Journal Pre-proof

Fostering safe food handling among consumers: Causal evidence on game- and video-based online interventions

Alexander K. Koch, Dan Mønster, Julia Nafziger, Nina Veflen

PII: S0956-7135(22)00018-4

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2022.108825

Reference: JFCO 108825

To appear in: *Food Control*

Received Date: 15 September 2021

Revised Date: 18 December 2021

Accepted Date: 9 January 2022

Fostering safe food handling among consumers: Causal evidence on game- and video-based online interventions

Alexander K. Koch[a,b,*], Dan Mønster[a], Julia Nafziger[a,c] & Nina Veflen[d,e*]

[a]Department of Economics and Business Economics, Aarhus University, Fuglesangs Allé 4, 8210 Aarhus, Denmark

[b]Center for Hybrid Intelligence, Aarhus University, Denmark

[c]Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR), UK

[d]BI Norwegian Business School, Nydalsveien 37, 0484 Oslo, Norway

[e]Nofima, Norway

December 2021

Abstract

We design a game-based online intervention to foster awareness of food safety and risk-reducing behavior among consumers. 1,087 participants, aged 20–50 years, and additional 886 participants, aged up to 89 years, from the UK and Norway were assigned to (i) a control condition with pre- and post-survey measures of food safety beliefs and behaviors with a one-week spacing, or (ii) in addition exposed to a brief information video, or (iii) in addition played an online game. Both intervention types improved food safety beliefs to a similar extent relative to control. But only the game interventions significantly improved self-reported food safety behavior, suggesting that providing information to consumers often is not sufficient to change routinized behavior. The novel insight of our study is that repeatedly applying correct behavior in the virtual environment of the online game spills over to real-world behavior. Importantly, treatment effects are not concentrated on young people, but are consistent across age groups.

Keywords: Food safety; Consumers; Behaviour; Knowledge; Survey experiments; Serious games; Video-based interventions

*Authors appear in alphabetical order. The study is pre-registered on OSF: https://osf.io/mhqet. *Corresponding author: A. Koch, Phone: +4587165539, Email: akoch@econ.au.dk.

Introduction

According to the WHO, 1 in 10 people in the world suffer from food-borne disease each year (WHO, 2015). While food-borne disease is in particular a problem in developing countries, it also causes high costs in developed countries in terms of sick days, hospitalizations and even death. In the US, for example, each year an estimated 9.4 million cases of food-borne disease result in more than 55,000 hospitalizations and more than 1,300 deaths (Scallan et al., 2011). For Europe, the estimates are 23 million cases of food-borne disease and 4,700 deaths each year (WHO, 2019). The actual numbers might be much higher because many cases go unreported (e.g., WHO, 2002; Langsrud et al., 2020).

Around 10 – 30 percent of the cases of food-borne disease can be attributed to food preparation at home (for the US and Europe respectively, see Dewey-Mattia et al., 2018; EFSA and ECDC, 2018). For example, private households are the most common place where food is consumed that leads to salmonellosis outbreaks (EFSA and ECDC, 2018). Improper handling and storage of food at home – such as inadequate cooking, consumption of risky foods, cross contamination, inadequate hand washing routines, and lack of time-temperature control – are frequent (Skuland, 2020; Evans and Redmond, 2019; Young et al., 2017a,b; Byrd-Bredbenner et al., 2013). Such mishandling facilitates bacterial contamination of food, which increases the likelihood of consumers contracting food-borne diseases.

Since consumers play an important role in the prevention of food-borne diseases, promoting awareness and fostering correct risk-reducing behavior has become an important objective for organizations dealing with the protection of citizens' health (Ravarotto et al., 2016). For example, one of the main topics of the WHO food safety day in 2021 was "Know what's safe – Consumers need to learn about safe and healthy food" (WHO, 2021); and numerous national and international health authorities provide information about food safety to consumers (e.g., CDC, 2021; NHS, 2020; WHO, 2006).

Yet, despite these hazards and information materials distributed, many people are not aware of food-borne disease and its prevention at home (e.g., Thaivalappil et al., 2019; Lange et al., 2016). But even people who are aware of the risks, do not necessarily follow the authorities' guidelines. That is, food safety information does not always result in proper food handling behavior or in consumers refraining from eating risky food (Brennan et al., 2007). For example, despite numerous campaigns by national food safety authorities and widespread news coverage of past outbreaks, many consumers prefer to eat hamburgers that are rare or not well done.

A reason for such behavior is that, in addition to scientific facts, people are influenced by preferences, ethical, political, and religious beliefs as well as culture, history, and personal experiences when making their decisions. The pleasure of eating is arguably one of the strongest predictors of food choice (see Steptoe et al., 1995) and sensory preferences may distract from food risk information (Olsen et al., 2014). Further, in the area of domestic food safety, both demographic factors (such as age, gender, and health), as well as psychological factors (such as habits, biased beliefs, overconfidence, trait worry, and internal locus of control) influence behavior (Fischer and Frewer, 2008; Young et al., 2017b,a). Specifically, individuals often adopt food safety beliefs and behaviors from their parents and apply them without much reflection (see Lange, 2017). Further, since food preparation involves repetitive behavior that is performed on a daily basis year in, year out, behaviors become habitual and under the control of automatic processes (see Aarts and Dijksterhuis, 2000). Consequently, routinised food safety behaviors and beliefs might be difficult to change with information alone.

To break such routines, we design an online game that does not only inform consumers about correct food safety behaviors, but also trains consumers to apply them. In their review of the E-bug project – a food safety project designed for young people by Public Health England's Primary Care Unit, which includes interactive, computerized components – Young et al. (2019) argue that effective risk communication on food hygiene will need to rely on the use of relevant and accessible methods in the digital era, such as online games. Yet, a survey by the SafeConsume consortium (Kasza et al., 2019) reveals that most authorities rely on "passive" information, such as webpages and only 10–20 percent rely on "active" information over, e.g., social media or an app.

Our study aims to demonstrate the potential for well-designed online games to contribute to the prevention of food-borne disease. We do not only test whether the game is successful in improving food safety beliefs and behaviors compared to a control condition, but also whether it is more successful than a more traditional intervention with video-based information only. Further, we include an additional condition in which we frame the information video in a disgust eliciting way to test whether such a frame further increases the impact of the game on food safety beliefs and behavior.

Related literature The game at the heart of our intervention is an example of a serious game – a game that has an educational purpose and is not just intended to be played for amusement (Abt, 1970). The broad idea of gamification[1] and serious games as tools to induce behavioral change is that the engaging nature of certain game elements helps consumers to change their behavior by influencing psychosocial constructs such as attitudes, intentions, motivations, cognitive skills and affective states. The engagement felt when playing a video game has been found to increase blood pressure and heart rate, and to change facial expressions (Ravaja et al., 2008). People get emotionally aroused by gaming, and both enjoyment and fear can be felt. This engagement and the intrinsic motivation it triggers, provide opportunities for learning. Games have been found to increase both descriptive and conceptual knowledge, problem solving, skills in spatial representation and higher-order thinking when compared with traditional lecturing methods (Ke, 2009; Boyle et al., 2011).

[1]Gamification is defined as "the use of game design elements in non-game contexts" (Deterding et al., 2011, p. 9). Examples are the use of rewards or avatars.

Serious games and gamification are increasingly being used as a behavior change technique, for example, to influence energy saving behavior (Iweka et al., 2019; Wemyss et al., 2019), transportation choice (Lieberoth et al., 2018), exercising (Höchsmann et al., 2019; Patel et al., 2017), or other health related behaviors (for reviews and meta-analyses see, e.g., Johnson et al., 2016; DeSmet et al., 2014; Koivisto and Hamari, 2019). Specifically, serious games, have been applied as educational tools in a variety of settings such as, for example, training of police, firefighters, safety training, well-being at the workplace, and healthcare (e.g., BinSubaih et al., 2009; Martínez-Durá et al., 2011; Backlund et al., 2007; Lowensteyn et al., 2019).

Food safety related educational interventions (for reviews see, e.g., Sivaramalingam et al., 2015; Young et al., 2015) primarily take the form of training (e.g., Harrison, 2012, developed a hand washing education initiative using a university mascot) or workshops (e.g., Ravarotto et al., 2016, found application of the consensus conference model as a communication process to be an effective opportunity to engage young consumers and experts on the topic of food safety). Yet, training or workshops can be impractical when it comes to educating large parts of the population about food-borne disease. Studies targeting larger audiences often rely on text messages (Trifiletti et al., 2012; Townsend et al., 2006) or videos (Quick et al., 2015). Only few studies consider the effects of serious games on food safety behavior of children and adolescents (Mac Namee et al., 2006; Quick et al., 2013; Clark et al., 2020).

Methods

Experimental procedures and sample. The study design and hypotheses were pre-registered (for the pre-analyis plan see Koch et al., 2020). A total of 1,087 participants (499 from the UK and 588 from Norway) completed our two-part, online experiment through the survey company Kantar Gallup from January to March 2021. Because the enjoyment of computer games tends to be higher for younger people, we expected that the game might have less of an impact for older people. This motivated our pre-registered restriction to participants aged 20 to 50 years. Data on an additional 886 participants outside the pre-registered age range that became available are analyzed separately (see the end of the Results section). As several of the targeted hygiene behaviors relate to the preparation of meat, we screened participants to prepare at least two warm lunches/dinners with meat or poultry per week on average. The sample was stratified to ensure equal distribution of gender across treatments.

Tables S.1 and S.2 provide more details on the sample (number of participants by country, condition and gender) and Supplementary Section S.1.1 gives further details on sampling. Table S.3 shows that compared to those who drop out, the final sample has individuals who are slightly older, have a somewhat higher income, and live in smaller households. Further, there are differences in what type of meat was consumed in the week prior to the study. We control for these variables in our analyses.

Experimental design. The study consisted of three main parts: A pre-survey, the intervention part, and a post survey. The intervention relied on information videos and a computerized home cooking game (see Figures 1 and 2 for screenshots; the game can be played at https://webgl.scienceathome.org/safeconsumegame). Participants were assigned to one of four conditions in a between-subjects design, as summarized in Table 1.

In all conditions, participants answered a pre-survey and seven days later a post-survey. In the survey, next to collecting some information on sociodemographic background and certain preferences, participants reported some recent food safety behaviors and we elicited beliefs in the efficacy of certain food safety actions, as well as beliefs in myths. The questions were either directly taken from or inspired by previous work of the SafeConsume EU consortium (https://safeconsume.eu/). The survey was developed by finding relevant established scales of food safety behaviors and beliefs. These were discussed and modified within the research team, and then tested on food safety experts within the SafeConsume consortium. During further iterations, the survey was discussed with experts from the survey company and pilot tested with members of the target group. To facilitate recall of behaviors, we asked participants to think of a specific dish they prepared within the last week (see Schwarz and Oyserman, 2001).

No further intervention took place in the *Control* condition. In the *Info* condition, after the pre-survey, participants watched a two minute information video about food safety. It addressed five broad categories: personal hygiene (hand washing), kitchen hygiene (cleaning utensils and surfaces), washing fresh vegetables and fruits, *not* rinsing meat or poultry, as well as cooking foods thoroughly. These categories align with core elements of the WHO's five keys for safer food (WHO, 2006). Pictures were accompanied by simple (spoken and written) messages such as: "Washing poultry or meat can spread harmful bacteria through water droplets. So do not wash raw poultry or meat." In the *Game* condition, after answering the pre-survey and watching the information video, participants played a home cooking computer game where they had to prepare four recipes with meat. After completion of a recipe, participants received feedback on how well they handled important food safety actions related to the categories addressed in the information video. The *DisgustGame* condition was identical to *Game*, except that we replaced the information video with a version were the pictures were visually framed to trigger a disgust reaction (see Figure 1; Supplementary Figures S.13-S.14 provide further examples). The messages accompanying these pictures were identical to those in the neutral video.

