

MS. LINDSEY PARNAROUSKIS (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-9208-0516)

DR. ASHLEY N GEARHARDT (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-3843-5731)

Article type : Original Article

A Randomized Study of Effects of Obesity Framing on Weight Stigma

Lindsey Parnarouskis*, Riley J. Jouppi*, Jenna R. Cummings^a, Ashley N. Gearhardt

The University of Michigan, Department of Psychology, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

*Shared first author

^aJenna R. Cummings is now at the Social and Behavioral Sciences Branch, Division of Intramural Population Health Research, of the *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Keywords: obesity, stigma, policy

Funding: The effort of Jenna R. Cummings for this research was in part supported by the *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (T32HD079350, Intramural Research Program). The content of this manuscript is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of this funding agency.

Corresponding Author:

Lindsey Parnarouskis, M.S.

Department of Psychology, University of Michigan

530 Church Street

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

lparnar@umich.edu

Word Count: 4,513 (with written permission from editor)

Disclosure: The authors declared no conflict of interest.

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1002/OBY.23247](https://doi.org/10.1002/OBY.23247)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

Author contributions: LP, RJJ, JRC, and ANG contributed to the design and implementation of the research. LP and RJJ contributed equally to the statistical analyses and drafting the manuscript. All authors have approved the final manuscript.

Study Importance Questions

What is already known about this subject?

- External and internalized weight stigma are detrimental to the health and well-being of people with obesity
- Recent evidence supports addiction-based explanations for obesity
- Evidence is mixed for whether addiction-based explanations reduce weight stigma

What are the new findings in your manuscript?

- Participants who read the food addiction explanation reported higher internalized weight stigma compared to those in the control condition, but there were no significant differences in comparison to the eating addiction explanation and calorie balance explanation
- Calorie-based and addiction-based explanations of obesity did not significantly affect external weight stigma

How might your results change the direction of research or the focus of clinical practice?

- Findings suggest that—when obesity is explained using tightly-controlled, non-affective language—food addiction, eating addiction, and calorie balance explanations may all be used without increasing external weight stigma
- Continued investigation is needed to understand the impact of addiction-based explanations of obesity on internalized weight stigma

Abstract

Objective

Growing evidence suggests highly processed foods may trigger an addictive-like process, which is associated with obesity. Other research suggests an addictive-like process occurs in response to eating itself, rather than specific foods. Addiction-based obesity explanations raise concerns about double stigmatization of people with obesity and addiction. This study compared effects of obesity framings on external and internalized weight stigma.

Methods

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

The study was pre-registered via Open Science Framework. 447 adults read an informational passage that described food addiction, eating addiction, or calorie balance explanations for obesity, or a control passage about memory. Participants then completed external and internalized weight stigma measures.

Results

Participants in the food addiction condition reported higher internalized weight stigma compared to those in the control condition. Obesity framing did not significantly affect external weight stigma compared to the control.

Conclusions

These findings suggest food addiction explanations for obesity may elicit greater internalized weight stigma than non-obesity-related messages. Addiction-based and traditional obesity explanations do not appear to influence external weight stigma. Illuminating the effects of obesity framing on stigma will help researchers communicate discoveries in ways that mitigate stigma.

Introduction

Between 1999 and 2016, adult obesity rates rose from 30.5% to 39.6% in the United States.¹ The dominant explanation for obesity's increased prevalence has been that individuals consume too many calories and/or do not burn enough calories through activity, resulting in an imbalance of energy in the body.² Researchers have critiqued the calorie balance theory for being overly simplistic, which has led to additional theoretical frameworks.³

Food addiction theory suggests highly processed (HP) foods may have the potential to trigger an addictive pattern in vulnerable individuals.⁴ Similar to addictive drugs, HP foods with elevated amounts of sugar and fat (e.g., chocolate, pizza) strongly activate neural reward circuitry and can be challenging to consume in moderation.⁴ The Yale Food Addiction Scale (YFAS) assesses symptoms of food addiction⁵ by applying Substance Use Disorder (SUD) criteria from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) to the HP food context.^{5,6} YFAS scores are positively associated with BMI and individuals who meet food addiction criteria have BMIs in the obesity range on average, which suggests that food addiction may contribute to obesity.⁴

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

Another explanation for obesity comes from eating addiction theory, which suggests that an addictive-like process occurs in response to the act of eating itself.⁷ Eating addiction theory emphasizes the behavioral aspects of the disorder because evidence is currently insufficient to label any specific food or ingredient as addictive.⁷ Eating addiction, as measured by the Addiction-like Eating Behavior Scale, has been positively associated with BMI, emotional eating, binge eating, and YFAS scores.⁸

One key implication of novel theories on obesity is their impact on weight stigma, which is defined as the co-occurrence of negative labeling, stereotyping, separation, status loss, and discrimination of individuals based on their weight status.⁹ There are two main types of weight stigma: external, which refers to negative weight-related attitudes and beliefs directed toward others, and internalized, which refers to these negative attitudes and beliefs directed toward oneself.¹⁰ Attribution theory predicts that individuals generally attempt to explain obesity by linking people who experience it to characteristics that are devalued by society (e.g., “weak-willed” or “lazy”).⁹ Presenting alternative theories about obesity to the public may therefore change these attributions.¹¹

