

© 2012

Kris Mescher

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE ROLE OF SEXUALIZED REJECTION IN MEN'S BODY SHAME AND MALE  
SEXUAL AGGRESSION

by

KRIS MESCHER

A thesis submitted to the  
Graduate School – New Brunswick  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Master of Science

Psychology

Written under the direction of

Dr. Laurie Rudman

And approved by

---

---

---

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May, 2012

## ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

The Role of Sexualized Rejection in Men's Body Shame and Male Sexual Aggression

By KRIS MESCHER

Thesis Director:

Dr. Laurie Rudman

Past research found a link between men's body shame and their willingness to engage in sexual aggression (Rudman & Mescher, 2010). Further, men who have been bullied (e.g., teased about their sexuality) are more likely to report body shame (Shelton & Liljequist, 2002). The present research tests a causal relationship between rejecting men for homosexuality and sexual aggression. Participants were rejected either for a sexual reason (accused of being gay), for no reason, or they were not rejected (controls) by either a male or female phantom confederate. I predicted that men accused of being gay would show more hostility toward women and female rape victims, and score higher on measures of sexual aggression, compared with the remaining two groups. I expected this pattern to be moderated by men's body shame and their negative affect in response to rejection. That is, men high on body shame or who reacted negatively to being accused of being gay should be especially likely to retaliate against women. Results demonstrated that men rejected by a *female* confederate for being gay who were *both* high on body shame and upset by the manipulation responded with increased sexual aggression, including scoring higher on a behavioral measure of rape (i.e., a rape analogue).

## **Table of Contents**

Abstract .....	iii
Literature Review .....	1
The Role of Sexualized Rejection.....	1
The Role of Shame in Manhood.....	2
Shame and Aggression.....	4
Men’s Body Shame and Aggression.....	5
Overview of the Research and Hypotheses.....	7
Method.....	9
Participants .....	9
Measures.....	10
Procedure.....	13
Results.....	15
Preliminary Analyses.....	15
Manipulation Check.....	15
Does Sexualized Shame Result in Sexual Aggression?.....	16
Does Body Shame and/or Negative Affect Moderate the Effect of Sexualized Shame on Sexual Aggression?.....	17
Discussion.....	22
Limitations.....	23
Conclusion .....	25
Table 1.....	26
Table 2.....	27

Appendix A.....	28
Appendix B.....	42
Appendix C.....	43
References.....	44

## List of Tables

Table 1.....	26
Table 2.....	27

## Literature Review

### *The Role of Sexualized Rejection and Men's Body Shame in Male Sexual Aggression*

Male sexual aggression perpetrated on female victims is a significant social issue. It has been estimated that 90% of the victims of sexual assault and 85% of the victims of domestic abuse are female (U.S. Department of Justice, 2005; Bureau of Justice Statistics Crime Data Brief, 2003). Sexual aggression is such a frequent occurrence for women in the U.S. that a rape occurs, on average, once every two minutes (U.S. Department of Justice, 2007). Research has examined individual differences that predispose men to sexual aggression, including high levels of narcissism (Bushman, Bonacci, vanDijk & Baumeister, 2003; Kosson, Kelly & White, 1997; Widman & McNulty, 2010); lower levels of moral development (Wilson, Goodwin & Beck, 2002); the tendency to commit non-sexual crimes in adolescence (Zimring, Piquero & Jennings, 2007); hypermasculinity (e.g., extreme adherence to masculine gender roles; Murnen, Wright, & Kaluzy, 2002); endorsing misogynous attitudes (Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes & Acker, 1995), and the tendency to implicitly objectify and dehumanize female targets (Rudman & Mescher, 2011).

Feminist scholars blame violence against women on a patriarchal system, in which men hold authority and may legitimize it through the use of force (Brownmiller, 1975; Dworkin, 1987). A patriarchal sense of authority contributes to an elevated sense of sexual entitlement (e.g., that sex is deserved and may be taken at will), which has been correlated with higher incidence of sexual aggression and lower levels of self-control in men (Bouffard, 2010). When women react negatively to being treated as sexual property for male use (e.g., by rejecting sexual advances), they may be viewed as a threat to the

sexual status quo and violence may be seen as a legitimate response (DeKeseredy, Rogness & Schwartz, 2004). Within a patriarchal system, men are often motivated to improve their status within the group in order to gain access to the personal respect, praise, and power that such status confers (Archer, 1988). However, power has been shown to indeed corrupt, given it leads to narcissism (Mead, Baumeister, & Vohs, 2011), a sense of entitlement (De Cremer & Van Dijk, 2005), and a tendency to objectify others (Galinsky, Magee, Inesi & Gruenfeld, 2006), all of which have been implicated as causative mechanisms of male sexual aggression. This relative imbalance of status among men, combined with the potent drive to gain and protect it (Tiedens, Unzueta, & Young, 2007) may be more than incidentally to blame for men's devaluation of and violence against women.

#### *The Role of Shame in Manhood*

Masculinity norms oblige men to adhere to a rigid set of standards for displaying emotions, traits, skills and preferences, and masculine imperatives include stoicism, agency, strength, and toughness (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Wohlers, 1986; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku). Although men enjoy higher status in society, precarious manhood theory (Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford & Weaver, 2008) argues that the status of one's manhood is perpetually in flux; it is difficult to achieve, but easily lost. Manhood is both a precious and temporary state that must be defended. Theorists suggest there are a number of ways that men can assert their masculinity, but their effects are short-lived; while earning money, excelling at physical challenges, or having numerous sexual partners may buffer ingroup skepticism about manhood status, it cannot be held at bay for long (Pleck, 1983; 1995). Men who fail to sufficiently demonstrate their masculinity risk



not only personal experiences of stress, but also exclusion from the group (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; Pleck, 1983).

As a punitive mechanism, exclusion is particularly effective; if belonging can be interpreted as a legitimate human need (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), the effects of its removal can be just as psychologically damaging as the physical loss of food or water. Exclusion from the group *hurts*, and it can function as an effective behavioral deterrent (Bernstein, Sacco, Young, Hugenberg & Cook, 2010), particularly so if it is a known consequence of one's actions. Masculinity, perhaps more so than femininity, must be demonstrated; girls biologically mature into womanhood by reaching puberty, but manhood must be *earned* (Vandello et al., 2008); therefore, masculinity threats demand efforts to regain ingroup admission.

As one of the "self-conscious" emotions (along with guilt and pride; Lewis, 1993; Miller & Leary, 1992), shame is described as experiencing a negative quality or characteristic as a reflection of a more global sense of self, accompanied with a feeling of exposure to an audience (real or imaginary; Tangney, Wagner, Hill-Barlow, Marschall and Gramzow, 1996). Therefore, shame requires knowing one has failed to adhere to socially prescribed norms (Kelter, 1995; Castelfranchi & Poggi, 1990). Because a norm violation threatens the norm's validity, it may provoke anger, distrust or other repercussions from fellow group members (Rudman, Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Nauts, 2012). In this way, shame is predominately a social emotion displayed for the benefit of one's ingroup; it provides an apologetic response to the emotional reaction it provokes (Goffman, 1967). As masculine norms are strongly associated with high status characteristics and low status characteristics are strictly forbidden (Rudman et al., 2012),

men must sufficiently establish their shame for having violated the standards of manhood and commitment to maintaining the group's high status associations.

Building on precarious manhood theory (Vandello et al., 2008), men walk a thin line; whether directly violating a masculine norm or falling behind the constant demand to reassert masculinity, the threat of shame may be omnipresent. Men are socialized to avoid open displays of emotion (David & Brannon, 1976; Pleck, 1983; Fivush, 1989; Kuebli & Fivush, 1992), but must acknowledge their masculine missteps to appease and earn re-entry to the group. Unable to express sadness, which is stereotyped as feminine (Plant, Hyde, Keltner, & Devine, 2000) and viewed as weak in men (Brescoll and Uhlmann, 2008), shame may be the most easily accessible option. However, because prescriptions for stoicism dictate that men's vulnerability must be minimized, men may be likely to sublimate negative emotions into acts of aggression.

### *Shame and Aggression*

With the exception of anger and pride, men are generally restricted in their ability to display emotion (Plant et al., 2000). Indeed, men are told early and often that their emotional displays are inappropriate (David & Brannon, 1976; Pleck, 1983; Fivush, 1989; Kuebli & Fivush, 1992), including demonstrations of both negative *and* positive affect (Jakupcak, 2003). If vulnerable emotions (fear, sadness, and *shame*) are taboo to express in their entirety, men may learn to transform their vulnerability into violence to reduce their discomfort (Long, 1987). Boys, more so than girls, have been shown to express sadness through aggression (Zeman & Gardner, 1996). Research on male batterers has suggested that such aggressive actions may at least partially be in response to the intimacy inherent in romantic partnerships; the batterer transforms his worry that

his partner will discover his “weak” emotional self into violence (Dutton & Golant, 1995). In clinical observations, rather than being able “to tolerate and modulate shame states,” some men have shown aggressive compensatory responses (Krugman, 1995).