We based the content of the information video on a thorough analysis of food safety issues and food safety advice given by authorities, which were collected and reviewed by the SafeConsume EU consortium. The design of the video drew on the evidence that information can be effectively communicated if it is factual, brief, easy to understand (Jacob et al., 2010) and supported by pictures (Alter and Oppenheimer, 2009). Because messages with argumentative power are more likely to have an effect (Byrne and Hart, 2009), we paired advice on behavior with an argument or fact that supports it (see Supplementary Figure S.13).

Through the video, we also addressed several food myths that were a subsample of food myths collected by the SafeConsume EU consortium: Fruit and vegetables that will be peeled do not have to be washed; it is safe to eat a piece of bread that has fallen to the ground if picked up within five seconds; and only poultry meat needs to be well done to be safe to eat. To avoid reinforcing the myths, we did not explicitly mention them in the video.

In the game (see Figure 2 for screenshots), participants had to prepare dishes consisting of chicken, raw vegetables, and bread. The kitchen included a worktop, a sink, hand soap, dish liquid, surface cleaner and paper towels, a rubbish bin, a cutting board and a knife, a pan on the stove, and a food thermometer. Participants had to take meat and fruit/vegetables from a refrigerator and bread from a basket. They had to cut each food item on a cutting board and to heat the meat in the pan before serving the food on a plate. Sometimes, a miaowing cat disturbed the cooking process. If the participant did not remove the cat, it kept walking over the worktop, leaving a trail of cat hair behind (see Figure 2).

The game involved a number of critical handling points, to which we henceforth refer as *important food safety actions*, or IFSAs. These were: (1) Washing hands with soap before starting to cook and after preparing a food item. (2) Cleaning food preparation tools with water and dish liquid after preparing a food item. (3) Cleaning kitchen surfaces after preparing a food item. (4) Checking with a food thermometer that the chicken has an internal temperature of 74°C before removing it from the pan. (5) Rinsing fruit/vegetables (even if later peeled) before preparing them. (6) Not rinsing raw meat. (7) Not consuming dropped food items.

Before the game, participants watched a video explaining how to play the game. They then completed four recipes. Recipes differed in the raw vegetable or fruit to be prepared and we included both fruit/vegetables that had to be peeled and some that did not. After each recipe, participants received feedback on whether they met the time limit and how well they performed in terms of the IFSAs.

Depending on treatment, the median duration for part 1 was 15 min. for *Control*, 18 min. for *Info*, 65 min. for *Game* and 61 min. for *DisgustGame*. The median duration for part 2 (the post-survey) was 9 min.

Theoretical background and hypotheses

Our primary hypotheses are that the game in combination with the information video in *Game* improves food safety related beliefs (**Hypothesis 1**) and behavior (**Hypothesis 2**) compared to the *Control* condition.

The foundation for Hypothesis 1 is that serious games foster active and problem-based learning and thus affect beliefs. Boyle et al. (2011) link the success of serious games to a number of psychological factors and emphasize that active learning is encouraged through two possible channels. First, the players get repeated feedback that is linked to their own past behavior. Such feedback reinforces knowledge because repeated exposure to a message makes it faster and more effortless to retrieve from memory; and processing fluency makes people more likely to perceive a message to be true (Hasher et al., 1977; Reber and Schwarz, 1999; Alter and Oppenheimer, 2009). Second, the online game requires players to become actively engaged. This engagement is likely to increase attention to the messages that target behavioral change, compared to passively consuming information materials (Deater-Deckard et al., 2013).

The foundation for Hypothesis 2 is the evidence that gamification can foster behavioral change. That is, we expect the game not only to change behavior indirectly over beliefs, but also directly. For example, Cugelman (2013) discusses elements such as committing to achieve a goal, capacity to overcome challenges, feedback on performance, reinforcement through rewards, monitoring progress, social connectivity, and fun and playfulness. Our game challenges participants because they need to keep the time and plan their actions. By connecting the desired behaviors with positive feedback through the scoring system and rewarding correct behavior, the game leverages the underlying psychology of goal setting, rewards, mastery, autonomy, and pursuit of meaning – thereby increasing intrinsic motivation to pursue desired behaviors (see Boyle et al., 2011). Further, the game gets participants to repeatedly practice behavior in the virtual environment, which can support forming new habits. The psychology literature emphasizes that in order to create habits it is important to repeatedly apply an action (e.g., washing hands in our context) in response to a cue (touching raw meat) and to receive immediate rewards for taking the action (e.g., Wood and Neal, 2007, 2009). In our game, the reward comes in the form of getting a higher feedback score.

In addition to the two primary Hypotheses 1 and 2, we test a range of secondary hypotheses to better understand the mechanisms behind our results. First, we test whether the game is more effective than a pure information intervention. The game, as well as the information condition affect beliefs and beliefs affect behavior. Yet, because of the active learning process outlined above, we expect the game to have a stronger effect on beliefs than the information condition. In addition, we expect that the game has a direct effect on behavior that is not mediated by beliefs.

To test whether the game is more successful than the information condition, as a first step, we test whether and in which dimensions the information intervention (condition *Info*) is successful. Based on past research that showed, for example, that corrective messages have a moderate positive influence on beliefs in the health domain (Walter and Murphy, 2018), we hypothesize that the pre-post change in food safety related beliefs and behavior, respectively, is larger in the *Info* than in the *Control* condition (**Secondary hypotheses 1 and 2**, respectively). Then, in a next step, we test the hypothesis that the game is more successful in changing beliefs and behavior, respectively, than just providing information. For this we compare the pre-post change in food safety related beliefs and behavior in *Game* with *Info*

(**Secondary hypotheses 3 and 4**, respectively).

We consider a second set of mechanisms related to disgust, which is an emotional reaction triggered by aversion towards potentially contaminated objects. Triggers of disgust are bodily products as feces, vomit, urine, mucus, and blood. Disgust is thought to be an evolutionary adaption to prevent exposure to pathogens (e.g., Curtis et al., 2004). It thus seems particularly relevant in the context of food safety.

Indeed, health campaigns often rely on images or words that evoke disgust (see Gagnon et al., 2010; Lupton, 2015) to persuade target audiences by linking health risks with the negative affective reaction that disgust triggers. Drawing on the research related to the "pedagogy of disgust" in public health communication (Lupton, 2015), eliciting a disgust reaction in participants may make our game intervention more effective. It has been shown that decisions can be influenced by presenting information in a way that triggers disgust (Rozin and Fallon, 1987; Haidt et al., 1997). Specifically, in the context of food safety, Nauta et al. (2008) observe that disgust formulated information is effective in changing beliefs and behavior.

What are the potential reasons for disgust being effective in changing behavior? It is well established that information presented in an emotionally evocative way is more memorable (e.g., Bradley et al., 1992), which is, at least in part, because emotionally arousing stimuli increase attention (Talmi and McGarry, 2012). Arousing stimuli have been shown to have an automatic memory enhancement effect, whereas high valence, low arousal stimuli rely on controlled encoding (Kensinger and Corkin, 2004). There is ample evidence that disgust enhances attention (Morales et al., 2012; Van Hooff et al., 2014) and memory consolidation (Croucher et al., 2011; Chapman et al., 2013; Van Hooff et al., 2014) – an effect that increases with time (Chapman et al., 2013; Moeck et al., 2021). Fear is another negative emotion with similar valence and arousal, but disgusting stimuli lead to greater immediate attention (Chapman, 2018).

In our setting, the more people pay attention to the video, the more information they retain in short-term memory. An additional effect is that disgust acts to enhance recall and recognition of episodic memory on both short (minutes) and longer (days – weeks) time scales (Chapman et al., 2013). Both of these effects serve to increase information retention, recall and recognition and therefore can result in a larger effect on beliefs. Further, exposing participants to the disgust formulated version of the information video may bolster the claim about the severity of the risk (Dillard and Shen, 2018). All of these factors would suggest that the subsequent play of the online game has a larger impact on beliefs and behavior than for those participants exposed to the neutral frame of the video. Hence, we test with the *DisgustGame* condition whether disgust formulated information creates more attention than merely factual presentation of information and in doing so leads to a larger pre-post change in beliefs and behavior than *Game* (**Secondary hypotheses 5 and 6**).

Lastly, even though disgust is thought to be a universal and basic emotion (e.g., Rozin et al., 2008), individual differences in disgust sensitivity exist (Haidt et al., 1994) that could potentially explain heterogeneity in the response to health messages like in our intervention. As disgust sensitive individuals may generally be more receptive to information about food safety, the disgust frame of information may be particularly effective for disgust sensitive individuals. That is, we expect the change in beliefs and behavior investigated under Secondary hypotheses 5 and 6 to be larger for more disgust sensitive individuals (**Secondary hypothesis 7**) and that in *Game* there is a positive moderation effect by disgust sensitivity (**Secondary hypothesis 8**). We capture disgust sensitivity using the 7-item food disgust picture scale (Ammann et al., 2018).

Empirical analysis

The empirical analysis was carried out using Stata 17 (see Koch et al. (2021) for the data and replication code).

Outcome variables. As the main outcome variables we use reported beliefs and behavior in the areas that are targeted in the game and the videos (*targeted behavior* and *targeted food safety efficacy beliefs*). For beliefs, we further use *beliefs in myths*.

Efficacy beliefs refer to an individual's belief that a particular action will affect the likelihood of contracting food-borne disease. We designed the game and video interventions to make people aware that certain actions, such as, for example, rinsing chicken, increase the likelihood of getting food-borne disease. We measured efficacy beliefs targeted by our interventions using 13 questions in the pre- and post-surveys (see Supplementary Table S.17).

Beliefs in myths refer to commonly held 'true-or-false' beliefs with no base in scientific facts. We measured them using 8 questions in the pre- and post-surveys (see Supplementary Table S.16). These myths were collected across Europe and assessed by the SafeConsume EU consortium.

Target behavior refers to self-reported food safety behaviors that were targeted in the intervention. We measured them with 21 questions in the pre- and post-surveys, such as, whether and how a participant checked the temperature of the meat when preparing a dish in the week before the survey or whether a participant rinsed certain fruits and vegetables (see Supplementary Table S.18).

If increased information about food safety triggers greater reflection and an increased general understanding of the causes of food-borne disease, the interventions may make people revise their beliefs or question myths also in areas that are not directly targeted in the intervention. Thus, further outcome variables used in some of the pre-registered exploratory analyses are beliefs and behavior in relevant food safety areas that were not targeted in the interventions (see Supplementary Tables S.16-S.18). For the beliefs, we consider a measure based on seven non-targeted beliefs. For behavior, we consider actions such as seeking information on how to safely handle food, checking the temperature of the fridge, and checking use-by dates of food items.

We standardize all individual items based on the mean and standard deviation of the respective pre-survey measure (see Supplementary Figure S.1). That is, comparison with the standardized post-survey measure captures by how many standard deviations the measure changed relative to the pre-survey and thus has the interpretation of an effect size. Whenever relevant, items are recoded so that a positive change between pre- and post-survey responses indicates an improvement in beliefs or behavior (see Supplementary Tables S.17- S.19). We then aggregate items for the respective groups of outcome measures by taking the average over the individual standardized measures.

