



4-25-2003

The Development of a Measure of Men's Objectification of Women

Liza Zolot '03
Illinois Wesleyan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/psych_honproj



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Zolot '03, Liza, "The Development of a Measure of Men's Objectification of Women" (2003). *Honors Projects*. 29.

https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/psych_honproj/29

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Commons @ IWU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this material in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This material has been accepted for inclusion by faculty at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@iwu.edu.

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

Running head: A MEASURE OF MEN'S OBJECTIFICATION OF WOMEN

The Development of a Measure
of Men's Objectification of Women

Liza Zolot

Illinois Wesleyan University

April 25, 2003

Abstract

Objectification is any action that separates a woman's body, body parts, or sexual functions from her person, or regards her as if her body were capable of representing her. This study aimed to develop a measure of men's objectifying attitudes and behaviors towards women. Based on research in areas of sexual harassment and self-objectification, items for this measure were developed across six categories: exclusion of face and emphasis on body, independence from attraction, disempathy/ disrespect, anonymity, surveillance, and social behaviors. Sixty items were created across these categories, and the measure was distributed to 93 Illinois Wesleyan University male students. Internal consistencies were high for the original 60 items ($\alpha=.89$), the refined 44-item pool ($\alpha=.92$), and the 25 items extracted from a factor analysis ($\alpha=.89$). A factor analysis with 4 factors produced the most interpretable groupings of items. The item groups produced by the factor analysis supported 3 of the proposed categories of objectification: exclusion of face and emphasis of body, independence from attraction, and disempathy. The development of this measure should be continued in other studies by examining the factors identified by this study, as well as testing the measure's reliability over time and its construct validity.

The Development of a Measure of Men's Objectification of Women

Objectification is 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 (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Actions of objectification include offensive comments about a person's body parts or clothing, references to sexual acts, gestures, street remarks, and unwanted flirting or staring (Swim, Hyers, Cohen, & Ferguson, 2001). Swim and colleagues illustrate an incident of objectification through one participant's report, "Another woman noted that she ...was approached by three men. One complimented her on her Harley Davidson belt, and the other one stared at her chest and said, 'Forget the belt, look at her rack.'"

It is important to study men's objectification of women because women often experience objectification and are negatively affected by it. Swim et al. (2001) found in two studies that approximately 28 percent of women had experienced objectification within the previous two weeks, and the average woman experienced one to two sexist incidents a week. They also found that women are typically distressed by the objectifying comments that they experience. Furthermore, women who experience objectification may internalize objectification and suffer from more severe consequences such as depression, shame, restricted eating and decreased performance on reasoning tasks (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Fredrickson, Noll, Roberts, Quinn, & Twenge, 1998). Women experience many more incidents of objectification than men (Swim et al, 2001), and for this reason this study focused on men objectifying women. The pervasiveness of objectification in our society is often taken for granted, but no published reports could be located that studied the practice

of objectification from men's perspective. This study aimed to create a measure of men's objectifying attitudes and behaviors that can be used to further understand objectification. This project was the first step in the study of men's objectification of women. The ultimate goal in of this project was to develop a valid and reliable measure of objectification, so that it may be studied in the context of other important issues such as masculinity and the dynamics of male social groups. This knowledge could contribute to implementing interventions that would decrease the frequency of incidents of objectification reported by women.

Knowledge from three research areas can be extended to the study of objectification of women: sexual harassment, self-objectification, and attraction. First, sexual harassment research is relevant to studying objectification because knowledge about the type of people who harass and the situations which promote harassment may be extended to hypotheses about objectification. Sexual harassment, however, is a more extreme offense than objectification, sexual harassment researchers may have identified stronger situational and personal factors than those that apply to objectification. Second, self-objectification research contributes to knowledge about men's objectification because it explains the attitudes of women who objectify themselves; it is possible that men who objectify adopt the same sort of attitudes toward women. The limitation of self-objectification theory and related research is that men's objectification is discussed but not empirically investigated. Third, physical attraction research is relevant because researchers in this domain examine how personality, facial and body characteristics interact in assessments of overall attraction. This in turn may lend insight into the emphasis that individuals in our society put on

women's looks. It is important to understand however, that expressing physical attraction towards someone is not typically considered objectification.

The development of this measure of men's objectification of women is based on the assumption that objectification is an individual trait; some men are more likely to objectify than are others and they display this characteristic the majority of the time. Ultimately, the measure being developed in this study will be used to investigate whether objectification is a relatively common practice among men and whether the degree this varies from man to man.

Six aspects of objectifying behavior and attitudes were identified from the literature. These include exclusion of face and emphasis on body, independence from attraction (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997), disempathy or lack of respect (Pryor & Whalen, 1997; Quinn, 2002), anonymity (Quinn, 2002), surveillance (McKinley & Hyde, 1996), and social behavior (Quinn, 2002; Pryor & Whalen, 1997). More specifically, the proposed measure examined the following six questions: Do his comments ignore her face and emphasize her body? Will he comment on a woman regardless of whether he is attracted to her? Do his comments about women's looks lack respect for her as a human? Does the behavior keep the man anonymous from the woman? Does he constantly keep women's looks under surveillance? Does he mainly practice objectification as a social behavior (specifically around other males)? An examination of the sexual harassment, self-objectification, and physical attraction literature can facilitate a better understanding of these dimensions.

Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment can be defined as unwelcome sexual behavior that significantly interferes with a recipient's work or learning (Pryor & Whalen, 1997). Some instances of

sexual harassment may be considered instances of objectification when a man's actions disregard a woman as a person and focus solely on her body or sexual functions. Sexual harassment and objectification share the following characteristics: both are experienced most often by women and carried out most often by men (Swim et al., 2001; Pryor & Whalen, 1997), both may involve similar comments and behavior (Gervasio & Rucksdeschel, 1992; Murnen, 2000; Gardner, 1980), and both have similar social and situational contributors (Quinn, 2002; Pryor & Whalen, 1997). However, these two constructs do not completely overlap. It is not accurate to say that objectification is a specific type of sexual harassment. Sexual harassment, by definition, is associated with an institutional setting, but objectifying actions are not restricted to any setting or public domain (Swim et al., 2001; Gardner, 1980). Second, objectification is not specifically prohibited by law. Third, there are many types of sexual harassment that cannot be considered to be objectification; sexual harassment may be too broad a subject in which to sufficiently study objectification.

Women are most often the targets of sexual harassment and objectification. The most common perpetrator is male and the most common recipient is female (Pryor & Whalen, 1997). It is estimated that approximately 50% of women in the workplace and 20% to 30% of college women experience sexual harassment (Gervasio & Rucksdeschel, 1992). In one study, the average college woman reported experiencing about two sexist or mildly harassing incidents a week (Swim et al., 2001). These women report that about half of the incidents were not aimed directly at them, but at women in general. Furthermore, the greatest gap between men and women's sexist experiences occurs in objectification. Within a two week period, twenty eight percent of the female participants experienced

objectification incidents while none of the male participants experienced incidents. Women reported experiencing between one and two objectifying incidents per week (Swim et al., 2001). This finding supports that objectification is a relatively common occurrence and that women are especially susceptible to objectification.

Research on verbal harassment supports the commonness of objectification. Verbal harassment is any remark of a sexual nature that is intimidating, hostile, or offensive (Gervasio & Rucksdeschel, 1992). Women report verbal advances and comments commonly occur in the workplace (Benson & Thomson as cited in Gervasio & Rucksdeschel, 1992). College women report that joking remarks about female's body parts are the most common type of verbal sexual harassment experienced (Maihoff & Forrest as cited in Gervasio & Rucksdeschel, 1992). This type of verbal harassment is similar to objectification as defined by Swim and colleagues (2001), because comments are about a person's body parts or clothing.

Men and women differ in what they classify as sexual intentions or sexual harassment. Pryor and Whalen (1997) state that the gender discrepancy may contribute to incidents of miscommunication, which they identify as a type of sexual harassment. Miscommunication occurs when a perpetrator does not understand that his or her behavior is not welcome by the recipient. This is arguably the most common type of sexual harassment. Different expectations of appropriate behavior are a big source of miscommunication. For instance, Abbey (1987) found that 72% of college women recognized incidents where their intentions were misperceived. What is considered inappropriate depends on an individual's perception. For example, 81% of women consider uninvited sexually suggestive looks or gestures from superiors at work as sexual

harassment, but only 68% of men do. Correspondingly, women are willing to define more actions as sexual harassment than men (US Merit Systems Protection Board as cited in Quinn, 2002). Men's perceptions of women's actions may compound the miscommunication between genders; men rate women as behaving more sexually than the women rate themselves as behaving (Abbey, 1982). These differences in perception may be due to the different norms men and women have about what behavior is socially acceptable.

Men and women may have different norms when it comes to appropriate language used to describe the body or sexual actions. On surveys, women rated a greater number of explicit comments as inappropriate and harassing than did men (Gervasio & Rucksdeschel, 1992). There is a set of words which both men and women rate as extremely obscene on surveys. In actual practice, however, men are more likely to use obscene words and are less disturbed by their use (Jay as cited in Gervasio & Rucksdeschel, 1992). Murnen (2000) found that men use sexually degrading language more frequently than women do when referring to three subjects: male genitals, female genitals and copulation. These findings have two implications. First, while men and women may have the same knowledge of appropriate language, men's behavioral norms allow more use of sexual and crude words. Second, women may be sensitive towards more words than men.

Gervasio and Rucksdeschel (1992) also found that explicit language used to compliment someone is less likely to be considered as obscene. Men might not consider the use of slang terms to compliment someone's looks as very sexually harassing, even though they may consider it inappropriate. Likewise, the majority of women would not consider crudely worded compliments as sexually harassing. This has important

implications to objectification. Would women consider a sexual comment about their bodies' offensive only if it was not complimentary? If this is true, it is possible that this permissiveness transfers to men's behavior in that they verbalize more positive assessments of women than negative. In terms of this study, objectification is classified as any comment that treats a woman solely as a sexual being rather human, regardless of whether the woman is deemed as attractive or unattractive.

Quinn's study (2002) on girl watching exhibits how a male peer group may be insensitive to females. Girl-watching is similar to objectification in that it is defined as "the act of men sexually evaluating women, often in the company of other men." This study interviewed 48 men in the workplace, and they described girl-watching as a harmless game played among a group of men. The men were hesitant to admit that a woman might dislike being watched and commented on by men. However, when a participant was asked to pretend he were a woman and describe her experience, he described girl watching as something to be avoided. Quinn states that none of the participants were able to describe girl-watching from a woman's perspective and maintain it as playful and harmless. Quinn termed this willful ignorance of women's perspective as disempathy. From these findings, two critical attributes of objectification were generated for this study. First, objectifying comments lack consideration for a woman and her feelings. Second, objectifying comments are often made in the presence of other men.

Pryor and Whalen (1997) argue that sexual harassment may serve two psychological functions for the male: expression of sexual feelings and expression of hostility. While these may also apply to objectification, they are not sufficient. Quinn (2002) interviewed men in the work place about girl-watching and showed that there may be other functions as

well. Men stated that girl-watching served as a form of entertainment, as a game, or as a way to be social with other men. These men reported many personal benefits from girl-watching; some men found it served to bolster masculinity, build a bond between men, feel powerful, or maintain knowledge of good taste in female attractiveness. Some of the social functions that girl watching serves may extend to objectification. In this study, some of these functions were examined by items that endorsed objectification as a social behavior among friends.

