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Abstract
No research has yet experimentally evaluated the role of narrative fiction in relation to eating disorders (EDs). This study used a between-participants design to assess vulnerability to EDs before and after reading two contemporary U.S. young adult sports novels. ED vulnerability was measured using the EAT-26 and a tailored questionnaire. The experimental group (n = 32) received the books with text-specific reading guides. The control group (n = 33) received only the novels. Our hypothesis was that post-reading measures would be lower (improved) in both groups, but more markedly in the experimental group. Scores were typically lower in the experimental group and higher in the control group, but these differences were not statistically significant after correction for multiple comparisons. These findings underline the need to expand empirical evidence on the effects of narrative reading in the context of EDs, while the innovative methods trialed here open up new methodological avenues.
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Introduction

Eating disorders (EDs) are a common health problem with high human and economic costs, and mainstream treatments still have disappointing success rates, especially for anorexia nervosa (AN) (Troscianko & Leon, 2020). The nature of EDs as complex biobehavioral disorders that are also socioculturally inflected offers a rationale for trialing interventions that target interpretive engagement with narrative (Troscianko, 2018a). Creative bibliotherapy involves reading literary texts (e.g., poetry or narrative fiction) for therapeutic purposes, especially in the context of mental health conditions (McCardle & Byrt, 2003). This form of bibliotherapy shows some promise for treatment of non-ED forms of mental distress, such as depression (Billington et al., 2010; Billington, 2011), adolescent aggression (Shechtman, 2006), and anxiety and emotional suppression (Tegnér et al., 2009) or reduced autonomy, competence, and social relatedness (Andersen, 2022) in cancer patients. These results vary in robustness, and some (such as Billington et al.’s research) involve a group rather than individual format for the reading. But the fact that bibliotherapy is relatively cheap and readily accessible, along with the urgent need for better ED treatments and the obvious potential for cultural artefacts to either exacerbate or counteract problematic ED-relevant cultural ideals, means that there is a good case for investigating bibliotherapy for EDs.

In the sphere of EDs specifically, only a handful of creative bibliotherapy studies have been conducted, and these are mainly observational rather than experimental. Our ambition here is to experimentally test the claim that bibliotherapy can be useful for preventing or treating EDs. We tested whether reading narrative fiction with or without prompts to guided reflection could helpfully impact on ED-influenced modes of thinking, by way of both standardized questionnaires and a bespoke corpus of questions, in order to establish whether this promising line of inquiry is worth developing further. Before presenting our study and findings, we offer a review of the existing literature on individual creative bibliotherapy for EDs.

Dramatherapy

In dramatherapy, participants enact desired behaviors and rehearse life roles through techniques such as storytelling, projective play, improvisation, and performance, among others. Focused on this form of bibliotherapy, Dokter’s canonical work Arts Therapies and Clients with Eating Disorders: Fragile Board (1994) reviews classic techniques in the use of dramatic texts for treatment of EDs. More recently, Brooke’s The Creative Therapies and Eating Disorders (2008) is a collection of essays exploring creative approaches relevant to patients with EDs, including music and poetry therapy. Wurr and Pope-Carter’s (1998) study documented how participants’ attitudes toward eating and the body can be steered toward recovery by use of journey metaphors. Finally, Agiman’s pilot dramatherapy study (2013) aimed to reduce anxiety and inflexibility, as well as improve emotional balance and self-
conceptualization, in participants with eating problems. These latter two studies report minor to moderate positive outcomes.

Methodological weaknesses mean that results generated in these studies remain provisional. It is not yet possible to claim that dramatherapy is an effective method in the treatment or prevention of EDs, since no controlled experimental studies have been conducted. Meyer (2010) offers a warning about the gap between practice and evidence:

> drama therapy has been documented as a treatment intervention for EDs and numerous authors have purported success with their drama therapy groups. It is important to note, however, that these groups are case study examples and should not be interpreted as empirical support for using drama therapy with eating disorders. (2010, p. 5)

The evidence base remains similar 13 years later.

**Poetry Therapy**

Turning to poetry therapy, which involves a combination of reading and creative writing, Ramsey-Wade et al. (2021) conducted a meta-analysis of studies in which poetry therapy was used to improve ED outcomes. Analysis of quantitative results in studies of moderate to high quality showed a positive trend. The authors conclude that “emotional expression, group cohesion, de-centering or distraction could all be causal pathways for therapeutic writing” (p. 14), although they found some evidence that control tasks equaled or outperformed the expressive writing paradigms being investigated, and that expressive writing was contraindicated for some individuals. Ramsey-Wade’s own (2016) qualitative interview study in poetry therapy, meanwhile, generated evidence that expressive writing tasks can decrease symptoms of alexithymia in groups diagnosed with EDs. Her conclusions highlight the beneficial role of writing as opposed to reading, however, and are limited to retrospective self-report. In her PhD dissertation, Alexander (2016) also used writing therapy (specifically journaling) in the context of ED recovery. In this study, 70 diarists offered testimony on the role of journaling during their illness and recovery. Findings included the suggestion that guided journaling can enhance recovery motivation. Again, these data are limited to observational self-report, with the attendant limitations and biases despite their richness.

**Narrative Bibliotherapy**

Next, we consider existing evidence on the interactions between narrative reading and eating disorders. This genre arguably has the most ecological validity in that narrative fiction is by far the most commonly read “literary” genre. People with EDs often choose to engage with ED-specific narrative materials, including novels and memoirs about EDs (Troscianko, 2018b). Thomas et al. (2006) found that reading ED memoirs had no effect on eating attitudes, drive for thinness, or implicit
associations between AN and glamor/danger in a nonclinical population. Troscianko (2018b) presented survey data on fiction-reading habits and preferences and the self-reported effects of such reading on people with and without personal experience of an ED. A key finding was that fiction thematically related to EDs was widely reported as significantly exacerbating ED-related attitudes and behaviors, while reading one’s preferred type of other fiction, unrelated to EDs, was reported as generating more positive effects and fewer negative ones than ED-specific reading. One mediating mechanism for the negative effects in ED-specific reading may be readers’ emulation of the pathological behaviors and attitudes exhibited by textual characters, such as the protagonists of ED memoirs (respondents did not systematically distinguish between narrative fiction and nonfiction in their retrospective reports). This finding contradicts the widespread belief in bibliotherapy theory and practice that reading narratives specifically about the illness or problem the patient/client wishes to address will lead to a beneficial process of identification followed by catharsis followed by insight and problem-solving, a hypothesis originally postulated by Schrodes (1949) and echoed by many researchers and practitioners since (Troscianko, 2018a).

The stark negative effects reported for ED fiction in Troscianko’s (2018b) data suggest a range of possible influencing factors behind the potential of narrative fiction to generate positive versus negative effects on ED-related dimensions. These potential influencing factors shaped our study design.

