

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MALE GAZER: APPLICATION OF AMBIVALENT SEXISM  
THEORY AND SOCIOSEXUALITY ON MALE GAZING BEHAVIOR

By

2016

Benjamin L. Compton

Submitted to the graduate degree program in  
Communication Studies and the Graduate Faculty  
of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

---

Chairperson Dr. Jeffrey A. Hall

---

Dr. Adrienne Kunkel

---

Dr. Yan Bing Zhang

Date Defended: May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016

The Thesis Committee for Benjamin L. Compton  
certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

Characteristics of the Male Gazer: Application of  
Ambivalent Sexism Theory and Sociosexuality on Male Gazing Behavior

---

Chairperson Dr. Jeffrey A. Hall

Date approved: May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016

## Abstract

Gaze behavior has been defined as a method of focusing social attention, which potentially can aid in the process of choosing a potential sexual or romantic partner during mate selection. The male gaze refers to visual inspection of a female's sexual body parts by men. This investigation seeks to understand what characteristics of men are associated with men's self-reported gazing behaviors and men's attitudes regarding their interpersonal gazing. Theories on sexual preferences (i.e., sociosexuality) and gender attitudes (i.e., ambivalent sexism theory) were used to predict men's gaze behavior and attitudes. Specifically, five factors of male gaze were developed and pilot tested: frequency of gaze behavior, unacceptability of gaze behavior, male enjoyment while gazing, perceived female enjoyment while being the recipient of male gaze, and awareness of gaze behavior. In the main study, heterosexual men ( $N= 236$ ) completed an online survey. Results demonstrated that attitudes towards short-term sex, desire for short-term sex, and hostile sexist beliefs were the best predictors of frequency of gaze behavior, acceptability of this behavior, and male enjoyment while gazing. Sociosexuality and ambivalent sexism theory, as well as objectification theory, were applied to explain the findings.

**Keywords:** *ambivalent sexism theory; male gaze; objectification; sociosexuality*

## Acknowledgements

I'd like to thank Dr. Jeffrey Hall for guiding me, being patient with me, and challenging me through this research project. I can't believe how many drafts of this manuscript I went through, but thanks to Jeff's critical feedback, each version drastically improved. I am light years away from being the researcher that I want to be, but Jeff's advising and teaching has helped me get one step closer. Although known as the Flirt Doctor, I will always refer to him as the Research Therapist.

In addition, I would also like to thank both Dr. Zhang and Dr. Kunkel for sitting on my committee despite their busy schedules. Yan Bing, in your classes I learned the basics that helped me in creating the foundation of this research project, as well as many other projects. And it was your stories that helped me understand that conducting research doesn't have to be a dry experience, but instead an adventure. Adrienne, it was your kindness that influenced my decision to come to KU in the first place. That kind of hospitality is something I will never forget. Thank you both for all of the feedback and I look forward to continuing my research career knowing I have learned from the best.

Finally, I want to thank Dr. Jonathan Bowman, for mentoring me through my first two years of graduate school. All of his predictions have come through. First, that I would get into the graduate programs I desired. Success. Second, that during graduate school, I would call him complaining that I was incapable of getting through graduate school. True. And third, that I would be my most physically attractive at age 25. Well, on that last one I am still waiting, but I believe in his judgment. Thanks, Bowmanizer.

## Table of Contents

|                        |    |
|------------------------|----|
| Introduction.....      | 1  |
| Literature Review..... | 2  |
| Rationale.....         | 8  |
| Methods.....           | 22 |
| Results.....           | 32 |
| Discussion.....        | 35 |
| References.....        | 46 |
| Tables.....            | 55 |
| Appendices.....        | 67 |

## **Introduction**

Humans interact everyday across a wide range of demographic markers. Viewing the interpersonal behaviors of strangers in public places, one notices these interactions may take place through verbal or nonverbal means. Much qualitative research has examined the male gaze, or the visual inspection of a woman's face, body, or body parts linked to sexual reproduction (Gervais, Holland, & Dodd, 2013; Moradi & Huang, 2008), from the perspective of the observed (i.e., women), yet there is a dearth of research that addresses the observer (i.e., men). While potential consequences for women who receive male gaze has been researched (Calogero, 2004) and theories have been created to help explain this behavior (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997), to fully understand the male gaze there needs to be an examination of the actual individuals who enact this behavior in daily life. Objectification theory has posited that patriarchal society potentially views women as objects (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Men's gaze behavior may be an indicator to better understand the cognitive and emotional experiences associated with men's beliefs and actions regarding the objectification of women.

The purpose of the present investigation is to determine whether heterosexual men's social and sexual attitudes influence their likelihood to engage in interpersonal gaze behavior and their underlying attitudes about gaze behavior. Tendencies in male gazing habits can help to understand how men communicate their desires towards women, and whether or not this nonverbal behavior is believed to be appropriate to enact in a public setting. Gender attitudes, such as ambivalent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996), and preferences for sexual behavior with regards to sociosexuality (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991) will be used to predict men's likelihood to a) more frequently gaze, b) see this behavior as acceptable, c) enjoy this behavior, d) perceive women to enjoy being gazed at, or e) be aware of their interpersonal behavior.

In an attempt to better understand male gaze behaviors, this manuscript will cover previous research conducted on gazing behavior and build an argument towards why certain male attitudes and experiences may predict their likelihood to engage in gazing activity and their attitudes about gazing. An evolutionary perspective for why gazing may have become a habit in daily human interaction will be presented. The evolutionary perspective, specifically related to mate selection, will then be used to predict one hypothesis and produce one research question. Next, the cultural perspectives will be discussed as an influence over gazing activity, and will then be used to predict one hypothesis. In addition, a final research question will be presented that combines both biological and cultural arguments to determine which factor may be the strongest predictor of gazing activity. After all hypotheses and research questions have been proposed, the specific methods used will be described, followed by the reporting of the results found. Finally, all results will be interpreted and the implications will be discussed.

## **Literature Review**

Male gaze has been conceptualized in many ways and is made up of many components (Henderson, 2003). Specifically, gaze has been defined as an indicator of social cognition and attention focus (Itier & Batty, 2009; Langton, Watt, & Bruce, 2000). One major component of the gazing behavior has been frequency of gaze (Cary, 1978; Ellsworth & Langer, 1976; Kendon, 1967). Frequency of gaze is the quantifiable amount of times an individual looks at a specific target person. This has been studied in regards to mutual eye contact between two persons (Conway, Jones, DeBruine, & Little 2008; Mason, Tatkov, & Macrae 2005) as well as frequency of gaze behavior directed at the female body, specifically gazed directed at sexual body parts (Bolmont et al., 2014; Hall et al., 2011; Lu & Chang, 2012).

The second component of gaze includes attitudes towards this gazing behavior. This involves both the attitude of the individual involved in gaze behavior (i.e., observer) as well as the target's (i.e., observed) perceived attitudes. For the observer, their motivation for doing so has been linked to either romantic (Bolmont et al., 2014) or sexual desire (Hall et al, 2011; Lykins et al, 2006). Regardless of motivation, the action of gazing may result in positive feeling or enjoyment, for the observer. Observer enjoyment involves the emotions that an individual experiences from - or while - engaging in gaze behavior. However, little to no research has looked at this link between the external act of gazing and the internal feelings experienced during this action. It should be noted that some research has focused on the observed individual's emotions, such as how facial expressions regulate the way that observers' employ gaze cues (Bayliss et al., 2007). Still, research is lacking in regards to the observer's emotions as a result of gaze behavior.

Similar to observer enjoyment, little to no quantitative research has focused on an observer's perceived attitudes of the observed individual (e.g., the observer's perception of the observed individual's enjoyment of being the recipient of gaze behavior). Most research on the observed individual has been qualitative research focusing on the objectification of the female figure (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Gervais et al., 2013; Moradi & Huang, 2008). Findings suggest that this objectification has led to lower self-esteem, anxiety, and many other mental health risks for women (Frerickson & Roberts, 1997; Keelan, Dion, & Dion, 1992). Some individuals believe that all women enjoy receiving male gaze (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). In cultures where women are sexually objectified, it is often (inaccurately) believed that these women enjoy receiving sexual attention from others and that this type of behavior is meant to compliment women rather than discourage or oppress them (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).



Therefore, observed enjoyment is defined as the observer's belief that the observed woman enjoys being the target of men's gaze behavior.

A third component of gazing behavior is an observer's belief that such gaze behavior is morally and culturally acceptable or unacceptable. An individual's cultural beliefs surrounding gender may result in the belief that a specific nonverbal behavior such as a gaze is an appropriate behavior to enact (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). If men believe that all women enjoy being the recipient of gaze behavior, then it follows that these same men may also see the very act of gazing as positive, acceptable behavior. Therefore, the perceived unacceptability of gaze behavior is directly related to the observer's belief that engaging in gaze behavior is inappropriate behavior.

Finally, in order for an individual to form opinions on the acceptability of such behavior, an individual must be self-aware that they participate in these gaze actions. Individuals who are unaware of their behavior when (and if) they are gazing at a woman's body may find it difficult to form an opinion on the positive or negative value of the very act of gazing. If individual men personally view this behavior as negative, then they must recognize if they themselves are participating as a first step towards actively not gazing at women's bodies. Therefore, gaze behavior awareness is the amount that an individual is aware of their behavior while engaged in gazing behavior.

Both frequency and location of gaze have been operationalized through the use of eye-tracking technology (Bolmont et al., 2014; Hall et al., 2011; Lykins et al., 2006; Rupp & Wallen, 2007), observation of research assistant coders (Ellsworth & Langer, 1976), and visual cueing tasks (Koranyi & Rothermund, 2012; Gervais et al., 2013; Maner, Gailliot, & Miller, 2009). The majority of this research has been done with participants viewing photos on a computer screen

(Bayliss, Frischen, Fenske, & Tipper, 2007; Lu & Chang, 2012; Maner et al., 2009), with only a few studies actually using in-person gaze tracking (Ellsworth & Langer, 1976). Using eye-tracking software (or other research means) has been vital in capturing frequency and location of the male gaze. However, these procedures alone have been unable to produce any findings that address the attitudes individuals hold specifically about their gazing habits. Therefore, self-reporting methods are necessary as a way to attempt to capture men's attitudes and beliefs regarding the male gaze.

Overall, few studies have involved self-reporting on behaviors and attitudes from the perspective of men. Current research on the male gaze is rich in behavior tracking, but lacks understanding in men's cognitive awareness and attitudes in regards to this behavior. Therefore, there is a current need in male gaze literature to focus on men's cognitive awareness and attitudes towards gazing at the female figure.

### **Gaze Purpose**

Evolutionary theories of sexual selection (Darwin, 1859) and mate preference (Buss, 1989) have lead to both psychological and physical differences in humans, while also influencing cultural ideologies and expectancies as noted in both social role theory (Eagly, 1987) and ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996). If both evolution and culture have combined to influence the human experience, then it is important to understand how individuals perceive their social reality as well as their environment. One tool for human perception in analyzing others' social behavior is that of the human gaze (Argyle & Cook, 1976). The use of vision functions as a way of focusing social attention, often unintentionally, on social targets who exhibit some sort of related interest to the perceiver (Eastwick & Tidwell, 2013). Humans have evolved mental adaptations for the unconscious and initial stages of social perception, which can aid in such

processes as mate selection (Eastwick & Tidwell, 2013). This visual perception is an “active process in which incoming stimuli are combined with learned information in order to make deductions which go far beyond the immediate sensory evidence” (Grumet, 2008, p. 123). If the human gaze serves the function of understanding external stimuli, then these stimuli can be environmental features or other human faces or bodies. With just one look, an individual can decipher another’s sex, age, emotional status, gaze direction, and potentially the intentions of the target (Macrae & Quadflieg, 2010).

If the human gaze serves the function of focusing cognitive attention, then it is important to understand the destination of where the gaze is focused. Like the human face, the human body is a relevant source of social and biological information (Macrae & Quadflieg, 2010). In line with the evolutionary theory of mate selection, the shape of human bodies indicates potential reproductive capacity (Buss, 1989; Buss, 1992). For males, the shape of the body can signal physical strength, such as great size or height. For females, the shape of the body, specifically fat distribution on the female figure in relation to waist-to-hip ratio, can signal higher likelihood of successful childbirth (Buss, 1989; Singh, 1993, Tassinary & Hansen, 1998). This ratio plays an important role in sexual attraction where females who may be too thin or too overweight may appear less youthful or healthy, both valuable characteristics during mate selection (Buss, 1989; Cuenca-Guerra & Quezada, 2004).

Sexual selection has allowed males to be aroused by visual stimuli, such as the female figure (Symons, 1979). It has been argued that the female figure more sexually arouses males than the male figure arouses females due to the sex difference in parental investment. Since a male can impregnate a female and then have little-to-no investment in the raising of the child, sexual selection “favored the male tendency to become sexually aroused by the sight of females”

(Symons, 1979, p. 180). This visual arousal could be considered proportional to the female's reproductive value, and it is in line with parental investment theory (Trivers, 1972). Because males invest less during reproduction and have the ability to reproduce more offspring in a shorter amount of time, it makes biological sense for males to receive more sexual arousal from the female figure than vice versa. For women, receiving sexual arousal simply from visually viewing the male figure may prove to be harmful. Given that females invest more during reproduction (i.e., biological investments like pregnancy), sexual arousal may lead to the pursuit of mating with a specific partner, and it may be in the female's interest to not pursue as many potential mates so as to decrease the chance in pregnancy. Instead, such gratification rewards males, which would in turn motivate them to engage in visual behavior that maximizes their arousal. Therefore, males' desire to look at the female figure is an adapted behavior to maximize the opportunity to seek out potential reproductive partners (Symons, 1979).

Gaze may serve a biological function, but cultural influences may also influence the amount of male gaze behavior (Argyle & Cook, 1979). Indeed, different cultural norms lead to varying tendencies in gaze behavior (Hall, 1963). While sexual selection argues that male gaze may serve a biological function, objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) argues that the male gaze is a product of cultural divides between men and women. According to the theory, women can be seen as objects that are defined by their physical traits. In the realm of the male gaze, sexual objectification can occur where their sexual body parts define their womanhood. This objectification leads to the ever-constant evaluation of women based on their physical attributes and appearance. Whereas sexual selection would argue that a man gazing at women is sexually arousing as a way to motivate men to pursue courtship, objectification theory may claim that objectifying women sexually arouses men due to cultural power differences.

## **Rationale**

The gaze serves as a nonverbal tool for humans to utilize to form perceptions of their surroundings (Argyle & Cook, 1976). However, given that internal beliefs can often influence individuals' enacted behavior, more information on men's perceptions of their own gaze behavior, as well as gaze behavior in general, can provide a more clear understanding of what gaze behavior may be communicating to the outside world. Men's gaze behavior is most likely the product of both biological and cultural circumstances.