While previous research has established a link between the experience of shame and resultant aggression, it has been primarily focused on expression in laboratory tasks (e.g., noise bursts; Thomaes, Bushman, Stegge, & Olthof, 2008) or in the interpretation of ambiguous stimuli (e.g., the tendency to view neutral actions as hostile; Dewart, Twenge, Gitter & Baumeister, 2009). Despite my reasoning that men may suffer more from shame proneness than women in response to gender identity threat and that men’s shame may result in aggression, no research to date has examined this possibility. For better or worse, female proscriptions discourage aggression and hostility (Brescoll & Uhlmann, 2008; Rudman et al., 2012), while acts of aggression are often socially approved of for men. If men must continually earn their masculinity to prove themselves to the ingroup, and public displays of toughness are condoned, aggression is then a very effective method of establishing manhood (Archer, 2004; Doyle, 1989; Vandello et al., 2008). Consistent with this view, Bosson, Vandello, Burnaford, Weaver & Wasti, (2009) found that men whose masculinity was threatened resorted to publicly punching a punching bag harder than unthreatened men.

#### *Men’s Body Shame and Aggression*

Feminist researchers have focused attention on the consequences, for women, of internalizing the “male gaze,” and objectifying themselves (Calogero, Davis & Thompson, 2005; Frederickson & Roberts, 1997; Frederickson, Roberts, Noll, Quinn & Twenge, 1998; Sanchez & Broccoli, 2008; Sanchez & Kiefer, 2007; Sanchez & Kwang,

2007; Saguy, Quinn, Dovidio & Pratto, 2010; Slater & Tiggemann, 2002; Tylka & Hill, 2004). The fact that women show more body shame than men is thought to be a consequence of self-objectification. However, research on male body image has suggested that men also self-objectify, but that men's concerns are based on musculature, rather than weight. Men of all ages stress the importance of a muscular physique for a positive body image (Fisher, Dunn & Thompson, 2002; Jones, 2001; McCreary & Sasse, 2000, 2002) and adolescent men's drive for muscularity is associated with poor self-esteem and depression (McCreary & Sasse, 2000). Because a muscular physique is often associated with masculinity (Weinke, 1998), there are consequences for men who do not meet this body standard; men without strong, muscular bodies are associated with femininity and weakness (Grogan & Richards, 2002; Weinke, 1998). This masculinity transgression does not go unnoticed; adolescent males who are not perceived as sufficiently muscular are often the target of bullying, both about their physical bodies and about the associated "weakness"; research has shown that young men may internalize these messages from their peers and be particularly likely to feel body shame (Shelton & Liljequist, 2002). In such situations, male adolescents are particularly likely to use homophobic epithets when bullying (e.g., "gay," "fag"), recognizing their potential to ostracize and strip masculinity from the victim (Poteat & Espelage, 2005; Thurlow, 2001; Vandello et al., 2008). As a severe consequence, theorists have proposed a link between displays of violence (e.g., school shootings) and the teasing experienced at school, particularly that which threatens a sense of manhood and associates the target with homosexuality (Kimmel & Mahler, 2003).

Although research suggests that adolescent men who were bullied by their peers subsequently report more body shame, to my knowledge, scant research has investigated the potential link between body shame and male sexual aggression. In an exception, Rudman and Mescher (2010) found that men who reported body shame also scored higher on measures of rape proclivity, stranger harassment (e.g., catcalling women in the street), negative attitudes toward female rape victims, hostile sexism, and sexual power beliefs (i.e., beliefs that sex is linked to dominance). Because our research is correlational, causal assumptions cannot be made. The present research is designed to test the causal hypothesis that men who are rejected for being gay will respond with increased sexual aggression, particularly if they are high on male body shame.

#### *Overview of the Research and Hypotheses*

The present research used male participants and male and female phantom confederates to investigate the role of shame in men's sexual aggression. Specifically, I hypothesized that men who are shamed by a sexualized rejection will subsequently self-report more sexual aggression, and more hostile attitudes toward women in general and female rape victims, than men in either the control or no information rejection conditions (H1). Specifically, I expect sexualized rejection to increase their body shame and decrease their self-esteem and therefore, their negative orientations toward women. In other words, men whose masculinity is threatened will seek to reduce their shame and recover their status by derogating women. Measures of sexual aggression included rape proclivity (Malamuth, 1989), likelihood to sexually harass (Pryor, 1987;1998), and a rape behavioral analogue that forces men to choose between a graphic image reflecting either nonsexualized violence or sexualized violence (rape). This measure was found to covary

with men's implicit dehumanization of women (Rudman & Mescher, 2011) and with men's implicit attitudes toward rape (Uncovering the unacceptable, 2011). Attitudes toward women will be assessed using the hostile attitudes toward women scale (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995) and negative attitudes toward female rape victims will be measured using the Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale (Ward, 1988).

I measured self-esteem using the State Self-Esteem Scale (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991) and self-esteem IAT (Greenwald & Farnham, 2000), which is less likely to be controlled and which has shown sensitivity to peer-rejection in the past (Rudman, Dohn, & Fairchild, 2007). I also measured shame in two ways. First, as a measure of body shame, I used the body shame subscale from the Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (OBCS; McKinley & Hyde, 1996). As a measure of affect, I used the International Positive and Negative Affect Schedule, Short Form (I-PANAS-SF; Thompson, 2007), which measures temporary emotions (e.g., shame and embarrassment).

I also hypothesized that men who experience shame from ingroup members, as opposed to outgroup members, will show the strongest effects on the dependent measures (H2). Although this mismatch between the gender of the rejecter and the target of aggression may seem counterintuitive (i.e., it could be argued that sexualized rejection from *women* ought to increase derogating women), my hypothesis stems from the fact that, throughout their lives, men experience more bullying and harassment from male, rather than female, peers (Tager, Good & Harrison, 2006). Further, women's lower status in society is a principal reason why they are vulnerable to male sexual aggression, but it is also a reason why a man might more readily discount a woman's opinion. If men respond to masculinity threats from men as being more frequent and/or more severe, they

will likely use women as convenient targets for their shame-based aggression (i.e., as scapegoats).

Finally, I predicted that narcissism will moderate the link between shame and sexual aggression, such that men who report higher levels of narcissism will respond with more sexualized aggression overall, but particularly in rejection conditions, as compared to non-narcissistic men (H3). This prediction stems from past research showing that narcissism has been implicated in non-sexual aggression (Papps & O'Carroll, 1998; Wink, 1991). When confronted with a threat to self-esteem, such as rejection, narcissists respond with aggressive or bullying behavior even when it is not directed at the rejecters themselves (Twenge & Campbell, 2003). I measured narcissism using a modified version of the NPI-16 (Ames, Rose & Anderson, 2005).

In summary, I hypothesized (1) that sexualized rejection is a more potent source of male shame than is nonsexualized rejection and that men will respond to sexualized shaming with increased sexual aggression; (2) that being sexually shamed by male peers is more damaging to men's self-esteem and body image than is being sexually shamed by women; and (3) that narcissists are especially likely to respond to rejection-based shame of any type with sexual aggression.

## Method

### *Participants*

Participants ( $N=235$ ) were all heterosexual men who completed the study in exchange for credit toward a course requirement ( $M$  age = 18.83 years). Four men failed a manipulation check by erroneously indicating that they believed their partner had accepted them to work on team tasks during the study; they were removed from analysis,

leaving a total of 231 men. Participants self identified as White (51.9%), Asian (22.5%), South Asian (8.7%), Latino (6.1%), and Black (5.6%), with 12 participants indicating another, non-specified ethnicity (5.2%).

### *Measures*

I administered the self-esteem IAT (Greenwald & Farnham, 2000; Rudman et al., 2007), the State Self-Esteem Scale (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991) and the Explicit Sex/Power Beliefs Scale (Chapleau & Oswald, 2010) as exploratory moderators of my primary prediction that men rejected on suspicion of being gay would respond with more sexual aggression. Because none of these measures were influenced by my manipulations or moderated my primary prediction, they are not further discussed.<sup>1</sup>

*Narcissism.* Participants were asked to respond to 9 items from the *Narcissistic Personality Inventory Short Form* (NPI-16; Ames, Rose & Anderson, 2005), developed as a short form of the original NPI-40 (Raskin & Terry, 1988). The original measure uses a forced choice between two items, one designated narcissistic, the other non-narcissistic (e.g., “People always seem to recognize my authority” vs. “Being an authority doesn’t mean that much to me”). To provide a continuous measure, I instead presented only the narcissistic items and a Likert scale, anchored at 1 (*disagree strongly*) and 5 (*agree strongly*). Sample items include, “I insist upon getting the respect that is due to me”; and “If I ruled the world, it would be a much better place” ( $\alpha = .74$ ).

