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ABSTRACT

A woman who acts agentically in the workplace is more likely to be disliked and viewed as less competent than a woman who acts caring and communal. The negative consequences for acting outside of a cultural stereotype are called backlash. Cultural gender stereotypes for western society depict women as warm and communal while men are agentic and independent. Women in the workplace act outside of the cultural stereotype, and thus face backlash from their peers. This study examines the extent to which women utilize self-sexualization as a recovery strategy to cope with the fear of backlash, and ultimately how these variables affect cognitive depletion. In this study, participants experienced a low or high fear of backlash condition and then were measured on self-sexualization and cognitive depletion. With an entirely female sample (N=118) I found a positive correlation between the fear of backlash and self-sexualization. Additionally, I found that self-sexualization moderated the relationship between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion. When the fear of backlash was low, there was no difference across conditions, but when the fear of backlash was high, those who were high in self-sexualization experienced less cognitive depletion than participants who were low in self-sexualization.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Influence of Backlash on Self-Sexualization and Cognitive Depletion

The norm for western society women is to be feminine, amongst other traits, and some women try to conform to this norm by self-sexualizing, treating themselves as a sexualized object (Allen & Gervais, 2012). Heels are higher, skirts are shorter, and make-up is a multibillion-dollar industry\(^1\). Pantene’s “Whip it\(^2\),” advertisement went viral, confronting major stereotypes about women in the work force such as men are the “boss,” while women are “bossy,” men are “persuasive” while women are “pushy,” and a man is “smooth” but a woman is a “show-off”. The advertisement implies that cultivating sex appeal can help women overcome discrimination. The present research tests the veracity of this claim using the Backlash Avoidance Model (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004).

When women act outside of the stereotypic role of the homemaker, they often experience backlash from their peers and co-workers (Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Glick, & Phelan, 2012a). Backlash refers to the negative economic and social consequences of acting outside of stereotypical norms (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008; Phelan & Rudman, 2010; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004;

\(^1\) L’Oreal made over 28.33 billion dollars in sales the year 2011, and the market is growing (http://huffingtonpost.com/2012/08/09/loreal-beauty-industry-2833-billion_n_1761412.html).

\(^2\) Watch the Advertisement here: http://www.youtube.com/user/PantenePhilippines
Rudman et al, 2012a). Women may try to minimize the negative consequences of backlash by using recovery strategies such as increased norm conformity (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). I tested whether self-sexualization is one expression of increased norm conformity. More specifically, I will test whether the fear of backlash causes women to use self-sexualization as a recovery strategy. If so, I will test whether this self-sexualization helps or hinders their cognitive resources in preparation for a job interview.

**The Backlash Model**

Cultural stereotypes are powerful forces in society, which can influence an individual’s thoughts and behaviors. According to Rudman and Fairchild (2004) (see Figure 5) women in business today automatically violate cultural stereotypes (see also Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts 2012a). In general, women are expected to be warm, nurturing, and communal while holding positions in the caregiver or secondary role, such as nurse, housewife, or secretary (Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Rudman & Kilianski, 2000; Rudman et al, 2012). Meanwhile, it is the cultural stereotype for men to be agentic, aggressive, and independent while holding positions of power such as CEO and Doctor (Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008; Rudman & Kilianski, 2000; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Rudman et al, 2012a).

Both men and women hold implicit prejudice towards women who occupy agentic jobs as well as towards men who occupy communal jobs (Rudman & Kilianski, 2000). When individuals act outside of or contrary to these cultural stereotypes, they are punished (Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Glick, & Phelan 2012) via backlash from their peers.
in the form of social ostracism and economic penalties (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Phelan, Moss-Racusin, 2008; Rudman et al, 2012a; Rudman et al, 2012b). When individuals act in line with cultural stereotypes, they are liked and included by their peers.

To examine the nature of backlash, Rudman and Fairchild (2004) tested participants on a stereotypically male or female activity, and then were told they performed better or worse than a member of the opposite gender on that same task. In the next round of tests, participants were given the opportunity to backlash against other participants by using sabotage. Participants sabotaged the other person by choosing to give unhelpful instead of helpful clues when both options were presented. They found that participants were more likely to sabotage the other person when that person was acting outside of gender norms. For example, a man was more likely to sabotage a woman who outperformed him on a football test than on a fashion test.

Furthermore, Phelan, Moss-Racusin, and Rudman (2008) tested to see if individuals exhibited backlash in a different way—by shifting the criteria needed for a job to insure that women were excluded from an agentic position. In their study, participants read two different descriptions of individuals applying to become a police officer. The applicants were either male or female and either had street smarts or book smarts (Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008). Participants were more likely to choose the male for the police officer position rather than the female, and there was no effect of what skills each candidate brought to the table. If the man had street smarts, participants believed street smarts to be more important; when the man had book smarts, participants rated book smarts as more important (Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman,
2008). That is, participants followed cultural stereotypes instead of qualifications when choosing who was better suited for the position, demonstrating yet again how cultural stereotypes keep people “in their place.”

Women pick up on social cues in their environment about actions that are permissible and actions that will result in consequences. These cues can be explicitly stated or implicitly inferred through body language or subtle gestures (Amanutullah & Morris, 2010). Women who act interdependently and warm are well liked by their peers and receive positive and supportive behavior. Women who act gender-atypically know that violating a gender stereotype often has negative consequences, and this knowledge instills fear (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). They may fear being disliked or excluded from a social group (Phelan & Rudman, 2010), being given less money in a business negotiation (Amanutullah & Morris, 2010), being sabotaged for holding a leadership role (Rudman et al, 2012), or being seen as less intelligent (Brescoll, 2012).

