1995

Misperception of body image in males and its relationship to self-concept and romantic relationships.

Robert O. Knauz

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/theses

Retrieved from https://scholarworks.umass.edu/theses/2296

This thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses 1911 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.
MISPERCEPTION OF BODY IMAGE IN MALES AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO SELF-CONCEPT AND ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

A Thesis Presented
by
ROBERT O. KNAUZ

Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
September 1995
Psychology
MISPERCEPTION OF BODY IMAGE IN MALES AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO
SELF-CONCEPT AND ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

A Thesis Presented

by

ROBERT O. KNAUZ

Approved as to style and content by:

Morton G. Harmatz, Chair

Richard P. Halgin, Member

Ronnie Janoff-Bulman, Member

Charles Clifton, Department Chair

Department of Psychology
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have helped me on the road to finishing my thesis. I would like to thank my classmates and friends: Erin, Loren, Kristen, and Tom for their support and encouragement over the last three years. They have made graduate school fun and exciting, and I would not be at this point without them.

I especially would like to thank Susan Flood, Roger Huebner, and Noelle Leonard for their friendship, encouragement, and love. They are invaluable and irreplaceable people in my life. Roger also assisted me with some of the administrative aspects of this project, and his help made the process go much more smoothly than I had originally anticipated.

Finally, I owe a debt of gratitude to my advisor and chair of this committee, Mort Harmatz. His dedication to this project and to my career have been exceptional. His advice and comments gave me the opportunity to turn a few ideas into a major research project. My goal of becoming a clinical psychologist is that much closer because of his assistance and support.
ABSTRACT

MISPERCEPTION OF BODY IMAGE IN MALES AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO SELF-CONCEPT AND ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS
SEPTEMBER 1995

ROBERT O. KNAUZ, B.S.ed., NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
M.S., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
Directed by: Professor Morton G. Harmatz

The current literature shows that there is a relationship among body weight, self-esteem, and romantic relationships in men. Overweight and underweight men tend to view themselves negatively, and they tend to be viewed by others as undesirable. Underweight men have lower self-esteem scores, and they perceive the quality of their social networks to be poorer when compared to overweight men. However, no studies have been conducted on a man's perception of body weight and its effect on self-concept and romantic relationships. Using a semantic differential and a questionnaire created for this study to measure self-concept and romantic relationships, it was found that men who misperceive themselves as normal weight characterized themselves and their partners as similar to their peers. Misperceiving oneself as overweight had no negative effects, and contrary to expectations, these subjects tended to see themselves and their partners in a more favorable manner.
Men who are underweight or misperceive themselves to be underweight saw themselves as small, weak, and powerless. Limitations of this study and future directions in research are also discussed.
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CHAPTER 1
MISPERCEPTION OF BODY IMAGE IN MALES AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO SELF-CONCEPT AND ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

The relationship between body image and personality has intrigued scientists since Hippocrates developed a classification of human body types into "long thins" and "short thicks." Sheldon (1942) believed that all humans could be divided into three basic forms: ectomorph, mesomorph, and endomorph. His divisions of body types into thin, muscular, and obese somatypes were hypothesized to determine a set of personality traits. Though his research was criticized because of weak methodology (Strongman and Hart, 1968), the notion that an individual's body build could affect his personality was examined by other researchers.

Most of the research after Sheldon began to focus on the environmental effects of attitudes on body image and less on the inherent characteristics of somatype traits. There was a decisive shift away from Sheldon's (1942) hypothesis that body size and personality were genetically based characteristics. The focus began to move toward the "perceiver and the perceived." Strongman and Hart (1968) in their study of 60 college students used a questionnaire based on Sheldon's original personality traits and body types. They found that individuals classified as endomorphs
were viewed by others as overly concerned with eating, comfort, and friendliness. Individuals classified as ectomorphs were seen as reclusive, while mesomorphs were energetic, assertive, and aggressive. Though the concept of genetically linked personality characteristics based on body size was discarded, Strongman and Hart suggested a stereotyped relationship between size and personality. They also hypothesized that this relationship would affect the behavior of the individual and the attitudes of others about that person.

Lerner (1969a) completed a study on female undergraduates' ratings of behavioral characteristics of thin, muscular, and obese men. These women attributed socially undesirable traits to the thin and obese men significantly more than they did to the muscular men. Thin and obese males were seen as the least likely to have many friends and the least likely to be wanted as a friend. They were also seen as the most likely to have the fewest friends, to need friends the most, and to be poor fathers when compared to muscular men. His findings supported the notion that body size is linked to perceived personality characteristics.

It would seem clear that if there is a perceived bias to certain body sizes, then individuals would incorporate these stereotypes in their perceptions of their own body
image. Tucker (1982) found that 65% of his sample stated they had some ectomorphic traits, and that 60% of the sample wished to be more mesomorphic. According to Tucker, college males were dissatisfied with their bodies. However, he did not do any statistical tests on their reports of dissatisfaction to see if their ideal size differed significantly from their perceived size. He also asked these undergraduates to rate how they felt about their perceived body size. Thin and obese men had significantly more negative reactions to their body size which became more pronounced for the thinnest and most overweight males. However, in another study, (Fallon and Rozin, 1985) no statistically significant differences in reactions to body size were found in a sample 248 male undergraduates who rated their current, perceived, and ideal figures. Also, Tucker's finding was not consistent with Gray's (1977) study which found that only overweight men had negative attitudes about their bodies. Gray's measurements of body-affect were associated more with food and eating than Tucker's questionnaire which may have given a positive bias toward overweight males. However, Tucker (1982) and Gray (1977) found that males tended to perceive themselves as weighing less than they actually weighed.

