

### Effective Teaching of Sexualization and Objectification

Nikki DiGregorio, Ph.D.  
Georgia Southern University

**ABSTRACT.** Accelerated developments in technology have occurred alongside an increasingly dynamic student population within higher education, serving as a catalyst for change in approaches to teaching and learning. In response to these rapid shifts, there has been increasing attention to integration of various instructional technologies into educational settings. Research has demonstrated that teachers use technology in various ways (Teo, 2009). Higher education also continues to examine different approaches to teaching and their effects on learning. Despite advances elsewhere, inquiry surrounding the intersection of teaching strategies and technology, specifically within family science, remains scarce. This study explores application of self-directed learning, media literacy, and recreational technology use in shaping intentional teaching assignments to foster learning surrounding sexualization and objectification within an upper-level family science course. Results demonstrate that students report lower body objectification scores and greater awareness of interpersonal sexual objectification after completing the course. This paper also suggests methods for using empirical evidence of best practices from the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) to inform contemporary teaching of family science courses alongside rapid technological changes.

*Keywords:* andragogy, technology, SoTL, sexualization, objectification

---

Direct Correspondence to Nikki DiGregorio at [ndigregorio@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:ndigregorio@georgiasouthern.edu)

### Effective Teaching of Sexualization and Objectification

Nearly three decades ago, Boyer (1990) warned, “For American higher education to remain vital, we urgently need a more creative view of the work of the professoriate” (p. 7). Research demonstrates that reflecting on the effectiveness of one’s teaching is not only good for the academic growth of educators but also benefits students and universities (Pedrosa-de-Jesus, Guerra, & Watts, 2017). Increased attention to teaching effectiveness is a function of the focus on student learning in higher education. Boyer (1990) readily acknowledged that good teaching often goes unrewarded on many campuses. What then is the impetus for faculty to spend valuable time and energy refining their teaching? The overemphasis on research often leads many devoted teachers to sacrifice the redesigning and updating of courses and assignments. Consequently, the integration of instructional technology in higher education beyond use for conventional tasks has been relatively slow (DiGregorio & Liston, in press; Ertmer & Ottenbriet-Leftwich, 2010). Many factors contribute to the extent to which educators utilize technology in their courses. Most extant research indicates that changes in instructional technologies are outpacing integration; in many cases, technology is not used in the most effective ways to best reach students (Celik & Yesilyurt, 2013; Zhou & Xu, 2007).

Alongside these changes in education and technology, contemporary American culture has become increasingly sexualized. In 2007, the American Psychological Association formally defined sexualization as follows:

Sexualization has occurred when any one of the following conditions are met: (1) a person’s value comes only from his or her sexual appeal; (2) a person is held to a standard that equates physical attractiveness with being sexy; (3) a person is sexually objectified, (4) sexuality is inappropriately imposed upon a person” (as cited in Slater & Tiggemann, 2016, p. 19)

Objectification, then, is a component of sexualization, as sexualizing someone often includes defining their worth by the value ascribed to a part of them, as opposed to viewing them as whole, complete beings. For example, there is a focus on isolated body parts such as breasts or buttocks, with the intent being “consumption” by others (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Slater & Tiggemann, 2016).

Proliferation of technology across the daily lives of the majority of students is changing the way they view themselves and others, and the ways they learn about the world around them. The generation of countless social media applications ripe with advertisements creates a breeding ground for body objectification and hypersexualization. Contemporary American culture is immersed in objectifying images that exploit both men and women. Presently, it is well understood that micro and macro level messages pertaining to objectification and sexualization are detrimental to psychological and physical health of women and men in our culture (LeVay & Baldwin, 2012). These messages typically influence men and women differently, prompting different approaches within the literature (Olivardia, Pope, Borowiecki, & Cohane, 2004; Steiger, Allemand, Robins, & Fend, 2014). Our understanding of the negative impact dominant cultural beliefs have on women is well defined. These influences include but are not limited to depression, low self-esteem, sexual dysfunction, and eating disorders (Calogero, Tantleff-Dunn, & Thomson, 2011; LeVay & Baldwin, 2012).

