|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Task Group –** **Body self-esteem, academic outcomes and career aspirations: a cross-cultural study** | | |
| **Group coordinator(s):** | | |
| **Name** | **Country** | **Email** |
| **Barbara Dooley** | **Ireland** | **Barbara.dooley@ucd.ie** |
| Toni Babarovic | **Croatia** | **Toni.Babarovic@pilar.hr** |
| Josip Burusic | **Croatia** | **josip.burusic@pilar.hr** |
| **TG members** | | |
| **Name** | **Country** | **Email** |
| Sandra Torres | Portugal | storres@fpce.up.pt |
| Miriam Catia | Portugal | catiamiriam1@gmail.com |
| Amanda Fitzgerald | Ireland | Amanda.fitzgerald@ucd.ie |
| Minna Anttila | Finland | minant@utu.fi |
| Maritta Välimäki | Finland | mava@utu.fi |
| Matti Pelkonen | Finland | matti.m.pelkonen@utu.fi |
| Dorit Olenik-Shemesh | Israel | doritol@openu.ac.il |
| Tali Heiman | Israel | talihe@openu.ac.il |
| Liesbet Boone | Belgium | liesbet.boone@ugent.be |
| Marijana Sunjic | Bosnia & Herzegovina | marijana.sunjic@gmail.com |
| Angeliki Leondari | Greece | leontari@uth.gr |
| Efthymia Sygkollitou | Greece | syngo@psy.auth.gr |
| **Overall Aims and Objectives of Task Group** | | |
| **PHASE 1**    **Desk research on body appearance satisfaction research in six partner countries**  **1. Aims**  Overall aim: To collect participant country’s literature (2000-2015) on **body appearance satisfaction research.**  **Objectives:**   * To capture what has been done in body appearance satisfaction research in participating countries in last 15 years. * To identify weaknesses, strengths and challenges in body appearance satisfaction research and related measures in order to take cross-cultural survey.   **PHASE 2**  The main aim of the Phase 2 was to conduct a cross-cultural study related to body self-esteem and it’s educational and career outcomes for emerging adults aged 18-26 years.  Aims of the study:   * To test the cross-cultural invariance of the   + Body Esteem Scale for Adolescents and Adolescents (BESAA)   + Body Appreciation Scale (BAS) * To examine the relation between body self-esteem and other constructs related constructs * To test the proposed model below     The study design sets out to estimate, and test a network of relationships between variables (measured variables and latent constructs). Firstly the factor structure of the Body Esteem Scale for Adults and Adolescents (BESAA) will be assessed using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and tested for measurement invariance cross-culturally. Structural equation modelling (SEM) will be used, which requires specification of a model based on theory and research. SEM is a multivariate technique incorporating measured variables and latent constructs, and explicitly specifies measurement error. A model (diagram above) allows for specification of relationships between variables. | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Activities of Task Group** |
| **PHASE 1**    **Desk research on body appearance satisfaction research in six partner countries**  **1. Aims**  Overall aim: To collect participant country’s literature (2000-2015) on the **body appearance satisfaction research.**  **Objectives:**   * To capture what has been done in body appearance satisfaction research in participating countries in last 15 years. * To identify weaknesses, strengths and challenges in body appearance satisfaction research and related measures in order to take cross-cultural survey.   **2. Search process**  **2.1 Resources:**   * Academic databases * Book chapters from handbooks or collections of papers * Published academic literature * Unpublished studies   **2.2 Key search terms:**   * body appearance satisfaction/dissatisfaction * appearance satisfaction/dissatisfaction * body (self)esteem * body shape satisfaction * Searches were undertaken using   + Key words in project partners’ language and in English.   + Boolean operators such as (“body appearance satisfaction” OR “body esteem”...)   **2.3 Limits:**   * Interval: 2000-2015 (publication date) * Territorial: project partner’s country * Language: Project partner’s language(s) and English.   **3. Exclusion process**  **3.1 First phase:**   * Identified publications were reviewed for relevance by the researcher executing the search.   **3.1.1 Relevance based on TITLES**  Exclusion criteria:   * The sample was not at least partly drawn from the partner country * Thematically irrelevant according to aims and objectives of this review * Duplicates (EndNote or other bibliography management software can be used to identify duplicates) * The abstracts of the remaining papers are to be retrieved.   **3.1.2 Relevance based on ABSTRACTS**  Exclusion criteria:   * The sample was not at least partly drawn from the partner country * Thematically irrelevant according to aims and objectives of this review * No full-text available   **3.2 Second phase: relevance based on FULL PAPER.**  In this phase all remaining papers are retrieved. Upon the independent judgment of 2 researchers papers are reviewed for relevance.    **Exclusion criteria:**   * Thematically irrelevant according to aims and objectives of this review * The sample was not at least partly drawn from the partner country * Duplicates (more papers address the same research without significant difference between them)   **3.3 Third phase**  In this phase, papers were excluded which were methodologically weak, based  on the independent judgment of 2 researchers.    **Exclusion criteria:**   * Purpose is a debate on an ethical issue * No references are cited * The research paper does not discuss at least one of the following topics: * Research design * Sampling procedure * Data collection * Methodological strengths * Methodological weaknesses * Non-response and attrition * Measurement errors * Weighting and imputation   Analysis of country data  **Countries and number of studies in research (remaining after the third phase)**   * Portugal (44) * Ireland (16) * Israel (4) * Finland (31) * Bosnia & Herzogovnia (8) * Croatia (15)   Number of valid studies: N=86; 29 studies - info not available/not clear   * Data type predominantly: quantitative (92%) * Geographic coverage: regional (71%) * Response Mode (quantitative): pen & pencil (69%) * Research design (quantitative): cross-sectional (68%) * Sampling method used (quantitative): non-random (69%) * Estimation unit: Individuals (99%) * Sample size: Mean =1263.13, Median= 335 * Response rate: Mean =74% (only reported in 46% of studies) * Respondent’s lowest target age: Mean = 16.94 * Respondent’s highest target age: Mean = 32.16   Main topics of research   * Obesity (body weight): N=55 (47%) * Psychological aspect of self-acceptance: N=43 (37%) * Psychological aspect of well-being: N=33 (28%) * Bulimia: N=26 (22%) * Psychological aspect of personality: N=24 (21%) * Anorexia: N=22 (19%) * Romantic and sexual relationship: N=12 (10%)   \*Note overlapping topics in many studies  **Scales used in analysed studies**   * Body Shape Questionnaire * Eating Disorders Inventory (EDI) * Figure Rating Scale (FRS) * Eating Attitudes Test (EAT) * Eating Disorder Examination Questionnaire (EDE-Q) * Collins’ Pictorial Silhouettes (silhouettes) * Adolescent Dieting Scale (ADS) * Contour Drawing Rating Scale (CDRS) * Sociocultural Attitudes Toward Appearance Questionnaire (SATAQ) * Self-Liking and Self-Competence Scale (SLCS) * Body Areas Satisfaction Scale (BASS) * Body Attitude Test (BAT) * Body Image Scale (BISb) * Body Dissatisfaction Scale (BDS) * Body Esteem Scale (BES) * Body Esteem Scale for Adolescents and Adults (BESAA)   **Scales not used in analysed studies**   * Body Silhouette Charts (BSC) * Body Size Rating Scale (BSRS) * Body Satisfaction Scale (BSS) * Body Satisfaction Tool (BST) * Body Weight Dissatisfaction (BWD) * Culturally Relevant Body Image Instrument (CRBII) * Computer-Based Figure-Choice Scale (FCS) * Human Figure Drawings Test (FDT) * Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents (SPPA) * The Silhouette Assessment of Body Shape (SQBS) * Adjusted Satisfaction with Appearance Scale (SWAP)   **Conclusions**   * Most studies were funded by governments or academic institutions * Study coverage is usually local (town) or regional, rarely national * Most studies are quantitative, and sampling units are individuals, not households (families) * Most samples are convenient (or non-random) * Most studies comprised of small samples, with the exception of a few big (cross) national surveys * The P&P assessment dominates, few studies applied Web-based assessment * Most of the studies focused on children, adolescents and emerging adults, rarely on adults * Main topics of research were health and psychological consequences, less related to social, educational or work area. * Most widely used instruments were: Body Shape Questionnaire (BSQ); Eating Disorder Inventory (EDI); Figure Rating Scale (FRS); Eating Attitudes Test (EAT-26)   **Future research directions for Phase 2**   * Conduct a cross-cultural research * Adapt the instruments for online assessment * Research an under-researched area such as the educational or vocational setting * Look to use structural equation modeling to assess the psychometric properties of questionnaires used in body-image research cross-culturally   **PHASE 2**  **Cross-cultural study**  **Data from Phase 1 discussed at Portugal meeting**   * Study Design for Phase 2 agreed * Model agreed to test across countries * Projected sample size per country N=300 * University students * Age 18-26, gender balanced * The proposed study focused on some of the under researched areas, the importance of body self-esteem in the educational setting; the validation of the Body Esteem Scale for Adolescents and Adults (BESAA), not yet validated in participating countries; consider the consequences of body-esteem for emerging adults in tertiary education.   **Study Proposal**  The main aim of the study is to conduct a cross-cultural study related to body self-esteem and it’s educational and career outcomes for emerging adults aged 18-26 years.  Aims of the study:   * To test the cross-cultural invariance of the   + Body Esteem Scale for Adolescents and Adolescents (BESAA)   + Body Appreciation Scale (BAS) * To examine the relation between body self-esteem and other constructs related constructs * To test the proposed model below   If we can understand the interaction between body self-esteem and body image disturbances within the tertiary educational setting we can develop programmes in an attempt to prevent, mediate, and build resilience in young people to promote educational competency and success. It is hypothesised that the study will contribute to understanding overarching patterns in body-image disturbance that occur across the EU, while recognizing the differences that each country experiences due to their unique cultural contexts.  In recent years, a great deal of research effort has been directed towards understanding the formative factors that play a role in the development and maintenance of body image disturbance and eating disorders (Thompson & Smolak, 2001). Research evidence now charts the extensive and damaging impacts of dissatisfaction with appearance on physical and psychological health across the lifespan.  The majority of outcomes of body dissatisfaction are in studies related to eating disorders and some psychosocial consequences. The most frequently researched psychosocial outcome variables or constructs are general self-esteem, depression, perfectionism and stress. However, restrictive eating is also associated with a range of detrimental cognitive effects, including decreased attention span and memory. Students with lower grades are more likely to report that body image concerns interfered with their academic performance (Yanover & Thompson, 2008). Additionally, Lovegrove (2002) found that 31% of UK teenagers avoid classroom debate and 20% absent themselves from school when lacking confidence about their appearance, suggesting some sort of interaction between body self-esteem and academic achievement that needs further research and study. A research area that has received limited attention is the role that eating problems and body image disturbance may play in reducing optimal cognitive functioning (Yanover & Thompson, 2008). According to Yanover & Thompson (2008) academic interference is a relatively unexamined, but potentially important, outcome for individuals who experience eating problems and body image disturbance using the Eating & Body Image Disturbances Academic Interference Scale (EBIDAIS).  From a measurement perspective the most widely used instruments in the field of body image and eating problems research are the following: Body Shape Questionnaire (BSQ); Eating Disorder Inventory (EDI); Figure Rating Scale (FRS); Eating Attitudes Test (EAT-26), while other instruments are used rarely. To further our understanding of body image in particular, it is useful to select instruments that have validity for use with both males and females; such as the BESAA. From a modelling perspective the Tripartite Influence Model of body dissatisfaction (Thompson et al. 1999) is the most commonly used, evaluated and researched model. However, both the instruments and model are primarily focused on a demographic of adolescents, and is applicable to emerging adults in an educational context. Therefore, this study proposes to test the dimensionality of the BESAA. Furthermore, there are no contemporaneous international data sets on body-image, eating & body Image disturbances on academic achievement in college students.  The scope of this project included research on the outcomes of appearance dissatisfaction in young adults in educational contexts, on the efficacy of new and different modelling techniques and scale measures, and to contribute to a larger, cross-cultural study on body image issues being conducted in the EU.  The variables in the propose study were based on a desk based literature overview carried out by the COST Action Appearance Matters Working Group on cross-cultural body image research. The participating countries collecting data were as follows: Croatia, Greece, Ireland, UK, Israel, Finland, Portugal, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Belgium.  