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Abstract

Chairperson: Dr. Caitlin Martin-Wagar

Objectification Theory (OT) states that women’s humanity is reduced to being a physical object whose sole purpose is to give men physical pleasure; OT explains why men objectify women, and why women objectify themselves, but does not explain why women objectify other women (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Research has found that participants primed to experience high- or low-power objectified others in a work relationship more than those primed to experience equal-power (Schaerer et al., 2018). The current study aimed to examine if this finding would replicate to women engaging in sexual and beauty objectification and dehumanization towards other women. 330 cisgender, heterosexual college women were primed to experience high-, equal-, or low-power via a writing prompt. After being primed to a power condition, participants filled out measures of sexual objectification, beauty objectification, dehumanization, sense of power, and desire for power. A multivariate analysis of covariance was used to determine if beauty objectification, sexual objectification, or dehumanization varied by power condition. No significant differences were detected. Hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted to examine if a continuous sense of power variable could predict women’s beauty objectification, sexual objectification, or dehumanization of others. Results indicated that sense of power is related to objectification and dehumanization, but their relationships with sense of power differ. Sexual objectification has a curvilinear relationship with sense of power, dehumanization has a linear positive association with sense of power, and beauty objectification has no relationship with sense of power. If we understand what levels of power lead to the greatest objectification and dehumanization, we can identify who to target when creating prevention methods for objectification and dehumanization. Objectification and dehumanization were not related to the primed power condition but were related to a continuous self-report measure of sense of power. This finding indicates that there may be some limitations of priming participants to a temporary (state) power condition rather than assessing the impact of trait power levels. Future research should work to identify what trait power levels are associated with objectification and dehumanization. Those findings can then be used in objectification and dehumanization prevention and intervention efforts.
Chapter I: Introduction

In Western cultures, women’s bodies are regularly under evaluation as sexual objects (Brinkman & Rickard, 2009). Objectification Theory states that women’s humanity is reduced to being a physical object whose sole purpose is to give men physical pleasure (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Though Objectification Theory accounts for why men often objectify women and why women would objectify themselves (i.e., self-objectification), it does not describe a rationale for why women may objectify other women (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Women objectifying other women has been shown to occur frequently (Bearman et al., 2009; Puvia & Vaes, 2015; Strelan & Hargreaves, 2005), but little is known about why this phenomenon occurs.

Preliminary research in the field of industrial/organizational psychology has used the Approach/Inhibition/Avoidance Theory (AIA) of Power theory to show why women would objectify other women for work-related issues (i.e., to get ahead in their career; Schaefer et al., 2018). The AIA of Power theory states that those with high- or low-power, while in opposite positions and with different motivations, can experience the same emotions or attitudes, and engage in the same behaviors (Anicich & Hirsh, 2017), i.e., engaging in work-related objectification (Schaefer et al., 2018). In a study examining the relationship between power and work-related objectification, researchers found that individuals who were primed to experience feelings of high- or low-power by completing a writing task in which they recalled a time in which they had high- or low-power objectified a work relationship more than those primed to have equal-power to those around them (Schaefer et al., 2018). Because power was associated with work-related objectification, perhaps power is also relevant for understanding why women objectify each other in other ways, such as sexual or beauty objectification. Using Objectification
Theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) and the Approach/Inhibition/Avoidance Theory of Power (Anicich & Hirsh, 2017), the aim of this study is to look at power as a predictor of women objectifying other women.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Objectification Theory

In Objectification Theory, the process of being objectified involves the body being evaluated in a way that reduces a person to their body parts (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Thus, women are not often judged on their skills or abilities, but rather are evaluated by their bodies used to or consumption by others. Objectification occurs through body gazes and happens in a variety of situations, ranging from social interactions to visual media, making it difficult for women to avoid being objectified (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Kaschak, 1992). Repeated exposure to sexual objectification and ideal body standards causes women internalize that their worth is based on their bodies (Fredrickson et al., 1998). The internalization of these beliefs means that women take on the perspective of others to objectify themselves, or self-objectify, so that they can attempt to measure up to body standards (Fredrickson, et al., 1998).

Objectification Theory outlines this process of men sexually objectifying women and how the internalization of this process leads to self-objectification, but the theory does not explain recent research finding that women objectify other women (Puvia & Vaes, 2015; Strelan & Hargreaves, 2005). Interestingly, women objectify other women more than they self-objectify (Strelan & Hargreaves, 2005). Women are more likely to objectify other women after they perceive a woman as objectifying another woman (Puvia & Vaes, 2015). When women read articles about other women who were describing their experiences being sexually objectified, they were more likely to dehumanize women who prompted objectification as a positive
experience instead of those who described feeling like a victim because of it (Puvia & Vaes, 2015). After they read these articles, they were shown pictures of women that focused on body parts with a sexual function. Those who had read the article where a woman had promoted objectification were more likely to objectify the images than the group who had read the article of the woman who described herself as a victim of objectification (Puvia & Vaes, 2015). In an observational study of objectification, 40% of the dyads of women observed discussed a woman as an object at least once during a 10-minute conversation (Bearman et al., 2009), suggesting that women are objectifying other women at substantial rates. These studies show that women can sexually objectifying each other, but previous research has not examined other types of objectification.

**Appearance-Based Objectification**

Objectification is the reduction of a whole person to just a part of them. One type of objectification, sexual objectification, focuses on the sexual attributes of a woman and a woman’s usability for sexual pleasure (Morris & Goldenberg, 2015). Experimental primes of women in sexual objectification studies are often explicit or show women in lingerie (Aubrey et al., 2009; Morris et al., 2018). Women and men alike sexual objectify women (Strelan & Hargreaves, 2005) and when objectification occurs, participants rate these women as being less trustworthy, humble, and civilized (Morris et al., 2018). But objectification does not need to be sexual in nature. Recent studies have differentiated beauty-based objectification from sexual objectification. Beauty objectification is defined as the reduction of a person from a whole to parts when they are evaluated based on their appearance apart from any sexualization (Morris & Goldenberg, 2015). Experimental primes of women in studies examining beauty objectification show women who are conventionally attractive in aesthetically pleasing outfits or ask
participants to complete writing tasks about the appearance of women (Heflick & Goldenberg, 2009; Heflick et al., 2011). Research shows that men and women engage in beauty-based objectification of women and when they do, they rate women they objectify as being less competent and warm (Heflick et al., 2011).

Objectification is a form of dehumanization, as it involves not viewing the individual as a whole person (Nussbaum, 1995). Dehumanization is a process in which an individual is treated as if they are a tool, interchangeable with objects, lacking agency, without autonomy, able to be owned, permissible to violate, and without their own subjective experience (Nussbaum, 1995). Research suggests that men may dehumanize sexually objectified women due to an activated sex goal but previous research has not explained why women may dehumanize other women (Vaes et al., 2011). Yet, ample evidence shows that women dehumanize other women (Morris et al., 2018; Riemer et al., 2019; Vaes et al., 2011). As such, this study will examine sexual objectification, beauty objectification, and dehumanization to explain why women engage in practices that may be harmful to other women. With evidence that women are objectifying and dehumanizing other women, research examining why objectification and dehumanization of others occurs is needed.