1. The most obvious possibility is that thematic content is a primary determinant of positive versus negative consequences: that an ED focus raises potential for harm and/or lowers potential for benefits. This effect may be mediated by the fact that ED-specific texts are sometimes sought out by people with EDs specifically for the purpose of “self-triggering”—that is, to induce behaviorally mediated worsening of ED symptoms (Troscianko, 2018b).

2. It is also possible that EDs may be an exception to the broader (if still weak) evidence that creative bibliotherapy may have positive effects on mental health. On this hypothesis, reading narrative fiction in general is less likely to be helpful and/or more likely to be harmful when an ED is the reader’s health context. Such a pattern might be attributable to the egosyntonic aspects of many individuals’ ED experience and the ways in which disordered eating is encouraged (and the processes needed for full recovery discouraged) by many cultural trends in the realms of eating, exercise, and the body. This alignment may make it easier for a narrative to support the ED mindset than is likely for, say, depression.

3. The distinction between everyday reading and structured bibliotherapy may interact with the texts’ thematic focus, for example in that accidentally encountering ED fiction may have harmful effects whereas the same text presented as part of a supported intervention might elicit more positive responses. This hypothesis would be compatible with Carney & Robertson’s (2022) 5-study paper, which reported no effects on mental health and mood of direct exposure to narrative fiction, but did find that reflective engagement with fiction through mnemonic integration and
social discussion had positive impacts. This finding relates to the distinction in bibliotherapy between pure and guided interventions, where pure involves simply reading a book and guided involves prompts to engage with the materials in formally structured ways, for example, in conversation or writing. If accidental reading generally offers fewer benefits than more structured forms of engagement as found in guided bibliotherapy, this discrepancy may be heightened in the ED context such that accidental engagement not only offers few or no benefits but in fact poses significant risks. A research design question raised by Troscianko’s survey results is that observational self-report data may or may not align with controlled experimental data. One might expect self-report about engagement with cultural artefacts to skew positive in line with social signaling priorities. This effect was not found in the survey, but there is substantial potential for different biases and errors to creep into interpretive recall of personal experiences.

4. EDs (particularly AN and bulimia nervosa [BN]) are more prevalent among women than among men (Franceschini & Fattore, 2021). Identification with stereotypical constructs of femininity and feminine roles has been shown to correlate positively with underlying ED symptomatology (Sheikh et al., 2013, p. 512). Gender dysphoria has also been identified as a factor increasing ED susceptibility, which accounts for the fact that trans individuals are at a much higher risk of developing an ED than cisgender people (Murray et al., 2013). An intervention that empowers readers to challenge maladaptive constructs—specifically traditional feminine attitudes and roles—may be predicted to reduce their vulnerability to developing a full-blown disorder.

**Hypotheses.** This study’s starting point was the idea that reading young adult (YA) sports fiction could be beneficial in the treatment and/or prevention of EDs, and that this positive effect could be enhanced with the use of reading guides designed to direct participants’ attention in constructive, gender-sensitive ways toward textual features relating to eating, exercise, and the body. Participants received two contemporary U.S. YA sports novels with or without accompanying reading guides. We predicted that post-reading survey scores would be lower (i.e., improved) in both groups, but more markedly in the experimental group. This prediction was tested through the following pair of hypotheses:

- **H1:** Post-reading EAT-26 scores will be lower than pre-reading scores, and scores will decrease more in the experimental group than in the control group.
- **H2:** Post-reading scores for (a) eating, (b) exercise, and (c) body items in the tailored questionnaire will be lower than pre-reading ones, decreasing more in the experimental than in the control group.

**Methods and Materials**

The study was conducted between September 2019 and March 2020. It was approved by the Ethical Committee in Research at the University of Oviedo (ref. 40/19) and by
Oxford University’s Central University Research Ethics Committee (CUREC) (ref. R65698/RE001). Data collection began on October 1, 2019 and ended on March 1, 2020.

Novels and Reading Guides

The narrative texts chosen for this experiment were *Breathe, Annie, Breathe* (*BAB*), and *Coming Up for Air* (*CUA*), two contemporary U.S. YA sports novels written by Miranda Kenneally in 2014 and 2017 respectively. We selected these texts to present to individuals vulnerable to developing an ED for two reasons. First, exercise addiction is a common component of eating disorders (Bratland-Sanda et al., 2010; Dalle Grave et al., 2008) and sports fiction foregrounds eating, exercise, and the body, making this genre meaningful for individuals at risk of developing disordered attitudes in these areas. However, this genre also bypasses the direct evocations of ED habits and value systems contained in ED-themed narratives, which have been found to risk exacerbating readers’ EDs. The female protagonists in Kenneally’s works emphasize the nourishing, performance-enhancing value of food and functional motivations for exercising that include skill development and fun rather than weight loss (Riestra-Camacho, 2021). As such, they offer an opportunity to constructively modulate eating-, exercise-, and body-related attitudes associated with ED vulnerability. Secondly, the “traditionally highly gendered nature of athletic competition makes fictional representations of sports inherently reflective of gender issues in society” (Cummins, 2009, p. 202). This thematic focus provides a readymade context in which gender questions can be raised and readers can develop new awareness of them, with the potential to reduce ED vulnerability.

The two novels were presented with or without a specially constructed reading guide to structure participants’ interpretive engagement with the text. The theoretical underpinning for this choice included the apparent benefits of more structured interpretive engagements discussed above, as well as Montgomery and Maunders’ (2015) suggestion that engaging with narratives may have therapeutic efficacy via the same forms of cognitive restructuring as achieved by cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT). Like CBT, reading may allow participants to transform ED-aligned attitudes to eating, exercise, and the body into more constructive forms. The reading guides are intended to intensify this potentially protective or therapeutic interpretive engagement with the novels, by directing readers’ attention to particular passages and offering text-specific ED- and gender-related guidance for their reading.

The materials and measures employed in this study were directly calibrated to one another and to existing ED research. Figure 1 shows the four-layered structure connecting the research literature, the novels, the reading guides, and the questionnaire. First, a survey of the clinical literature on EDs was conducted and used to guide selection of relevant features and passages in the novels. Second, the selected passages were used to build the reading guide items. And third, these items were incorporated into the tailored questionnaire.
More specifically, the reading guides consisted of messages that highlighted the body-positive attitudes and behaviors displayed by the characters in *BAB* and *CUA*. A set of prominent cognitive biases are thought to underlie susceptibility to EDs (Siep et al., 2011), and the aim of these messages was to reverse the maladaptive interpretations that might be made by a vulnerable reader.

