#### 

**Appendix A**

# **Detailed study design**[[1]](#footnote-1)

The study was conducted in cooperation with TNS Kantar, a company recruiting participants from their survey panel in Germany. Participants needed to live in Germany and be between 18 and 59 years old. All invited participants went through a screening process to identify those who had a goal to eat healthier (see Figure A1 for a detailed flow chart). Participants were included in our study if they met two criteria: (1) they responded to the following question “How satisfied are you with the healthiness of your diet?” with less than a seven (0 = *very* *dissatisfied*, 10 = *very satisfied*), and (2) if they indicated to have at least one of six specified dietary goals (to lose weight, to eat less sweet and fatty food, to eat more fruits and vegetables, to take more time for eating, to eat more homemade food, or to snack less). Of the 8,752 participants entering the survey, 3,021 (35%) did not provide consent and 1,613 (18%) were excluded as they did not meet the inclusion criteria. Furthermore 1,953 (22%) did not finish the intake questionnaire or failed our quality checks, i.e., attention question or speeding. The remaining 1,454 participants completed the intake survey successfully and were subsequently asked to download a mobile app to their phone (Qmob©; see <https://www.qmobme.com/> for more details) that collected the experience sampling data. The app is available for Android and iOS users. For these participants the researchers have access to the intake survey data, while for the other 7,298 potential participants no data is available.

To complete the study, participants needed to respond to at least seven experience surveys and the exit survey, which entitled them to receive a fixed compensation of 8 EUR. A bonus of 2 EUR was offered to those completing more than 15 surveys during the assessment period. After completing the daily surveys, participants completed an exit survey. The data collection started on 17th of November and the last entry survey was submitted on the 12th of December 2018. Mobile data was collected between the 17th of November and the 19th of December. The last exit survey was submitted on the 2nd of January 2019 and concluded the data collection phase.

For the experience surveys, the number of entries per participant ranged from seven to 33, with a median of two and a maximum of eight entries per participant per day. Most study subjects completed the study in seven days (*n* = 374) with a maximum of eleven days.. During the data collection phase we made a single adjustment to the inclusion criteria that deviated from the pre-registration (*omitted from review manuscript*). We also allowed 23 participants to complete the exit survey and the study if they had provided more than seven responses but did so over only six rather than seven days. This decision was made before the data was known to the researchers and intended to increase the final sample size in an increasingly depleted participant pool. The final sample is described in Table A1.

**Figure A1**

*Flow chart of participant inclusion/exclusion*

Started the intake survey
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* Satisfied with their diet (n=1,584)
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Completed intake interviews
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Started mobile survey
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* Did not successfully download mobile app (n=429)

Completed the study
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* Did not complete mobile/exit survey (n=616)

**Table A1**

*Sample Description*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **All** | **Out-of-home** | **At home** |
| Age (mean)  SD  Min/max | 36.64  (8.71)  [18-55] |  |  |
| Male (%) | 42 |  |  |
| Female (%) | 58 |  |  |
| German nationality (%) | 98 |  |  |
| **Education:**  University degree (%) | 25 |  |  |
| Vocational education (%) | 36 |  |  |
| Other (%) | 39 |  |  |
| **Employment status:**  Full-time (%) | 54 |  |  |
| Part-time (%) | 19 |  |  |
| Students (%) | 13 |  |  |
| Retired | 5 |  |  |
| Others (%) | 9 |  |  |
| **Main Variables:** (mean, SD) |  |  |  |
| Dietary Goal failure | 3.83 (1.01) | 4.77 (1.54) | 3.51 (1.07) |
| Policy Acceptance | 5.18 (1.01) |  |  |
| Blame Attribution | 1.33 (0.38) |  |  |
| Policy-Effectiveness | 4.37 (1.31) |  |  |
| Self-Control | 3.90 (0.37) |  |  |
| Reflective Thoughts |  |  |  |
| Dietary Goal | 3.64 (1.27) | 3.02 (1.62) | 3.84 (1.36) |
| Reward | 3.12 (1.28) | 3.60 (1.72) | 2.96 (1.3) |
| Number of observations (Obs.) | 6,447 | 1,458 | 4,803 |
| Number of people | 409 | 364 | 408 |

# **Missing data and non-response**

The 409 participants were asked to report all meals and snacks but where twice a day prompted to report they lunch and dinner. With the exception of open questions, all survey items in the mobile reports were forced choice. Hence, our data does not have item-specific missing values. In the intake survey of the complete sample, only one person clearly reported unrealistic BMI values which was therefore recoded to a missing.

Selective non-response remains a threat to our estimates if the likelihood to report a mobile survey was related to our relationships of interest, e.g., participants were more likely to report a healthy meal. To provide further insights into participants response pattern, we focus on their response to our two daily prompts for lunch and dinner. We focus on this sub-category as missing data to these meals are more likely an indication of non-response rather than a correct indication of non-occurance – as compared to reports of a snack.

Table A2 provides and overview of the 2,809 person-days where at least one mobile report was received. Among these, 60% reported at least lunch and 72% at least dinner, while on 9% did not respond to any of the prompts. Overall, we received more reports about dinner than lunch.

**Table A2**

*Non-response to prompts*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Lunch | | Total |
|  |  | No | Yes |  |
| Dinner | No | 258 | 518 | 776 |
|  | (9.18%) | (18.44%) | (27.63%) |
| Yes | 862 | 1,171 | 2033 |
|  | (30.69%) | (41.69%) | (72.37%) |
| Total |  | 1,120 | 1,689 | 2,809 |
|  |  | (39.87%) | (60.13%) | (100%) |

Given that we have no data about the situational circumstances that might cause the non-response, we exploit data from the intake and completed mobile surveys to better understand the missing data. As participants differed in their number of response days (6 to 11) we create a variable indicating the individual average of missing responses to the two prompts per day (mean = 0.68, SD = 0.37, min = 0, max 1.85). Table A3 shows that some information from the intake survey does predicit the average missing responses to our lunch and dinner prompts. Missing responses decline with age, part-time and unemployed compared to full-time employed, good health, higher score on emotional eating, higher trait self-control, and the importance of taste when eating out. We further asked participants in the exit survey to estimate how many reports they have missed. We provide an analysis for prompted lunch and dinner (mean = 3.02, SD = 4.15, min = 0, max = 22) as well as all reports including breakfast, snack, and other reports (mean = 6.39, SD = 6.90, min = 0, max = 42). As shown in Table A3 column 2 and 3, very few variables are predictive. Noteworthy, attributing more importance to individual weight considerations when eating out-of-home is associated with missing more reports.

