

Editorial Manager(tm) for Sex Roles
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: SERS-1729R4

Title: Gender Comparisons of Fat Talk in the United Kingdom and the United States

Article Type: Sp. Iss. - Body Image

Keywords: fat talk; self-accepting and positive body talk; gender; cross-cultural comparisons

Corresponding Author: Professor Lucinda O Payne, MA

Corresponding Author's Institution: Appalachian State University

First Author: Lucinda O Payne, MA

Order of Authors: Lucinda O Payne, MA; Denise M Martz, PhD; K Brooke Tompkins, MA; Anna B Petroff, MA; Claire V Farrow, PhD

Abstract: This study compared different forms of body talk, including "fat talk," among 231 university men and women in central England (UK; n = 93) and the southeastern United States (US; n = 138). A 2 (gender) by 2 (country) repeated measures ANOVA across types of body talk (negative, self-accepting, positive) and additional Chi-square analyses revealed that there were differences across gender and between the UK and US cultures. Specifically, UK and US women were more likely to report frequently hearing or perceiving pressure to engage in fat talk than men. US women and men were also more likely to report pressure to join in self-accepting body talk than UK women and men.

Running head: GENDER COMPARISONS OF FAT TALK IN UK AND US

Gender Comparisons of Fat Talk in the United Kingdom and the United States

Lucinda O. Payne ^{a, b}

paynesmithlo@appstate.edu

Denise M. Martz ^a

martzdm@appstate.edu

K. Brooke Tompkins ^a

brooke.tompkins@gmail.com

Anna B. Petroff ^a

anna.petroff@gmail.com

Claire V. Farrow ^b

c.v.farrow@lboro.ac.uk

^aAppalachian State University, Department of Psychology, 222 Joyce Lawrence Lane,
Boone, NC 28608, USA

^bLoughborough University, School of Sport, Exercise, and Health Sciences,
Loughborough, Leicestershire LE11 3TU, England

All correspondence should be addressed to: martzdm@appstate.edu, (828) 262-2715,
(828) 262-2974 (fax) [Denise M. Martz].

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Running head: GENDER COMPARISONS OF FAT TALK IN THE UK AND US

Gender Comparisons of Fat Talk in the United Kingdom and the United States

Abstract

This study compared different forms of body talk, including “fat talk,” among 231 university men and women in central England (UK; $n = 93$) and the southeastern United States (US; $n = 138$). A 2 (gender) by 2 (country) repeated measures ANOVA across types of body talk (negative, self-accepting, positive) and additional Chi-square analyses revealed that there were differences across gender and between the UK and US cultures. Specifically, UK and US women were more likely to report frequently hearing or perceiving pressure to engage in fat talk than men. US women and men were also more likely to report pressure to join in self-accepting body talk than UK women and men.

Key words: fat talk, self-accepting and positive body talk, gender, cross-cultural comparisons

Gender Comparisons of Fat Talk in the United Kingdom and the United States

Introduction

Body dissatisfaction and drive for thinness are commonplace among Western cultures where thin ideals for physical attractiveness are emphasized among women (Swami et al., 2010). Based in feminist theory, McKinley (2002) proposed that women's tendency for more body image dissatisfaction compared to men's is not individual pathology, but rather a "systematic" gendered "social phenomenon" driven by the United States (US) culture's imperative to objectify the female body (p. 55). This body objectification leads many girls and women to treat their bodies as a project that always requires attention and modification (Brumberg, 1997). Despite the relatively small amount of body image research in men compared to women, studies have demonstrated that men also experience body dissatisfaction (Cash, 2002; Olivardia, Pope, Borowiecki, & Cohane, 2004; Smolak, Murnen, & Thompson, 2005). In contrast to the drive for thinness in women (Wertheim, Paxton, & Blaney, 2008), men experience body dissatisfaction due to the drive for muscularity (Smolak & Murnen, 2008) and often engage in strategies to increase body muscle and size (McCreary & Sasse, 2000). Literature has clearly demonstrated that women in the US experience body dissatisfaction because of exposure to unrealistic beauty ideals portrayed in the media (Grogan, 2008), and that the drive for muscularity in men is most related to internalization of media ideals (Daniel & Bridges, 2010).

Women, in particular, often express said body image concerns through discussions in all-female groups, a phenomenon Nichter and Vuckovic (1994) termed "fat talk." They believe that US middle school girls engage in this dialogue as part of a social norm in order to be accepted by the group and to avoid appearing conceited (Nichter, 2000). Similarly, Britton, Martz, Bazzini, Curtin, and LeaShomb (2006) found that both male and female US university students