Most obesity-related messaging has centered on personal choice and responsibility, which are associated with increased weight stigma,¹² and biologically-based explanations, which have shown mixed associations with weight stigma.¹³ With regard to food and eating addiction frameworks, stigma researchers have expressed concern that these messages may doubly stigmatize individuals, based on both SUD and obesity.^{14, 15} However, some studies have found that using the food addiction framework to explain obesity *decreases* external weight stigma.^{16, 17} This observed reduction in stigma may be due to a heightened focus on the addictive potential of HP foods themselves, reducing the blame and control attributed to individuals who overconsume them.^{16, 17} Observed effects could also have been driven by language in the control vignettes describing obesity as the result of deliberate lifestyle choices. Although this reflects a dominant societal narrative, describing obesity as driven by choices increases blame attribution toward people with obesity.¹²

Another recent study compared the effects of descriptions of medically-diagnosed and self-diagnosed food addiction to a control condition that described obesity with no explanation.¹⁸ In two samples, they found no significant differences in levels of external weight stigma between conditions. In an all-female sample of mostly lower weight undergraduates, they found those

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

exposed to food addiction explanations expressed greater stigma toward a fictional vignette target with obesity compared to the control condition. However, this effect did not replicate in a larger, more diverse sample.¹⁸ Thus, findings regarding the relative stigmatization of food addiction explanations for obesity continue to be mixed. Given that the mere use of the term “obesity” can elicit stigma, comparing the food addiction framework to a control condition that does not mention obesity is important for understanding how this framework impacts stigma.¹⁹

Additionally, no research has examined how the eating addiction framework affects stigma, nor how it compares to the food addiction or calorie balance frameworks. Advocates of the eating addiction framework assert that a food addiction framework may inappropriately strip away personal responsibility tied to problematic eating patterns, whereas the eating addiction framework would not.⁷ In SUD, however, blaming the individual increases stigma.²⁰ Thus, the eating addiction framework’s emphasis on individual behavior may inadvertently increase weight stigma.²¹

The aim of the current, preregistered study was to investigate the effects of using either food addiction, eating addiction, or traditional calorie balance frameworks to explain obesity on external and internalized weight stigma. This study sought to address methodological concerns of previous studies of framing and weight stigma by developing and piloting informational vignettes that were matched on length and tone and by including a control condition without any mention of obesity, to compare stigma levels without any manipulation. We hypothesized that exposure to the food addiction explanation would be associated with lower reported levels of external and internalized weight stigma as compared to the eating addiction and calorie balance frameworks.

We also examined how individual differences impacted responses to the various frameworks. Individuals who perceive themselves as having obesity tend to experience more internalized weight stigma than those who perceive themselves as “normal weight.”²² Moreover, personal relevance influences the persuasiveness of weight-related messaging. Individuals who perceive themselves as having excess weight or food addiction may feel the strongest sense of relevance to obesity and addiction-related messages.²³ Therefore, we examined whether individuals who perceived themselves as having food addiction or excess weight differed in the degree to which the conditions elicited internalized weight stigma.

Methods

Ethical Approval

All procedures were reviewed and considered exempt by the University of Michigan Health Sciences and Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Participants

Participants were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk (Mturk), an online platform that has been shown to produce higher quality data than college student, online panel, and community samples.²⁴ Participants responded to an invitation to complete a “survey on lifestyle factors.” After informed consent, participants followed a link to the experiment in Qualtrics.²⁵ Participants were limited to United States residents and could complete the survey from any convenient location. Participants received \$1.25 for study completion. On average, participants completed the study in 15.09 minutes ($SD = 16.0$).

Participants were excluded from analyses if they responded incorrectly to any of three “catch questions,” implemented to assess data quality ($n = 60$), completed the study in under five minutes ($n = 39$), or if their reported height and weight indicated an implausible BMI (below 12 or above 70) ($n = 6$).²⁶ Some participants reported height and weight consistent with the example given in the survey, which may have been entered for convenience and may not be accurate. Thus, participants who entered these parameters and took less than 10 minutes to complete the survey were excluded from analyses ($n = 3$).

Vignette Development

Participants were randomly assigned to first read an informational vignette explaining obesity using a food addiction, eating addiction, calorie balance explanation, or a control vignette about human memory (see Appendix 1). Vignettes were designed to use person-first language and be as similar as possible across conditions except for their explanations for obesity. Vignettes were designed to have an informational tone that did not use words associated with increased stigma like “choice,” “willpower,” or “self-control.”^{27, 28} Food and eating addiction vignettes had one sentence presented in boldfaced type to draw attention to the key point (see Appendix 1).

