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ABSTRACT

The sexualization of women in advertisements remains a controversial form of media, specifically infantilization. Infantilization is defined as the portrayal of adult women acting and looking childish through attire and demeanor. This study examines consumers’ perceptions of infantilized women in advertisements. Students (n = 100) from a 4-year university participated in an online questionnaire examining the scales of morality, objectionability, and ubiquity of five advertisements. Three out of the five advertisements display infantilized female models. The others display women in a non-infantilizing manner. A single chi-square conducted on the participants found significant differences in if students can correctly identify infantilization in ads. Additionally, a series of analyses of variance (ANOVA) also found significant differences between males and females in their perception of the infantilization of women in advertisements. Overall, the results indicate that participants incorrectly identified infantilization and males rated it lower in morality and higher in objectionability than females. These findings support the need for a more critical analysis of the infantilization of women.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

With the growth of consumerism, online media is absorbed daily. Further, exposure to media can affect individuals’ development and perception of the world. With an increasingly feminist atmosphere, the critical examination of media has increased, and it has become vital to do so. One of the most ubiquitous and influential genres in the media is advertisements. The average American is exposed to over 3,000 advertisements per day (Media Education Foundation et al., 2010), making commercial media one of the most consumed media contents. Advertisements featuring female models in infantilizing manners remain a controversial matter. With the infantilization of women also prevalent in popular culture, such as on video game covers and in the music industry, the influence these images have on the perception of women by younger, more impressionable audiences is of concern. Such advertisements may also manifest in cultural beauty criteria. The current study examined the relationship between infantilizing advertisements and the perception of women, including the ad’s ubiquity, objectionability, and morality. It is hypothesized that females exposed to infantilizing advertisements will more accurately recognize infantilization and find it more immoral. For this study, infantilization is defined as the portrayal of an adult acting childish through their dress and demeanor.

Infantilization in Advertising

Something as innocent and unassuming as an American holiday can be a victim of infantilization. Halloween, a day reserved for celebration and fun, and is typically enjoyed by children, bears another method of sexualizing girls and women. Sullivan et al. (2017) explored
the relationship between gender stereotypes and North American Halloween costumes. They found that the Halloween costumes of women and girls consisted of more overt sex work and seduction themes than that of boys and men. The researchers also found that, despite the wearer's age, boys’ and men’s costumes often wholly covered the wearer with a full head mask and full body suit, offering more bodily coverage.

Furthermore, this double standard is also prominent in Laing’s study (2020), where they found that there exists no culturally mainstream male equivalent to “Lolita,” a popular book that sparked the phenomenon of the sexualization of young girls. Sullivan et al. (2017) concluded that the blatant youthification of women and adultification of girls is prominent. According to the American Psychological Association’s (APA, 2007) Task Force on the Sexualization of Women and Girls, adultification occurs when young girls dress up to appear as adult women, and youthification occurs when women dress down to resemble young girls. The study stressed that there is no age limit to be objectified, even in the means of celebrating a widely loved holiday.

Burgess and Sturmer (2007) noted that while it seems like infantilization only exists in the fashion world, the dilemma does not limit itself to one dimension. The infantilization of women is also exceedingly prevalent on the covers of video games. Often targeted toward the adolescent population, males experience extreme overrepresentation on video game covers (Burgess & Sturmer, 2007). However, their study highlighted that when women are on display, they are almost always sexualized to fit the male fantasy. They affirmed that this finding may be particularly concerning, considering that 21% of video game players in 2022 were under 18 (Clement, 2022). It is crucial to assess the impact of exposure to constant sexualization and infantilization of women in advertising— not only for girls but also for boys. It is alarming to
ponder the developmental effects of this mistreatment, potentially furthering and encouraging an already detrimental issue that women face.

**Beauty Standards**

Beauty ideals remain one of the main culprits behind women's sexualization and infantilization. These ideals often reign themselves unrealistic, sometimes even unattainable. However, they still ensure that bodily modification is necessary to experience happier romantic relationships (Puvia & Vaes, 2012). Frequently, women will undergo various changes, at times permanent, to feel desirable and fulfill cultural beauty stereotypes.

