Social Physique Anxiety and Body Image in Traditional Dance within the Contemporary Greek Dance Context

Boulougaris Georgios[1], Pitsi Athina[2], Masadis Grigorios[3], Emmanouilidou Kyriakoula[4], Mavridou Zoe[5], Mpenavidi Andriana[6], Michaloudis Georgios[7], Feidaki Ioanna[8], Filippou Filippos[9]

Department of Physical Education & Sport Sciences, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece

ABSTRACT: This study aimed to examine the relationship between body image -specifically the subscales Appearance Evaluation and Attitude Towards External Appearance of the Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire (MBSRQ)- and social physique anxiety, within the context of traditional dance in contemporary Greek society. It also explored the structural validity of the two MBSRQ subscales and the Social Physique Anxiety Scale (SPAS-7), and investigated gender as a differentiating factor. The sample consisted of 145 dancers involved in organized Greek traditional dance activities, of whom 33.1% were men and 66.9% were women. Data were collected using the SPAS and the MBSRQ-Appearance Scales. Statistical analyses included descriptive and inferential statistics, confirmatory factor analysis, assessments of internal consistency and construct validity, correlation analysis, and one-way ANOVA. Results showed: a) confirmed construct validity of both scales, b) a significant positive correlation between social physique anxiety and both MBSRQ subscales, and c) higher levels of social physique anxiety and greater appearance-related concern among women compared to men. It is concluded that: a) both instruments are appropriate for research in the context of contemporary Greek traditional dance, and b) gender differentiates levels of social physique anxiety and the two body image subscales.

Keywords: Aesthetic sports, Eating disorders, Greek Traditional dance, Perfectionism, Overweight, Obesity

----

1. INTRODUCTION

The majority of researchers agree that body image is a socially constructed concept, shaped by the influence of multiple factors [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Gender, age, societal pressure to attain and, conversely, to maintain the "ideal" weight, as well as the stress associated with maintaining it, are all significant contributors to the development of an individual's body image [4, 6, 7, 8, 9].

According to Gleeson and Firth [2], body image constitutes an integral part of an individual's identity and is therefore unique and personal. Its importance lies in the fact that it significantly affects psychological, emotional, and physical health, ultimately influencing behavior [4].

Cash [6] and Swami et al. [9] describe body image as a subjective construct aligned with one's personal perceptions, yet formed under the influence of various external and internal factors. This perspective is also supported by Grogan et al. [4], who argue that body image is shaped not only by the individual's own perceptions

and beliefs about their body, but also by the evaluations it receives from both the individual and their immediate family and social environment.

Although Grogan [3] emphasizes the personal nature of body image construction, she also acknowledges the role of close familial and social influences, including the judgments and evaluations the body receives. She is joined by many researchers who argue that body image is dynamic, constantly adapting under the influence of historical, economic, and biological factors. Key factors contributing to the development of body image include participation in organized or informal physical activities, internalized pressure as well as external social pressure, and anxiety not only about achieving the ideal body type -frequently promoted by mass media and social networks- but also about maintaining it. Finally, both age and gender are considered influential factors in the shaping of individual body image [4, 6, 7, 8, 9].

According to Cash [6], Cash and Fleming [7], Stewart and Williamson [8], and Cash, Fleming, Alindogan, Steadman, and Whitehead [10], body image is composed of four dimensions. The first –cognitive- refers to how individuals mentally construct or interpret their physical appearance. The second –emotional- relates to the emotional responses associated with one's appearance. The behavioral dimension concerns the actions individuals take or wish to take in response to their appearance. Lastly, the perceptual dimension refers to how individuals perceive both specific parts of their body and their overall appearance, in comparison to their actual physical form.

Swami et al. [9], however, offer a different model, suggesting that body image consists of two primary dimensions. The first involves the discrepancy between one's perceived actual body and the internalized ideal body. The second dimension reflects the individual's subjective evaluation of their body.

According to Wood-Barcalow, Tylka, and Augustus-Horvath [11], as well as Tylka and Wood-Barcalow [12], an individual's evaluation of their body image may be either positive or negative. A positive body image is formed when individuals do not reject or resent their bodies, but rather accept and appreciate them for both their appearance and their functionality. Importantly, according to Gattario and Frisén [13] and Tylka [5], positive body image should not be interpreted as narcissism or vanity. On the contrary, it can serve as a protective factor for both physical and mental health [1].

In contrast, a negative body image often results from negative judgments and evaluations, received either directly or indirectly from the broader social environment. When such criticism is intense, it can lead individuals to undergo cosmetic procedures to alter parts of their bodies they perceive as responsible for this judgment and potential social exclusion [14].

