Many researchers have examined the impact of media exposure on young adults’ mental health. Several studies have examined how particular aspects of traditional media (i.e., magazines, television), such as the inclusion of idealized, appearance-focused photos, impact women’s body image (Silverstein et al., 1986; Tiggemann & Polivy, 2010). Exposure to thin-ideal content in traditional media leads to internalization of the ideal, which in turn greatly increases body dissatisfaction (Groesz et al., 2002; Stice & Shaw, 1994; Stice et al., 1994).

In addition to findings from traditional media research, social comparison processes can be elicited from viewing idealized content on these online social media platforms such as Instagram (Fardouly et al., 2017). Social comparison theory posits that, when people compare themselves, they tend to identify a discrepancy between themselves and the other, which can subsequently alter their self-perceptions (Festinger, 1954). Upward social comparisons are defined as the process in which individuals compare themselves to someone who they deem to be superior on a particular dimension (e.g., intelligence, physical appearance). Those who engage in this type of social comparison may perceive a discrepancy between themselves and the other person and interpret this as an inadequacy on their part. The social comparisons that are specific to one’s physical appearance are known as body
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or appearance comparisons. Engaging in such comparisons has been found to impact body image in young women negatively (Choukas-Bradley et al., 2019; Fardouly et al., 2017). Individuals who report making frequent appearance comparisons also report having intense cognitions related to disordered eating (Fitzsimmons et al., 2016).

Although people typically make social comparisons in person, most now have the ability to compare themselves to thousands of others online with only a few taps on their mobile device (Fardouly et al., 2017). The most popular picture-sharing platform, Instagram, allows social media users to share photos or videos to a large audience and to receive feedback through likes and comments (Clement, 2020). The platform varies widely in content; however, a great deal is focused on physical appearance, and images often depict individuals looking physically flawless.

Although Instagram and other social media platforms can be used to cultivate connections with peers and explore interests, young adults have greater accessibility to idealized content and space to engage in appearance comparisons with peers, celebrities, and strangers. As a result of being able to visually compare themselves to others in public and private, there are more opportunities to make more upward social comparisons, which is an underlying mechanism that has been found to facilitate body dissatisfaction (Rodgers et al., 2015; Tiggemann & Polivy, 2010). Brown and Tiggemann (2016) demonstrated how influential these comparison processes can be to both mood and body image, finding that women who viewed pictures of attractive peers were more likely to report experiencing negative mood and body dissatisfaction than those who viewed travel pictures. Research by Hogue and Mills (2019) additionally supports the impact idealized media has on psychological functioning, and their findings show that comparing oneself to a known attractive peer, rather than a family member, resulted in increased negative feelings toward one’s body. Moreover, exposure to idealized social media images has been found to decrease self-perceived attractiveness in young women (Sherlock & Wagstaff, 2019).

Given these adverse effects, researchers have employed a wide range of intervention methods, including utilizing disclaimers, warning labels, and social media literacy exercises, as ways to mitigate the effects associated with exposure to idealized content (Halliwell et al., 2011; Livingston et al., 2020). The adoption of content disclaimers (i.e., warnings or labels) in particular is a widely explored, brief intervention method. Borau and Nepomuceno (2019) examined the impact that novel content disclaimers informing individuals about airbrushing practices had on body satisfaction. In their study, female participants viewed images of female models in beauty magazines who represented the thin ideal, with an experimental group receiving an airbrushing “disclaimer.” Borau and Nepomuceno (2019) found that participant knowledge of airbrush usage did not alleviate personal body dissatisfaction, which did not support their hypothesis. Similarly, Livingston et al. (2020) adapted intervention methodology used for traditional media by investigating the effect of having social media influencers convey the reality of idealized Instagram photos through their own captions. Their findings also suggest that first-person disclaimer captions are as ineffective at preserving body image as content disclaimers. Although initially promising, content disclaimers have been shown to be ineffectual at protecting young women from experiencing body dissatisfaction (Danthinne et al., 2020; McComb & Mills, 2020;).

