

Vol 7, n 2, 2019

Clinical Psychology

Whose Gaze is More Objectifying? An Experimental Study of College Women's State Self - Objectification, Body Shame, Negative Mood, and Body Dissatisfaction

Tuğba Yılmaz^{1*}, Özlem Bozdoğan²

Abstract

Objectification theory posits that women internalize males' sexualizing gaze upon them and pay more attention to their appearance than to their feelings. To date, the literature has focused on the differences that males and females arouse in objectification experiences of women. In the current study, a tripartite comparison of the effects of self-gaze, female gaze, and male gaze upon women's self-objectification, body dissatisfaction, body shame, appearance anxiety, and negative mood was made with Turkish college women. The study utilized a 3x2 repeated measures factorial design with six different imagined scenarios comprised of three types of gaze (self, female, and male) and two types of clothing (swimsuit, and sweater and jeans). All dependent variables were significantly affected by clothing type. Body shame, negative mood, appearance anxiety, and state SO were significantly affected by the type of gaze. Interaction effects were significant for body dissatisfaction and negative mood.

¹ Psychology Department, Izmir Bakircay University, Turkey

² Psychology Department, Middle East Technical University, Turkey

E-mail corresponding author: tugba.yilmaz.psy@gmail.com



Keywords:

Objectification; Self-objectification; Women; Body image; Culture; Cross-cultural.

DOI: 10.6092/2282-1619/2019.7.2108

1. Introduction

Objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) is one of those theories that has investigated why women are more vulnerable to some specific psychological disorders. The theory posits that women are frequently treated as a collection of body parts, each of which is given value for their potential use by others (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Hence, women are exposed to repeated social and cultural experiences in which their bodies are perceived as objects that exist to be used and exploited for the pleasure of others. Accordingly, they are looked at and evaluated, especially for sexual purposes (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; McKinley & Hyde, 1996). The most implicit and subtle mean of sexual evaluation is visual inspection, i.e. the gaze (Kaschak, 1992). Thus, sexual objectification of women body can occur in any context involving social interactions.

1.1 Process of self-objectification

Because of the sociocultural practice of men looking at women for sexual purposes, women become socialized to view themselves from an outsider's viewpoint. Thus, women come to terms with being constantly self-conscious. In other words, self-objectification occurs when women privilege their physical attractiveness more than their non-observable body attributes such as physical competence and health (Fredrickson et al., 1998). They check for themselves whether they are acceptable to others (Moradi, 2010). That is to say, they internalize the gazes upon their bodies and practice self-objectification.

Self-objectification has experiential, emotional, and behavioral costs including emotions of shame and anxiety, derailment of peak motivational states, and decreased awareness of internal body states (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). For women particularly, these costs increase their risks of developing a range of psychological disorders, including depression, sexual dysfunction, and eating disorders (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Noll & Fredrickson, 1998).

McKinley and Hyde (1996) developed the Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (OBCS) to study the effect of shame on disordered eating. Among its subscales, body surveillance (corresponding to self-objectification) and body shame were positively correlated with each other, and both were positively correlated with disordered eating. Likewise, Noll and Fredrickson (1998) studied causal pathways among shame, self-objectification, and disordered eating; and their results supported McKinley and Hyde's (1996) findings by showing that self-objectification contributed to disordered eating both directly, and indirectly through the mediation of shame. Since body shame consumes and disrupts attentional resources, it also affects mental performance negatively (Fredrickson et al., 1998). This finding has been consistently confirmed by the classic swimsuit experiments in which body shame and state self-objectification were manipulated by asking male and female participants to try on either a swimsuit or a sweater and jeans and then to engage in cognitive tasks such as solving a mathematical problem (Gapinski, Brownell, & LaFrance, 2003; Hebl, King, & Lin, 2004; Martins, Tiggemann, & Kirkbride, 2007; Quinn, Kallen, Twenge, & Fredrickson, 2006; Quinn, Kallen, & Cathey, 2006). The results of these studies showed that cognitive performance was worse when individuals wore swimsuits than when they wore sweater and jeans.

To complement the swimsuit methodology, researchers manipulated state SO in several perceptive experiments to observe its effects on specified psychological outcomes. For example, cognitive performance was assessed following manipulation of the laboratory environment with subtle objectifying cues such as paying compliments to participants (Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008), and filmmaking of participants by either a man or a woman (Gay & Castano, 2010). The

studies that assessed psychological consequences such as body dissatisfaction, body shame, and negative mood manipulated various scenarios comprised of different types of clothing and settings (Tiggemann, 2001; Tiggemann & Andrew, 2012), complimenting of participants (Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008; Calogero, Herbozo, & Thompson, 2009), and fat talk (Gapinski, Brownell, & LaFrance, 2003; Salk & Engeln-Maddox, 2011). The overall findings of the studies mentioned above showed that women are more vulnerable than men being affected by self-objectification and its consequences such as diminished sexual appeal, depression, body shame, and appearance anxiety. Many of the studies had exposed women to thin ideals such as models or mirrors, or they made men look at them.

Thus far, studies on SO were predominantly conducted in Western cultures, such as the US, the UK and Australia. Relatively few studies tested the objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) in non-Western cultures (e.g., Gattino, Piccoli, Fedi, Boza, & Rollero, 2017; Loughnan et al., 2015) and some of them even compared Western and non-Western cultures with this respect (Dunkel, Davidson, & Qurashi, 2010; Loughnan et al., 2015). To the best of our knowledge, there is no study conducted in Turkish culture testing objectification theory. However, studies on other non-Western cultures suggested that cultural norms about objectification (Loughnan et al., 2015) and type of clothes that young women prefer (Dunkel, Davidson, & Qurashi, 2010) make individuals from these cultures to be less vulnerable to the adverse effects of sexual objectification. For instance, in their seven-nations study, Loughnan et al. (2015) found that participants from India and Pakistan had lower levels of SO than those from the US, the UK, Australia and Italy. However, lower level of SO was not explained only with religion; participants from Japan did also score lower on SO than those in Western cultures. Thus, researchers suggested that cultural norms can qualify the broad effects of objectification in traditional Western cultures. Supporting this finding, Dunkel and colleagues (2010) compared three groups of Muslim women living in the US; wearing Western dress, non-Western dress without a head veil and non-Western dress with a head veil. They reported that non-Muslim and Muslim women wearing Western type of clothing were more vulnerable to Western definition of beauty and therefore to sexual objectification. As a result, they indicated that rather than religion, dress preference could account for body image concerns. Thus, these two studies had similar findings about non-Western cultures. They highlighted the importance of culture rather than religion in affecting self and other objectification practices.