1
2
3
4 expect other women to respond with negative body talk in a fat talk discussion, suggesting the
5
6 existence and awareness of a fat talk social norm for women. Moreover, Martz, Petroff, Curtin
7
8 and Bazzini (2009) demonstrated that more US women report having heard fat talk and feel
9
10 more pressure to join in fat talk conversations compared to men. Yet there is no research
11
12 examining if this gender discrepancy is unique to US culture. It is possible that this phenomenon
13
14 of fat talk appears in the United Kingdom (UK; English), as the English report high levels of
15
16 body dissatisfaction and similar gender-specific weight concerns as in the US (Mautner, Owen,
17
18 & Furham, 2000; Wardle & Johnson, 2002). Considering that the fat talk norm has been
19
20 suggested as a possible function of, or a source of, body dissatisfaction in the US (Britton et al.,
21
22 2006; MacDonald Clarke, Murnen, & Smolak, 2010; Ousley, Cordero, & White, 2008; Stice,
23
24 Maxfield, & Wells, 2003; Tucker, Martz, Curtin, & Bazzini, 2007), it is imperative to identify
25
26 fat talk that may be present in other countries. This study is the first to investigate fat talk outside
27
28 the US, specifically in the UK.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 Although Nichter (2000) purports that fat talk in US adolescent girls serves more
37
38 positive social and psychological functions and may help dispel body image dissatisfaction, fat
39
40 talk discourse can also have negative emotional consequences for women and perhaps for men.
41
42 For example, Stice et al. (2003) reported that when engaging in conversation with a confederate,
43
44 US women felt worse about their bodies after hearing a thin, attractive confederate talk
45
46 negatively about her body. Ousley et al. (2008) were the first to associate fat talk with disordered
47
48 eating. They surveyed randomly selected US male and female college students and were able to
49
50 compare students with either bulimia or eating disorder- not otherwise specified diagnoses to
51
52 students without eating pathology. They used a self-developed fat talk scale that assessed five
53
54 areas: self-comparison to ideal eating and exercise habits, fears of becoming overweight, how
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 eating and exercise habits compare to others, evaluations of others' appearances, and meal
5
6 replacements and muscle-building strategies. They found that students with an eating disorder
7
8 diagnosis reported spending more time engaging in each of the five fat talk areas compared to
9
10 the students without an eating disorder diagnosis. Thus, we see that verbal expressions of body
11
12 dissatisfaction are associated with temporary or lasting emotional problems for women and
13
14 perhaps men.
15
16
17

18
19 Similarly, MacDonald Clarke et al. (2010) developed a fat talk scale assessing 17
20
21 scenarios whereby a target female named "Naomi" converses with female friends and engages in
22
23 different forms of fat talk. Participants made frequency ratings as to how similar to Naomi they
24
25 would have responded in such scenarios. Positive psychometric properties were reported and
26
27 increased fat talk was associated with higher levels of fear of negative peer evaluation, body
28
29 shame, body surveillance, and eating disorder symptoms; higher levels of reported tendency to
30
31 silence one's thoughts, actions, and feelings; and higher levels of passive acceptance of sexism.
32
33 Higher levels of fat talk were negatively associated with a sense of empowerment and body
34
35 esteem. Thus, young women's reports of how often they would engage in fat talk were
36
37 associated with their personal body image and eating behavior.
38
39
40
41
42

43 Although men and women are aware that fat talk is normative for women in the US,
44
45 participants believe themselves to be immune to it. Britton et al. (2006) found a discrepancy
46
47 between how young US college women (and men) thought that others would respond to fat talk
48
49 versus how they would themselves respond. Both the male and female participants surmised that
50
51 a target female would conform to a group's fat talk; yet they themselves did not chose the fat talk
52
53 option over other conversational options for how they believed that they would respond in that
54
55 situation. Furthermore, there is emerging research suggesting alternative norms for female body
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 image. Women in today's society must choose between acknowledging personal shortcomings
5
6 against societal beauty standards, or risking social rejection by abandoning the beauty ideal in an
7
8 effort to be unique and to gain independence (Strahan et al., 2008). Through the use of
9
10 hypothetical conversations, Tompkins, Martz, Rocheleau, and Bazzini (2009) found that female
11
12 participants appreciated a target woman's self-accepting body talk more than fat talk in a
13
14 vignette about body image, suggesting an alternative norm of body acceptance that competes
15
16 with the known fat talk norm in the US.
17
18
19
20

21 Although it is thought that fat talk is a gendered phenomenon, to date only one study
22
23 (Martz et al., 2009) has investigated the likelihood of hearing fat talk and pressure to engage in
24
25 fat talk between females and males. Results indicated that adult US women experience a greater
26
27 likelihood of hearing fat talk and more pressure to engage in fat talk when compared to US adult
28
29 men (Martz et al., 2009). The present study aims to compare these same gender differences, but
30
31 to do so cross-culturally across participants from the US and the UK, and also to compare fat talk
32
33 with self-accepting and positive forms of body talk.
34
35
36
37

38 *Cross-Cultural Comparisons of Body Image*

39

40
41 Cross-cultural research on body image satisfaction has identified expected gender
42
43 patterns across multiple nations. For example, in a 22-country study of university students,
44
45 women were more likely to perceive themselves as overweight when compared to men,
46
47 regardless of their current Body Mass Index (BMI); and men were also less likely to feel
48
49 overweight or to attempt to lose weight, even when they were overweight or obese (Wardle,
50
51 Haase, & Steptoe, 2006). McElhone, Kearney, Giachetti, Zunft, and Martinez (1999) also
52
53 found that in European Union nations, only 31% of women were satisfied with their weight
54
55 compared to approximately half of men. These findings suggest that there are similar gender
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 differences in body dissatisfaction across cultures, thus prompting our investigation about how
5
6 the negative, self-accepting, and positive expressions of body image may arise in other
7
8 countries.
9

10
11 Specifically, there has been no research to date examining fat talk, self-accepting talk, or
12
13 positive talk in the UK, despite the high levels of body dissatisfaction reported in UK samples
14
15 (Wardle & Johnson, 2002). Eating behaviors in the UK have been associated with the perceived
16
17 attitudes and expressions of others, concepts that are likely linked to fat talk. For example, in UK
18
19 samples, the attitudes of others have been shown to be important predictors of drive for thinness
20
21 (Ahern, Bennett, & Hetherington, 2008) with social comparisons and perceived pressure to lose
22
23 weight influencing eating behaviors even in UK adolescents (Halliwell & Harvey, 2006). Gender
24
25 comparisons in the UK also yield interesting differences which reflect gender comparisons
26
27 identified in the US, with concerns about being overweight being more prevalent among UK
28
29 women compared to UK men, and with more women reporting that they feel overweight or are
30
31 trying to lose weight (Wardle & Johnson, 2002). Indeed, research from the UK suggests that
32
33 normal weight women are more likely to favor losing weight, while normal weight UK men are
34
35 more likely to prefer a slightly higher weight (Wardle & Johnson, 2002). This data from the UK
36
37 suggests that body dissatisfaction is a common phenomenon, is influenced by the perceived
38
39 attitudes and pressures of others, and is more prevalent among women.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Summary*