**Social Comparison Theory**

Social Comparison Theory (SCT) and Objectification Theory both describe situations in which individuals evaluate the self and others. However, SCT posits that humans have an innate drive to evaluate themselves through comparing themselves to others (Festinger, 1954). Social comparisons are done to attempt to fit in with the desired social ingroup, drive self-improvement, and evaluate oneself more generally (Festinger, 1954). Evidence supports that the two theories are related as objectification of others and social comparisons have been positively associated.
with each other (Tylka & Sabik, 2010). Research also finds social comparisons and sexual objectification can lead to similar outcomes as both objectification of others and social comparisons contribute to the onset of body image disturbance and eating disorder symptomatology (Lindner et al., 2012). SCT helps explain why women objectify other women in situations where they compare themselves to the women that they are objectifying. But this does not contribute to our knowledge of objectification of other women when comparison is not the goal or intention. If a woman were to reduce another woman to her appearance, without a comparison to the self, then SCT would not explain this behavior. Thus, SCT may explain some objectification of other women, but will not be sufficient in explaining fully. Social Comparison Theory and Objectification Theory do not specify other variables that may be important when looking at the bigger picture of women viewing other women as less than whole beings.

**The Consequences of Objectification and Dehumanization**

Objectification has been linked empirically to negative emotional states and adverse mental health outcomes. Women may experience body shame if they do not meet the cultural standard of physical beauty (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). They may also experience anxiety, as they never know the next time they will be evaluated based on their sexual nature or appearance (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Sex-based objectification leads women to feeling guilty and both sex and beauty-based objectification led women to feel anger (Chevallereau et al., 2021). Viewing media ads of objectified women increased women’s body dissatisfaction (Hamilton et al., 2007). Women not only experience adverse health outcomes when being objectified, but also when they objectify others. Women who objectified other women by comparing their bodies reported increased body shame and disordered eating symptomatology.
(Tylka & Sabik, 2010). Crucially, sexual objectification of others contributes to the onset of body image disturbance and eating disorder symptomatology (Linder et al., 2012).

Sexual objectification has been conceptualized as a type of insidious trauma, which refers to cumulative trauma that comes from low levels of discrimination across the lifetime (Root, 1992). Objectification is indirectly related to increased traumatic symptoms through body shame (Miles-Mclean et al., 2015). It is also indirectly linked to increased depressive symptoms through increased body shame and fear of men (Szymanski et al., 2021). Being sexually objectified is also an ostracizing experience, as it involves ignoring and devaluing personal attributes. For women, being objectified led to feelings of ostracism which predicted decreased mood, self-esteem, sense of belonging, and experiencing of meaningful existence (Dvir et al., 2020). The trauma and isolation of being sexually objectified may lead women to have heightened body awareness and fear of assault. These negative symptoms linked to sexual objectification are alarming, especially considering the prevalence of this phenomena.

Further, simply being in objectifying environments can have a negative impact on a person. Experiencing sexual objectification is predictive of experiencing many risk factors of serious mental illness including dissociation, emotion dysregulation, interpersonal ineffectiveness, and hypervigilance (Carr et al., 2015). Sexual objectification is associated with multiple risk factors for serious mental health issues and is linked to multiple mental health conditions (anxiety, depression, eating disorders; Moradi & Huang, 2008). Because of this, sexual objectification should be treated as a problematic societal behavior that needs to be reduced so that individuals do not experience adverse outcomes related to objectification.

Dehumanization can also create negative consequences for women. Dehumanization is the higher order construct of sexual objectification. Dehumanization from others leads to shame
and negativity which can create a decrease in mental health (Cascalheira & Choi, 2023). Being dehumanized can also be physically dangerous for women. Men who dehumanize women are more likely to be aggressive towards them, endorsing a higher likelihood to rape women (Rudman & Mescher, 2012). Being exposed to objectified or dehumanized women in the media leads to increased body dissatisfaction and eating disorder prevalence (Boccato et al., 2015). For transgender individuals, dehumanization is associated with internalized transgender negativity and poorer mental health (Cascalheira & Choi, 2023). Because there are so many negative consequences of objectification and dehumanization, it is important to understand the process that causes women to engage in these behaviors so that they can be prevented. Theories of power may be applied when identifying possible reasons of why objectification and dehumanization occurs, with and without the presence of a social comparison.

**Objectification and Power**

Definitions of power vary, but for the purposes of this study it will be defined as the ability to evaluate or control another individual (Keltner et al., 2003). Power may also be worthy of being explored as a possible explanation for the finding that women objectify and dehumanize other women. For example, in research where power is given to a participant by allowing them the authority to control how another participant completed a task, both male and female participants assigned power perceived members of a different sex in an overly sexualized manner (Kunstman & Maner, 2011); however, there is limited work investigating the relationship between power and sexual objectification in the social and clinical psychology literatures. A small body of research from industrial/organizational psychology examines the role of power in work-related objectification that may be relevant to sexual objectification theory. Work-related objectification, or instrumentalization, is another type of objectification. In work-related
objectification individuals, regardless of sex, are evaluated not based on the individual characteristics that make them a person, but on their usefulness for completing a task for the objectifiers’ personal gain (Gruenfeld et al., 2008). This work can be used as a framework for understanding possible associations between power and other types of objectification (i.e., beauty or sex-based and dehumanization).

**AI Theory**

Approach-Inhibition theory (AI; Keltner et al., 2003) is a commonly used theory of power that defines power as the ability to evaluate or control another individual. AI theory assumes that the effect of power is linear (i.e., those with high power experience the inverse effect of those in low power) and has been supported when applied in relation to many variables. It has been applied in studies exploring work-related objectification and power and findings show that, in general, most individuals will objectify subordinates, but those in high-power objectify subordinates more than those in low power. For example, when there is an active goal present, individuals primed to be high in power objectify those working for them more compared to those in a power neutral condition (Gruenfeld et al., 2008). The logic of AI theory means that most research uses a two-cell design (i.e., high-power versus low-power, high-power versus control, etc.; Schaerer et al., 2018). Results suggest that high-power increases sex-based objectification, work-based objectification, and dehumanization (Civile & Obhi, 2016; Gruenfeld et al., 2008; Lammers & Stapel, 2011; Xiao et al., 2019), but newer research suggests that the association between power and objectification and dehumanization may be more complex than a simple linear relationship. For example, the relationship between chronic power and sexual aggression is moderated by acute power (i.e., experimentally induced sense of power). Individuals with chronic low-power and acute high-power exhibited more sexually aggressive
behaviors than individuals with chronic high-power and acute high-power (Williams et al., 2017). The logic of AI theory cannot explain why individuals of chronic low-power would report high levels of sexual aggression, but Approach/Inhibition/Avoidance theory (Anicich & Hirsh, 2017) posits a more complex relationship between power and objectification.

**Approach/Inhibition/Avoidance Theory**

Approach/Inhibition/Avoidance theory (AIA: Anicich & Hirsh, 2017) expands on AI theory by positing that power has a curvilinear association with a variety of constructs. For variables who have a curvilinear relationship with power, high- and low-power would predict similar effects to each other, while neutral/equal-power would predict the opposite effect. For example, both individuals in high-power (assigned to think about a subordinate/a worker they had power over) and individuals in low-power conditions (assigned to think about a boss/a worker who had power over them) objectified the work relationship more than those in a neutral-power condition (assigned to think of a coworker/a worker in which no one held power over the other; Schaerer et al., 2018). Thus, AIA helps explain the recent findings describing a curvilinear relationship of power and work-related objectification by suggesting different motivations can lead to similar outcomes.

