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ABSTRACT

Previous research has indicated that exposure to pornography, or sexually explicit media (SEM), can lead married men to express a stronger desire for sexual intimacy (Staley & Prause, 2013). However, SEM exposure has also resulted in decreased physical attractiveness ratings among men evaluating their spouses (Kenrick, et al., 1989). Only a small amount of research has investigated the effects of SEM on attraction among unmarried males. The current study examined the effects of SEM in a sample of 108 heterosexual, undergraduate males. Participants evaluated pictures of 15 unknown women’s faces for physical attractiveness. They were then exposed to five minutes of SEM, after which they re-evaluated the same 15 faces for attractiveness. This study also examined the association between Big Five personality traits and self-reported sexual attitudes. The relations between sexual attitudes and the effects of SEM exposure were also explored. Counter to the expected hypothesis, results indicated an increase in attractiveness ratings after SEM exposure, demonstrating a sensitization rather than a desensitization effect on attraction. The Big Five Extraversion trait significantly predicted increases in attractiveness ratings after SEM exposure. Personality was also a significant predictor of sexual attitudes in relation to the socio-sexual orientation facets of behavior and attitude, which constitute the number of casual and changing sex partners and attitudes towards uncommitted sex, respectively. Additional research is necessary to replicate and confirm novel findings in this study.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Today’s media market is saturated with sexually explicit media (SEM). Due to increases in acceptance and popularity of SEM, the possible effects of SEM use, either beneficial or detrimental, needs to be further studied. In the real world, young men typically encounter unknown women in public, social settings. During these encounters their judgments of women may be influenced simply because they have previously watched SEM. These changes in judgments of attraction could impact the normal social interaction which would otherwise be experienced without previous SEM exposure. Even greater implications of the effects of SEM on attraction arise when personality and socio-sexual attitudes are taken into consideration. This study investigated the effects of SEM, particularly on attraction to unknown women, as it parallels common social scenarios. This research additionally examined personality traits and socio-sexual attitudes for significant associations with the effects of SEM on attraction. This study aimed to answer several questions about the effects of SEM which have not been fully clarified by previous research. These questions include: a) does viewing SEM increase or decrease attractiveness ratings of the opposite sex? b) are certain personality traits related to the effects of SEM on attractiveness ratings? c) how does personality relate to socio-sexual attitudes? and d) do socio-sexual attitudes have any association with the effect of SEM on evaluations of attractiveness?

*Background and Significance*

Previous research has examined the prevalence of SEM use among males, as well as their acceptance of and willingness to participate in risky sexual acts. In a study of 813 students from six different universities across America, researchers found an association between
pornography use and acceptance of risky sexual attitudes and behaviors, substance abuse patterns and non-marital cohabitation values (Carroll, Padilla-Walker, Olson, Barry, & Madson, 2008). Risky sexual attitudes and behaviors for this study were defined as personal opinions of or experience with having premarital sex, multiple sex partners or anonymous sex. Researchers in this study also investigated attitudes towards SEM. Their findings indicated that among American college students, 67% of young men and 49% of young women agree that viewing SEM is acceptable. Furthermore, 87% of college age men and 31% of college age women report using SEM (Carroll et al., 2008). With such high levels of acceptance and use among college-aged individuals, the possible detrimental effects of SEM on socially acceptable interpersonal interactions may pose a major social concern.

**SEM and Romantic Relationships**

Connections between viewing SEM and attitudes towards sex and romantic relationships have been investigated. Emmers-Sommer, Hertlein, and Kennedy (2013) examined attitudes regarding sexual openness, inhibition, as well as desire for monogamous romantic relationships, between and within users and non-users of pornography. The study consisted of 846 participants, 355 males and 491 females. 67% of males and 24% of females were labeled pornography consumers (Emmers-Sommer et al., 2013). Pornography consumers, for this research, were those individuals who watched pornography on a regular basis. The results of this study indicated regardless of pornography use, men overall were more sexual seeking and less relationally oriented than female users and non-users of pornography (Emmers-Sommer, et al., 2013). However, pornography users of both sexes were more sexually open and uninhibited as well as less relationally oriented compared to non-users of pornography (Emmers-Sommer, et al., 2013).
This study further supports the idea that men may become less inhibited and more inclined to seek sexual activity after viewing SEM. Additionally, male viewers of SEM were less desirous of establishing meaningful relationships. These effects of SEM may influence social interactions among young adult males in a college setting. Thus, priming them for risky sexual activity, disinhibiting normal social constraints, and diminishing their desire for healthy relationships.

Further implications of SEM exposure on romantic relationships has been explored in other research. The way in which SEM can help or hinder a relationship was brought into question by Staley and Prause (2013). A sample of 44 heterosexual couples viewed sexually explicit/erotic films, exciting but non-sexually explicit films and neutral films. These films were viewed by participants either alone or with their relationship partners. Participants were then asked to rate their feelings on four different factors. These factors were: their level of physical arousal (e.g. excitement), relationship satisfaction, perceptions of their own and partner’s attractiveness and sexual behavior. Researchers found that both the erotic and exciting films increased excitement. Sexually explicit films, however, were more arousing and heightened the participants’ desire for closeness with their partner. Findings from this study also suggested that the erotic films produced co-occurring emotional responses. Specifically, participants reported experiencing both positive affect, meaning feelings of greater energy and enthusiasm and negative affect, meaning feelings of anger, contempt, disgust or fear, along with anxiety and guilt after watching erotic films (Staley & Prause, 2013). Furthermore, Staley and Prause (2013) found that the more participants had been exposed to SEM previously, the more likely they were to assign lower ratings to their relationship satisfaction and partner attraction. Therefore, similar to previous research findings, viewing SEM produced an increase in arousal among men, as well
as a greater need to seek sexual intimacy. Frequent past SEM use was, additionally, associated with a decrease in attraction to one’s partner. Overall, these findings suggest a detrimental effect of SEM use on interpersonal relationships and possibly on evaluations of attractiveness in the opposite sex.

