Promoting healthy foods in the new digital era: An experimental study on the effect of a popular versus fictitious ‘Insta-influencer’ on brand attitude and purchase intentions

Frans Folkvord (✉ fransfolkvord@Gmail.com)  
Tilburg University Tilburg School of Humanities  https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7602-3792

Elze Roes  
Radboud Universiteit Behavioural Science Institute

Kris Bevelander  
Radboud Universiteit Behavioural Science Institute

Research article

Keywords: social influencers, marketing, healthy foods, public health, attitude, intention

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-51632/v1

License: ☇️ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.  
Read Full License
Abstract

**Background:** Most studies on influencer marketing techniques have focused on the promotion of unhealthy foods whereas little is known about the promotion of healthier foods. The present experimental study investigated whether a popular real versus fictitious social influencer is more successful in promoting healthy food products. In addition, we examined the role of parasocial interaction as an underlying mechanism of healthy food product endorsement.

**Methods:** We used a randomized between-subject design with 154 participants (age: 24.0 years). Viewers’ product attitude and purchase intention were tested after exposure to an Instagram post by a popular social influencer ($n = 77$) or fictitious social influencer ($n = 77$).

**Results:** Results showed that parasocial interaction mediated the relation between the type of social influencer and product attitude as well as purchase intention. Parasocial interaction was higher for participants exposed to the popular influencer compared to the fictitious influencer, leading to higher healthy food brand attitude and purchase intentions.

**Discussion:** The findings showed that it is crucial for influencers to establish a warm personal relationship and connection with their followers when promoting a healthy product successfully. We suggest that the promotion of healthy foods could be more successful in public health when using popular social influencers.

Introduction

The prevalence of obesity is still rising. People are continuously exposed to an overload of unhealthy food appeals in their physical as well as online environment. During the last decade, sharing online video content on YouTube and other social media platforms like Facebook and Instagram has become increasingly popular (Schouten, Janssen, & Verspaget, 2020). Following other people on online platforms has become a daily activity among millions of people worldwide (Lin, Bruning, and Swarna, 2018). Food advertisers have been starting collaborations with popular ‘social influencers’ to target their followers by promoting (food) products or services via online social media platforms (Boyland et al. 2016; Buijzen, Owen, and Van Reijmersdal 2010; Coates et al. 2019; De Veirman, Cauberghe, and Hudders 2017; Folkvord 2019; Folkvord et al. 2016, 2019a,b). Although there is an emerging body of academic research investigating this social influencer marketing technique, most studies have focused on the promotion of unhealthy foods and little is known about the promotion of healthier foods (Boyland et al. 2016; Folkvord 2019; Folkvord et al. 2016). In light of the current obesity epidemic, an important objective is to promote healthier food consumption. Therefore, the current study examined the impact of social influencers on attitude and purchase intentions of a healthy food product.

The exponential growth of social media has given rise to micro-celebrities, such as bloggers and vloggers. These new types of celebrities, so-called ‘social influencers’, have received fame through self-branding. Self-branding is a new strategy whereby social media users use their social media activities to
engage in strategic self-presentation to attract attention of a large number of young followers, in particular young people (Chae 2018; Khamis, Ang, and Welling 2017). A new online trend that is designed to inspire viewers towards a healthier lifestyle is called ‘Fitspiration’ (i.e., the amalgamation of fitness and inspiration). In general, fitspiration stimulates health and well-being through the promotion of healthy eating, higher levels of exercise and self-care (Tiggeman and Zaccardo 2016). The overall philosophy of strength and empowerment is one that is strongly emphasized by images that are shared online. Because fitspiration has been positioned as a healthy alternative to the Internet-based trend known as ‘thinspiration’ (i.e., amalgamation of thin and inspiration), it is highly popular among young people and often used to influence predominantly young women (Sumter, Cingel, and Antonis 2018; Boepple and Thompson 2016). The most important platform to share fitspiration images while endorsing healthy products is Instagram (Tiggeman and Zaccardo 2016), which has been used as social medium for the current study.

