

Who Objectifies? Trait and Situational Predictors of Interpersonal Objectification in a Sample of
Male and Female Perpetrators

Danielle Tetley

The University of Adelaide

Word Count: 9,142

*This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of the Honours degree of Bachelor of Psychological
Science (Honours)*

Table of Contents

List of Tables	4
Abstract	5
Declaration	6
Contribution Statement	7
Acknowledgements	8
1. Introduction	9
1.1. The Social Construction of Gender	9
1.2. Objectification Theory	11
1.3. Objectification Theory Applied to Men	13
1.4. Who Objectifies?	15
1.5. Objectification and Sexual Orientation	17
1.6. Trait Predictors of Objectification	18
1.7. Situational Predictors of Objectification	18
1.8. Aims and Hypotheses	20
2. Method	24
2.1. Participants	24
2.2. Measures	24
2.2.1. Dominance	25
2.2.2. Desire for Control	25
2.2.3. Need for Power	26
2.2.4. Conservatism	26

PREDICTORS OF OBJECTIFICATION	3
2.2.5. Sexism	27
2.2.6. Value for Fairness	27
2.2.7. Sexual Media Consumption	27
2.2.8. Gender-Typical Childhood Socialisation	28
2.2.9. Objectification Perpetration	29
2.3. Procedure	29
3. Results	30
3.1. Missing Data	30
3.2. Testing Normality	30
3.3. Sample Characteristics	31
3.4. Bivariate Relations Between Variables.....	31
3.5. Predictors of Objectification	34
4. Discussion	37
4.1. Gender Differences	37
4.2. Predictors of Objectification	38
4.3. Limitations and Future Research	41
4.4. Implications.....	43
4.5. Conclusions.....	44
References	45
Appendix A	50
Appendix B	52

List of Tables

Table 1: Sample Characteristics

Table 2: Pearson Correlations Between All Variables – Divided by Gender

Table 3: Multiple Regression Model for Predictors of Objectification of Women

Table 4: Multiple Regression Model for Predictors of Objectification of Men

Abstract

Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) originally proposed objectification theory as a framework for understanding women's oppressed experiences, and the consequences that come with being female in a society that sexually objectifies the female body. Since then, studies have also applied this theory to male victims of objectification, as well as used it to explain a number of wider issues such as sexual violence, body image issues, and low self-esteem. However, what causes or contributes to the perpetration of objectification is still somewhat unknown. While there are studies exploring how situational factors contribute to this problem, there is very little research looking at the specific personality traits of the objectifier. The present study fills in this gap by exploring whether certain personality traits can predict one's likelihood of objectifying others, in order to determine which traits are the best predictors. Additionally, some situational factors are also further explored. To test this, a survey was administered to a sample of 203 male and female participants, measuring their objectification perpetration, as well as six personality traits including dominance; desire for control; need for power; conservatism; sexism; and value for fairness. Additionally, two situational factors were also measured, which included sexual media use, and gender-typical childhood socialisation. The primary findings are that value for fairness significantly predicts men's objectification of women, while sexism significantly predicts women's objectification of men. Limitations and future research directions are discussed, as well as the theoretical and practical implications of these findings.

Keywords: objectification, predictors, traits, situational factors

Declaration

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree of diploma in any University, and, to the best of my knowledge, this thesis contains no material previously published except where due reference is made. I give permission for the digital version of this thesis to be made available on the web, via the University of Adelaide's digital thesis repository, the Library Search and through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the School to restrict access for a period of time.

September 2020

Danielle Tetley

Contribution Statement

When beginning this thesis, my supervisor proposed a research area, and we both collaborated to create possible research questions and design the appropriate methodology. I conducted the literature review, completed the ethics application, and chose the scales that were to be used in the survey. My supervisor and I both collaborated in designing appropriate questions for the parts of the survey which measured the situational factors. I was responsible for all participant recruitment, survey administration, and allocating the appropriate course credits to first-year students as reward for participating. I conducted all the statistical tests and analyses, which my supervisor oversaw, guided, and approved of. I wrote up all sections of this thesis, and my supervisor provided me with feedback for all sections except the discussion.

September 2020

Danielle Tetley

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge all the incredible people who helped me get here, this thesis is dedicated to each of you. First, thank you to my parents who inspired and encouraged my love for learning and knowledge, without which I wouldn't be here pursuing a career in research. To my mum, I am so incredibly grateful for all your love, constant support, and unwavering faith in me, I am so unbelievably lucky to have you. And to my dad, thank you for everything you gave me while you were here, I will never forget all the lessons you taught me, nor how often you would take every opportunity to tell me how proud you were of me, I miss you more than ever, and I hope I've made you proud this year. Thank you to my sister Shannon and my brother Jordan, I am forever grateful for our incredible friendship, and for your continuous support in all that I do. Thank you to Stella, Luna, Loki and Donjamin for always keeping me comforted and happy. Thank you to all my friends who have helped me through this year, I can't begin to describe how much I needed it, and how grateful I am to have each of you. And finally, to my supervisor Peter, thank you for all your guidance, encouragement, patience and advice that helped me get through my Honours year. Though this year has been a hard one, thanks to you it's also been rewarding and enjoyable, and I've been very lucky to have had you as my supervisor.

1. Introduction

Sexual objectification involves the singling out of an individual's body or body parts from them as a person, so that they are viewed as an object with the purpose of fulfilling the sexual desires of others (Szymanski et al. 2011). Originally, this was commonly understood as something that primarily happens to women, with their bodies being objectified for the sexual gratification of men, however, as research has found, men's bodies are also objectified, although to a lesser extent (Englen-Maddox et al., 2011). This sexual objectification of people's bodies is extremely problematic as it has been linked to a host of negative outcomes including body image issues, low self-esteem, and sexual violence. As such, there is a need for more knowledge and research concerning the mechanics of sexual objectification, in order to inform interventions that could potentially reduce it. An important theory that captures this idea that male and female bodies are sexually objectified is that of Frederickson and Robert's objectification theory (1997). However, before unpacking the specifics of this theory, it is first important to discuss the social construction of gender, as this is central to understanding why sexual objectification consistently takes place in society, and why women are more commonly the victims.

1.1. The Social Construction of Gender

There is no denying that everyday life is organised in ways that constantly distinguish men and women, and there is a common belief that this distinction is necessary because men and women are *naturally* different (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Further, the body has always been the criterion for this gender separation, with considerable essentialist literature claiming that one's gender identity stems from, and is largely influenced by, their biological body (Morton et al., 2009). Specifically, male and female anatomy, genetics, and hormones have all been used to clarify these gender distinctions (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). However, understandably so, feminists,

sociologists, and other researchers are suspicious of such claims, and have instead chosen to utilise more sociocultural explanations for gender (Hollander & Howard, 2000). Therefore, extensive sociological literature has highlighted how gender differences can be explained in ways that have little to do with biology, and much more to do with the socialisation of men and women respectively (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

As the role of 'woman' differs greatly from the role of 'man', so do the expectations and social power that each gender possesses (Connell, 2009). As feminist scholars explain, men and women are socialised from a young age to conform to socially defined gender roles, and therefore often feel compelled to behave and think in ways that adhere to what is expected of their gender (Cranny-Francis, 2003). Thus, masculine and feminine identities are largely a product of societal expectations that serve to conform individuals to the gender binary (Connell, 2009). As a result, these social pressures can dictate individual actions, thoughts, choices, and identities, which is problematic for many obvious reasons, as well as the fact that this also leads to gender stereotypes, gender segregation, and gender discrimination (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

As is common across many cultures, traditional notions of masculinity typically depict men as authoritative, physically strong, 'breadwinners', while traditional notions of femininity typically depict women as passive, emotional, caregivers (Parent & Moradi, 2010). Thus, if men and women are traditionally depicted this way, then this provides an explanation for many of the gender inequalities we see occurring in society, such as men feeling like they cannot show too much emotion, or women being judged based on their reproductive abilities and plans for motherhood (Szymanski et al., 2011). Furthermore, these traditional gender depictions, which are so strongly ingrained in individual minds, and embedded in many social institutions, often place females as the inferior sex, thus enabling a host of oppressions that women face on a daily basis, including

issues of employment discrimination, violence against women, and sexual objectification (Davidson & Gervais, 2015).

