# Supplement:
# A Comparative Investigation of Interventions to Reduce Anti-Fat Prejudice Across Five Implicit Measures

Last updated: November 1, 2024

For questions, contact Calvin Lai at calvin.lai@rutgers.edu

## Table of Contents

## S1. Detailed Procedure for Demographic Information (Studies 1 & 2)

As part of a standard pre-screen at Project Implicit, participants in both studies were asked to report on a range of demographic questions. The response options for the demographic information we used in the study are listed below alongside information about how we collapsed groups together for main text reporting.

**Age:** Participants reported their birth month and year of birth and we estimated age using those two variables. We did not collect their exact birth date due to concerns about identifiability.

When a person's birth month coincided with the month of data collection, we assumed they were a year younger (i.e., didn't have their birthday yet) if the data of data collection was before the 15$^{th}$ of the month. If the date of data collection was after the 15$^{th}$ of the month, we assumed they were a year older (i.e., they did have their birthday).

**Gender**:

- Male
- Female

**Race/ethnicity**:

*Race*

- American Indian/Alaska Native
- East Asian
- South Asian
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- White
- More than one race - Black/White
- More than one race - Other
- Other or Unknown

*Ethnicity*

- Hispanic or Latino
- Not Hispanic or Latino
- Unknown

Race and ethnicity were asked separately and based on the U.S. Census's standard approach for asking about race/ethnicity 2005-2020. For reporting in the participants sections, we collapsed categories together into eight groups: White, Black, Asian, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Indian/Alaska Native, Multiracial, and Other or Unknown.

Participants who did not identify as "Hispanic or Latino" on the ethnicity question were sorted into the following six groups: White (White), Black (Black or African American), Asian (East Asian, South Asian), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander), American Indian/Alaska Native (American Indian/Alaska Native), Multiracial (More

than one race – Black/White, More than one race – Other), and Other or Unknown (Other or Unknown).

We followed the U.S. Census's Office of Management and Budget's designation of people as Hispanic or Latino if they identify as "Hispanic or Latino" regardless of race for reporting (U.S. Census Bureau, 2021). However, we recognize that approach is an incomplete account of race and ethnicity. For a more thorough approach, we report a full description of participant race and ethnicity in Tables S1 and S2.

**Table S1**

*Participant Race and Ethnicity in Study 1*

| Race | Hispanic or Latino | Not Hispanic or Latino | Unknown |
|---|---|---|---|
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 28 | 52 | 2 |
| Black or African American | 51 | 1003 | 89 |
| East Asian | 6 | 420 | 34 |
| More than one race - Black/White | 51 | 155 | 19 |
| More than one race - Other | 402 | 324 | 57 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 10 | 63 | 8 |
| Other or Unknown | 432 | 118 | 89 |
| South Asian | 2 | 279 | 29 |
| White | 691 | 8702 | 475 |

**Table S2**

*Participant Race and Ethnicity in Study 2*

| Race | Hispanic or Latino | Not Hispanic or Latino | Unknown |
|---|---|---|---|
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 18 | 37 | 2 |
| Black or African American | 33 | 789 | 65 |
| East Asian | 6 | 332 | 36 |
| More than one race - Black/White | 46 | 120 | 16 |
| More than one race - Other | 249 | 247 | 49 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 2 | 35 | 4 |
| Other or Unknown | 236 | 130 | 101 |
| South Asian | 3 | 255 | 59 |
| White | 514 | 7878 | 485 |

**Education**:

- Elementary school

- Junior high
- Some high school
- High school graduate
- Some college
- Associate's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Some graduate school
- Master's degree
- M.B.A.
- J.D.
- M.D.
- Ph.D.
- Other advanced degree

For reporting in the Participants sections, we collapsed categories together into four groups: Less than a high school degree (Elementary school, Junior high, Some high school), high school degree (High school graduate, Some college), undergraduate degree (Associate's degree, Bachelor's degree, Some graduate school), or postgraduate degree (Master's degree, M.B.A., J.D., M.D., Ph.D., Other advanced degree).

**Ideology**:

- Strongly conservative
- Moderately conservative
- Slightly conservative
- Moderate/neutral
- Slightly liberal
- Moderately liberal
- Strongly liberal

For reporting in the Participants sections, we collapsed categories together into three groups: conservative (Strongly conservative, Moderately conservative, Slightly conservative), moderate (Moderate/neutral), and liberal (Slightly liberal, Moderately liberal, Strongly liberal).

## S2. Exclusion Criteria for Implicit Measures (Studies 1 & 2)

We followed the exclusion criteria used in Bar-Anan & Nosek's (2014) study of the psychometrics of seven implicit measures. See Table S3 for a summary of our trial-level exclusion criteria and our criteria for excluding participant sessions from analysis.

**Table S3**

*Implicit Measure Exclusion Criteria*

| | Lower tail deletion | Upper tail deletion | Error trials treatment | Other trial deletion | Session deletion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **IAT** | < 400ms | > 10000ms | Use latency of correct response | No | > 10% trials faster than 300ms |
| **BIAT** | < 400ms | > 10000ms | Use latency of correct response | first 4 of each block | > 10% trials faster than 300ms |
| **ST-IAT** | < 400ms | > 10000ms | Use latency of correct response | No | > 10% trials faster than 300ms |
| **EPT** | < -2 std | > 2 std | Exclude trial | No | > 40% error trials |
| **AMP** | ---No trial exclusion or treatment--- | | | | > 95% same response |

*Note*. Table adapted from Table A1 of Bar-Anan and Nosek (2014). The table is identical to Bar-Anan and Nosek (2014) except for the omission of criteria for two implicit measures we did not use (the GNAT and SPF).

## S3. Description and Analyses of Exploratory Measures (Study 1)

**Exploratory Measures**

*Perceived control over body weight.* Given that anti-fat prejudice is related to attributions about responsibility over weight (Crandall, 1994; Crandall et al., 2001), participants were asked, "How much control do people have over their weight?" on a 5-point scale from (1) "No control" to (5) "Complete control".