49

50
51 Although the US and the UK have similar levels of body image-related weight concerns
52
53 in comparison to other nations (Mautner et al., 2000; Wardle et al., 2006), to date there has been
54
55 no research examining gender comparisons or cross-cultural similarities or differences in fat talk
56
57 between the US and the UK, since all extant fat talk research has focused exclusively on US
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 samples. The present study therefore aimed to investigate these cross-cultural comparisons by
5
6 exploring the likelihood of hearing different forms of body talk and perceived pressure to join in
7
8 conversations concerning body talk among female and male university students in the UK and
9
10 the US. We used the same rudimentary scale as Martz et al. (2009) that assessed likelihood of
11
12 hearing three different forms of body talk (positive, self-accepting, and negative) in one's social
13
14 circles using a 5-point rating, as well as perceived pressure to engage in these three forms of
15
16 body talk using a 5-point rating. Past literature indicates that fat talk is a phenomenon associated
17
18 with women of "normal weight BMI" (see MacDonald Clarke et al., 2010; Nichter, 2000); yet it
19
20 is unknown how body size may influence fat talk. Hence, BMI was controlled for as a covariate
21
22 in this research. Given previously identified gender differences in fat talk and body
23
24 dissatisfaction (Martz et al., 2009; McElhone et al., 1999; Wardle et al., 2006), it was
25
26 hypothesized that, controlling for BMI, women in US would report a greater likelihood of
27
28 hearing and greater perceived pressure to engage in fat talk compared to US men (Hypothesis 1).
29
30 Additionally, considering research showing similar body image trends between individuals in
31
32 Western countries, it was hypothesized that, controlling for BMI, women in the UK would also
33
34 report a greater likelihood of hearing and greater perceived pressure to engage in fat talk
35
36 compared to UK men (Hypothesis 2). All cross-cultural analyses were exploratory.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Method

46 *Participants*

47
48 Researchers collected data from 231 students from the psychology participant pools
49
50 at midsized universities located in central England ($n = 93$; 72% women, 28% men) and the
51
52 southeastern US ($n = 138$; 73% women, 27% men). Prior to collecting data, researchers
53
54 gained ethical approval for each study (UK: Ethical Advisory Committee; US: Institutional
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Review Board). Demographic information is summarized in Table 1. The variables of BMI
5
6 and age were not normally distributed thus requiring nonparametric data comparisons. When
7
8 compared by gender, separate Mann-Whitney tests indicated no significant differences in
9
10 BMI between the UK and US samples, $U = 4463.00$, ns , $r = -.12$, nor were there any
11
12 differences in age, $U = 4851.50$, ns , $r = -.04$, suggesting reasonable matching in body size
13
14 and age which could have an impact on variables related to body talk. Matching the racial
15
16 demographics of both regions, most participants (89.24% English, 92.03% US) self-
17
18 identified their ethnicity as non-Hispanic white.
19
20
21
22

23 *Measures*

24
25
26 *Body talk survey (Appendix).* Participants completed a modified version of a
27
28 questionnaire previously used by Martz et al. (2009). This 29-item survey, entitled “University
29
30 Health” in the UK and “Perception of Body Image Among College Students” in the US, was
31
32 intended to assess body image concerns and opinions on societal beauty norms. The current
33
34 study examined six survey items embedded within the larger survey. These individual items
35
36 assessed the participants’ likelihood of hearing and perceived pressure to join in negative, self-
37
38 accepting, and positive body talk within group discussions.
39
40
41
42

43 *Body mass index (BMI).* Researchers measured the height and weight of English
44
45 participants. Participants in the US reported their height and weight on the questionnaire
46
47 described above. All height and weight data were converted into BMI scores (weight in
48
49 kilograms divided by height in meters squared; Centers for Disease Control and
50
51 Prevention, 2010).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Procedures

The current study was part of a larger project investigating health practices of university students in both the UK and the US. All participants received class research credit for taking part in the study. The procedures used were country-specific due to differing ethical review board policies. English students were emailed their consent forms and questionnaires according to university and departmental policy. Students completed the questionnaires in their own time and returned the consent forms and questionnaires to researchers for research credit. Trained research assistants then measured students' heights and weights in a private setting. US students received research credit after completing their questionnaires at a scheduled time in a university classroom setting consisting of 15 to 30 students per session. Students self-reported their height and weight at the end of the questionnaire.

Design

The current study used a quasi-experimental research design. The two quasi-independent variables were the participant's country of residence (UK or US) and the participant's gender, which was nested within each country. The six dependent variables were the likelihood of hearing and pressure to engage in each of the three types of body talk scenarios (negative, self-accepting, and positive). Since each participant completed ratings for each type of body talk, these three measures were considered a within-subjects variable for both likelihood of hearing and pressure to engage in the three forms of body talk.

Results

Mean scores for each subscale by gender and country are reported in Table 2. We used a 2 (gender) by 2 (country) repeated measures analyses of covariance (RM-ANCOVA) across type

of body talk (negative, self-accepting, positive) for both the likelihood and pressure variables with BMI as a covariate.