Considering all this information, an additional point worth investigating is *whether women's self-objectification levels alter when they are looked at by other women and by themselves*. Objectification theory postulates that women internalize men's sexually evaluating gaze upon their appearance. But

does women's self-objectification occur only in response to the gaze of men? Will there be a difference when women look at themselves or when they are being looked at by other males or females?

Only a few studies have investigated what would differ when women are being looked at by other males or females (Calogero, 2004; Gay & Castano, 2010; Strelan & Hargreaves, 2005). The current experimental study was designed to investigate negative mood, appearance anxiety, body dissatisfaction, body shame, and state SO, all of which are psychological consequences of the objectification of women, by taking into consideration the potential differences in the effects of self-gaze, female-gaze and male-gaze upon women's bodies.

Drawing on the existing literature reviewed above, the current study had 7 hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: There will be a main effect of different clothing types on state SO: Swimsuit scenarios will elicit higher state SO than sweater-jean pair scenarios

Hypothesis 2: There will be a main effect of different types of gazes on state SO: 2.1: Self-gaze scenarios will elicit higher state SO than other types of gazes; 2.2. Male gaze scenarios will elicit higher state SO than female gaze scenarios.

Hypothesis 3: There will be an interaction effect between types of gazes and clothing on state SO.

Hypothesis 4: There will be an interaction effect between types of gazes and clothing on negative emotions.

Hypothesis 5: There will be an interaction effect between types of gazes and clothing on body dissatisfaction.

Hypothesis 6: There will be an interaction effect between types of gazes and clothing on appearance anxiety.

Hypothesis 7: There will be an interaction effect between types of gazes and clothing on body shame.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

One-hundred and seventy Turkish college women participated in the study. All of the participants were single university students aged 18-30 years ($M = 21.44$, $SD = 1.60$). The mean height of the participants was 165.5 cm with a standard deviation of 6.28. The mean weight of the participants was 58.03 with a standard deviation of 9.89. Participants were speaking Turkish and attending to an English-medium University. They were typically wearing Western style

clothing and making eye contact with males. For them, one-piece and bikinis would be appropriate. Means, standard deviations, and frequency table for grades, SES, size, BMI, and diet experience are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for grades, SES, Size, Diet Experience of the Participants.

Variables	Levels	Frequency	Percentage	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Grades	1	49	28.8	2.12	.94
	2	68	40		
	3	36	21.2		
	4	17	10		
SES	Low	10	5.9	2.02	.38
	Middle	145	85.3		
	High	15	8.8		
Size	XS	18	10.6		
	S	54	31.8		
	M	63	37.1		
	L	28	16.5		
	XL	7	4.1		
Diet	No	86	50.6		
	Yes	83	48.8		
BMI	Underweight	27	16		
	Normal weight	127	75		
	Overweight	16	9		

2.2 Measures

Demographics. Participants' university, class, age, gender, socioeconomic status, marital status, height in cm, and weight in kg were asked in the demographic information form in Turkish.

Trait Self-Objectification. Trait self-objectification was assessed by the Self-Objectification Questionnaire (SOQ), which was developed by Noll and Fredrickson (1998) to measure general self-objectification. This scale contains 10 body attributes which are supposed to be ranked by participants in order of their importance to physical self-concept. The ten body attributes contain five appearance-based attributes (weight, sex appeal, physical attractiveness, firm/sculpted muscles, and measurements), and five competence-based attributes (physical coordination, health, strength, energy level, and physical fitness level). Scores are obtained by summing the ranks of appearance-based attributes and competence-based attributes separately. Then, the sum of the ranks for the competence attributes is subtracted from the sum of the ranks for the appearance attributes. The obtained difference score ranges between -25 and $+25$ whereby higher scores indicate greater dependence on physical self-concept focused on

appearance, indicating greater self-objectification. Turkish adaptation of the SOQ was done by Yılmaz (2017). Psychometric qualities of the Turkish SOQ were satisfactory. The internal consistency reliability coefficient of the Turkish SOQ for the present sample was .61.

-State Self-Objectification. The modified version of the Twenty Statements Test (TST; Fredrickson et al., 1998) was used to assess state-self objectification. For this scale, participants are asked to complete 10 sentences that begin with “I” to describe their condition (i.e., feelings, thoughts, ideas). Then, two independent researchers code participants’ responses into one of six categories: body shape and size, other physical appearance, physical competence, traits or abilities, states or emotions, and uncodable or illegible.

Inter-rater reliability coefficients for appearance items in the first two categories were .93, and it was .80 for the whole scale (Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008). This measurement tool was used in the present study for manipulation check.

Tiggemann and Boundy (2008) suggested that earlier items of the modified version of the TST were more indicative of participants’ state SO than later items. They reached this conclusion based on the recommendation of Gapinski, Brownell, and LaFrance (2003).

Thus, state SO was operationalized as the number of responses in the first two categories (body shape and size, and other physical appearance) in the first three responses. The internal consistency reliability coefficient of TST for the present sample was .78.

Appearance Anxiety. Participants’ appearance anxiety was assessed by the Social Physique Anxiety Inventory (SPAII; Hart, Leary, & Rejeski, 1989). This inventory measures self-presentational anxiety related to appearance. It includes 12 items (e.g., “In the presence of others, I feel apprehensive about my physique/figure”) and responses to these items are scored on a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from “not at all” to “extremely”. Higher scores indicate greater social physique anxiety.

The scale has high internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = .90$) and test-retest reliability ($r = .82$). Construct validity of the original scale was measured by correlations of SPAII with self-consciousness (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975), fear of negative evaluation (Leary, 1983a), and interaction anxiousness (Leary, 1983b). SPAII correlated moderately with interaction anxiousness and fear of negative evaluation. Hence, SPAII showed strong correlations with measures that are related to general concerns of others’ evaluations. The scale was translated and adapted to the Turkish culture by Mülazımoğlu-Ballı and Aşçı (2006). Internal consistency of the adapted scale was .81 and test-retest reliability was .81. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient was used to test the criterion-related validity between scores for SPAII

and the Body Image Scale (Berscheid, Walster, & Bohrnstedt, 1973). Correlation coefficients were negative and they ranged between $-.43$ and $-.57$. The authors stated that Turkish SPAI has satisfactory validity and reliability. The internal consistency reliability coefficient of SPAS for the present sample was $.89$.

Body Shame. The Body Shame subscale of the Objectified Body Consciousness scales (OBC Scales; McKinley & Hyde, 1996) was used to assess body shame. This subscale consists of eight items rated on a 7-point Likert type scale to assess how participants feel at that particular moment. Higher scores indicate greater body shame.

The scale has satisfactory internal consistency ($\alpha = .75$) and good test-retest reliability ($r = .79$). The scale was translated and adapted to Turkish by Yilmaz (2017) within the scope of the present study. For the present sample the internal consistency reliability coefficient of the body shame scale was $.78$.