## **Natural Selection**

In 1859, Charles Darwin proposed a theory of natural selection, where species that had adaptable traits that better suited them to survive their environmental conditions, such as predators, competitive for food, or climate challenges, were more likely to survive and reproduce. Darwin concluded that many of the physical characteristics of species that increased the likelihood of survival, and thus the likelihood to reproduce, were partially heritable and therefore passed down genetically to offspring. Environments heavily influence natural selection, where genes that enhanced an organism's chance of survival within their physical environment would be passed down genetically in order to ensure the survival of offspring while other traits decreased in prevalence. The relationship between environment and natural selection resulted in the theory of adaptation, where inherited characteristics that were relevant to and beneficial in environmental conditions were inherited by offspring as a way to increase survival and reproductive success. Therefore, an adaptation functioned to solve a survival problem, such as aiding an organism in finding food - or avoiding becoming food (Buss, Haselton, Shackelford, Bleske, & Wakefield, 1998). Natural selection doesn't just serve as a way to adapt purely physical features, but also behavioral processes (Eastwick & Tidwell, 2013). An example of this

would be how primates adapted to live in social groups as a way to gain an advantage in the realm of protection from predators, access to food, and contact with potential mates (Fleagle, 2013).

### **Sexual Selection**

With natural selection describing the process of characteristics being transmitted genetically, Darwin (1859) created the term sexual selection as a way to explain the development of characteristics that did not seem to directly guarantee species survival. Theories of natural selection deal with survival; theories of sexual selection deal with reproduction. Sexual selection therefore focuses on the “characteristics that enhance successful mating, even if they imposed a potential survival cost, [which] can be selected if the mating enhancement is enough to compensate for their costs on longevity” (Kenrick & Luce, 2000, p. 44). One example of this is the male peacock’s colorful feathers. In regards to survival, possessing large bright feathers may impede the survival for male peacocks because it hinders flight. However, if these bright feathers served the function of attracting potential mates and reproducing more often, then the benefits outweigh the potential costs.

The concept of adaptation was not commonly applied to humans until many years later, when natural selection and sexual selection were first applied to human mating behaviors (Wilson, 1975). This led to the theory of differential parental investment (Trivers, 1972), which stated that females invest more heavily than do males, in regards to pregnancy, lactation, and nurturing. Therefore, females had much more to lose if they were to choose a less invested mating partner. This difference in parental investment proposed that mental adaptations would create a sex difference in mating strategies, such that females would evolve behavioral strategies to be more choosy and cautious in mate selection, while males in turn evolved strategies to

pursue many sexual opportunities. This sex difference is believed to be a psychological adaptation to increase the potential of reproductive success after mate selection (Eastwick & Tidwell, 2013).

### **Mate Selection**

The selection of a mate is an important personal decision (Gunaydin, Selcuk, & Hazan, 2013, p. 103). Mate selection is the natural human process of deciding on an appropriate partner for reproduction (Schmitt, 2008). Natural selection favors which genes are necessary for the species to survive; mate selection helped individuals to identify which mates are the best to create offspring with. As mentioned above, the theory of parental investment claimed that each sex had different investment in the raising and survival of offspring (Trivers, 1972). The theory claimed that parental investment was not just in regards to pre-birth, but also post-birth survival, when offspring were vulnerable to potential dangers that directly threatened their long-term survival. Because survival of the offspring post-birth was vital, it involved both the mother and father's investment to increase the likelihood of survival. Therefore, early humans would have adapted the psychological functioning to decipher potential mates physical and psychological traits, especially ones associated with parenting (Buss, 1989). Specifically, females would search for evidence that a male mate could provide the strongest ability to provide resources and physical protection for offspring, while males would search for evidence that a female mate had the highest reproductive capacity and nurturing capabilities (Buss, 1992).

One way that males assess a female's reproductive capacity is through the female's youth, wherein youth signals better fertility and the potential for better health (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Therefore, males found more youthful physical characteristics as more attractive and appealing, such as soft skin, smooth hair, full lips, and good muscle tone, all characteristics that

are available through visual inspection (Buss, 1989). The male gaze may be used as a way to sort through which potential female mates were most desirable (Macrae & Quadflieg, 2010).

However, as the male body is not as strained during child rearing, male's reproductive capacity was not as strongly tied to age. This explains why less emphasis is placed on male physical appearance as an indicator of reproductive capacity for females compared to by males.

Mate selection is a series of steps to help to narrow down the pool of eligible mates to find the best possible reproductive partner (Gunaydin et al., 2013). In essence, mate selection starts at the question of "Who is accessible?", to "Who is appealing?", then to "Who is attainable?", and finally to "Who is the one?". Such mate selection involves accessibility, appeal, attainability, and compatibility (Gunaydin et al., 2013). One of the most important factors on narrowing the human population down to a realistic mate pool is propinquity, or distance in space. It is hard to court another if one lacks any interaction with that individual. This can be physical propinquity, cyber propinquity, or social propinquity. Physical propinquity plays a vital role in initiating relationships, and, in fact, may even boost initial attraction (Kossinets & Watts, 2006; Mayer & Puller, 2008). Whereas geographical proximity to another individual used to be the primary indicator of possible mate selection, the creation and daily use of the internet and dating applications have allowed for cyber propinquity to connect individuals who may never had previously crossed physical paths (Gunaydin et al., 2013). Internet technology has allowed individuals, who geographically could be many miles apart, to communicate virtually through internet media, such as online dating websites, forums, chat rooms, and social media (Rosenfeld & Thomas, 2012). However, regardless of how prevalent online interaction may have become, meeting through friends is currently still the most common way for heterosexual couples to meet (Rosenfeld & Thomas, 2012). This is called social propinquity, or closeness within social space



or social networks (Gunaydin, et al., 2013). Mate selection can occur within social spaces in that an individual may be set up on a date with a mutual friend, or may interact with a stranger at a friend's party. All three kinds of proximity increase the potential for interaction, thus creating the opportunity for reproduction.

Of course, simple interaction with another individual does not necessarily mean that they would serve as a potential mate, but rather concerns who is appealing as a potential mate. Proximity - whether physical, virtual, or social - helps introduce individual to available potential mates, however, not all potential mates will be necessarily appealing. Such factors influencing appeal include similarity, familiarity, physical attractiveness, affective state, social status or resources, and personality all impact whether or not an individual will be interested in pursuing a specific mate (Gunaydin et al., 2013). The specific appeal factors of physical appearance, social status/resources, and personality have been focused on in looking at sex differences and the importance of these characteristics in mate selection (Gunaydin et al., 2013). Within this stage, gaze behavior can help to be a first filter through these desired characteristics (Macrae & Quadflieg, 2010).

While specific appeal factors aid in decision-making during mate selection, once the various appeal factors has filtered out whom an individual deems interesting, an individual must deal with the reality of who is attainable (Gunaydin et al., 2013). The biggest indicator of attainability is one's degree reciprocity of romantic interest (e.g., it is hard to mate with an individual if that individual has no mutual interest or desire). As mentioned previously, mate selection calls for individuals to seek out characteristics such as resources, attractiveness, and good personality in a potential mate, and individuals who possess these qualities tend to be more selective when choosing potential mates (Lee, Loewenstein, Ariely, Hong, & Young, 2008).

These factors help individuals to be selective in mate choice, and thus selectivity plays a vital role in mutual interest. Therefore, pursuing a potential mate who selectively reciprocates one's interest assures that the other person is attainable yet desirable as a mate (Gunaydin et al., 2013). The factors that potentially make up selectivity (i.e., resources, attractiveness, personality) can be thought as a hierarchy, where depending upon how much an individual possesses of each can determine how desirable they are. For example, if an individual has a high number of resources, is very attractive, and has a great personality, they may fall higher on the hierarchy of desirability. Therefore, this individual will most likely be more selective and only be interested in other individuals who are also higher on the hierarchy of desirability (Lee et al., 2008).

For an individual to determine if a potential mate is attainable, gaze behavior can help to assist this process. If applied to a social environment where there are many individuals potentially looking for a mate, such as a bar, eye gazing at other individuals can serve the function to filter through potential mates' desirable characteristics. If this gaze behavior is occurring from multiple parties within a social setting, there arises the potential for eye contact, where a signal of mutual interest in desirability can be communicated through eye contact (Mason et al., 2005). Individuals are more prone to like and be attracted to others when there is direct eye contact, as opposed to averted eyes (Conway et al., 2008). Repeated direct eye contact gaze may reflect a positive evaluation of another (Mason et al., 2005), and therefore can become a nonverbal signal to judge possible romantic or sexual interest. For example, if an individual is in a bar setting and notices that an attractive woman sits across the bar, that individual may decide to continually gaze to see if the woman possesses other desirable characteristics, such as access to resources or a good personality. As this individual gazes at the woman, she has the

opportunity to mutually gaze. If she returns the interest, increasingly repeated and higher levels of mutual eye contact could signal both parties desire to initiate a potential relationship.

After determining who is mutually attainable and desirable, an individual must now determine who is the best possible mate, or as society often calls “the one” (Gunaydin et al., 2013). Once an individual has filtered down to all of the accessible, appealing, and attainable potential mates, how do they find just one? Early research suggested that this singling out process is related to romantic infatuation (Tennov, 1979). Characteristics of romantic infatuation are physical arousal, mental preoccupation, idealization of the target attraction, and an intense longing for contact with the desired individual. This feeling of infatuation would help to narrow the small select pool of potential mates to just one, and then directs attention away from attractive alternatives (Koranyi & Rothermund, 2012). However, in regards to gaze behavior, this final stage of mate selection involves more than just a visual examination; verbal interaction is necessary to then filter between all possible mate candidates.

Within the four stages of mate selection, gaze behavior is of the most importance within the middle two stages. For individuals to discover who is appealing, gaze behavior can serve as a tool for discovering and analyzing potential mates’ physical characteristics. In addition, gaze behavior also plays an important role for attainability, where visual inspection can help to decipher whether potential mates are currently already in a romantic relationship or are mutually interested via the possibility of mutual eye contact.

### **Sociosexuality**

Desire to engage in short-term mating strategies has been researched in relation to sociosexuality, which is an individual’s tendency or willingness to have short-term, uncommitted sexual relationships (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Sociosexuality is measured in terms of

restricted versus unrestricted individuals. A sexually-restricted individual is one whom is more cautious in engaging in sexual activity and more choosy when deciding on sexual partners. On the other hand, a sexually-unrestricted individual tends to be more willing to engage in sexual activity with a partner and less likely to be choosy about who they sexually interact with. In other words, the desire to seek out more potential sexual partners is a tendency for unrestricted individuals than restricted individuals. It has been suggested that sexually unrestricted individuals focus more attention on the mate selection appeal factors, such as partner physical attraction, rather than more investing appeal factors, such as potential resources and positive parenting behaviors (Maner, Kenrick, Becker, Delton, Hofer, Wilbur, & Neuberg, 2003). Studies on sociosexuality have found that men self-reported a higher willingness to partake in short-term uncommitted sex than women (Schmitt, Alcalay, Allik, Ault, Austers et al., 2005; Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). This can be explained by parental investment theory, where males are less invested in a situation that could lead to the potential of offspring (Trivers, 1972). Therefore, males may be more likely to be behavior in unrestricted ways than are females because males have less to lose in the case that a sexual encounter leads to reproduction. Since unrestricted males may not have the intention of reproduction during a sexual encounter, these males may be more likely to focus on mate characteristics such as physical appearance, rather than on characteristics including paternity confidence and/or willingness to commit. While gaze behavior can aid in determining the desirability of a female mate, physical appearance takes much less time investment for unrestricted males than does comprehending a female's personality or attitudes towards relational commitment.

For males seeking out short-term mates, they would most likely be seeking out females that are mutually interested in short-term relationships so as to avoid violating any expectations.

Since unrestricted men are more likely to engage in short-term sexual behavior, it can be concluded that men who report a higher desire to engage in short-term sexual encounters (i.e., sexual desire) to also be more likely to engage in gaze behaviors (Duncan, Park, Faulkner, Schaller, Neuberg, & Nerick, 2007; Maner et al., 2009). Similarly, because unrestricted men tend to focus more on physical appearance when deciding upon potential sexual partners (Maner et al., 2003), it can be inferred that they may be more aware of their gazing behavior. Therefore, sociosexuality sub-components of sexual behavior (SOI-behavior), sexual attitudes (SOI-attitudes), and sexual desire (SOI-desire) will all positively predict the frequency of gaze behavior and men's awareness of this behavior.

*H1: Sociosexuality scores (i.e., SOI-behavior, SOI-attitudes, SOI-desire) will positively predict their reporting of a) frequency in gazing behavior and b) awareness of their gazing behavior.*

### **Cultural Influence**

It should be noted that while mate selection is in part a natural psychological adaptive process, outside cultural factors have throughout history played a role in mate selection. Although biological processes may regulate an individual's desire, cultural or external factors may influence whether or not these internal desires are acted upon. For example, marriages were historically negotiated by father figures, or elder kinsmen, which impacted the female's freedom of choice in pair bonding (Crook, 1972). Therefore, mate selection is a process of desire, but not necessarily action, where the psychological process of mate selection isn't always 100% unconscious, like other biological processes such as digestion, breathing, or reflexes (Symons, 1979). In this sense, human biology and culture are not isolated from one another and are instead interwoven (Kenrick & Trost, 1993).

Interestingly, while cross-cultural studies find similarities across cultures, there simultaneously tend to be cultural variations as well, which falls in line with evolutionary perspectives (Kenrick & Luce, 2000). For example, while natural selection seeks to explain the human characteristics and behaviors as uniform, adaptations allow for variation dependent on the environment, whether it is physical or social. One example that shows the interconnectedness between biological and cultural preferences is male preference for youth in mate preferences (Kenrick & Keefe, 1992). As in the theory of mate selection, youth can be a symbol of fertility for reproductive capacity, so males tend to seek out youthfulness in female partners (Buss, 1992). When examining developed cultures such as modern Europe and the United States - as compared to developing cultures such as the Philippines - it was found that the age-gap between men and women varied; men in the Philippines married much younger women than did European or American men (Kenrick & Keefe, 1992). This finding highlighted the link between biological mechanisms and culture where the difference in mate age preference may be due to cultural factors. Compared to developing countries, modern countries have a higher access to and use of cosmetics, which allow older women to appear younger (Kenrick & Keefe, 1992). Since youthfulness is a desired characteristic in female mates, males in both developing and modern countries would seek out females who appear naturally or cosmetically youthful. In theory, a 30 year-old American woman may look equivalent to a 20 year-old Philippino woman. Therefore, American men may be less inclined to pursue younger women, and instead opt to potentially mate with older women who can use cosmetics to appear more youthful, diminishing the importance of actual youth as a mate preference for American men. This example of access to cosmetic resources showed the influence that cultural factors might impact biological mate selection processes.

