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Language and its potential effect on the individual has been a much-debated topic in psycholinguistics. Past psycholinguistic research has typically focused on the way in which males and females speak. This research instead focuses on the way to which females are referred. This study hypothesized that exposing females to a pejorative reference-based language would decrease three types of self-efficacy and one measure of behavioral output in a negative or decreasing direction. The language construct defined in this study is "non-directive female-pejorative language" (NDFPL): indirect language that imbues the receiver with real or stereotypical female characteristics and is used pejoratively. A total of $N=89$ female college undergraduate students were tested: ages 18-43, and 97% Caucasian. An experimental group was exposed to a 10-minute video comprised of successive NDFPL media clips, while a control group was exposed to a 10-minute video of neutral, non-NDFPL content. Participants completed pre- and post-test measures of the Physical Self-Efficacy Scale, Self-Regulation Self-Efficacy Scale, General Self-Efficacy Scale, dynamometer grip test, and a post-test only general qualitative measure. Results from a $2 \times 2$ ANOVA analysis and post-hoc $t$ tests indicate that of the three tested types of self-efficacy and the dynamometer, only physical self-efficacy differences at post-test are nearing significant difference, with the experimental group reporting an unexpected increase in physical self-efficacy after viewing the NDFPL-containing video. Additionally, participants in the experimental condition, and not the control condition, report qualitative feedback indicating feelings of anger, shame, and frustration specific to the NDFPL content. Limitations of the study include restricted exposure to the independent variable and limited ability of the measures to capture outcome. Overall, for its apparent trend toward affecting physical self-efficacy, as well as its qualitative effect on emotion and cognition, NDFPL appears to be a construct that may deserve attention in further, more expansive research.
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Non-directive female-pejorative language (NDFPL):

The effects of indirect pejorative language on females’ perception and thought.

History

Today, overt discrimination and prejudice against females in American society is no longer a socially accepted norm. However, historically, females have been denied voting rights, access to higher education, participation in research, and acquisition of a job equivalent to male counterparts. In recent history, activists have brought attention to prejudice in areas including sexual harassment in the workplace, domestic violence, and sexual abuse. As a result, such overt gender discrimination is now considered socially taboo, as expressed legally and through unwritten social norms. Conscious attitudes are becoming increasingly egalitarian but implicit stereotypical perceptions of abilities continue to contribute to intended and unintended perceptual bias towards girls and women (Greenwald, 1995; Kahn & Crosby, 1987; Kite, 2001; Lemons, 2003; Rudman, Greenwald, Mellot, & Schwartz, 1999). The presence of this bias indicates that it is not enough to look at consciously mediated processes of bias and stereotyping because habitual unattended beliefs still exist.

Such biases indicate the need for further research to determine what may be contributing to the maintenance of these unconscious stereotypical perceptions and their associated reflective behaviors. It is proposed in this study that language is one of these contributors to stereotypical perceptions of females, and that language may affect females' perceptions and behaviors.
Two implicitly held perceptions still held by both men and women in contemporary majority American culture are that girls and women are disparately less physically strong (Hunter & Forden, 2002) and emotionally regulated (Brody & Hall, 1993) than boys and men. Empirical research and meta-analysis have elicited a few characteristics in which women and men differ in stereotyped ways, but these are quantitatively few and indicate qualitatively small differences (Eagly, 1989; Hyde & Linn, 1986; Maccoby, 2002). Real-world evidence of female athletes and sports teams indicates that girls and women are capable of physically defending their selves and performing acts of strength within an adequate to superior range of competence. However, this ability may not always be displayed. For example, Evaldsson (2003) determined that girls’ displayed physical skills depended on the context, and that the girls in her study downplayed physical skills in certain situations.

Emotionally, there is significant between- and within-group variability in women's and men's experience and expression. Emotions are tied to heritable biological processes, yet, the triggers vary for the individual depending on environmental contingencies (Garside & Klimes-Dougan, 2002). In other words, women and men are similar in that between and within their respective groups, variability exists. In fact, researchers have found overall similarities in the underlying emotional experience of men and women (Fischer, 1993; LaFrance & Banaji, 1992). However, girls and women are stereotypically seen as "emotional," and therefore their emotional reactions may be viewed as overblown and thus negatively evaluated (Zammuner, 2000).
In summary, some stereotypical perceptions of highly disparate abilities and traits between men and women persist, despite science and real-world evidence indicating otherwise. Whether held by a man or woman, these perceptions may leave girls and women vulnerable to a host of consequences; for example, through the process of behavioral conformation. Behavioral confirmation is a well-documented phenomenon in which the individual behaves according to others' expectations, especially if that other person controls a reward system (Faxio, Effrein, & Falender, 1981; Miller & Turnbull, 1986; Snyder, 1984). One possible reward is social approval for conforming to the feminine gender role (Bem, 1993). Illustratively applied, a girl or woman who is expected to be emotionally and physically vulnerable will behaviorally act the part. In an ironic twist, the girl or woman will actually move toward and reinforce the existing stereotype, belying her genetically endowed physical and emotional capabilities.

Translated into social context, such perceptions and their related behavioral conformations can be dangerous and detrimental for girls and women. For example, an attacker is more likely to target and "complete" the rape of a victim who is perceived to be physically weak and unable to fight back (Galliano, Noble, Travis, & Puechl, 1993). In defending one's self, research indicates that forceful physical resistance greatly decreases the likelihood of rape "completion" (Zoucha-Jensen & Coyne, 1993). In this example, the woman's and the attacker's perception of a girl or woman's incompetent physical ability could lead to deleterious consequences.

In further demonstration of the possible negative consequences of holding gender-specific stereotypical beliefs, Lirgg, George, Chase, and Ferguson (1996) reported results in which the perceptions of gender differences in physical self-efficacy were predictive of
performance. Specifically, females perceived themselves to be less physically able, and performed accordingly. In a sample of 675 adolescents, Bacchini and Magliulo (2003) revealed that female adolescents reported a significantly lesser degree of emotional self-efficacy than males. Bandura, Gian, Barbaranell, Gerbino, and Pastorelli (2003) described a gender-specific trajectory for females in which emotional inefficacy bred depressive despondency. In other words, females were more likely to believe themselves unable to regulate their emotions, and were subsequently more likely to become depressed.

**Perception Processing**

Past research has attempted to explain the creation and maintenance of these biased perceptions of females, held by both men and women. The path to understanding starts with the substrate, the perception itself. Perceptions are akin to memories, stored in the human brain as a result of learning. The brain processes stimuli from a variety of sensory domains, in order to form memories and learn new information. Vision, olfaction, touch, balance, and auditory neurons all contribute to the individual’s perception of the environment. Through these channels, and the combination of input from each, we form perceptions about the world and our place in it.

**Language and Perception**

A body of researchers and theorists claim that language contributes to our perceptions of who we are and what we do and think, purporting that words have the power to influence our thinking and enforce social norms (Crawford, 1995; Carli, 1990; Romaine, 1999; Whorf, 1956). In other words, our perception of self and others is partially received and modified through language input; our cognitions and our language
affect one another circularly (Tomasello, 2003; Durst, 2003). In an empirical example, Hamilton (1988) demonstrated that male pronoun use tends to lead one to view the world in a masculine sense. Similarly, Fitzsimons and Kay (2004) found that participants who read a vignette utilizing the word “we” perceived a closer relationship between characters than if the words “she” or “I” were utilized. The same was demonstrated for actual interpersonal interactions. These authors interpreted this to mean that the implicit or connotative meanings associated with the language symbols of “we” versus “she” or “I” influenced the participants’ cognitions.

In line with such research indicating a language-perception/cognition connection, the concern of this study is in determining whether females' self-perceptions are affected by language. Could it be that girls and women change their perceptions of their capabilities and attributes as they receive language input, especially language input that indirectly references their “girlliness/womanliness” in a negative manner? For example, could hearing via a language label that a girl/woman is physically weak result in a perception matching that stimuli input?

Females in Language

To begin answering these questions, a bit of background is helpful in examining the foundation for the interpersonal language transaction purported in this study to partially contribute to perceptions of self. In psycholinguistic literature and other disciplines, the process of labeling and the semantics that accompany a label have gleaned a great deal of attention. A word is not just a word. In order for a word to be useful, it must have meaning. Most words in our lexicon have a denotative, or dictionary, as well as a connotative, or underlying, meaning associated with them. Words can have
positive connotation, serving a soothing, peaceful, or empowering function, such as meditative mantras. Words can have negative connotations, also. Violence, anger, interpersonal rifts, and other tragedies have occurred because of the connotations of a word, such as a racial epithet.