For these motivations, AIA posits that individuals consistently high in power engage in approach-oriented behavior – i.e., those with high-power perceive that they will gain rewards if they engage in certain behaviors, such as objectification, so they engage in these behaviors (Anicich & Hirsh, 2017). Those consistently low in power engage in avoidance behavior – i.e., those in low-power perceive many potential threats and therefore engage in behaviors that will help them avoid threats (Anicich & Hirsh, 2017). Those with moderate/equal-power, such as a store supervisor who has direct reports but also reports to a regional manager, may experience
high-power in some situations and low-power in other situations. Frequent switching between positions of high-power and positions of low-power, referred to as vertical code-switching, is associated with increased role conflict, anxiety, and inhibited behavior (Anicich & Hirsh, 2017; Ashforth, et al., 2000; Prins et al., 2015). Vertical code-switching is more broadly defined as the act of alternating between behavioral patterns (Anicich & Hirsh, 2017). Code-switching is commonly discussed in research examining racial discrimination, as racial minorities often change their behaviors to avoid backlash from misperceptions of others caused by racial stereotypes (Boulton, 2016). Code-switching is a coping strategy frequently used to navigate discrimination, and it takes a lot of cognitive resources and is mentally exhausting (Hall et al., 2012). While code-switching helps protect from stereotype threat, it creates stress, a lack of a cohesive sense of self, and negative emotions (Shavers & Moore, 2014a). This example highlights the negative consequences that can accompany code-switching. Because those in middle power frequently code switch, it is possible they are at an increased risk to become overwhelmed and unable to engage in certain behaviors. These roles explain how it could be possible for those in high- and low-power to objectify and dehumanize more than those in moderate/equal-power.

Because research on sex and beauty-based objectification/dehumanization and power is limited, no current research exists that explores what potential positive outcomes may exist that could lead high-power women to objectify or dehumanize others and what potential negative outcomes may exist that could lead low-power women to objectify or dehumanize others. However, it may be helpful to consider possible pathways to conceptualize why power may be a predictor of these constructs. Approach behaviors involve going after a positive outcome. A positive outcome of objectifying or dehumanizing others might be feeling/establishing
dominance. Avoidance behaviors involve getting away from negative outcomes. The negative state of feeling insecure might be avoided by those who objectify others. To that end, high- and low-power could lead to the same amount of sexual objectification even though power is affecting individuals of high- and low-power differently. Because the AIA theory viewing objectification and power as having a curvilinear relationship is relatively new, it is important to explore if this curvilinear relationship also exists between different types of objectifications (i.e., beauty and sexual) and power. If the relationship does exist, it is also important to investigate possible explanations for why the relationship between types of objectifications and power may occur in young adult women.

**Desire for Power**

One construct that is tied to both power and objectification that may contribute to a curvilinear association is the desire for power. Desire for power describes how much an individual aspires to be powerful. Being powerful is associated with pleasure (Keltner et al., 2003), while being low in power is associated with increased stress (Sherman et al., 2012). Individuals who feel powerless may be motivated to take advantage of opportunities for power and control (Kay et al., 2015) and have a greater desire for power than those in high power (Williams et al., 2017). Williams and colleagues found that high acute power led to more sexually aggressive behaviors for those with chronic low power, but that high acute power had no effect of sexually aggressive behaviors for those with chronic high power. In this study, desire for power mediated this relationship such that those with the highest level of desire for power (chronic low-power who were given acute high-power) had the most sexually aggressive behaviors. Since sexual aggression is a similar construct to sexual objectification and is a consequence of dehumanization (Rudman & Mescher, 2012), this relationship between power
and desire for power may also be important to understanding why women objectify and
dehumanize women, especially for women in low power.

**Limitations of Current Research**

In summary, Objectification Theory primarily considers men’s objectification of women
and does not account for why women engage in sex-based or appearance-based objectification of
other women. Social Comparison Theory fails to explain why women objectify or dehumanize
others when a comparison is not being made. Both theories fail to describe other forms of
objectification (i.e., not sexual). Though little research explores the impact of women
objectifying other women, results consistently show that this occurs (Heflick et al., 2011; Strelan
& Hargreaves, 2005). The literature also consistently shows women as dehumanizers as well as
dehumanizees (Morris & Goldenberg, 2015), yet there are also no theories to explain why
women would be dehumanizing other women. Nonetheless, studies exploring objectification and
dehumanization of women by women also have some limitations, including small sample sizes,
primarily White women participants, and a focus on the outcomes rather than the mechanisms
underlying why women may objectify women. Combining the preliminary research in
objectification and dehumanization of women by women and research of the Approach,
Inhibition, Avoidance Theory of Power, there is ample support for conducting new studies to
address these limitations. To do this, this study recruited a large sample of diverse women and
test power as a possible reason why women may objectify and dehumanize other women.
Examining power as a possible predictor of women’s objectification and dehumanization of
other women will add to our understanding of what is occurring when women objectify and
dehumanize other women, why women objectify and dehumanize other women, and how this
objectification and dehumanization can be prevented.
Overview and Hypotheses

This project used data from a recently completed data collection in which the author of this thesis is the primary investigator. The goal of this study was to test the relationship of sexual objectification, beauty objectification, and dehumanization with power using Approach/Inhibition/Avoidance theory as a framework and to address methodological limitations of previous studies on the relationship of power and objectification. The predictions of this study are as follows.

Research question 1: What is the relationship between sense of power and sex-based and beauty-based objectification and dehumanization?

Hypothesis 1: Participants in the high- and low-power conditions will report higher levels of sex and beauty-based objectification and dehumanization than those in the equal-power condition.

Research question 2: Does desire for power moderate the relationship between sense of power and objectification/dehumanization?

Hypothesis 2: Desire for power will moderate the relationship between sense of power and objectification/dehumanization. Participants with low desire for power will display the quadratic association between objectify/dehumanize and power while participants with high desire for power will objectify/dehumanize at the same level regardless of sense of power.

Research question 3: Does the predicted relationship between sense of power and objectification differ based on objectification type (beauty, sexual, or dehumanization)?
Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited from the University of South Florida through the undergraduate research pool, SONA. Research suggests that models of women’s sexual objectification vary by age and sexual orientation (Augustus-Horvath & Tylka, 2009; Kozee & Tylka, 2006). As such, for this initial test of the AIA theory for women objectifying other women, inclusion criteria included identifying as a cis-gender woman, being between the ages of 18-25, and identifying as heterosexual. Participants received partial course credit as compensation for their voluntary participation. The average age of participants was 19.34 (SD = 1.40) and the average BMI was 24.32 (SD = 5.22).

Procedure

This study used a three-cell (power: high, equal, and low) between-subjects design. Cisgender women were primed in high-, equal-, or low-power conditions prior to completing measures of sense of power, desire for power, sexual objectification, beauty objectification, dehumanization, body image, and self-esteem.

A maximum of three participants came into the lab to complete the study at the same time. Only three participants were in the room at once to ensure that participants had enough space between them so that they would not be able to view each other’s power prime essays, which would potentially muddy the effect of the prime. After participants completed the informed consent, as a group, they were seated at individual computers to complete the baseline survey via Qualtrics. The baseline questionnaire included the Desire for Power and Sense of Power scales in random order.
After completion, participants saw a screen that told them to notify a research assistant to move them to the next part of the study. Research assistants then sat participants at a table where they worked on a word search for five minutes, to help minimize any priming effects of the pre-tests. After this five-minute period, participants began the experimental paradigm. Participants were randomly assigned to the low-power, equal-power, or high-power condition and received a writing task corresponding to their experimental condition to prime participants’ power level. Participants randomized to the high- and low-power conditions were primed with a writing task developed by Galinsky and colleagues (2003, Experiments 2 and 3). For the purposes of this study, an equal-power condition prime was developed using the high- and low-power primes as templates. These primes asked participants to write about a situation revolving control and evaluation (corresponding to their assigned level of power).

When handing out power primes to participants, research assistants sat participants at a table as soon as the participant finished their own pre-test surveys, so participants were all seated at the same table, but they did not need to wait for other participants to finish their pre-test surveys before being seated. Research assistants ensured that there was at least one seat between all participants when they were seated at the table so that no participant could look at another participant's written response. Research assistants took care to minimize their presence in the room and ensured that participants completed the word search and worked on the prime for exactly five minutes each. To do this, research assistants asked participants to keep writing if participants finish writing before five minutes was up and asked them to move onto the next task if they were still writing after five minutes.