The prevalence of cultural ideals and behavioral preferences serve as an environmental adaptation for males during the process of mate selection (Kenrick & Keefe, 1992). This absorption of cultural norms served the function of enabling individuals to create small societies to survive and to pass on knowledge, such as how to build using tools (Caporeal, 2001). Natural and sexual selection processes determined the tendencies in human mating behavior, while cultural environments altered the expression of genes (Rudman & Glicke, 2008), such that some genetic dispositions are either enacted or suppressed in habitual human behavior due to external circumstances. For example, aggressiveness is a trait that is found in all cultures (Rudman & Glick, 2008). This suggests that aggressive is an evolutionary trait that is innate in the human psyche. However, in some cultures where there are less levels of patriarchy, violence between the sexes is lower than cultures where there is more inequality. Therefore, culture likely has the ability to either enhance or suppress human desires, such as the enactment of aggressiveness. Cultural influence on gendered interactions can be explained through the lens of ambivalent sexism theory.

### **Ambivalent Sexism Theory**

If power distribution within a culture directly relates to individuals' preferences for desirable mate qualities (Eagly & Wood, 1999), then power dispersion also plays a vital role in mate selection. Another theory that examines the role of power on individual beliefs and behavior is ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Ambivalent sexism theory (AST) relies on the belief that gender relations mix the combination of power difference and intimate interdependence cross-culturally (Glick & Fiske, 2001). This combination of power and intimate interdependence created both hostile and benevolent ideologies of men and women, which helped to systematically legitimize ideal gender roles. Overall, sexism has been conceptualized

as a reflection of hostility towards women (Glick & Fiske, 1996). AST breaks this sexism down as a “multidimensional construct that encompasses two sets of sexist attitudes: hostile and benevolent sexism” (Glick & Fiske, 1996, p. 491). The first type of sexism, hostile sexism is simply any prejudice that is a result of an individual’s identified gender (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Hostile sexism is seen as the mental acceptance of male dominance. Typically, this is the easiest type of sexism to notice. An example of this would be the common question asked, “Do you think a woman could be president?” The implication is that women are not able to lead, and that a position like the presidency should always reside in the hands of a man. The second type of sexism, which is oftentimes not as universally recognized as sexism, is benevolent sexism. This is an array of interdependent attitudes toward women that are sexist in terms of perceiving women stereotypically and in restricted roles but that are subjectively positive in feeling tone (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Benevolent sexism often resulted in behavior that is seen as prosocial or intimate, such as helping another or self-disclosure, which AST argued is because of men’s dependency on women as complementary to men. Men’s dependency on women created complementary roles, which resulted from a division of labor where men worked outside the home while women worked in the home. Those traits that men lacked were made up for by women, leading to the common saying that a woman “completes” a man. AST considered benevolent sexism to not be a positive belief because it’s belief is a direct result of gender stereotypes and masculine dominance, even though it could potential arise positive feelings in the perceiver. Also, in regards to the receiver of benevolent sexism, it may not always be met with negativity. Oftentimes, individuals may feel specific actions or comments are well intentioned. A common example of this would be the oft-thought chivalrous action of holding



the door open for a woman. While on the surface it might appear as a nice gesture, AST would claim this action is a result of the woman in need of help stereotype.

Ambivalent sexism theory proposed that both hostile and benevolent sexism was a result of both biological and cultural conditions (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Culturally speaking, patriarchy has been common among most human cultures, while matriarchy is believed to have been significantly less prevalent (Harris, 1991; Stockard & Johnson, 1992). Patriarchy is defined as male ownership of economic, legal, and political institutions (Glick & Fiske, 1996). This constant presence of a patriarchy is suggested to be a probable consequence of biological sex differences. From a biological perspective, AST sees the modern gender roles as a result of sexual selection, sexual dimorphism, and labor division. AST acknowledges that patriarchy may be a result of the sex-difference in size and strength, known as sexual dimorphism (Harris, 1991). As for sexual selection, men have historically had a larger social dominance than women (Pratto, Sidanius, & Stallworth, 1993). And finally, as mentioned previously, the division in labor resulted in women taking a primary role in domestic duties, such as physically carrying the fetus and being the source of nourishment for an infant (Stockard & Johnson, 1992).

Regardless of whether an individual actively enacts expected social role external behaviors, internal mental ideologies can still influence behavior. Ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) states that individuals can possess both hostile and benevolent sexism, which in turn can affect exhibited external behavior. Since hostile sexism often places a power differential between men and women, where women are placed lower within the power hierarchy, it would be assumed that any behavior from men aimed towards women would be seen as appropriate, especially if in the realms of focusing on female physical appearance, such as gaze behavior. Similarly, since part of hostile sexist belief is that women should focus on their

physical appearance (Glick & Fiske, 1996), behaviors that focus attention on physical appearance would be deemed acceptable behavior, while also being enjoyable for the male observer and the observed female.

*H2: Scores of hostile sexism will positively predict a) frequency in gazing behavior and b) observer enjoyment, c) observed female, and negatively predict d) belief the behavior is unacceptable.*

Research on ambivalent sexism has found that scores of hostile sexism and scores of benevolent sexism are positively correlated (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 1999; Glick, Fiske, Mladinic, Saiz, Abrams, Masser, et al. 2000; Glick, Lameiras, Fiske, Eckes, Volpato, et al., 2004). Ambivalent sexism theory explained this correlation by arguing that hostile sexism and benevolent sexism are complementary positions, and not conflicting positions (Glick & Fiske, 2008). For example, if ambivalent sexist belief were a three-story building, hostile sexism would be the top floor, benevolent sexism would be the middle floor, and the lack of sexist belief would be the lower floor. To get to from bottom floor to the top floor, or have hostile sexist beliefs, an individual would have to also pass through the second floor, or possess benevolent sexist beliefs. However, while hostile sexist beliefs often result in expectations about the physical appearance of women, benevolent sexism focuses less on such issues. Therefore, it is hard to know if a man who possessed benevolent sexist beliefs would be less or equally likely to enact gaze behavior. This potentially could lead to a difference in the performance of external behaviors between men who have high hostile sexism and men who have low hostile sexist beliefs but high benevolent sexism beliefs. However, since individuals who possess benevolent sexist beliefs tend to view women positively (Glick & Fiske, 1996), they may also be more likely to cognitively perceive that certain external behavior may not be as appropriate.

*RQ1: Does benevolent sexism beliefs influence a) frequency in gazing behavior and b) belief the behavior is unacceptable?*

To better understand which of the three sub-categories of sociosexuality and both hostile and benevolent sexism are the strongest predictors of the five dependent variables, a research question is proposed to determine which independent variable has the highest unique variance.

*RQ2: After controlling for all of the independent variables, which independent variable will explain the highest unique variance in each of the five dependent variables?*

## **Methods**

**Pilot Studies.** Two pilot studies were conducted to create the dependent variables. First, 87 items were created and were then reviewed by a panel of experts to test face validity. Due to no existing measure that encompassed multiple aspects of the male gaze, the 87 items were created by the researcher and divided into three main categories, with 11 sub-categories guided by previous literature (Bayliss et al., 2007; Bolmont et al., 2014; Cary, 1978; Conway et al., 2008; Ellsworth & Langer, 1976; Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Gervais et al., 2013; Hall et al., 2011; Kendon, 1967; Koranyi & Rothermund, 2012; Lu & Chang, 2012; Lykins et al., 2006; Maner et al., 2009; Mason et al., 2005; Moradi & Huang, 2008; Rupp & Wallen, 2007). The items are presented in Appendix A. The items were then presented to a panel of three social science research experts during a master's prospectus defense, which resulted in feedback to improve the face validity, edit question wording, and add greater specificity to the items. This resulted in the changing of the writing of a few items, as well as narrowing down the scope of the 87 items to a select group of 47 items. The items are presented in Appendix B.

These 47 items were then pilot studied to further test face validity. The researcher used a Q-sort method to get qualitative feedback on the 47 items. A Q-sort is a type of methodology that stems from Q methodology (Block, 2008; Ozer, 1993; van Exel & de Graaf, 2005). A Q-sort can be thought of as an inversion of a factor analysis, where the researcher looks for correlations among subjects across a sample of variables and items. Nine male, self-identified heterosexual participants were brought into a research lab to participate in the Q-sort study. Due to the small amount Each participant received 15 research credit points towards their COMS130 public speaking course. Once arriving, the participants were each seated at a separate table. On the table were the 47 items printed and each cut out on a slip of paper. The researcher randomized the items so that any previous association with the original categories was untraceable. The researcher then instructed the participants to organize the 47 statements into categories. They were told that they could have as many or as few of categories as they deemed fit. This procedure took roughly 25 minutes to complete. Once all nine participants had organized the 47 items into categories, the researcher led a discussion with the participants about the items.

The first topic discussed was the wording of the statements, as well as the ability for each participant to understand what the statements were saying. From this, the participants unanimously stated that certain words were too negatively valenced and would potentially restrain them from giving an honest response to the statement. An example of this was the item that stated, “If I don’t think a woman can see me, I stare at her body.” For this item specifically, participants noted that the word “stare” implied a negative connotation of the gaze behavior. The main takeaway from this part of the Q-sort pilot study was that certain words or phrasing might make participants feel uncomfortable, and therefore be less likely to respond truthfully to the statement.

The second topic discussed was if the participants read the statements from the perspective of “I” or from a third-person perspective. That is, whether the participants read the statements from their own perspective or did they read the statements and think of what the typical male may respond. Roughly half (four) of the participants indicated that they read the statements from a third-party perspective. An example of one of the items was, “Under any circumstances, it is not okay to look at women’s cleavage.” As a way to address the issue of future participants reporting what they perceived as stereotypical male behavior, the researcher included the pronoun “I” into all items. In addition, words such as “generally”, “typically”, and “usually” were included as a way to not make the statements seem so definite to the participant.

The third topic discussed with the nine participants was the categories that they created, as well as any items that they could not categorize. From this, no two participants created the same exact categories in name. However, common themes emerged, such as avoidance of behavior, subconscious versus unconscious behavior, respectfulness versus disrespectfulness, and behavior and feelings. The most categories that a participant created were six categories, while the least was two categories. A few participants categorized items by the sentence structure or the specific words used within the statement. From this part of the discussion, participants repeatedly reported that there was a tendency to notice that some statements addressed behavior, while some addressed feelings, and others addressed awareness (i.e., consciousness). Of the original categories intended by the researcher, both behavior (i.e., frequency) and attitudes (i.e., enjoyment, unacceptability) were similar to the categories created by the participants. However, the researcher’s intended third category of active suppression was not mentioned or referenced by any participant.

After completing and addressing concerns from the qualitative Q-sort study, a series of quantitative factor analyses were conducted to better understand how many latent variables were present in the set of items. The purpose was to condense items so that variation can be accounted for using a smaller number of items (DeVellis, 2003). To determine if an item was significantly associated with a specific factor, any item with a factor loading above .40 was deemed significant (DeVellis, 2003). This second pilot study involved 89 participants who took an online survey through the statistical software Qualtrics. Participants were all undergraduates who were male and self-identified as heterosexual. Participants received five research credit points for participation that would be attributed to their COMS 130 public speaking course. The survey had 53 items. Two demographic items (i.e., participant gender and sexual orientation) were included. One new question was created and added to the previous 47 modified statements from Q-sort pilot study. These 48 items measuring gaze behavior and attitudes are presented in Appendix C. There were three attention check items that were placed throughout the survey to track for quality in participants' responses. An example of the attention check items was, "Please select the 'Strongly agree' option below." With the exception of the two demographic items, the other 48 dependent variable items and three attention check items were randomized to lower any organizational bias in item responses. There were 119 participants that initially completed the survey. From this, three cases were removed due to falling outside the required demographics (i.e., female participants), and then 27 cases were removed for not responding accurately to all three attention check items.

A varimax rotated exploratory factor analysis with maximum likelihood extraction was conducted on all 48 items to determine how many factors were in the data (DeVellis, 2003). A scree plot revealed that within the 48 items, there were five factors with an eigenvalue above 1.0

(Kaiser, 1960). “An eigenvalue represents the amount of information captured by a factor” (DeVellis, 2003, p. 114). The factor matrix indicated that these factors were frequency, unacceptability, observed enjoyment, observed enjoyment, and observer awareness. Of the 48 items, exactly 24 items fell into one of the five factors. A second factor analysis specifying a five-factor solution was then performed and confirmed that these 24 items fit into their respective factors.

Reliability tests were then performed on the 24 items now separated into five categories. Scale reliability is “the proportion of variance attributable to the true score of the latent variable” (DeVellis, 2003, p. 27). The first factor, or the frequency category, had seven items that had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .922. The second factor, or the unacceptability category, had five items that had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .889. The third factor, or the observed enjoyment category, had six items that had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .647. The fourth factor, or the observer enjoyment category, had three items that had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .857. The fifth and final factor, or the observer awareness category, had three items that had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .822.

Of the five factors, two factors only had three items that measured the concept, while the other three factors had five or more items measuring each concept. In an attempt to strengthen the Cronbach’s Alpha level, the researcher tested whether or not adding additional items or subtracting original items would improve reliability given the results of the initial factor analyses. Therefore, additional reliability tests were run including more items. For the second factor, which originally had five items, two additional items were included based on the results from factor analysis testing. For the total seven items, reliability tests showed that these items had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .888. Because the addition of both items did not significantly change the reliability score, these items were included in the final measures as a way to increase the

likelihood that the set of items would accurately capture the intended concept. For the third factor, which originally had six items, a second reliability test indicated that one item was significantly lowering the set of items' reliability score. After removing the item, Cronbach's Alpha increased from .647 to .871. Because both the fourth and fifth factors originally only had three items each, one item per factor was included during the second set of reliability tests. For the fourth factor, an additional fourth item actually increased the Cronbach's Alpha from .857 to .861. For the fifth factor, an additional fourth item decreased the Cronbach's Alpha from .822 to .771. Both additional items were chosen because they added extra support for the sets of items to accurately capture the conceptualization of the intended concepts. It was proposed that these items would be a fail-safe, which would allow for potentially dropping a weak item in the main study if the factor structure changed. Therefore, these items were included in the measurements taken to the main study. A third round of factor analyses was then conducted on a total of 27 items and confirmed that these items all fell within their five respective factors. Results are presented in Table 1.

The final statistical test conducted was a correlation analysis in order to final check if any additional items should be included in the final measurements. To do this, the researcher took the 27 items and created five composite scores based on the five determined categories. These five composite scores were then included in a correlation matrix with the 21 items that were excluded from previous statistical analyses. From this test, no additional items were strongly associated with any of the five composite scores.

After three rounds of factor analyses, as well as a correlation check, the researcher concluded that a total of 27 items were able to accurately capture the intended five concepts. The details of these 27 items will be discussed later in the methods section.



## Main Study

**Participants** were 236 students recruited from introductory communication courses at a large Midwestern university. Participants received partial class credit for participating in the study worth less than 3% of their final grade. Procedures were IRB approved. The mean age of the participants was 19.6,  $SD = 1.34$ . Approximately 77.1% of the participants identified as Caucasian, 9.8% Asian American, 6.4% Latino/Hispanic decent, 3.4% Black/African-American, 2.1% mixed race/ethnicity, and 1.3% American Indian. The inclusion criteria were that they self-identified as male, self-identified as heterosexual, and were at least 18 years old.