American etymologist, H.L. Mencken (1977), reported in his classic linguist work, "The American Language: An Inquiry Into the Development of English in the United States," that most words used to label women take on negative connotations. Today, such labels remain, including: shrew, bunny, beaver, bitch, sow, chick, cow, fox, bitch, bat, nag, harpy, dame, mistress, and madame. Kramarae (1981, 1990) and Sutton (1995) contend that such labels for females tend to objectify girls and women. Modern researchers and clinicians pay close attention to the potential harmful effects of labels; for example, no longer referring to a “schizophrenic” but rather a “person with schizophrenia” because of the awareness of negative connotation in labeling. In summary, language has semantic properties above and beyond the dictionary definition, carrying meaning and the capability of eliciting emotion.

Mencken (1977) and Cameron (1997) postulate that the use of slang labels by men, including euphemisms when referring to women, is to confer an air of toughness, masculinity, separateness and distance. Yet, girls and women also utilize labels such as “bitch.” Lips (2002), Penelope (1998), and Rakow (1998) contend that this is because boys and men remain at the top of the social hierarchy, and therefore determine the dominant communication system. They purport that in most social systems the subordinate group finds it in their best interest to try to understand and internalize the system and its properties. Crawford (1995) adds that the more powerful class creates this
social system and its associated beliefs, which are internalized by subordinates who may then doubt or deny their own experience when it does not match with this assigned perceptual framework. Based on this logic, it may be that girls and women are more influenced by the dominant language system than are boys and men.

*Non-Directive Female-Pejorative Language (NDFPL)*

Consequently, we are left with a lexicon utilized by both males and females that refers to females with labels that take on a negative connotation. As discussed previously, directly addressing girls and women with many of these labels is no longer acceptable. However, insults that utilize these labels are typically accepted in today's United States majority culture (e.g., a male/female calling another male/female a “bitch” or a “girl”). There is very little research available to demonstrate how such covert or indirect language use contributes to self-perceptions and behaviors. Considerable literature has focused descriptively on the way females and males speak, but there has been little empirical investigation into how perceptions of the self are created or modified through the way in which a female is verbally referenced (Weatherall, 1998).

Specifically, the interest here is in the effect of a specific form of verbal referencing— a construct defined here as "non-directive female-pejorative language" (NDFPL). It is language practiced by both males and females, communicated with the intention of deprecating another. This deprecation is intended to be achieved by imbuing the receiver with stereotypical or real female characteristics. These characteristics can predominantly be factored into two negatively-valenced categories: physical weakness and emotion dysregulation. The construct NDFPL can be heard either as an observer or recipient. This type of language is not intended to directly insult females, even though its
connotation toward females is negative and disparaging. It is indirect in that a female is being belittled, devalued, or deprecated, but not as a direct insult. This type of language can be utilized in the form of a joke, an insult, or teasing, and can even be heard in friendly interchange. However, the use of NDFPL does not directly indicate a negative female quality. Rather, it is implied and indirect. The user is protected from societal consequences because NDPFL allows indirect degradation without explicit malicious intent.

Examples of frequently utilized NDFPL terms expressed between males/females, females/females, and males/males are: "Stop acting like a girl", "Put on a skirt, wuss," "What are you afraid of Nancy?" "sissy," "Go play with dolls you crybaby," "Go ahead and cry like a girl," and "pussy." Even pronouns such as "she" and "her" have the capability to elicit umbrage, especially if directed at or speaking about a male. Non-directive female-pejorative language can be encountered in everyday situations, and proliferates in contemporary media, such as movies and television shows.

Measuring Perceptions and Abilities

How might NDFPL affect a female's perceptions and abilities? Self-efficacy was chosen in this study as the outcome variable to study perceptions and abilities because of its relation to the construct studied, and its empirical backing and predictive value. It is important to note that self-efficacy is differentiated from self-esteem. Self-esteem is a general feeling about one's self, whereas self-efficacy is behaviorally oriented to what you believe you can do with what you have under a variety of circumstances (Bandura, 1997). Bandura's (1997) prolific research allows him to summarily indicate that self-efficacy beliefs influence goals, courses of action, effort put forth, resilience, and
accomplishment. Explicitly, it has been proven to be highly predictive of behavior in many contexts, such as therapy outcome and physical performance (Bandura, 1997; Lirgg et al., 1996).

Specifically, physical self-efficacy, self-regulation self-efficacy, and general self-efficacy will be measured in this study because NDFPL tends to focus on emotional dysregulation and physical weakness. Physical self-efficacy is defined as perceived confidence in performing tasks using physical skills and the confidence an individual has in displaying these physical skills and being evaluated in them (Ryckman, Robbins, Thornton, & Cantrell, 1982). Self-regulation self-efficacy is defined by Schwarzer (1992) as the ability to keep a favorable emotional balance and focus attention on the task at hand. General self-efficacy as defined by Schwarzer (1992) is the personal agency belief that one's actions are responsible for successful outcomes.

Self-efficacy partially develops through behavioral experiences, such as mastery experiences as an infant and child, indicating to the individual that he or she is capable of that specific behavior. It also develops through adulthood via vicarious behavioral experiences, and as the result of reinforcement or punishment after performing a behavior. In addition, it develops as a result of an individual's affective feedback. Another channel through which one develops self-efficacy is verbal persuasion/social influence (Bandura, 1997). In this way, others either proscribe abilities to an individual by stating and guiding them directly and indirectly, or offer themselves as comparative bases. Social influence includes caretakers, peers, media, government, and tacit role expectations, among others. This social influence channel is one that is related to the research question posed in this study.
In addition to affecting self-efficacy, social influence has also been shown to affect actual behavioral outcomes. For example, Peters, Greenberg, Williams, and Schneider (2005) report that participants invested in strength training displayed increased dynamometer grip strength after being reminded of and writing about their own mortality. Another study revealed that motivational strategies were found to be effective in increasing strength on a knee-extension isokinetic dynamometer (Theodorakis, Weinberg, Natsis, Douma, & Kazakis, 2000). Therefore, in this study, behavioral outcome will also be measured, to determine whether actual behavior, in addition to self-efficacy, can be affected by NDFPL.

In reference to social influence through indirect verbal persuasion, research has shown how information is accepted more readily when it is not directly persuasive, and people tend to resist influence that is overtly persuasive, especially if they are forewarned (Marcel, 1983; Petty & Cacioppo, 1979; Yi, 1990). Related to this subject, Kardes (2005) writes of how advertising is partially successful because of its subtle effects on memory that are not consciously noticed by consumers. Also, Bargh and Pietromonaco (1982) concluded in their research that conscious judgments can be influenced by social stimuli of which the participants report being unaware. In other words, one may change a cognition or perception as a result of exposure to stimuli that are presented in an indirect manner (Bargh & Ferguson, 2000; Tice, 1994).

How then might self-efficacy perceptions and indirect language interact? First, it must be noted that although self-efficacy serves as a foundation for habitual beliefs and actions, it is modifiable with training and didactic education throughout one’s lifetime (Bandura, 1997). As a function of this modifiability, it is hypothesized here that
exposure to NDFPL could allow integration of the underlying connotative ideas (e.g., I am physically weak because I am a woman; I am unable to regulate my emotions because I am a woman) into self-efficacy perceptions through the perceptual language channel of verbal persuasion/social influence.

When measuring self-efficacy, Bandura (1997) recommends assessing specific efficacy measures over a variety of contexts. Self-efficacy scales have been developed for the areas of interest in this study: physical, emotional, and general self-efficacy. In terms of measuring self-efficacy within a specific population, college students were chosen as the population for this study because they are traditionally a group in a vulnerable transitory period in which their self-efficacy is theoretically more malleable and able to be influenced through input from others (Bandura, 1997). According to Bandura (1997), the framework of an individual’s self-efficacy is already apparent in early adulthood, but is especially malleable during times of change and transition (e.g., moving from home to living independently at college). Also, in early years, our sense of self is largely determined by the reactions of others. In early adulthood, peer association provides the most salient points for comparisons, acting as a major source for validation of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).
Hypotheses

The aim of this research is to examine female participants’ change in perceived physical self-efficacy, emotional self-efficacy, general self-efficacy, and physical behavior, as a result of viewing a videotape with either NDFPL or neutral content. This reasoning led to the following hypotheses:

1. $H_1$: Female participants will record decreased physical self-efficacy on the Physical Self-Efficacy Scale after viewing an NDFPL videotape.