*SEM and Attraction*

Earlier research on the effects of visual stimuli on attraction can then be connected with research on SEM and its effect on evaluations of attractiveness. Kenrick, Gutierres, and Goldberg (1989), conducted two experiments with college students which examined sexual attraction judgments after exposure to SEM in the form of erotica. Erotica in this study was defined by print images intended to arouse sexual desire. In the first experiment, 107 male and 89 female undergraduates judged an image of a nude female after being exposed to either abstract nudes, average nudes, or nudes taken from sexually explicit magazines. Participants judged the nude female as less attractive only after exposure to centerfold nudes from magazines. In the second experiment, 35 male and 35 female undergraduates were shown opposite sex SEM and rated their feelings of love and attraction for their spouses. The results indicated that there was an interaction between gender and erotica. Specifically, only the males who found playboy type centerfolds more pleasant rated themselves as less in love with their wives (Kenrick et al., 1989). Therefore men may have experienced a desensitization of *emotional* attraction to their spouses after viewing the erotica. These experiments demonstrated the effects of pornography on the self-reported feelings of love that a husband may have for his wife, as well as examined sexual attraction judgments (Kenrick et al., 1989).
SEM and Internal Dispositions/Attitudes

The totality of research thus far appears to suggest that short-term exposure to SEM can elicit perceptual changes in men, which in turn may affect their attitudes towards and subjective evaluations of women (Staley & Prause, 2013; Kenrick et al. 1989). These perceptual changes may occur directly after SEM exposure and would suggest a more temporary, rather than a permanent change in female perception. However, there may be long-term, or stable, internal attitudinal characteristics or behavioral tendencies which are associated with these effects of SEM. Research completed by Jansma, Linz, Mulac, and Imrich (1997) examined possible intra-individual characteristics which may factor into the negative effects of SEM exposure. In their research, Jansma and colleagues (1997) differentiated between sexually explicit films and non-sexual films, as well as sexually explicit films which are degrading versus non-degrading towards women. This research tapped into the connection between effects of SEM and pre-existing behavioral tendencies.

Jansma and colleagues (1997) examined the effects of films that males viewed on their intellectual and sexual judgments of women in later face-to-face interactions. Researchers randomly assigned “sex-typed” men, those males who possessed more stereotypical masculine qualities and “non-sex-typed” men, those males who did not possess stereotypical masculine qualities, to view one of three types of films. The films were either: a) sexually explicit and degrading, b) sexually explicit and non-degrading, or c) non-sexual. After the men viewed the film, they interacted with and evaluated women in several different categories including: intellectual competence, sexual interest, sexual attractiveness, and sexual permissiveness (Jansma et al., 1997). Jansma and colleagues (1997) found that only men’s sex-role orientation
(i.e. sex-typed or non-sex-typed) moderated the effects of exposure to the film on evaluations of their female partner’s intellectual competence and sexual interest. The differences between sex-type males and non-sex-type males were only evident after exposure to pornographic films (Jansma et al., 1997). The sex-typed men rated females as less intellectually competent and had more sexual interest in the females when compared to non-sex-typed men (Jansma et al., 1997). This research therefore, provides a foundation that attitudinal characteristics or behavioral tendencies within the male may be associated with and predict some of the effects of SEM exposure.

Earlier research has also connected internal, personal characteristics, such as attitudes towards pornography, with the effects of SEM. Bernstein, Huang, Teng, and Lin (1986), examined the different attitudes males have toward pornography and how they rated the attractiveness of nude, semi-nude, and clothed females in pictures, with and without obliterated (i.e. obscured) faces. Researchers found that pro-pornography and pornography-neutral males preferred nude or semi-nude models over clothed ones by rating them higher on attractiveness. Both group’s ratings of pictures of nude and semi-nude women were higher than the ratings given by the anti-pornography group of males, whose ratings were consistent in all three categories (nude, semi-nude, and clothed). Researchers also found that the obliteration of the models faces had no effect on the pro-pornography group, but did lower attractiveness ratings in the other groups (Bernstein et al., 1986). In this experiment, pro-pornography participants kept rating nude models as attractive even when presented with obliterated faces. This may support findings of Jansma and colleagues (1997) that sex-typed males, or the more masculine, stereotypical male, will have heightened sexual interest after viewing pornography. The results
of this study, again, suggest that for males with certain attitudinal characteristics or behavioral tendencies, SEM exposure will prime them for sexual interest and attraction towards females even when the females’ faces are obscured.

These attitudes towards pornography and other trait-like behavioral tendencies may relate to or predict the amount of previous pornography use. This in turn, may alter the effect which SEM has on person perception. In a study conducted by Egan and Parmar (2013), individual differences in personality and compulsive SEM use were studied. Researchers used these factors to predict pornography consumption. Personality traits were found to significantly correlate with a latent measure of compulsive behavior, in which the use of internet pornography was applied (Egan & Parmar, 2013). Neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and obsessional checking predicted a higher degree of compulsive pornography use. Researchers suggested that the greater use of pornography may reflect a general vulnerability to compulsive problems related to basic personality traits (Egan & Parmar, 2013). Therefore, measurement of these traits may be used to assess compulsive pornography use. Thus, personality may be an important tool in understanding differences in the effects of SEM exposure and chronic SEM use.

Overall, previous literature has suggested the possible detrimental effects of SEM exposure to interpersonal relationships between romantic relationship partners and negative evaluations and judgments of women in social settings. Additionally, findings have indicated that certain types of men, or men with specific traits or attitudes, may be more vulnerable to these negative effects. Research supports that men become more sexually desirous after viewing SEM, while also rating their spouses as less attractive (Kenrick et al., 1989). Staley and Prause (2013)
attributed these types of effects to excitation transfer theory and the proximity to a standard effect found in social comparison theory. The excitation transfer theory suggests that because SEM may be sexually stimulating, males may misattribute that stimulation to partners and therefore find them more arousing. In turn, social comparison theory argues for a proximity to a standard effect when evaluating stimuli in our social environments. As this effect relates to SEM exposure, normal women in the everyday environment may be evaluated as less attractive when compared against a standard of attractive female actresses presented in SEM.

In relating SEM effects to behavioral consequences in social interactions, research purports that men exposed to SEM experience higher arousal and are more likely to seek sexual intimacy (Staley & Prause, 2013). This could potentially prime young men for sexual activity in non-sexual social scenarios with the opposite sex. Additionally, research has shown that after viewing SEM, men viewed their spouses as less physically attractive, and rated themselves as less in love with their spouse (Kenrick et al., 1989). In light of these findings, it may suggest that men who are exposed to SEM are more likely to bypass emotional intimacy and go straight to seeking sexual gratification. Thus, heterosexual males when exposed to SEM show an increased desire for sexual intimacy with female partners while at the same time evaluate those sexual partners as less physically attractive. It is possible, therefore, that a mental construct is created where women are seen as objects to satisfy sexual arousal, instead of attractive and intelligent relationship partners. This devaluation of women, as a result of viewing sexually explicit media, then becomes a modern interpersonal concern worth further examination.
Overview of the Present Study

The current study addresses the areas of interest which were lacking in previous research. Specifically, little research has examined the impact of SEM exposure on perceptions of attractiveness of women among unmarried college-aged males. Nor have these studies examined the relations between SEM effects and Big Five personality traits, SEM effects and socio-sexual attitudes; and Big Five personality traits and socio-sexual attitudes in this population. There is a need to examine the influence of personality traits and socio-sexual attitudes on men evaluating women after SEM exposure, which has not previously been done. Results from prior studies have suggested that men who had favorable attitudes towards pornography and were more stereotypically masculine, were more likely to rate women as attractive after SEM exposure (Bernstein et al., 1986; Jansma et al., 1997). This, in turn, may suggest that certain personality traits and sexual attitudes are predictive of SEM use, as well as the possible resulting consequences which accompany SEM use.