**Procedure.** Eligible participants took an online cross-sectional survey administered online through the Qualtrics© survey software. Students were able to access the survey link through a blackboard database. Upon agreeing to participate, students were then asked to complete four sections of items.

*Section one: Student profile.* Participants first filled out four items that attempted to access basic demographic characteristics (i.e., age, biological sex, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity). The demographic set of items always appeared first for all participants. However, the remaining five blocks of items were randomized to lower any chance of organizational bias within the survey.

*Section two: Sociosexual orientation inventory.* Participants were then asked to complete nine items that addressed their sociosexuality. The measures were taken from the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory-R from Penke & Asendorpf (2008), where the measures were successfully tested for reliability ( $\alpha = .83$ ) and validity with the original sociosexual orientation inventory (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). The items are presented in Appendix D. Items were broken into three categories. The first set of three items assessed participant's behavior and past sexual

history. An example was, “With how many different partners have you had sex within the past year?” Participants could select anywhere from 0-1 (no partners or one partner) to 7 (20 or more partners). The three items were then composited to form the behavior sub-category called SOI-behavior ( $\alpha = .85$ ). The second set of items assessed participant’s beliefs around sex. An example was, “I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying ‘casual’ sex with different partners.” This series of items were on a Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). These three items were then composited to form the attitude sub-category called SOI-attitudes ( $\alpha = .89$ ). The final set of items assessed participant’s desire to engage in short-term sexual behavior. An example was, “How often do you fantasize about having sex with someone with whom you do *not* have a committed romantic relationship?” Participants could select anywhere from 1 (never) to 9 (at least once a day). These last three items were then composited to form the desire sub-category called SOI-desire ( $\alpha = .88$ ). Finally, all nine items were composited to create one global sociosexual orientation score ( $\alpha = .87$ ). Higher scores indicated more desire to participate in short-term sexual behavior or an unrestricted SOI. One item was reverse coded as a way to control for participant consistency. Due to the organizational nature of this series of items, the items were not randomized.

*Section three: Ambivalent sexism inventory.* Participants then filled out 22 items from the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) that addressed their benevolent and hostile attitudes. The items are presented in Appendix E. In the original study, the measures were tested for reliability across six studies ( $\alpha = .83 - .92$ ). All items were on a Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scores indicated a higher belief in either benevolent or hostile attitudes. Examples of items were, “A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man” and, “Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of

culture and good taste.” Half of the items (11) measured participant hostile sexism beliefs, such as “Women are too easily offended” and, “Women seek to gain power by getting control over men”, while the other half of the items (11) measured participant benevolent sexism. Examples of these items were, “Men are complete without women” and, “No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.” Of the 22 items, six items were reverse coded as a way to check for participant consistency, such as “In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.” After completion of the 22-item inventory, the 11 items that addressed benevolent sexism were then averaged together to create a composite benevolent sexism score for each participant ( $\alpha = .79$ ). The same process was carried out to create a composite hostile sexism score with the remaining 11 other items ( $\alpha = .87$ ). In addition, two attention check items were included to ensure quality participant responses. The 24 items were randomized within this block of the survey to lower any chance of organizational bias.

*Section four: Gaze activity.* The final section that participants completed were 27 items that accessed their behavior, attitudes, and awareness of gazing at the female figure. The items are presented in Appendix F. All items were designed on 7-point Likert-style scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

The first component of gaze activity was frequency of gazing behavior, which was made up of seven items. An example of these items was, “If I don’t think a woman can see me, I usually try to check out her body.” These seven items were then used to create a composite score for frequency. The second component of gaze activity was unacceptability of gaze behavior, which was made up of seven items. An example of these items was, “If a woman is wearing a low-cut shirt, it is usually not okay to look at her cleavage.” These seven items were then used to

create a composite score for unacceptability. The third component of gaze activity was male enjoyment, which was made up of four items. An example of these items was, “In my opinion, it is generally fun checking out women’s bodies.” These four items were then used to create a composite score for male enjoyment. The fourth component of gaze activity was female enjoyment, which was made up of five items. An example of these items was, “In my opinion, if I check out a woman’s body, it most likely makes her feel pleased about her body.” These five items were then used to create a composite score for female enjoyment. The fifth component of gaze activity was awareness, which was made up of four items. An example of these items was, “From past experiences, if I look at a female’s body, I am usually aware that I am doing it.” Two items were reverse coded. These three items were then used to create a composite score for awareness. In addition, two attention check items were included to ensure quality participant responses. The 29 items were randomized within this block of the survey to lower any chance of organizational bias.

Following the procedures of Green & Salkind (2011), factor analyses were run on all measures to indicate model fit. Results are presented in Table 2. Consistent with the previous pilot studies, the five factors were frequency (Eigenvalue = 4.53), unacceptability (Eigenvalue = 4.34), male enjoyment (Eigenvalue = 3.08), female enjoyment (Eigenvalue = 3.24), and awareness (Eigenvalue = 2.47). Factor analysis tests indicated that of the five factors, two factors would benefit from the removal of an item. Therefore, one item was removed from the sub-scale of items for unacceptability and one item was removed from the sub-scale of items for awareness. With the removal of two items, the final total of items used for analysis was 25 items. Final reliability tests indicated the following scores: Frequency ( $\alpha = .91$ ), unacceptability ( $\alpha = .89$ ), male enjoyment ( $\alpha = .90$ ), female enjoyment ( $\alpha = .86$ ), and awareness ( $\alpha = .81$ ).

After completion of the four blocks of items, to ensure anonymity of the participant, participants were thanked and given a new survey link web address to copy and paste into their internet search browser. After following this link, participants were asked to give their first name, last name, and the last name of the instructor for the class they would be receiving 10 research credit points toward. All participant information was kept separate from all survey responses. In addition, both sexual strategies (Buss & Schmitt, 1993) and traditional gender role beliefs (Eagly, 1987) were measured. However, due to too high of correlations with other concepts, both of these sets of items were excluded after data collection and not used in the analyses performed.

## **Results**

There were two hypotheses predicted and two research questions proposed that examined the influence of a set of independent variables on five components of gaze activity. Before analyses were run, a correlation matrix was conducted that showed the relationships between all independent and dependent variables. The results can be found in Table 3.

The five dependent variables had a few interesting correlations. Looking first at frequency, results indicated that frequency had a statistically significant negative relationship with unacceptability. Since higher scores on unacceptability meant that participants believed that gaze behavior was less acceptable, this negative correlation showed that the more a participant frequently gazed, the more acceptable they believed the behavior to be. Frequency was also positively statistically significant with both male enjoyment and perceived female enjoyment, which were positively statistically significant with each other. Of the five gazing activity constructs, awareness of gaze behavior had the fewest statistically significant correlations with other constructs.

*Sociosexuality.* The first hypothesis looked at the relationship between sociosexuality scores (i.e., SOI-behavior, SOI-attitudes, SOI-desire) on frequency and awareness of gazing behavior. It was predicted that sociosexuality scores would positively predict both frequency and awareness of gazing behavior. To analyze this, linear regression analyses were conducted for each of the five dependent variables. Both participant age and race/ethnicity were controlled for. Due to the low number of non-Caucasian participants, race/ethnicity was categorized into two groups, Caucasian and non-Caucasian. The results are presented in Table 4. Rather than using a total sociosexuality score, analyses were conducted using the three composited scores, which were SOI-behavior, SOI-attitudes, and SOI-desire.

Results partially supported the first hypothesis. In regards to reported frequency of gaze behavior, it was only SOI-desire, or desire for short-term sexual behavior, that positively predicted whether or not an individual reported being more likely to gaze at the female figure. As for awareness, it was only SOI-attitudes, or attitudes towards short-term sexual behavior, that predicted participant awareness of gazing behavior. Interestingly, having a higher desire for engaging in short-term sexual behavior predicted more frequent gazing behavior, while having more positive attitudes about short-term sexual behavior predicted being more aware of this gaze behavior. In addition, SOI-attitudes predicted all three gaze attitude concepts (i.e., unacceptability, male enjoyment, female enjoyment). SOI-attitudes positively predicted both male and female enjoyment, while negatively predicted unacceptability. Therefore, participants' who had a more positive attitude toward short-term sex were more likely to see gaze behavior as more acceptable, enjoy the act of gazing more, and perceive the female as enjoying being the recipient of their gaze.

*Ambivalent sexism.* The second hypothesis looked at the relationship between hostile sexism on frequency in gazing behavior, belief the behavior is unacceptable, male enjoyment, and perceived female enjoyment. It was predicted that scores in hostile sexism would positively predict frequency, both male and female enjoyment, and negatively predict unacceptability. To analyze this, a linear regression analyses was run for each of the five dependent variables. Both participant age and race/ethnicity were controlled for. The results are presented in Table 5.

Results supported the second hypothesis. It was found that high scores in hostile sexism positively predicted frequency of gaze behavior, male enjoyment, and perceived female enjoyment, while hostile sexism negatively predicted unacceptability. That is, the higher an individual scored in hostile sexism beliefs, the more likely the individual was to see gazing behavior as acceptable. It was also found that hostile behavior indicated higher scores of perceived female enjoyment. Therefore, individuals who had more hostile sexist beliefs were more likely to gaze more often, see this behavior as acceptable, enjoy the behavior, and perceive the female to enjoy being the recipient of their gaze.

In addition, a research question was proposed that questioned if benevolent sexism scores predicted either frequency of gaze behavior or unacceptability of gaze behavior. The results are presented in Table 5. Results showed that higher scores in benevolent sexism did not predict either frequency of gaze nor unacceptability. However, results indicated that benevolent sexism positively predicted participants' perception of the female enjoying being the target of gaze behavior.

*All variables.* The second proposed research question looked at the relationship between all independent variables on all of the dependent variables. After controlling for participant age and race/ethnicity, a two level regression model was conducted. The results are presented in

Table 6a-6c. Results showed that participant desire for short-term sexual behavior (SOI-desire) and scores of hostile sexism predicted frequency of gaze behavior,  $R^2 = .33$ . Comparing the standardized betas, SOI-desire was the largest indicator of frequency of gaze behavior. For unacceptability, SOI-attitudes, SOI-desire, and hostile sexism were predictors,  $R^2 = .31$ . Therefore, higher scores for perceiving short-term sexual behavior as acceptable and higher scores of desirability for short-term sexual behavior, as well as higher scores of hostile sexism predicted higher scores that the participant perceived gazing behavior as acceptable behavior. Comparing the standardized betas, it appeared that SOI-attitudes scores were the strongest predictor.

Similar to the findings for unacceptability, results showed that SOI-attitudes, SOI-desire, and hostile sexism were predictors of male enjoyment,  $R^2 = .33$ . Comparing the standardized betas, SOI-desire demonstrated to be the strongest indicator of male enjoyment and resulted in the highest unique variance. As for female enjoyment, SOI-attitudes and both benevolent and hostile sexism were predictors,  $R^2 = .32$ . In other words, both ambivalent sexism beliefs, as well as SOI-attitude scores, were able to predict participants' scores on perceived female enjoyment. Comparing the standardized betas, hostile sexism accounted for the most unique variance in perceived female enjoyment. Finally, for the dependent variable of awareness, results indicated that only SOI-attitudes was a predictor of participant awareness of engaging in gazing behavior,  $R^2 = .06$ . However, SOI-desire approached significance,  $p = .07$ .

### **Discussion**

This study aimed to help better understand the prevalence of heterosexual men's nonverbal gazing habits and to shine light on their beliefs and attitudes about gazing behavior. Specifically, desires stemming from sexual behaviors and intentions (i.e., sociosexuality) and



attitudes toward gender relations (i.e., ambivalent sexism) were examined over their influence on whether or not men were more prone to gaze, if the behavior was perceived as unacceptable, the amount of enjoyment experienced, the perceived enjoyment of the observed female, and men's awareness of their gaze behavior.

The first hypothesis predicted that the three sociosexuality scores (i.e., SOI-behavior, SOI-attitudes, SOI-desire) would positively influence frequency and awareness of gazing behavior. It was found that those individuals with a higher desire for short-term sexual behavior (SOI-desire) were more likely to report higher frequency of gazing activity. SOI-desire also predicted unacceptability and male enjoyment. That is, it was only individuals desire for engaging in short-term sex, not their beliefs (SOI-attitudes) about the behavior or previous sexual experience (SOI-behavior) that was associated with how much they gazed, if they thought it was okay behavior, and if the behavior was enjoyable. Interestingly, since it was only men's SOI-desire that was a predictor, it would suggest that it isn't all unrestricted men who are more likely to focus on the physical appearance, but instead only unrestricted men who have a higher sexual appetite. If gazing serves the purpose of filtering out potential mates (Eastwick & Tidwell, 2013), it doesn't necessarily mean that gazing behavior equates to successful sexual relationship initiation, which would then in turn lead to more sexual experience (i.e., SOI-behavior). Since the sexual behavior sub-component was not a significant predictor, it may just be that men with a higher desire for sex gaze more, regardless of previous experience or attitudes on whether such behavior is positive or negative. Unrestricted men are more likely to focus on the physical appearance than are restricted men (Maner et al., 2003) and with SOI-desire also being a positive predictor of male enjoyment, it may be that unrestricted men gaze more at the female because the enjoyment received during this action rewards or feeds their sexual desire.

Similar to desire for short-term sexual behavior, it was found that SOI-attitudes, or attitudes that viewed short-term behavior as acceptable behavior, was also negatively predictive of unacceptability, and positively predictive of male enjoyment. In addition, SOI-attitudes also positively predicted both female enjoyment and observer awareness of gazing activity. Therefore, it can be concluded that men who have more positive views on short-term sexual behavior see gazing as more acceptable and more enjoyable for everyone involved, all while being more aware of their external gazing behavior. While attitudes toward short-term sexual behavior (SOI-attitudes) predicted unacceptability, male and female enjoyment, and awareness, and desire for short-term sexual behavior (SOI-desire) predicted frequency, unacceptability, and male enjoyment, actual short-term sexual experience (SOI-behavior) did not predict any of the gazing factors.

Whereas sociosexuality scores can be indicative of mate selection, ambivalent sexism is a measure of cultural attitudes about gender (Glick & Fiske, 1996). The second hypothesis predicted that hostile sexism beliefs would positively influence frequency, unacceptability, and male enjoyment. It was found that hostile sexism predicts frequency, unacceptability, and male and female enjoyment. In addition, benevolent sexism only predicts female enjoyment. Since ambivalent sexist belief is a product of cultural power differences (Glick & Fiske, 1996), and power distribution within a culture can directly influence individuals' preferences for desirable mate qualities (Eagly & Wood, 1999), it would follow that men with higher levels of hostile sexist belief may focus more on the physical appearance of women due to the belief that women's bodies are potentially just objects to be sexualized (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Products of hostile sexism belief are that women should primarily focus on their physical appearance, as well as that women serve the role to be submissive to men (Glick & Fiske, 1999).