2. $H_2$: Female participants will record decreased self-regulation self-efficacy on the Self Regulation Self-Efficacy Scale after viewing an NDFPL videotape.

3. $H_3$: Female participants will record decreased general self-efficacy on the General Self-Efficacy Scale after viewing an NDFPL videotape.

4. $H_4$: Female participants will demonstrate decreased physical grip strength on the dynamometer after viewing an NDFPL videotape.

Note: A qualitative measure was also included in an effort to acquire and identify further group differences and/or similarities that are not captured by the chosen measures.
Method

Participants

The participants were eighty-nine female undergraduate students participating to partially fulfill a requirement for the introductory psychology course at The University of Montana, Missoula. Participant ages ranged from 18 to 43, with 85% of participants between the ages of 18 and 20. The majority (97%) of the participants reported Caucasian ethnicity. The majority (67%) of participants reported single marital status.

Materials

Experimental room. The main room was divided into eight closed-door rooms. Each individual room allowed each participant to view the videotape and complete the measures with a minimum of external distraction. Each room contained a chair, a table, and a 25" TV with VCR. All rooms were arranged identically, with the TV/VCR on the east side of the room.

Videotapes. The NDFPL and control videotapes were compilations of media clips, movie and television, chosen for either neutral or NDFPL content. The NDFPL videotape contained 10 minutes (32 video clips) of NDFPL material (see Appendix A for details). The neutral videotape contained 10 minutes (41 video clips) from similar media utilized in the NDFPL condition, but did not include the NDFPL references (see Appendix A for details). The researcher for this study reviewed the videotapes and confirmed accuracy based on group condition by ensuring that the neutral video contained only neutral clips and the NDFPL video contained clips with NDFPL references. Also, a small pilot study (N=8) determined that the videotapes were accurate.
for group condition. In this pilot, the videos were rated separately for interest, humor, and excitement, each on a Likert scale of 1-10.

**Physical Self-Efficacy Scale (PSE).** Ryckman et al. (1982) created this self-administered scale (Appendix B) to specifically measure physiological self-efficacy. It measures perceived physical competence and individuals' feelings of confidence of displaying these skills in the presence of others. The scale contains 22 items rated on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly disagree." Scores can range from 22 to 132. Past research has found the measure to have a satisfactory 6-week test-retest reliability, \( r = .85 \), and associations with participation in athletics and use of physical skills (Ryckman et al., 1982).

**Self-Regulation Self-Efficacy Scale.** Schwarzer (1992) developed this 10-item self-report questionnaire (Appendix C) to measure the relative convictions of one’s own capacities to regulate negative and positive emotions adequately. It contains emotion-regulation and attention-regulation items such as “If an activity requires a problem-oriented attitude, I can control my feelings” and “When I worry about something, I cannot concentrate on an activity.” Items are endorsed on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from “not at all true” to “exactly true.” Scores can range from 10 to 40. In a sample of \( N = 442 \) persons the scale has obtained an internal consistency of Cronbach's alpha = .76, and in a sample of \( N = 239 \) persons the scale yielded a test-retest stability of .62 after six weeks (Schwarzer, 1992). Schwarzer (1992) also demonstrated associations with general self-efficacy beliefs (\( r = .57 \)), and with proactive coping (\( r = .55 \)).
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General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE). The GSE is a 10-item self-report measure (Appendix D) that was designed to assess general self-efficacy (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). Items are endorsed on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from “Not at all true” to “Exactly true.” Scores can range from 10 to 40. Although self-efficacy is commonly understood to be domain-specific (Bandura, 1997), general self-efficacy refers to global confidence across a wide range of situations and remains valuable in reporting overall efficacy that may be missed by specific measures (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). The GSE has evidence of good internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and construct validity (Schwarzer & Born, 1997).

Grip Test. The researcher-administered grip test (dynamometer) is commonly utilized by physical therapists and neuropsychologists to determine gross motor ability. The participant grips the mechanism and it registers applied force (Appendix E). The participant gripped the mechanism three times. The three grip amounts were recorded, as well as a mean grip score.

General Qualitative Measure. This open-ended questionnaire was developed by the researcher on this project (Appendix F), and asks for any feedback regarding reactions or thoughts to the viewed video. It asks the question, “Please let us know here of any thoughts or feelings you may have after viewing the videotape.”

Demographics Questionnaire. This 6-item self-report questionnaire was developed by the researcher on this project (Appendix G). It includes questions of age, ethnicity, living situation, number of siblings, gender of siblings, frequency of physical exercise, and marital status.
Design & Procedure

Overview. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups and participated individually. Each participant had an equal chance of being assigned to the control or experimental condition. Participants in the control condition viewed a 10-minute videotape containing neutral references. Participants in the experimental condition viewed a 10-minute videotape containing NDFPL references. Participants were tested before viewing the video and after viewing the video. Therefore, the design was 2 (pre-test/post-test) x 2 (NDFPL/Control). Participants were tested within a two-month period: November 1, 2004 through December 9, 2004.

Participants were required to be 18 years or older. Participants were asked before the start of the session if they had normal or corrected-to-normal vision and if English was their first-learned language. One participant was excused for not meeting the criteria of English as a first-learned language, and was awarded research credits.

After arriving in a waiting room, each participant was seated in an individual room within the experimental room. The participant was directed according to a pre-composed script (Appendix G). The participant completed consent procedures, and was asked to complete the self-administered measures. The participant’s stated preferred hand was then recorded and the participant was asked to squeeze the grip with that hand as hard as she possibly could for five seconds, three separate times, with a ten-second break for recovery between each squeeze. Participants were then told that they would be viewing a 10-minute videotape, without any reference to its content. They were asked to watch the video in its entirety. However, they were informed that they could leave the video room and discontinue participation at any time without repercussions. None of the
participants excused their selves during the study. Any questions were answered, and the participant was left alone to view the videotape. After the 10-minute video was viewed, the participant emerged, and repeated the pre-test process (excluding the self-administered demographics measure) plus the qualitative measure. Participants were then debriefed (Appendix H), research credits were awarded, and they were asked to keep the procedure to themselves.

Both conditions were framed as procedurally identical with the exception of the videotape. Control participants viewed a neutral videotape and experimental condition participants viewed the NDFPL videotape.
Results

Data Analysis

A sum score was calculated for three of the four continuous dependent variables: physical self-efficacy, general self-efficacy, and self-regulation self-efficacy. For the fourth dependent variable, a mean grip test score was calculated for each participant. The dependent variable data was closely examined for outliers, distribution, and range by using box plots, stem and leaf plots, histograms, and data inspection. As a result of this data inspection it was unnecessary to exclude any data and it was determined that the data met all assumptions for the analyses to be run.

A 2 (group) x 2 (time) repeated measures ANOVA was conducted separately for each of the four dependent variables. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests, unless otherwise specified. In addition to initial ANOVA analyses to test for main and interaction effects, post hoc tests were conducted on significant interactions in order to determine specific differences.

Demographic variables were considered as potential covariates that might account for any significant variance in self-efficacy between groups. To accomplish this, correlations were performed between each demographic variable, the independent variable of group (NDFPL/Control), and pre- and post-test scores for each dependent variable (see Table 1).
In addition to quantitative analysis, analysis of qualitative data/responses was done (see Tables 4 and 5). Participant responses were coded for the type of response (e.g., ANG- Angry), valence of response (e.g., positive, negative, neutral), and whether the response was related to the theme of the video (e.g., NDFPL) or the format of the video (e.g., short, quickly ending clips). The resulting numbers were summed according to these categories. Two separate raters coded this data, and inter-rater reliability for this coding was $r = .89$. 
Table 1.

Correlations Between Independent, Dependent, and Demographic Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>group</th>
<th>ethnicity</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>marital status</th>
<th>living situation</th>
<th>exercise frequency</th>
<th>siblings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>physical self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-regulation self-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficacy</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-regulation self-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficacy</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-test</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-test</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dynamometer grip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dynamometer grip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-test</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sig</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Results

It was hypothesized that at post-test the NDFPL-exposed group means for all dependent variables would significantly differ from those of the Control group means, with the direction of the effect indicating a decrease in self-efficacy and physical ability after exposure to NDFPL. The ANOVA results indicate non-significant between-group differences for all dependent variables (see Table 2). However, a significant Time x Group within-group interaction was found for physical self-efficacy ($p = .042$). Specific values in regards to this interaction are provided in Tables 2 and 3, and further results follow.
Table 2.