Negative Mood. A series of Visual Analogue Scales (VAS) (Heinberg & Thompson, 1995) were employed to measure negative mood. Five adjectives (i.e., happy, anxious, confident, angry, and depressed) were rated on a 100-mm horizontal line with a vertical line between the polar points of “none” and “very much”. The distance between the participant’s mark on the line and the “none” polar point indicates the participant’s score for each adjective.

VAS has two advantages. First, it is sensitive to the small changes in mood. Second, it is advantageous for repeated measures design since it is not easy for participants to recall their initial responses. Positive items are reverse coded and all items are summed. An average is calculated as a composite score for negative mood. Scores on VAS measure were correlated significantly with subscales of the Profile of Mood States (PMO; McNair, Lorr, & Droppelman, 1971). In Tiggemann and Andrew’s (2012) study, internal consistency reliability of VAS ranged between $.81$ and $.86$ for four experimental conditions. The internal consistency reliability coefficient of VAS-negative mood for the present sample was $.85$.

Body Dissatisfaction. Two Visual Analogue Scales (VAS; Heinberg & Thompson, 1995) were used to measure state body dissatisfaction. In these scales, two stems (dissatisfaction with my weight and dissatisfaction with my appearance) are rated by respondents on a 100-mm horizontal line with a vertical line between the polar points of “none” and “very much”. Then, the distance between the respondent’s mark on the line to the polar point for “none” gives the score for each stem. These two items were correlated significantly with the body dissatisfaction subscale of the Eating Disorders Inventory (Garner, Olmstead, & Polivy, 1983). In the study by Tiggemann and Andrew (2012), the internal consistency reliability ranged between $.79$ and $.86$

for four experimental conditions. The internal consistency reliability coefficient of VAS-body dissatisfaction for the present sample was .95.

2.3 Procedure

Institutional review board (IRB) approval was obtained from Middle East Technical University (METU) Applied Ethics Board. Participants were female university students at METU and Çankaya University from various departments who volunteered to participate in the research project in exchange for extra course credits. Participants were called to a research laboratory by appointment, where they were administered the hardcopy questionnaires in groups.

The main aim of the study was to study differences in dependent variables across six different scenarios. Imagined scenarios (Tiggemann, 2001; Tiggemann & Andrew, 2012) were prepared to manipulate the practice of self-objectification. Tiggemann was e-mailed and her permission was obtained to use the scenarios.

These scenarios were (1) wearing a sweater and jeans in a dressing room and looking at oneself in the mirror, (2) wearing a sweater and jeans on a beach while a man is looking, (3) wearing a sweater and jeans on a beach while a woman is looking, (4) wearing one-piece swimsuit in a dressing room and looking at oneself in the mirror, (5) wearing one-piece swimsuit on a beach when a man is looking, and (6) wearing one-piece swimsuit on a beach when a woman is looking.

Participants were called by e-mails to take part in the study which was conducted in a laboratory environment containing tables and chairs. The subject of the study was announced as “Effect of Environmental Factors on Body”. Thus, participants were not fully informed about the aim of the study. After being welcomed to the laboratory, they read and signed the informed consent forms. Each informed consent form was labeled with an identifying code number instead of participants’ personal information to ensure anonymity.

After they had filled out the demographic information form and SOQ, participants were provided with the six scenarios that had been labelled with the same code number beforehand. They were asked to read each of the scenarios and consider themselves as the protagonist in the scenario and answer the questions that followed accordingly.

Since the experiment had a 3x2 repeated measures design (type of gaze: self, female, and male) x (clothes: swimsuit and sweater/jeans), all participants were exposed to all conditions. The order of presentation of the scenarios was counterbalanced (balanced Latin square) for 6 different orders across the sample. For each dependent variable, one-way ANOVA results were run to examine the effect of the sequence. All *F* statistics were non-significant; thus, the main effect of scenarios was insignificant.

Afterwards, the participants were asked about their expectations of the study, and all of them reported that they had expected something about the environment, like the effect of weather on their mood. This was done to check whether participants understood the aim of the study. After this, the participants were debriefed thoroughly, and they were given a debriefing form before they left the laboratory.

2.4 Statistical methods

There are several statistical analyses to test the hypotheses.

For hypothesis 1 (There will be a main effect of different clothing types on state SO: Swimsuit scenarios will elicit higher state SO than sweater-jean pair scenarios) and hypothesis 2 (There will be a main effect of different types of gazes on state SO: 2.1: Self-gaze scenarios will elicit higher state SO than other types of gazes;

2.2. Male gaze scenarios will elicit higher state SO than female gaze scenarios.) and hypothesis 3 (There will be an interaction effect between types of gazes and clothing on state SO.), a 3 (type of gazes: self, male, and female) by 2 (clothing: swimsuit, sweater and jeans) repeated measures factorial ANOVA was conducted with state SO as the dependent variable.

For the remaining four hypotheses-hypothesis 4: There will be an interaction effect between types of gazes and clothing on negative emotions; hypothesis 5: There will be an interaction effect between types of gazes and clothing on body dissatisfaction; hypothesis 6: There will be an interaction effect between types of gazes and clothing on appearance anxiety; hypothesis 7: There will be an interaction effect between types of gazes and clothing on body shame) a 3 (type of gaze) by 2 (clothing type) within subjects MANOVA was conducted with body shame, appearance anxiety, negative emotions, and body dissatisfaction as multiple dependent variables. By making MANOVA with multiple dependent variables instead of several ANOVAs, the authors had several aims. The first aim was to see which factor was truly important. The second was to protect the study from Type I error. The last was to discover the differences that ANOVAs cannot give.

3. Results

3.1 Means and Standard Deviations of the Variables

Means and standard deviations of the variables were given in Table 2.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for Negative Mood, Appearance Anxiety, and Body Dissatisfaction, Body Shame and State SO.

Scenarios	Negative Mood		Appearance Anxiety		Body Dissatisfaction		Body Shame		State SO	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Sweater-self	20.46	14.19	33.94	8.66	2.97	2.70	2.75	.96	.79	.94
Sweater-male	31.03	19.83	33.90	8.61	3.25	2.60	2.77	.90	.74	.99
Sweater-female	31.16	19.02	34.20	8.78	3.22	2.65	2.73	.92	.70	.90
Swimsuit-self	39.04	24.46	35.66	9.57	4.30	3.19	2.89	1.06	1.96	1.12
Swimsuit-male	39.87	24.05	35.16	9.97	3.92	3.11	2.87	1.01	1.33	1.13
Swimsuit-female	40.45	23.73	35.72	10.11	3.99	3.11	2.86	1.03	1.37	1.11
Min-Max	0 – 100		5 - 60		0 – 10		1 – 7		0 - 3	

3.2 Correlations among the Variables

Pearson correlation coefficients were examined among 30 variables (6 scenarios across 5 dependent variables; i.e., appearance anxiety, negative mood, body dissatisfaction, body shame, and state SO). However, since a 30 x 30 correlation matrix is not a compact one, general means across 6 scenarios for 5 dependent variables were calculated instead. All correlations among the means of the variables were significant at $p < .001$ level (see Table 3).