Personal characteristics are important contributors to sexual harassment (Pryor & Whalen, 1997). Researchers have set out to identify personal traits that are correlated with men who sexually harass. Pryor (1987) developed the Likelihood to Sexually Harass (LSH) scale to identify the individuals who are prone to sexually harass. This scale gives scenarios, and participants' responses reflect their degree of endorsement of the sexual harassment contained in the scenario. High LSH has been positively correlated with high scores in sexual aggression and stereotypic masculine behavior. Those individuals with high LSH are less likely to have positive attitudes towards feminists and less likely to report perspective-taking ability (Pryor & Whalen, 1997). This lack of perspective-taking ability may be related to the disempathy discussed earlier. The more that men and women identify with traditional gender roles, the more likely they are to deny the harm in sexual harassment (Quinn, 2002). Correspondingly, men's social characteristics are also related to how they assess female attractiveness. A man's physical attractiveness was largely unassociated to his degree of criticism of a woman's physical appearance (Gynther, Davis, Snake, 1991). However, males with high scores of macho attitudes tended to rate women lower in attractiveness and femininity (Keisling & Gynther, 1993).

Situational factors also influence men's social and sexual actions. Sexual harassment is more common in environments where men outnumber women. Men who are identified as those who are likely to sexually harass will only act if local social norms permit or promote such behavior (Pryor & Whalen, 1997). Norms that permit sexual harassment may come either from a peer group or an authority figure. A man's own interpretation of local norms is also important. Denton (as cited in Pryor & Whalen, 1997) found a correlation between a man's LSH score and his estimate of the extent to which other men would behave similarly. The existence of social traits, gender roles, and situations that promote sexual harassment has implications for objectification. This study examined participants' beliefs about how much their male friends and males in general objectify, participants' reactions to their friends objectifying, and social settings in which participants are more likely to objectify.

Knowledge about objectification is still limited when it is studied in the context of sexual harassment. A clear distinction must be made that objectification may, but is not always, considered sexual harassment. First, sexual harassment research often neglects the more everyday types of experiences such as objectification (Swim et al., 2001). Second, sexual harassment is an offense committed to someone. Objectification does not always involve a comment directed to the woman (Quinn, 2002); it may be said to a third party, and in the absence of the woman. Third, sexual harassment has primarily been studied in institutional settings such as the workplace and schools. The objectification of women can occur in a variety of social situations, where no institutional regulations exist to police such behaviors. Fourth and most importantly, sexual harassment is prohibited by law, but some acts of objectification may be considered to be at least passively socially sanctioned. For

example, man and women compliments as more acceptable, even when inappropriate language is used (Gervasio & Rucksdeschel, 1992). It is possible that it takes less extreme personal and environmental motivators for a male to objectify versus the factors it takes for a male to sexually harass.

Self-objectification

Self-objectification theory focuses on why women are preoccupied with their looks. The authors of self-objectification theory state that society sets up women for preoccupation with their bodily appearance and other associated consequences (Frederickson & Roberts, 1997). According to this theory, the societal emphasis on women's looks has a very unfortunate impact on many women. Other research has supported these assumptions. Women objectify their bodies more often than men (Franzoi, 1995). Women also experience objectification from others more than men (Swim et al., 2001). Self-objectification theory maintains that these findings are related to each other; women look at themselves because they know others are looking at them and they want others to see them as attractive.

Indeed, psychological studies have found that women's assessment of their worth is linked to their physical image. For example, Wade (1999) found that body shape largely contributed to females' self-perceived attractiveness and self-esteem, but body shape did not significantly contribute to similar self-assessment in males. Overweight women are more likely to have negative perceptions of their bodies than overweight men are (McCreary, 2001). Cash (cited in Johnston, 1997) estimated that the average woman based over 25 percent of her self-esteem on her looks. A woman's self-esteem often depends on her physical attractiveness while a man's relies on his physical effectiveness (Lerner, Orlos,

& Knapp as cited in Miner-Rubino, 2002). This body of research suggests that women's looks are valued more than men's looks.

Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) list three avenues in which objectification is practiced in our society. First, the media objectifies women when they zoom in on women's specific body parts in films or pictures. For example, they may cut off a model's head and just picture her breasts. This objectifies the woman because it puts the viewer in a position to view her just as a nice chest. Miner-Rubino (2002) calls the visual media's practice of objectification the most prevalent and dehumanizing treatment of women. Second, the media objectifies women in the way they depict relationships between men and women. For example, a commercial may humorously depict a boyfriend gawking at a woman walking by and getting caught by his girlfriend. This type of objectification sets norms about the type of relationships and attitudes males should have towards females and their bodies. Third, women are objectified in an everyday context. For example, a man could be talking to a woman and could come back and report to his friends, "Did you see that nice pair of legs I was talking to?" Everyday objectification is the focus of this study. Self-objectification research examines how women evaluate their appearance on a regular basis, and this may be valuable in investigating men's objectification of women.

A critical characteristic of self-objectification is that the woman adopts an observer's perspective of herself (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Fredrickson et al., 1998). In other words, when a woman assesses her looks and her worth, she is most concerned with how other people see her. Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) state that self-objectification occurs as a result of women internalizing the objectification that they experience. Adopting the observer's prospective is a step further than simply being aware

of oneself. She can adopt this mindset even when no other observers are present. For instance, Fredrickson and colleagues (1998) had women try on a swimsuit in a private dressing room and this induced a state of self-objectification, as measured by the presence of body shame on a survey women filled out while still wearing the swimsuit and restrictive eating during a later behavioral task.