The social influencer-consumer relation differs from traditional one-way communication forms of expert or celebrity endorsement in magazines and on television, because interaction between the social influencer and consumer is highly important. In addition, influencers are seen as specialists in their community and the match between them and the endorsed product can establish a high level of trust among their viewers and followers (Chung and Cho 2017; Liu et al. 2015). Product endorsements by influencers are perceived as more credible and authentic than regular (commercial) messages of celebrities or advertisers, because viewers are more likely to believe they will receive a trustworthy advice or get a genuine opinion about certain brands or products. In this regard, influencer marketing can be seen as a new interactive form of electronic word of mouth advertising (eWOM). It has even been found that the influencer strategy's carryover effects are substantially longer than traditional marketing actions and produce higher response elasticity (Trusov, Bucklin, and Pauwels 2009). It is suggested that mediated experiences with social influencers tap into more interpersonal processes due to the openness, frequency and reciprocal nature of celebrity endorsement than traditional forms of marketing. However, there is an urgent need to further investigate the way in which social influencers impact the effectiveness of healthy product endorsements, brand attitudes and purchase intentions (Folkvord 2019).

Therefore, the current experimental study investigated the role of ‘parasocial interaction’ as an underlying mechanism of social influencer endorsement of a healthy food product on Instagram. Previous studies have shown that parasocial interaction drives feelings of connectedness and loyalty to the endorsed product and the willingness to consume the brand’s products (Castonguay, Kunkel, Wright and Duff 2013; Lee and Watkins 2016; Folkvord et al. 2016, 2019a,b; Labrecque et al. 2013; Xiang, Zheng, Lee, and Zhao 2016). Social media platforms like Instagram allow two-way communication between the influencer and viewers. These social media interactions can promote parasocial relationships, which means that media users feel connected to media personalities (e.g., celebrities or fictional characters) (Horton and Wohl 1956; Giles 2002). In some cases viewers even perceive friendship relations with the media personalities when they get to know the influencer better (Brown 2015; Hoffner 2008). In the case of Instagram advertising, social influencers often let their viewers be part of their personal life by sharing personal and intimate stories and images. This reinforces the identification process and engagement with the
influencer (Basil and Brown 2004). For example, the residential setting that is often shown in vlogs can further increase identification and bonding with the social influencer.

In addition, viewers often do not recognize advertising in sponsored messages compared to traditional forms of advertising, which lowers the probability that they will pro-actively use their skepticism towards the social influencer (Buijzen et al. 2010; Folkvord et al., 2019; Glucksman 2017; Kim and Song 2018;). And even if viewers recognize advertising in sponsored messages, the extent to which they perceive that they share values, attitudes and perceptions with the social influencer creates a connection or bond between both, leading to more positive attitudes towards the product and increased purchase intentions (De Jans, Cauberghe and Hudders 2019; Erdogan 1999). The few studies on product endorsement in blogs and YouTube vlogs have shown the positive effect of parasocial interaction relationships on purchase intentions (DeJans, Cauberghe and Hudders 2019; Lee and Watkins 2016). In this study, we therefore expected that parasocial interaction would increase the likelihood that a product endorsed by a social influencer on Instagram was viewed more positively.

Altogether, the current study focused on the promotion of healthy food products by testing whether a popular real Instagram influencer would be more effective in endorsing a healthy food product compared to an unknown fictitious influencer. We expected that viewers who were exposed to a popular real social influencer had a more positive attitude towards the healthy food product and a higher purchase intention than those exposed to a fictitious social influencer due to higher parasocial interaction.

**Methods**

**Design and Participants**

This study involved a between-participants design (popular real vs. fictitious fit influencer), while testing the mediating role of parasocial interaction on participants’ product attitude and purchase intention of a healthy product. Inclusion criteria were that participants were 18 years or older and followed a real fit influencer on Instagram. Participants were assigned to the conditions randomly. Power calculations were conducted using the program G*Power 3.1.9.4 (Faul et al. 2007, 2009). To detect a medium to large effect using linear multiple regression, a minimum of 105 participants were needed ($f^2=0.20$, power .95, $p < .05$).