After this step, participants were seated back at their same computer to complete the post-prime questionnaire online via Qualtrics. First participants completed the Sense of Power scale
(manipulation check) and then they completed the following counterbalanced measures: the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale-Perpetrator Version (sexual objectification), the Other Objectification Questionnaire (beauty objectification), and Mind Perception Scale (dehumanization). After completing those surveys, participants completed the following counterbalanced measures: Desire for Power (desire for power), Body Image State Scale (body image), and State Self-Esteem Scale (self-esteem). They then rated the attractiveness of the three women they saw previously and completed a set of demographic questions. Finally, participants had their height and weight were measured by a research assistant identifying as a woman and were given mental health resources.

**Measures**

**Demographics.** Participants provided a variety of demographic information including race, ethnicity, age, year in school, sexual orientation, and body weight perception (the BMI classification category that the individual views themselves to be). Height and weight of participants were measured by a research assistant identifying as a woman after survey completion. The standard Center for Disease Control Formula of BMI was used (Formula: weight (lb.) / [height (in)] 2 x 703).

**Sexual Objectification.** The Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale-Perpetrator Version (ISOS-P; Gervais et al., 2018) was used to assess state sexual objectification. The ISOS-P is a 15-item measure with three subscales: body gazes, body comments, and unwanted sexual advances, along with an overall scale score. For the purposes of this study, the overall mean score will be used, with higher scores indicating greater sexual objectification. Items assess how often participants sexually objectify other women, with items rated on a 5-point Likert from 1 (never) to 5 (almost always). Example items are, “How often have you made inappropriate
sexual comments about another woman’s body?” and “How often have you stared at another woman’s body?” This measure has been used in a male college-age sample (Samji & Vasquez, 2020) and was validated with a sample of men and women (Gervais et al., 2018). Cronbach’s alpha for this sample was .75, indicating acceptable reliability. To help ensure a sexual objectification focus, an image of a woman in lingerie was presented to participants for 10 seconds with the prompt “You are about to view an image of a woman. Please pay attention to her physical appearance.”

**Beauty Objectification.** A modified version of the Self-Objectification Questionnaire (SOQ; Noll & Fredrickson, 1998) named the Other-Objectification Questionnaire (OOQ; Strelan & Hargreaves, 2005) was used to capture state beauty objectification by measuring how participants rank the importance of certain aspects of other people’s body attributes. This modified version of the SOQ has been used in previous research examining college aged women (Hoover-Thompson, 2013; Strelan & Hargreaves, 2005). The OOQ is a measure of objectification of others that asks participants to rate how important certain aspects of others’ bodies are to them. There are 10 items in total, with five appearance-focused items (e.g., “What rank do you assign to sex appeal?”) and five competence-based items (e.g., “What rank do you assign to strength?”). Participants rank order each item on a scale from 10 (most important) to 1 (least important). The modification used by Calegro & Jost (2011) to make the OOQ a state measure was used here. The instructions read “This section is concerned with how women think about other women’s bodies. Listed below are ten different body attributes. Right now, if you were to think about, or look at other women, which of these body attributes are most important? Please rank the attributes in order from 1 (least important) to 10 (most important) in other women.” The five competence items are summed and subtracted from the summation of the five
appearance items. Higher scores indicate higher valuation of the appearance items and thus, more objectification.

Because the OOQ is a rank order scale, internal consistency cannot be measured; instead, correlations are used to test reliability. It has been posited that participants who rank appearance as important should rank competence as less important creating a strong negative correlation between the two sets of attributes, so the reliability of the OOQ is determined by correlating the appearance ranks and competence ranks. Correlations of the two sets have found strong reliability, $r = -.88$, $r = -.81$ (Calgero & Jost, 2011; Hill & Fischer, 2008). To help ensure a beauty focus, an image of a women jeans and a white t-shirt was presented to participants for 10 seconds with the prompt “You are about to view an image of a woman. Please pay attention to her physical appearance.”

**Dehumanization.** The Mind Perception Scale (MPS; Gray et al., 2007) was used to measure dehumanization. This measure focuses on whether the rater views another person as capable of experiencing feelings and emotions and of having agency. The two subscales of this measure are “experience,” which is conceptualized as the ability to experience feelings and emotions such as pain, pleasure, and pride, and “agency,” which is conceptualized as the ability to act, plan, and exert self-control. To ensure a focus on dehumanization, an image of a woman in sexualized clothes who was being merged with the background of a beer bottle was presented to women for 10 seconds with the prompt “You are about to view an image of a woman. Please pay attention to her physical appearance.” displaying before the image. Each item of this questionnaire began as “This person is capable of …”, then participants were asked to rate how much they agreed with the image being capable of what the item stated. An example item from the experience subscale is, “This person is capable of experiencing hunger.” An example item
from the agency subscale is, “This person is capable of exercising self-control.” Participants were asked to rate their agreement on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Mean scores for each subscale are used to measure dehumanization, with higher scores indicating less dehumanization. Cronbach’s alpha for this sample was .95, indicating excellent reliability. This scale has been used in samples of adult women previously (Hiel & Mervielde, 2004).

**Sense of Power.** The Sense of Power scale was used as a manipulation check of the power prime (Anderson et al., 2012). Participants were asked to respond to items such as “In this relationship I think I have a great deal of power” and “In this relationship, if I want to, I get to make the decisions” using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Items are mean scored with higher scores indicating a greater sense of power. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale is reported at .91 (Anderson et al., 2012). Cronbach’s alpha was .81 at pretest and .87 at posttest, indicating good reliability at both timepoints. In a study using a similar power manipulation to the prime proposed in the current study, this scale was successfully used as a power manipulation check (Schaerer et. Al, 2018). This scale has been used in a sample of college-aged women before (Wang & Krumhuber, 2016).

**Desire for Power.** Desire for power was measured by a four-item measure called the Desire for Power Scale (Williams et al., 2017). The items are “I deserve to be a more powerful and influential person than I am now”, “In a fairer world, I would have more control over things than I do now”, “I don’t have as much power as I deserve”, “I’m OK with how much influence I have these days” (reverse scored). The items were measured using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) and were mean scored, with higher scores indicating
stronger desire for power. Cronbach’s alpha for this sample was .76, indicating acceptable reliability.

**Body Image.** State body image was measured with the six-item Body Image State Scale (BISS: Cash et al., 2002). The BISS measures body image through participants’ evaluation and affective experience of their physical appearance, body shape and size at the current moment. A 9-point scale ranges from 1 (*extremely dissatisfied*) to 9 (*extremely satisfied*) and is scored by calculating the mean of the six items after reverse-scoring the three negatively worded items. Higher BISS scores indicate more favorable body image states. Sample items include, “Right now I feel *extremely satisfied* with my body shape and size” and “Right now I feel *extremely dissatisfied* with my physical appearance.” Cronbach’s alpha for this sample was .85, indicating good reliability.

**Self-Esteem.** State self-esteem was measured with the State Self-Esteem Scale (SS-ES: Heatherton & Polivy, 1991). This measure has 20-items and uses a 5-point response format ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*). Three subscales measure participants’ current appearance, social, and performance self-esteem. This study was validated using a college-aged sample of men and women (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991). Cronbach’s alpha for this sample was .93, indicating excellent reliability. The Performance subscale measures an individual’s confidence in their abilities. An example item of this is “I feel that I have less scholastic ability than others right now.” The Social subscale measures how much an individual is worried about looking poorly in the eyes of others. For example, “I feel worried about what others think of me.” The Appearance subscale measures how good an individual feels about themselves. An example item from this subscale is “I feel unattractive.” For the purposes of the current study, an
overall sum score of all subscales was used to represent overall state self-esteem, with higher scores representing higher state self-esteem.