*Rape behavioral analogue.* The rape behavioral analogue (RBA) was adopted from Rudman and Mescher (2010; see Appendix B). The cover story was as follows:

*For this last part of the study we need you to help us select pictures for an upcoming study with women. In this future study we will show women some of*



*the pictures you will see today, but they will see the pictures many times to test their perceptions. On the next few screens, we will show you two pictures and we would like you to pick the one picture we should use in the women's study.*

*Pick the one you think should be shown to women many times.*

Over 17 trials, participants were obliged to choose between two images that were either sexually violent or otherwise offensive to women (e.g., depicting rape or sexual harassment) or aggressive without women involved (e.g., male-on-male aggression). Stimuli were downloaded from the Internet and included classical paintings (e.g., “The Rape of Lucretia”) as well as contemporary images (e.g., video game posters and magazine ads).<sup>2</sup> Responses were scored so that 0 = *violent*, 1 = *sexually violent*, and summed to form the RBA ( $\alpha = .82$ ).

*Hostile Attitudes Toward Women Scale (HATW)* The ATW (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995) is a 10-item measure, designed to assess participant endorsement of hostile beliefs about women. The scale is anchored at 1 (*disagree strongly*) and 5 (*agree strongly*). Sample items include “Most women would lie just to get ahead” and “Sometimes women bother me just by being around” ( $\alpha = .77$ ).

*Attitudes Toward Rape Victims Scale (ARVS)*. The ARVS (Ward, 1988) consists of 25 items that assess commonly held negative attitudes toward rape victims. Items reflect aspects of victim denial, blame, deservingness, and credibility. Responses were anchored at 1 (*strongly disagree*) and 5 (*strongly agree*). Sample items include: “A healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really tries,” and “In most cases when a woman was raped, she deserved it.” Higher scores indicate more hostile attitudes toward rape victims,  $\alpha = .81$ .

*The Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale (LSH).* Pryor's (1987, 1998) LSH consists of 10 vignettes describing a situation in which the participant has power over another and can use it to coerce her into having sex (see Appendix for vignettes). Participants indicated on a 5-point scale anchored at 1 (*not at all likely*) and 5 (*very likely*) whether they would take advantage of the situation and sexually harass the target described in each vignette. Responses showed good internal consistency,  $\alpha = .93$ .

*Rape proclivity.* Six items from Malamuth's (1987) Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale were averaged to form the rape proclivity index ( $\alpha = .84$ ). Participants indicated whether they were aroused by rape, attracted to rape, or would be likely to commit rape (if they could be assured of never being known or punished) on scales ranging from 1 (*very unlikely*) to 5 (*very likely*). Three other items replaced "rape" with "force a sexual partner to do something they did not want to do."

*Body shame.* I used the 13-item body shame subscale from the Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (McKinley & Hyde, 1996) because previous research found a positive link between male body shame and sexual aggression (Rudman & Mescher, 2010). Sample items include, "I am ashamed by the size and shape of my buttocks"; "I do not like the way my stomach looks"; and "Overall, I am comfortable with how my body looks" (reverse coded), anchored on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) scale ( $\alpha = .82$ ).

*Negative affect.* To assess negative affect following the rejection manipulation, participants completed the International Positive and Negative Affect Scale, Short Form (I-PANAS-SF; Thompson, 2007). The measure is composed of adjectives describing current mood states (e.g., "ashamed," "defensive," and "humiliated") and uses a scale

ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very much*).. To prevent suspicion, participants completed the I-PANAS-SF at three time points during the experiment: at the beginning of the study, directly after the rejection manipulation, and upon the study's completion. However, I was only interested in negative affect at Time 2 ( $\alpha = .91$ ).

### *Procedure*

Participants signed up for a study ostensibly about “the interpersonal factors that build effective teamwork,” in which they believed they would compete as a dyad with a partner over a networked computer in teamwork building tasks, with the most effective teams earning a chance to be entered into a lottery to win \$50.00. As each participant arrived at the lab, a research assistant escorted him to a private cubicle with a computer and provided basic instruction, indicating that computer program would provide further information. The assistant started the program and left the participant alone to complete the measures. The program administered the items for each measure in random order.

After consenting to the study, participants were told that their mood would be assessed at various times throughout the study, and they completed the I-PANAS-SF (Time 1). They were then informed that the computer would randomly assign one member of the potential partnership to view the other's complete personality profile and judge whether they will continue on to perform tasks together. All participants were “randomly assigned” to the condition in which their partner (in fact, a phantom confederate) evaluated their materials. They then completed a bogus personality profile (e.g., “If you could have a superpower, what would it be? and “What do you consider your worst trait?”). This profile has been used successfully in the past as a basis for peer rejection (Rudman et al., 2007). While participants ostensibly waited for their materials

to be evaluated by the phantom, they completed the narcissism measure and 16 filler items to afford more time (e.g., “ I have more energy than most people” and “People say I’m a good listener”). Once completed, they were either informed that their partner had rejected them, or that the computer had malfunctioned and could not connect them to their partner (control condition). In the experimental condition, their partner provided feedback indicating that they believed the participant to be gay, and thus they would not be an effective team (see Appendix C for a transcript). In a second control condition, the phantom provided no reason for their rejection. Participants were then automatically enrolled in a “second study” in order to complete their experimental obligation.

Following the rejection manipulation, the program administered the self-esteem IAT. Participants were then informed that they were being moved to a new study and were presented with a new consent form. They then completed a second, post-manipulation I-PANAS-SF (Time 2), the SSES, the ARVS, HATW, rape proclivity, body shame, the LSH, and Explicit Sex Power Beliefs Scale. The RBA was administered last to be consistent with its cover story. Participants were then thoroughly debriefed, thanked for their participation, and credited.

## Results

### *Preliminary Analyses*

I first factor analyzed the mood variables of the modified I-PANAS-SF from Time 2, taken immediately post manipulation, using principle components analysis, with Varimax rotation, specifying two factors. This analysis found that the majority of the mood variables factored into positive affect or negative affect, with “amused,” “confident” and “uncertain” failing to load on either factor. As this study is primarily concerned with the outcomes related to negative mood, these variables were combined into a single index ( $\alpha = .91$ ) for further analysis. The eight items in the negative affect index were: hurt, insulted, offended, ashamed, angry, disgusted, hostile, and sad

As a check on whether men’s body shame and sexual aggression measures were positively correlated (as in the preliminary study; Rudman & Mescher, 2010), I found that they were. Table 1 shows these results, and also includes post-rejection negative affect, which was also positively correlated with rape proclivity and HATW. Table 1 also shows reasonable convergent validity among the measures of sexual aggression.

### *Manipulation Check*

To examine whether sexual rejection had the intended effect on men’s affect, results of a 3 (treatment) x 2 (phantom gender) ANOVA using post-rejection negative affect as the dependent variable showed only a main effect for treatment,  $F(2, 225) = 17.26, p < .001$ . As expected, participants reported more negative affect in the presumed gay condition ( $M = 1.94, SD = .97$ ) than in the no information condition ( $M = 1.32, SD = .50$ ),  $t(155) = 4.96, p < .001$ . They also reported feeling worse in the presumed gay condition than in the control condition ( $M = 1.37, SD = .61$ ),  $t(152) = 4.32, p < .001$ .

A similar analysis using body shame revealed only a main effect of phantom gender,  $F(1, 225) = 4.48, p < .04$ . Unexpectedly, participants reported more body shame when the phantom was male ( $M = 2.33, SD = .64$ ) than female ( $M = 2.16, SD = .60$ ). There was no treatment effect,  $F(2, 225) = 1.03, p = .36$ . Thus, being rejected on suspicion of being gay had the intended effect on men's negative affect, but did not result in greater body shame for men. Nonetheless, I will examine both negative affect and body shame as potential moderators of my treatment effects.

#### *Does Sexualized Shame Result in Sexual Aggression?*

I hypothesized that men who experienced shame due to a sexualized rejection, either from ingroup (i.e., from other men) or outgroup (i.e., women) members, would subsequently show more tendencies toward sexual aggression, and more hostile attitudes toward women in general and female rape victims, than men in either the control or no information rejection conditions (H1). I also hypothesized that men who experienced shame from ingroup members, as opposed to outgroup members, would show the strongest effects on these measures (H2). Therefore, I expected to find Treatment x Phantom Gender interactions. However, results of a 3 (treatment) x 2 (phantom gender) Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) on all of these measures yielded null results, all  $F$ s (2, 225)  $< 1.74, p$ s  $> .17$ . Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations as a function of treatment and phantom gender.

