

1 Running Head: THE BODY PARTS SATISFACTION SCALE

2
3 Factor Structure and Validity of the *Body Parts Satisfaction Scale*:
4 Results from the 1972 *Psychology Today* Survey

5
6 David A. Frederick

7 Crean School of Health and Life Sciences, Chapman University

8
9 George W. Bohrnstedt

10 American Institutes for Research

11
12 Elaine Hatfield

13 Department of Psychology, University of Hawaii

14
15 Ellen Berscheid

16 Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota

17
18 Word Count: 8773

19
20 *Correspondence to:* Dr. David Frederick, One University Drive, Orange, CA 92866

21 (enderflies1@aol.com) or Dr. Elaine Hatfield, 2530 Dole St., Sakamaki C400, Honolulu, HI.

22 elaineh@hawaii.edu

23

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Abstract

In 1972, the first major national study on body image was conducted under the auspices of *Psychology Today*. Body image was assessed with the *Body Parts Satisfaction Scale*, which examined the dissatisfaction people experienced with 24 aspects of their bodies. Despite the continued use of this scale, data on the validity of this measure have never been published. As the 40th anniversary of the first major national study on body image approaches, we take this opportunity to examine the prevalence and factor structure of body image concerns in 1972. An exploratory factor analysis conducted on 2,013 participants revealed factors that differed slightly for men (Face, Sex Organ, Height, Lower Body, Mid Torso, Upper Torso) compared to women (Face, Sex Organ, Height, Lower Torso, Mid Torso, Extremities, Breast). The factors were highly intercorrelated, suggesting the scale can be analyzed by item, by subscales, or by total score.

Factor Structure and Validity of the *Body Parts Satisfaction Scale*:**Results from the 1972 *Psychology Today* Survey**

Despite the maxim “beauty is only skin deep,” people make inferences about a person’s personality and treat them differently based simply on their appearance. Men and women who are more physically attractive experience a host of positive social outcomes, including higher salaries, greater likelihood of receiving job offers, more friends, and more positive treatment by teachers and authority figures (Langlois, Kalakanis, Rubenstein, Larson, Hallam, & Smoot, 2000). Popular media images represent a narrow range of body types as being prestigious and physically attractive, and humans naturally aspire to attain traits that will give them greater social prestige. In every culture across the world, people attempt to enhance their appearance in the hopes of gaining greater social status (Etcoff, 1999).

These social benefits to beauty cause many men and women to evaluate whether or not their appearance matches these ideals, to strive to match them, and to feel dissatisfaction and shame when they believe that they have failed to live up to these standards (Cafri, Yamamiya, Brannick, & Thompson, 2005; Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). This dissatisfaction is associated with social anxiety (Cash, Theriault, & Annis, 2004), depression (Stice, Hayward, Cameron, Killen, & Taylor, 2000), binge eating (Gordon, Holm-Denoma, Troop-Gordon, & Sand, 2012), a compulsive need for excessive exercise (White & Halliwell, 2010), negative impacts on many aspects of one's life (Cash, Jakatdar, & Williams, 2004), desire for cosmetic surgery (Frederick, Lever, & Peplau, 2007), and discomfort with one's sex life (Peplau, Frederick, Yee, Maisel, Lever, & Ghavami, 2010).

Despite the harmful effects of poor body image, surprisingly there have been no nationally representative studies of adults examining the prevalence of body dissatisfaction. There have been, however, several notable attempts to recruit demographically representative samples or large and broad samples (e.g., Asgeirsdottir, Ingolfsdottir, & Sigfusdottir, 2012; Cash & Henry, 1995; Cash, Winstead, &

59 Janda, 1986; Frederick, Peplau, & Lever, 2006; Swami et al., 2010; for a review, see Frederick, Jafary,
60 Daniels, & Gruys, 2012).

61 The first large-scale attempt to assess the epidemiology of body dissatisfaction came in 1972, when
62 Berscheid, Hatfield [Walster], and Bohrnstedt created the 109 item *Body Image Satisfaction Scale* and
63 published it in the magazine *Psychology Today* and asked readers to complete the survey and mail it in.
64 The authors then presented a subset of the results in *Psychology Today* (Berscheid, Hatfield [Walster], &
65 Bohrnstedt, 1973).

66 Of most interest here are the first 24 items, which directly assessed dissatisfaction with different
67 aspects of one's body, which have been termed the *Body Parts Satisfaction Scale*. This scale, or subsets of
68 items from this scale, have been used by scholars conducting research on media (Cameron & Ferraro,
69 2004; Pinhas, Toner, Ali, Garfinkel, & Stuckless, 1999), body image (Petrie, Tripp, & Harey, 2002),
70 sexual orientation (Bergeron & Senn, 1998), gender identity (Kimlicka, Cross, & Tamal, 1983), sexual
71 dysfunction (Adersen & Legrand, 1991), and disordered eating (Brown, Cash, & Lewis, 2006; Mintz &
72 Betz, 1988; Siever, 1994; Tripp & Petrie, 2001). Data on the concurrent validity and underlying factor
73 structure of the full measure, however, have never been published. This paper is intended to remedy that
74 omission.