Empirical strategy. To test our hypotheses, we estimate average treatment effects using difference-in-differences regressions (e.g., Imbens and Wooldridge, 2009) that take the average pre-post difference in the outcome variable in each condition and compare the difference in these differences across two conditions:[2]

$$y_{it} = \beta_0 + \delta_0\, P_{it} + \beta_1\, T_i + \delta_1\, P_{it} \cdot T_i + \gamma\, X_i + \varepsilon_{it},$$

where y_{it} is the outcome variable of interest for a person at date t (we have two observations per person), T_i is a treatment dummy, and P_{it} is a dummy equal to zero for the pre-survey observation and equal to one for the post-survey observation. P_{it} captures any time-related changes that occur across treatments. The interaction between T_i and P_{it} is the difference-in-difference estimate of interest. It captures how the treatment affects changes in the outcome variable between pre- and post-survey observations. We add a set of control variables X_i that include individual and socioeconomic characteristics and further account for experience with cooking and food safety (the list of control variables is given in Supplementary Section S.2.1).

Specifically, to test the main hypotheses (Hypothesis 1 and 2), the treatment dummy is set equal to one for *Game* and 0 for *Control*. To test secondary hypotheses 1 and 2, the treatment dummy is set equal to one for *Info* and 0 for *Control*. Similarly, to test secondary hypotheses 3 and 4, the treatment dummy is equal to one if the participant participated in *Info* and 0 if s/he participated in *Game*. Finally, to test secondary hypotheses 5 and 6, the treatment dummy is equal to one if the participant participated in *DisgustGame* and 0 if s/he participated in *Game*. The treatments not mentioned are not included in the respective regressions.

The p-values and effect sizes in the results that we report in the next section refer to our main specifications that estimate the treatment effects without controls, but we also report estimates with a basic and extended set of control variables (see Supplementary Section S.2.1)

[2] In principle, we could include an individual specific intercept, or so-called fixed effect. While this typically reduces standard errors by controlling for certain types of omitted variables, the downside is that inference is "notoriously susceptible to attenuation bias from measurement error" (Angrist and Pischke, 2008, p.225). For this reason, we implement the model without individual fixed effects.

and run a number of robustness checks (see Supplementary Section S.1.2).

Results

Table S.4 shows the descriptive statistics for the main outcome measures for the pre- and post surveys. Outcome measures at baseline are not perfectly balanced against the control treatment (see Table S.5) and there are some imbalances between the treatments for some control variables (see Table S.6). The difference-in-differences estimation approach accounts for such imbalances.

The data support Hypotheses 1 and 2, as illustrated in Figure 3 and summarized in the following result:

Result 1 *Relative to Control, Game improves targeted efficacy beliefs by 0.16 standard deviations* ($p < 0.001$)*, beliefs in myths by 0.13 standard deviations* ($p = 0.013$)*, and targeted behavior by 0.20 standard deviations* ($p < 0.001$)*.*

We next turn to our first set of secondary hypotheses (Secondary hypotheses 1-4). While the information video improves food safety related beliefs compared to the control condition, a knowledge-behavior gap (Hornik, 1989) emerges in that information changes beliefs, but not behavior. Given that *Info* and *Game* are both effective in changing food safety related beliefs, it is not surprising that we find no treatment difference in beliefs between these two conditions. Yet, unlike the information video, the game improves behavior and thus bridges the knowledge-behavior gap. We summarize in the following result (see Figure 3):

Result 2

1. *Relative to Control, Info improves targeted efficacy beliefs by 0.14 standard deviations* ($p < 0.001$)*, but has no significant impact on beliefs in myths* ($p = 0.279$) *or targeted behavior* ($p = 0.242$)*.*

2. *Relative to Info, Game has no significant impact on targeted efficacy beliefs* ($p = 0.771$) *or beliefs in myths* ($p = 0.374$)*, but it improves targeted behavior by 0.13 standard deviations* ($p = 0.013$)*.*

We next turn to our secondary hypotheses related to disgust (Secondary hypotheses 5–8). We hypothesized that disgust formulated information would lead to a stronger learning effect, but expected the effect to be small. In line with this, the estimated treatment effects relative to *Control* for efficacy beliefs, beliefs in myths, and targeted behavior are all higher for *DisgustGame* compared to *Game*, but for the latter two outcomes the differences are not of sufficient magnitude to be statistically significant (0.09 standard deviations and $p = 0.045$ for targeted efficacy beliefs; $p = 0.848$ for beliefs in myths, and $p = 0.542$ for targeted behavior).

Further, the evidence contradicts the hypothesized mechanism of a disgust reaction increasing attention to food safety. We do not find treatment effects being moderated by disgust sensitivity (see Supplementary Table S.7 and Supplementary Section S.1.2.2). Only for one outcome do we find a significant effect, yet it goes against our hypothesis: for participants with disgust sensitivity above the median compared to those below the median, there is a lower treatment effect of *DisgustGame* on beliefs in myths relative to *Game* (-0.299 standard deviations, $p = 0.003$).

Mechanisms. We next test the potential mechanism behind our observed result that the game affects behavior (this analysis is not pre-registered). From a theoretical point of view, the game may either change behavior directly or affect behavior by changing beliefs. Figure 4 illustrates how we can decompose the total treatment effect on behavior (panel A) into a direct effect of being exposed to the treatment and an indirect effect that operates through the mediator efficacy beliefs (panel B). The classic approach to mediation analysis outlined in Baron and Kenny (1986) requires four conditions to be met. First and second, that the overall treatment effect (TE in panel A) and the treatment effect on the mediator (path a in panel B) are significant. We already saw that both conditions hold for *Game* and *DisgustGame* treatments, as illustrated in Figure 3. Third, controlling for the treatment, the effect of the mediator on the outcome (path b in panel B) is significant (for *Game* $\beta = 0.17$, $p < 0.001$; for *DisgustGame* $\beta = 0.19$, $p < 0.001$). Interaction terms between treatments and mediator are insignificant, indicating that treatments do not moderate the mediator-outcome effect (for *Game* $\beta = 0.08$, $p = 0.33$; for *DisgustGame* $\beta = 0.08$, $p = 0.25$). Fourth, a significant indirect effect, or mediated effect (panel B), which we establish by estimating the effects using the procedure of Imai et al. (2010).

We find that most of the total treatment effect of *Game* operates as a direct effect on behavior and only around 1/6th of it is mediated through efficacy beliefs (see Table 2). The picture is similar for *DisgustGame*, for which the higher total treatment effect on behavior (we find no statistically significant difference, as shown in Figure 3) is distributed proportionally across higher direct and indirect effects. Above we discussed a number of theoretical mechanisms through which serious games can affect behavior directly rather than through beliefs. Our results support the importance of these mechanisms.

Exploratory analysis. We conduct additional pre-registered exploratory analyses. First, given that the game exhibits promising effects on targeted beliefs and behavior, we test whether these lead to spillover effects on food safety related behavior and beliefs in areas that are not targeted in the game. We observe no significant spillover effects on non-targeted behavior and beliefs (see Figure 3 and Supplementary Table S.7). This indicates that the game increases attention to specific food safety actions, not food safety knowledge in general.

Second, we analyze treatment effects on individual items (see Supplementary Section S.1.2.1).

In line with the analysis of aggregate beliefs, we also do not find treatment differences for individual belief items. Yet, for the targeted behaviors there is a pattern of *Game* and *DisgustGame* having larger treatment effects compared to *Info* – in particular, for the individual items related to handling meat, and rinsing fruits and vegetables even if they are to be peeled.

Third, we explore heterogeneous treatment effects (UK vs. Norway and Men vs. Women). We do not find any significant effects (available upon request).

Finally, we report exploratory results based on an additional 886 participants: The survey company also collected data outside of our pre-registered age range of 20–50 years because they omitted screening on age and this was only noticed after data collection had run for a while. Using the extended sample with 1,973 participants aged 18–89, our main findings are robust, with the exception that we find for the extended sample that *Game* also significantly improves efficacy beliefs relative to *Info* (see Supplementary Figure S.8). This result stems from heterogeneous treatment effects by age. We observe that *Game* relative to *Info* has little impact on beliefs for individuals aged 20–30, but has an effect for the older age groups; for targeted behavior the treatment effect is constant across age groups (see Supplementary Figures S.9-S.11).

While positive news, the result is surprising. Our motivation for recruiting only 20–50 year old individuals was that we expected older individuals to enjoy less or even have difficulty playing computer games. Indeed, we find that both enjoyment and frequency of computer gaming generally tend to decrease with age (see Supplementary Figure S.12). Yet, we find no correlation between age and the rating of how much fun our game was (Spearman $\rho = 0.03$, $p = 0.359$).

Discussion

We provide causal evidence from a randomized experiment with a large number of observations on the ability of an online serious game to change beliefs and behavior in the area of domestic food safety. The previous literature on serious games and game-based interventions often does not involve experimental designs or quasi experimental methods, relies on small samples, or has other methodological issues (see Hamari et al., 2014; Koivisto and Hamari, 2019; Sailer and Homner, 2020).

Our study goes beyond a simple treatment-control comparison by also comparing a game-based intervention with a pure information-based intervention. Specifically, by comparing the game-based with the video-based condition, we provide insights into the comparative advantage of a game-based intervention relative to a pure information intervention. Existing studies on promoting health related behavior using serious games (see above) tend to focus on the impact of a game and do not include the comparison of game-based and non-game-based approaches (e.g., Chow et al., 2020). Yet, such comparisons are important because there would be no need to impose the extra costs for a game intervention on society and participants (e.g., in terms of programming costs and participants' time) if simple information material was equally effective as the game in inducing behavioral change.

We observe that both interventions successfully communicate information. Yet, despite its impact on beliefs, the video-based intervention has no significant effect on changing food safety behavior. In contrast, the game-based intervention significantly improves behavior. Importantly, these results arise not only for young people. Previous studies on the effects of serious games on food safety (Mac Namee et al., 2006; Quick et al., 2013; Clark et al., 2020), as well as many food safety interventions in general, focus on children, teenagers, or professionals in the food service sector. Much less is known about how such interventions work among the general adult population, especially when it comes to game-based interventions. For older individuals, habits and non-scientific beliefs might be more persistent and more difficult to change. By targeting adults, our study shows the potential for serious games to educate the general population about food safety and to promote safe food handling behavior.

While the knowledge-behavior gap that arises in the video-based intervention is well known in other areas, such as vaccinations and health screenings, the result may appear surprising in the context of food safety. In contrast to vaccinations or screenings, the planning costs of conducting food safety actions are rather low and people have little incentive to procrastinate. This suggests that other forces, such as bad habits, are at play for the observed knowledge-behavior gap in the area of food safety. Our results suggest that the reason why the game is able to alleviate the knowledge-behavior gap, is that it provides an engaging environment in which individuals repeatedly apply correct behavior (In our study, 50 percent of the participants agreed with the statement "The game is fun", with the mean on the 5-point Likert scale being significantly higher than the neutral mid-point rating; t-test, $p < 0.001$, $N = 545$). By doing so, the game trains correct behavior and facilitates the creation of appropriate food preparation habits. What is interesting about our findings is that exposing consumers to repeated targeted behavior in a virtual environment for a limited time is able to change reported real-life behavior in the right direction. That is, not only repetition in real life, but also repetition in a game has the power to change behavior.

Our study further sheds light on whether framing information in a disgusting way can enhance the effects of the game-based intervention. While a disgust frame, improves targeted efficacy beliefs relative to the neutral frame, it does not additionally change behavior and beliefs in myths. Further, we find no evidence of individual differences in disgust sensitivity being a moderator. Thus, the results contradict the hypothesized mechanism of disgust triggering heightened attention to food safety – a result that might appear surprising given the previous literature. A plausible ex post rationalization of the findings is that the disgust frame perhaps made the video more amusing and memorable. Future studies should look further into such mechanisms.