Therefore, men who possess more hostile sexist beliefs would be more likely to enact behavior (i.e., gazing at female figures) as a result of internal beliefs they hold about women, all while allowing such behavior to be internally processed as an acceptable, enjoyable activity.

The second research question asked out of the three sub-components of sociosexuality and the two types of ambivalent sexist beliefs, which were the strongest predictors of each of the five gazing factors. Results indicate that hostile sexism along with both attitudes towards and desire for short-term sex, were the strongest predictors of gazing behaviors and attitudes. From these analyses, it was revealed that both SOI-desire and hostile sexism were significant predictors for frequency, while SOI-attitudes, SOI-desire, and hostile sexism were significant predictors for unacceptability and male enjoyment. Finally, SOI-attitudes and hostile sexism were both significant predictors of perceived female enjoyment.

A major theory commonly used in qualitative research that examines gaze behavior is objectification theory, which states that women can be reduced to objects to be examined, often for the sexual pleasure of male viewers (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Moradi & Huang, 2008). This theory may help explain how SOI-attitudes, SOI-desire and hostile sexism are predictors of gaze behavior. Hostile sexism is the belief that women are inferior to men, and that female attributes, such as their physical appearance, are defining of a woman's character (Glick & Fiske, 1996). From this, it can be inferred that men with higher levels of hostile sexist beliefs are more prone to view women simply as objects. In addition, because SOI-behavior (i.e., actual previous sexual experience) did not predict frequency of gazing, it may be that hostile sexist men who simply have the desire for short-term sex while also perceiving casual sex as acceptable may be more likely to sexually objectify the female figure. As demonstrated by the findings, this in turn

may result in these individuals gazing more frequently and then using their hostile sexist beliefs to justify their behavior.

It is interesting that in terms of sociosexuality, SOI-desire was found to be a significant predictor, whereas previous experience (SOI-behavior) with short-term sex was not significant. Thus, rather than actual sexual experience, it is men's potential sexual fantasies that predicted them to gaze more. A sexual fantasy is a mental image or thought that invokes a person's sexuality and potentially can lead to sensory stimulation or arousal (Leitenberg & Henning, 1995). This sensory stimulation or arousal may explain the finding that both SOI-desire and hostile sexism also predicted men's enjoyment during this gaze behavior. That is, gazing at the female figure as a sexual object brought these men pleasure, which was related to them gazing more. Since objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) states that women's bodies are the objects of men's sexual desire, it may be that men with a higher desire for short-term sex are attaching their sexual fantasies to women's bodies. That is, a woman's body may be an opportunity for men to fantasize their sexual desires.

As for men's attitudes towards gazing behavior, both SOI-desire and hostile sexist belief also predicted whether men saw gazing behavior as acceptable or not. It makes sense for men who more frequently experience these potential sexual fantasies to also see this experience as acceptable behavior, since internal beliefs can be used to justify external behavior. In line with objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997) and ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996), engaging in activity that may be demeaning towards women may not morally bother men who see women as inferior or just as objects. In addition, with the sexual objectification of women, it is not surprising that men's attitudes towards whether or not they viewed short-term sex as acceptable behavior also predicted acceptability of gaze behavior. For

these men, gazing behavior may be the acceptable behavior that positions them toward accomplishing sexual conquest through seeking opportunities of potential sexual relationships.

These findings can find support from both biological and cultural arguments. From a biological perspective, since men are more likely to desire short-term sex due to lower parental investment (Trivers, 1972), and the gaze serves the initial filter of mate selection (Eastwick & Tidwell, 2013), it would follow that men who desire short-term sex would be more likely to engage in this behavior than would men less interested in short-term sex. In addition, from a reproductive point-of-view, men who consciously desire to maximize their reproductive opportunities would need to be constantly in the process of mate selection, which may result in more gazing behavior. Therefore, the desire to engage in more short-term sexual relationships would encourage males to pursue this gazing behavior so as to ensure successful and maximal reproductive opportunities.

Whereas mate selection may be able to explain how desire for short-term sexual behavior can lead to more gaze behavior, hostile sexism is better understood through a cultural explanation. Since hostile sexism (and ambivalent sexism as a whole) is a result of a gendered power differential within society (Glick & Fiske, 1996), certain male behaviors, such as the male gaze, which potentially serves to sexually objectify women, may be encouraged for men. Therefore, the group in power (i.e., men) would create the cultural tendency of specific behaviors (e.g., gazing) and beliefs (i.e., acceptance of gazing, sexism) to be deemed normal and expected behavior. So, men who play into this culturally set standard who also hold higher hostile sexist beliefs would be more prone to enact the external behaviors that reinforce societal gender expectations. Interestingly, SOI-desire too may be explained from this cultural perspective, where men are taught and expected to be sexual dominant creatures. When women are seen as

objects, a male-dominated society might teach men that they need to “dominate” or conquer the sexual female body (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). This may all result in men, regardless of their sexual experience (SOI-behavior), to over-search (i.e., gaze more frequently) for potential female mates as a way to compliment their sexual achievements or cope for the lack of sexual accomplishments. That is, a male-dominating culture may pressure men into believing that the man’s worth is tied to his sexual achievements, leading men to engage in the potential search for as many female mates as possible.

Overall, the following study provides quantifiable evidence to support the notion that heterosexual hostile sexists men are more likely to not only exhibit behaviors that sexualize women, but also to see such behaviors as morally acceptable. In line with objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997), the belief that women are mere objects to be sexualized, as well as positive attitudes towards and a high desire for short-term sexual behavior, all indicate that for some men, gazing at women is an enjoyable experience that only further objectifies and denies women of their personhood. The findings suggest that certain men do not refrain from engaging in gaze behavior that degrades women through sexual exploitation, which may lead to further objectifying behavior, such as cat-calling or sexual assault. Unfortunately, the implications may be that the visual exploitation of women is most common among men who see no problem with the status quo.

### **Limitations**

All results were retrieved from self-reported data. Unfortunately, because the participation in the male gaze may be partially subconscious, results may be influenced by participant bias, which in turn may have led to error. Bias may be from either the participant intentionally false reporting their actual behaviors or from the participant not being fully

cognitively aware of their actual behavior, thus causing them to respond inaccurately for specific items. That is, while unacceptability and both male and female enjoyment are all attitudes (i.e., beliefs that participants may be cognitively attune to), both frequency and awareness may be harder for participants to recall. Therefore, this limitation may potentially cause participants to over or under report the measures attempting to capture frequency and awareness of gaze behavior, whereas measures attempting to capture attitudes and beliefs may be easier for participants to respond to using a self-report format. This limitation may have influenced how all of the studies' variables only accounted for six percent of the variance in awareness. Despite the self-reporting items that measured awareness showing high reliability, the concept of awareness may best assessed through other methods or a more advanced technology, such as eye-tracking software.

In addition, all measures were pilot tested to remove the potential for question wording bias, while survey bias was controlled for by the randomization of blocks of items and the items themselves. However, answering questions about the participants' gazing behaviors, specifically frequency of this behavior, may have potentially received biased results. There is a possibility that individual's beliefs may have influenced their reporting of their behavior. For example, individuals who believe gazing behavior to be unacceptable may have intentionally reported lower frequencies that their actual behavior would suggest.

In addition, all participants were college-age individuals. Therefore, while they were not asked about their living location, it may be that since a high percentage either live or spend a large amount of time on a college campus. This potentially could mean that these men frequently see the same women. That is, since a college campus can be comparable to a small town community, these men may be routinely gazing at the same pool of women, either in class,

around campus, or at parties. This could lead to men becoming more familiar with the same potential female mates, thus influencing their gazing behavior (Gunaydin et al., 2013). It could be that this increase in physical proximity may lead to more interaction between men and the women they potentially gaze at. While the current study only asked about previous gaze frequency and did not address any information about *who* the female figure was, familiarity with the specific female body being gazed at may play an important role in gazing activity.

Finally, the generalizability of the findings to the broader population may be in question. Compared to the public as a whole, the current participants were all college-age, where most of the women they may be gazing at are more likely to be available potential mates, considering college campuses tend to draw younger women who may not have had the opportunity to establish romantic relationships. This may limit the generalizability of the findings to the larger public, since a male college student may be more likely to establish a romantic or sexual relationship after gazing at a female student than would a post-college man publically gazing at a female stranger. Also, the current findings do not support an evolutionary theory to gaze behavior due to all participants being of American descent. In order to make an evolutionary argument, more cross-cultural participants would be needed to check for cross-cultural variation.

### **Future directions**

This study focused primarily on male observers and intra-group comparisons. Yet, to fully understand the male gaze, future research needs to include female participants as a way to see if participation in the gazing of female figures is a male-only phenomena or the product of societal influence that can affect all genders. For example, this thesis could not answer the questions, do men think gazing is more acceptable than do women, and do women gaze at other women at rates similar to men? In other words, while this research focused on men only, it may



be that the differences found in men were also prevalent in women, which could potentially suggest the male gaze may be solely influenced more by attitudes towards gender (i.e., hostile sexism) or desire for short-term sex for everyone rather than a result of sex differences. If results would show that there are major inter-group differences, and that men overall gaze more than do women, controlling for hostile sexism and SOI, then it might suggest that biological sex plays a unique role in gazing. Also, while this study only focused on a few aspects of the male gaze (i.e. frequency, unacceptability, etc.), there may be many other components of the behavior that may help in predicting the likelihood of such actions. For example, in regards to the actual enactment of the behavior, the location on the female figure that an observer gazes at or the length of actual gaze may be very telling.

A third direction that future research could extend the current findings is to look at the male gaze from the perspective of those that intentionally avoid such behavior. That is, while this study looked at what attitudes may influence if an individual who is likely to gaze, it lacked looking one step further for individual's who suppress their gaze behavior. More research on these individual's could help to better understand if there is a conscious decision-making or impulse control process for those who are not prone to gazing at the female figure.

Finally, since the current project used self-reporting measures in order to assess frequency as well as attitudes, incorporating eye-tracking technology within an experimental design could further explain the role of hostile sexism, desire for, and attitudes toward short-term sex. Specifically, eye-tracking technology could better capture men's actual behavior (i.e., frequency or location of gaze) during an interpersonal or social interaction. Since results found that frequency and male enjoyment were positively correlated, an experimental design using eye-tracking technology could determine any sort of causal relationship between frequency and male

enjoyment. For example, in an experimental design where men were to have an interpersonal interaction with female confederates who were all dressed in varying revealing clothing, eye-tracking technology could track men's frequency of gaze while a post-interaction survey could capture men's enjoyment of the conversation experienced.

## References

- Argyle, M., & Cook, M. (1976). *Gaze and mutual gaze*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bayliss, A. P., Frischen, A., Fenske, M. J., & Tipper, S. P. (2007). Affective evaluations of objects are influenced by observed gaze direction and emotional expression. *Cognition*, *104*, 644-653. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2006.07.012
- Block, J. (2008). *The Q-sort in character appraisal: Encoding subjective impressions of persons quantitatively*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *12*, 1-49. doi:10.1017/S0140525X00023992
- Buss, D. M. (1992). Mate preference mechanisms: Consequences for partner choice and intrasexual competition. In J. H. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Buss, D. M., & Scmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, *100*, 204-232. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.100.2.204
- Buss, D. M., Haselton, M. G., Shackelford, T. K., Bleske, A. L., & Wakefield, J. C. (1998). Adaptations, exaptations, and spandrels. *American Psychologist*, *53*, 533-548. doi:10.1037/0003-006X.53.5.533
- 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. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00118.x

- Caporeal, L. R. (2001). Evolutionary psychology: Toward a unifying theory and hybrid science. *Annual review of psychology*, 2, 195-211. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.607
- Cary, M. S. (1978). Does civil inattention exist in pedestrian passing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 1185-1193. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.36.11.1185
- Conway, C. A., Jones, B. C., DeBruine L. M., & Little, A. C. (2008). Evidence for adaptive design in human gaze preference. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*, 275, 63-69. doi:10.1098/rspb.2007.1073
- Crook, J. H. (1972). Sexual selection, dimorphism, and social organization in the primates. In B. Campbell (Ed.). *Sexual selection and the Descent of Man 1871-1971*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Cuenca-Guerra, R., & Quezada, J. (2004). What makes buttocks beautiful? A review and classification of the determinants of gluteal beauty and the surgical techniques to achieve them. *Aesthetic Plastic Surgery*, 28, 340-347. doi:10.1007/s00266-004-3114-6
- Darwin, C. (1859). *On the origin of species by means of natural selection*. London: Murray.
- Darwin, C. (1871). *The descent of man and selection in relation to sex*. London: Murray.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications second edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Duncan, L. A., Park, J. H., Faulkner, J., Schaller, M., Neuberg, S. L., & Kenrick, D. T. (2007). Adaptive allocation of attention: Effects of sex and sociosexuality on visual attention to attractive opposite-sex faces. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 359-364. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumanbehav.2007.05.001
- Eastwick, P. W., & Tidwell, N. A. (2013). To pair bond or not: The evolutionary psychological approach to human mating. In Hazan, C. & Campa, M. I. (Ed.). *Human bonding: The science of affectional ties*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). Origins of sex differences in human behavior. *American Psychologist*, *54*, 408-423. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.54.6.408
- Ellsworth, P. C., & Langer, E. J. (1976). Staring and approach: An interpretation of the stare as a nonspecific activator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *33*, 117-122.  
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.33.1.117
- Fleagle, J. G. (2013). *Primate adaptation and evolution: 3<sup>rd</sup> edn*. Academic Press.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*, 173-206.  
doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x
- Gervais, S. J., Holland, A. M., & Dodd, M. D. (2013). My eyes are up here: The nature of the objectifying gaze toward women. *Sex Roles*, *69*, 557-570. doi:10.1007/s11199-013-0316-x
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491-512.  
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The ambivalence toward men inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *23*, 519-536.  
doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00379.x
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ambivalent sexism. In M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2011). Ambivalent sexism revisited. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *35*, 530-535. doi:10.1177/0361684311414832

- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, Masser, B., et al. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 763-775. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.79.5.763
- Glick, P., Lameiras, M., Fiske, S. T., Eckes, T., Masser, B., Volpato, C., et al. (2004). Bad but bold: Ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender inequality in 16 nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 713-728. doi:10.1037/0022.-3514.86.5.713
- Green, S. L., & Salkind, N. J. (2011). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and Understanding Data*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Grumet, G. W. (2008). Eye contact: The core of interpersonal relatedness. In L. K. Guerrero & M. L. Hecht (Eds.), *The nonverbal communication reader: Classic and contemporary readings*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Gunaydin, A., Selcuk, E., & Hazan, C. (2013). Finding the one: A process model of human mate selection. In Hazan, E. & Campa, M. I. (Ed.), *Human bonding: The science of affectional ties*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Hall, E. T. (1963). A system for the notation of proxemic behavior. *American Anthropologist*, 65, 1003-1026. doi:10.1525/aa.1963.65.5.02a00020
- Harris, M. (1991). *Cultural anthropology* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Henderson, J. M. (2003). Human gaze control during real-world scene perception. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11, 498-504. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2003.09.006
- Itier, R. J., & Batty, M. (2009). Neural bases of eye and gaze processing: The core of social cognition. *Neurosciences and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 33, 843-863. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.02.2004

- Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*, 141-151.
- Keelan, J.P., Dion, K.K., & Dion, K.L. (1992). Correlates of appearance anxiety in late adolescence and early adulthood among young women. *Journal of Adolescence, 15*, 193-205. doi:10.1016/0140-1971(92)90047-9
- Kendon, A. (1967). Some functions of gaze-direction in social interaction. *Acta Psychologica, 26*, 22-63. doi:10.1016/0001-6918(67)90005-4
- Kenrick, D. T., & Keefe, R. C. (1992). Age preferences in mates reflect sex differences in human reproductive strategies. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 15*, 75-91. doi:10.1017/S0140525X00067595
- Kenrick, D. T., & Luce, C. L. (2000). An evolutionary life-history model of gender differences and similarities. In T. Eckes & H. M. Trautner (Ed.). *The developmental social psychology of gender*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Kenrick, D. T., & Trost, M. R. (1993). The evolutionary perspective. In A. E. Beall & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of gender*. New York: Guilford.
- Koranyi, N., & Rothermund, K. (2012). When the grass on the other side of the fence doesn't matter: Reciprocal romantic interest neutralizes attentional bias towards attractive alternatives. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 186-191. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.06.012
- Kossinets, G., & Watts, D. J. (2006). Empirical analysis of an evolving social network. *Science, 311*, 88-90. doi:10.1126/science.1116869

- Langton, S. R. H., Watt, R. J., & Bruce, V. (2000). Do the eyes have it? Cues to the direction of social attention. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4, 50-59. doi:10.1016/S1364-6613(99)01436-9
- Lee, L., Loewenstein, G., Ariely, D., Hong, J., & Young, J. (2008). If I'm not hot, are you hot or not: Physical attractiveness evaluation and dating preferences as a function of one's own attractiveness. *Psychological Science*, 19, 669-677. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02141.x
- Leitenberg, H., & Henning, K. (1995). Sexual fantasy. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 469-496. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.469
- Lu, H. J., & Chang, L. (2012). Automatic attention towards face or body as a function of mating motivation. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 10, 120-135.
- Maner, J. K., Gailliot, M. T., & Miller, S. L. (2009). The implicit cognition of relationship maintenance: Inattention to attractive alternatives. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 174-179. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2008.08.002
- Maner, J. K., Kenrick, D. T., Becker, V., Delton, A. W., Hofer, B., Wilbur, C. J., & Neuberg, S. L. (2003). Sexually selective cognition: Beauty captures the mind of the beholder. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 1107-1120. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.6.1107
- Mason, M. F., Tatkov, E. P., & Macrae, C. N. (2005). The look of love: Gaze shifts and person perception. *Psychological Science*, 16, 236-239. doi:10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00809.x
- Mayer, A., & Puller, S. (2008). The old boy (and girl) network: Social network formation on university campuses. *Journal of Public Economics*, 92, 329-347. doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2007.09.001



- Moradi, B., & Huang, Y. (2008). Objectification theory and psychology of women: A decade of advances and future directions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32, 377-398.  
doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00452.x
- Ozer, D.J. (1993). The Q-sort method and the study of personality development. In D.C. Funder, R.D. Parke, & C. Tomlinson-Keasey (Ed.), *Studying lives through time: Personality and development*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Penke, L., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2008). Beyond global Sociosexual orientations: A more differentiated look at sociosexuality and its effect on courtship and romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1113-1135. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.5.113
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Stallworth, L. M. (1993). Sexual selection and the sexual and ethnic basis of social hierarchy. In L. Ellis (Ed.), *Social stratification and socioeconomic inequality*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Rosenfeld, M. J., & Thomas, R. J. (2012). Searching for a mate: The rise of the Internet as social intermediary. *American Sociological Review*, 77, 523-547. doi:10.1177/0003122412448050
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2008). *The social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Rupp, H. A., & Wallen, K. (2007). Sex differences in viewing sexual stimuli: An eye-tracking study in men and women. *Hormones and Behavior*, 51, 524-533.  
doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2007.01.008
- Schmitt, D. P. (2008). An evolutionary perspective on mate choice and relationship initiation. In Sprecher, S., Wenzel, A., & Harve, J. (Ed.), *Handbook of relationship initiation*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

- Schmitt, D. P., Alcalay, L., Allensworth, M., Allik, J., Ault, L. Austers, I., et al. (2005). Sociosexuality from Argentina to Zimbabwe: A 48-nation study of sex, culture, and the strategies of human mating. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 28, 247-311. doi:10.1017/S0140525X05000051
- Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 870-883. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.60.6.870
- Singh, D. (1993). Adaptive significance of female physical attractiveness: Role of waist-to-hip ratio. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 293-307. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.65.2.293
- Stockard, J., & Johnson, M. M. (1992). *Sex and gender in society* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Symons, D. (1979). *The evolution of human sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Symons, D. (1992). What do men want? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 5, 113-114.
- Tassinary, L. G., & Hansen, K. A. (1998). A critical test of the waist-to-hip-ratio hypothesis of female physical attractiveness. *Psychological Science*, 9, 150-155. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00029
- Tennov, D. (1979). *Love and limerence: The experience of being in love*. New York: Stein and Day.
- Trivers, R. L. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. G. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual selection and the descent of man, 1871-1971*. Chicago: Aldine.
- van Exel, J., & de Graaf, G. (2005). Q methodology: A sneak preview. Available at <http://ww.qmethodology.net> (accessed on 27 March 2016).

Wilson, E. O. (1975). *Sociobiology: The new synthesis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Young, L. J. (2003). The neural basis of pair bonding in a monogamous species: A model for understanding the biological basis of human behavior. In K. W. Wachter & R. A. Bulatao (Eds.), *Offspring: Human fertility behavior in biodemographic perspective*. Washington, DC: National Academic Press.

Table 1

*Post-Pilot Study Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factory Analysis With Varimax Rotation of Gaze Activity Scales*

| Scale            | Frequency  | Unacceptability | Female Enjoy | Male Enjoy | Awareness  |
|------------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Frequency        |            |                 |              |            |            |
| FR1              | <b>.76</b> | -.17            | .10          | .15        | .01        |
| FR2              | <b>.77</b> | -.14            | .09          | .14        | .05        |
| FR3              | <b>.72</b> | -.25            | .10          | .22        | -.01       |
| FR4              | <b>.69</b> | -.28            | .06          | .22        | -.05       |
| FR5              | <b>.66</b> | -.23            | .15          | .15        | .09        |
| FR6              | <b>.65</b> | -.23            | .15          | .15        | .09        |
| FR7              | <b>.67</b> | -.22            | .14          | .17        | .00        |
| Unacceptability  |            |                 |              |            |            |
| AB1              | -.27       | <b>.66</b>      | -.35         | .08        | .03        |
| AB2              | -.32       | <b>.61</b>      | -.13         | -.10       | -.05       |
| AB3              | -.14       | <b>.55</b>      | -.46         | -.13       | .02        |
| AB4              | -.18       | <b>.72</b>      | -.17         | -.19       | -.15       |
| AB5              | -.16       | <b>.70</b>      | -.15         | -.29       | -.16       |
| AB6              | -.27       | <b>.67</b>      | -.15         | -.13       | -.13       |
| AB7              | -.22       | <b>.70</b>      | -.22         | -.08       | -.06       |
| Male Enjoyment   |            |                 |              |            |            |
| ME1              | .42        | -.26            | .22          | <b>.69</b> | -.02       |
| ME2              | .30        | -.22            | .07          | <b>.85</b> | -.06       |
| ME3              | .42        | -.24            | .11          | <b>.59</b> | .02        |
| ME4              | .43        | -.24            | .16          | <b>.59</b> | .02        |
| Female Enjoyment |            |                 |              |            |            |
| FE1              | .14        | -.13            | <b>.64</b>   | .07        | -.06       |
| FE2              | .10        | -.13            | <b>.81</b>   | .04        | .04        |
| FE3              | .10        | -.18            | <b>.80</b>   | .08        | .04        |
| FE4              | .11        | -.29            | <b>.69</b>   | .15        | -.00       |
| FE5              | .09        | -.15            | <b>.68</b>   | .06        | -.01       |
| Awareness        |            |                 |              |            |            |
| AW1              | .08        | -.11            | .04          | .08        | <b>.84</b> |
| AW2              | -.17       | -.17            | -.14         | -.07       | <b>.72</b> |
| AW3              | .20        | -.00            | .11          | .09        | <b>.82</b> |
| AW4              | -.43       | -.11            | -.06         | -.32       | <b>.45</b> |

Note: Factor loadings > .40 are in boldface.

Table 2

*Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factory Analysis With Varimax Rotation of Gaze Activity Scales*

| Scale            | Frequency  | Unacceptability | Female Enjoy | Male Enjoy | Awareness  |
|------------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Frequency        |            |                 |              |            |            |
| FR1              | <b>.76</b> | -.16            | .10          | .16        | .02        |
| FR2              | <b>.78</b> | -.12            | .09          | .15        | .06        |
| FR3              | <b>.72</b> | -.24            | .10          | .23        | .01        |
| FR4              | <b>.68</b> | -.27            | .06          | .23        | -.04       |
| FR5              | <b>.66</b> | -.22            | .14          | .16        | .11        |
| FR6              | <b>.64</b> | -.22            | .23          | .31        | -.02       |
| FR7              | <b>.68</b> | -.21            | .15          | .18        | .00        |
| Unacceptability  |            |                 |              |            |            |
| AB1              | -.29       | <b>.62</b>      | -.35         | -.11       | .03        |
| AB2              | -.33       | <b>.60</b>      | -.14         | -.10       | -.04       |
| AB4              | -.18       | <b>.72</b>      | -.18         | -.20       | -.14       |
| AB5              | -.15       | <b>.73</b>      | -.15         | -.29       | -.16       |
| AB6              | -.28       | <b>.65</b>      | -.16         | -.14       | -.13       |
| AB7              | -.22       | <b>.70</b>      | -.23         | -.09       | -.05       |
| Male Enjoyment   |            |                 |              |            |            |
| ME1              | .42        | -.24            | .22          | <b>.71</b> | -.01       |
| ME2              | .29        | -.22            | .07          | <b>.84</b> | .08        |
| ME3              | .41        | -.22            | .11          | <b>.61</b> | .03        |
| ME4              | .43        | -.22            | .15          | <b>.61</b> | -.00       |
| Female Enjoyment |            |                 |              |            |            |
| FE1              | .14        | -.12            | <b>.63</b>   | .08        | -.04       |
| FE2              | .10        | -.12            | <b>.82</b>   | .05        | .04        |
| FE3              | .10        | -.18            | <b>.80</b>   | .08        | .04        |
| FE4              | .12        | -.28            | <b>.70</b>   | .15        | -.01       |
| FE5              | .09        | -.15            | <b>.68</b>   | .06        | -.01       |
| Awareness        |            |                 |              |            |            |
| AW1              | .06        | -.12            | -.04         | .07        | <b>.85</b> |
| AW2              | -.16       | -.17            | -.14         | -.08       | <b>.70</b> |
| AW3              | .18        | -.02            | .10          | .08        | <b>.82</b> |

Note: Factor loadings > .40 are in boldface.

Table 3

*Correlations among Predictor Variables for all Independent Variables (n = 236)*

|          | M    | SD   | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4     | 5     | 6      | 7     |
|----------|------|------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| 1. FR    | 4.53 | 1.18 | ---    |        |        |       |       |        |       |
| 2. AB    | 3.75 | 1.22 | -.57** | ---    |        |       |       |        |       |
| 3. ME    | 4.67 | 1.17 | .68**  | -.55** | ---    |       |       |        |       |
| 4. FE    | 3.89 | .97  | .32**  | -.46** | .33**  | ---   |       |        |       |
| 5. AW    | 4.77 | 1.17 | .08    | -.21** | -.06   | -.01  | ---   |        |       |
| 6. SOIB  | 2.05 | 1.46 | .18**  | -.31** | .22**  | .16*  | -.00  | ---    |       |
| 7. SOIA  | 5.21 | 1.69 | .31**  | -.45** | .38**  | .23** | .09   | .52**  | ---   |
| 8. SOID  | 4.46 | 2.13 | .53**  | -.36** | .493** | .13*  | -.09  | .32**  | .48** |
| 9. SRQ   | 3.24 | .78  | .13    | -.23** | .15*   | .37** | -.06  | .13    | .07   |
| 10. ASib | 3.97 | .86  | .08    | -.04   | .07    | .36** | -.05  | -.02   | -.13* |
| 11. ASIh | 3.97 | .95  | .27**  | -.33** | .27**  | .49** | -.14* | .11    | .17** |
| 12. SSL  | 4.84 | 1.04 | -.10   | .31**  | .17*   | -.07  | -.01  | -.37** | .56** |
| 13. SSS  | 3.85 | 1.18 | .27**  | -.42** | .32**  | .24** | -.01  | .46**  | .78** |

Table 3 continued

|          | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11     | 12     | 13  |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-----|
| 8. SOID  | ---   |       |       |        |        |     |
| 9. SRQ   | .02   | ---   |       |        |        |     |
| 10. ASib | -.06  | .45** | ---   |        |        |     |
| 11. ASIh | .10   | .50** | .34** | ---    |        |     |
| 12. SSL  | .30** | -.16* | .16*  | -.22** | ---    |     |
| 13. SSS  | .41** | .14*  | -.06  | .19**  | -.66** | --- |

Note: FR = Frequency, AB = Unacceptability, ME = Male Enjoyment, FE = Female Enjoyment, AW = Awareness, SOIB = Sociosexuality Behavior, SOIA = Sociosexuality Acceptability, SOID = Sociosexuality Desire, SRQ = Social Role Beliefs, ASib = Benevolent Sexism, ASIh = Hostile Sexism, SSL = Long-term Mating Strategy, SSS = Short-term Mating Strategy.  
 \*  $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$

Table 4

*Sociosexuality Regression Predicting Dependent Variables*

|                | Frequency<br>( <i>n</i> = 221) |     |         |          | Unacceptability<br>( <i>n</i> = 225) |     |         |          |
|----------------|--------------------------------|-----|---------|----------|--------------------------------------|-----|---------|----------|
|                | B                              | SE  | $\beta$ | <i>t</i> | B                                    | SE  | $\beta$ | <i>t</i> |
| Sociosexuality |                                |     |         |          |                                      |     |         |          |
| Behavior       | -.04                           | .06 | -.05    | .49      | -.05                                 | .06 | -.06    | -.84     |
| Attitudes      | .06                            | .05 | .09     | 1.26     | -.24**                               | .06 | -.33    | -4.41    |
| Desire         | .28**                          | .04 | .51     | 7.80     | -.11*                                | .04 | -.19    | 2.78     |
| Control        |                                |     |         |          |                                      |     |         |          |
| Age            | -.05                           | .05 | -.05    | -.90     | .05                                  | .05 | .05     | .83      |
| Race           | .23                            | .16 | -.08    | -1.44    | .30                                  | .17 | .10     | 1.73     |
| R <sup>2</sup> | .30                            |     |         |          | .25                                  |     |         |          |