75 Specifically, here we present the intercorrelations among the items, a factor analysis of the *Body*
76 *Parts Satisfaction Scale*, and the internal consistency of the items within each factor. Further, we
77 predicted that if the measure was valid, then higher levels of body dissatisfaction on this measure would be
78 linked to lower levels of self-esteem (Pesa, Syre, & Jones, 2000), more difficulty interacting with the other
79 sex (Davison & McCabe, 2006), and greater body mass (Frederick, Forbes, Grigorian, & Jarcho, 2007;
80 Frederick, Peplau, & Lever, 2006).

81

82 **Overview of Research Goals**

83 To summarize, the goals of this study were:

84 **Goal 1: Identifying the extent of body dissatisfaction in 1972.** We present the percentage of
85 men and women who were dissatisfied with different aspects of their bodies based on their responses to
86 the *Body Parts Satisfaction Scale*. We also highlight the percentage of people who were substantially
87 dissatisfied with each aspect of their bodies, and comment on the relevance of these findings for modern
88 research on body image.

89 **Goal 2: Identifying the factor structure and intercorrelations among items.** We present the
90 intercorrelations among items and the factors that emerge through an exploratory factor analysis, as well
91 as second order factors that may link together the lower order factors. That is, do people who score high
92 on some items tend to score high on other specific items because responses to them are driven by a latent
93 factor, how many of these latent factors can be identified by the responses, and are there additional factors
94 that link together the first set of factors identified?

95 **Goal 3: Examining links between dissatisfaction with whole body and aspects of body.**

96 We examine the extent to which concerns with different aspects of the body predict one's feelings about
97 their overall attractiveness. For example, are concerns with the mid torso area (e.g., abdomen) a better
98 predictor of overall feelings of attractiveness than concerns with one's face, and do these associations
99 differ for men and women?

100 **Goal 4: Establishing concurrent validity of the scale.** To demonstrate the predictive validity of
101 the measure, we examine whether people who are more dissatisfied with their bodies report greater
102 feelings of inadequacy, less comfort interacting with the other sex, and greater body mass.

103 **Method**

104 **Participants**

105 The data was collected using a questionnaire mailed to the readership of *Psychology Today*. More
106 than 60,000 readers completed and mailed in the questionnaire. This large number of participants made it
107 impossible to code and keypunch every questionnaire. Therefore, a sample of 2,013 (1000 men and 1013
108 women) was drawn on which to base our analyses. In order to approximate the actual distribution of sex
109 and age in the United States, a sample that had been stratified by sex and age was selected. The chosen
110 sample included roughly 50% men and 50% women, and within each sex, 45% of the sample was 24 years
111 of age or younger, 25% was 25-44 years of age, and 31% was 45 years of age or older.

112 **Procedure**

113 The participants completed all 109 items on the questionnaire, a subset of which are presented here.
114 The entire survey can be viewed here: (<http://www.elainehatfield.com> (research articles, #33)).

115 **Body Parts Satisfaction Scale.** Participants were presented with a list of 24 aspects of their bodies
116 (see Table 1). They expressed their degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with each of these aspects
117 using a six-point Likert scale (1 = Extremely Satisfied, 2 = Quite Satisfied, 3 = Somewhat Satisfied, 4 =
118 Somewhat Dissatisfied, 5 = Quite Dissatisfied, 6 = Extremely Dissatisfied). To facilitate interpretation of
119 the data, we created several different versions of this variable, including the percent expressing any
120 dissatisfaction with each aspect of their body (scores of 4-6 for that item; see Tables 1 and 2) and those
121 expressing substantial dissatisfaction (scores of 5-6) for each item (see Table 2). Higher scores on the
122 items indicate greater dissatisfaction.

123 **Overall Body Dissatisfaction.** Participants rated their satisfaction with their "overall body
124 appearance" on the six-point Likert Scale ranging from Extremely Satisfied to Extremely Dissatisfied
125 mentioned above. Higher scores indicate greater dissatisfaction.

126 **Body Mass.** Participants reported their height in inches and weight in pounds. Their weight was
127 then divided by their height to create an assessment of body mass. This approach differs from the

128 currently common convention of calculating body mass using the standard BMI formula (weight divided
129 by height squared using metric system values) but provides a similar assessment of body mass. Higher
130 scores indicate greater body masses.

131 **Feelings of Inadequacy.** Poor self-esteem was assessed with the Janis-Field Feelings of
132 Inadequacy Scale, which measures lack of confidence with oneself in a variety of life domains and (Janis
133 & Field, 1959). The measure included 10 items such as "How often do you feel self-conscious" (1 =
134 Never, 5 = Very Often) and "When you talk in front of a class or group of persons your own age, how
135 apprehensive do you usually feel?" (1 = Not at all apprehensive, 5 = Very Apprehensive). Cronbach's α
136 for this measure were .84 for women and .82 for men. Higher scores on the scale indicate greater feelings
137 of inadequacy.

138 **Difficulty Relating to Other Sex.** Participants were presented with the item "In general, I find it
139 difficult to relate well to persons of the opposite sex". They recorded their answers on a Likert scale
140 ranging from 1 (Strongly agree) to 6 (Strongly disagree). Higher scores indicate less difficulty interacting
141 with the other sex.

142 **Results**

143 **Overview of Results**

144 Although the original dataset no longer exists, detailed archival records of the analyses conducted
145 were maintained by George Bohrnstedt. Some of the data analytic procedures reported in this manuscript
146 were state of the art at the time of the analyses, but may have been supplanted with more refined methods.
147 For example, confirmatory factor analysis was just being developed at the time of study and was not
148 conducted on the measure. Therefore, only results of an exploratory factor analysis are reported.