*Subjective weight status* ($\alpha_{Study\ 1}$ = .93, $\alpha_{Study\ 2}$ = .96). In Study 1, participants were asked, "Other people would say I am:" and "Currently, I am:" on a 7-point scale from (-3) "Very underweight" to (+3) "Very overweight". For analysis, we took an average of these two questions. In Study 2, we used the same question but replaced the response options with "thin/fat" instead of "underweight/overweight" to better match with terminology in the rest of the study.

*Perceived similarity to fat and thin people*. Participants were asked two questions, "How much do you feel similar to people who are [Fat/Thin]?" on a 5-point scale from (1) "Not at all similar" to (5) "Extremely similar". For analysis, we computed a difference score, such that higher scores indicated great perceived similarity to fat people relative to thin people.

*Objective weight status.* As a proxy for objective weight status, participants were asked for their height and weight to calculate their BMI (weight in kilograms divided by the square of height in meters). We omitted responses from 0.10% of participants (14 in Study 1, 11 in Study 2) who selected the most extreme options on both questions (i.e., above 440 pounds, below 50 pounds, above 7 feet, below 3 feet). This exclusion was made due to suspected participant misbehavior and was un-preregistered in Study 1 but pre-registered in Study 2.

**Analyses**

*Perceived control over body weight.* On average in the control condition, participants reported people had "some control" over their weight, $M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.75$. As with explicit weight attitudes generally, perceived control was weakly positively related to all implicit measures except for the EPT: IAT, $r(2906) = .12$, $p < .001$, BIAT, $r(2873) = .11$, $p < .001$, EPT, $r(2963) = -.01$, $p = .69$, and AMP, $r(2449) = .06$, $p = .001$. None of the interventions were effective at changing perceived control over weight relative to the control condition, $p$s > .05.

*Weight status and weight attitudes.* Weight status was operationalized in terms of subjective weight, perceived similarity to fat rather than thin people, and BMI. Subjective weight was weakly negatively related to pro-thin/anti-fat attitudes on all attitude measures except for the EPT ($rs_{implicit} = -.15, -.10, -.07$, $r_{explicit} = -.20$, $p < .001$). Unexpectedly, subjective weight was very slightly positively related to pro-thin/anti-fat attitudes on the EPT, $r(2963) = .05$, $p = .013$. Perceived similarity showed a similar pattern to subjective weight, with mostly weak negative relations to pro-thin/anti-fat attitudes except for the EPT ($rs_{implicit} = -.16, -.13, -.10$, $r_{explicit} = -.35$, $p < .001$). Perceived similarity was very slightly positively related to pro-thin/anti-fat attitudes on the EPT, $r(2935) = .04$, $p = .042$. In contrast to the more subjective measures, BMI was less consistently related to weight attitudes. BMI was weakly negatively related to pro-thin/anti-fat attitudes on the IAT, BIAT, and measures of explicit weight attitudes ($rs_{implicit} = -.15, -.09$, $r_{explicit} = -.22$, $p < .001$), but not related to the AMP, $r(2410) = -.03$, $p = .097$, or EPT, $r(2887) = .03$, $p = .097$. We also examined whether weight status moderated the effect of condition on weight attitudes, finding that it did not across all 18 models we conducted.

## S4. Description and Analyses of Exploratory Measures (Study 2)

Study 2 assessed the same exploratory measures as Study 1.

**Analyses**

*Perceived control over body weight.* On average in the control condition, participants reported people had "some control" over their weight, $M = 3.20$, $SD = 0.74$. As with explicit weight attitudes generally, perceived control was weakly positively related to all implicit measures except for the EPT: IAT, $r(2586) = .08$, $p < .001$, BIAT, $r(2526) = .14$, $p < .001$, EPT, $r(2597) = .02$, $p = .41$, and AMP, $r(2021) = .08$, $p < .001$. None of the interventions were effective at changing perceived control over weight relative to the control condition, $p$s > .05.

*Weight status and weight attitudes.* Subjective weight was weakly negatively related to pro-thin/anti-fat attitudes on the IAT and BIAT and both explicit measures ($rs_{implicit} = -.09, -.12$, $rs_{explicit} = -.25, -.04$, $p$s < .001), but unrelated to the AMP, $r(2019) = -.04$, $p = .086$, and the EPT, $r(2593) = -.01$, $p = .58$. Unlike in Study 1, perceived similarity showed mostly weak negative relations with all measures of pro-thin/anti-fat attitudes ($rs_{implicit} = -.13, -.13, -.08, -.06$, $rs_{explicit} = -.34, -.10$, $ps < .01$). BMI was weakly negatively related to pro-thin/anti-fat attitudes all measures of implicit explicit weight attitudes ($rs_{implicit} = -.07, -.10, -.04$, $rs_{explicit} = -.22, -.03$, $p$s < .05), except for the EPT, $r(2519) = -.008$, $p = .69$. We also examined whether weight status moderated the effect of condition on weight attitudes, finding a barely significant interaction once ($p = .044$) out of 18 models conducted.

# S5. Pre-registered *t*-tests Comparing Intervention Conditions Against Each Other (Study 1)

These pre-registered analyses compared interventions against each other. As these results are largely consistent with our conclusions in the main text, we have relegated these to the supplement for brevity. Below, we report tables for each of those comparisons, organized into six subsections:

- "Comparisons Against Emotional Narrative (Relative Measures)"
- "Comparisons Against Active Evaluative Conditioning (Relative Measures)", "Comparisons Against Egalitarian Goals (Relative Measures)"
- "Comparisons Against Emotional Narrative (Single-Target Measures)"
- "Comparisons Against Active Evaluative Conditioning (Single-Target Measures)"
- "Comparisons Against Egalitarian Goals (Single-Target Measures)"

Guide for Reading Tables

- *N, M, SD* = Descriptive statistics of the condition
- *d, t, p df* = Comparisons against the focal comparison condition
- Cohen's *d*
    - Positive *d* = Condition has greater pro-Thin/anti-Fat bias than focal comparison condition
    - Negative *d* = Condition has lower pro-Thin/anti-Fat bias than focal comparison condition

