Title: A call for research exploring social media influences on mothers' child feeding practices and childhood obesity risk

Allison E. Doub, MS (Corresponding author)

Doctoral student

Department of Human Development and Family Studies

College of Health and Human Development

^aPennsylvania State University

aed5142@psu.edu

Meg Small, PhD

Assistant Director for Innovations and Social Change

Bennett Pierce Prevention Research Center for the Promotion of Human Development

^aPennsylvania State University

Leann L. Birch, PhD

William P. "Bill" Flatt Childhood Obesity Professor

Department of Foods and Nutrition

College of Family and Consumer Sciences

^bUniversity of Georgia

Corresponding author information:

Allison E. Doub, MS

Doctoral student

Department of Human Development and Family Studies

College of Health and Human Development

Pennsylvania State University

115 Health and Human Development

University Park, PA 16802

Phone: 717-658-3998

Fax: 814-863-7963

Email: aed5142@psu.edu

A call for research exploring social media influences on mothers' child feeding practices and childhood obesity risk

Abstract

There is increasing interest in leveraging social media to prevent childhood obesity, however, the evidence base for how social media currently influences related behaviors and how interventions could be developed for these platforms is lacking. This commentary calls for research on the extent to which mothers use social media to learn about child feeding practices and the mechanisms through which social media influences their child feeding practices. Such formative research could be applied to the development and dissemination of evidence-based childhood obesity prevention programs that utilize social media. Mothers are identified as a uniquely important target audience for social media-based interventions because of their proximal influence on children's eating behavior and their high engagement with social media platforms. Understanding mothers' current behaviors, interests, and needs as they relate to their social media use and child feeding practices is an integral first step in the development of interventions that aim to engage mothers for obesity prevention. This commentary highlights the importance of mothers for childhood obesity prevention; discusses theoretical and analytic frameworks that can inform research on social media and mothers' child feeding practices; provides evidence that social media is an emerging context for social influences on mothers' attitudes and behaviors in which food is a salient topic; and suggests directions for future research.

Keywords

Social media; Systems theory; Social network analysis; Social network theory; Social cognitive theory; Child feeding practices; Mothers

Introduction

For the past decade nearly one-in-five children in the United States have been classified as obese.¹ There is increasing evidence that the first five years of life are a critical period for childhood obesity prevention.^{2–5} Innovative research identifying modifiable risk and protective factors and potential intervention opportunities during infancy and early childhood is necessary to address this important public health issue.^{6,7} There is growing interest in leveraging social media for childhood obesity prevention due to the high prevalence of use. The use of social media platforms, such as Facebook,⁸ Twitter,⁹ and Instagram,¹⁰ has increased among online adults from 16% in 2006 to nearly 75% in 2014.¹¹ In this commentary, “social media” are defined as Internet-based platforms that allow users to create unique personal profiles, contribute and access searchable digital content (e.g., text, images, videos, hyperlinks to other webpages intended to inform, entertain, or sell products), form online relationships with other social media users, and view these social connections.¹² Social media platforms are accessible through Internet-connected devices including computers, tablets, and smartphones, which are continually increasing in user adoption.¹¹ Although social media may be an innovative setting for childhood obesity prevention initiatives, the evidence base for how social media currently influences behavior and how interventions could be developed for these platforms is lacking.^{13–15}

Systems frameworks of obesity development suggest factors within broader social and environmental contexts contribute to obesity risk.^{16–20} The attitudes and behaviors conveyed by family, peers, and media affect social norms and individual-level decisions related to food intake, physical activity, and body weight.^{21–25} Although the Internet and social media may influence numerous risk factors for childhood obesity (e.g., physical activity),^{26–28} this commentary serves as a specific call for research on the extent to which mothers use social media to learn about

child feeding practices and the mechanisms through which social media influences their child feeding practices. “Child feeding practices” are defined as attitudes and behaviors related to what to feed children (i.e. the types and portion sizes of food and beverages), how to feed children (e.g., restricting certain foods, responding to hunger and fullness cues), as well as the extent to which mothers model the consumption of a healthy diet.^{29–31} Formative research on mothers’ social media use and its influence on their child feeding practices could be applied to the development and dissemination of evidence-based childhood obesity prevention strategies that utilize social media.

To encourage researchers in the fields of public health, human development, and nutrition to pursue research on the extent to which mothers use social media to learn about child feeding practices and the mechanisms through which social media influences their child feeding practices, this commentary first highlights the importance of mothers for childhood obesity prevention. It then describes three theoretical and analytic frameworks that could inform research on child feeding practices in the context of social media. Next, the commentary provides evidence that social media platforms are increasingly adopted online social contexts in which food and eating behavior are salient topics. The commentary concludes by offering specific directions for future research.

Mothers’ Child Feeding Practices Influence Children’s Risk for Obesity

During infancy and early childhood, mothers (i.e. primary caregivers) have substantial control over children’s food choices, such as determining when, where, what, and how much children eat.^{32–34} On average, mothers spend more time than fathers on child feeding tasks, such as grocery shopping, preparing food, and eating with children, which suggests mothers are the primary nutritional gatekeepers in many households.³⁵ Previous studies have found associations

contribute to, the norms that exist within their social groups.¹⁷ Individual-level attitudes and behaviors are impacted by social norms, which are formed through explicit and implicit social influences.^{45,46} Explicit social influences are the observable beliefs, behaviors, and available opportunities in ones' social networks (e.g., awareness of others' public eating behaviors, expressed opinions, and opportunities to engage in certain behaviors). Implicit social influences are processes that are not explicitly cognitively processed and include mechanisms such as behavioral synchrony (e.g., eating when others are eating), adoption of implicit weight norms shared by ones' social group, or behavioral economic processes and biases. The media can also contribute to social norms through explicit and implicit mechanisms.⁴⁷ Media influences on child feeding practices are included in existing systems frameworks, however, the rapid growth of *social media* may require these models to be revised to include social media as a novel media context that can facilitate family, peer, and cultural influences on social norms.⁴⁸