1.2. Objectification Theory

Originally, Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) developed objectification theory as a framework for understanding *women's* oppressed experiences, and the consequences that come with existing in a sociocultural environment that sexualises the female body. However, since its inception, there has been extensive research examining how this theory is also applicable to men, which will be discussed in depth later. However, for the purpose of understanding objectification theory as it was originally proposed, the main focus for the following paragraphs will be on the objectification of women.

Objectification theory posits that, rather than being evaluated based on who she is as a person, a woman is instead judged primarily on the basis of her appearance and sexual function (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) explain that, as women's value has historically been related to their physical appearance, women are therefore often reduced to their body parts and viewed as sexual objects. Additionally, there are some contexts in which this sexual objectification of women's bodies is not only normalised, but encouraged, including in beauty pageants, modelling, and cheerleading (Moffit & Szymanski, 2010). Further, Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) explain that there are two main components to objectification theory; self-objectification, and interpersonal objectification, which will both be discussed next.

Self-objectification refers to this idea that women objectify themselves, because they are constantly surveilling themselves in relation to the sexualised gaze of men (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). As Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) explain, after continuous experiences of being sexually

objectified, girls and women begin to internalise this male observer's sexualized gazing as a primary view of themselves.¹ This concept is explained by Berger, who states "[A woman] is almost continually accompanied by her own image of herself... Men act and women appear. Men look at women. Women watch themselves being looked at" (Berger, 1973, p.46-47). Additionally, self-objectification not only describes the internalisation of the male gaze, but also the internalisation of cultural beauty standards, which often sexualise the female body, and are constantly portrayed in various media outlets (Siegmund, 2016).

Interpersonal objectification, on the other hand, specifically refers to the sexual objectification that occurs in interactions with others, including strangers, colleagues, friends, family members, employers, romantic partners, or any other individual (Siegmund, 2016). Interpersonal objectification can occur in a variety of ways, as it can be anything from unwanted sexual advances, to simply the feeling of being watched by external observers (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). In essence, interpersonal objectification refers to how people are viewed and treated in a sexualised way by others, and this is the aspect of objectification theory which will be the focus of the present study.

Overall, Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) suggest that, as women are consistently viewed as sexual objects by others, themselves, and the media, this contributes to many issues that disproportionately affect women such as sexual harassment, domestic violence, body image issues, eating disorders, and some mental health disorders such as depression. However, it is important to note that all women experience and respond to sexual objectification in different ways, and various

¹ This male observer's sexualised gazing is consistently referred to in literature as "the male gaze" (Englen-Maddox et al., 2011).

combinations of race, culture, religion, class, sexuality, age, and other attributes, all contribute to unique experiences of sexual objectification across women. But, while this theory is vital to convey and explain the reality of women's oppression, it is also important to discuss how it relates to men.

1.3. Objectification Theory Applied to Men

Clearly there is extensive research using objectification theory as a framework for understanding women's issues, however, this has consequently left a limited application of this theory to men. This has most likely occurred because objectification theory was originally created to address the psychological experiences that were thought to be unique to women (Englen-Maddox et al., 2011). Additionally, many studies have often used objectification theory to examine body dissatisfaction and eating disorders, which are statistically more common in women than in men (Englen-Maddox et al., 2011). Nevertheless, the application of objectification theory to men is slowly growing, with recent works beginning to explore the extent to which aspects of this theory are relevant to men.

Most of the research examining how objectification theory relates to men has largely focused on how self-objectification can predict men's body dissatisfaction (Frederick et al., 2007). One such study includes that by Parent and Moradi, who applied objectification theory to body image and mental health problems in men, specifically looking at how the drive for a muscular physique leads to an inclination for steroid use, and consequently, body dysmorphia and poor mental health (Parent & Moradi, 2011). Their findings revealed that the internalisation of sexualised cultural beauty standards was an important correlate for both men's drive for muscularity, and for their steroid use, and concluded that the pressure of adhering to social standards of attractiveness, which was originally thought of as a women's issue, also negatively impacts men (Parent & Moradi, 2011). This was further supported by Davids et al. (2018), who

revealed similar findings in that sexual objectification experiences were significantly and positively correlated with the internalisation of cultural standards of appearance, body shame, and the drive for muscularity in a sample of 473 heterosexual men.

Although it is true that these cultural standards of attractiveness that idealise smallness and thinness for women, and tallness and physical strength for men, serve primarily to reinforce patriarchal power structures that oppress and disempower *women*, it nevertheless appears that the internalisation of these gendered notions of attractiveness also has a negative impact on *men*. This is further supported by research which has found that the exposure to objectified media images of one's own gender is associated with greater self-objectification and body shame in both women and men (Aubrey, 2006; Morry & Staska, 2001). This is especially relevant in today's world, as evidence suggests that media images of both women and men have slowly evolved to become more and more objectified over time (Englen-Maddox et al., 2011).

However, the internalisation of unrealistic standards of masculinity is not the only way that objectification theory applies to men. According to Heimerdinger-Edwards et al. (2011) exposure to the sexual objectification of women is also problematic for men, as it can teach men to perceive women as one-dimensional objects whose only purpose is to fulfil their sexual desires, which negatively impacts their relationships with women. Furthermore, this can not only reduce men's satisfaction with their female sexual partners, but in extreme cases, this can lead to a greater inclination to sexual aggression and violence towards women, and can limit men's sexual pleasure solely to situations where their female partner is hurt or dominated (Heimerdinger-Edwards et al.,

2011).² As a result, this can negatively affect the healthy maintenance of heterosexual men's intimate relationships, and hinder their understanding of how to build healthy connections with women (Heimerdinger-Edwards et al., 2011). Further, if men are socialised from a young age to view women in a sexualised way, it can be difficult to break these habits in adulthood, resulting in unhealthy and unstable relationships between men and women.

However, despite these studies exploring the application of objectification theory to men, overall, the extent to which all the assumptions of this theory can be applied to men still remains somewhat ambiguous. In fact, a systematic review of objectification research by Moradi and Huang (2008) specifically noted that there was a need for more research examining how sexual objectification affects men. However, it is still important to take note of the findings described above, as they provide an important insight into male experiences of interpersonal and self-objectification.

1.4. Who Objectifies?

Given the above findings, if both genders can be victims of objectification, is it then given that both genders can also act as perpetrators of objectification? Or put another way, do women, as well as men, objectify others? A study by Strelan and Hargreaves (2005) sought to explore this, as they examined the ways in which both men and women objectified others from the opposite gender, as well as their own gender. Their results found that both men and women objectified women more than they both objectified men, and interestingly, that men objectified women more than women

²For obvious reasons, these specific issues also negatively impact women and their intimate relationships with men, however, for the sake of understanding the application of objectification theory to men, the focus will remain on interpreting these issues from male perspectives.

did, and that women objectified men more than men did (Strelan & Hargreaves, 2005). Thus, this demonstrates that women are capable of objectifying others, and also further confirms that men can be the victims of objectification.

Another study which sought to explore whether women could be perpetrators of objectification was that by Civile and Obhi (2016). They explain that sexual objectification is traditionally thought of as something that men do to women, however, they propose that this may be due to the higher social power that men possess, rather than because of their male qualities (Civile & Obhi, 2016). Thus, their study involved priming separate groups of female participants to high, neutral, or low power, and then exposing them to a series of sexualised images of men and women (Civile & Obhi, 2016). Their results found that the high-power group showed strong objectification towards the sexualised men, while the neutral control group displayed objectification only towards the sexualised women, and finally, the low-power group tended to perceive images of both sexualised men and women as whole persons, rather than body parts (Civile & Obhi, 2016). This therefore demonstrates the role that social power plays in governing objectification perpetration, and demonstrates how both women and men are capable of perpetrating. Furthermore, as the control group showed objectification only towards the sexualised women, this also demonstrates how women are more normally the victims of objectification, and that this can come from both male and female perpetrators.