149 Consistent with Goal 1 (*extent of dissatisfaction*), report the percent who experience significant
150 dissatisfaction as well as the overall percent dissatisfied, with the items grouped according to the subscales

151 generated by the factor analysis (Table 1). Consistent with Goal 2 (*factor structure*), we then present the
152 intercorrelations among the items, showing the extent to which people who express dissatisfaction with
153 one aspect of their bodies tend to express dissatisfaction with other aspects of their bodies (Table 2). We
154 present the factor loadings of each item and the correlations among factors for men and women (Table 3),
155 followed by the average level of dissatisfaction across each of the subscales for men and women (Table 4),
156 as well as the overall intercorrelations among scores on these subscales. We then present the results of the
157 second order factor analysis (Table 5).

158 Consistent with Goal 3 (*linking part to whole body dissatisfaction*), we then present the correlations
159 between scores on each subscale and reports of overall body dissatisfaction, and well as a regression
160 predicting overall body dissatisfaction (Table 6). Finally, consistent with Goal 4 (*establishing concurrent*
161 *validity*), we present the extent to which people who report more body dissatisfaction on each subscale
162 report more feelings of inadequacy and more difficulty interacting with members of the other sex (Table
163 6).

164 **Goal 1: Identifying the Extent of Body Dissatisfaction in 1972.**

165 It is clear that weight was on people's mind in 1972. As shown on Table 1, dissatisfaction with
166 one's abdomen the most common source of dissatisfaction for both women (50%) and men (36%), and
167 dissatisfaction with weight was ranked third for women (48%) and second for men (35%). Overall, traits
168 that can be affected by increasing or decreasing body fat level, such as abdomen, hips, weight, and
169 buttocks, were among the most common sources of dissatisfaction for women and men. The percentage
170 expressing substantial dissatisfaction with those aspects of the body was substantially lower. Only 19% of
171 women and 11% of men reported being substantially dissatisfied with their abdomen, and 21% of women
172 and 10% of men were substantially dissatisfied with their weight.

173 Dissatisfaction with muscle tone was somewhat common for women (30%) and men (26%).

174 Concern for sex specific traits was somewhat common for women (26% were dissatisfied with breasts)
175 and not very common for men (15% were dissatisfied with penis size). When it came to facial features,
176 dissatisfaction with teeth was the only aspect of the face that more than 25% of men and women expressed
177 dissatisfaction with. Only 11% of women and 8% of men expressed dissatisfaction with their face overall.
178 Surprisingly, a full 20% of women were dissatisfied with their feet, as were 11% of men.

179 **Goal 2: Identifying the Factor Structure and Intercorrelations Among Items.**

180 **The multidimensional factor structure of body image.** A factor analysis was conducted to
181 determine whether underlying factors could account for covariation among the individual body
182 dissatisfaction items. The intercorrelations (Table 2) among the 24 body-image items were factor analyzed
183 using a principal components algorithm with the square of the multiple correlations in the diagonal,
184 followed by an oblimax rotation (Harman, 1967; see Table 3). Only loadings greater than or equal to .35
185 are tabled. Two points are immediately clear. First, body image is not unidimensional: not one but five
186 interpretable factors emerge. Second, while the loading patterns for men and women are similar, they are
187 not exactly the same.

188 For both sexes, Factor I appears to be a *face factor*. For both sexes, the item primarily defining the
189 factor is dissatisfaction with overall facial attractiveness. In addition, for women, dissatisfaction with their
190 faces seems most heavily determined by dissatisfaction with complexion, nose, mouth, and eyes. For men,
191 the relevant features appear to be dissatisfaction with mouth, nose, and chin. The most interesting
192 difference between men and women on this factor is the absence of dissatisfaction with complexion for
193 men and its rather prominent inclusion for women.

194 The items defining Factor II for women are dissatisfaction with shoulders, arms, hands, and feet.
195 The emergence of this factor suggests that women see these body parts in a unitary way. Given the items
196 that define this factor for the women, it has been named the *extremities factor*. No parallel factor for men

197 was found. Instead, Factor II for men appears to be an *upper torso factor*, defined by dissatisfaction with
198 chest, shoulders, arms, and general muscle tone.

199 For both sexes, Factor III appears to be a *lower torso factor* for women and a *lower body factor*.
200 For women dissatisfaction with hips and upper thighs, buttocks, legs, and ankles (in that order) define this
201 factor. For men, dissatisfaction with feet also loads on this factor. Furthermore, the *pattern* of loadings is
202 somewhat different for men. Dissatisfaction with legs and ankles appears to be the most important item
203 for defining this factor, followed by dissatisfaction with hips/thighs, feet, and buttocks (in that order).

204 Factor IV is a *mid-torso factor* for both sexes. Dissatisfaction with weight and abdomen are the
205 defining items for the women, while the same two items plus dissatisfaction with buttocks defines this
206 item for the men. This last item is the only one that loaded on more than one factor (it also loaded on
207 Factor IV), a fact that suggests the relative *conceptual* independence of the five factors for both sexes.
208 When scores were constructed to represent the factors, this item was included with the lower-torso factor
209 since it better fits that factor conceptually.

210 Factor V is a *sex organ factor* for both men and women. The two items defining the factor for both
211 sexes are dissatisfaction with the size of one's sex organ and dissatisfaction with its appearance.

