Filtered vs. Unfiltered Selfies: AI Beauty Filter Effects on Adolescent Girls' Perceptions

Mehruba Shabaab Haque
Management, Estonian Business School, Tallinn, Estonia

mehruba.haque@ebs.ee

Abstract: AI-driven beauty filters are now embedded in adolescents' everyday digital self-presentation, yet their ethical implications for marketing communication have received limited attention within management and consumer research. Existing studies largely rely on exposure-based quantitative designs that assess outcomes such as body dissatisfaction, offering limited insight into how young users actively interpret digitally altered imagery. This study contributes to this literature by examining how early adolescent girls aged 10–14 make sense of AI-filtered and unfiltered facial images and how their side-by-side visual contrast shapes evaluations of beauty and postability. The study employs a three-stage qualitative visual elicitation design that mirrors naturalistic social media engagement. In Stage 1, participants are presented with five variations of the same face, ranging from unfiltered to differently filtered versions, and select their preferred image for beauty and posting suitability, providing baseline judgements for the analysis. Stage 2 introduces paired filtered and unfiltered images presented side by side, creating visual contrast that renders digital modification perceptually salient and functions as a brief visual micro-intervention. Stage 3 reintroduces the same facial images presented in Stage 1 to examine whether participants' evaluative judgements shift following the contrast exposure in Stage 2. Audio-recorded interviews capture participants' verbal explanations, enabling analysis of how adolescents articulate, justify, and reason about digitally modified appearance cues. The study contributes methodologically by showing how sequential visual exposure can be used to examine adolescents' interpretations rather than relying only on scale-based outcomes. Theoretically, it draws on Social Comparison Theory and Online Self-Presentation Theory because evaluating what is considered beautiful and deciding what is suitable to post represent related but distinct processes. Together, these theories explain how filtered and unfiltered appearances are evaluated and how these evaluations inform posting preferences. By foregrounding adolescents' own interpretations, the research advances understanding of how beauty norms are cognitively constructed within digital marketing environments and highlights the ethical significance of representational authenticity in visual communication targeting young consumers.

Keywords: Visual elicitation, Qualitative design, AI modification, Beauty filters, Adolescents, Marketing ethics

1. Introduction

Picture this: a thirteen-year-old girl sits in her bedroom, phone raised at the perfect angle, scrolling through filter options with practised ease. Smooth skin. Brightened eyes. Fuller lips. Within seconds, an AI-driven filter transforms her face into what she instinctively understands to be a postable version of reality. This everyday ritual is now one of the most common consumer-facing applications of generative and computer vision technology, and it sits squarely at the intersection of AI ethics and marketing communication: adolescents are routinely altering their own likeness with tools built on the same underlying techniques as AI image generation more broadly, raising direct questions for how platforms, marketers, and educators should respond.

What makes this different in kind, not just in degree, from earlier appearance pressures is worth pausing on. A magazine advertisement shows a girl an idealised image of someone else and invites her to compare. A beauty filter shows her an idealised version of her own face, changed by an algorithm, and asks her to decide whether her real face is worth posting. The gulf between who she is and who she is expected to be once existed out there, in advertisements and in the faces of celebrities she would never meet. Now it sits on her own screen, in her own reflection, even if no longer quite her own.

Existing research gives a fairly consistent answer to what this does to adolescent girls, if a narrower one than the problem deserves. Repeated exposure to idealised, filtered imagery is associated with lower body satisfaction, largely through appearance-based social comparison (Fardouly and Vartanian, 2016; Festinger, 1954a). This is not simply a matter of passive exposure: photo-related activities such as editing and posting selfies are more strongly linked to dissatisfaction than general browsing (Cohen et al., 2018; Lee and Lee, 2021), and even brief encounters with AR beauty filters can measurably reduce body satisfaction within minutes, particularly among users with low self-esteem (Dijkslag et al., 2024). Awareness of digital manipulation offers little protection: users can recognise that an image is artificial while still internalising filtered beauty as an achievable standard (Caravelli et al., 2025; Hermans et al., 2022). Girls face disproportionate pressure in this regard, editing images more frequently than boys from an early age, with consequences that can solidify well before adulthood (Mascheroni et al., 2015; McLean et al., 2015; Mingoia et al., 2017).