It would seem likely that a male's negative attitude about his body size would also carry over into negative
attitudes about himself in other areas. Goldberg and Folkins (1974) studied 113 male and 135 female undergraduates and found that there were significant correlations of body image and negative emotional attitudes. Specifically, the more dissatisfied a person was with his body size, the more anxious, depressed, and hostile the person was when compared with those who were satisfied with their body image. This study, however, did not group people into weight or size categorize. Therefore, it is quite possible that obese or thin individuals who were comfortable with their weight would not have any negative attitudes about themselves.

McCaulay, Mintz, and Glenn (1988) grouped men and women into five weight categories of overweight, slightly overweight, normal weight, slightly underweight, and underweight. They found that men who were slightly underweight expressed the greatest body dissatisfaction when compared to men in the other categories. They also found that men who were dissatisfied with their bodies were also more prone to depression than women who were equally dissatisfied with their bodies. Kaplan, Busner, and Pollack (1988), in a sample of 133 male adolescents, found that underweight males had the highest depression scores, normal weight males had lower scores than underweight males, and overweight males had the lowest overall scores for
depression. Similarly, Rosen and Ross (1968) found that body image and a positive self-concept were highly correlated \( r = .62 \). However, their sample was not divided into any weight categories which may confound their findings as one weight group's self-concept may be more correlated with body image than another weight groups' self concept.

Society seems to hold stereotyped views of body size and personality characteristics which can affect the individual both positively, if one happens to possess these desirable traits, and negatively, if one deviates from this ideal. Though most of the samples mentioned above have come from undergraduate populations, other studies have focused on the origins of body size stereotypes and their relationship to personality characteristics. It was found that children as young as 5 years could discriminate body size and could indicate a preference for a certain type of body (Lerner and Schroeder, 1971a). A significant number of children preferred an average build, and they had a clear aversion toward the fat build. In another study (Lerner and Gellert, 1969), 86% of a sample of 29 kindergarten aged children showed a consistent dislike for the "chubby" photographs. No statistically significant aversion was noted for thinness, and, contrary to the results of Lerner and Schroeder (1971b), no preference was given to the medium or average build. Young children also ascribe similar
personality characteristics as do college undergraduates to body size. Staffieri (1967) found that boys between the ages of six and ten years old displayed clear associations between body type and personality. All the traits used to describe mesomorphs were favorable, the traits assigned to the endomorphs were unfavorable and mostly socially aggressive, and the traits assigned to the ectomorphs were also mostly negative, though somewhat socially submissive. A statistically significant number of boys ages 7-10 preferred the more muscular, mesomorphic image to the thin or obese males. Staffieri, however, used pictures which displayed gross characteristics of thin, muscular, and obese children and this may have negatively biased the sample.

The presence of body build stereotypes in children seems to be continuous and seems to grow more powerful through adolescence (Lerner, 1972; Lerner and Korn, 1972). Samples of 5, 15, and 20 year olds displayed similar stereotypes of body builds which seemed more entrenched for each group, respectively. There also seems to be an increasing association of negative attributes to thin and obese males as children age. Lerner's (1969b) results on adolescent males' views of personality traits of ectomorphs, mesomorphs, and endomorphs were similar to his study on college males' attitudes for similar groups. He found that both thin and obese adolescents were rated as having the
fewest friends and needing friends the most when compared to muscular builds. Thin and obese adolescents were also seen as the least likely to be wanted as a friend.

Cohn et al. (1987) looked at adolescent males and females in terms of their current body figures, their ideal body figures, and what they think the opposite sex finds most attractive. Male adolescents chose an ideal size which was heavier than what they assumed females would find attractive. Their ideal figures were also significantly larger than their current body size. In contrast to the myth that only females are concerned with body image, male and female early adolescents were both similarly dissatisfied with their body image. These finding also held true for different ethnic backgrounds. Similarly, cross-cultural studies in Great Britain and Nigeria show that adolescents are consistently dissatisfied with their body size, and that males wish to be heavier (Salokun and Toriola, 1986; Strongman and Hart, 1968).

Dissatisfaction with body image also seems to play a more significant role for gay men than heterosexual men (Herzog, Newman, and Warshaw, 1991). Herzog, Newman, and Warshaw looked at 32 heterosexual men and 43 gay men between the ages of 18 and 35 years. Gay men were underweight and selected an ideal weight that was underweight significantly more often than heterosexual men. Heterosexual men chose
figures that were heavier than their current or ideal body size that they thought females would find more attractive. By contrast, gay men tended to choose figures which were thinner and similar to their current and ideal size. Overall, it was found that gay men were more dissatisfied with their bodies than were heterosexual men. In another study comparing these two groups (Silberstein, Mishkind, Striegel-Moore, Timko, and Rodin, 1989), heterosexual men were more satisfied with their body parts than gay men. Gay men also had a wider gap between their ideal and perceived bodies than heterosexual men. However, more heterosexual men wished to be heavier, while more gay men wished to be thinner. This wish to be heavier in heterosexual men was significantly related to lower self-esteem than the wish to be thinner in gay men.