In her work "Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body", Bordo [15] presents a distinct perspective, conceptualizing the body as a cultural text that reflects societal and historical attitudes toward the body. According to Bordo (2004), the body -particularly the female body- is not merely a biological entity but is "constructed" and shaped by social, cultural, and ideological influences. From an early age, women are taught and socialized into performing femininity. The social and cultural environment into which women are born plays a decisive role in how they learn to shape, perceive, and control their bodies. The restriction and regulation of the female body are reinforced by media, advertising, and education, all of which promote an idealized female form. Bordo further contends that eating disorders, particularly among women, should not be viewed merely as medical conditions but rather as a somatic language- a physical response to societal pressures surrounding the control of the female body and feminine identity.

Anxiety is one of the consequences—perhaps the most significant—of the belief that the social environment will judge an individual's body [16]. This type of anxiety is referred to as Social Physique Anxiety (SPA), and it is theoretically grounded in the self-presentation and impression management theories. These theories connect the body image formed by an individual to their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with it [16, 17].

SPA appears to be related to gender and age. At younger ages, boys do not seem to differ from girls in terms of SPA levels. However, as age increases, differences begin to emerge, with girls displaying higher SPA than boys [18]. A similar perspective is offered by Crombie, Brunet, and Sabiston [19], who argue that young individuals are more likely to experience SPA, particularly when they find themselves in environments that place high value on physical appearance and fitness. Niven, Fawkner, Knowles, Henretty, and Stephenson [20] also support the

idea that age is a factor in the modulation of SPA, as it tends to increase with age. However, they also emphasize that, within the overall sample, no correlation was found between SPA and levels of physical activity.

In contrast, Gay, Monsma, and Torres- McGehee [21] observed that female athletes participating in individual aesthetic sports such as artistic swimming, dance, dance aerobic, and rhythmic gymnastics exhibit higher levels of SPA compared to those participating in team aesthetic sports.

The relationship between participation in physical activities -such as dance and various sports- and SPA has drawn the attention of many researchers. According to Koidou [22], consistent participation in exercise programs reduces leisure time and results in the emergence of negative psychological states. Casper and Reed [23] share a similar view, arguing that these negative psychological states stem from the pursuit of perfection, the need to achieve high performance, and the intense competition present among individuals involved in competitive sports.

In dance, the high level of technical skill required to execute movements flawlessly is a major source of body image doubts - a risk not typically encountered by athletes in sports that do not demand such technical precision [24]. As a technically demanding activity, dance has been widely examined as a factor influencing body image. Researchers have also considered the dance genre and dancer level as co-determining variables [25, 26, 27].

According to Swami and Harris [27], contemporary dancers tend to have a more positive attitude toward their bodies, in contrast to classical dancers, particularly professional ones. Similar findings emerged in the study conducted by Heiland, Murray, and Edley [28], which focused on dancers performing in Hollywood productions. According to Burgess et al. [25] and Swami et al. [9], dancers' perceptions and beliefs are key factors in shaping their body image.

From the above, it is evident that no studies have explored the relationship between body image and social physique anxiety within the context of Greek dance, as it is practiced in contemporary Greek society. So, the aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between body image -specifically the subscales "appearance evaluation" and "attitude towards external appearance"- and social physique anxiety within the context of Greek traditional dance (GTD) in contemporary Greek society. In addition, the structural validity of the two subscales of "The Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire" [29] and the Social Physique Anxiety Scale [30], as modified by Motl and Conroy [31, 32], was examined. Finally, gender was examined as a factor differentiating body image and social physique anxiety.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Sample

The sample consisted of 145 dancers participating in dance activities organized by cultural and dance associations, cultural societies, and municipal cultural organizations. Of these, 48 (33.1%) were male and 97 (66.9%) female. The demographic characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the sample

Gender				Age		
Total	Men		Women	Aging group	Numeric	%
		%		%	<20	22	15.20
145	48	33.1	97	66.9	21-29	52	35.90
					30-39	20	13.80
					40-49	21	14.50
					>50	30	20.70
	Total				145	100

1.2 Measurement Instruments

Quantitative data were collected using: a) the Greek version of the Social Physique Anxiety Scale (SPAS-12) [30], as modified by Motl and Conroy (SPAS-7) [31, 32], b) the Greek version of the Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire: Appearance Scales (MBSRQ-AS) {29}. Specifically:

a) To measure social physique anxiety, the Greek version of the Social Physique Anxiety Scale (SPAS-12) [30], revised by Motl and Conroy [31, 32], was used. The original SPAS is a unidimensional instrument consisting of 12 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Does not describe me at all; 5 = Describes me very well). Items 1, 5, 8, and 11 require reverse scoring to ensure uniform directionality. Higher scores indicate greater social physique anxiety.