Previous studies on the predictors of mothers' child feeding practices have primarily focused on individual-level factors including maternal demographic characteristics (e.g., education), mental health (e.g., depression, eating pathology), and weight status,^{49–53} or on children's weight status, appetitive traits and temperament.^{54–57} Studies that have examined social and environmental influences on child feeding practices have mostly been limited to the breastfeeding period. These studies suggest mothers' understanding of breastfeeding and the messages they receive about breastfeeding from their partners, family members, and peers impact their initiation and duration of breastfeeding.^{58–60} One unique study examined the association between advertisements for infant “hand feeding” in a popular parenting magazine (i.e. advertisements for infant formulas, cereals, and other solid foods) and breastfeeding rates in the United States between 1972-2000. The results suggested that when the frequency of hand

feeding advertisements increased, the rate of breastfeeding significantly decreased the following year.⁶¹ These studies offer some evidence that social and environmental influences can impact mothers' child feeding practices, however, research extending beyond the breastfeeding period and including social media as a new social context is needed.^{48,53}

Social Network Analysis and Theory

Social media platforms allow individuals to form and maintain social relationships over the Internet. Previous studies have found that in-person social networks can protect against or promote obesity depending on how the characteristics of the individual interact with those of his/her social group.^{62–64} To date, research has yet to examine the role of social media in creating and maintaining relationships that influence mothers' child feeding practices. Social network analysis is a relevant field of research concerned with the structure and function of relationships.^{65–67} A recent meta-analysis found interventions based on social network theory and delivered via social media were among those with the strongest effects on health-related behavior change.⁶⁸ Social network theory offers several principles of relationship (i.e. "tie") formation that could inform hypotheses about providers of information about child feeding practices to mothers on social media. Preferential attachment suggests individuals are more likely to form ties with other individuals who are already high connected in the network.⁶⁹ This implies social media "influencers" who have a large number of friends and followers are particularly important for determining the tone and content of conversations about topics related to child feeding practices, particularly mothers' brand preferences.⁷⁰

Homophily suggests relationships are more likely to form among individuals who share similar characteristics (e.g., similar demographic characteristics, attitudes, interests).⁷¹ One experimental study of relationship formation within an online exercise community found that

users established relationships based on similarities in physical characteristics including age, gender and body mass index, even though these traits were observable only through text (i.e. no photographs were included).⁷² In contrast, users did not form relationships, homophilous nor heterophilous, based on traits related to health values such as exercise goals.⁷² These findings suggest easily observable characteristics such as physical and demographic attributes may be more important than values about child health and nutrition in determining who is likely to connect on social media for information about child feeding practices.

Even though relationships on social media are somewhat more likely to form among individuals who share a geographic location,⁷³ mothers can access information that is shared by anyone over the Internet, presenting new opportunities for information diffusion, including the dissemination of evidence-based information. Social media platform features may influence the composition of mothers' online social networks. Platforms with features enabling more direct communication and reciprocated relationships among users such as Facebook may be more likely to encourage online relationships among individuals who have or previously had in-person contact (e.g., family members, peers from work, school, or leisure settings).^{74,75} Platforms that allow users to form unreciprocated ties, such as Twitter, Pinterest, Instagram, and blogs (i.e. User A can form a tie with User B but User B may or may not choose to form a tie with User A), may encourage ties among individuals who have not met in person.⁷⁴ The extent to which mothers are accessing reciprocal close ties (e.g., family, friends) versus unreciprocated distant ties (e.g., celebrities, brands, public health groups) for information about child feeding practices and how ties of each kind influence mothers' actual behavior is currently unknown.

Social Cognitive Theory

Social cognitive theory⁷⁶ offers several intrapersonal mechanisms through which social and

environmental factors, including social media, may influence mothers' child feeding practices. Social cognitive theory proposes individuals learn behaviors through selectively observing, remembering, and reproducing behaviors that are modeled and reinforced within social groups.⁷⁷ Factors such as social status and perceived similarity of the model to the observer affect the likelihood of acquiring behaviors through social learning.⁷⁶ Social cognitive theory is a commonly cited framework in health behavior change interventions delivered online (e.g., through websites and forums).⁷⁸ Social media may be an emerging context for social influence because it enables users to easily observe, contribute, and reinforce attitudes and behaviors within social groups. Social media is likely to facilitate social learning in ways that other online contexts do not, such as webpages that do not facilitate relationships or on which the source of information is unclear. Select functions of social media, potential mechanisms of social influence from a social cognitive framework, and platform specific terminology are described in Table 1.

Information shared on social media may help mothers learn about the social norms related to child feeding practices that exist within their social groups. These social norms may reinforce existing behaviors or promote behavior change such that mothers adjust their behavior to more closely resemble their online peers. A recent meta-analysis of experimental studies examining the influence of social norms on adult eating behavior found that observing or having prior knowledge of what foods other individuals had consumed influenced the types and amount of food participants consumed.⁷⁹ Viewing photos of food alone has been shown to activate areas of the brain associated with appetite^{80,81} and induce sensory specific satiety.⁸² Research is needed to identify the intrapersonal mechanisms through which exposure to information about child feeding practices influences mothers' attitudes and behaviors, including those proposed by social cognitive theory.

Social Media is an Emerging Context for Social Influence, Particularly for Mothers

The Internet and social media are increasingly used to facilitate social interactions and information exchange as they are integrated into school, work, home, and leisure contexts.⁸³ Internet use among adults increased from 66% in 2005 to 87% in 2014.⁸⁴ As of January 2014, Internet use did not differ significantly by gender, race, or community type (i.e. urban, suburban, rural), however it was significantly lower among older adults and those with less education and lower incomes.⁸⁵ Younger adults 18 to 49 years of age were highly engaged with the Internet and mobile technology: 93% to 97% used the Internet⁸⁵ and 74% to 83% used smartphones.⁸⁶

Individuals use social media platforms to maintain and build social relationships,⁷⁴ gather health information,²⁸ learn about current events,⁸⁷ and for entertainment.⁷⁴ Social media platforms are also used by companies for marketing purposes.^{88,89} In September 2014, 52% of adult Internet users had at least two social media profiles.⁹⁰ Facebook was the most popular platform, used by 71% of online adults overall and accessed daily by 70% of Facebook users.⁹⁰ There was some evidence of racial and ethnic disparities in social media use by platform, such that Twitter and Instagram were more highly used by Black and Hispanic adults, whereas Pinterest was more highly used by White adults.⁹⁰