Overall these studies demonstrate that, not only can women perpetrate objectification, but that men can also be the victims. However, women still remain, unsurprisingly, more likely to be the victims of sexual objectification in both studies. Interestingly, according to the results obtained by Strelan and Hargreaves, it appears that people are more likely to be objectified by the opposite

gender, rather than by their own gender, which may indicate that, from a heteronormative perspective, who we objectify may be related to sexual attraction.

1.5. Objectification and Sexual Orientation

The male gaze, as mentioned above, assumes a heteronormative ideology where women are viewed and evaluated in a sexualised way by men, however, this notion fails to consider the sexual orientation of both the observer and the observed. Given this, there is research exploring the role that one's sexuality plays in the objectification process, specifically looking at how it predicts self-objectification, and consequently, body dissatisfaction, and disordered eating. Overall, there appears to be mixed findings when it comes to comparing these body image issues between lesbian and heterosexual women, as, while some have found that lesbian women report less concern for appearance and weight, and lower body dissatisfaction (Lakkis et al., 1999), others have struggled to replicate this, instead finding comparable levels of these for both groups of women (Beren et al., 1996). Therefore, it remains unclear as to how self-objectification affects lesbian women. However, there does appear to be substantial findings when it comes to men, as research has consistently found that gay men show significantly higher body dissatisfaction and disordered eating than heterosexual men, with some suggesting that their levels are comparable to heterosexual women (Beren et al., 1996; Englen-Maddox et al., 2011; Lakkis et al., 1999).

Overall, there appears to be a relationship between sexuality and objectification, however, how significant this is, and the specific details of which, still remains unclear. Additionally, while there is substantial research examining how one's sexuality influences their self-objectification, there is little examining how this impacts interpersonal objectification, which is the area of interest in the present study.

1.6. Trait Predictors of Objectification

As discussed above, there has been extensive research examining how gender is involved with objectification of the self and others, but are there factors other than gender that could act as predictors of objectification perpetration? There is some, albeit limited, research examining various personality traits and how they relate to objectification theory. For example, some research has explored whether sexism influences the objectification process, with one study by Lameiras-Fernandez et al. (2018) exploring whether women's sexist attitudes influence how they interpret various positive and negative objectifying comments. Their findings revealed that those who scored higher in hostile sexism towards women felt less objectified from the positive comments, and felt more enjoyment from tame sexual body comments (Lameiras-Fernandez et al., 2018). Additionally, they also found that those with higher hostile sexism towards men had higher feelings of objectification from all types of comments, and had less enjoyment from the crude sexual body comments (Lameiras-Fernandez et al., 2018). Thus, it appears that sexism may influence women's attitudes about being objectified, however, does this also translate to their views about the objectification of others? And how do men's sexist views play a role? These are questions that the present study aims to explore and answer.

Besides those studies exploring how sexism influences objectification perpetration, there is little to no other published research examining how other traits are related. As such, the present study aims to fill in this research gap by determining what traits are common among those who frequently objectify others, and which traits are the best predictors of this behaviour.

1.7. Situational Predictors of Objectification

Unlike that of trait predictors, there is immense research exploring the role that situational factors play in the objectification process. For example, one study by Tylka and Kroon Van Diest

(2015) sought to explore how men's pornography use could be integrated with objectification theory. They explain that due to the nature of mainstream pornography, which often portrays the objectification and domination of women, women's male partners' pornography use could therefore serve as another form of sexual objectification, and hence negatively affect women's well-being (Tylka & Kroon Van Diest, 2015). Thus, they examined 171 college women, and measured their male partners' pornography use, as well as some key objectification theory constructs such as the internalisation of cultural beauty standards, interpersonal objectification, self-esteem, and body appreciation (Tylka & Kroon Van Diest, 2015). Their findings revealed that women's male partners' pornography use directly predicted their internalisation of cultural beauty standards, their interpersonal objectification, and their eating disorder symptoms, and it indirectly predicted their body surveillance and body shame (Tylka & Kroon Van Diest, 2015). Other research by Maas and Dewey (2018) also explored the impact of pornography, finding that women who frequently used pornography engaged in more body monitoring, and had a higher endorsement of rape myths, than women who did not use pornography. Additionally, Rousseau et al. (2018) also explored how television viewing influenced boy's endorsement of sexualised gender roles, finding that increased viewing of music and tween TV was associated with increased views of men as sexually dominant, and women as sex objects. Although this isn't specifically related to pornography use, this still demonstrates how an individual's exposure to sexually objectifying media can greatly impact how they view men and women's gender roles. Therefore, there appears to be a relationship between male and female sexual media use, and women's experiences of sexual objectification.

Another situational factor that can influence an individual's likelihood of objectifying others includes their socialisation during childhood, and their parent's gender-typical attitudes. One

study by Epstein and Ward (2011) found that adolescents who received messages from their parents during childhood that promoted traditional gender roles, were found to have more traditional gender beliefs in adolescence (Epstein & Ward, 2011). This is supported by Rousseau et al. (2018), who also found that adolescents who experienced high levels of gender-typical socialisation from their parents, perpetrated higher objectification of women's bodies. Additionally, research by Arroyo and Anderson (2015) also explored how mothers' attitudes about the importance of physical appearance can affect their daughter's likelihood to self-objectify. Their results revealed significant positive relationships between mothers' attitudes and their daughters' self-objectification, suggesting that mothers can act as a protective or inhibitory factor in their daughters' experiences of self-objectification (Arroyo & Anderson, 2015). Overall, it appears that an individual's childhood, particularly the messages from their parents and the gender-typical socialisation that they receive during childhood, is directly related to their views about gender roles in adolescence, and in turn, their involvement in the objectification of themselves and others.

1.8. Aims and Hypotheses

Rather than exploring the many consequences of objectification, as so many previous studies have done, the present study instead aims to determine what predicts the likelihood that one will objectify others. Specifically, the present study aims to explore whether certain traits and situational factors can be linked to the perpetration of objectification, in order to obtain a profile of the typical objectifier. But first, it is important to note that much of the research described above mainly focuses on how various factors predict the likelihood that one is to self-objectify. However, it is given that those who self-objectify place a vast importance on appearance, so it is therefore reasonable to expect that these self-objectifying individuals also evaluate others' appearance in the same or a similar way. Thus, the present study will move forward under the premise that some of

these factors which predict self-objectification, may also predict one's likelihood of objectifying others.

Firstly, as previous research has found that men who adhere more closely to traditional notions of masculinity (ie. muscularity) are more likely to self-objectify (Davids et al., 2018; Parent & Moradi, 2011), the present study will therefore examine whether those who possess more traditionally masculine *traits* are also more likely to objectify others. Therefore, the traditional masculine traits of dominance, the desire for control, and the need for power, will be measured in order to determine whether they correlate with the perpetration of objectification. Furthermore, as the adherence to these traditional ideals is linked with greater objectification outcomes, it will also be pertinent to explore whether one's inclination towards more traditional values in general are linked to the perpetration of objectification. Therefore, the present study will also measure traditionalism, or as it's also commonly referred 'conservatism', as a trait in order to determine whether this also correlates with the perpetration of objectification.

Second, as previous research has examined the role of sexism, revealing that an individual's sexist attitudes can influence how they feel about being objectified (Lameiras-Fernandez et al., 2018), sexism will therefore be measured and assessed as a trait predictor of objectification perpetration, to further examine the role it plays in the objectification process. Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that an opposite to sexism would be the belief in, or value for, equality and fairness. Therefore, the present study will also measure participants' value for fairness in order to explore whether this has an opposite effect to sexism, in regard to predicting objectification perpetration.

Consistent with previous research (Maas & Dewey, 2018; Rousseau et al, 2018; Tylka & Kroon Van Diest, 2015), participants frequency of sexual media use will be measured, as well as the nature of this sexual media (ie. how derogatory it is). This will further confirm whether increased sexual media use is associated with a higher likelihood of objectifying others, as well as explore if the content of this sexual media is also related. Additionally, in order to further explore the influence of childhood socialisation, and to expand on the findings of Epstein and Ward (2011), Rousseau et al. (2018), and Arroyo and Andersen (2015), the present study will also measure the gender-typical messages that participants received from their parents or caregivers during childhood, to further explore the role that this situational factor plays in the objectification process.

