



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1016/j.bodyim.2013.10.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2013.10.003)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Veale, D., Eshkevari, E., Ellison, N., Costa, A., Robinson, D., Kavouni, A., & Cardozo, L. (2014). A comparison of risk factors for women seeking labiaplasty compared to those not seeking labiaplasty. *Body Image, 11*(1), 57-62. Article N/A. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2013.10.003>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Table 1

Demographics in the Women Seeking Labiaplasty and Comparison Group

	Labiaplasty group	Comparison group	Statistic
Age Median (IQR)	30.00 (19)	28.50 (20)	$U = 1902.5, Z = -.11, p = .91$
Sexual orientation <i>n</i> (%):			
Only to the opposite sex	39 (73.6%)	52 (74.3%)	
Mainly to the opposite sex	11 (20.8%)	11 (15.7%)	$\chi^2 (4) = 1.13, p = .61$
Equally to both sexes	3 (5.7%)	7 (10.0%)	
Mainly to the same sex	0	0	
Only to the same sex	0	0	
Marital status <i>n</i> (%):			
Single	35 (63.6%)	38 (54.3%)	$\chi^2 (3) = 3.87, p = .29$
Separated/divorced	7 (12.7%)	5 (7.1%)	
Married/cohabiting	12 (21.8%)	26 (37.1%)	
Widowed	1 (1.8%)	1 (1.4%)	
Children <i>n</i> (%):			
Yes	15 (27.3%)	22 (31.4%)	$\chi^2 (1) = .255, p = .61$
No	40 (72.7%)	48 (68.6%)	
Ethnicity <i>n</i> (%):			
White	48 (87.3%)	53 (75.7%)	$\chi^2 (3) = 7.17, p = .07$
Black/Black British	0	8 (11.4%)	

Mixed	2 (3.6%)	4 (5.7%)	
Other	3 (5.5%)	3 (4.3%)	
Higher education <i>n</i> (%):	19 (34.5%)	21 (30%)	$\chi^2(1) = .25, p = .62$
Secondary	35 (63.6%)	47 (67%)	
Tertiary			

Table 2

Childhood Trauma Questionnaire

	Labiaplasty group <i>Med (IQR)</i>	Comparison group <i>Med (IQR)</i>	Statistic <i>n = 118</i>	Effect size Cohen's <i>d</i>
Emotional abuse	8.0 (6.0)	7.0 (6.0)	$U = 1526.0, Z = -1.002, p = .32$	$d = -0.19$
Emotional neglect	11.0 (7.0)	9.0 (8.0)	$U = 1497.0, Z = -1.154, p = .25$	$d = -0.21$
Physical abuse	5.0 (2.0)	5.0 (1.0)	$U = 1687.5, Z = -.134, p = .90$	$d = -0.03$
Physical neglect	6.0 (4.0)	6.0 (4.0)	$U = 1553.0, Z = -.876, p = .38$	$d = -0.16$
Sexual abuse	5.0 (1.0)	5.0 (1.0)	$U = 1654.5, Z = -.351, p = .73$	$d = -0.07$

Table 3

Sexual Behaviour in Women Seeking Labiaplasty and Comparison Group

	Labiaplasty group	Comparison group	Statistic
			$U = 1631.0, Z = -.1038, p = .301$
Age at first intercourse <i>Med (IQR)</i>	17.0 (2)	17.0 (2)	
History of rape or sexual abuse since the age of 16	7/54 (13%)	4/70 (6%)	$\chi^2 (1) = 1.981, p = .207$

Table 4

Perception of Teasing in Women Seeking Labiaplasty and Comparison group

Frequency	Labiaplasty group <i>Med (IQR)</i>	Comparison group <i>Med (IQR)</i>	Statistic <i>n = 118</i>	Effect size Cohen's <i>d</i>
Appearance teasing (<i>freq</i>)	9.0 (7.0)	7.0 (5.0)	$U = 1508.0, Z = -1.262, p = .21$	$d = -0.23$
Competency teasing (<i>freq</i>)	10.0 (8.0)	11.0 (5.0)	$U = 1591.0, Z = -.642, p = .52$	$d = -0.12$
Teasing total score (<i>freq</i>)	18.0 (10.5)	19.0 (8.0)	$U = 1698.0, Z = -.236, p = .82$	$d = -0.04$
	Labiaplasty <i>M (SD)</i>	Control <i>M (SD)</i>	Comparison	Effect size Cohen's <i>d</i>
Appearance teasing distress score	3.72 (1.00)	3.54 (0.98)	$t(86) = -.816, p = .42$	$d = -.18$
Competency teasing distress score	2.80 (1.21)	2.50 (0.89)	$t(92) = -1.375, p = .17$	$d = -.28$
Upset total score	3.17 (1.06)	2.82 (1.00)	$t(100) = -1.718, p = .09$	$d = -.34$

Table 5

Disgust Sensitivity in Women Seeking Labiaplasty and Comparison Group

Disgust Scale	Labiaplasty group	Comparison group	Statistic	Effect size
Revised	<i>Med (IQR)</i>	<i>Med (IQR)</i>	<i>n = 116</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Total score	46.0 (15.0)	49.0 (22.0)	$U = 1506.0, Z = -.843, p = .40$	$d = -0.16$
Core disgust	24.5 (8.0)	26.0 (8.0)	$U = 1407.5, Z = -1.393, p = .17$	$d = -0.26$
Contamination and self-disgust	6.0 (5.00)	7.0 (7.0)	$U = 1642.0, Z = -.086, p = .93$	$d = -0.16$
Animal disgust	15.0 (6.3)	15.0 (10.0)	$U = 1603.5, Z = -.301, p = .77$	$d = -0.06$

Table 6

Aesthetic Sensitivity in Women Seeking Labiaplasty and Comparison Group

Higher education or training in art or design	Labiaplasty group <i>n</i> = 26	Comparison group <i>n</i> = 22	Statistic
Positive	14 (54%)	10 (45%)	$\chi^2 (1) = .336, p = .562$
Negative	12 (46%)	12 (55%)	