This creates a genuine paradox that existing designs are not well placed to explain. Despite the pressure to appear filtered, audiences do not straightforwardly reward it: filtered selfies receive fewer likes than unfiltered ones, suggesting a social preference for authenticity that runs counter to the pressure to enhance (Hong et al., 2020). Adolescents must navigate a real tension between meeting a filtered beauty norm and risking social rejection for appearing inauthentic, and understanding how girls actually reason through that contradiction requires engaging with their own interpretations directly, not just measuring whether exposure correlates with dissatisfaction.

This study makes two contributions to the literature. First, while research on beauty filters and facial appearance has concentrated on university-aged women and on thinness, body shape, and eating-related outcomes (Fardouly and Rapee, 2019; Manning and Mulgrew, 2022; Slater et al., 2017), and existing work on adolescents has examined how they perceive their own filtered appearance (Isakowitsch, 2023), what motivates filter use (Javornik et al., 2022), or its association with cosmetic surgery acceptance (Maes and de Lenne, 2022), this study extends that work by asking which filtered images younger girls find more beautiful, what they would choose to post, and whether side-by-side comparison shifts these evaluations. This focus matters because the selfie, not the body more broadly, has become the primary format through which adolescents construct and share self-image, placing the face rather than the body at the centre of daily social media participation. Second, this study contributes a qualitative, in-the-moment account of how adolescents actively interpret filtered imagery, complementing exposure-based quantitative designs that measure downstream outcomes (Harriger et al., 2023). It also centres a younger and more diverse sample than the older, White, and digitally fluent populations that dominate existing research (Papageorgiou et al., 2022a). Without centring adolescents' own voices, media literacy interventions and marketing ethics guidance risk reflecting adult assumptions about filtered beauty rather than adolescent realities.

Qualitative visual methods offer a way to pursue this focus. Visual elicitation interviews, in which participants respond directly to filtered and unfiltered images, treat adolescents as active meaning-makers rather than passive data points, and preserve the visual nature of the environments the research is trying to understand. Presenting filtered and unfiltered images side by side interrupts habitual viewing and can render digital modification perceptually salient in a way that functions as a brief visual micro-intervention, prompting reflection rather than dictating judgement.

This paper presents a three-stage visual elicitation method designed to do exactly this, developed for use with girls aged 10 to 14. As a methods paper, its contribution is the design and demonstration of the elicitation procedure itself, illustrated through a single participant's data, rather than a set of generalisable empirical findings. The method is intended to generate data relevant to two research questions:

RQ1: How do girls aged 10–14 perceive and describe beauty when comparing natural and beauty-filtered faces?

RQ2: How do girls aged 10–14 perceive and justify their choice of natural or beauty-filtered faces to post on social media?

By foregrounding adolescents' own interpretations, this method lays the groundwork for advancing both theoretical understanding of how beauty norms are cognitively constructed in AI-mediated digital environments, and practical guidance on the ethical use of filtered and AI-generated facial imagery in marketing communication targeting young consumers.

2. Methodology

2.1 Design

This study employs a qualitative methodology, using visual elicitation interviews to explore how early adolescent girls interpret beauty-filtered and unfiltered selfies. It captures participants' perceptions of beauty and their intentions to post selfies with or without filters, before and after exposure to a brief visual micro-intervention, to examine whether these perceptions and intentions shift.

The design responds to the pervasive nature of digital viewing environments, where filtered imagery predominates and visual distortion has become normalised within adolescents' everyday consumption practices. To counteract this habituated exposure, the study introduces a micro-intervention in which participants view side-by-side comparisons of identical faces, filtered and unfiltered, prompting direct observation of the alterations and critical reflection on digital modification practices.

Direct questioning alone risks producing brief or socially desirable responses rather than deeper reflection. The study therefore adopts an elicitation-based design, using visual and verbal stimuli to support richer articulation of ideas that are otherwise taken for granted or hard to express abstractly.

Elicitation stimuli take two forms, corresponding to the first two interview stages: in Stage 1, multiple filtered and unfiltered versions of the same face; and in Stage 2, side-by-side filtered/unfiltered pairs using a consistent filter across several faces. When participants identify one version as more beautiful or more post-worthy, they are asked to explain their reasoning, surfacing underlying judgements and assumptions.