**Table A3**

*Prediction of non-response*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Average non-response to prompted lunch and dinner | Self-reported number of non-responses to prompted lunch and dinner | Self-reported number of non-responses total |
| Female | -0.01 | -0.52 | -0.46 |
|  | [-0.10,0.08] | [-1.52,0.49] | [-2.20,1.27] |
| Age | -0.01\* | -0.05 | 0.01 |
|  | [-0.01,-0.00] | [-0.11,0.02] | [-0.09,0.12] |
| Marital status: |  |  |  |
| Single | reference |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Married/with partner | -0.05 | -0.11 | -0.64 |
|  | [-0.15,0.05] | [-1.12,0.91] | [-2.40,1.12] |
| Separted/divorced | 0.07 | 0.57 | -0.13 |
|  | [-0.06,0.20] | [-1.18,2.33] | [-3.37,3.11] |
| German nationality | -0.11 | -0.11 | -0.82 |
|  | [-0.28,0.07] | [-0.28,0.07] | [-3.40,1.76] |
| Net household income |  |  |  |
| Below 1000€ | reference |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1000 up to 1500 € | -0.20\* | -1.71 | -3.45 |
|  | [-0.37,-0.04] | [-3.80,0.38] | [-7.02,0.13] |
| 1500 up to 2000 | -0.25\*\* | -0.54 | -1.28 |
|  | [-0.41,-0.09] | [-2.79,1.71] | [-5.16,2.59] |
| 2000 up to 2500 € | -0.09 | -0.69 | -1.71 |
|  | [-0.26,0.08] | [-2.85,1.47] | [-5.37,1.94] |
| 2500 up to 3000 € | -0.08 | -0.25 | -1.02 |
|  | [-0.25,0.10] | [-2.42,1.92] | [-4.60,2.57] |
| 3000 up to 3500 € | -0.05 | -1.47 | -2.69 |
|  | [-0.21,0.11] | [-3.47,0.54] | [-6.03,0.66] |
| 3500 up to 4000 € | -0.08 | -0.76 | -1.76 |
|  | [-0.26,0.09] | [-2.99,1.48] | [-5.47,1.94] |
| 4000 € and more | 0.04 | -1.82 | -3.74\* |
|  | [-0.13,0.22] | [-4.02,0.39] | [-7.41,-0.08] |
| Income N/A | -0.04 | -0.49 | -0.91 |
|  | [-0.22,0.14] | [-2.96,1.97] | [-4.83,3.01] |
| Employment status |  |  |  |
| Full-time | reference |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Part-time | -0.15\*\* | -0.76 | -0.73 |
|  | [-0.26,-0.04] | [-2.02,0.50] | [-2.72,1.26] |
| Unemployed seeking | -0.40\*\* | -1.37 | -2.42 |
|  | [-0.64,-0.16] | [-4.27,1.52] | [-6.18,1.35] |
| Homemaker | -0.14 | -0.40 | 0.10 |
|  | [-0.33,0.05] | [-2.93,2.13] | [-3.93,4.14] |
| Student | 0.08 | -1.12 | -2.15 |
|  | [-0.05,0.21] | [-2.83,0.58] | [-4.74,0.44] |
| Retired | 0.14 | 0.20 | 0.11 |
|  | [-0.07,0.36] | [-1.81,2.22] | [-3.65,3.87] |
| Not working | -0.01 | -1.47 | 0.04 |
|  | [-0.22,0.20] | [-3.77,0.82] | [-5.44,5.51] |
|  |  |  |  |
| Highest educational degree |  |  |  |
| Lower school degree | reference |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Mid school degree | 0.18 | 1.91 | 3.72\* |
|  | [-0.07,0.43] | [-0.37,4.19] | [0.27,7.17] |
| Higher school degree | -0.01 | 1.21 | 3.86\* |
|  | [-0.26,0.24] | [-1.16,3.58] | [0.16,7.57] |
| Vocational training | 0.12 | 1.46 | 2.63 |
|  | [-0.12,0.36] | [-0.60,3.51] | [-0.50,5.75] |
| University | 0.18 | 1.95 | 3.71\* |
|  | [-0.06,0.43] | [-0.24,4.13] | [0.39,7.02] |
| Physical activity |  |  |  |
| Poor Exercise | reference |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Little | 0.02 | 0.39 | 1.38 |
|  | [-0.11,0.15] | [-1.00,1.78] | [-0.85,3.61] |
| Moderate | 0.02 | 0.36 | 0.79 |
|  | [-0.12,0.15] | [-1.07,1.79] | [-1.51,3.09] |
| Very active | -0.04 | -0.10 | 0.67 |
|  | [-0.27,0.19] | [-2.30,2.10] | [-3.08,4.43] |
| Smoking |  |  |  |
| No, never | reference |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| No, but used to | -0.02 | -0.24 | -0.68 |
|  | [-0.11,0.08] | [-1.27,0.79] | [-2.56,1.21] |
| Yes, currently | 0.09 | 0.09 | -0.56 |
|  | [-0.01,0.18] | [-1.03,1.21] | [-2.48,1.36] |
| BMI | 0.00 | -0.05 | -0.09 |
|  | [-0.00,0.01] | [-0.12,0.03] | [-0.21,0.03] |
| Self-reported health |  |  |  |
| Poor | reference |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fair | -0.21 | 0.06 | -0.56 |
|  | [-0.49,0.08] | [-2.90,3.02] | [-6.01,4.90] |
| Good | -0.20 | -1.09 | -2.00 |
|  | [-0.48,0.09] | [-3.94,1.76] | [-7.25,3.26] |
| Very good | -0.30\* | -1.69 | -2.68 |
|  | [-0.59,-0.01] | [-4.70,1.33] | [-8.12,2.76] |
| Excellent | -0.43\*\* | -2.43 | -2.52 |
|  | [-0.76,-0.11] | [-5.64,0.78] | [-8.36,3.32] |
| Satisfaction with healthiness of  own diet | 0.01 | -0.02 | 0.10 |
|  | [-0.01,0.04] | [-0.37,0.33] | [-0.51,0.70] |
| DEBQ: dietary restraint | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.76 |
|  | [-0.06,0.06] | [-0.36,0.95] | [-0.44,1.95] |
| DEBQ: emotional eating clearly labelled | -0.07\* | -0.25 | -0.14 |
|  | [-0.13,-0.01] | [-1.11,0.62] | [-1.52,1.25] |
| DEBQ: emotional eating diffuse emotions | 0.05 | -0.05 | -0.06 |
|  | [-0.01,0.11] | [-0.79,0.69] | [-1.24,1.12] |
| DEBQ: external eating | -0.04 | 0.30 | 0.76 |
|  | [-0.12,0.04] | [-0.36,0.95] | [-0.44,1.95] |
| Trait self-control | -0.07\* | -0.25 | -0.14 |
|  | [-0.13,-0.01] | [-1.11,0.62] | [-1.52,1.25] |
| Frequency eating out of home food per week: |  |  |  |
| Fast food/ take away / bakery | 0.02 | -0.05 | -0.06 |
|  | [-0.01,0.05] | [-0.37,0.35] | [-0.35,0.79] |
| Classic restaurant | -0.06 | -0.19 | -0.70 |
|  | [-0.14,0.03] | [-1.25,0.86] | [-2.36,0.96] |
| Other incl. canteens, cafeterias | -0.03 | 0.29 | 0.63 |
|  | [-0.06,0.00] | [-0.13,0.72] | [-0.06,1.32] |
| Importance when eating out: |  |  |  |
| Taste | -0.10\* | 0.38 | 0.61 |
|  | [-0.19,-0.01] | [-0.67,1.43] | [-1.05,2.27] |
| Nutrition | 0.00 | -0.61 | -1.16 |
|  | [-0.06,0.06] | [-1.31,0.10] | [-2.33,0.01] |
| Costs | 0.04 | 0.01 | -0.11 |
|  | [-0.02,0.10] | [-0.68,0.70] | [-1.18,0.95] |
| Convenience | -0.03 | -0.03 | -0.08 |
|  | [-0.09,0.02] | [-0.59,0.52] | [-1.07,0.92] |
| Effect on own weight | 0.03 | 0.79\* | 1.53\* |
|  | [-0.03,0.09] | [0.02,1.57] | [0.26,2.79] |
| Freshness | 0.02 | -0.47 | -0.50 |
|  | [-0.04,0.09] | [-1.27,0.34] | [-1.87,0.87] |
| No artificial additives | -0.01 | -0.28 | -0.52 |
|  | [-0.06,0.03] | [-0.89,0.33] | [-1.54,0.51] |
| Intercept | 1.76\*\*\* | 9.29 | 10.74 |
|  | [1.04,2.48] | [-0.17,18.75] | [-4.54,26.02] |
| *N* | 406 | 406 | 406 |
| adj. *R*2 | 0.11 | -0.01 | 0.00 |
| Notes: N is lower due to invalid responses in the predicting variables, e.g., BMI. Estimates are based on OLS. 95% CIs based heteroscedastic robust S.E. in brackets. P-values: \*<.05, \*\*<.01, \*\*\*<.001. | | | |