However, our understanding of appropriate points of intervention and prevention is less developed. Moloney and Pelehach (2013) attest that despite the existing work directing the attention of medical professionals towards body image issues among youth in America, there have been few attempts to understand the influence of teaching and learning associated with these topics. While implementation

of teaching methods to help counter and deconstruct these thought systems is rare, scales to assess the extent of these issues have been developed. This study draws from two validated scales. The Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale [ISOS] as developed by Kozee, Tylka, Augustus-Horvath, and Denchik (2007) presents an instrument geared toward understanding how individuals internalize dominant cultural messages. Researchers have implemented the ISOS in several disciplines and validated the scale among samples of traditionally aged college students (Augustus-Horvath & Tylka, 2009; Davidson, Gervais, Canivez, & Cole, 2013; Kozee et al., 2007). Secondly, the Objectified Body Consciousness Scale [OBC] (McKinley & Hyde, 1996) serves as a necessary compliment to the ISOS, as the OBC tends to issues surrounding body shame, monitoring of self appearance, and body surveillance. The OBC (McKinley & Hyde, 1996) has been widely used in a various settings over time (Castonguay, Sabiston, Crocker, & Mack, 2014; Noll & Fredrickson, 1998).

The Sexuality in Human Development course, the class involved in this study, provides a unique opportunity to highlight the ubiquitous nature of sexualization and objectification in contemporary American culture. The course also illustrates how pervasive these messages are along with their roles in shaping our values, and equips students with skills to critically evaluate the impact each has on their own well-being. Topics discussed in this course are often taught only as subtopics within a larger course, if at all. Using the course as a platform, content ranges from discussion of typical and atypical sexual development, menstruation, and contraception, to attraction, social trends around mating, and advertising. Thus, throughout the semester, content either directly or indirectly relates to sexualization and objectification. This work aims to build on a growing body of literature focusing on intentional teaching strategies in higher education as providing opportunities to dismantle generalized attitudes about objectification and sexualization within our culture (Moloney & Pelehach, 2013) by addressing the following research questions:

1. Can course content and effective teaching help offset internalized beliefs about sexualization and objectification?
2. Can integrating technology into methods of teaching also aid men and women in understanding the intersection of course content and contemporary American culture?
3. Can these teaching strategies foster critical evaluation of society and one's own values and beliefs surrounding sexualization and objectification?

### **Theoretical Foundation**

#### **Andragogy**

The quest to understand how adults learn is not novel. After nearly a century of research, there is no single model of adult learning that explains the process of learning or the numerous contexts wherein adults learn (Merriam, 2001). Andragogy, or the teaching of adult learners, is rooted in these assumptions about adult learners: (a) they can direct their own learning, (b) their life experiences will inform their learning, (c) their learning is problem-centered, and (d) they are largely motivated to learn by internal factors (Merriam, 2001; Ozuah, 2005). The primary role of the teacher is to facilitate the learning and application processes in what Habibi and Branch (2015) refer to as “partnership.” Thus, andragogy can be viewed as a fundamentally constructivist approach to teaching because students are active participants in their own learning. The partnership that andragogical approaches facilitate is paramount to alignment between educator and student learning goals. Partly as a result of technological advances, today's

students learn and communicate in ways that simply did not exist until recently. In many cases, this creates a disconnect between approaches to teaching and successful learning. Andragogy provides a platform from which to examine student learning within courses that employ formal and informal uses of technologies. Additionally, andragogy provides a bridge to help educators meet students where they are, along with opportunities for using current technologies to disseminate course content in relevant, meaningful ways.