Analytic Plan

Previous research measuring the effect of power on objectification obtained medium to large effect sizes (Schaerer et al., 2018, $d = .58-.85$). Using Gpower, an \textit{a priori} power analysis for an analysis of covariance with fixed effects and main effects and interactions to detect a small-to-medium effect size ($f = 0.18$). The analysis was designated by three groups (high-power, equal-power, and low-power), 3 covariates (body image, self-esteem, and BMI), a significance level of .05, and a power of .80. This led to a suggested a sample size of 301 (Faul et al., 2007). Considering that approximately 20% of data may need to be excluded due to inattentive responding, the final target sample size was 360 (120 per condition). Given the nature of this study three covariates were used: body mass index (BMI), self-esteem, and body image. BMI is a common covariate in objectification research because of its association with self-objectification and the objectification of others (e.g, Martinez, 2012). Post-test levels of self-esteem were used as a covariate because it has been shown to have a negative association with objectification (Choma et al., 2010; Liss et al., 2011). Finally, post-test levels of body image were used as a covariate due to its association with objectification (Mason et al., 2018).

For moderation analyses, hierarchical multiple regressions were used. For these analyses, the same three covariates (body image, self-esteem, and BMI) were used and entered as step one. Because it is hypothesized that a quadratic relationship between power and objectification/dehumanization exists, sense of power was transformed to examine this variable in a regression. Sense of power was transformed to a quadratic variable by squaring the mean scores from the sense of power variable. Squaring a variable to examine its quadratic function is
a technique that has been recommended in previous literature (Assaf & Tsionas, 2019; Hayes 2015). This transformed variable will be referred to as “quadratic sense of power”. The untransformed linear sense of power will be entered in step two to explore both the potential for a linear relationship and quadratic relationship. Quadratic sense of power will be entered into step three and the moderation effect will be entered into step four. The moderation effect of desire for power on the relationship between sense of power and objectification/dehumanization was determined by creating a moderation variable. This variable was created by multiplying the desire for power scores by the quadratic sense of power scores.

**Results**

There were 372 students who participated in the study. To ensure the quality of the power primes, each response was reviewed and participant data removed by one of the study research assistants when prime responses did not meet inclusion criteria. Because participants were intended to spend five minutes working on the power primes to ensure efficacy of the primes, inclusion criteria for the power primes were created based on recommendations from the literature (Anderson et al., 2012; Galinsky et al., 2003) and peer researchers, to ensure consistency in participant responses. Inclusion criteria included: responses being on topic, participants actively writing for more than half the allotted time (i.e., > 2.5 minutes), and writing more than three sentences. When power primes were examined, 35 responses were removed; 22 had responses that were off topic, 11 had written less than three sentences, and two had not written for over two and a half minutes. Of the remaining 337 participants, four were removed for having one or more incomplete measures, one removed for missing attention checks, and four more removed for missing height or weight information. There was no additional item-level
missing data. The final sample included 330 participants. See Table 1 for complete demographic information.

Data was assessed for normality. Sense of power, desire for power, body image, and self-esteem were found to have normal distributions. As such the variables were left untransformed. Sexual objectification, measured by the ISOS-P, was found to be positively skewed, so ISOS-P scores were transformed with an inverse transformation. After the transformation was completed, ISOS-P scores were normally distributed. Dehumanization, as measured by the MPS, was also positively skewed. The inverse transformation was effective, leaving MPS scores normally distributed. No outliers were identified in the final sample.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Sense of power was positively correlated with dehumanization ($r = .13$, $p = .02$), but was not correlated with sexual ($r = .01$, $p = .87$) or beauty objectification ($r = -.02$, $p = .78$). Desire for power was negatively correlated with sexual objectification ($r = -.15$, $p = .01$), but was not correlated with beauty objectification ($r = -.03$, $p = .58$) or dehumanization ($r = -.01$, $p = .92$). Pearson’s correlations for variables of interest are reported in Table 2.

**Power Prime Manipulation Check**

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) confirmed that the manipulation was successful such that the sense of power across conditions was significantly different and as intended, $F(2, 327) = 12.83, p < .00$, $\eta^2 = .07$. Pairwise comparisons revealed that those in the high-power condition ($M = 5.16$, $SD = .84$) reported a significantly greater sense of power than those in the equal-power condition ($M = 4.90$, $SD = .84$, $p < .05$) and those in the low-power condition ($M = 4.58$, $SD = .96$, $p < .001$). Those in the equal-power condition reported a greater sense of power than those in the low-power condition ($p < .05$).
Primary Analyses

**Hypothesis 1:** Participants in the high- and low-power conditions will report higher levels of sex and beauty-based objectification and dehumanization than those in the equal-power condition.

To test Hypothesis 1, a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was conducted with sexual objectification, beauty objectification, and dehumanization as the dependent variables, power condition as the independent variable (three groups from the priming: high, equal, and low), and self-esteem, body image, and BMI as covariates. Results revealed that with the use of Wilks’ criterion, beauty objectification, sexual objectification, and dehumanization were not significantly different based on power prime condition (Wilk’s Λ = 1.00, F(6, 644) = 0.21, p = .97, partial η² = .002). Because the overall model was not significant, pairwise comparisons were not analyzed. To assess if the model was significant without covariates, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with the same variables. Results were still not significantly different based on power prime condition (Wilk’s Λ = 1.00, F(6, 650) = 0.08, p = .99, partial η² = .001).

To ensure that any effects were not being washed out due to having similar dependent variables in one model, an ANCOVA was run for each dependent variable. To test if sexual objectification varied by power condition, an ANOCVA was conducted with sexual objectification as the dependent variable, power condition as the independent variable (three groups: high, equal, and low), and self-esteem, body image, and BMI as covariates. Results revealed that sexual objectification was not significantly different based on power prime condition (F(2, 324) = 0.21, p = .81, partial η² = .001). The same model was run with beauty objectification as the dependent variable. This model was also nonsignificant (F(2, 324) = 0.14, p
Finally, the same model was run with dehumanization as the dependent variable. This model was also nonsignificant ($F(2, 324) = 0.29, p = .75$, partial $\eta^2 = .002$).

**Hypothesis 2:** Desire for power will moderate the relationship between sense of power and each of the three variables: sexual objectification, beauty objectification, and dehumanization. Participants with low desire for power will display the quadratic association between objectification and dehumanization and power while participants with high desire for power will objectify/dehumanize at the same level regardless of sense of power.

While the MANCOVA from hypothesis one was nonsignificant by condition, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted for each dependent variable to examine if sexual/beauty objectification and dehumanization held a quadratic relationship with sense of power. To test the quadratic effect, a quadratic variable was computed for sense of power, by squaring the sense of power scores. To test if desire for power would moderate the quadratic effect of sense of power on sexual/beauty objectification and dehumanization, an interaction variable was created by multiplying the quadratic sense of power by desire for power scores.

The first hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with sexual objectification as the dependent variable. Covariates (BMI, self-esteem, and body image) were entered into step 1. Then, sense of power was entered into step 2 to control for linearity, quadratic sense of power was entered into step 3 to test for the curvilinear main effect of sense of power, and the interaction of desire for power and quadratic sense of power was entered into step 4 to test for moderation. The overall model was statistically significant ($R^2 = .07, F = 3.96, p < .001$), as expected linear sense of power did not predict sexual objectification ($\beta = -.05, p = .35$) while quadratic sense of power did ($\beta = 1.25, p = .002$). Contrary to hypotheses, desire for
power did not moderate this relationship ($\beta = -0.01, p = .87$). For the full regression table see Table 3.