Labre (2002) detailed one of the many ways women conform to aesthetic standards. This includes utilizing methods from tweezing, bleaching, waxing, shaving, and even laser treatments to remove hair. Some of these techniques can be more painful than others, and they endure them weekly, sometimes daily. Additionally, many body parts are subject to these methods, including their eyebrows, upper lip, chin, legs, arms, underarms, and bikini area. Labre upheld that the elimination of body hair is an extensive pervasive, time- and money-consuming chore that is endlessly encouraged in advertisements and media to push for ideal female beauty. Since around the 2000s, they also found that waxing women’s genitals has become the subject of immense popularity and media publicity. This exposure and praise are prime examples of one of the many cosmetic alterations women undergo that are promoted by the male gaze. Seto et al. (2021) affirmed that the preference for hairlessness on an adult woman’s body is evident in pedophilic ideals. They found that body hair removal is one of many procedures found to replicate a child’s
appearance. While their research does not state that every individual who prefers a hairless partner is a pedophile, it is crucial to deliberate why this is a widely accepted standard of beauty.

In addition to hair removal, feminist theorists have contested beauty ideals, including an unrealistically thin body ideal often portrayed in media (Graff et al., 2012). Moreover, this standard does not limit itself to Western society. South Korea remains the origin of one of the most famous music phenomena in the industry, with millions of fans worldwide. Korean pop, also known as KPOP, is widely recognized for creating stars overnight—specifically, boy bands and girl groups. In female KPOP groups, performers are in the design of a specific image that caters to patriarchal norms. They should be skinny, have big eyes, have doll-like characteristics, and have thin legs (Jonas, 2021). Guidelines regarding their physical appearance are so austere that groups must face disbanding for even the slightest variation. If performers cannot conform to the patriarchal customs, they are too inadequate to be a star. Jonas’s (2021) study further justified that maintaining a girlish, thin body is a principle in a woman’s personal and professional life.

The ability to find a mate attractive is innate to the human experience. Sometimes, it is a subconscious activity when one deems an entity appealing. However, the question of what factors are considered enticing is imperative. Even more so, the example it sets for the archetype of attractiveness in women. How beauty is perceived can be detrimental to the phenomenon of infantilization. In a study conducted by Jones et al. (1995), one of the main attributes of an attractive female face is the dimensions that echo a child’s face: large eyes, high cheekbones, small nose, small chin, full lips, and short eye-chin distance, all of which are the product of a high estrogen-testosterone ratio. Johnston and Franklin (1993) gave participants in their study a
chance to curate their ideal woman’s face in a computer program. The face their participants created had the dimensions of a 14-year-old girl.

The Effects of Infantilization

Demeanor in advertisements sends viewers messages about the media’s expectations of women and girls. Carlson (2010) argued that the media is swarming with gender stereotypes that fuel gender ideals in society, all of which have many consumers. Additionally, Laing (2020) theorized that fashion has a specific fixation with the brink between girlhood and womanhood. Failure to conform to ubiquitous cultural beauty standards can induce feelings of insecurity and desire to modify one’s current physical presentation via either adultification or youthification (Sullivan et al., 2017). These two processes can be gestated as an aspect of age compression, a practice in which women and girls compress to an age at which they are most valued for their sexual function (Speno & Aubrey, 2018).

As the effects of infantilization go hand in hand with general discomfort in one’s body, for some, it can be much more detrimental. Kaur et al. (2020) alleged a rise in body dysmorphic disorder among adolescent girls. Body dysmorphic disorder, previously labeled as dysmorphophobia, is a psychiatric illness characterized by the obsessive thoughts that some aspect of one's appearance is flawed, coinciding with compulsions such as comparing oneself to others and mirror-checking (Veale, 2004). The cause for the rise in symptoms of body dysmorphia remains undiscovered in Kaur’s (2020) study. However, it is fair to ponder if online media may be to blame. The average teen is constantly exposed to picture-perfect models in
advertisements (Media Education Foundation et al., 2010). With the rise of online media coinciding with the increase in body dysmorphia, there is an identifiable cause for concern.

Tadinac (2010) described that the concept of beauty and its importance has been evident throughout history. When considering why women desire to be “young and beautiful,” Tadinac took an evolutionary approach. Their findings contested the famous statement, “Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.” They explained that the desire for a woman to feel desirable dates to universal human nature: the preference for physical traits mirrors adaptations developed as displays for attracting sufficient sexual mates. Though modern-day society is far from Stone Age ideology, Tadinac suggested that our mental processes remain deeply rooted in prehistoric ideals. One of the most well-documented differences between men and women in all cultures is that men place a higher value on physical appearance than women. This preference has been confirmed in a study conducted within 37 different cultures on all continents, in every culture, with no exceptions (Buss et al., 1990). The study showed that women are met with the demand to appeal to the male gaze. This claim is made exceedingly clear through popularizing conformity methods to infantilizing beauty concepts.