Participants were recruited via a post by a real Dutch fit influencer on Instagram. Of the 246 participants who reacted to her post to participate in research, 92 participants were excluded because they did not complete the study (n=87), were under aged (n=4) or guessed the research aim (n=1). The final sample consisted of 154 participants ($M$ age=24.030, $SD=6.046$; 94.8% female). The present study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki, and procedures were approved by the Ethics Committee of the Behavioural Science Institute, Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

**Procedure**
The study took place in May 2019. Participants were followers of an actual Dutch female fit influencer on Instagram who cooperated in this study. She posted a recruitment message twice via Instagram stories, a feature that lets users post photos and videos which automatically disappear after 24 hours. In the recruitment message, the fit influencer asked her followers to participate in a 10-minute research survey and provide their opinion and feedback on different Instagram pages with the chance to win one of the three allotted vouchers (€ 10,- each). When the participants ‘swiped up’ (i.e., in Instagram this resembles clicking on a link to direct you to another Internet page), they were forwarded to our official online survey that further informed them about the study.

In a cover story, participants were asked to answer questions about their social media use and evaluate different Instagram pages. All participants were exposed to an Instagram post of an experienced traveler and a news site made up by the researchers. In between these two posts, they were exposed to our manipulation which was either a post of the real or fictitious fit influencer promoting a mock healthy product called ‘Green Recovery’. Green Recovery was described as a healthy vegetable cottage cheese – low in carbs and high in proteins – which was excellent to eat after performing exercise and sports. The promotion of such a product fits to the real product range that is often promoted by fit influencers. After the study ended, participants were debriefed about the real aim of the study and were asked to provide active consent to use their data in our study.

**Stimulus material**

The participants were exposed to a photo supplemented with text on Instagram in which either the real or fictitious fit influencer endorsed the product Green Recovery. The influencers looked alike and were sitting on a bench outside in the sun while eating Green Recovery out of its package. The text next to the Instagram photo contained a message from the fit influencer informing participants that it is important to consume proteins after performing sports and that the influencer ate delicious vegetable cottage cheese of Green Recovery on that day. The influencer also added that the cottage cheese is low in calories and has a smooth soft taste. In the other bogus posts before and after the manipulation, viewers were exposed to travel and animal images with text about the magnificent view and animals, respectively.

**Measures**

*Descriptives.* Demographics were assessed consisting of participant’s age, sex, and education level. Additionally, the frequency of participant’s Instagram usage was asked.

*Product attitude.* The attitude towards the promoted product Green Recovery was measured by a 4 item questionnaire adapted from two validated questionnaires (Henthorne, LaTour en Nataraajan 1993; Spears and Singh 2004) on a 10 point Likert scale ranging from negative (1) to positive (10) answering categories. The questions focused on how much participants liked the product, if they were interested in the product, whether they found the product good for themselves and were attracted to the product (Cronbach’s $\alpha= .932$).
**Purchase intention.** The intention to buy the product Green Recovery was measured by 4 statements focusing on whether participants wanted to try the product, would search for Green Recovery in the stores and buy the product (Baker and Churchill 1977). Answering categories for these statements ranged from 'completely disagree' (1) to 'completely agree' (6) (Cronbach’s α = .900).

**Parasocial interaction.** Parasocial interaction was measured by a scale from a study that examined vlogger’s influence on consumer perceptions (Lee and Watkins 2016; Rubin, Perse and Powell 1985). The scale measures feelings of trust, desire to interact and perceived friendship with the influencer. Participants answered to statements on a scale ranging from ‘completely disagree’ (1) to ‘completely agree’ (6) (Cronbach’s α = .876).

**Identification.** Identification with the influencer was measured with the Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale (Aron, Aron and Smollan 1992). The scale exists of seven pairs of circles with the circles representing ‘You’ and the ‘Influencer’. The circles stand apart (1) and come closer each step until they almost overlap (7). Participants were asked to select the pair of circles that best described their relationship with the fit influencer.