Women may manage their fear of backlash using recovery strategies such as hiding deviant behavior and increasing gender conformity (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). One way women avoid backlash is to act in line with cultural stereotypes (Amanutullah & Morris, 2010). Women want to keep a good relationship with their boss, and know that being less assertive keeps the peace, thus a woman may adjust her level of assertiveness to avoid problems in the work place. The boss notices how all the women in the office are unassertive and this reinforces the notion that “women are not assertive” or “women are less agentic than men.” Thus, by conforming to the social stereotype
through increased gender conformity, women reduce the likelihood of backlash occurring at the cost of stereotype maintenance in the eyes of their boss.

Another way to avoid backlash is to monitor one’s behavior by minimizing success on a counter-stereotypic task, hiding the deviant behavior (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). When a woman is seen as agentic, she is often seen as unintelligent (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Brescoll, 2012). Thus, some women may monitor how much they speak up to be seen as intelligence when in a male dominated field. In a naturalistic observation by Brescoll (2012), women in congress spent significantly less time talking about their plans than men and demonstrated both verbal and non-verbal signs of a lower power role. Unfortunately, this translates to women remaining in low power roles and positions, such as the women in congress.

For the purposes of this study, I will focus on the recovery strategy of increasing gender norm conformity to avoid backlash as found in the study by Amanatullah and Morris (2010). Norm conformity is when an individual exhibits the behaviors that are similar to the group. In the case of my study, women will have the option to conform to the gender norm by showing more gender stereotypic traits. In western society, the norm is for women to act warm and communal; it also encourages women to enhance their femininity and sexuality (Allen & Gervais, 2012). I will test whether women conform to gender norms using self-sexualization.

Self-Sexualization

Self-sexualization is a form of self-objectification. Self-objectification involves treating the self as an object or a body to be used by others, rather than a person with
thoughts and feelings to be respected by others (Bernard, Gervais, Allen, Compomizzi, & Klein, 2012; Gervais, Vesccio, Forster, Maass, & Suitner, 2012; Helfick, Goldenberg, Cooper, & Puvia, 2011). Self-sexualization is a ubiquitous theme in western society, surrounding women through facets of the media such as television, advertisements, and magazines. From a young age, girls are taught that to be well liked is to attain a cultural sense of what is beautiful (i.e., thin and sexy). This constant exposure to the cultural norm causes girls to internalize these ideals and standards, which later informs self-sexualization in women (Goodin et al, 2011; Grabe, Hyde, & Ward, 2008; Graff, Muren, & Smolak, 2012; Nowatzki & Morry, 2009).

When individuals self-sexualize, they emphasize the sexualized body (Allen & Gervais, 2012; Gooden et al, 2011; Nowatzki & Morry, 2009). Self-sexualization is mainly depicted through clothing choices that emphasize the sexualized body (Allen & Gervais, 2012; Goodin et al, 2011). Low cut tops, miniskirts, and high heeled shoes are all sexualized clothing because they bring attention to the breasts, buttocks, and legs of women. Sexualized and feminized clothing can overlap, but have notable differences (Grabe et al, 2008; Graff et al, 2012; Goodin et al, 2011). For example, a pair of flats with a pink bow would be considered highly feminine, but not very sexual.

Self-sexualization can decrease a woman’s well being. Body surveillance is one way women may regulate their appearance. When women pay close attention to their body and body movement, they may also restrain physical movements or eating (Allen & Gervais, 2012; Liss et al, 2011). Liss, Erchull, and Ramsey (2011) gave women online surveys to determine their enjoyment of sexualization, body consciousness, eating
attitudes, self-objectification, and explicit self-esteem. Participants who were high in body surveillance reported more enjoyment of sexualization statements and ideas. Women who reported enjoying sexualization were also more likely to have high levels of body surveillance (i.e., the constant monitoring of one’s body and/or chronic awareness of the appearance of one’s body), self-objectification, and disordered eating behaviors.

My study tests whether self-sexualization is used as a form of self-regulation to cope with a fear of backlash for violating gender norms. Women who self-sexualize often do not see it as a form of objectification, but as a way to feel powerful (Allen & Gervais, 2012; Liss et al, 2011). Appreciating how one looks contributes to self-esteem and it is this look-good-feel-good idea that may lead to self-sexualization to boost confidence (Allen & Gervais, 2012; Liss et al, 2011). However, men tend to see sexy women as unintelligent (Allen & Gervais, 2012). Thus, women who choose to self-sexualize to gain power and respect may receive more negative than positive outcomes.

**Decreased Performance: Cognitive Depletion**

Cognitive depletion—a lack of cognitive resources—results in depressed performance on cognitive tasks (Richeson & Shelton, 2007; Richeson & Trawalter, 2005). When cognitive resources are depleted, anything requiring thought becomes increasingly difficult. Reaction times decrease, attentional focus is harder to control, and the mental capacity to solve problems is limited.

To date, research has not tested whether self-sexualization affects cognitive depletion. My study will test whether self-sexualization decreases performance on cognitive tasks. A common result of self-regulation is a decreased performance because
of depleted cognitive resources (Richeson & Trawalter, 2005; Richeson & Shelton, 2007). For example, participants who believed they had implicit prejudice monitored their speech closely to insure they did not offend members of a different race (Richeson & Trawalter, 2005). The effort used to self-regulate speech left the participants cognitively depleted. Because self-sexualization is a form of self-regulation, I believe that the effort used to self-sexualize will also result in cognitive depletion.

Depleted cognitive resources negatively affect a person’s ability to negotiate in a job setting (Amanutullah & Morris, 2010; Amanatullah & Tinsley, 2012) and may negatively impact an individual’s communication skills at an interview or during actual job performance. Cognitive depletion, although problematic, may be unavoidable for many individuals who self-regulate. The process of self-regulating causes the brain to engage in effortful processing, using the resources that should be allocated to accomplish the task at hand. For example, if a woman wears a short skirt to be sexy she may spend more time thinking about how she is being perceived than thinking about an eloquent response to an interview question. By using cognitive resources to maintain the desired appearance (e.g., to self-regulate), the individual has fewer resources to think critically about a situation (e.g., negotiate a business proposition). Thus, I predict that the more individuals self-regulate through self-sexualization the more their performance will suffer on a measure of cognitive depletion.