212 Some body parts often believed to be important to body dissatisfaction did not load significantly on
213 any of the factors. For example, for both sexes, dissatisfaction with *height* is relatively independent of any
214 factors. Similarly, for women, dissatisfaction with *breasts* is relatively independent of dissatisfaction with
215 other body parts. This examination of the structure of body dissatisfaction suggests that these are best
216 conceptualized of as specific single-item rather than multiple-item common factors (Harman, 1967).

217 Therefore when scores to represent the factors are built, these two items are treated as single-item scores.

218 **Constructing subscales.** To summarize, body dissatisfaction is clearly multidimensional and the
219 items appear linked in ways that make conceptual sense. The factors were substantially correlated with

220 each other, however, with the average intercorrelation among factors being .31 for women and .38 for men
221 (Table 3). The items for each factor identified above were averaged to create subscale scores. The items
222 composing the various scores are shown in Table 4. In addition to these scores, a separate, one-item score
223 representing dissatisfaction with height and a one-item score for dissatisfaction with breasts (women only)
224 were also used.

225 Each score was constructed by summing the items and dividing by the total number of items in it in
226 order to standardize the range of the scores. The means, standard deviations, in intercorrelations among
227 the subscores are shown in Table 4. The items are scored so that the higher the score, the greater the
228 dissatisfaction (Range = 1 to 6). While the actual sizes of the correlations are slightly different than those
229 in Table 2 (since the subscores are factor-based, rather than actual factor scores), the pattern of
230 relationships is virtually identical. The reliabilities of the subscores were estimated using Cronbach's α
231 and are included in the main diagonal of Table 4. All are reasonable in size (ranging from .66 to .82 for
232 women, and .74 to .84 for men).

233 **Second order factor analysis: Building a single body image score.** The high intercorrelations
234 among the scores suggested that it might be fruitful to do a second-order factor analysis (Schmid &
235 Leiman, 1957), where the intercorrelations among the factors were factor analyzed. If a single, second-
236 order factor emerged, that finding would indicate the plausibility of building a single, overall *Body Image*
237 *and Satisfaction-24* score as well as a set of subscores.

238 The results of the second-order factor analysis are shown in Table 4. For men, a single factor
239 emerged that reflected the substantial intercorrelation among the various subscores. For the women, a
240 strong first factor emerged together with a second weaker one. However, since (1) both subscores loaded
241 *higher* on Factor I as well, and (2) the first factor accounted for 70% of the common variance in the
242 correlation matrix, building a single, overall body-image score for women as well as men seemed

243 warranted. The internal consistency reliability estimates of the total score are .86 and .89 for women and
244 men, respectively. It is not meant to imply that the subscores can now be discarded. However, when an
245 overall score is desired, the findings indicate that its construction is justified.

246 **Goal 3: Examining Links between Dissatisfaction with Whole Body and Aspects of Body.**

247 To examine criterion-related validity, the subscores were correlated with an item that asked the
248 respondent to rate dissatisfaction with *overall* body appearance on a six-point scale ranging from
249 extremely satisfied to extremely dissatisfied. The correlation with this item of the total body
250 dissatisfaction score is .78 for both sexes (all $ps < .001$). In addition, the correlations of each subscore
251 with the item were computed (see Table 6). They range in size from $r = .24$ to .68, thus providing
252 evidence for the validity of the subscores as well (see Table 5).

253 For women, dissatisfaction with their mid-torso area, followed by their dissatisfaction with lower-
254 torso area, were most predictive of their ratings of overall body dissatisfaction. This interpretation is
255 supported by the *beta* coefficients produced when dissatisfaction with overall body appearance is
256 regressed on the seven subscores from the *Body Parts Satisfaction Scale* (Table 6). Dissatisfaction with
257 the mid-torso area is clearly the most important determinant followed by dissatisfaction with the face and
258 extremities. Although statistically significant, dissatisfaction with breasts, height, and sex organs were
259 less predictive.

260 For men, the aspects of the body that were most predictive of overall body dissatisfaction differed
261 from the aspects that were most predictive for women. Dissatisfaction with the mid- and upper-torso areas
262 appears the prime determinant of dissatisfaction with men's overall body attractiveness, as both the zero-
263 order correlations and the beta weights in Table 6 indicate. While dissatisfaction with the lower torso and
264 body, face, and height made statistically significant contributions to the variance explained, they were
265 considerably lower in strength.

266 **Goal 4: Establishing the Concurrent Validity of the Scale.**

267 To examine the construct validity of the *Body Parts Satisfaction Scale*, we examined whether
268 people who scored higher on the subscales and overall scale score reported greater feelings of inadequacy,
269 less comfort interacting with the other sex, and higher body masses.

270 **Feelings of inadequacy.** People who were more dissatisfied with their bodies, across all measures,
271 reported greater feelings of inadequacy (all $ps < .001$; Table 6), with the correlations ranging from $r = .16$
272 to $r = .43$. The pattern of results suggests that dissatisfaction with mid-torso, lower-torso, facial, and
273 extremity areas were most highly related to feelings of inadequacy for women. Dissatisfaction with one's
274 breasts and height appear to be less important. For men, dissatisfaction with the facial, upper-torso, and
275 lower-torso areas along with dissatisfaction with their penises appear to be most highly related to self-
276 esteem. Of less importance was dissatisfaction with height and the mid-torso area. The correlations
277 between the total body dissatisfaction score and feelings of inadequacy were $r = .45$ and $r = .44$ for the
278 women and men respectively, suggesting that the overall total dissatisfaction score has concurrent and
279 construct validity.