Likelihood of Hearing Body Talk

Results for likelihood of hearing body talk rendered a gender by country by type of talk interaction, Wilks' Lambda $F(2, 225) = 3.21, p = .042, \eta^2 = .028$. Because pairwise comparisons suggested significant differences whereby everyone reported a greater likelihood of hearing negative body talk ($M = 2.64$) than self-accepting talk ($M = 2.17$) with both of those more than positive talk ($M = 1.84$), $F(1, 226) = 9.88$, all p 's $< .001$, the gender by country interactions were explored further separately by each type of body talk. Since BMI was not a significant covariate in the former analysis, it was not added as a covariate for the following post-hoc analyses.

In order to examine our assumptions that US (Hypothesis 1) and UK (Hypothesis 2) women were more likely to hear negative body talk than US and UK men, a 2 (gender) by 2 (country) ANOVA for likelihood of hearing negative body talk was performed, yielding a significant main effect for gender, $F(1, 227) = 7.11, p = .008, \eta^2 = .030$, whereby women reported a higher likelihood of hearing negative talk compared to men. A 2 (gender) by 2 (country) ANOVA for likelihood of hearing self-accepting body talk yielded a main effect for country, $F(1, 227) = 10.2, p = .002, \eta^2 = .043$, whereby participants in the US had higher ratings ($M = 2.36$) compared to those in the UK ($M = 2.00$). A 2 (gender) by 2 (country) ANOVA for likelihood of hearing positive body talk yielded a main effect for country, $F(1, 227) = 7.32, p = .007, \eta^2 = .031$, with participants in the US reporting a greater likelihood of hearing positive body talk ($M = 2.00$) than those in the UK ($M = 1.70$). In sum, women in the US are most likely to hear all forms of body talk.

Pressure to Engage in Body Talk

The same RM-ANOVA for pressure to engage in body talk yielded a gender by country by type of talk interaction, Wilks' Lambda $F(2, 224) = 3.46, p = .033, \eta p^2 = .030$. Pairwise comparisons of the within subjects variable, type of talk, was significant, $F(1, 225) = 6.94, p = .009$, so each post-hoc pair was evaluated further. While pressure to engage in fat talk was higher ($M = 2.19$) than positive talk ($M = 1.93, p = .011$), and pressure to self-accept was higher ($M = 2.15$) than positive talk ($M = 1.93, p < .001$), there was no significant difference between pressure to fat talk and pressure to self-accept, $p = .663$.

Due to these collective differences, the gender by country interactions were explored separately for each type of body talk. To investigate our theory that US (Hypothesis 1) and UK (Hypothesis 2) women would be more likely to experience pressure to engage in negative body talk than US and UK men, a 2 (gender) by 2 (country) ANOVA for pressure to engage in negative body talk yielded a significant interaction, $F(1, 226) = 2.65, p = .012, \eta p^2 = .012$, whereby women reported higher levels of pressure to engage in negative body talk compared to men. The interaction with country was composed of similar means between men and women in the UK, but women in the US had higher scores than women in the UK, and men in the US had lower scores than men in the UK. A 2 (gender) by 2 (country) ANOVA for pressure to engage in self-accepting body talk yielded a main effect for country, $F(1, 227) = 10.7, p = .001, \eta p^2 = .045$, whereby men and women in the US reported more pressure ($M = 2.4$) than those in the UK ($M = 1.9$). A 2 (gender) by 2 (country) ANOVA for pressure to engage in positive body talk yielded no main or interaction effects. Overall, women from both countries were more likely than men to feel pressure to engage in negative body talk (Hypotheses 1 and 2). In

1
2
3
4 addition, US participants reported more pressure to engage in self-accepting body talk than did
5
6 UK participants.

7
8
9 *Gender by Country Comparisons of Those with Higher Levels of Likelihood of Hearing Body*
10
11 *Talk and Pressure to Engage in Body Talk*

12
13
14 In order to capture the college students for whom body talk was most salient, and to be
15
16 consistent with the Martz et al. (2009) methodology, responses for each variable were
17
18 dichotomized as high or low on likelihood of hearing and pressure to join in each type of body
19
20 talk. Participants who answered “frequently” or “very frequently” were categorized as having
21
22 a “high” likelihood of hearing body talk, and those who reported “a lot” or “extreme” were
23
24 categorized as having “high” perceived pressure to engage in each type of body talk. The
25
26 percentage of participants who reported high levels of likelihood of hearing and perceived
27
28 pressure to join in each type of body talk are reported in Table 3.
29
30
31

32
33 Across countries, Chi-square analyses indicated that women were 4.29 times more likely
34
35 to report high levels of exposure to negative body talk than men, $\chi^2(1, N = 231) = 15.84, p <$
36
37 $.001$. Additionally, women in both countries were 3.86 times more likely to report high perceived
38
39 pressure to engage in negative body talk than men, $\chi^2(1, N = 231) = 7.28, p <$
40
41 $.01$. Within each
42
43 country, there were no significant differences between genders for exposure to, or pressure to
44
45 engage in, self-accepting or positive body talk. Yet, between countries US women and men were
46
47 6.39 times more likely to report pressure to join in self-accepting talk when compared to English
48
49 women and men, $\chi^2(1, N = 231) = 7.61, p <$
50
51 $.01$.
52