Vignettes were piloted with Mturk participants on November 15, 2019 ($n = 41$; same inclusion criteria as larger study) to determine whether they influenced participant attitudes. After reading a randomly assigned vignette, pilot participants rated their agreement on a six-point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” to the statement, “A person may

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

experience addiction to the behavior of eating, regardless of the kinds of foods they eat.” A one-way ANOVA revealed a significant effect of condition on participant rating [$F(3, 37) = 7.56, p = <.001, \eta^2 = .38$]. The Tukey *HSD* test indicated significant pairwise differences between conditions in the expected order: Those assigned to the eating addiction vignette agreed most strongly [$M(SD) = 4.75 (0.45)$], followed by calorie balance [$M(SD) = 3.75 (1.39)$], control [$M(SD) = 3.67 (0.89)$], and food addiction [$M(SD) = 2.56 (1.42)$]. Results suggest the vignettes influence beliefs about the ability of certain foods to trigger an addictive response in some individuals.

Procedure

After vignettes were piloted, they were presented to participants in the main study on November 24, 2019. Participants were first asked to read their randomly assigned vignette, then shown a photograph of a woman accompanied by a vignette describing “Paulina,” adapted from a recent paper by Ruddock and colleagues (2019). The vignette describes Paulina’s age, education, hobbies, and family. Paulina is described as “very overweight,” followed by “and has food addiction,” “and has eating addition,” or no additional explanation if participants were assigned to the calorie balance or control conditions. Explanations were consistent with the informational vignettes (i.e., participants who read the food addiction vignette were told Paulina had food addiction). Participants completed the Modified Fat Phobia Scale (M-FPS) in reference to Paulina. Participants then completed the Anti-Fat Attitudes Questionnaire (AFA) and Modified Weight Bias Internalization Scale (WBIS-M), in randomized order. Lastly, participants completed descriptive measures. All randomization followed a simple randomization procedure via Qualtrics.

Dependent Measures.

Modified Fat Phobia Scale (M-FPS). The Fat Phobia Scale (FPS) is a shortened version of the original 50-item FPS²⁹ that lists 14 antonym pairs (e.g., Lazy vs. Industrious) with five points between them.²⁷ Participants choose the point that indicates which antonym they feel best describes a target.²⁷ The FPS assesses negative attitudes and stereotypes about people with obesity.²⁷ In this study, the FPS was modified to assess weight stigma toward a vignette target, Paulina.¹⁸ Points between each antonym pair were scored from one to five. Total scores could range from one to five, with higher scores indicating higher levels of stigma. The M-FPS demonstrated good internal consistency in this sample ($\alpha = .84$).

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

Anti-Fat Attitudes Questionnaire (AFA). The AFA consists of 13 statements (e.g., “I really don’t like fat people much.”), for which participants rate their agreement.²⁸ The AFA assesses participants’ prejudice toward people with obesity.²⁸ Although the original scale is scored on a nine-point Likert scale, due to author error, items were scored from one, “strongly disagree,” to five, “strongly agree.” Total scores could range from one to five, with higher scores indicating more weight stigma. The AFA demonstrated good internal consistency in this sample ($\alpha = .89$).

Modified Weight Bias Internalization Scale (WBIS-M). The WBIS-M consists of 11 statements (e.g., “I am less attractive than most other people because of my weight.”), for which participants rate their agreement using a seven-point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.”²² The WBIS-M is a version of the original Weight Bias Internalization Scale,³⁰ which assesses internalized weight stigma in individuals who self-identify as “overweight,” that has been modified to assess internalized weight stigma in individuals across body weight statuses.²² In this study, the WBIS-M assessed levels of internalized weight stigma. Although the original scale is scored on a seven-point Likert scale, due to author error, items were scored from one, “strongly disagree,” to five, “strongly agree,” in the current study. Total scores could range from one to five, with higher scores indicating more internalized weight stigma. The WBIS-M demonstrated excellent internal consistency in this sample ($\alpha = .94$).

Descriptive Measures.

Modified Yale Food Addiction Scale 2.0 (mYFAS 2.0). The mYFAS 2.0 is a 13-item self-report measure to assess food addiction symptoms in adults.³¹ The questions are based on DSM-5 SUD criteria, adapted for HP food.³¹ Participants provided the frequency they experienced each symptom in the past year. Symptom scores were calculated by adding the number of symptoms each participant endorsed and could range from zero to 11. The average symptom score was 1.58 ($SD = 2.79$). Participants received a diagnostic score (no = 0, yes = 1) based on whether they endorsed at least two symptoms and clinically significant impairment or distress. 13.2% of participants met diagnostic criteria. The mYFAS 2.0 had excellent internal consistency in this sample ($\alpha = .95$).

Perceived food addiction status. Participants were asked to respond “yes” or “no” in response to the following statement: “I believe myself to be a food addict.” 27.3% of participants believed themselves to be “food addicts.”