**Congruency.** The match between the real or fictitious fit influencer and the endorsed product was measured by the statement ‘The fit influencer and Green Recovery are a good match’ (Lim et al. 2017). Answering categories ranged from ‘completely disagree’ (1) to ‘completely agree’ (6).

**Similarity.** Attraction to a social influencer has been found to be higher when there is a perceived connection with the influencer (Ballantine and Martin 2015; Lee and Watkins 2016). Social attractiveness was measured by an adapted scale for social influencers specifically (McCrosky and McCain 1974; Lee and Watkins, 2016). There are six statements measuring whether the fit influencer is perceived similar to the viewer, whether the influencer behaves like the viewer, has a lot in common with the viewer, etc. Participants answered to statements on a scale ranging from ‘completely disagree’ (1) to ‘completely agree’ (10) (Cronbach’s α = .876).

**Analysis**

First, randomization checks were performed by using one-factor analysis of variance to test for differences among the two experimental intake conditions. Second, Spearman’s rank and Pearson’s correlations were performed for the model variables of age, sex education and time spent on Instagram to determine which variable had to be controlled for in the main analyses. Data were analyzed using SPSS for Windows (version 22.0, 2012, SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, US). Third, we tested whether our manipulation was successful by comparing the antecedents identification, congruency and similarity of parasocial interaction between the real and fictitious condition. This was based on the model proposed by Lee and Watkins (2016) in which they showed that parasocial interaction was associated with these antecedents. Finally, for our main analyses, to investigate whether parasocial interaction mediated the relation between a real and fictitious fit influencer on product attitude and purchase intentions, a path model (with parasocial interaction, product attitude and purchase intentions as latent variables) was tested using
bootstrapped standard errors (1,000) and estimator ML (MacKinnon et al., 2004) (Mplus Version X; Muthén and Muthén, 1998-2017). Model fit information was assessed by the following fit indices: the $\chi^2$ test of model fit, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI; cut-off values close to or above .90). The model provided acceptable fit to the observed data with $\chi^2$ test of model fit being significant ($p < .0001$) and according to the values for CFI (.92) and TLI (.90).

**Results**

**Descriptives**

Most participants were female (94.8%) varying from 18 to 54 years old, of which 61% was between 18 and 23 years old. The education level of the participants was mixed with participants who (had) followed middle education (54.5%), lower education (30.5%) or higher education (22.1%). Of the sample, 20.7% reported to spend less than 30 minutes per day on Instagram, 37.7% of the sample reported to spend 30-60 minutes per day and 43.5% reported to spend even more time per day on Instagram (32.5% 1-2 hours and 11% more than 1-2 hours).

Spearman’s and Pearson’s correlations were performed between these variables and product attitude and purchase intentions. Only product attitude and purchase intentions were correlated significantly ($r_s = 0.406$, $p < .001$). Randomization checks (Table 1) showed there were no differences between conditions. Based on the correlations and randomization check, product attitude and purchase intentions were tested in the same path model without covariates.

--- ENTER TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE ---

**Manipulation check.**

The manipulation checks showed that there were significant differences between the fit influencer conditions on identification ($F_{1,153} = 40.348$, $p < .001$), congruency ($F_{1,153} = 7.275$, $p = .008$) and social attractiveness ($F_{1,153} = 4.574$, $p = .034$). This means that the manipulation was successful because participants felt more connected and similar to the real influencer and reported a greater perceived match between the influencer and the endorsed product compared to those exposed to the product endorsement by the fictitious influencer.

--- ENTER TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE ---

**Main analysis**

The path model showed that the fit influencer condition significantly predicted parasocial interaction ($B = .965$, $SE_B = .197$, $p = < .001$, 95% CI [.593,1.358]) and that parasocial interaction significantly predicted product attitude ($B = .472$, $SE_B = .204$, $p = .021$, 95% CI [.062,843]) as well as purchase intentions ($B = .774$, $SE = .132$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.520,1.021]). This means that the popular real fit influencer was associated with higher parasocial interaction than a fictitious influencer, leading to higher product
attitude and purchase intentions. The indirect effects were significant for product attitude ($B = .455$, $SE_B = .222$, $p = .040$, 95% CI [.081,.961]) and purchase intention ($B = .747$, $SE_B = .195$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.422, 1.197]). Importantly, the direct effect between the influencer condition and purchase intentions remained significant, meaning that there was a partial mediation effect ($B = -.710$, $SE_B = .238$, $p = .003$, 95% CI [-1.162, -.242]).

