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Abstract

The goal of the body positive (#BoPo) movement is to challenge the thin-ideal and build body appreciation and acceptance by including all body types in media images. Yet, with #BoPo’s increasing popularity, shifts in content have been observed, and people with larger bodies have been pushed to the fringes of the movement. #BoPo images including individuals with smaller or average bodies attract more “likes” and comments, which is concerning given that this does not celebrate the diversity in body sizes the movement was created for. The current study utilized an experimental design to test the effects of body size (average versus larger bodies) and social approval (lower versus higher number of likes/comments) in #BoPo posts on changes in college women’s state body satisfaction and state body appreciation. Participants included 201 female undergraduate students who were randomly assigned to view a set of ten large body size or average body size images paired with a low or high number of likes in an Instagram frame. A repeated measured ANOVA found a significant effect of time on state body satisfaction and state body appreciation, such that both improved after viewing images. These results showed no significant effects of body size, social approval, or their interaction on college women’s body image. Future research should incorporate a non-#BoPo condition to test the hypothesis that viewing #BoPo images caused improvements in body image as intended by this movement.
Introduction

College women across many cultures prefer a thinner body over their current figure, resulting in body dissatisfaction (Grogan, 2017). This dissatisfaction can have serious mental health consequences. Higher levels of body dissatisfaction predict low self-esteem, depressive and bulimic symptoms (Johnson & Wardle, 2005; Tiggemann, 2005; Paxton, Neumark-Sztainer, Hannan, & Eisenberg, 2006). Perceived pressure to be thin from peers, thin-ideal internalization, higher body mass index (BMI) and adipose levels, and social media use have all been associated with higher body dissatisfaction (Presnell, Bearman & Stice, 2004; Stice & Whitention, 2002; Fardouly & Vartanian, 2016). Among these, the recent rise of social media has motivated research focused on the effects of social networking sites (or SNS) on body image and body satisfaction. General social media use as well as investment in SNS photo activities have been associated with increased body concerns (Fardouly & Vartanian, 2016; Cohen, Newwton-John, & Slater, 2018). Viewing others’ bodies on social media may trigger upward social comparison and contribute to body dissatisfaction (Vogel, Rose, Roberts, & Eckles, 2014; Betz, Sabik, & Ramsey, 2019). Instagram has become the focus of recent social media and body image research because the platform’s sole purpose involves sharing photos and videos, giving the user ample exposure to risk factors for developing body image concerns. As a possible antidote to these effects, social media users introduced the body positive movement to Instagram and to other SNS, such as Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest and Reddit.

The goal of the body positive movement, known by the #BoPo tag, is to challenge the thin ideal and build body appreciation and acceptance by including all body types (Cwynar-Horta, 2016). Instead of posting images depicting thin abled bodies, #BoPo posts include individuals whose body weights deviate from the thin ideal as well as individuals who possess
physical limitations. Cohen, Fardouly, Newton-John and Slater (2019) sought to determine whether #BoPo posts on Instagram could positively affect college women’s body image. The researchers recruited 195 young women and randomly assigned them to view body-positive, thin-ideal or appearance neutral Instagram posts. Pre- and post-exposure, participants completed measures of state mood, body appreciation, and body satisfaction. Participants also completed a measure of attitudes towards body positive content. Women randomly assigned to view #BoPo posts reported significant increases in positive mood, body satisfaction and body appreciation when compared to women in the thin-ideal and appearance-neutral posts (Cohen et al., 2019). Furthermore, participants showed supportive attitudes towards body positive accounts (Cohen et al., 2019). Results indicate that the #BoPo posts positively influence body image and that the movement has the potential to grow in popularity.

