

Abstract

1
2 Compensatory health beliefs (CHBs) - beliefs that an unhealthy behaviour can be
3 compensated for by healthy behaviour - are hypothesised to be activated automatically
4 to help people resolve conflicts between their desires (e.g. eat chocolate) and their long-
5 term goals (e.g. dieting). The aim of the present research was to investigate diet-
6 specific CHBs within the context of a theoretical framework, the Health Action Process
7 Approach (HAPA), to examine the extent to which diet-specific CHBs contribute to
8 dieting intentions and dietary intake. Seventy five dieting women were recruited in
9 Switzerland and England and were asked to complete measures of diet-specific CHBs,
10 risk perception, outcome expectancies, self-efficacy, intention, and behaviour. Path
11 modelling showed that, overall, diet-specific CHBs were not related to dieting
12 intentions ($\beta = .10$) or behaviour ($\beta = .06$) over and above variables specified in the
13 HAPA. However, risk perception moderated the relationship between diet-specific
14 CHBs and intention ($\beta = .26$). Diet-specific CHBs positively predicted intention in
15 women with high risk perception, but not in women with low risk perception. This
16 positive relationship might be explained by the assumption that CHBs play different
17 roles at different stages of the health-behaviour change process. Future studies should
18 further examine moderators and stage-specific differences of the associations between
19 CHBs, intention and health-behaviour change.

20
21 *Keywords:* Compensatory Health Beliefs; dieting; Health Action Process Approach;
22 intention; moderator; Switzerland; England;

23

1 **Introduction**

2 People who diet routinely face situations in which their immediate desires (e.g. eat a
3 dessert) interfere with their long-term goals (e.g. lose weight) resulting in a mental
4 conflict between the desire to eat the tempting food and the superordinate goal of
5 dieting (e.g. Carver & Scheier, 1998; Festinger, 1957; Rabiau, Knäuper, & Miquelon,
6 2006). Although people try to act in accordance with their long-term goals, they often
7 fail because their need to fulfil their desires (e.g. eat a dessert) is greater than the
8 willpower to achieve the long-term goal (e.g. Baumeister & Heatherton, 1996;
9 Baumeister, Heatherton, & Tice, 1994; Trope & Fishbach, 2000). According to Rabiau
10 et al. (2006), individuals may activate compensatory health beliefs (CHBs) to resolve
11 such dilemmas. CHBs are thoughts that an unhealthy behaviour (e.g. eating unhealthy)
12 can be compensated for (or neutralised) through the performance of a healthy behaviour
13 (e.g. physical activity). According to the CHB model, the use of CHBs allows people
14 the best of both worlds, namely, to indulge their temptations while working toward their
15 health goals (Rabiau et al., 2006).

16 In line with the CHB model (Rabiau et al., 2006) and as emerging evidence
17 shows, the use of CHBs interferes with successful adherence to health-behaviour
18 changes among dieters, adolescents with type 1 diabetes, and smokers (Kronick &
19 Knäuper, 2010; Rabiau, Knäuper, Nguyen, Sufrategui, & Polychronakos, 2009; Radtke,
20 Scholz, Keller, & Hornung, 2012; Radtke, Scholz, Keller, Knäuper, & Hornung, 2011).
21 For example, women who are on a diet have been shown to activate diet-specific CHBs
22 by planning to engage in future compensatory behaviour when faced with tempting,
23 high caloric food choices and end up consuming more calories as a result (Kronick,
24 Auerbach, Stich, & Knäuper, 2011; Kronick & Knäuper, 2010). However, no studies to
25 date have investigated diet-specific CHBs in comparison with other well-established
26 concepts like self-efficacy, risk perception, or planning found in theoretical models of

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 behavior change (e.g. Health Action Process Approach, HAPA; Schwarzer, 1992,
2 2008). The fact that diet-specific CHBs were examined without (e.g. Kronick &
3 Knäuper, 2010) or just in comparison with one construct (e.g. motivation; Miquelon,
4 Knäuper, & Vallerand, 2012) raises the possibility that CHBs merely account for
5 variance that is routinely accounted for by concepts such as self-efficacy or intention
6 (e.g. Armitage & Conner, 1999; Scholz, Nagy, Göhner, Luszczynska, & Kliegel, 2009).
7 Thus, it might be that CHBs are not as relevant for the prediction of intentions and/or
8 behaviour as concluded from the studies mentioned above. To examine the unique
9 explained variance of intention and/or behaviour by the CHBs a comparison with other
10 well-established concepts is necessary. In addition, until now it has not been
11 investigated under which conditions the relationship between CHBs and intention or
12 behaviour is more likely. Therefore, the investigation of moderators for the relationship
13 between CHBs and intention and/or behaviour is advisable, especially because Rabiau
14 and her colleagues (2006) stated that CHBs will be activated when self-efficacy is low.
15 In contrast, when individual's self-efficacy is high, it is more likely that individuals
16 resist a desire like eating a cake which in turn makes the activation of CHBs
17 unnecessary. Furthermore, it is hypothesised that CHBs interfere with risk perception
18 and outcome expectancies such that CHBs will be activated whenever risk perception
19 and positive outcome expectancies are high (Rabiau et al., 2006). Nevertheless, the
20 empirical evidence is currently lacking.

21 Thus, the present study aims to investigate diet-specific CHBs within the context
22 of the Health Action Process Approach (HAPA; Schwarzer, 1992, 2008) and will
23 examine the extent to which diet-specific CHBs can contribute to the prediction of
24 dieting intention and behaviour relative to the HAPA, a parsimonious, well-established
25 model in the field of health behaviour change.