### **Constructivist Learning Theory**

Multiple shifts in higher education have included increased investment in student-centered learning approaches (Pedrosa-de-Jesus et al., 2017). Student-centered learning is founded on the understanding that learning is largely student-driven and, to an extent, students direct their own educational trajectory (Merriam, 2001). Constructivist learning theory (Habibi & Branch, 2015; Thomas, Menon, Boruff, Rodriguez, & Ahmed, 2014) posits that learning is the result of individual construction and application of knowledge and that context plays a critical role in shaping both facets of learning. This study is largely centered on concepts of objectification and sexualization, both of which students come to understand largely through messages and channels outside classroom settings. However, by employing a constructivist approach, students can identify artifacts from their own lives via various forms of technology and media to critically evaluate how and where objectification and sexualization thrive in contemporary American culture. Using a student-centered foundation also enables the researcher to put the onus on the student to apply pieces of their everyday lives to course content, as opposed to vice versa (Elmer, 2017; Thomas et al., 2014). This framework helps students create their own internal working definitions and understandings of concepts that are socially constructed and highly influential throughout contemporary American culture.

### **Feminist Standpoint Theory**

Feminist standpoint theory encourages individuals to engage in critical analysis of dominant ideologies and to examine their interactions and experiences with them while working towards system change (Harding, 1986). The relationship between early experiences and current social and cultural expectations also generates an individualized construct from which people experience their lives.

Furthermore, this perspective aims to help understand the varying positions and experiences of women in society (Harding, 1986). Generally, women's position in society is subordinate, and this in turn shapes their world views. This point is exemplified throughout contemporary American culture: advertisements, movies, television shows, music - all of these ready for immediate consumption via numerous forms of technology. The overwhelming majority of the sample in this study is composed of self-identified women, making this focal point relevant.

Experiences are also situated and lived differently by each individual (Hartsock, 1983), thus resulting in individuals developing different standpoints. However, Hartsock (1983) posits that women living in Western societies such as the United States experience similar pressures. This similarity on a cultural level results in women sharing perspectives, to some extent. Although students in this sample come from various parts of the broader population, they share the common experience of living in contemporary American culture, which influences how they view themselves. Fundamentally, students are always experiencing life while trying to make sense of messages they receive from numerous facets of their lives, all of which are embedded in social ideologies (Harding, 1991). This study aims to facilitate

student self-reflection and critical analysis of these ideologies as they pertain to sexualization and objectification.

## Method

### Sample

The sample consisted of 77 total participants who were enrolled in an undergraduate sexuality in human development course lasting one semester long, which was taught at a public university in Southeastern Georgia during the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 semesters. The sample primarily self-identified as female (95%) with the remaining 5% identifying as male. Individuals in this sample also grouped themselves as Caucasian (51.9%), African American (45.5%), or Asian American (2.6%). Participants ranged in age from 19 to 26, with 68.4% of the sample reporting an undergraduate academic rank of junior or senior level.

### Procedures

The Sexuality in Human Development course is required for Child and Family Development students with a concentration in Family Services and serves as an elective for other program emphasis areas and the minor. The course also counts towards a minor in Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. As an upper-level course, students enrolled in the class are generally at the junior or senior undergraduate academic level.

Multiple intentional teaching strategies, delivery methods, and technologies were scaffolded throughout the semester in an effort to reach students with different learning styles. These included social media, documentary clips, current events, anonymous feedback collected intermittently throughout the semester, Kahoot, in-class discussions, and Folio, the university's online delivery platform. During the semester, students must complete three written assignments, which provided qualitative data for this study: two formative written assignments in the shape of an advertisement critique and lyrical analysis of a publicly available song strategically assigned during the first unit of the course, and one summative written assignment analyzing their own sexual values system, due at the end of the course.