Mothers are highly engaged with the Internet and social media and use these tools to seek information about parenting and child health.^{91–94} Mothers have also expressed interest in joining online communities focused on child health.⁹⁵ In 2014, women were more likely than men to use Facebook (77% vs. 66%), Pinterest (42% vs. 13%), and Instagram (29% vs. 22%).⁹⁰ In a similar pattern, mothers were more engaged with some social media platforms compared to fathers, including Facebook (81% vs. 66%), Pinterest (40% vs. 15%), and Instagram (30% vs. 19%).⁹⁶ Mothers were more likely than fathers to use social media to obtain parenting formation

and to receive social and emotional support on parenting issues.⁹⁶ Additionally, the majority of mothers of young children read blogs,⁹⁷ which are frequently updated personal webpages increasingly connected to other social media platforms through hyperlinks.^{12,98} Because it is clear that mothers are highly engaged with social media in the general areas of parenting and child health, research is needed to describe the content and delivery of information relevant to child feeding practices mothers are likely to obtain from these platforms.^{6,48}

Several Social Media Platforms Expose Users to Food-Related Digital Content

The volume, velocity, and variety of data generated on social media makes it challenging to quantify the amount of content dedicated to any given topic.⁹⁹ That said, there is preliminary evidence to suggest several social media platforms expose users to food-related digital content. Examples of food-related digital content that may be shared on social media platforms include text, images, and/or videos about meals consumed at home or away from home, food or beverage products and/or restaurant endorsements, and hyperlinks to recipes found on blogs or other websites containing recipes. Mothers who observe such content on social media may develop perceived social norms about the types and amount of food they should consume and feed to their children. Few studies have specifically looked at content specific to child feeding practices on social media, which is a critical next step to inform future research and intervention studies that aim to leverage social media for childhood obesity prevention. The following studies are examples of food-related research conducted across various social media platforms that can inform future studies specific to child feeding practices.

Pinterest is one social media platform that allows users to collect, share, and endorse information about food. Pinterest users create categorized groupings of images that are hyperlinked the original content source. Individually, the hyperlinked images are referred to as

“Pins.” As a categorized grouping, they are referred to as “Pinboards.”^{100–104} Hall and Zarro¹⁰² analyzed a random sample of 1,000 pins collected between February and March 2012 and found pins depicting food and beverages were the single largest category (15%). Pins depicting home and garden décor were the next largest category (14%), which may have contained images related to eating contexts such as kitchens and dining rooms. Blogs were the original content source for 45% of sampled pins, indicating these two social media platforms are closely connected.¹⁰² Ecommerce sites (i.e. webpages primarily intended to sell products) were the next most frequent source of original content (10%). This finding suggests Pinterest users are frequently exposed to food-related images and are often able to easily purchase products they see endorsed by other users. Mothers who use Pinterest may create and follow Pinboards that focus on child feeding topics (e.g., snacks for toddlers, family dinner recipes). Future studies should examine the extent to which mothers use Pinterest to obtain ideas about child feeding practices and the sources of information they draw upon to create their own Pinboards (e.g., friends, family, food bloggers). Research should also explore how Pinterest influences mothers’ attitudes and behaviors, such as the types of food brands they purchase and the types of recipes they prepare for their children.

Food blogs offer information about recipes, food products, and restaurants that may inform readers’ social norms regarding what and how much to eat. Food blogs written by mothers and focused specifically on child and family feeding may be particularly like to influence mothers’ child feeding practices; mothers may view food bloggers as domain experts and relatable social models and thus be more likely to take action on their recommendations.^{45,46} The types of recipes food bloggers prepare and the nutritional quality of those recipes could impact children’s dietary quality if mothers prepare recipes they obtain from food blogs. In a small study examining the

nutrition profiles of 96 recipes found on six general food blogs, Schneider et al.¹⁰⁵ found recipes were within one-third of the adult dietary reference intake for calories ($M = 516$ calories), but exceeded dietary recommendations for saturated fat and sodium content. Over one-third (38%) of sampled recipes were for vegetarian dishes, and these dishes were significantly lower in calories, saturated fat, and sodium than recipes that contained red meat or poultry.¹⁰⁵ Additional studies examining a larger sample of recipes and food blogs, particularly blogs created to appeal to mothers feeding young children, would provide further insight into the information about the types and portion sizes of foods endorsed for children's consumption on food blogs.

Twitter users share food-related content related to the main meals of the day, which suggests mothers who use Twitter may be exposed information relevant to eating behavior and child feeding practices even if they were not initially seeking it out when accessing the platform. Fried et al.¹⁰⁶ collected a sample of over 3.5 million tweets containing a selection of food-related labels (i.e. "hashtags") between October 2013 and May 2014. Among the sampled food-related hashtags, the most common hashtag was #dinner, found in 32% of collected tweets, followed by #breakfast (27%) and #lunch (26%). Less than 10% of tweets contained the remaining sampled hashtags: #brunch, #snack, #meal, and #supper. Twitter users may be sharing text, images, videos, or hyperlinks to webpages about what they consumed or plan to prepare for their meals along with these hashtags. Future studies should explore the amount of content that is relevant to child feeding practices by examining more domain specific hashtags such as #breastfeeding, #PickyEater, or #FamilyMeals. Future studies should also explore how receiving reinforcement for sharing content related to certain child feeding practices (e.g., rewarding a toddler with candy for good behavior or preparing family meals) influences the likelihood the behavior is sustained.

Facebook is another social media context in which mothers may be exposed to food-related

digital content, which may include food and beverage marketing. Food and beverage companies can use Facebook to advertise to users by creating company unique profiles (i.e. “pages”), which allow them to form online relationships with other users, contribute content (e.g., images, videos, games, giveaways, polls), and engage with other users (i.e. endorse their content and/or directly communicate).^{88,89} Freeman et al.⁸⁹ found over 277.5 million Facebook users from across the globe had endorsed (i.e. “liked”) food companies among their sample of 27 food company pages. Young adults 18 to 24 years of age were the most frequent group to endorse the sampled food company Facebook pages.⁸⁹ Facebook users can see the pages that members of their online social network (i.e. “friends”) have endorsed, which may establish social norms around the food brands and products mothers purchase for themselves and their children. Previous qualitative research has found mothers endorse companies as a source of information about parenting and child development, which suggests it is important to understand the quality of content companies provide to mothers who engage with their social media pages.⁹¹ Future studies should explore which food companies target mothers of young children on social media, as well as the characteristics of mothers who choose to engage with these companies on social media.