A woman can objectify herself regardless of whether she is happy or unhappy with what she sees (Frederickson & Roberts, 1997; Miner-Rubino et al., 2002). In other words, when a woman thinks about how others see her and incorporates this into how she feels about herself, her judgments about her body can be positive or negative. Self-objectification does not necessarily have to be linked with body dissatisfaction. The unhealthiness of self-objectification is not simply due to a negative body image; it is the constant assessment of outward image that may be problematic. McKinley and Hyde (1996) term this behavior as surveillance. Since part of a woman's self-objectifying behavior is assessing herself as she believes others do, it makes sense to also examine if men indeed do practice surveillance in their objectification of women. The measure used in this study included items adapted from McKinley and Hyde's measure of surveillance in order to assess whether men's surveillance of women parallels women's self-surveillance.

Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) propose that shame, anxiety, depression, decreased internal motivation and decreased awareness of internal bodily states are possible psychological consequences of self-objectification. A woman who self-objectifies gives herself more of an opportunity to feel shame. Since a woman incorporates others' opinions of her into her own opinion, she is constantly comparing herself to societal ideals. Women feel anxious because they feel they must be attentive of their bodies since others are

constantly watching them. Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) hypothesize that depression in women who self-objectify might be attributed to a sense that that cannot meet society's ideals of beauty. This self-doubt may then cause her to depend on others' assessments of her looks to validate her.

Self-objectification research mainly serves as justification for the importance of studying men's practices of objectifying women and may offer novel approaches to the measurement of men's objectification of women.

Physical Attraction

Attraction is defined as the attitude or predisposition to respond to another positively, whether it is through emotions, appraisals, or actions. Physical attraction is only one of four factors in overall attraction on first encounters; the other three components are reciprocity, familiarity, and similarity (Berscheid & Reis, 1998).

The bulk of research on physical attraction has focused exclusively on facial attractiveness (Berscheid & Reis, 1998). The main way that assessments of physical attraction differ from objectifying assessments is that the latter places little if any attention on facial attractiveness (Brooks, 1995). The attraction that is present in objectification has more to do with assessment of the woman as a sexual object, and therefore her body is emphasized and her face and personality deemphasized.

Researchers who have studied body type have found that there are certain types that are more attractive than others. Alicke, Smith, and Klotz (1986) found that both face assessments and body assessments have strong main effects on attractiveness judgments. However, an interaction exists in that overall attractiveness judgments significantly decreased when a highly attractive face was paired with an unattractive body. This has

important implications to the study of objectification; a person's body type may be emphasized more in someone's overall attractiveness. It is possible that body attractiveness conforms towards certain ideal body types. For example, female body features such as large breasts, a small waist, narrow hips, and a small overall body size contribute to men's positive judgments (Singh & Young, 1995). The attractiveness of these features may be related to evolutionary selection. For a full review of the evolutionary perspective of attraction, refer to Berry (1995).

There are a number of ways that objectification can be distinguished from physical attraction. First, physical attraction is a feeling; it may or may not be acted out in one's behavior. Objectification is an action, and it may or may not be accompanied by feelings of physical attraction. The actions of expressing objectification may differ from the action of expressing physical attraction.

Purpose and Rationale

Based on a review of the literature, the following assumptions have been made about typical objectifying behavior: appraisals of a woman are often expressed to other males and rarely expressed to the woman, appraisals of the woman are often disrespectful, appraisal of the body is emphasized, appraisals may allude to sex, and appraisals may conform to the media's ideals of good looking bodies. The goal of this research project was to develop a measure of objectification, assess its internal reliability, and inspect whether any of the proposed categories of objectification were consistent with factor analyses. Participants filled out the 60-item survey, and statistical analyses were run.

Method

Participants

Participants were 93 Illinois Wesleyan male students enrolled in one of five classes: general psychology (n=35), introduction to information systems (n=25), social psychology (n=9), learning and conditioning (n=13), or physics (n=11). Approximately half of the participants were freshman (n=47), and a third of the participants were sophomores (n=29). Juniors (n=10) and seniors (n=7) were underrepresented in this sample.

In general psychology, males were recruited as one of the options for a class research credit, a part of the Research Experience Program. In social psychology and learning and conditioning classes, males were recruited as an extra credit opportunity, and in physics and information systems classes, males were recruited with no credit, but a request to help the student researcher. All participation was optional.

Development of objectification inventory

Approximately 60 items were developed across six categories based on the literature: emphasis on the body and exclusion of the face, independence from attraction, lack of respect, anonymity, social behavior, and surveillance. Participants rated the items on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Surveillance items were adapted from the Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (OBCS) (McKinley & Hyde, 1996). This scale measures three aspects of objectified body consciousness: surveillance, control and shame. In the McKinley and Hyde study, internal consistencies for these three subscales were moderate to high, and all were correlated with a woman's negative body esteem as predicted. McKinley and Hyde had 8 surveillance items to measure how often a woman thinks about how her body looks. Six of these items were adapted and used in the proposed measure, an example of an adapted item is, "A woman's physical performance and health is more important than how she looks." None of the

shame or control items were used on the proposed scale because these categories were judged to not be relevant to men's objectification of women. A few additional original items were added to the surveillance category. An example of these items includes, "I frequently give women a rating based on attractiveness."

Items for the remaining five categories were created during a brainstorming session with laboratory members, consisting of seven undergraduate females, two undergraduate males and the male faculty advisor. Approximately 98 items were produced during this session. Example items included, "I feel guilty if a woman catches me checking her out," and "Commenting on a woman's features is done all in fun."

The 98 items were assessed for clarity and appropriateness by two professors who have knowledge either in instrument development or in a related social psychology research area. Professors ranked the items for clarity on a scale of 1 (not at all clear) to 5 (very clear.) Professors were instructed to rank the appropriateness of the items by considering how offensive or ridiculous it would be to the student, and to rank the items from 1 (not at all appropriate) to 5 (very appropriate.) Items that received average ratings of 4.0 were kept in the pilot measure. Seventeen of the items were eliminated. The student researcher and faculty advisor eliminated an additional 21 items by selecting the 10 items per category that focused on the key issues of that category. The remaining items were randomly ordered and administered to the first participant pool. See Appendix for the apparatus distributed to the participants.