**Selection and attrition**

From the 1,454 people that qualified for participation after completing the intake survey, 429 did not successfully download the mobile app. Of the remaining 1,025 people starting with the mobile surveys, 616 did not complete the study. We show which participants successfully downloaded the mobile app and which completed the study in Table A4. We observe a few noteworthy pattern: (1) people with higher income, were more likely to successfully down the mobile app; (2) students were more likely to complete the study; (3) people with no school degree were less likely to download the mobile app and complete the study; (4) higher BMI was positively associated with completing the study; (5) people who eat more frequently in classic sit-in restaurants where less likely to complete the study; and (6) people for whom taste and convenience is more important when eating out were more likely to complete the study.

**Table A4**

*Selection into study and attrition*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|  | Download  Mobile App  (=1) | Completed study  (=1) | Completed study given  Download Mobile App (=1) |
| Female | 0.01 | -0.04 | -0.06 |
|  | [-0.04,0.06] | [-0.09,0.01] | [-0.12,0.01] |
| Age | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | [-0.01,0.00] | [-0.00,0.00] | [-0.00,0.01] |
| Marital status: |  |  |  |
| Single |  | reference |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Married/with partner | -0.12\*\*\* | -0.02 | 0.02 |
|  | [-0.18,-0.06] | [-0.08,0.04] | [-0.06,0.09] |
| Separated/divorced | -0.03 | -0.02 | -0.03 |
|  | [-0.12,0.06] | [-0.10,0.07] | [-0.15,0.09] |
| German nationality | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0.13 |
|  | [-0.09,0.14] | [-0.01,0.21] | [-0.03,0.29] |
| Net household income |  |  |  |
| Below 1000€ |  | reference |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1000 up to 1500 € | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
|  | [-0.12,0.09] | [-0.09,0.11] | [-0.09,0.18] |
| 1500 up to 2000 | -0.03 | 0.02 | 0.06 |
|  | [-0.13,0.07] | [-0.07,0.12] | [-0.07,0.20] |
| 2000 up to 2500 € | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.07 |
|  | [-0.03,0.17] | [-0.05,0.16] | [-0.07,0.20] |
| 2500 up to 3000 € | 0.11\* | 0.11 | 0.12 |
|  | [0.00,0.22] | [-0.00,0.22] | [-0.02,0.27] |
| 3000 up to 3500 € | 0.15\*\* | 0.10 | 0.10 |
|  | [0.05,0.26] | [-0.01,0.22] | [-0.05,0.24] |
| 3500 up to 4000 € | 0.11\* | 0.05 | 0.06 |
|  | [0.00,0.23] | [-0.06,0.17] | [-0.09,0.21] |
| 4000 € and more | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.06 |
|  | [-0.01,0.22] | [-0.07,0.17] | [-0.10,0.21] |
| Income N/A | 0.12\* | 0.07 | 0.08 |
|  | [0.01,0.22] | [-0.04,0.19] | [-0.07,0.22] |
| Employment status |  |  |  |
| Full-time |  | reference |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Part-time | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
|  | [-0.05,0.08] | [-0.04,0.09] | [-0.07,0.11] |
| Unemployed seeking | -0.06 | -0.02 | -0.03 |
|  | [-0.23,0.11] | [-0.15,0.12] | [-0.25,0.19] |
| Homemaker | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.05 |
|  | [-0.11,0.10] | [-0.12,0.08] | [-0.20,0.09] |
| Student | 0.07 | 0.12\* | 0.14\* |
|  | [-0.01,0.15] | [0.03,0.21] | [0.03,0.26] |
| Retired | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.16 |
|  | [-0.13,0.15] | [-0.02,0.25] | [-0.01,0.34] |
| Not working | -0.07 | 0.10 | 0.21\* |
|  | [-0.23,0.08] | [-0.05,0.25] | [0.01,0.41] |
| Employment status N/A | -0.17 | -0.18\*\* | -0.29\* |
|  | [-0.51,0.17] | [-0.31,-0.05] | [-0.53,-0.05] |
| Highest educational degree |  |  |  |
| No school degree |  | reference |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Lower school degree | 0.41\* | 0.35\*\*\* | 0.52\*\*\* |
|  | [0.01,0.81] | [0.19,0.52] | [0.24,0.80] |
| Mid school degree | 0.54\*\* | 0.40\*\*\* | 0.50\*\*\* |
|  | [0.14,0.93] | [0.26,0.54] | [0.26,0.74] |
| Higher school degree | 0.50\* | 0.37\*\*\* | 0.48\*\*\* |
|  | [0.11,0.89] | [0.22,0.51] | [0.25,0.71] |
| Vocational training | 0.54\*\* | 0.41\*\*\* | 0.52\*\*\* |
|  | [0.14,0.93] | [0.26,0.55] | [0.29,0.75] |
| University | 0.49\* | 0.40\*\*\* | 0.54\*\*\* |
|  | [0.09,0.88] | [0.26,0.55] | [0.30,0.77] |
| Degree N/A | 0.44 | 0.17 | 0.40 |
|  | [-0.28,1.16] | [-0.19,0.53] | [-0.24,1.04] |
| Physical activity |  |  |  |
| Poor Exercise |  | reference |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Little | 0.06 | 0.09\* | 0.09 |
|  | [-0.01,0.13] | [0.02,0.16] | [-0.00,0.19] |
| Moderate | 0.07 | 0.09\* | 0.10\* |
|  | [-0.01,0.14] | [0.02,0.17] | [0.00,0.20] |
| Very active | -0.01 | 0.05 | 0.09 |
|  | [-0.13,0.11] | [-0.06,0.17] | [-0.07,0.25] |
| Smoking |  |  |  |
| No, never |  | reference |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| No, but used to | -0.03 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
|  | [-0.09,0.03] | [-0.06,0.06] | [-0.07,0.09] |
| Yes, currently | -0.04 | -0.05 | -0.05 |
|  | [-0.10,0.01] | [-0.11,0.00] | [-0.12,0.03] |
| BMI | 0.01\* | 0.01\*\*\* | 0.01\*\* |
|  | [0.00,0.01] | [0.00,0.01] | [0.00,0.01] |
| Self-reported health |  |  |  |
| Poor |  | reference |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fair | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.14 |
|  | [-0.15,0.16] | [-0.05,0.27] | [-0.06,0.35] |
| Good | -0.03 | 0.10 | 0.15 |
|  | [-0.18,0.13] | [-0.06,0.26] | [-0.05,0.35] |
| Very good | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.13 |
|  | [-0.10,0.21] | [-0.04,0.28] | [-0.08,0.33] |
| Excellent | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
|  | [-0.09,0.26] | [-0.07,0.30] | [-0.12,0.35] |
| Satisfaction with healthiness of  own diet | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
|  | [-0.00,0.03] | [-0.01,0.02] | [-0.02,0.03] |
| DEBQ: dietary restraint | -0.02 | -0.02 | -0.02 |
|  | [-0.05,0.02] | [-0.05,0.02] | [-0.07,0.03] |
| DEBQ: emotional eating clearly labelled | -0.05\*\* | -0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | [-0.09,-0.02] | [-0.05,0.03] | [-0.04,0.06] |
| DEBQ: emotional eating diffuse emotions | 0.02 | -0.00 | -0.01 |
|  | [-0.02,0.05] | [-0.04,0.04] | [-0.06,0.03] |
| DEBQ: external eating | 0.03 | 0.01 | -0.00 |
|  | [-0.02,0.08] | [-0.04,0.06] | [-0.06,0.06] |
| Trait self-control | -0.02 | 0.03 | 0.05\* |
|  | [-0.06,0.02] | [-0.01,0.07] | [0.01,0.10] |
| Frequency eating out of home food per week: |  |  |  |
| Fast food/ take away / bakery | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
|  | [-0.01,0.03] | [-0.01,0.02] | [-0.02,0.03] |
| Classic restaurant | -0.06\*\*\* | -0.05\*\*\* | -0.06\*\* |
|  | [-0.08,-0.03] | [-0.07,-0.03] | [-0.10,-0.02] |
| Other incl. canteens, cafeterias | -0.00 | -0.01 | -0.01 |
|  | [-0.02,0.02] | [-0.03,0.01] | [-0.04,0.01] |
| Importance when eating out: |  |  |  |
| Taste | 0.07\*\* | 0.08\*\*\* | 0.10\*\*\* |
|  | [0.02,0.11] | [0.04,0.12] | [0.04,0.16] |
| Nutrition | -0.03 | -0.04\* | -0.03 |
|  | [-0.06,0.01] | [-0.08,-0.00] | [-0.08,0.02] |
| Costs | 0.03 | -0.01 | -0.03 |
|  | [-0.01,0.06] | [-0.05,0.02] | [-0.07,0.02] |
| Convenience | 0.05\*\* | 0.04\*\* | 0.04\* |
|  | [0.02,0.08] | [0.01,0.07] | [0.00,0.08] |
| Effect on own weight | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | [-0.04,0.03] | [-0.03,0.04] | [-0.04,0.05] |
| Freshness | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
|  | [-0.01,0.07] | [-0.01,0.06] | [-0.04,0.07] |
| No artificial additives | -0.04\* | -0.02 | -0.00 |
|  | [-0.07,-0.01] | [-0.05,0.01] | [-0.05,0.04] |
| Intercept | -0.29 | -1.09\*\*\* | -1.41\*\*\* |
|  | [-0.82,0.23] | [-1.46,-0.72] | [-1.96,-0.86] |
| *N* | 1,437 | 1,437 | 1,018 |
| adj. *R*2 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.05 |
| Notes: N is lower due to invalid responses in the predicting variables, e.g., BMI. Estimates are based on OLS. 95% CIs based heteroscedastic robust S.E. in brackets. P-values: \*<.05, \*\*<.01, \*\*\*<.001. | | | |