Conclusions and Future Directions

Childhood obesity remains a persistent health problem in the United States affecting nearly 20% of children.¹ Children who enter kindergarten overweight or obese are more likely to develop obesity in later childhood,² which underscores the importance of early prevention.⁵ To date, there is limited empirical evidence to inform the development of effective interventions that aim to leverage social media to prevent childhood obesity.¹⁴ This commentary draws upon various theoretical and analytic frameworks to propose social media is an emerging context for social influence on mothers’ child feeding practices, which have a proximal influence on

children's risk for obesity. Social network theory and social cognitive theory are relevant frameworks that could inform research on the mechanisms through which social media influences mothers' child feeding practices. Given that mothers are highly engaged with social media in the general areas of parenting and child health and these platforms contain food-related content, future studies should examine whether social media platforms such as Pinterest, Twitter, blogs, and Facebook influence child feeding practices. In particular, research is needed to explore how the content and delivery of information on social media attracts and engages mothers, prompts behavior change, and sustains behavior change to have a lasting impact on child feeding practices and children's risk for obesity.

One specific area of future research relates to how mothers build and maintain social networks to obtain information about child feeding practices on social media. Studies should explore how mothers form ties based on easily observable traits such as demographic characteristics or parenting stage (e.g., pregnancy, infancy, toddlerhood, school-aged) and more subtle characteristics such as attitudes toward child feeding practices. Previous research on naturally occurring ties on Twitter¹⁰⁷ and Pinterest,^{100,101} and experimental research on an online exercise community,⁷² suggest individuals form homophilous relationships, which may serve to maintain rather than change behavior. Research is needed to test how the structure and composition of social media relationships influence mothers' child feeding practices in combination with the information that is shared. Such research could guide the development of interventions that use social network concepts to promote positive child feeding practices. Potential intervention opportunities include engaging social media influencers to disseminate evidenced-based information and facilitating the formation of new ties that expose individuals to new information and social support for positive child feeding practices.^{13,15} This is a promising

avenue given the evidence that social network-based interventions have effectively promoted behavior change in related domains such as encouraging exercise¹⁰⁸ and weight loss.¹⁰⁹

Additionally, research should explore when mothers form their attitudes about infant and early childhood feeding practices and how the information they obtain on social media during that timeframe influences their attitudes and behaviors (e.g., during preconception, pregnancy, toddlerhood). Previous research on mothers' breastfeeding intention and duration found the majority of mothers decided whether to breastfeed prior to conception or during their first trimester of pregnancy¹¹⁰ and social support for breastfeeding was an important predictor of long-term breastfeeding intention (i.e. beyond 9-months).¹¹¹ A recent qualitative study found that while mothers and their partners used the Internet and social media to learn about pregnancy and receive social support, few could recall finding information about infant feeding from these sites.⁹¹ Research that explores how to deliver memorable and impactful information about child feeding practices during the timeframe when mothers' form their attitudes about child feeding is a critical next step for developing effective childhood obesity prevention programs.

Finally, studies are needed on the role of food companies and public health-oriented groups in informing mothers' child feeding attitudes and behaviors on social media. Even though government and non-profit groups are more likely promote evidence-based content than corporations,¹¹² they are less likely to have social media profiles or engage with other social media users (i.e. endorse their content or directly communicate) when they are represented on these platforms.¹¹³ Government, non-profit, and academic groups that are already attempting to use social media to prevent childhood obesity could offer insight into how evidence-based information about child feeding practices could be effectively disseminated by reporting on the successes and challenges of strategies they have used to engage users and share content.^{14,114}

There is growing enthusiasm to use large-scale data, including data collected from social media platforms, to address public health issues.¹¹⁵ Childhood obesity is a research area of public health importance that would benefit from studies using such data. Research on the extent to which mothers use social media platforms to learn about child feeding practices and the mechanisms through which social media influences their attitudes and behaviors is needed to determine how these highly accessed contexts could be manipulated to promote healthy and responsive child feeding practices. Integrating multiple frameworks of social influences on health behaviors, including systems theory, social network analysis, and social cognitive processes, is a useful approach for future research that aims to leverage social media for childhood obesity prevention.

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to the editor and reviewers whose comments helped to improve and clarify this manuscript. This material is based on work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE1255832. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. The authors have no conflicts of interests to disclose.

References

1. Ogden C, Carroll M, Kit B, Flegal K. Prevalence of childhood and adult obesity in the United States, 2011-2012. *JAMA*. 2014;311(8):806–14.
2. Cunningham SA, Kramer MR, Narayan KMV. Incidence of childhood obesity in the United States. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;370(5):403–11.
3. Druet C, Stettler N, Sharp S, Simmons RK, Cooper C, Smith GD, et al. Prediction of childhood obesity by infancy weight gain: an individual-level meta-analysis. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*. 2012 Jan;26(1):19–26.