Although the 12-item scale has been widely used in previous research [34, 35, 36, 37, 38] proposed a 9-item version by removing items 1, 2, and 5. This shortened version was found to be psychometrically robust and more concise. Eklund et al. [39] and [40] found that women tend to report higher social physique anxiety than men. However, Martin et al.'s study [38] was based solely on a female sample, raising concerns regarding generalizability. These concerns were addressed by Motl and Conroy [31], who validated the 9-item version on both male and female samples. Their analysis revealed that one item was more applicable to women and another was redundant. As a result, they proposed the 7-item version (SPAS-7), which demonstrated acceptable structural validity and reliability in a female student sample.

The structural validity of the SPAS-7 has since been confirmed in multiple studies [41, 42, 43, 44, 45]. The SPAS-7 includes items 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10; among these, only item 8 is reverse-scored due to its negative phrasing.

b) Although a Greek adaptation of the Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire: Appearance Scales by Argyrides and Kkeli [33] already exists, a revalidation was deemed necessary due to the original adaptation being based on a Cypriot student sample (mean age = 16.1 years, SD = .89).

The original instrument consists of 64 items across 10 subscales examining attitudes and behaviors related to body image. However, given the primary interest in appearance-related constructs, a shortened 34-item version (MBSRQ-Appearance Scales) was employed, as recommended by Cash (2018). This version includes the following five subscales: (1) Appearance Evaluation: Comprising 7 items (5, 11, 21, 30, 39, 42, 48), with items 42 and 48 reverse-scored. This subscale assesses individuals' satisfaction with their physical appearance and perceived attractiveness. High scores indicate satisfaction; low scores reflect dissatisfaction. (2) Appearance Orientation: Includes 12 items (1, 2, 12, 13, 22, 23, 31, 32, 40, 41, 49, 50), with items 23, 32, 40, and 49 reverse-scored. This subscale evaluates the degree of investment in one's physical appearance. High scorers show heightened concern and effort regarding appearance, while low scorers show little concern or care. (3) Body Areas Satisfaction: Comprises 9 items (61, 62, 63 [duplicated], 64 [duplicated], 65, 66, 67, 68, 69). This subscale examines satisfaction with specific body parts. High scores indicate satisfaction with most areas of the body; low scores reflect dissatisfaction with the size or appearance of certain areas. (4) Overweight Preoccupation: Consists of 4 items (10, 20, 57, 58) and measures anxiety about weight gain and behaviors aimed at weight control (e.g., dieting, food avoidance). (5) Self-Classified Weight: Comprises 2 items (59, 60), assessing how individuals perceive and categorize their weight (e.g., underweight, average, overweight). Answers to both subscales are given on a five-point Likert-type scale from 1= definitely disagree to 5= definitely agree.

The inclusion of only two subscales from the MBSRQ-AS for this study does not constitute a methodological flaw [29]. The questionnaire's applicability to both genders allows for comparisons between male and female participants. Permission for use was obtained from the instrument's author upon payment of a €25 licensing fee.

1.3 Statistical Analysis

The following statistical procedures were employed:

a) Descriptive and inferential statistics (Mean [M], Standard Deviation [SD]), b) Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to assess the structural validity of the instruments, c) Internal consistency and construct validity were evaluated using Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). According to Alarcón and Sánchez [46], acceptable thresholds for CR and AVE are ≥ .70 and ≥ .50, respectively, d) Correlation analysis between the questionnaires using (r), Pearson's coefficient, e) One-way ANOVA was conducted to examine potential differences related to gender.

3. RESULTS

3.1   Questionnaires Validation

3.1.1   Social Physique Anxiety Scale

The CFA for the "Social Physique Anxiety Scale" was conducted using LISREL 8.80, based on the model proposed by Motl and Conroy [31]. Maximum Likelihood estimation was used to calculate model parameters [47]. The model consists of a single latent factor named "Social Physique Anxiety".

Fit indices recommended in the literature were applied to a sample of 145 individuals. The results were as follows: both CFI and NFI were 0.92, surpassing the minimum acceptable level of 0.90 and thus indicating satisfactory model fit [48]. The RMSEA value of 0.067 fell within the acceptable range of 0.05 to 0.08, suggesting moderate but acceptable fit [49]. The SRMR was 0.059, also within acceptable limits, reflecting good fit. GFI = 0.91 and AGFI = 0.91 both indicated good model fit, exceeding the cutoff of 0.90. Considering that all indices met the recommended values, the model fit was regarded as satisfactory, especially in light of the sample size. For the evaluation of reliability and convergent validity, CR and AVE values were examined. Both indicators exceeded the minimum acceptable levels, with CR = .949 and AVE = .728, confirming high internal consistency and acceptable convergent validity for the subscale [50] (Table 4).

Table 2. Social Physique Anxiety Scale: Reliability & convergent validity

Item	Factor loading	CR	AVE
1	.88		
2	.89		
3	.76		
4	.78	.949	.728
5	.89		
6	.78		
7	.89		

3.1.2   Appearance Evaluation/Assessment

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for the "Appearance Evaluation/ Assessment" subscale was conducted using the statistical package LISREL 8.80. The theoretical model was based on the framework proposed by Cash [29], and parameter estimation followed the Maximum Likelihood method [47]. The theoretical model includes a single factor/ a latent variable labeled named "Appearance Evaluation/Assessment".