This study used a mixed-methods design to best approach the research inquiries. Data for this study were collected across four semesters. This course is taught only once a semester and by the same professor. After informed consent was distributed, students who elected to participate in the study took the pretest survey during the second week of the semester. Due to heightened prevalence of the sexual objectification of women (Frederickson & Roberts, 1997; Slater & Tiggemann, 2016), data from students self-identifying as male were not used in the analysis. Additionally, only completed surveys were kept in the data set. The surveys, composed of items from the ISOS (Kozee et al., 2007) and the OBC (McKinley & Hyde, 1996), were administered by a research assistant to ensure participant anonymity to the professor. The survey was distributed a second time at the end of the semester. Scores on the ISOS (Kozee et al., 2007) have demonstrated adequate internal consistency reliability for traditionally aged college women (18-24) for the complete scale ( $\alpha = .92$ ). Furthermore, scores on the ISOS have reported acceptable sufficient test-retest reliability for the full scale ( $r = .90$ ). Among samples of traditionally aged (18-24) college women, scores on the OBC (McKinley & Hyde, 1996) demonstrated adequate levels of internal consistency reliability ( $\alpha = .89$ ), with 2-week test-retest reliability ( $r = .79$ ). With student consent, the researcher and a graduate assistant also coded written assignments for themes

related to objectification and sexualization. Open coding was used to develop thematic categories observed within students' written assignments (Cho & Lee, 2014).

## Results

Paired samples t-tests were used to compare pre and post course survey responses for independent semesters. Across each semester analyzed, significant differences were found on select survey items. Notably, significant differences were found only on items from the OBC scale ( $p < .05$ ). More specifically, responses to survey items "I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether they look good on me" and "I would be ashamed for people to know what I really weigh" changed significantly during Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 semesters. A synopsis of all significant t-test results can be found in Table 1 and Table 2.

Open coding was used to develop thematic categories observed within students' written assignments and similar concepts were grouped together thematically (Cho & Lee, 2014). Cohen's kappa ( $\kappa$ ) was computed to ascertain inter-rater reliability. Using Landis and Koch's (1977) interpretation of Cohen's kappa resulted in a very strong level of agreement between the raters' coding of qualitative data ( $\kappa = .812$ ,  $p < .005$ ). Quotes reflecting themes from written work of participants appear below.

### Reflecting Upon Body Image

This study was centered on the Sexuality in Human Development course taught with specific focus on critical evaluation of objectifying and/or sexualizing cultural messages received via various technological modalities. The researcher hypothesized increased student awareness of exposure to, and awareness of, said messages. Students noted being unable to "unsee" their social realities through this lens after completing course requirements, along with increased awareness of everyday experiences of objectification and sexualization, "Advertisements like this one, make me view myself as just a mere object only used for a man's pleasure rather than my own. This advertisement makes me pay even more attention to my surroundings especially when alcohol is involved."

Qualitative data were also supported by survey results, with significant differences recorded on select items from the OBC (e.g., "I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether they look good on me" and "I would be ashamed for people to know what I really weigh"), which is of particular interest within this thematic category. The findings are complementary because they help illustrate complexities of social norms surrounding objectification and sexualization as well as internalization of said messages. As another student noted, "I never knew that over 95% of female bodies aren't built like the ones in the advertisements. If you don't learn about it, you only know what you see online and on TV." Students highlighted the shift in cognizance related not only to influence of advertisements on their sense of self-worth and body image, but also in terms of how messages conveyed by advertisements and macro level culture intersect with experiences on campus.

### Beyond Objectification and Sexualization

Along with critical examination of advertisements and dominant cultural messages, the researcher hypothesized significant differences on ISOS and OBC survey items before and after students completed the course. However, significant differences were found only on items from the OBC with both cohorts. Internalization of sexual objectification as something that can impact body consciousness is of interest.

Notably, these findings have further support in excerpts from written assignments documenting lived experiences contending with cultural messages surrounding body image, as one student noted:

I became fixated on women's bodies and how they were deemed beautiful in the media, and my heart sank when I realized I did not fit this description. During my sophomore year of high school, I developed an eating disorder after battling with depression and self-harm. My whole life has been focused on living up to what society has expected of me as a woman and what it values from my gender. It was not until this class that I realized my true potential and what really matters in life. I explored my identity more and learned to love myself better.