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Coefficients among Appearance Anxiety, Negative Mood, Body Dissatisfaction, Body Shame and State SO.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Negative mood	1				
2. Appearance anxiety	.80*	1			
3. Body dissatisfaction	.71*	.72*	1		
4. Body shame	.53*	.68*	.54*	1	
5. State SO	.63*	.65*	.58*	.50*	1
Internal consistency	(.85)	(.89)	(.95)	(.78)	(.78)

Note 1. * $p < .001$

Note 2. Values in parentheses show Cronbach's alpha coefficients

3.3 Participants' Characteristics

Trait SO was also investigated in the preliminary analyses. For normality assumptions, skewness and kurtosis values of the variables were examined. The skewness and kurtosis values for each variable was between -2 and +2, which is accepted as normal (George & Mallery, 2010). Overall mean trait SO of the participants was -7.52 and standard deviation was 9.87. Moreover, all participants' body mass indices (BMI) were calculated by the formula $BMI = kg/m^2$. Mean BMI for the sample was 21.15 and standard deviation of BMI was 3.19. Based on the BMI classification table of World Health Organization (WHO, 2004) participants were categorized as underweight (BMI less than 18.49), of normal weight (BMI between 18.50 and 24.99), or overweight (BMI greater than 25.00). According to this classification, the mean and standard deviation of BMI of the current participants fell within the normal weight class, which was a result consistent with other studies (e.g., Tiggemann & Andrew, 2012). After the classification, the current sample consisted of 27 underweight, 127 of normal weight, and 16 overweight participants. The three BMI groups were compared on trait SO, state SO, body shame, body dissatisfaction, negative mood, and appearance anxiety. The three BMI classes did not differ significantly on trait SO [$F(2,167) = .57, p = n.s.$]. However, they did significantly differ on negative mood [$F(2,167) = 4.54, p < .05$], appearance anxiety [$F(2,167) = 5.36, p < .01$], body dissatisfaction [$F(2,167) = 16.60, p < .001$], body shame [$F(2,167) = 3.05, p < .05$], and state SO [$F(2,167) = 3.86, p < .05$]. See Table 4 for details.

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations for Trait SO, State SO, Body Shame, Body Dissatisfaction, Negative Mood, and Appearance Anxiety by BMI groups and significance of effects.

Variables	Under weight	Normal Weight	Overweight	Total Sample	Min-Max
Trait SO	-8.81 _a (7.59)	-7.05 _a (10.24)	-9.06 _a (10.36)	-7.52 (9.87)	-25 - +25
State SO	.82 _a (.48)	1.23 _b (.73)	1.10 _{ab} (.71)	1.15 (.70)	0 - 3
Body shame	2.47 _a (.71)	2.84 _{ab} (.94)	3.15 _b (.93)	2.81 (.92)	1 - 7
Body dissatisfaction	16.15 _a (19.16)	37.52 _b (24.29)	58.26 _c (27.07)	36.08 (25.94)	0 - 100
Negative mood	26.07 _a (15.44)	34.60 _b (14.98)	39.05 _b (17.84)	33.67 (15.65)	0 - 100
Appearance anxiety	29.91 _a (7.99)	35.48 _b (8.60)	37.26 _c (9.97)	34.76 (8.85)	5 - 60

Note 1. The mean scores that do not share the same subscript on the same row are significantly different from each other.

Note 2. Values in parentheses are standard deviations.

Post hoc tests were done by Tukey's honest significant difference (HSD) test. First, the underweight group displayed significantly lower state SO than the normal and overweight groups but the normal and overweight groups did not differ significantly from each other on state SO. Second, the overweight group showed significantly more body shame than under- and normal weight participants. Under- and normal weight participants did not differ significantly from each other on body shame. Third, the overweight group had significantly greater body dissatisfaction than the normal weight and underweight groups. The normal weight group had significantly greater body shame than underweight participants. Fourth, the underweight group had significantly lower appearance anxiety than the normal and overweight groups. However, the normal and overweight groups did not significantly differ from each other on appearance anxiety. Last, the underweight group had significantly lower negative mood than normal and overweight groups. The normal and overweight groups did not differ significantly on negative mood.

3.4 Effects of Clothing Type and Type of Gaze on State Self-Objectification

To test the first three hypotheses of the present study, 3 (type of gazes: self, male, and female) x 2 (clothing: swimsuit, sweater and jeans) a repeated measures factorial ANOVA was conducted with state SO as the dependent variable. Table 5 displays the mean and the standard deviations for the six conditions as well as the significance of the effects.

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations for State SO by Clothes and Type of Gaze.

Clothes	Type of gaze			
	Self-gaze	Male observer	Female observer	
Sweater	<i>M</i>	.79 _a	.75 _a	.70 _a
	<i>(SD)</i>	(.94)	(.99)	(.90)
Swimsuit	<i>M</i>	1.95 _b	1.34 _c	1.37 _c
	<i>(SD)</i>	(1.12)	(1.14)	(1.11)

Note. The mean scores that do not share the same subscript on the same row or on the same column are significantly different from each other.

Mauchly's test statistics were insignificant ($p = .62$) suggesting that it is reasonable to conclude that the variances of differences were not significantly different (i.e., roughly equal). Thus, two-way ANOVA results were interpreted. There was a significant main effect for clothing type on state SO, $F(1,169) = 187.23, p < .001, \eta p^2 = .53$, whereby swimsuit scenarios elicited significantly higher state SO than sweater and jeans scenarios (Hypotheses 1 and 1.1)

There was also a significant main effect for type of gaze, $F(2,338) = 17.40, p < .001, \eta p^2 = .09$, suggesting that self-gaze led to greater state SO than male and female gazes. However, male and female gazes were not significantly different in terms of state SO they elicited (Hypotheses 2, 2.1, and 2.2).

The interaction of clothing type and conditions was significant $F(2,338) = 14.60, p < .001, \eta^2 = .08$, and showed that self-gaze elicited greater state SO than other gazes only when the clothing type was the swimsuit; in other words, self-gaze did not result in statistically greater state SO than other gazes when clothing type was the sweater and jean pair. Additionally, both in sweater and jean, and in swimsuit scenarios, male gaze and female gaze did not lead to significantly different state SO from each other (Hypothesis 3).