Yet, with #BoPo’s increasing popularity, shifts in content have been observed, and Cwynar-Horta (2016) noted that people with larger bodies have been pushed to the fringes of the movement. People with smaller bodies posting #BoPo pictures appear to be more celebrated by attracting more “likes” and comments (Cwynar-Horta, 2016). Tiggemann, Hayden, Brown, and Veldhuis (2018) sought to determine whether the number of likes on an Instagram post affects college women’s body dissatisfaction. The researchers recruited 220 undergraduate women and randomly assigned them to view a set of thin-ideal or average images paired with a high or low number of likes within the frame of an Instagram post. Pre- and post-exposure, participants completed measures of state mood, body dissatisfaction and facial dissatisfaction. During the exposure, participants rated the visual quality of the images to ensure participants were paying attention to the images. Post-exposure, participants completed a recall the average number of likes for the images they viewed to determine whether participants had attended to this while
viewing images. Women randomly assigned to the thin ideal condition reported significant increases in body and facial dissatisfaction compared to women who viewed the average images (Tiggemann et al., 2018). Women randomly assigned to conditions with a high number of likes recalled a higher number of likes compared to women randomly assigned to conditions with a low number of likes. Furthermore, women who viewed photos that had a higher number of likes reported a significant decrease in facial dissatisfaction (Tiggemann et al., 2018). However, there was no reported association between number of likes and body dissatisfaction, and no interaction between body size and number of likes for predicting body dissatisfaction (Tiggemann et al., 2018). Tiggemann et al. concluded that the number of likes on an Instagram post might represent a form of community support that improved how women evaluated the attractiveness of their own faces. The lack of association between number of likes and changes in body dissatisfaction and the lack of interaction with body size may reflect limitations in the study design. First, compared to the number of likes commonly observed on Instagram #BoPo posts with a high number of followers, the number of likes in the two experimental conditions (low likes condition=1-10; high likes condition=100-300) might both reflect a low number of likes. For example, among the top #BoPo posts, average number of likes often exceeds 1,000. Therefore, the difference in apparent social support may have not been enough to influence participants’ own body image. In addition, Tiggemann et al. (2018) included images of that depicted close ups of faces, which are common to Instagram, as well as full body pictures. A reduced focus on the bodies of images may account for the influence of number of likes on facial satisfaction and absence of effect on body satisfaction. Finally, it is unclear whether the findings from Tiggemann et al. would extend to #BoPo content because they explicitly eliminated images that were rated as “very overweight” from their experimental conditions.
This study expands on both Cohen et al.’s (2019) and Tiggemann et al.’s (2018) research by comparing the effect of likes on photos of average or overweight #BoPo bodies on college women’s body dissatisfaction. This study will expand the number of likes in each condition in order to reflect the trends on the #BoPo tag on Instagram and only include images of the full body. Furthermore, the study will focus on the differential effects of images rated “average”/“somewhat overweight” versus “overweight”/“very overweight” to capture content that is representative of #BoPo posts. The study has two aims; the first aim is to test the effects of exposure to average versus larger #BoPo images on state body satisfaction and state body appreciation. We hypothesized that body size will affect changes in state body satisfaction and state body appreciation, such that images that contain larger bodies will cause greater increases in state body satisfaction and appreciation compared to images that contain average bodies. The second aim is to test the effect of different levels of social approval (represented as higher versus lower number of likes and comments) on the impact of the #BoPo images on state body satisfaction and state body appreciation. We hypothesized that there will be interaction between social approval and body size, such that the effect of body size on changes in body satisfaction and appreciation will be greater when social approval is high compared to when it is low.

Methods

Design

The study used a 2 (image size: average, larger) x 2 (social approval: low, high) x 2 (time: pre and post image exposure) design. The major dependent variables were state body satisfaction and state body appreciation.

Participants
Participants were 201 female undergraduate students between ages 18 and 24 (Mean (SD) age= 19 (1.26) years) who owned an Instagram account and were recruited from the Florida State University Psychology research pool. The target sample size (N=200) was based on the number of participants included in the Tiggemann et al. (2018) study, evidence of medium to large effect sizes from experimental designs examining the influence of Instagram posts on college women’s body image (Cohen et al., 2019; Tiggemann et al., 2018; Wick & Keel, 2020), and to permit even distribution of participants per condition. Between 48 and 53 participants were assigned to each condition. A majority of the participants identified as White non-Hispanic (65.7%) with 19.9% Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin, 9.0% Black or African American, 3.5% Asian or Pacific Islander, 0.5% American Indian or Alaska Native. Participants had a mean (SD) BMI of 23.24 (4.31) kg/m$^2$. This study was approved by FSU’s IRB Human Subjects Committee, and all participants provided informed consent prior to their participation.