Body Mass Index (BMI). Participants reported their height in inches and weight in pounds. BMI was calculated using the formula $\text{weight (lb)} / [\text{height (in)}]^2 \times 703$.³² The average BMI was 27.09, which falls in the “overweight” range ($SD = 7.35$).³²

Perceived weight status. Participants’ perceptions of their weight and objectively measured BMI are often inequivalent.³³ Given concerns about the validity of self-reported height and weight, we used a measure of perceived weight status for moderation analyses.³⁴ Participants were asked, “Compared to others, would you say you are very thin, thin, average, overweight, obese, or morbidly obese?” Perceived weight status was coded as follows: very thin = 0 ($n = 9$), thin = 1 ($n = 48$), average = 2 ($n = 205$), overweight = 3 ($n = 121$), obese = 4 ($n = 44$), morbidly obese = 5 ($n = 20$). On average, participants perceived themselves as “overweight” ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.03$).

Demographic Information. Participants reported their gender, age, race/ethnicity, education level, annual household income, and political party.

Data Analytic Plan

The sample size was based on a power analysis conducted in G*Power, Version 3.1.9 with the following parameters: one-way ANOVA, power = 0.95, $\alpha = .05$, and expected $\eta^2 = 0.04$.¹⁸ Power analysis yielded a sample size of 436, but we rounded up to 440 to further increase power. The study ended once an adequate sample size was reached.

Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 26. Study methods and hypotheses were preregistered on the Open Science Framework at <https://osf.io/hp9rb>, with an amendment at <https://osf.io/6394w>.¹ All measures were assessed for normality and outliers prior to analyses. None were found. Prior to testing hypotheses, a one-way ANOVA was run with condition as the independent variable and continuous demographic variables as dependent variables to assess whether participants significantly differed across conditions. Differences across conditions by categorical demographic variables were assessed using chi-square tests. Between-group demographic comparisons are detailed in Table 1.

Hypothesis 1: External Weight Stigma. Two one-way ANOVAs were conducted with condition as the independent variable and total M-FPS and AFA scores as dependent variables.

¹ We note the following deviations between the current manuscript and the study pre-registration. Although we had hypotheses regarding support for obesity-related policies and attitudes toward the food industry, we chose to limit the scope of the current manuscript to hypotheses related to external and internalized weight stigma. We note that the analyses of main effects of condition on support for obesity-related policies and attitudes toward the food industry yielded non-significant results.

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

Where a significant effect was detected, pairwise comparisons were run using the Tukey *HSD* test and inspected.³⁵

Hypothesis 2: Internalized Weight Stigma. A one-way ANOVA was conducted with condition as the independent variable and total WBIS-M scores as the dependent variable. Where a significant effect was detected, pairwise comparisons were run using the Tukey *HSD* test and inspected.³⁵

Exploratory Analyses. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used to determine whether perceived weight status or self-identification as a “food addict” moderated the effect of condition on internalized weight stigma. Condition was dummy-coded into three variables with the control condition as the reference group. Self-identified “food addict” and perceived weight status variables were dummy-coded (no = 0, yes = 1; not overweight = 0, overweight = 1). We chose to split the perceived weight status variable at the “overweight” category to allow for an adequate number of participants in each cell for moderation analyses. Only 14.3% of participants in this sample perceived their weight status as “obese” or “morbidly obese.” Interaction terms were computed by taking cross-products of the dummy-coded condition variables and the dummy-coded self-identification variables. Perceived food addiction/perceived weight status were included in step 1 of each model, the dummy-coded condition variables were added in step 2 of each model, and the interaction terms were added in step 3 of each model.

Results

The final sample comprised 447 participants. Table 1 details participant characteristics by condition. Participants did not differ across conditions in terms of gender, age, race/ethnicity, education level, annual household income, political party, food addiction symptoms, or food addiction diagnosis. Participants appeared to differ in BMI across conditions, but Tukey *HSD* revealed no significant pairwise differences in BMI.

Hypothesis 1: External Weight Stigma

The average M-FPS score was 2.58 ($SD = 0.62$), indicating mid-range fat phobia across conditions. The average AFA score was 2.63 ($SD = 0.82$), indicating mid-range anti-fat attitudes across conditions. There was no effect of condition on total M-FPS scores [$F(3, 443) = 2.36, p = .07, \eta^2 = .02$] or total AFA scores [$F(3, 443) = 2.51, p = .06, \eta^2 = .02$]. Due to marginal significance of the effect, *post hoc* pairwise comparisons were conducted using the Tukey *HSD* test. There were no significant pairwise differences in M-FPS or AFA scores across conditions.

Hypothesis 2: Internalized Weight Stigma

The average WBIS-M score was 2.45 ($SD = 1.07$), indicating mid-range internalized weight bias. There was an effect of condition on total WBIS-M scores [$F(3, 443) = 3.23, p = 0.02, \eta^2 = 0.02$]. *Post hoc* pairwise comparisons using the Tukey *HSD* test indicated that, compared to the control condition ($M = 2.21, SD = 0.98$), WBIS-M scores were higher for participants in the food addiction condition ($M = 2.64, SD = 1.06; p = .01, d = 0.42$). Compared to the eating addiction condition ($M = 2.50, SD = 1.10$), WBIS-M scores were not significantly different for participants in the food addiction condition ($p = .76, d = 0.13$). Compared to the calorie balance condition ($M = 2.45, SD = 1.09$), WBIS-M scores were not significantly different for participants in the food addiction condition ($p = .53, d = 0.18$) (see Figure 1).