3.5 Effects of Clothing Type and Type of Gaze on Body Shame, Appearance Anxiety, Negative Emotions, and Body Dissatisfaction

To examine these four overall experimental effects (hypotheses 4, 5, 6, 7), a doubly multivariate MANOVA was run, as had been done in Tiggemann and Andrew's (2012) study. This analysis is recommended for moderately correlated variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). A 3 (type of gaze) x 2 (clothing type) within subjects MANOVA was conducted with body shame, appearance anxiety, negative emotions, and body dissatisfaction as multiple dependent variables. This analysis yielded a significant main effect for type of gaze (Wilk's $\lambda = .86; F(8, 670) = 6.34, p < .001; \eta^2 = .07$) and clothes (Wilk's $\lambda = .66; F(4, 166) = 21.00, p < .001; \eta^2 = .34$). Multivariate interaction of gaze and clothing type was also significant (Wilk's $\lambda = .87; F(8, 670) = 5.81, p < .001; \eta^2 = .07$).

Bonferroni correction was computed as $.05/4 = .0125$. Follow-up univariate tests of significant effects indicated that there was a significant main effect of clothes on body dissatisfaction [$F(1, 169) = 53.74, p < .001; \eta^2 = .24$], body shame [$F(1, 169) = 14.19, p < .001; \eta^2 = .08$], negative mood [$F(1, 169) = 81.37, p < .001; \eta^2 = .33$], and appearance anxiety [$F(1, 169) = 29.99, p < .001; \eta^2 = .15$]. As can be seen in Table 6, swimsuit scenarios led to significantly higher body dissatisfaction, body shame, negative mood, and appearance anxiety than sweater-jeans scenarios. For the main effect of type of gaze, follow-up analyses showed a significant main effect for negative mood [$F(2, 338) = 14.89, p < .001; \eta^2 = .08$], but not for body dissatisfaction [$F(2, 338) = .14, p = .87; \eta^2 = .00$], body shame [$F(2, 338) = .58, p = .56; \eta^2 = .00$], and appearance anxiety [$F(2, 338) = 2.06, p = .13; \eta^2 = .01$].

Post-hoc analysis revealed that male gaze (sweater $m = 31.03, sd = 19.83$; swimsuit $m = 39.87, sd = 24.05$) and female gaze (sweater $m = 31.16, sd = 19.02$; swimsuit $m = 40.45, sd = 23.73$) led to higher negative mood than self-gaze (sweater $m = 20.46, sd = 14.19$; swimsuit $m = 39.04, sd = 24.46$). However, male and female gazes did not significantly differ from each other in terms of negative mood. For the interaction effect of type of gaze and clothes, follow-up analyses showed a significant effect for body dissatisfaction [$F(2, 338) = 8.28, p < .001; \eta^2 = .05$], and negative mood [$F(2, 338) = 22.23, p < .001; \eta^2 = .12$]. For appearance anxiety [$F(2, 338) = .62,$

$p = .54$; $\eta p^2 = .00$], and body shame [$F(2, 338) = .18, p = .84$; $\eta p^2 = .00$], there was no significant interaction effect of type of gaze and clothing type.

For the interaction effect of type of gaze and clothing type on negative mood, post-hoc analyses illustrated that across swimsuit scenarios, the effects of type of gaze did not significantly differ from each other in terms of negative mood (self-gaze $m = 39.04, sd = 24.46$; male gaze $m = 39.87, sd = 24.05$; female gaze $m = 40.45, sd = 23.73$). However, for the imaginary sweater/jeans scenarios, male ($m = 31.03, sd = 19.83$) and female gazes ($m = 31.16, sd = 19.02$) led to greater negative mood than self-gaze ($m = 20.46, sd = 14.19$). Female and male gazes did not significantly differ from each other in terms of their effects on negative mood (Hypothesis 4). For the interaction effect of type of gaze and clothing types on body dissatisfaction, post-hoc analyses illustrated that for sweater-jeans scenarios, type of gazes did not differ significantly in terms of body dissatisfaction (self-gaze $m = 29.71, sd = 27.01$; male gaze $m = 32.48, sd = 26.01$; female gaze $m = 32.24, sd = 26.51$). However, when participants imagined themselves trying on a swimsuit, the highest body dissatisfaction was reported in self-gaze ($m = 43.03, sd = 31.94$) and the least body dissatisfaction was reported in male gaze ($m = 39.16, sd = 31.08$). Female gaze ($m = 39.86, sd = 31.10$) was not significantly different from self- and male gazes in terms of body dissatisfaction (Hypothesis 5).

Table 6. Means and Standard Deviations for Body Dissatisfaction, Body Shame, Negative Mood, and Appearance Anxiety by Type of Gaze and Clothes, and Significance of Effects.

Variables		Type of gaze						<i>Gaze</i>	<i>Cloth</i>	<i>Inter-action</i>
		Self		Male		Female				
		Sweater	Swimsuit	Sweater	Swimsuit	Sweater	Swimsuit	<i>F</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>F</i>
Body dissatisfaction	<i>M</i>	29.71 _a	43.03 _b	32.48 _a	39.16 _c	32.24 _a	39.86 _{bc}	.14	53.73*	8.28*
	<i>(SD)</i>	(27.01)	(31.94)	(26.01)	(31.08)	(26.52)	(31.10)			
Body shame	<i>M</i>	2.75 _a	2.89 _a	2.77 _a	2.87 _a	2.73 _a	2.85 _a	.58	14.19*	.18
	<i>SD</i>	(.96)	(1.06)	(.90)	(1.01)	(.92)	(1.02)			
Negative mood	<i>M</i>	20.46 _b	39.04 _a	31.03 _c	39.87 _a	31.16 _c	40.44 _a	14.89*	81.37*	22.23*
	<i>SD</i>	14.19	24.45	19.83	24.05	19.02	23.72			
Appearance anxiety	<i>M</i>	33.94 _a	35.66 _a	33.90 _a	35.16 _a	34.20 _a	35.72 _a	2.06	29.99*	.62
	<i>SD</i>	8.66	9.57	8.60	9.97	8.78	10.11			

Note 1. The mean scores that do not share the same subscript on the same row are significantly different from each other.

Note 2. * $p < .001$.

4. Discussion

The current study tested the premises of objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) with regard to the role of clothes and type of gaze directed to woman body in a non-Western culture. The findings contributed to the theory in several ways. First, they showed the importance of clothing on the psychology of non-Western women by stressing that the clothes that make women focus on their own bodies have some experiential and psychological consequences, such as increased body dissatisfaction, body shame, negative mood, and appearance anxiety. This result should be interpreted with caution. Revealing clothes are not limited to swimsuits and non-revealing clothes are not limited to swimsuit-jeans pair. Therefore, rather than thinking about clothes as revealing or not, women's experience with clothes seems to be important. In other words, the fact that revealing clothes make women feel more body dissatisfaction, body shame, negative mood, and appearance anxiety than non-revealing clothes should not be interpreted as wearing unrevealing clothes is safer in terms of the experiences they lead to in women; thereby, they should not be advised to wear unrevealing clothes. Instead, this result implies that as women are more vulnerable to Western definition of beauty (Dunkel et al., 2010), they prefer clothes that make them feel more focused on their own body. Hence, internalization of Western definition of beauty might lead women to have more psychological and experiential consequences. Thus, what is toxic in making women experience psychological costs is not only the clothes themselves; but the practice of the culture, which is given in response to seeing women in some kinds of clothes (Dunkel et al., 2010).