The messages covered three broad categories—eating, exercise, and body—and addressed 12 factors in total. The eating category comprised a set of seven factors contributing to ED vulnerability:

1. Messages addressing guilty eating emphasized the pleasure of eating food treats or comfort food, and aimed to reduce feelings of remorse associated with their consumption.
2. Anxiety over food control messages presented positive interpretations of reduced control over food, including where food is prepared by others.
3. Messages about eating inflexibility highlighted that there need be no rigid mealtime boundaries, and that food can be eaten distractedly.
4. Food anxiety messages aimed to reduce feelings of fear associated with food encounters.
5. Calorie control comments made explicit the need to eat an adequate quantity of high-quality nutrients, and decreased the salience and perceived value of calorie tracking.
6. Messages about excuses and dieting attempted to debunk the validity of deceptive reasons to miss meals (i.e., those where calorie control is the unspoken motivation).
7. Messages focusing on diet salience were created to reduce the salience of energy-restrictive dieting behaviors in ambiguous situations.

The exercise category contained three further factors:
1. **Weight loss-oriented exercise** messages were designed to decrease the salience of size-, weight-, and shape-related reasons to exercise.

2. **Performance-oriented exercise** messages highlighted pragmatic performance-related motivations to exercise in contrast to the aim to achieve appearance/size/weight/shape-related changes.²

3. **Exercise inflexibility** messages emphasized the enjoyment to be found in practising sport, in contrast to the feeling of forcing oneself to do so. They also contained comments on pain, highlighting that whenever pain or injuries are experienced, the responsible option is to stop exercising and focus on rest and rehabilitation.

Body, the third and final message category, comprised two factors:

1. **Body perception** messages underscored ways in which the body can be misperceived in response to temporary changes such as bloating.

2. Messages about **gender stereotypes** were designed to debunk stereotypes associating femininity with skinniness or food restriction, and to strengthen links between femininity and muscularity or strength.

Each message was either _expository_ or _interactive_, depending on the relationship that the reader was asked to establish with it. Expository prompts elicited interpretive reflection by elaborating on content in the novel. Interactive messages asked readers to actively engage with this content, for example, by prompting them (a) to connect a passage in the novel with their own life, (b) to think a particular type of thought or recall a particular type of memory, (c) to perform a specific type of behavior (e.g., drink or eat while reading), or (d) to change a habit in a more lasting sense (e.g., eat around friends instead of alone). We offer two illustrative examples here:³

**Expository message from BAB:** On page 9, we learn of the pain Annie endured the first time she tried to start running at her school track. *The cool February air burned my lungs and throat and my shins felt like somebody had kicked soccer balls at them for hours.* Remember that, even though she felt very disappointed at herself, she stopped running that day because it was too painful to endure.

**Interactive message from CUA:** On page 110, Maggie compares the feelings she experiences when kissing Levi to “lemonade on a hot day.” Can you establish a similar comparison to suggest physical pleasure? For example, complete the sentence Having a good dinner after a long day feels like ____________________.

This example from _BAB_ fits within the four-layered construction illustrated in Figure 1 as follows. Often, people with EDs cannot resist the compulsion to exercise, despite pain or injury (Dalle Grave et al., 2008). Based on this finding, the _BAB_ message encourages readers to stop exercising in such contexts by highlighting the protagonist’s decision to do so. Question 33 in the tailored questionnaire (“I try to stick to my exercise routine even when I have an injury”), in turn, evaluates potential
changes to this dysfunctional habit. Meanwhile, for the CUA message, the starting point in existing research is that associations between food and pleasure are often obfuscated in EDs (Holsen et al., 2012). The message asks readers to generate such associations for themselves. Then, question 75 in the tailored questionnaire (“I very much enjoy having a good meal after a long day”) assesses potentially increased sensitivity to these associations after reading with or without the reading guide as an explicit intermediary between the books and the questionnaire.

On average across both novels, a message appeared once every four pages. Of the messages in BAB, 47 (56.6%) were expository and 36 (43.4%) were interactive. In CUA, 46 (56.7%) were interactive and 35 (43.3%) were expository. The reading guides represented a roughly 5% increase in reading content. In order to monitor readers’ progress, additional messages served as checkpoints. On pages selected at random, a total of 20 bubbles per novel incorporated checkpoints, and each read “check point: reply writing ['1', '2' ... '20'].” These checkpoints occurred in both conditions. The books were read in a non-downloadable PDF format via Google Drive, and the reading guides were presented in the form of user-generated comments (tagged as posted by “Rocío”) in the right-hand margin, using the sticky-note function.

Participants

The absence of data directly concerning potential dangers associated with reading this type of text mandated caution in participant selection criteria, and Oxford University’s ethics review board (CUREC) required that an active ED diagnosis be an exclusion criterion for participation. The intended sample size was 60 ($n = 30$ per group). A potential participant was a person with no current diagnosis of an ED, aged 18–35 years old, interested in sport and fitness, and willing to read young adult sport novels. Sampling people with an interest in fitness was an indirect way of reaching a clinically relevant population, since EDs are known to be more prevalent amongst individuals who engage in physical activity and sports (Nazem & Ackerman, 2012). The age requirement also targeted a relevant population as regards ED onset (Volpe et al. [2016], for example, found that 18 years was the mean age of onset for AN and BN) and regarding reading preferences; the 18–35 age group is “the single largest purchasing group for YA” books (Whitford & Vineyard, 2013, par. 4).

Recruitment adverts were posted online and in physical locations around Oxford and Oviedo. 163 people responded to the call and signed up for the study, and 65 completed all reading and questionnaires. Group allocation used alternating assignment, meaning that the first participant was allocated to the experimental group and the second was placed in the control group, and so on.

Fifty-five participants identified as women, nine identified as men, and one identified as a trans man. The initial sample consisted of 133 women, 28 men, and 2 people who identified as trans men, and it did not differ from the final sample in substantial ways that could have skewed results. The small number of participants in the final sample identifying as other than women meant that sex and gender were ignored as
independent variables. English was the native language of 20 participants and a second language (SL) for the remaining 45. For those who used English as a SL, a minimum intermediate level in English was established as a prerequisite for taking part in the study (B2 level, following the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages). Mean participant age was 26.7 \( (SD = 6.77) \).

**Measures**

Two types of measure were applied. Quantitative measures included two questionnaires, which participants completed through the JISC online survey platform (the U.K. higher education sector’s open-access survey tool). The qualitative measure consisted of an optional interview conducted via Skype to evaluate participants’ perceptions of their involvement in the study. RRC conducted the interviews \( (n = 49) \), transcribed the recordings, and analyzed the transcripts. This paper deals with the quantitative measures (on the qualitative findings, see Riestra-Camacho, 2021).