## S5.1 Comparisons Against Emotional Narrative (Relative Measures)

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure - IAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 724 | 0.42 | 0.45 | | | | |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 777 | 0.24 | 0.46 | -0.40 | -7.68 | < .001 | 1493.86 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 664 | 0.49 | 0.39 | 0.18 | 3.35 | < .001 | 1378.37 |
| Control | 766 | 0.52 | 0.39 | 0.23 | 4.50 | < .001 | 1425.1 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure - BIAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 755 | 0.18 | 0.45 | | | | |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 740 | 0.06 | 0.54 | -0.26 | -4.92 | < .001 | 1436.42 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 652 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.17 | 3.18 | .0015 | 1387.93 |
| Control | 749 | 0.25 | 0.47 | 0.14 | 2.71 | .0067 | 1499.47 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure - EPT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 720 | 0.12 | 0.25 | | | | |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 782 | 0.04 | 0.37 | -0.24 | -4.81 | < .001 | 1384.47 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 708 | 0.12 | 0.32 | 0.00 | -0.02 | .99 | 1350.84 |
| Control | 796 | 0.12 | 0.28 | 0.01 | 0.1 | .92 | 1513.97 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure - AMP**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 658 | 0.01 | 0.18 | | | | |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 639 | 0.01 | 0.20 | -0.02 | -0.33 | .74 | 1271.50 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 550 | 0.05 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 3.66 | < .001 | 1066.64 |
| Control | 627 | 0.05 | 0.20 | 0.24 | 4.35 | < .001 | 1247.37 |

## S5.2 Comparisons Against Active Evaluative Conditioning (Relative Measures)

**Conditions vs. Active Evaluative Conditioning by measure - IAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 724 | 0.42 | 0.45 | 0.40 | 7.68 | < .001 | 1493.86 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 777 | 0.24 | 0.46 | | | | |
| Egalitarian Goals | 664 | 0.49 | 0.39 | 0.60 | 11.52 | < .001 | 1438.62 |
| Control | 766 | 0.52 | 0.39 | 0.66 | 12.93 | < .001 | 1506.18 |

**Conditions vs. Active Evaluative Conditioning by measure - BIAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 755 | 0.18 | 0.45 | 0.26 | 4.92 | < .001 | 1436.42 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 740 | 0.06 | 0.54 | | | | |
| Egalitarian Goals | 652 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.41 | 7.63 | < .001 | 1387.93 |
| Control | 749 | 0.25 | 0.47 | 0.38 | 7.30 | < .001 | 1450.57 |

**Conditions vs. Active Evaluative Conditioning by measure - EPT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 720 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 0.24 | 4.81 | < .001 | 1384.47 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 782 | 0.04 | 0.37 | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Egalitarian Goals | 708 | 0.12 | 0.32 | 0.23 | 4.41 | < .001 | 1482.45 |
| Control | 796 | 0.12 | 0.28 | 0.23 | 4.65 | < .001 | 1447.94 |

**Conditions vs. Active Evaluative Conditioning by measure - AMP**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 658 | 0.01 | 0.18 | 0.02 | 0.33 | .74 | 1271.5 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 639 | 0.01 | 0.20 | | | | |
| Egalitarian Goals | 550 | 0.05 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 3.78 | < .001 | 1127.43 |
| Control | 627 | 0.05 | 0.20 | 0.25 | 4.42 | < .001 | 1262.59 |

## S5.3 Comparisons Against Egalitarian Goals (Relative Measures)

**Conditions vs. Egalitarian Goals by measure – IAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 724 | 0.42 | 0.45 | -0.18 | -3.35 | < .001 | 1378.37 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 777 | 0.24 | 0.46 | -0.60 | -11.52 | < .001 | 1438.62 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 664 | 0.49 | 0.39 | | | | |
| Control | 766 | 0.52 | 0.39 | 0.06 | 1.13 | .26 | 1401.58 |

**Conditions vs. Egalitarian Goals by measure – BIAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 755 | 0.18 | 0.45 | -0.17 | -3.18 | .0015 | 1369.06 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 740 | 0.06 | 0.54 | -0.41 | -7.63 | < .001 | 1387.93 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 652 | 0.26 | 0.46 | | | | |
| Control | 749 | 0.25 | 0.47 | -0.03 | -0.53 | .59 | 1378.81 |

**Conditions vs. Egalitarian Goals by measure – EPT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 720 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 0.00 | -0.02 | .99 | 1350.84 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 782 | 0.04 | 0.37 | -0.23 | -4.41 | < .001 | 1482.45 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 708 | 0.12 | 0.32 | | | | |
| Control | 796 | 0.12 | 0.28 | 0.01 | 0.1 | .92 | 1418.54 |

**Conditions vs. Egalitarian Goals by measure – AMP**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 658 | 0.01 | 0.18 | -0.22 | -3.66 | < .001 | 1066.64 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 639 | 0.01 | 0.20 | -0.22 | -378 | < .001 | 1127.43 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 550 | 0.05 | 0.21 | | | | |
| Control | 627 | 0.05 | 0.20 | -0.02 | -0.33 | .74 | 1131.21 |

## S5.4 Comparisons Against Emotional Narrative (Single-Target Measures)

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure – ST-IAT**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 743 | 0.05 | 0.31 | | | | |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 758 | 0.01 | 0.26 | -0.11 | -2.21 | .027 | 1443.85 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 694 | 0.04 | 0.30 | -0.02 | -0.29 | .77 | 1431.30 |
| Control | 816 | 0.02 | 0.29 | -0.09 | -1.67 | .095 | 1525.24 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure - EPT-Fat**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 720 | 0.06 | 0.24 | | | | |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 782 | 0.10 | 0.32 | 0.15 | 2.98 | .0029 | 1429.24 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 708 | 0.07 | 0.28 | 0.04 | 0.85 | .40 | 1383.44 |
| Control | 796 | 0.05 | 0.26 | -0.03 | -0.58 | .56 | 1513.88 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure – EPT-Thin**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 720 | 0.18 | 0.21 | | | | |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 782 | 0.14 | 0.21 | -0.17 | -3.23 | .0013 | 1492.38 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 708 | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 1.06 | .29 | 1425.00 |
| Control | 796 | 0.17 | 0.20 | -0.04 | -0.83 | .41 | 1478.74 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure – AMP-Fat**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 658 | 0.59 | 0.20 | | | | |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 639 | 0.58 | 0.21 | -0.06 | -1.05 | .29 | 1278.85 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 550 | 0.55 | 0.22 | -0.20 | -3.47 | < .001 | 1105.04 |
| Control | 627 | 0.56 | 0.22 | -0.16 | -2.91 | .0037 | 1252.29 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure – AMP-Thin**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 658 | 0.60 | 0.19 | | | | |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 639 | 0.58 | 0.20 | -0.08 | -1.41 | .16 | 1285.68 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 550 | 0.60 | 0.21 | 0.00 | -0.04 | .97 | 1118.99 |
| Control | 627 | 0.61 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 1.07 | .28 | 1257.01 |