**The Current Study**

The goal of this study is to use the Backlash Avoidance Model (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004) as a framework to explore the impact of self-sexualization on
cognitive depletion. From the backlash model, fear of backlash should result in women attempting to use various recovery strategies. If the participant chooses to self-sexualize as a recovery strategy, then her cognitive resources may be depleted. I hypothesize there will be a positive correlation between the fear of backlash and self-sexualization as well as a positive correlation between self-sexualization and cognitive depletion. Furthermore I hypothesize self-sexualization will affect the relationship between fear of backlash and cognitive depletion. Since this study has never been done before, the literature does not indicate if self-sexualization will control the association between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion or if self-sexualization will simply change the strength of the association between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion. Therefore it is unclear if the relationship between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion will be moderated or mediated by self-sexualization.

Self-sexualization could moderate the relationship between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion if the act of self-sexualizing occurs as a way to increase a woman’s feeling of empowerment in the situation. Women self-sexualize when they want to feel empowered, often in response to the fear of backlash (Allen & Gervais, 2012). If there is a low fear of backlash, a woman might not consciously see the need to feel empowered and thus there should be no direct influence on self-sexualization. However, when the fear of backlash is high, then the need to increase one’s power is salient and drives the woman to self-sexualize. This salient need to increase one’s power in response to the fear of backlash would only apply to the high fear of backlash condition and thus
explain a moderation effect of self-sexualization between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion.

On the other hand, the research regarding self-sexualization as self-regulation would argue towards a mediation effect. Constant self-regulatory actions require cognitive resources and so the more one self-regulates, the more cognitively depleted one becomes (Amanutullah & Morris, 2010; Amanutullah & Tinsley, 2012). If the fear of backlash leads to self-sexualization as a form of self-regulation, then more fear should result in more self-regulation, and thus end in more cognitive depletion. In turn, by this argument, less fear should equate to less self-regulation, which ends in less cognitive depletion, resulting in a mediating effect of self-sexualization.
CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

Participants

I recruited a sample of 144\(^1\) female undergraduate psychology students at Loyola University Chicago. Students received course credit for their participation in this study. During the first half of data collection, twenty-two participants failed to pay attention to instructions and failed to complete all aspects of the procedure as directed. These participants were excluded from analysis and a procedural change was implemented to increase proper completion of the procedure. Following the change, only five participants were excluded from analysis because the experimenter noted they were extremely distracted and/or suspicious during the debriefing.

The final sample size consisted of 118 participants\(^2\). A majority of this sample identified as White (N=79); 12 identified as South Asian; 9 identified as East Asian; 7 identified as Multi-racial; 4 identified as Black; 4 identified as Latino/Mexican; 2 identified as native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; and 1 identified as Middle Eastern. The mean age of participants was 18.74 years (SD=0.90 years). This sample only included

---

\(^{1}\) Original effect size from Rudman and Fairchild (2004) from backlash to atypical women was found to be large (\(d = .57\)). After calculating a power analysis with an effect size of \(d = .57\), power = .80 and a significance value of \(p = .05\), the necessary number of participants came to 50 people per condition. Thus, there will be at least 50 women in each condition.

\(^{2}\) Demographic information for the excluded participants reflected those of the sample retained. Of these excluded participants, the mean age was 18.88 years (SD = 1.03). 16 identified as White; 4 identified as South Asian; 2 identified as Multi-racial; 3 identified as Black; and 1 identified as Middle Eastern.
participants who identified as women, because the aim of this study was to see how fear of backlash affects young women entering into the work force.

**Design**

Participants were randomly assigned to either a low or high fear of backlash condition. I measured their level of self-sexualization and performance on the cognitive depletion task.

**Procedure**

Women were told that they would be participating in a study looking at how individuals prepare for a job interview. In phase one, they were told we were assessing their first impressions of candidates for a new job while playing the role of the Boss. I manipulated fear of backlash (high or low) by having participants read a salary negotiation with either a male or female candidate. Then participants answered questions to assess their liking of “Mark” or “Mary” as well as the hireability and ability to succeed of “Mark” or “Mary” (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010).

In phase two, participants were told that they would be put in the role of the subordinate for a mock negotiation. To prepare for this negotiation, participants were given a paper doll and seven items of clothing and were told the goal is to dress the doll as they would dress themselves for the negotiation. I measured self-sexualization by examining the types of clothes they choose for the doll. Participants were told to select one top, one bottom, and one pair of shoes to put on the doll. Participants had three minutes to complete this doll task. Once the time was up, participants kept their doll in their workstation, but the experimenter came over to take away the other clothing
options. Finally, participants were instructed to advocate for themselves as a valuable candidate deserving of a high salary by writing a short paragraph explaining why they should be given higher wages. Participants did not actually participate in a second negotiation round, as they were previously told.

In phase three, to measure cognitive depletion participants completed the stroop task on a computer in their workstation (Stroop, 1953). Finally, once the stroop task was completed, participants answered demographic questions, were debriefed, and then thanked for their participation in the study.