- 369 4. Gillman MW, Ludwig DS. How early should obesity prevention start? *N Engl J Med*. 2013
370 Dec 5;369(23):2173–5.
- 371 5. Paul IM, Bartok CJ, Downs DS, Stifter CA, Ventura AK, Birch LL. Opportunities for the
372 primary prevention of obesity during infancy. *Adv Pediatr*. 2009;56(1):107–33.
- 373 6. Bentley ME, Johnson SL, Wasser H, Creed-Kanashiro H, Shroff M, Fernandez Rao S, et al.
374 Formative research methods for designing culturally appropriate, integrated child nutrition
375 and development interventions: an overview. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2014;1308(1):54–67.
- 376 7. Nader PR, Huang TT-K, Gahagan S, Kumanyika S, Hammond RA, Christoffel KK. Next
377 steps in obesity prevention: altering early life systems to support healthy parents, infants,
378 and toddlers. *Child Obes Print*. 2012 Jun;8(3):195–204.
- 379 8. Facebook [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.facebook.com/>
- 380 9. Twitter [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.twitter.com>
- 381 10. Instagram [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.instagram.com>
- 382 11. Pew Research Center. Three technology revolutions [Internet]. Pew Research Center's
383 Internet & American Life Project. [cited 2014 Dec 18]. Available from:
384 <http://www.pewinternet.org/data-trend/internet-use/connection-type/>
- 385 12. Kane GC, Alavi M, Labianca G (Joe), Borgatti SP. What's different about social media
386 networks? A framework and research agenda. *MIS Q*. 2014 Mar;38(1):275–304.
- 387 13. Shin H-S, Valente TW, Riggs NR, Huh J, Spruijt-Metz D, Chou C-P, et al. The interaction of
388 social networks and child obesity prevention program effects: The pathways trial. *Obesity*.
389 2014 Jun 1;22(6):1520–6.
- 390 14. Tobey LN, Manore MM. Social media and nutrition education: the food hero experience. *J*
391 *Nutr Educ Behav*. 2014 Mar;46(2):128–33.
- 392 15. Valente TW, Palinkas LA, Czaja S, Chu K-H, Brown CH. Social network analysis for
393 program implementation. *PLoS ONE* [Internet]. 2015 Jun 25 [cited 2015 Oct 6];10(6).
394 Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4482437/>
- 395 16. Davison KK, Birch LL. Childhood overweight: a contextual model and recommendations for
396 future research. *Obes Rev*. 2001;2(3):159–71.
- 397 17. Davison KK, Jurkowski JM, Lawson HA. Reframing family-centred obesity prevention
398 using the Family Ecological Model. *Public Health Nutr*. 2013 Oct;16(10):1861–9.
- 399 18. Hall KD, Hammond RA, Rahmandad H. Dynamic interplay among homeostatic, hedonic,
400 and cognitive feedback circuits regulating body weight. *Am J Public Health*. 2014 May
401 15;104(7):1169–75.

- 402 19. Harrison K, Bost KK, McBride BA, Donovan SM, Grigsby-Toussaint DS, Kim J, et al.
 403 Toward a developmental conceptualization of contributors to overweight and obesity in
 404 childhood: The Six-Cs Model. *Child Dev Perspect.* 2011;5(1):50–8.
- 405 20. Institute of Medicine (IOM). *Accelerating progress in obesity prevention: Solving the weight*
 406 *of the nation.* Washington, DC: National Academics Press; 2012.
- 407 21. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. In: Lange PAMV, Kruglanski AW, Higgins ET,
 408 editors. *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology: Volume One.* Thousand Oaks, CA,
 409 US: SAGE; 2012. p. 438–59.
- 410 22. Bandura A. Health promotion from the perspective of social cognitive theory. *Psychol*
 411 *Health.* 1998 Jul 1;13(4):623–49.
- 412 23. Hammond RA. Social influence and obesity. *Curr Opin Endocrinol Diabetes Obes.* 2010
 413 Oct;17(5):467–71.
- 414 24. Nestle M, Wing R, Birch L, DiSogra L, Drewnowski A, Middleton S, et al. Behavioral and
 415 social influences on food choice. *Nutr Rev.* 1998;56(5):50–64.
- 416 25. Rosenstock IM, Strecher VJ, Becker MH. Social learning theory and the Health Belief
 417 Model. *Health Educ Q.* 1988;15(2):175–83.
- 418 26. Eysenbach G, Powell J, Kuss O, Sa E-R. Empirical studies assessing the quality of health
 419 information for consumers on the world wide web: A systematic review. *JAMA.* 2002 May
 420 22;287(20):2691–700.
- 421 27. Eysenbach G. Medicine 2.0: Social networking, collaboration, participation, apomediation,
 422 and openness. *J Med Internet Res.* 2008 Aug 25;10(3):e22.
- 423 28. Pagoto S, Bennett GG. How behavioral science can advance digital health. *Transl Behav*
 424 *Med.* 2013 Sep;3(3):271–6.
- 425 29. Faith MS, Scanlon KS, Birch LL, Francis LA, Sherry B. Parent-child feeding strategies and
 426 their relationships to child eating and weight status. *Obes Res.* 2004 Nov;12(11):1711–22.
- 427 30. Gevers DWM, Kremers SPJ, de Vries NK, van Assema P. Clarifying concepts of food
 428 parenting practices. A Delphi study with an application to snacking behavior. *Appetite.*
 429 2014 Aug;79:51–7.
- 430 31. Musher-Eizenman D, Holub S. Comprehensive feeding practices questionnaire: Validation
 431 of a new measure of parental feeding practices. *J Pediatr Psychol.* 2007 Sep 1;32(8):960–
 432 72.
- 433 32. Anzman SL, Rollins BY, Birch LL. Parental influence on children’s early eating
 434 environments and obesity risk: implications for prevention. *Int J Obes.* 2010
 435 Jul;34(7):1116–24.

- 436 33. Birch LL, Fisher JO. Development of eating behaviors among children and adolescents.
437 Pediatrics. 1998 Mar;101(3 Pt 2):539–49.
- 438 34. Gable S, Lutz S. Household, parent, and child contributions to childhood obesity. *Fam Relat.*
439 2000;49(3):293–300.
- 440 35. Bureau of Labor Statistics. American time use survey - 2012 results [Internet]. 2013.
441 Available from: <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/atus.nr0.htm>
- 442 36. Gerards SMPL, Kremers SPJ. The role of food parenting skills and the home food
443 environment in children's weight gain and obesity. *Curr Obes Rep.* 2015;1–7.
- 444 37. Chaidez V, McNiven S, Vosti SA, Kaiser LL. Sweetened food purchases and indulgent
445 feeding are associated with increased toddler anthropometry. *J Nutr Educ Behav.* 2014
446 Jul;46(4):293–8.
- 447 38. Rodgers RF, Paxton SJ, Massey R, Campbell KJ, Wertheim EH, Skouteris H, et al. Maternal
448 feeding practices predict weight gain and obesogenic eating behaviors in young children: a
449 prospective study. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2013 Jan;10(1):24–33.
- 450 39. Wehrly SE, Bonilla C, Perez M, Liew J. Controlling parental feeding practices and child
451 body composition in ethnically and economically diverse preschool children. *Appetite.*
452 2014 Feb 1;73:163–71.
- 453 40. Entin A, Kaufman-Shriqui V, Naggan L, Vardi H, Shahar DR. Parental feeding practices in
454 relation to low diet quality and obesity among LSES children. *J Am Coll Nutr.* 2014 Jul
455 4;33(4):306–14.
- 456 41. Gregory JE, Paxton SJ, Brozovic AM. Maternal feeding practices predict fruit and vegetable
457 consumption in young children. Results of a 12-month longitudinal study. *Appetite.* 2011
458 Aug;57(1):167–72.
- 459 42. Paul IM, Williams JS, Anzman-Frasca S, Beiler JS, Makova KD, Marini ME, et al. The
460 Intervention Nurses Start Infants Growing on Healthy Trajectories (INSIGHT) study. *BMC*
461 *Pediatr.* 2014;14:184.
- 462 43. Waters E, de Silva Sanigorski A, Hall BJ, Brown T, Campbell KJ, Gao Y, et al. Interventions
463 for preventing obesity in children (review). *Cochrane Collab.* 2011 Jan 1;(12):1–212.
- 464 44. Skinner AC, Foster EM. Systems science and childhood obesity: A systematic review and
465 new directions. *J Obes.* 2013 Apr 23;2013:e129193.
- 466 45. Higgs S. Social norms and their influence on eating behaviours. *Appetite* [Internet]. 2015
467 [cited 2014 Dec 1]; Available from:
468 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0195666314005017>
- 469 46. Higgs S, Thomas J. Social influences on eating. *Curr Opin Behav Sci.* 2016;9:1–6.