Importantly, the present study will explore these traits and situational factors in a sample of both men and women. Moreover, as research suggests that individuals are more likely to objectify the opposite gender rather than their own gender, the objectification measure will be tailored so that women will be asked questions that examine their objectification of men, and men will be asked questions that examine their objectification of women. However, this will only be the case for those who identify as heterosexual, and participants who identify as homosexual will complete a measure that examines their objectification of their own gender, to further explore how sexuality relates to interpersonal objectification.

Given what has been found in previous research and discussed above, it is therefore hypothesised that:

1. Objectification of women scores will be higher than objectification of men scores.
2. Men's scores for dominance, desire for control, need for power, and conservatism, will all positively correlate with their objectification of women scores. Although there is no previous research examining how these factors influence women's objectification

perpetration, based on general theorising, it is expected that these same relations will also be observed among women objectifying men.

3. Both men's and women's sexism scores will positively correlate with their objectification perpetration.
4. Both men's and women's value for fairness scores will negatively correlate with their objectification perpetration.
5. Both men's and women's scores for the situational factors (sexual media use and gender-typical socialisation), will both positively correlate with their objectification perpetration.

Importantly, the overarching aim of the present study is to determine which out of these traits and situational factors best predicts objectification perpetration, whilst also further exploring how this compares in men and women.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

Before data was collected, an *a priori* power analysis was run in order to determine a sample size that will ensure sufficient power. A medium effect size was specified ($d = .50$), as well as an alpha of .05, and the use of a two-tailed test, and results revealed that a total sample of 84 is required in order to achieve a power level of .80. Overall, results were obtained from a sample of 203 participants, thus the present study should possess sufficient power. The sample contained 42 males and 161 females, and their ages ranged from 17-70 years. Participants' mean age was 25.89 (SD = 12.61), while the mean age for men was 26.98 (SD = 13.08), and the mean age for women was 25.69 (SD = 12.57). Participants identified as coming from a total of 15 different cultural backgrounds, and 14 different religions, though the majority identified as Caucasian (70.4%) and non-religious (54.2%). Additionally, all male participants identified as heterosexual, as well as most female participants (94.0%), as there were only 12 female participants who identified as homosexual. Further, most participants (70.9%) were first-year psychology students at The University of Adelaide who participated for course credit via the Research Participation System, while all other participants were recruited from the general public through Facebook. There were no strict inclusion or exclusion criteria, as people were eligible to participate if they were Australian residents and could speak fluent English, in order to ensure comprehension of instructions in an all Australian sample.

2.2. Measures

The survey was comprised of nine measures: six were measures of the personality traits, two were measures of the situational factors, and the last one measured the outcome variable of objectification perpetration, and each of these is detailed below. Additionally, the survey also

collected relevant demographics including participant's age, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity and religious background. Importantly, for all of the below measures, scores were summed so that higher scores indicate a higher magnitude of the variable being measured.

2.2.1. Dominance

Dominance was measured using The California Psychological Inventory – Dominance Scale (CPI-D) (Gough & Bradley, 1956), which is a subscale within the California Psychological Inventory, and measures participants' dominant tendencies and behaviours. It consists of 11 items which include statements such as "I like to impose my will on others", that participants responded to on a 5-point scale, and scores can range between 11 and 55. Studies which have assessed the psychometric properties of the CPI have consistently found support for the concurrent, construct and predictive validity of the dominance subscale, with a review by Megargee (1972) explaining that the dominance scale is one of the best validated out of all eighteen subscales in the CPI. Furthermore, in another review by Butt and Fiske (1968), they explain that in comparison to other dominance scales, the CPI-D is the most appropriate for assessing dominance and leadership tendencies. Additionally, assessment of this scale's internal reliability for the present sample revealed a Cronbach's alpha of .85, indicating good internal consistency.

2.2.2. Desire for Control

In order to measure participants' desire for control, the Desirability of Control Scale (Burger, 1992) was used, which consists of 20 items that measure participants' desire for control. The scale consists of statements such as "I prefer a job where I have a lot of control over what I do and when I do it", and participants were asked to indicate on a 7-point scale whether or not each statement described them, with scores ranging between 7 and 140. Validity examination of this scale has revealed strong evidence for discriminant validity, demonstrating that items do not correlate with

measures of locus of control, Machiavellianism, and extraversion (Burger, 1992). Additionally, reliability analysis of the Desirability of Control Scale for the present sample found good internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of .79.

2.2.3. Need for Power

Participant's need for power was measured using the Index of Personal Relations – Need for Power Subscale (Bennett, 1985), which measures participant's need to obtain a high position, and their overall drive to pursue power. The scale consists of 10 items, and participants were asked to indicate on a 5-point scale whether or not each statement described them, with scores ranging between 10 and 50. There is strong evidence for this scale's convergent and discriminant validity, with patterns of correlations demonstrating that the need for power construct is distinctive from many seemingly related personality traits, such as dominance, leadership, and self-esteem (Bennet, 1985). Furthermore, internal reliability analysis revealed a Cronbach's alpha of .84, indicating good internal consistency for the present sample.

2.2.4. Conservatism

The 12 item Scale of Social Conservatism (Henningham, 1996) was used to measure the extent of participants' conservatist leaning. The scale consists of 12 words or phrases that represent issues important to conservatism, such as "legalised abortion", "pre-marital virginity" and "legalised prostitution", and participants were asked to indicate whether they are for or against each of these issues, with scores ranging between 12 and 36. Analysis of the scale's validity has revealed that scores for this scale are weakly correlated with political leaning, thus supporting its construct validity as a reflection of ideology, rather than political affiliation (Henningham, 1996). Further, reliability analysis for this scale revealed adequate internal consistency in the present sample, with a Cronbach's alpha score of .72.

2.2.5. Sexism

To measure sexism, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) was used, which has a series of 22 items that measure both hostile and benevolent sexism. Participants responded to statements such as “women are too easily offended” by agreeing or disagreeing on a 6-point scale (1= strongly disagree, 6= strongly agree), and scores can range between 22 and 132. Further, there is strong evidence for acceptable convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity of this scale (Glick & Fiske, 1996), and internal reliability analysis revealed a Cronbach’s alpha of .90 for the present sample, indicating high internal consistency.

2.2.6. Value for Fairness

In order to measure value for fairness, a subscale of the HEXACO Personality Inventory (Lee & Ashton, 2004) was used. Specifically, the Honesty/Humility subscale of the HEXACO consists of items that measure participants’ sincerity, fairness, greed avoidance, and modesty, however, for the purpose of investigating participant’s value for fairness, only the 10 items which measured fairness were used (Lee & Ashton, 2004). The fairness scale consists of statements such as “I would never take things that aren’t mine”, and participants were asked to indicate on a 5-point scale whether or not each statement described them, with scores ranging between 10 and 50. Research examining the psychometric properties of the HEXACO has revealed good convergent and discriminant validity for the scale as a whole (Lee & Ashton, 2004), and reliability analysis has revealed an acceptable level of internal consistency for the present sample, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .68.

2.2.7. Sexual Media Consumption

This scale was created in order to measure participant’s frequency of sexual media use, and the nature of the material that they view (ie. how derogatory it is). Participants were first asked to

rate how often they use sexual media (1= Never, 8 = 7 or more times per week), and were next asked to rate their agreement towards a series of 5 statements relating to the content of the material they use. An example statement includes “I believe that the women featured in the pornographic material with which I engage are treated respectfully”. The first item relating to the frequency of use was separated from those relating to the content, and was labelled “Sexual Media Use”, with scores ranging between 1 and 8, and higher scores indicating greater frequency of use. The rest of the items were summed and labeled “Sexual Media Nature”, with higher scores indicating a greater derogatory nature of the sexual media, and scores can range between 5 and 35. The overall Cronbach’s alpha score for this scale is .77, and for the sexual media nature items alone the alpha coefficient is .73, indicating good internal consistency.³

2.2.8. Gender-Typical Childhood Socialisation

This scale was created to measure the gender-typical socialisation that participants received during their childhood. There were 8 items in total, and participants were asked to indicate how often they received certain messages from their parents or caregivers during their childhood on a 5-point scale, where 1=Never received this message, and 5=Constantly received this message. An example message includes “the husband should be the primary financial provider for the family”, and scores can range between 8 and 40. Additionally, reliability analysis revealed high internal consistency for the present sample, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .89.