Moderating Effect of Perceived Food Addiction Status

Results from the hierarchical regression analysis are detailed in Table 2. In step 1, perceived food addiction status was significantly associated with weight bias internalization, accounting for 25.6% of the variance [$R^2 = 0.26, F(1,445) = 153.17, p < .001$]. In step 2, the overall regression model for condition was significantly associated with weight bias internalization, controlling for perceived weight status, accounting for an additional 2.3% of the variance [$\Delta R^2 = 0.02, F(3,442) = 42.83, p = 0.003$]. The dummy-codes comparing food addiction, eating addiction, and calorie balance conditions to the control condition were significantly associated with weight bias internalization. In step 3, the overall regression model testing the interaction between perceived food addiction status and condition was not significantly associated with weight bias internalization [$\Delta R^2 = 0.01, F(3,439) = 24.92, p = 0.38$]. In this model, the dummy-code comparing food addiction to the control condition was significantly associated with weight bias internalization.

Moderating Effect of Perceived Weight Status

Results from the hierarchical regression analysis are detailed in Table 3. In step 1, perceived weight status was significantly associated with weight bias internalization, accounting for 21.2% of the variance [$R^2 = 0.21, F(1,445) = 119.93, p < .001$]. In step 2, the overall regression model for condition was not significantly associated with weight bias internalization, controlling for perceived weight status [$\Delta R^2 = 0.01, F(3,442) = 31.32, p = 0.19$]. However, the dummy-code comparing food addiction to the control condition was significantly associated with weight bias internalization. In step 3, the overall regression model testing the interaction between

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

perceived weight status and condition was not significantly associated with weight bias internalization [$\Delta R^2 = 0.00$, $F(3,439) = 17.86$, $p = 0.93$].

Discussion

The current study was the first to compare the effects of food addiction, eating addiction, and calorie balance frameworks on external and internalized weight stigma. We hypothesized that the food addiction framework would be associated with lower external and internalized weight stigma compared to eating addiction, calorie balance, and control conditions. The data did not support the hypotheses, as external stigma scores did not significantly differ across conditions. In contrast to our hypotheses, participants in the food addiction condition expressed greater internalized weight stigma than participants in the control condition. However, internalized weight stigma did not differ between food addiction and the alternative frames for obesity.

When accounting for self-identification as having food addiction or perceived overweight, the effect of the food addiction versus the control condition on internalized weight stigma remained significant. We also did not find any evidence that endorsement of internalized weight stigma in response to the food addiction condition was greater for individuals who self-identified as having food addiction or perceived themselves to be overweight. It therefore appears that one or more components of the food addiction framework increased internalized weight bias across individuals, but it is unclear which component and why. Because the WBIS-M was designed to address several content areas of internalized weight bias,³⁶ we additionally conducted *post hoc* exploratory analyses to investigate which items on the WBIS-M the food addiction framework was increasing (see Supplemental Tables 1 and 2). The food addiction condition was associated with higher scores on the items that assess weight-related feelings of anxiety and depression and a desire to change one's weight. The items about weight determining worth, value, competence, and attractiveness did not differ across conditions. It is plausible that reading a strong case for the role of addictive foods and "not other foods" in the current study's vignette may have increased participants' self-blame for choosing foods identified as addictive or induced hopelessness about whether they could stop eating HP foods; this may have heightened participants' weight-related feelings of anxiety and depression and a desire to change one's weight. However, future research is needed to understand these effects and should consider

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

debriefing participants to identify the components of food addiction messages that may contribute to internalized weight bias.

Future studies may also explicitly utilize blame attribution toward the food industry to reduce the impact of food addiction explanations for obesity on internalized weight stigma. Typical calorie balance explanations explicitly or implicitly blame individuals for eating too many calories and burning too few, which increases weight stigma.¹⁰ If individuals hold strong prior beliefs that people are personally responsible for excess caloric intake and obesity, stating that certain foods are addictive may not sufficiently challenge these beliefs. Industry responsibility for engineering and marketing addictive foods is a major implication of the food addiction framework.³⁷ Comparably, when the addictive potential of tobacco was publicly acknowledged, it highlighted the tobacco industry's role in creating and marketing harmful products.³⁸ However, the connection between foods' addictive potential and industry culpability was not explicitly highlighted in the current study's vignette. Future studies may test vignettes that explicitly blame the industry for engineering addictive foods and targeting vulnerable individuals, in addition to describing the clinical presentation of food addiction. Explicitly blaming the food industry may also help distinguish the food addiction framework from the eating addiction framework, which does not implicate industry practices.⁷

Findings from this study add to a growing body of evidence that addiction-based explanations for obesity do not increase external weight stigma. However, the current findings contrast with prior findings that the food addiction framework reduced external weight stigma compared to a calorie balance explanation.^{16, 17} The findings are consistent with research that found no differences in external weight stigma between the food addiction framework and a control condition that only mentioned obesity.¹⁸ Vignette design and content is a key difference between this study and prior research comparing the effects of obesity frameworks on external weight stigma. Latner and colleagues' (2014) vignettes had equivalent sentence structure and length but used more negatively affective language in the control condition that may have influenced stigma.¹⁶ Ruddock and colleagues (2019) kept vignettes simple and consistent except for source of diagnosis. The current study's vignettes were more similar to the vignettes used by Ruddock and colleagues, in that they were structurally consistent across conditions except for information about each framework and had an informational, neutral tone. Designing the vignettes in such a controlled manner may have improved the internal validity of this study at the