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 The HAPA (Schwarzer, 2008) distinguishes a pre-intentional motivational from
2 a post-intentional volitional phase. Furthermore, it states that risk perception, as a distal
3 starting point of a deliberation process for health behaviour change, outcome
4 expectancies, and self-efficacy as predictors of behavioural intention. Outcome
5 expectancies are defined as a reflection of possible pros and cons of behavioural
6 consequences, whereas self-efficacy is defined as one`s belief in one`s own ability to
7 overcome barriers in everyday life. Individuals within this phase are characterised as
8 pre-intenders. After the formation of an intention people enter the volitional phase. In
9 this phase there are individuals who already act according to their intentions (actors)
10 and those who have not yet translated their intentions into actions (intenders). In this
11 case, the HAPA suggest action planning and action control as mediators between the
12 intention and the behaviour. Planning is understood as the prospective formation of
13 concrete plans about when, where and how to implement intended behaviour. In
14 contrast, action control is defined as a self-regulation strategy, where one`s own
15 behaviour is monitored with regard to the behavioural standard (Schwarzer, 2008). The
16 HAPA has already demonstrated applicability across a variety of health behaviours,
17 such as chronic illness and disability (Schwarzer, Lippke, & Luszczynska, 2011) or
18 smoking behaviour (Radtke et al., 2012; Scholz et al., 2009), as well as to diverse
19 samples (e.g. Schwarzer, 2008). However, one criticism of the HAPA is that it assumes
20 implicitly that the individual is a rational decision maker. The role of a motivational
21 conflict that arises between affective states (e.g. temptations, cravings, or desires) and
22 motivation (e.g. health goals) as well as situational variables is rather neglected. Thus,
23 the integration of CHBs, which are activated by a motivational and emotional conflict
24 (Rabiau et al., 2006), into the HAPA might be of special benefit for the model. In line
25 with this, preliminary research shows that smoking- and physical exercise-specific

1 CHBs are an additional predictor of behavioural intentions within the HAPA (cf., Berli,
2 Loretini, Radtke, Hornung, & Scholz, in press; Radtke et al., 2012).

3 Moreover, including CHBs into a model of health behaviour change might be
4 advantageous in terms of developing theories of multiple health behaviour change. As
5 of now, it is poorly understood how different healthy and/or unhealthy behaviour are
6 linked with each other (Spring, Moller, & Coons, 2012). Therefore, the investigation of
7 CHBs within a health behaviour change model might be of special advantage to
8 understand how different health behaviours are bundled with each other (e.g. dieting
9 and physical activity) and how this can guide interventions.

10 **Aim of the study and hypothesised model**

11 The present study hypothesised that diet-specific CHBs will be negatively
12 related to the intention to diet over and above the standard predictors of the motivational
13 and volitional phases of the HAPA (cf. Figure 1). Moreover, the CHB model states that
14 the use of CHBs in the long-run should reduce a certain health behaviour because
15 individuals a) have a strategy at hand to resolve their experienced dissonance without
16 engaging in the health behaviour and b) often fail to engage in the intended
17 compensatory behaviour (e.g., go to the gym the next day instead of going today)
18 because of procrastination or because time passed by and the initially felt dissonance
19 weakens over time (Rabiau et al., 2006). Thus, we hypothesise a direct negative effect
20 of CHBs on behaviour. Furthermore, we expected a mediation of diet-specific CHBs on
21 planning and action control via intention based on previous findings on smoking-
22 specific CHBs (Radtke et al., 2012). In addition, we tested whether the relationship
23 between the diet-specific CHBs and intention is moderated by self-efficacy, outcome
24 expectancies, and/or risk perception. According to Rabiau et al. (2006) the relationship
25 should be higher for individuals with low self-efficacy as well as high positive outcome
26 expectancies and risk perception.

1 **Method**

2 **Participants**

3 Participants were recruited in Switzerland (CH) and England (ENG)¹ from the
4 undergraduate and employee populations of two Universities [blinded for peer review]
5 via e-mailing lists and notices posted on campuses advertising a study to women who
6 were dieting or trying to maintain their weight. In Switzerland, recruitment also took
7 place in “Weight Watcher” meetings.

8 As a cover story all women were told that the study was a taste test to
9 understand how colour preference is linked to taste perception in women who diet
10 versus women who do not diet in different cultures (cf. Kronick & Knäuper, 2010).

11 Overall, $N = 250$ people expressed interested in taking part in the study. Before
12 the invitation to the laboratory, all women had to fill in an online-questionnaire for
13 measuring e.g. food allergies, or dieting behaviour. Inclusion criteria for invitation and
14 participation in the study were that the women needed to have a wish to lose or maintain
15 weight and/or were currently dieting (excluded: $n = 25$). Moreover, study participants
16 were required to be fluent in (Swiss-) German and English respectively. Exclusion
17 criteria were being allergic to nuts (because women had to taste M&Ms) and/or latex
18 glove (because women had to wear gloves when tasting the M&Ms; $n = 23$), or having
19 an eating disorder ($n = 18$). From the remaining women ($n = 184$) who met these
20 criteria, $n = 99$ did not provide their contact details, did not reply to our invitation mail,
21 or were absent at the appointed date. Of the 85 participants, 10 women were excluded
22 from further analyses because their body mass index was < 20 , which classifies them as
23 being underweight. Therefore, the final sample size consisted of 75 women who were

¹ In the following we use the words *English/England* and *Swiss/Switzerland* for the distinction between residents from England or Switzerland, even though their nationality might be another one.

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 on a diet aged 19 to 66 years with a mean age of 31.95 years ($SD = 12.40$). Thirty eight
2 were residents of Switzerland and 37 of England.

3 Participating in the study was rewarded through the research participation
4 schemes of each University, whereas all non-students in Switzerland were paid 10
5 Swiss Francs (10.6 US-Dollars).

6 All individuals attended voluntarily, gave their informed consent to participate
7 and were treated in accordance to the ethical standards of the Declaration of Helsinki
8 (World Medical Organization, 1996). Furthermore, all participants were debriefed after
9 the experiment. Ethical approval for the study was given by the internal review board
10 of the University of [blinded for peer review] and the study protocol adhered to British
11 Psychological Society ethical guidelines.