A correlation of body weight and self-esteem was also reported by Lerner, Karabenick, and Stuart (1973). They found that the degree of positive self-concept increases as satisfaction with one's body increases. Body build, distribution of weight, and waist size were all highly correlated with a positive self-concept in males. Lerner, Karabenick, and Stuart also found that these three characteristics were ranked as some of the highest attributes associated with physical attractiveness in both what males perceived as characteristics they thought females
find attractive and what females find most attractive in males. In another study on a sample of 47 male undergraduates, those who wished to be thinner or heavier were found to have lower self-esteem scores than men whose perceived and ideal figures matched (Silberstein, Striegel-Moore, Timko, and Rodin, 1988). They also found that the relationship between an individual’s perceived and ideal figure and between their actual and desired weight was highly correlated.

It would seem probable that poor self-esteem would also be correlated with poor sexual relationships. However, few studies have been conducted on this topic. Herzog, Norman, Gordon, and Pepose (1984) found that males with an eating disorder and a poor body image were more likely to have extremely limited sexual relationships than were a comparative sample of females. However, their sample consisted of inpatients, and therefore, the authors may have only looked at the most pathological cases. They also stated that their sample of males was less likely to be involved in a heterosexual relationship, however they also stated that most of the males in their sample were gay. In a study by Kishchuk, Gagnon, Belisle, and Laurendeau (1992) on 11,323 individuals in Canada, it was found that those who wished to be thinner had fewer social relationships than those who were satisfied with their weight. Those who were
underweight were also more likely to be distressed, depressed and anxious than those who were of normal weight. No comparisons were done between those who wished to be heavier, or those who were overweight.

Harmatz, Gronendyke, and Thomas (1985) found that undergraduate males who were underweight had significantly more problems with sexual relationships than normal and overweight men. They tended to attribute the least amount of positive traits to themselves, to have a greater desire to change their physiques, and to be the least demanding of a potential partner. They also perceived their current romantic partner as having fewer positive qualities than the romantic partners of males who were overweight and normal weight. Overall, the underweight male perceived himself as having more negative qualities, as lonelier than others, and as having an increased chance of rejection by others in a social setting.

It seems that there may be a learned relationship between body size and dispositions. The image of the self is influenced by the size and shape of one's body. Because self-esteem is closely tied to the perceptions of others, if there is a negative bias toward the general shape of a person, this will negatively affect the individual who has that build. Though several studies have been completed on characteristics associated with somatype, few studies have
been conducted on whether these characteristics actually affect the quality and quantity of romantic relationships, sexual relationships, and friendship networks. The studies which have been completed have shown a definite relationship between body image and a poorer support network.

Though there is an indirect link between negative stereotypes of body build and negative attitudes toward the self and poorer social relationships, there have been no studies which have looked at the perception of body weight in these areas for men. Kaplan, Busner, and Pollack (1988) looked at perceived weight and depression in their study of 344 adolescents, however they grouped men and women together which may have distorted their results. Harmatz (1987) examined women who perceived themselves as overweight though they were normal weight or underweight, and he found that they had lower self-esteem and had more negative emotional states than women who accurately perceived their weight. The findings associated with this misperception of body weight are similar to other findings which have shown that women who are actually overweight have lower self-esteem and a poorer self-image than normal weight or underweight women.

Given that underweight men have a poor self-image and poor romantic relationships and that misperception of body weight for women is a salient factor in their self-image, it seems likely that men's perceptions of their weight may also
be a salient factor in how they characterize themselves and their romantic relationships. It is probable that men who misperceive themselves to be normal weight, though they are actually underweight or overweight, would have a more positive sense of self and more fulfilling romantic relationships compared to those who are actually overweight and underweight. In other words, if one's stereotyped perception of the association between body size and certain desirable traits is congruent, then one should have a similar sense of himself and his world as do those who actually fit the ideal body image.

The current study looks at whether this misperception of body weight and its association with stereotyped beliefs holds true for males in their concept of themselves and in their social relationships. Hypothesis number 1 is that those who misperceive themselves as normal in weight will view themselves in a more favorable manner than those who do not perceive themselves to be normal weight. Also, underweight and overweight men who misperceive their weight as normal will indicate that they have more satisfying social and sexual relationships than underweight and overweight men who do not perceive themselves as normal weight. It is thought that males who perceive themselves both correctly and incorrectly as thin and overweight will have a poorer self-concept and have poorer social and sexual
relationships than those who perceive both correctly and incorrectly as normal weight. Hypothesis number 2 is that men who are actually underweight or men who misperceive themselves as underweight will have more negative attitudes about themselves, and they will have poorer social and sexual relationships than those who are actually overweight or those who misperceive themselves as overweight. Similar results are expected when these actual underweight men and misperceiving underweight men are compared against men who are normal weight or misperceive themselves as normal weight. This hypothesis is consistent with the literature that bigger is better in males.

Method

Subjects

Data for this study was drawn from a sample of male undergraduates at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. These males were asked to rate themselves as overweight, normal weight, or underweight. They also were asked to list their actual and ideal weight. These men were weighed on a standard scale after they completed the questionnaire to avoid any possible bias in their reported weight.

Their reported heights and actual weights were compared to average heights and weights for 18 - 24 year olds derived from a standardized table from the U.S. Center for Health
Statistics (1987). Weight categories were obtained by using a method based on a study by Kaplan, Busner, and Pollack (1988) which measured nonpathologic fluctuations in body weight. Men who were 5% above the average weight for their respective height were classified as overweight, and men who were 5% under the average weight for their respective height were classified as underweight. Men who were within the 5% under to 5% over range were classified as normal weight.