## S5.5 Comparisons Against Active Evaluative Conditioning (Single-Target Measures)

**Conditions vs. Active Evaluative Conditioning by measure – ST-IAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 743 | 0.01 | 0.31 | 0.11 | 2.21 | .027 | 1443.85 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 758 | 0.05 | 0.26 | | | | |
| Egalitarian Goals | 694 | 0.04 | 0.30 | 0.10 | 1.87 | .062 | 1367.36 |
| Control | 816 | 0.02 | 0.29 | 0.03 | 0.50 | .62 | 1567.61 |

**Conditions vs. Active Evaluative Conditioning by measure - EPT-Fat**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 720 | 0.10 | 0.24 | -0.15 | -2.98 | .0029 | 1429.24 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 782 | 0.06 | 0.32 | | | | |
| Egalitarian Goals | 708 | 0.07 | 0.28 | -0.11 | -2.04 | .041 | 1484.07 |
| Control | 796 | 0.05 | 0.26 | -0.17 | -3.44 | < .001 | 1494.31 |

**Conditions vs. Active Evaluative Conditioning by measure – EPT-Thin**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 720 | 0.14 | 0.21 | 0.17 | 3.23 | .0013 | 1492.38 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 782 | 0.18 | 0.21 | | | | |
| Egalitarian Goals | 708 | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 4.27 | < .001 | 1473.87 |
| Control | 796 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.13 | 2.55 | .011 | 1565.19 |

**Conditions vs. Active Evaluative Conditioning by measure – AMP-Fat**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 658 | 0.58 | 0.20 | 0.06 | 1.05 | .29 | 1278.85 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 639 | 0.59 | 0.21 | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Egalitarian Goals | 550 | 0.55 | 0.22 | -0.14 | -2.38 | .017 | 1144.92 |
| Control | 627 | 0.56 | 0.22 | -0.10 | -1.80 | .072 | 1261.49 |

**Conditions vs. Active Evaluative Conditioning by measure – AMP-Thin**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 658 | 0.58 | 0.19 | 0.08 | 1.41 | .16 | 1285.68 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 639 | 0.60 | 0.20 | | | | |
| Egalitarian Goals | 550 | 0.60 | 0.21 | 0.07 | 1.24 | .21 | 1143.59 |
| Control | 627 | 0.61 | 0.21 | 0.13 | 2.37 | .018 | 1259.61 |

## S5.6 Comparisons Against Egalitarian Goals (Single-Target Measures)

**Conditions vs. Egalitarian Goals by measure – ST-IAT**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 743 | 0.04 | 0.31 | 0.02 | 0.29 | .77 | 1431.30 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 758 | 0.01 | 0.26 | -0.10 | -1.87 | .06 | 1367.36 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 694 | 0.05 | 0.30 | | | | |
| Control | 816 | 0.02 | 0.29 | -0.07 | -1.35 | .18 | 1452.61 |

**Conditions vs. Egalitarian Goals by measure - EPT-Fat**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 720 | 0.07 | 0.24 | -0.04 | -0.85 | .40 | 1383.44 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 782 | 0.10 | 0.32 | 0.11 | 2.04 | .04 | 1484.07 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 708 | 0.06 | 0.28 | | | | |
| Control | 796 | 0.05 | 0.26 | -0.07 | -1.36 | .17 | 1452.00 |

**Conditions vs. Egalitarian Goals by measure – EPT-Thin**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 720 | 0.19 | 0.21 | -0.06 | -1.06 | .29 | 1425.00 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 782 | 0.14 | 0.21 | -0.22 | -4.27 | < .001 | 1473.87 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 708 | 0.18 | 0.21 | | | | |
| Control | 796 | 0.17 | 0.20 | -0.10 | -1.93 | .053 | 1454.48 |

**Conditions vs. Egalitarian Goals by measure – AMP-Fat**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 658 | 0.55 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 3.47 | < .001 | 1105.04 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 639 | 0.58 | 0.21 | 0.14 | 2.38 | .017 | 1144.92 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 550 | 0.59 | 0.22 | | | | |
| Control | 627 | 0.56 | 0.22 | 0.04 | 0.65 | .51 | 1150.07 |

**Conditions vs. Egalitarian Goals by measure – AMP-Thin**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 658 | 0.60 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.04 | .97 | 1118.99 |
| Active Evaluative Conditioning | 639 | 0.58 | 0.20 | -0.07 | -1.24 | .21 | 1143.59 |
| Egalitarian Goals | 550 | 0.60 | 0.21 | | | | |
| Control | 627 | 0.61 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 1.01 | .31 | 1153.67 |

# S6. Pre-registered *t*-tests Comparing Intervention Conditions Against Each Other (Study 2)

These pre-registered analyses compared interventions against each other. As these results are largely consistent with our conclusions in the main text, we have relegated these to the supplement for brevity. Below, we report tables for each of those comparisons, organized into six subsections:

- "Comparisons Against Emotional Narrative (Relative Measures)"
- "Comparisons Against Passive Evaluative Conditioning (Relative Measures)", "Comparisons Against Evaluative Statement (Relative Measures)"
- "Comparisons Against Emotional Narrative (Single-Target Measures)"
- "Comparisons Against Passive Evaluative Conditioning (Single-Target Measures)"
- "Comparisons Against Evaluative Statement (Single-Target Measures)"