To assess model fit, several indices recommended in the international literature were applied to a sample of 145 participants. The fit indices, their acceptable thresholds, and the values observed in this study were as follows: the Comparative Fit Index (CFI = 0.92) and the Normed Fit Index (NFI = 0.93) exceeded the acceptable threshold of 0.90, indicating satisfactory model fit, in line with Hu and Bentler [48]. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA = 0.063) also fell within the acceptable range of 0.05 to 0.08, reflecting a moderate but acceptable fit [49]. Additionally, the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR = 0.048) indicated excellent fit, being below the threshold of 0.08. The Goodness of Fit Index (GFI = 0.91) suggested a good model fit, while the Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI = 0.89) was just below the acceptable cutoff of 0.90. Taking all indices into account, most of which met or closely approached acceptable values, the overall model fit was considered satisfactory, especially given the sample size.

To evaluate the reliability and convergent validity of the subscale, the Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) were calculated. The resulting values (.959 for CR and .770 for AVE) exceeded the minimum acceptable thresholds (.70 for CR and .50 for AVE, as per Hair et al. [50], indicating high internal consistency and satisfactory convergent validity for the subscale (Table 2).

Table 3. Appearance Evaluation/Assessment: Reliability & convergent validity

Item	Factor loading	CR	AVE
1	.90		
2	.91		
3	.86		
4	.85	.959	.770
5	.91		
6	.86		
7	.85		

3.1.3 Attitude Toward Physical Appearance

CFA for the "Attitude Toward Physical Appearance" subscale was also conducted using LISREL 8.80, based on the theoretical model proposed by Cash [29]. Parameters were estimated using the Maximum Likelihood method [47]. The model includes one latent factor labeled "Attitude Toward Physical Appearance."

Model fit was evaluated using established fit indices, based on a sample of 145 individuals. The indices used, their recommended cutoff values, and the corresponding results from this study are as follows: CFI = 0.93 and NFI = 0.93, both exceeding the acceptable value of 0.90, indicating satisfactory model fit [48]. RMSEA = 0.069 also fell within the acceptable range (0.05–0.08), indicating a moderate but acceptable fit [49]. SRMR = 0.037 reflected excellent fit, remaining well below the threshold of 0.08. The GFI was 0.92, indicating good fit, and the AGFI was 0.91, marginally above the recommended minimum of 0.90. Given that all indices reached acceptable levels, the model fit was deemed satisfactory, particularly considering the sample size.

The reliability and convergent validity of the subscale were assessed using CR and AVE. Both indicators yielded values above the recommended minimums -CR = .972 and AVE = .740- suggesting high internal consistency and strong convergent validity [50] (Table 3).

Table 4. Attitude Toward Physical Appearance: Reliability & convergent validity

Item	Factor loading	CR	AVE
1	.83		
2	.85		
3	.89		
4	.84		
5	.88	.972	.740
6	.88		
7	.85		
8	.84		
9	.85		
10	.87		
11	.89		
12	.88		

3.2 Correlation analysis

Pearson's coefficient was used to examine the linear relationships between the two subscales of the MBSRQ-AS and the SPAS-7. Examining the Pearson correlation results of the SPAΣ-7 scale and the two subscales of the MBSRQ-AS in the whole research sample, it was found that:

a) SPAS-7 is statistically significantly positively related to the subscale "appearance orientation" (r = .486; p<.01),

b) SPAS-7 is statistically significantly positively related to the subscale "appearance evaluation" (r = .222; p<.001).

c) There is no statistically significant correlation between the two subscales of the MBSRQ-AS (r = .120; p=.151).

Table 4. Pearson correlation coefficient between SPAS-7 and the 2 subscales of the MBSRQ-AS

Factors	1	2	3
Social Physique Anxiety	1		
Appearance evaluation	.222**	1	
Appearance orientation	.486**	.120	1

3.3 Sex as a Differentiating Factor in

3.3.1 Social Physique Anxiety

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in the SPA factor based on participants' gender. The results showed that sex significantly differentiated SPA levels (F $_{(1,144)}$ = 17.27, p < .001), with women reporting higher SPA (M = 3.49, SD = .76) compared to men (M = 2.89, SD = .90).

3.3.2 Appearance evaluation

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine whether there were statistically significant differences in the "appearance evaluation" subscale based on participants' sex. The results indicate that sex is a differentiating factor in appearance evaluation (F $_{(1,144)}$ = 41.97, p < .001), with women being more concerned about the attractiveness of their bodies (M = 3.82, SD = 1.10) than men (M = 2.62, SD = .92).