³ Internal reliability analysis could not be conducted for the sexual media use measure, as it only contained one item.

2.2.9. Objectification Perpetration

In order to measure participant's objectification perpetration, the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale – Perpetrator Version (ISOS-P) (Gervais et al., 2018) was used. This scale measures the frequency with which participants perpetrated objectifying gazes, appearance commentary, and unwanted sexual advances in the past year (Gervais et al., 2018). There are 15 items in total, however, for the present study, 3 items were removed for ethical reasons as they pertained to sexual assault, leaving 12 items which were used. Participants selected their response on a 5-point scale, and scores can range between 12 and 60. This scale has good construct validity, as the ISOS-P has been found to positively correlate with other measures of sexual objectification perpetration (Gervais et al., 2018). This scale's internal reliability was also assessed in the present sample, with results revealing a Cronbach's alpha of .78 for objectification of women scores, and .87 for objectification of men scores.

2.3. Procedure

Participants completed the above scales in the form of an online survey which was not timed, but on average took approximately 15 minutes, and participants gave informed consent electronically before they began the survey. Participants were also able to withdraw from the study at any time, and confidentiality was ensured as no names or personal information was collected with the data. Although distress was not expected to occur, questions about sexual objectification and sexual media use may have caused mild discomfort in some participants, and therefore the contact details for Lifeline and other relevant mental health services were provided at the start and end of the survey. This study received approval from The University of Adelaide, School of Psychology: Human Research Ethics Committee.

3. Results

3.1. Missing Data

When first examining the data, there was a total of 229 responses. However, it was clear that some responses were incomplete, as participants had filled in the demographic information, but had not completed the various trait and situational measures. Therefore, for the relevant analyses, 26 responses were removed due to incompleteness, leaving a sample of 203 completed responses. Importantly, as all male participants identified as heterosexual, there were therefore no male participants who completed the objectification of men measure, and as such, some sections of the below tables remain blank.

3.2. Testing Normality

Before undertaking any significance testing, the data was first screened to test for normality using Shapiro-Wilk tests. Results of these indicated that both desire for control ($W = .99, p = .61$), and need for power ($W = .99, p = .32$) were normally distributed, while all other variables were not. Upon inspection of the skewness and kurtosis statistics, it was clear that dominance (skewness = .61, kurtosis = .28), conservatism (skewness = .70, kurtosis = -.05), sexism (skewness = .25, kurtosis = -.75), sexual media use (skewness = .81, kurtosis = -.23), and sexual media nature (skewness = .17, kurtosis = -.68) were all positively skewed, while value for fairness (skewness = -1.19, kurtosis = 1.86) was negatively skewed. Additionally, the dependent variables were also tested for normality, and results again indicated that these were not normal, as both objectification of women (skewness = .81, kurtosis = .31) and objectification of men (skewness = 1.33, kurtosis = 2.19) were positively skewed.⁴

⁴ Given this, some non-parametric versions of the relevant statistical tests were also run, however, it was found that both the non-parametric and parametric tests yielded very similar results. Therefore, as parametric tests have more statistical power than non-parametric tests, the parametric versions are reported in the main text. To see the results of the non-parametric tests, see Appendix A.

3.3. Sample Characteristics

Table 1 contains the mean scores for male and female participants on each of the variables. In all cases, the means for males are higher than those for females, except for the value for fairness and sexual media nature scores. In order to determine if any of these differences between the male and female means are significant, a series of independent samples t-tests were conducted. Results found that the differences between male and female means were significant for all variables except conservatism, value for fairness, and gender-typical socialisation (see Table 1).

3.4. Bivariate Relations Between Variables

Table 2 displays the Pearson correlations between all the variables, divided by gender. Below the diagonal are the correlations for women, while those above the diagonal are the correlations for men. For women, the strongest correlation is that between their sexism and conservatism scores, and this was positive and significant. Similarly, the correlation between men's sexism and conservatism scores was also one of the strongest for this group, however, their strongest was that between their sexism and gender-typical socialisation scores, and again both of these were positive and significant. As for the objectification correlations, while there are no significant relationships between female predictor scores and their objectification of women, there are however, some significant relationships between female predictor scores and their objectification of men, and male predictor scores and their objectification of women. For males, both their value for fairness and gender-typical socialisation scores significantly correlated with their objectification of women scores, with value for fairness correlating negatively, and gender-typical socialisation correlating positively. For females, their dominance, sexism, and value for fairness scores all significantly correlated with their objectification of men scores, with dominance and sexism correlating positively, and value for fairness correlating negatively.

Table 1:

Sample Characteristics

	Females (<i>n</i> = 161)				Males (<i>n</i> = 42)				Results of Independent Samples t-tests Comparing Males and Females (<i>n</i> = 203)			
	M		SD		M		SD		t	<i>p</i> -value	95% Confidence Interval	
											Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Dominance	25.45	7.11	30.02	6.79	3.75	<.001	2.17	6.98				
Desire for Control	87.94	12.92	95.00	13.54	3.12	.002	2.60	11.51				
Need for Power	27.56	7.45	31.00	7.16	2.69	.008	.915	5.97				
Conservatism	17.86	3.75	17.95	4.32	.133	.895	-1.23	1.41				
Sexism	55.81	17.64	63.24	18.43	2.41	.017	1.35	13.51				
Value for Fairness	43.75	4.52	42.40	5.51	-1.63	.104	-2.96	.278				
Sexual Media Use	2.47	1.51	5.14	2.02	9.46	<.001	2.11	3.23				
Sexual Media Nature ^a	16.09	6.11	13.32	5.10	-2.57	.011	-4.90	-.639				
Gender-Typical Socialisation	19.56	8.81	20.79	7.13	.834	.405	-1.68	4.13				
Objectification of Women ^b	18.17	4.63	23.19	6.00	2.68	.010	1.26	8.79				
Objectification of Men ^c	21.28	6.97	–	–	–	–	–	–				

^a For Sexual Media Nature *n* = 145 (104 females, 41 males) as this was only measured in participants who used sexual media.

^b For Objectification of Women *n* = 54 (12 females, 42 males).

^c For Objectification of Men *n* = 149 (149 females, 0 males).

Table 2:

Pearson Correlations Between All Variables – Divided by Gender

	Male Correlations (<i>n</i> = 42)										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Dominance		.269	.485**	.059	.180	-.390*	.126	.028	.125	.140	–
2. Desire for Control	.315**		.332*	-.107	-.027	-.008	-.054	-.262	.005	-.213	–
3. Need for Power	.419**	.355**		.212	.220	-.308*	.162	-.099	-.060	.033	–
4. Conservatism	.015	-.204**	.032		.530**	-.017	-.190	.172	.313*	.156	–
5. Sexism	.179*	-.075	.108	.635**		.006	-.137	-.063	.588**	.148	–
6. Value for Fairness	-.267**	-.002	.003	.218**	.042		-.271	-.026	-.010	-.435**	–
7. Sexual Media Use	.096	-.131	.130	-.197*	-.157*	-.019		-.218	-.140	.169	–
8. Sexual Media Nature	.105	-.062	.217*	.225*	.181	.002	-.026		-.018	.030	–
9. Gender-Typical Socialisation	.268**	.075	.035	.097	.159*	-.088	.076	-.003		.318*	–
10. Objectification of Women	-.173	.204	.427	.292	-.237	.275	.083	.331	-.023		–
11. Objectification of Men	.194*	.090	.053	.053	.298**	-.211**	.152	.145	.153	–	

Note: **p* < .05, ***p* < .0

Female Correlations (*n* = 161)

3.5. Predictors of Objectification

In order to determine the specific contributions that each of these variables have on objectification scores, two multiple linear regressions were run, with objectification of women and objectification of men as the outcome variables respectively. As displayed in Table 3, results revealed that, while value for fairness was the best predictor, none of the variables significantly predicted objectification of women, and overall, the proportion of variance explained by these predictors was low and not significant ($F(9, 41) = 1.16, p = .343, R^2 = .204$).⁵ For objectification of men, sexism was the best predictor, and this was also significant, although this was the only significant predictor out of all the variables (see Table 4). Additionally, although once again low, the predictors explain a significant amount of variance in objectification of men scores ($F(9, 85) = 3.19, p = .002, R^2 = .253$).