**Table A5**

*Public food policies*

1. **Unhealthy tax:** Increases prices on unhealthy food through, e.g., sugar tax or tax on calorie-dense products
2. **Healthy subsidies:** Lower the price of healthy food through, e.g., vouchers or coupons
3. **Unhealthy ad restrictions:** Restricts promotion of unhealthy food, e.g., through ban advertisement of sweets or fast food
4. **Healthy education:** increases knowledge on healthy foods through public education campaigns
5. **Calorie labels:** requires calorie labels at chain restaurants (such as McDonald’s and Burger King)
6. **Traffic light system**: requires a ‘‘traffic light” system for food by which healthy foods would be marked with a small green label, unhealthy foods with a small red label, and foods that are neither especially healthy nor especially unhealthy with a small yellow label
7. **Warnings:** requires warning labels on products that have unusually high levels of salt, fat and sugar; for example, ‘‘This product contains high levels of salt, which may be harmful to your health”
8. **Healthy availability requirement:** requires worksite cafeterias and restaurants to ensure the availability of healthy food options
9. **Unhealthy availability restriction:** restricts access to unhealthy food options in schools and public places
10. **Healthier ingredients:** restricts the use of unhealthy ingredients in processed foods by setting maximum values

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A6**  *Factor Analysis of Policy Acceptance* | | | |
|  | **Factor 1**  **(Pull policies)** | **Factor 2**  **(Push policies)** | **Factor 3**  **(Decision Support)** |
| Availability requirement (Pull 1) | **0.67** | 0.06 | 0.23 |
| Subsidies (Pull 2) | **0.64** | 0.11 | 0.16 |
| Education (Pull 3) | **0.54** | 0.21 | 0.30 |
| Ingredients (Pull 4) | **0.48** | 0.38 | 0.27 |
| Tax (Push 1) | 0.05 | **0.57** | 0.16 |
| Ad restriction (Push 2) | 0.15 | **0.71** | 0.14 |
| Availability restriction (Push 3) | 0.33 | **0.46** | 0.31 |
| Traffic light (Decision support 1) | 0.33 | 0.22 | **0.62** |
| Warnings (Decision support 2) | 0.27 | 0.36 | **0.64** |
| Calorie labels (Cl) | 0.28 | 0.10 | 0.30 |

*Note.* Abbreviations: Pl = Pull Policies, Ps = Push Policies, Ds = Decision Support Policies, Cl = Calorie labels.   
Ps1 (**Tax**):Increase prices on unhealthy food through, e.g., sugar tax or tax on calorie-dense products. Pl2 (**Subsidies**):Lower the price of healthy food through, e.g., vouchers or coupons. Ps2 **(Ad restrictions):** Restrict promotion of unhealthy food, e.g., by banning advertisements of sweets or fast food. Pl3 **(Education):** increase knowledge of healthy foods through public education campaigns. Cl (**Calorie labels):** require calorie labels at chain restaurants (such as McDonald’s and Burger King). Ds1 (**Traffic light)**: require a ‘‘traffic light” system for food by which healthy foods would be marked with a small green label, unhealthy foods with a small red label, and foods that are neither especially healthy nor especially unhealthy with a small yellow label. Ds2 (**Warnings):** require warning labels on products that have unusually high levels of salt, fat, and sugar; for example, ‘‘This product contains high levels of salt, which may be harmful to your health”. Pl1 **(Availability requirement):** require worksite cafeterias and restaurants to ensure the availability of healthy food options. Ps3 **(Availability restriction):** restrict access to unhealthy food options in schools and public places. Pl4 **(Ingredients):** restricts the use of unhealthy ingredients in processed foods by setting maximum values.

**Table A7**

*Regression table (H1): Predicted values of food policy acceptance, with food selection made at home and out-of-home separately*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model Main | | | | |  | Model Home | | | | | |  | Model Out of Home | | | | |
|  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | *p* |  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | | *p* |  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | *P* |
| Main | *LL* | *UL* |  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* | |  |  | *LL* | *UL* |
| Intercept | 5.18 | 0.05 | 5.08 | 5.28 | **<.001** |  | 5.18 | 0.05 | 5.08 | | 5.28 | **<.001** |  | 5.19 | 0.05 | 5.08 | 5.29 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.12 | 0.05 | -0.22 | -0.02 | .**014** |  | -0.18 | 0.05 | -0.27 | | -0.09 | **<.001** |  | 0.06 | 0.03 | -0.01 | 0.12 | .092 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | 364 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.015/0.012 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.034/0.032 |  |  | |  |  |  | 0.008/0.005 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pull |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.70 | 0.05 | 5.60 | 5.80 | **<.001** |  | 5.70 | 0.05 | 5.60 | | 5.80 | **<.001** |  | 5.70 | 0.05 | 5.59 | 5.81 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.04 | 0.05 | -0.14 | 0.06 | .424 |  | -0.11 | 0.05 | -0.21 | | -0.02 | **.023** |  | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.17 | **.005** |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | 364 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.002/-0.001 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.013/0.01 |  |  | |  |  |  | 0.021/0.019 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Push |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 4.39 | 0.07 | 4.25 | 4.53 | **<.001** |  | 4.39 | 0.07 | 4.25 | | 4.53 | **<.001** |  | 4.40 | 0.08 | 4.25 | 4.55 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.29 | 0.07 | -0.43 | -0.15 | **<.001** |  | -0.32 | 0.07 | -0.45 | | -0.19 | **<.001** |  | 0.02 | 0.05 | -0.08 | 0.11 | .742 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | 364 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.04/0.037 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.054/0.052 |  |  | |  |  |  | 0/-0.002 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Decision Support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.49 | 0.07 | 5.35 | 5.62 | **<.001** |  | 5.49 | 0.07 | 5.36 | | 5.62 | **<.001** |  | 5.50 | 0.07 | 5.37 | 5.64 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.11 | 0.07 | -0.24 | 0.02 | .104 |  | -0.15 | 0.06 | -0.28 | | -0.03 | **.015** |  | 0.04 | 0.05 | -0.05 | 0.13 | .362 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | 364 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.006/0.004 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.014/0.012 |  |  | |  |  |  | 0.002/0 |  |  |  |  |