**Discussion**

The current study was the first to test whether promoting healthy foods by a popular real fit influencer on the social media platform Instagram led to a higher product attitude and purchase intention compared to the promotion of healthy foods by a fictitious influencer. The study showed that it is crucial for influencers to establish a warm personal relationship and connection with their followers to promote a healthy product successfully.

In line with our expectations, we found that viewers who were exposed to the popular real social influencer had a more positive attitude towards the healthy food product and a higher purchase intention than those who were exposed to the fictitious social influencer due to higher parasocial interaction. Our findings are in line with the parasocial interaction theory which explains that repeated exposure to a media personality increases people's feelings of friendship and trust with that personality (Horton and Whohl 1965). Consequently, the higher feelings of identification, congruency and similarity, which are related to parasocial interaction relationships, resulted in a more positive product attitude and purchase intention (Chung and Cho 2017; Lee and Watkins 2016).

Our findings also showed that there was not only a relationship between parasocial interaction and the purchase intention of the endorsed product, but also a direct relationship between the real influencer and purchase intention (i.e., partial mediation effect). Research has shown that people's consumption behavior is strongly influenced by one's direct (online) environment, thereby particularly emphasizing on the interaction between personal and environmental factors (Bandura 1989; Piaget 1964). According to the Social Learning Theory (Bandura 1989) people acquire cognitions and behaviors from their social agents through the process of modeling, reinforcement, and social interaction. At the moment, young people spend an enormous amount of their time on social media platforms (Anderson and Jiang 2018).

Therefore, it has been suggested that online celebrities (i.e., social influencers) have a strong impact on consumer socialization, because they are considered as peers and layman and thus more credible than traditional celebrity endorsers (Djafarova and Rushworth 2017). Considering we found an effect on purchase intention and not for product attitude, it could mean that the viewers considered the influencers as highly trustworthy, thereby not activating any form of skepticism when exposed to the images. Viewers did not seem to reflect on whether they even liked the product, but simply followed the recommendations of the influencer and wanted to buy the products that were promoted, which is in line with the Processing Commercial Media Content (PCMC) model (Buijzen et al. 2010). This model suggests that when
advertising is more integrated in the content of the media message, mainly entertaining content, it is difficult to activate skepticism because the advertising message is not recognized as such.

Social influencers are able to reach thousands or even millions of potential consumers in a few minutes, and are thus considered to be highly influential, in particular among young active followers that identify with the influencers and spend large amounts of time viewing posts of their preferred influencer (Lin, Bruning, and Swarna 2018). Due to the rapid developing forms of communications that youth currently use to share their daily experiences, food marketers have realized that collaborations with social influencers to target followers and promote their (food) products or services on these online platforms is essential to keep selling their brands and products (Boyland et al. 2016; Buijzen, Owen and Van Reijmersdal 2010; Coates et al. 2019; De Veirman, Cauberghe, and Hudders 2017; Folkvord et al. 2016; Sumter, Cingel, and Antonis 2018). Nevertheless, these findings also have potential for health promotion activities among young people.

To the authors' knowledge, public health institutions rarely collaborate with social influencers and tend to communicate in impersonal ways in general. For example, by providing information via social media endorsed by their institution's profile, employees or field experts. The Promotion of Healthy Food Model (Folkvord 2019) states that by increasing attention toward healthier foods through food promotion and reinforcing its value, other people increase their consumption. Social influencers are well suited to create positive associations, increase liking, and act as role models. Subsequently, a reciprocal relation with eating behavior occurs, which in time could lead to a normalization of intake of healthy foods. Therefore, health interventions could benefit from utilizing social influencers, considering their large influence on an important target group (Van Woudenberg et al. 2019). For example, social network interventions utilizing peer influence (i.e., social influencers within school classes) are believed to affect normative behaviors (Smit et al. 2016). Research has shown that people do not like to deviate from group norms, which triggers them to conform to the normative behavior of social influencers (Cruwys, Bevelander and Hermans 2015). When social influencers show and promote a behavior on Instagram and followers see a large group of other followers liking their product endorsements, they can improve the perceived value of healthier foods and set and change the norm of the type and amount of foods or drinks people should consume.