Based on past research, I also hypothesized that narcissism would moderate the link between rejection and sexual aggression, such that men who report high levels of narcissism will respond with more sexualized aggression overall, but particularly in rejection conditions, as compared to men low on narcissism (H3). To test this hypothesis,

I conducted a Univariate Analysis of Variance (UNIANOVA) using narcissism as a continuous moderator variable. Results for the RBA, ATRV, and HATW were negligible, all  $F_s(35, 124) < 1.12$ ,  $p_s > .33$ , *ns*.

Results for rape proclivity showed a marginal main effect for narcissism, qualified by the expected but marginal Treatment x Narcissism interaction,  $F(35, 124) = 1.45$ ,  $p = .051$ . Simple slopes analysis showed that the correlation between rape proclivity and narcissism in the rejected groups,  $r(155) = .13$ ,  $p = .12$ , was higher than the correlation in the control group,  $r(72) = .04$ , *ns*. However, these two correlations were not significantly different,  $z = .64$ , *ns*.

Results for LSH also showed a marginal main effect for narcissism, qualified by the expected but marginal Treatment x Narcissism interaction,  $F(35, 124) = 1.49$ ,  $p = .06$ . Simple slopes revealed that the correlation between LSH and narcissism in the rejected groups,  $r(155) = .23$ ,  $p < .01$ , was higher than the correlation in the control group,  $r(72) = .15$ , *ns*. However, these two correlations were not significantly different,  $z = .56$ , *ns*. Therefore, there was no support for Hypothesis 3.

*Does Body Shame and/or Negative Affect Moderate the Effect of Sexualized Shame on Sexual Aggression?*

Because body shame is correlated with sexual aggression (see Table 1), it was possible that men high on body shame would respond to my manipulations with increased sexual aggression. Similarly, it was possible that men high on post-rejection negative affect would react more strongly to my manipulations, given the positive correlations between negative affect and sexual aggression in Table 1. I therefore conducted separate UNIANOVAs using body shame and negative affect as moderators of the sexual aggression variables, in concert with treatment condition and phantom gender.

These analyses revealed either null or marginally significant results. As a result, it was not the case that men who were high on body shame (or who felt bad about being rejected for being gay) were especially likely to score high on sexual aggression measures.

I therefore used multiple regressions to examine whether body shame and negative affect *together* might moderate the effect of treatment on men's sexual aggression. In other words, would men rejected for "being gay" be more likely to score high on sexual aggression measures if they were both high on body shame *and* felt bad about the rejection?

Because I had three levels of treatment, I would normally have to make two dummy variables (Aiken & West, 1991) and therefore, I would need to include 24 interaction terms in each regression analysis. Given my sample size, this would have been an untenable analytic strategy. Instead, I examined each treatment level separately by regressing each measure on phantom gender, body shame, negative affect, and all interaction terms, followed up by simple slopes analyses for any interaction effects that emerged. The results for RBA, LSH, and HATW were similar and in the expected direction, as I describe next.

*Rape Behavioral Analogue.* Analysis for the RBA in the gay rejection condition revealed a nearly significant Body Shame x Negative Affect x Phantom Gender interaction,  $\beta = 3.88$ ,  $t = 1.99$ ,  $p = .05$ . Decomposing the 3-way interaction by Phantom Gender, I found null results when the phantom was male, all  $ps > .18$ , but a marginally significant Body Shame x Negative Affect interaction when the phantom was female,  $\beta = 1.43$ ,  $t = 1.95$ ,  $p = .06$ . I then conducted a median split on body shame for the simple slopes analyses. They showed that the relationship between negative affect and the RBA



was positive when body shame was high and the phantom was female,  $r(16) = .43, p = .07$ , but negative when body shame was low,  $r(22) = -.31, p = .13$ . The difference between these two correlations was significant,  $z = 2.31, p < .05$ . Therefore, men who were rejected for being gay by a female phantom were especially likely to subject future women to sexually offensive photos if they were high on body shame and felt bad about being rejected, compared with comparable men who were low on body shame.

The same analysis in the no information rejection condition resulted in null results, all  $ps > .39$ . The same analysis in the control condition also resulted in null results, all  $ps > .42$ . Therefore, the effect of body shame, negative affect, and being rejected by a female phantom on the RBA was specific to the gay rejection condition.

*Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale.* Analysis for the LSH in the gay rejection condition revealed a significant Body Shame x Negative Affect x Phantom Gender interaction,  $\beta = 4.89, t = 2.57, p = .01$ . Decomposing the 3-way interaction by Phantom Gender, I found only a main effect for body shame when the phantom was male,  $\beta = .86, t = 2.33, p = .03$ . In contrast, there was a significant Body Shame x Negative Affect interaction when the phantom was female,  $\beta = 1.61, t = 2.17, p = .04$ . Simple slopes analyses revealed that the correlation between negative affect and the LSH was positive when body shame was high and the phantom was female,  $r(16) = .51, p < .05$ , but weakly negative when body shame was low,  $r(22) = -.23, ns$ . The difference between these two correlations was significant,  $z = 2.34, p < .05$ . Therefore, men who were rejected by a female phantom for being gay were especially likely to sexually harass women if they were high on body shame and felt bad about being rejected, compared with comparable men who were low on body shame.

Results of the same analysis in the no information rejection condition showed null effects, all  $ps > .22$ . The same analysis in the control condition also resulted in null results, all  $ps > .19$ . Therefore, the effect of body shame, negative affect, and being rejected by a female phantom on the LSH was specific to the gay rejection condition.

*Hostile Attitudes toward Women.* Analysis for the HATW in the gay rejection condition revealed a marginally significant Body Shame x Negative Affect x Phantom Gender interaction,  $\beta = 3.60, t = 1.93, p = .06$ . Decomposing the 3-way interaction by Phantom Gender, I found null results when the phantom was male, all  $ps > .17$ , but a significant Body Shame x Negative Affect interaction when the phantom was female,  $\beta = 2.22, t = 2.92, p < .01$ . Simple slopes analyses revealed that the correlation between negative affect and the HATW was robust when body shame was high and the phantom was female,  $r(16) = .55, p < .05$ , but nonsignificantly positive when body shame was low,  $r(22) = .26, ns$ . Although the interaction effect suggested these correlations should differ, in fact, they did not significantly,  $z = 1.06, ns$ . However, because the overall pattern replicates the findings for the RBA and the LSH, I view this as further evidence that men rejected by a woman for being gay who are both high on body shame and negative affect react negatively toward women (in this case, by reporting hostile female attitudes).

Results of the same analysis in the control condition showed null effects, all  $ps > .28$ . Results of the same analysis in the no information rejection condition showed a Shame x Negative Affect interaction,  $\beta = 4.29, t = 2.32, p = .02$ . Simple effects showed that for men high on body shame in this condition, the relationship between negative affect and the HATW was positive,  $r(42) = .35, p = .02$ , but less positive for men low on body shame,  $r(31) = .29, p = .09$ . However, these correlations did not significantly differ,

$z = .29, ns$ . There was also a Phantom Gender x Body Shame interaction,  $\beta = 3.18, t = 2.60, p = .01$ . Simple effects showed that for men rejected by a male phantom, body shame was positively related to hostile female attitudes,  $r(36) = .38, p < .05$ , whereas this association was weakly positive when the phantom was female,  $r(37) = .15, ns$ . However, these correlations did not significantly differ,  $z = 1.05, ns$ . Therefore, I conclude that the effect on hostile attitudes toward women of body shame, negative affect, and being rejected by a female phantom was specific to the gay rejection condition.

*Rape proclivity.* Results of the same analysis in the gay condition using rape proclivity showed null effects, all  $ps > .12$ . However, when I examined the correlations, I found results comparable to those for RBA, LSH, and HATW. In the gay rejection condition, when the phantom was female and body shame was high, the relationship between negative affect and rape proclivity was  $r(16) = .64, p < .01$ , but when body shame was low this same relationship was negligible,  $r(20) = -.05, ns$ . The difference between these two correlations was significant,  $z = 2.35, p < .05$ . In the gay rejection condition, when the phantom was male and body shame was high, the relationship between negative affect and rape proclivity was  $r(22) = .09, ns$ . The difference between this correlation and  $r = .64$  was significant,  $z = 1.99, p < .05$ . Finally, when the phantom was male and body shame was low, the relationship between negative affect and rape proclivity in the gay rejection condition was  $r(14) = -.05, ns$ . The difference between this correlation and  $r = .64$  was significant,  $z = 2.15, p < .05$ . Therefore, it appears that rape proclivity showed the same pattern as the other sexual aggression measures, even though the 3-way interaction effect was nonsignificant.

*Attitudes Toward Rape Victims.* Results of the same analysis in the gay condition using the ATRV showed null effects, all  $ps > .51$ . Examining the correlations, the relationship between the ATRV and negative affect when the phantom was female and body shame was high was  $r(16) = .37, p = .13$ , which was higher than when body shame was low,  $r(20) = .07, ns$ , but nonsignificantly so,  $z = .90, ns$ . Therefore I conclude that the ATRV does not show the same pattern revealed by the RBA, LSH, ATW, and rape proclivity.