Limitations and future research

A limitation of our study is that we rely on self reported behavior. To observe real behavior in a large, representative, two-country study as ours would be very expensive and time consuming. For example, a study by the SafeConsume EU consortium that observed and interviewed households in six European countries during shopping and preparation of a meal with chicken and vegetables reached only 87 households and paid EUR 60-170 per visited household (Møretrø et al., 2021).

While self-reported and observed food safety behaviors have been found to have low correlation in a study of 183 professional food handlers in Brazil (da Cunha et al., 2019), another recent study of 38 individuals from low-income families in four U.S. states showed a high agreement between self-reported and observed behavior (Moore et al., 2019). The latter study included actions such as time-temperature control, personal hygiene, cross-contamination, and adequate cooking in a real-life setting very similar to our game setting: one meal consisted of chicken breast and apple, while the other consisted of ground beef and tomato (Moore et al., 2019, p. 451). Whether the difference between these two studies are due to the different study populations (professional food handlers vs. home cooking), methodologies or other factors is hard to say, and further research is clearly needed both to test how well self-reported and observed behavior correlate, but also whether it is possible to affect real-life behavior with a game intervention, as our results indicate.

Conclusion

Our study aims to demonstrate the potential for well-designed online games to contribute to the prevention of food-borne disease. Overall, our study demonstrates that a relatively short duration of game play is enough to change beliefs and behavior in the short run and that it can be an effective tool not only for targeting young people but for reaching the general population. Next to being engaging, a game has the advantage that, once developed, it is cheap to roll-out on a large scale and thus has the potential to create a large impact on preventing food-borne disease by reaching many consumers.

Acknowledgments. The game was developed by the ScienceAtHome team headed by Jacob Sherson. We thank in particular, Anders Duemose Lund, Mads Kock Pedersen, Christian Brinkmann Poulsen, Ulrik K. Roos, and Emil Stephansen for making this game come to life. The videos were developed by the company Designit. Mohammed Hussen Alemu provided research assistance for the literature review. We would like to thank Luk Warlop and members of the SafeConsume EU consortium for helpful comments and feedback.

Financial disclosure. This work was supported by funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 727580, as part of the SafeConsume project. The game development unit of ScienceAtHome was supported by the Carlsberg foundation Semper Ardens grant CF18-0019. The funders had no role in any part of the research process. There are no competing interests of the authors to declare.

Data availability. Data and the replication code are accessible at Koch et al. (2021).

Ethics. As a low risk study on human behavior, the study was exempted from review by the Health Research Authority in the UK, by the Norwegian Centre for Research Data, and Nofima's ethical board in Norway. Participants gave informed consent.

References

Aarts, Henk and AP Dijksterhuis, "The automatic activation of goal-directed behaviour: The case of travel habit," *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 2000, *20* (1), 75–82.

Abt, Clark C., *Serious games*, New York: Viking Press, 1970.

Alter, Adam L and Daniel M Oppenheimer, "Uniting the tribes of fluency to form a metacognitive nation," *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2009, *13* (3), 219–235.

Ammann, Jeanine, Christina Hartmann, and Michael Siegrist, "Development and validation of the food disgust picture scale," *Appetite*, 2018, *125*, 367–379.

Angrist, Joshua D and Jörn-Steffen Pischke, *Mostly harmless econometrics*, Princeton University Press, 2008.

Backlund, Per, Henrik Engstrom, Cecilia Hammar, Mikael Johannesson, and Mikael Lebram, "Sidh–a game based firefighter training simulation," in "2007 11th International Conference Information Visualization (IV'07)" IEEE 2007, pp. 899–907.

Baron, Reuben M and David A Kenny, "The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations.," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1986, *51* (6), 1173.

BinSubaih, Ahmed, Steve Maddock, and Daniela Romano, "Developing a serious game for police training," in "Handbook of research on effective electronic gaming in education," IGI Global, 2009, pp. 451–477.

Boyle, Elizabeth, Thomas M Connolly, and Thomas Hainey, "The role of psychology in understanding the impact of computer games," *Entertainment Computing*, 2011, *2* (2), 69–74.

Bradley, Margaret M, Mark K Greenwald, Margaret C Petry, and Peter J Lang, "Remembering pictures: Pleasure and arousal in memory," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 1992, *18* (2), 379.

Brennan, Mary, Mary McCarthy, and Christopher Ritson, "Why do consumers deviate from best microbiological food safety advice? An examination of 'high-risk'consumers on the island of Ireland," *Appetite*, 2007, *49* (2), 405–418.

Byrd-Bredbenner, Carol, Jacqueline Berning, Jennifer Martin-Biggers, and Virginia Quick, "Food safety in home kitchens: a synthesis of the literature," *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 2013, *10* (9), 4060–4085.

Byrne, Sahara and Philip Solomon Hart, "The boomerang effect a synthesis of findings and a preliminary theoretical framework," *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 2009, *33* (1), 3–37.

CDC, "Food safety," 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/foodsafety/index.html.

Chapman, Hanah A, "Enhanced recall of disgusting relative to frightening photographs is not due to organisation," *Cognition and Emotion*, 2018, *32* (6), 1220–1230.

_ , Kristen Johannes, Jordan L Poppenk, Morris Moscovitch, and Adam K Anderson, "Evidence for the differential salience of disgust and fear in episodic memory," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 2013, *142* (4), 1100.

Chow, Ching Yue, Reisya Rizki Riantiningtyas, Mie Bojer Kanstrup, Maria Papavasileiou, Gie Djin Liem, and Annemarie Olsen, "Can games change children's eating behaviour? A review of gamification and serious games," *Food Quality and Preference*, 2020, *80*, 103823.

Clark, Jeffrey, Joel Reynolds, and Philip G Crandall, "Perceptions of a video game to promote handwashing habits in foodservice," *Food Control*, 2020, *107*, 106772.

Croucher, Camilla J, Andrew J Calder, Cristina Ramponi, Philip J Barnard, and Fionnuala C Murphy, "Disgust enhances the recollection of negative emotional images," *PloS one*, 2011, *6* (11), e26571.

Cugelman, Brian, "Gamification: what it is and why it matters to digital health behavior change developers," *JMIR Serious Games*, 2013, *1* (1), e3.

Curtis, Val, Robert Aunger, and Tamer Rabie, "Evidence that disgust evolved to protect from risk of disease," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 2004, *271* (suppl_4), S131–S133.

da Cunha, Diogo Thimoteo, Veridiana Vera de Rosso, Mariana Bessi Pereira, and Elke Stedefeldt, "The differences between observed and self-reported food safety practices: a study with food handlers using structural equation modeling," *Food Research International*, 2019, *125*, 108637.

Deater-Deckard, Kirby, Mido Chang, and Michael E Evans, "Engagement states and learning from educational games," *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 2013, *2013* (139), 21–30.

DeSmet, Ann, Dimitri Van Ryckeghem, Sofie Compernolle, Tom Baranowski, Debbe Thompson, Geert Crombez, Karolien Poels, Wendy Van Lippevelde, Sara Bastiaensens, Katrien Van Cleemput et al., "A meta-analysis of serious digital games for healthy lifestyle promotion," *Preventive Medicine*, 2014, *69*, 95–107.

Deterding, Sebastian, Dan Dixon, Rilla Khaled, and Lennart Nacke, "From game design elements to gamefulness: defining gamification," in "Proceedings of the 15th international academic MindTrek conference: Envisioning future media environments" ACM 2011, pp. 9–15.

Dewey-Mattia, Daniel, Karunya Manikonda, Aron J Hall, Matthew E Wise, and Samuel J Crowe, "Surveillance for foodborne disease outbreaks—United States, 2009–2015," *MMWR Surveillance Summaries*, 2018, *67* (10), 1.

Dillard, James Price and Lijiang Shen, "Threat appeals as multi-emotion messages: An argument structure model of fear and disgust," *Human Communication Research*, 2018, *44* (2), 103–126.

Dohmen, Thomas, Armin Falk, David Huffman, Uwe Sunde, Jürgen Schupp, and Gert G Wagner, "Individual risk attitudes: Measurement, determinants, and behavioral consequences," *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2011, *9* (3), 522–550.

EFSA and ECDC, "The European Union summary report on trends and sources of zoonoses, zoonotic agents and food-borne outbreaks in 2017," *EFSA Journal*, 2018, *16* (12), e05500.

Evans, Ellen W and Elizabeth C Redmond, "Older adult consumers' attitudes and perceptions of risk, control, and responsibility for food safety in the domestic kitchen," *Journal of Food Protection*, 2019, *82* (3), 371–378.

Fischer, Arnout RH and Lynn J Frewer, "Food-Safety Practices in the Domestic Kitchen: Demographic, Personality, and Experiential Determinants 1," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2008, *38* (11), 2859–2884.

Gagnon, Marilou, Jean Daniel Jacob, and Dave Holmes, "Governing through (in) security: a critical analysis of a fear-based public health campaign," *Critical Public Health*, 2010, *20* (2), 245–256.

Haidt, Jonathan, Clark McCauley, and Paul Rozin, "Individual differences in sensitivity to disgust: A scale sampling seven domains of disgust elicitors," *Personality and Individual Differences*, 1994, *16* (5), 701–713.

_ , Paul Rozin, Clark McCauley, and Sumio Imada, "Body, psyche, and culture: The relationship between disgust and morality," *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 1997, *9* (1), 107–131.

Hamari, Juho, Jonna Koivisto, and Harri et al. Sarsa, "Does Gamification Work? A Literature Review of Empirical Studies on Gamification," in "HICSS," Vol. 14 2014, pp. 3025–3034.

Harrison, Judy A, "Teaching Children to Wash Their Hands—Wash Your Paws, Georgia! Handwashing Education Initiative," *Food Protection Trends*, 2012, *32* (3), 116–123.

Hasher, Lynn, David Goldstein, and Thomas Toppino, "Frequency and the conference of referential validity," *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 1977, *16* (1), 107–112.

Hicks, Raymond and Dustin Tingley, "Causal mediation analysis," *Stata Journal*, 2011, *11* (4), 605–619.

Höchsmann, Christoph, Denis Infanger, Christopher Klenk, Karsten Königstein, Steffen P Walz, and Arno Schmidt-Trucksäss, "Effectiveness of a Behavior Change Technique–Based Smartphone Game to Improve Intrinsic Motivation and Physical Activity Adherence in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes: Randomized Controlled Trial," *JMIR Serious Games*, 2019, *7* (1), e11444.

Hooff, Johanna C Van, Melanie van Buuringen, Ihsane El M'rabet, Margot de Gier, and Lilian van Zalingen, "Disgust-specific modulation of early attention processes," *Acta Psychologica*, 2014, *152*, 149–157.

Hornik, Robert, "The knowledge-behavior gap in public information campaigns: A development communication view," *Information Campaigns: Balancing Social Values and Social Change*, 1989, pp. 113–138.

Imai, Kosuke, Luke Keele, and Dustin Tingley, "A general approach to causal mediation analysis.," *Psychological Methods*, 2010, *15* (4), 309.

Imbens, Guido W and Jeffrey M Wooldridge, "Recent developments in the econometrics of program evaluation," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 2009, *47* (1), 5–86.

Iweka, Obiajulu, Shuli Liu, Ashish Shukla, and Da Yan, "Energy and behaviour at home: A review of intervention methods and practices," *Energy Research & Social Science*, 2019, *57*, 101238.

Jacob, Casey, Lisa Mathiasen, and Douglas Powell, "Designing effective messages for microbial food safety hazards," *Food Control*, 2010, *21* (1), 1–6.