Another student echoed this point, but from a different perspective:

For a while it felt like being a woman and being a Christian were battling against each other. I had to be modest, but I longed to feel pretty and important. I felt ashamed of the way that God created me and was embarrassed by the shape of my body. But as I complete this course I realize that my religion is just a part of who I am. I can be a woman and be proud of myself, because God created me this way for a purpose. My sexual values system does not have to compete with itself, it can complement itself.

Students grappled with making sense of their self-perceptions and social definitions of what is acceptable in juxtaposed messages insisting that bodies cannot be both pure and sexual. Comparisons to body types seen in popular culture also underwent significant change during the Fall 2016 semester.

### **Fostering Awareness of Cultural Messages Via Recreational Technology Use**

Another goal of this research was to explore whether employing technologies that most students use informally in a formal manner would foster learning and meaning-making surrounding objectification and sexualization. Overwhelmingly, students noted how surprised they were to see they had become desensitized to many of the objectifying messages they consumed via technology:

I guess I hadn't noticed how much women were being objectified everywhere. Now I can't look at my phone without thinking about the advertisements we looked at in class. They make everything from food to cars about sex. Consumers need to start thinking more about what is going on around them so we can change society.

Increased levels of awareness were apparent throughout student writing. Many students reported feeling overwhelmed by all the examples of objectification that had previously gone undetected every day.

## **Discussion**

Traditionally, learning has been viewed as being teacher-centric. However, more recently a shift towards student-centered learning points to the growing number of ways students learn (Elmer, 2017). Study results show that intentional teaching strategies coupled with informal and formal technology use can increase awareness and knowledge pertaining to body objectification and sexualization across a 16-week course. More specifically, data pulled from student written assignment submissions highlight the role of course content in shaping student perceptions and understanding of sexualization and objectification in their everyday lives.

At the outset of the course, students typically reported feeling as if objectification and sexualization were phenomena that predominantly occurred outside themselves, and that they transpired on a more macro level. Similarly, findings indicate that before completing the course, students were largely unaware of or desensitized to the role technology plays in their exposure to sexualized and objectifying materials. Interestingly, significant differences in pretest and posttest scores on various survey items indicate a shift in conceptualization, critical evaluation, and internalization of media consumed via personal technology devices.

Data that emerged from the students' written assignments also demonstrated that many students not only remembered course content surrounding objectification and sexualization to successfully complete course assignments, but were applying this content to their own lives. Thus, many students moved from viewing these issues as separate from them and having no direct consequence, to expressing concern over the omnipresent nature of sexualization and objectification in the world in which they live. A number of students utilized written assignments as opportunities to illustrate ways in which internalized cultural messages inform their daily decisions and shape their values across levels. Several students noted the role of objectification and sexualization in contemporary American culture's media in perpetuating harmful ideas about rape and sexual violence. Thus, students were able to synthesize assignment prompts from the formative written assignments to larger cultural issues.

As noted, results showed that significant differences between pretest and posttest were not always on the same survey items across semesters. The role of cohort differences and variations in baseline knowledge may have informed these findings. Proximity to mainstream current events related to sexualization and objectification (e.g., allegations against President Trump; high-profile sexual assault cases) may also have informed student responses based on the social media being consumed.

Within the context of each semester analyzed, select items from the OBC underwent significant changes, whereas results from the ISOS did not differ substantially from pre-test to post-test. One interpretation of these findings is that since the ISOS focuses primarily on one's perceptions of direct interactions with others in public (e.g., "How often have you been whistled at while walking down a street," "How often have you heard a rude, sexual remark made about your body?"), it is unreasonable to expect one's daily interactions with the world to shift dramatically in 16 weeks. However, students often noted heightened awareness of these experiences in their written work. Plausibly, these findings indicate that although the broader culture had not changed in terms of sexualization and objectification of women across time and place, students' ability to recognize and acknowledge these transgressions had changed. Thus, the ISOS alone would not capture these nuanced data.