Analysis of Variance for NDFPL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Physical SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Main Effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.193</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within-group error</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>(245.037)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Self-Regulation SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Main Effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.109</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within-group error</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(33.484)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-General SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Main Effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within-group error</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>(22.611)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Dynamometer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Main Effect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects within-group error</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(49.873)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Physical SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.929</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.265</td>
<td>.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within-group error</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>(14.218)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Self-Regulation SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.711</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within-group error</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(2.237)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-General SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.736</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.736</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within-group error</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>(1.816)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Dynamometer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.325</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.733</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within-group error</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(3.296)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values endorsed in parentheses represent mean square errors. SE = self-efficacy. * p < .05
Table 3.

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Means Between Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Group (N=)</th>
<th>Pre-test M (SE)</th>
<th>Post-test M (SE)</th>
<th>Change Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical SE</td>
<td>Experimental (39)</td>
<td>85.82 (1.613)</td>
<td>88.33 (1.884)</td>
<td>+2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control (44)</td>
<td>82.68 (1.763)</td>
<td>82.77 (1.782)</td>
<td>+0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reg. SE</td>
<td>Experimental (33)</td>
<td>28.61 (.799)</td>
<td>28.21 (.789)</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control (40)</td>
<td>26.93 (.633)</td>
<td>26.50 (.610)</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General SE</td>
<td>Experimental (35)</td>
<td>30.94 (.568)</td>
<td>31.40 (.639)</td>
<td>+0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control (41)</td>
<td>30.49 (.541)</td>
<td>30.22 (.528)</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamometer (grip)</td>
<td>Experimental (37)</td>
<td>34.73 (.874)</td>
<td>35.86 (.924)</td>
<td>+1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control (44)</td>
<td>33.68 (.758)</td>
<td>34.30 (.712)</td>
<td>+0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SE = standard error. SE = self-efficacy
In regards to H₁ of physical self-efficacy, between-group analysis reveals no significant difference between control and experimental groups between pre- and post-test $F(1, 81) = 3.193, p = .078$. In within-group analysis; however, physical self-efficacy significantly interacts with group, $F(1, 81) = 4.265, p = .042$. The effect size of this interaction is moderate (eta squared = .050, power = .532).

Means comparison indicates a difference of 2.51 points gained between pre- and post-test physical self-efficacy scores for the experimental group in comparison to .09 point gained between pre- and post-test for the control group (see Table 3). This data then indicates that in contrast to the predicted direction of the difference, the experimental group’s post-test score is greater after viewing the NDFPL video than before viewing the video (see Figure 1).
Figure 1. Time x Group Within-Group Interaction, Physical Self-Efficacy.
In regards to H2 of self-regulation self-efficacy, between-group analysis reveals no significant difference between control and experimental groups between pre- and posttest, $F(1, 71) = 3.109, p = .082$. In within-group analysis, self-regulation self-efficacy does not significantly interact with group, $F(1, 71) = .004, p = .950$.

In regards to H3 of general self-efficacy, between-group analysis reveals no significant difference between control and experimental groups between pre- and posttest $F(1, 74) = 1.117, p = .294$. In within-group analysis, general self-efficacy does not significantly interact with group $F(1, 74) = 2.736, p = .102$.

In regards to H4 of dynamometer grip strength, between-group analysis reveals no significant difference between control and experimental groups between pre- and posttest $F(1, 79) = 1.380, p = .244$. In within-group analysis, dynamometer grip strength does not significantly interact with group $F(1, 79) = .829, p = .365$.

Post-hoc comparisons between groups were done utilizing paired and independent samples $t$ tests to determine the direction and specifics of the one significant finding; the interaction between physical self-efficacy and group (see Table 4). The first paired samples two-tailed $t$ test indicates that within the experimental group, the change in physical self-efficacy score is significant, $M = -2.513, SD = 6.561, t(38) = -2.392, p = .022$ (two-tailed). The second paired samples two-tailed $t$ test indicates that the within the control group, the change in physical self-efficacy score is not significant, $M = -0.091, SD = 3.940, t (43) = -.153, p = .879$ (two-tailed).
The first independent samples two-tailed $t$ test indicates that the difference between experimental and control groups at pre-test is not significant, $M = 3.14$, $SE = 2.411$, $t(81) = 2.144$, $p = .197$ (two-tailed). The second independent samples two-tailed $t$ test did indicate that the difference between experimental and control groups at post-test is significant, $M = 5.56$, $SE = 2.594$, $t(81) = 2.144$, $p = .035$ (two-tailed).

However, after adjusting the alpha level to account for error rate inflation, none of the comparisons prove to be significant ($\alpha \leq .0127$), though the physical self-efficacy by group interaction nears significance.
Table 4.

**Physical Self-Efficacy: Two-tailed t Test Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of t test</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>( t ) value</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Samples</td>
<td>pre-test: experimental / control</td>
<td>1.302</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Samples</td>
<td>post-test: experimental / control</td>
<td>2.144</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired Samples</td>
<td>experimental: physpre- / physpost-</td>
<td>-2.392</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired Samples</td>
<td>control: physpre- / physpost-</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In addition to quantitative analysis, qualitative analysis indicates that many of the participants in the experimental condition report particular conscious emotional and cognitive reactions specific to the NDFPL content, whereas participants in the control condition unanimously report a lack of similar emotional and cognitive reaction related to the content, after viewing the neutral video (see Tables 5 and 6).

More specifically, participants in the experimental condition report emotions including anger, frustration, and shame, whereas participants in the control condition report a limited range of emotions loading more on items of amusement, boredom, and curiosity (see Appendix I). Also, although participants in the control group report negatively valenced emotions, they are most often related to the short duration and quickly changing nature of the video clips (see Appendix I).
Discussion

Overview

The main purpose of this study was to expand on previous psycholinguistic research, and to ascertain whether an indirect joking-style language that portrays female characteristics as derogatory (NDFPL) has an effect on females’ self-efficacy. The results do not find that all areas of self-efficacy were affected by NDFPL. However, the results do indicate that perceived physical self-efficacy is impacted by NDFPL, though in a different direction than postulated, and in a manner nearing significance. The results also indicate qualitatively different emotional reactions between the experimental and control groups.

The statistical analyses show that between pre-test and post-test, in comparison to a control group, females’ exposure to an NDFPL videotape does not result in significant between group differences in grip strength, general self-efficacy, self-regulatory self-efficacy, or physical self-efficacy. However, females in the experimental group report a within-group interaction with the control group between pre- and post-test measures of physical self-efficacy, where the average physical self-efficacy change score for the females viewing the NDFPL videotape is higher than that for the females viewing the neutral videotape, and the difference nears significance.

In addition to these quantitative analyses, qualitative analyses reveal that the majority of the females in the experimental condition report subjective feelings of anger and distress. Experimental group females also report interest in the subject matter, concern about the presence of NDFPL in the media, and motivation to further explore and be attentive to NDFPL in their lives (e.g. “It is aggravating to see such a compilation
because it makes me realize how predominant such degrading speech is,” “I had never
thought of it in the past but the media really does set a standard for women and men
alike,” “The media has a huge influence on people so I’m wondering how this is affecting
the women of the world.”).

**Limitations**

Research constraints required that the NDFPL clips were viewed in succession,
rather than separated by other varying content, as would be the case in ecological
exposure to NDFPL. Therefore, although the participants are hypothetically exposed to
much more NDFPL over their lifetimes, each incidence is typically bookmarked with
other life experiences. In addition, individuals are typically exposed to NDFPL from a
variety of sources, including in-vivo interpersonal exposure from strangers as well as
closer acquaintances, whereas this study solely utilized the media source. It may be that
NDFPL would be received and/or reacted to differently if exposure were in-vivo, and
emitted from personally respected or cared for others.

The most significant limitation appears to be in regards to the questionnaires
chosen to measure participant responses and possible changes. Specific forms of self-
efficacy were chosen as the primary outcome variables for this study. The predictive
value and empirical backing of self-efficacy informed the inclusion of this construct as
the primary outcome variable, as well as the face validity relatedness of the self-efficacy
forms to the hypotheses. However, it may be that NDFPL affects other types of self-
efficacy, or other outcome variables not studied here, such as outcome expectancy or
self-esteem. It should be noted that modifying the study to address these limitations
would expand the ability of the study to find statistically significant effects of NDFPL.
In summary, results indicate that participants did respond to the NDFPL video, but that the measures did not sufficiently capture or assess these responses.