280 **Cross-sex interactions.** Construct validity was also examined by correlating the scores with
281 responses to the item dealing with degree of discomfort in cross-sex interactions (Table 6). For women,
282 the correlations range from $r = -.13$ to $r = -.24$; for men, from $r = -.12$ to $r = -.27$, with all $ps < .001$. While
283 not large, these correlations do suggest, as hypothesized, that dissatisfaction with one's body is related to
284 the less comfort interacting with the opposite sex. It is interesting that the pattern of correlations observed
285 is nearly the same as the patterns of correlations between the scores and self-esteem. For the women,
286 dissatisfaction with the face, extremities, lower-torso, mid-torso, and sex organs is most highly correlated
287 with difficulty in cross-sex interactions. For men, the most important variables appear to be dissatisfaction
288 with the face, upper-torso, lower-torso, and sex organs. The correlations of $r = -.21$ and $r = -.28$ between

289 the total score and difficulty in interacting with the opposite sex is evidence of the construct validity of this
290 measure as well.

291 **Body mass.** Additional evidence for validity of this construct is provided by correlating body mass
292 with the body dissatisfaction subscores and totals (Table 6). Among women, participants with greater
293 body masses were more likely to be dissatisfied with their mid-torsos ($r = .55, p < .001$), extremities ($r =$
294 $.23, p < .001$), and lower-torsos ($r = .33, p < .001$). Body mass was uncorrelated with dissatisfaction with
295 the face, sex organs, and height. Women with lower body masses were slightly more dissatisfied with
296 their breasts. This relation, however, was a weak one ($r = -.09, p < .001$). Unfortunately, the correlation
297 between the total body dissatisfaction and body mass was not computed at the time these analyses were
298 conducted and therefore is not reported in Table 6 for either sex.

299 Among men, participants with greater body masses were more likely to be dissatisfied with their
300 mid-torsos ($r = .38, p < .001$) but not their upper-torso area ($r = -.15, p < .001$). Body mass was not
301 significantly correlated with dissatisfaction with lower-torsos, face, or height. A small significant
302 correlation was found between body mass and dissatisfaction with one's sex organs ($r = .07, p < .05$),
303 although the correlation is so small as to call into question its substantive importance.

304 **Discussion**

305 **Goal 1: Identifying the Extent of Body Dissatisfaction in 1972.**

306 It is clear that in 1972, many men and women were dissatisfied with aspects of their appearance,
307 particularly aspects of their appearance that change notably as one gains weight. Consistent with much
308 other research, women were more likely to be dissatisfied than men, but many men were also dissatisfied.
309 The number of people who were significantly dissatisfied, however, was relatively low. A total of 23% of
310 the women, and 15% of the men, indicated any dissatisfaction with *overall* body appearance, and 50% of
311 women and 35% of men reported some dissatisfaction with their weight. It is unclear how this compares

312 to current levels of dissatisfaction. For example, in a sample of 52,677 heterosexual adults, 21% of
313 women and 11% of men rated their overall body as unattractive, and 63% of women and 52% of men
314 reported being to some degree self-conscious about their weight (Frederick, Peplau, & Lever, 2006).
315 These numbers are not directly comparable to the 1972 results, however, because the wording of the
316 questions and sample recruitment methods differ, and the population of the United States has increased in
317 body mass across the past 40 years.

318 Consistent with the prestige attached to muscularity and muscle tone (e.g., Frederick, Fessler, &
319 Haselton, 2005), dissatisfaction with muscle tone was relatively common for both men and women, which
320 is consistent with modern research (McCreary & Sasse, 2000). For men, this is likely in part because men
321 perceive that muscularity will make them more intimidating and attractive to women (Frederick et al.,
322 2007) and because women prefer somewhat muscular men, especially in short-term affairs (Frederick &
323 Haselton, 2007)

324 The face, like the body, can contain cues to one's underlying health and attributes (Gallup &
325 Frederick, 2010; Little, Jones, & Debruine, 2011), so it is not surprising that many people attend to facial
326 appearance when choosing a mate. Most participants were satisfied with aspects of their face, but
327 dissatisfaction with teeth and complexion were most common. Preferences for the color and shape of
328 eyes, ears, chins, and so on may be relatively free to vary, but crooked, yellow, or rotting teeth are
329 commonly viewed as unattractive (Hendrie & Brewer, 2012), as are blotches and pimples.

330 Given the link between breast size with femininity and penis size with masculinity, the relatively
331 *low* degree of dissatisfaction with these aspects of the body parts is somewhat surprising. If the sample
332 can be considered representative, these findings suggest that the popular press and the psychiatric
333 literature of the 1970s had overemphasized the importance of these body parts for American men and
334 women. These findings for women contrast with those of Forbes and Frederick (2008), who found that

335 61% of college women desired larger breasts whereas only 14% desired smaller breasts, and that 25%
336 were often to always dissatisfied with their breast size. Similarly, 70% of women in a broad sample of
337 adults indicated some degree of dissatisfaction with their current breast size or droopiness (Frederick,
338 Peplau, & Lever, 2008). It is possible that more similar results would have been found had the 1972 study
339 asked about self-ideal discrepancies in size and shape of breasts instead of asking only about satisfaction
340 with breasts.