Thus, three categories: overweight, normal weight, and underweight were created from this sample. Men also were classified according to the self-reported weight categories of overweight, normal weight, and underweight that they marked on the questionnaire. A 3 x 3 table consisting of actual and perceived weight categories was created for this study (see Table 1).

Cells 1, 5, and 9 consist of men who accurately perceive their weight category, ie. in cell 1, these men state they are overweight, and they actually are overweight in comparison with their peers. Cells 2, 3, and 6 consist of men who misperceive themselves to weigh less than their actual weight. Cells 4, 7, and 8 consist of men who misperceive themselves to weigh more than their actual weight.
Measures

A demographic questionnaire was used to assess age, current year at the university, and whether they were in a committed romantic relationship. Subjects also were asked to complete a semantic differential (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957) on how they viewed a set of concepts along a given number of polar scales. The semantic differential is a measure of the magnitude of an individual’s affective response to the meaning of a particular concept. It is considered an accurate measure of an individual’s experiential self (Liebowitz, 1976), and it is a more valid and reliable scale than the Likert or single anchor scales (Ofir, Reddy, and Bechtel, 1987).

The concepts used with this semantic differential questionnaire (see Appendix A) were: myself, my ideal self (me – as I would like to be), my social self (me – as others see me), my partner or most recent partner, my ideal partner (my partner or most recent partner – as I would like her/him to be), and my social partner (my partner or most recent partner – as others see her/him). A 9-item scale adapted from a study by Harmatz (1967) (based on the work of Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum) was used to assess these concepts. The polar adjectives were large-small, active-passive, clean-dirty, strong-weak, slow-fast, light-heavy, fair-unfair, hot-cold, and good-bad. These scales are scored for
the three semantic differential dimensions: evaluative, potency, and activity. According to the original factor analysis (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957) good-bad, clean-dirty, and fair-unfair load high on the evaluative factor and low on the potency and activity factors. Large-small, strong-weak, and light-heavy load high on the potency factor and low on the evaluative and activity factors. Finally, active-passive, slow-fast, and hot-cold load high on the activity factor and low on the other two factors.

Subjects also were asked questions about their physical and personality characteristics. Since no standardized questionnaire about physical and personality characteristics exists in the literature, a measure was created specifically for this study. These questions (see Appendix B) asked the subjects to rate how they compared to others on certain traits, how satisfied they were with those traits, and how they could be more attractive to others on certain traits. They also rated how their partners or most recent partners compared to others and how satisfied they were with their partner's or most recent partner's traits.

Procedure

The administration of these questionnaires was accomplished by employing a walk-in type testing opportunity. Male undergraduate students enrolled in psychology courses were informed of open questionnaire
administrations to be held over an extended period. They earned one experimental credit for completing this questionnaire. The experimental credits were exchangeable for extra credit in various psychology courses. Subjects were informed of the confidential nature of this questionnaire, and they were given the option of withdrawing at any time during the administration.

Design

Comparisons were done on the reported and measured weights for all men to determine if there were any report biases of weight. Independent samples t-tests were used to test hypothesis number one. Cells 4 and 6 were combined for the misperceiving normal weight group, and cells 2 and 8 were combined for the misperceiving overweight and underweight group. Hypothesis number 2 was tested using a one-way ANOVA on the three groups: 1.) men who are or believe that they are overweight (cells 1, 2, and 3), 2.) men who are or believe that they are normal weight (cells 4, 5, and 6), and 3.) men who are or believe that they are underweight (cells 7, 8, and 9). The Tukey-HSD procedure (alpha = .05) was used to test post-hoc contrasts among these three groups.

Results

Male subjects were obtained over the course of four months of testing: May, 1994 and October - December, 1994.
91 undergraduate men participated in this study. One individual's questionnaire was eliminated as he participated in the Spring and in the Fall. Thus, 90 subjects, with a mean age of 20.6 years (SD = 2.91), were used for the data analysis. Table 2 displays the frequency distribution of the actual weight by perceived weight categories for the total sample.

After subtracting three pounds from the actual weights for clothing, actual weights were significantly higher than reported weights, \( t(30) = -4.22, p < .000 \), for overweight men (see Table 3 for means and standard deviations). Actual weights for underweight men were significantly lower than reported weights, \( t(22) = 2.12, p < .05 \). No significant differences were found between actual and reported weights for normal weight men.

Results for hypothesis number one in which undergraduate men who misperceive themselves as normal weight were compared to those who misperceive themselves as overweight or underweight, were contrary to expectations. It was assumed that men who misperceive themselves as normal weight would view themselves and their social and sexual relationships more favorably than men who misperceive themselves as overweight or underweight. Men who misperceived themselves as overweight or underweight were found to be significantly more confident, \( t(36) = 2.04, p < \)
more assertive, $t(36) = 2.13, p < .05$, and were asked out on more dates, $t(36) = 2.15, p < .05$, than men who misperceived themselves as normal weight (see Table 4 for means and standard deviations). They also believed that their partners or most recent partners were more intelligent, $t(36) = 2.45, p < .05$, and had better physiques, $t(36) = 2.03, p < .05$, than men who thought they were normal weight (see Table 5 for means and standard deviations). Finally, men who misperceived themselves to be underweight or overweight evaluated their partners or most recent partners significantly more favorably, $t(36) = 2.08, p < .05$, and they felt their partners or most recent partners were significantly more active, $t(35) = 2.23, p < .05$, than men who misperceived themselves to be normal weight. No significant differences were found for their responses on the semantic differential questionnaire.