One of the strengths of the current study is that we examined the influence of a popular real fit influencer on the food consumption behavior of young people. Food marketing research has predominantly focused on the influence of food advertising of unhealthy foods on eating behavior among children and adolescents (Boyland et al. 2016; Folkvord 2019; Folkvord and Van ‘t Riet, 2018; Folkvord et al. 2016), while research examining the effects of food marketing for healthy foods is scarce (Folkvord 2019; Folkvord et al. 2017, 2018, 2019a,b,c,d). Considering that a great number of people do not consume enough fruit and vegetables (Miller et al. 2019), it is of great importance to examine the potential of food promotion techniques of healthier foods. Promoting increased fruit and vegetable consumption has shown to may have a role in weight maintenance or loss (Mytton et al. 2014). Second, the expenditure of food companies to advertise their brands and products through social influencers is increasing, while the
understanding of its effects on eating behavior is lacking. Taking into account that new generation mostly communicate through online platform.

A limitation of the current study is that we did not take into account actual consumption. Therefore it would be interesting for future research to include the intake of the promoted products, to see whether promotion on social media platforms for healthy foods increase the intake of healthier foods, such as fruit and vegetables. Another limitation is that primarily young female adults participated, so it is difficult to conclude if the same effects would have been found among other target groups, such as men or elderly. Nonetheless, this group of people is also one of the main target group through marketing on social media.

**Conclusions**

The current study showed that it is crucial for a social influencer to establish a strong connection with the followers in order to effectively convey their message, for example, promoting healthy food products. Taking into account that for some decades many dietary guidelines have emphasized the importance of a diet high in fruit and vegetables (Miller et al. 2019), consumption of fruit and vegetables remains below recommended levels in many countries. New and innovative methods to effectively promote fruit and vegetables are necessary to improve people’s dietary intake (Folkvord 2019), since it has been widely accepted that the current food systems have a negative effect on human health and threaten environmental sustainability (Willett et al. 2019).

**Abbreviations**

CFI = Comparative Fit Index

eWOM = electronic word of mouth

PCMC = processing commercial media content

TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index
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Tables

Table 1. Randomization checks of variables measured by experimental condition\(^a\).

| Variables                      | Fictitious fit influencer (n=77) | Real fit influencer (n=77) | \(p\) value\(^b\) |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Age (y)                       | 23.44 (5.18)                     | 24.61 (6.79)              | .231            |
| Sex (n/ n)                    | 3/74                             | 5/72                      | .468            |
| Education level (lower/middle/higher) | 15/42/20                     | 21/42/14                 | .525            |
| Time spend on Instagram (<1h/1-2h/>2h/p/d)\%) | 67.5/35.1/10.4               | 58.5/29.9/11.7           | .250            |

\(^a\) Values are in means ± SDs, minimum–maximum; \(^b\) Reflects the differences in total means between conditions by one-factor ANOVA or Pearson's chi square test.

Table 2. Manipulation checks for the variables identification, congruency and similarity\(^a\).
| Variables             | Fictitious fit influencer (n=77) | Real fit influencer (n=77) | P-value |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| Identification        | 1.180 (1.448)                    | 2.740 (1.593)               | <.001   |
|                       | (0-5)                            | (0-7)                       |         |
| Congruency            | 4.390 (.934)                     | 4.770 (.793)                | .008    |
|                       | (1-6)                            | (2-6)                       |         |
| Similarity            | 5.566 (1.727)                    | 6.197 (1.930)               | .034    |
|                       | (1-9)                            | (1-10)                      |         |

*Means ± (SD), min-max.*
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