Johnson, Daniel, Sebastian Deterding, Kerri-Ann Kuhn, Aleksandra Staneva, Stoyan Stoyanov, and Leanne Hides, "Gamification for health and wellbeing: A systematic review of the literature," *Internet Interventions*, 2016, *6*, 89–106.

Kasza, Gyula, Joachim Scholderer, Gajendira Sivajothi, Teresa Mylord, Lars Münter, Alicia Demirjian, Tekla Izsó, and Eszter Csenki, "Report on applied risk communication policy models," 2019. Unpublished, but see: https://safeconsume.eu/articles/non-authority-initiatives-and-best-practices-related-to-food-safety-risk-communication.

Ke, Fengfeng, "A qualitative meta-analysis of computer games as learning tools (chapter 1)(pp. 1–33)," 2009.

Kensinger, Elizabeth A and Suzanne Corkin, "Two routes to emotional memory: Distinct neural processes for valence and arousal," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2004, *101* (9), 3310–3315.

Koch, Alexander K, Dan Mønster, Julia Nafziger, and Nina Veflen, "A gamification approach for debunking food safety myths," October 2020. OSF, osf.io/mhqet.

Koch, Alexander K., Dan Mønster, Julia Nafziger, and Nina Veflen, "Fostering safe food handling among consumers: Data from an online survey experiment with 1,973 consumers from Norway and the UK," December 2021. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5782834.

Koivisto, Jonna and Juho Hamari, "The rise of motivational information systems: A review of gamification research," *International Journal of Information Management*, 2019, *45*, 191–210.

Lange, Marie, "Food safety learning in home and consumer studies: Teachers' and students' perspectives." PhD dissertation, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis 2017.

_ , Helen Göranzon, and Ingela Marklinder, "Self-reported food safety knowledge and behaviour among Home and Consumer Studies students," *Food Control*, 2016, *67*, 265–272.

Langsrud, Solveig, Oddvin Sørheim, Silje Elisabeth Skuland, Valérie Lengard Almli, Merete Rusås Jensen, Magnhild Seim Grøvlen, Øydis Ueland, and Trond Møretrø, "Cooking chicken at home: Common or recommended approaches to judge doneness may not assure sufficient inactivation of pathogens," *PloS one*, 2020, *15* (4), e0230928.

Lieberoth, Andreas, Niels Holm Jensen, and Thomas Bredahl, "Selective psychological effects of nudging, gamification and rational information in converting commuters from cars to buses: A controlled field experiment," *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 2018, *55.*

Lowensteyn, Ilka, Violette Berberian, Claudie Berger, Deborah Da Costa, Lawrence Joseph, and Steven A Grover, "The Sustainability of a Workplace Wellness Program That Incorporates Gamification Principles: Participant Engagement and Health Benefits After 2 Years," *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 2019, *33* (6), 850–858.

Lupton, Deborah, "The pedagogy of disgust: the ethical, moral and political implications of using disgust in public health campaigns," *Critical Public Health*, 2015, *25* (1), 4–14.

Martínez-Durá, Rafael J, Miguel Arevalillo-Herráez, Ignacio García-Fernández, Miguel A Gamón-Giménez, and Angel Rodríguez-Cerro, "Serious games for health and safety training," in "Serious Games and Edutainment Applications," Springer, 2011, pp. 107–124.

Moeck, Ella K, Lucy A Matson, and Melanie KT Takarangi, "Mechanisms underlying memory enhancement for disgust over fear," *Cognition and Emotion*, 2021, pp. 1–7.

Moore, Carla J, Cori L Sweet, Judy A Harrison, and Karen L Franck, "Validating Responses to a Food Safety Survey with Observations of Food Preparation Behaviors Among Limited Resource Populations," *Food Protection Trends*, 2019, *39* (6), 449–460.

Morales, Andrea C, Eugenia C Wu, and Gavan J Fitzsimons, "How disgust enhances the effectiveness of fear appeals," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 2012, *49* (3), 383–393.

Møretrø, Trond, Christophe Nguyen-The, Pierrine Didier, Isabelle Maître, Tekla Izsó, Gyula Kasza, Silje E Skuland, Maria João Cardoso, Vania B Ferreira, Paula Teixeira et al., "Consumer practices and prevalence of Campylobacter, Salmonella and norovirus in kitchens from six European countries," *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 2021, *347*, 109172.

Namee, Brian Mac, Pauline Rooney, Patrick Lindstrom, Andrew Ritchie, Frances Boylan, and Greg Burke, "Serious gordon using serious games to teach food safety in the kitchen," 2006. working paper, Dublin Institute of Technology.

Nauta, Maarten J, Arnout RH Fischer, Esther D Van Asselt, Aarieke EI De Jong, Lynn J Frewer, and Rob De Jonge, "Food safety in the domestic environment: the effect of consumer risk information on human disease risks," *Risk Analysis*, 2008, *28* (1), 179–192.

NHS, "How to prepare and cook food safely," 2020. https://www.nhs.uk/live-well/eat-well/how-to-prepare-and-cook-food-safely/.

Olsen, Nina Veflen, Elin Røssvoll, Solveig Langsrud, and Joachim Scholderer, "Hamburger hazards and emotions," *Appetite*, 2014, *78*, 95–101.

Patel, Mitesh S, Emelia J Benjamin, Kevin G Volpp, Caroline S Fox, Dylan S Small, Joseph M Massaro, Jane J Lee, Victoria Hilbert, Maureen Valentino, Devon H Taylor et al., "Effect of a game-based intervention designed to enhance social incentives to increase physical activity among families: the BE FIT randomized clinical trial," *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 2017, *177* (11), 1586–1593.

Quick, Virginia, Kirsten W Corda, Barbara Chamberlin, Donald W Schaffner, and Carol Byrd-Bredbenner, "Ninja Kitchen to the Rescue: Evaluation of a food safety education game for middle school youth," *British Food Journal*, 2013, *115* (5), 686–699.

_ , _ , Jennifer Martin-Biggers, Barbara Chamberlin, Donald W Schaffner, and Carol Byrd-Bredbenner, "Short food safety videos promote peer networking and behavior change," *British Food Journal*, 2015.

Ravaja, Niklas, Marko Turpeinen, Timo Saari, Sampsa Puttonen, and Liisa Keltikangas-Järvinen, "The psychophysiology of James Bond: Phasic emotional responses to violent video game events.," *Emotion*, 2008, *8* (1), 114.

Ravarotto, Licia, Stefania Crovato, Claudio Mantovani, Fabiano D'Este, Anna Pinto, and Giulia Mascarello, "Reducing microbiological risk in the kitchen: piloting consensus conference methodology as a communication strategy," *Journal of Risk Research*, 2016, *19* (7), 934–950.

Reber, Rolf and Norbert Schwarz, "Effects of perceptual fluency on judgments of truth," *Consciousness and Cognition*, 1999, *8* (3), 338–342.

Rozin, P, J Haidt, and CR McCauley, "Disgust In: Lewis M, Haviland-Jones JM, Barrett LF, editors," *Handbook of emotions. 3rd edition New York: Guilford*, 2008.

Rozin, Paul and April E Fallon, "A perspective on disgust.," *Psychological Review*, 1987, *94* (1), 23.

Sailer, Michael and Lisa Homner, "The gamification of learning: A meta-analysis," *Educational Psychology Review*, 2020, *32* (1), 77–112.

Scallan, Elaine, Robert M Hoekstra, Frederick J Angulo, Robert V Tauxe, Marc-Alain Widdowson, Sharon L Roy, Jeffery L Jones, and Patricia M Griffin, "Foodborne illness acquired in the United States—major pathogens," *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 2011, *17* (1), 7.

Schwarz, Norbert and Daphna Oyserman, "Asking questions about behavior: Cognition, communication, and questionnaire construction," *American Journal of Evaluation*, 2001, *22* (2), 127–160.

Sivaramalingam, Bhairavi, Ian Young, Mai T Pham, Lisa Waddell, Judy Greig, Mariola Mascarenhas, and Andrew Papadopoulos, "Scoping review of research on the effectiveness of food-safety education interventions directed at consumers," *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease*, 2015, *12* (7), 561–570.

Skuland, Silje Elisabeth, "European food safety: Mapping critical food practices and cultural differences in France, Norway, Portugal, Romania and the UK," *Research report*, 2020.

Steptoe, Andrew, Tessa M Pollard, and Jane Wardle, "Development of a measure of the motives underlying the selection of food: the food choice questionnaire," *Appetite*, 1995, *25* (3), 267–284.

Talmi, Deborah and Lucy M McGarry, "Accounting for immediate emotional memory enhancement," *Journal of Memory and Language*, 2012, *66* (1), 93–108.

Thaivalappil, Abhinand, Ian Young, Charles Paco, Apiramy Jeyapalan, and Andrew Papadopoulos, "Food safety and the older consumer: A systematic review and meta-regression of their knowledge and practices at home," *Food Control*, 2019, p. 106782.

Townsend, Marilyn S, Margaret Johns, Mical Kay Shilts, and Lucrecia Farfan-Ramirez, "Evaluation of a USDA nutrition education program for low-income youth," *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, 2006, *38* (1), 30–41.

Trifiletti, Elena, Stefania Crovato, Dora Capozza, Emilio Paolo Visintin, and Licia Ravarotto, "Evaluating the effects of a message on attitude and intention to eat raw meat: salmonellosis prevention," *Journal of Food Protection*, 2012, *75* (2), 394–399.

Walter, Nathan and Sheila T Murphy, "How to unring the bell: A meta-analytic approach to correction of misinformation," *Communication Monographs*, 2018, *85* (3), 423–441.

Wemyss, Devon, Francesca Cellina, Evelyn Lobsiger-Kägi, Vanessa de Luca, and Roberta Castri, "Does it last? Long-term impacts of an app-based behavior change intervention on household electricity savings in Switzerland," *Energy Research & Social Science*, 2019, *47*, 16–27.

WHO, "Statistical Information on Food-Borne Disease in Europe. Microbiological and Chemical Hazards," in "FAO/WHO Pan-European conference on food quality and safety" Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Budapest, Hungary, 25–28 February 2002 2002.

— , *Five keys to safer food manual*, Geneva: WHO Press, 2006.

— , *WHO estimates of the global burden of foodborne diseases: foodborne disease burden epidemiology reference group 2007-2015*, World Health Organization, 2015.

— , "23 million people falling ill from unsafe food each year in Europe is just the tip of the iceberg," 2019. https://www.euro.who.int/en/media-centre/sections/press-releases/2019/23-million-people-falling-ill-from-unsafe-food-each-year-in-europe-is-just-the-tip-of-the-iceberg.

— , "World Food Safety Day 2021," 2021. https://www.who.int/campaigns/world-food-safety-day/2021.

Wood, Wendy and David T Neal, "A new look at habits and the habit-goal interface.," *Psychological Review*, 2007, *114* (4), 843.

— **and** — , "The habitual consumer," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 2009, *19* (4), 579–592.

Young, Ian, Danielle Reimer, Judy Greig, Patricia Turgeon, Richard Meldrum, and Lisa Waddell, "Psychosocial and health-status determinants of safe food handling among consumers: A systematic review and meta-analysis," *Food Control*, 2017, *78*, 401–411.

_ , _ , _ , **Richard Meldrum, Patricia Turgeon, and Lisa Waddell**, "Explaining consumer safe food handling through behavior-change theories: a systematic review," *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease*, 2017, *14* (11), 609–622.

_ , **Lisa Waddell, Shannon Harding, Judy Greig, Mariola Mascarenhas, Bhairavi Sivaramalingam, Mai T Pham, and Andrew Papadopoulos**, "A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of food safety education interventions for consumers in developed countries," *BMC Public Health*, 2015, *15* (1), 822.