⁵ This regression includes both men's and women's objectification of women, however, due to the low number of women objectifying women in this sample, another regression was run, again with objectification of women as the outcome variable, however, this time with the female perpetrators excluded, so that it only represents men's objectification of women. Results revealed that value for fairness was still the best predictor, however, it was now significant ($t = -2.46, p = .02$). Furthermore, gender-typical socialisation now closely follows this ($t = 1.91, p = .06$), although it still remains non-significant. Additionally, the proportion of variance explained by the predictors increased, although this still remained non-significant ($F(9, 31) = 1.16, p = .096, R^2 = .351$). See Appendix B for further details.

Table 3:

Multiple Regression Model for Predictors of Objectification of Women (n = 54)

	Unstandardised B	Coefficients	Standardised	t-value	p-value	95% Confidence Interval for B	
		Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Dominance	-.054	.142	-.062	-.380	.706	-.341	.233
Desire for Control	.003	.070	.007	.044	.965	-.138	.145
Need for Power	.070	.149	.090	.471	.640	-.231	.372
Conservatism	.137	.271	.093	.504	.617	-.411	.684
Sexism	.055	.061	.174	.896	.375	-.069	.178
Value for Fairness	-.320	.179	-.283	-1.785	.082	-.682	.042
Sexual Media Use	.468	.501	.146	.934	.356	-.544	1.481
Sexual Media Nature	.106	.176	.090	.604	.549	-.249	.462
Gender-Typical Socialisation	.040	.128	.052	.311	.757	-.219	.298

Table 4:

Multiple Regression Model for Predictors of Objectification of Men (n = 149)

	Unstandardised B	Coefficients Std. Error	Standardised Beta	t-value	p-value	95% Confidence Interval for B	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Dominance	.191	.165	.162	1.157	.250	-.137	.519
Desire for Control	.099	.068	.169	1.449	.151	-.037	.234
Need for Power	-.213	.135	-.213	-1.581	.118	-.482	.055
Conservatism	-.372	.284	-.179	-1.312	.193	-.936	.192
Sexism	.169	.055	.405	3.061	.003	.059	.280
Value for Fairness	-.212	.162	-.131	-1.307	.195	-.534	.110
Sexual Media Use	.441	.543	.081	.813	.419	-.638	1.521
Sexual Media Nature	.192	.121	.159	1.583	.117	-.049	.433
Gender-Typical Socialisation	.060	.090	.070	.672	.503	-.118	.238

4. Discussion

4.1. Gender Differences

The aim of the present study was to identify any trait and/or situational predictors of objectification perpetration, as well as to explore how these present across men and women. Results revealed that males scored higher than females on each of the predictors except value for fairness and sexual media nature, and all of these differences were found to be significant, except for conservatism, value for fairness, and gender-typical socialisation. Thus, it appears that this sample of men are significantly more domineering, have a significantly higher desire for control and need for power, are significantly more sexist, and use significantly more sexual media, than the women in this sample. Contrastingly, women scored significantly higher than men on sexual media nature, suggesting that women engage with more derogatory content than men do. However, importantly, in all cases except for desire for control, need for power, and value for fairness, the data were positively skewed, suggesting that this sample tended to have lower scores on all of these variables, indicating a generally lower magnitude of these traits. Additionally, the data for value for fairness was negatively skewed, indicating that this sample had generally higher scores, and therefore higher value for fairness.

As hypothesis 1 predicted, objectification of women scores were higher than objectification of men scores, as evident by the group means. However, it is important to note that overall, objectification scores were relatively low in this sample, as the means fell below the midpoint for both objectification of men and objectification of women, and the data are positively skewed, indicating generally low scores in this sample. Additionally, it is clear from the group means that men objectified women more than women did, thus supporting Strelan and Hargreaves (2005), who had this same finding. However, the sample of women who objectified women consisted of only

12 participants, thus significant weight should not be placed on this finding. Additionally, the objectification of men by men was unable to be explored due to a lack of gay male participants, thus the men's versus women's objectification of men cannot be compared.

4.2. Predictors of Objectification

Hypothesis 2 predicted that men's scores for dominance, desire for control, need for power, and conservatism would all positively correlate with objectification of women scores, however, this was not supported by the results. While dominance, need for power, and conservatism all correlated positively with objectification of women scores, desire for control correlated negatively, and overall these were all weak and non-significant correlations, suggesting that these traits may not necessarily predict men's objectification of women. However, hypothesis 2 also noted that these relations were expected to translate to women's objectification of men, and this was partially supported. Women's scores on these traits all correlated positively with objectification of men, and the relationship between women's dominance scores and their objectification of men was significant. However, once again these were all weak correlations, and all except dominance were non-significant.⁶ The regression further confirmed these results, as none of these traits were found to significantly predict objectification of women or men. Thus, it appears that these traits may not predict men's or women's objectification perpetration, with the exception of women's dominance scores significantly correlating with their objectification of men. This idea that individuals with more traditionally masculine traits will objectify others more, was based on research by Davids et

⁶ For the correlations between women's scores on these traits and their objectification of women, these were once again weak, non-significant, and all correlated positively, except for dominance which correlated negatively. However, once again due to the low number of participants in this category, these findings should not receive considerable weight.

al. (2018), and Parent and Moradi (2011), who found that men who adhered to more traditionally masculine ideals objectified themselves and others more, however, it is clear that the results of the present study do not support this previous research.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that both men's and women's sexism scores would positively correlate with their objectification perpetration, and this was again partially supported. While the correlation between men's sexism scores and their objectification of women was positive, it was also weak and not significant. However, there was a significant positive relationship between women's sexism scores and their objectification of men, although again this was weak. Additionally, the results of the regressions confirmed that sexism did not significantly predict men's objectification of women, however, it did best and significantly predict women's objectification of men. Therefore, although sexism does not seem to be related to men's objectification of women, it does appear to predict women's objectification of men. Although not directly related, this expands the findings by Lameiras-Fernandez et al. (2018), and supports their primary finding that women's sexist attitudes play a role in the objectification process. While Lameiras-Fernandez et al. found that sexism influenced women's attitudes about being objectified, the findings of the present study revealed that these sexist views also influence women's objectification perpetration.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that both men's and women's value for fairness scores would negatively correlate with objectification perpetration, indicating that higher value for fairness should result in less objectification of others. Results supported this hypothesis, as both men's and women's value for fairness significantly and negatively correlated with their objectification

perpetration towards the opposite sex.⁷ Specifically, men's value for fairness correlates moderately with objectification of women scores, while women's value for fairness correlates weak-to-moderately with objectification of men scores. Furthermore, the regressions revealed that value for fairness was the best predictor of objectification of women scores, and when the female perpetrators were removed from this analysis, it was a significant predictor, suggesting that value for fairness predicts men's objectification of women. However, this was not the case for women's objectification of men, as the second regression revealed that value for fairness was not the best, nor a significant predictor. Although this hypothesis was not based on previous findings per se, it was based around the idea that value for fairness is in a way, opposite to sexism, and thus we should see contrasting results for each (ie. if sexism correlates positively with objectification perpetration, then value for fairness should correlate negatively). While sexism denotes the idea that one sex is superior to the other, value for fairness promotes this idea of equality, and thus, it appears that those who frequently objectify others tend to believe that their gender is superior, and they do not necessarily regard everyone as equal.