Materials

Fear of Backlash. Having knowledge of cultural stereotypes causes women to fear backlash if they plan to act agentically (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008; Phelan & Rudman, 2010; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Rudman et al, 2012a; Rudman et al, 2012b). Based on this idea, Amanatullah and Morris (2010) manipulated fear of backlash by having participants backlash against a female job applicant. In my study, participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions. Following Amanatullah and Morris (2010), in the low backlash condition, participants read a negotiation between themselves and a male candidate and then rated the candidate “Mark”. Participants in the high backlash condition read a negotiation between themselves and a female candidate and then rated the candidate “Mary”. The high backlash condition is the same negotiation conversation but the negotiator in this condition was changed to be a woman named “Mary” (See Appendix B). Participants typically exhibit backlash by giving Mary lower ratings than Mark. By backlashing
against “Mary,” the participants are primed with the idea that women experience backlash if they act agentically. Participants should come to expect the same or higher level of backlash against themselves as they gave to “Mary,” in the high backlash condition. As intended, pilot testing demonstrated that both men and women rated “Mark” as more likeable ($M = 4.00, SD = 1.31$), having a higher ability to succeed ($M = 4.75, SD = 1.37$), and being more hirable ($M = 6.00, SD = 0.82$) for the position than “Mary,” (Likable $M = 3.56$ $SD = 1.36$; Ability to Succeed $M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.17$; Hireability $M = 5.42$, $SD = 1.00$).

**Self-Sexualization.** Participants were then given the chance to self-sexualize as a recovery strategy. Each participant was given a paper doll, with three options for a top, two options for a bottom, and two options for shoes to dress the doll, which represented them in a negotiation setting. Each participant chose one top, one bottom, and one pair of shoes to dress the doll from the clothing provided. Each clothing item represents either high, medium, or low on sexuality from descriptions found in the literature review by Allen and Gervais (2012). A costume student at DePaul University designed the dolls and clothing. These items were pilot tested to distinguish sexuality from femininity and can be found in Appendix C.

Pilot testing data was collected from 48 Loyola University-Chicago students. The goal of pilot testing was to isolate different levels of sexy clothing that were equally appealing. For each article of clothing students were asked to what degree they thought the item was cute, liked the item, would buy the item, and thought the item was sexy on a 1 to 7 Likert Scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Ratings of cute, like, and
buy were then combined into an “appealing” variable. The three levels of tops were found to be equally appealing (i.e., no statistical difference). The three levels of tops were also found to differ with regards to sexiness, as expected. Therefore I will retain all three levels of the tops. The three levels of bottoms were not found to be equally appealing. The pants and medium skirt were thought to be slightly less appealing than the mini skirt. Unfortunately, only the two skirts were found to significantly differ in terms of sexiness. Therefore I retained only the two skirts for the bottoms. One of the shoe options was found to be universally unappealing and was therefore dropped as an option. The remaining two levels of shoes were rated as equally attractive and significantly different on sexiness. In sum, even though three levels of each type of clothing were tested, because of the pilot testing data, participants will choose from three tops, two bottoms, and two shoes (see Table 1).

Cognitive Depletion. To measure cognitive depletion participants took a computerized stroop task. During the stroop task, participants saw a word on the screen and instead of simply reporting what the word says they had to answer what color the word was written in. For example, if the word was “blue” but was written in a red font, then the correct answer is “red.” A longer reaction time to choose the correct answer indicated a higher depletion of cognitive resources in participants. A list of the stimulus words and instructions can be found in Appendix D.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

A Pearson’s r correlation analysis indicated that the fear of backlash ($M = 0.51$, $SD = 0.50$) was significantly correlated with self-sexualization ($M = 1.84$, $SD = 0.44$) with a correlation of $r = .21$, $p = .02$. The fear of backlash was not significantly correlated to stroop scores ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 0.11$, $r = -.08$, $p = .37$). Additionally, self-sexualization was not significantly correlated with stroop scores ($r = -.08$, $p = .38$). To view a full table of these descriptive statistics, please see Table 1.

The first objective of the research was to determine if the fear of backlash lead to the usage of self-sexualization as a recovery strategy. Thus, one of the first statistical tests run was to see if fear of backlash conditions affected self-sexualization. An independent samples t-test indicated that participants’ self-sexualization ratings differed by backlash condition, $t(116) = -2.28$, $p = .02$. Participants in the low backlash condition had lower self-sexualization scores ($M = 1.75$, $SD = 0.43$) than participants in the high backlash condition ($M = 1.93$, $SD = 0.43$). These results indicate that higher fear of backlash leads to higher self-sexualization scores, which confirms that self-sexualization was used as a recovery strategy as predicted.

Next, I wanted to examine if fear of backlash directly influenced the participants’ cognitive depletion. An independent samples t-test showed no significant difference in stroop response times due to condition for the incongruent $t(116) = 0.80$, $p = .43$. 

congruent $t(116) = 0.88, p = .38$, or incongruent-congruent difference score trials $t(116) = 0.24, p = .81$. This indicates that there is no direct relationship between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion.

**Mediation and Moderation Analyses**

*Mediation Model.* The next step was to analyze if there was an indirect relationship between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion. Self-sexualization was examined as a mediator of the relationship between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion. The Preacher and Hayes (2008) SPSS bootstrapping MACROS was used to compute a 95% bias-corrected bootstrapping confidence interval for the mediator of self-sexualization. Because cognitive depletion was measured via the reaction times to the Stroop task, average times for participants were log transformed to reduce skewness of scores in subsequent analyses. Contrary to the hypothesis, the fear of backlash did not indirectly affect cognitive depletion through self-sexualization (See Table 2).

Since the mediation analysis was not significant, I then ran a moderation analysis to further test if self-sexualization influenced the relationship between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion. Next, I tested whether self-sexualization moderated the influence of backlash on cognitive depletion. I used model 1 of the Preacher and Hayes (2008) PROCESS macros. I entered backlash as the independent variable, self-sexualization as the moderator, and the incongruent stroop trials as the dependent variable. The fear of backlash was not a significant predictor of cognitive depletion (*see Table 3*). Self-sexualization was a marginally significant predictor of cognitive depletion. Importantly, the interaction term explained a significant proportion of variance in
cognitive depletion. Thus, backlash is a significant moderator of the relationship between self-sexualization and cognitive depletion.