53 Discussion

54
55
56 Nichter and Vuckovic (1994) coined the term fat talk in the previous decade, yet only
57
58 formative research on the social psychological functions of fat talk or other forms of body talk
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 has been produced since then. Given the negative association between fat talk and well-being, it
5
6 seems imperative that researchers study this phenomenon more extensively. Previously
7
8 published studies have focused almost exclusively on girls or women in the US. This study
9
10 advances our understanding of gender differences in familiarity with and pressure to engage in
11
12 fat talk, with unique cross-cultural comparisons between university participants in the US and the
13
14 UK. As expected, our results suggest that fat talk is a more feminine, rather than masculine,
15
16 conversational phenomenon for university students and appears to be more common in both
17
18 countries than self-accepting or positive body talk. Cross-culturally, we found that US men and
19
20 women reported more exposure to and pressure to engage in self-accepting body talk than
21
22 English men and women, and US men and women reported more exposure to positive body talk
23
24 than English men and women. These findings are important because they expand our
25
26 understanding of body dissatisfaction by illustrating how English and US men and women differ.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 The gender discrepancy identified here is consistent with the Martz et al. (2009) study of
35
36 an age-representative sample of US adults. Notably, in this study, 51% of English women and
37
38 39.6% of US women reported “frequently” or “very frequently” hearing fat talk, compared to
39
40 4% of English and 21.6% of US men. Though both US women and men assumed fat talk to be a
41
42 normative response for women (Britton et al., 2006), only 21% of women surveyed reported
43
44 personally experiencing “a lot” or “extreme” pressure to engage in negative body talk.
45
46
47

48
49 Such gender differences were not surprising, as previous research has demonstrated that
50
51 US men often report experiencing less body dissatisfaction than women (Feingold & Mazzella,
52
53 1998; Pruzinsky & Cash, 2002). Similarly, research on body image in the UK indicates that
54
55 British men were less likely to perceive themselves as overweight or to attempt to lose weight,
56
57 compared to women, regardless of their actual weight (Wardle & Johnson, 2002). With regard
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 to fat talk, research suggests that few US men report feeling pressure to engage in fat talk,
5
6 though they report some exposure to fat talk discussions (Martz et al., 2009). This is the first
7
8 study to demonstrate that, as in the US, English women are significantly more familiar with
9
10 hearing fat talk and feel more pressure to engage in such conversation compared to English
11
12 men. While these findings may be related to body dissatisfaction differences between men and
13
14 women, they may also reflect social norm differences with men perceiving less pressure to talk
15
16 about their body fat and women feeling more pressure to engage in fat talk because other
17
18 women are engaged in such discussions. Future research should examine how actual weight or
19
20 BMI and body image dissatisfaction interact with cultural factors in predicting varied forms of
21
22 body talk.
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 When considering these findings, it is important to note that though men may not report
30
31 pressure to engage in fat talk, and though they may report less body dissatisfaction in general as
32
33 compared to women, recent research has demonstrated that men are experiencing increasing
34
35 levels of body dissatisfaction (Cash, 2002; Olivardia et al., 2004; Smolak et al., 2005). In
36
37 contrast to females, men of low BMI are at greatest risk for body dissatisfaction and are more
38
39 likely to engage in behaviors to increase muscularity (Jones & Crawford, 2006; Smolak et al.,
40
41 2005). McCreary and Sasse (2000) found that males had a higher drive for muscularity than
42
43 females, that this drive was related to strategies to increase body muscle and size, and that the
44
45 drive for muscularity was unrelated to the drive for thinness. When considering that males
46
47 experience body dissatisfaction for largely differing reasons than females (muscularity vs.
48
49 thinness), it is understandable that men would report hearing little fat talk in group
50
51 conversations, and report even less pressure to engage in fat talk. Instead, they likely engage in
52
53 conversations about muscularity, as demonstrated by Jones and Crawford (2006), who assessed
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 males' and females' appearance conversations and body talk among friends. Interestingly, they
5
6 found that males talk with their friends about muscle building more often than females discuss
7
8 dieting with their friends (but not more often than general appearance discussions among
9
10 females). Future research on the pressure felt by males and females to engage in various types of
11
12 body talk should assess and consider the types of body talk most commonly used by each
13
14 gender. Moreover, future research is needed to determine the predictors and consequences of
15
16 "muscularity talk" in men, as fat talk in women has been a primary focus of body talk research
17
18 in recent years.
19
20
21
22

23
24 When comparing the cross-cultural results of this study, US participants reported more
25
26 pressure to engage in self-accepting talk than English participants. In fact, 11.9% of US women
27
28 and 16.2% of US men reported high pressure to engage in self-accepting body talk, compared to
29
30 1.5% of English women and 4.0% of English men. Thus, US participants were 6.39 times more
31
32 likely to report pressure to join in self-accepting body talk than were English participants. As
33
34 ethnographic research has previously demonstrated that middle school girls who deviate from the
35
36 norm of negative body talk may be judged as conceited (Nichter, 2000), perhaps this finding
37
38 reflects varying levels of cross-cultural standards for confidence and modesty and perhaps
39
40 developmental effects as younger people progress into adulthood. Future research should further
41
42 examine this finding to determine if these cultural differences are unique to more positive forms
43
44 of body talk or are part of a more global cultural communication pattern (e.g. people in the US
45
46 are expected to express confidence whereas English are expected to express humility).
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The above finding supports the existence of newly discovered norms for US
54
55 women to express fat talk and/or self-acceptance of their bodies in social conversations
56
57 (Tompkins et al., 2009). In fact, US women seem to struggle with a conflict between two
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 cultural standards: one that represents a traditional feminine role of being nurturing and
5
6 inclusive (Jost & Kay, 2005), and one increasingly popular role that represents
7
8 independence and uniqueness (Crocker, Luhtanen, Cooper, & Bouvrette, 2003; Markus &
9
10 Kitayama, 1991; Strahan et al., 2008). Recently, researchers in the US have explored self-
11
12 accepting body talk and positive body image (Wood-Barcalow, Tylka, & Augustus-
13
14 Horvath, 2010). Women in the US may feel more pressure to engage in self-accepting
15
16 body talk due to the recent importance placed on female independence and body image
17
18 acceptance in the US, whereas such pressure may not be as salient in the UK. In the
19
20 future, researchers may wish to examine how cultural context affects exposure to such
21
22 conversations and in what situations people experience pressure to engage in either form
23
24 of body image dialogue.
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 While extending our understanding of cultural similarities in body talk between the UK
32
33 and the US, the present study has limitations. Research on fat talk is in its infancy and there is
34
35 no scientific consensus on how best to measure any form of body talk. We used the same survey
36
37 as Martz et al. (2009); yet the real world validity of these hypothetical vignettes is unknown.
38
39 Moreover, MacDonald Clarke et al. (2010) have a validated measure of fat talk developed for
40
41 female participants, but its ability to accurately tap into gender differences is unknown. We
42
43 believe that additional ethnographic research would likely increase the validity of future fat talk
44
45 measures. This research is also limited by the fact that the types of body talk were not
46
47 counterbalanced and that UK BMI was measured, whereas US BMI was self-reported. In
48
49 addition, because all participants were university aged, it is unknown if these results are
50
51 generalizable to other ages. Additional research examining non-university participants would be
52
53 helpful in advancing our understanding of the development of body talk across the lifespan.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Additionally, although we used our measure to ascertain gender comparisons, our measure of
5
6 body talk has not been systematically developed in a way to ensure its validity for women, for
7
8 men, and especially not direct comparisons between the genders. For example, there was
9
10 nothing in the body talk scale tapping into concerns about muscularity.
11
12