Finally, hypothesis 5 predicted that men's and women's scores on both situational predictors would correlate positively with objectification perpetration, and this was partially supported by the results. The correlations revealed that men's gender-typical socialisation had a weak-to-moderate, positive, and significant relationship with objectification of women scores, however, this was not the case for women's objectification of women, nor women's objectification of men. Furthermore,

⁷ Women's value for fairness scores did not negatively or significantly correlate with their objectification of women, however, there were no significant correlations for any of the predictors in this category, and once again the low number of participants suggests that this should not be extensively considered.

both men's and women's sexual media use and sexual media nature scores did not have strong or significant relationships with their objectification perpetration. However, it is worth noting that all correlations between these situational factors and objectification scores were positive, except for that between women's gender-typical socialisation and their objectification of women scores.⁸ The regression revealed similar findings, as neither sexual media use, sexual media nature, nor gender-typical socialisation significantly predicted objectification of women or objectification of men. However, when the female perpetrators were removed from the objectification of women regression, gender-typical socialisation was the second-best predictor, however it still remained non-significant. Therefore, these results suggest that men's gender-typical socialisation may have some (perhaps small) effect on their likelihood of objectifying women, however, this is not the case for women's objectification of others. As such, these results partially support the findings of Epstein and Ward (2011), Rousseau et al. (2018), and Arroyo and Andersen (2015), as it appears that the gender-typical messages received during childhood play a role in men's objectification of women. Additionally, these findings do not support the findings of Tylka and Kroon Van Diest (2015), Maas and Dewey (2018), and Rousseau et al. (2018), as sexual media use and nature did not significantly correlate, nor significantly predict, objectification perpetration in men or women.

4.3. Limitations and Future Research

Although the present study produced some interesting findings, it is important to note some of its limitations. The first limitation relates to the sample, as it contained only a small number of males, an even smaller number of gay females, and no gay males. Therefore, valid and reliable conclusions can only really be drawn from the sample of women objectifying men. Although results

⁸ As discussed before, this should not be deeply considered due to the small number of participants in this category.

from the sample of men objectifying women should still be considered in depth, due to the smaller sample size, these results are not as reliable. Additionally, the sample of women objectifying women should not be greatly considered, as this sample is too small for any reliable conclusions to be drawn. Furthermore, participants were mostly young (under thirty) first-year university students who were predominately Caucasian and heterosexual, thus limiting the generalisability of these results to diverse groups of people. Therefore, future research should aim to use a more inclusive sample, which contains more males, more people from older age groups with a range of education backgrounds, and more people with varying sexualities and diverse cultural backgrounds, to increase the external validity of the findings, and to also allow for exploration into how various other oppressions (eg. racism, homophobia etc.) may intersect with interpersonal objectification.

A second limitation relates to the use of self-report measures, as, due to the nature of the traits that were measured (in that they are considered undesirable qualities), socially desirable responding may have occurred. As such, results may therefore not truly represent participant's actual scores, and this may also explain why most of the variables were positively skewed. This social desirability bias would particularly impact the objectification measure, the sexism measure, and the sexual media consumption measure, as these had the most potential to be confronting and cause mild discomfort in participants. As such, participants may not have been honest with how often they perpetrated objectifying behaviours, nor with how sexist they are, nor with how often they used sexual media. Therefore, future researchers should be mindful of this, and possibly aim to avoid socially desirable responding through the use of a social desirability scale, or by keeping the purpose of the study as vague as possible.

A methodological limitation includes the fact that the internal reliability score for the value for fairness measure was not as high as that for all the other measures. As such, this indicates that

this measure lacks some consistency across items, and is therefore less likely to evoke similar results in potential replication studies, thus reducing the reliability of the present results. Future research should therefore consider this, and instead make use of a more reliably sound measure of this construct.

Another limitation includes that, for both regressions, the predictors only accounted for approximately twenty percent of the variance in the dependent variables, leaving about eighty percent of the variance unaccounted for. Thus, it appears that the traits and situational factors examined in this study do not have a large impact on objectification perpetration, however, they should not be completely disregarded, as value for fairness and sexism demonstrated significant and promising results. Still, if these variables only accounted for about twenty percent of the variance, then the question remains as to what else predicts objectification perpetration. Future research should aim to answer this by attempting to identify any other significant predictors of objectification perpetration, whilst also further confirming the role of sexism and value for fairness. One suggestion is to explore constructs related to sexism and value for fairness such as feminism, as, given the present findings, this will also be likely to predict objectification perpetration.

4.4. Implications

One of the biggest implications of the present study is the increased awareness it brings to the problem of sexual objectification, as it outlines the need to better understand the multitude of factors that may predict or contribute to this problematic issue. With regards to practical implications of this research, the present findings can help inform potential interventions aimed at preventing interpersonal objectification. Specifically, the present findings reveal who to target these interventions at (mainly those who are sexist and do not value fairness), and also tell us what traits to foster (and not to foster) in people from a young age, in order to reduce their likelihood of

objectifying others in the future. Furthermore, as research has consistently found that personality can change and evolve over time, this is promising in regard to the effectiveness of potential interventions aimed at changing some of these negative traits. Further, as previous research has linked sexual objectification with a host of negative outcomes such as sexual violence, gender inequality, domestic violence, body image issues, low self-esteem, and poor mental health and well-being, any information that can help to reduce sexual objectification, should in turn, also help to reduce some of these negative consequences. In terms of the theoretical implications, the present study reveals new findings in relation to what traits predict objectification perpetration, and this should be further examined in more inclusive samples, in order to test the extent that these variables can predict interpersonal objectification.

4.5. Conclusions

Overall, the present findings revealed that value for fairness significantly predicts men's objectification of women, while sexism significantly predicts women's objectification of men. These findings should offer as a useful groundwork for future research that further explores these predictors, and other predictors of objectification perpetration. Despite their limitations, the present findings extend some tenets of objectification theory predominantly to heterosexual women perpetrators, and broadens our understanding of what predicts objectification perpetration at a trait and situational level, within this population. Previous research on objectification theory has thus far been relatively lacking when it comes to its applicability to male victims, however, the present study adds to the growing literature surrounding men's experiences of objectification, thus helping to enhance the generalisability of objectification theory. Overall, these findings are presented in the hope that they will prompt greater theorising and investigation into predicting objectification perpetration in both men and women.

References

- Arroyo, A., & Anderson, K. K. (2015). The Relationship between Mother-Daughter Self-Objectification: Identifying Direct, Indirect, and Conditional Direct Effects. *Sex Roles*, 231-241. doi:10.1007/s11199-015-0554-1
- Aubrey, J. S. (2006). Exposure to sexually objectifying media and body self-perceptions among college women: An examination of the selective exposure hypothesis and the role of moderating variables. *Sex Roles*, 159-172. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9070-7.
- Beren, S. E., Hayden, H. A., Wilfley, D. E., & Grilo, C. M. (1996). The influence of sexual orientation on body dissatisfaction in adult men and women. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 135-141.
- Bennet, J. B. (1985). Power and Influence in the Personality: A Psychometric Approach. *The University of Texas at Austin*.
- Berger, J. (1973). *Ways of seeing*. New York: Viking.
- Burger, J. M. (1992). *Desire for Control: Personality, Social and Clinical Perspectives*. New York: Plenum Press
- Butt, D. S., & Fiske, D. W. (1968). Comparison of strategies in developing scales for dominance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 505-519.
- Civile, C., & Obhi, S. S. (2016). Power, Objectification, and Recognition of Sexualised Women and Men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 199-212. doi:10.1177/0361684315604820
- Connell R. W. (2009), *Gender: In World Perspective*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cranny-Francis, A. (2003). *Gender Studies: Terms and Debates*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Dauids, C. M., Watson, L. B., & Gere, M. P. (2018). Objectification, Masculinity, and Muscularity: A Test of Objectification Theory with Heterosexual Men. *Sex Roles*, 443-457. doi:10.1007/s11199-018-0940-6.
- Davidson, M. M., & Gervais, S. J. (2015). Violence Against Women Through the Lens of Objectification Theory. *Violence Against Women*, 330-354. doi:10.1177/1077801214568031.
- Englen-Maddox, R., Miller, S. A., & Doyle, D. M. (2011). Tests of Objectification Theory in Gay, Lesbian, and Heterosexual Community Samples: Mixed Evidence for Proposed Pathways. *Sex Roles*, 518-532. doi:10.1007/s11199-011-9958-8.
- Epstein, M., & Ward, L. M. (2011). Exploring Parent-Adolescent Communication About Gender: Results from Adolescent and Emerging Adult Samples. *Sex Roles*, 108-118, doi:10.1007/s11199-011-9975-7
- Frederick, D. A., Forbes, G. B., Grigorian, K., & Jarcho, J. M. (2007). The UCLA Body Project I: Gender and ethnic differences in self-objectification and body satisfaction among 2,206 undergraduates. *Sex Roles*, 317-327. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9251-z.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 173-206. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x.
- Gervais, S. J., Davidson, M. M., Styck, K., Canivez, G. & DiLillo, D. (2018). The Development and Psychometric Properties of the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale – Perpetrator Version. *Psychology of Violence*, 546-559. doi:10.1037/vio0000148
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 491-512.