The present findings contributed to the objectification research by also showing the effect of the type of gaze/observer on state self-objectification and negative mood levels of women. Self-gaze led to higher state self-objectification than female and male gazes. However, female and male gazes led to higher negative mood than self-gaze. Female and male gazes were indistinguishable from each other for both of the dependent variables. The main effect of type of gaze was not significant for body dissatisfaction, appearance anxiety, and body shame. Since this variable was studied for the first time, related results could not be compared with other studies in the literature.

Nevertheless, statistically insignificant effects of female and male gazes on state SO in the current study were not in line with the main results of the studies of Calogero (2004), Strelan and Hargreaves (2005), and Gay and Castano (2010). These studies generally reported that male gaze resulted in more state SO than female gaze. They compared only male gaze and female gaze; however, they did not compare them with self-gaze. In fact, in this study self-gaze is also a female gaze since all participants were females. It was thought that the effects of the repeated

measures design on presentation of scenarios might have led participants not to process female and male scenarios adequately. Another explanation was defensiveness of the participants, which was also apparent in the mean trait SO of the sample. Mean trait SO of the current sample was -7.52 with a standard deviation of 9.87. Unlike the previous studies (Fredrickson et al., 1998; Harper & Tiggemann, 2008; Tiggemann & Andrew, 2012), these statistics suggested that participants in the current study gave more importance to their competence than their appearance. Young undergraduate female students might have acted defensively in answering the questions when they were exposed to male and female gaze scenarios because of this reason. However, their defensiveness was not high when they were exposed to self-gaze scenarios. This situation might also be related to actor-observer bias. When participants thought that they were looking at themselves in the mirror, they were the actors since they gazed at themselves. But, when they imagined that a female or a male was looking at them, they were the observers of this situation, so their answers might have been differentiated.

Cultural factors might be another important reason of why “type of gaze” led to different results than previous studies. The participants of the current study were members of a non-Western culture whereas majority of objectification research was conducted in Western cultures (Calogero, 2004; Gay & Castano, 2010; Strelan & Hargreaves, 2005). The influence of cultural acceptances about sexual objectification, especially on dress styles and the appropriateness of gaze towards others, might have acted on this result. Although the participants were college students from the capital city of Turkey and they were generally wearing Western style clothing and acculturated to Western culture, there are socially-accepted practices in the culture in which they have been brought up. For example, in Turkey as a sign of respect people do not stare at each other or point at each other. It is not culturally acceptable for men to stare at women and sexually objectify them. Therefore, especially males do not tend to stare overtly at women and typically avoid eye contact especially with the women even if they wear modern clothes. Males shift seats in the buses and trains so as to not sit next to a woman unless necessary. As a consequence of these cultural practices, participants’ answers might have differentiated in self-gaze and male-female gaze scenarios. When they were alone, the participants objectified themselves more than when they imagined themselves as being looked at by other people. This result might be best explained by cultural effects as Loughnan and colleagues (2015) did. These researchers showed that non-Western cultures reported lower levels of SO than Western cultures. As a result, the authors concluded that traditional cultures of objectification research are more prone to self-objectification. Moreover, these researchers showed that gender related differences might also be different in Western and non-Western cultures. They claimed that

even though there is a general acceptance that women are objectified more than men, this result was completely opposite in Japan and Pakistan (Loughnan et al., 2015).

Another contribution of this study to objectification research was showing the importance of the interaction of the type of gaze with clothing type on state self-objectification, negative mood, and body dissatisfaction levels. Detailed analyses revealed the role of the internalized gaze (self-gaze) in women's body experiences. While the three types of gaze did not differ across sweater/jeans scenarios, they differed across swimsuit scenarios for state self-objectification and body dissatisfaction. For negative mood, the situation was in the opposite direction. In other words, the three types of gaze differed across swimsuit scenarios, but not in sweater/jeans scenarios.

Until now, research on objectification theory has focused primarily on the comparative effects of female and male gazes upon women's body experiences (Calogero, 2004; Gay & Castano, 2010; Newheiser, LaFrance, & Dovidio, 2010; Tiggemann & Boundy, 2008), measuring self-objectification levels of female and male participants when they interacted with an opposite-sex partner (Garcia, Earnshaw, & Quinn, 2016), or comparing how participants objectify themselves with how they objectify other people (Loughnan et al., 2015; Strelan & Hargreaves, 2005). To the best of our knowledge, there is no study investigating the effects of male and female gazes on women's bodies in comparison to effects of a woman's own internalized observer gaze (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

Results for the interaction of type of gaze and clothing type on state self-objectification demonstrated that self-gaze elicited greater state SO than other gazes only when a swimsuit was the imagined clothing. In other words, self-gaze did not result in statistically greater state SO than other gazes when sweater/jeans pair was the clothing type. Additionally, there was no significant difference between state SO elicited by male gaze and female gaze in either the sweater/jeans or swimsuit scenarios. However, self-gaze, in other words, the interior female gaze showed its detrimental effects when a person's body and body parts were revealed in a swimsuit. Covered by pants and sweater, women might have felt that they hid their "defective" body parts. Hence, the source of the gaze did not lead to significantly different state SO levels when they wore unrevealing clothes. Self-monitoring gaze dominated when women felt more vulnerable to be criticized because of their "not ideal" body and/or their "defective" body part/s are visible to outsiders. This result was important in showing that women carry their monitoring, criticizing, guarding gaze within themselves. Thus, they protect their body and appearance from the criticisms of this internal guarding gaze, in fact, from themselves.

Results for the interaction of type of gaze and clothes on body dissatisfaction revealed that for sweater-jeans scenarios, type of gaze did not differ significantly in terms of body dissatisfaction. However, when participants imagined themselves trying on a swimsuit, the greatest body dissatisfaction was revealed in self-gaze whereas the least body dissatisfaction was obtained in male gaze condition. Female gaze was not statistically different from the two other types of gazes. It was thought that when an unrevealing item of clothing was imagined to be tried on, females might have felt safe from receiving body related criticisms; thus, the source of the gaze did not matter in the level of body dissatisfaction. However, when a revealing piece of clothing was imagined, body dissatisfaction was elevated thereby to the source of the gaze gained importance. Specifically, self-gaze led to the highest body dissatisfaction, whereas opposite-sex gaze elicited the least body dissatisfaction. Female gaze score, however, was not statistically different from either gazes in terms of body dissatisfaction. This finding might be explained by Cattarin, Thompson, Thomas, and Williams' (2000) study, which emphasized the role of social comparison in body dissatisfaction. The present authors did not know what kind of a female was imagined by the participants when they read the scenarios; hence, it was thought that the participants might have imagined a female gaze which was not powerful enough to trigger a social comparison in participants to feel body dissatisfaction.