The proposed measure also includes a modified version of the Self-Objectification Questionnaire (Fredrickson, Noll, Roberts, & Twenge, 1998). This questionnaire assesses trait self-objectification. It assesses concern about appearance without an evaluative

component (in other words, it does not assess whether one is satisfied or dissatisfied with her appearance). Participants were asked to rank the value of ten attributes of women's bodies in order of importance. Example statements include, "What rank do you assign her sex appeal?" "What rank do you assign her physical strength?" "What rank do you assign her physical attractiveness?" These values were not be directly added into the total score of the other 60 items, but will be assessed in future development of the objectification measure. In order to assess the Self-Objectification Questionnaire, Fredrickson and colleagues assigned each attribute points so that those emphasizing appearance were worth more points. They calculated participants' scores based on the rankings and points assigned to each attribute. Scores ranged from -36 (low trait self-objectification) to 36 (high trait self-objectification.)

Participants were also given a demographics form, which included their race, major, year in school, and type of residence (on campus, off campus, or fraternity).

Procedure

Upon arrival for the data collection session for the Research Experience Program, students were greeted by the experimenter and told that they will fill out multiple surveys for different studies and provided with an informed consent form. They were seated in a classroom with a number of other participants and given a folder with eight other measures, the 60 objectification items, and a short demographics form. The surveys took approximately one hour to complete. When finished, participants were instructed to put the surveys back into the folder and hand the data to the experimenter. They were handed a debriefing form and dismissed after reading it.

For the four in-class data collections, the student researcher obtained permission from the professors to come in and conduct a fifteen minute data collection session. Participants were informed about the study, provided with an informed consent form and the measure, and given a debriefing form when finished.

Analysis. All analyses were conducted using version 10.1 of SPSS. Fourteen items were initially reverse-scored. The internal consistency for all the items in the scale was assessed by calculating a Cronbach's alpha rating. Internal consistency is a measure of reliability; it is the extent to which items in the measure assess the same characteristic or quality. Cronbach's alpha is a coefficient of this reliability; ratings range from zero to one, indicating low to high internal consistency. Item means and item-total correlations were calculated and used in refining the item pool. The item mean is the average Likert rating given to that item by participants. The item-total correlation is measures how closely each item is related to the overall score. Items with large negative item-total correlations were reverse scored. Items were omitted if their means were extreme (average Likert ratings over 4.0 or under 2.0) or if they showed a restricted range of responses (fewer than all 5 of the Likert response options were used by the participants). Items were also omitted if the item-total correlation was below 2.0 or if their omission caused the Cronbach's alpha value to increase (Serling & Betz, 1997). Items that contributed the least positively to the Cronbach's alpha coefficient were removed one at a time until the combination of all items remaining contributed to the highest possible coefficient.

Items from the refined item pool were then assessed in a factor analysis. A factor analysis is used to detect structure in the relationships between variables, that is to group variables. A factor analysis can be applied as an exploratory method to detect the structure

of a group of items (StatSoft, Inc., 2002). First, a principle components factor analysis (PCA) using varimax rotation was conducted. A scree plot of factor Eigen values was examined to determine the possible number of factors. The scree plot indicated that four, five, and six factor solutions were viable. Next, principle axis structure factor analyses using varimax rotations were run specifying four, five, and six factors. Factor loadings were calculated for each solution. A factor loading is the correlation value between the item and the factor; they are a measure of how well each item fits within each factor. Items were classified into a particular factor if they loaded the highest on that factor and they were above the cutoff value. Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) consider items with factor loadings of 0.45 as fair items for that factor, so this was designated as the cutoff value.

Results

Internal consistency for the original 60 items was 0.89. Based on the analysis procedure, 3 items with negative item-total correlations were reversed and 16 items were eliminated from the 60-item pool. The remaining 44 items had an internal consistency of 0.92.

Factor analyses were conducted to see how items clustered together. The PCA factor analysis with varimax rotation, produced one easily interpretable factor, but other factors were not obvious. Of the three principle axis structure factor analyses run, the 4-factor structure was judged to produce the most interpretable results. Factor loadings were calculated for all the items across these four factors. The 25 items above the 0.45 cutoff are shown in Table 1. Factor 1 contains 12 items, Factor 2 contains 6 items, Factor 3 contains 5 and Factor 4 contains 2 items. The internal consistency for these 25 items identified from the factor analysis was calculated ($\alpha=0.89$).

Based on the items contained within each of the four factors, we interpreted labels for each of the factors that describe the overlying relationship between the items. Items in Factor 1 seem to show that one component of objectification is seen as a natural and entertaining behavior. Items in Factor 2 suggest that insulting unattractive women is an objectifying behavior. In Factor 3, items relate to disempathy and crudeness displayed by men when they objectify. Items in Factor 4 seem to relate to the face/body distinction made when men objectify women. In sum, three of the original six categories were supported by the factor analysis: exclusion of face and emphasis of body, independence from attraction, and disempathy.

Total scores for each factor were computed and correlations between the factors were examined. This was done in order to examine the relationships that existed between each of the factors. Refer to Table 2 for correlation values. All of the correlations except one indicated were moderate and significant, which suggests that these factors are related to each other, but they are not measuring the exact same thing. Only one relationship between Factor 2 and Factor 4 was not significant.

Discussion

The original 60-item scale had very high reliability, but refining the scale to 44 items further improved reliability. The 25 items identified from the factor analysis still had very good internal consistency. The high total-scale internal reliability is consistent with the idea that although four factors emerged—all four factors (natural and entertaining components of objectification, insults about unattractive women, disempathy and crudeness, and distinctions between facial and bodily assessments) are related to one

another and represent different facets of objectification. The intercorrelations between the factors further support this idea.