Guide for Reading Tables

- *N, M, SD* = Descriptive statistics of the condition
- *d, t, p df* = Comparisons against the focal comparison condition
- Cohen's *d*
  - Positive *d* = Condition has greater pro-Thin/anti-Fat bias than focal comparison condition
  - Negative *d* = Condition has lower pro-Thin/anti-Fat bias than focal comparison condition

## S6.1 Comparisons Against Emotional Narrative (Relative Measures)

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure – IAT**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 565 | 0.35 | 0.43 | | | | |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 609 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 0.25 | 4.26 | < .001 | 1167.39 |
| Evaluative Statement | 589 | 0.24 | 0.48 | -0.23 | -4.00 | < .001 | 1148.87 |
| Control | 839 | 0.47 | 0.40 | 0.30 | 5.46 | < .001 | 1144.28 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure - BIAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 581 | 0.16 | 0.48 | | | | |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 580 | 0.20 | 0.48 | 0.09 | 1.51 | 0.13 | 1159.00 |
| Evaluative Statement | 552 | -0.06 | 0.5 | -0.45 | -7.57 | < .001 | 1119.15 |
| Control | 828 | 0.23 | 0.47 | 0.15 | 2.85 | .0044 | 1246.13 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure – EPT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 582 | 0.06 | 0.26 | | | | |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 584 | 0.05 | 0.25 | -0.03 | -0.46 | 0.64 | 1158.56 |
| Evaluative Statement | 527 | 0.06 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.95 | 1103.82 |
| Control | 919 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.03 | 0.60 | 0.55 | 1220.36 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure - AMP**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 458 | 0.03 | 0.18 | | | | |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 455 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.09 | 1.34 | .18 | 910.63 |
| Evaluative Statement | 460 | -0.08 | 0.32 | -0.42 | -6.41 | < .001 | 738.64 |
| Control | 661 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.11 | 1.86 | .063 | 1017.31 |

## S6.2 Comparisons Against Passive Evaluative Conditioning (Relative Measures)

**Conditions vs. Passive Evaluative Conditioning by measure - IAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 565 | 0.35 | 0.43 | 0.25 | 4.26 | < .001 | 1167.39 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 609 | 0.46 | 0.44 | | | | |
| Evaluative Statement | 589 | 0.24 | 0.48 | 0.47 | 8.14 | < .001 | 1180.43 |
| Control | 839 | 0.47 | 0.40 | -0.04 | -0.73 | .47 | 1237.31 |

**Conditions vs. Passive Evaluative Conditioning by measure - BIAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 581 | 0.16 | 0.48 | -0.09 | -1.51 | .13 | 1159 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 580 | 0.20 | 0.48 | | | | |
| Evaluative Statement | 552 | -0.06 | 0.50 | -0.54 | -9.02 | < .001 | 1119.15 |
| Control | 828 | 0.23 | 0.47 | 0.07 | 1.21 | .23 | 1243.80 |

**Conditions vs. Passive Evaluative Conditioning by measure - EPT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 582 | 0.06 | 0.26 | 0.03 | 0.46 | 0.64 | 1158.56 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 584 | 0.05 | 0.25 | | | | |
| Evaluative Statement | 527 | 0.06 | 0.25 | 0.02 | 0.40 | 0.69 | 1092.67 |
| Control | 919 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.06 | 1.15 | 0.25 | 1284.67 |

**Conditions vs. Passive Evaluative Conditioning by measure - AMP**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 458 | 0.03 | 0.18 | -0.09 | -1.34 | .18 | 910.63 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 455 | 0.05 | 0.19 | | | | |
| Evaluative Statement | 460 | -0.08 | 0.32 | -0.48 | -7.34 | < .001 | 745.58 |
| Control | 661 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.42 | .67 | 1002.64 |

## S6.3 Comparisons Against Evaluative Statement (Relative Measures)

**Conditions vs. Evaluative Statement by measure – IAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 565 | 0.35 | 0.43 | 0.23 | 4.00 | < .001 | 1148.87 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 609 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 0.47 | 8.14 | < .001 | 1180.43 |
| Evaluative Statement | 589 | 0.24 | 0.48 | | | | |
| Control | 839 | 0.47 | 0.40 | 0.54 | 9.67 | < .001 | 1122.71 |

**Conditions vs. Evaluative Statement by measure - BIAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 581 | 0.16 | 0.48 | 0.45 | 7.57 | < .001 | 1119.74 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 580 | 0.20 | 0.48 | 0.54 | 9.02 | < .001 | 1119.15 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Evaluative Statement | 552 | -0.06 | 0.50 | | | | |
| Control | 828 | 0.23 | 0.47 | 0.6 | 10.89 | < .001 | 1138.17 |

**Conditions vs. Evaluative Statement by measure - EPT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 582 | 0.06 | 0.26 | 0.00 | -0.06 | 0.95 | 1103.82 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 584 | 0.05 | 0.25 | -0.02 | -0.40 | 0.69 | 1092.67 |
| Evaluative Statement | 527 | 0.06 | 0.25 | | | | |
| Control | 919 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.04 | 0.67 | 0.51 | 1121.68 |

**Conditions vs. Evaluative Statement by measure - AMP**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 458 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.42 | 6.41 | < .001 | 738.64 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 455 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.48 | 7.34 | < .001 | 745.58 |
| Evaluative Statement | 460 | -0.08 | 0.32 | | | | |
| Control | 661 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.52 | 7.89 | < .001 | 699.53 |