341 Similarly, the findings for men contrast with those of Lever, Frederick, & Peplau (2006), who
342 found that 45% of adult men desired a larger penis (and 0.2% desired a smaller penis), and those of
343 Tiggemann, Martins, and Churchett (2008), who found that 68% of adult men desired a larger penis (and
344 1.6% desired a smaller penis). In contrast, however, Morisson, Bearden, Ellis, and Harriman (2005)
345 asked about degree of dissatisfaction rather than desire for larger or smaller penis, and found that only
346 29% of men were dissatisfied with the length of their non-erect penis, 5% with the length of their erect
347 penis, 6% with the circumference of their erect penis, and 25% with the circumference of their non-erect
348 penis. Few studies have been conducted on this topic, however, which is likely due in part to the potential
349 stigma associated with conducting research on genitalia and sexuality more generally.

350 The findings highlight two additional aspects of the body that are rarely studied in the field of body
351 image: height and feet. First, 13% of men and women were dissatisfied with their height. The low level
352 of dissatisfaction is surprising. Taller men and earn higher salaries (Judge & Cable, 2004) and are
353 perceived as more dominant (Boyson, Pryor, & Butler, 1999). Many people attend to height when
354 selecting a partner, with people preferring a relationship in which the man is taller than the woman,
355 although men are somewhat more willing to violate this male-taller norm (Salska, Frederick, Pawlowski,
356 Laird, & Rudd, 2008). Jacobi and Cash (1994) found that men and women want to be a little over an inch
357 taller on average. Lever, Frederick, Laird, and Sadeghi-Azar (2007) found that dissatisfaction with height

358 depended strongly on one's height, with shorter than average men and women expressing the most
359 dissatisfaction.

360 Finally, a surprisingly large number of women expressed dissatisfaction with their feet (20%), and
361 aspect of the body for which there is little research. Fessler et al. (2012) found consistent evidence across
362 seven studies that smaller feet in women are rated more attractive, which may partly explain the
363 dissatisfaction identified here.

364 **Goal 2: Identifying the Factor Structure and Intercorrelations Among Items**

365 The factor analysis revealed factors that roughly translated into the following categories for men: face,
366 upper torso, lower body, midtorso, sex organ, and height. The factors were similar for women: face,
367 extremities, lower torso, mid torso, sex organ, breast, and height. These factors suggest that concerns with
368 one's body can be separated by different aspects of one's appearance. These factors are, however, fairly
369 highly intercorrelated, and a second order factor analysis suggests it may be defensible to create an overall
370 body dissatisfaction score from the items on the *Body Parts Satisfaction Scale*.

371 **Goal 3: Examining Links between Dissatisfaction with Whole Body and Aspects of Body.**

372 Some aspects of appearance were more predictive of overall body dissatisfaction than others.
373 Dissatisfaction with the mid-torso was a particularly strong predictor for women ($r = .68$), followed by the
374 lower torso ($r = .59$), extremities ($r = .50$), and face ($r = .41$). The biggest contributors to body
375 dissatisfaction for men went up and down the entire torso, including upper torso ($r = .61$), midtorso ($r =$
376 $.60$), and lower body ($r = .54$), with sex organs not far behind ($r = .47$). Many of these aspects are heavily
377 influenced by body fat levels and degree of muscle tone, suggesting the primacy of these concerns when
378 people evaluate their overall attractiveness, in conjunction with how they feel about their faces.

379 **Goal 4: Establishing the Concurrent Validity of the Scale**

380 The results supported the validity of the scale. People who reported higher levels of body

381 dissatisfaction on the *Body Parts Satisfaction Scale* tended to report greater feelings of dissatisfaction on a
382 single item measure of dissatisfaction with appearance, higher body masses, greater feelings of
383 inadequacy, and less comfort interacting with members of the other sex.

384 ***Limitations***

385 While the readership was national in scope, it differed in several respects from a 1970s national
386 probability sample of adults. The readership was somewhat younger and better educated than was the
387 general population, and the sample overrepresented students and underrepresented minority groups.
388 Despite its limitations, however, the sample was much broader than other samples drawn to examine body
389 image at the time, which were primarily limited to college students (e.g., Berscheid, Dion, Hatfield
390 [Walster] & Walster, 1971).

391 An additional limitation is the inability to further access the dataset for further statistical analyses,
392 such as confirmatory statistical analysis. For example, the linear relationship between body mass and
393 body dissatisfaction was assessed, but it is known that there is a strong curvilinear relationship between
394 body mass and body dissatisfaction for men: skinny men tend to feel dissatisfied because they lack the
395 powerful body build that is idealized, fat men tend to feel dissatisfied because body fat is stigmatized, and
396 men in the normal and overweight categories tend to be most satisfied because they have a more powerful
397 appearing body type (Frederick, Forbes, Grigorian, & Jarcho, 2007; Frederick, Peplau, & Lever, 2006).

398 **Conclusion**

399 This study provides the first systematic investigation of the factor structure and validity of the
400 *Body Parts Satisfaction Scale* in a large population of adults. The convergent and predictive validity of
401 the scale suggests that it is useful for investigating body image dissatisfaction concerns across multiple
402 aspects of the body, and that it useful to examine dissatisfaction with specific parts of the body via the
403 individual items, general body areas through subscales identified , and through overall body dissatisfaction

404 with the total scale score.