Factor 1 items, which regard objectification as natural and entertaining, support that men view objectification as a socially acceptable behavior. This is consistent with the opinions of the men interviewed in Quinn's (2002) study. This also is consistent with the general sexual harassment research findings that men's norms allow for behaviors that women may view as problematic.

The concepts behind the original category independence from attraction were supported by Factor 2, which includes items about insulting unattractive women. The original category for independence from attraction assumes that a man may comment on a woman's looks regardless of his attraction to her. This factor clearly supports that men's comments are not contingent on the presence of attraction. This is consistent with past research.

Factor 3 items relate to the more insensitive aspect of objectification. Items on this measure related to men not being bothered by the use of crude words when describing women and not being bothered when someone comments on the body of a woman they know well. This factor seems to be consistent with the proposed category of disempathy.

Factor 4, face/body distinction, is related to the original category of emphasis on body and exclusion of face. However, only two items loaded on this factor, so the exact relationship is unclear. Perhaps this factor implies that when men evaluate women's appearance, they assess women's bodies and faces as separate components. This is different from the category originally proposed because it does not assume that the body is more important than the face. Other questions, which were omitted due to low item-total

correlations, actually supported that men look at the face first. For instance, on the item "The first thing I look at on a woman is her __," face was the response with the highest frequency (n=55). It is possible that this factor is subject to participants giving the socially acceptable answer. In this case, behavioral methods might be better to assess this aspect of objectification.

One implication of this study is objectifying behaviors are not the same as sexual harassment behaviors. Items in Factor 1 investigate if men objectify often and if they believe that everyone does it. These items imply that objectification is socially sanctioned in contrast to sexual harassment, which is prohibited by various institutions. Factor 1 also supports that men objectify for entertainment purposes. This supports the distinction made between the proposed underlying functions of sexual harassment versus objectification. Sexual harassment serves as a way to express hostile or sexual feelings (Pryor & Whalen, 1997), while objectification has the more benign intentions of entertainment and fraternization with other men (Quinn, 2002).

In order to further develop this measure of objectification, subsequent studies must expand on the findings of this project. First, the items and factors identified in this study should be elaborated upon and distributed to participants again. Efforts should be made to develop more items especially on Factor 4, since the underlying construct driving these two items is ambiguous. Second, we collected data on the modified objectification questionnaire, but were unable to analyze due to time constraints. Subsequent studies might find this useful in investigating what attributes of a woman's body men value most. Third, since this measure assumes that objectification is an individual trait, the test-retest reliability of this measure needs to be assessed. Fourth, the construct validity of this

measure must be assessed. Background literature and the results from this study support that objectification is distinct from sexual harassment, but future research should directly contrast this measure of objectification to an established measure of sexual harassment, such as the LSH (Pryor, 1987), to examine any possible correlations that may exist. Future research might also seek to clarify additional features of factors. For example, under what situations is objectification considered natural and entertaining and under what situations is objectification considered inappropriate by the men engaging in these behaviors. In addition, although we have restricted our analysis to men, objectification behaviors of women might also be fruitfully investigated to help us better understand general principles of objectification.

The value of a reliable and valid measure of objectification might lay in the potential applications of this measure. If objectification is a personal trait as assumed in this study, it would be interesting to examine other personal characteristics that may be correlated with high objectification. For instance, a relationship may exist between a man's level of objectification that he endorses and his level masculinity. Researchers have already identified relationships between masculinity and sexual harassment tendencies, and the relationship between objectification and masculinity may have interesting parallels. This idea is consistent with past research; Quinn (2002) has proposed that girl-watching may function as a method to bolster masculinity and create a bond between males.

The ultimate value of the study of men's objectification lies in the potential it has to improve women's lifestyles. A large discrepancy exists between the frequency in which men and women experience objectification. Instances of objectification can be much more than everyday nuisances. Swim and colleagues (2001) showed that a woman's anxious

mood and self-esteem may be related to the number of sexist incidents that she experienced that day. Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) propose that the consequences of objectification are far greater reaching. When women are bombarded with messages of objectification from multiple sources in our society, women may in turn begin to view themselves as objects and suffer consequences such as shame, depression and disordered eating. Self-objectification research is exploring interventions for women who take unhealthy perspectives of their outward appearance, but developing intervention methods to decrease men's objectification of women may help supplement these efforts.

Perhaps one of the most promising methods of intervention of men's objectification will be in combating the disempathy that may be a factor in objectification. For instance, Quinn displayed how men may understand what is wrong with sexually evaluating women if they are forced to think about what their experiences would be like as a woman. This is just one possible method of personalizing what it is like to experience objectification. Personalization has also been employed successfully in sexual harassment interventions. For example, in Katz's (1995) Mentors in Violence Prevention Project, he has men think about women such as their mothers, sisters and girlfriends being on the receiving end of sexual harassment in order to get them emotionally involved in changing their actions.

The development of this measure is the first step in studying objectification. Hopefully, the measure being developed in this study will be used to investigate whether objectification is a relatively common practice among men, and future studies will contribute to knowledge and interventions of men's objectification of women.