Note: \*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ , For Race, Caucasian = 0, Non-Caucasian = 1

Table 4 continued

|                | Male Enjoyment<br>( <i>n</i> = 224) |     |         |          | Female Enjoyment<br>( <i>n</i> = 225) |     |         |          |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----|---------|----------|---------------------------------------|-----|---------|----------|
|                | B                                   | SE  | $\beta$ | <i>t</i> | B                                     | SE  | $\beta$ | <i>t</i> |
| Sociosexuality |                                     |     |         |          |                                       |     |         |          |
| Behavior       | -.03                                | .06 | -.04    | -.60     | .04                                   | .05 | .06     | .72      |
| Attitudes      | .13*                                | .05 | .19     | 2.60     | .11*                                  | .05 | .18     | 2.23     |
| Desire         | .23**                               | .04 | .43     | 6.54     | .01                                   | .03 | .02     | .28      |
| Control        |                                     |     |         |          |                                       |     |         |          |
| Age            | -.05                                | .05 | -.06    | -1.08    | -.07                                  | .05 | -.10    | -1.48    |
| Race           | -.42*                               | .17 | -.15    | 2.54     | -.06                                  | .15 | -.03    | .69      |
| R <sup>2</sup> | .29                                 |     |         |          | .06                                   |     |         |          |

Note: \*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ , For Race, Caucasian = 0, Non-Caucasian = 1

Table 4 continued

|                | B    | SE  | Awareness<br>( <i>n</i> = 225)<br>$\beta$ | <i>t</i> |
|----------------|------|-----|---|----------|
| Sociosexuality |      |     |   |          |
| Behavior       | -.05 | .06 | -.07                                      | -.82     |
| Attitudes      | .15* | .06 | .21                                       | 2.48     |
| Desire         | -.03 | .04 | -.05                                      | -.68     |
| Control        |      |     |   |          |
| Age            | .07  | .06 | .08                                       | 1.20     |
| Race           | -.08 | .19 | -.03                                      | -.42     |
| R <sup>2</sup> | .01  |     |   |          |

Note: \*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ ,  
 For Race, Caucasian = 0, Non-Caucasian = 1



Table 5

*Ambivalent Sexism Regression Predicting Dependent Variables*

|                   | Frequency<br>( <i>n</i> = 222) |     |         |          | Unacceptability<br>( <i>n</i> = 226) |     |         |          |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----|---------|----------|--------------------------------------|-----|---------|----------|
|                   | B                              | SE  | $\beta$ | <i>t</i> | B                                    | SE  | $\beta$ | <i>t</i> |
| Ambivalent Sexism |                                |     |         |          |                                      |     |         |          |
| Benevolent        | .00                            | .09 | .00     | .02      | .07                                  | .10 | .05     | .77      |
| Hostile           | .31**                          | .08 | .26     | 3.72     | -.43**                               | .09 | -.34    | -5.00    |
| Control           |                                |     |         |          |                                      |     |         |          |
| Age               | -.00                           | .06 | -.00    | -.06     | -.02                                 | .06 | -.02    | -.27     |
| Race              | -.17                           | .18 | -.06    | -.92     | .34                                  | .18 | .12     | 1.85     |
| R <sup>2</sup>    | .07                            |     |         |          | .12                                  |     |         |          |

Note: \*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ , For Race, Caucasian = 0, Non-Caucasian = 1

Table 5 continued

|                   | Male Enjoyment<br>( <i>n</i> = 225) |     |         |          | Female Enjoyment<br>( <i>n</i> = 226) |     |         |          |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----|---------|----------|---------------------------------------|-----|---------|----------|
|                   | B                                   | SE  | $\beta$ | <i>t</i> | B                                     | SE  | $\beta$ | <i>t</i> |
| Ambivalent Sexism |                                     |     |         |          |                                       |     |         |          |
| Benevolent        | -.00                                | .09 | -.00    | -.05     | .26**                                 | .07 | .23     | 3.70     |
| Hostile           | .32**                               | .08 | .26     | 3.83     | .42**                                 | .06 | .42     | 6.82     |
| Control           |                                     |     |         |          |                                       |     |         |          |
| Age               | -.00                                | .06 | -.01    | -.11     | .01                                   | .04 | .01     | .13      |
| Race              | -.37*                               | .18 | -.13    | -2.05    | -.17                                  | .13 | -.07    | -1.31    |
| R <sup>2</sup>    | .09                                 |     |         |          | .29                                   |     |         |          |

Note: \*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ , For Race, Caucasian = 0, Non-Caucasian = 1

Table 5 continued

|                   | B    | SE  | Awareness<br>( <i>n</i> = 226)<br>$\beta$ | <i>t</i> |
|-------------------|------|-----|---|----------|
| Ambivalent Sexism |      |     |   |          |
| Benevolent        | .04  | .10 | .03                                       | .42      |
| Hostile           | -.11 | .09 | -.09                                      | -1.24    |
| Control           |      |     |   |          |
| Age               | .08  | .06 | .10                                       | 1.39     |
| Race              | -.08 | .19 | -.03                                      | -.40     |
| R <sup>2</sup>    | .02  |     |   |          |

Note: \*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ ,  
 For Race, Caucasian = 0, Non-Caucasian = 1

Table 6

*Independent Variables in Two Model Regression Predicting Dependent Variables with Unstandardized Betas*

| Variable          | Frequency ( $n = 216$ ) |         |             |
|-------------------|-------------------------|---------|-------------|
|                   | Model 1 $B$             | Model 2 |             |
|                   |                         | $B$     | 95% CI      |
| Constant          | 5.56**                  | 2.29    | [.08, 4.50] |
| Age               | -.05                    | -.02    | [-.12, .08] |
| Race              | -.20                    | -.23    | [-.55, .09] |
| SOI Behavior      |                         | -.04    | [-.15, .06] |
| SOI Attitude      |                         | .06     | [-.04, .16] |
| SOI Desire        |                         | .27**   | [.20, .34]  |
| Benevolent Sexism |                         | .10     | [-.06, .26] |
| Hostile Sexism    |                         | .22*    | [.07, .36]  |
| $R^2$             | .01                     | .33     |             |
| $F$               | .83                     | 14.87** |             |
| $\Delta R^2$      |                         | .33     |             |
| $\Delta F$        |                         | 20.34** |             |

Note: SOI = Sociosexuality, \*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$

Table 6 continued

| Variable          | Unacceptability ( $n = 220$ ) |                |              |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
|                   | Model 1 $B$                   | Model 2<br>$B$ | 95% CI       |
| Constant          | 3.09*                         | 6.70**         | [4.32, 9.07] |
| Age               | .03                           | .00            | [-.10, .11]  |
| Race              | .37                           | .30            | [-.04, .64]  |
| SOI Behavior      |                               | -.04           | [-.15, .08]  |
| SOI Attitude      |                               | -.22**         | [-.32, -.11] |
| SOI Desire        |                               | -.11           | [-.19, -.03] |
| Benevolent Sexism |                               | -.04           | [-.22, .13]  |
| Hostile Sexism    |                               | -.26**         | [-.47, -.15] |
| $R^2$             | .02                           | .31            |              |
| $F$               | 1.81                          | 13.39**        |              |
| $\Delta R^2$      |                               | .29            |              |
| $\Delta F$        |                               | 17.74**        |              |

Note: SOI = Sociosexuality, \*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$

Table 6 continued

| Variable          | Male Enjoyment ( $n = 219$ ) |         |              |
|-------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------------|
|                   | Model 1 $B$                  | Model 2 |              |
|                   |                              | $B$     | 95% CI       |
| Constant          | 5.52**                       | 2.16    | [-.07, 4.39] |
| Age               | -.04                         | -.02    | [-.11, .08]  |
| Race              | -.36                         | -.43*   | [-.75, -.10] |
| SOI Behavior      |                              | -.04    | [-.15, .07]  |
| SOI Attitude      |                              | .12*    | [.02, .22]   |
| SOI Desire        |                              | .23**   | [.16, .30]   |
| Benevolent Sexism |                              | .10     | [-.06, .27]  |
| Hostile Sexism    |                              | .22*    | [.08, .37]   |
| $R^2$             | .02                          | .33     |              |
| $F$               | 1.96                         | 14.89** |              |
| $\Delta R^2$      |                              | .31     |              |
| $\Delta F$        |                              | 19.73** |              |

Note: SOI = Sociosexuality, \*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$

Table 6 continued

| Variable          | Female Enjoyment ( $n = 220$ ) |         |               |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---------------|
|                   | Model 1 $B$                    | Model 2 |               |
|                   |                                | $B$     | 95% CI        |
| Constant          | 5.37**                         | .79     | [-1.06, 2.63] |
| Age               | -.07                           | -.01    | [-.09, .08]   |
| Race              | -.13                           | -.15    | [-.41, .12]   |
| SOI Behavior      |                                | .01     | [-.08, .01]   |
| SOI Attitude      |                                | .10*    | [-.02, .18]   |
| SOI Desire        |                                | .01     | [-.05, .07]   |
| Benevolent Sexism |                                | .30**   | [.16, .43]    |
| Hostile Sexism    |                                | .37**   | [.25, .50]    |
| $R^2$             | .01                            | .32     |               |
| $F$               | 1.40                           | 14.42** |               |
| $\Delta R^2$      |                                | .31     |               |
| $\Delta F$        |                                | 19.39** |               |

Note: SOI = Sociosexuality, \*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$

Table 6 continued

| Variable          | Awareness ( $n = 220$ ) |                |              |
|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------------|
|                   | Model 1 $B$             | Model 2<br>$B$ | 95% CI       |
| Constant          | 2.90*                   | 2.56           | [-.10, 5.23] |
| Age               | .10                     | .08            | [-.04, .20]  |
| Race              | -.10                    | -.09           | [-.47, .29]  |
| SOI Behavior      |                         | -.06           | [-.19, .07]  |
| SOI Attitude      |                         | .17*           | [.05, .29]   |
| SOI Desire        |                         | -.02           | [-.10, .07]  |
| Benevolent Sexism |                         | .11            | [-.09, .30]  |
| Hostile Sexism    |                         | -.14           | [-.32, .04]  |
| $R^2$             | .01                     | .06            |              |
| $F$               | 1.46                    | 1.78           |              |
| $\Delta R^2$      |                         | .04            |              |
| $\Delta F$        |                         | 1.89           |              |

Note: SOI = Sociosexuality, \*  $p \leq .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$

Appendix A  
*Original 87 Items for Dependent Variables*

**Gaze Behavior: Frequency**

1. I look at women's bodies.
2. I check out women's bodies.
3. If I don't think a woman can see me, I usually try to check out at her body.
4. If I don't think a woman can see me, I tend to glance at her body.
5. On a typical walk through campus, I generally check out women's bodies.
6. If a woman is dressed in tight-fitting clothes, I tend to try not to look at her body.\*
7. On any average day, I tend to check out the women's bodies that I see on campus.
8. If I see a woman dressed in tight-fitting pants, I tend to look at her butt.
9. If a woman is dressed in a short skirt, I usually try to check her out her legs.
10. If a woman is dressed in a low-cut shirt, I typically try not to check out her cleavage.\*
11. If I see a woman dressed in a low-cut shirt, I generally tend to glance at her cleavage.
12. If walking behind a woman, I usually try to look at her butt.
13. If I see a woman walking towards me on a sidewalk, I generally tend to not glance at her breasts.\*
14. If I don't think a woman can see me, I try to check out her body.
15. On a typical walk through campus, I tend to check out women's bodies.
16. While sitting in class, I usually check out the women in my class.
17. If a woman is dressed in tight-fitting clothes, I try to look at her body.
18. If a woman is dressed in a short skirt, I try to check her out her legs.
19. If a woman is dressed in a low-cut shirt, I try to check out her breasts.
20. If given the opportunity, I try to look at a woman's body.

**Gaze Behavior: Location/Focus of Attention**

1. I prefer to look at a woman's body than her face.
2. When I see a woman dressed in tight-fitting pants, I tend to look at her butt.
3. When walking behind a woman, I try to look at her butt.
4. When checking out a woman's body, I tend to focus on her butt.
5. When I see a woman dressed in a low-cut shirt, I tend to look at her cleavage.
6. When I see a woman walking towards me on a sidewalk, I tend to look at her breasts.
7. When checking out a woman's body, I tend to focus on her breasts.

**Gaze Attitudes: Observer enjoyment**

1. I generally enjoy checking out women's bodies.
2. It tends to make me happy to checking out a woman's body as she walks by.
3. In my experience, checking out women's bodies is typically fun.
4. Generally, it tends to make me feel sad if I check out a woman's body.\*
5. It is usually enjoyable whenever I get the opportunity to glance at a woman's cleavage.
6. Checking out women's bodies is enjoyable.
7. I like to look at women's butts because it makes me happy.
8. I like to look at women's butts because it is enjoyable.
9. I like to look at women's cleavage because it makes me happy.
10. I like to look at women's cleavage because it is enjoyable.



**Gaze Attitudes: Observer motivation**

1. I like to check out women's bodies because I think I have a chance of interacting with them.
2. I like to walk behind women so that I can check them out.
3. I try to walk around parts of campus where I can check out more women.
4. I sometimes go out of my way to check out a woman's body.
5. If I see a woman look at me, I try to look at her body.

**Gaze Attitudes: Acceptability**

1. If a woman catches me checking her out, I don't mind.
2. In my experience, if a woman is wearing revealing clothing I check out her body.
3. Checking out women's bodies is normally an acceptable behavior.
4. I mostly tend to not feel bad about staring checking out at women's bodies.
5. If a woman flirts with me, it is okay for me to then check her out.
6. I feel ashamed if I get caught staring at a woman's body or breasts.
7. It is okay to check out a passing woman's butt.
8. If I am walking behind a woman, it is generally okay acceptable behavior to stare glance at their her butts.
9. If a woman stands in front of me, it is okay to check her out.
10. If a woman is wearing a low-cut shirt, it is usually not okay to look at women's her cleavage.\*
11. When walking around campus, it is okay for me to check out women's breasts.
12. If a woman is jogging past me by me, it is typically not okay to check her out as she passes.\*
13. It is generally offensive to women to check out a woman's body.\*
14. In my opinion, I tend to find it rude to glance at a woman's cleavage if she is wearing a low-cut shirt.\*

**Gaze Attitudes: Observed enjoyment**

1. A woman enjoys it when men check her out.
2. If a woman is wearing tight-fitting pants, she probably does not appreciate it if I check her out being checked out.\*
3. When I check out a woman's body, it most likely makes her feel good about herself.
4. Women want me to look at their bodies.
5. If a woman who is wearing revealing clothing, she usually enjoys likes it being looked at if I look at her body.
6. It would typically make a woman happy when they notice that I am checking them out.
7. Women look forward to men looking at them.