Simple slope analysis for the association between the independent variable of the fear of backlash and the dependent variable of cognitive depletion were tested for low (-1 SD below the mean) and high (+1 SD above the mean) levels of the moderating variable of self-sexualization. Simple slopes test indicated that self-sexualization scores only moderated this relationship in the high fear of backlash condition. Results revealed a significant difference in self-sexualization scores when fear of backlash was high ($\beta = -85.15$, $t = -2.13$, $p = .04$), but not when the fear of backlash was low ($\beta = 26.65$, $t = 0.67$, $p = .51$). Thus, only in the high fear of backlash condition did the participant’s self-sexualization level effect their cognitive depletion. Plots for the simple slopes for the interaction can be found in Figure 6.
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION

Women who display counter stereotypic qualities in order to succeed in business violate cultural norms and thus anticipate backlash from their peers (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Phelan et al 2008; Rudman et al, 2012a; Rudman et al, 2012b). This research aims to examine how young woman’s cognitive resources are affected by the influence of cultural gender stereotypes in a business setting. As hypothesized, the fear of backlash triggered the usage of self-sexualization as a recovery strategy. Participants in the high fear of backlash condition self-sexualized more than participants in the low fear of backlash condition. Participants who held a high fear that they would receive backlash for acting agentically engaged in higher levels of self-sexualization than participants who held a low fear that they would receive backlash for acting agentically. I believe participants used self-sexualization as a recovery strategy. Because self-sexualization is used as a way to conform to gender norms, this adds to the preliminary data, which argues that self-sexualization is becoming a new norm in young women in western society.

Contrary to my second hypothesis, self-sexualization did not directly predict cognitive depletion in participants. I believe this indicates that, in this study, self-sexualization was not a taxing exercise for participants. One explanation is that self-sexualizing behavior is virtually automatic and therefore is not draining to one’s
cognitive resources. After choosing to self-sexualize via the doll task, participants were not given any other opportunities to regulate the self-sexualizing behavior, and did not expend the necessary cognitive resources needed to maintain the behavior. With these cognitive resources available, participants were able to use them on the Stroop Task and perform no better or worse than participants who were low on self-sexualization.

Interestingly, in line with my final hypothesis, self-sexualization did have an impact on the relationship between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion. Although self-sexualization could mediate the relationship between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion, given this research it seems self-sexualization changed the magnitude of the relationship between the fear of backlash and cognitive depletion. Participants in the high fear of backlash condition differed on their levels of cognitive depletion, depending upon their level of self-sexualization. The more participants self-sexualized in the high fear of backlash condition the faster their reaction times on the Stroop Task. In essence, when the fear of backlash was high, participants who chose to self-sexualize experienced less cognitive depletion than those who did not choose to participate in this recovery strategy. Participants in the low fear of backlash condition did not differ significantly on their cognitive depletion depending upon their level of self-sexualization so this effect is unique to fearing backlash. This self-sexualization strategy appears to yield immediate positive results. Young woman entering into the workforce may actually gain short-term cognitive benefits through self-sexualization.

These findings both support and contradict previous research. Supporting the literature on the Backlash Avoidance Model (Phelan et al, 2008; Rudman & Fairchild,
2004; Rudman et al, 2012a; Rudman et al, 2012b) results indicate that the fear of backlash leads to the use of self-sexualization as a recovery strategy. The backlash model indicates that there are three ways in which a recovery strategy is used: hiding deviant behavior, deception, and increased gender norm conformity (Phelan et al, 2008; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Rudman et al, 2012a; Rudman et al, 2012b). In this study, self-sexualization did not hide any deviant behavior nor was it used for deception. Self-sexualization was used to conform to gender norms. In the past, self-sexualization has not been described as a gender norm, but this research supports the argument by Allen and Gervais (2012) that sexualization is a new cultural norm for women in western society. However, because self-sexualization is both a form of self-objectification and self-regulation, the usage of self-sexualization should result in more cognitive depletion in participants (Allen & Gervais, 2012; Richeson & Trawalter, 2005; Richeson & Shelton, 2007). My current findings contradict the previous research in this area of study.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

The measurement of self-sexualization was created specifically for this study. Pilot testing indicated that each level of clothing measured a significantly different level of sexualization such that lower levels of clothing were rated as less sexy than higher levels of clothing. Additionally, the doll was created to portray the average American Woman. However, this does not guarantee that each participant identified with the doll, and thus her clothing choices may not have directly measured self-sexualization. If the participant did not identify with the doll, then the clothing choices may not have
represented her sexualization, but maybe the sexualization of someone else. Instead of self-sexualization, the doll clothing could be a measure of sexualization of others, resulting in an indirect measurement of the objectification of women. A way future researchers could attempt to validate this clothing measure is twofold. First, following the doll task, participants could be asked a few questions about how much they identify with the doll to affirm that participants are internalizing the clothing choices instead of treating the doll as someone else. Second, the doll task could be transformed to the program PhotoShop in which the participants could take a picture of their face via the computer and then use that photo on the doll. This would increase the likelihood of associating the doll with oneself and the ability for the participant to internalize the choices made during the doll task.

Additionally, even the highest levels of sexual clothing options available to participants were still normatively appropriate choices for the work place. I may have observed a limited range of effects because even the highly sexual options could still be justified as normal and accepted. There is a possibility that if the different levels of self-sexualization were more extreme, then the affects on cognitive depletion could be larger as well.