References

- Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 830-838.
- Abbey, A. (1987). Misperceptions of friendly behavior as sexual interest: A survey of naturally occurring incidents. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 11, 173-194.
- 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.
- American Dietetic Association. (2000, January 3). American's food and nutrition attitudes and behaviors. Retrieved April 7, 2002, from <http://www.eatright.org/pr/2000/010300a.html>
- Berry, D. S. (2000). Attractiveness, attraction, and sexual selection: Evolutionary perspectives on the form and function of physical attractiveness. [Chapter] In M. P. Zanna (Ed). *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 32 (p. 273-342).
- Berscheid & Reis (1998). Attraction and close relationships. [Chapter] In D. T. Gilbert & S. T. Fiske (Eds.). *The handbook of social psychology: Vol. 2* (4th Ed, p. 193-281).
- Brooks, G. R. (1995). *The Centerfold Syndrome*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 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.
- Gynther, M. D., Davis, A. T., & Snake, L. G. (1991). The perception of attractiveness: What about the beholders. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47, 745-748.
- Katz, J. (1995). Reconstructing masculinity in the locker room: The Mentors in Violence Prevention Project. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65, 163-174.
- Keisler, B. L. & Gynther, M. D. (1993). Male perceptions of female attractiveness: The effects of target's personal attributes and subjects' degree of masculinity. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 49, 190-195.
- McCreary, D. R., & Sadara, S. W. (2001). Gender differences in relationships among perceived attractiveness, life satisfaction, and health in adults as a function of body mass index and perceived weight. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2, 108-116.
- McKinley, N. M., & Hyde, J. S. (1996). The objectified body consciousness scale: development and validation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 181-215.
- Miner-Rubino, K., Twenge, J. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2002). Trait self-objectification in women: Affective and personality correlates. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36, 147-172.
- Murnen, S. K. (2000). Gender and the use of sexually degrading language. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 319-327.
- Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual harassment proclivities in men. *Sex Roles*, 17, 269-290.
- Pryor, J. B. & Whalen, N. J. (1997). A typology of sexual harassment: Characteristics of harassers and the social circumstances under which sexual harassment occurs. Chapter in *Sexual harassment: Theory research and treatment*. (p.127-150) O'Donohue, W. (Ed.) Needham Heights, MA Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

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

StatSoft, Inc. (2002). Electronic Statistics Textbook [Computer Software].
Retrieved from <http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/stathome.html>

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.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). Using Multivariate Statistics (4th Ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Wade, T. J., & Cooper, M. (1999). Sex differences in the links between attractiveness, self-esteem and the body. *Personality and Individuality Differences*, 27, 1047-1056.

Author Note

I thank Dr. Glenn Reeder and Dr. John Pryor for their help in the initial refinement process of this measure. Both agreed to assess the clarity and appropriateness of 100 items composed for this measure. I also thank Dr. Ray Bergner, who raised some important discussion in the critical analysis of the objectification measure.

I extend appreciation to the following lab research assistants participated in brainstorming items for the measure and entered data: Amy Atwood, Natalie Bruner, Paul Curran, Anna Czipri, Ren Mathew, Emily Maxwell, Shaylin Ebert, Karen Fernandez, Amy Kobit, Sarah Poland, and Lauren Sax. I owe additional gratitude to Emily Maxwell, who assisted in data collection sessions and in the preparation of materials for data collection sessions.

I also thank Dr. Susie Balser, Dr. Doran French, and Dr. Vickie Folse for agreeing to sit in on the review committee for this project and invest the time to read this paper and suggest improvements.

Finally, I extend my greatest gratitude to Dr. John Ernst, the faculty advisor for this project. His supervision was instrumental in the conceptualization and materialization of my research. Dr. Ernst made many valuable investments by offering his enthusiasm in the project, personal textbooks and other resources, time and energy during frequent meetings, help in revising papers, and his expertise and experience in social psychology research.

Appendix

Measure Distributed to Participants

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. A woman should be flattered when I look at her.	1. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I am not concerned by how a woman might react if I stare at her.	2. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. I have made up nicknames for a female based on her appearance.	3. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Women secretly want you to notice their looks, even when they are strangers.	4. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. I always use appropriate names when describing women's bodies.	5. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. I make comments about a woman's body when I am not speaking to her, but so she can hear.	6. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. When speaking to friends, I would compliment a woman's looks if she had an ideal body, but a not so ideal face.	7. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. A woman's physical performance and health is more important to me than how she looks.	8. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. I like it when a thin woman wears tight clothing.	9. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. I think women are flattered when I make it obvious that I am checking them out.	10. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. When speaking to friends, I would compliment a woman's looks if she had a very attractive face, but a not so ideal body.	11. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Women who want to be on the cutting edge of fashion need to show a little skin.	12. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. I think watching females is entertaining.	13. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. I often do not know the women I look at and comment on.	14. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. It is more important to me that a woman be comfortable with her body than how her body actually looks.	15. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. I think a woman who doesn't take care of her fitness level should be ashamed of herself.	16. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. If a woman doesn't hear a comment made about her, no harm is done.	17. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. I treat attractive women differently than I treat unattractive women.	18. <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	1	2	3	4	5
19. During the day, I think about how women look many times.	19. O	O	O	O	O
20. I think women usually have no idea that I am evaluating them.	20. O	O	O	O	O
21. I frequently give women a rating based on attractiveness.	21. O	O	O	O	O
22. Women with extremely unattractive bodies are talked about most frequently.	22. O	O	O	O	O
23. Commenting on a woman's physical features is only natural.	23. O	O	O	O	O
24. I am most likely to make comments about women's looks when I am in a social setting with a male friend I know well.	24. O	O	O	O	O
25. I like it when all women wear tight clothing.	25. O	O	O	O	O
26. I respect all women.	26. O	O	O	O	O
27. Commenting on a woman's physical features is all in fun.	27. O	O	O	O	O
28. I feel it is alright to comment to friends on a woman's chest in a bar setting.	28. O	O	O	O	O
29. My friends often make crude comments about women loud enough for others to hear.	29. O	O	O	O	O
30. I look at woman's face when I say hello to her.	30. O	O	O	O	O
31. Cat calling is a fun way to compliment a female stranger.	31. O	O	O	O	O
32. Other's sexualized comments of a woman never factor into my opinion of her.	32. O	O	O	O	O
33. I rarely compare how one woman looks to another.	33. O	O	O	O	O
34. Some women just cannot seem to take a joke.	34. O	O	O	O	O
35. It does not bother me when other men around me make crude comments about women loud enough for them to hear.	35. O	O	O	O	O
36. Comments about a woman's attractiveness usually involves a woman's face first, then her body.	36. O	O	O	O	O
37. It does not bother me when other men around me make crude comments about women.	37. O	O	O	O	O
38. I believe that all men comment on women's bodies.	38. O	O	O	O	O
39. When in a group of male friends, commenting on a woman's physical features makes me feel closer to my friends.	39. O	O	O	O	O
40. I have made comments to friends about women who I find attractive.	40. O	O	O	O	O
41. I have a right to discuss my opinions on another person's physical characteristics.	41. O	O	O	O	O