**Materials**

Each condition included 10 images constructed for the study. 75 images were taken from public Instagram profiles using the hashtags “#BoPo,” “#bodypositive,” and “#plussize” and rated by Dr. Pamela Keel and her graduate student, Madeline Wick, using the Figure Rating Scale (Stunkard, Sorensen, & Schulsinger, 1983; see Figure 1) as a measure of body size. This measure has demonstrated interrater reliability and concurrent validity with objectively measured BMI when ratings are made by an unbiased observer (Cardinal, Kaciroti, & Lumeng, 2006). These ratings were used to select 10 high quality images that depicted an average body size (rated as =4 or 5) and 10 images that depicted a large body size (rated as ≥6). Each image was presented with the Instagram frame, logo, profile picture and profile name of the post (see Figure 2). To manipulate the level of social approval, a low number of likes (ranging from 0-50) and
comments (ranging from 0-4) was added to the set of images with the large body sizes and
average body sizes and a high number of likes (ranging from 300-2,000) and comments (ranging
from 23-83) was added to the same sets of images with large and average body sizes. The
numbers of likes and comments used to create the high and low social approval conditions were
based on those used by Tiggemann et al. (2018).

Demographic Questionnaire

Participants were asked to report their age, race/ethnicity, height, and weight.

State Body Appreciation

State Body Appreciation Scale-2 (SBAS-2; Homan, 2016). The SBAS-2 was presented as
a Likert scale (where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly
agree). The scale contains 10 items that include “At this moment, I feel good about my body,”
“At this moment, I feel love for my body,” “Right now, I am comfortable in my body,” and
“Right now, I appreciate the different and unique characteristics of my body.” Internal
consistency was excellent at both pre- (α = .95) and post-exposure (α = .96) in the current
sample.

State Body Satisfaction

State Body Satisfaction was presented as a computer-based VAS and required
participants to rate how they feel at that moment by moving a marker along a line with 0 labelled
“not at all” and 100 being “very much.” It includes “satisfied with my weight,” “satisfied with
my overall appearance,” and “satisfied with my body shape” (Heinberg & Thompson, 1995).
Internal consistency for this measure was good to excellent at pre- (α = .84) and post-exposure (α
= .90) in the current sample.
State Mood

The measure of State Mood was assessed using the computer-based VAS, and participants were asked to rate how depressed, anxious, confident and happy they felt at that moment (Heinberg & Thompson, 1995). Ratings of depressed and anxious were combined to measure state negative mood. Ratings of confident and happy were combined to measure state positive mood. We found the positive scale had acceptable internal consistency at pre- ($\alpha = .74$), and post-exposure ($\alpha = .75$) for the positive mood, and acceptable internal consistency at pre- ($\alpha = .67$), and post-exposure ($\alpha = .69$) for negative mood in the current sample.

Trait Body Appreciation

The Body Appreciation Scale-2 (Tylka & Wood-Barclow, 2015) was used to measure trait body appreciation. Participants were asked to complete the ten items on a five-point scale. Internal consistency for this measure was excellent ($\alpha = .96$) in the current sample.

Instagram Use Questionnaire

The Instagram Use Questionnaire (Wick & Keel, 2020) was used to measure the amount of time participants spend using Instagram, participants’ activities on Instagram, importance of receiving likes and comments on participants’ photos and other Instagram-based activities that have been associated with body dissatisfaction.

State Appearance Comparison

Post-exposure, an adaptation from Tiggemann and McGill’s (2004) state appearance comparison scale was used to focus on the extent to which participants compared their own body to the images they viewed. The items were altered to include the statement “when viewing the images” and changed the phrase from “in the advertisements or imagined using the products
shown” to “in the pictures or imagined posting the comments.” The two items were averaged to measure state appearance comparison immediately following participants’ exposure to their experimental condition. Internal consistency for this measure was good ($\alpha = .88$) in the current sample.

Recall

Post-exposure, participants were asked to report how many likes and comments on average the photos they viewed had received. This was included as a post-manipulation check of whether participants attended to the number of likes and comments on the photos they viewed.