12 **Design**

13 This study was designed as a randomised control trial to investigate whether
14 diet-specific CHBs that propose exercise as compensation can be manipulated. For the
15 present analyses the experimental design is not of interest, because this paper focuses on
16 diet-specific CHBs in the framework of the HAPA and not on physical activity.
17 Importantly, there was no significant effect of experimental condition on any of the
18 variables reported here (further description available upon request from the authors or
19 [blinded for peer review]).

20 **Measures**

21 The following instruments were included in the questionnaire to investigate diet-
22 specific CHBs concurrently with the HAPA. All of the listed materials were available
23 in German and English and were completed after the taste test. Furthermore, all of
24 these measures have proven their validity and reliability (Cronbach`s Alpha is given in
25 parenthesis) as can be referred in the listed references. Table 1 the means, standard
26 deviations, and the internal consistencies resulted in this study are shown.

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 **Diet-specific CHBs** (Knäuper, Rabiau, Cohen, & Patriciu, 2004; Lippke,
2 Hohmann, Kalusche, & Knäuper, 2007). The original CHB scale proved to be valid
3 regarding construct and criterion related validity. Furthermore, internal consistency of
4 the overall scale is $\alpha = .80$ and $\alpha = .57$ of the subscale weight regulation. From the
5 general CHB scale only CHBs related to dieting and maintaining weight were used in
6 this study. The five items ($\alpha = .44$) were answered on a five-point Likert-scale of
7 ‘strongly disagree’ (0) to ‘strongly agree’ (4). Items are ‘If one exercises one can eat
8 without many restrictions,’ ‘Using artificial sweeteners compensates for extra calories,’
9 ‘Skipping the main dish can make up for eating dessert,’ ‘Starting a new diet tomorrow
10 compensates for breaking a diet today,’ and ‘Eating whatever one wants in the evening
11 is OK, if one did not eat much during the day.’

12 **Risk perception** (Scholz et al., 2009; $\alpha > .89$). Risk perception was measured
13 with three items (e.g. ‘If I continue the way I live now, there`s a high probability that I
14 will suffer from serious health issues.’) according to the Health Action Process
15 Approach (HAPA). The items ($\alpha = .94$) are scored on a 6-point Likert-scale ranging
16 from ‘not true at all’ (1) to ‘very true’ (6).

17 **Positive outcome expectancies** (Renner, Hahn, & Schwarzer, 1996; Renner,
18 Schwarzer, Kwon, Spivak, & Panzer, 2005; Sniehotta, Scholz, & Schwarzer, 2005; $\alpha >$
19 $.80$). Positive outcome expectancies defined as evaluations of the pros of certain
20 consequences of behaviours, were measured with five items ($\alpha = .63$) concerning the
21 positive consequences of reducing weight (e.g. ‘If I lose weight, I feel physically more
22 attractive.’). The items are scored on a 6-point Likert-scale ranging from ‘not true at
23 all’ (1) to ‘very true’ (6).

24 **Self-efficacy** (Renner et al., 1996; Renner et al., 2005; Scholz et al., 2009; $\alpha >$
25 $.84$). Seven items ($\alpha = .74$) assessing dieting self-efficacy, which is defined as an
26 individual’s belief of competency to adhere to a diet to lose weight or to maintain a

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 current weight status, were scored on 6-point Likert-scales ranging from ‘not true at all’
2 (1) to ‘very true’ (6). An item example is ‘I am sure that I can reduce my weight, even
3 if I initially have to make plans.’

4 **Intention** (Renner et al., 1996; Renner et al., 2005; Sniehotta et al., 2005; $\alpha >$
5 .82). Intentions concerning nutrition behaviour and diet were measured with five items
6 ($\alpha = .72$; e.g. ‘I intend to eat low-fat food.’). Answering format was a six-point Likert-
7 scale of ‘not true at all’ (1) to ‘very true’ (6).

8 **Action planning** (Scholz et al., 2009; $\alpha > .81$). Four items ($\alpha = .69$) assessed
9 action planning with a 6-point Likert-scale ranging from ‘not true at all’ (1) to ‘very
10 true’ (6). The item stem ‘I already have concrete plans...,’ was followed by the items
11 like ‘...of when I will start to lose weight,’ or ‘...of how I can lose weight.’

12 **Action control** (Scholz et al., 2009; $\alpha > .68$). Action control was measured by
13 five items ($\alpha = .61$). The items were introduced by the stem ‘During the last seven days,
14 I have...’ and followed by items that addressed self-monitoring, awareness of standards,
15 and self-regulatory effort. Examples are ‘...constantly monitored what I eat,’ or ‘...
16 done everything to act the way I intended.’ The items are scored on a 6-point Likert-
17 scale ranging from ‘not true at all’ (1) to ‘very true’ (6).

18 **Dietary Intake** (Renner et al., 1996; Renner et al., 2005). Eight items ($\alpha = .63$)
19 were chosen from the 28-item nutrition style questionnaire which measure the amount
20 of sugar and fat intake as well as the food preference for fatty and sugary products.
21 Items which measure food preferences for e.g. vegetarian, whole meal products or salty
22 foods were excluded, because we were interested in sugar and fat intake among dieters
23 and not among the food preferences. The answers are on a 6-point scale ranging from
24 ‘not true at all’ (1) to ‘very true’ (6). Item examples are ‘I pay regard to eating little fat’
25 or ‘I drink soft drinks without sugar.’

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 Socioeconomic status was operationalized as four groups ranging from (0) no
2 degree, (1) secondary school diploma, (2) high-school diploma to (3) university
3 diploma. Body mass index (BMI; Bray, 1978) was also measured.