## Discussion

Although my findings do not support my three initial hypotheses, they nonetheless contribute toward understanding the role that traditional masculinity and its maintenance play in prejudice toward and violence against women. Prior work suggests that men threatened with the loss of their masculinity, scapegoat and lash out at women (Vandello & Cohen, 2008; Maass, Cadinu, Guarnieri, & Grasselli, 2003). This work informed the development of my hypotheses that single moderators would prove effective in explaining the relationship between male shame and sexual aggression. These predictions failed to find support. However, when body shame and negative affect were both included as moderators, target sex and the shame manipulation *did* have an effect on sexual aggression, such that men rejected for being gay by *female* phantoms responded with increased rape proclivity, hostile attitudes toward and likelihood to harass women provided they were high on body shame and felt bad about being rejected. While unanticipated, in retrospect, this pattern is consistent with previous findings in the masculinity threat literature (Vandello & Cohen, 2008; Maass, Cadinu, Guarnieri, & Grasselli, 2003). Research on masculinity suggests that this identity is built on a

prescription of heterosexuality (Herek, 1989; Kimmel, 2004) and the insinuation of homosexuality is considered to be the “worst possible insult” to masculinity (Murphy, 2004).

The threat of homosexuality produced significant changes in negative affect regardless of gender of the phantom, but was only linked to sexual aggression in the specific case of men with high body shame, who responded to the manipulation when delivered by a female phantom with sexual aggression. Plausibly, this may reflect an aggressive response isolated only toward the gender of the perpetrator; that is, participants insulted by male phantoms may also experience heightened aggression, but primarily toward other men and as such, sexual assault is not an appropriate expression of that aggression. Alternately, a sexually aggressive response toward women may reflect the perception that women are more easily dominated, and thus pose less of a potential threat to one’s masculinity (e.g., men may feel it is less “risky” to aggress toward women, believing them to be unlikely to challenge or defeat such an advance.) Future research should attempt to discern why women are especially targeted by men as scapegoats when their masculinity is challenged by a woman.

Although body shame did not, on its own, moderate the effect of the rejection manipulation on sexual aggression, the present study replicated previous findings suggesting that men’s body shame is correlated positively with measures of sexual aggression (Rudman & Mescher, 2010). Thus, the study provides insight into individual differences affecting men’s proclivity to perpetrate sexual violence.

### *Limitations*

Because I expected single moderators to be effective, and they were not, my study is underpowered. Future research should prepare for the possibility of double moderator effects by including twice the number of participants. With more participants, I may have been able to find significant results for rape proclivity and attitudes toward rape victims that mirrored those found for the rape behavioral analogue, the LSH, and hostile attitudes toward women.

In addition, the present research investigated young adult men, who may be especially likely to sexually aggress against women (Freeman, 2007; Barbaree, Hudson & Seto, 1993). Nonetheless, future research should investigate older adults.

While the RBA, LSH, and rape proclivity measures have previously produced data with sufficient variance to support hypotheses (Rudman & Mescher, 2011), participants may have suppressed their responses and the laboratory setting may have negatively influenced participant's willingness to honestly report their sexual interests (due to social desirability bias). Future research should attempt to assess men's sexual aggression using less direct measures.

The current research cannot speak to the long-term consequences of sexualized rejection, because it is a single laboratory study using a relatively mild manipulation. Children and adolescents are particularly likely to use homophobic slurs when taunting one another (Thurlow, 2001), and repeated exposure to such conditions may have stronger, more lasting effects than can be approximated by the data in this study. Further research should attempt to measure men's history of being the target of sexualized bullying to test whether the hypothesized effects may be stronger among men who were often the target of homophobic bullying when they were young.

Finally, while it is generally understood that insults based on sexual orientation are perceived as threatening (Vandello et al., 2008), this study cannot account for individual differences in the perception of the stigma associated with homosexuality. Some participants may have friends, family or be otherwise personally involved with the LGBTQ community, and thus did not feel the anticipated shame response. Additionally, some men may not have responded to a masculinity threat because they are less invested in their gender identity (e.g., they may identify with feminism) and be less subject to sexual aggression; or conversely, men who identify with hypermasculine groups (e.g., fraternity members) may have overestimated the naturalness of sexual aggression (Koss & Gaines, 1993). Although no participant expressed suspicion of the cover story itself, some may have failed to believe the shame manipulation (e.g., some may feel “too manly” to believe that someone perceives them as gay.) Therefore, future research should assess attitudes toward gay men, gender identity, and masculinity confidence as potential moderator variables.

### *Conclusion*

Although my results do not support my initial hypotheses, this research is nonetheless an important contribution to understanding the interpersonal experiences that may drive some men to sexual aggression. While underpowered, it nonetheless reiterates the importance of investigating male body shame as a contributing factor toward the perpetration of gender violence.

Table 1

## Correlations Among Body Shame, Negative Affect, and Sexual Aggression Measures

	Body Shame	Negative Affect	RBA	Rape Proclivity	LSH	HATW
Negative Affect	.23***	---				
RBA	.14*	.06	---			
Rape Proclivity	.21***	.22***	.20**	---		
LSH	.30***	.12	.27***	.42***	---	
HATW	.33***	.28***	.20**	.28***	.36***	---
ATRV	.22***	.13	.15*	.44***	.29***	.42***

*Note.* Negative affect was measured after the rejection manipulation.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .



Table 2

Means (and Standard Deviations) by Rejection Condition and Phantom Confederate Gender

	<u>Sexualized Rejection</u>		<u>No Reason Rejection</u>		<u>Controls</u>	
	Male ( <i>n</i> = 40)	Female ( <i>n</i> = 40)	Male ( <i>n</i> = 38)	Female ( <i>n</i> = 39)	Male ( <i>n</i> = 37)	Female ( <i>n</i> = 37)
RBA	9.30 (4.55)	9.57 (4.29)	9.94 (4.09)	10.07 (4.14)	9.49 (4.29)	8.22 (4.32)
Rape Proclivity	1.39 (.65)	1.45 (.57)	1.45 (.55)	1.51 (.61)	1.32 (.50)	1.48 (.76)
LSH	2.09 (1.06)	2.25 (.95)	2.06 (1.10)	2.26 (1.00)	1.96 (.81)	1.94 (.93)
HATW	2.73 (.63)	2.66 (.51)	2.61 (.62)	2.51 (.53)	2.60 (.55)	2.48 (.60)
ATRV	2.31 (.54)	2.30 (.40)	2.26 (.42)	2.32 (.46)	2.32 (.47)	2.30 (.48)

## Appendix A

## Explicit Measures

International Positive and Negative Affect Schedule, Short Form  
 I-PANAS-SF  
 (Thompson, 2007)

1	2	3	4	5
Not At All				Very Much

**Directions:** Thinking about how you feel RIGHT NOW, using the scale provided, please tell us to what extent are you feeling:

1. Upset
2. Hostile
3. Alert
4. Ashamed
5. Inspired
6. Nervous
7. Determined
8. Attentive
9. Afraid
10. Active
11. Defensive
12. At ease
13. Humiliated
14. Confident
15. Embarrassed
16. Cheerful

NPI-16  
(Ames, Rose & Anderson, 2006)

1	2	3	4	5
disagree strongly	disagree somewhat	neither agree nor disagree	agree slightly	agree strongly

**Directions:** In the following survey, please indicate how much you agree with each statement using the scale provided. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.
2. I expect a great deal from other people.
3. I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world.
4. I have a strong desire to be powerful.
5. I insist upon getting the respect that is due to me.
6. If I ruled the world, it would be a much better place.
7. I deserve to have good things happen to me in life.
8. I expect people to do the things I tell them to do.
9. I deserve to be happy and to get what I want.

State Self-Esteem Scale  
Heatherton & Polivy, 1991

1	2	3	4	5
Not At All				Very Much

**Directions:** Consider how you are feeling right at this moment, and indicate using the scale provided how much you agree with the following statements. There is no right answer, the best answer is what you feel is true of yourself right at this moment.

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

Hostile Attitudes Toward Women  
(Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995)

1	2	3	4	5
disagree strongly	disagree somewhat	neither agree nor disagree	agree slightly	agree strongly

**Directions:** Please rate your agreement with the following items using the scale provided. Please be honest; your answers are completely anonymous.

1. Generally, it is safer not to trust women.
2. I usually find myself agreeing with women.
3. When it really comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful.
4. Women are responsible for most of my troubles.
5. Many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them.
6. Most women tell the truth.
7. Most women would lie just to get ahead
8. I am easily angered by women.
9. I am sure I get a raw deal from the women in my life.
10. Sometimes women bother me by just being around.