Procedure

Participants completed the study on-line. First participants were directed to an on-line consent form to read and complete before they are able to access the experiment. Once the participant agreed to participate, they completed a brief demographic questionnaire, baseline measures of state body appreciation, state body satisfaction, and state mood. Participants were then randomly assigned to one of four conditions (average body with higher likes/comments, average body with lower likes/comments, larger body with higher likes/comments, larger body with lower likes/comments) in which each image was shown for 15 seconds, matching the methods used by Tiggemann et al. (2018). Participants were asked to rate each image on overall visual quality (1 = very poor, 5 = excellent quality) to ensure they attended to the images. After viewing the images, participants completed the computer-based state measures again to determine the effect of condition on immediate changes in body satisfaction and appreciation. Following this, the state body comparison items were completed, and then participants completed the trait measure of body appreciation and the Instagram Use Questionnaire. After
completing all measures, participants reached a screen in which they were fully debriefed about the purpose of the study. Participants received course credit for study participation.

**Data Analyses**

Data distributions were examined for violations of assumptions of normality and indicated no need for the data to be transformed. To perform the manipulation check, we used an independent samples t-test to determine if there was a significant difference in the number of likes and comments recalled between conditions that differed in social approval as well as between conditions that did not differ in social approval.

To test our main hypotheses, we used a repeated measured ANOVA with both model size and social approval as between-subjects effects and time as a within-subjects effect. Our first hypothesis would be supported if we saw a significant interaction for model size X time, and post-hoc analyses showed that women randomly assigned to view larger bodies reported significantly greater increases in body appreciation and weight/shape satisfaction compared to women randomly assigned to view average bodies. Our second hypothesis would be supported if we saw significant model size x social approval x time interaction, and post-hoc analyses demonstrate larger differences (greater improvements in state body appreciation and weight/shape satisfaction) between the larger and average body sizes when bodies were paired with high social approval than when they were paired with low social approval.

**Results**

**Manipulation Check**

Participants randomly assigned to the high social approval condition recalled a higher number of likes (mean [SD] = 3.61 [0.81]) and comments (mean [SD] = 3.61 [1.06]) compared to participants randomly assigned to the low social approval condition (mean [SD] = 1.59 [0.79];
1.70 [0.96]; t(193)=17.61, p<.001 for likes; t(193)=13.16, p<.001 for comments). Thus, participants were aware of differing numbers of likes and comments based on the condition to which they were assigned. There was no significant difference in the recalled number of likes or comments between participants randomly assigned to the large (mean [SD] = 2.56 [1.35] for likes; mean [SD] = 2.52 [1.38] for comments) versus average body size conditions (mean [SD] = 2.67 [1.23]; mean [SD] = 2.82 [1.39]; t(193)=.63, p=.53 for likes; t(193)=1.52, p=.30 for comments), indicating that participants did not inaccurately attribute differences that were not objectively present.

**Descriptive Statistics and Differences at Baseline**

Table 1 presents the mean (SD) for state weight and shape satisfaction and body appreciation before and after the experimental manipulation for participants in each condition as well as descriptive statistics for other measures completed by participants. A comparison across the four groups supported no significant differences at baseline on weight and shape satisfaction, body appreciation, or BMI, trait body appreciation or Instagram use items (all p-values > .10). Thus, random assignment did not produce any differences across groups that could account for observed effects of the experimental manipulation.

**Does Model Size in Photos Influence Body Image?**

Weight and Shape Satisfaction. The main effect of model size was not statistically significant, F(1,187)=1.62, p=.21. The main effect of time was statistically significant, F(1,187)=36.55, p<.01, such that weight and shape satisfaction increased over time. The interaction between model size X time was not significant, F(1,187)=1.15, p=.29. Therefore, the hypothesis that a larger model size would have a positive effect of weight and shape satisfaction was not supported.
Body Appreciation. The main effect of model size was not statistically significant, F(1,191)=0.79, p=.37. The main effect of time was statistically significant, F(1,191)=21.37, p<.01, such that body appreciation increased over time. The interaction between model size X time was not significant, F(1,191)=0.75, p=.39. Therefore, the hypothesis that a larger model size would have a positive effect on body appreciation was not supported.

**Does Social Approval of Photos Influence Body Image?**

There was no significant model size X social approval X time interaction for either weight shape satisfaction (F(1,187)=1.67, p=.19) or body appreciation (F(1,191)=0.63, p=.43). Therefore, our second hypothesis that social approval would moderate the impact of model size on body image was not supported.