- Gough, H. G., & Bradley, P. (1996). *The California Psychological Inventory Manual*. California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Heimerdinger-Edwards, S. R., Vogel, D. L., & Hammer, J. H. (2011). Extending Sexual Objectification Theory and Research to Minority Populations, Couples, and Men. *The Counselling Psychologist*, 140-152. doi:10.1177/0011000010383894.
- Henningham, J. P. (1995). A 12-item scale of social conservatism. *Personality Individual Differences*, 517-519.
- Hollander, J. A., & Howard, J. A. (2000). Social Psychological Theories on Social Inequalities. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 338-351.
- Lakkis, J., Ricciardelli, L. A., & Williams, R. J. (1999). Role of sexual orientation and gender-related traits in disordered eating. *Sex Roles*, 1-16. doi:10.1023/A:1018829506907
- Lameiras-Fernandez, M., Fiske, S. T., Fernandez, A. G., & Lopez, J. F. (2018). Objectifying Women's Bodies is Acceptable from an Intimate Perpetrator, at Least for Female Sexists. *Sex Roles*, 190-205. doi:10.1007/s11199-017-0862-8
- Lee, K. & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric Properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioural Research*, 329-358. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8
- Maas, M. K., & Dewey, S. (2018). Internet Pornography Use Among Collegiate Women: Gender Attitudes, Body Monitoring, and Sexual Behaviour. *SAGE Open*, 1-9. doi:10.1177/2158244018786640
- Megargee, E. P. (1972). *The California Psychological Inventory Handbook*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Moffit, L. B., & Szymanski, D. M. (2010). Experiencing sexually objectifying environments: A qualitative study. *The Counselling Psychologist*, 67-106. doi:10.1177/0011000010364551

- Moradi, B., & Huang, Y. P. (2008). Objectification theory and psychology of women: a decade of advances and future directions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 377-398.
doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00452.x
- Morry, M. M., & Staska, S. L. (2001). Magazine exposure: Internalisation, self-objectification, eating attitudes, and body satisfaction in male and female university students. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 269-279.
- Morton, T. A., Postmes, T., Haslam, S. A., & Hornsey, M. J. (2009). Theorizing Gender in the Face of Social Change: Is There Anything Essential About Essentialism? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 653-664. doi:10.1037/a0012966.
- Parent, M. C., & Moradi, B. (2011). His Biceps Become Him: A Test of Objectification Theory's Application to Drive for Muscularity and Propensity for Steroid Use in College Men. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 246-256. doi:10.1037/a0021398.
- Rousseau, A., Rodgers, R. F., & Eggermont, S. (2018). A Short-Term Longitudinal Exploration of the Impact of TV Exposure on Objectifying Attitudes Toward Women in Early Adolescent Boys. *Sex Roles*, 186-199. doi:10.1007/s11199-018-0925-5
- Siegmund, C. (2016). Feminist Identity Style and Objectification Theory. *Roosevelt University*
- Strelan, P. & Hargreaves, D. (2005). Women Who Objectify Other Women: The Vicious Circle of Objectification?. *Sex Roles*, 707-712. doi:10.1007/s11199-005-3737-3
- Szymanski, D. M., Moffitt, L. B., & Carr, E. R. (2011). Sexual Objectification of Women: Advances to Theory and Research. *The Counselling Psychologist*, 6-38.
doi:10.1177/0011000010378402.
- Tylka, T. L., & Kroom Van Diest, A. M. (2015). You Looking at Her "Hot" Body May not be "Cool" for Me: Integrating Male Partners' Pornography Use into Objectification Theory for Women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 67-84. doi:10.1177/0361684314521784

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender and Society*, 125-151.

Appendix A

Results of Non-Parametric Tests

Table A1:

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test Comparing Males and Females for Each Variable (n = 203)

	U	<i>p</i> -value
Dominance	2049.0	<.001
Desire for Control	2386.5	.003
Need for Power	2464.5	.007
Conservatism	3354.0	.936
Sexism	2614.5	.024
Value for Fairness	2894.5	.150
Sexual Media Use	1053.5	<.001
Sexual Media Nature	1571.0	.014
Gender-Typical Socialisation	2980.5	.237
Objectification of Women	121.5	.006
Objectification of Men	–	–

Table A2:

Spearman Correlations Between All Variables – Divided by Gender

	Male Correlations (<i>n</i> = 42)										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Dominance		.165	.630**	.174	.249	-.317*	.138	.008	.110	.162	–
2. Desire for Control	.277**		.303	-.066	-.036	.024	-.035	-.249	.029	-.226	–
3. Need for Power	.411**	.338**		.308*	.242	-.313*	.126	-.0050	-.060	.063	–
4. Conservatism	.032	-.184*	.044		.548**	.004	-.149	.102	.286	.183	–
5. Sexism	.137	-.079	.074	.652**		.155	-.142	-.067	.637**	.136	–
6. Value for Fairness	-.223**	-.022	.000	.246**	.082		-.222	-.074	.117	-.138	–
7. Sexual Media Use	.121	-.155	.062	-.226**	-.180*	-.088		-.151	-.144	.164	–
8. Sexual Media Nature	.162	-.086	.236*	.209*	.165	.069	-.072		-.005	.007	–
9. Gender-Typical Socialisation	.306**	.073	.048	.116	.171*	-.043	.074	-.018		.268	–
10. Objectification of Women	-.330	.211	.320	.264	-.354	.336	.171	.336	.213		–
11. Objectification of Men	.188*	.039	.046	.030	.236**	-.132	.181*	.126	.115	–	

Note: **p* < .05, ***p* < .01

Female Correlations (*n* = 161)

Appendix B

Results of Multiple Regression Assessing Men's Objectification of Women

Table B1:

Multiple Regression Model for Predictors of Objectification of Women – Female Perpetrators Excluded (n = 42)

	Unstandardised B	Coefficients	Standardised	<i>t</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value	95% Confidence Interval for B	
		Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Dominance	.003	.159	.003	.018	.986	-.322	.328
Desire for Control	-.098	.076	-.221	-1.29	.206	-.253	.057
Need for Power	-.017	.160	-.021	-.109	.914	-.345	.310
Conservatism	.092	.272	.066	.339	.737	-.462	.646
Sexism	-.023	.072	-.068	-.317	.753	-.170	.124
Value for Fairness	-.444	.181	-.404	-2.457	.020	-.812	-.075
Sexual Media Use	.213	.510	.068	.417	.680	-.828	1.253
Sexual Media Nature	-.041	.190	-.035	-.217	.829	-.430	.347
Gender-Typical Socialisation	.302	.158	.352	1.91	.066	-.021	.624

Note: $R^2 = .351$