Given the sensitive nature of topics the course covered, written assignments provide students with an open-ended opportunity to respond to course material candidly, in ways they may not feel comfortable doing during in-class discussions or via online course platforms. Moreover, students were given freedom to select items for analysis that resonated with them, songs of their choice, and advertisements they encountered in their recreational use of technologies. In this regard, qualitative data from students' written work may serve as better indicators of student learning and application.

Similar to Moloney and Pelehach (2013), results point to a gap between the social insistence on sexualization and objectification and exposure within an educational context. Building on their research, this study's findings illustrate the importance of delivering content specific to objectification and sexualization while simultaneously fostering student engagement with the content as it applies to their

daily experiences with technology and the overarching culture. Overwhelmingly, students reported via anonymous course feedback that the course should be required for all students and wished they had had a chance to learn about these issues earlier.

### **SoTL as a Vehicle**

#### **Implications For Teaching**

Educators who use rigorous research designs to document effectiveness of their teaching strategies employing technology will help establish best practices for student learning. By proxy, this may also help further the scholarship of teaching and learning at institutions of higher education. Research indicates increasing SoTL integration into universities across the United States (DiGregorio, Maurer, & Pattanaik, 2016; Huber & Hutchings, 2005). However, most research detailing the presence of SoTL has explored faculty members' perceived support at departmental and institutional levels. More specifically, within the field of family science there is a paucity of research examining SoTL's role in our classrooms (DiGregorio, Maurer, & Pattanaik, 2016). Moreover, there are less data available investigating the role of technology in the teaching and learning that transpires in family science programs. All technology is not created equally; likewise, technologies do not present information uniformly. The multitude of changes that continue to transpire within the vast technology field are some of the very changes that shape how our students learn.

As with any teaching strategy, student buy-in is critical to success. The shift away from teacher-centric learning has created opportunities for greater student participation in their own education. In line with SoTL, empowering students to be collaborators in shaping their experiences in our classrooms is a great way to improve our understanding of how students learn and of what we can do to foster increased learning across various contexts (Huber & Hutchings, 2005).

#### **Future Research**

The extent to which deviations from the traditional teacher-centered framework are accepted is predicated upon socially constructed norms during specific time periods within specific institutions. Similarly, the amounts of time, resources, and recognition ascribed to SoTL at any particular institution often reflect the amount support for student-centered learning. The rapid influx of availability and application of technologies outside higher education prompt educators not only to reevaluate how students learn but also how they teach. SoTL provides educators with foundational literature and research designs to help them examine whether or not their approaches for redesigning andragogy and technology are effective in their classrooms.

There is an ongoing need to educate students about the impact of sexualization and objectification in their lives and about technology's role in increasing the pervasiveness of both issues. Understanding the role of instructional technologies is also salient to effective teaching. SoTL can aid educators in this endeavor. Future research efforts may include mapping courses across family science curricula to engage with formal and informal uses of technology.

### Limitations and Conclusion

This pilot study has several limitations. First, there was no control group. The researcher teaches the only section of this course that is offered each semester. Additionally, numerous external variables would make it difficult to isolate effects of the course, even with a control group. For this reason, a mixed methods approach was utilized to grant the researcher access to qualitative data generated by individual students across the semesters explored in the study. Furthermore, even though Cohen's kappa revealed high inter-rater reliability, having only two coders to analyze qualitative data could also have been a limitation.