4 # (over here Table 1) #

5 **Data analysis**

6 To test the hypothesised model, a path analysis with manifest variables was
7 analysed with Mplus 6.12 (Muthén & Muthén, 2007). Manifest instead of latent
8 variables were inserted in the model due to the small sample size. The predictors of
9 intention, the control variables as well as planning and action control were allowed to
10 covary. To account for missing values the Full Information Maximum Likelihood
11 technique (FIML), which is an integral part of Mplus, was applied. The FIML estimates
12 model parameters on the basis of all available information of all observed cases. Overall
13 missing data were below 2%.

14 For evaluation of the model-fit, the χ^2 -test of Model Fit for the Baseline Model is
15 informative (Kline, 2005). Bollen and Long (1993) recommend that χ^2 should not be
16 larger than two to five times the degrees of freedom. Furthermore, the comparative fit
17 index (CFI), and the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI), which should be $> .95$ as well as the
18 standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) which should be $< .05$ (Kline, 2005)
19 are presented. The hypothesised mediation of CHBs on planning and action control via
20 intention was tested by the use of bootstrapping to test the strength and significance of
21 the indirect effects (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). The nature of the assumed moderation
22 effects was probed by plotting the moderation by generating regression equations for
23 low to high diet-specific CHBs. The interaction was plotted by an online-tool (Dawson
24 & Richter, 2006) as suggested by Aiken and West (1991). Furthermore, for examining
25 statistical significance, simple slopes analyses were conducted (O'Connor, 1998).

1 were no significant differences. Nevertheless, we included the country of residence
2 within all analysis as control variable².

3 **Inter-correlations**

4 Table 2 presents the intercorrelations among all measures and possible control
5 variables. As can be seen the control variables age ($r = .10$; $p = .38$), BMI ($r = .18$; $p =$
6 $.13$), education ($r = .01$; $p = .90$), and the experimental condition ($r = -.03$; $p = .82$) were
7 not related with the intention to diet for the whole sample. Furthermore, education, and
8 the experimental condition were not correlated with any of the other endogenous
9 variables (cf. Figure 1) of the hypothesised model. Therefore, these two variables were
10 excluded from further analysis. As also shown in Table 2, the control variable country
11 of residence was significantly correlated with the intention to diet and the diet-specific
12 CHBs. Regarding the CHBs and the HAPA-specific variables, intention was
13 significantly positively correlated with diet-specific CHBs, positive outcome
14 expectancies, planning, action control, and marginally with diet-specific self-efficacy
15 but not with risk perception.

16 # (over here Table 2) #

17 **Hypothesised model integrating diet-specific CHBs into the HAPA**

18 The path model specifies the prediction of the intention to diet with the
19 predictors of self-efficacy, outcome expectancies, risk perception, and diet-specific
20 CHBs as well as the control variables country of residence, age, and BMI. Furthermore,
21 according to the HAPA, planning and action control are predicted by intention and self-

² It should be noted that we do not assume differences in the results due to country, as both countries have similar health campaigns, nutrition recommendations and prevention campaigns (e.g. Five a day). The eatwell plate in England and the nutrition pyramid in Switzerland contain similar recommendations on healthy diets (The Department of Health (DH), 2012; Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Ernährung, 2011) and physical activity (cf., Bundesamt für Sport, 2009; DH, 2011).

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 efficacy and in accordance with Radtke et al. (2012), by the CHBs, which are altogether
2 defined as predictors of the dietary intake.

3 Figure 1 presents the parameter estimates (standardized solution) of the model
4 integrating diet-specific CHBs into the HAPA ($\chi^2(34, N = 75) = 134.30; p < .001; CFI =$
5 $.98, TLI = .93, SRMR = .03$). In line with our hypothesised model intention was
6 predicted by positive outcome expectancies ($\beta = .37, p < .01$), and on a 10%-level by
7 diet-specific self-efficacy ($\beta = .19, p = .06$). Contrary to our assumptions, diet-specific
8 CHBs ($\beta = .10, p = .36$) and risk perception ($\beta = .01, p = .76$) were not related to the
9 intention to diet. Instead a significant association between the country of residence and
10 the intention was found ($\beta = .28, p = .02$). Overall, 29% of the variance in intention
11 could be explained.

12 Contrary to our expectation the mediation analysis revealed no mediation of
13 diet-specific CHBs on planning and respectively action control via intention.
14 Furthermore, diet-specific CHBs were not directly related to the dietary intake.

15 In terms of the HAPA most of the assumptions were confirmed, but however,
16 the effect of intention on behaviour was not mediated via planning and/or action
17 control. Intention was rather directly associated with the dietary intake ($\beta = .42, p <$
18 $.001$).

19 # (over here Figure 1) #

20 In a next step, we tested whether the interaction term of the diet-specific CHBs
21 with a) the self-efficacy, b) the outcome expectancies, and c) the risk perception might
22 explain further variance within the path analysis. All variables were centered. Neither
23 the interaction term of CHBs with self-efficacy ($\beta = -.03, p = .77$) nor the interaction
24 with outcome expectancies ($\beta = -.06, p = .57$) was significantly related to intention to
25 diet. However, analysis revealed that risk perception moderated the CHB – intention
26 relationship ($\chi^2(38, N = 75) = 143.29; p < .001; CFI = .99, TLI = .94, SRMR = .03$): the

1 interaction term was significantly related to intention to diet ($\beta = .26, p = .01$). No main
2 effects of diet-specific CHBs ($\beta = .08, p = .50$) and risk perception ($\beta = .05, p = .74$) on
3 intention emerged. Figure 1 displays the parameter estimates of the model including the
4 interaction term of CHBs and risk perception. Next, the moderation effect was probed
5 (see Figure 2) by generating regression equations for low to high diet-specific CHBs.
6 The simple slopes analyses demonstrated that the higher the diet-specific CHBs the
7 higher the intention to diet in participants with a high ($t(70) = 2.93, p = .01$) and
8 medium ($t(70) = 2.04, p = .05$) risk perception, but not in women with low risk
9 perception ($t(70) = .07, p = .95$). These results suggest that the relationship between
10 diet-specific CHBs and intention to diet varied depending upon participants' risk
11 perception.
12 # (over here Figure 2) #