Focusing on a sample of unmarried college-aged males may also be important due to the findings of previous studies pertaining to men and their spouses. These studies on married men may not reflect the same results when examining unmarried men’s attraction to unknown women. The feelings of negative affect experienced by the married men, in the study of Staley and Prause (2013), may not occur in unmarried men. Therefore, unmarried participants may rate unknown women more favorably than when spouses were rated. Married men also reported feeling less in love with their wives after SEM use (Kenrick et al., 1989). In both of these studies, the perceptual changes that occur on attraction and emotion are seen in married couples.
Using unmarried men and unknown women might produce different results than previously seen in other studies.

In the context of the current study, social comparison theory processes may still operate, after SEM exposure. Specifically, after being exposed to the SEM video compilation as the standard, male participants may rate images of “everyday” female faces as less attractive in comparison. The processes described by excitation transfer theory and social comparison theory, although not directly supported by the findings of the study conducted by Staley and Prause (2013), were used as possible explanations for the research findings. Therefore, these processes may influence attractiveness ratings given after SEM exposure in the current study.

Another differentiating factor in this study, which may possibly lead to differences in findings from previous literature, is the sole use of female faces. It is generally rare for males to encounter nude females in public. Therefore, it would be difficult to generalize the findings of Bernstein and colleagues (1986), which used evaluations of nude women, with and without obliterated faces, to real world situations. Using faces may allow participants to focus on evaluating attractiveness rather than just sexual interest. Also, degree of sexual desire men had for nude women, or spouses (whom have been previously seen nude) might not be the same and could impact the attractiveness ratings given to unknown women. Furthermore, rating only faces, instead of full bodies, may allow participants to focus on facial attractiveness. This may eliminate any confounding variables that the inclusion of bodies could elicit, such as a decrease or increase of sexual arousal. This study was designed to examine the effects of SEM on attractiveness ratings of unknown women among college-age males. This study also examined
associations between personality traits and sexual attitudes. It further investigated how the intra-individual characteristics of personality traits and sexual attitudes are related to the degree of sensitization or desensitization of attraction. A pretest-posttest design was used to evaluate the sensitization or desensitization effect of SEM on attraction, as seen by an increase or decrease in attractiveness scores after SEM exposure, respectively. A correlational component was used to evaluate possible associations between the effects of SEM on attractiveness ratings and personality traits. Correlational associations between effects of SEM on attractiveness ratings and sexual attitudes were measured as well. Additionally, the relations between sexual attitudes and personality were examined for statistical significance.

Study Hypotheses and Goals

Based on findings from previous literature, a number of specific hypotheses were developed, along with general exploratory goals. The predictions of this study can be grouped by their relation to: a) the effects of SEM exposure on attractiveness ratings, b) the effects of SEM use and related SEM behaviors, such as frequency of watching and desire to watch SEM, c) the use of personality as a predictor of SEM exposure effects and d) the use of socio-sexual attitudes as a predictor of SEM exposure effects. An additional aim of this study was to examine whether or not personality characteristics were associated with sexual attitudes. Therefore, this research attempts to clarify these four areas of interest to better understand these processes among college-age males.

Overall this research study had four specific hypotheses. The first specific hypothesis was that due to the social comparison process of proximity of a standard effect, participants were
expected to hold the erotic models as the standard, and judge the female faces in the posttest as less attractive. Therefore, attractiveness evaluations of female images should significantly decrease from the pre-SEM exposure to post-SEM exposure (See App. A). This hypothesis was of particular interest as it would support the detrimental effects of SEM exposure on person perception and how young males may evaluate women in social settings.

As the findings of Staley and Prause (2013) indicated, the more participants had been previously exposed to SEM the more likely they were to assign lower ratings to partner attraction. Therefore, the second hypothesis was that the compulsivity with which one views pornography, as measured by the Pornography Craving Questionnaire (PCQ), should predict desensitization to attraction effects after SEM exposure. Thus, compulsive viewers of SEM are likely to have more previous SEM exposure. This hypothesis was important to clarifying how longer-term exposure to SEM factors into the short-term consequences of SEM effects.

The third hypothesis takes into account previous research on how personality predicts SEM use. Big Five personality traits of neuroticism, agreeableness and conscientiousness were found to be indicators of compulsive SEM use (Egan & Parmar, 2013). As stated previously, compulsive viewers of SEM are likely to have more previous SEM exposure. Therefore, the third hypothesis was that low scores on the traits of neuroticism, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, as measured by the Big Five Inventory (BFI), should predict desensitization to attraction effects after SEM exposure, due to their association with as compulsive SEM use. This hypothesis was important to understanding how personality may be an indirect indicator and predictor of SEM effects.
The fourth hypothesis was based on previous literature which suggests that the more “sex-typed”, or stereotypically masculine, attitudes one holds may result in a higher desire for sexual intimacy after SEM exposure (Jansma et al., 1997). Therefore, the last prediction of this research was that participants with lower Socio-sexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-r) scores, which may indicate fewer “sex-typed” male attitudes and behaviors, should predict lower attractiveness ratings after SEM exposure. These low scorers on the SOI-r measure may be less likely to misattribute arousal for attraction. This hypothesis was important in clarifying the role of sexual attitudes on the effects of SEM among young, unmarried males. Although specific predictions were not made in regards to how personality should relate to socio-sexual attitudes, the constructs were examined to determine whether or not there were significant associations between specific Big Five personality traits and the various facets of socio-sexual attitudes as measured in the SOI-r.
METHOD