Implications

Despite the limitations, findings from this study have important implications. Though the interaction effect between physical self-efficacy and group did not meet significance, it neared this level, and larger mean differences were found between the NDFPL group than the control group at pre- and post-test. In cautious interpretation then, cross-referencing with qualitative measure responses (e.g. “I feel offended, yet motivated to change this image...”) reveals a potential explanation for this difference. Participants describe emotions including anger and offense after viewing the NDFPL videotape. It may be that after viewing the videotape, participant perceived strength increases as a result of this emotional and cognitive motivation. In analogy, the NDFPL may serve as an immunization of sorts, in that it is not strong enough to create a full-blown illness (negative change to all areas of self-efficacy and behavioral output), but motivates the immune system (motivational system) just enough to allow awareness and creation of defenses (increased perceived physical ability) against the communicable agent (NDFPL). In this manner, exposure to NDFPL may actually serve a beneficial function by motivating females toward perceiving increased physical ability. Such a tool might be utilized by therapists, domestic violence counselors, and victims of abuse, in order to counter phenomena such as stereotype threat and learned helplessness.

The second implication is specifically in regards to the qualitative findings. Analysis of participants’ responses reveals that many of the females in the experimental group report feeling offended and distressed after exposure to NDFPL. For example,
"...I started getting frustrated," "I am a girl, and having me be the term for someone who is scared, incapable, or weak is very insulting," "It really is unfair. Perhaps if women were not portrayed as being weak they would truly be stronger," "...people need to take in consideration of others feelings," "...it sorta pisses me off," "After a while it almost made me feel guilty or somewhat ashamed." For this face validity of offensiveness, the findings from this study hold value. That which creates offense and negatively valenced emotion is that which may contribute to disharmonious relationships between individuals and groups of people. Therefore, it is theoretically important to identify and negate such stimuli if and when possible. Based upon this research, non-directive female-pejorative language appears to be one such offense upon females' emotional and cognitive equilibrium.

Future research exploring these qualitative findings may be beneficial. Focus groups would be helpful in gathering more comprehensive reactions. Additionally, quantitative measures based on initial hypotheses of emotional and cognitive reactions might further address these areas, and catalogue them in a manner in which more detailed and predictive statistical analyses may be done.

Also, participants in this study commented in writing upon NDFPL's potential effect on males. Specifically, NDFPL may serve as a motivator for males toward hypermasculinity. This may be explored in further research, and could be a more important undertaking than measuring females' responses, because hypermasculinity has been associated with abuse toward others (Parrott & Zeichner, 2003; Ryan, 2004). Participants in this study commented upon the possibility of this hypermasculinizing effect of NDFPL on males; for example, "the way movies and TV shows portray men is
the need to be extremely masculine...stronger, more powerful.” Participants in the experimental group also commented that NDFPL may have more effect on “...younger generations.” This is an intriguing question that may also be addressed in future studies. Perhaps the self-efficacy of the females was not significantly altered by the NDFPL video because their adult levels of self-efficacy are relatively fixed as a function of their age. Younger participants may be more easily influenced, as their self-efficacy is typically more plastic than an adult’s (Bandura, 1997)

Conclusions

Overall, results indicate that NDFPFL and language of its type may be valuable because of the observed near-significant difference in perceived physical self-efficacy scores as well as its apparent qualitative impact on personal equilibrium and therefore social harmony and mutual respect. Applied, this construct may be utilized as a tool to motivate behavior and thought in females, specifically regarding physical self-efficacy. Future research may address the motivational and cognitive processes to empirically explain these findings.

Further, future research with male populations and young children may reveal even more important and salient findings that expand upon this research. In addition, focus groups might more closely look at the qualitative emotional and cognitive reactions to NDFPFL, expanding and exploring to observe the processes and outcomes of exposure to NDFPFL. Also, hypotheses oriented toward looking for cognitive and emotional reactions may yield more descriptive and predictive statistical and clinical findings to expand and clarify the qualitative findings of this research.
Finally, and apparently most saliently, this research demonstrates that NDFPL affects the female individual, but that the measures utilized here did not capture these effects, rather hinting at them in participants' qualitative responses. Future research focusing on measurement may find further impacts and consequences of NDFPL.

In closing, overall, this study provides an awareness of NDFPL in the research and larger community. The study of covert and indirect manifestations of stereotypes may be a valuable research undertaking; one that contributes to individual and interpersonal respect and appropriate interpersonal interaction.
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Appendix A

Videotape(s) Information

**Experimental Video (NDFPL):**
(32) video clips, 10 minutes in length

NDFPL word(s)
1. sissy girl
2. pussies
3. girl
4. pussies
5. sissies
6. princess
7. pussy ass weakness
8. girls
9. bitch (4x)
10. girls
11. Sally
12. girls
13. girl
14. bitch (2x)
15. girls names, Judy
16. bitch (2x)
17. sissy boy
18. girls (2x)
19. Melinda
20. girl, Annie
21. girly man
22. girl
23. sissy girl
24. bitch, pussy (repeated)
25. girl (3x)
26. girls
27. bitch (repeated)
28. Tami
29. Girl Scouts
30. girl
31. pussy (2x)
32. pussy

**Control Video (Neutral):**
(41) video clips, 10 minutes in length

(Note. Video(s) available upon request.)
Appendix B

Physical Self-Efficacy Scale

"Please indicate your responses to the following questions by checking the box next to the answer that best describes you."

1. I have excellent reflexes
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

2. I am not agile and graceful.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

3. I am rarely embarrassed by my voice.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

4. My physique is rather strong.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

5. Sometimes I don’t hold up well under stress.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
6. I can’t run fast.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

7. I have physical defects that sometimes bother me.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

8. I don’t feel in control when I take tests involving physical dexterity.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

9. I am never intimidated by the thought of a sexual encounter.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

10. People think negative things about me because of my posture.
    - Strongly agree
    - Fairly agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Fairly Disagree
    - Strongly disagree
11. I am not hesitant about disagreeing with people bigger than me.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

12. I have poor muscle tone.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

13. I take little pride in my ability in sports.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

14. Athletic people usually do not receive more attention than me.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

15. I am sometimes envious of those better looking than myself.
   - Strongly agree
   - Fairly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Fairly Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
16. Sometimes my laugh embarrasses me.
  - Strongly agree
  - Fairly agree
  - Agree
  - Disagree
  - Fairly Disagree
  - Strongly disagree

17. I am not concerned with the impression my physique makes on others.
  - Strongly agree
  - Fairly agree
  - Agree
  - Disagree
  - Fairly Disagree
  - Strongly disagree

18. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable shaking hands because my hands are clammy.
  - Strongly agree
  - Fairly agree
  - Agree
  - Disagree
  - Fairly Disagree
  - Strongly disagree

19. My speed has helped me out of some tight spots.
  - Strongly agree
  - Fairly agree
  - Agree
  - Disagree
  - Fairly Disagree
  - Strongly disagree

20. I find that I am not accident prone.
  - Strongly agree
  - Fairly agree
  - Agree
  - Disagree
  - Fairly Disagree
  - Strongly disagree
21. I have a strong grip.
   □ Strongly agree
   □ Fairly agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Fairly Disagree
   □ Strongly disagree

22. Because of my agility, I have been able to do things which many others could not do.
   □ Strongly agree
   □ Fairly agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Fairly Disagree
   □ Strongly disagree
Appendix C

Self-Regulation Self-Efficacy Scale

"The following statements deal with reactions you may have to various situations. Indicate how true each of these statements is depending on how you feel about the situation. Do this by checking the box next to the most appropriate choice."

1. I can concentrate on one activity for a long time, if necessary.
   - Not at all true
   - Barely true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

2. If I am distracted from an activity, I don't have any problem coming back to the topic quickly.
   - Not at all true
   - Barely true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

3. If an activity arouses my feelings too much, I can calm myself down so that I can continue with the activity soon.
   - Not at all true
   - Barely true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

4. If an activity requires a problem-oriented attitude, I can control my feelings.
   - Not at all true
   - Barely true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

5. It is difficult for me to suppress thoughts that interfere with what I need to do.
   - Not at all true
   - Barely true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

6. I can control my thoughts from distracting me from the task at hand.
   - Not at all true
   - Barely true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true
7. When I worry about something, I cannot concentrate on an activity.
   □ Not at all true
   □ Barely true
   □ Moderately true
   □ Exactly true

8. After an interruption, I don't have any problem resuming my concentrated style of working.
   □ Not at all true
   □ Barely true
   □ Moderately true
   □ Exactly true

9. I have a whole bunch of thoughts and feelings that interfere with my ability to work in a focused way.
   □ Not at all true
   □ Barely true
   □ Moderately true
   □ Exactly true

10. I stay focused on my goal and don’t allow anything to distract me from my plan of action.
    □ Not at all true
    □ Barely true
    □ Moderately true
    □ Exactly true
Appendix D

General Self-Efficacy Scale

"The following statements deal with reactions you may have to various situations. Indicate how true each of these statements is depending on how you feel about the situation. Do this by checking the box next to the most appropriate choice."