The study used a three-stage visual elicitation interview structure. In Stage 1, participants viewed three facial identities, each in five versions representing increasing modification: unfiltered, three moderately filtered versions, and one highly filtered version. The moderate versions varied not only in facial modification but also in additional appearance elements (no added elements, added makeup and hair volume, and enhanced makeup and hair volume), allowing participants to indicate whether their evaluations tracked facial change specifically or broader appearance cues as well. Participants identified which images they considered most beautiful and most post-worthy and explained their evaluations.

In Stage 2, participants viewed eleven further facial identities, each shown side by side in unfiltered and highly filtered versions, and were given as much time as they wished to browse and compare the pairs.

In Stage 3, participants returned to the same three faces as in Stage 1 and repeated the evaluative tasks, allowing baseline and post-exposure narratives to be directly compared. This return to the original stimuli made it possible to assess whether interpretations of beauty and posting intentions shifted following the micro-intervention, through participants' own explanations rather than through separate measures.

A single filtering application (FaceApp) was used throughout, chosen at random from among the many available filtering tools, simply to ensure that comparable facial features were altered consistently across stimuli. Presenting multiple facial identities further reduced the influence of face-specific characteristics, so that observed interpretations reflected responses to patterns of digital facial modification rather than to any particular individual or application.

2.2 Participants

In Estonia, research shows that adolescent girls are particularly vulnerable to problems associated with social media use, with 13-year-old girls identified as an especially at-risk group (Kalmus, Opermann and Kurvits, 2026). In response, the Estonian government established an expert advisory board in 2026 to address social media's effects on young people, favouring greater platform responsibility over restricting children's access. This context motivated the focus of the present study on early adolescent girls' interpretations of digitally modified imagery. Participants were recruited through snowball sampling, beginning with the researcher's personal and professional contacts, including teachers in local schools. Through these contacts, study information reached pupils and parents who might be interested, and parents were also free to share it further within their own networks. Parents who wished for their child to take part contacted the researcher directly, and each participant's involvement proceeded only after parental consent had been given and the adolescent herself had separately agreed to take part.

The study aimed to recruit around 15 to 20 girls aged 10 to 14, a range that reflects both the depth demanded by visual elicitation interviews and common practice in qualitative research prioritising rich interpretive data over large samples; recruitment continued until thematic saturation was reached, with this range serving as a guideline rather than a fixed target. All participants were permanent residents of Estonia, which helped limit cultural and contextual variation in beauty norms, media practices, and posting conventions that a more diverse sample might introduce. Participants also needed enough spoken English to engage comfortably in interview discussion, and some regular exposure to digital platforms such as YouTube, Instagram, TikTok, or Snapchat, whether through their own accounts or a parent's device.

Because this age group is considered a vulnerable population, the study's design and procedures reflected that throughout: parents were given the option of remaining in the room during the interview, and both parents and participants received age-appropriate information sheets explaining the study's aims, what taking part involved, and the right to withdraw at any time without any effect on schooling or other activities.

2.3 Materials and Stimuli

The visual stimuli were derived from selfies of female volunteers who gave informed consent for their images to be used for research purposes; no selfies of study participants themselves were collected or used at any stage. The volunteer images were organised into two stimulus sets: Faces A–C, three facial identities used in Stage 1 and reintroduced in Stage 3, and Faces D–N, eleven further identities used exclusively in Stage 2. This structure allowed direct pre- and post-exposure comparison using the same faces, while introducing a broader range of identities during the exposure phase itself.

Using multiple facial identities, rather than a single face, reflected the diversity of appearances typically encountered in social media environments and reduced the likelihood that participants' evaluations were driven by the idiosyncratic characteristics of any one individual. This ensured that interpretations reflected patterns of digital facial modification rather than face-specific features.

3. Data Collection

Data collection took the form of individual, one-on-one, in-person interviews, each lasting approximately 30-45 minutes. Interviews were conducted in a quiet and private setting, either in participants' homes if preferred by parents or legal guardians, or in a designated meeting room at the participant's school, subject to school approval. This approach was adopted to ensure participant comfort, privacy, and ethical appropriateness when working with early adolescents.

Visual stimuli were displayed on an iPad, allowing participants to control the pace of viewing by swiping through the images themselves. All interview sessions were audio-recorded with prior consent, transcribed verbatim, and anonymised to protect participant confidentiality.

