results of our factor analysis and test-retest data, as well as our correlations with the LSH scale. Second, those administrations of our measure in the future can take note of the specific conditions of any given session, including gender of participants and gender of administrators in order to potentially see how participant's self reports of objectification change under different circumstances. Because of the strong component of removal of disempathy as a means of removal of objectification, it might be predicted that a group of men administered our measure by a male administrator would show higher scores than if female participants or a female administrator were present. Through this, scores on our measure could be used to see what situations and behaviors leave people more likely to objectify. Because our measure has been shown to be reliable over the course of two weeks, a future study could make experimental changes to one of the sessions. Notable and significant change in a participants score could then be attributed to this experimental change.

Third, more work on our women's objectification of men measure, and subsequent analysis between it and our men's objectification of women measure might yield parallels between the two measures, or even provide answers to some of the questions we have yet to answer about objectification. A non-gendered measure of objectification that can be administered to both sexes, and also to those of varying sexual preference, would be a very useful tool. Such future research on objectification can also

attempt to explain more of why objectification occurs, under what situations objectification is most likely to occur, and how it can be avoided.

As well as this, the construct validity of our measure also needs to be tested. We are in the process of a study which uses a false video job interview task in order to determine whether participants remember more about a person's physical appearance or job qualifications. Our prediction is that participants that score higher on our measure of objectification will remember more about physical appearance than those who score low on our measure. We also predict that those who score lower on our measure will remember more about job qualifications than those who score high on our measure. With the validation of our measure through this future study, we would have a measure of objectification that was both internally consistent, reliable over time, and valid. This measure would be a powerful addition to the field of research of objectification, as such a measure, and even more so a short measure, does not exist in current literature.

References

Alicke, M. D., Smith, R. H.; & Klotz, M. L. (1986). Judgments of Physical Attractiveness: The role of faces and bodies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 12,* 381-389.

Costa, Paul T., McCrae, Robert R. (1992). The Five Factor Model of Personality and its Relevance to Personality Disorders. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 6,* 343-359.

Dion, K.E., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39,* 406-415.

Franzoi, S. L. (1995). The body-as-object versus the body-as-process: Gender differences and gender considerations. *Sex Roles, 33,* 417-437.

Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T.A. (1997). Objectification theory: Experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21,* 173-206.

Fredrickson, B. L., Noll, S. M., Roberts, T. A., Quinn, D. M., & Twenge, J. M (1998). That Swimsuit Becomes You: Sex differences in self-objectification, restrained eating, and math performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75,* 269-284.

Gardner, C. B. (1980). Passing by: Street remarks, address rights, and the urban female. *Sociological Inquiry, 50,* 328-356.

Gervasio, A. H., & Rucksdechel, K. (1992). College students' judgments of verbal sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22,* 190-211.

Hawley, L, Cacioppo, J. T, & Ernst, J. M. (2003). *Loneliness Dimensions Scale.* In development.

Katz, Jackson. (2000). Pornography and Men's Consciousness. In Adams, M, Blumenfeld, W, Castaneda, R, Hackman, H, Peters, M, & Zuniga, X, *Readings for Diversity and Social Justice* (pp. 247-251). New York, NY: Routledge.

Leventhal, G., & Krate, R. (1977). Physical attractiveness and the severity of sentencing. *Psychological Reports, 40*, 315-318.

Nelson, Todd D. (1996). *The Psychology of Prejudice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Oswald, P.A. (2000). Subtle sex bias in empathy and helping behavior. *Psychological Reports, 87*, 545-551.

Pryor, J. B., Giedd, J. L., & Williams, K. B. (1995). A social psychological model for predicting sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*, 69-84.

Quinn, B. A. (2002). Sexual Harassment and masculinity: The power and meaning of "girl watching." *Gender & Society, 16*, 386-402.

Serling, Deborah, Betz, Nancy E., Wohlgemuth, Elaine, & Harshbarger, J. (1995). Evaluation of a measure of self-esteem based on the concept of unconditional self-regard. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74*, 76-83.

Singh, D., & Young, R. K. (1995). Body weight, waist-to-hip ratio, breast and hips: Role in judgments of female attractiveness and desirability for relationships. *Ethology & Sociobiology, 16*, 483-507.

Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., & Cohen, M. J. (2001). Everyday Sexism: Evidence for its incidence, nature, and psychological impact from three daily diary studies. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 31-53.

Zolot, L. (2003). *The Development of a Measure of Men's Objectification of Women*. Unpublished manuscript, Illinois Wesleyan University

Author Note

Table 1

Men's Objectification of Women Twenty Two Item Measure and Factor Loadings

Item	Our Factors			Zolot's Factors				Sex Obj
	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	
31. I often imagine what women I meet on a daily basis would be like in bed.	**0.87**	0.21	0.20	-	-	-	-	X
26. I often imagine what women I meet on a daily basis would look like naked.	**0.81**	0.13	0.25	-	-	-	-	X
24. As soon as I see an attractive woman, I wonder what sex with her would be like.	**0.81**	0.25	0.14	-	-	-	-	X
6. If I see a woman walking down the street, it is easy for me to imagine what she's like during sex.	**0.77**	0.24	0.20	-	-	-	-	X
28. When I'm with female friends, I sometimes wonder what they would look like naked.	**0.72**	0.15	0.20	-	-	-	-	X
7. I like it when a thin woman wears tight clothing.	**0.59**	0.37	0.29	**0.49**	0.12	0.25	0.00	-
23. The first thing that attracts me to a woman is a nice body.	**0.51**	0.17	0.00	-	-	-	X	-
14. I think watching women is entertaining.	**0.51**	0.36	0.33	**0.58**	0.00	0.27	0.37	-
15. When commenting on women, it's okay to be crude.	0.35	**0.63**	0.26	-	-	X	-	-
38. Women should be used to hearing the men around them comment on their bodies.	0.00	**0.62**	0.15	X	-	X	-	-
16. I am more likely to notice or flirt with a woman with an attractive body than one with an attractive face	0.34	**0.61**	0.18	-	-	-	X	-
17. You can tell a lot about a woman's sexual availability by how she looks.	0.15	**0.58**	0.00	-	-	-	-	X
9. Commenting on a women's physical features is all in fun	0.17	**0.56**	0.00	**0.62**	0.00	**0.45**	0.00	-
39. I feel it is alright to comment on a woman's chest in a bar setting.	0.35	**0.55**	0.28	0.42	0.15	**0.53**	0.28	-
4. A woman should be flattered when I look at her.	0.15	**0.55**	0.00	**0.59**	0.00	0.00	0.12	-

Item	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	Sex Obj.
8. Women who want to be on the cutting edge of fashion need to show a little skin. *	0.42	**0.52**	0.00	**0.54**	0.24	0.00	0.12	-
27. I frequently give women a rating based on attractiveness.	0.31	**0.51**	0.33	**0.62**	0.25	0.13	0.22	-
5. I have made jokes about ugly women.	0.17	0.11	**0.81**	0.01	**0.58**	0.20	0.01	-
12. I have made comments to friends about women who I find unattractive.	0.00	0.16	**0.81**	0.18	**0.62**	0.01	0.00	-
36. I would never make comments to peers about unattractive women.**	0.22	0.00	**0.69**	0.22	**0.46**	0.15	0.28	-
22. Commenting on a women's physical features is only natural.	0.13	0.30	**0.59**	**0.62**	0.12	0.29	0.18	-
25. I always use appropriate names when describing women's bodies.**	0.22	0.12	**0.58**	0.00	**0.52**	0.16	0.00	-
33. I enjoy pornography.	**0.46**	0.13	**0.47**	-	-	-	-	X

Note: Bold indicates factor loadings above 0.45 cutoff.
* Reworded item from Zolot
** Denotes reverse scored item
X – No corresponding item from Zolot, X marks prediction before factor analysis