**Exploratory Analyses**

Exploratory analyses found no significant difference in the level of state body comparison post-exposure between participants randomly assigned to the large (mean [SD] = 2.59 [1.67]) versus average (mean [SD] = 3.05 [1.79]; F(1, 193)=3.23, p=.07) sized body conditions. Furthermore, there was no significant difference in the level of state body comparison post-exposure between participants randomly assigned to the high (mean [SD] = 2.75 [1.69]) versus low (mean [SD] = 2.91 [1.79]; F(1,193)=.32, p=.58) social approval conditions. The interaction between model size X social approval was not significant, F(1,193)=0.17, p=.69, indicating that neither size nor social approval of #BoPo posts nor the interaction between the two influenced the extent to which participants compared themselves to the images.

Table 2 presents correlations between measures completed by participants that have been associated with body image in prior research to determine whether any might contribute to how
women responded to viewing the #BoPo images. Participant’s BMI was negatively correlated with pre- and post-manipulation body appreciation and weight and shape satisfaction, trait body appreciation, state body comparison, and pre- and post-manipulation positive affect (p < .01), such that participants with higher BMIs endorsed worse body image and lower positive affect. The recall measures of likes and comments were positively correlated, such that as a participant reported a higher number of likes observed on the posts, they also reported a higher number of comments observed (p < .01). Pre- and post-manipulation body appreciation and weight and shape satisfaction, trait body appreciation and pre- and post-manipulation positive affect were positively correlated with each other (p < .01). State body comparison was negatively correlated with pre- and post- body appreciation and weight and shape satisfaction and trait body appreciation, such that participants who reported comparing themselves more to the #BoPo posts also reported worse overall body image (p < .01).

Given that participants may have been viewing images that represented their own size, were smaller than their own size, or larger than their own size, additional exploratory analyses were run to understand the potential for women to experience a greater improvement in weight and shape satisfaction and body appreciation based on their BMI category (with <25 kg/m² “Average” and ≥25 kg/m² “Overweight or Obese”). These analyses found no significant interaction of BMI category on the effect of condition size, condition approval, or their interaction on change in body appreciation or weight and shape satisfaction (all p-values >.10). Consistent with results from correlation analyses, BMI category was a significant predictor of state levels of body appreciation (F(1,196)=12.35, p<.01) and weight and shape satisfaction (F(1,194)=28.52, p<.01) measured before and after viewing #BoPo images. In addition, BMI category significantly predicted changes in state body appreciation (F(1,192)=4.55, p=.03) but
not changes in state weight and shape satisfaction (F(1,188)=2.44, p=.12). Participants with BMIs in the overweight or obese range reported significantly greater increases in state body appreciation after viewing #BoPo images (pre- mean [SD] = 3.22 [.72]; post-exposure mean [SD] = 3.38 [.80]) compared to participants with BMI’s in the average range (pre- mean [SD] = 3.72 [.90]; post-exposure mean [SD] = 3.79 [.95]).

Finally, we examined the effect of our experimental manipulation on changes in positive affect. Similar to models run for body appreciation and weight/shape satisfaction, the only significant effect was for time, F(1,190)=6.00, p=.02, such that positive mood increased from pre- to post-manipulation, regardless of the condition to which they were randomly assigned. Given that all participants in the current study viewed #BoPo images, this partially replicates increases in positive mood among women who viewed #BoPo posts compared to those who viewed thin-ideal posts observed by Cohen et al. (2019).

Discussion

The study aimed to test the effects of exposure to average versus larger #BoPo images on state body satisfaction and state body appreciation and to test the effect of different levels of social approval (represented as higher versus lower number of likes and comments) on the impact of the #BoPo images on state body satisfaction and state body appreciation. Neither body size nor social approval on #BoPo images nor their interaction affected changes in state body satisfaction and state body appreciation. A main effect of time was found on state body satisfaction and state body appreciation, such that both increased over time.