13 Discussion

14 This study is to our knowledge the first one investigating diet-specific CHBs within the
15 framework of a health behaviour change model, HAPA. The results of the hypothesised
16 model demonstrated that diet-specific CHBs were neither significantly related to the
17 intention to diet nor related to the behaviour of dietary intake. However, a significant
18 moderating effect of risk perception for the relationship between CHBs and intention
19 was found. As can be seen, only in women with a high or moderate risk perception
20 diet-specific CHBs were related to the intention to diet: the higher the diet-specific
21 CHBs the higher the intention to diet or vice versa. This interaction is in line with
22 assumptions of the CHB model (Rabiau et al., 2006). However, contradictory to our
23 hypothesis and previous results of other studies (e.g., Kronick & Knäuper, 2010; Radtke
24 et al, 2012), the moderator analysis revealed that diet-specific CHBs were significantly
25 positively, and not negatively, related to the intention to diet. How might this difference
26 be explained? One explanation might be that CHBs are differently relevant at different

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 stages of a health behaviour change process. According to Schüz, Sniehotta, Mallach,
2 Wiedeman, and Schwarzer (2009) different information is relevant at diverse points of a
3 behaviour change process. Perhaps CHBs act as a motivator for individuals at an earlier
4 stage of the health behaviour change process to strengthen one`s own intention, because
5 CHBs reduce the level of difficulty to reach the aim of losing weight by believing that
6 compensation is possible. Therefore, high CHBs might support the intention to diet
7 because the goal seems reachable. This might also explain why no moderating effect of
8 outcome expectancies and self-efficacy have been found: According to the HAPA, risk
9 perception is a distal starting point of the health behaviour change process whereas
10 outcome expectancies and self-efficacy are stimulated afterwards (Schwarzer, 2008).

11 Nevertheless, Knäuper and colleagues (2004) stated that in the long run, the
12 activation of CHBs will result in a negative relationship between CHBs, intention and
13 behaviour, as the need to compensate for the unhealthy behaviour decreases over time.
14 This in turn will result in the pathogenesis of diseases, which might explain the negative
15 association of CHBs with intention or behaviour found in other studies (e.g., Kronick &
16 Knäuper, 2010; Rabiau et al., 2009; Radtke et al., 2011; Radtke et al., 2012). In line
17 with this, it is conceivable that the continuous activation of CHBs undermine the
18 intention to change behaviour over time, especially in the action stage. This is
19 reasonable, because in the action stage, individuals will experience several lapses that
20 result in negative and guilty feelings regarding their intention change behaviour.
21 According to the CHB model (Rabiau et al., 2006) the activation of the CHBs neutralise
22 these negative feeling, which again might undermine intention.

23 Overall, most of the assumptions in regards to the HAPA were confirmed.
24 Comparable to other studies (Scholz et al., 2009) no significant direct association of risk
25 perception with the intention to diet was found. This non-significant link between risk
26 perception and intention might be due to the different ascertainment of measurement,

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 because risk perception was measured in general whereas intention was measured
2 behaviour-specific.

3 In our study most of the participants had high intentions to diet. However,
4 intention was not associated with planning and not mediated via planning/or action
5 control on behaviour. Intention was rather directly associated with dietary intake. One
6 possible explanation might be that the measurement of planning and action control did
7 not match the general measure of dietary intake. Whereas planning and action control
8 were formulated regarding weight loss, the dietary intake measured the amount of sugar
9 and fat intake as well as the food preference for fatty and sugary products.

10 Next to the results of the HAPA model it should be noted that the country of
11 residence was significantly related with the diet-specific CHBs and the intention to diet:
12 Swiss women had higher CHBs and higher intentions than English women. One
13 explanation for these differences might be due to sampling bias between the two
14 countries, because most of the Swiss participants were recruited in “Weight Watcher”
15 meetings whereas the English women were students and staff members of the
16 University, and to our knowledge did not attend any weight loss programs. Therefore, it
17 is reasonable that the intention to diet was stronger in the Swiss sample. Moreover, as
18 stated in the CHB model (Rabiau et al., 2006) a higher importance of one`s own health
19 goal (here: intention to diet) is more likely to lead to an activation of CHBs, because the
20 guiltiness when failing to act according to one`s intention is higher. Thus, CHBs will be
21 higher in the Swiss sample, because CHBs are activated as a self-regulation strategy.

22 In sum, the most central result of our analyses demonstrated that the relationship
23 between diet-specific CHBs and intention to diet depends upon ones risk perception
24 whereby CHBs were significant positively related with the intention to diet in
25 participants with a high or medium risk perception.

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 This study is not without limitations. A first limitation is the small group size,
2 which can result in skewed results. Therefore, the results need to be interpreted
3 cautiously (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007). In line with this, our conclusions need to be
4 further tested within a larger, cross-cultural population to confirm them.