Table 2

Men's Objectification of Women Twelve Item Measure and Factor Loadings

Item	Our Factors			Zolot's Factors				Sex Obj
	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	
31. I often imagine what women I meet on a daily basis would be like in bed.	0.88	0.22	0.19	-	-	-	-	X
24. As soon as I see an attractive woman, I wonder what sex with her would be like	0.84	0.24	0.11	-	-	-	-	X
6. If I see a woman walking down the street, it is easy for me to imagine what she's like during sex.	0.79	0.24	0.20	-	-	-	-	X
26. I often imagine what women I meet on a daily basis would look like naked.	0.76	0.19	0.25	-	-	-	-	X
16. I am more likely to notice or flirt with a woman with an attractive body than one with an attractive face	0.26	0.73	0.00	-	-	-	X	-
17. You can tell a lot about a woman's sexual availability by how she looks.	0.15	0.62	0.00	-	-	-	-	X
15. When commenting on women, it's okay to be crude.	0.35	0.56	0.29	-	-	X	-	-
38. Women should be used to hearing the men around them comment on their bodies. \	0.00	0.51	0.20	X	-	X	-	-
12. I have made comments to friends about women who I find unattractive.	0.00	0.00	0.89	0.18	0.62	0.01	0.00	-
36. I would never make comments to peers about unattractive women.**	0.23	0.00	0.73	0.22	0.46	0.15	0.28	-
5. I have made jokes about ugly women.	0.23	0.00	0.71	0.01	0.58	0.20	0.01	-
22. Commenting on a women's physical features is only natural.	0.15	0.25	0.62	0.62	0.12	0.29	0.18	-

Note: Bold indicates factor loadings above 0.45 cutoff.
* Reworded item from Zolot
** Denotes reverse scored item
X – No corresponding item from Zolot, X marks prediction before factor analysis

Table 3

Intercorrelations Between Factors of Men's Objectification of Women Twenty Two Item Measure and LSH Score

Factor	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	LSH Score	Tot. Obj.
1. Sexual Objectification	-	0.59**	0.52**	0.22	0.90**
2. Disempathy and Commenting About Women's Bodies.		-	0.30*	0.65**	0.81**
3. Insulting Unattractive Women			-	0.16	0.68**
Total Score for LSH				-	0.44**
Total Score for Objectification Measure					-

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 4

Intercorrelations Between Factors of Men's Objectification of Women Twelve Item Measure and LSH Score

Factor	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	LSH Score	Tot. Obj.
1. Sexual Objectification	-	0.47**	0.38**	0.21	0.87**
2. Disempathy and Commenting About Women's Bodies.		-	0.25	0.63**	0.74**
3. Insulting Unattractive Women			-	0.15	0.66**
Total Score for LSH				-	0.41**
Total Score for Objectification Measure					-

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 5

Factor Subscale Reliabilities for Twelve and Twenty Two Item Measures

Factor	Twenty Two Item Scale	Twelve Item Scale
1. Sexual Objectification	$\alpha=0.92$	$\alpha=0.92$
2. Disempathy and Commenting About Women's Bodies.	$\alpha=0.84$	$\alpha=0.72$
3. Insulting Unattractive Women	$\alpha=0.84$	$\alpha=0.84$

N=60

Appendix

Men's Objectification of Women Measure Distributed to Male Participants

This measure asks you to consider your responses to the women you see in your everyday life. Please read the following statements and mark how much you agree according to the following values:

1= strongly disagree   2= disagree   3= undecided or neutral   4= agree   5= strongly agree

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	The first thing I notice about a woman is her body.	1. O	O	O	O	O
2.	It doesn't bother me when men around me make crude comments about women.	2. O	O	O	O	O
3.	I would compliment a woman's looks if she had a very attractive face, but a not so ideal body.	3. O	O	O	O	O
4.	A woman should be flattered when I look at her.	4. O	O	O	O	O
5.	I have made jokes about ugly women.	5. O	O	O	O	O
6.	If I see a woman walking down the street, it is easy for me to imagine what she's like during sex.	6. O	O	O	O	O
7.	I like it when a thin woman wears tight clothing.	7. O	O	O	O	O
8.	Women who want to be on the cutting edge of fashion need to show a little skin.	8. O	O	O	O	O
9.	Commenting on a woman's physical features is all in fun.	9. O	O	O	O	O
10.	I would be less likely to comment on the body of a woman I know well.	10. O	O	O	O	O
11.	I often comment on a woman's looks based on how her clothing fits her.	11. O	O	O	O	O
12.	I have made comments to friends about women who I find unattractive.	12. O	O	O	O	O
13.	I respect all women.	13. O	O	O	O	O
14.	I think watching women is entertaining.	14. O	O	O	O	O
15.	When commenting on women, it's okay to be crude.	15. O	O	O	O	O
16.	I am more likely to notice or flirt with a woman with an attractive body than one with an attractive face.	16. O	O	O	O	O
17.	You can tell a lot about a woman's sexual availability by how she looks.	17. O	O	O	O	O
18.	My friends and I tease each other about unattractive women with whom we have had romantic encounters.	18. O	O	O	O	O
19.	I am more likely to notice or flirt with a woman with an attractive face than one with an attractive body.	19. O	O	O	O	O