**Gaze Attitudes: Observed motive**

1. If a woman wears a low-cut shirt, she knows that men will want to look at her cleavage.
2. If a woman wears tight-fitting pants, she knows that men will want to check her out.
3. If a woman dresses up in revealing clothes to go out with her friends, she wants men to check her out.
4. Women want me to check them out when they wear revealing clothing.

**Gaze Attitudes: Female tolerance**

1. Women generally accept that men I will look at their bodies.
2. Women don't care that men check them out.
3. If a woman is dressed in tight- fitting clothing, she usually accepts welcomes the fact that men that I might may check her out.
4. It typically does not bother women when men are checking them out.\*
5. If a woman is wearing revealing clothing, she tends to not be bothered with men looking at her body.

**Gaze Suppression: Avoidance**

1. I tend to actively try to not to check out women's bodies.
2. I tend to actively avoid staring at women's bodies.
3. When I see a woman dressed in revealing clothing, I try to look more at her face than her body.
4. If I notice a woman is wearing a short dress, I try not to look at her butt.
5. If a woman is wearing a short mini dress, I try to look at her butt.
6. If a woman bends over in front of me, I generally try avert my eyes to not check her outso that I am looking away.
7. If I know a woman is about to bends over in front of me, I typically don't bother to look away.\*
8. When woman wear tight-fitting jeans or pants, I try to not stare.
9. If I see a woman wearing a low-cut shirt, I try not to look at her cleavage.
10. If I notice a woman is showing a lot of cleavage, I try not to check her out.
11. When a woman is wearing clothing that exposes her cleavage, I try not to notice.

**Gaze Suppression: Disdain**

1. In my experience, if I catch myself looking at a woman's body, I usually feel bad about it.
2. In my opinion, I generally feel like a creep if I stare at women's bodies.
3. If a woman is dressed in revealing clothes, I typically do not feel bad about looking.\*
4. It mostly makes me feel ashamed if I check out a woman that passes by.

## Appendix B

### *Post-Prospectus Dependent Variables Items*

All items with responses 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

#### **Gaze Behavior: Frequency**

- Q10) If I don't think a woman can see me, I stare at her body.
- Q20) On a typical walk through campus, I check out women's bodies.
- Q30) If a woman is dressed in tight-fitting clothes, I try to look at her body.
- Q40) On any average day, I check out the women's bodies that I see on campus.
- Q50) When I see a woman dressed in tight-fitting pants, I tend to look at her butt.
- Q60) If a woman is dressed in a short skirt, I try to check her out her legs.
- Q70) If a woman is dressed in a low-cut shirt, I try to check out her breasts.
- Q80) When I see a woman dressed in a low-cut shirt, I tend to look at her cleavage.
- Q90) When walking behind a woman, I try to look at her butt.
- Q100) When I see a woman walking towards me on a sidewalk, I tend to look at her breasts.

#### **Gaze Attitudes: Observer enjoyment**

- Q110) In my opinion, it is fun checking out women's bodies.
- Q120) It makes me happy to check out a woman's body as she walks by.
- Q130) In my experience, checking out women's bodies is enjoyable.
- Q140) It makes me feel sad if I check out a woman's body.\*

#### **Gaze Attitudes: Acceptability**

- Q150) In my experience, when a woman is wearing revealing clothing, it is okay for me to check out her body.
- Q160) In my opinion, staring at women's bodies is an acceptable behavior.
- Q170) I do not feel bad about checking out women's bodies.
- Q180) When I am walking behind women, it is acceptable behavior to stare at their butts.
- Q190) Under any circumstances, it is not okay to look at women's cleavage.\*
- Q200) If a woman is jogging past me, it is not okay to check her out as she passes.\*
- Q210) It is offensive to women to check out a woman's body.\*
- Q220) It is wrong to check out a woman's butt if she is wearing tight-fitted jeans.\*
- Q230) In my opinion, I find it rude to check out a woman's cleavage if she is wearing a low-cut shirt.\*

#### **Gaze Attitudes: Observed enjoyment**

- Q240) In my experience, if a woman is wearing a low-cut shirt, she does not enjoy it if I look at her cleavage.\*
- Q250) In my experience, if a woman is wearing tight-fitting pants, she does not appreciate it if I check her out.\*
- Q260) In my opinion, if I check out a woman's body, it makes her feel pleased about her body.
- Q270) Whenever I have encountered a woman who is wearing revealing clothing, she likes it if I look at her body.
- Q280) In my opinion, when a woman is wearing revealing clothing, it would make her happy if I checked her out.

**Gaze Attitudes: Female tolerance**

Q290) In my opinion, women accept that I will look at their bodies.

Q300) In my opinion, women condone that I check them out.

Q310) In my experience, if a woman is dressed in tight-fitting clothes, she welcomes that I might check her out.

Q320) In my opinion, it does not bother women when men are checking them out.

Q330) If a woman is wearing revealing clothing, she is not mad with me if I am looking at her body.

**Gaze Suppression: Awareness**

Q340) From past experiences, if I look at a female's body, I am aware that I am doing it.

Q350) If I check out a woman's body, I sometimes don't even recognize that I am doing it.\*

Q360) Even without meaning to, I sometimes catch myself staring at women's bodies without even realizing it.\*

Q370) In my experience, I am always aware that I am looking when I check out women.

Q380) In my experience, if I am interacting with a woman who is dressed in revealing clothes, I am aware that certain parts of her body may be exposed.

**Gaze Suppression: Avoidance**

Q390) From past experiences, I actively try not to check out women's bodies.

Q400) In my opinion, I actively avoid staring at women's bodies.

Q410) If a woman bends over in front of me, I avert my eyes so that I am looking away.

Q420) If I know a woman is about to bend over in front of me, I don't bother to look away.\*

Q430) From past experiences, if I am having a conversation with a woman who is wearing a low-cut shirt, I try not to look at her cleavage.

**Gaze Suppression: Disdain**

Q440) In my experience, if I catch myself looking at a woman's body, I feel bad about it.

Q450) In my opinion, I feel like a creep if I stare at women's bodies.

Q460) If a woman is dressed in revealing clothes, I do not feel bad about looking.\*

Q470) It makes me feel ashamed if I check out a woman that passes by.

Appendix C  
*48 Items used for Factor Analysis of Pilot Study*

All items with responses 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Gaze Behavior: Frequency**

- F1. If I don't think a woman can see me, I usually try to check out at her body.
- F2. If I don't think a woman can see me, I tend to glance at her body.
- F3. On a typical walk through campus, I generally check out women's bodies.
- F4. If a woman is dressed in tight-fitting clothes, I tend to try not to look at her body.\*
- F5. On any average day, I tend to check out the women's bodies that I see on campus.
- F6. If I see a woman dressed in tight-fitting pants, I tend to look at her butt.
- F7. If a woman is dressed in a short skirt, I usually try to check her out her legs.
- F8. If a woman is dressed in a low-cut shirt, I typically try not to check out her cleavage.\*
- F9. If I see a woman dressed in a low-cut shirt, I generally tend to glance at her cleavage.
- F10. If walking behind a woman, I usually try to look at her butt.
- F11. If I see a woman walking towards me on a sidewalk, I generally tend to not glance at her breasts.\*

**Gaze Attitudes: Observer enjoyment**

- A1. In my opinion, it is generally fun checking out women's bodies.
- A2. It tends to make me happy to check out a woman's body as she walks by.
- A3. In my experience, checking out women's bodies is typically enjoyable.
- A4. Generally, it tends to make me feel sad if I check out a woman's body.\*
- A5. It is usually enjoyable whenever I get the opportunity to glance at a woman's cleavage.

**Gaze Attitudes: Acceptability**

- A6. In my experience, if a woman is wearing revealing clothing, it is generally okay for me to check out her body.
- A7. In my opinion, looking at women's bodies is normally an acceptable behavior.
- A8. I mostly tend to not feel bad about checking out women's bodies.
- A9. If I am walking behind a woman, it is generally acceptable behavior to glance at her butt.
- A10. If a woman is wearing a low-cut shirt, it is usually not okay to look at her cleavage.\*
- A11. If a woman is jogging past me, it is typically not okay to check her out as she passes.\*
- A12. It is generally offensive to women to check out a woman's body.\*
- A13. It is usually wrong to check out a woman's butt if she is wearing tight-fitted jeans.\*
- A14. In my opinion, I tend to find it rude to glance at a woman's cleavage if she is wearing a low-cut shirt.\*

**Gaze Attitudes: Observed enjoyment**

- A15. In my experience, if a woman is wearing a low-cut shirt, she most likely does not enjoy it if I glance at her cleavage.\*
- A16. In my experience, if a woman is wearing tight-fitting pants, she probably does not appreciate it if I check her out.\*
- A17. In my opinion, if I check out a woman's body, it most likely makes her feel pleased about her body.

A18. Whenever I have encountered a woman who is wearing revealing clothing, she usually likes it if I look at her body.

A19. In my opinion, when a woman is wearing revealing clothing, it would typically make her happy if I checked her out.

### **Gaze Attitudes: Female tolerance**

A20. In my opinion, women generally accept that I will look at their bodies.

A21. In my experience, if a woman is dressed in tight-fitting clothes, she usually welcomes that I might check her out.

A22. In my opinion, it typically does bother women when men are checking them out.\*

A23. If a woman is wearing revealing clothing, she tends to not be bothered if I am looking at her body.

### **Gaze Suppression: Awareness**

S1. From past experiences, if I look at a female's body, I am usually aware that I am doing it.

S2. If I check out a woman's body, I generally don't even recognize that I am doing it.\*

S3. Even without meaning to, I usually catch myself glancing at women's bodies without even realizing it.\*

S4. In my experience, I am typically aware that I am looking when I check out women.

S5. In my experience, if I am interacting with a woman who is dressed in revealing clothes, I am most likely aware that certain parts of her body may be exposed.

### **Gaze Suppression: Avoidance**

S6. From past experiences, I tend to actively try not to check out women's bodies.

S7. In my opinion, I tend to actively avoid staring at women's bodies.

S8. If a woman bends over in front of me, I generally avert my eyes so that I am looking away.

S9. If I know a woman is about to bend over in front of me, I typically don't bother to look away.\*

S10. From past experiences, if I am having a conversation with a woman who is wearing a low-cut shirt, I usually try not to look at her cleavage.

### **Gaze Suppression: Disdain**

S11. In my experience, if I catch myself looking at a woman's body, I usually feel bad about it.

S12. In my opinion, I generally feel like a creep if I stare at women's bodies.

S13. If a woman is dressed in revealing clothes, I typically do not feel bad about looking.\*

S14. It mostly makes me feel ashamed if I check out a woman that passes by.

## Appendix D

### *Sociosexual Orientation Inventory-R (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008)*

Please respond honestly to the following questions.

1. With how many different partners have you had sex within the past year?  
0-1    2    3    4    5-6    7-9    10-19    20 or more
2. With how many different partners have you had sex on *one and only one* occasion?  
0-1    2    3    4    5-6    7-9    10-19    20 or more
3. With how many different partners have you had sexual intercourse without having an interest in a long-term committed relationship with this person?  
0-1    2    3    4    5-6    7-9    10-19    20 or more
4. Sex without love is OK.  
1-9 (I strongly disagree – I strongly agree)
5. I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying “casual” sex with different partners.  
1-9 (I strongly disagree – I strongly agree)
6. I do *not* want to have sex with a person until I am sure that we will have a long-term, serious relationship.\*  
1-9 (I strongly disagree – I strongly agree)
7. How often do you fantasize about having sex with someone with whom you do *not* have a committed romantic relationship?
  1. never
  2. very seldom
  3. about once every two or three months
  4. about once a month
  5. about once every two weeks
  6. about once a week
  7. several times per week
  8. nearly every day
  9. at least once a day
8. How often do you experience sexual arousal when you are in contact with someone with whom you do *not* have a committed romantic relationship?
  1. never
  2. very seldom
  3. about once every two or three months
  4. about once a month
  5. about once every two weeks
  6. about once a week
  7. several times per week
  8. nearly every day
  9. at least once a day
9. In everyday life, how often do you have spontaneous fantasies about having sex with someone you have just met?
  1. never
  2. very seldom
  3. about once every two or three months
  4. about once a month
  5. about once every two weeks
  6. about once a week
  7. several times per week
  8. nearly every day
  9. at least once a day

Appendix E  
*Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996)*

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please read the following statements and rate them from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality".
3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.\*
4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
5. Women are too easily offended.
6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.\*
7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.\*
8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
13. Men are complete without women.\*
14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.
15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.
18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.\*
19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.
20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.
21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.\*
22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.



Appendix F  
*Male Gaze Measures Final (Compton, 2016)*

Please read the following statements and rate them from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Frequency ( $\alpha = .922$ )**

- FR1. If I don't think a woman can see me, I usually try to check out at her body.
- FR2. If I don't think a woman can see me, I tend to glance at her body.
- FR3. On a typical walk through campus, I generally check out women's bodies.
- FR4. On any average day, I tend to check out the women's bodies that I see on campus.
- FR5. If a woman is dressed in a short skirt, I usually try to check her out her legs.
- FR6. If I see a woman dressed in a low-cut shirt, I generally tend to glance at her cleavage.
- FR7. If walking behind a woman, I usually try to look at her butt.

**Acceptability ( $\alpha = .888$ )**

- AB1. If a woman is wearing a low-cut shirt, it is usually not okay to look at her cleavage.
- AB2. If a woman is jogging past me, it is typically not okay to check her out as she passes.
- AB4. In my experience, if I catch myself looking at a woman's body, I usually feel bad about it.
- AB5. It mostly makes me feel ashamed if I check out a woman that passes by.
- AB6. It is usually wrong to check out a woman's butt if she is wearing tight-fitted jeans.
- AB7. In my opinion, I generally feel like a creep if I stare at women's bodies.

**Male Enjoyment ( $\alpha = .861$ )**

- ME1. In my opinion, it is generally fun checking out women's bodies.
- ME2. In my experience, checking out women's bodies is typically enjoyable.
- ME3. It is usually enjoyable whenever I get the opportunity to glance at a woman's cleavage.
- ME4. It tends to make me happy to check out a woman's body as she walks by.

**Female Enjoyment ( $\alpha = .871$ )**

- FE1. In my opinion, if I check out a woman's body, it most likely makes her feel pleased about her body.
- FE2. Whenever I have encountered a woman who is wearing revealing clothing, she usually likes it if I look at her body.
- FE3. In my opinion, when a woman is wearing revealing clothing, it would typically make her happy if I checked her out.
- FE4. In my experience, if a woman is dressed in tight-fitting clothes, she usually welcomes that I might check her out.
- FE5. If a woman is wearing revealing clothing, she tends to not be bothered if I am looking at her body.

**Awareness ( $\alpha = .771$ )**

- AW1. From past experiences, if I look at a female's body, I am usually aware that I am doing it.
- AW2. If I check out a woman's body, I generally don't even recognize that I am doing it.\*
- AW3. In my experience, I am typically aware that I am looking when I check out women.