Young, Vicki L, Carla L Brown, Catherine Hayes, and Cliodna AM McNulty, "Review of risk communication and education strategies around food hygiene and safety for children and young people," *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 2019, *84*, 64–67.

Tables

Table 1: Overview of treatments and time line

	Date 1			Date 1 + 7 days
Treatment	Pre-Survey	Information Video	Game	Post Survey
Control	✓			✓
Info	✓	Neutral frame		✓
Game	✓	Neutral frame	✓	✓
DisgustGame	✓	Disgust frame	✓	✓

Table 2: Mediation of the Game treatment effects on behavior trough efficacy beliefs

	Total effect[a]	Direct effect	Indirect effect[b]	Percentage mediated[c]
Game	0.20***	0.17***	0.03***	15.51***
DisgustGame	0.23***	0.19***	0.04***	17.58***

[a] Total effect of treatment on targeted behavior. [a] Effect mediated through targeted efficacy beliefs, [C] Indirect effect as percentage of the total effect. * p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01 based on bootstrapped confidence intervals using the `medeff` package for STATA (Hicks and Tingley, 2011). Controls (not reported): targeted efficacy beliefs and behavior at baseline and the basic and extended control variables listed in Supplementary Section S.2.1.

Figures

Figure 1: Screenshots from the information videos



Journal Pre-proof

Figure 2: Screenshot of the game



Figure 3: Average treatment effects for the main outcomes



Note: Difference-in-differences estimates. * p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Based on Supplementary Table S.7.

Figure 4: Mediation



Online Supplement for
Fostering safe food handling: Causal evidence on game- and video-based online interventions

‡

December 2021

‡

S.1 Further analyses

S.1.1 Details on sampling

Kantar Gallup contacted 12,000 panelists in Norway and the UK, out of which 4,122 responded to the initial invitation (34 percent of invitees). Among these, 1,275 did not meet the eligibility requirements and were screened out. This left 2,847 participants who started the study, out of which 1,621 (Norway: 882, UK: 739) completed the required first part of their respective condition (57 percent completion rate). 1,087 (Norway: 588, UK: 499) participants (33 percent attrition) completed the second part of the study (the post-survey).

S.1.2 Robustness checks

Our difference in difference estimation approach accounts for potential imbalances at baseline. To identify the causal effect, the approach assumes that, in the absence of treatment, the treatment and control follow the same trend. Adding additional controls can account for possible differences in the trend. Tables S.8-S.10 show that including controls does not affect the estimated treatment effects. For some participants, household income is not available and we hence excluded this measure from the control variables. Adding them reduces the sample size but does not affect the average treatment effects, as shown in Tables S.11 and S.12. These tables also report coefficients on the control variables.

As an additional robustness check, we use Propensity Score Matching to match individuals based on their likelihood, conditional on observables, of being in the treatment condition and estimate the difference in difference. Again, the estimated average treatment effects are robust (see Tables S.8-S.10).

To assess robustness of our findings to parametric assumptions, we re-estimate our main specification using bootstrapped standard errors (see Table S.14). As ordinary least squares regression is sensitive to outliers, we also perform Quantile Difference in Differences estimation to obtain difference in difference estimates for the median and find that our qualitative results are robust. (see Table S.14).

A subtle issue related to the targeted behaviors could potentially bias our findings. Some questions were conditional on the behavior of the person in the week before. First, for those individuals who had not prepared meat in the week before, we asked about questions about meat preparation in a typical week rather than last week. Second, for targeted behaviors 1-3, we asked participants to consider a specific situation within the last week where they cooked a warm lunch or dinner with < *meat* >. If they had previously answered that they had prepared chicken during the last week then < *meat* > was replaced with *chicken*. If they had not prepared chicken, but indicated that they prepared minced meat last weak, then < *meat* > was replaced with *minced meat*, otherwise < *meat* > was replaced with *meat or poultry*. For participants in the minced meat category or who had not prepared any meat, the pre-post comparison of the target behavior 3 (Did you rinse a piece of raw meat) potentially are blurred because we do not expect that people would rinse minced meat. Excluding such observations reduces the sample from 1,087 to 913 participants but does not affect the conclusions from the main analysis (see Table S.13).

S.1.2.1 Individual outcomes

In the main analysis we used aggregated responses for blocks of questions. In Figures S.2 - S.7 we estimate the average treatment effects (ATE) at the individual item level. The purpose of these additional analyses is not to test a broader set of independent hypotheses but to assess the robustness of our main analysis and to provide insights that allow a better understanding of the potential mechanisms driving the main findings.

For the directly targeted efficacy beliefs in Figure S.2, there is no clear difference between *Info* and *Game*, in line with the main findings. But the ATEs for *DisgustGame* – marked by the large gray circle – are consistently higher than the ATEs for the other two treatments (with the exception of the item on rinsing unwashed vegetables and fruit; but here the ATEs are all close to each other and not statistically distinguishable). For the beliefs in myths in Figure S.4, there is a similar tendency of the ATEs for *DisgustGame* to be largest, yet the differences to the other treatments are less consistent.

For the indirectly targeted or non-targeted efficacy beliefs in Figure S.3, there is no clear pattern of differences in ATEs across treatments, in line with the main findings.

For the targeted behaviors in Figures S.5 and S.6, there is a pattern of the *Game* and *DisgustGame* treatments having larger ATEs compared to *Info*. In particular, there are significant positive ATEs for the individual items related to handling meat (see Figure S.5) and rinsing fruits and vegetables even if they are to be peeled (see Figure S.6).

S.1.2.2 Moderation

An alternative to the test of Secondary hypotheses 7 and 8 that we offer in the main text based on the difference-in-differences framework is to estimate a classical moderation model based on the post-survey outcomes:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Z_i + \beta_2 Mo_i + \beta_3 Z_i Mo_i + \beta_4 X_i + \epsilon_i,$$

where Y_i is the outcome (targeted efficacy beliefs, beliefs in myths, or targeted behavior), Z_i is a treatment dummy that indicates whether a participant was in the control condition or in the treatment condition of interest, Mo_i is the moderator variable (disgust sensitivity), $Z_i Mo_i$ is the interaction between the previous two variables, and X_i is a set of control variables (targeted efficacy beliefs or beliefs in myths and behavior at baseline and the basic and extended control variables listed in Section S.2.1).

If the treatment effect varies in magnitude as a function of the value of the moderator, we should find a significant coefficient b_3. We reject moderation for all outcomes (see Table S.15)

S.2 Further details on methods

S.2.1 List of control variables

- BCOV 1. Age
- BCOV 2. Female: dummy=1 if the participant is female
- BCOV 3. Single household: dummy=1 if the participant lives in a single-person household
- BCOV 4. Dummies for highest level of education (Primary school, High-school/Tertiary education, University, Postgraduate)
- BCOV 5. Dummies for household income. Purchasing power adjusted (PPP) compared to EU27 as baseline, EUR based on 2019 PPP adjustment factors for NOK and GBP.[1]
    - Income 1: Less than 13,279 EUR (NO: 200,000 NOK)/ 13,883 EUR (UK: 15,000 GBP)
    - Income 2: Above category 1 & less than 26,559 EUR (NO: 400,000 NOK)/ 25,831 EUR (UK: 28,000 GBP)
    - Income 3: Above category 2 & less than 39,883 EUR (NO: 600,000 NOK)/ 36,902 EUR (UK: 40,000 GBP)
    - Income 4: Above category 4 & less than 53,118 EUR (NO: 800,000 NOK)/ 50,740 EUR (UK: 55,000 GBP)
    - Income 5: Above category 5
- BCOV 6. FreqMeatPre: How often the participant prepares a warm lunch or dinner with meat (including poultry) on average
- BCOV 7. Disgust sensitivity: measured by the 7-item food disgust picture scale of (Ammann et al., 2018)
- BCOV 8. FreqComputerGames: Frequency of playing computer games
- BCOV 9. WorkedFoodSector: Dummy for whether the participant has ever worked in the food industry or in gastronomy/food service, coded 1 if yes and 0 if no/don't know.

[1]Source: Statistics Norway, PPP adjustment factor for "A01 Actual individual consumption", https://www.ssb.no/en/statbank/table/13007/.

- BCOV 10. HealthSector: Dummy for whether the participant has ever worked as a health professional (health worker, nurse, doctor, physician, nutritionist, ...), coded 1 if yes and 0 if no/don't know.
- BCOV11. HadFoodPoison: Dummy for whether the participant has ever had food poisoning, coded 1 if yes and 0 if no/don't know.
- BCOV 12. Risk tolerance: measured by the question of (Dohmen et al., 2011)

Extended set of control variables (variables in addition to basic control variables):

- ECOV 1. No of kids: Number of children (0,1,2,3, 3 or more)[2]
- ECOV 2. Stressed: How often the participant felt stressed when cooking because of time pressure (pre-survey)
- ECOV 3. ConcernedFoodPois: Food-related risk tolerance: Are you a person who is concerned about getting sick from food poisoning or are you not concerned about getting sick from food poisoning? Scale: 0: "not at all concerned about getting sick" ... 10: "very concerned about getting sick"
- ECOV 4. HamburgerPref: Preference for eating hamburger meat pink inside rather than well done, measured by a question showing two different hamburgers (A: pink inside, B: well done). Scale: I would only eat hamburger A (1), I would prefer by a large margin to eat hamburger A (2), I would slightly prefer to eat hamburger A (3), I would like both hamburgers equally (4), I would slightly prefer to eat hamburger B (5), I would prefer by a large margin to eat hamburger B (6), I would only eat hamburger B (7)
- ECOV 5. PrefHygienic: Importance of the meal being prepared under hygienic circumstances.
- ECOV 6. PrefFast: Importance of the meal being fast to prepare
- ECOV 7. PrefKitchenClean: Importance of not messing up the kitchen when cooking
- ECOV 8. PrefNoWaste: Importance of avoiding food waste

Comments:

- ECOV 5-8 are based on questions about what is important when shopping for, preparing, and cooking a meal: Scale: Not important (1), Low importance (2), Neutral (3), Slightly important (4), Very important (5).
- BCOV 12 and ECOV 3/ ECOV 3 and 4, respectively, might be collinear. Thus, we might include only one question in the main analysis and use the other question(s) to assess robustness.

[2] Contrary to expectations, the survey company could not provide us with the pre-registered variable "ECOV 1. Age of the youngest child (if child at home)". We use the number of children instead.

S.2.2 Ex ante power analysis

The minimum detectable effect size is 0.251 for comparisons of two conditions (N=250 per treatment) with a two-tailed t-test with alpha=0.05 and power=0.8. If the two game treatments are pooled (N_1=500 and N_2=250), the minimum detectable effect size is 0.217. If, in addition, the control condition is pooled with the information treatment (N_1=500 and N_2=500), the minimum detectable effect size is 0.177.

S.3 Tables

Table S.1: Sample

	All	NO	UK	Control		Information		Game		DisgustGame	
				NO	UK	NO	UK	NO	UK	NO	UK
Part 1	1,621	882	739	242	194	231	176	170	175	239	194
Duration[a]		42	36	16	14	21	16	72	59	62	61
Part 2	1,087	588	499	146	126	145	125	139	124	158	124
Duration[a]		10	8	10	9	10	8	10	8	9	8
Attrition	534	294	240	96	68	86	51	31	51	81	70

Out of 12,000 panelists, 4,122 responded to the initial invitation. 1,275 did not meet the eligibility requirements and were screened out, leaving 2,847 who started the study.

[a] Median duration in minutes.