The study design sets out to estimate, and test a network of relationships between variables (measured variables and latent constructs). Firstly the factor structure of the Body Esteem Scale for Adults and Adolescents (BESAA) will be assessed using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and tested for measurement invariance cross-culturally. Structural equation modelling (SEM) will be used, which requires specification of a model based on theory and research. SEM is a multivariate technique incorporating measured variables and latent constructs, and explicitly specifies measurement error. A model (diagram above) allows for specification of relationships between variables.  **Sample:**   * University students * Approximately age from 18 to 26 * N­ = 300 or more pre country, as diverse by the study programme as possible * Balanced by gender: 1:3 at least male: female   **Data assessment method:**   * Online assessment – the same questionnaire format in all countries * Demographics: Age, gender, year and level of study (BA, MA), Ethnicity, GPA   **Questionnaires selected**   * **Body Appreciation Scale - (BAS - 2):** (Tylka 2005) is a 10 item questionnaire that measures a person's acceptance of their body despite perceived imperfections, respect of body by remaining healthy and attentive to bodily needs, and rejecting unhealthy and unrealistic body images portrayed in the media. Cronbach’s alpha .94 and .93 for females & males. * **Body Esteem Scale for Adolescents and Adults - (BESAA)** (Mendelson, 2001) is a 23-item, single factor + 3 factor scale: general feeling about appearance, weight satisfaction, and attributions of positive evaluations about one's body and appearance to others. Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .75 to .96 within subscales. * **Eating and Body Image Disturbance Academic Interference Scale - (EBIDAIS)** (Thompson 2008); 12-item scale assesses how eating disturbance interferes with academic achievement. Cronbach's alpha of .92 & validated for use with men and women. * **Flourishing Scale** (Diener, 2010) 8-item assesses respondent's self-perceived success in important areas such as relationships, self-esteem, purpose, and optimism. The scale provides a single psychological well-being score. Cronbach's alpha of .73 to .78 on a range of participant groups. * **Self-Esteem Scale – SES**  (Rosenberg, 1965) is a 10-item self-report measure of global self-esteem. Cronbach’s alpha of .78 on average across groups. * **Career Aspiration Scale - Revised (only Achievement Aspiration subscale and Educational Aspiration Subscale)** (Gregor & O'Brian 2015) 16 items measuring different aspects of career aspiration. Cronbach's alpha of .76 to .84 * **Academic Achievement Scale** (Babarovic, 2013); 6 item scale assessing perceptions about academic achievements, Alpha =.862   **Procedure**   * Secure permission from authors of questionnaires * Ethical approval in each country * Generate Google Forms (also Qualtrics) * Each country translated the questionnaires into the language of the participating country * The TRAPD system was used * TRAPD stands for Translation, Review, Adjudication and Documentation. It is the system of questionnaire translation and assessment suggested by Harkness (2003) * The TRAPD system uses a structured approach to translation and assessment which reduces the chances of subjective and idiosyncratic features * Translation Review Adjudication Sign off   **Sampling and procedure**   * Sample of students from eight countries   + B&H, Belgium, Croatia, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Portugal * Convenient sampling – different methods   + University mailing lists, snowballing, mailing lists, personal contacts… * Online testing platform – standardized by form and content between counties * Approximately 20 min. to complete * Upper age limit of 30 years   **Sample to date**   * 3,646 students (71.8% female) * Age and educational structure   + Average age 21.7 (sd = 3.04)   **Data analyses conducted to date:**   * Instruments reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha) * Inter-correlations by gender * Correlation matrix to determine relationships among   + Similar constructs   + Related measures * Predicting academic and career outcomes * Hierarchical regression   + Block 1: SES & FS – personal   + Block 2: BESAA & BAS – body satisfaction   + Block 3: EBIDAIS – Body satisfaction – academic performance interference   **Testing the model**   * Model does not hold * Interference scale (EBIDAIS) is not related substantially neither to body-satisfaction scales, nor to academic and career outcomes * Body satisfaction scales relation to academic outcomes is completely mediated by self- esteem and general well-being * We are testing alternative models |