The first questionnaire comprised the 31 items of the Eating Attitudes Test (EAT-26) (Garner et al., 1982), including 26 attitudinal questions and five behavioral questions evaluating characteristic of EDs.\(^4\) The tailored questionnaire consisted of 86 items formulated in alignment with the information presented in the reading guides. These items were sorted into three categories, the same used to categorize the messages in the reading guides: eating, exercise, and body. Each category contained items corresponding to the 12 factors listed above, which served as dependent variables. The tailored questions were answered using a five-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The survey also included 10 questions about the novels, to verify that participants had read them. In the experimental group, participants answered an additional set of 10 questions about the reading guides to check that they had read them.

Higher scores reflected higher ED vulnerability. For the EAT-26, scores were calculated following Garner et al. (1982). For the tailored questionnaire, a customized scale was used (see Appendix 2).\(^5\) Participants completed the questionnaires twice, before and after reading the books.

**Procedure**

Participants entered the JISC platform through a link provided on the adverts. They were able to proceed to the questionnaire only after giving their informed consent and declaring that they met the inclusion criteria. After completing the questionnaires, they were assigned to one of the two groups. A week later they received a link to read the novels. When a participant clicked on the link, a permission request to access the first text was received and approved by the experimenters.

The procedure for distribution of the books amongst participants complied with copyright Directive 2001/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001, which at the time was the regime operative in the U.K. and the
European Union. Google Drive allowed for the sharing of files with a limited number of people (the participants), giving them permission only to view the file, and preventing them from copying, editing, downloading, and sharing it with others. Each participant had access to their own file and when each finished reading, their access was removed.

Once they accessed the novels, participants could read them at their own pace in their own homes. Reading time guidelines were provided, however. Three deadlines were established. For those participants who started to read the novels in September 2019, the deadline was December 20, 2019. For those who started to read the novels between September and December 2019, it was February 1, 2020. For those who started the novels later than December 2019, it was March 1, 2020. Participants who deviated from the time guidelines received reminders to keep reading. Once a participant approached the end of the second novel, an email was sent providing a questionnaire link and asking them to complete it as soon as they finished the novel. Once a participant completed the second questionnaire, a second email was sent requesting their consent to be interviewed (making clear that this was entirely optional). After completion, with or without the interview, all participants were placed into a draw to win one of three £250 prizes, which were transferred to winners via PayPal.

**Results**

Data consisted of 65 completed responses, with 33 in the Reading Guide (RG) condition and 32 in the No Reading Guide (NRG) condition. RG participants had a mean age of 26.03 ($SD = 5.49$) and included 28 females; NRG participants had a mean age of 27.39 ($SD = 7.68$) and included 27 females. Reading duration—calculated as the difference between the administration of the first survey and conclusion of the last survey—had a mean of 42.68 days ($SD = 33.14$).

The effects of condition and time were assessed using a mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA) model implemented in the pingouin statistics library for python 3, version 0.5.0 (Vallat, 2018). This model took time of survey administration (pre-reading, post-reading) as the within-participants condition; the presence or absence of the reading guide was the between-participants condition. Dependent variables were created by summing the relevant questions on the EAT-26 subscales into the three outcome variables (oral control, dieting, and bulimia and food preoccupation). The tailored variables were summed into 12 dependent variables: guilty eating, anxiety over food control, eating inflexibility, food anxiety, calorie control, excuses and dieting, dieting saliency, weight-loss oriented exercise, performance-oriented exercise, exercise inflexibility, body perception, and gender stereotypes. (See Table 1 for summary statistics and Figure 2 for a variable correlation matrix; Appendix 3 gives details of variable construction and reliability testing.)

Testing the resulting 15 variables returned no statistically significant effects of condition for nine of the variables; these included the three EAT-26 variables, which
showed a trend towards worsening in the control group and no clear trend for the experimental group. Table 2 gives the results for the six variables that evinced a significant effect of condition (see Appendix 4 for results of all statistical testing). While the application of Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons caused these effects to fall below the corrected significance threshold ($\alpha = 0.00333$), it should be noted that the $\eta^2$ effect sizes are all moderate-to-large (>0.06) and the results for the experimental group are consistently in the predicted direction (Figure 3). Of these, only gender stereotypes exhibited an interaction of time and group that was significant before the correction was applied. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that participants in the RG condition would so consistently improve relative to those in the NRG condition in the absence of time-based effects, statistical significance levels notwithstanding.

Figure 2. Correlation matrix for dependent variables across all four experimental conditions. Most variables positively correlated with each other. The exception is the performance variable, which either did not correlate or negatively correlated with the other variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI lower</th>
<th>95% CI upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.2308</td>
<td>3.718</td>
<td>0.3248</td>
<td>3.5881</td>
<td>4.8734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.2462</td>
<td>4.9196</td>
<td>0.4315</td>
<td>4.3925</td>
<td>6.0998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.1374</td>
<td>1.7531</td>
<td>0.1532</td>
<td>0.8344</td>
<td>1.4404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.2769</td>
<td>2.728</td>
<td>0.2393</td>
<td>1.8035</td>
<td>2.7503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calorie</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.0308</td>
<td>2.3058</td>
<td>0.2022</td>
<td>1.6306</td>
<td>2.4309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuses</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4.9308</td>
<td>3.8321</td>
<td>0.3361</td>
<td>4.2658</td>
<td>5.5957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weightloss</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6.0077</td>
<td>4.0548</td>
<td>0.3556</td>
<td>5.3041</td>
<td>6.7113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.3308</td>
<td>2.2701</td>
<td>0.1991</td>
<td>2.9368</td>
<td>3.7247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.0385</td>
<td>0.3151</td>
<td>0.0276</td>
<td>-0.0162</td>
<td>0.0931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>7.7308</td>
<td>5.9855</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>6.6921</td>
<td>8.7694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4.8385</td>
<td>3.6489</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>4.2053</td>
<td>5.4717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.8231</td>
<td>3.0613</td>
<td>0.2685</td>
<td>1.2919</td>
<td>2.3543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAT dieting</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4.7154</td>
<td>6.0518</td>
<td>0.5308</td>
<td>3.6652</td>
<td>5.7655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAT food</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.2077</td>
<td>2.1806</td>
<td>0.1913</td>
<td>0.8293</td>
<td>1.5861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAT oral control</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.8769</td>
<td>2.3362</td>
<td>0.2049</td>
<td>1.4715</td>
<td>2.2823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the large variation in reading times across group conditions, the effect of duration was investigated. This was done using a linear mixed effects regression model with random slopes and random intercepts implemented in the python 3 statsmodels statistics library, version 0.12.2 (Skipper & Perktold, 2010). Reading duration was taken as the independent variable, change score on each of the 15 relevant variables as the dependent variable, and group condition as the level. Reading duration

Table 2. Significance Values and Effect Sizes for All Variables Showing a Statistically Significant Difference Between Experimental Groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF1</th>
<th>DF2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-unc</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>p-corr</th>
<th>var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.309</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>Guilty eating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.341</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>Anxiety over food control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.595</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>Eating inflexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.275</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>Food salience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.252</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>Exercise inflexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group × time</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.701</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>0.0829</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>Gender stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. source = source of significant difference; df = degrees of freedom; F = F-statistic; p-unc = uncorrected p-value; η² = eta-squared; p-corr = corrected p-value; var = summed questionnaire variable.