Table S.2: Gender composition

	All	NO	UK	Control		Information		Game		DisgustGame	
				NO	UK	NO	UK	NO	UK	NO	UK
Female	553	301	252	72	63	74	64	71	62	84	63
Male	534	287	247	74	63	71	61	68	62	74	61
All	1,087	588	499	146	126	145	125	139	124	158	124

Table S.3: Balance: Pre-survey only vs completed study

Variable	Sample	Pre-survey only	Difference
Female	0.509	0.551	0.042
	(0.500)	(0.498)	(0.113)
Age	37.341	35.629	-1.712***
	(8.702)	(8.966)	(0.000)
Fulltime	0.638	0.610	-0.028
	(0.481)	(0.488)	(0.276)
Income1	0.099	0.088	-0.011
	(0.299)	(0.283)	(0.476)
Income2	0.042	0.026	-0.016
	(0.201)	(0.161)	(0.104)
Income3	0.100	0.094	-0.006
	(0.300)	(0.292)	(0.699)
Income4	0.172	0.187	0.015
	(0.378)	(0.391)	(0.477)
Income5	0.377	0.251	-0.127***
	(0.485)	(0.434)	(0.000)
Parttime	0.102	0.107	0.005
	(0.303)	(0.309)	(0.776)
Selfemployed	0.047	0.049	0.002
	(0.212)	(0.215)	(0.876)
Retired	0.006	0.002	-0.005
	(0.080)	(0.043)	(0.136)
Unemployed	0.086	0.090	0.004
	(0.280)	(0.286)	(0.773)
Studies	0.086	0.094	0.007
	(0.281)	(0.292)	(0.638)
Homemaker	0.024	0.026	0.002
	(0.153)	(0.160)	(0.783)
PrimarySchool	0.106	0.092	-0.014
	(0.308)	(0.289)	(0.368)
HighSchoolTertiary	0.420	0.414	-0.006
	(0.494)	(0.493)	(0.829)
Postgraduate	0.274	0.253	-0.021
	(0.446)	(0.435)	(0.357)
Householdsize	2.629	2.794	0.165**
	(1.198)	(1.228)	(0.011)

Continued on next page

Table S.3 – continued from previous page

Variable	Sample	Pre-survey only	Difference
Noofkids	0.322	0.455	0.133***
	(0.716)	(0.822)	(0.001)
FreqMeatPre	4.896	4.963	0.067
	(0.936)	(0.970)	(0.189)
ReadyMealPre	1.999	2.030	0.031
	(1.012)	(1.012)	(0.564)
InfoSeekPre	1.439	1.644	0.205***
	(0.846)	(1.075)	(0.000)
MincedMeatPre	2.098	2.380	0.283***
	(0.919)	(1.043)	(0.000)
ChickenPre	2.386	2.521	0.134**
	(0.968)	(1.081)	(0.015)
OtherMeatPre	2.397	2.549	0.152***
	(0.993)	(1.110)	(0.007)
StressedPre	1.735	2.071	0.336***
	(1.087)	(1.310)	(0.000)
Observations	1,087	534	1,621

Table S.4: Descriptive statistics for the main outcomes

	Targeted efficacy beliefs		Beliefs in myths		Targeted behavior		Non-targeted efficacy beliefs		Non-targeted behavior	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Control (N=272)										
	0.00	- 0.06	- 0.02	- 0.08	0.02	0.01	- 0.05	- 0.06	0.01	0.03
	(0.34)	(0.31)	(0.52)	(0.58)	(0.44)	(0.44)	(0.57)	(0.59)	(0.59)	(0.56)
Info (N=270)										
	- 0.01	0.07	0.03	0.04	- 0.00	0.05	0.01	- 0.02	0.04	0.00
	(0.31)	(0.34)	(0.55)	(0.58)	(0.42)	(0.46)	(0.53)	(0.55)	(0.58)	(0.59)
Game (N=263)										
	0.00	0.09	0.01	0.08	- 0.02	0.17	0.01	- 0.00	- 0.01	0.00
	(0.34)	(0.40)	(0.54)	(0.57)	(0.42)	(0.46)	(0.53)	(0.51)	(0.60)	(0.59)
DisgustGame (N=282)										
	0.00	0.18	- 0.02	0.07	0.01	0.23	0.02	- 0.00	0.02	0.01
	(0.33)	(0.40)	(0.55)	(0.60)	(0.42)	(0.46)	(0.48)	(0.54)	(0.56)	(0.57)
N=	1,087	1,087	1,087	1,087	1,087	1,087	1,087	1,087	1,087	1,087

The individual components of the aggregate outcome measures are standardized based on the pre-survey mean and standard deviation in parentheses.

Table S.6: Balance of covariates at baseline

Variable	Control	Info	Game	DisgustGame	Info vs Control	Game vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control
Female	0.496	0.511	0.506	0.521	0.015	0.009	0.025
	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.030)
Age	38.430	37.689	36.236	36.989	-0.741	-2.194***	-1.441***
	(8.637)	(8.560)	(8.676)	(8.795)	(0.522)	(0.529)	(0.524)

Continued on next page

Table S.5: Balance of main outcomes at baseline

Targeted efficacy beliefs	Myth beliefs	Targeted behavior	Non-targeted efficacy beliefs	Non-targeted behavior
Info vs Control				
-0.01	0.04	-0.02	0.06	0.03
Game vs Control				
0.04*	0.06	0.06	0.05	-0.02
DisgustGame vs Control				
0.09***	0.04	0.10	0.06	0.01

Differences (t-test): * p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

Table S.6 – continued from previous page

Variable	Control	Info	Game	DisgustGame	Info vs Control	Game vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control
Fulltime	0.680	0.641	0.616	0.617	-0.039	-0.064**	-0.063**
	(0.467)	(0.480)	(0.487)	(0.487)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.029)
Income1	0.089	0.080	0.114	0.112	-0.009	0.025	0.023
	(0.285)	(0.271)	(0.318)	(0.316)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Income2	0.042	0.046	0.045	0.036	0.004	0.002	-0.006
	(0.202)	(0.210)	(0.207)	(0.186)	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.012)
Income3	0.106	0.101	0.093	0.100	-0.005	-0.012	-0.006
	(0.308)	(0.301)	(0.291)	(0.300)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Income4	0.148	0.151	0.195	0.192	0.003	0.047*	0.044*
	(0.356)	(0.359)	(0.397)	(0.394)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)
Income5	0.428	0.366	0.362	0.356	-0.062**	-0.066**	-0.072**
	(0.495)	(0.482)	(0.481)	(0.479)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.031)
Parttime	0.081	0.107	0.095	0.124	0.027	0.014	0.043**
	(0.273)	(0.310)	(0.294)	(0.330)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.018)
Selfemployed	0.044	0.044	0.038	0.060	0.000	-0.006	0.016
	(0.206)	(0.206)	(0.191)	(0.238)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.013)
Retired	0.007	0.007	0.004	0.007	0.000	-0.004	-0.000
	(0.086)	(0.086)	(0.062)	(0.084)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Unemployed	0.085	0.096	0.103	0.060	0.012	0.018	-0.024
	(0.278)	(0.295)	(0.304)	(0.238)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.016)
Studies	0.070	0.070	0.099	0.106	0.001	0.029*	0.037**
	(0.255)	(0.256)	(0.299)	(0.309)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Homemaker	0.018	0.026	0.038	0.014	0.008	0.020*	-0.004
	(0.134)	(0.159)	(0.191)	(0.118)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.008)
Primaryschool	0.107	0.111	0.095	0.110	0.004	-0.012	0.003
	(0.309)	(0.315)	(0.294)	(0.313)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.019)
Highschooltertiary	0.434	0.411	0.433	0.401	-0.023	-0.000	-0.033
	(0.496)	(0.492)	(0.496)	(0.490)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)
Postgraduate	0.268	0.252	0.285	0.291	-0.017	0.017	0.022
	(0.444)	(0.434)	(0.452)	(0.455)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)
Householdsize	2.662	2.629	2.601	2.622	-0.032	-0.061	-0.039
	(1.184)	(1.207)	(1.152)	(1.244)	(0.073)	(0.072)	(0.073)
Noofkids	1.305	1.322	1.354	1.309	0.017	0.048	0.003
	(0.669)	(0.697)	(0.746)	(0.750)	(0.042)	(0.043)	(0.043)
Freqmeatpre	4.923	4.848	4.894	4.918	-0.075	-0.029	-0.004
	(0.958)	(0.965)	(0.913)	(0.906)	(0.058)	(0.057)	(0.056)

Continued on next page

Table S.6 – continued from previous page

Variable	Control	Info	Game	DisgustGame	Info vs Control	Game vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control
Readymealpre	1.945	2.033	1.977	2.039	0.088	0.032	0.094
	(0.990)	(1.067)	(0.948)	(1.037)	(0.063)	(0.059)	(0.061)
Infoseekpre	1.449	1.426	1.475	1.408	-0.023	0.027	-0.041
	(0.861)	(0.826)	(0.868)	(0.830)	(0.051)	(0.053)	(0.051)
Mincedmeatpre	2.114	1.989	2.129	2.156	-0.125**	0.015	0.042
	(0.923)	(0.905)	(0.898)	(0.941)	(0.056)	(0.056)	(0.056)
Chickenpre	2.404	2.341	2.384	2.415	-0.064	-0.020	0.010
	(0.966)	(0.980)	(0.953)	(0.973)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.058)
Othermeatpre	2.412	2.330	2.338	2.500	-0.082	-0.073	0.088
	(0.993)	(1.019)	(0.958)	(0.991)	(0.061)	(0.060)	(0.060)
Stressedpre	1.684	1.770	1.715	1.770	0.087	0.031	0.086
	(1.070)	(1.146)	(1.054)	(1.076)	(0.067)	(0.065)	(0.064)
Observations	544	540	526	564	1,084	1,070	1,108

Table S.11: DID regression coefficients: Efficacy beliefs and beliefs in myths

	Efficacy beliefs			Beliefs in myths		
	Game vs Control	Information vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control	Game vs Control	Information vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control
ATE[a]	0.17***	0.14***	0.25***	0.15**	0.10	0.16**
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Age	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	-0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Female	0.05*	0.05**	0.07***	0.04	0.01	0.05
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Single household	-0.02	0.03	0.05*	-0.04	0.01	-0.02
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.05)
Primary school	-0.08	-0.04	-0.08	-0.08	-0.22**	-0.09

Differences-in-differences regressions with standard errors in parentheses: * p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01.

[a]Average treatment effect. [b]Treatment dummy. [c]Dummy for post-survey observation.

See Section S.2.1 for explanations of the control variables.

Income and single-household status are not available for all subjects.

Continued on next page

Table S.11 – continued from previous page

	Efficacy beliefs			Beliefs in myths		
	Game vs Control	Information vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control	Game vs Control	Information vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)
High-school/Tertiary	-0.04	-0.02	-0.04	-0.10	-0.10	-0.01
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
University	-0.02	-0.03	-0.04	-0.01	-0.08	-0.05
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Postgraduate	-0.09*	-0.08*	-0.10**	-0.05	-0.07	0.01
	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.09)
Income1	0.09*	0.02	0.00	0.01	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.07)
Income2	0.10*	0.03	0.11**	0.07	0.08	0.05
	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Income3	0.01	-0.01	-0.03	0.02	-0.04	0.04
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Income4	0.02	-0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.10	-0.01
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Income5	0.02	0.07**	0.05	0.02	0.00	0.04
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
FreqMeatPre	0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.01	-0.03	0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Disgust sensitivity	0.01	0.03***	0.00	0.04*	0.04**	-0.03
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
FreqComputerGames	0.00	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
WorkedFoodSector	0.02	0.06**	0.05*	-0.09**	-0.07*	-0.18***
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)
HealthSector	0.00	0.04	0.00	-0.01	0.07	0.07
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
HadFoodPoison	0.01	0.02	0.03	-0.01	0.05	0.06
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Risk tolerance	-0.02***	-0.01**	-0.01*	-0.03***	-0.04***	-0.05***

Differences-in-differences regressions with standard errors in parentheses: * p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01.