3.1 Stage 1: Pre-exposure Evaluation

In the first stage, participants were presented with three facial identities (A–C), each shown in five versions representing different levels and forms of visual modification: one unfiltered version, three moderately filtered versions, and one highly filtered version. The three moderately filtered versions progressively incorporated broader appearance modifications: facial filtering alone, facial filtering with added makeup and hair volume, and facial filtering with more pronounced makeup and hair enhancement. This variation allowed the study to examine whether participants' evaluations were associated primarily with facial modification or with broader appearance cues.

All five versions of each facial identity were displayed together, allowing participants to compare the variations directly. For each set, participants were invited to respond to two guiding questions:

"Which version do you find most beautiful, and why?"

"Which version would you be most likely to post on social media, and why?"

Follow-up prompts were used to encourage elaboration and explore the reasoning underlying participants' selections. Participants' choices and explanations established a baseline of how they evaluated beauty and posting suitability before the exposure in Stage 2.

3.2 Stage 2: Exposure and Reflection

In the second stage, participants were presented with eleven additional facial identities (D–N), each shown in two versions: one unfiltered and one highly filtered. For each facial identity, the unfiltered and highly filtered versions were displayed side by side, contrasting the natural and substantially digitally modified appearance immediately visible. Participants were invited to browse the image pairs freely at their own pace by swiping through them on the iPad.

Following the browsing phase, the researcher initiated a reflective discussion. Participants were invited to describe the differences they noticed between the unfiltered and highly filtered versions, share their thoughts about facial filtering, and reflect on their evaluations of the images in relation to beauty and posting suitability. This stage functioned as the exposure component of the visual micro-intervention, encouraging participants to inspect and reflect on digital facial modification through direct visual contrast and open-ended discussion.

3.3 Stage 3: Post-exposure Evaluation

In the third stage, participants revisited the same three facial identities and the same five versions presented in Stage 1. The five versions of each identity were again displayed together, and participants were asked to repeat the original questions regarding beauty and posting suitability and explain the reasoning underlying their selections.

Participants' Stage 3 responses were compared with their corresponding Stage 1 responses to examine whether, and in what ways, their evaluations changed following exposure to the side-by-side unfiltered and highly filtered versions of the same facial identities in Stage 2. The comparison considered both changes in participants' image selections and changes in the reasoning underlying their evaluations. In this way, the pre-post design enabled the study to examine how direct visual contrast between unfiltered and highly filtered facial images shaped early adolescent girls' interpretations of beauty and posting suitability.

3.4 Data Management and Storage

The primary data for this study consisted of participants' verbal responses generated during the interviews. All interviews were audio-recorded with prior consent, producing digital audio files that served as the raw data source. These recordings were transcribed verbatim to create textual data suitable for analysis. No video recordings were made, ensuring that only verbal content was retained. In addition, the researcher took field notes during each interview to document paralinguistic cues such as pauses, changes in tone, emphasis, or laughter. These notes were used to support interpretation by capturing nuances that may not be fully evident in the transcripts alone.

Complementary data were generated through Google Form ratings, in which participants assigned scores for perceived beauty and posting likelihood to each stimulus. These ratings were not intended for inferential statistical analysis. Instead, they functioned as descriptive indicators used to identify consistencies or discrepancies between participants' spoken narratives and their evaluative judgements. For example, when a participant expressed a verbal preference for unfiltered images but consistently assigned higher ratings to filtered versions, this divergence was treated as analytically informative. In this way, the ratings provided an additional layer of interpretive depth rather than serving as independent outcome measures.

Each participant was assigned a unique identifier (e.g., P01, P02), which was used consistently across transcripts, field notes, and rating files. All transcripts were anonymised by systematically replacing identifying information with neutral placeholders (e.g., [friend], [school], [city]) to prevent deductive disclosure. Once transcription accuracy had been verified, the corresponding audio recordings were permanently deleted, ensuring that identifiable voice data were not retained beyond the transcription process.

All digital data were stored on a password-protected and encrypted device accessible only to the primary researcher. Consent forms were stored separately from transcripts and rating files in a different encrypted folder, ensuring that participant identities could not be directly linked to the anonymised research data. This separation of identifiable and research data upheld confidentiality in accordance with ethical and data protection requirements, including the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

4. Data Analysis

All interviews were transcribed verbatim and analysed using thematic analysis to examine how early adolescent girls interpreted filtered and unfiltered selfies and how these interpretations shifted or remained stable across stages. Analysis proceeded inductively, with codes developed directly from participants' narratives rather than from predefined categories. Initial coding focused on participants' explicit explanations of beauty, postability, and emotional responses to the images.