13
14 Overall, this research suggests that fat talk appears to have a presence in both countries
15
16 with women reporting more familiarity and pressure to engage in this type of dialogue compared
17
18 to men. Although this study provides unique evidence for fat talk in England, future work is
19
20 needed to understand the lower levels of pressure to engage in self-accepting body talk reported
21
22 by English students. Given recent documentation of pressures for self-acceptance in the US
23
24 (Tompkins et al., 2009), further research should investigate the presence or absence of a similar
25
26 trend in the UK, while also studying the reasons for why these seemingly competing norms
27
28 emerge. In addition, research is needed to understand why fat talk appears to be a feminine form
29
30 of discourse. Perhaps fat talk is a normal female conversational style emphasizing the disclosure
31
32 of personal information, while demonstrating personal modesty, and showing reassurance and
33
34 support in friendships, each embedded in a culture that objectifies the female body (Carli, 1982;
35
36 Dindia & Allen, 1992; Eagly, 1987; Janoff-Bulman & Wade, 1996; McKinley, 2002; Tannen,
37
38 1990). Note the finding, however, that these participants reported having heard more fat talk than
39
40 they felt compelled to engage in it, which is consistent with the Martz et al. (2009) study of an
41
42 age-representative sample of US adults. In addition, Tompkins et al. (2009) discovered that
43
44 university females appreciated a target female more when she engaged in positive body talk as
45
46 opposed to fat talk. Perhaps our cultures are locked into thinking that women “should” engage in
47
48 fat talk in order to be liked and accepted in female social circles, yet we really respect and would
49
50 prefer hearing more positive talk, knowing that positive attitudes about one’s body might foster
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 higher self-worth and general well-being. Future research should explore this possible
5
6 discrepancy more thoroughly with the ultimate goals of reducing fat talk, encouraging more self-
7
8 accepting body talk, and improving female body image and self-esteem, thereby reducing
9
10 vulnerability for eating disorders.
11
12

13
14 Considering our findings of cross-cultural similarities between the UK and the US by
15
16 gender for fat talk and the national difference in pressure to self-accept one's body image,
17
18 additional cross-cultural research, beyond the UK and the US, should continue to investigate
19
20 the various verbal expressions of body image. Currently, we do not know how cultural norms
21
22 relate to body ideals or how body image interacts with actual body sizes to form conversational
23
24 strategies in varied cultural contexts. Further cross-cultural research on body talk would enrich
25
26 our understanding of cultural similarities and differences.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- Ahern, A. L., Bennett, K. M., & Hetherington, M. M. (2008). Internalization of the ultra-thin ideal: Positive implicit associations with underweight fashion models are associated with drive for thinness in young women. *Eating Disorders, 16*, 294-307.
- Britton, L. E., Martz, D. M., Bazzini, D. G., Curtin, L. A., & LeaShomb, A. (2006). Fat talk and self-presentation of body image: Is there a social norm for women to self-degrade? *Body Image, 3*, 247-254.
- Brumberg, J. J. (1997). *The body project: An intimate history of American girls*. New York: Random House.
- Carli, L. L. (1982). *Are women more social and men more task oriented? A meta-analytic review of sex differences in group interaction, reward allocation, coalition formation, and cooperation in the Prisoner's Dilemma game*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Cash, T. F. (2002). A "negative body image": Evaluating epidemiological evidence. In T. F. Cash & T. Pruzinsky (Eds.), *Body image: A handbook of theory, research, and clinical practice* (pp. 269–276). New York: Guilford.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2010). Healthy weight- it's not a diet, it's a lifestyle. Atlanta, GA: Author. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/adult_bmi/index.html
- Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R. K., Cooper, M. L., & Bouvrette, A. (2003). Contingencies of self-worth in college students: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 894-908.