Participants

The participants were a sample of 108 male undergraduate students enrolled at the University of Central Florida. The participants’ ages ranged from 18 to 24 years (M = 19.37, SD = 1.50). Participants were Caucasian/white (54.6%), African-American/Black (9.3%), Asian/Asian American (12%), Native American (0.9%), Hispanic/Latino (15.7%), and Multi-racial or undisclosed (2.8%). Of the 108 participants, 65.7% were in their first year of college, 18.5% were in their second year, 11.1% were in their third, 1.9% were in their fourth year, and 2.8% were in their fifth year and up. The participants’ living situations were investigated and 75% were living with roommates, 19.4% were living with parents or family, 3.7 were living alone, and only 1.9% were unmarried but living with a romantic partner. Participants were unmarried, however, 35 of 108 participants were involved in a romantic relationship at the time they participated in the study. Length of relationship ranged from 0 to 60 months (M = 15.97 months, SD = 14.97 months). Participants reported their religion as agnostic (20.4%), atheist (13%), Jewish (4.6%), Muslim (1.9%), Hindu (1.9%), Buddhist (1.9%), Christian (38%), Roman Catholic (13.9%), and other religious faith (4.6%). The participant’s ages of first exposure to SEM ranged from 4 to 17 years old (M = 12.59, SD = 2.26). Participants also reported how many times they watched pornography during the week and for how long they watched per session. Frequency of SEM viewing ranged from 0 to 21 times per week. (M = 3.81, SD = 3.074). The duration of pornography use during a typical session ranged from 0 – 120 minutes (M = 22.27 minutes, SD = 20.61 minutes).
Procedure

Approximately 108 heterosexual males over 18 years old were asked to take part in the study. Participants self-selected into this study based upon the description that this was a study examining personality, sexual attitudes and the effects of sexually explicit media. Participants were able to enroll in the study, which was conducted in a pre-selected research room. Participants needed to show proof of legal age by a state issued identification in order to take part in the study. Participants were required to be over 18 years old in order to legally watch the sexually explicit media. Participants were provided a computer as well as internet access. They were able to complete the study alone, during approved times when the research room was available. Ethical concerns of exposing participants to SEM were eliminated with informed consent to participate in a SEM study. If any distress was experienced, information for the student counselling center was provided at the end of the survey. The experimenter involvement was minimal. The experimenter set up the survey software on the computer and had it ready for each participant. The experimenter verified the age of the participant and instructed the participant to carefully read all instructions found on the survey software, then exited the room.
A pretest-posttest study was conducted. Before commencing the study, participants were advised to take their time, read the questions carefully, and exit the room when they finished with the study. Each participant completed the study privately in the assigned room and had one hour to complete the study.

Participants first answered the Pornography Craving Questionnaire (See App. B). Participants then rated a series of 15 pictures of unknown female’s faces which were presented on a computer screen (See App. A). The participants proceeded to rate the women on a nine
point scale of attractiveness (1=extremely unattractive, 2=very unattractive, 3=unattractive, 4=mildly unattractive, 5=average, 6=mildly attractive, 7=attractive, 8= very attractive and 9=extremely attractive). To reduce the likelihood that participants would recall the attractiveness ratings, they then completed the Big Five Inventory (See App. C) and a distractor inventory not related to study hypotheses (See App. D). The survey then proceeded to play a five minute compilation of preselected heterosexual pornographic film. The compilation included scenes of female masturbation, oral sex, couple intercourse, and group sex. After the viewing the SEM clip, participants re-evaluated the same 15 images, which were presented in randomized order, on the same nine point scale of attractiveness. Participants then completed the revised Socio-Sexual Orientation Inventory and demographic questions (See App. E and F). A debriefing statement was issued to each participant disclosing the purpose of the study, as well as providing counselling information if any distress was experienced. The participants had one hour to complete the study, however most finished the study within 30 to 45 minutes.

Materials

Survey Software. The Qualtrics web surveyor software was used to administer the questionnaires and the pretest/posttest. The online survey contained: the questionnaires, the presentation of the SEM visual stimuli, and the presentation of the female faces with the recording of ratings. Below each picture of the female faces, there was a series of selections, indicating level of attraction. Participants chose their responses through either mouse or keyboard when answering the questionnaires or judging attractiveness.
Pretest/Posttest. Pictures of 15 female faces, unknown to the participants were uploaded to Qualtrics survey software (See App. A). The images were obtained from the online site Flickr, as well as other public domains. The images were chosen by the experimenter to roughly represent an average range of attractiveness. The pretest attractiveness scores were assumed to be control scores, as participants had not yet been exposed to SEM. The posttest scores indicated any change in attractiveness after SEM exposure. The images did not have a specific intended level of attractiveness, since that would be determined by the participants in the pretest. In both pretest and posttest, the pictures were presented in randomized order in order to prevent the effects of proximity to a standard. Images were displayed in uniform size. Below each picture, a series of attractiveness ratings were listed on a nine point scale. The ratings selections were: 1 = extremely unattractive, 2 = very unattractive, 3 = unattractive, 4 = mildly unattractive, 5 = average, 6 = mildly attractive, 7 = attractive, 8 = very attractive and 9 = extremely attractive. Cronbach reliability analysis were run for the pretest (α = .91) and posttest (α = .90). Cronbach reliability suggests that participants’ ratings of attractiveness were a cohesive and reliable measurement of dimensional ratings of attractiveness.

Questionnaires. Personality Measurement. The Big Five Inventory (BFI) was used to assess individual personality traits among participants (See App. C). The BFI consists of 44 short phrases which participants will agree or disagree if the phrase applies to them, on a five point scale (1 = disagree strongly, 2 = disagree a little, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree a little, or 5 = strongly agree) (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). The BFI is a self-report inventory designed to measure the personality dimensions of Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism (John et al., 1991). The dimension of openness measures a
person’s openness or closed-ness to experiences. This personality trait is defined as containing the facets of curiosity, imagination, creativity, excitability and unconventionality (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). The openness subscale consists of 10 items, with possible scores ranging from 10-50. Higher scores indicate greater openness to experience. Cronbach reliability for this scale was .77 in this sample. The dimension of conscientiousness measures a person’s sense of direction or lack of direction. This trait is defined by possessing the qualities of order, competence, dutifulness, self-discipline and deliberation (John et al., 2008). The conscientiousness subscale consists of 9 items, with possible scores ranging from 9-45. Higher scores indicate higher levels of the trait. The Cronbach reliability for this scale was .75 in this sample, which is within an acceptable range.

The dimension of extraversion measures sociability and positive emotionality. It is defined as possessing the qualities of gregariousness, assertiveness, adventurousness, enthusiasm, outgoingness and energy (John et al., 2008). The extraversion subscale consists of 8 items, with possible scores ranging from 8-40. Higher scores indicate greater extroversion. Cronbach reliability for this subscale was .90, suggesting highly reliable measurement of the trait in this sample. The dimension of agreeableness measures the traits of agreeableness versus antagonism. It is defined by facets of trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance and modesty (John et al., 2008). The agreeableness subscale consists of 9 items, with possible scores ranging from 9-45. Higher scores indicate greater agreeableness. Cronbach reliability for this subscale was .74. The dimension of neuroticism measures emotional instability versus stability. It is defined by facets of anxiety, hostility, depression, shyness, and vulnerability (John et al., 2008). The neuroticism subscale consists of 8 items with possible scores ranging from 8-40.
Higher scores indicate greater neuroticism or less emotional stability. Cronbach reliability for this subscale was .82, suggesting highly reliable measurement of this trait in this sample.