Coding followed an open, axial, and selective structure. During open coding, meaning units were identified within and across transcripts. Axial coding examined relationships between codes, with particular attention to narrative continuity and change between Stage 1 (pre-exposure) and Stage 3 (post-exposure). Stage 2 served as the exposure phase by introducing direct visual comparison between filtered and unfiltered images. Analytic attention then focused on whether evaluations articulated in Stage 1 were sustained, nuanced, or revised when the same faces reappeared in Stage 3. Selective coding was used to integrate these patterns into higher-order themes that captured both stability and transformation in participants' meaning-making.

Qualitative data analysis software (e.g., NVivo or MAXQDA) was used to organise transcripts, link codes to data extracts, and maintain a transparent audit trail. Reflexive notes were kept throughout the analytic process to

document coding decisions and to ensure that interpretations remained grounded in participants' own language. Analytical consistency was further supported through pilot testing of the coding framework on a subset of transcripts prior to full analysis.

In addition to narrative data, descriptive summaries of participants' Google Form ratings were generated. These ratings were not subjected to inferential statistical analysis but were used as a supplementary interpretive tool to cross-check alignment between spoken accounts and evaluative judgements. Instances where numeric ratings diverged from verbal explanations were noted and examined thematically, allowing the ratings to enrich, rather than determine, interpretation.

5. Illustrative Results

To demonstrate how the interview procedure functions in practice, the qualitative responses of a single participant are presented below. These are offered not as empirical findings but as an illustration of the kind of reasoning the elicitation stimuli are able to surface.

Across the three facial identities, the participant consistently favoured moderately filtered images over both unfiltered and highly filtered versions, explaining her choices in terms of naturalness and restraint. She described a preferred image as "not too much Photoshopped" and criticised more heavily filtered versions as involving contouring, a makeup and filtering technique that uses shading to reshape the appearance of the face, that was "too rough" or "too much." This suggests that the procedure is able to elicit not just a preference, but the participant's own vocabulary for what distinguishes an acceptable level of modification from an excessive one.

The three-stage structure also proved capable of capturing shifts in reasoning across exposure. For one facial identity, the participant's stated preference moved from a highly filtered image before exposure to a moderately filtered image after, and she was able to articulate the change herself, explaining that she had come to see the previously preferred image as "not enough" by comparison and had come to regard the moderate version as "most not invasive." This indicates that the procedure can surface not only whether a preference shifts, but the participant's own explanation of why.

A further notable finding illustrating the depth of the method concerns the distinction between aesthetic judgement and personal posting intention. When asked whether she would post a given filtered image, the participant distinguished between judging the image as beautiful and imagining herself as its subject. She indicated she would post the image "if she were her," but that if she had to choose for herself, "being herself in the body of this girl, she wouldn't post any." This kind of distinction, between an evaluative judgement made about someone else's image and a personal posting decision, is unlikely to emerge from direct questioning alone, and illustrates the value of the elicitation format in surfacing reasoning that participants may not otherwise articulate.

Finally, the participant's transcript illustrated how the procedure can surface participants' broader relationship to appearance modification, beyond the immediate stimuli. She described filters as an extension of a pre-existing practice of physical makeup use, referring to her filtered face as "her canvas," and reasoned that filter-related pressure was more likely to affect those without access to physical makeup as an alternative means of self-presentation. This kind of contextual, self-generated reasoning demonstrates the method's capacity to elicit responses that extend beyond simple evaluation of the stimuli themselves, toward participants' own frameworks for understanding filtered imagery.

Taken together, these illustrative responses are not intended to represent generalisable findings, but to demonstrate that the three-stage elicitation structure is capable of generating rich, participant-articulated reasoning across multiple dimensions: perceptual judgement, change over time, the distinction between evaluation and personal intention, and broader self-understanding in relation to appearance modification.

6. Discussion

As a methods paper, this study's main contribution is the design of a three-stage visual elicitation method capable of generating rich data relevant to RQ1 and RQ2, rather than a set of generalisable empirical findings. The illustrative case presented above, in which a single participant consistently favoured moderate over high filtration, revised her judgement for one face after exposure, and distinguished between finding an image beautiful and being willing to post it as herself, demonstrates the kind of interpretive material the method is positioned to generate once applied across the full sample. The findings are situated within a critical realist and

post-positivist perspective, recognising that beauty norms are socially constructed yet experienced by adolescents as real and influential.