Post-hoc results for the interaction of type of gaze and clothes were somewhat different for negative mood. Results showed that negative mood was higher across sweater/jeans scenarios than swimsuit scenarios. Moreover, across swimsuit scenarios, type of gaze did not significantly affect participants' negative mood scores. However, when participants imagined they wore a sweater and jean pair, male and female gazes elicited greater negative mood than self-gaze. Female and male gazes did not significantly differ in terms of negative mood in this context.

For negative mood, it was discussed that public conditions (i.e., a context where there are outsiders and viewers) increase negative mood more than private situations, which is parallel to the findings of Tiggemann and Andrew (2012). Interaction effect of type of gaze and clothing on negative mood showed that the type of clothing can alter this result, but the premise is valid only for unrevealing clothing, and not for revealing clothing. A revealing piece of clothing (i.e., swimsuit) increases negative mood so much that the source of gaze/setting does not matter; on the other hand, unrevealing clothing (i.e., a sweater and jeans pair) keeps negative mood at an optimum level that type of gaze can show its effects across its three levels, whereby outsiders' gazes reveal greater negative mood than self-gaze. This might be related to some cognitive processes, such as not being distracted by internalized beauty standards. In other words, when participants imagined themselves wearing a sweater/jeans pair, they might have not been quite distracted by internalized beauty standards, since their bare body was not visible to others.

Hence, they might have enough personal resources to process the source of their emotions, especially the negative ones. They might have thought which type of gaze lead to more negative mood. However, when they imagined themselves in swimsuits, they might have been so distracted by the internalized beauty standards and comparing their bare body with this ideal that they were overwhelmed by the negative mood they experience and could not process the source of the negative mood.

Unlike body dissatisfaction and negative mood, MANOVA results did not show significant differences in body shame and appearance anxiety across different scenarios. Tiggemann and Andrew (2012) found significant differences across each scenario for body shame. This might be due to the fact they used a different version of the body shame scale of OBC scales. They modified the scale by “Right now I am feeling...” phrase so that each item of the body shame subscale began with these words. This modification might have addressed the instant feelings of body shame in the scenarios better. Another explanation might be that imagining oneself in a specific scenario might not be strong enough to elicit differences in body shame. For example, in an actual manipulation, Tiggemann and Boundy (2008) used compliments in their study and found significant differences in body shame, although they used the original body shame scale of the OBC scales. Appearance anxiety seems to be closely linked with shame. When women compare their body with the culturally-idealized beauty standards, they report anxiety regarding their appearance, but they also feel shame in not meeting the beauty standards. Shame creates confusion, since it makes people to turn to themselves (Lewis, 1992). Women feel shame because they fall short of the ideal. Negative emotions led by shame, lead women to make corrective attempts to change their appearance (Lewis, 1992). Hence, women may attempt to use cosmetics, exercise, start a diet, undergo plastic surgeries, or they may develop symptoms of eating and/or depressive disorders (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Noll & Fredrickson, 1998).

The current study has a number of implications. First, this study showed how women might feel in Western and non-Western cultures when they wear revealing clothes. Body shame, appearance anxiety, body dissatisfaction, negative mood and state self-objectification might deter women from engaging in daily activities such as going to sports, the beach, or a swimming pool (Tiggemann & Andrew, 2012). BMI group comparisons revealed that overweight women are more vulnerable to these negative psychological effects. In fact, this group of young people are more in need of engaging in sports and exercise (Slater & Tiggemann, 2010). Second, results indicated the detrimental effects of internalized sociocultural practices and the observing eye on the psychology of women in a non-Western culture. Exposure to hard-to-attain thin Western beauty ideals posed in advertisements and media seem to be affecting women via social comparisons and disrupt the psychological functioning of women, especially of those who are

overweight. Women seem to believe that their bodies have some “defective” parts and their psychology is affected negatively (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Thus, the present findings indicate the necessity for improving the governmental regulations for the media sector in Turkey, as it has been done in France, where bans have been implemented for underweight and underage models. According to a bill passed by the lower house of France’s Parliament, models are required to see a doctor to obtain a bill of health. They must be over 18, and they should have a healthy BMI and agree to sustain this BMI for the following years (BBC news, 2015). Moreover, if a commercial image has used tools to alter thinness of a model, it must have a cigarette-package style warning on it (BBC news, 2017). Third, the results of this study may also have practical implications for the process of psychotherapy. When working with women patients suffering from eating disorders, psychotherapists can offer psychoeducation about the sociocultural origins of the development of symptoms. They can discuss sexual objectification and how it is converted into self-objectification, and then highlight the ways in which self-objectification might contribute to or trigger an episode, a feeling or a symptom. Treatment studies of eating disorders illustrate that the effective means of psychotherapy is cognitive behavioral therapy. Among its techniques, cognitive restructuring was reported to be very effective in the treatment of body image in eating disorders (Rosen, 1996; Rosen, Saltzberg, & Srebnik, 1989). Therefore, while restructuring cognitions about body and body perception; participants attention might be called on the the strong effects of the society and the individuals vulnerability to accept beauty rules of the society. By this way, clients might find alternative explanations about how they feel about their bodies and question their distorted thoughts and beliefs about their body.

The current study is not without its limitations. First, due to the nature of the manipulations used, the scenarios were imaginary. Future studies are suggested to employ actual manipulations to manipulate state self-objectification more effectively. Second, the present study included 6 scenarios on a repeated measures design to eliminate individual differences as an external variable. It used counterbalancing to control for sequence effects. However, reading 6 scenarios consecutively might have tired participants, since it required lots of imaginary work. This might have hindered the detection of alterations in body shame and appearance anxiety.

In conclusion, the current study contributed to what is known in the body image literature about the role of different clothing types on women’s perceptions of themselves when viewed by three different types of observers (self, female and male) in a non-Western culture. It has been shown that when clothing types are interacted with these different observers, the level of negative psychological consequences for women may differ. Thus, these two factors are important determinants of psychological well-being of contemporary women in a non-Western culture.