Another hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with beauty objectification as the dependent variable. Covariates (BMI, self-esteem, and body image) were entered into step 1. Sense of power was entered into step 2 to control for linearity, quadratic sense of power was entered into step 3 to test for the curvilinear main effect of sense of power, and the interaction of desire for power and quadratic sense of power was entered into step 4 to test for moderation. Contrary to hypotheses, the overall model was not statistically significant ($R^2 = .01, F = 0.79, p = .58$), linear sense of power did not predict beauty objectification ($\beta = -0.03, p = .66$) nor did quadratic sense of power ($\beta = -0.13, p = .75$). For the full regression table see Table 4.

A final hierarchical multiple regression was conducted with dehumanization as the dependent variable. Covariates (BMI, self-esteem, and body image) were entered into step 1. Sense of power was entered into step 2 to control for linearity, quadratic sense of power was entered into step 3 to test for the curvilinear main effect of sense of power, and the interaction of desire for power and quadratic sense of power were entered into step 4 to test for moderation. The overall model was not statistically significant ($R^2 = .03, F = 1.65, p = .13$). Contrary to hypotheses, the linear sense of power did predict beauty objectification ($\beta = -0.12, p = .04$) and quadratic sense of power did not ($\beta = -0.13, p = .75$). Contrary to hypotheses, desire for power did not moderate this relationship ($\beta = 0.02, p = .86$). For the full regression table see Table 5.

**Research question 3:** Does the predicted relationship between sense of power and objectification differ based on objectification type (beauty, sexual, or dehumanization)?

As the original model was nonsignificant, differences between dependent variables were not analyzed.
Discussion

Contrary to hypotheses, power condition (low, equal, or high) was not predictive of sexual or beauty-based objectification or dehumanization. While no relationship was detected between power condition and sexual objectification, beauty objectification, or dehumanization by the MANCOVAs, a significant quadratic effect of sense of power on sexual objectification was detected in a hierarchical multiple regression. In line with hypotheses and previous literature (Kunstman & Maner, 2011), quadratic sense of power was predictive of sexual objectification. To try to synthesize the discrepancy between the two analyses which examine the same relationship, we must look at the discrepancy in how power was entered as the independent variable. Power condition was entered as the fixed effect for all MANCOVAs, but quadratic sense of power was used for the regression analyses. The power conditions had been significantly different from each other in the anticipated ways (high > equal > low), but it is possible that the groups had not been differentiated enough to detect differences in the MANCOVA. Potentially, an individual’s trait-level power is still impactful in how they think about the world, even if we can manipulate state-level power successfully. This influence of trait power could impact state power and create enough variation in responses to limit any ability to detect statistically significant differences. The state-level power manipulation (power condition) may also not have been as strong of a predictor as the more trait-level sense of power measure. If the sense of power measure is tapping into trait power and the manipulation is only tapping into state power, it appears more likely that trait measure, and the findings of the regression analyses, are more reflective of how the relationship exists in the world. If this is true, evidence points towards sense of power having a quadratic relationship with sexual objectification. Yet, the trait measure of sense of power was impacted by the manipulation, as shown in the manipulation
check. Therefore, it is impossible to be sure if the measure reflects the real-world relationship of power and sexual objectification. Future research should replicate this study using a trait measure of sense of power to clear up this discrepancy.

The same discrepancy in findings between the MANCOVA and regression is present when examining the relationship between power and dehumanization. However, the regression revealed that dehumanization is related to sense of power in a linear relationship rather than a quadratic relationship. This does not align with the stated hypotheses but does align with some previous literature (Lammers & Stapel, 2011). It was hypothesized that dehumanization would have a quadratic relationship with power instead of the previously supported linear relationship as there have been findings that work-related objectification is quadratically associated with power (Schaerer et al., 2018) and dehumanization is the higher order construct of objectification. Because no previous studies have used a 3-cell design (i.e., high- vs. middle- vs. low-power) or intentionally examined a quadratic effect, it is possible that a quadratic effect was present in those studies but it would be impossible to know if one was present. Only assessing high- vs low-power (or high-power vs. control) means researchers cannot detect any differences with middle power. AIA theory was the theoretical guide for the hypothesis of a potential quadratic relationship existing between power and objectification/dehumanization. AIA states that it is possible for quadratic relationships to occur between power (Anicich & Hirsh, 2017) and other variables but that these often go undetected due to a lack of measurement of middle power in research (Schaerer et al., 2018). However, AIA does not state that linear relationships to power do not occur; AIA only highlights the possible pathway for other types of relationships (e.g., quadratic). By outlining how variables all have unique relationships with power, AIA allows for the potential of linear or quadratic relationships.
A positive bivariate correlation was detected for sense of power and dehumanization, but no correlation was detected between sense of power and sexual objectification. This can be explained as Pearson’s correlation detects a linear relationship. Because dehumanization is a higher order construct for sexual objectification, and other types of objectification more broadly (Nussbaum, 1995), it is surprising that a quadratic relationship would exist between power and sexual objectification whereas a linear relationship exists for dehumanization. But as AIA theory supports both are possible, it could be that there is something specialized about sexual objectification that makes it operate differently from dehumanization. AIA theory states that high and low power lead to automatic cognition that creates approach or avoidance behavior whereas middle power leads to controlled cognition which increases cognitive load and creates constrained, inhibited behavior. Potentially, there is something different in the threat of dehumanization that always allows for automatic cognitive in the form of approach and avoidance behaviors. It is possible dehumanization leads to adaptive responses that do not inhibit the person being dehumanized. Sexual objectification may be a more nuanced construct that creates conflict in those being objectified, allowing for inhibition. Future studies should examine the role of cognitive inhibition in sexual objectification and dehumanization for potential differences.

Unlike dehumanization and sexual objectification, and contrary to hypotheses, beauty-based objectification was not associated with power in all analyses. Beauty-based objectification was only correlated with self-esteem and none of the other variables of interest that it has been correlated with in the past (e.g., body dissatisfaction, Linder et al., 2012). The mean score of the OOQ (M = 0.33, SD = 17.13) was also lower than has been reported in the past and had more variability (M = 7.33, SD = 13.11, Linder et al., 2012; M = 1.23, SD = 8.64, Gervais et al., 2018).
These findings point to a potential measurement issue. In the validation paper of the ISOS-P (sexual objectification), the measure we used for beauty objectification (OOQ) was used to establish convergent validity (Gervais et al., 2018). The results reveal a correlation of .16 (significant at p < .01), yet our results reveal no correlation. The measure used here for beauty objectification was originally created as a measure of self-sexual objectification (Noll & Fredrickson, 1998). We used the OOQ here as beauty objectification because the items better fit the current conceptualization of beauty objectification: the reduction of a person from a whole to parts when they are evaluated based on their appearance apart from any sexualization (Morris & Goldenberg, 2015). The correlation of the OOQ and ISOS-P provides support that the OOQ is a better measure of beauty objectification than sexual objectification, as if they were both tapping into sexual objectification, we would expect their association to be stronger. Future work should replicate this study with other measures of beauty objectification to determine if there was a measurement error in this study or if there is no relationship between beauty objectification and power. Future research should also work to identify measurements that cleanly distinguish beauty and sexual objectification. Part of this process should include examining construct proliferation between beauty and sexual objectification. Construct proliferation refers to the creation of theoretically distinct constructs that are empirically indistinguishable (Le et al., 2010), leading to empirical redundancy. Because beauty and sexual objectification are theoretically similar but distinct, any future research that creates measurement techniques for these constructs should test for construct proliferation to ensure that beauty and sexual objectification have unique predictive power.