**Table A8**

*Regression table (H2a): Predicted values of food policy acceptance, with food selection made at home and out-of-home separately*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model Main | | | | |  | Model Home | | | | | |  | Model Out of Home | | | | | |
|  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | *p* |  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | | *p* |  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | *P* |
| Main | *LL* | *UL* |  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* | |  |  | *LL* | *UL* |
| Intercept | 5.17 | 0.04 | 5.08 | 5.25 | **<.001** |  | 5.18 | 0.04 | 5.09 | | 5.26 | **<.001** |  | 5.18 | 0.04 | 5.10 | 5.27 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.02 | 0.04 | -0.10 | 0.07 | .702 |  | -0.18 | 0.04 | -0.16 | | 0.00 | .061 |  | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.13 | **.007** |
| Effectiveness all | 0.42 | 0.03 | 0.35 | 0.48 | **<.001** |  | 0.41 | 0.03 | 0.34 | | 0.47 | **<.001** |  | 0.43 | 0.03 | 0.37 | 0.50 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Effectiveness all | -0.03 | 0.03 | -0.09 | 0.02 | .245 |  | -0.02 | 0.03 | -0.07 | | 0.03 | .392 |  | -0.03 | 0.02 | -0.08 | 0.01 | .124 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | 364 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0293/0.288 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.298/0.293 |  |  | |  |  |  | 0.313/0.308 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pull |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.69 | 0.05 | 5.60 | 5.78 | **<.001** |  | 5.69 | 0.05 | 5.60 | | 5.79 | **<.001** |  | 5.70 | 0.05 | 5.60 | 5.80 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | 0.04 | 0.05 | -0.05 | 0.13 | .394 |  | -0.03 | 0.05 | -0.12 | | 0.06 | .528 |  | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.17 | **.001** |
| Effectiveness pull | 0.37 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.43 | **<.001** |  | 0.35 | 0.03 | 0.28 | | 0.42 | **<.001** |  | 0.36 | 0.04 | 0.29 | 0.43 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Effectiveness pull | -0.04 | 0.03 | -0.10 | 0.02 | .156 |  | -0.03 | 0.03 | -0.08 | | 0.02 | .287 |  | -0.02 | 0.02 | -0.06 | 0.02 | .392 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | 364 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.215/0.210 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.213/0.207 |  |  | |  |  |  | 0.237/0.230 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Push |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 4.40 | 0.06 | 4.28 | 4.52 | **<.001** |  | 4.39 | 0.06 | 4.27 | | 4.51 | **<.001** |  | 4.41 | 0.06 | 4.28 | 4.53 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.14 | 0.06 | -0.26 | -0.02 | **.025** |  | -0.18 | 0.06 | -0.30 | | -0.07 | **.002** |  | 0.03 | 0.04 | -0.03 | 0.13 | .195 |
| Effectiveness push | 0.49 | 0.04 | 0.42 | 0.57 | **<.001** |  | 0.49 | 0.04 | 0.41 | | 0.57 | **<.001** |  | 0.53 | 0.04 | 0.45 | 0.61 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Effectiveness push | 0.03 | 0.04 | -0.04 | 0.10 | .415 |  | 0.01 | 0.03 | -0.05 | | 0.08 | .705 |  | 0.02 | 0.03 | -0.04 | 0.07 | .578 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | 364 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.317/0.312 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.325/0.319 |  |  | |  |  |  | 0.325/0.320 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Decision Support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.48 | 0.05 | 5.38 | 5.58 | **<.001** |  | 5.49 | 0.05 | 5.38 | | 5.59 | **<.001** |  | 5.50 | 0.05 | 5.39 | 5.60 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | 0.02 | 0.05 | -0.08 | 0.12 | .719 |  | -0.04 | 0.05 | -0.14 | | 0.06 | .394 |  | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.15 | **.033** |
| Effectiveness Decision Support | 0.50 | 0.03 | 0.44 | 0.56 | **<.001** |  | 0.49 | 0.03 | 0.43 | | 0.55 | **<.001** |  | 0.52 | 0.03 | 0.45 | 0.58 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Effectiveness Decision S | -0.02 | 0.03 | -0.08 | 0.04 | .502 |  | -0.01 | 0.03 | -0.06 | | 0.05 | .820 |  | -0.05 | 0.02 | -0.10 | -0.01 | **.009** |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | 364 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.387/0.383 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.388/0.384 |  |  | |  |  |  | 0.411/0.406 |  |  |  |  |