Figure 3. Between-group differences across experimental conditions pre- and post-reading. Although no results are significant after correction for multiple comparisons, there is an overall trend where readers in the RG condition do better (or no worse) than readers in the NRG condition. The most robust effect is for the gender stereotype questions.

Given the large variation in reading times across group conditions, the effect of duration was investigated. This was done using a linear mixed effects regression model with random slopes and random intercepts implemented in the python 3 statsmodels statistics library, version 0.12.2 (Skipper & Perktold, 2010). Reading duration was taken as the independent variable, change score on each of the 15 relevant variables as the dependent variable, and group condition as the level. Reading duration
was calculated in seconds using the python 3 datetime parser library, which converted date strings from the survey software into native datetime objects. Multicollinearity was tested for by calculating a variable inflation factor (VIF) for each variable (Appendix 4, Table 5). All models converged, with one significant effect of duration on calorie control, but after a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons this was no longer significant (see Appendix 4 for results of testing and VIF scores). We therefore concluded that duration of reading was not an important factor in determining any effects of condition.

Discussion

This study used a between-participants design to assess ED vulnerability before and after reading two U.S. YA sports novels. ED vulnerability was measured using the EAT-26 and a tailored questionnaire. In the experimental group, participants received the novels with reading guides, whereas the control group received only the novels. Our hypothesis was that post-reading measures would be lower (improved) in both groups, but more markedly in the experimental group in (1) the EAT-26 and (2) in the tailored questionnaire, including (a) eating, (b) exercise, and (c) body factors.

The results did not support hypothesis 1, and only partially supported hypotheses (2a), (2b), and (2c). Generally, post-test analyses revealed that EAT-26 scores showed a trend toward increasing (worsening) for the control group and that tailored questionnaire scores trended toward improvement in the experimental group and the opposite in the control group. Both observations of worsening in the control group were unexpected, since our hypotheses predicted that scoring in all factors would improve (i.e., decrease) in both groups. However, the fact that there were statistically significant effects for group (i.e., textual condition) but not for time means we cannot confidently attribute changes to guide-supported reading, even though the direction of effects suggests that these effects are present.

The most robust result of the present study is the interaction between group and time (suggesting an effect that can be confidently traced back to the experimental intervention) with respect to the gender stereotypes question. Participants showed a reduction in gender stereotypes after they had been exposed to the text plus reading guide. This finding is in line with the study by Fong et al. (2015), which showed that exposure to fiction, but not other forms of media, is related to reduced gender role stereotyping. While our result is no longer significant after the application of a Bonferroni correction, the variance in responses is considerably lower than in other questions, strengthening the implication that guided reading can have impacts on cultural stereotypes. This must be of value when it comes to tackling EDs, which exist in a complex interplay with cultural and biological conceptions of gender.

Returning to the procedural aspects of bibliotherapeutic interventions, our findings suggest that if people read these books unsupported, reading may be less likely to be helpful or more likely to be unhelpful than if the reading is supported by guides
(or other methods of interpretive support). This aligns with the emphasis in group bibliotherapy research on the “shared reading” model in which readers listen to a text being read aloud and engage in discussion guided by a trained facilitator (e.g., Billington, 2011; Billington et al., 2010), rather than, for example, reading the text alone and/or discussing it in less formally supported ways. We offer the reading guide method as an example of how supported reading can serve to challenge dysfunctional cognitions and can thus constitute an elegant way of adapting an ED therapy intervention to a fiction bibliotherapy context. The text- and context-aligned reading guide method attunes readers’ attention to anti-ED aspects of a text. As such, it sidesteps the documented hazards of everyday encounters with ED-specific textual material and may heighten the positive potential of more formal bibliotherapeutic interventions. Experimentally, the use of the guides also allows us to account in a controlled manner for the post-reading effects of readers’ attentional shifts on ED-relevant dimensions during the reading process, offering one answer to the perennially tricky question of what counts as a control condition for the process of reading a book (see also Troscianko & Carney, 2021, pp. 46–47).

The use of reading guides to reduce the novels’ iatrogenic potential (Troscianko, 2018b) was complemented by our choice of text. Rather than giving participants a text about EDs—as in Thomas et al.’s (2006) study, for example, which used ED memoirs—in this experiment we tested an intermediate text type, featuring characters whose behaviors and attitudes have eating- and body-related emphases but are not maladaptive. It is possible that exposure to the experiences of characters highly engaged in sports and meal plans may, despite the body-positive nature of this activity, have made some readers feel uneasy about being more sedentary and less food-conscious than the protagonists (Riestra-Camacho, 2021), but the risks here seem likely to be considerably less than for ED fiction, read with or especially without an accompanying reading guide.

Limitations, Strengths, and Future Directions

This study has a number of limitations. Initially, recruitment difficulties prevented us from using group allocation strategies to counteract pre-test group differences, and we, therefore, had to use a nonequivalent-groups design. Before the experiment, the control group scored higher than the experimental group on all factors (except excuses and dieting) and displayed higher variance levels on all factors (with the exception of performance-oriented exercise). This indicates that scoring in the control group was less homogenous than in the experimental group, so the principle of homoscedasticity was not met. These differences can be probably attributed to the small overall sample. (However, between-group testing on age and bodyweight—the two most relevant demographic factors—showed no significant differences between experimental conditions.) In future replications, a more homogeneous sample and an equivalent-groups design would be desirable. Moreover, the small number of male and trans participants resulted in high variance in their responses.
In the future, it would be desirable either to have more non-female participants and include sex and gender as independent variables or to exclude these altogether.

An additional constraint of the study concerned timing. Some of the participants took two weeks to read the books, while others spent one or two months. The longer participants took to read, the less controlled were their life circumstances, which decreased the internal validity of the results. Conversely, readers engage with books at different paces depending on many personal and contextual factors, so relative freedom to read at their own pace increased the ecological validity of the study. Nevertheless, no significant effect of duration was found on the relevant variables.

A third limitation was the large number of survey questions. Moreover, the tailored questionnaire was created ad hoc for this study, and psychometric evidence for its statistical power is unavailable. This means that conclusions about the results obtained through it should be drawn with caution. In future studies, this questionnaire could be streamlined to a smaller set of questions and be formally validated. Finally, some participants’ decision to take part may have been influenced by the monetary incentive, although the relatively time-consuming nature of the tasks reduces this danger.