3.3.3 Appearance orientation

One-Way ANOVA analysis was performed to test whether there were statistically significant differences in the subscale "appearance orientation" due to the sex of the participants. The results indicate that sex significantly differentiates appearance orientation (F $_{(1,144)}$ = 12.85, p < .001), with women attaching greater importance to their physical appearance and therefore taking more care of it (M = 3.54, SD = .76) compared to men (M = 3.01, SD = .99).

4. DISCUSSION

Based on a systematic literature review conducted in databases such as Google Scholar, PubMed, and Scopus, no studies were identified that specifically examine the relationship between social physique anxiety and body image as expressed through participation in Greek traditional dance within the modern dance landscape. Consequently, a survey was carried out involving 145 dancers who participate in organized dance classes across Greece.

The aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between social physique anxiety and body image in the context of Greek traditional dance within the contemporary Greek dance environment. Additional objectives included the confirmation of the structural validity of the two instruments employed, as well as the exploration of gender as a moderating factor in the relationship between social physique anxiety and body image.

The results obtained from the confirmatory factor analysis confirmed the unidimensional structure of the Greek version of the Social Physique Anxiety Scale (SPAS-7). This finding is consistent with the research by Motl and Conroy (2000; 2001), who modified the original scale developed by Hart, Leary, and Rejeski (1989). Furthermore, it aligns with the findings of Hagger et al. (2007), who validated the scale in both Spanish and Turkish cultural contexts, Lindwall (2004) for the Swedish version, Scott, Burke, and Joyner (2004), who validated the scale in a U.S. student population, and Smith (2004) in a sample of 398 Spanish students aged 12–19 years. The appropriateness of the scale for use in research exploring the presence and levels of social physique anxiety in dance contexts is further supported by the values of the indicators used to assess Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE).

Similarly, both subscales -Appearance Evaluation and Appearance Orientation- of the MBSRQ-AS, used to assess dancers' body image, demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties. The values obtained for the fit indices -CFI, NFI, RMSEA, SRMR, GFI, and AGFI- confirmed the structural validity of both subscales, thereby supporting their use in studies within the contemporary Greek dance context. This suitability is further reinforced by the

values of CR and AVE, which were considered in evaluating the internal consistency and convergent validity of the two subscales.

The findings of the present study align with those of previous validation efforts. For instance, Argyrides and Kkeli (2013) validated the scale in a Cypriot student population, reporting Cronbach's α values of .81 for the Appearance Orientation subscale and .82 for Appearance Evaluation. The study by Laus, Vales, Oliveira, Braga Costa, and Almeida also confirmed the structural validity of the two subscales, with Cronbach's α values of .87 for Appearance Orientation and .83 for Appearance Evaluation. Finally, in the French adaptation conducted by Untas, Koleck, Rascle, and Borteyrou, Cronbach's α values of .84 for Appearance Orientation and .88 for Appearance Evaluation were recorded—values that are considered satisfactory.

The linear correlation analysis of Social Physique Anxiety and the two subscales of the MBSRQ-AS revealed a statistically significant relationship between social physique anxiety and both subscales. In contrast, no statistically significant correlation—either positive or negative—was found between appearance orientation and appearance evaluation. This finding may suggest that individuals who experience high levels of anxiety, stemming from the perception that their bodies are being judged and possibly negatively evaluated by their social environment, tend to be particularly preoccupied with their physical appearance, to invest in it, and to evaluate it negatively.

The non-significant correlation between the two MBSRQ-AS subscales may indicate that although participants in the study are highly concerned with their appearance, this concern does not necessarily reflect the way they evaluate it. This finding reaffirms the multidimensional nature of body image, as supported by previous research [53], which highlights that various factors influence the cognitive and affective dimensions of body self-perception—dimensions that are not necessarily interrelated. The absence of a correlation observed here further supports the notion that these two aspects of body image function autonomously and independently.

The examination of gender as a differentiating factor across the three dimensions—social physique anxiety, appearance orientation, and appearance evaluation—related to body image constituted the third aim of this study. Statistical analysis revealed that female participants scored higher than males across all dimensions. Specifically, women demonstrated higher levels of social physique anxiety and placed greater importance on their appearance compared to men, indicating a heightened preoccupation with and concern about physical appearance. This concern is reflected in the increased attention, care, and overall investment they dedicate to their appearance.

The findings of this study align with previous studies, which suggest that women are more significantly influenced by prevailing social and cultural standards of beauty and the ideal body type. As a result, they tend to pay more attention to their external appearance, devote considerable time to its care, and are particularly concerned about how they are perceived and evaluated by their social environment [54, 55].