**Table A9**

*Regression table (H2b): Predicted values of food policy acceptance, with food selection made at home and out-of-home separately*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model Main | | | | |  | Model Home | | | | | | |  | | Model Out of Home | | | | | |
|  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | *p* |  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | | *p* |  | | Estimate | | *SE* | 95% CI | | *P* |
| Main | *LL* | *UL* |  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* | |  |  | | *LL* | *UL* |
| Intercept | 5.18 | 0.05 | 5.08 | 5.28 | **<.001** |  | 5.18 | 0.05 | 5.08 | | 5.28 | **<.001** |  | | 5.19 | | 0.05 | 5.08 | 5.29 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.12 | 0.05 | -0.22 | -0.02 | **.015** |  | -0.18 | 0.05 | -0.27 | | -0.08 | **<.001** |  | | 0.06 | | 0.03 | -0.01 | 0.13 | .077 |
| Blame Attribution | 0.00 | 0.06 | -0.12 | 0.12 | .997 |  | -0.01 | 0.06 | -0.12 | | 0.11 | .929 |  | | -0.05 | | 0.06 | -0.17 | 0.08 | .476 |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Blame Attribution | -0.01 | 0.06 | -0.12 | 0.11 | .901 |  | 0.00 | 0.06 | -0.10 | | 0.11 | .936 |  | | -0.01 | | 0.04 | -0.09 | 0.06 | .746 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | | 364 | |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.015/0.007 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.034/0.027 |  |  | |  |  |  | | 0.009/0.001 | |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Pull |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.70 | 0.05 | 5.45 | 6.27 | **<.001** |  | 5.70 | 0.05 | 5.60 | | 5.80 | **<.001** |  | | 5.71 | | 0.06 | 5.60 | 5.82 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.04 | 0.05 | -0.14 | 0.06 | .425 |  | -0.11 | 0.05 | -0.21 | | -0.02 | **.023** |  | | 0.09 | | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.17 | **.009** |
| Blame Attribution | 0.12 | 0.06 | -0.00 | 0.24 | .051 |  | 0.12 | 0.06 | -0.01 | | 0.24 | .060 |  | | 0.07 | | 0.07 | -0.06 | 0.20 | .300 |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Blame Attribution | 0.00 | 0.06 | -0.12 | 0.12 | .970 |  | 0.03 | 0.06 | -0.09 | | 0.14 | .623 |  | | -0.04 | | 0.04 | -0.12 | 0.04 | .327 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | | 364 | |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.011/0.004 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.022/0.015 |  |  | |  |  |  | | 0.027/0.019 | |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Push |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 4.39 | 0.07 | 4.25 | 4.53 | **<.001** |  | 4.39 | 0.07 | 4.25 | | 4.53 | **<.001** |  | | 4.39 | | 0.08 | 4.24 | 4.54 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.29 | 0.07 | -0.43 | -0.15 | **<.001** |  | -0.32 | 0.07 | -0.45 | | -0.19 | **<.001** |  | | 0.03 | | 0.05 | -0.07 | 0.13 | .568 |
| Blame Attribution | -0.11 | 0.08 | -0.28 | 0.05 | .185 |  | -0.12 | 0.08 | -0.28 | | 0.05 | .157 |  | | -0.16 | | 0.09 | -0.34 | 0.02 | .083 |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Blame Attribution | -0.01 | 0.08 | -0.18 | 0.15 | .882 |  | -0.03 | 0.08 | -0.19 | | 0.12 | .695 |  | | 0.08 | | 0.06 | -0.03 | 0.19 | .113 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | | 364 | |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.044/0.037 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.059/0.052 |  |  | |  |  |  | | 0.015/0.007 | |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Decision Support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.49 | 0.07 | 5.35 | 5.62 | **<.001** |  | 5.49 | 0.07 | 5.36 | | 5.62 | **<.001** |  | | 5.51 | | 0.07 | 5.37 | 5.65 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.11 | 0.07 | -0.24 | 0.02 | .108 |  | -0.15 | 0.06 | -0.28 | | -0.03 | **.015** |  | | 0.05 | | 0.05 | -0.04 | 0.14 | .296 |
| Blame Attribution | -0.04 | 0.08 | -0.20 | 0.11 | .576 |  | -0.05 | 0.08 | -0.21 | | 0.10 | .523 |  | | -0.08 | | 0.09 | -0.25 | 0.08 | .331 |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Blame Attribution | -0.02 | 0.08 | -0.17 | 0.14 | .834 |  | 0.01 | 0.07 | -0.13 | | 0.16 | .844 |  | | -0.03 | | 0.05 | -0.13 | 0.07 | .548 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | | 364 | |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.007/0.000 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.015/0.008 |  |  | |  |  |  | | 0.006/-0.002 | |  |  |  |  |

**Table A10**

*Predicted values of food policy acceptance, with food selection made at home and out-of-home separately*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model Main | | | | |
|  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | *p* |
| Main | *LL* | *UL* |
| Intercept | 5.18 | 0.05 | 5.08 | 5.28 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.12 | 0.05 | -0.22 | -0.02 | **.014** |
| Self-Control | 0.09 | 0.13 | -0.17 | 0.36 | .491 |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Self Control | 0.10 | 0.12 | -0.14 | 0.34 | .401 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.015/0.012 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pull |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.70 | 0.05 | 5.60 | 5.81 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.04 | 0.05 | -0.15 | 0.06 | .395 |
| Self-Control | 0.04 | 0.14 | -0.24 | 0.31 | .799 |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Self Control | 0.28 | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.53 | **.031** |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.013/0.006 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Push |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 4.39 | 0.07 | 4.25 | 4.53 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.29 | 0.07 | -0.43 | -0.15 | **<.001** |