Media literacy videos have also been a tested intervention method aimed at improving body image and mental health outcomes in young media consumers. Halliwell et al. (2011) found that showing young girls a video of a one-minute media literacy message on the prevalence of Photoshop prior to viewing thin-ideal content, reduced negative feelings related to body image. Expanding upon this work, Arendt and colleagues (2017) found a reduction in participant motivation to engage in upward social comparison processes after exposing their participants to a media awareness video. This intervention engendered more realistic self-perceptions of body image within their participants, which seemed to lessen upward social comparison tendencies in participants. Although researchers are seeing promising findings for extensive media literacy interventions, these interventions can be time consuming to develop and costly to administer. More extensive research is therefore needed to develop effective disclaimers that can briefly inform social media users about idealized content and act as a body image preservation tool.

Because social media users may manipulate the images they post on platforms slightly, one brief intervention method that may be effective at inhibiting social comparison processes is informing participants about photo-editing practices and the concept of change blindness. To our knowledge,
no other researchers have used content disclaimers to inform participants about photo-editing practices by explaining the concept of change blindness. Change blindness is a common cognitive phenomenon, which occurs when someone fails to perceive a change in visual stimuli (Pashler, 1988). Interestingly, even when people are aware that they will view changed images, they overestimate their ability to detect those changes (Levin et al., 2000). Participants viewed four different scenarios, each depicted by a series of still images, and imagined them as a movie. Participants were instructed to spot changes between the images and report their confidence in performing the task correctly. Although 85% predicted that they would detect the changes, less than 15% of participants were able to accurately detect changes. The findings from Levin et al. (2000) suggest that social media users may be more confident, rather than accurate, at detecting edited photos posted on platforms. Therefore, those viewing edited appearance-focused images may be unable to detect minute changes that can be made using photo-editing apps, leaving them to perceive a person’s physical appearance to be realistic. Those who do not detect that an appearance-focused photo was edited may think that the pictured physical appearance is attainable and may be more likely to engage in upward social comparison processes (Tiggemann & Polivy, 2010).

For the current study, we aimed to design a novel intervention that incorporated the concept of change blindness. We informed participants about the concept of change blindness in an effort to highlight most people’s failure to detect whether a photo has been edited. We predicted that participants informed about photo-editing change blindness before viewing the sequence of images would better detect the changes than those who did not learn of change blindness. Additionally, we predicted that those informed about change blindness would be less likely to engage in physical appearance comparisons.

**Method**

**Participants**

This study was approved by the University of San Diego’s (USD) Institutional Review Board. Participants (N = 46) identified as women and recruited from an upper division psychology course using convenience sampling methods. The exclusion criterion included all gender identities except for women; this criterion was set to enhance social comparison processes. Participants were informed they would receive course credit for participating in this study and given a cover story that the study’s aim was to explore the factors that influence popularity on Instagram. The average age of the participants was 20.57 years (SD = 1.4, range = 19–27). Participants identified as White (n = 34, 70.8%), Asian or Asian American (n = 5, 10.4%), and Black or African American (n = 3, 6.3%), and some participants identified as a race that was not listed (n = 4, 8.3%). Additionally, 68.8% (n = 33) identified their ethnicity as non-Latino or non-Hispanic, and most participants (n = 41, 89.1%) reported being active Instagram users.

**Materials**

**Content Disclaimers**

Two content disclaimers, an experimental and control, appeared prior to the appearance-focused images (see Appendix A). The purpose of the experimental content disclaimer was to inform participants about the frequent photo-editing practices of social media users and how this relates to the concept of change blindness. The control disclaimer only contained task instructions, which were the same instructions given in the last two sentences of the experimental disclaimer.

**Images**

A total of 10 appearance-focused Instagram pictures featuring a woman wearing a bikini were selected from public Instagram accounts, and each photo was seen by the participant twice. The women featured in the images were European American, African American, Asian American, and Latin American. We did not receive permission from the Instagram users to include the publicly posted images in this manuscript, and thus, we have not included them in the appendix. A random number generator was used, while controlling for racial representativeness, to randomly select five images to be edited. We then utilized an application called Bodytune to digitally manipulate those five women’s bodies to appear more like the thin ideal (i.e., reduced waist size, expanded hip width).