Moreover, this sample overwhelmingly identified as female. While research indicates that objectification and sexualization impact men and women differently, and that women are at risk for increased rates of eating disorders, depression, and experiencing low self-esteem (LeVay & Baldwin, 2012), men's experiences also warrant further exploration. Lastly, the sexual orientations of participants in this sample were not taken into account. The experiences of gender and sexual minorities with cultural norms surrounding objectification and sexualization are of interest because they may send oppressive messages to those not complying with the dominant heteronormative framework of contemporary American culture. These differences in perceptions of objectification and sexualization could impact learning for these students. Future research should aim at evaluating these teaching strategies with more diverse samples and with control groups.

This study aimed to provide a platform from which to view how student experiences intersect with course content, particularly sensitive topics such as objectification and sexualization, within a sociocultural and historical moment that is immersed in technology. Technology has quickly become a salient feature in our lives, delivering messages that we process consciously and subconsciously.

In the past, the development of literally every kind of information was relatively slow (Siemens, 2005). Technology has completely reshaped the ways information is generated and shared, making experiences with sexualized and objectifying content commonplace, normative, and expected. This study sought to help deconstruct the desensitization to sexualization and objectification that is culturally transmitted in the United States while delivering course content that challenged students to look beyond the classroom. Thus, students were prompted to use technologies that are part of their daily lives as springboards for analysis, critical evaluation, and self-reflection.

This study highlights the role of teaching in informing students not only as learners but also as individuals. Learning more about the ways our students learn is beneficial to development of healthy self-concepts and of healthy relationships with media and others. The vast majority of family science students move on to work directly with the public. Unique opportunities with SoTL, technology, and family science course content are relevant not just beyond their work or course-related goals, but also to their own personal lives.

---

Nikki DiGregorio is an Assistant Professor of Child and Family Development in the School of Human Ecology at Georgia Southern University.

### References

- Augustus-Horvath, C. L., & Tylka, T. L. (2009). A test and extension of objectification theory as it predicts disordered eating: Does women's age matter?. *Journal of counseling psychology, 56*(2), 253. doi: 10.1037/a0014637
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Castonguay, A. L., Sabiston, C. M., Crocker, P. R., & Mack, D. E. (2014). Development and validation of the body and appearance self-conscious emotions scale (BASES). *Body Image, 11*(2), 126-136. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2013.12.006>
- Celik, V., & Yesilyurt, E. (2013). Attitudes to technology, perceived computer self-efficacy and computer anxiety as predictors of computer supported education. *Computers & Education, 60*(1), 148-158. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.06.008>
- Cho, J. Y., & Lee, E. H. (2014). Reducing confusion about grounded theory and qualitative content analysis: Similarities and differences. *The Qualitative Report, 19*(32), 1. Retrieved from <http://www.nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol19/iss32/2>
- Davidson, M. M., Gervais, S. J., Canivez, G. L., & Cole, B. P. (2013). A psychometric examination of the Interpersonal Sexual Objectification Scale among college men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*(2), 239. doi: 10.1037/a0032075
- DiGregorio, N., & Liston, D. (in press). Experiencing technical difficulties: Teacher self-efficacy and instructional technology. In C. Hodges, *Self-efficacy in instructional technology contexts*. New York, NY: Springer.
- DiGregorio, N., Maurer, T. W., & Pattanaik, S. (2016). Documentation of scholarship of teaching and learning trends at national council on family relations annual conferences 2006-2015. *Family Science Review, 21*, 54-73. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.26536/fsr.2016.21.02.03>
- Elmer, J. (2017). A learner centered approach. *Journal of Online Higher Education, 1*(1), 1-5. Retrieved from <https://online-shc.com/arc/ojs/index.php/JOHE/article/view/3>
- Ertmer, P.A., & Ottenbriet-Leftwich, A.T. (2010). Teacher technology change: How knowledge, confidence, beliefs, and culture intersect. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 24*(3), 55-84. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2010.10782551>
- Habibi, M., & Branch, M.B. (2015). The difference between andragogy and pedagogy in adult education. *Life Science Journal, 12*, 91-96. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412950596.n125>
- Harding. S. (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hartsock, N. C. M. (1983). *Money, sex, and power: Toward a feminist historical materialism*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Kozee, H. B., Tylka, T. L., Augustus-Horvath, C. L., & Denchik, A. (2007). Development and psychometric evaluation of the interpersonal sexual objectification scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*(2), 176-189. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00351.x>
- LeVay, S., & Baldwin, J. (2012). *Human sexuality*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer.
- McKinley, N. M., & Hyde, J. S. (1996). The objectified body consciousness scale development and validation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*(2), 181-215. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1996.tb00467.x>
- Merriam, S. B. (2001). Andragogy and self-directed learning: Pillars of adult learning theory. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 89*, 3-14. Doi: 10.1002/ace.3
- Moloney, M. E., & Pelehach, L. (2013). "You're not good enough": Teaching undergraduate students about the sexualization of girls and women. *Teaching Sociology, 42*(2), 119-129. doi: 10.1177/0092055X13513179
- Noll, S. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). A mediational model linking self-objectification, body shame, and disordered eating. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*(4), 623-636. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1998.tb00181.x>
- Olivardia, R., Pope Jr, H. G., Borowiecki III, J. J., & Cohane, G. H. (2004). Biceps and body image: The relationship between muscularity and self-esteem, depression, and eating disorder symptoms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 5*(2), 112. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.2.112
- Ozuah, P. O. (2005). First, there was pedagogy and then came andragogy. *Einstein Journal of Biology and Medicine, 21*, 83-87. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23861/EJBM20052190>
- Pedrosa-de-Jesus, H., Guerra, C., & Watts, M. (2017). University teachers' self-reflection on their academic growth. *Professional Development in Education, 43*(3), 454-473. doi: 10.1080/19415257.2016.1194877
- Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: Learning as network-creation. *ASTD Learning News, 10*(1), 1-28. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijlt.2010.031617>
- Steiger, A. E., Allemand, M., Robins, R. W., & Fend, H. A. (2014). Low and decreasing self-esteem during adolescence predict adult depression two decades later. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*(2), 325. doi: 10.1037/a0035133
- Teo, T. (2009). Modelling technology acceptance in education: A study of pre-service teachers.