## S6.4 Comparisons Against Emotional Narrative (Single-Target Measures)

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure – ST-IAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 615 | 0.05 | 0.31 | | | | |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 579 | 0.02 | 0.32 | -0.1 | -1.76 | .078 | 1184.89 |
| Evaluative Statement | 617 | 0.05 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | .997 | 1228.64 |
| Control | 884 | 0.05 | 0.32 | -0.02 | -0.45 | .65 | 1345.15 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure - EPT-Fat**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 582 | 0.15 | 0.22 | | | | |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 584 | 0.15 | 0.23 | 0 | 0.03 | .98 | 1161.91 |
| Evaluative Statement | 527 | 0.12 | 0.22 | -0.1 | -1.74 | .082 | 1094.05 |
| Control | 919 | 0.16 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 1.28 | .20 | 1253.64 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure – EPT-Thin**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 582 | 0.21 | 0.23 | | | | |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 584 | 0.2 | 0.23 | -0.03 | -0.48 | .63 | 1163.97 |
| Evaluative Statement | 527 | 0.18 | 0.22 | -0.11 | -1.76 | .079 | 1104.88 |
| Control | 919 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.1 | 1.92 | .055 | 1200.72 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure – AMP-Fat**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 458 | 0.6 | 0.21 | | | | |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 455 | 0.61 | 0.22 | 0.05 | 0.72 | .47 | 903.53 |
| Evaluative Statement | 460 | 0.63 | 0.23 | 0.16 | 2.37 | .018 | 907.97 |
| Control | 661 | 0.59 | 0.22 | -0.06 | -0.96 | .34 | 1024.89 |

**Conditions vs. Emotional Narrative by measure – AMP-Thin**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 458 | 0.63 | 0.19 | | | | |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 455 | 0.66 | 0.2 | 0.14 | 2.04 | .041 | 909.25 |
| Evaluative Statement | 460 | 0.55 | 0.24 | -0.34 | -5.21 | < .001 | 875.13 |
| Control | 661 | 0.64 | 0.2 | 0.05 | 0.75 | .45 | 1006.67 |

## S6.5 Comparisons Against Passive Evaluative Conditioning (Single-Target Measures)

**Conditions vs. Passive Evaluative Conditioning by measure – ST-IAT**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 615 | 0.02 | 0.31 | 0.10 | 1.76 | .079 | 1184.89 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 579 | 0.05 | 0.32 | | | | |
| Evaluative Statement | 617 | 0.05 | 0.30 | 0.10 | 1.79 | .074 | 1179.55 |
| Control | 884 | 0.05 | 0.32 | 0.08 | 1.44 | .15 | 1246.73 |

**Conditions vs. Passive Evaluative Conditioning by measure - EPT-Fat**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 582 | 0.15 | 0.22 | 0.00 | -0.03 | .98 | 1161.91 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 584 | 0.15 | 0.23 | | | | |
| Evaluative Statement | 527 | 0.12 | 0.22 | -0.10 | -1.73 | .084 | 1104.14 |
| Control | 919 | 0.16 | 0.22 | 0.06 | 1.22 | .22 | 1216.56 |

**Conditions vs. Passive Evaluative Conditioning by measure – EPT-Thin**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 582 | 0.20 | 0.23 | 0.03 | 0.48 | .63 | 1163.97 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 584 | 0.21 | 0.23 | | | | |
| Evaluative Statement | 527 | 0.18 | 0.22 | -0.08 | -1.28 | .20 | 1106.35 |
| Control | 919 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 2.46 | .014 | 1207.28 |

**Conditions vs. Passive Evaluative Conditioning by measure – AMP-Fat**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 458 | 0.61 | 0.21 | -0.05 | -0.72 | .47 | 903.53 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 455 | 0.60 | 0.22 | | | | |
| Evaluative Statement | 460 | 0.63 | 0.23 | 0.10 | 1.59 | .11 | 912.99 |
| Control | 661 | 0.59 | 0.22 | -0.10 | -1.67 | .095 | 966.70 |

**Conditions vs. Passive Evaluative Conditioning by measure – AMP-Thin**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 458 | 0.66 | 0.19 | -0.14 | -2.04 | .041 | 909.25 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 455 | 0.63 | 0.20 | | | | |
| Evaluative Statement | 460 | 0.55 | 0.24 | -0.46 | -6.95 | < .001 | 886.21 |
| Control | 661 | 0.64 | 0.20 | -0.09 | -1.44 | .15 | 976.88 |

## S6.6 Comparisons Against Evaluative Statement (Single-Target Measures)

**Conditions vs. Evaluative Statement by measure – ST-IAT**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 615 | 0.05 | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.00 | .997 | 1228.64 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 579 | 0.02 | 0.32 | -0.10 | -1.79 | .074 | 1179.55 |
| Evaluative Statement | 617 | 0.05 | 0.30 | | | | |
| Control | 884 | 0.05 | 0.32 | -0.02 | -0.47 | .64 | 1373.18 |

**Conditions vs. Evaluative Statement by measure - EPT-Fat**

| Condition | *N* | *M* | *SD* | *d* | *t* | *p* | *df* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 582 | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.10 | 1.74 | .082 | 1094.05 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 584 | 0.15 | 0.23 | 0.10 | 1.73 | .084 | 1104.14 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Evaluative Statement | 527 | 0.15 | 0.22 | | | | |
| Control | 919 | 0.16 | 0.22 | 0.17 | 3.13 | .0018 | 1104.58 |

**Conditions vs. Evaluative Statement by measure – EPT-Thin**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 582 | 0.18 | 0.23 | 0.11 | 1.76 | .080 | 1104.88 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 584 | 0.20 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 1.28 | .20 | 1106.35 |
| Evaluative Statement | 527 | 0.21 | 0.22 | | | | |
| Control | 919 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.21 | 3.90 | < .001 | 1111.16 |

**Conditions vs. Evaluative Statement by measure – AMP-Fat**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 458 | 0.63 | 0.21 | -0.16 | -2.37 | .018 | 907.97 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 455 | 0.61 | 0.22 | -0.10 | -1.59 | .11 | 912.99 |
| Evaluative Statement | 460 | 0.60 | 0.23 | | | | |
| Control | 661 | 0.59 | 0.22 | -0.21 | -3.40 | < .001 | 969.25 |

**Conditions vs. Evaluative Statement by measure – AMP-Thin**

| **Condition** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Narrative | 458 | 0.55 | 0.19 | 0.34 | 5.21 | < .001 | 875.13 |
| Passive Evaluative Conditioning | 455 | 0.66 | 0.20 | 0.46 | 6.95 | < .001 | 886.21 |
| Evaluative Statement | 460 | 0.63 | 0.24 | | | | |
| Control | 661 | 0.64 | 0.20 | 0.39 | 6.15 | < .001 | 866.74 |

# S7. Pre-registered Analyses Comparing Intervention Conditions Against Individual Matched Control Conditions (Study 2)

## S7.1 Background

We pre-registered that "we will examine whether the three matched control conditions are statistically equivalent using equivalency tests with a smallest effect size of interest (SESOI) of $d = 0.10$. If we have evidence of non-equivalence between control conditions, we will re-conduct other analyses without collapsing the control conditions together."