These findings linking power to dehumanization and sexual objectification have important clinical implications. Dehumanization from others leads to shame and negativity
which can create adversely impact mental health (Cascalheira & Choi, 2023). We detected a positive linear relationship between sense of power and dehumanization such that those reporting high sense of power were more likely to dehumanize. AIA theory states that those in high power can engage in approach behaviors (i.e., dehumanization) because they have more flexible automatic cognitions, as they are not engaging in vertical code-switching (Anicich & Hirsh, 2017). Automatic cognitions refer to thoughts and emotions that occur with little to no processing time and take up minimal space on an individual’s cognitive load (Anicich & Hirsh, 2017). This study did not test if automatic cognitions were the mechanism that allowed for those with high power to dehumanize more. If future studies find that the automatic cognitions are the mechanism driving this relationship, automatic cognitions can be targeted to reduce dehumanization of others in lower power.

Social cognition theory supports that people automatically categories others into ingroups and outgroups, which can contribute to discrimination (Fiske, 1998). Perhaps the automatic cognitions associated with high power impact categorizing others as outgroup members allow for easier dehumanization. If this is true, we know to create more interventions to address automatic cognitions. Reduced dehumanization may allow for safer environments, and reduced mental health effects. Previous research has tried to address these cognitions by priming people of high power with egalitarian values, which led to participants paying greater attention to information that disconfirmed outgroup stereotypes (Operario et al., 1998). Implementing these techniques for those in power may help reduce dehumanization and act as a clinical prevention effort targeting the negative outcomes of dehumanization. As the automatic cognitions that lead to discrimination and dehumanization increase discouragement at work (Heslin et al., 2012), depression (Mikrut et al., 2022), and other health deficits (Cascalheira & Choi, 2023), targeting
the automatic conditions may prevent others from experiencing dehumanization and the adverse outcomes of dehumanization.

The same implications can be applied to sexual objectification. This study found a quadratic association between sense of power and sexual objectification, that those in high power are not the only group more likely to sexually objectify. Future research is needed to expand on exactly which types of power may be associated with automatic associations if automatic association is the mechanism driving this relationship that allows for increased sexual objectification. Once that is done, the same types of interventions targeting automatic cognitions can be created to reduce sexual objectification. These interventions will need to be created with care, so that they are not only implemented with those with high power, but also for those with low power when appropriate. Sexual objectification is associated with trauma (Miles-McLean et al., 2015), depressive symptoms (Szymanski et al., 2021), and serious mental illness (Carr et al., 2015). If interventions are created to prevent sexual objectification from occurring, we can prevent others from experiencing the negative consequences of sexual objectification. Research suggests that objectification and dehumanization work in a cyclical pattern with objectifying experiences leading to the objectified becoming the objectifier (Davidson et al., 2013; Linder et al., 2012), so these interventions are especially important as they could have a snowball effect of reduce the amount of people dehumanizing and objectifying.

In conclusion, our findings support that sense of power is related to sexual objectification and dehumanization. These findings highlight that sense of power does not only linearly relate to other variables, and that variables that are closely related to each other may have different relationships with sense of power. It remains unclear if beauty objectification is associated with power. It is important to understand the relationship between power and
objectification/dehumanization because of the negative consequences of
objectification/dehumanization. Understanding what causes people to objectify/dehumanize
more (i.e., power) allows us to identify problems within our society/culture which may help up
break the cycle. Breaking the cycle can reduce objectification/dehumanization, which will in turn
reduce the amount folks are traumatized and ostracized from these experiences. Future research
is needed to test what are the mechanisms explaining the association of power and
dehumanization/objectification to best prevent objectification/dehumanization.
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Table 1

*Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants (N = 330)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native Alaskan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/Arab</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Races Endorsed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite Hispanic</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hispanic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>49.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or More</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of Power₁</td>
<td>Sense of Power₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power₁</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power₂</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty Obj₁</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Obj₁</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehumanization</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for Power₁</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image₁</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem₁</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean:
- Sense of Power₁: 4.90
- Sense of Power₂: 4.87
- Beauty Obj₁: 0.33
- Sexual Obj₂: 0.80
- Dehumanization: 0.82
- Desire for Power₁: 4.02
- Body Image₁: 5.21
- Self-Esteem₁: 67.89
- BMI: 24.32

Standard Deviation:
- Sense of Power₁: 0.82
- Sense of Power₂: 0.92
- Beauty Obj₁: 17.13
- Sexual Obj₂: 0.12
- Dehumanization: 0.19
- Desire for Power₁: 1.06
- Body Image₁: 1.47
- Self-Esteem₁: 14.33
- BMI: 5.22

Note. Obj. = Objectification; BMI = Body Mass Index; X₁ = Measured at baseline; X₂ = Post power primes; ** = < .01; * = < .05
Table 3.

Hierarchical multiple regression predicting Sexual Objectification, with Desire for Power as a Moderator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F (df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>4.20 (3, 326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.00**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.37 (4, 325)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.00**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.76 (5, 324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.00**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power²</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.96 (6, 323)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.00**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power²</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP² X DFP</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SOP² = Sense of Power Squared; SOP² X DFP = interaction of sense of power squared and desire of power; SE = Standard Error; CI = Confidence Interval; Bolded ΔR² indicates a significant step of the model; *p < .05; **p < .001
Table 4.

Hierarchical multiple regression predicting Beauty Objectification, with Desire for Power as a Moderator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F (df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-10.38</td>
<td>-24.04</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1.47 (3, 326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-8.77</td>
<td>-24.20</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.15 (4, 325)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-14.22</td>
<td>-50.78</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.94 (5, 324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>-13.01</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power²</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-14.96</td>
<td>-51.93</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.79 (6, 323)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>-12.89</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power²</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP² X DFP</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. $SOP^2$ = Sense of Power Squared; $SOP^2 \times DFP$ = interaction of sense of power squared and desire of power; SE = Standard Error; CI = Confidence Interval; Bolded $\Delta R^2$ indicates a significant step of the model; *$p < .05$; **$p < .001$
Table 5.

Hierarchical multiple regression predicting Dehumanization, with Desire for Power as a Moderator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>(df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power$^2$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Image</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power$^2$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP$^2$ X DFP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* SOP$^2$ = Sense of Power Squared; SOP$^2$ X DFP = interaction of sense of power squared and desire of power; SE = Standard Error; CI = Confidence Interval; Bolded $\Delta R^2$ indicates a significant step of the model; *$p<.05$; **$p<.001$
Appendix A: Power Prime Task

High Power: Please recall a particular incident in which you had power over another individual or individuals. By power, we mean a situation in which you controlled the ability of another person or persons to get something they wanted, or were in a position to evaluate those individuals. Please describe this situation in which you had power- what happened, how you felt, etc.

Equal Power: Please recall a particular incident in which you and another individual or individuals had comparable power. By having comparable power, we mean a situation in which no one individual controlled the ability of any other person to get something they wanted and no one person was in a position to evaluate anyone else. Please describe a situation in which all individuals had comparable power – what happened, how you felt, etc.

Low Power: Please recall a particular incident in which someone else had power over you. By power, we mean a situation in which someone had control over your ability to get something that you wanted, or was in a position to evaluate you. Please describe this situation in which you did not have power- what happened, how you felt, etc.
Appendix B: Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale (ISOS-P)

You are about to view the image of a woman. Please focus on her physical appearance.

How often have you done the following to other women… 1(never) 5(almost always)
1. Whistled at someone while she/he was walking down a street?
2. Stared at someone’s breasts/chest when you are talking to them?
3. Evaluated someone’s physical appearance?
4. Stared at someone’s body?
5. Leered at someone’s body?
6. Made a rude, sexual remark about someone’s body?
7. Honked at someone when she/he was walking down the street?
8. Stared at one or more of someone’s body parts?
9. Made inappropriate sexual comments about someone’s body?
10. Gazed at someone’s body or a body part, instead of listening to what she/he was saying?
11. Made sexual comments or innuendos when noticing someone’s body?
12. Touched or fondled someone against her/his will?
13. Perpetrated sexual harassment (on the job, in school, etc.)?
14. Grabbed or pinched someone’s private body areas against her/his will?
15. Made a degrading sexual gesture towards someone?
Appendix C: Other Objectification Questionnaire (OOQ)

You are about to view an image of a woman. Please focus on her physical appearance.