*Socio-Sexual Attitudes.* The revised Socio-sexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R), seen in Appendix E, consists of nine items and is used to assess differences in the tendency to have casual, uncommitted sexual relationships (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008). Participants were able to respond to all questions on a nine point scale. For questions with an answer of numerical value, such as, “with how many different partners have you had sex within the past 12 months?” a nine point scale (0 = 1, 1 = 2, 2 = 3, 3 = 4, 4 = 5, 5 - 6 = 6, 7 – 9 = 7, 10 – 19 = 8, and 20 or more = 9) was used. For statements such as, “sex without love is ok,” the nine point scale (strongly disagree = 1 to strongly agree = 9) was used.

This inventory examines three facets of behavior, attitude and desire. The first subscale, the behavior facet, measures the number of casual and changing sex partners and consists of three items. Scores can range from 6-21. The Cronbach reliability for this subscale was .88. The second subscale, the attitude facet, consists of three items and measures the participants’ attitude towards uncommitted sex. Scores can range from 3 – 27. The Cronbach reliability for this subscale was .87. The third subscale, the desire facet, consists of three items which measures the participants craving to be with people not in a romantic relationship. Scores can range from 3 – 27. The Cronbach reliability for this subscale was .78. The scale can also be combined for one overall global socio-sexual orientation score, which is a broad measure of the tendency to have casual, uncommitted sexual relationships (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008). The three facets combine to form one global socio-sexual orientation score which ranged from 5 – 24.3. The Cronbach
reliability for the overall scale was .83. Higher global socio-sexual orientation scores indicate a greater tendency to have casual uncommitted sexual relationships.

**SEM Behaviors/Use.** The Pornography Craving Questionnaire (PCQ) (See App. B), was used to assess the prevalence and urge to watch SEM by measuring craving among different types of pornography users (Krause & Rosenberg, 2014). In the current study, the scores acquired from the PCQ were utilized to assess the craving of SEM use, as well as the degree of SEM craving. There are 12 items which are used to calculate a single scale (Kraus & Rosenberg, 2014). Each item is a statement relating to pornography use, which can be answered by a seven point scale. The seven responses are 1 = disagree completely, 2 = disagree somewhat, 3 = disagree a little, 4 = neither agree/disagree, 5 = agree a little, 6 = agree somewhat, and 7 = agree completely. To score this measure an average score of all items is calculated. Total scores may range from one to seven. Scores above a five are designated as positive for craving (Kraus & Rosenberg, 2014). The inventory was found to be highly reliable with a Cronbach reliability of .87.

Sexually Explicit Media (SEM). An edited, five minute compilation of preselected heterosexual pornographic films was uploaded to the survey software. The SEM compilation was selected based on the criteria that it needed to include scenes of female masturbation, oral sex, couple intercourse, and group sex. It was obtained from an online pornography website, Pornhub. The SEM criteria was based on sex acts being indicative of sexual explicitness. The compilation was not selected based on SEM model attractiveness.

RESULTS

It was predicted that participants would rate images of women as less attractive after watching SEM. Therefore, lower scores in the post-test would be indicative of a desensitization to attraction effect. It was further predicted that there would be a significant association between higher PCQ scores and desensitization. Lower scores on the personality traits of neuroticism, agreeableness and conscientiousness were expected to significantly correlate with the desensitization to attraction. Furthermore, higher socio-sexual orientation scores were predicted to have an association with the desensitization to attraction as well. Although not specifically predicted, it was expected that personality and socio-sexual orientation scores would be significantly correlated.

Descriptive Statistics and Analyses

Before examining the primary predictions of the study, means and standard deviations were calculated for all survey measures. For the PCQ, the total score was calculated by taking the mean of items one through twelve. Scores above a five were interpreted to be positive for craving. The range in these data was from 1 – 4.08 ($M = 2.42$, $SD = .34$). The results show that participants did not meet threshold scores to be considered positive for pornography craving, or did not possess strong SEM use behaviors.

BFI results indicate that participants overall scored moderately on the extraversion trait ($M = 26.58$, $SD = 6.53$), with higher scores indicating greater extraversion. The results for the openness trait showed that participants scored moderately on the trait ($M = 30.48$, $SD = 5.52$), with higher scores indicating greater openness to experience. The results for the conscientious
The results obtained from the SOI-r can be categorized by low range scores for the subscales (1 to 9), moderate range scores (10 – 18), and high range scores (19 – 27). Results indicate that participants’ overall tendency to have casual uncommitted relationships, measured by the Global socio-sexual orientation score, was moderate ($M = 14.47, SD = 4.27$). Participants scored in the moderate range in the behavior facet ($M = 9.28, SD = 3.71$) which reported numbers of casual and changing sex partners and moderate in the desire facet ($M = 15.86, SD = 5.94$) which assessed their desire to be with other people not in a romantic relationship. Results indicate that participants scored moderate in the attitude facet, which measures the participants attitude towards uncommitted sex ($M = 18.30, SD = 6.84$). Overall, participants had a moderate tendency to have casual uncommitted relationships.