- 470 47. Lapinski MK, Rimal RN. An explication of social norms. *Commun Theory*. 2005 May
471 1;15(2):127–47.
- 472 48. Li JS, Barnett TA, Goodman E, Wasserman RC, Kemper AR. Approaches to the prevention
473 and management of childhood obesity: The role of social networks and the use of social
474 media and related electronic technologies. A scientific statement from the American Heart
475 Association. *Circulation*. 2013 Jan 15;127(2):260–7.
- 476 49. Blissett J, Haycraft E. Parental eating disorder symptoms and observations of mealtime
477 interactions with children. *J Psychosom Res*. 2011 Apr;70(4):368–71.
- 478 50. Cachelin FM, Thompson D. Predictors of maternal child-feeding practices in an ethnically
479 diverse sample and the relationship to child obesity. *Obes Silver Spring Md*. 2013
480 Aug;21(8):1676–83.
- 481 51. Francis LA, Hofer SM, Birch LL. Predictors of maternal child-feeding style: Maternal and
482 child characteristics. *Appetite*. 2001 Dec;37(3):231–43.
- 483 52. Haycraft EL, Blissett JM. Maternal and paternal controlling feeding practices: reliability and
484 relationships With BMI. *Obesity*. 2008;16(7):1552–8.
- 485 53. McPhie S, Skouteris H, Daniels L, Jansen E. Maternal correlates of maternal child feeding
486 practices: A systematic review. *Matern Child Nutr*. 2014 Jan;10(1):18–43.
- 487 54. Blissett J, Farrow C. Predictors of maternal control of feeding at 1 and 2 years of age. *Int J*
488 *Obes*. 2007 Oct;31(10):1520–6.
- 489 55. Carnell S, Benson L, Driggin E, Kolbe L. Parent feeding behavior and child appetite:
490 Associations depend on feeding style. *Int J Eat Disord*. 2014;47(7):705–9.
- 491 56. Haycraft E, Blissett J. Predictors of paternal and maternal controlling feeding practices with
492 2- to 5-year-old children. *J Nutr Educ Behav*. 2012 Sep;44(5):390–7.
- 493 57. Webber L, Cooke L, Hill C, Wardle J. Child adiposity and maternal feeding practices: A
494 longitudinal analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2010 Dec 1;92(6):1423–8.
- 495 58. Cameron AJ, Hesketh K, Ball K, Crawford D, Campbell KJ. Influence of peers on
496 breastfeeding discontinuation among new parents: The Melbourne InFANT Program.
497 *Pediatrics*. 2010 Aug 2;126(23):e1–7.
- 498 59. Rempel LA, Rempel JK. Partner influence on health behavior decision-making: Increasing
499 breastfeeding duration. *J Soc Pers Relatsh*. 2004 Feb 1;21(1):92–111.
- 500 60. Street DJ, Lewallen LP. The influence of culture on breast-feeding decisions by African
501 American and white women. *J Perinat Neonatal Nurs*. 2013 Mar;27(1):43–51.
- 502 61. Foss KA, Southwell BG. Infant feeding and the media: the relationship between Parents'
503 Magazine content and breastfeeding, 1972–2000. *Int Breastfeed J*. 2006 Apr 30;1(1):10.

- 504 62. Christakis NA, Fowler JH. The spread of obesity in a large social network over 32 years. *N*
505 *Engl J Med*. 2007;357(4):370–9.
- 506 63. Cohen-Cole E, Fletcher JM. Is obesity contagious? Social networks vs. environmental
507 factors in the obesity epidemic. *J Health Econ*. 2008 Sep;27(5):1382–7.
- 508 64. Leahey TM, Doyle CY, Xu X, Bihuniak J, Wing RR. Social networks and social norms are
509 associated with obesity treatment outcomes. *Obes Silver Spring Md*. 2015 Aug;23(8):1550–
510 4.
- 511 65. Kadushin C. *Understanding Social Networks: Theories, Concepts, and Findings*. Oxford
512 University Press, USA; 2012. 266 p.
- 513 66. Wasserman S, Faust kath. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and applications*. 19th ed.
514 Cambridge University Press; 1994. 852 p.
- 515 67. Wellman B, Berkowitz SD. *Social structures: a network approach*. Cambridge, New York:
516 Cambridge University Press; 1988. 532 p.
- 517 68. Laranjo L, Arguel A, Neves AL, Gallagher AM, Kaplan R, Mortimer N, et al. The influence
518 of social networking sites on health behavior change: a systematic review and meta-
519 analysis. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2015 Jan 1;22(1):243–56.
- 520 69. Newman MEJ. Clustering and preferential attachment in growing networks. *Phys Rev E*.
521 2001 Jul 26;64(2):025102.
- 522 70. Goodman MB, Booth N, Matic JA. Mapping and leveraging influencers in social media to
523 shape corporate brand perceptions. *Corp Commun Int J*. 2011 Aug 9;16(3):184–91.
- 524 71. McPherson M, Smith-Lovin L, Cook JM. Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks.
525 *Annu Rev Sociol*. 2001;27:415–44.
- 526 72. Centola D, van de Rijt A. Choosing your network: Social preferences in an online health
527 community. *Soc Sci Med*. 2015 Jan;125:19–31.
- 528 73. Takhteyev Y, Gruzd A, Wellman B. Geography of Twitter networks. *Soc Netw*. 2012
529 Jan;34(1):73–81.
- 530 74. Ellison NB, boyd danah m. Sociality through social network sites. In: Dutton WH, editor.
531 *The Oxford Handbook of Internet Studies*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press;
532 2013. p. 151–72.
- 533 75. Sosik VS, Bazarova NN. Relational maintenance on social network sites: How Facebook
534 communication predicts relational escalation. *Comput Hum Behav*. 2014 Jun;35:124–31.
- 535 76. Bandura A. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood
536 Cliffs, NJ, US: Prentice-Hall, Inc; 1986. 617 p.