| Self-Control | 0.14 | 0.19 | -0.24 | 0.52 | .466 |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Self Control | -0.10 | 0.17 | -0.45 | 0.24 | .548 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.042/0.035 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Decision Support |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.49 | 0.07 | 5.35 | 5.62 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Goal Failure | -0.11 | 0.07 | -0.24 | 0.02 | .110 |
| Self-Control | 0.20 | 0.18 | -0.15 | 0.56 | .264 |
| Dietary Goal Failure \* Self Control | 0.04 | 0.16 | -0.28 | 0.36 | .819 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.010/0.002 |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model Main | | | | |  | Model Pull | | | | | |  | Model Push | | | | |  | Model Decision Support | | | | |
|  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | *p* |  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | | *p* |  | Estimate | *SE* | 95% CI | | *P* |  | Estimate | *SE* | *95% CI* | | *p* |
| Main | *LL* | *UL* |  |  |  | *LL* | *UL* | |  |  | *LL* | *UL* |  | *LL* | *UL* |
| Intercept | 4.13 | 0.36 | 3.42 | 4.84 | **<.001** |  | 5.01 | 0.39 | 4.25 | | 5.77 | **<.001** |  | 2.73 | 0.52 | 1.72 | 3.75 | **<.001** |  | 4.47 | 0.49 | 3.5 | 5.43 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Foal Failure | -0.13 | 0.05 | -0.22 | -0.03 | .**009** |  | -0.04 | 0.05 | -0.15 | | 0.06 | .392 |  | -0.3 | 0.07 | -0.44 | -0.17 | **<.001** |  | -0.11 | 0.07 | -0.24 | 0.02 | .106 |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.02 | .057 |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0 | | 0.02 | .138 |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.03 | .142 |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.03 | .064 |
| Gender | 0.44 | 0.1 | 0.24 | 0.64 | **<.001** |  | 0.38 | 0.11 | 0.16 | | 0.59 | **.001** |  | 0.56 | 0.15 | 0.27 | 0.84 | **<.001** |  | 0.41 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.68 | **.003** |
| Income | -0.02 | 0.02 | -0.06 | 0.02 | .248 |  | -0.02 | 0.02 | -0.07 | | 0.02 | .291 |  | -0.05 | 0.03 | -0.11 | 0.01 | .094 |  | 0.02 | 0.03 | -0.04 | 0.07 | .590 |
| Education | 0.02 | 0.04 | -0.07 | 0.1 | .714 |  | -0.03 | 0.05 | -0.12 | | 0.06 | .546 |  | 0.13 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.24 | **.039** |  | -0.05 | 0.06 | -0.16 | 0.06 | .386 |
| Observations | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 409 |  |  | |  |  |  | 409 |  |  |  |  |  | 409 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.065/0.054 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.037/0.026 |  |  | |  |  |  | 0.090/0.079 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.033/0.021 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Home |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 4.12 | 0.36 | 3.41 | 4.82 | **<.001** |  | 4.99 | 0.38 | 4.23 | | 5.74 | **<.001** |  | 2.73 | 0.51 | 1.72 | 3.74 | **<.001** |  | 4.45 | 0.49 | 3.49 | 5.41 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Foal Failure | -0.18 | 0.05 | -0.27 | -0.09 | **<.001** |  | -0.12 | 0.05 | -0.21 | | 0.02 | .**018** |  | -0.33 | 0.07 | -0.46 | -0.2 | **<.001** |  | -0.15 | 0.06 | -0.27 | -0.03 | **.015** |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.02 | **.038** |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0 | | 0.02 | **.**103 |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.03 | .109 |  | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.03 | .051 |
| Gender | 0.43 | 0.1 | 0.24 | 0.63 | **<.001** |  | 0.38 | 0.11 | 0.16 | | 0.59 | **.001** |  | 0.55 | 0.14 | 0.26 | 0.83 | **<.001** |  | 0.4 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.67 | **.004** |
| Income | -0.03 | 0.02 | -0.07 | 0.01 | .182 |  | -0.03 | 0.02 | -0.07 | | 0.02 | .209 |  | -0.05 | 0.03 | -0.11 | 0.01 | .074 |  | 0.01 | 0.03 | -0.04 | 0.07 | .675 |
| Education | 0.02 | 0.04 | -0.06 | 0.1 | .677 |  | -0.02 | 0.04 | -0.11 | | 0.06 | .601 |  | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.24 | **.039** |  | -0.05 | 0.06 | -0.16 | 0.06 | .402 |
| Observations | 408 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | |  |  |  | 408 |  |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.086/0.075 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.05/0.038 |  |  | |  |  |  | 0.104/0.093 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.041/0.029 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Out-of-Home |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 4.24 | 0.38 | 3.49 | 5 | **<.001** |  | 5.18 | 0.4 | 4.39 | | 5.97 | **<.001** |  | 2.85 | 0.56 | 1.76 | 3.95 | **<.001** |  | 4.62 | 0.52 | 3.6 | 5.64 | **<.001** |
| Dietary Foal Failure | 0.04 | 0.03 | -0.02 | 0.11 | .192 |  | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.02 | | 0.16 | **.011** |  | 0 | 0.05 | -0.1 | 0.09 | .927 |  | 0.03 | 0.05 | -0.06 | 0.12 | .514 |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.02 | .085 |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.01 | | 0.02 | .279 |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.01 | 0.03 | .169 |  | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0 | 0.03 | .061 |
| Gender | 0.44 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.32 | **<.001** |  | 0.38 | 0.11 | 0.15 | | 0.6 | **.001** |  | 0.58 | 0.16 | 0.27 | 0.88 | **<.001** |  | 0.37 | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.65 | **.012** |
| Income | -0.02 | 0.02 | -0.06 | 0.02 | .361 |  | -0.02 | 0.02 | -0.07 | | 0.02 | .267 |  | -0.04 | 0.03 | -0.1 | 0.02 | .209 |  | 0.02 | 0.03 | -0.04 | 0.08 | .491 |
| Education | -0.01 | 0.04 | -0.1 | 0.08 | .871 |  | -0.04 | 0.05 | -0.14 | | 0.05 | .355 |  | 0.09 | 0.07 | -0.04 | 0.21 | .191 |  | -0.08 | 0.06 | -0.2 | 0.04 | .196 |
| Observations | 364 |  |  |  |  |  | 364 |  |  | |  |  |  | 364 |  |  |  |  |  | 364 |  |  |  |  |
| R²/R² adj. | 0.058 / 0.044 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.06 / 0.046 |  |  | |  |  |  | 0.047 / 0.034 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 / 0.017 |  |  |  |  |