**Theoretical Perspective and Current Study**

The current study drew from the theory of Desensitization of Infantilization (Carlson, 2010). Carlson (2010) asserted that some degree of infantilization is identifiable in advertisements and is prevalent and prominent in media, leading to its normalization. What the study lacked to seek is if participants’ biological sex affected their recognition and perspectives on infantilization in advertisements. Derived from Tadinac’s (2010) evolutionary approach, it is
hypothesized that males equate infantilization with sexualization, leading to arousal rather than the realization that the sexual embeds are childlike. Furthermore, it is possible that females could not be directed to arousal and correctly identify infantilization in advertisements. The purpose of this study was to measure participants' perspectives, which are the dependent variables. It considered the three scales found in Sexual Embeds: if the image was Widespread, if the essence of the image was Moral, and if the image was Objectionable of women (Widing et al., 1991). Additionally, expert ratings of ads from Carlson’s study were considered for selecting advertisements in this study.
CHAPTER TWO: METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Data for the current study were collected from the University of Central Florida via the Sona System and received IRB approval (see Appendix A). Participants received class credit or extra credit for completing the online questionnaire. Participants took an average of 27 minutes and 48 seconds ($SD = 161.83$) to complete the questionnaire. Participants whose responses indicated that they did not actively participate in the study were removed before analysis. These included 35 participants who did not complete the consent form and five who did not complete each questionnaire.

Participants analyzed in the current study included 36 male and 59 female college students. Most participants were White (72.6%, $n = 69$). The majority of participants were between the ages of 18 to 24 (92.6%, $n = 88$). The majority of participants identified as Christian (56.8%, $n = 54$) or not religious (29.5%, $n = 28$).

Measures

Advertisement Consumption Questionnaire

Participants were prompted to rank a list of media outlets according to their viewing frequency, with 1 being the most frequently viewed and 5 being the least frequently viewed source of advertisements. The index consisted of magazines, newspapers, billboards, the internet, and others, where participants may write in their preferred media source.
Exposure to Infantilizing Advertisements

Participants were exposed to five advertisements in total prior to completing the online questionnaire to examine their recognition and attitudes toward infantilization in ads. Infantilization was defined as the portrayal of grown women acting and looking childish through attire, demeanor, possessions, and posture (Carlson, 2010). Advertisements were chosen in the manner of Carlson’s (2010) study, where six experts from the Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Department at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, were shown various ads and asked a series of questions ranging from moral values to appeal of the image. From the conclusions made by these professionals, the advertisements were chosen for the participant questionnaire. The selection of the pictures was in consideration of what the model was wearing (e.g., pigtails, high socks, and overalls), holding (e.g., popsicles, toys, or candy), and posture (e.g., crawling).

In this study, ads 1 and 3 were considered non-infantile. In ad 1, a woman was shown portrait style smiling and wearing age-appropriate clothing: sunglasses and a coat. Similarly, in ad 3, the model was dressed conservatively in a long-sleeved blouse.

Ads 2, 4, and 5 were deemed infantile in this study. In ad 2, the image displays the model wearing her hair in two pigtails, donned with pink ribbons. Additionally, she was holding a pacifier. In ads 4 and 5, the models were clothed in childlike attire (Knee socks, overalls, etc.) and wore minimal clothing. They were also seen blowing bubbles and licking oversized lollipops.
VASE Scale

Participants completed 70 questions that assessed their perceptions of the advertisements. The questions were measured in three categories: Moral, Widespread, and Objectionable (Widing et al., 1991). Example items that assessed moral views of the ad included, “The advertisement is a contributor to lower sexual standards,” “The advertisement is morally harmful,” and “I feel like advertisements like this are a cause of lower moral values.” Alpha reliability for morality was (a=.69) for the first ad, (a=.77) for the second ad, (a=.80) for the third ad, (a=.71) for the fourth ad, and (a=.80) for the fifth ad. Example items that assessed objectionable views of the ad include “The advertisement is unethical,” “The advertisement is very objectionable,” and “The advertisement is offensive.” Alpha reliability for objectionability was (a=.83) for the first ad, (a=.75) for the second ad, (a=.78) for the third ad, (a=.70) for the fourth ad, and (a=.73) for the fifth ad. Example items that assessed the ubiquity of the ad include, “I see similar advertisements frequently,” “Advertisements like the one pictured above are ubiquitous,” and “Images like this are very common in advertisements.” Alpha reliability for ubiquity was (a=.65) for the first ad, (a=.75) for the second ad, (a=.69) for the third ad, (a=.82) for the fourth ad, and (a=.87) for the fifth ad. All answers were on a 1-5 Likert scale, with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree. The complete list of questions can be found in Appendix C.