- 537 77. Fryling MJ, Johnston C, Hayes LJ. Understanding observational learning: An interbehavioral
538 approach. *Anal Verbal Behav.* 2011;27(1):191–203.
- 539 78. Webb TL, Joseph J, Yardley L, Michie S. Using the internet to promote health behavior
540 change: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the impact of theoretical basis, use of
541 behavior change techniques, and mode of delivery on efficacy. *J Med Internet Res.*
542 2010;12(1):e4.
- 543 79. Robinson E, Thomas J, Aveyard P, Higgs S. What everyone else is eating: a systematic
544 review and meta-analysis of the effect of informational eating norms on eating behavior. *J*
545 *Acad Nutr Diet.* 2014 Mar 1;114(3):414–29.
- 546 80. Frank S, Laharnar N, Kullmann S, Veit R, Canova C, Hegner YL, et al. Processing of food
547 pictures: Influence of hunger, gender and calorie content. *Brain Res.* 2010 Sep 2;1350:159–
548 66.
- 549 81. van Meer F, van der Laan LN, Adan RAH, Viergever MA, Smeets PAM. What you see is
550 what you eat: An ALE meta-analysis of the neural correlates of food viewing in children
551 and adolescents. *NeuroImage.* 2015 Jan 1;104:35–43.
- 552 82. Larson JS, Redden JP, Elder RS. Satiation from sensory simulation: Evaluating foods
553 decreases enjoyment of similar foods. *J Consum Psychol.* 2014 Apr;24(2):188–94.
- 554 83. Pew Research Center. Digital life in 2025 [Internet]. Pew Research Center's Internet &
555 American Life Project; 2014 Mar [cited 2014 Dec 19]. Available from:
556 <http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/03/11/digital-life-in-2025/>
- 557 84. Pew Research Center. Internet use over time [Internet]. Pew Research Center's Internet &
558 American Life Project. 2014 [cited 2014 Dec 19]. Available from:
559 <http://www.pewinternet.org/data-trend/internet-use/internet-use-over-time/>
- 560 85. Pew Research Center. Internet user demographics [Internet]. Pew Research Center's Internet
561 & American Life Project. 2014 [cited 2015 Feb 21]. Available from:
562 <http://www.pewinternet.org/data-trend/internet-use/latest-stats/>
- 563 86. Pew Research Center. Cell phone and smartphone ownership demographics [Internet]. Pew
564 Research Center's Internet & American Life Project. 2014 [cited 2015 Jan 9]. Available
565 from: [http://www.pewinternet.org/data-trend/mobile/cell-phone-and-smartphone-](http://www.pewinternet.org/data-trend/mobile/cell-phone-and-smartphone-ownership-demographics/)
566 [ownership-demographics/](http://www.pewinternet.org/data-trend/mobile/cell-phone-and-smartphone-ownership-demographics/)
- 567 87. Purcell K, Rainie L, Mitchell A, Rosenstiel T, Olmstead K. Understanding the participatory
568 news consumer [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2014 Oct 30]. Available from:
569 <http://www.pewinternet.org/2010/03/01/understanding-the-participatory-news-consumer/>
- 570 88. Constantinides E, Fountain SJ. Web 2.0: Conceptual foundations and marketing issues. *J*
571 *Direct Data Digit Mark Pract.* 2008;9(3):231–44.

- 572 89. Freeman B, Kelly B, Baur L, Chapman K, Chapman S, Gill T, et al. Digital junk: food and
573 beverage marketing on Facebook. *Am J Public Health*. 2014 Dec 1;104(12):e56–64.
- 574 90. Duggan M, Ellison NB, Lampe C, Lenhart a, Madden M. Social media update 2014
575 [Internet]. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center’s Internet & American Life Project;
576 2015 [cited 2015 Jan 12]. Available from: [http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/09/social-](http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/09/social-media-update-2014/)
577 [media-update-2014/](http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/09/social-media-update-2014/)
- 578 91. Asiodu IV, Waters CM, Dailey DE, Lee KA, Lyndon A. Breastfeeding and use of social
579 media among first-time African American mothers. *J Obstet Gynecol Neonatal Nurs*. 2015
580 Mar 1;44(2):268–78.
- 581 92. Okdie BM, Ewoldsen DR, Muscanell NL, Guadagno RE, Eno CA, Velez JA, et al. Missed
582 programs (you can’t TiVo this one) why psychologists should study media. *Perspect*
583 *Psychol Sci*. 2014 Mar 1;9(2):180–95.
- 584 93. Dworkin J, Connell J, Doty J. A literature review of parents’ online behavior.
585 *Cyberpsychology J Psychosoc Res Cyberspace*. 2013;7(2).
- 586 94. Radey M, Randolph KA. Parenting sources: How do parents differ in their efforts to learn
587 about parenting? *Fam Relat*. 2009;58(5):536–48.
- 588 95. Mitchell SJ, Godoy L, Shabazz K, Horn IB. Internet and mobile technology use among urban
589 African American parents: Survey study of a clinical population. *J Med Internet Res*.
590 2014;16(1):e9.
- 591 96. Duggan M, Lenhart A, Lampe C, Ellison NB. Parents and social media [Internet]. Pew
592 Research Center; 2015 Jul. Available from:
593 <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/07/16/parents-and-social-media/>
- 594 97. McDaniel BT, Coyne SM, Holmes EK. New mothers and media use: associations between
595 blogging, social networking, and maternal well-being. *Matern Child Health J*. 2012
596 Oct;16(7):1509–17.
- 597 98. Park HW. Hyperlink network analysis: a new methods for the study of social structure on the
598 web. *Connections*. 2003;25(1):49–61.
- 599 99. Manovich L. Trending: The promises and challenges of big social data. In: Gold MK, editor.
600 *Debates in the Digital Humanities*. U of Minnesota Press; 2012. p. 463–75.
- 601 100. Chang S, Kumar V, Gilbert E, Terveen LG. Specialization, homophily, and gender in a
602 social curation site: Findings from Pinterest. In: *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference*
603 *on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing* [Internet]. New York, NY,
604 USA: ACM; 2014 [cited 2014 Dec 19]. p. 674–86. Available from:
605 <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2531602.2531660>
- 606 101. Gilbert E, Bakhshi S, Chang S, Terveen L. “I Need to Try This”? A statistical overview of
607 Pinterest. In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing*