- 1
2
3
4 Daniel, S., & Bridges, S. K. (2010). The drive for muscularity in men: Media influences
5 and objectification theory. *Body Image, 7*, 32-38.
6
7
8
9 Dindia, K., & Allen, M. (1992). Sex differences in self-disclosure: A meta-analysis.
10
11 *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 106-124.
12
13
14 Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*.
15
16 Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
17
18
19 Feingold, A., & Mazzella, R. (1998). Gender differences in body image are increasing.
20
21 *Psychological Science, 9*, 190-195.
22
23
24 Grogan, S. (2008). *Body image: Understanding body dissatisfaction in men, women, and*
25
26 *children*. New York: Routledge.
27
28
29 Halliwell, E., & Harvey, M. (2006). Examination of a sociocultural model of disordered
30
31 eating among male and female adolescents. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 11*,
32
33 235-248.
34
35
36 Janoff-Bulman, R., & Wade, M. B. (1996). The dilemma of self-advocacy for women:
37
38 Another case of blaming the victim? *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 15*,
39
40 143-152.
41
42
43 Jones, D. C., & Crawford, J. K. (2006). The peer appearance culture during adolescence:
44
45 Gender and body mass variations. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 2*, 257-269.
46
47
48 Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender
49
50 stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal*
51
52 *of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 498-509.
53
54
55 MacDonald Clarke, P., Murnen, S. K., & Smolak, L. (2010). Development and
56
57 psychometric evaluation of a quantitative measure of “fat talk.” *Body Image, 7*, 1-7.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion,
5
6 and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*, 224-253.
7
8
- 9 Martz, D. M., Petroff, A. B., Curtin, L. A., & Bazzini, D. G. (2009). Gender differences in fat
10
11 talk among American adults: Results from the psychology of size survey. *Sex Roles*, *61*,
12
13 34-41.
14
15
- 16 Mautner, R. D., Owen, S. V., & Furnham, A. (2000). Cross-cultural explanations of body
17
18 image disturbance in western cultural samples. *International Journal of Eating*
19
20 *Disorders*, *28*, 165-172.
21
22
- 23 McCreary, D. R., & Sasse, D. K. (2000). An exploration of the drive for muscularity
24
25 in adolescent boys and girls. *Journal of American College Health*, *48*, 297-
26
27 304.
28
29
- 30 McElhone, S., Kearney, J. M., Giachetti, I., Zunft, H. J., & Martinez, J. A. (1999). Body image
31
32 perception in relation to recent weight changes and strategies for weight loss in a
33
34 nationally representative sample in the European Union. *Public Health Nutrition*, *2*, 143-
35
36 151.
37
38
- 39 McKinley, N. M. (2002). Feminist perspectives and objectified body consciousness. In T. F.
40
41 Cash & T. Pruzinsky (Eds.), *Body image: A handbook of theory, research, and clinical*
42
43 *practice* (pp. 55-62). New York: Guilford Press.
44
45
46
- 47 Nichter, M. (2000). *Fat talk: What girls and their parents say about dieting*. Cambridge,
48
49 MA: Harvard University Press.
50
51
- 52 Nichter, M., & Vuckovic, N. (1994). Fat talk. In N. Sault (Ed.), *Many mirrors: Body image and*
53
54 *social relations* (pp. 109-131). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Olivardia, R., Pope Jr., H. G., Borowiecki, J. J., & Cohane, G. H. (2004). Biceps and body
5
6 image: The relationships between muscularity and self-esteem, depression, and eating
7
8 disorder symptoms. *Psychology of Men and Muscularity, 5*, 112-120.
9
- 10
11 Ousley, L., Cordero, E. D., & White, S. (2008). Fat talk among college students: How
12
13 undergraduates communicate regarding food and body weight, shape, & appearance.
14
15 *Eating Disorders, 16*, 73-84.
16
17
- 18
19 Pruzinsky, T., & Cash, T. F. (2002). Understanding body images: Historical and contemporary
20
21 perspectives. In T. F. Cash & T. Pruzinsky (Eds.), *Body image: A handbook of theory,*
22
23 *research, and clinical practice* (pp. 3-12). New York: Guilford Press.
24
25
- 26
27 Smolak, L. & Murnen, S. K. (2008). Drive for leanness: Assessment and relationship to gender,
28
29 gender role and objectification. *Body Image, 5*, 251-260.
30
- 31
32 Smolak, L., Murnen, S. K., & Thompson, J. K. (2005). Sociocultural influences and muscle
33
34 building in adolescent boys. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 6*, 227-239.
35
- 36
37 Stice, E., Maxfield, J., & Wells, T. (2003). Adverse effects of social pressure to be thin
38
39 on young women: An experimental investigation of the effects of "fat talk." *International*
40
41 *Journal of Eating Disorders, 34*, 108-117.
42
- 43
44 Strahan, E. J., Lafrance, A., Wilson, A. E., Ethier, N., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. (2008).
45
46 Victoria's dirty secret: How sociocultural norms influence adolescent girls and
47
48 women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 288-301.
49
- 50
51 Swami, V., Frederick, D. A., Aavik, T., Alcalay, L., Allik, J., Anderson, D., et al., (2010). The
52
53 attractive female body weight and female body dissatisfaction in 26 countries across 10
54
55 world regions: Results of the international body project I. *Personality and Social*
56
57 *Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 309-325.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York:
5
6 Ballentine Books.
7
8
- 9 Tompkins, K. B., Martz, D. M., Rocheleau, C. A., & Bazzini, D. G. (2009). Social
10
11 likeability, conformity, and body talk: Does fat talk have a normative rival in female
12
13 body image conversations? *Body Image, 6*, 292-298.
14
15
- 16 Tucker, K. L., Martz, D. M., Curtin, L. A., & Bazzini, D. G. (2007). Examining “fat talk”
17
18 experimentally in a female dyad: How are women influenced by another woman’s
19
20 body presentation style? *Body Image, 4*, 157-164.
21
22
- 23 Wardle, J., Haase, A. M., & Steptoe, A. (2006). Body image and weight control in young
24
25 adults: International comparisons in university students from 22 countries. *International*
26
27 *Journal of Obesity, 30*, 644-651.
28
29
- 30 Wardle, J., & Johnson, F. (2002). Weight and dieting: Examining levels of weight
31
32 concern in British adults. *International Journal of Obesity Related Metabolic Disorders,*
33
34 *26*, 1144-1149.
35
36
37
- 38 Wertheim, E. H., Paxton, S. J., & Blaney, S. (2008). Body image in girls. In L. Smolak, & J. K.
39
40 Thompson (Eds.), *Body image, eating disorders, and obesity in youth* (2nd edition,
41
42 pp. 47-76). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
43
44
- 45 Wood-Barcalow, N. L., Tylka, T. L., & Augustus-Horvath, C. L. (2010). “But I like my body”:
46
47 Positive body image characteristics and a holistic model for young-adult women. *Body*
48
49 *Image, 7*, 106-116.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1