6.1 Theoretical Implications

RQ1 draws on social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954a), which explains how individuals judge appearance against internal or external standards. The Stage 2 exposure phase tests whether making digital alteration visible shifts that standard. A shift toward natural preference after exposure would suggest visible comparison reduces the appeal of filtered beauty; a shift toward filtered preference would suggest the opposite, that comparison makes enhancement more noticeable and more desirable; no shift would suggest that awareness of alteration alone, as the introduction notes is already common among adolescents, is not sufficient on its own to change evaluation.

RQ2 draws on self-presentation theory (Goffman, 1959), which distinguishes private judgement from managed public image. This distinction is already visible in the illustrative case, where the participant's aesthetic judgement did not straightforwardly predict her stated posting choice: she indicated she would post a filtered image if she were its subject, but would not post any version of herself. This kind of divergence speaks directly to the paradox raised in the introduction, that filtered selfies are socially penalised with fewer likes despite the pressure to produce them. Where preference and posting choice align, personal judgement is reflected directly in self-presentation; where they diverge, factors such as anticipated judgement or a wish to appear authentic are likely shaping the posting decision independently of aesthetic preference, and the method's capacity to surface this distinction in a participant's own words is precisely what exposure-based quantitative designs are unable to capture.

6.2 Practical Implications

Because beauty filters are a consumer-facing application of the same generative and computer vision techniques behind AI image generation more broadly, the method's findings, once established across the full sample, have implications beyond adolescent wellbeing research. For schools, educators, and child wellbeing organisations, they can clarify whether direct visual comparison is a useful tool for digital and media literacy interventions, or whether it risks unintentionally reinforcing the appeal of filtered beauty by making the enhancement more visible. For social media platforms, they can help assess whether making digital alteration visible is sufficient to influence adolescents' evaluations, with direct implications for transparency and labelling practices for filtered and AI-generated content. For beauty, cosmetics, skincare, and fashion marketers, they can provide insight into how digitally altered facial representations shape beauty and posting evaluations, supporting more responsible and authentic visual communication targeting young consumers.

7. Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when applying this method. First, responses to facial images may be influenced by appearance characteristics beyond facial filtering, including makeup, hairstyle, lighting, and individual facial features. Although the use of multiple facial identities helps reduce reliance on a single face, these influences cannot be fully separated from participants' evaluations. Second, viewing images in a researcher-guided setting differs from encountering filtered content naturally on social media, which may limit ecological validity. Third, repeated presentation of the same images in the pre- and post-exposure stages may introduce familiarity or recall effects. Finally, the method captures participants' stated posting suitability rather than actual social media posting behaviour and should therefore be interpreted as an evaluation of intended self-presentation rather than observed behaviour.

Ethics Declaration: Ethical approval was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Estonian Health Development Institute (Tervise Arengu Instituudi inimuuringute eetikakomitee, TAIEK, approval number 1510), and all procedures complied with the Declaration of Helsinki and GDPR. Given participants' age, particular care was taken to protect their rights, privacy, and emotional wellbeing. Written parental or guardian consent was obtained before participation, alongside age-appropriate assent from each participant; participation was voluntary, with a clear right to withdraw at any time without negative consequences. During interviews, the researcher monitored for verbal and non-verbal signs of discomfort and was prepared to pause or end the session if needed, and all participants were debriefed afterward in age-appropriate language, with support resources provided where necessary. To minimise risk, participants were never asked to provide, display, or discuss their own selfies; all visual stimuli used donated images from consenting adult volunteers. Data were anonymised at transcription, stored on encrypted devices separately from consent documentation, and access was restricted to the primary researcher.

AI Declaration: During the preparation of this work, the author used ChatGPT (OpenAI, GPT-5) to improve the readability and grammar of the manuscript. As the author's first language is not English, the tool was used to support clarity and expression. After using this tool, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the published article.

References

Caravelli, N.S., Henriksen, H.A. and Blashill, A.J. (2025) 'Associations between TikTok facial filter use and body image variables', *Body Image*, 53, p. 101877. doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2025.101877.