OUTCOMES, ACTIVITIES & ACHIEVEMENTS RESULTING

FROM TASK GROUP ACTIVITIES

|  |
| --- |
| **Publications** (include only those with at least 3 authors from 3 different COST Countries) |
| No publications to date  **Proposed papers to be published**   * The validity of Body Esteem Scale for Adolescents and Adults across cultures and gender * The relation between body self-esteem and flourishing scale as a new measure of personal well-being: a cross-cultural approach * Self esteem, career aspiration and academic achievement of students across eight European countries * Eating and Body Image Disturbances Academic Interference Scale: the evidence of its structural invariance across cultures * Body self-esteem, personal well-being, and academic achievement – setting the model * BMI data from (B&H, Croatia, Greece, Ireland, Portugal) |

|  |
| --- |
| **NETWORKING** |
| **Added value of the Networking** (within the TASK GROUP) |
| Significant networking and exchange of ideas between members of the group.  Extensive sharing of expertise, for example,   * How to conduct large scale data collection online, * The use of sophisticated statistical analyses such as structural equation modelling, * How to use the TRAPD for translating questionnaires. TRAPD: Translation, Review, Adjudication and Documentation. It is the system of questionnaire translation and assessment suggested by Harkness (2003) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Please describe any other outputs and achievements that have resulted from Task Group activities, or that are still in progress, highlighting in particular on those relevant to the aims of COST** (“COST enables break-through scientific developments leading to new concepts and products and thereby contributes to strengthen Europe’s research and innovation capacities.”) |
| Publications and primary data generated cross-countries with a current sample size of >3,000 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Impacts** | | |
| Please describe the impacts that have resulted, or might result from the Action in future | | |
| **Description of the impact** | **Type of impact1** | **Timing of impact2** |
| The main impact will be the generation of new data cross-countries on commonly used measures in body-image research but have not been tested for measurement invariance. This study will address a significant gap in our understanding on whether we can generalise findings from one country to another using the same instruments | Scientific | Foreseen within two years |

Scientific/ Technological, Economic, Societal

2 Achieved/ Foreseen within 2 years/ Foreseen 2-5 years/ Foreseen 5-10 years/ Foreseen 10+ years

DISSEMINATION & EXPLOITATION OF TASK GROUP ACTIVITIES

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Add description here** (Add more rows if needed) | | | | | |
| **Item/ activity** | **Country** | **Target Audience** | **Number** | **Result** | **Hyperlink** (if available) |
| ***Below are examples of some activities,***  ***Please delete before starting*** | | | | | |
| Publications |  |  |  | Not yet achieved |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Were there any challenges that were encountered in your task group? What solutions were used to overcome these challenges?

|  |
| --- |
| The main issue encountered was data collection. There are a number of outstanding issues that the group are working on.  **Questions to be resolved**   * Age limits > 26? * Gender balance – not achieved, do we collect more data * Study profile * Countries to be included or excluded from the final data set due to sample size- what are the parameters? |

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR completing this and for ALL YOUR HARD WORK!