	1	2	3	4	5	
42. I feel guilty if a woman catches me checking her out.	42.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
43. I do not say comments about a woman with the intention of her hearing.	43.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
44. I don't tend to comment on a woman's body if I think that she might see me later.	44.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
45. I am most likely to make comments about women's looks when I am in a social setting with a male friend I do not know well.	45.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
46. When my friends and I evaluate a woman's body, it would be difficult for me to identify her just by her face later on.	46.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
47. I like it when a large woman wears tight clothing.	47.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
48. I have made comments to friends about women who I find unattractive.	48.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
49. Women should be used to hearing the men around them comment on their bodies.	49.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
50. I would never make comments to peers about a woman I find unattractive.	50.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
51. My friends and I tease each other about unattractive women with whom we have had romantic encounters.	51.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
52. I often comment on a woman's looks based on her clothing and how it fits her.	52.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
53. I would be less likely to comment on the body of a woman I know well.	53.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
54. Women with outstandingly attractive bodies are talked about most frequently.	54.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
55. It bothers me when someone comments on a woman's body if I know her.	55.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
56. I have made jokes about ugly women.	56.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
57. I am more likely to comment on women in a large social setting where I do not know anyone but my friends.	57.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
58. The first thing that attracts me to a woman is a nice body.	58.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
59. A. The first thing that I look at on a woman is her _____. <input type="radio"/> face <input type="radio"/> chest <input type="radio"/> hips <input type="radio"/> waist <input type="radio"/> legs <input type="radio"/> butt <input type="radio"/> hair <input type="radio"/> fashion sense <input type="radio"/> other						
B. I am more likely to make comments to peers about this part of a woman's appearance than any other part.	59b.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
60. Men do women a favor by telling them when they don't find them attractive.	60.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

We are interested in how men think about women's bodies. Please rank order the body attributes below to indicate those which have the greatest impact on your assessment of a woman (rank of 10) to that which has the least impact (rank of 0). Please do not assign the same rank to more than one attribute.

When considering a woman:

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

Table 1

Objectification Inventory and Factor Loadings

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
23. Commenting on a woman's physical features is only natural.	0.62	0.12	0.29	0.18
21. I frequently give women a rating based on attractiveness.	0.62	0.25	0.13	0.22
27. Commenting on a woman's physical features is all in fun.	0.62	0.00	0.45	0.00
1. A woman should be flattered when I look at her.	0.59	0.00	0.00	0.12
13. I think watching women is entertaining.	0.58	0.00	0.27	0.37
52. I often comment on a woman's looks based on how her clothing fits her.	0.57	0.35	0.00	0.00
19. During the day, I think about how women look many times.	0.54	0.00	0.15	0.45
12. Women need to show a little skin to be on the cutting edge of fashion.	0.54	0.24	0.00	0.12
14. I often do not know the women I look at and comment on.	0.50	0.12	0.25	0.00
38. I believe that all men comment on women's bodies.	0.49	0.00	0.00	0.15
9. I like it when a thin woman wears tight clothing.	0.49	0.12	0.14	0.36
10. I think women are flattered when I make it obvious that I am checking them out.	0.47	0.15	0.00	0.00
48. I have made comments to friend about women who I find unattractive.	0.18	0.62	0.01	0.00
3. I have made up nicknames for a woman based on her appearance	0.32	0.61	0.12	0.01
51. My friends and I tease each other about unattractive women with whom we have had romantic encounters.	0.12	0.60	0.22	-0.20
56. I have made jokes about ugly women.	0.01	0.58	0.20	0.01
5. I always use appropriate names when describing women's bodies.*	0.00	0.52	0.16	0.00
50. I would never make comments to peers about unattractive women.	0.22	0.46	0.15	0.28
37. It doesn't bother me when men around me make crude comments about women.	0.19	0.29	0.68	-0.11

Continued

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
35. It doesn't bother me when men around me make crude comments about women loud enough for them to hear.	0.14	0.20	0.63	-0.24
53. I would be less likely to comment on the body of a woman I know well.*	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.25
55. It bothers me when someone comments on a woman's body if I know her well.*	0.01	0.21	0.59	0.23
28. I feel it is alright to comment on a woman's chest in a bar setting.	0.42	0.15	0.53	0.28
11. I would compliment a woman's looks if she had a very attractive face, but a not so ideal body.	0.12	0.00	0.13	0.66
7. I would compliment a woman's looks if she had an ideal body, but a not so ideal face.	0.21	0.26	0.24	0.59

Note. Boldface indicates factor loadings above 0.45 cutoff.

* Reverse score item.

Table 2

Intercorrelations between Factors for Objectification

Factor	1	2	3	4
1. Natural and Entertaining Behavior	-	0.31*	0.42*	0.41*
2. Insulting Unattractive Women		-	0.35*	0.11
3. Display of Disempathy and Crudeness			-	0.35*
4. Distinction between Face and Body				-

*Correlations is significant at the 0.01 level