While women may have historically been more affected by prevailing beauty norms, it should not be overlooked that men are increasingly exposed to similar social pressures. Television advertisements for male grooming and beauty products have grown significantly. This trend is confirmed by Pope, Phillips, and Olivardia [56], who reported a notable increase in advertisements—both electronic and print—promoting male beauty standards that emphasize muscularity and physical "perfection." The same researchers [56] introduced the term "The Adonis Complex" to describe the near-obsessive preoccupation some men develop with their bodies—an obsession that can lead them to spend extensive hours in the gym, use nutritional supplements, and even resort to anabolic steroids in pursuit of the desired physique.

While women may have historically been more affected by prevailing beauty norms, it should not be overlooked that men are increasingly exposed to similar social pressures. Television advertisements for male grooming and beauty products have grown significantly. This trend is confirmed by Pope, Phillips, and Olivardia [56], who reported a notable increase in advertisements—both electronic and print—promoting male beauty standards that emphasize muscularity and physical "perfection." The same researchers [56] introduced the term "The Adonis Complex" to describe the near-obsessive preoccupation some men develop with their bodies—an obsession that can lead them to spend extensive hours in the gym, use nutritional supplements, and even resort to anabolic steroids in pursuit of the desired physique.

Although the present study found statistically significant gender differences—with women scoring higher on all three body image-related dimensions—the mean score for men on the appearance evaluation factor (M = 3.01) indicates that men are also increasingly vulnerable to appearance-related concerns. Research has shown that men, now equally exposed to idealized body standards through media and social networks, tend to experience dissatisfaction with their body image, particularly when it fails to align with the promoted ideals of muscularity [57].

5. CONCLUSION

The statistical analysis and the ensuing discussion led to the following conclusions:

a) The structural validity of the SPAS-7 was confirmed, indicating that it is a reliable instrument for research within the context of contemporary Greek traditional dance;

b) Similarly, the structural validity of the Appearance Evaluation and Attitude Towards External Appearance subscales of the Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire was established, supporting their use in this research field;

c) A significant positive correlation was found between social physique anxiety and both body image dimensions;

d) Gender was identified as a key differentiating factor in levels of social physique anxiety, with women reporting higher anxiety than men;

e) Women also expressed greater concern regarding their external appearance compared to their male counterparts.

6. REFERENCES

[1]   A Androulidaki, M Psychountaki, M Koutsouba, and O Donti, Body Image in Dance and Sport: Theoretical Approaches and Evaluation Scales. *Inquiries in Physical Education and Sport*, *17(3),* 2019, 138–156. https://doi.org/10.26253/heal.uth.ojs.ispe.2019.1530.

[2]   K Gleeson and H Frith, (De)constructing body image. *Journal of health psychology, 11(1),* 2006, 79–90. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105306058851.

[3]   S Grogan, *Body Image: Understanding Body Dissatisfaction in Men, Women and Children* (Routledge, 2017).

[4]   S Grogan, A Williams, S Kilgariff, J Bunce, JS Heyland, T Padilla, T. ... and W Davies, Dance and body image: young people's experiences of a dance movement psychotherapy session. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *6(2)*, 2014, 261-277. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2013.796492.

[5]   TL Tylka, Overview of the field of positive body image, in EA. Daniels, MM Gillen, and CH Markey (Eds.), *Body positive: Understanding and improving body image in science and practice*, (Cambridge University Press, 2018) 6–33. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108297653.002.

[6]   TF Cash, The situational inventory of body-image dysphoria: psychometric evidence and development of a short form. *The International journal of eating disorders*, *32(3)*, 2002, 362–366. https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.10100.

[7]   TF Cash, and EC Fleming, The impact of body image experiences: Development of the Body Image Quality of Life Inventory. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *31(4)*, 2002, 455–460. https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.10033.

[8]   TM Stewart, and DA Williamson, Multidisciplinary treatment of eating disorders—Part 2: Primary goals and content of treatment. *Behavior modification*, *28(6)* 2004, 831–853. https://doi.org/10.1177/0145445503259854.

[9]   V Swami, US Tran, LH Brooks, L Kanaan, EM LUESSE, IW Nader, and M Voracek, Body image and personality: Associations between the Big Five Personality Factors, actual-ideal weight discrepancy, and body appreciation. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *54(2)*, 2013, 146-151. https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12014.

[10] TF Cash, EC Fleming, J Alindogan, L Steadman, and Whitehead, Beyond body image as a trait: the development and validation of the Body Image States Scale. *Eating disorders*, *10(2),* 2002, 103–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/10640260290081678.

[11] NL Wood-Barcalow, TL Tylka, and CL Augustus-Horvath, "But I Like My Body": Positive body image characteristics and a holistic model for young-adult women. *Body image*, *7(2)*, 2010, 106–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2010.01.001.

[12] TL Tylka, and NL Wood-Barcalow, What is and what is not positive body image? Conceptual foundations and construct definition. *Body Image, 14,* 2015, 118–129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2015.04.001

[13] KH Gattario, and A Frisén, from negative to positive body image: Men's and women's journeys from early adolescence to emerging adulthood. *Body image*, *28*, 2019, 53-65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2018.12.002.