*Computers & Education*, 52(2), 302-312. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu/2008.08.006>

Thomas, A., Menon, A., Boruff, J., Rodriguez, A.M., & Ahmed, S. (2014). Applications of social constructivist learning theories in knowledge translation for healthcare professionals: A scoping review. *Implementation Science*, 9(54), 1-20. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-9-54>

Zhou, G., & Xu, J. (2007). Adoption of educational technology: How does gender matter?. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 19, 140-153. doi: <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1249>

Table 1.

Overview of paired samples *t*-test results: Fall 2016

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
I would be ashamed for people to know what I really weigh.	-.29412	.75996	.13033	-.55928	-.02895	-2.257	33	.031
I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether they look good on me	.47059	1.07971	.18517	-.84732	-.09386	-2.541	33	.016
I am more concerned with what my body can do than how it looks	.50000	1.08012	.18524	-.87687	-.12313	-2.699	33	.011
I rarely think about how I look	.38235	1.01548	.17415	.02804	.73667	2.196	33	.035
When I'm not the size I think I should be, I feel ashamed	-.35294	.98110	.16826	-.69526	-.01062	-2.098	33	.044
I tend to compare my body to people in magazines and on TV	.88235	.97746	.16763	.54130	1.22341	5.264	33	.000

Note.  $N = 34$ ,  $*p < .05$

Table 2.

Overview of paired samples t-test: Spring 2017

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether they look good on me.	.34884	.78327	.11945	.10778	.58989	2.920	42	.006
I rarely compare how I look with how other people look.	.44186	1.00717	.15359	.13190	.75182	2.877	42	.006
I would be ashamed for people to know what I really weigh.	.46512	1.36885	.20875	.04385	.88639	2.228	42	.031

Note.  $N = 43$ ,  $*p < .05$