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

expense of external validity. Health-related messages that elicit stronger affect are more persuasive than affectively neutral messages.³⁹ Thus, this study's vignettes may not have elicited the affective response needed to sway weight-related attitudes. Future studies might balance methodological rigor and ecological validity by developing vignettes that are as equivalent as possible in all domains except for the target language and including language that elicits greater affective response.

This study was subject to limitations. Although the sample size was adequately powered for primary analyses, the sample size may have been underpowered to detect moderation effects in exploratory analyses. Thus, non-significant interactions in exploratory analyses should be interpreted with caution. Less than half the sample identified as "overweight," which may have limited our ability to test for meaningful differences in internalized weight stigma. Although results did not appear to differ by weight status, prior research shows that internalized weight stigma is most relevant for those with higher weights.²² Thus, future research should examine the effects of addiction-based explanations for obesity on internalized weight stigma in samples comprised of participants who identify as "overweight."

The sample reflected a higher proportion of White participants and participants with at least a bachelor's degree than the United States population.⁴⁰ Replication with representative samples is needed to determine generalizability of results. Furthermore, the vignettes were written at a tenth-grade reading level, which may have limited comprehension for participants with fewer years of education. This study allowed participants to complete surveys via Mturk at convenient times and locations, which raises questions about data quality. Future studies may benefit from increased participant surveillance. Additionally, participants commonly misestimate their weight.⁴¹ To address this, we used perceived weight status, which may be more consistent with individuals' body sizes.⁴¹ Future research should replicate this study using direct BMI measurement. This study focused on weight stigma as the outcome variable of interest. However, in order to better understand the potential for double stigmatization of obesity and addiction, future research should examine the effects of addiction-based obesity explanations on addiction-specific stereotypes (e.g., emotional instability, self-pitying).⁴²

Conclusion

Language powerfully influences how individuals stigmatize groups.⁴³ We aim to ensure the language we use to explain obesity does not stigmatize people with higher body weights. The

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

current study suggests that—when obesity is explained using tightly controlled, non-affective language—the food addiction, eating addiction, and calorie balance frameworks do not significantly differ from each other in their tendency to increase external or internalized weight stigma. Compared to a control condition, food addiction narratives may result in an increase in internalized (but not external) weight stigma. Future research is needed to understand the mechanism underlying this effect. Individual differences in perceived food addiction or weight status were not related to the direction or magnitude of these associations. Finally, future research is needed to identify the optimal obesity framing that promotes health while mitigating weight stigma.

References

1. Hales, C.M., et al., *Prevalence of Obesity Among Adults and Youth: United States, 2015-2016*. NCHS Data Brief, 2017(288): p. 1-8.
2. Hill, J.O., H.R. Wyatt, and J.C. Peters, *Energy balance and obesity*. *Circulation*, 2012. **126**(1): p. 126-132.
3. Camacho, S. and A. Ruppel, *Is the calorie concept a real solution to the obesity epidemic?* *Global health action*, 2017. **10**(1): p. 1289650.
4. Gearhardt, A.N., R.G. Boswell, and M.A. White, *The association of "food addiction" with disordered eating and body mass index*. *Eating behaviors*, 2014. **15**(3): p. 427-433.
5. Gearhardt, A.N., W.R. Corbin, and K.D. Brownell, *Preliminary validation of the Yale Food Addiction Scale*. *Appetite*, 2009. **52**(2): p. 430-436.
6. Gearhardt, A.N., W.R. Corbin, and K.D. Brownell, *Development of the Yale Food Addiction Scale Version 2.0*. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 2016. **30**(1): p. 113.
7. Hebebrand, J., et al., *"Eating addiction", rather than "food addiction", better captures addictive-like eating behavior*. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*, 2014. **47**: p. 295-306.
8. Ruddock, H.K., et al., *The development and validation of the Addiction-like Eating Behaviour Scale*. *International journal of obesity (2005)*, 2017. **41**(11): p. 1710-1717.
9. Link, B.G. and J.C. Phelan, *Conceptualizing Stigma*. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2001. **27**(1): p. 363-385.
10. Puhl, R.M. and C.A. Heuer, *The stigma of obesity: a review and update*. *Obesity*, 2009. **17**(5): p. 941-964.