Reverse Score: 2, 6

11. The Attitudes Towards Rape Victims Scale (ARVS)  
Ward, 1988

1	2	3	4	5
disagree strongly	disagree somewhat	neither agree nor disagree	agree slightly	agree strongly

**Directions:** Please rate your agreement with the following items using the scale provided. Please be honest; your answers are completely anonymous.

0. "A raped woman is a less desirable woman."
1. "The extent of the woman's resistance should be the major factor in determining if a rape has occurred. "
2. "A raped woman is usually an innocent victim."
3. "Women often claim rape to protect their reputations."
4. "'Good' girls are as likely to be raped as 'bad' girls."
5. "Women who have had prior sexual relationships should not complain about rape."
6. "Women do not provoke rape by their appearance or behavior."
7. "Intoxicated women are usually willing to have sex."
8. "It would do some women good to be raped."
9. "Even women who feel guilty about engaging in premarital sex are not likely to claim rape falsely."
10. "Most women secretly desire to be raped."
11. "Any female may be raped."
12. "Women who are raped while accepting rides from strangers get what they deserve."
13. "Many women invent rape stories if they learn they are pregnant."
14. "Men, not women, are responsible for rape."
15. "A woman who goes out alone at night puts herself in a position to be raped."
16. "Many women claim rape if they have consented to sexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards."
17. "Accusations of rape by strippers, prostitutes and other sex workers should be viewed with suspicion."
18. "A woman should not blame herself for rape."
19. "A healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really tries."
20. "Many women who report rape are lying because they are angry or want revenge on the accused."
21. "Women who wear short skirts or tight blouses are not inviting rape."
22. "Women put themselves in situations in which they are likely to be sexually assaulted because they have an unconscious wish to be raped."
23. "Sexually experienced women are not really damaged by rape."
24. "In most cases when a woman was raped she deserved it."

Reverse Code: 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 19, 22

Explicit Sex/Power Beliefs Scale  
Chapleau & Oswald, 2010

Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5
------------------------	---	---	---	---------------------

**Directions:** Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements using the scale provided. There is no right answer for any of the following statements. The best answer is what you feel is most reflective of your attitudes and experiences.

1. "During sex, one person is typically in control of the other."
2. "Sex is about one person submitting to the will of another."
3. "Often sex is about one person persuading another to do something they are reluctant to do."
4. "During sex, one person should feel a little vulnerable and the other should feel in control."
5. "During sex, one person should be dominant and the other should be submissive."
6. "Sex means that one person is in control of the relationship."
7. "Sex means that one person is in control of the other person's body."
8. "In sex, to penetrate someone is to gain power over them."
9. "In sex, to penetrate someone is to give up power."
10. "Having sex means gaining possession of someone else's body."
11. "Having sex means giving up possession of my body to someone else."

The Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale  
Pryor, 1987; 1998

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

On the pages that follow you will find 10 brief scenarios that describe 10 different interactions between males and females. In each case, you will be asked to imagine that you are the main character in the scenario. The scenarios assume that the character interacting with you is female but if it is applicable please envision the other character described by the scenario as the gender that you sexually prefer. Then you will be asked to rate how likely it would be that you would perform each of the several different behaviors in the described social context. Assume in each scenario that no matter what you choose to do, nothing bad would be likely to happen to you as the result of your action. Try to answer each question as honestly as you can.

There is no right answer for any of the following statements.

The best answer is what you feel is most reflective of your opinions and attitudes.

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

**Assuming that you are secure enough in your job that no possible reprisals could happen to you, would you offer her the job in exchange for sexual favors?"**

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



situation:

**Would you let her keep the job in exchange for sexual favors?"**

3. "Imagine you are a manager of a shipping company. One day your supervisor asks you to study the possibility of buying several personal computers for the office. You call up several competing companies that sell computers. Each company sends a sales representative to your office who describes the company's products. You narrow down your choice to three companies. After considering all the pros and cons, you decide that all three companies have equal products. A salesperson from company A calls you and asks to come to your office. You agree and the next day a very attractive woman shows up. She can offer no real reason for buying their company's products over those of the other companies. However, she seems very sexy. How likely are you to do the following in this situation:

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

4. "Imagine you are a Hollywood film director. You are casting for a minor role in a film you are planning. The role calls for a particularly stunning actress, one with a lot of sex appeal. You find that there are several who are amply qualified. How likely are you to do the following in this situation:

**Would you give the role to an actress who agree to have sex with you?"**

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

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

6. "Imagine you are a college professor. You are 38 years old. You teach in a large state university. You are a full professor with tenure. You are renowned in your field (Abnormal Psychology) and have numerous offers for other jobs. One day following the return of an examination to a class, a student stops in your office. She tells you that her score is one point away from an 'A' and ask you if she can do some extra credit project to raise their score. She tells you that she may not have a sufficient grade point average to get into graduate school without the A. Several other students have asked to do extra credit assignments and you have

declined to let them. This particular student is very attractive to you. She sits in the front row of class every day and wears suggestive clothing. You find her extremely sexy. How likely are you to do the following in this situation:

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

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

**Would you let Sarah use your paper in exchange for sexual favors?"**

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

**Would you agree to reading the novel in exchange for sexual favors?"**

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

**Assuming that you fear no reprisals, would you tell Alex in private that you will not report her if she will have sex with you?"**

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

**Assuming that you fear no reprisals in your job, would you offer Lauren the job in exchange for sexual favors?"**

The Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale  
Malamuth, 1989

Section A:

**Directions:** The following are a series of questions regarding your beliefs and attitudes about sexuality. We would like to remind you that your data are completely anonymous. In questions that immediately follow, please answer using a 1-5 scale, with 1 representing "very unattractive" and 5 representing "very attractive" (These labels will continue to appear above the scale as you answer)

There is no right answer for any of the following statements.

The best answer is what you feel is most reflective of your true opinions and attitudes.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Unattractive				Very Attractive

**Whether or not you have ever thought of it, do you find the idea of:**

1. Making out (heavy kissing)
2. Oral sex
3. Heterosexual (Vaginal) Intercourse
4. Group Sex
5. Bondage (e.g. tying up self or sex partner)
6. Whipping or Spanking
7. Rape
8. Forcing a sex partner to do something sexual that she or he did not want to do

Section B:

**Directions:** The following are a series of questions regarding your beliefs and attitudes about sexuality. We would like to remind you that your data are completely anonymous. In questions that immediately follow, please answer using a percentage scale. 0% meaning "none" and 100% meaning "all" (These labels will continue to appear above the scale as you answer) There is no right answer for any of the following statements. The best answer is what you feel is most reflective of your opinions and attitudes.

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

**What percentage of MALES do you think would find the following sexual activity arousing?**

1. Making out (heavy kissing)
2. Oral sex
3. Heterosexual (Vaginal) Intercourse
4. Group Sex
5. Bondage (e.g. tying up self or sex partner)
6. Whipping or Spanking
7. Rape
8. Forcing a female to do something sexual that she did not want to do.

Section C:

**Directions:** The following are a series of questions regarding your beliefs and attitudes about sexuality. We would like to remind you that your data are completely anonymous. In questions that immediately follow, please answer using a percentage scale. 0% meaning "none" and 100% meaning "all" (These labels will continue to appear above the scale as you answer) There is no right answer for any of the following statements. The best answer is what you feel is most reflective of your opinions and attitudes.

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

**What percentage of FEMALES do you think would find the following sexual activity arousing?**

1. Making out (heavy kissing)
2. Oral sex
3. Heterosexual (Vaginal) Intercourse
4. Group Sex
5. Bondage (e.g. tying up self or sex partner)
6. Whipping or Spanking
7. Rape
8. Forcing a male to do something sexual that he did not want to do.

Section D:

**Directions:** The following are a series of questions regarding your beliefs and attitudes about sexuality. We would like to remind you that your data are completely anonymous. In questions that immediately follow, please answer using a 1-5 scale, with 1 representing "very unarousing" and 5 representing "very arousing" (These labels will continue to appear above the scale as you answer) There is no right answer for any of the following statements. The best answer is what you feel is most reflective of your opinions and attitudes.

1 Very Unarousing	2	3	4	5 Very Arousing
----------------------	---	---	---	--------------------

**How sexually arousing do you think you would find the following sexual activity if you engaged in it (even if you have never engaged in it)**

1. Making out (heavy kissing)
2. Oral sex
3. Heterosexual (Vaginal) Intercourse
4. Group Sex
5. Bondage (e.g. tying up self or sex partner)
6. Whipping or Spanking
7. Rape
8. Forcing a sex partner to do something sexual that she or he did not want to do.