Furthermore, the cognitive effects of self-sexualization may have more of an effect when participates actually wear sexualizing clothing rather than imagining wearing sexualizing clothing. Often imagined behavior does not equate to actual behavior (Azjen, 1991; Nisbett & Wilson, 1977; Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001). The literature on the theory of planned behavior states that individuals cannot directly observe their own
cognitive processing and although it is possible to accurately predict behavior, more often than not, people fail to accurately predict their actions and feelings (Azjen, 1991; Nisbett & Wilson, 1977; Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001). In the study by Woodzicka and LaFrance (2001), participants predicted that they would be angry in response to sexual harassment during a job interview, but results indicated that during such an event, participants were not angry, but experienced fear. Woodzicka and LaFrance’s (2001) results indicated the imagined sexual harassment resulted in anger, but the actual behavior resulted in fear. In my study, participants did not experience cognitive depletion when the self-sexualization was imagined. If this self-sexualization was a behavior (i.e., actually wearing self-sexualizing clothes to a business negotiation), participants may then experience cognitive depletion, in line with the theory of self-regulation and its affects on cognitive resources.

Future research in this area should analyze the generalizability of the doll task to actual self-sexualizing behavior. Daily diary studies or observational research could directly analyze real world self-sexualizing behaviors and their effects on cognitive depletion. This research indicates that self-sexualization is one way in which young women recover from the fear of backlash and this action yields positive immediate consequences on a cognitive task. Future research should explore the effects of self-sexualization on real world tasks such as interviews and business negotiations.

**Conclusion**

When women anticipate negative consequences for acting outside of cultural gender norms, they may use various recovery strategies. One-way women recover is
through an adherence to the gender norm of being sexy. This research indicates that, when faced with this threat, self-sexualization frees up cognitive resources and ultimately helps the individual in the short-term. Young women may see self-sexualization as a way to succeed in their careers, but it could ultimately come at a price. Being sexy may help their problem solving abilities, but comes at a risk of being perceived as less intelligent by their male counterparts. This research is important because it demonstrates how young woman receive a false sense of security through cultural norm conformity.
APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Title: Business Negotiation

Researcher: Mallory Grembowski

Introduction: You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by Mallory Grembowski for a Thesis under the supervision of Robyn Mallett in the Department of Psychology at Loyola University of Chicago. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study.

Purpose: You are invited to participate in research investigating how individuals react to a business situation. The study examines how people make decisions heading into a business negotiation as well as the effects of those actions on cognitive resources. Please know that you will not be informed of the full scope or hypotheses until after your participation.

Procedures: Participants will engage in one or more of the following four activities: 1) read a salary negotiation vignette 2) chose clothing for a negotiation 3) prepare for a negotiation and/or write a cover letter for a job 4) complete a questionnaire. All participants also may be asked to complete a reading comprehension task and participants may be asked questions about themselves.

Risks and Benefits: There are minimal risks that do not exceed a level that you may encounter during your normal daily activities. There are no direct benefits to your participation, however this research will help our understanding of how conditions present during the interview process affect performance during an interview.

Time Commitment: The experiment will take about 30 minutes to complete.

Compensation: You will receive 2 credits for a Psyc 100 or Psyc 101 class for completion of this experiment.

Confidentiality: Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data from the study. Your name will not be connected to the information you provide, nor will your individual responses be identified in any research reports describing the study. All information obtained during the study will remain confidential. Joining of your own free will: Your participation is voluntary. You may withhold information that you do not wish to disclose, and you do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer. You may choose not to serve as a participant or withdraw from this study at any time without penalty.
This study has been approved by the Loyola Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689. If you have any questions about the study, please contact Mallory Grembowski (phone: 815.529.0472 email: mgrembowski@luc.edu) and/or Robyn Mallett (rmallett@luc.edu).

**Participant Statement:** I have read the explanation provided to me and I understand that by signing this document, I am verifying that I am at least 18 years of age and that I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

**Participant Signature:** __________________ Date: __________

**Researcher Signature:** ___________________ Date: __________
APPENDIX B

FEAR OF BACKLASH MANIPULATION VIGNETTES
**Instructions:** Imagine you are a market research analyst acting as hiring manager for your company, the Corp. You are responsible for the formulation and execution of hiring a new member to your marketing team, together with your team of eight experienced marketers. You coordinate market analyses aimed at identifying consumer needs, and introduce new products and services to strengthen our position in the market. You have a master’s degree in marketing; you like to take the initiative; you have excellent analytic and communication skills; and you can manage and inspire a team. Read the conversation below and rate your impression of the negotiator in the questions that follow.

**Woman Negotiator (note: this heading will not be included on experiment copies)**

You: Good morning. I am the hiring manager for the Corp. Congratulations on your offer with us. We are really looking forward to you joining our team and think you will find the experience very rewarding. As you know, the Corp is a non-profit, student-run organization with the goal of providing low-cost goods and services to students. We operate 7 businesses, including the Vital Vittles convenience store, 3 coffee shops - Uncommon Grounds, More Uncommon Grounds, and Midnight Mug, Corp Catering, Student Storage, and Hoya Snaxa, and we are excited about what you can bring to the company as a new marketing manager in Vital Vittles.

Mary: Thanks. I’m really excited about the opportunity and eager to begin.

You: Great, then let’s get right to it. Thanks for coming in today to discuss and hopefully finalize the details of your offer so that we can get you started working here.

Mary: Absolutely. I am confident that we can come to an agreement today that I will be happy to accept.

You: Salary is the one issue left and we are prepared to offer you $1,100 per semester.

Mary: oh’ I don’t think so. That offer is insulting; it is way too low for me. I propose $1,800 per semester. You would be foolish not to seriously consider this counteroffer.

You: No, that’s no good. How about $1,300? That seems fair.

Mary: I don’t think that’s fair at al. Frankly, I’m shocked that you would offer me so little. I have other offers that are looking much more desirable right now. How about $1,700 per semester? If you do not consider this salary, I may be forced to accept another campus offer.