These results are consistent with Tiggemann et al.’s (2018) findings of no main effect or interaction of social approval on body dissatisfaction (2018). This could be because participants perceived the number of likes or comments received by an image as influenced by how soon they
viewed an image after it was posted. That is, participants in the low social approval condition may have interpreted the low number of likes as reflecting that images were recently posted on Instagram, such that they were more influenced by how much they liked the image versus perceptions of how much others liked the images. We did not replicate Tiggemann et al.’s (2018) main effect of image size on appearance comparison. In that study, thin-ideal images generated greater comparison compared to average sized images. Our study did not include images of thin women, and the effect of model size on appearance comparison did not appear to extend to differences in appearance comparison to women with average versus large body sizes in the present study. In addition, our results appear consistent with Cohen et al.’s (2019) results that viewing #BoPo posts resulted in an improvement in body satisfaction and positive mood. However, we cannot conclude from our study that #BoPo images directly caused increases in body satisfaction, body appreciation, or positive mood because these changes were observed across conditions. Changes could be a simple effect of time or demand characteristics given that participants were informed that they would be viewing #BoPo images.

Exploratory analyses indicated that BMI category predicted changes in body appreciation, such that viewing #BoPo images caused greater improvements in body appreciation for women in larger bodies compared to those with BMIs in the average range. However, this effect did not depend on the size of bodies depicted in the #BoPo images, suggesting that women were not necessarily responding to seeing their own body size represented in the images they viewed. This is consistent with previous research findings that highlight increasing appearance diversity as a possible avenue for improving body image (Paraskeva et al., 2017).

Strengths
This study had several strengths. We utilized an experimental design which permitted us to determine whether altering the size or level of social approval of #BoPo posts impacted their influence of state levels of body appreciation or satisfaction. In addition, the images were presented as they would be viewed within the Instagram app, which increases the ecological validity of findings. Further, the ethnicities of the women in the photos were equally distributed across conditions to minimize confounds related to racial/ethnic similarity of images to participants’ own race/ethnicity. Randomization of the conditions minimized the risk of confounding factors influencing results. In addition, we observed significant associations between state variables and trait variables, such as their state levels of body appreciation before and after viewing #BoPo posts and their reported trait levels of body appreciation. These patterns increase confidence that participants were attending to questions and responding in a consistent and meaningful way despite the fully on-line format of data collection.

Limitations

Despite study strengths, certain limitations constrain conclusions that may be drawn from results. Participants in each condition viewed #BoPo images. Thus, one interpretation of the improvements in body image is that these images achieved their intended effects. Alternatively, improvements in state body appreciation and state weight and shape satisfaction could reflect demand characteristics because participants were informed that they would be viewing #BoPo images during informed consent. In addition, images depicted women who were strangers to the participants. This may have limited social comparison if participants perceived images as coming from social media influencers. We provided no information on how we identified the #BoPo posts, but some participants may have recognized the images as coming from Instagram influencers with large followings. Participants may have demonstrated greater effects of social
approval if they believed they were viewing images of peers (e.g., fellow undergraduates at FSU).

**Future Directions**

Further research should include a non-#BoPo condition to minimize the potential influence of participants’ expectations on findings. Including images that depict the thin ideal would help determine whether improvements observed for average and larger bodies reflect the value of depicting more diverse images of beauty on Instagram. Furthermore, a measure of thin-ideal internalization could be included to understand if the effects of exposure to average or larger images differentially impacted participants based on their own attitudes towards the importance of thinness. Finally, future research could assess how much participants follow #BoPo accounts to understand whether this may be another factor influencing the effect of viewing these images on body image.