Cohen, R., Newton-John, T. and Slater, A. (2018) '"Selfie"-objectification: The role of selfies in self-objectification and disordered eating in young women', *Computers in Human Behavior*, 79, pp. 68–74. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2017.10.027.

Dijkslag, I.R. et al. (2024) 'To beautify or uglify! The effects of augmented reality face filters on body satisfaction moderated by self-esteem and self-identification', *Computers in Human Behavior*, 159, p. 108343. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2024.108343.

Fardouly, J. and Rapee, R.M. (2019) 'The impact of no-makeup selfies on young women's body image', Body Image, 28, pp. 128–134. doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2019.01.006.

Fardouly, J. and Vartanian, L.R. (2016) 'Social media and body image concerns: Current research and future directions', *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 9, pp. 1–5. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.09.005.

Festinger, L. (1954a) 'A theory of social comparison processes', *Human Relations*, 7(2), pp. 117–140. doi:10.1177/001872675400700202.

Goffman, E. (1959) The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group.

Harriger, J.A., Thompson, J.K. and Tiggemann, M. (2023) 'TikTok, TikTok, the time is now: Future directions in social media and body image', *Body Image*, 44, pp. 222–226. doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2023.01.005.

Hermans, A.-M., Boerman, S.C. and Veldhuis, J. (2022) 'Follow, filter, filler? Social media usage and cosmetic procedure intention, acceptance, and normalization among young adults', *Body Image*, 43, pp. 440–449. doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2022.10.004.

Hong, S., Jahng, M.R., Lee, N. and Wise, K.R. (2020) 'Do you filter who you are? Excessive self-presentation, social cues, and user evaluations of Instagram selfies', Computers in Human Behavior, 104, p. 106159. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2019.106159.

Isakowitsch, C. (2023) 'How augmented reality beauty filters can affect self-perception', in Longo, L. and O'Reilly, R. (eds.) Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Science: AICS 2022 (Communications in Computer and Information Science, Vol. 1662). Springer, pp. 252–265. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-26438-2_19.

Javornik, A. et al. (2022) '"What lies behind the filter?" Uncovering the motivations for using augmented reality (AR) face filters on social media and their effect on well-being', *Computers in Human Behavior*, 128, p. 107126. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2021.107126.

Kalmus, V., Opermann, S. and Kurvits, R. (eds) (2026) *EU Kids Online'i Eesti 2025. aasta uuringu esialgsed tulemused*. Tartu: University of Tartu, Institute of Social Studies. doi:10.5281/zenodo.18668024.

Lee, M. and Lee, H.-H. (2021) 'Social media photo activity, internalization, appearance comparison, and body satisfaction: The moderating role of photo-editing behavior', *Computers in Human Behavior*, 114, p. 106579. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2020.106579.

Maes, C. and de Lenne, O. (2022) 'Filters and fillers: Belgian adolescents' filter use on social media and the acceptance of cosmetic surgery', Journal of Children and Media, 16(4), pp. 587–605. doi:10.1080/17482798.2022.2079696.

Manning, T.M. and Mulgrew, K.E. (2022) 'Broad conceptualizations of beauty do not moderate women's responses to body positive content on Instagram', Body Image, 40, pp. 12–18. doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2021.10.009.

Mascheroni, G., Vincent, J. and Jimenez, E. (2015) '"Girls are addicted to likes so they post semi-naked selfies": Peer mediation, normativity and the construction of identity online', *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 9(1). doi:10.5817/cp2015-1-5.

McLean, S.A. et al. (2015) 'Selfies and social media: Relationships between self-image editing and photo-investment and body dissatisfaction and dietary restraint', *Journal of Eating Disorders*, 3(S1). doi:10.1186/2050-2974-3-s1-o21.

Mingoia, J. et al. (2017) 'The relationship between social networking site use and the internalization of a thin ideal in females: A meta-analytic review', *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01351.

Papageorgiou, A., Fisher, C. and Cross, D. (2022a) '"Why don't I look like her?" How adolescent girls view social media and its connection to body image', *BMC Women's Health*, 22(1). doi:10.1186/s12905-022-01845-4.

Slater, A., Varsani, N. and Diedrichs, P.C. (2017) '#Fitspo or #loveyourself? The impact of fitspiration and self-compassion Instagram images on women's body image, self-compassion, and mood', Body Image, 22, pp. 87–96. doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2017.06.004.