Demographic Summary by Nationality and Gender for Body Mass Index (BMI) and Age

Measure	English		US	
	Women ($n = 67$)	Men ($n = 26$)	Women ($n = 101$)	Men ($n = 37$)
	BMI			
Mean	22.34	24.04	23.75	24.54
Standard deviation	2.70	4.38	4.65	5.25
Minimum	18.00	18.84	15.81	16.74
Maximum	29.66	39.66	42.51	45.04
	Age			
Mean	18.85	18.88	19.73	20.60
Standard deviation	2.24	1.56	1.15	5.19
Minimum	18.00	18.00	19.00	19.00
Maximum	33.00	25.00	25.00	50.00

Note. BMI = weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010). When compared by gender, there were no significant differences between English and US participants.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Likelihood of Hearing and Pressure to Engage in Negative, Self-Accepting, and Positive Body Talk

Measure	English		US	
	Women ($n = 67$)	Men ($n = 26$)	Women ($n = 101$)	Men ($n = 37$)
Likelihood				
Negative	3.22 (1.06) _a	1.73 (0.78) _b	3.11 (1.19) _a	2.49 (1.02) _b
Self-accepting	1.99 (0.71) _c	1.96 (0.87) _c	2.26 (0.74) _d	2.46 (1.04) _d
Positive	1.54 (0.66) _c	1.81 (0.94) _c	1.95 (0.85) _d	2.05 (0.85) _d
Pressure				
Negative	2.48 (1.09) _a	2.00 (1.00) _b	2.65 (1.14) _a	1.65 (0.82) _b
Self-accepting	2.00 (0.80) _c	1.85 (0.88) _c	2.36 (0.98) _d	2.39 (0.99) _d
Positive	1.82 (0.98)	1.88 (0.91)	2.09 (0.95)	1.89 (0.91)

Note. Each subscale is based on a 5-point scale where higher numbers indicate greater likelihood or pressure. Significant differences between cells are indicated with a and b subscripts for gender and c and d subscripts for country using repeated measures ANOVA $p \leq .01$. Other differences were not significant.

Table 3

Percentage of Participants Reporting High Likelihood of Hearing and High Pressure to Engage in Negative, Self-Accepting, and Positive Body Talk

Measure	English		US	
	Women ($n = 67$)	Men ($n = 26$)	Women ($n = 101$)	Men ($n = 37$)
	High Likelihood			
Negative	51.0 _a	4.0 _b	39.6 _a	21.6 _b
Self-accepting	6.0	8.0	7.9	13.5
Positive	3.0	4.0	6.9	5.4
	High Pressure			
Negative	21.0 _a	12.0 _b	21.8 _a	2.3 _b
Self-accepting	1.5 _c	4.0 _c	11.9 _d	16.2 _d
Positive	6.0	4.0	8.9	5.4

Note. Significant differences between cells are indicated with a and b subscripts for gender and c and d subscripts for country using Chi-Square $p < .01$. Other differences were not significant.

Appendix

Fat Talk Scenario

Imagine you are in a group of friends/coworkers who were saying *negative* things about their bodies (For example, “My butt is fat”).

How likely would this scenario occur in your life?

Never	Sometimes	Usually	Frequently	Very Frequently
1	2	3	4	5

How much pressure would you feel to say *negative* things about your body in this group?

None	Maybe Some	Some	A Lot	Extreme
1	2	3	4	5

Self-accepting Scenario

Imagine you are in a group of friends/coworkers who were saying *self-accepting* things about their bodies (For example, “I feel okay about my body”).

How likely would this scenario occur in your life?

Never	Sometimes	Usually	Frequently	Very Frequently
1	2	3	4	5

How much pressure would you feel to say *self-accepting* things about your body in this group?

None	Maybe Some	Some	A Lot	Extreme
1	2	3	4	5

Positive Scenario

Imagine you are in a group of friends/coworkers who were saying *positive* things about their bodies (For example, “I really like my body”).

How likely would this scenario occur in your life?

Never	Sometimes	Usually	Frequently	Very Frequently
1	2	3	4	5

How much pressure would you feel to say *positive* things about your body in this group?

None	Maybe Some	Some	A Lot	Extreme
1	2	3	4	5

Dr. Tylka's comments:

1. Page 5: in the paragraph describing the MacDonald Clarke et al. study, delete "thought a target female" in the last sentence, so it reads "young women's reports of how often they would engage in fat talk were associated with their personal body image and eating behavior."

We have made this change.

2. Also, on page 8, could you replace "fat talk, hence BMI" with "fat talk. Hence, BMI"

We have made this change.

3. Page 17, should be "Martz et al. (2009); yet the real world"

We have made this change.