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Purpose

- **Role of mass media** (e.g., Lopez-Guimera, Levine, Sanchez-Carracedo, & Fauquet, 2010)
- **Thin ideals and body image** (Grabe, Ward, & Hyde, 2008; Groesz, Levine, & Murnen, 2002)
- **Meaning = Message + Perception**
- **Previous research**
  - Post-test only
  - Thinness/attractiveness confound (Groesz et al., 2002)
  - Use of extreme model size (Trampe, Stapel, & Siero, 2007; Tucci & Peters, 2008)
- **Current study....**
Literature

- **Media as socializing agent**
  - Cultural ideals of thinness (Bryant & Oliver, 2009; Levine & Harrison, 2008)
  - Model body size (e.g., Groesz et al., 2002)

- **Predictors of body satisfaction** (Lopez-Guimera et al., 2010)
  - Body image discrepancy (e.g., Cafri, van den Berg, & Brannick, 2010; Dittmar, Halliwell, & Stirling, 2009)
  - Social comparison (e.g., Cattarin et al., 2000; Dittmar & Howard, 2004)
  - Internalization of the thin ideal (e.g., Tiggemann & Polivy, 2010; Tiggemann, Polivy, & Hargreaves, 2009)

- **Effect of instructions**
  - Appearance (e.g., Cattarin et al., 2000; Tiggemann & McGill, 2004)
  - Non-Appearance (Tiggemann & Polivy, 2010)
Methods

- Between-groups factors:
  - Model Size: Thin vs. Average
  - Rating Focus: Appearance vs. Non-Appearance Focus

- Within-groups factor:
  - Body Satisfaction

Participants

- 214 undergraduate females participated (75% white)
- BMI (M = 23.15, SD = 4.04) (65.2%)
- Online Psychology subject pool

Materials: Stimulus Images

- 22 Images of “thin” and 22 Images of “average” models
- Criteria for selection and matching of images
Methods Cont…

- **Body Parts Satisfaction Scale-Revised (BPSS-R)**
  - (Petrie, Tripp, & Harvey, 2002)

- **Figure Rating Scale (FRS)** (Stunkard, Sorensen, & Schulsinger, 1983)
  - Actual – Ideal = Body Image Discrepancy (BID)

- **Sociocultural Attitudes Towards Appearance Questionnaire (SATAQ-I)**
  - Internalization sub-scale (Heinberg, Thompson, & Stormer, 1995)

- **Upward Physical Comparison Scale (UPACS)**
  - (O’Brien, Caputi, Minto, Peoples, Hooper, Kell, & Sawley, 2009)

- **General Media Consumption**

- **Demographics, height, weight**
Results & Discussion
Preliminary Analyses

- **Manipulation check: Model size**
  - Rating: “Thin” (5-point scale)
  - Thin: 4.19 (.46)
  - Average: 2.58 (.37)
  - $t(107) = 20.00, p < .001, \eta^2 = .79$

- **Confound: Thin vs. attractive**
  - Rating: “Attractive”
  - Thin: 3.57 (.52)
  - Average: 3.63 (.47)
  - $t(107) = -0.72, p = .473, \eta^2 = .01$
Analysis 1: Effects of Model Size and Rating Focus on Body Satisfaction (N=214)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPSS-R:</th>
<th>Model Size:</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thin</td>
<td>4.05 (.72)</td>
<td>3.99 (.78)</td>
<td>-.06 (.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.94 (.84)</td>
<td>4.06 (.90)</td>
<td>.12 (.29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F(1, 210) = 25.47, p<.001, \eta^2 = .11$
Analysis 2: Predictors of Changes in Body Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model Size</th>
<th>BMI</th>
<th>BID</th>
<th>SATAQ-I</th>
<th>UPACS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adj $R^2 = .10$</td>
<td></td>
<td>F Change = 12.69***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adj $R^2 = .12$</td>
<td></td>
<td>F Change = 6.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>BPSS-R</th>
<th>BMI</th>
<th>BID</th>
<th>SATAQ-I</th>
<th>UPACS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change (DV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BMI | -.02 |     |     |         |       |
| BID | -.15* | .45*** |     |         |       |
| SATAQ-I | -.03 | -.04 | .49*** |     |       |
| UPACS | -.09 | -.06 | .35*** | .63*** |       |

$M$ | 0.02 | 23.14 | 1.12 | 3.17 | 3.53 |
$SD$ | 0.27 | 4.06 | 1.06 | 0.91 | 0.91 |

Notes:
• $p<.05$  ** $p<.01$  ***$p<.001$
## Analysis 3: Predictors of Pre-existing Body Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Pre-BPSS-R (DV)</th>
<th>BMI</th>
<th>BID</th>
<th>SATAQ-I</th>
<th>UPACS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BID</td>
<td>-.63***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATAQ-I</td>
<td>-.55***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPACS</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $M$  | 3.99 | 23.14 | 1.12   | 3.17   | 3.53  |
| $SD$ | 0.79 | 4.06  | 1.06   | 0.91   | 0.91  |

Notes:
- $p<.05$  **  $p<.01$  ***  $p<.001$  

*Adj $R^2 = .03$  
*F Change = 6.89**  

*Adj $R^2 = .47$  
*F Change = 6.66***
Contributions & Conclusion
Thank you!
Discussion

- Effects of thin models
- Social comparison (Langer, Pirson, & Delizonna, 2010)
- Effects of average sized models
- Body image discrepancy
- Internalization of the thin ideal (Grabe et al., 2008)
- Limitations
- Future directions
- Conclusion
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