**Change Blindness**

To account for change detection, or the lack thereof, and the accuracy with which one could detect what was changed about the photo, two items were included in the questionnaire. Items included “Did you detect any changes in the second photo?” and “Where on the body did this change occur?” The second item appeared only if the respondent
selected “yes” to the first item. These items were presented below the second-appearance focused image in each pair.

**Popularity**

Two items related to popularity were used to align with the cover story that participants were presented with at the beginning of the study. Items included, “How many likes do you think this photo received on Instagram?” and “Please indicate your perception of the pictured woman’s popularity (0 = not popular at all, 10 = most popular).” These items were not included in the analysis. Participants responded to items regarding popularity after responding to change blindness items.

**Physical Appearance Comparison Scale-3 (Modified)**

A modified version of the 20-item Physical Appearance Comparison Scale-3 (PACS-3; Schaefer & Thompson, 2018) was used in this study. We modified the PACS-3 in order to better examine appearance comparisons made on social media rather than traditional media (see Appendix B). This version contained 10 items that asked participants how they feel about comparing themselves to peers, influencers, and celebrities who appear on television, social media, and in the public. The following are examples of the items included in the scale: (a) “When I’m out in public, I compare my weight/shape to the weight/shape of others”; (b) “When I see a USD female peer on social media, I compare my weight/shape to her”; and (c) “When I watch television, I compare my weight/shape to the weight/shape of the actors/actresses.”

The COVID-19 pandemic has caused many people to quarantine at home and therefore spend less time in public spaces. The original PACS-3 scale contained six items related to comparing one’s physical appearance to public others, so most of these items were omitted from the scale due to irrelevance; the modified version contained only two items related to in-person social comparisons. The following were included in our measure: (a) “When I’m out in public, I compare my weight/shape to the weight/shape of others”; and (b) “When I see a female influencer on social media, I compare my weight/shape to her weight/shape.” Participants responded to all items on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (always, much better, or extremely good) to 5 (never, much worse, or extremely bad). Schaefer (2017) reported alphas of .85 and higher for each subscale of the PACS-3 when measuring female participants’ responses. In the present study, the following alpha reliability coefficients were found for the Comparison Amount, Comparison Type, and Comparison Outcome subscales, respectively: .89, .70, and .74.

**Procedure**

Participants accessed the online survey via an anonymous link. An online informed consent form was presented first, and participants electronically signed to indicate their consent. Participants then responded to a single item that asked about their gender identity as the inclusion criteria for this study included women. Participants who identified as women were shown a brief description that included the study’s cover story (i.e., researchers are investigating factors that influence popularity on Instagram); participants were deceived from the true purpose of the study to reduce the likelihood of participant bias impacting the results.

Following this, participants were randomly assigned to be shown either experimental or control disclaimers. The experimental disclaimer explains the concept of change blindness, stating that people typically fail to see a visual change between two images. All participants were presented with a randomized series of 10 idealized image pairs depicting women wearing bikinis. Half of these image pairs featured an edited second photo, and the other half remained unedited. After viewing each image pair, participants answered four questions, two measuring accuracy of change detection and two assessing perceptions of the pictured woman’s popularity. After viewing the entire paired-image set, participants completed 10 items from the modified version of the PACS-3. Six demographic questionnaire items gathered information about participants’ class level, age, race, ethnicity, and social media usage. At the end of the experiment, participants were debriefed about the study’s true aim.

**Design**

A 2 x 2 mixed experimental design was utilized for this study. Participants were randomly assigned to be shown an experimental or control disclaimer; thus, the type of disclaimer was a between-subjects independent variable. Photo condition was a within-participant measure, with five of the images edited, and the rest remained unedited. Accuracy in detecting editing was the main dependent variable and was measured with one forced-choice response item that asked participants to indicate whether the photo had been edited. Participants’ accuracy in
detecting editing scores were reported out of five points for both edited and unedited photos.

Participant engagement in physical comparison processes was measured using a modified version of the PACS-3 (see Appendix B), which was broken into three categories: Comparison Amount (items 1, 4, 7, 8), Comparison Type (items 2, 5, 9), and Comparison Outcome (items 3, 6, 10). The first category was a frequency measure that assessed how often participants compared their physical appearance to others. The following category, comparison type, measured whether the comparison participants engaged in was an upward or downward comparison. The final category measured the impact that engaging in a physical appearance comparison had on the participants. Specifically, participants were asked to report their feelings after engaging in a certain comparison.