Participants had a list of adjectives and were prompted to check each corresponding word the model appeared to convey. The terms include “Strong,” “Intelligent,” “Childlike,” “Creative,” “Weak,” and “Mature.”
Infantilization Questionnaire

Participants completed five questions after being presented with the definition of infantilization. For each advertisement, the participant was told that the ad displays infantilization. Participants responded with “Yes,” “No,” or “Not sure.”

Demographic Questionnaire

Participants answered nine items to assess their age, biological sex, gender identity, race, ethnicity, religious status, academic major(s), academic minor(s), and current school year.
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS

Preliminary analyses were conducted to assess the reliability of scales, distributional characteristics, and intercorrelations of measures. Analyses relevant to the study aims are described in the following sections. These included a single sample chi-square that determined if participants correctly identified infantilization compared to the experts and a series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) that examined if participants’ biological sex influenced their perception of the infantilization of women in advertisements.

Intercorrelations of Scales

Correlations were conducted to determine if there were significant relationships between the scales examined, including questions of morality, objectivity, and ubiquity. All three scales in advertisement exposure were significantly correlated with each other. A significant positive correlation occurred between morality and objectionability for all infantile and non-infantile ads. There was a significant negative correlation between morality and ubiquity. There was also a significant negative correlation between objectionability and ubiquity. The results of correlation analysis among the scales and advertisements can be found in Table 4.

Participant Recognition

All five advertisements were separated into two groups defined by the experts: Infantile advertisements are ads 2, 4, and 5, and non-infantile advertisements are ads 1 and 3, as rated by experts (Carlson, 2010). The participants’ recognition of infantilization was then compared to the experts’ results with a single sample, chi-square goodness of fit test, with the expected
frequencies that matched those of the experts. Experts rated infantile ads 100 percent; therefore, all students had to have answered “Yes” to the question.

The results were significant for all infantile ads (see Figure 6) and non-infantile ads (see Figure 7). It can be concluded then that participants have the same recognition of infantilization and non-infantilization compared to experts.

**Participant Recognition of Infantilization Based on Biological Sex**

Data were analyzed using a series of analyses of variance (ANOVA) to determine if exposure to infantilizing advertisements impacted participants’ recognition and perception of infantilization. There was a significant difference in scores for morality in ad 1 for males ($M = 11.61, SD = 2.62$) and females ($M = 12.85, SD = 1.95$), [$F(1, 93) = 6.91, p = .010$], objectionability in ad 1 for males ($M = 11.67, SD = 2.68$) and females ($M = 12.90, SD = 2.31$), [$F(1, 93) = 5.62, p = .020$], morality in ad 2 for males ($M = 10.69, SD = 2.68$) and females ($M = 11.92, SD = 2.12$), [$F(1, 93)= 6.05, p = .016$], objectionability in ad 2 for males ($M = 10.78, SD = 2.77$) and females ($M = 11.95, SD = 1.94$), [$F(1, 93) = 5.80, p = .018$], morality in ad 3 for males ($M = 11.78, SD = 2.50$) and females ($M = 13.02, SD = 1.92$), [$F(1, 93) = 7.34, p = .008$], and objectionability in ad 3 for males ($M = 11.72, SD = 2.66$) and females ($M = 12.93, SD = 1.89$), $F(1, 93) = 6.69, p = .011$. Descriptive statistics for participant biological sex and the dependent scales can be found in Tables 5-7.

When measuring morality, lower scores indicated that participants found the ad less moral. The tests found that infantile ads had an average lower morality score than noninfantile ads. Table 1 shows the results of the morality ratings by advertisement type. Further, when
advertisements were measured individually, there was a significant difference in scores between the sexes for morality in ads 1, 2, and 3. Males found ads 1 through 5, despite the presence of infantilization or lack thereof, to be less moral than females. Both sexes’ scores lessen for ads 4 and 5, reporting less morality in these two infantile ads, but it is not significant. Therefore, infantile ads were found to be less moral, as shown in Table 5.

When measuring objectionability, lower scores indicated that participants found the ad more objectionable. When measured individually, there was a significant difference in scores between the sexes for objectionability in ads 2 and ad 3. Males found ads 2 and 3 more objectionable than females. Scores dramatically drop in both sexes for ads 4 and 5, making them more objectionable, but it is not significant. Therefore, infantile ads were found to be more objectionable, as shown in Table 6.