5 A second limitation is that due to the translation process some of the face
6 validity of the variables might have been reduced. Nevertheless, all questionnaires
7 (German and English) were checked by native speakers to ensure that they measured
8 what they were supposed to measure. Furthermore, the majority of the measures proved
9 to be valid and reliable in German and in English (cf. Renner et al. 1996; Renner et al.,
10 2005). However, the internal reliability of some measures (e.g. positive outcome
11 expectancies or CHBs) in our study were questionable (<0.70 ; Cortina, 1993), which
12 might be due to the translation of the questionnaire items from English to German or
13 vice-versa. Regarding the CHB items, one further explanation for the rather low
14 internal consistency might be that the items measure different compensatory behaviours
15 as justification for a neglected diet (e.g. exercise, using artificial sweeteners, or skipping
16 the main dish; cf. Radtke, Scholz, Keller, Perren, and Hornung, in press). Nonetheless,
17 the inclusion of a broader range of different compensating behaviours in the CHB scale
18 provides a more realistic picture of dieting behaviour and justification beliefs than
19 including only one compensating behaviour. In addition, it should be mentioned that
20 only eight out of 28 items from the scale to dietary intake were chosen. However, the
21 remaining 20 items measure food preferences we were not interested in, e.g., like
22 vegetarianism. Furthermore, adaptations of this scale proof to be valid and reliable
23 measures as shown by other research (e.g., Ochsner, Scholz, & Hornung, 2013).

24 A third limitation is that in both countries participants were rewarded differently,
25 but we believe this can be disregarded, because the incentives were adapted to the
26 conditions of rewarding in the two countries.

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 Fourthly, due to the small sample size the path model could only be defined with
2 manifest mean values instead of specifying latent variables. This kind of SEM – path
3 analysis – assumes that all variables are measured without error, which is normally not
4 the case. Therefore, future research should analyse the present research questions in
5 larger samples with the use of structure equation model with latent variables in order to
6 take errors in measurement into account (Kline, 2005).

7 A fifth limitation is the cross-sectional design, because differentiating between
8 causal inference for cause and effect relations and simple association is limited. Future
9 studies might want to test the added value of CHBs in a longitudinal, if not
10 experimental design in order to clarify causal directions. Furthermore, this study is
11 based on self-reports. Objective measures of the behaviour are preferable. Moreover,
12 the CHBs were measured with the general CHB scale (Knäuper et al., 2004) which
13 includes no situational or emotional aspects of the CHBs even though these are
14 characteristics of CHBs according to Rabiau et al. (2006). Future studies should
15 therefore measure the CHBs in a more situation-specific way (cf. Kronick & Knäuper,
16 2010) and use items that also capture the affective aspects to fully cover the construct as
17 originally intended. An item example would be “At the very moment of snack
18 consumption I was thinking that it is OK to snack because today I have not eaten much
19 yet.” (Radtko, Inauen, Rennie, Orbell, & Scholz, 2013). Implicit measurements of
20 CHBs are also suggested (cf. Glock, Müller, & Krolak-Schwerdt, 2013). In addition, it
21 is also recommended to examine CHBs together with a stage algorithm over and above
22 continuous measures of social-cognitions (cf. Schwarzer, 2008). Thus, it can be
23 examined in more detail whether or not CHBs are differently relevant at diverse points
24 of a health behaviour change process.

25 A final limitation within this study is that the samples across countries were
26 heterogeneous in terms of the recruitment procedures. In England mostly students were

1 recruited, whereas in Switzerland recruitment also took place in “Weight Watcher”-
2 meetings. Future studies should try to harmonise the enrollment of participants and
3 avoid different recruitment methods.

4 This study is one of the first investigating diet-specific CHBs in the framework
5 of a health behaviour change model. Therefore, it provides important and new
6 information to better understand the significance of these beliefs for the prediction of
7 intention and health behaviour.

8 According to our results, future research should further investigate moderators of
9 the relationship between diet-specific CHBs and the intention to diet. In addition, the
10 investigation of CHBs at different stages of a health behaviour change process is
11 suggested. The question should be answered whether there is a difference in the
12 influence in pre-intenders, intenders, and actors in terms of the diet-specific CHBs and
13 their influence on a health behaviour change (Schwarzer et al., 2011). Knowing how to
14 handle or prevent diet-specific CHBs would contribute to the development of future
15 successful interventions for successful dieting.

16 **Acknowledgments**

17 This work was supported by the European Health Psychology Society (EHPS) by the
18 tandem grant for the first and the second author. The authors would like to thank all
19 assistants for their help with data collection, especially Angela Bearth, Fabienne
20 Schlatter, and Sandra Zibell. Furthermore, great thanks go to the Swiss Weight
21 Watchers group for supporting us by recruiting participants.

22

1 **References**

- 2 Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting*
3 *interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 4 Baumeister, R. F., & Heatherton, T. F. (1996). Self-regulation failure: An overview.
5 *Psychological Inquiry*, 7(1), 1-15. doi:10.1207/s15327965pli0701_1
- 6 Baumeister, R. F., Heatherton, T. F., & Tice, D. M. (1994). *Losing control: How and*
7 *why people fail at self-regulation*. San Diego, CA: Academic.
- 8 Berli, C., Loretini, P., Radtke, T., Hornung, R., & Scholz, U. (in press). Predicting
9 Physical Activity in Adolescents: The Role of Compensatory Health Beliefs within
10 the Health Action Process Approach. *Psychology & Health*.
- 11 Bollen, K., & Long, J. (Eds.) (1993). *Testing structural equation models*. Thousand
12 Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 13 Bray, G. (1978). Definition, measurement, and classification of the syndromes of
14 obesity. *International Journal of Obesity*, 2, 99-112.
- 15 Bundesamt für Sport (Eds.) (2009). *Gesundheitswirksame Bewegung* [Health benefits of
16 physical activity]. Magglingen: Bundesamt für Sport.
- 17 Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. New York,
18 NY: Cambridge University Press.
- 19 Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and
20 applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 98-104. doi:10.1037/0021-
21 9010.78.1.98
- 22 Dawson, J. F., & Richter, A. W. (2006). Probing three-way interactions in moderated
23 multiple regression: Development and application of a slope difference test. *Journal*
24 *of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 917-926. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.917
- 25 The Department of Health (2012). *About the eatwell plate*. Retrieved 12, 2012, from
26 <http://www.dh.gov.uk/health/2012/06/about-the-eatwell-plate/>