*Effects of SEM Exposure*

A way to discern if a desensitization to attraction effect was demonstrated in this study was to calculate the mean for attractiveness ratings across the pretest and the mean attractiveness ratings across the post-test for all participants. Although the Likert-like rating scale used appears to be ordinal, attractiveness ratings can be measured as interval data. Scale level analysis, such as
Cronbach’s alpha, suggests that these ratings are indeed a dimensional scale and can be treated as interval data. As stated previously, reliability analyses for the pretest and post-test ratings were $\alpha = .91$ and $\alpha = .90$ respectively. Therefore, this scale would be considered dimensional rather than categorical. Attractiveness ratings ranged from 2 to 7 in the pretest ($M = 5.18, SD = 1.00$) and from 1.73 to 7.47 in the post-test ($M = 5.29, SD = 1.02$). These findings suggest that the images were rated, on average, as “attractive” in both the pre-test and post-test conditions. An examination of mean differences from the pre-test ratings to posttest ratings was completed to determine if these differences were significant. In order to determine if an increase or decrease in group means is statistically significant, a paired sample t-test analysis was conducted on the pretest attractiveness mean scores ($M = 5.18, SD = 1.00$) and the posttest attractiveness mean scores ($M = 5.29, SD = 1.02$). The results indicate that participants on average, rated the faces as significantly more attractive after SEM exposure; $t(106) = 2.21, p = .03$.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest Attractiveness</th>
<th>Pretest Attractiveness</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Posttest - Pretest</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>2.209*</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The overall attractiveness ratings from the pretest to the posttest were then subtracted from each other to create a change or difference score. The difference scores were calculated to
indicate an overall change in participants’ ratings of attractiveness from pre-SEM exposure to post-SEM exposure. There has been significant debate among social scientists as to the psychometric appropriateness of using change or difference scores in statistical analyses (Allison, 1990). However, an extensive body of research suggests that the use of this type of index may be appropriate in certain conditions (Catell, 1983; Gardener, 1987; Kenny, 1975; Kenny & Cohen, 1979). The focus of a difference score analysis is specific to the change that occurs from pretest to posttest and therefore provides targeted information about the hypothesis of interest. This difference score was then correlated with other variables of interest in the study including BFI personality subscales, socio-sexual attitude facets of the SOI-r, and SEM use behaviors measured by PCQ scores.

Effects of SEM Behaviors/Use

The difference of score was correlated with the PCQ scores to determine whether or not the degree of SEM craving predicted the sensitization to attraction effect seen in the data. No significant results were found ($r = .15, p = .13$).

Effects of Personality

A significant correlation was found between the difference score and the Extraversion subscale measured by the BFI ($r = .21, p = .03$). Those participants who scored higher in the personality subscale of extraversion rated the female faces as significantly more attractive after SEM exposure. Although no specific predictions were made about the association between personality and socio-sexual attitudes, personality was found to be a significant predictor of SOI-r scores on the behavior and attitude subscales. Specifically, BFI Neuroticism was significantly,
negatively associated with the SOI-r attitude facet \( (r = -.22, p = .03) \). This finding suggests that higher levels of Neuroticism were predictive of less acceptance of uncommitted sex. BFI Extraversion was significantly, positively, correlated with the SOI-r behavior facet \( (r = .30, p = .00) \). This finding suggests that more extraverted participants had more casual sex partners and more frequently changing sex partners. No additional significant correlations were found between personality subscales and socio-sexual facets or global socio-sexual scores.

*Effects of Sexual Attitudes*

The attractiveness difference score was correlated with the four different facets of the SOI-r for the attitude, behavior, desire and global subscales. Socio-sexual attitudes did not predict overall differences in attractiveness ratings from pre- to post-test. All correlations were nonsignificant with \( p \)-values greater than .15.
DISCUSSION

Nine out of ten college age men report using SEM (Carroll et al., 2008). Due to the high prevalence of SEM use among young males, it is necessary to explore the effects of SEM exposure. An aim of this study was to show that young, unmarried males exposed to SEM, experience desensitization to attraction in evaluating women’s faces. This desensitization effect could be detected by significant decreases in attractiveness ratings, from pre-SEM exposure to post-SEM exposure, for the same female faces. However, this specific hypothesis on the effects of SEM was not supported in this sample. Males, in this study, showed a small, but significant, increase in attractiveness ratings from pre-SEM exposure to post-SEM exposure. This sensitization effect was also predicted by personality. Specifically, more extraverted males tended to rate female faces as more attractive after viewing SEM. Other expected relationships between SEM exposure and porn-craving, as well as between SEM exposure and socio-sexual attitudes were not found. However, personality was a significant predictor of behavioral and attitudinal facets of the socio-sexual attitudes. In trying to understand these novel findings and how they compare to previous literature, one must consider the underlying components of the personality traits, as well as the basic cognitive and social processes which may be operating for the individuals studied. To begin this examination, explanations for why personality was related to the SEM effect is explored.

SEM and Personality

There are a number of reasons as to why personality was a predictor of the SEM effect in this sample. The extraversion personality trait is characterized by an outgoing and energetic disposition, as well as by positive emotions, sociability and a tendency to seek stimulation in the
company of others (John et al., 2008). Due to these characteristics, it is possible that participants who scored high in this trait felt greater arousal and positive emotions while watching the SEM, which resulted in excitation transfer or transference of arousal. Excitation transfer is a broad term explaining how arousal can influence subsequent perception, including its misattribution (Staley & Prause, 2013). The participants’ emotional state when judging the faces for attractiveness may have been intensified by the excitement or arousal experienced while watching the SEM. The tendency to seek stimulation could make extraverts more easily influenced by the SEM. They may be more attentive to SEM, which may cause greater arousal. Research has suggested that men who view SEM are more sexually aroused and more likely to seek sexual intimacy (Staley & Prause, 2013; Emmers-Sommer et al., 2013). Higher arousal may prime extraverted participants for sexual intimacy and due to excitation transfer, they view females as more attractive. Additionally, greater sociability may also be an influencing factor in higher posttest rating among these extraverted males. Higher levels of friendliness may encourage assigning more positive evaluations of attractiveness to unknown females.

**Personality and Socio-Sexual Attitudes**

When examining personality traits and socio-sexual attitudes in this sample, personality predicted the socio-sexual behavior facet. Therefore it was found that higher levels of extraversion predicted larger numbers of casual and changing sex partners. As previously stated extraversion is characterized by the qualities of being gregarious, assertive, adventurous, enthusiastic, outgoing and energetic (John et al., 2008). The gregariousness and sensation seeking component of this personality trait dimension may contribute to having more casual and changing sex partners. The ability to seek and attract numerous partners matches the dynamics
of this trait. Additional social implications can be derived from this finding as it could help market better sexual awareness programs and sexually transmitted disease (STD) prevention programs aimed at more extraverted individuals. STD prevention programs may need to focus on visually and socially based messages and programming for extraverts who may be more responsive to greater amounts of visual stimuli, social interaction, as well as more positive and up-beat messages. A community outreach campaign, with exciting social interactions and messages containing positive emotions would have a greater chance of encouraging safer sex practices among extraverted males who may have frequent casual, uncommitted sexual relations.