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

11. Puhl, R., J.L. Peterson, and J. Luedicke, *Fighting obesity or obese persons? Public perceptions of obesity-related health messages*. International Journal of Obesity, 2013. **37**(6): p. 774-782.
12. Pearl, R.L., *Weight bias and stigma: public health implications and structural solutions*. Social Issues and Policy Review, 2018. **12**(1): p. 146-182.
13. Burnette, J.L., et al., *Weight beliefs and messages: Mindsets predict body-shame and anti-fat attitudes via attributions*. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2017. **47**(11): p. 616-624.
14. DePierre, J.A., R.M. Puhl, and J. Luedicke, *Public perceptions of food addiction: a comparison with alcohol and tobacco AU - DePierre, Jenny A*. Journal of Substance Use, 2014. **19**(1-2): p. 1-6.
15. Reid, J., et al., *Food addiction and its potential links with weight stigma*. Current Addiction Reports, 2018. **5**(2): p. 192-201.
16. Latner, J.D., et al., *Food addiction as a causal model of obesity. Effects on stigma, blame, and perceived psychopathology*. Appetite, 2014. **77**: p. 77-82.
17. O'Brien, K.S., et al., *The Effect of a Food Addiction Explanation Model for Weight Control and Obesity on Weight Stigma*. Nutrients, 2020. **12**(2): p. 294.
18. Ruddock, H.K., et al., *Obesity Stigma: Is the 'Food Addiction' Label Feeding the Problem?* Nutrients, 2019. **11**(9): p. 2100.
19. Meadows, A. and S. Daniélsdóttir, *What's in a word? On weight stigma and terminology*. Frontiers in psychology, 2016. **7**: p. 1527.
20. Witte, T.H., A. Wright, and E.A. Stinson, *Factors influencing stigma toward individuals who have substance use disorders*. Substance use & misuse, 2019. **54**(7): p. 1115-1124.
21. Schulte, E.M., M.N. Potenza, and A.N. Gearhardt, *A commentary on the "eating addiction" versus "food addiction" perspectives on addictive-like food consumption*. Appetite, 2017. **115**: p. 9-15.
22. Pearl, R.L. and R.M. Puhl, *Measuring internalized weight attitudes across body weight categories: validation of the modified weight bias internalization scale*. Body Image, 2014. **11**(1): p. 89-92.

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

23. Derricks, V. and A. Earl, *Information targeting increases the weight of stigma: Leveraging relevance backfires when people feel judged*. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 2019. **82**: p. 277-293.
24. Hauser, D., G. Paolacci, and J. Chandler, *Common Concerns with MTurk as a Participant Pool*, in *Handbook of Research Methods in Consumer Psychology*. 2019, Routledge.
25. Qualtrics, *Qualtrics*. Provo, UT, USA, 2019.
26. Li, W., et al., *Small-area estimation and prioritizing communities for obesity control in Massachusetts*. Am J Public Health, 2009. **99**(3): p. 511-9.
27. Bacon, J.G., K.E. Scheltema, and B.E. Robinson, *Fat phobia scale revisited: the short form*. Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord, 2001. **25**(2): p. 252-7.
28. Crandall, C.S., *Prejudice against fat people: ideology and self-interest*. Journal of personality social psychology, 1994. **66**(5): p. 882.
29. Robinson, B.B.E., L.C. Bacon, and J. O'reilly, *Fat phobia: Measuring, understanding, and changing anti-fat attitudes*. International Journal of Eating Disorders, 1993. **14**(4): p. 467-480.
30. Durso, L.E. and J.D. Latner, *Understanding self-directed stigma: development of the weight bias internalization scale*. Obesity, 2008. **16**(S2): p. S80-S86.
31. Schulte, E.M. and A.N. Gearhardt, *Development of the modified Yale food addiction scale version 2.0*. European Eating Disorders Review, 2017. **25**(4): p. 302-308.
32. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *About Adult BMI*. 2020; Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/adult_bmi/index.html#Interpreted.
33. Wilson, O.W., et al., *Objective vs self-report assessment of height, weight and body mass index: Relationships with adiposity, aerobic fitness and physical activity*. Clinical obesity, 2019. **9**(5): p. e12331.
34. Himmelstein, M. and A.J. Tomiyama, *It's not you, it's me: Self-perceptions, antifat attitudes, and stereotyping of obese individuals*. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 2015. **6**(7): p. 749-757.
35. Abbott, M.L., *Using Statistics in the Social and Health Sciences with SPSS and Excel*. 2016, Newark, UNITED STATES: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

36. Carels, R.A., et al., *Internalized weight bias: ratings of the self, normal weight, and obese individuals and psychological maladjustment*. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 2013. **36**(1): p. 86-94.
37. Gearhardt, A.N., et al., *Can food be addictive? Public health and policy implications*. Addiction, 2011. **106**(7): p. 1208-1212.
38. Brownell, K.D. and K.E. Warner, *The perils of ignoring history: Big Tobacco played dirty and millions died. How similar is Big Food?* Milbank Q, 2009. **87**(19298423): p. 259-294.
39. McCormick, M. and T. McElroy, *Healthy choices in context: How contextual cues can influence the persuasiveness of framed health messages*. 2009.
40. United States Census Bureau, *QuickFacts*. 2019.
41. Linder, J., et al., *The epidemiology of weight perception: perceived versus self-reported actual weight status among Albertan adults*. Canadian journal of public health, 2010. **101**(1): p. 56-60.
42. Corrigan, P., et al., *Developing a research agenda for understanding the stigma of addictions Part I: lessons from the mental health stigma literature*. The American journal on addictions, 2017. **26**(1): p. 59-66.
43. Broyles, L.M., et al., *Confronting inadvertent stigma and pejorative language in addiction scholarship: a recognition and response*. 2014, Taylor & Francis.