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

- 1 The Department of Health (2011). Factsheet 4. Physical activity guidelines for adults
2 (16-64 years). Retrieved from http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh
3 [/groups/dh_digitalassets/documents/digitalasset/dh_128145.pdf](http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh/groups/dh_digitalassets/documents/digitalasset/dh_128145.pdf)
- 4 Festinger, L.A. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford University
5 Press.
- 6 [Blinded for review]
- 7 Glock, S., Müller, B. C. N., & Krolak-Schwerdt, S. (2013). Implicit associations and
8 compensatory health beliefs in smokers: exploring their role for behaviour and their
9 change through warning labels. *British Journal of Health Psychology*. Advance
10 online publication. doi:10.1111/bjhp.12023.
- 11 Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New
12 York: Guilford Press.
- 13 Knäuper, B., Rabiau, M., Cohen, O., & Patriciu, N. (2004). Compensatory Health
14 Beliefs scale development and psychometric properties. *Psychology and Health*,
15 *19*(5), 607-624. doi:10.1080/70887044042000196737
- 16 Kronick, I., Auerbach, R. P., Stich, C., & Knäuper, B. (2011). Compensatory beliefs
17 and intentions contribute to the prediction of caloric intake in dieters. *Appetite*, *57*(2),
18 435-438. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2011.05.306
- 19 Kronick I., & Knäuper, B. (2010). Temptations elicit compensatory intentions.
20 *Appetite*, *54*(2), 398-401. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2009.12.011
- 21 Lippke, S., Hohmann, C., Kalusche, A., & Knäuper, B. (2007). *Compensatory beliefs*
22 *scale – general and diet (German)*. Retrieved from
23 <http://www.psych.mcgill.ca/perpg/fac/knaeuper/GermanCHB.doc>
- 24 Miquelon, P., Knäuper, B., & Vallerand, R. J. (2012). Motivation and goal attainment.
25 The role of compensatory beliefs. *Appetite*, *58*(2), 608-615.
26 doi:10.1016/j.appet.2011.12.025

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

- 1 Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2007). *Mplus. User's Guide* (5th ed.). Los Angeles:
2 Muthén & Muthén.
- 3 O'Connor, B. P. (1998). All-in-one programs for exploring interactions in moderated
4 multiple regression. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 58(5), 833-837.
5 doi:10.1177/0013164498058005009
- 6 Ochsner, S., Scholz, U., & Hornung, R. (2013). Testing phase-specific self-efficacy
7 beliefs in the context of dietary behaviour change. *Applied Psychology: Health and*
8 *Well-being*, 5(1), 99-117. doi:10.1111/j.1758-0854.2012.01079.x
- 9 Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for
10 assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior*
11 *Research Methods*, 40(3), 879-891. doi:10.3758/BRM.40.3.879
- 12 Rabiau, M., Knäuper, B., & Miquelon, P. (2006). The external quest for optimal balance
13 between maximizing pleasure and minimizing harm: The Compensatory Health
14 Beliefs model. *The British Psychology Society*, 11(1), 139-153.
15 doi:10.1348/135910705X52237
- 16 Rabiau, M., Knäuper, B., Nguyen, T.-K., Sufrategui, M. & Polychronakos, C. (2009).
17 Compensatory beliefs about glucose testing are associated with low adherence to
18 treatment and poor metabolic control in adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *Health*
19 *Education Research*, 24(5), 890-896. doi:10.1093/her/cyp032
- 20 Radtke, T., Inauen, J., Rennie, L., Orbell, S., & Scholz, U. (2013). *Trait versus state:*
21 *effects of situational and dispositional Compensatory Heath Beliefs on snack*
22 *consumption*. Paper submitted for publication.
- 23 Radtke, T., Scholz, U., Keller, R., & Hornung, R. (2012). Smoking is ok as long as I eat
24 healthily: Compensatory Health Beliefs and their role for intentions and smoking
25 within the Health Action Process Approach. *Psychology and Health*, 27(2), 91-107.
26 doi:10.1080/08870446.2011.603422

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

- 1 Radtke, T., Scholz, U., Keller, R., Knäuper, B., & Hornung, R. (2011). Smoking-
2 specific Compensatory Health Beliefs and the readiness to stop smoking in
3 adolescents. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, *16*(3), 610-625.
4 doi:10.1348/2044-8287.002001
- 5 Radtke, T., Scholz, U., Keller, R., Perren, S., & Hornung, R. (in press). *German*
6 *language version of the Compensatory Health Belief Scale: Assessing the*
7 *psychometric properties*. *Zeitschrift für Gesundheitspsychologie*.
- 8 Renner, B., Hahn, A., & Schwarzer, R. (1996). *Risiko- und Gesundheitsverhalten.*
9 *Dokumentation der Meßinstrumente des Forschungsprojekts „Berlin risk appraisal*
10 *and health motivation study“ (BRAHMS) [Risk and health behaviours documentation*
11 *of the scales of the research project: „Berlin risk appraisal and health motivation*
12 *study“ (BRAHMS)]. Berlin, DE: Freie Universität Berlin.*
- 13 Renner, B., Schwarzer, R., Kwon, S., Spivak, Y., & Panzer, M. (2005). *Risk and health*
14 *behaviors documentation of the scales of the research project: “Risk appraisal*
15 *consequences in Korea” (RACK) 2nd edition*. Retrieved from [http://www.](http://www.gesundheitsrisiko.de/docs/RACKEnglish.pdf)
16 [gesundheitsrisiko.de/docs/RACKEnglish.pdf](http://www.gesundheitsrisiko.de/docs/RACKEnglish.pdf)
- 17 Scholz, U., Nagy, G., Göhner, W., Luszczynska, A., & Kliegel, M. (2009). Changes in
18 self-regulatory cognitions as predictors of changes in smoking and nutrition
19 behaviour. *Psychology and Health*, *24*(5), 545-561.
20 doi:10.1080/08870440801902519
- 21 Schwarzer, R. (1992). Self-efficacy in the adoption and maintenance of health
22 behaviors. Theoretical approaches and a new model. In R. Schwarzer (Ed.), *Self-*
23 *efficacy: thought control of action* (pp. 217-242). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- 24 Schwarzer, R. (2008). Modelling health behaviour change: how to predict and modify
25 the adoption and maintenance of health behaviour. *Applied Psychology: An*
26 *International Review*, *57*(1), 1-29. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00325.x