However, we did not realize that power for a SESOI of $d = +/- 0.10$ was similar to powering for *t*-tests and would require over 1,700 participants per condition to obtain 80% power to detect a SESOI of $d = .10$. Given that our average sample size for matched control condition

was 279.50, we only had about 80% power to detect a SESOI of $d$ = +/- 0.25. Not surprisingly, we did not find evidence of equivalence according to a SESOI of $d$ = +/- 0.10 and report our analyses without collapsing control conditions together below.

## S7.2 Analyses of Relative Measures

We compared each intervention condition against its corresponding matched control condition. The results were mostly consistent with analyses that collapse the control conditions. In our primary analyses comparing interventions against the control conditions, the direction and significance of effects replicated in 11 out of 12 times.

The one exception involved comparisons of BIAT scores in the Emotional Narrative's matched control condition. As BIAT scores in the Emotional Narrative's matched control condition ($M$ = 0.16, $SD$ = 0.46) were much lower than in the other two matched control conditions ($M$s = 0.25, 0.30, $SD$s = 0.48, .47), the comparison between the BIAT scores in the Emotional Narrative condition was not significantly different from the Emotional Narrative's matched control condition, $t(560.51) = 0.01$, $p = .99$, $d = 0.00$. This result diverged from the main text, which found a small intervention effect of the Emotional Narrative on the BIAT compared to the collapsed-together control condition, $t(1246.13) = 2.85$, $p < .001$, $d = -0.15$. We speculate that this discrepancy is a false-negative that is attributable to the matched control condition's unexpectedly low average BIAT scores.

*Matched Control Condition Descriptives*

**Emotional Narrative Matched Control Descriptives**

| Measure | *N* | *M* | *SD* | One-sample *t* | One-sample *p* | One-sample *d* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IAT | 278 | 0.45 | 0.38 | 20.00 | < .001 | 1.20 |
| BIAT | 277 | 0.16 | 0.46 | 5.85 | < .001 | 0.35 |
| EPT | 301 | 0.06 | 0.28 | 3.97 | < .001 | 0.22 |
| AMP | 229 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 3.96 | < .001 | 0.26 |

**Passive Evaluative Conditioning Matched Control Descriptives**

| Measure | *N* | *M* | *SD* | One-sample *t* | One-sample *p* | One-sample *d* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IAT | 275 | 0.45 | 0.41 | 19.52 | < .001 | 1.18 |
| BIAT | 292 | 0.25 | 0.48 | 8.73 | < .001 | 0.51 |
| EPT | 310 | 0.06 | 0.25 | 4.51 | < .001 | 0.26 |
| AMP | 229 | 0.06 | 0.19 | 4.87 | < .001 | 0.32 |

**Evaluative Statement Matched Control Descriptives**

| Measure | *N* | *M* | *SD* | One-sample *t* | One-sample *p* | One-sample *d* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IAT | 286 | 0.49 | 0.41 | 20.03 | < .001 | 1.18 |
| BIAT | 259 | 0.30 | 0.47 | 10.29 | < .001 | 0.64 |
| EPT | 308 | 0.07 | 0.25 | 5.17 | < .001 | 0.29 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AMP | 203 | 0.05 | 0.20 | 3.25 | .0013 | 0.23 |

*Comparisons against Matched Control Conditions*

Guide for Reading Tables

- *N, M, SD* = Descriptive statistics of the intervention condition
- *d, t, p df* = Comparisons against the relevant matched control condition
- Cohen's *d*
    - Positive *d* = Condition has greater pro-Thin/anti-Fat bias than the relevant matched control condition
    - Negative *d* = Condition has lower pro-Thin/anti-Fat bias than the relevant matched control condition

**Conditions vs. matched control by condition – Emotional Narrative**

| **Measure** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IAT | 565 | 0.35 | 0.43 | -0.25 | -3.52 | < .001 | 624.63 |
| BIAT | 581 | 0.16 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.01 | .99 | 560.51 |
| EPT | 582 | 0.06 | 0.26 | -0.02 | -0.27 | .79 | 577.04 |
| AMP | 458 | 0.03 | 0.18 | -0.10 | -1.21 | .23 | 441.23 |

**Conditions vs. matched control by condition – Passive Evaluative Conditioning**

| **Measure** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IAT | 609 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 0.05 | 0.73 | .46 | 564.79 |
| BIAT | 580 | 0.20 | 0.48 | -0.09 | -1.21 | .23 | 577.63 |
| EPT | 584 | 0.05 | 0.25 | -0.05 | -0.73 | .47 | 619.34 |
| AMP | 455 | 0.05 | 0.19 | -0.07 | -0.87 | .38 | 448.62 |

**Conditions vs. matched control by condition - Evaluative Statement**

| **Measure** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| IAT | 589 | 0.24 | 0.48 | -0.54 | -7.91 | < .001 | 639.37 |
| BIAT | 552 | -0.06 | 0.50 | -0.73 | -9.93 | < .001 | 9.93 |
| EPT | 527 | 0.06 | 0.25 | -0.06 | -0.83 | .41 | 654.16 |
| AMP | 460 | -0.08 | 0.32 | -0.43 | -6.05 | < .001 | 573.48 |

## S7.3 Analyses of Single-Target Measures

In our primary analyses comparing interventions against their corresponding matched control conditions, the direction and significance of effects replicated results using a combined control condition 9 out of 12 times.

Like in analyses using collapsed control conditions, these analyses found that the Evaluative Statement increased pro-fat biases on the AMP, $t(401.80) = 2.53$, $p = .011$, $d = 0.21$,reduced pro-thin biases on the AMP, $t(443.74) = -4.18$, $p < .001$, $d = -0.33$, and reduced pro-thin biases on the EPT, $t(625.60) = -2.66$, $p = .008$, $d = -0.19$. However, they diverged from analyses using collapsed control condition by not finding that Passive Evaluative Conditioning reduced pro-thin biases on the EPT, $t(648.81) = -0.81$, $p = .42$, $d = -0.06$. This was a small intervention effects in analyses using collapsed control conditions ($d = -0.13$), suggesting that the non-replication could be attributable to reduced statistical power.