Future studies could investigate the underlying mechanisms at play in the guided reading context. One may be the creation of cognitive dissonance followed by its reduction. If the reader initially endorses ED-aligned values and norms regarding eating, exercise, and the body and the reading guide appended to the text invites readers to challenge them, dissonance (between the two opposing sets of beliefs) may result in a contradiction that demands resolution, for example via attitude change in which the prior beliefs are abandoned in favor of those encouraged by the reading guide. The potential for heightened dissonance and therefore greater attitude change could be increased by raising the stakes of the challenge made to the initial beliefs, perhaps by inviting participants to make their critique public in some way. Guidance here could be taken from the ED intervention program The Body Project (Becker & Stice, 2017), in which dissonance reduction has been identified as a driver of positive intervention effects (Troscianko, 2020). Methods of this kind might also be adopted to allow narrative texts that themselves espouse pro-ED or equivocal values to be used for positive therapeutic or preventive ends. This possibility would radically expand the potential corpus for ED bibliotherapy, creating connections between “accidental” bibliotherapy and more formalized types, for instance by training individuals in critical reading practices with which to approach standard endorsements of the thin ideal. This is just one illustration of the avenues for further investigation of mechanisms and effects opened up by the present study.

**Conclusions**

This was, to our knowledge, the first controlled experiment performed in the field of bibliotherapy research that included a text-specific reading aid, testing the effects of
prompts designed to increase the salience of textual elements that run counter to ED vulnerability. It was also the first to involve individuals reading two full-length novels, in the comfort of their own environments and at times that suited them, offering a precedent for future ecologically valid research in the area.

Notwithstanding the study limitations, the protocols generated a modestly clear pattern of results and some experimentally provocative outcomes. While effects of reading in the two conditions did not reach statistical significance after the application of a correction for multiple comparisons, the consistent pattern of results in the predicted direction for the RG condition indicates that there is likely to be an underlying structure in the data toward reduced espousal of cognitions and biases about eating, exercise, and the body. This is particularly so for the gender stereotypes question, wherein participants showed the clearest changes after exposure to the experimental condition.

Methodologically, we suggest that a major part of the value of this study lies in its innovative four-layer experimental design. The reading guide method serves as a way to implement a structured bibliotherapy intervention and to tackle particular ED-related biases, and it also opens up possibilities for evaluation of post-reading effects. In conclusion, our findings suggest that guided reading with a gender-informed perspective has potential to improve attitudes and thought patterns characteristic of vulnerability to EDs. In light of the ongoing elusiveness of reliable treatment methods for EDs, especially restrictive EDs, this finding may be relevant to improving outcomes in clinical settings and/or to preventing the onset of EDs in vulnerable populations. Nonetheless, potential iatrogenic effects of reading novels that thematically focus on women’s bodies and the way characters eat and exercise should be borne in mind, and all research should be guided by acknowledgment of the potential for damaging as well as beneficial reader responses to textual material. More empirical evidence regarding the effects of fiction reading is needed, particularly in the form of controlled experiments involving the reading of full-length books in naturalistic settings.
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Notes
1. For anecdotal evidence compatible with this finding, see Freeman (2018).
2. The tailored questionnaire score values are reversed in these questions (as well as in several others; see Appendix 2) because this category is positively valenced.
3. We hope that these comments give a useful sense of how the dependent variables were operationalized in the study. For comprehensive details of the interpretive and classificatory decisions made in the construction of the reading guide and associated questionnaire, see the full set of reading-guide items and corresponding text excerpts in Riestra-Camacho, 2021, pp. 289–319.
4. EAT-26 reliability is high (alpha = 0.90 for the ED group) and test–retest reliability ranges from .84 to .89 (Banasiak et al., 2001).
5. This scale roughly replicates Garner et al.’s scoring rationale but substitutes the 1 score category for a 0 category because the NA/ND category cannot be imputed as a positive value in line with Garner et al.’s sometimes/often 1 score category.
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Appendix I

Tailored Questionnaire Questions

1. When I exercise, I think of the effects it may have on my body size, weight, or shape.
2. When I exercise, I think of the positive effects it may have on my performance.
3. When I exercise, I like the setting to be as attractive as possible (e.g., beautiful countryside, nice gym).
4. I like to have dessert at most meals.
5. If I feel some kind of pain or discomfort when exercising, I stop.
6. I prefer to eat in the company of my loved ones rather than alone.
7. When deciding whether to stop exercising, I think of how many calories I will burn if I exercise longer.
8. Being given food by others makes me uncomfortable. I prefer to pick my own food.
9. If a doctor or trainer advises me to eat more, I follow their advice because I trust their knowledge.
10. I find watching others cook pleasing.
11. The mere sight of food, particularly fatty foods, makes me uncomfortable.
12. If given a choice, I always choose low calorie foods over food higher in calories.
13. If I feel sweaty but extremely tired, I postpone showering to rest.
14. If I’m sad and don’t feel like eating, I don’t eat even though I know I need to.
15. My favorite food causes me a slight headache or other kind of pain. I eat it anyway.
16. I dislike the idea of exercising in a different place from usual.
17. Thinking about food makes me uncomfortable.
18. I like snacking while I watch television.
19. I check myself in the mirror after eating and, even though I know it’s the result of the temporary presence of food in my stomach, I feel fat.
20. I never have non-diet drinks; I always ask for a diet one.
21. I compare my body to others’ even though I know that natural (e.g., genetic) variation means the comparison is not meaningful.
22. If I’ve just started dieting or exercising, I keep checking my body for changes.
23. When I exercise, I don’t stop to have a break or to catch my breath.
24. I think it’s normal for people to make themselves vomit because they are sad.
25. I like it when people give me my favorite drink or food without me asking.
26. I prefer to exercise in the company of friends rather than alone.
27. If I’m getting skinnier through exercise, I reduce the intensity or increase my calorie intake.
28. If I’m sick with gastroenteritis, I think positively about its weight loss consequences.
29. I don’t eat if I’m doing something else (e.g., watching television or reading).
30. I think playing with food is disgusting.
31. I think being offered free food or a discount at a restaurant is cool.
32. Exercising can serve useful purposes in life.
33. I try to stick to my exercise routine even when I have an injury.
34. Many drinks and dishes look beautiful to me.
35. If someone is making weird faces while eating, I assume she does not like whatever she’s having.
36. I avoid bread and sweet foods, even though I like them.
37. I feel uncomfortable about eating dessert.
38. If I’m feeling low and I fancy a food or drink treat, I have it without much consideration, simply because I like it.
39. I think it is unfeminine to eat a lot.
40. I’m wearing a horizontal-striped shirt and it makes me look fatter, but I’m aware of the optical effect and know I’m not really fatter.
41. If I’m starting a weight loss plan, I restrict my calorie intake as well as exercising more.
42. When I’m exercising, about to exercise, or afterwards, I don’t eat a snack, even if I’m hungry.
43. If I feel a new exercise routine or goal is too much for me (e.g., too many kilometers to run or too much weight to lift), I pursue it anyway.
44. If others prepare food for me, I feel anxious.
45. I prevent myself from grazing, even if I’m hungry.
46. If I miss some meals, I feel satisfied.
47. I lie about my feelings of hunger to avoid eating.
48. I find it hard to believe that eating more than usual when exercising builds muscle but no fat.
49. I prevent myself from eating, even if I’m hungry.
50. I think girls should eat less than boys.
51. I think willpower is more important than proper nourishment and proper rest to finish an intense workout routine.
52. I think it is unfeminine for girls to look muscular and strong.
53. If it is not explicitly narrated, I tend to think that characters in a novel do not eat.
54. If I don’t have the time, I don’t eat.
55. I feel anxious about varying my exercise routine.
56. I find super-size food or drinks quite threatening.
57. I always complete my workout, even if it’s too early or too late for me to do it.
58. I don’t stand eating when others might be looking at me.
59. I never eat or drink something I do not like the taste of, even if I’m hungry or thirsty.
60. I exercise every week. I don’t skip a week.
61. I don’t particularly perceive the good taste of food or drinks when I’m having them.
62. I think exercising means you have to eat more.
63. I associate eating slowly, cutting food in pieces, and pushing it around with eating less.
64. I think it makes sense to follow a restrictive diet in sports, particularly gymnastics or cheerleading.
65. If I have body issues, I ask a friend for support.
66. No matter where I am, I always manage to do my workout routine.
67. I work out even if I’m tired.
68. When training for a competition, I think achieving a good body shape is more important than winning.
69. I think being skinny and being strong are incompatible.
70. If I see someone refusing food or drink, I tend to think this person is dieting.
71. Even if I’m hungry, I don’t stop to eat when I’m studying, since I will have lunch or dinner later.
72. If I’m sad and I overeat, I tend to feel guilty afterwards.
73. If I want to relax, I prefer to exercise for a couple of hours rather than meditate.
74. I force myself to exercise but I don’t enjoy it.
75. I very much enjoy having a good meal after a long day.
When I go to friends’ houses, I don’t eat much because eating a lot in these situations makes me very uncomfortable.