**Table A11**

*Regression table: Predicted values of food policy acceptance, with food selection made at home and out-of-home separate, including control variables*

**Appendix B**

**Effects of Thoughts during Food Selection**

To better understand our main finding that higher dietary goal failure relates to lower food policy acceptance, we explored whether people's thoughts during food selection impact the relationship between dietary goal failure and policy support (not pre-registered).

In our study, participants were asked to describe their thoughts when they selected or prepared their food (Anonymous, 2022). They were presented with the following five items and asked to indicate their answer on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). (1) “I thought about my goal to eat healthily”; (2) “I felt like I needed a reward or treat”; (3) “I experienced a desire to choose unhealthy food”; (4) “I experienced a desire to eat a large portion”; and an open text question (5) “I thought about something different.”

We found that people with highly salient health goals during decision-making reported higher public food policy acceptance across all policies (β= .19, *p* < .001), while people using food to reward themselves showed lower acceptance (β = -.14, *p* = .003). This means that people reflecting on their dietary goals during the food selection were more supportive of food policies that helped them reach their goals. However, people who chose food with an explicit need to reward themselves accepted the same food policies less. The positive relation between dietary goal salience and policy acceptance was observed for all three policy types when estimated separately.

The pattern that those selecting unhealthy food to reward themselves showed lower food policy acceptance, and people who rather thought about their health goals during food selection accepted these policies more, which may reflect the established conflict between short-term hedonic goals and long-term goals (Bargh & Chartrand, 1999; Lewin, 1946; Miller, 1944; Shah & Kruglanski, 2002). When short-term hedonic goals are salient, important long-term goals easily become inhibited (e.g., Fishbach et al., 2003). For example, customs like eating cake with family on Sundays or enjoying an after-work beer with colleagues, these short-term goals of rewarding oneself can override the long-term goal of changing unhealthy eating habits. Supporting public food policies would then collide with the prevailing short-term goal.

The use of reward strategies and health goal salience both reflect cognitive processes, where food choices are used instrumentally to serve a goal. For the democratic process, it is relevant that both situational reflections in everyday life can be likened to policy attitudes. This may indicate that people, on average, incorporate these everyday experiences into their policy attitudes. Sub-conscious processes and more intuitive thoughts (i.e., unhealthy desires, mindless eating) have been shown to increase dietary failure (e.g., Ogden et al., 2013,2017; Lemoine & McCarthy, 2008; Allan et al., 2010; Stroebe et al., 2013) and cannot be linked to the acceptance of public food policy, even though some are designed to target non-cognitive processes, particularly. Inspecting eating-out and eating-at-home in this context, we find that people reflect less at home. Again, selecting healthy food at home is probably less challenging and thus requires less reflective thoughts. The real experience of dietary goal failure appears to happen on the streets.
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