When measuring ubiquity, lower scores indicated that participants found the advertisement more ubiquitous. Non-infantile ads were rated lower than infantile ads on a ubiquitous scale. When measured individually, no significant differences were found in ubiquity, but Table 7 shows that males found non-infantile ads to be the most ubiquitous when compared to females. However, when it comes to infantile ads apart from ad 2, females reported them to be more ubiquitous than males. Thus, participants found non-infantile ads to be more ubiquitous than infantile ads, as shown in Table 7.
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION

This study aimed to examine the relationship between the infantilization of women and participants’ perspectives based on biological sex, including scales of morality, objectionability, and ubiquity. The hypothesis was that females exposed to infantilizing ads would correctly identify infantilization and find the concept more immoral and objectionable than males. The importance of this study was emphasized by the fact that advertisements are a media that is frequently difficult to examine due to their controversial nature and subjective perspectives.

Advertisement Analysis

The images used were from five different advertisements. Ad 1 was a Marc Jacobs sunglasses advertisement, ad 2 was an advertisement for Melanie Martinez’s Cry Baby perfume, ad 3 was an advertisement for Viktor & Rolf’s Flowerbomb perfume, ad 4 was an American Apparel advertisement, and ad 5 was a Lee advertisement. Ads 2, 4, and 5 specifically demonstrated instances of infantilization.

For ad 1, the image displayed the model wearing a pair of Marc Jacobs sunglasses. The model was seen smiling and donned a coat in front of a scarlet red backdrop. The image was portrait style, so only her shoulders and above were visible. Similarly, in ad 3, the model was dressed conservatively in a long-sleeved blouse. With a neutral face, she held the product in her hand so it was clear to see what was being sold. For both ads, there is an apparent lack of sexual embeds. Both models were dressed modestly and appropriately for their age, ultimately considering the advertisements to be non-infantile and deficient in sexual embeds.
In ad 4, the model was sprawled across a bed, donned in a tank top, high socks, and no pants. The model was also chewing bubblegum and blowing a bubble. Like a young child, the makeup on the model was sparse, if any. In ad 5, the model was on her knees, licking a popsicle. Donned in high socks and denim overalls, the model was topless. Both models’ demeanor and attire portray adult women as young girls, licking lollipops or popsicles or wearing versions of children’s clothing styles like knee socks (Kilbourne, 1999). Consumers of advertisements like ads 4 and 5 pose as an influence or model for females to follow or mimic.

Furthermore, advertisements that portray adult women in this fashion capitalize on the pressure grown women feel about dressing and acting younger than their age (Speno & Aubrey, 2018). This finding further affirmed that the correlation between a woman’s age and her sexual attractiveness is “so intuitively obvious” (Symons, 1979, p. 188). Commercial magazines are the birthplace of fashion trends and beauty standards, further affirming that provocative, childlike ads can negatively affect how a woman perceives her level of attractiveness.

In ad 2, the image displayed the model holding a baby bottle-shaped perfume, as an infant would have a regular milk bottle. The product was meant to convey youth to its consumers. The model was also seen resembling characteristics of a child, wearing a pink blouse with puffed sleeves and her hair in two pigtails donned with pink ribbons (Kilbourne, 1999). Her expression depicted childish wonder, with her mouth agape and doe-eyed. Here, the model displayed infantilism overtly and covertly. The model’s face contributed to her youthful appearance covertly by showing an expression connotating innocence (Jones, 2021). Coinciding with the model’s overtly infantile clothing, the model is attempted to embody a child.
Perception of Infantilizing Advertisements Based on Biological Sex

The results of this study discovered that male participants found ad 2, an infantile advertisement, more immoral than female participants. However, females found ad 2 to be more objectionable than males. No significant differences were found for the ubiquitous measure in all five advertisements. This indicates that, other than ad 2, there were no significant differences in ratings of morality, objectivity, and ubiquity in infantile and non-infantile ads. This data is inconsistent with previous research indicating that females find infantile ads to be lower in morality and higher in ubiquity and objectivity (Carlson, 2010). In other words, this study found that while males found infantilizing advertisements more immoral, females found them more objectionable.