1= strongly disagree   2= disagree   3= undecided or neutral   4= agree   5= strongly agree

20. It doesn't bother me when men around me make crude comments about women loud enough for them to hear.   20. O O O O O

21. It is okay to insult a friend's girlfriend if she is ugly.   21. O O O O O

22. Commenting on a woman's physical features is only natural.   22. O O O O O

23. The first thing that attracts me to a woman is a nice body.   23. O O O O O

24. As soon as I see an attractive woman, I wonder what sex with her would be like.   24. O O O O O

25. I always use appropriate names when describing women's bodies.   25. O O O O O

26. I often imagine what women I meet on a daily basis would look like naked.   26. O O O O O

27. I frequently give women a rating based on attractiveness.   27. O O O O O

28. When I'm with female friends, I sometimes wonder what they would look like naked.   28. O O O O O

29. It is okay to insult a friend's sister if she is ugly.   29. O O O O O

30. I have made up nicknames for a woman based on her appearance   30. O O O O O

31. I often imagine what women I meet on a daily basis would be like in bed.   31. O O O O O

32. A woman doesn't have to be totally beautiful, but if she at least has something cute about her face or her body, I'll comment about it.   32. O O O O O

33. I enjoy pornography.   33. O O O O O

34. I would compliment a woman's looks if she had an ideal body, but a not so ideal face.   34. O O O O O

35. It bothers me when someone comments on a woman's body if I know her well.   35. O O O O O

36. I would never make comments to peers about unattractive women.   36. O O O O O

37. I treat attractive women differently than I treat unattractive women.   37. O O O O O

38. Women should be used to hearing the men around them comment on their bodies.   38. O O O O O

39. I feel it is alright to comment on a woman's chest in a bar setting.   39. O O O O O

40. I rarely compare how one woman looks to another.   40. O O O O O

41. If a woman is attractive, she doesn't need to have anything interesting to say.   41. O O O O O

Women's Objectification of Men Measure Distributed to Female Participants

This measure asks you to consider your responses to the men you see in your everyday life. Please read the following statements and mark how much you agree according to the following values:

1= strongly disagree   2= disagree   3= undecided or neutral   4= agree   5= strongly agree

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	My friends and I talk about the way men look or how attractive they are.	O	O	O	O	O
2.	If a guy has enough money, he doesn't need to have anything interesting to say.	O	O	O	O	O
3.	I only date men who are taller than me.	O	O	O	O	O
4.	I am often attracted to men who I know I cannot date.	O	O	O	O	O
5.	You can tell a lot about if a guy is worth dating by the kind of car he drives.	O	O	O	O	O
6.	I wouldn't date a guy that was too nice.	O	O	O	O	O
7.	Commenting on how much money a guy has is only natural.	O	O	O	O	O
8.	It is more important for a man to be ambitious than to have a good personality.	O	O	O	O	O
9.	I find firemen in uniform attractive.	O	O	O	O	O
10.	I think male athletes are attractive just because they play a sport.	O	O	O	O	O
11.	I am more likely to take interest in a guy on the basis of popularity rather than who he is.	O	O	O	O	O
12.	If a guy is incredibly hot, it would be ok if he was mute.	O	O	O	O	O
13.	I would date a man who does not have a well paying job.	O	O	O	O	O
14.	I am sometimes attracted to a man that is already in a relationship because I know that I cannot have him.	O	O	O	O	O
15.	I would consider being in a relationship with a man only if he has an attractive body.	O	O	O	O	O
16.	If I walk past a very attractive guy, I would turn around to take another look.	O	O	O	O	O
17.	I think guys who are smart are attractive regardless of personality.	O	O	O	O	O
18.	I would be more likely to date a man who holds a public office than one who does not.	O	O	O	O	O
19.	I would like to date the captain of a football team.	O	O	O	O	O