1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.
   - Not at all true
   - Hardly true
   - Moderately true
   - Exactly true

10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.
    - Not at all true
    - Hardly true
    - Moderately true
    - Exactly true
Appendix E

Dynamometer Recording Form

Dominant Hand (circle): Left / Right

Pre-test:
Grip 1
Grip 2
Grip 3

Post-test:
Grip 1
Grip 2
Grip 3
Appendix F

General Qualitative Measure

"Please let us know here of any thoughts or feelings you may have after viewing the videotape."

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
Appendix G

Demographics Questionnaire

"Please indicate your responses to the following questions by circling the number next to the answer that best describes you."

1. Ethnicity:
   1. African / African American
   2. Asian / Asian American
   3. Caucasian / European American
   4. Hispanic / Hispanic American
   5. Native American / American Indian
   6. Other (please specify: _________)

2. Age:
   1. (please specify _________)

3. Siblings (with whom you grew up):
   1. 1 sibling (gender of sibling: ______________)
   2. 2 siblings (gender of siblings: ______________)
   3. 3 siblings (gender of siblings: ______________)
   4. 3+ siblings (please specify #: _______) (gender of siblings: ______________)
   5. only child

4. Marital status:
   1. unmarried
   2. unmarried with boyfriend/girlfriend
   3. married
   4. divorced

5. Living situation:
   1. alone
   2. with roommate(s)
   3. with spouse
   4. with spouse and children
   5. with children

6. Physical exercise (at least 20 minutes, in which you feel you are breathing hard):
   1. 1-2 times per week
   2. 3-4 times per week
   3. 5-6 times per week
   4. 7+ times per week (please specify #: _________)
Appendix H
Procedural Scripts

(administer after informed consent)

"Here are five questionnaires for you to complete. Please fill them out as completely and as truthfully as possible, and in order. Please do not skip any questions, and answer each to the best of your ability. After you have finished, I will be in the main room here, and we will begin with the next step. If you have any questions while you are filling out these forms, I will be available to answer them as best I can."

"Thank you for completing this paperwork. Now, I will ask you a few questions. First, with what hand do you throw a ball? Please pretend to hammer a nail. With what hand do you write? (use this information to determine dominant hand). Now, please grip this mechanism here with your ____ hand, as hard as you possibly can, for five seconds. Now, let's rest for a few moments (wait 10 seconds). Okay, again, please grip this mechanism here with your ____ hand, as hard as you possibly can, for five seconds. (repeat one more time)"

"Okay, now I will push play on this 10-minute videotape. Please watch the video for the entire 10 minutes. If at any time you feel uncomfortable or would like to stop viewing, you have the right to do so and there will not be any negative consequences to you for doing so. Simply exit and inform me. Otherwise, I will return after 10 minutes. Any questions?"

"Now, again, here are four of the questionnaires for you to complete, and an additional questionnaire. Please fill them out as completely and as truthfully as possible, and in order. After you have finished, I will be in the main room here, and we will begin with the next step. If you have any questions while you are filling out these forms, I will be available to answer them as best I can."

"Thank you for completing this paperwork. Now, again, please grip this mechanism here with your ____ hand, as hard as you possibly can, for five seconds. Now, let's rest for a few moments (wait 10 seconds). Okay, again, please grip this mechanism here with your ____ hand, as hard as you possibly can, for five seconds. (repeat one more time- should be a total of 3 times).

"Okay, you have completed the necessary activities. Do you have any questions?"

**********************************************************************************************************
Debriefing Script:

"Thank you for participating in this research. This research was to determine whether seeing and hearing other people degraded by referring to them as female causes people to begin to believe and act as though they are less competent in a variety of areas. It is very important that you do not discuss this research or its purpose with anyone, as it will compromise the results. Again, we appreciate your participation. Are there any questions I can answer? Are there any feelings, thoughts, or physical reactions that I can help you address? OK. Remember, it is very important that you do not discuss this project or its purpose with anyone. If you wish to contact me with any questions or concerns after your leave, my name and phone number are listed on your consent form."
Appendix I

Participants' Verbatim Responses to Qualitative Measure

Experimental Group (NDFPL):

1. The videotape was degrading to women. All of the scenes made men seem stronger than women and it also implied that being called a woman or anything to do with a woman is bad.

2. All the clips were of men being called many different names, all meaning women, weak, or afraid to do something. I didn't realize how often men are called "pussy" or "bitch" because they don't want to do something, or are not man enough to, and/or others don't think they are. When a man shows emotion or weakness they are put down/called names.

3. First off- very entertaining. I definitely got the impression the way movies and TV shows portray men is the need to be extremely masculine. All the guys were ridiculed if being too "weak," etc. I have a feeling that this is why younger generations of men have the need to be stronger, more powerful, more good looking, etc. Movies and TV have created social norms that little boys strive to be like. As for girls, many watch the shows and find that they are looking for the more masculine, etc. They don't want a boyfriend who is a "pussy." As you grow older, these feelings will change, but it heavily impacts younger generations.

4. Personally I am not offended by the things I saw in the movie.

5. It is aggravating to see such a compilation because it makes me realize how predominant such degrading speech is, even in popular shows like Seinfeld. At the same time, I was already aware of this and conscientiously don't use words like "pussy" or say things like "you run like a girl." But mostly I just started getting frustrated.

6. I felt there was a lot of bad language or using the word girl as a bad thing. Since we did being a girl be a bad thing. Otherwise it didn't bother me. I've already seen most of those movies.

7. I thought that parts of it were funny in the beginning. After a while it got kinda old because it was just repeatedly insulting women. I had never thought of it in the past but the media really does set a standard for women, and men alike.

8. Obviously, being called a "pussy" or a "girl" is an insult...it's a sign of weakness and incapability...which is very insulting to males, and females alike. It makes me feel less, like a bad trait and not a person...like my whole self can be characterized into a simple insult..."pussy" or "girl." I am a girl, and having me be the term for someone who is scared, incapable or weak is very insulting.
9. Some parts of the video were funny and other parts were quite rude. I liked the short video because I knew a lot of the shows or movies that the clips came from. Towards the end, they used the word "pussy" a lot, which was both funny and mean. During some clips, they made me feel happy, others made me feel sad, and others made me a little mad.

10. I have often thought about society's names and referrals to women as being weak. There are many arguments, questions, and proposed solutions I have come up with because I was very sick of the "feminine" aspects of life. But after coming to college and meeting my boyfriend, he had the same issues and complexes about being a man-a provider-strong and assertive-hard-cold. He was none of these things, but a saxophonist. He was so afraid of not being a man at all times, and I realized that women are blessed with the "excuse" of weakness. We can do whatever we want and try to reach for any goal. No one is going to refer to us as a pussy, we aren't looked at as pussys at all, only beautiful, delicate women whom men and other women love. I don't even realize all the innuendos anymore. They brush past me like other slangs used for comedy.

11. The video made me realize that women are put down a lot and they are viewed as less capable. It never realized how much degrading words about women are used toward men.

12. I never realized in TV or movies how many derogatory words there are for women. I thought to myself that I use the word "bitch" but never thought of its true meaning. I've also compared my guy friends to girls. It shows that as much as there is more equality between men and women but there is still many unequal terms in language. I personally don't put to much emotion and meaning to name calling. But the comparisons throughout the film of women being slow or emotional and then comparing them to women was bothersome.

13. I thought all of the expressions like "you girl" and "you pussy" are just ways of saying you are weak. It is not an attack or insult on girls. I do not take any offense to those things because I know I am not that way. I can hold my own so it doesn't matter. It is proven that boys are stronger so it is just a generalization of a weak guy to say that they are like a "girl."

14. While watching this video, I was first affected by the humor portrayed throughout the video. However, I gradually noticed the pattern of derogatory comments towards women, and felt both sad and angry that media refers negatively to women in order to entertain America. Throughout the clip people are told they do something "like a woman" or that they are a "pussy" because they don't do something to full expectations. However, this is simply the terminology used by Americans in humorous context, and I suppose that this trend of abasing women will continue for quite sometime.
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15. Well, I learned that the media is very degrading towards women. How they portray woman as weak→little pussy, bitch, and girl. Meaning women aren't as strong as men. The media has a huge influence on people so I'm wondering how this is effecting the women of the world?!