Results for hypothesis number two in which undergraduate men who are underweight or misperceive themselves to be underweight were compared to those who are normal weight and overweight or misperceive themselves to be overweight and normal weight, were consistent with expectations. It was assumed that men who believed that they were underweight would have a poorer self-concept, and poorer social and sexual relationships than men who believed that they were overweight or normal weight. There was a
main effect for weight, $F(2,86) = 25.73, p < .0000$.

Underweight men believed that they weighed less than most of their peers, and overweight men believed that they weighed more than most of their peers (see Table 6 for means and standard deviations). There also was a main effect for strength, $F(2,86) = 10.55, p < .0001$, with underweight men believing their strength to be significantly less than overweight or normal weight men. A similar main effect was noted for build, $F(2,86) = 9.35, p < .0002$, with underweight men viewing their build to be significantly smaller than normal weight or overweight men.

As expected, a main effect for attractiveness on the weight variable was noted, $F(2,86) = 43.94, p < .0000$. Underweight men believed that they would be significantly more attractive if they weighed more, and overweight men believed they would be significantly more attractive if they weighed less when compared to normal weight men who were satisfied with their weight (see Table 7 for means and standard deviations). There also was a main effect for attractiveness on the strength variable, $F(2,86) = 3.27, p < .05$. Underweight men believed that they would be significantly more attractive if they were stronger compared to overweight men. A similar main effect was noted for build, $F(2,86) = 5.04, p < .01$. Underweight men believed
that they would be significantly more attractive if they had a larger build compared to normal weight and overweight men.

There was a significant main effect for the three groups' satisfaction with their respective weights, $F(2,86) = 10.44, p < .0001$. Normal weight men were significantly more satisfied with their weight than underweight and overweight men (see Table 8 for means and standard deviations). A significant main effect for their satisfaction with their strength also was found between the three weight categories, $F(2,86) = 3.90, p < .05$. Underweight men were significantly more dissatisfied with their strength than normal weight men.

Results for the semantic differential questionnaire were also consistent with expectations. A significant main effect was found for potency, $F(2,85) = 19.95, p < .0000$. Underweight men felt significantly less potent in comparison to their normal weight and overweight peers, while overweight men felt significantly more potent in comparison to their normal weight peers (see Table 9 for means and standard deviations). A main effect for how others view their potency was also significant, $F(2,86) = 10.09, p < .0001$. Again, underweight men believed that others viewed them to be significantly less potent than normal weight or overweight men. Similarly, there was a main effect for one's ideal potency, $F(2,86) = 4.47, p < .05$, with
underweight and normal weight men wishing to be significantly more potent than their overweight peers. No significant differences were found for their responses on the evaluative or activity dimensions of the semantic differential.

**Discussion**

Overweight and underweight men are not accurate perceivers of their weight. Overweight men view themselves as thinner, while underweight men see themselves as heavier. This finding is contrary to Gray's (1977) research which showed that men perceive themselves as weighing less than their actual weights. However, Gray did not divide her sample into overweight, normal weight, and underweight categories. Her findings may not have been sensitive to the desires of underweight men to be normal weight. The findings of this study also show that men are quite aware of what constitutes normal weight for their age group. Overweight men and underweight men misperceived their actual weight towards the normal weight men. This wish for normalcy becomes even more evident when one looks at the normal weight men who were quite accurate in their perceptions of their weight. In other words, there is little reason to incorrectly report one's weight if one is in the desired weight range. It is possible that normal weight men feel content with their weight, and they are less
likely to distort their body size like overweight and underweight men.

Misperception of one's weight formed the basis for hypothesis number one. It was hypothesized that men who misperceive themselves as normal weight would have a more favorable view of themselves and their partners than men who misperceive themselves as overweight or underweight. However, results from this study were contrary to expectations. Undergraduate men who misperceived themselves as overweight or underweight were more confident, assertive, and were asked out on more dates than men who misperceived themselves as normal weight. They also felt that the people they date were more intelligent and had better physiques than men who misperceived themselves as normal weight.

It would seem that misperceiving oneself as normal weight had little bearing on the way the subjects felt about themselves or their partners. Yet, a number of factors must be looked at before one can make this conclusion. If mean rating scores for the statistically significant results of the misperceiving normal weight group are examined (see Tables 3, 4, and 5), it is apparent that the means are around four which, according to the questionnaire (see Appendix B), is "like most men in college". In other words, even though these undergraduate men are actually overweight or underweight, they are still characterizing themselves and
their partners as similar to their peers. This report bias may be related to the tendency of these men to state that their weights are closer to the norm as stated above. Again, there might be a wish for normalcy which pervades more than reported weight. There may be a desire for overweight and underweight men who believe their weight to be normal, to characterize themselves and their partners similarly to their peers.

This finding further refines studies by Harmanz, Gronendyke, and Thomas (1985) and Kishchuk, Gagnon, Belisle, and Laurendeau (1992) which showed that underweight males made significantly more negative self attributes than their normal weight peers. The current results show that an individual's perception of their weight also is as vital a component in one's self-concept and romantic relationships as actual weight. Misperceiving oneself as normal weight appears to be related to an overall trend by these men to perceive many characteristics of themselves and others as normal as well.