1= strongly disagree   2= disagree   3= undecided or neutral   4= agree   5= strongly agree

42. My friends and I tease each other about unattractive men with whom we've had romantic encounters.   20. O   O   O   O   O

43. It is fun to imagine being a groupie for a musician.   21. O   O   O   O   O

44. I would enjoy watching a male stripper.   22. O   O   O   O   O

45. I am attracted to 'bad boys.'   23. O   O   O   O   O

46. It's entertaining to make fun of weak men.   24. O   O   O   O   O

47. If a guy has a great personality he doesn't need to be good looking.   25. O   O   O   O   O

\

Big Five Personality Measure Distributed to Both Genders Second Semester

Instructions: Indicate on a scale of 1-7 how well each of the following characteristics describes you using the following scale:

(1) never or almost never true
(2) usually not true
(3) sometimes but infrequently true

(4) occasionally true
(5) often true
(6) usually true
(7) always or almost always true

___1. self-reliant
___2. yielding
___3. helpful
___4. defends own beliefs
___5. cheerful
___6. moody
___7. independent
___8. shy
___9. conscientious
___10. athletic
___11. affectionate
___12. theatrical
___13. assertive
___14. flatterable
___15. happy
___16. strong personality
___17. loyal
___18. unpredictable
___19. forceful
___20. feminine
___21. reliable
___22. analytical
___23. sympathetic
___24. jealous
___25. has leadership abilities
___26. sensitive to the needs of others
___27. truthful
___28. willing to take risks
___29. understanding
___30. secretive

___31. makes decisions easily
___32. compassionate
___33. sincere
___34. self-sufficient
___35. eager to soothe hurt feelings
___36. conceited
___37. dominant
___38. soft spoken
___39. likable
___40. masculine
___41. warm
___42. solemn
___43. willing to take a stand
___44. tender
___45. friendly
___46. aggressive
___47. gullible
___48. inefficient
___49. acts as a leader
___50. childlike
___51. adaptable
___52. individualistic
___53. does not use harsh language
___54. unsystematic
___55. competitive
___56. loves children
___57. tactful
___58. ambitious
___59. gentle
___60. conventional

Marlow Crowne Social Desirability Scale Distributed to Both Genders Second Semester

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you.

T   F   1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.

T   F   2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.

T   F   3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.

T   F   4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.

T   F   5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.

T   F   6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

T   F   7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.

T   F   8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.

T   F   9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.

T   F   10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.

T   F   11. I like to gossip at times.

T   F   12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.

T   F   13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

T   F   14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.

T   F   15. There have been some occasions when I took advantage of someone.

T   F   16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

T   F   17. I always try to practice what I preach.

T   F   18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouth obnoxious people.

T   F   19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.

T   F   20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.

T   F   21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

T   F   22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.

T   F   23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.

T   F   24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.

T   F   25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.

T   F   26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.

T   F   27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.

T   F   28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.

T   F   29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.

T   F   30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

T   F   31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.

T   F   32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.

T   F   33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale Distributed to Both Genders Second Semester

LSH Scale
© J. B. Pryor 1987.

Instructions

On the sheets that follow you will find 10 brief scenarios that describe 10 different interactions between males and females. In each case you will be asked to imagine that you are the main male character in the scenario. Then you will be asked to rate how likely it is that you would perform each of several different behaviors in the described social context. Assume in each scenario that no matter what you choose to do, nothing bad would be likely to happen to you as a result of your action. Try to answer each question as honestly as you can. Your answers will be completely anonymous. No one will ever try to discover your identity, no matter what you say on the questionnaire.