16. It seems like a lot of media portrays men to be called females by "tough" guys. It really is unfair. Men should realize that women can be just as strong as men. Perhaps if women were not portrayed as being weak, they would truly be stronger.

17. Umm... there were a lot of funny parts of movies that I recognized. But there were also many parts that I wish to never see again... like Jennifer Lopez and Ben Affleck 😒. The were a lot of parts that reflected on people's sexuality and or terms of questioning people's sexuality. It's become quiet a joke and no one really takes offense to some of that stuff but people need to take in consideration of others feelings.

18. Wow, women are really looked @ as weak, stupid, incompadent and unable to perform every day tasks. I found it funny that in almost every genera of TV/movie entertainment, the words "pussy" and "bitch" are used like nothing. When you see it usually, you don't think much of it, but after seeing how often the comments are used it sorta pisses me off. Why are girls viewed like this? I'm not weak, I don't run weird or back down from things. I guess I'm just confused as to how and why our culture has chosen to use women as an insult. Why do we use anything pertaining to people as insults, like "you're gay!" Both that statement and ones like "you're a pussy!" Being gay is not stupid, and being a girl is not weak. Why do people feel they have to use another group of people against people? Maybe they are just insecure with themselves.

19. I think that the videotape was kinda funny. I kinda got the impression that girls are weak and can't do anything right. And that men are being called "girls" is an offence.

20. I thought the tape was very funny. I kept trying to figure out what scenes went to what movie. But I can see how someone might of took offense to the movies. But I was raised on them.

21. I thought that most of the scenes were funny, because I've seen all of the movies—maybe felt that their was a point that calling people names is negative attention.

22. The first clip was funny so I sort of felt that the rest should be funny, so I was definitely amused, then I was trying to identify what each clip was from and was annoyed when I didn't know.

23. At first, it was sorta funny watching clips of my favorite movies. But then I began to notice how much belittling was used in reference to girls. After a while it almost made me feel guilty or somewhat ashamed. All the images of people acting aggressive and belittling became tedious. I also never noticed how common this is, but now that I am aware of it, that could change.
24. It portrayed girls as being weak. When men were not acting like "men" they got called "girls/pussies." Generally, it said women are stupid and weak. If a man wants to insult another man, the worst he could do is call him a girl's name. Makes for good humor, but bad values.

25. It was entertaining to me and a little strange as well. I feel like I wasted time by watching that because I could watch those shows at my house other than that I don't have any strong feelings or other thoughts.

26. After a few segments I realized that every show, or movie clip used some sort of name to the female gender. Words like girl, women, pussy and bitch. All of them used in a degrading manner some referencing that the male gender is superior to the female gender. I have never realized that derogating phrases towards women were used so frequently in television films and media in general. I personally do not take a lot of offense when they are used in shows and films.

27. Honestly, I was familiar with a lot of the clips that were shown. They were funny and while it did have an extensive use of profanity, wasn't really bothered. It was nice for some laughs, but I'm really not sure what the video and the paperwork and the grip test have to do with one another. So that will be interesting to find out. Other than that, no complaints from me, out of all my research credits this one has probably been the funniest.

28. I've always been somewhat of a feminist and I always call my brother or boyfriend on it when they say "sissy" or "girlie," or "pussy" or any of those things. I think it makes women look weak. I don't see myself as a weak person and I don't think any woman is weak. That videotape made me realize just how much those terms are used in society. To be completely honest, it pisses me off. And it doesn't help women seem any stronger.

29. This videotape displayed a lot of sexism towards women. Portraying women as weak and un-worthy. I feel offended, yet motivated to change this image (Being a woman.)

30. After viewing the video, I noticed that episodes of different shows using different words for "girls" was obviously the main theme. I find it extremely weird how such words have become about to portray the female gender. I don't have many thoughts on it other than what I just said mainly because it is a part of todays world and those words are heard all the time.

31. It just brought the idea that girls, women and female things in general are often used as derogatory terms to insult others especially other males. It could lead on to believe that females are the weaker of the two sexes which by no means is true. I think it is like a double standard type thing. Women are raised being told that they can do anything that males can do, but for males them being seen as feminine is socially unacceptable and being called a girl, etc. is to motivate them to do "better," not show emotion, and be "stronger."
32. I definitely think some of the clips may be viewed as offensive to women, because some of the slang used was to portray women as a weaker, more emotionally feeble sex. Most of those terms are so commonplace now, especially in films, that unless you are consciously thinking about sexism, you might not even really notice that the terms are in fact sexist. I also think most women realize that lines in movie and TV are not meant to be hurtful to the female gender as a whole, but rather they're expressions from the writer's interpretation of his/her character's minds and the way certain characters speak.

33. Lots of strong language. I didn’t realize how many negative references to women there are in our society/media.

34. They were very funny clips put together. I recognized most of them. Some were more serious than others.

35. It is often shown on television that calling men/boys girls or to reference them as females or female reproductive parts is demeaning and entertaining. In our society being called a girl when you are a boy is associated with negative feelings. It is used as a source of mockery. If you are called a girl it is a challenge to your "manhood." Throughout the clips the use of referring men/boys as girls was used as a comical or as a hostile act, never in a positive aspect. It is not good if you are a male to be referred to as anything associated with females.

36. The videotape made me realize how much females are still looked at as weaker. Before viewing this videotape I never thought very much about this still present role of "weaker" women. People using terms like "pussy" ad other various negative words and phrases have seemed normal. I have even used different terms like this w/out thinking twice. I feel that our society does have a view of women weaker but not as weak as people's language makes it sound. I think these different words and phrases have become and stayed a part of our language because of the roles women have played and have been expected to play and maybe b/c women are naturally not as physically strong as men in terms of muscle mass and aggressiveness. I did not feel very offended by this video because as a female I still feel very valuable and equal in ar society.

37. The videotape was a little disturbing to me in that it associated all negative scenarios to women of any sort. To justify immature behavior men and women alike were called "pussys or sissy girls." I didn't enjoy much hearing girls' natural behaviors and/or body parts spoke in vain. It was a known component that anything girlish was used to put down another. Gay people, men, women and even young children are brought up to think being a girl is a bad thing. When in all actually being a girl doesn't mean what it used to.

38. There was definitely an overabundance of the words pussy, bitch and like a girl used. Funny on a comedic level yet sad because you don't hear don't act like such a boy or dick very much at all. Kind of made me think about how much these phrases or words are used and I don't even think about it.
39. After seeing the tape, I realized that derogative words/phrases are used so much more than I thought. I even use the terminology once in a while. Even when I disagree with it. I even forbid my boyfriend to use it in front of me. I feel the terminology has formed different meaning with somethings but don't know how to explain it. I wish that the offensive words didn't exist because it keeps out culture in a narrow-minded tight-spot.

40. Many of the scenes in the video were very humorous. Although, there was quite a lot of profanity and some violence. Many of the TV shows and movies were familiar to me. Most of the clips seemed to be from comedy clips videos/shows.

41. I'm not sure if the tape was supposed to show the viewer something bad. I found most of the clips humorous. I think that the word "pussy" was used a lot and tried to show that something was wrong with using this word. The clips often showed sitcoms calling men-ladies or something along those lines, but I see nothing wrong with that.

42. I noticed that in every little clip, they either called each other a girl, a girl's name, a pussy, or some other name referring to a girl.

Control Group (Neutral):

1. I was getting bored watching all those different videos. I kept dazing off and thinking about other things.

2. The movie clips started off funny, but as it progressed, more serious clips began to be showed intermittently. The funny clips were all recognizable movies, but the more serious ones weren't. The baby duck in the Friends clips reminded me of the baby duck I had at the beginning of the semester, Mercutio. It brought a smile to my face.

3. The video kind of shows how the brain works. I feel like it flips between different subjects at random. It is sometimes a struggle for me to concentrate on one thing and I really have to concentrate on one thing and I really have to concentrate very hard to stay on subject. I have learned to help this by reading many books and by playing my violin. The more I do these things, the easier it is to stay on one topic for a longer period of time. It is like training my mind.