The present study contributes to the existing body of research surrounding #BoPo media. Even if improved body image and mood reflected how participants expected to respond to #BoPo media, this could translate into the real-world impact of viewing such images. If young women believe they will be viewing social media posts that can improve their body image, it may do so. Greater understanding of #BoPo images and their effects is needed to understand the potential of this trend and the value of inclusivity of all body types on young women’s body image.
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Table 1.
Descriptive Statistics of Weight and Shape Satisfaction and Body Appreciation at all Time Points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Body Size (n=98)</th>
<th>Large Body Size (n=93)</th>
<th>Average Size and High Likes (n=48)</th>
<th>Average Size and Low Likes (n=50)</th>
<th>Large Size and High Likes (n=48)</th>
<th>Large Size and Low Likes (n=45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight and Shape Satisfaction:</strong> 49.23 (1.83)</td>
<td>51.44 (2.55)</td>
<td>46.897 (2.62)</td>
<td>52.87 (3.44)</td>
<td>50.08 (3.78)</td>
<td>49.42 (3.65)</td>
<td>44.21 (3.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre: 45.94 (1.84)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49.55 (2.57)</td>
<td>42.51 (2.60)</td>
<td>50.36 (3.47)</td>
<td>48.76 (3.84)</td>
<td>44.74 (3.64)</td>
<td>40.09 (3.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post: 51.70 (1.89)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>53.48 (2.62)</td>
<td>49.82 (2.74)</td>
<td>55.67 (3.57)</td>
<td>51.39 (3.84)</td>
<td>52.03 (3.88)</td>
<td>47.48 (3.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body Appreciation:</strong> 3.63 (0.07)</td>
<td>3.69 (.09)</td>
<td>3.57 (.10)</td>
<td>3.74 (.12)</td>
<td>3.63 (.12)</td>
<td>3.57 (.14)</td>
<td>3.57 (.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre: 3.57 (.07)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.65 (.09)</td>
<td>3.49 (.10)</td>
<td>3.71 (.12)</td>
<td>3.60 (.12)</td>
<td>3.53 (.14)</td>
<td>3.44 (.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post: 3.68 (0.7)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.73 (.09)</td>
<td>3.63 (.10)</td>
<td>3.79 (.13)</td>
<td>3.66 (.13)</td>
<td>3.62 (.14)</td>
<td>3.64 (.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body Mass Index</strong></td>
<td>23.58 (5.05)</td>
<td>22.91 (3.44)</td>
<td>23.46 (4.15)</td>
<td>23.69 (5.83)</td>
<td>22.86 (3.88)</td>
<td>22.96 (2.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trait Body Appreciation</strong></td>
<td>3.70 (.79)</td>
<td>3.58 (1.35)</td>
<td>3.73 (.76)</td>
<td>3.68 (.83)</td>
<td>3.59 (.97)</td>
<td>3.57 (.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instagram Use Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days/Week Using Instagram</td>
<td>6.32 (1.60)</td>
<td>6.28 (1.35)</td>
<td>6.31 (1.63)</td>
<td>6.33 (1.59)</td>
<td>6.35 (1.34)</td>
<td>6.20 (1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times/Day Using Instagram</td>
<td>6.79 (7.88)</td>
<td>4.63 (5.67)</td>
<td>5.84 (4.77)</td>
<td>7.70 (9.97)</td>
<td>6.75 (7.07)</td>
<td>4.38 (3.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time Spent (minutes)</td>
<td>15.11 (14.50)</td>
<td>18.35 (14.92)</td>
<td>13.08 (10.95)</td>
<td>17.06 (17.13)</td>
<td>18.04 (15.56)</td>
<td>18.70 (14.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time Spent (minutes)</td>
<td>67.77 (72.82)</td>
<td>70.04 (64.44)</td>
<td>62.22 (59.11)</td>
<td>73.10 (84.18)</td>
<td>85.39 (75.87)</td>
<td>52.25 (42.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy of Account</td>
<td>1.55 (.50)</td>
<td>1.70 (.46)</td>
<td>1.52 (.51)</td>
<td>1.58 (.49)</td>
<td>1.69 (.47)</td>
<td>1.71 (.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Posting</td>
<td>6.34 (.85)</td>
<td>6.34 (.87)</td>
<td>6.25 (.89)</td>
<td>6.42 (.81)</td>
<td>6.33 (.93)</td>
<td>6.36 (.802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Photo Editing</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Value 3</td>
<td>Value 4</td>
<td>Value 5</td>
<td>Value 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Comparison</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Likes</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Comments</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Having More Likes and Comments than Peers</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Taking Photos in Public</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Untagging Photos</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Deleting Photos</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Values associated with different superscripts differ significantly after Fisher’s Least Significant Difference post-hoc test.
Table 2.
Correlations Between Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recall of Likes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recall of Comments</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BMI</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pre-Manipulation Body Appreciation</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Post-Manipulation Body Appreciation</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pre-Manipulation Weight/Shape Satisfaction</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Post-Manipulation Weight/Shape Satisfaction</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Trait Body Appreciation</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. State Body Comparison</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pre-Positive Mood</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Post-Positive Mood</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.85**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
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