This explanation for men who misperceive as normal weight does not explain why those who misperceive themselves as underweight or overweight would see themselves as better than their peers. One would expect these men to feel poorly about themselves and their romantic relationships. A possible confound which may have affected the results to
hypothesis number 1 is that the two groups which were combined to create the misperceiving underweight or overweight group were too dissimilar. Undergraduate men may misperceive themselves as overweight or underweight for different reasons, and they may have different personality characteristics which could impact their answers on questions pertaining to themselves or their partners. However, post-hoc t-tests comparing normal weight men who misperceive themselves as overweight to those who misperceive themselves as underweight men revealed no significant differences between the two groups.

Given these results, it is possible that the benefits a male receives by misperceiving himself as normal weight are not reversed if he perceives himself as overweight or underweight. Misperceiving oneself as overweight or underweight may not necessarily be related to negative self-attributes in the same manner as misperceiving oneself as normal weight is related to positive self-attributes and positive romantic relationships. The effects of misperceiving weight are positive if one is actually underweight or overweight, but there are no effects of misperceiving weight if one is actually normal weight. However, because previous researchers have shown that there are negative connotations to underweight and overweight men,
it is difficult to explain the significant results of hypothesis number one from this study.

The second hypothesis, that undergraduate men who are underweight or misperceive themselves as underweight will have a poorer sense of self and their partners than undergraduate men who are overweight or normal weight or who misperceive themselves as overweight or normal weight, was strongly supported. Men who perceived themselves as underweight viewed themselves as smaller and weaker than overweight or normal weight men. They also felt their weight, strength, and build made them less attractive than their overweight and normal weight peers, and there was a greater dissatisfaction with their weight and strength. Men who perceived themselves as underweight also viewed themselves as powerless, thought their peers viewed them as powerless, and they had a greater desire to become more powerful than their overweight or normal weight peers.

The group of men who perceived themselves as underweight included men who were actually underweight and men who were normal weight but perceived themselves to be underweight. According to the results of hypothesis number one, men who perceived themselves as underweight though they were normal weight viewed themselves as more confident, assertive, and were asked out on more dates than their peers. Thus, these two subgroups combined for the perceived
underweight category in hypothesis number two may
categorize themselves differently. Men who are normal
weight but perceive themselves as underweight view
themselves in more favorable terms than men who accurately
perceive themselves as underweight.

Data for hypothesis number two was reanalyzed without
the subgroup of men who are normal weight but perceive
themselves as underweight as they may have inflated the mean
scores for the perceived underweight male group. Thus, this
post-hoc analysis consisted of men who are overweight and
perceive themselves as overweight, men who are normal weight
and perceive themselves as normal weight, and men who are
underweight without any misperceiving subgroup.

Results for the post-hoc analysis were mostly
consistent with the original findings of hypothesis number
two, though lower mean scores were found for some of the
variables in the underweight group (see Table 10 for
comparisons of means and standard deviations). Men who
accurately perceived themselves as underweight viewed
themselves more critically than their peers when men who
misperceive themselves as underweight were removed from the
sample.

Two variables, which were not significantly different
in the first analysis, were significantly different in the
second analysis. Significant main effects were found for
the amount of dates, $F(2, 82), p < .01$, and for how often one was asked out on dates, $F(2, 81), p < .05$. Underweight men believed that they had significantly fewer dates ($M = 2.0, SD = 1.18$) than men who perceived themselves as overweight ($M = 4.0, SD = 1.36$) or men who perceived themselves as normal weight ($M = 3.34, SD = 1.45$). Underweight men also believed that they were asked out on significantly fewer dates ($M = 2.36, SD = 1.36$) than men who perceived themselves as overweight ($M = 3.67, SD = 1.18$) or men who perceived themselves as normal weight ($M = 3.47, SD = 1.34$).

One result which was significantly different in the original analysis of hypotheses number two was not significantly different in the reanalysis of the data. No differences were found for the three groups in their ideal ratings of potency. Men who accurately perceived themselves as underweight did not wish to be any more potent than their peers. The significant results found in the original analysis of hypothesis number two seems to stem more from men who perceive themselves as underweight though they are normal weight.

Overall, this study supports the previous literature (Harmatz, Gronendyke, & Thomas, 1985; Kaplan, Busner, & Pollack, 1988; McCaulay, Mintz, & Glenn, 1988; Kishchuk, Gagnon, Belisle, & Laurendeau, 1992) which found that underweight men view themselves more unfavorably than their
peers. The results also show that an individual's perception of his weight, regardless of accuracy, is as salient a factor in influencing a negative self-image as his actual weight. It also seems that undergraduate men in this sample have internalized some of the traits that subjects in previous studies (Lerner, 1969a; Lerner, 1969b; Lerner & Gellert, 1969; Lerner & Korn, 1972) ascribed to underweight males. Thus, it would seem that underweight men have internalized similar stereotypes such as weak, small, and powerless. In other words, there is a congruence between underweight men and the people around them in the stereotyped belief that underweight men are weak and powerless.

The measures used in this study were a useful tool in detecting these unfavorable traits. The semantic differential proved to be a valuable means of detecting subtler attributions of the self which more direct measures may fail to detect. However, the measure created for this study needs to be refined and validated in order to be more confident about its results and its generalizability to other populations.

Future research on body image in men should further examine the differences between men who are underweight and men who misperceive themselves to be underweight. Given the findings that underweight men view themselves as weak and
powerless, it is possible that underweight men see themselves or their partners differently than men who are normal weight and misperceive themselves to be underweight. There also may be differences between underweight men and men who are underweight and misperceive themselves to be normal weight.