4. I have not had any serious revelations! I thought it was funny the way it was chopped and that's about all there was to it! Hope that's helpful! Sorry

5. I was annoyed because you kept switching videos right when the tape was about to get exciting.

6. I don't really know what to say. It was like watching TV w/a kid that has ADHD-always flipping the channels. I tried to pay attention since this is part of an experiment but I kept finding myself think about other things or zoning out.
7. I felt like I really did not get enough time to act against each one of the movie clips before it changed, it kind of gave me a sense of uneasiness because you would never know what came next.

8. I feel humorous, jittery, excited. They were mostly funny clips (so it seemed...)

9. While I was watching the tape I was trying to find any relation between any of the scenes/dialogues I saw. I didn't find anything though. I also tried to see if dialogues were continued through to the next scene (which would connect all the different scenes I saw).

10. After viewing the tape I mainly thinking about the shows which I could name. Most of the shows were humorous, so I actually feel quite good. I was reminded of the humor and how many of those shows make me laugh. I am wondering though what the connection between all of them is, if there even is one at all. Overall, I just feel good because all of those shows were good and funny.

11. Most of the shows or movies shown on the videotape were ones that I had seen before. Most of those were ones I liked. A lot of them were humorous, and I found myself thinking about what happens next in the show after it was cut off. I also got kind of agitated at times because some of the shows were ones that I was really interested in, so when they got cut off I wanted to see more of it. Also, even if they weren't particularly interesting to me, some of the shows got cut off in mid-sentence, and I was frustrated that I didn't find out what happened afterwards.

12. They video stirred up a lot of emotions. So many I can't remember them all. A lot of the clips left me dumbfounded, that may be due to the fact I don't watch many TV shows either. Everytime I saw ER clips I feel a sense of emergency. Dumb and Dumber put a tickle in my eye because I remembered how funny the show was.

13. Watching the tape made me a little frustrated because it would cut out at all the good parts. It seemed to go from funny clips to violent or emotional clips to provoke different feelings and surprise.

14. I thought the video seemed like a random mix of popular tv and movie clips. The only connections I made were that it seemed like most of the clips were from comedies and the focus was mostly on male characters. I recognized almost everything from the last 20 years. It made me laugh when I recognized what the clips were from.

15. At some points there would be a climax in the scene and it would just cut off and that was frustrating at times. Most shows or videos I recognized and some were really funny. I was confused why the selected clips were picked and what order and why they were in. Most of the clips were short but it seemed like the shows I hated were on the longest (Seinfeld and Friends).
16. I thought the tape was pretty random. It seemed like most of the clips had male characters. It was kind of funny how the clips would end right before something important would happen.

17. The movie clips were very funny, but I definitely got annoyed when the clips ended in the middle of a sentence.

18. I realized I had seen a lot of the shows and movies. Except the ones like CNT or the dramatic boring ones. My attention always perked up when the comedies or ones I recognized came up. I thought the video was kind of strange and I thought it was going to change into something else.

19. I liked watching most of it. Quite a bit of the scenes were funny. Jim Carrey in Dumb and Dumber was the best. And I didn't pay much attention to the serious parts or scenes. When one scene started I wanted to keep watching and find out what happened.

20. I kept trying to make some correlation between the numerous clips, but never discovered one. Some of the clips were humorous happy and overall positive while others were negative and violent. The clips overall did not create an overwhelming sense of emotion for me in any direction.

21. I felt that the video did not make much sense. Most of the clips were blurry and jumped around too often to concentrate a whole lot.

22. There were a lot, a variety of feelings from all the clips. My feelings fluctuated from cheerful, to concerned, to angry, to sadness. The clips that made me feel sad or angry were relieved by the clips that made me laugh or smile, which I found pleasing. I liked seeing such a variety of feelings displayed, especially the ones that make you laugh.

23. I got annoyed easily because it kept changing shows and movies and there was no plot or trend or anything. I did like seeing my favorite shows, like Friends, Dumb and Dumber, and the Breakfast Club. I really don't understand how this all correlates together, but I guess that's why I'm not a Psychology major.

24. It was a very bizarre mix of excerpts from videos and it shows. It seemed there was nearly every emotion in it. Anger happiness, fright, confusion, deceitful. It was interesting and funny.

25. It was kind of a roller coaster ride of emotions- funny then serious- sad then happy. I feel somewhat unfulfilled- like when you miss the end of a movie and so many of the cuts were cut off in the middle of a sentence. It kind of lead you on only to prep you.

26. It was entertaining. It made me want to watch some of the movies or shows I recognized and liked. I also wanted to see the whole clip sometimes because they would get cut off. It was an interesting assortment of movies and shows and I was entertained by trying to figure out what each one was before it was gone.
27. I was just thinking of how pathetic it was that I actually took the time to watch some of those dumb movies on the video clip such as "dumb and dumber," "super troopers" etc. The sight of them annoyed me.

28. I started out being entertained by the video clips. Then, after a while I started getting annoyed with them. I wanted to know what else was going to happen in specific shows and I was interrupted over and over. Also I was very surprised when a movie clip with cussing came out of no where.

29. I was a little confused and wasn't able to follow a lot of the clips. It was harder to concentrate. I was amused at the end. There were some clips that made me laugh even after it was over. I'm a little unsure of what to think.

30. I had quite a few feelings after viewing some sad from some of the clips and some slightly aggrivated. Most humor though because some of the clips were funny.

31. The video was fairly spastic. It was difficult to really follow along. I didn't see any type of pattern other than most of the clips were from popular culture. I tried to identify each clips, I was fairly successful in doing so which made me think that perhaps I watch way too much TV 😒. I think that the way they kept switching almost builds like an adrenaline rush and a little bit of confusion. I don't really remember much of what I saw even though I feel I paid close attention.

32. I really don't have any thoughts or feelings. I supposed I laughed at some of the clips because I knew what happened next or the movies that they were from. They seem to be funny or violent clips. Going from Dumb and Dumber to the Sopranos.

33. I thought that the videotape was very interesting. It had a lot of really good shows in it. I was a little how it would only show a few brief seconds from each show. But all in all I though it was very interesting to watch.

34. I was definitely confused by the tape, but overall I was pleased. It showed a lot of tv shows and movies that I like so it was definitely a good experience.

35. I now know what my friends/family etc. feel like. I am a constant channel flipper. Made me slightly more aware of the fact I watch too much tv. I had seen most everything on that only minus Basketballs and the Sopranos. The ending was ok just a slight cut off like all the others! 😏

36. While viewing the video I kept trying to figure out what I was trying to get out of it. Some made me laugh and made me want to watch the movie or show. Others ended quickly and I wanted to find out what was going to happen next. Some clips gave me anxiety. Those were my thoughts! 😏

37. I liked it. I wish it would have shown more because they were some of my favorite shows and movies. It brought back memories because I watch that stuff all the time. It did seem to cut out a lot of the funny parts though. I was expecting the punchline to be delivered ad it would just switch movies or shows.
38. I thought that there were many emotions of men shown throughout this video. Sometimes I didn't know what was going on or why they were doing what they were doing. There were a wide variety of emotions/behaviors shown. Some made me laugh, some made me smile, some made me scared or surprised, shocked, or excited.

39. Well, it was kind of annoying when the video switched back and forth between the different shows. I missed all the punchlines of the jokes! It seemed like there was more "Ace Ventura" and "Scrubs" than anything else. That scene were Ace is stabbed by the freaky aborigine people was rather shocking. What this experience really reminded me of is when I'm surfing through the television channels at home, desperately searching for something to watch. Of course, I would've paused longer on the sitcoms than on the police dramas or whatnot. Another scene that stood out for me was the one with the two people swearing at each other. I think it was supposed to be a comedy, but it's hard to tell with that type of show.

40. I was frustrated that I did not get to view more of the clips. I recognized a lot of them and it always cuts out just as I was getting into it. Toward the end it was hard to even want to watch it because I knew I wouldn't get to see the full clip.

41. I felt like going home and watching movies. 😔 I also remembered a lot of personal stories (friends, family...) that were triggered by some of the clips.

42. I am a little confused as to what this tape was supposed to mean. All throughout it, I felt many feelings. I laughed and remembered the times I had watched the movies and shows. I was confused and curious. I also was thinking about media, how much there is (movies, TV) and how much feeling it arises in us. I caught myself searching to find an order to the clips but couldn't find one.

43. Watching the tape didn't give me any strong thoughts or feelings. The scenes selected left the viewer hanging. There was also a good amount of language and violence.

44. I don't have any particular thoughts. Just a lot of different shows running through my head.

45. I don't really have many thoughts. It was odd that there were just pieces from all different shows and there was no ending to any of the clips. I thought that all the clips were pretty funny, but overall I have no idea what it was about.
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