\

Scenario #1

Imagine that you are an executive in a large corporation. You are 42 years old. Your income is above average for people at your job level. You have had numerous job offers from other companies. You feel very secure in your job. One day your personal secretary decides to quit her job and you have the task of replacing her. The personnel department sends several applicants over for you to interview. All seem to be equally qualified for the job. One of the applicants, Michelle S., explains during her interview that she desperately needs the job. She is 23 years old, single and has been job hunting for about a month. You find yourself very attracted to her. She looks at you in a way that possibly conveys she is also attracted to you. How likely are you to do the following things in this situation?

a. Would you give her the job over the other applicants? (Circle a number to indicate your response.)

```
1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all                        Very
   likely                        likely
```

b. Assuming that you are secure enough in your job that no possible reprisals could happen to you, would you offer her the job in exchange for sexual favors? (Circle a number to indicate your response.)

```
1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all                        Very
   likely                        likely
```

c. Assuming that you fear no reprisals on your job, would you ask her to meet you later for dinner to discuss her possible employment?

```
1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all                        Very
   likely                        likely
```

Scenario #2

Imagine that you are the owner and manager of an expensive restaurant. One day, while going over the receipts, you discover that one of the waitresses has made some errors in her checks. She has undercharged several customers. The mistake costs you $100. In talking to some of the other employees, you find that the particular customers involved were friends of the waitress. You call her into your office and ask her to explain her behavior. The waitress confesses to having intentionally undercharged her friends. She promises that she will never repeat this dishonest act and tells you that she will do anything to keep her job. The waitress is someone you have always found particularly attractive. She is a divorcee and about 25 years old. How likely are you to do the following things in this situation?

a. Would you let her keep her job?

1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
  likely   likely

b. Would you let her keep her job in exchange for sexual favors?

1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
  likely   likely

c. Would you ask her to meet you for dinner after work to discuss the problem?

1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
  likely   likely

Scenario #3

Imagine that you are the manager of a shipping company. One day your supervisor asks you to study the possibility of buying several computers for the office. You call up several competing companies that sell computers. Each company sends a sales representative over to your office who describes the company's products. A salesperson from company "A" calls you and asks to come to your office. You agree and the next day a very attractive woman shows up. She can offer no real reason for buying her company's products over those of the other companies. However, she seems very sexy. How likely are you to do the following things in this situation?

a. Would you recommend her line of computers?

1...........2............3...........4...........5
Not at all   Very
  likely   likely

b. Assuming that you are secure enough in your job that no possible reprisals could happen to you, would you agree to recommend her line of computers in exchange for sexual favors?

1...........2............3...........4...........5
Not at all   Very
  likely   likely

c. Given the same assumptions as the last question above, would you ask her to meet you later for dinner to discuss the choice of computers?

1...........2............3...........4...........5
Not at all   Very
  likely   likely

Scenario #4

Imagine that you are a Hollywood film director. You are casting for a minor role in a film you are planning. The role calls for a particularly stunning actress, one with a lot of sex appeal. How likely are you to do the following things in this situation?

a. Would you give the role to the actress whom you personally found sexiest?

1..........2...........3...........4...........5
Not at all   Very
  likely   likely

b. Would give the role to an actress who agreed to have sex with you?

1..........2...........3...........4...........5
Not at all   Very
  likely   likely

c. Would ask the actress to whom you were most personally attracted to talk with you about the role over dinner?

1..........2...........3...........4...........5
Not at all   Very
  likely   likely

Scenario #5

Imagine that you are the owner of a modeling agency. Your agency specializes in sexy female models used in television commercials. One of your models, Amy T., is a particularly ravishing brunette. You stop her after work one day and ask her to have dinner with you. She coldly declines your offer and tells you that she would like to keep your relationship with her "strictly business." A few months later you find that business is slack and you have to lay off some of your employees. You can choose to lay off Amy or one of four other women. All are good models, but someone has to go. How likely are you to do the following things in this situation?

a. Would you fire Amy?

```
1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all                        Very
  likely                          likely
```

b. Assuming that you are unafraid of possible reprisals, would you offer to let Amy keep her job in return for sexual favors?

```
1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all                        Very
  likely                          likely
```

c. Would you ask Amy to dinner so that you could talk over her future employment?

```
1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all                        Very
  likely                          likely
```

Scenario #6

Imagine that you are a college professor. You are 38 years old. You teach in a large midwestern university. You are a full professor with tenure. You are renowned in your field (Abnormal Psychology) and have numerous offers for other jobs. One day following the return of an examination to a class, a female student stops in your office. She tells you that her score is one point away from an "A" and asks you if she can do some extra credit project to raise her score. She tells you that she may not have a sufficient grade to get into graduate school without the "A." Several other students have asked you to do extra credit assignments and you have declined to let them. This particular woman is a stunning blonde. She sits in the front row of the class every day and always wears short skirts. You find her extremely sexy. How likely are you to do the following things in this situation?