Results

A 2 (experimental vs. control disclaimer) x 2 (edited vs. unedited image-pairs) repeated-measures ANOVA was conducted. A main effect was found for the type of photo, either edited or unedited, \( F(1, 44) = 14.59, p < .001 \), Cohen’s \( d = 1.39 \), such that people were more accurate in detecting unedited photos (\( M = 4.11, SD = 0.82 \)) than edited photos (\( M = 3.26, SD = 1.27 \)). There was no main effect for the disclaimer condition between experimental and control groups, \( F(1, 44) = 2.49, p = .12, \eta^2_p = .05 \); however, a significant interaction (see Figure 1) was observed between type of photo and disclaimer condition on change detection scores, \( F(1, 44) = 7.45, p = .01, \eta^2_p = .15 \). In other words, there was no difference between the group that received the experimental (\( M = 3.96, SD = 0.86 \)) and control (\( M = 4.27, SD = 0.77 \)) disclaimer on change detection accuracy for unedited image pairs; however, participants who viewed the experimental disclaimer (\( M = 3.71, SD = 1.27 \)) were more accurate than those who viewed the control disclaimer (\( M = 2.77, SD = 1.11 \)) in detecting change when an image pair had been edited.

An independent-samples \( t \) test demonstrated that participants who viewed the experimental disclaimer (\( M = 10.67, SD = 4.54 \)) were not significantly different in the amount of physical appearance comparisons than those in the control (\( M = 12.95, SD = 3.96 \)) as was measured by the PACS-3 Comparison Amount scores, \( t(44) = 1.82, p = .05, \) Cohen’s \( d = 0.05 \) (Refer back to Design section for PACS-3 subscales). Another independent-samples \( t \) test indicated that participants who received the experimental disclaimer (\( M = 11.46, SD = 1.79 \)) did not make different types of comparisons (i.e., upward or downward) than those who received the control disclaimer (\( M = 11.73, SD = 1.58 \)) as was measured by the PACS-3 Comparison Type scores, \( t(44) = 0.54, p = .59, \) Cohen’s \( d = 0.16 \). A third independent samples \( t \) test showed that participants receiving the experimental disclaimer (\( M = 11.46, SD = 1.64 \)) did not have different fluctuations in their mood (i.e., “When you make these comparisons, how does it usually make you feel?”) after making specific comparisons than participants who received the control disclaimer (\( M = 11.45, SD = 1.79 \)) as measured by the PACS-3 Comparison Outcome scores, \( t(44) = -0.01, p = .99, \) Cohen’s \( d < 0.01 \).

Discussion

The current experimental study investigated the impact of a brief social media intervention on change detection and physical appearance comparison processes. The data supported our first hypothesis that exposure to an experimental disclaimer would improve the ability to detect changes in images. A significant interaction revealed that, when the images were changed, the experimental disclaimer group scored better on detecting changes in edited photos when compared to the control. From this finding, it appears that the experimental disclaimer successfully informed women about photo-editing practices. This suggests that increasing awareness of distorted media among young people may have led them to question the
realistic nature of images, and this skepticism contributed to greater accuracy in detecting edits between images. The main effect of photo change condition indicated that participants were more accurate at detecting whether the images had been edited when the images were unedited rather than edited. The results mentioned above supported prior research, which demonstrated that change blindness occurs when viewing visually discrepant images, but that people are largely unaware of this cognitive shortcoming.

Contrary to our second hypothesis, the analysis of the modified PACS showed that there was no effect of disclaimer condition on comparison processes (Schaefer and Thompson, 2018). Therefore, participants made more upward comparisons when informed about change blindness and how it relates to photo-editing practices compared to the group that received no intervention. From this, it appears that the experimental disclaimer provided no buffer to viewing idealized, appearance focused images, and therefore did not influence young women to reduce the amount of appearance comparison processes that they engage in. Although this finding did not support our prediction, it contributes to the growing evidence that content disclaimers may be ineffective at reducing upward social comparison processes (Danthinne et al., 2020; Kleemans et al., 2016; McComb & Mills, 2020). Despite these findings, social media platforms have started to employ similar brief interventions that act as a buffer to media content that is defined as disturbing; however, there are no findings on whether this sensitive content warning has been effective.