- 608 Systems [Internet]. New York, NY, USA: ACM; 2013 [cited 2014 Feb 18]. p. 2427–36.
609 Available from: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2470654.2481336>
- 610 102. Hall C, Zarro M. Social curation on the website Pinterest.com. *Proc Am Soc Inf Sci*
611 *Technol.* 2013;49(1):1–9.
- 612 103. Mittal S, Gupta N, Dewan P, Kumaraguru P. Pinned it! A large scale study of the Pinterest
613 network. *J ACM* [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2014 Feb 5]; Available from:
614 http://precog.iiitd.edu.in/Publications_files/Pinterest-IKDD.pdf
- 615 104. Pinterest. All about Pinterest [Internet]. Help Center. [cited 2015 Mar 5]. Available from:
616 <https://help.pinterest.com/en/guide/all-about-pinterest>
- 617 105. Schneider EP, McGovern EE, Lynch CL, Brown LS. Do food blogs serve as a source of
618 nutritionally balanced recipes? An analysis of 6 popular food blogs. *J Nutr Educ Behav.*
619 2013 Nov;45(6):696–700.
- 620 106. Fried D, Surdeanu M, Kobourov S, Hingle M, Bell D. Analyzing the language of food on
621 social media. In 2014. Available from: [http://ec2-54-85-248-8.compute-](http://ec2-54-85-248-8.compute-1.amazonaws.com/main.pdf)
622 [1.amazonaws.com/main.pdf](http://ec2-54-85-248-8.compute-1.amazonaws.com/main.pdf)
- 623 107. Wu S, Hofman JM, Mason WA, Watts DJ. Who says what to whom on Twitter. In:
624 *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on World Wide Web* [Internet]. New
625 York, NY, USA: ACM; 2011 [cited 2014 Mar 4]. p. 705–14. Available from:
626 <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1963405.1963504>
- 627 108. Zhang J, Brackbill D, Yang S, Centola D. Efficacy and causal mechanism of an online
628 social media intervention to increase physical activity: Results of a randomized controlled
629 trial. *Prev Med Rep.* 2015;2:651–7.
- 630 109. Poncela-Casasnovas J, Spring B, McClary D, Moller AC, Mukogo R, Pellegrini CA, et al.
631 Social embeddedness in an online weight management programme is linked to greater
632 weight loss. *J R Soc Interface.* 2015 Mar 6;12(104):20140686.
- 633 110. Lawson K, Tulloch MI. Breastfeeding duration: Prenatal intentions and postnatal practices.
634 *J Adv Nurs.* 1995 Nov;22(5):841–9.
- 635 111. Rempel LA. Factors influencing the breastfeeding decisions of long-term breastfeeders. *J*
636 *Hum Lact.* 2004 Aug 1;20(3):306–18.
- 637 112. Adams SA. Revisiting the online health information reliability debate in the wake of “web
638 2.0”: an inter-disciplinary literature and website review. *Int J Med Inf.* 2010 Jun;79(6):391–
639 400.
- 640 113. Lovejoy K, Waters RD, Saxton GD. Engaging stakeholders through Twitter: How nonprofit
641 organizations are getting more out of 140 characters or less. *Public Relat Rev.* 2012
642 Jun;38(2):313–8.

- 643 114. Spring B, Gotsis M, Paiva A, Spruijt-Metz D. Healthy apps: mobile devices for continuous
644 monitoring and intervention. *IEEE Pulse*. 2013 Dec;4(6):34–40.
- 645 115. Kaplan RM, Riley WT, Mabry PL. News from the NIH: leveraging big data in the
646 behavioral sciences. *Transl Behav Med*. 2014 Sep 1;4(3):229–31.

Table 1. Select social media functions, potential mechanisms of social influence, and platform specific terminology

Function	Potential mechanism of social influence	Platform: Terminology
Form online relationships	Creates an online social network whose attitudes and behaviors are observable through social media activity (i.e. content contributions, endorsements, and direct communication); Homophilous and strong ties may reinforce existing behavior where as heterophilous or weak ties may encourage behavior change	Facebook: Friend (Profiles); Like (Pages) Twitter: Follow Pinterest: Follow Instagram: Follow Blogs: Follow via direct webpage visitation or Rich Site Summary (RSS) feed
Contribute and categorize/label content	Content may convey users' attitudes and behaviors and establish social norms within online communities	Facebook: Post; Hashtag Twitter: Tweet; Hashtag Pinterest: Pin; Hashtag; Pinboard names Instagram: Share; Hashtag Blogs: Post; Tag or category
Browse and search content	Exposes users to content that may reinforce existing attitudes and behaviors or introduce new attitudes and behaviors	Facebook: News Feed Twitter: Timeline Pinterest: Home Feed Instagram: Home Tab / Feed Blogs: Homepage or RSS Feed
Endorse content	Reinforces social norms through affirming content that other social media users have created	Facebook: Like, Share Twitter: Favorite; Retweet Pinterest: Heart; Repin Instagram: Like Blogs: Share
Direct Communication	Allows for social pressure and support to be exchanged among users	Facebook: Comment; Message; Tag other users Twitter: Reply; Mention; Direct message Pinterest: Comment; Message Instagram: Comment; Message; Tag other users Blogs: Comment