a. Would you let her carry out a project for extra credit (e.g. write a paper)?

```
1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all                        Very
   likely                        likely
```

b. Assuming that you are very secure in your job and the university has always tolerated professors who make passes at students, would you offer the student a chance to earn extra credit in return for sexual favors?

```
1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all                        Very
   likely                        likely
```

c. Given the same assumptions as in the question above, would you ask her to join you for dinner to discuss the possible extra credit assignments?

```
1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all                        Very
   likely                        likely
```

Scenario #7

Imagine that you are a college student at a large Midwestern university. You are a junior who just transferred from another school on the East coast. One night at a bar you meet an attractive female student named Rhonda. Rhonda laments to you that she is failing a course in English Poetry. She tells you that she has a paper due next week on the poet, Shelley, and fears that she will fail since she has not begun to write it. You remark that you wrote a paper last year on Shelley at your former school. Your paper was given an A+. She asks you if you will let her use your paper in her course. She wants to just retype it and put her name on it. How likely are you to do the following things in this situation?

a. Would you let Rhonda use your paper?

        1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
    likely   likely

b. Would you let Rhonda use your paper in exchange for sexual favors?

        1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
    likely   likely

c. Would you ask Rhonda to come to your apartment to discuss the matter?

        1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
    likely   likely

Scenario #8

Imagine that you are the editor for a major publishing company. It is your job to read new manuscripts of novels and decide whether they are worthy of publication. You receive literally hundreds of manuscripts per week from aspiring novelists.Most of them are screened by your subordinates and thrown in the trash. You end up accepting about one in a thousand for publication. One night you go to a party. There you meet a very attractive woman named Betsy. Betsy tells you that she has written a novel and would like to check into getting it published. This is her first novel. She is a dental assistant. She asks you to read her novel. How likely are you to do the following things in this situation.

a. Would you agree to read Betsy's novel?

```
1..........2...........3...........4...........5
Not at all                        Very
   likely                        likely
```

b. Would you agree to reading Betsy's novel in exchange for sexual favors?

```
1..........2...........3...........4...........5
Not at all                        Very
   likely                        likely
```

c. Would you ask Betsy to have dinner with you the next night to discuss your reading her novel?

```
1..........2...........3...........4...........5
Not at all                        Very
   likely                        likely
```

Scenario #9

Imagine that you are a physician. You go over to the hospital one day to make your rounds visiting your patients. In looking over the records of one of your patients, you discover that one of the attending nurses on the previous night shift made an error in administering drugs to your patient. She gave the wrong dosage of a drug. You examine the patient and discover that no harm was actually done. He seems fine. However, you realize that the ramifications of the error could have been catastrophic under other circumstances. You pull the files and find out who made the error. It turns out that a new young nurse named Wendy H. was responsible. You have noticed Wendy in some of your visits to the hospital and have thought of asking her out to dinner. You realize that she could lose her job if you report this incident. How likely are you to do each of the following things?

a. Would you report Wendy to the hospital administration?

1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
   likely   likely

b. Assuming that you fear no reprisals, would you tell Wendy in private that you will not report her if she will have sex with you?

1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
   likely   likely

c. Assuming that you fear no reprisals, would you ask Wendy to join you for dinner to discuss the incident?

1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
   likely   likely

Scenario #10

Imagine that you are the news director for a local television station. Due to some personnel changes you have to replace the anchor woman for the evening news. Your policy has always been to promote reporters from within your organization when an anchor woman vacancy occurs. There are several female reporters from which to choose. All are young, attractive, and apparently qualified for the job. One reporter, Loretta W., is someone whom you personally find very sexy. You initially hired her, giving her a first break in the TV news business. How likely are you to do the following things in this situation?

a. Would give Loretta the job?

    1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
   likely   likely

b. Assuming that you fear no reprisals in your job, would you offer Loretta the job in exchange for sexual favors?

    1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
   likely   likely

c. Assuming that you fear no reprisals in your job, would you ask her to meet you after work for dinner to discuss the job?

    1..........2..........3..........4..........5
Not at all   Very
   likely   likely