The transient and low-intensity nature of the intervention might have been the primary reason that there was no reduction in social comparison processes. Although content disclaimers may be cost and time effective, lengthier intervention methods, such as actively watching a short video, have been shown to be more effective at mitigating adverse effects of media exposure (Halliwell et al., 2011). Impressionable adolescents and young adults internalize the idealized appearance-focus content seen in media as realistic, which can lead to skewed perceptions about one’s own body. Interventions that focus on promoting content that features diverse body types may help to change young adults’ perception of “realistic” (Kleemans et al., 2016). A study conducted by Ogden et al. (2020) found that showing women participants images of diverse body types positively impacted their overall self-reported body positivity, whereas the women who viewed thin-ideal images reported adverse body image outcomes, demonstrating the impacts that the thin-ideal beauty standard has on young adults’ body image.

To reduce negative appearance outcomes, researchers have employed intervention videos on media literacy and body positive content, which have reduced negative appearance outcomes and increased overall mood and body image (Cohen et al., 2019; Tiggemann & Polivy, 2010). Experimental evidence from Halliwell et al. (2011) demonstrates that participants who received a warning intervention reported increased body esteem after viewing images of thin models compared to individuals who did not receive the intervention. In addition to this, Halliwell (2013) found that individuals who report high levels of body appreciation were less negatively impacted by idealized, appearance-focused images. Interventions that foster individual cultivation of body appreciation and positivity may serve longer lasting positive effects on body image and should be designed and tested as a replacement to brief preventative methods, such as content disclaimers, which have consistently shown to be ineffective at preserving body image (McComb & Mills, 2020).

Concerning the study’s methodology, the failure to collect data on participants’ visual attention during the change blindness task was an additional weakness in design. Andrighetto et al. (2019) explored how visual attention toward different body parts may influence change blindness or change detection and found that individuals were more likely to accurately assess changes of body parts that are typically sexualized by the media. Interestingly, the participants in our study who reported that the photo had been changed reported body parts such as the hips, legs, buttocks, and chest being changed, with the waist and stomach region being identified the most by participants. This aligns with Andrighetto et al. (2019) findings that individuals are more attuned to changes made to characteristically sexualized body parts. Eye-tracking software can help gauge participants’ visual attention and shed light on how attention, or lack thereof, impacts change detection or appearance comparison processes. Cho and Lee (2013) used similar software to explore attentional biases in photos and found those experiencing high levels of body dissatisfaction to be more visually drawn toward thin-ideal content, suggesting more frequent opportunities to engage in more upward social comparisons and feel more inadequacy about one’s body. This attentional bias to the thin ideal
may uniquely impact social media users’ feelings and behaviors related to their body image due to the high amount of appearance-focused content on picture sharing platforms. Additionally, some young adults might have read the experimental disclaimer, but chose to disregard the information that was provided due to reactance (Brehm, 1966). The eye-tracking software could elucidate whether an adverse reaction to the disclaimer occurred by providing valuable information regarding participant visual engagement.

Although participants viewed pictures that were selected from real public Instagram accounts in this study, the overall experimental design had low ecological validity. Participants were instructed to view paired images that were displayed successively on Qualtrics. Each photo was displayed alone on a screen for 10 seconds before its photo pair was presented for an equivalent time interval. This methodology differed from previous studies that used the one shot and flicker paradigm to examine change blindness (Andrighetto et al., 2019; Bracco & Chiorri, 2008; Rensink et al., 1997; Simons, 1996). This novel approach to detecting change blindness is not an inherent design flaw; however, it is important to note the difference in approaches. The reason we conclude that our study has low generalizability across settings is that, on picture sharing platforms such as Instagram, photos are not viewed separately, with one image per screen, but are rather viewed singularly as users scroll through a feed. Although Instagram now enables users to swipe through multiple photos included on the same post, it is uncommon for individuals posting edited images to include the original, unedited photo as their first photo. Therefore, our study requires further replication to better understand the effectiveness of using disclaimers that aim to improve social media users’ experience. Additionally, utilizing scales that measure body dissatisfaction and mood in participants upon viewing idealized images may further aid our understanding of brief interventions’ impact on young social media users’ mental health. Future studies should also focus on expanding data collection with social media users, who identify differently than White, female undergraduates to gather more robust insights since generalizability of results was limited due to our participants being pooled from a predominantly White, private university.