[14] L Lev-ari, AH Zohar, and R Bachner-melman, Enjoying your body: The psychometric properties of an English version of the Dresden Body Image Questionnaire. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *72(3)*, 2020, 267-275. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajpy.12284.

[15] S Bordo, *Unbearable weight: Feminism, Western culture, and the body* (University of California Press, 1993).

[16] CM Sabiston, E Pila, G Pinsonnault-Bilodeau, and AE Cox, Social physique anxiety experiences in physical activity: A comprehensive synthesis of research studies focused on measurement, theory, and predictors and outcomes. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *7(1),* 2014, 158–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2014.904392.

[17] E Kosmidou, E Giannitsopoulou, and D Moysidou, Social Physique Anxiety and pressure to be thin in adolescent ballet dancers, rhythmic gymnastics and swimming athletes. *Research in Dance Education*, *18(1),* 2016, 23–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2016.1223027.

[18] MS Hagger, A Stevenson, NL Chatzisarantis, PMP Gaspar, JPL Ferreira, and JMG Ravé, Physical self-concept and social physique anxiety: Invariance across culture, gender and age. *Stress and Health*, *26(4)*, 2010, 304-329. https://doi.org/10.1002/SMI.1299.

[19] PA Crombie, J Brunet, and CM Sabiston, Stop Staring! Proposed Strategies to Reduce Students' Body-related Concerns in Physical Education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, *82(2),* 2011, 39–43.https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2011.10598581.

[20] A Niven, S Fawkner, AM Knowles, J Henretty, and C Stephenson, Social physique anxiety and physical activity in early adolescent girls: The influence of maturation and physical activity motives. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 27(3),* 2009, 299 –305. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410802578164.

[21] JL Gay, EV Monsma, and TM Torres-McGehee, Developmental and contextual risks of social physique anxiety among female athletes. *Research quarterly for exercise and sport*, *82(2)*, 2011, 168–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2011.10599744.

[22] E Kosmidou, E Giannitsopoulou, D Moysidou, Social Physique Anxiety and pressure to be thin in adolescent ballet dancers, rhythmic gymnastics and swimming athletes. *Research in Dance Education*, *18(1)*, 2017, 23-33.https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2016.1223027.

[23] CR Casper, and E Reed, Body Image and Self Image in College Athletes. *Stanford Humanities Review*, 1998, 89-97.

[24] AG Dantas, DA Alonso, PA Sánchez-Miguel, and Del Río Sánchez, Factors dancers associate with their body dissatisfaction. *Body image*, *25*, 2018, 40-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2018.02.003.

[25] G Burgess, S Grogan, and L Burwitz, Effects of a 6-week aerobic dance intervention on body image and physical self-perceptions in adolescent girls. *Body image*, *3(1)*, 2006, 57–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2005.10.005.

[26] E Pollatou, N Bakali, Y Theodorakis, and M Goudas, Body image in female professional and amateur dancers. *Research in Dance Education*, *11(2)*, 2010, 131-137. https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2010.482980.

[27] V Swami, and AS Harris, Dancing toward positive body image? Examining body-related constructs with ballet and contemporary dancers at different levels. *American Journal of Dance Therapy*, *34*, 2012, 39-52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10465-012-9129-7.

[28] TL Heiland, DS Murray, and PP Edley, Body image of dancers in Los Angeles: the cult of slenderness and media influence among dance students. *Research in Dance Education*, *9(3)*, 2008, 257-275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijom.2007.06.011.

[29] TF Cash, The Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire users' manual (fourth revision) 2018 Available from the author at www.body-images.com.

[30] EA Hart, MP Leary, and WL Rejeski, The measurement of social physique anxiety. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *11*, 1989, 94-104.

[31] RW Motl, and DE Conroy, Validity and factorial invariance of the Social Physique Anxiety Scale. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, *32(5)*, 2000, 1007–1017. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005768-200005000-00020.

[32] RW Motl, and DE Conroy (2001). The Social Physique Anxiety Scale: Cross Validation, Factorial Invariance, and Latent Mean Structure. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science, 5*, 2001, 81-95. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327841MPEE0502_2.

[33] M Argyrides, and N Kkeli, Multidimensional body-self-relations questionnaire-appearance scales: psychometric properties of the Greek version. *Psychological reports*, *113(3)*, 2013, 885–897. https://doi.org/10.2466/03.07.PR0.113x29z6.

[34] EA Cox, S Ullrich-French, J Madonia, and K Witty, Social physique anxiety in physical education: Social contextual factors and links to motivation and behavior. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 12*, 2011, 555 - 562. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.05.001.

[35] E McAuley, and Burman, The Social Physique Anxiety Scale: Construct validity in adolescent females. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, *25(9)*, 1993, 1049–1053. https://doi.org/10.1249/00005768-199309000-00013.