Section E:

**Directions:** The following are a series of questions regarding your beliefs and attitudes about sexuality. We would like to remind you that your data are completely anonymous. In questions that immediately follow, please answer using a 1-5 scale, with 1 representing "very unlikely" and 5 representing "very likely" (These labels will continue to appear above the scale as you answer) There is no right answer for any of the following statements. The best answer is what you feel is most reflective of your opinions and attitudes.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Unlikely				Very Likely

**If you could be assured that no one would know and that you could in no way be punished for engaging in the following act, how likely, if at all, would you be to commit such act?**

1. Making out (heavy kissing)
2. Oral sex
3. Heterosexual (Vaginal) Intercourse
4. Group Sex
5. Bondage (e.g. tying up self or sex partner)
6. Whipping or Spanking
7. Rape
8. Forcing a sex partner to do something sexual that she or he did not want to do.

The Objectified Body Consciousness Scale  
McKinley & Hyde, 1996

**Directions:** Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements, using the scale provided. There is no right answer for any of the following statements. The best answer is what you feel is most reflective of your attitudes and experiences.

Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5
------------------------	---	---	---	---------------------

1. "I rarely think about how I look."
2. "I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether they look good on me."
3. "I think more about how my body feels than how my body looks."
4. "I rarely compare how I look with how other people look."
5. "During the day, I think about how I look many times."
6. "I often worry about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look good."
7. "I rarely worry about how I look to other people."
8. "I am more concerned with what my body can do than how it looks."
9. "When I can't control my weight, I feel like something must be wrong with me."
10. "I feel ashamed of myself when I haven't made the effort to look my best."
11. "I feel like I must be a bad person when I don't look as good as I could."
12. "I would be ashamed for people to know what I really weigh."
13. "I worry that something is wrong with me when I am not exercising as much as I should."
14. "When I am not exercising enough, I question whether I am a good person."
15. "Even when I can't control my weight, I think I'm an okay person."
16. "When I'm not the size I think I should be, I feel ashamed."
17. "I am uncomfortable with the size of my thighs."
18. "I am ashamed by the size and shape of my buttocks."
19. "I do not like the way my stomach looks."
20. "I am satisfied with my upper body (i.e., breasts or chest)."
21. "Overall, I am comfortable with how my body looks."

Reverse code: 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 15, 21.

## Appendix B

Sample Images  
Forced Choice Behavior Rape Analogue  
(Uncovering the unacceptable, 2011)

Non-Sexual Violence, *The Battle of Zama*



Sexual Violence, *The Rape of the Sabine Women*





## Appendix C

## Sexual Shaming Rejection Feedback:

*I don't think we have anything in common and won't be a good team. It would be a waste of time to work on an experiment together if we can't win the money I'd rather work with someone else, or complete the survey for my RPUs than work with this guy on friendship tasks. Looking at his profile, I get the impression he is gay. We won't work well together if he likes men.*

## References

- Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C. P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*, 440-450.
- Archer, J. (1988). *The behavioural biology of aggression*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, J. (2004). Sex differences in aggression in real-world settings: A meta-analytic review. *Review of General Psychology, 8*, 291–322.
- Ashmore, R. D., Del Boca, F. K., & Wohlers, A. J. (1986). Gender stereotypes. In R. D. Ashmore & F. K. Del Boca (Eds.), *The social psychology of female-male relations* (pp. 69–119). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Banse, R., Seise, J., & Zerbes, N. (2001). Implicit attitudes toward homosexuality: Reliability, validity, and controllability of the IAT. *Zeitschrift für Experimentelle Psychologie, 48*(2), 145-160.
- Barbaree, H., Hudson, S., & Seto, M. (1993). Sexual assault in society: The role of the juvenile offender. In H. Barbaree, W. Marshall, and S. Hudson (Eds.), *The Juvenile Sex Offender* (pp. 1-24). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Bernstein, M. J., Sacco, D. F., Young, S. G., Hugenberg, K., & Cook, E. (2010). Being “in” with the in-crowd: The effects of social exclusion and inclusion are enhanced by the perceived essentialism of ingroups and outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*(8), 999-1009.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497-529.

- Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., Burnaford, R., & Weaver, J., & Wasti, A. (2009). Precarious manhood and displays of physical aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 623-634.
- Bouffard, L. A. (2010). Exploring the utility of entitlement in understanding sexual aggression. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*, 870-879
- Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2008). Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral, gender and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Psychological Science, 19*, 268-275.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women, and rape*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics Crime Data Brief, *Intimate Partner Violence, 1993-2001*, February 2003.
- Bushman, B. J., Bonacci, A. M., van Dijk, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2003). Narcissism, sexual refusal, and aggression: Testing a narcissistic reactance model of sexual coercion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 1027-1040.
- Calogero, R. M., Davis, W. N., & Thompson, J. K. (2005). The role of self-objectification in the experience of women with eating disorders. *Sex Roles, 52*, 43-50.
- Castelfranchi, C., & Poggi, I. (1990). Blushing as discourse: Was Darwin wrong? In W. R. Crozier (Ed.), *Shyness and embarrassment: Perspectives from social psychology* (pp. 230-254). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. 464-486.
- Chapleau, K. M., & Oswald, D. L. (2010). Power, sex, and rape myth acceptance: Testing two models of rape proclivity. *Journal of Sex Research, 47* (1), 66-78.
- David, D. S., & Brannon, R. (1976). *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

- De Cremer, D., & Van Dijk, E. (2005). When and why leaders put themselves first: Leader behaviour in resource allocations as a function of feeling entitled. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*, 553–563.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., Rogness, M., & Schwartz, M. D. (2004). Separation/divorce sexual assault: The current state of social scientific knowledge. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*, 675–691.
- Dewall, C. N., Twenge, J. M., Gitter, S. A., & Baumeister, R. F. (2009). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(1), 45-59.
- Doyle, J. A. (1989). *The male experience*. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown. .
- Dutton, D., & Golant, S. K. (1995). *The batterer*. New York: Basic Books.
- Dworkin, A. (1987). *Intercourse*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. (1987). Masculine gender-role stress: Scale development and components factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. *Behavior Modification, 11*, 123–136.
- Fairchild, K., & Rudman, L. A. (2008). Everyday stranger harassment and women's objectification. *Social Justice Research, 21*(3), 338-357.
- Fisher, E., Dunn, M., & Thompson, J. K. (2002). Social comparison and body image: An investigation of body comparison processes using multidimensional scaling. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 21*, 566 –579.
- Fivush, R. (1989). Exploring differences in the emotional content of mother-child conversations about the past. *Sex Roles, 20*, 675– 691.

- Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T. A. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 173–206.
- Fredrickson, B., Noll, S., Roberts, T., Twenge, J., & Quinn, D. (1998). That Swimsuit Becomes You: Sex Differences in Self-Objectification, Restrained Eating, and Math Performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 269-284.
- Freeman, N. J. (2007). Predictors of rearrest in rapists and child molesters on probation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*, 752-768.
- Galinsky, A. D., Magee, J. C., Inesi, M. E., & Gruenfeld, D. H. (2006). Power and perspective not taken. *Psychological Science, 17*, 1068-1074.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491-512.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Farnham, S. D. (2000). Using the Implicit Association Test to measure self-esteem and self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 1022-1038.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1464-1480.
- Grogan, S., & Richards, H. (2002). Body image: Focus groups with boys and men. *Men and Masculinities, 4*, 219–232.

- Herek, G. M. (1989). Hate crimes against lesbians and gay men: Issues for research and policy. *American Psychologist*, 44, 948-955.
- Heatherton, T. F., & Polivy, J. (1991). Development and validation of a scale for measuring state self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60 (6), 895-910.
- Jakupcak, M. (2003). Masculine gender role stress and men's fear of emotions as predictors of self-reported aggression and violence. *Violence and Victims*, 18, 533-542.
- Jones, D. C. (2001). Social comparison and body image: Attractiveness comparisons to models and peers among adolescent boys and girls. *Sex Roles*, 45, 645- 664.
- Keltner, D. (1995). Signs of appeasement: Evidence for the distinct displays of embarrassment, amusement, and shame. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(3), 441-454.
- Kim, D. Y. (2003). Voluntary controllability of the Implicit Association Test (IAT). *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 66, 83-96.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2004). *The gendered society*. New York: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Kimmel, M. & Mahler, M. (2003) Adolescent masculinity, homophobia and violence. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(10): 1439-1458.
- Koss, M. P., & Gaines, J. A. (1993). The prediction of sexual aggression by alcohol use, athletic participation, and fraternity affiliation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8, 104-108.
- Kosson, D. S., Kelly, J. C., & White, J. W. (1997). Psychopathy-related traits predict self-reported sexual aggression among college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 241-254.
- Kozee, H. B., Tylka, C. L., Augustus-Horvath, C. L., & Denchik, A. (2007). Development and