Future research on body image should also examine whether men who are underweight continue to have a poor self-image beyond their college years. It is fairly clear that men from childhood to early adulthood are quite aware of and affected by their bodies. Few studies have looked at whether a relationship between body image and self-concept remains for older men, and whether one's body image has any impact on one's perceptions of their partner or spouse. For example, no studies have compared a man's perception of his body image after a divorce or as he begins to age. It is probable that a divorce or separation would increase a man's focus on his body image as he has to attract a new partner. It is also possible that as men age and issues of longevity become more important, men will want to weight less. Consequently, older overweight men might view themselves as critically as younger underweight men. It is in these areas that body image research about men could prove most exciting and fruitful.
Table 1: Layout for Perceived Weight by Actual Weight Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Weight</th>
<th>Actual Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over</td>
<td>Cell 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Cell 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under</td>
<td>Cell 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Frequency Distributions for Perceived Weight by Actual Weight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Weight</th>
<th>Actual Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Dashes indicate that there were no subjects in a particular cell.
Table 3:  Actual and Reported Mean Weights and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight</td>
<td>200.13</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Weight</td>
<td>165.62</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underweight</td>
<td>144.52</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported Weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight</td>
<td>195.36</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Weight</td>
<td>164.97</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underweight</td>
<td>147.96</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Weight is measured in pounds.
Table 4: Mean Scores for Misperceivers' Comparisons to Other Undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misperceive Overweight or Underweight (n = 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misperceive Normal Weight (n = 31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The higher the score is, the more a subject believes that they possess a particular variable in comparison to other undergraduate men.
Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Partners or Most Recent Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misperceive Overweight or Underweight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physique</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misperceive Normal Weight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physique</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. An average score for variables one and two is 4 with higher scores signifying that a variable is more characteristic of their partner or most recent partner than most undergraduate men's partner or most recent partner. An average score for variables three and four is 12 with higher scores signifying a greater attribution.
Table 6: Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings for Subjects' Comparisons to His Peers Using Perceived Weight Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overweight (n = 15)</th>
<th>Normal Weight (n = 59)</th>
<th>Underweight (n = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>4.67 (0.82)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.80 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.27 (0.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>4.07 (0.96)</td>
<td>4.44 (1.04)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>4.20 (1.08)</td>
<td>4.36 (1.06)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The higher the rating is, the more the subject believes he possesses a variable compared to other undergraduate men.

<sup>a</sup>Standard deviations are in parentheses.
Table 7: Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings for Level of Attractiveness Using Perceived Weight Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overweight ( (n = 15) )</th>
<th>Normal Weight ( (n = 59) )</th>
<th>Underweight ( (n = 15) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>2.80 (0.56)*</td>
<td>4.10 (0.80)</td>
<td>5.33 (0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>4.67 (0.90)</td>
<td>4.90 (0.82)</td>
<td>5.47 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>4.80 (1.01)</td>
<td>4.98 (0.75)</td>
<td>5.67 (0.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard deviations are in parentheses.

Note. The higher the rating is, the more attractive a subject would feel on a particular variable.
Table 8: Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings for Subjects' Level of Satisfaction Using Perceived Weight Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overweight (n = 15)</th>
<th>Normal Weight (n = 59)</th>
<th>Underweight (n = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>2.73 (0.88)*</td>
<td>4.36 (1.48)</td>
<td>3.20 (1.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>3.93 (1.28)</td>
<td>4.19 (1.57)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The higher the rating is, the more satisfied a subject feels.
*Standard deviations are in parentheses.*
Table 9: Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings on the Semantic Differential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overweight (n = 15)</th>
<th>Normal Weight (n = 59)</th>
<th>Underweight (n = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potency (Self)</td>
<td>15.47 (1.36) (^a)</td>
<td>13.72 (1.20)</td>
<td>10.53 (3.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency (Social)</td>
<td>14.53 (2.23)</td>
<td>13.24 (2.94)</td>
<td>9.73 (4.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency (Ideal)</td>
<td>14.27 (1.49)</td>
<td>15.92 (2.02)</td>
<td>16.00 (2.17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. An average score is 12 with higher scores signifying a greater attribution. 
\(^a\)Standard deviations are in parentheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure and Variable</th>
<th>Original Analysis</th>
<th>Post-hoc Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Differential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency (Self)</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency (Social)</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

On each page of this booklet you will find a different concept to be judged and beneath it a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order. The direction toward which you place the checkmark depends upon which end of the scale seems most characteristic to you of the concept you are judging. For example:

Myself (concept)

Big  _ : _X : _ : _ : _ : _ Little
(Scale)

Please place your checkmarks on this questionnaire and in the middle of the spaces, not on the boundaries.

- Do not omit any scales.
- Do not put more than one check mark on a single scale.
- Please mark your first impression or feeling on each scale. Do not spend a lot of time on individual items.

Myself
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Me - As I Would Like To Be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Unfair</th>
<th>Hot</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Me - As Others See Me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Unfair</th>
<th>Hot</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My Current Or Most Recent Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Dirty</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Fast</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Cold</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Partner or Most Recent Partner - As I Would Like Her/Him To Be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>Hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Cold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Large  | Passive| Clean | Strong| Slow   | Light | Unfair| Hot   | Good  |
| My Partner or Most Recent Partner - As Others See Her/Him |
| Large  | Passive| Clean | Strong| Slow   | Light | Unfair| Hot   | Good  |
|        | Active | Dirty | Weak | Fast   |       |       |       |       |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Light</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
<th>Unfair</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Hot</th>
<th>Cold</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PHYSICAL AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS QUESTIONNAIRE

In the following questionnaire, you will be asked to respond to a variety of questions regarding your romantic and sexual relationships. All of your responses should be recorded on the OP-SCAN form. The term partner is used throughout this questionnaire. For purposes of this questionnaire, partner refers to any person you see in a casual, committed, romantic, or sexual relationship.