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

- 1 Schwarzer, R., Lippke, S., Luszczynska, A. (2011). Mechanisms of health behavior
2 change in persons with chronic illness or disability: The health action process
3 approach (HAPA). *Rehabilitation Psychology*, *56*(3), 161-170.
4 doi:10.1037/a0024509
- 5 Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Ernährung (2011). *Die Schweizerische*
6 *Lebensmittelpyramide* [The Swiss Nutrition Pyramide]. Retrieved from
7 <http://www.sge-ssn.ch/de/ich-und-du/essen-und-trinken/ausgewogen/lebensmittel>
8 [pyramide/](http://www.sge-ssn.ch/de/ich-und-du/essen-und-trinken/ausgewogen/lebensmittel)
- 9 Schüz, B., Sniehotta, F. F., Mallach, N., Wiedemann, A. U., & Schwarzer, R. (2009).
10 Predicting transitions from preintentional, intentional and actional stages of change,
11 *Health Education Research*, *24*, 64-75. doi:10.1093/her/cym092
- 12 Sniehotta, F., Scholz, U., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). Bridging the intention-behaviour
13 gap: Planning, self-efficacy, and action control in the adoption. *Psychology &*
14 *Health*, *20*(2), 143-160. doi:10.1080/08870440512331317670
- 15 Spring, B., Moller, A. C., & Coons, M. J. (2012). Multiple health behaviours: overview
16 and implications. *Journal of Public Health*, *34*(1), i3-i10.
17 doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdr111
- 18 Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.). Boston:
19 Pearson.
- 20 Trope, Y., & Fishbach, A. (2000). Counteractive self-control in overcoming temptation.
21 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(4), 493-506. doi:10.1037//0022-
22 3514.79.4.493
- 23 World Medical Organization (1996). Declaration of Helsinki (1964). *British Medical*
24 *Journal*, *7070*(313), 1448-1449.
- 25

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

1 Table 1

2 *Scale characteristics (mean, SD, range)*

Scale	<i>M</i>			<i>SD</i>		
	Overall	CH	ENG	Overall	CH	ENG
Diet-specific CHBs (range 0-4)	1.50	1.82	1.16	0.63	0.54	0.54
HAPA variables:						
Risk perception	2.38	2.07	2.71	1.47	1.44	1.44
Positive outcome expectancies	4.64	4.52	4.77	0.81	0.88	0.74
Diet-specific self-efficacy	4.20	4.09	4.33	0.88	0.88	0.87
Intention	5.11	5.31	4.91	0.72	0.64	0.75
Planning	4.66	4.86	4.47	0.95	0.87	0.99
Action control	4.05	4.36	3.74	0.90	0.79	0.91
Dietary intake	4.00	4.01	3.88	0.82	0.70	0.92

Note. CHBs = Compensatory Health Beliefs. CH = Switzerland, ENG = England. If not noted the range of the scales was from 1-6.

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

Table 2

Intercorrelations between the manifest variables used in path analysis and control variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Diet-specific CHBs	1.00												
2. Risk perception	-.04	1.00											
3. Positive outcome expectancies	.01	.36**	1.00										
4. Diet-specific self efficacy	-.22	.05	.23	1.00									
5. Intention	.24*	.12	.37**	.20†	1.00								
6. Planning	.02	-.02	.24*	.29*	.29*	1.00							
7. Action Control	.27*	.08	.17	.13	.34**	.58**	1.00						
8. Dietary intake (Low fat/sugar preference)	.26*	.05	.37**	-.14	.62**	.41**	.47**	1.00					
9. Age	-.20	.01	.38*	.33**	.10	.23*	.10	.19	1.00				
10. BMI	.04	.63**	.32**	.20	.18	.26*	.22†	.26*	.21	1.00			
11. Education	-.20	-.07	-.01	.03	.01	.09	.06	.01	.16	.01	1.00		
12. Experimental condition	-.17	-.07	.19	.10	-.03	.03	.01	.05	.21	-.15	.06	1.00	
13. Country of residence	.52**	-.22	-.15	-.14	.28*	.12	.27*	.13	-.09	-.25*	-.29*	-.04	1.00

Note. Experimental condition: control group = 0, experimental group = 1. Country of residence: CH = 1, ENG = 0. †p<0.10. *p<0.05. **p<0.01.

Figure caption

Figure 1. Hypothesised model of diet-specific CHBs within the Health Action Process Approach. *Note.* CHBs = Compensatory Health Beliefs; Standardised solution of the path model conducted with MPlus 6.12. The correlations between the predictors of intention are not displayed as well as the control variables age and BMI in order to allow a simplified overview and because both control variables were not significantly related to any of the other variables. The numbers in parenthesis are the results when including the interaction term (displayed by dotted lines) into the analysis. When no parenthesis is provided, the estimators are the same in both analyses. † $p = 0.10$. * $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. *** $p < 0.001$.

COMPENSATORY HEALTH BELIEFS IN WOMEN WHO ARE ON A DIET

Figure 2. Risk perception as moderator. *Note.* CHBs = Compensatory Health Beliefs. Standardised solution. The figure displays simple slopes for low to high diet-specific CHBs at three levels of the moderator. The interaction is plotted by an online-tool of Dawson and Richter (2006).