These results suggest that while males understood that the infantile advertisement was immoral, they rated it less objectionable than females because they equated sexualization to infantilization. Arousal could occur when women are sexualized in an infantilizing manner rather than processing the infantilizing demeanor portrayed. In contrast, females failed to express arousal and properly process the infantilization displayed. Thus, results also seem to suggest that females rated infantile ads more immoral than males because they realized the advertisement contributed to lower sexual standards. Suppose infantilized women in media are designed for the male gaze and displayed on video game covers where males are more likely to be exposed. In that case, this could predict why males are less likely to notice it due to desensitization.
**Limitations of Research**

This study had specific weaknesses, which may affect the internal and external validity of the data. The study only used a sample size of students from a four-year university, with the majority within 18- to 22-year-old age. Most participants were female and White or Hispanic, meaning it cannot be generalized to all populations. The advertisements and questionnaire were online, leaving no way to ensure that the images were genuinely looked at and that all the questions were adequately understood or read before being answered.

As discussed above, the instances of infantilizing behavior were chosen for their harmful portrayals of women as described by previous research. However, fashion is also a highly subjective field, and the interpretations of certain scenes may have occurred in a positive light for individuals. For example, ad 5 featured a topless model, and women distinctly sexualized may have been viewed as positive due to the sexually liberating nature of the model. The advertisements may also have been interpreted critically before the questionnaire was answered, which may negate its infantilization effect.

Another shortcoming of this study was the period in which the scales used were developed. They were all created to analyze perspectives from almost 30 years ago, in the 1990s. As a result of third and fourth-wave feminism, sociocultural perspectives on women have dramatically changed. Thus, so has the social context of both advertisements: non-infantile and infantile. This means that the scales used in this study could be outdated. The reliability and validity of the VASE Scale concerning scales of ubiquity in ads 1 and 3 and morality in ad 1 was also not high enough to be considered consistent. Furthermore, a good deal of the result analyses was not found to be statistically significant, leading to no conclusion about their meaning.
Future Research

This study raises many questions regarding infantilization, particularly in the media. Future research should examine the differences in infantilization between cisgender women and transgender women. The advertisements chosen only featured cisgender women, which may have affected the participants' opinions. For example, cultural differences among the LGBTQ+ community could contribute to different ways of fashion expression, specifically transgender women. Another direction of future research that can be taken is the use of Black models and how infantilization affects them. This study should also be conducted with a larger, more diverse sample size.
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APPENDIX C: ADVERTISEMENT CONSUMPTION SCALE
Rank the following print media outlets according to your viewing frequency, with one being the most frequently viewed and 5 being the least frequently viewed source of advertisements.

____ Magazines
____ Newspaper
____ Billboard
____ Internet
____ Other ________________________________
APPENDIX C: VASE SCALE
1. This advertisement is very appealing to me.
2. This advertisement is the kind of advertisement you forget easily.
3. At first glance, I can recognize the product being sold in this advertisement.
4. This advertisement is suggestive of child pornography.

Factor 1: Objectionable
5. The advertisement above is offensive.
7. The advertisement is unethical.
11. The advertisement is very objectionable.

Factor 2: Widespread
6. I see similar advertisements frequently.
9. Advertisements like the one pictured above are widespread.
12. Images like this are very common in advertisements.

Factor 3: Moral
8. The advertisement is morally harmful.
10. The advertisement is a contributor to lower sexual standards.
13. I feel like advertisements like this are a cause of lower moral values.

14. In my opinion, the model(s) in this advertisement appear…? (please select all that apply)
   a. Independent
   b. Strong
   c. Intelligent
   d. Childlike
   e. Creative
   f. Weak
   g. Mature
Table 1  
*Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Morality Based on Ad Exposure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertisement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad 1</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 2</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 3</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 4</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 5</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
*Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Objectionability Based on Ad Exposure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertisement</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad 1</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 2</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 3</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 4</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 5</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Ubiquity Based on Ad Exposure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertisement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad 1</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 2</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 3</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 4</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 5</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Pearson Correlations Among Scales of Morality (M), Objectivity (O), and Ubiquity (U)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. M ad 1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. M ad 2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. M ad 3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. M ad 4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. M ad 5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. O ad 1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. O ad 2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. O ad 3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. O ad 4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. O ad 5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. U ad 1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. U ad 2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. U ad 3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. U ad 4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. U ad 5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01, **p < .00
Table 5  
*Group Statistics for Levels of Morality Based on Sex*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertisement</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad 1</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 2</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 3</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 4</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 5</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Group Statistics for Levels of Objectionability Based on Sex*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertisement</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad 1</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 2</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 3</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 4</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 5</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

*Group Statistics for Levels of Ubiquity Based on Sex*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertisement</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad 1</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 2</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 3</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 4</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad 5</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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