I never eat when I’m not hungry.

I sometimes reject food others offer me even though I want it.

Exercising means you need to eat enough of everything, including carbohydrates.

If I decide to abandon exercise, I start worrying about eating too much.

I think femininity is bound to slimness.

When doing sport, it’s important to have friends to support you.

I pay a lot of attention to the quantity of food I eat.

If I’m feeling low, I treat myself to comfort food in the good company of friends and family.

I think it is important to both feel satiated and experience pleasure when eating.

When thinking about pregnancy, I get anxious about gaining weight and bodily changes.

Appendix 2

Tailored Questionnaire Score Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>NA/ND</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83, 86</td>
<td>3 2 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15, 18, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34, 38, 40, 62, 65, 75, 79, 82, 84, 85</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree; NA/ND = neither agree nor disagree; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree.

Appendix 3

Summed Variables from Tailored Questionnaire

- Guilty eating: Qs 4, 36, 37, 72, 80, 84
- Anxiety over food control: Qs 6, 8, 9, 25, 42, 44, 45, 49, 58, 59, 65, 76, 77, 78
- Eating inflexibility: Qs 17, 18, 29, 75
- Food anxiety: Qs 10, 11, 30, 31, 34, 56
- Calorie control: Qs 12, 20, 38, 83
- Excuses and dieting: Qs 14, 15, 24, 28, 46, 47, 53, 54, 71
- Dieting saliency: Qs 35, 48, 61, 63, 70, 85
• Weight-loss oriented exercise: Qs 1, 7, 27, 41, 51, 62, 68, 79
• Performance-oriented exercise: Qs 2, 32
• Exercise inflexibility: Qs 3, 5, 13, 16, 23, 26, 33, 43, 55, 60, 66, 67, 73, 74, 82
• Body perception: Qs 19, 21, 22, 40, 86
• Gender stereotypes: Qs 39, 50, 52, 64, 69, 81

Internal reliability of tailored questions

Cronbach’s alphas with 95% confidence intervals with were calculated across the four experimental conditions for the tailored questionnaire (Table 3). High alphas showed that there were consistent patterns of answering by condition, indicating that the questions exhibited internal reliability.

Table 3. Cronbach’s Alphas by Condition for Internal Reliability of Tailored Questions by Experimental Conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading guide</td>
<td>$\alpha = 0.873$ 95% CI = [0.799, 0.929]</td>
<td>$\alpha = 0.776$ 95% CI = [0.642, 0.876]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reading guide</td>
<td>$\alpha = 0.845$ 95% CI = [0.753, 0.914]</td>
<td>$\alpha = 0.869$ 95% CI = [0.793, 0.927]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 4