This section is concerned with how women think about other women’s bodies. Listed below are ten different body attributes. Right now if you were to think about, or look at other women, which of these body attributes are most important? Please rank the attributes in order from 1 (least important) to 10 (most important) in other women.

1. . . .what rank do you assign to physical coordination? _____
2. . . .what rank do you assign to health? ______
3. . . .what rank do you assign to weight? _____
4. . . . what rank do you assign to strength? _____
5. . . .what rank do you assign to sex appeal? ______
6. . . .what rank do you assign to physical attractiveness? ______
7. . . .what rank do you assign to energy level (e.g., stamina)? ______
8. . . .what rank do you assign to firm/sculpted muscles? ______
9. . . .what rank do you assign to physical fitness level? ______
10. . . what rank do you assign to measurements (e.g., chest, waist, hips)? ______
Appendix D: Mind Perception Scale (MPS)

You are about to view the image of a woman. Please focus on her physical appearance.

Mind Perception (adapted from Gray, Gray, & Wegner, 2007)

Please read each item and then carefully record your answer using a scale ranging from 1 to 7, where a score of 1 means “strongly disagree” and a score of 7 means “strongly agree.”

**Agency**
1. This person is capable of exercising **self-control**
2. This person is capable of acting **morally**
3. This person has a good **memory**
4. This person is capable of **recognizing emotions**
5. This person is capable of **planning**
6. This person is capable of **communication**
7. This person is capable of **thought**

**Experience**
1. This person is capable of feeling **hunger**
2. This person is capable of feeling **fear**
3. This person is capable of feeling **pain**
4. This person is capable of feeling **pleasure**
5. This person is capable of feeling **rage**
6. This person is capable of feeling **desire**
7. This person is capable of feeling **personality**
8. This person is capable of feeling **consciousness**
9. This person is capable of feeling **pride**
10. This person is capable of feeling **embarrassment**
11. This person is capable of feeling joy
Appendix E: Sense of Power Scale (SOP)

Right now, in my relationship with others

1 (Disagree strongly) to 7 (agree strongly)
1. I can get them to listen to what I say
2. My wishes do not carry much weight
3. I can get them to do what I want
4. Even if I voice them, my views have little sway
5. I think I have a great deal of power
6. My ideas and opinions are often ignored
7. Even when I try, I am not able to get my way
8. If I want to, I get to make the decisions
Appendix F: Desire for Power

Please rate the following statements on how much you agree with them, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

1. I deserve to be a more powerful and influential person than I am now.
2. In a fairer world, I would have more control over things than I do now.
3. I don’t have as much power as I deserve.
4. I’m OK with how much influence I have these days.
Appendix G: Body Image State Scale

For each of the items below, choose the statement that best describes, how you feel RIGHT NOW AT THIS VERY MOMENT. Read the items carefully to be sure the statement you choose accurately and honestly describes how you feel right now.

1. Right now I feel...
   - Extremely dissatisfied with my physical appearance
   - Mostly dissatisfied with my physical appearance
   - Moderately dissatisfied with my physical appearance
   - Slightly dissatisfied with my physical appearance
   - Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied with my physical appearance
   - Slightly satisfied with my physical appearance
   - Moderately satisfied with my physical appearance
   - Mostly satisfied with my physical appearance
   - Extremely satisfied with my physical appearance

2. Right now I feel...
   - Extremely satisfied with my body shape and size
   - Mostly satisfied with my body shape and size
   - Moderately satisfied with my body shape and size
   - Slightly satisfied with my body shape and size
   - Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied with my body shape and size
   - Slightly dissatisfied with my body shape and size
   - Moderately dissatisfied with my body shape and size
   - Mostly dissatisfied with my body shape and size
   - Extremely dissatisfied with my body shape and size

3. Right now I feel...
   - Extremely dissatisfied with my weight
   - Mostly dissatisfied with my weight
   - Moderately dissatisfied with my weight
   - Slightly dissatisfied with my weight
   - Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied with my weight
   - Slightly satisfied with my weight
   - Moderately satisfied with my weight
   - Mostly satisfied with my weight
   - Extremely satisfied with my weight

4. Right now I feel…
   - Extremely physically attractive
   - Very physically attractive
   - Moderately physically attractive
   - Slightly physically attractive
   - Neither attractive nor unattractive
Slightly physically unattractive
Moderately physically unattractive
Very physically unattractive
Extremely physically unattractive

5. Right now I feel…
A great deal worse about my looks than I usually feel
Much worse about my looks than I usually feel
Somewhat worse about my looks than I usually feel
Just slightly worse about my looks than I usually feel
About the same about my looks as usual
Just slightly better about my looks than I usually feel
Somewhat better about my looks than I usually feel
Much better about my looks than I usually feel
A great deal better about my looks than I usually feel

6. Right now I feel…
A great deal better than the average person looks
Much better than the average person looks
Somewhat better than the average person looks
Just slightly better than the average person looks
About the same as an average person looks
Just slightly worse than the average person looks
Somewhat worse than the average person looks
Much worse than the average person looks
A great deal worse than the average person looks
Appendix H: State Self-Esteem Scale

This is a questionnaire designed to measure what you are thinking at this moment. There is of course, no right answer for any statement. The best answer is what you feel is true of yourself at the moment. Be sure to answer all of the items, even if you are not certain of the best answer. Again, answer these questions as they are true for you RIGHT NOW.

1. I feel confident about my abilities.
2. I am worried about whether I am regarded as a success or failure.
3. I feel satisfied with the way my body looks right now.
4. I feel frustrated or rattled about my performance.
5. I feel that I am having trouble understanding things that I read.
6. I feel that others respect and admire me.
7. I am dissatisfied with my weight.
8. I feel self-conscious.
9. I feel as smart as others.
10. I feel displeased with myself.
11. I feel good about myself.
12. I am pleased with my appearance right now.
13. I am worried about what other people think of me.
15. I feel inferior to others at this moment.
16. I feel unattractive.
17. I feel concerned about the impression I am making.
18. I feel that I have less scholastic ability right now than others.
19. I feel like I’m not doing well.
20. I am worried about looking foolish.
Appendix I: Word Find

Tundra Dwellers

ARCTIC FOX
ARCTIC HARE
Bald Eagles
Bumble Bee
Caribou
Ermine
Gray Falcons
Grizzly Bear
Gyrfalcon

MOOSE
MOSQUITO
Musk Ox
Norway Lemming
Pocket Gopher
Polar Bear
Ptarmigan
Raven
Ruddy Turnstone

SHREW
Sled Dog
Snowy Owl
Squirrel
Tundra Swan
Vole
Water Bird
White Wolf
Wolverine
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Appendix J: Demographics

1. What is your race?
   - White
   - Black or African American
   - American Indian or Alaska Native
   - Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
   - Asian/Asian American
   - Southeast Asian
   - Arab or Middle Eastern
   - Hispanic or Latinx
   - Other

2. What is your age?
   - 18
   - 19
   - 20
   - 21
   - 22
   - 23
   - 24
   - 25

3. What is your sexual orientation?
   - Heterosexual
   - Homosexual
   - Bisexual
   - Pansexual
   - Asexual
   - Other

4. Please indicate your gender?
   - Cis man
   - Cis woman
   - Trans man
   - Trans woman
   - Non-binary/third gender
   - Other

5. For how many years have you attended college?
   - One
   - Two
   - Three
   - Four
• Five
• Six or more
6. How would you best describe your weight?
• Very underweight
• Underweight
• Average
• Overweight
• Very overweight
• Obese
• Very obese