You: Well, that’s not acceptable for us. We could do $1,350.

Mary: I can’t agree to that. Your offer is unreasonable; I’d refuse to work for so little. There is no way you can possibly expect me to work for less than $1,600.

You: That’s still too high for us. What about $1,400?

Mary: No. I am definitely worth more than this and need to be paid more. How about $1,550?
You should accept this offer because I would refuse to work for less.

End of Conversation. After more back and forth in the negotiation you and Mary reach a mutually acceptable agreement on her salary of $1,500.

Male Negotiator

You: Good morning. I am the hiring manager for the Corp. Congratulations on your offer with us. We are really looking forward to you joining our team and think you will find the experience very rewarding. As you know, the Corp is a non-profit, student-run organization with the goal of providing low-cost goods and services to students. We operate 7 businesses, including the Vital Vittles convenience store, 3 coffee shops - Uncommon Grounds, More Uncommon Grounds, and Midnight Mug, Corp Catering, Student Storage, and Hoya Snaxa, and we are excited about what you can bring to the company as a new marketing manager in Vital Vittles.

Mark: Thanks. I’m really excited about the opportunity and eager to begin.

You: Great, then let’s get right to it. Thanks for coming in today to discuss and hopefully finalize the details of your offer so that we can get you started working here.

Mark: Absolutely. I am confident that we can come to an agreement today that I will be happy to accept.

You: Salary is the one issue left and we are prepared to offer you $1,100 per semester.

Mark: oh’ I don’t think so. That offer is insulting; it is way too low for me. I propose $1,800 per semester. You would be foolish not to seriously consider this counteroffer.

You: No, that’s no good. How about $1,300? That seems fair.

Mark: I don’t think that’s fair at al. Frankly, I’m shocked that you would offer me so little. I have other offers that are looking much more desirable right now. How about $1,700 per semester? IF you do not consider this salary, I may be forced to accept another campus offer.

You: Well, that’s not acceptable for us. We could do $1,350.

Mark: I can’t agree to that. Your offer is unreasonable; I’d refuse to work for so little. There is no way you can possibly expect me to work for less than $1,600.

You: That’s still too high for us. What about $1,400?

Mark: No. I am definitely worth more than this and need to be paid more. How about $1,550? You should accept this offer because I would refuse to work for less.

End of Conversation. After more back and forth in the negotiation you and Mark reach a mutually acceptable agreement on her salary of $1,500.
APPENDIX C

DOLL COMPOSITION AND COMPONENTS
The idea to create an external source to represent self-sexualization came from the avatars in the experiment by Schlenker (2010) and the idea to create different items of clothing as different levels of sexualization came from Goodin et al (2011), Graff et al (2012), and Allen and Gervais (2012).

Figure 1. Scanned image of the doll used during the doll task.

**The Doll:** The dolls used in the study will be white women, with a dress size of about 12, and a bust to waist ratio of about 0.75. According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the average height of the American women is five feet, four inches and the average weight is 152 pounds (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2012). This would give the average women a dress size of about 12-16 depending on the manufacturer. Additionally, the most desired waist to hip ratio of women is .70 (Singh, 1993), so the doll will be close to the ideal at about .75. The doll will be designed to not be a culturally beautiful Barbie, but to represent a normal individual. However, humans do prefer an idealized version of themselves, so the doll has a smooth hourglass look to her, while still representing the “average” women.
**Tops:** Tops are based off of an actual product sold at H&M. Sexualization brings the sexualized body to focus, so each top increase with sexualization as the shirt unbuttons towards the chest. The blazer and other shirt details will be held constant.

Figure 2. Scanned images of top options for doll task.

![Top Options](image1.jpg)
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**Bottoms:** Bottoms are designed after actual products sold at New York & Co. Sexualization brings the sexualized body to focus, so each bottom increased with sexualization as the legs are more exposed, and the gaze directed upward. Low sexualized clothing are pants, medium are long skirts, and high are short skirts.

Figure 3. Scanned images of bottom options for doll task both used and discarded.

![Bottom Options](image2.jpg)

Level 1 Pants   Level 2 Knee-length skirt   Level 3 Mid-thigh skirt
**Shoes:** Shoes are designed from actual products sold at Payless Shoe Co. Sexualization brings the sexualized body to focus, so each shoe increased with sexualization as attention is brought to the legs. Low sexualized shoes are flats, medium are small heals, and high are high heels.

Figure 4. Scanned images of shoe options for doll task both used and discarded.

![Shoe Options](image)

Level 1 Flats                  Level 2 Medium Heel                  Level 3 High Heel

**What the participant will see:**

For this next task, pretend that you are getting dressed to go to an interview for a job, and dress the doll as you would dress yourself. Please use the options of clothing provided.

Please pick one top, one bottom, and one pair of shoes to dress the doll.
APPENDIX D

STROOP TASK
Instructions: In this experiment you are required to click the color of the word, not what the word says. For example, for the word, RED, you should click the answer "Blue." As soon as the words appear on your screen, read the list as fast as you can. When you have finished, click on the "Finish" button. The time it took you to read all of the words will be shown. If you want to try the same set of words, click on the "reload" button of your browser. If you want to continue with the experiment, click on "Continue Experiment," (Chudler, 2014).

List of Stimulus:

Word-Color Congruent Stimuli (Chudler, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RED</th>
<th>GREEN</th>
<th>BLUE</th>
<th>YELLOW</th>
<th>PINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>YELLOW</td>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>YELLOW</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINK</td>
<td>YELLOW</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word-Color Incongruent Stimuli (Chudler, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RED</th>
<th>GREEN</th>
<th>BLUE</th>
<th>YELLOW</th>
<th>PINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>YELLOW</td>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>YELLOW</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINK</td>
<td>YELLOW</td>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

DEBRIEFING FORM
Thank you for participating in today’s experiment. We hope that you found this study educational and insightful with regards to psychological research.