Results of the mixed ANOVAs on all 15 variables are summarized in Table 4. Variable inflation scores (VIFs) for all variables are shown in Table 5. Table 6 gives the output of the mixed linear models that regressed each variable against reading time, nested in experimental conditions.
### Table 4. Results of All ANOVAs on the 15 Dependent Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF1</th>
<th>DF2</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-unc</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>eps</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>167.4827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>167.4827</td>
<td>7.309125</td>
<td>0.008809</td>
<td>0.103957</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.896788</td>
<td>0.173324</td>
<td>0.029226</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>8.076989</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.076989</td>
<td>2.946048</td>
<td>0.091001</td>
<td>0.044674</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>181.3092</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>181.3092</td>
<td>4.341803</td>
<td>0.04125</td>
<td>0.064474</td>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4.430769</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.430769</td>
<td>0.940281</td>
<td>0.335914</td>
<td>0.014706</td>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>8.70228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.70228</td>
<td>1.846765</td>
<td>0.179005</td>
<td>0.028479</td>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>23.028</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23.028</td>
<td>4.59546</td>
<td>0.035924</td>
<td>0.067985</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eating inflexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.930769</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.930769</td>
<td>0.70359</td>
<td>0.404752</td>
<td>0.011045</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eating inflexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.646882</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.646882</td>
<td>0.24001</td>
<td>0.625901</td>
<td>0.003795</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>39.27509</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39.27509</td>
<td>2.918683</td>
<td>0.092482</td>
<td>0.044277</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.276923</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.276923</td>
<td>0.24001</td>
<td>0.625901</td>
<td>0.003795</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.033683</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.033683</td>
<td>0.029193</td>
<td>0.864882</td>
<td>0.000463</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>29.51755</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29.51755</td>
<td>3.460637</td>
<td>0.067515</td>
<td>0.05207</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calorie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3.076923</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.076923</td>
<td>1.672788</td>
<td>0.200608</td>
<td>0.025865</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calorie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.040975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.040975</td>
<td>0.022276</td>
<td>0.881832</td>
<td>0.000353</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calorie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>13.02134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13.02134</td>
<td>0.508628</td>
<td>0.478367</td>
<td>0.008009</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>10.53077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10.53077</td>
<td>2.62292</td>
<td>0.110326</td>
<td>0.03997</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>6.03031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.03031</td>
<td>1.252909</td>
<td>0.267247</td>
<td>0.0195</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>91.38814</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>91.38814</td>
<td>3.545002</td>
<td>0.064344</td>
<td>0.053272</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weightloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>14.22308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.22308</td>
<td>2.2902</td>
<td>0.135194</td>
<td>0.035077</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weightloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>6.021241</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.021241</td>
<td>0.00342</td>
<td>0.953549</td>
<td>5.43E-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weightloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>47.21821</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47.21821</td>
<td>6.275061</td>
<td>0.014843</td>
<td>0.090582</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.577569</td>
<td>0.450101</td>
<td>0.009084</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.39864</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.39864</td>
<td>0.177209</td>
<td>0.675216</td>
<td>0.002805</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.193177</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.193177</td>
<td>2.045052</td>
<td>0.157643</td>
<td>0.031441</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.192308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.192308</td>
<td>1.983081</td>
<td>0.163982</td>
<td>0.030517</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 4. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DFI</th>
<th>DF2</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-unc</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>eps</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.198317</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.198317</td>
<td>2.045052</td>
<td>0.157643</td>
<td>0.031441</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>419.6394</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>419.6394</td>
<td>7.252157</td>
<td>0.009062</td>
<td>0.10323</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise inflexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>5.607692</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.607692</td>
<td>0.667911</td>
<td>0.416861</td>
<td>0.010491</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise inflexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>21.95291</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21.95291</td>
<td>2.61473</td>
<td>0.110872</td>
<td>0.03985</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise inflexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>64.1683</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64.1683</td>
<td>2.859106</td>
<td>0.0958</td>
<td>0.043412</td>
<td></td>
<td>Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.223077</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.223077</td>
<td>0.593377</td>
<td>0.443995</td>
<td>0.009331</td>
<td></td>
<td>Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1.248514</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.248514</td>
<td>0.33325</td>
<td>0.565809</td>
<td>0.005262</td>
<td></td>
<td>Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>30.882</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30.882</td>
<td>1.753475</td>
<td>0.190225</td>
<td>0.027079</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.376923</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.376923</td>
<td>0.380126</td>
<td>0.539758</td>
<td>0.005998</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>5.653853</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.653853</td>
<td>5.701892</td>
<td>0.019957</td>
<td>0.082995</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>121.3182</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>121.3182</td>
<td>1.913799</td>
<td>0.171425</td>
<td>0.029482</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAT dieting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>9.423077</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.423077</td>
<td>0.999679</td>
<td>0.321213</td>
<td>0.01562</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAT dieting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>6.2327</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.2327</td>
<td>0.661217</td>
<td>0.419193</td>
<td>0.010387</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAT dieting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>7.197232</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.197232</td>
<td>0.852793</td>
<td>0.359287</td>
<td>0.013356</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAT food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.730769</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.730769</td>
<td>1.498654</td>
<td>0.225437</td>
<td>0.023235</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAT food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.011655</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.011655</td>
<td>0.001092</td>
<td>0.920299</td>
<td>0.00016</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAT food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>17.90956</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.90956</td>
<td>1.822425</td>
<td>0.181855</td>
<td>0.028114</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAT oral control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.769231</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.769231</td>
<td>0.740042</td>
<td>0.392909</td>
<td>0.01161</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAT oral control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.745921</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.745921</td>
<td>0.717616</td>
<td>0.400134</td>
<td>0.011262</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAT oral control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Variable Inflation Factors (VIFs) for All Regression Variables. As All Scores are Below 5, Variables Do Not Exhibit Significant Collinearity and Linear Modeling is Appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guilty change</td>
<td>1.624502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control change</td>
<td>1.588322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating inflexibility change</td>
<td>1.374559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety change</td>
<td>1.454955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calorie change</td>
<td>1.824451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuses change</td>
<td>1.570615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weightloss change</td>
<td>1.621931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience change</td>
<td>1.332848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance change</td>
<td>1.150821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise inflexibility change</td>
<td>1.502611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body change</td>
<td>1.527263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender change</td>
<td>1.250635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAT diet change</td>
<td>1.848556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAT oral change</td>
<td>1.625718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAT food change</td>
<td>1.932987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Results of Multilevel Linear Model with Duration as Independent Variable and Group Set as Random Intercept.

| Dependent variable             | Coef.  | Std.Err. | z      | P>|z|  | [0.025 | 0.975 |
|-------------------------------|--------|----------|--------|------|--------|--------|
| Guilty change                 | 0.008  | 0.015    | 0.520  | 0.603 | -0.022 | 0.038  |
| Control change                | 0.022  | 0.010    | 2.230  | 0.026 | 0.003  | 0.042  |
| Eating inflexibility change   | 0.006  | 0.005    | 1.116  | 0.264 | -0.004 | 0.015  |
| Anxiety change                | 0.002  | 0.006    | 0.427  | 0.669 | -0.009 | 0.014  |
| Calorie change                | 0.004  | 0.007    | 0.620  | 0.535 | -0.009 | 0.017  |
| Excuses change                | 0.019  | 0.011    | 1.780  | 0.075 | -0.002 | 0.039  |
| Weightloss change             | 0.005  | 0.011    | 0.443  | 0.658 | -0.016 | 0.026  |
| Salience change               | 0.009  | 0.008    | 1.156  | 0.248 | -0.006 | 0.024  |
| Performance change            | -0.000 | 0.003    | -0.024 | 0.981 | -0.005 | 0.005  |
| Body change                   | 0.004  | 0.009    | 0.394  | 0.694 | -0.015 | 0.022  |
| Gender change                 | -0.007 | 0.007    | -0.940 | 0.347 | -0.021 | 0.008  |
| EAT diet change               | 0.001  | 0.029    | 0.018  | 0.986 | -0.055 | 0.057  |
| EAT oral change               | 0.003  | 0.011    | 0.228  | 0.819 | -0.019 | 0.024  |
| EAT food change               | -0.006 | 0.012    | -0.454 | 0.650 | -0.030 | 0.019  |