Tables

Table 1

Participant Characteristics by Condition

Variable	Food Addiction (N = 111)	Eating Addiction (N = 102)	Calorie Balance (N = 118)	Control (N = 116)	Between- Group Differences
Excluded from analyses due to data quality concerns (% excluded)	18.38	19.69	17.48	21.09	$X^2(3) = 0.688, p = .88$
Age (years)	41.40	38.81	39.07	40.42	$F(3,443) = 1.133, p = .34$

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

	(±12.33)	(±11.46)	(±11.55)	(±12.23)	
BMI	27.76 (±6.06)	28.48 (±10.19)	26.34 (±6.85)	25.98 (±5.60)	F(3,443) = 2.849, <i>p</i> = .04
Food Addiction Symptom Count	1.59 (±2.76)	1.67 (±2.86)	1.68 (±3.08)	1.38 (±2.45)	F(3,443) = 0.281, <i>p</i> = .84
Gender (% female)	54.05	55.88	49.15	45.69	χ^2 (9) = 8.900, <i>p</i> = .52
Ethnicity (%)					
White	74.77	74.51	67.8	70.69	
Black	7.21	8.82	12.71	12.07	χ^2 (9) = 3.65, <i>p</i> = .93
Asian	9.0	6.86	9.32	6.90	
Other	9.0	9.80	10.17	10.34	
Annual Household Income (%)					
Less than \$10,000 – 29,999	19.82	19.61	18.64	15.52	
\$30,000 - \$59,999	41.44	37.25	38.14	34.48	χ^2 (9) = 0.896, <i>p</i> = .68
\$60,000 - \$89,999	17.12	27.45	22.03	25.0	
\$90,000 - \$150,000 or more	21.62	15.69	21.19	25.0	
Educational level (% with bachelor’s degree or higher)	66.67	61.76	67.8	63.79	χ^2 (3) = 1.084, <i>p</i> = .78
Political Affiliation (% Democrat)	57.66	45.1	44.92	43.97	χ^2 (12) = 9.850, <i>p</i> = .63
Food Addiction Diagnosis (% that met criteria for diagnosis)	10.81	16.67	16.95	8.62	χ^2 (3) = 5.194, <i>p</i> = .16

Note. This table displays participant characteristics by condition and tests of differences between conditions (ANOVA for continuous variables, χ^2 for categorical variables).

BMI appeared to differ across conditions (*p* = .04), but post hoc pairwise comparisons with Tukey *HSD* indicated no significant differences (*p* > .05).

Table 2

Regression output with mean WBIS-M score as the dependent variable

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

Model	B	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Step 1				
Perceived Food Addiction Status	1.21	0.10	12.38	<.001
Step 2				
Perceived Food Addiction Status	1.21	0.10	12.58	<.001
Food Addiction	0.45	0.12	3.70	<.001
Eating Addiction	0.30	0.12	2.42	0.02
Calorie Balance	0.27	0.12	2.24	0.03
Step 3				
Perceived Food Addiction Status	1.01	0.19	5.38	<.001
Food Addiction	0.40	0.14	2.79	0.006
Eating Addiction	0.24	0.15	1.68	0.09
Calorie Balance	0.14	0.14	1.00	0.32
Perceived Food Addiction Status x Food Addiction	0.18	0.27	0.65	0.51
Perceived Food Addiction Status x Eating Addiction	0.19	0.28	0.70	0.49
Perceived Food Addiction Status x Calorie Balance	0.47	0.27	1.75	0.08

Table 3

Regression output with mean WBIS-M score as the dependent variable

Model	B	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Step 1				
Perceived Weight Status	1.00	0.09	10.95	<.001
Step 2				
Perceived Weight Status	0.97	0.09	10.64	<.001
Food Addiction	0.27	0.13	2.10	0.04

EFFECTS OF OBESITY FRAMING ON WEIGHT STIGMA

Eating Addiction	0.21	0.13	1.59	0.11
Calorie Balance	0.15	0.12	1.18	0.24

Step 3

Perceived Weight Status	0.93	0.19	4.93	<.001
Food Addiction	0.26	0.17	1.58	0.12
Eating Addiction	0.14	0.16	0.87	0.38
Calorie Balance	0.14	0.16	0.91	0.36
Perceived Weight Status x Food Addiction	0.02	0.26	0.09	0.93
Perceived Weight Status x Eating Addiction	0.16	0.27	0.61	0.55
Perceived Weight Status x Calorie Balance	0.02	0.26	0.07	0.94

Figures

Figure 1

Internal weight bias (WBIS-M) by condition

Note. Mean Modified Weight Bias Internalization Scale (WBIS-M) scores by condition. Higher scores indicate more internalized weight stigma. Error bars denote standard deviation.

Figure 1