A woman who acts agentically in the workplace is more likely to be disliked and viewed as less competent than women who act caring and communal. The negative consequences for acting outside of a cultural stereotype is called backlash. Women in the workplace act outside of the cultural stereotype, and thus face backlash from their peers. This study aims to examine the extent to which women utilize self-sexualization as a recovery strategy to cope with the fear of backlash, and ultimately how these variables affect an individual’s ability to solve problems and complete tasks.

In this experiment, there were two possible conditions and each participant was randomly assigned to either condition 1 or condition 2. Each participant had an equal chance of being in either the first or second condition. In the first condition participants read a negotiation between them and “Mark,” then rate “Mark.” Participants in condition two read the same negotiation as in condition one, but instead of “Mark,” the other negotiator’s name is “Mary.” Participants in condition two therefore rate “Mary” rather than rating “Mark.” This is the only difference between conditions. When participants rate “Mark,” as competent and intelligent, cultural gendered stereotypes become salient and accessible. This elicits a small fear of backlash in the participant. When participants rate “Mary,” as less competent and intelligent as pilot testing as shown, not only are gender stereotypes accessible, but also by participating in backlash, participants will attain a high fear of backlash from their own personal stereotypes and judgments.

Next, the clothing choices were used to monitor the extent to which women participated in self-sexualization. When individuals self-sexualize, they emphasize the sexualized body by drawing attention to breasts, legs, and buttocks through clothing (e.g. mini skirts, low cut tops, ect.). Self-sexualization may be temporarily empowering, but ultimately leads to decreased well being, low self-esteem, and even disordered eating. This study will test if self-sexualization helps or hinders participants after they experience the fear of backlash.

To measure if self-sexualization helps or hinders participants solve problems, each participant took the Stroop Task, a measure of cognitive depletion. The ability to solve problems, make decisions, and think critically all depend upon the amount of cognitive resources a person has available to them. By measuring an individual’s cognitive depletion through the Stroop task, one can determine their level of cognitive resources and then how well they would be able to handle a complex task.

Lastly, we ask that you not discuss the specifics of this experiment with other students, as that may bias individuals who may become participants in this study at a later time. You may tell others that you took place in a negotiation. If you have any questions regarding this particular research project or psychological research in general, please feel free to contact:
Researcher: Mallory Grembowski (mgrembowski@luc.edu) Faculty Advisor: Robyn Mallett (rmallett@luc.edu)

For information or questions regarding research ethics and guidelines, please contact:

Office of Research Services
6525 N. Sheridan Road
Granada Center, Suite 400
(773) 508-2471 ORS@luc.edu

For more information on the concepts used in this study, please consult:


Note: Debriefing will be formatted to fit to a single page to give to participants
APPENDIX F

TABLES
Table 1. Pilot Testing Analysis of Clothing for Doll Activity. Tables indicate significant differences between each level of clothing. Superscripts show which levels are significantly different from each other (e.g. superscript of 3 means this variable is significantly different than level 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bottoms</th>
<th>Level 1 Pants</th>
<th>Level 2 Knee-length Skirt</th>
<th>Level 3 Mid thigh length Skirt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>3.264(^3)</td>
<td>3.306(^3)</td>
<td>3.875(^1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexy</td>
<td>2.3830(^3)</td>
<td>2.4043(^3)</td>
<td>3.8511(^1,2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tops</th>
<th>Level 1 Fully Buttoned Shirt</th>
<th>Level 2 Semi-Opened Shirt</th>
<th>Level 3 Fully Opened Shirt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>4.104</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>4.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexy</td>
<td>2.9792(^4)</td>
<td>3.2083(^3)</td>
<td>4.3125(^1,2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shoes</th>
<th>Level 1 Flats</th>
<th>Level 2 Medium Heel</th>
<th>Level 3 High Heel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>4.313(^2)</td>
<td>3.729(^1,3)</td>
<td>4.431(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexy</td>
<td>3.2500(^3)</td>
<td>3.2083(^3)</td>
<td>4.0417(^1,2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Results of Bootstrapping Analyses Testing for an Indirect Effect of the Fear of Backlash on Cognitive Depletion through Self-Sexualization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Estimated Path</th>
<th>Cognitive Depletion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backlash to self-sexualization</td>
<td>0.18 (.08)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sexualization to cognitive depletion</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of backlash to cognitive depletion</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect of fear of backlash to cognitive depletion</td>
<td>-0.01 (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias corrected 95% confidence intervals for the indirect effect</td>
<td>LLCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *\(p<.05\)
Table 3. Results of the Moderation Analyses Testing for an Interaction Effect of the Fear of Backlash and Self-Sexualization on Cognitive Depletion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Estimated Path</th>
<th>Cognitive Depletion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of backlash to cognitive depletion</td>
<td>0.16 (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sexualization to cognitive depletion</td>
<td>.03 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction effect between fear of backlash and self sexualization</td>
<td>-.09 (.05)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias corrected 95% confidence intervals for the interaction</td>
<td>LLCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.10, *p<.05

Table 4. Correlation Table Between Variables Analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fear of Backlash</th>
<th>Average Self-Sexualization</th>
<th>Log Transformed Stroop Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Backlash</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.207*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Self-Sexualization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.207*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log Transformed Stroop Score</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>- .081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05

Table 5. Mean and Standard Deviations of Variables Analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Backlash Condition</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Self-Sexualization Score</td>
<td>1.8390</td>
<td>.43741</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Transformed Stroop Score</td>
<td>3.0372</td>
<td>.10925</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

FIGURES
Figure 5. The Backlash Avoidance Model

Figure 6. Interaction effect between condition and self-sexualization on cognitive depletion
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