Unexpectedly (and in contrast to analyses using collapsed control conditions), analyses using matched control conditions also found that the Emotional Narrative slightly reduced pro-thin biases on the EPT, $t(625.60) = -2.66$, $p = .0078$, $d = -0.19$, and slightly reduced pro-fat biases on the EPT, $t(583.60) = -2.37$, $p = .018$, $d = -0.17$. These effects suggest a simultaneous decrease in positive evaluations of both thin and fat people that cancel out together when understood relatively.

**Emotional Narrative Matched Control Descriptives**

| Measure | *N* | *M* | *SD* | One-sample *t* | One-sample *p* | One-sample *d* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STIAT-Fat | 296 | 0.06 | 0.32 | 3.38 | < .001 | 0.20 |
| EPT-Fat | 301 | 0.19 | 0.23 | 14.03 | < .001 | 0.81 |
| EPT-Thin | 301 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 19.18 | < .001 | 1.11 |
| AMP-Fat | 229 | 0.59 | 0.22 | 6.46 | < .001 | 0.43 |
| AMP-Thin | 229 | 0.64 | 0.19 | 11.23 | < .001 | 0.74 |

**Passive Evaluative Conditioning Matched Control Descriptives**

| Measure | *N* | *M* | *SD* | One-sample *t* | One-sample *p* | One-sample *d* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STIAT-Fat | 294 | 0.03 | 0.32 | 1.36 | .17 | 0.08 |
| EPT-Fat | 310 | 0.15 | 0.22 | 11.61 | < .001 | 0.66 |
| EPT-Thin | 310 | 0.21 | 0.23 | 16.60 | < .001 | 0.94 |
| AMP-Fat | 229 | 0.58 | 0.22 | 5.22 | < .001 | 0.34 |
| AMP-Thin | 229 | 0.64 | 0.20 | 10.36 | < .001 | 0.68 |

**Evaluative Statement Matched Control Descriptives**

| Measure | *N* | *M* | *SD* | One-sample *t* | One-sample *p* | One-sample *d* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STIAT-Fat | 294 | 0.05 | 0.32 | 2.84 | .0048 | 0.17 |
| EPT-Fat | 308 | 0.15 | 0.21 | 12.55 | < .001 | 0.71 |
| EPT-Thin | 308 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 17.93 | < .001 | 1.02 |
| AMP-Fat | 203 | 0.58 | 0.22 | 5.55 | < .001 | 0.39 |
| AMP-Thin | 203 | 0.63 | 0.21 | 8.93 | < .001 | 0.62 |

*Comparisons against Matched Control Conditions*

Guide for Reading Tables

- *N, M, SD* = Descriptive statistics of the intervention condition
- *d, t, p df* = Comparisons against the relevant matched control condition
- Cohen's *d*
    - Positive *d* = Condition has greater pro-Thin/anti-Fat bias than the relevant matched control condition
    - Negative *d* = Condition has lower pro-Thin/anti-Fat bias than the relevant matched control condition

**Conditions vs. matched control by condition – Emotional Narrative**

| **Measure** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STIAT-Fat | 615 | 0.05 | 0.31 | -0.03 | -0.37 | .71 | 566.25 |
| EPT-Fat | 582 | 0.15 | 0.22 | -0.17 | -2.37 | .018 | 583.60 |
| EPT-Thin | 582 | 0.21 | 0.23 | -0.19 | -2.66 | .0078 | 625.60 |
| AMP-Fat | 458 | 0.60 | 0.21 | 0.01 | 0.17 | .87 | 426.32 |
| AMP-Thin | 458 | 0.63 | 0.19 | -0.08 | -0.98 | .32 | 453.72 |

**Conditions vs. matched control by condition – Passive Evaluative Conditioning**

| **Measure** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STIAT-Fat | 579 | 0.02 | 0.32 | -0.01 | -0.11 | .91 | 583.60 |
| EPT-Fat | 584 | 0.15 | 0.23 | 0.00 | -0.01 | .99 | 643.17 |
| EPT-Thin | 584 | 0.20 | 0.23 | -0.06 | -0.81 | .42 | 648.81 |
| AMP-Fat | 455 | 0.61 | 0.22 | 0.14 | 1.74 | .082 | 460.09 |
| AMP-Thin | 455 | 0.66 | 0.20 | 0.09 | 1.10 | .27 | 456.59 |

**Conditions vs. matched control by condition - Evaluative Statement**

| **Measure** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***d*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***df*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STIAT-Fat | 617 | 0.05 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.08 | .94 | 547.19 |
| EPT-Fat | 527 | 0.12 | 0.22 | -0.14 | -1.93 | .054 | 655.37 |
| EPT-Thin | 527 | 0.18 | 0.22 | -0.20 | -2.83 | .0048 | 639.12 |
| AMP-Fat | 460 | 0.63 | 0.23 | 0.21 | 2.53 | .011 | 401.80 |
| AMP-Thin | 460 | 0.55 | 0.24 | -0.33 | -4.18 | < .001 | 443.74 |

## S8. References


Bar-Anan, Y., & Nosek, B. A. (2014). A comparative investigation of seven indirect attitude measures. *Behavior Research Methods*, *46*(3), 668–688. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0410-6

Crandall, C. S. (1994). Prejudice against fat people: Ideology and self-interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*(5), 882–894. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.5.882

Crandall, C. S., D'Anello, S., Sakalli, N., Lazarus, E., Nejtardt, G. W., & Feather, N. T. (2001). An attribution-value model of prejudice: Anti-fat attitudes in six nations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(1), 30–37. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201271003

U.S. Census Bureau. (2021). *Measuring racial and ethnic diversity for the 2020 Census*. https://www.census.gov/newsroom/blogs/random-samplings/2021/08/measuring-racial-ethnic-diversity-2020-census.html