Compare yourself to other men in college on the following traits using the scale below:
1 = a lot less than most men in college
2 = less than most men in college
3 = a little less than most men in college
4 = like most men in college
5 = a little more than most men in college
6 = more than most men in college
7 = a lot more than most men in college

1. I am intelligent ________________________________.
2. I weigh ________________________________.
3. My strength is ________________________________.
4. My height is ________________________________.
5. I am shy ________________________________.
6. I am self-confident ____________________________.
7. I am self-conscious ____________________________.
8. I am assertive ____________________________.
9. I am sexually active ____________________________.
10. My build is ____________________________.
11. I am comfortable with myself ____________________________.
12. I am sexually attractive ____________________________.
13. I have a sense of humor ____________________________.
14. I am physically attractive ____________________________.
15. I have a good personality ____________________________.
16. I go out on dates ____________________________.
17. I ask for/am asked on dates ____________________________.
18. I am turned down for dates ____________________________.
19. I am lonely ____________________________.
20. I am sexually responsive ____________________________.

Use the following scale to answer the questions below.

1 = a lot less
2 = less
3 = a little less
4 = the same (as I am now)
5 = a little more
6 = more
7 = a lot more

21. I would be more attractive to others if I was
I would be more attractive to others if I weighed ________.

23. I would be more attractive to others if I had ________ strength.

24. I would be more attractive to others if I had ________ height.

25. I would be more attractive to others if I was ________ shy.

26. I would be more attractive to others if I had ________ self-confidence.

27. I would be more attractive to others if I was ________ self-conscious.

28. I would be more attractive to others if I was ________ assertive.

29. I would be more attractive to others if I was ________ sexually active.

30. I would be more attractive to others if I had ________ of a build.

31. I would be more attractive to others if I was ________ comfortable with myself.

32. I would be more attractive to others if I was ________ sexually attractive.

33. I would be more attractive to others if I had ________ sense of humor.
34. I would be more attractive to others if I was ____________ physically attractive.
35. I would be more attractive to others if I had ____________ of a good personality.
36. I would be more attractive to others if I was ____________ sexually responsive.

Use the following scale to answer the questions below.
1 = quite dissatisfied
2 = dissatisfied
3 = somewhat dissatisfied
4 = neutral
5 = somewhat satisfied
6 = satisfied
7 = quite satisfied

37. I am ____________________ with my intelligence.
38. I am ____________________ with my weight.
39. I am ____________________ with my strength.
40. I am ____________________ with my height.
41. I am ____________________ with my shyness.
42. I am ____________________ with my self-confidence.
43. I am ____________________ with my self-consciousness.
44. I am ____________________ with my assertiveness.
45. I am ________________ with my sexual activity.
46. I am ________________ with my build.
47. I am ________________ with myself.
48. I am ________________ with my sexual attractiveness.
49. I am ________________ with my sense of humor.
50. I am ________________ with my physical attractiveness.
51. I am ________________ with my personality.
52. I am ________________ with my sexual responsiveness.

Compared to other men's partners, describe your current partner(s) on the following dimensions. (If you do not have a current partner, then your most recent partner.)

1 = a lot less
2 = less
3 = a little less
4 = the same (no difference)
5 = a little more
6 = more
7 = a lot more

53. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has ________ intelligence.
54. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has ________ weight.
55. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has ______ strength.
56. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has ______ height.
57. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has ______ shyness.
58. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has ______ self-confidence.
59. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has ______ self-consciousness.
60. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has ______ assertiveness.
61. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has ______ sexually activity.
62. Compared to other men's partners my current partner has ______ build.
63. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner is ______ comfortable with herself/himself.
64. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has ______ sexually attractiveness.
65. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has ______ sense of humor.
66. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner
has _______ physically attractiveness.

67. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has _______ of a good personality.

68. Compared to other men's partners, my current partner has _______ sexually responsiveness.

Using the following scale to answer the questions below.
(If you do not have a current partner, then your most recent partner.)

1 = quite dissatisfied
2 = dissatisfied
3 = somewhat dissatisfied
4 = neutral
5 = somewhat satisfied
6 = satisfied
7 = quite satisfied

69. I am __________________________ with my partner's intelligence.

70. I am __________________________ with my partner's weight.

71. I am __________________________ with my partner's strength.

72. I am __________________________ with my partner's height.
73. I am __________________ with my partner's shyness.
74. I am __________________ with my partner's self-confidence.
75. I am __________________ with my partner's self-consciousness.
76. I am __________________ with my partner's assertiveness.
77. I am __________________ with my partner's sexual activity.
78. I am __________________ with my partner's build.
79. I am __________________ with my partner's level of comfort with herself/himself.
80. I am __________________ with my partner's sexual attractiveness.
81. I am __________________ with my partner's sense of humor.
82. I am __________________ with my partner's physical attractiveness.
83. I am __________________ with my partner's personality.
84. I am __________________ with my partner's sexual responsiveness.
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