Researchers should also examine body part location as a measure of change detection accuracy. Prior research has supported that images with sexualized body parts (e.g., waist, hips) promote greater attention to these areas, which thereby leads to greater change detection accuracy for edits made in those areas of the body (Andrighetto et al., 2019). The selected images used in this study contained a woman wearing a two-piece swimsuit, and thus leads us to conclude that the participants’ attentional biases may be important to understand change blindness within specific contexts.

Our research contributes to the pre-existing knowledge about interventions aimed at lessening the effects that mass media can have on young adult body image. The primary implication this research has for the general public is that the findings can be taken into consideration when designing similar content disclaimers for social media platforms. The media literacy that is provided from a brief intervention can aid users in recognizing edited content that might have first been assessed as realistic by the user, and consequently help to optimize social media users’ experience and well-being. Tamplin et al. (2018) found that individuals with low social media literacy skills, or those that do not possess a combination of critical thinking and realism skepticism when viewing media content, experienced a decrease in body satisfaction after viewing idealized content. This finding suggests that improvement in perceiving, evaluating, and interpreting media content can help protect social media users from experiencing body image disturbance. More research that examines the effectiveness of pre-existing interventions that are focused on improving media literacy among young adults on social media platforms should also be conducted.

Multiple platforms are beginning to regulate their content, including Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, and TikTok. Independent fact-checkers are currently being employed by Instagram to aid users in discriminating fake news from fact, and sensitive content warnings are being implemented on the platform by algorithms that identify and flag posts that users may find disturbing (Instagram, 2020). These design modifications can help to increase media literacy among users and provide an option to not be exposed to particular media content. The abundance of evidence that has shown the harmful effects of consuming idealized, appearance focused media indicates the need for additional platform updates. Therefore, interventions focusing on mitigating adverse outcomes associated with exposure to such media usage must continue to improve the mental health trajectories of young social media users.
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### APPENDIX A

**Content Disclaimers**

**Experimental disclaimer:** Have you ever done an activity when you had to “spot the changes” between two photos or cartoons? When looking at successive images, people often fail to see changes between them. People might also be unlikely to spot the difference between images with subtle modifications intended to be undetectable. Photoshop is an editing practice among social media users, enabling them to tweak or change their photos in discrete and believable ways. In this study, you will view a sequence of 10 photo pairs displayed in succession. After viewing each set of paired photos, you will answer items related to popularity perceptions of the pictured women.

**Control disclaimer:** In this study, you will view a sequence of 10 photo pairs displayed in succession. After viewing each set of paired photos, you will answer items related to popularity perceptions of the pictured women.

### APPENDIX B

**Physical Appearance Comparison Scale-3 (Modified Version)**

1. When I’m out in public, I compare my weight/shape to the weight/shape of others.
   - Participants selected one of the following options: Always, Most of the time, About half the time, Sometimes, Never.

2. When I make these comparisons, I typically believe that I look ______ than the person to whom I am comparing myself.
   - Participants selected either: Much better, Somewhat better, About the same, Somewhat worse, Much worse.

3. When you make these comparisons, how does it usually make you feel?
   - Participants selected either: Extremely good, Somewhat good, Neither good nor bad, Somewhat bad, Extremely bad.

4. When I watch television, I compare my weight/shape to the weight/shape of the actors/actresses.

5. When I make these comparisons, I typically believe that I look ______ than the person to whom I am comparing myself.

6. When you make these comparisons, how does it usually make you feel?

7. When I see a female influencer on social media, I compare my weight/shape to her weight/shape.

8. When I see an USD female peer on social media, I compare my weight/shape to her.

9. When I make these comparisons, I typically believe that I look ______ than the person to whom I am comparing myself.

10. After making these comparisons on social media, how does it usually make you feel?
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