[36] C Maïano, AJS Morin, RC Eklund, J Monthuy-Blanc, JM Garbarino, Y Stephan, Construct Validity of the Social Physique Anxiety Scale in a French Adolescent Sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *92(1)*, 2009, 53–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890903381809.

[37] Ö Mülazımoğlu-Ballı, C Koca, and HF Aşçı, An Examination of Social Physique Anxiety with Regard to Sex and Level of Sport Involvement. *Journal of Human Kinetics*, *26*, 2010, 115-122. https://doi.org/10.2478/v10078-010-0055-9.

[38] KA Martin, WJ Rejeski, MR Leary, E McAuley, S Bane, Is the Social Physique Anxiety Scale really multidimensional? Conceptual and statistical arguments for a unidimensional model. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *19(4)*, 1997, 359–367.

[39] RC Eklund, B Kelley, and P Wilson, The Social Physique Anxiety Scale: Men, women, and the effects of modifying Item 2. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *19(2)*, 1997, 188–196.

[40] AM Haase, and H Prapavessis, Social physique anxiety and eating attitudes: Moderating effects of body mass and gender. *Psychology, Health and Medicine*, *3*, 1998, 201–210. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13548509808402236.

[41] MS Hagger, FH Asçi, M Lindwall, V Hein, Ö Mülazımoğlu-Ballı, M Tarrant and V Sell, Cross-cultural validity and measurement invariance of the Social Physique Anxiety Scale in five European nations. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sport*, *17*, 2007, 703–719. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0838.2006.00615.x.

[42] H Isogai, BW Brewer, AE Cornelius, S Komiya, M Tokunaga, and S Tokushima, Cross-cultural validation of the Social Physique Anxiety Scale. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, *32*, 2001, 76–87.

[43] M Lindwall, Factorial validity and invariance testing of the Swedish Social Physique Anxiety Scale: Arguments for gender-specific scales. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *26(3)*, 2004, 492–499. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.26.3.492.

[44]   LA Scott, KL Burke, AB Joyner, and JS Brand, Examining the Stability of the 7- Item Social Physique Anxiety Scale Using a Test-Retest Method. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, *8(2)*, 2004, 57–62. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327841mpee0802_1.

[45]   AL Smith, Measurement of social physique anxiety in early adolescence. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, *36*, 2004, 475-483. http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/01.MSS.0000117111.76228.BF.

[46]   D Alarcón, and JA Sánchez, Assessing convergent and discriminant validity in the ADHD-R IV rating scale: User-written commands for AVE, CR, and HTMT. Paper presented at the Spanish STATA Meeting, (Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Seville, Spain, 2015).

[47]   RB Kline, *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling.* 4th ed. (New York: Guilford Press, 2016).

[48]   L Hu, and PM Bentler, Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6(1)*, 1999, 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118.

[49]   MW Browne, and R Cudeck, Alternative Ways of Assessing Model Fit. in KA Bollen and JS Long (Eds.), *Testing Structural Equation Models* (Pp. 136-162). (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1993), 136-162.

[50]   JF Hair, WC Black, BJ Babin, and RE Anderson, *Multivariate Data Analysis* 8 (Cengage, 2019).

[51]   MF Laus, LDMF Vales, NG Oliveira, TM Braga Costa, and SS Almeida, Brazilian version of the Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire-Appearance Scales (MBSRQ-AS): translation and psychometric properties in adults. *Eating and weight disorders: EWD*, *25(5)*, 2020, 1253–1266. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40519-019-00758-w.

[52]   A Untas, M Koleck, N Rascle, and X Borteyrou, Psychometric properties of the French adaptation of the multidimensional body self relations questionnaire-appearance scales. *Psychological reports*, *105(2)*, 2009, 461–471. https://doi.org/10.2466/PR0.105.2.461-471.

[53]   TF Cash, and T Pruzinsky, (Eds.) Body image: A handbook of theory, research, and clinical practice (Guilford Press, 2002).

[54]   TF Cash, and L Smolak, *Body image: A handbook of science, practice, and prevention* 2, (New York: Guilford Press, 2011).

[55]   M Tiggemann, (2011). Sociocultural perspectives on human appearance and body image in TF Cash and L Smolak (Eds.), *Body image: A handbook of science, practice, and prevention* 2, (The Guilford Press, 2011, 12-19).

[56]   HG Pope, KA Phillips, and R Olivardia, *The Adonis Complex: The Secret Crisis of Male Body Obsession*. (New York: Free Press, 2000).

[57]   RA Leit, HG Pope, and JJ Gray, Cultural expectations of muscularity in men: the evolution of playgirl centerfolds. *The International journal of eating disorders*, *29(1)*, 2001, 90–93. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-108x(200101)29:1<90::aid-eat15>3.0.co;2-f.