References

1. BBC news (2015, December 18). France passes bill banning ‘excessively thin’ models. Retrieved May 4, 2017 from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-35130792>
2. BBC news (2017, September 30). Is she photoshopped? In France now, they have to tell you. Retrieved January 2, 2018 from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-41443027>
3. Berscheid, E., Hatfield [Walster], E., & Bohrnstedt, G. (1972). Body image – A Psychology Today Questionnaire. *Psychology Today*, 6, 57–67.
4. Calogero, R. M. (2004). A test of objectification theory: The effect of the male gaze on appearance concerns in college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28, 16–21.
5. Calogero, R. M., Herbozo, S., & Thompson, J. K. (2009). Complimentary weightism: The potential costs of appearance-related commentary for women’s self-objectification. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 33(1), 120–132.
6. Cattarin, J. A., Thompson, J. K., Thomas, C., & Williams, A. R. (2000). Body image, mood, and televised images of attractiveness: The role of social comparison. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19(2), 220–239.
7. Dunkel, T. M., Davidson, D., & Qurashi, S. (2010). Body satisfaction and pressure to be thin in younger and older Muslim and non-Muslim women: The role of Western and non- Western dress preferences. *Body Image*, 7, 56–65.
8. Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 37, 75–86.
9. 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.
10. Fredrickson, B. L., Roberts, T. A., Noll, S. L., Quinn, D. M., & Twenge, J. M. (1998). That swimsuit becomes you: Sex differences in self-objectification, restrained eating and math performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(1), 269–284.
11. Gapinski, K. D., Brownell, K. D., & LaFrance, M. (2003). Body objectification and “fat talk”: Effects on emotion, motivation, and cognitive performance. *Sex Roles*, 48(9/10), 377–388.
12. Garcia, R. L., Earnshaw, V. A., & Quinn, D. M. (2016). Objectification in action: Self- and other-objectification in mixed-sex interpersonal interactions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(2), 213–228.
13. Garner, D. M., Olmsted, M. A., & Polivy, J. (1983). Development and validation of a multi- dimensional eating disorder inventory for anorexia nervosa and bulimia. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 2, 15–34.
14. Gattino, S., De Piccoli, N., Fedi, A., Boza, M., & Rollero, C. (2017). A cross-cultural study of biological, psychological and social antecedents of self-objectification in Italy and Romania. *Sex Roles*, 78 (5-6), 325-337.
15. Gay, R. K., & Castano, E. (2010). My body or my mind: The impact of state and trait objectification on women’s cognitive resources. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 695–703.
16. George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference, 17.0 update* (10a ed.) Boston: Pearson.
17. Harper, B. J., & Tiggemann, M. (2008). The effect of thin ideal media images on women’s self-objectification, mood, and body image. *Sex Roles*, 58, 649–657.

18. Hart, E. A., Leary, M. R., & Rejeski, W. J. (1989). The measurement of social physique anxiety. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11*, 94–104
19. Hebl, M. R., King, E. B., & Lin, J. (2004). The swimsuit becomes us all: Ethnicity, gender and vulnerability to self-objectification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(10), 1322–1331.
20. Heinberg, L. J., & Thompson, J. K. (1995). Body image and televised images of thinness and attractiveness: A controlled laboratory investigation. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 14*, 1–14.
21. Kaschak, E. (1992). *Engendered lives: A new psychology of women's experience*. New York: Basic Books.
22. Leary, M. R. (1983a). A brief version of the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9*, 371–376.
23. Leary, M. R. (1983b). Social anxiousness: The construct and its measurement. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 47*, 66–75.
24. Lewis, M. (1992). *Shame: The exposed self*. New York: Free Press.
25. Loughnan, S., Fernandez-Campos, S., Vaes, J., Anjum, G., Aziz, M., Harada, C., Holland, E., Singh, I., Puvia, E., & Tsuchiya, K. (2015). Exploring the role of culture in sexual objectification: A seven nations study. *Revue Internationale De Psychologie Sociale, 28*(1), 125–152.
26. Martins, Y., Tiggemann, M., & Kirkbride, A. (2007). Those speedos become them: The role of self-objectification in gay and heterosexual men's body image. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*(5), 634–647.
27. Mckinley, N. M., & Hide, J. S. (1996). The objectified body consciousness scale: Development and validation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*, 181–215.
28. McNair, D., Lorr, M., & Droppelman, L. (1971). *Edits manuals for the Profile of Mood States*. San Diego, CA: Education and Industrial Testing Service.
29. Moradi, B. (2010). Addressing gender and cultural diversity in body image: Objectification theory as a framework for integrating theories and grounding research. *Sex Roles, 63*(1), 138–148.
30. Mülazımoğlu-Ballı, Ö., & Aşçı, F. H. (2006). Reliability and validity study of Social Physique Anxiety Inventory. *Hacettepe Journal of Sport Sciences, 17*(1), 11–19.
31. Newheiser, A-K., LaFrance, M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2010). Others as objects: How women and men perceive the consequences of self-objectification. *Sex Roles, 63*, 657–671.
32. Noll, S. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). A mediational model linking self-objectification, body shame and disordered eating. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 623–636.
33. Quinn, D. M., Kallen, R. W., & Cathey, J. (2006). Body on my mind: The lingering effect of state self-objectification. *Sex Roles, 55*, 869–874.
34. Quinn, D. M., Kallen, R. W., Twenge, J. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2006). The disruptive effect of self-objectification on performance. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*, 59–64.
35. Rosen, J. C. (1996). Body image assessment and treatment in controlled studies of eating disorders. *International Journal of Eating Disorders, 20*(4), 331–343.
36. Rosen, J. C., Saltzberg, E. & Srebrik, D. (1989). Cognitive behavior therapy for body image. *Behavior Therapy, 20*, 393–404.

37. Salk, R. H., & Engeln-Maddox, R. (2011). Fat talk among college women is both contagious and harmful. *Sex Roles, 66*, 636–645.
38. Strelan, P., & Hargreaves, D. (2005). Women who objectify other women: The vicious circle of objectification. *Sex Roles, 52*(9/10), 707–712.
39. Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
40. Tiggemann, M. (2001). Person x situation interactions in body dissatisfaction. *International Journal of Eating Disorders, 29*, 65–70.
41. Tiggemann, M., & Andrew, R. (2012). Clothes make a difference: The role of self-objectification. *Sex Roles, 66*, 646–654.
42. Tiggemann, M., & Boundy, M. (2008). Effect of environment and appearance compliment on college women's self-objectification, mood, body shame and cognitive performance. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 299–405.
43. Yilmaz, T. (2017). *An experimental study on women to understand negative mood, appearance anxiety, body dissatisfaction, and body shame considering Adlerian theory and objectification theory* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.



©2019 by the Author(s); licensee Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology, Messina, Italy. This article is an open access article, licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Unported License. Mediterranean Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol.7, No. 2 (2019).

International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

DOI: 10.6092/2282-1619/2019.7.2108