405 This study provides a look into the body image concerns and their underlying structure forty years
406 ago. Given that there has never been a nationally representative study of body image concerns, an
407 examination of the prevalence and structure of body image concerns in the population would be a valuable
408 next step for the field.

409

410

References

- 411 Asgeirsdottir, B. B., Ingolfsson, G., & Sigfusdottir, I. D. (2012). Body image trends among Icelandic
412 adolescents: A cross-sectional national study from 1997 to 2010. *Body Image, 9*, 404-408.
- 413 Adersen, B. L., & LeGrand, J. (1991). Body image for women: Conceptualization, assessment, and a test
414 of its importance to sexual dysfunction and medical illness. *The Journal of Sex Research, 28*, 457-
415 478.
- 416 Bergeron, S. M., & Senn, C. Y. (1998). Body image and sociocultural norms- A comparison of
417 heterosexual and lesbian women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 385-401.
- 418 Berscheid, E., Hatfield [Walster], E., & Bohrnstedt, G. (1972). Body image—a *Psychology Today*
419 Questionnaire. *Psychology Today, 6*, 57-67.
- 420 Berscheid, E., Hatfield, [Walster], E., & Bohrnstedt, G. (1973). The happy American body: A survey
421 report. *Psychology Today, 7*, 119-131.
- 422 Berscheid, E., Dion, K., Walster, E., & Walster, W.G. (1971). Physical attractiveness and dating choice: A
423 test of the matching hypothesis. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 7*, 173-189
- 424 Brown, T. A., Cash, T. F., & Lewis, R. J. (2006). Body-image disturbances in adolescent female binge-
425 purgers: A brief report of the results of a national survey in the USA. *The Journal of Child*
426 *Psychology and Psychiatry, 30*, 605-613.
- 427 Boyson, A. R., Pryor, B., Butler, J. (1999). Height as power in women. *North American Journal of*
428 *Psychology, 1*, 109-114.
- 429 Cafri, G., Yamamiya, Y., Brannick, M., & Thompson, J. K. (2005). The influence of sociocultural factors
430 on body image: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 12*, 421-433.
- 431 Cameron, E. M., & Ferraro, F. R. (2004). Body satisfaction in college women after brief exposure to
432 magazine images. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 98*, 1093-1099.

- 433 Cash, T. F., & Henry, P. E. (1995). Women's body images: The results of a national survey in the United
434 States. *Sex Roles*, 33, 19-28.
- 435 Cash, T. F., Jakatdar, T. A., Williams, E. F. (2004). The Body Image Quality of Life Inventory: Further
436 validation with college men and women. *Body Image*, 1, 279-287.
- 437 Cash, T. F., Theriault, J., & Annis, N. M. (2004). Body image in an interpersonal context: Adult
438 attachment, fear of intimacy, and social anxiety. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 23,
439 89-103.
- 440 Cash, T. F., Winstead, B. W., & Janda, L. H. (1986). The great American shape-up: Body image
441 survey report. *Psychology Today*, 20, 30-37.
- 442 Davison, T. E., & McCabe, M. P. (2006). Adolescent body image and psychosocial functioning.
443 *Journal of Social Psychology*, 146, 15-30.
- 444 Fessler, D. M. T., Stieger, S., Asaridou, S. S., Bahia, U., Cravalho, M., de Barros, P., et al. (2012).
445 Testing a postulated case of intersexual selection in humans: The role of foot size in judgments
446 of physical attractiveness and age. *Evolution & Human Behavior*, 33, 147-164.
- 447 Forbes, G. B., & Frederick, D. A. (2008). The UCLA Body Project II: Breast and body
448 dissatisfaction among African, Asian, European, and Hispanic American college women.
449 *Sex Roles*, 58, 449-457.
- 450 Frederick, D. A., Buchanan, G. M., Sadeghi-Azar, L., Peplau, L. A., Haselton, M. G.,
451 Berezovskaya, A., & Lipinski, R. E. (2007). Desiring the muscular ideal: Men's body
452 satisfaction in the United States, Ukraine, and Ghana. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 8,
453 103-117.
- 454 Frederick, D. A., Fessler, D. M. T., & Haselton, M. G. (2005). Do representations of male
455 muscularity differ in men's and women's magazines? *Body Image*, 2, 81-86.

- 456 Frederick, D. A., Forbes, G. B., Grigorian, K., & Jarcho, J. M. (2007). The UCLA Body Project I:
457 Gender and ethnic differences in self-objectification and body satisfaction among 2,206
458 undergraduates. *Sex Roles, 57*, 317-327.
- 459 Frederick, D. A., Lever, J., & Peplau, L. A. (2007). Interest in cosmetic surgery and body image:
460 Views of men and women across the lifespan. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 120*, 1407-
461 1415.
- 462 Frederick, D. A., Hadji-Michael, M., Furnham, A., & Swami, V. (2010). The influence of leg-to-body
463 ratio (LBR) on judgments of female physical attractiveness: Assessments of computer-generated
464 images varying in LBR. *Body Image, 7*, 51-55.
- 465 Frederick, D. A., & Haselton, M. G. (2007). Why is muscularity sexy? Tests of the fitness indicator
466 hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 1167-1183.
- 467 Frederick, D. A., Peplau, L. A., & Lever, J. (2008). The Barbie mystique: Satisfaction with breast
468 size and shape across the lifespan. *International Journal of Sexual Health, 20*, 200-211.
- 469 Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T. A. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived
470 experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 173-206.
- 471 Gallup, G. G., Jr., & Frederick, D. A. (2010). The science of sex appeal: An evolutionary perspective.
472 *Review of General Psychology, 14*, 240-250.
- 473 Gordon, K. H., Holm-Denoma, J. M., Troop-Gordon, W., & Sand, E. (2012). Rumination and body
474 dissatisfaction interact to predict concurrent binge eating. *Body Image, 9*, 352-357.
- 475 Harman, H. H. (1967). *Modern Factor Analysis (Rev. Ed.)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 476 Hendrie, C. A., & Brewer, G. (2012). Evidence to suggest that teeth act as human ornament displays
477 signalling mate quality. *PLoS ONE, 7*, e42178.
- 478 Little, A. C., Jones, B. C., & DeBruine, L. M. (2011). Facial attractiveness: Evolutionary based research.