Personality also predicted the socio-sexual attitude facet. The high levels of the neuroticism trait, which taps into emotional instability, anxiety, hostility, depression, shyness and vulnerability (John et al., 2008) was related to low levels of acceptance of uncommitted sex, as measured in the attitude facet of the SOI-r. This connection may also confirm the general disposition of a neurotic. Specifically, emotional instability may be increased by uncommitted sex, causing greater emotional distress, irritability and hostility in the neurotic male. Thus, attitudes towards uncommitted sex may be less positive and more negative for individuals higher in neuroticism. Greater feelings of anxiety, shyness, and vulnerability could dissuade those who score higher in neuroticism from engaging in uncommitted sex, due to potential social anxiety, rejection, or fear of contracting an STD. Again, different sexual awareness and STD prevention campaigns could be tailored to men with this trait, encouraging their attitudes against uncommitted sex. Overall, personality may be the missing element in understanding some of the effects of SEM which requires additional exploration. Although these findings are promising for
their possible “real-world” applications, it is also important to explore and compare why there were differences in the effects found in this study in comparison to previous research on SEM.

Differences and Limitations

Previous research found that SEM exposure heightened participants’ desire for intimacy with their partner. However, males also reported a co-occurrence of a heightened sense of anxiety, guilt, negative affect, as well as a likelihood to devalue partner attraction (Staley & Prause, 2013). Again, excitation transfer can explain how any form of arousal, positive or negative, may impact later perceptions, including its misattributions (Staley & Prause, 2013). In the present study, participants were unmarried and, therefore, may not have experienced any negative emotions after viewing SEM. Therefore, participants may have only experience positive emotions, rather than co-occurring positive and negative emotions. As a result, the arousal experienced during SEM increased the posttest attractiveness ratings, as the unmarried men misattributed sexual arousal for attraction when judging the images. In this sample, without the presence of negative emotions, a sensitization to attraction effect occurred. Subsequently, it is possible that current states of negative affectivity or mood, may be of significant influence in decreased attractiveness ratings among married men. Without these negative emotions, unmarried men may be primed for sexual interest and thus find female targets more attractive.

Another expected effect that was not seen, which influenced the hypothesis, was the proximity of standard effect. It was proposed that participants will hold the erotic models as the standard, and judge the female faces in the posttest as less attractive. The proximity of standard effect was not seen in this study as participants rated the images of faces as more attractive after
SEM exposure. When the mere exposure effect, or familiarity principle is taken into account these findings may be appropriate. In this case, the mere exposure effect would support an increase in posttest attractiveness ratings, since the same faces are being viewed for a second time. The increase of attractiveness ratings from pretest to posttest supports the experiment conducted by previous researchers (Moreland & Beach, 1992). Moreland and Beach (1992) found that the mere exposure demonstrated strong effects on physical attraction and similarity. The familiarity principle along with the heightened arousal produced by the SEM could have been responsible for the increase in attractiveness rating in the posttest.

A further possible reason that posttest attractiveness scores were higher than expected could be the actual images of women that were selected. It was difficult to obtain a wide range of representative images, from extremely unattractive to extremely attractive. Most of the ratings fell in the middle of the attractiveness scale. A broader selection of facial attractiveness could have added a greater variation of responses and perhaps produced more different results. Also, the number of images could have been too low. Too few images might have allowed the participants to remember the previously assigned score. Thereby, eliminating any significant difference in scores that would have otherwise been observed. Adding more images to the posttest could prevent the participants from remembering the previously assigned ratings. In order to prevent participants from remembering the previously assigned attractiveness ratings, the BFI was administered after the pretest was completed. This may have resulted in a confounding variable. However, participants completed their post-test rating right after viewing the SEM clip. Therefore, there was no intervening measure or activity between the actual SEM exposure and the posttest.
In addition to the female images which were rated for attractiveness having possible methodological issues, there may have been issues with the SEM clip selected for participant exposure. Specially, the SEM actresses may not have been a proximity standard for comparing attractiveness of faces. Since the SEM was selected for specific sex acts, the actresses in the SEM were not judged for facial attractiveness. In order for the proximity of standard effect to be seen, the SEM actresses needed to have been viewed as highly attractive. Attractiveness ratings could have increased in the posttest due to a lack of attractiveness of the SEM actresses, rather than the sexually explicit content. To eliminate both of these possibilities, actresses and images of faces would have to be pre-selected for similar attractiveness scores.

Aside from preselecting the SEM and images for attractiveness, another possible explanation of the unexpected result is demand characteristics. Demand characteristics suggest that a participant might alter their natural behavior to fit research expectations. Based on the content of the questionnaires and of the pretest/posttest, the participants might have assumed that the posttest scores should increase after watching SEM, and altered their natural responses.

*Strengths and Future Directions*

Although there is a small body of literature which has examined attitudes towards SEM exposure and some effects of SEM as they relate to romantic relationships, this research has been limited in the examination of specific effects of SEM as they relate to judgments of women among college-age males. Considering the fact that SEM is widely used in this population, understanding the consequences of frequent SEM use and how attitudes towards SEM relate to person perception is an important concern. This study attempted to address some the possible
social effects of SEM exposure in a college aged sample. The significant findings of this study as it relates to increases in attractiveness ratings after SEM exposure and the findings between the five personality dimensions and the socio-sexual orientation facets merit deeper investigation. This research provides a basis for additional exploration, clarification and validation of study findings.

A further improvement to this study would be the addition of a control group. Participants in the control group would follow the same steps as the experimental group, however instead of viewing SEM, they would watch non-sexual scenes of women. Adding a control group would make the study a true experiment. This would allow for a comparison between control and experimental group permitting greater causal interpretation of the results.

Although a desensitization to attraction after SEM exposure was not found in this study, a sensitization to attraction after SEM exposure was evident, due to the increase in posttest attractiveness ratings. This suggest that SEM has a possible sensitizing effect on attraction, rather than a desensitizing one. This finding can be generalized to young, unmarried heterosexual men. Furthermore, personality is a significant predictor of mean changes in attractiveness ratings, as extraversion was found to significantly correlate with the difference score of attractiveness rating means. These results have real world implications. It suggest that young men who score highly in this trait are more influenced by sexually explicit media. As previously stated, high levels of extroversion also account for greater gregariousness, assertiveness, excitement-seeking behaviors (John et al., 2008). These extraversion qualities paired with sensitization to attraction after SEM exposure could encourage unsolicited sexual advances. Greater feelings of attraction paired with
friendliness would encourage male social interaction with women. However, greater attraction when exposed to SEM, added with assertiveness and excitement-seeking tendencies may prevent ending romantic pursuit if the female does not share romantic interest. The sensitization to attraction after viewing SEM experienced by extroverts would influence social interaction among young adult males in a college setting, priming them for greater attraction to the opposite sex and more sexually charged interpersonal relations. Overall, it is necessary that this line of research continue to be pursued and explored given the possible far-reaching interpersonal consequences SEM exposure may have on men on college campuses.
APPENDIX A:

FEMALE FACES: FIGURES 1-15
APPENDIX A

Female Faces: Figures 1-15

Figure 1: “Madison,” by Peter Cabral
Figure 2: “Glimpse,” by Harr Hart
Figure 3: “Photo,” by Natalia Pizano
Figure 4: “52 Faces of 2015: Number 6. Lindsay,” by Murray McMillan
Figure 5: “Britain,” by Jesse Rinka
Figure 6: “Portrait,” by Simon Olofson
Figure 7: “The Short-Hair Shoot-A,” by Primatage
Figure 8: “Audrey,” by Peter Cabral
Figure 9: “Face Female,” by Unknown
Figure 10: “First Attempt at High Key Lighting,” by Captured by Ciara
Figure 11: “DSC_1368 Blancpain Endurance Series- Silverstone 2013-Grid Girl,” by Dennis Goodwin
Figure 12: “Magic, as in Smile,” by Helmut the Horrible
Figure 13: “Beautiful Girl, October Afternoon,” by Doyle Walls
Figure 14: “DSC_7350 Autosport 2014- Ghetto- Emily Jane,” by Dennis Goodwin
Figure 15: “Miss X,” by Giancarlo Mannetta
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The Pornography Craving Questionnaire (PCQ) (Kraus & Rosenberg, 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pornography Craving Questionnaire (PCQ)</th>
<th>Disagree Completely</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree A Little</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Agree A Little</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directions: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Remember, we are interested in how you are thinking or feeling RIGHT NOW, as you are filling out the questionnaire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The thought of watching pornography makes me sexually aroused.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would feel less bored if I watched pornography right now.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I will watch pornography as soon as I get the chance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If I were watching pornography this minute, I would feel energized.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If I watched pornography right now, I would have difficulty stopping.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have an urge to watch pornography right now.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If I were watching pornography this minute, I would feel happier.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If the situation allowed, I would watch pornography right now.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Right now, I am making plans to watch pornography.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I would feel less stressed if I watched pornography right now.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My heart would beat faster if I were watching pornography right now.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I want to watch pornography right now.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C:

THE BIG FIVE INVENTORY (BFI)
APPENDIX C

The Big Five Inventory (BFI) (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991).

How I am in general

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>2 Disagree a little</th>
<th>3 Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree a little</th>
<th>5 Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am someone who...
APPENDIX D:

THE “SEXY SEVEN” INVENTORY (SSI)
APPENDIX D

The “Sexy Seven” Inventory (SSI) (Schmitt & Buss, 2000).

How Accurately Can You Describe Your Sexuality?
• Please rate how accurately each of the following adjectives describes your sexuality.
• So that you can describe yourself in a completely honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence; only a random identification number will be connected with your responses.
• Please try to describe yourself as you are at the present time, not as you wish to be in the future.
• Try also to describe yourself as you are generally or typically, as compared with other persons you know of the same sex and of roughly your same age.
• Please write a number after each adjective indicating how accurately that word describes you by using the following nine-point scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INACCURATE</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Quite</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>ACCURATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstinent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obscene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adorable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orgasmic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adulterous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orgiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perverted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polygamous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promiscuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prudish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risqué</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celibate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sensual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shameless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuddlesome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stuning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effeminate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sultry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfaithful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vulgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Womanly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E:

THE REVISED SOCIO-SEXUAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

(SOI-R)
APPENDIX E

The Revised Socio-Sexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-r) (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008).

The revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R)

Please respond honestly to the following questions:

1. With how many different partners have you had sex within the past 12 months?
   ![Rating Scale]

2. With how many different partners have you had sexual intercourse on one and only one occasion?
   ![Rating Scale]

3. With how many different partners have you had sexual intercourse without having an interest in a long-term committed relationship with this person?
   ![Rating Scale]

4. Sex without love is OK.
   ![Rating Scale]
   | Strongly disagree | Strongly agree |

5. I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying "casual" sex with different partners.
   ![Rating Scale]
   | Strongly disagree | Strongly agree |

6. I do not want to have sex with a person until I am sure that we will have a long-term, serious relationship.
   ![Rating Scale]
   | Strongly disagree | Strongly agree |
7. How often do you have fantasies about having sex with someone you are not in a committed romantic relationship with?
   □ 1 – never
   □ 2 – very seldom
   □ 3 – about once every two or three months
   □ 4 – about once a month
   □ 5 – about once every two weeks
   □ 6 – about once a week
   □ 7 – several times per week
   □ 8 – nearly every day
   □ 9 – at least once a day

8. How often do you experience sexual arousal when you are in contact with someone you are not in a committed romantic relationship with?
   □ 1 – never
   □ 2 – very seldom
   □ 3 – about once every two or three months
   □ 4 – about once a month
   □ 5 – about once every two weeks
   □ 6 – about once a week
   □ 7 – several times per week
   □ 8 – nearly every day
   □ 9 – at least once a day

9. In everyday life, how often do you have spontaneous fantasies about having sex with someone you have just met?
   □ 1 – never
   □ 2 – very seldom
   □ 3 – about once every two or three months
   □ 4 – about once a month
   □ 5 – about once every two weeks
   □ 6 – about once a week
   □ 7 – several times per week
   □ 8 – nearly every day
   □ 9 – at least once a day
APPENDIX F:

GENERATION RATED X: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS
APPENDIX F

Generation Rated X: Demographic Questions

1. How old were you when you first saw pornography?

2. Typically, about how many times do you watch pornography during the week?

3. During a typical session, what is the duration of pornography use? Please indicate the approximate number of minutes of hours below:

4. What is your current relationship status?
   (Single, Dating, Engaged, or Married)

5. If you are currently in a romantic relationship please provide an estimate of how long you have been with your current dating partner in months and/or years (e.g. 1 year, 6 months).

6. If you are currently in a romantic relationship, please rate your current level of satisfaction:
   All things considered, how happy are you in your relationship?
   (Very Unhappy, Unhappy, Somewhat unhappy, neither happy nor unhappy, somewhat happy, happy, very happy, perfectly happy)

7. How old are you? (Type your age below)

8. Please indicate the number of years attending the university
   (First year, second year, third year fourth year, first year and up)

9. What is your current living situation?
   (Living alone, with roommates, with romantic partner, with parents/family member)

10. What is your religious preference?
    (Agnostic, atheist, Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, Roman Catholic, other religion/faith)

11. How would you rate your level of religiousness?
    (Not at all religious, a little religious, moderately religious, very religious, extremely religious)
12. Please indicate your race/ethnicity below:

(Caucasian/white, African-American/black, Asian American, native American, Hispanic, Latino/Latina, multi-racial/multi-ethnic, rather not say)
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