- psychometric evaluation of the interpersonal sexual objectification scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 176-189.
- Krugman, S. (1995). *The development and transformation of shame*. In R. Levant & W. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 91–128). New York: Basic Books.
- Kuebli, J., & Fivush, R. (1992). Gender differences in parent– child conversations about past emotions. *Sex Roles*, 27, 683– 698.
- Lewis. M. (1993). Self-conscious emotions: Embarrassment, pride, shame, and guilt. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 353-364). New York: Guilford. Guilford.
- Long, D. (1987). Working with men who batter. In M. Scher & M. Stevens (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with men* (pp. 305–320). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A Theoretical and empirical reexamination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(4), 704-711.
- Maass, A. Cadinu, M., Guarnieri, G. & Grasselli, A. (2003). Sexual harassment under social identity threat: The computer harassment paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 85, 853-870.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1989). The attraction to sexual aggression scale: Part one. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 26, 26-49.
- Malamuth, N. M., Linz, D., Heavey, C. L., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men’s conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 353-369.
- McCreary, D. R., & Sasse, D. (2000). An exploration of the drive for muscularity in adolescent

- boys and girls. *Journal of American College Health*, 48, 297–304.
- McCreary, D. R., & Sasse, D. K. (2002). Gender differences in high school students' dieting behavior and their correlates. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 1, 195–213.
- McKinley, N. M., & Hyde, J. S. (1996). The objectified body consciousness scale: Development and validation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 181–215.
- Mead, N. L., Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2011). Power causes socially harmful behavior because it unleashes narcissism. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Miller, R. S., & Leary, M. R. (1992). Social sources and interaction functions of embarrassment. In M. Clark (Ed.), *Emotional and social behavior* (pp.202-221). New York: Sage.
- Murnen, S., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If “boys will be boys,” then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles*, 46(11/12), 359-375.
- Murphy, J. A. (2004). The use of sexual orientation-related insults among college students  
 Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 2004. Dissertation Abstracts  
 International, 66, 619.
- Papps, B., & O'Carroll, R. E. (1998). Extremes of self-esteem and narcissism and the experience and expression of anger and aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 24, 421 – 438.
- Plant, E. A., Hyde, J. S., Keltner, D., & Devine, P. G. (2000). The gender stereotyping of emotions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 81-92.
- Pleck, J. H. (1983). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pleck, J. H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 11–32). New York: Basic Books.



- Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993). Masculinity ideology and its correlates. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society* (pp. 85-110). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Poteat, V. P., & Espelage, D. L. (2005). Exploring the relation between bullying and homophobic verbal content: The Homophobic Content Agent Target (HCAT) Scale. *Violence and Victims, 20*, 513-528.
- Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual harassment proclivities in men. *Sex Roles, 17*, 269–290.
- Pryor, J. B. (1998). The Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale. In C. M. Davis, W. H. Yarber, R. Bauserman, G. Schreer, & S. L. Davis (Eds.), *Sexuality-related measures: A compendium* (pp. 295–298). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Rudman, L. A., Dohn, M. C., & Fairchild, K. (2007). Implicit self-esteem compensation: Automatic threat defense. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 798-813.
- Rudman, L. A., & Mescher, K. (2010). [Male body shame and sexual aggression]. Unpublished raw data. Rutgers University.
- Rudman, L. A., & Mescher, K. (2011). Of animals and objects: Men's implicit dehumanization of women and male sexual aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
- Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice toward female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 165-179.
- Saguy, T., Quinn, D. M., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2010). Interacting like a body: Objectification can lead women to narrow their presence in social interactions. *Psychological Science, 21*, 178-182.

- Sanchez, D. T., & Broccoli, T. L. (2008). The romance of self objectification: Does priming romantic relationships induce states of self-objectification among women? *Sex Roles, 59*, 555-567.
- Sanchez, D. T., & Kiefer, A. K. (2007). Body concerns in and out of the bedroom: Implications for sexual pleasure and problems. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 36*, 808-820.
- Sanchez, D. T., & Kwang, T. (2007). When the relationship becomes her: Revisiting body concerns from a relationship contingency perspective. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 401-414.
- Shelton, S., & Liljequist, L. (2002). Characteristics and behaviors associated with body image in male domestic violence offenders. *Eating Behaviors, 3*, 217–227.
- Slater, A., & Tiggemann, M. (2002). A test of objectification theory in adolescent girls. *Sex Roles, 46*(9/10), 343 – 349.
- Tager, D., Good, G. E., & Morrison, J. B. (2006). Our bodies, ourselves revisited: Male body image and psychological well-being. *International Journal of Men's Health, 5*(3), 228-237.
- Thomaes, S., Bushman, B.J., Stegge, H., & Olthof, T. (2008). Trumping shame by blasts of noise: Narcissism, self-esteem, shame and aggression in young adolescents. *Child Development, 79*(6), 1792-1801.
- Thompson, E. R. (2007). Development and validation of an internationally reliable short-form of the positive and negative affect schedule (PANAS). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 38*, 227-242.
- Thurlow, C. (2001). Naming the “outsider within”: Homophobic pejoratives and verbal abuse of lesbian, gay, and bisexual high-school pupils. *Journal of Adolescence, 24*, 25-38.

- Tiedens, L. Z., Unzueta, M. M., & Young, M. J. (2007). An unconscious desire for hierarchy? The motivated perception of dominance complementarity in task partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 402–414.
- Tiggemann, M., & Kuring, J. K. (2004). The role of body objectification in disordered eating and depressed mood. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 43*, 299–311.
- Tiggemann, M., & Slater, A. (2001). A test of objectification theory in former dancers and non-dancers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 25*, 57–64.
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2003). “Isn’t it fun to get the respect that we’re going to deserve?” Narcissism, social rejection, and aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 261–272.
- Tylka, T.L., & Hill, M.S. (2004). Objectification theory as it relates to disordered eating among college women. *Sex Roles, 51*, 719-730.
- Uncovering the unacceptable: Exposing the relationship between automatic rape attitudes and sexual assault.* (2011). Manuscript submitted for blind review.
- U.S. Department of Justice. *2003 National Crime Victimization Survey.*
- U.S. Department of Justice. *2007 National Crime Victimization Survey.*
- Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1325-1339.
- Vandello J. A., & Cohen, D. (2008). Gender, culture, and intimate partner violence against women. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*, 1-16.
- Ward, C. (1988). The attitudes toward rape victims scale: Construction, validation, and cross cultural applicability. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*, 127-146.

- Weinke, C. (1998). Negotiating the male body: Men, masculinity, and cultural ideals. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 6, 255–282.
- Widman, L., & McNulty, J. K. (2010). Sexual narcissism and the perpetration of sexual aggression. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39, 926-939.
- Wilson, C., Goodwin, S., & Beck, K. (2002). Rape attitude and behavior and their relationship to moral development. *Psychiatry, Psychology, and Law*, 9(1), 85-95.
- Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 590 – 597.
- Zeman, J., & Garber, J. (1996). Display rules for anger, sadness, and pain: It depends on who is watching. *Child Development*, 67, 957–973.
- Zimring, F. E., Piquero, A. R., & Jennings, W. G. (2007). Sexual delinquency in Racine: Does early sex offending predict later sex offending in youth and young adulthood? *Criminology and Public Policy*, 6, 507–534.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> For completion's sake, I describe these measures here.

*Self-Esteem Implicit Association Test (SE IAT)*. Participants completed the SE IAT immediately following the rejection manipulation. The SE IAT obliged participants to categorize words related to the self and others (e.g., me, my, myself vs. they, them, theirs) with positive and negative words (e.g., gift, holiday, success vs. pain, grief, failure). Following standard procedures, *D* scores were computed so that high scores reflect stronger association of self with positive, compared with negative, evaluation (i.e., high implicit SE). *D* scores ranged from -.24 to 1.27 ( $M = .63$ ).

*State Self Esteem Scale (SSES)*. State self-esteem was measured using the SSES (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991), which consists of 20 items scored on a 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very much*) scale. Sample items include "At this moment...I feel like I am not doing well" and "I am worried about what other people think of me" ( $\alpha = .90$ ).

*Explicit Sex/Power Beliefs Scale*. The Sex/Power Beliefs Scale (Chapleau & Oswald, 2010) asked participants to indicate their level of endorsement of statements that associate sex with power, with responses anchored on a 1 (*not at all agree*) to 7 (*very much agree*) scale. Sample items include: "During sex, one person is typically 'in charge' of the other" and "Having sex means gaining possession of someone else's body." Higher scores indicate more endorsement of a link between power and sex ( $\alpha = .87$ ).

<sup>2</sup> Of the sexually offensive images, 12 depicted rape (six used classical paintings, six used magazine ads or other photos). Two photos depicted female bondage, and three photos were otherwise offensive (e.g., statue of a man with a large erection). Of the aggression images, ten depicted war (six used classical paintings, four depicted modern men in battle garb). Three photos portrayed men being assaulted by other men; two photos portrayed aggressive athletes; one photo depicted a man being gang raped (Dolce & Gabbana magazine ad), and one photo depicted a man with a bruised and bandaged face.