- 479 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 366, 1638-1659.
- 480 Janis, I., & Field, P. (1959). Sex differences and personality factors related to persuasibility. In C.
481 Hovland & I. Janis (Eds.). *Personality and persuasibility*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- 482 Jacobi, L., & Cash, T. F. (1994). In pursuit of the perfect appearance: Discrepancies among self-ideal
483 percepts of multiple physical attributes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 379-396.
- 484 Judge, T. A., & Cable, D. M. (2004). The effect of physical height on workplace success and income:
485 Preliminary test of a theoretical model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 428-441.
- 486 Kimlicka, T., Cross, H., & Tamal, J. (1983). A comparison of androgynous, feminine, masculine, and
487 undifferentiated women on self-esteem, body satisfaction, and sexual satisfaction. *Psychology of*
488 *Women Quarterly*, 7, 291-294.
- 489 Langlois, J. H., Kalakanis, L., Rubenstein, A. J., Larson, A., Hallam, M., & Smoot, M. (2000). Maxims or
490 myths of beauty? A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 390-423.
- 491 Lever, J., Frederick, D. A., Laird, K., & Sadeghi-Azar, L. (2007). Tall women's satisfaction with
492 their height: General population data challenge assumptions behind medical interventions to
493 stunt girls' growth. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40, 192-194.
- 494 Lever, J., Frederick, D. A., & Peplau, L. A. (2006). Does size matter? Men's and women's views
495 on penis size across the lifespan. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 7, 129-143.
- 496 McCreary, D. R., & Sasse, D. K. (2000). An exploration of the drive for muscularity in adolescent boys
497 and girls. *Journal of American College Health*, 48, 297-304.
- 498 Mintz, L. B., & Betz, N. E. (1988). Prevalence and correlates of eating disordered behaviors among
499 undergraduate women. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 35, 463-471.
- 500 Morrison, T. G., Bearden, A. B., Ellis, S. R., & Harriman, R. (2005). Correlates of genital perceptions
501 among Canadian post-secondary students. *Electronic Journal of Human Sexuality*, 8.

- 502 Petrie, T. A., Tripp, M. M., & Harey, P. (2002). Factorial and construct validity of the body parts
503 satisfaction scale revisited: An examination of minority and nonminority women. *Psychology of*
504 *Women Quarterly*, 26, 213-221.
- 505 Peplau, L. A., Frederick, D. A., Yee, C. K., Maisel, N., Lever, J., & Ghavami, N. (2009). Body
506 image satisfaction in heterosexual, gay, and lesbian adults. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38, 713.
- 507 Pesa, J. A., Syre, T. R., & Jones, E. (2000). Psychosocial differences associated with body weight among
508 female adolescents: The importance of body image. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 26, 330-337.
- 509 Pinhas, L., Toner, B. B., Ali, A., Garfinkel, P. E., & Stuckless, N. (1999). The effects of the ideal of
510 female beauty on mood and body satisfaction. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 25, 223-
511 226.
- 512 Salska, I., Frederick, D. A., Pawlowski, B., Reilly, A., Laird, K., & Rudd, N. (2008). Conditional mate
513 preferences: Factors influencing preferences for height. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44,
514 203-215.
- 515 Siever, M. D. (1994). Sexual orientation and gender as factors in socioculturally acquired vulnerability to
516 body dissatisfaction and eating disorders. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62, 252-
517 260.
- 518 Stice, E., Hayward, C., Cameron, R. P., Killen, J. D., & Taylor, C. B. (2000). Body-image and eating
519 disturbances predict onset of depression among female adolescents: A longitudinal study. *Journal*
520 *of Abnormal Psychology*, 109, 438-444.
- 521 Swami, V., Frederick, D. A., Aavik, T., Alcalay, L., Allik, J., & Anderson, D., et al. (2010). The attractive
522 female body weight and female body dissatisfaction in 26 countries across 10 world regions:
523 Results of the International Body Project I. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 309-
524 325.

- 525 Tiggemann, M., Martins, Y., & Churchett, L. (2008). Beyond muscles: Unexplored parts of men's body
526 image. *Journal of Health Psychology, 13*, 1163-1172.
- 527 Tripp, M. M., & Petrie, T. A. (2001). Sexual abuse and eating disorders: A test of a conceptual model. *Sex*
528 *Roles, 44*, 17-32.
- 529 White, J., & Halliwell, E. (2010). Examination of a sociocultural model of excessive exercise among male
530 and female adolescents. *Body Image, 7*, 227-2