[a]Average treatment effect. [b]Treatment dummy. [c]Dummy for post-survey observation.

See Section S.2.1 for explanations of the control variables.

Income and single-household status are not available for all subjects.

Continued on next page

Table S.11 – continued from previous page

	Efficacy beliefs			Beliefs in myths		
	Game vs Control	Information vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control	Game vs Control	Information vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
No of kids	-0.00	0.02	0.00	-0.06	-0.04	-0.09**
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Stressed	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	-0.09***	-0.10***	-0.12***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
ConcernedFoodPois	0.00	0.00	0.01***	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
HamburgerPref	-0.00	0.01	0.02***	0.03**	0.05***	0.03**
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
PrefHygienic	0.06***	0.04***	0.06***	0.11***	0.07***	0.08***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)
PrefFast	-0.02	-0.05***	-0.04***	-0.00	-0.04**	-0.02
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
PrefKitchenClean	0.01	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.04***	-0.04**
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
PrefNoWaste	0.02	0.03**	0.05***	-0.01	0.02	0.06**
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Information[b]		-0.00			0.07	
		(0.03)			(0.04)	
Game[b]	0.00			0.03		
	(0.03)			(0.05)		
DisgustGame[b]			0.00			-0.00
			(0.03)			(0.05)
Post-survey[c]	-0.08***	-0.08***	-0.08***	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Constant	-0.30**	-0.28**	-0.46***	-0.03	0.39*	0.13
	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.22)	(0.20)	(0.20)
N	948	938	958	948	938	958
Adj. R^2	0.11	0.10	0.16	0.12	0.18	0.19

Differences-in-differences regressions with standard errors in parentheses: * p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01.

[a]Average treatment effect. [b]Treatment dummy. [c]Dummy for post-survey observation.

See Section S.2.1 for explanations of the control variables.

Smaller sample than main sample as income and single-household status are not available for all subjects.

Table S.7: DID estimates for the main outcomes

Targeted efficacy beliefs	Beliefs in myths	Targeted behavior	Non-targeted efficacy beliefs	Non-targeted behavior
Game vs Control (N=535)				
0.16***	0.13**	0.20***	-0.01	-0.01
(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Info vs Control (N=542)				
0.14***	0.07	0.06	-0.02	-0.06
(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.07)
Game vs Info (N=533)				
0.01	0.06	0.13**	0.01	0.05
(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.07)
DisgustGame vs Control (N=554)				
0.25***	0.15**	0.23***	-0.02	-0.03
(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.07)
DisgustGame vs Game (N=545)				
0.09**	0.01	0.03	-0.01	-0.03
(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.07)
DisgustGame vs Control (disgust sens., N=554)[a]				
0.04	-0.11	-0.02	0.03	-0.23**
(0.06)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.10)
DisgustGame vs Game (disgust sens., N=545)[a]				
0.00	-0.30***	-0.05	-0.10	-0.30***
(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Control (N=817)				
0.20***	0.14**	0.21***	-0.01	-0.02
(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Info (N=815)				
0.06	0.07	0.15***	0.01	0.04
(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.06)

Differences-in-differences estimates with standard errors in parentheses: * p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01 [a]Differences-in-differences-in-differences estimate of the difference in treatment effect for above vs below median disgust sensitivity. Regressions with control variables are reported in Tables S.8 – S.10.

Table S.8: DID estimates for targeted efficacy beliefs

	(1)	(2)	(3)	PSM[b]
Game vs Control (N=535, N=527 with controls[a])				
	0.16***	0.16***	0.16***	0.16***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Info vs Control (N=542, N=536 with controls[a])				
	0.14***	0.15***	0.15***	0.15***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Game vs Info (N=533, N=525 with controls[a])				
	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
DisgustGame vs Control (N=554, N=547 with controls[a])				
	0.25***	0.24***	0.24***	0.25***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
DisgustGame vs Game (N=545, N=536 with controls[a])				
	0.09**	0.07*	0.07*	0.05
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Control (N=817, N=805 with controls[a])				
	0.20***	0.20***	0.20***	0.21***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.04)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Info (N=815, N=803 with controls[a])				
	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)
Controls	No	Basic	Extended	No

Differences-in-differences estimates with standard errors in parentheses:
* p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. [a] Single-household status are not available for all subjects.
[b] Propensity score matching DID estimate.

Table S.9: DID estimates for beliefs in myths

	(1)	(2)	(3)	PSM[b]
Game vs Control (N=535, N=527 with controls[a])				
	0.13**	0.14**	0.14**	0.14*
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.07)
Info vs Control (N=542, N=536 with controls[a])				
	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.06
	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.07)
Game vs Info (N=533, N=525 with controls[a])				
	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.08
	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.07)
DisgustGame vs Control (N=554, N=547 with controls[a])				
	0.15**	0.16**	0.16**	0.17**
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.07)
DisgustGame vs Game (N=545, N=536 with controls[a])				
	0.01	0.02	0.02	- 0.01
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.07)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Control (N=817, N=805 with controls[a])				
	0.14**	0.15***	0.15***	0.16**
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.06)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Info (N=815, N=803 with controls[a])				
	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.06)
Controls	No	Basic	Extended	No

Differences-in-differences estimates with standard errors in parentheses:
* p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. [a] Single-household status are not available for all subjects.
[b] Propensity score matching DID estimate.

Table S.10: DID targeted behavior

	(1)	(2)	(3)	PSM[b]
Game vs Control (N=535, N=527 with controls[a])				
	0.20***	0.20***	0.20***	0.21***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.06)
Info vs Control (N=542, N=536 with controls[a])				
	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.08
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Game vs Info (N=533, N=525 with controls[a])				
	0.13**	0.14***	0.14***	0.13**
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.06)
DisgustGame vs Control (N=554, N=547 with controls[a])				
	0.23***	0.22***	0.22***	0.23***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
DisgustGame vs Game (N=545, N=536 with controls[a])				
	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.06)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Control (N=817, N=805 with controls[a])				
	0.21***	0.21***	0.21***	0.22***
	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Info (N=815, N=803 with controls[a])				
	0.15***	0.15***	0.15***	0.15***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.05)
Controls	No	Basic	Extended	No

Differences-in-differences estimates with standard errors in parentheses:
* p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. [a] Single-household status are not available for all subjects.
[b] Propensity score matching DID estimate.

Table S.12: DID regression coefficients: Targeted behavior

	Targeted behavior		
	Game vs Control	Information vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control
ATE[a]	0.22***	0.08	0.21***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Age	-0.00	-0.00**	-0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Female	0.05	0.05*	0.05*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Single household	-0.07*	0.03	-0.01
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Primary school	-0.13	-0.12	-0.17**
	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.07)
High-school/Tertiary	-0.13***	-0.09**	-0.14***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
University	-0.11**	-0.00	-0.06
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Postgraduate	0.00	0.09	-0.06
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Income1	-0.03	0.04	0.08
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Income2	0.04	0.11*	0.04
	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.07)
Income3	-0.03	-0.09	0.05
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.06)
Income4	-0.01	-0.08	0.04
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)
Income5	0.04	0.09**	0.10**
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
FreqMeatPre	0.00	0.02	0.03*
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)

Differences-in-differences regressions with standard errors in parentheses:

* p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01.

[a]Average treatment effect. [b]Treatment dummy. [c]Dummy for post-survey observation.

See Section S.2.1 for explanations of the control variables.

Income and single-household status are not available for all subjects.

Continued on next page

Table S.12 – continued from previous page

	Targeted behavior		
	Game vs Control	Information vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control
Disgust sensitivity	-0.00	0.00	0.00
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)
FreqComputerGames	0.01	0.01	0.03***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
WorkedFoodSector	-0.03	-0.07**	-0.03
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
HealthSector	0.03	0.09**	0.04
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
HadFoodPoison	0.05*	0.04	0.07***
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Risk tolerance	-0.00	-0.01*	-0.02***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
No of kids	0.07***	0.09***	0.01
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Stressed	-0.01	-0.01	-0.03**
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
ConcernedFoodPois	0.04***	0.02***	0.04***
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
HamburgerPref	-0.01	-0.00	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
PrefHygienic	0.16***	0.12***	0.12***
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
PrefFast	-0.03**	-0.04**	-0.05***
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
PrefKitchenClean	-0.00	0.01	-0.02
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
PrefNoWaste	0.00	0.01	0.02
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Information[b]		0.01	

Differences-in-differences regressions with standard errors in parentheses:

* p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01.

[a]Average treatment effect. [b]Treatment dummy. [c]Dummy for post-survey observation.

See Section S.2.1 for explanations of the control variables.

Income and single-household status are not available for all subjects.

Continued on next page

Table S.12 – continued from previous page

	Targeted behavior		
	Game vs Control	Information vs Control	DisgustGame vs Control
		(0.04)	
Game[b]	-0.01		
	(0.04)		
DisgustGame[b]			0.00
			(0.04)
Post-survey[c]	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Constant	-0.72***	-0.67***	-0.62***
	(0.14)	(0.16)	(0.15)
N	947	938	958
Adj. R^2	0.23	0.16	0.19

Differences-in-differences regressions with standard errors in parentheses:

* p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01.

[a]Average treatment effect. [b]Treatment dummy. [c]Dummy for post-survey observation.

See Section S.2.1 for explanations of the control variables.

Income and single-household status are not available for all subjects.

Table S.13: DID estimates: Targeted behavior (robustness to excluding certain subjects)

Full sample	Sample with exclusions[a]
Game vs Control (N=535[a])	
0.20***	0.20***
(0.05)	(0.06)
Info vs Control (N=542[a])	
0.06	0.05
(0.05)	(0.06)
Game vs Info (N=533[a])	
0.13**	0.15**
(0.05)	(0.06)
DisgustGame vs Control (N=554[a])	
0.23***	0.24***
(0.05)	(0.06)
DisgustGame vs Game (N=545[a])	
0.03	0.04
(0.05)	(0.06)
DisgustGame vs Control (disgust sens., N=554[a])[b]	
-0.02	0.02
(0.08)	(0.08)
DisgustGame vs Game (disgust sens., N=545[a])[b]	
-0.05	0.02
(0.08)	(0.08)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Control (N=817[a])	
0.21***	0.22***
(0.05)	(0.05)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Info (N=815[a])	
0.15***	0.17***
(0.05)	(0.05)

Differences-in-differences estimates with standard errors in parentheses: * p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01.
[a]Excluding subjects who prepared only minced meat or no meat in the weeks prior to the pre- or post-survey. [b]Differences-in-differences-in-differences estimate of the difference in treatment effect for above vs below median disgust sensitivity.

Table S.14: DID estimates: bootrapped standard errors and quantile regressions

Targeted efficacy beliefs	Beliefs in myths	Targeted behavior	Targeted efficacy beliefs	Beliefs in myths	Targeted behavior
DID bootstrapped std.err.[a]			Quantile DID[b]		
Game vs Control (N=535)					
0.16***	0.13*	0.20***	0.18***	0.03***	0.15**
(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.00)	(0.07)
Info vs Control (N=542)					
0.14***	0.07	0.06	0.16***	0.02	0.02
(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.02)	(0.07)
Game vs Info (N=533)					
0.01	0.06	0.13***	0.02	0.01	0.13*
(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.02)	(0.08)
DisgustGame vs Control (N=554)					
0.25***	0.15**	0.23***	0.27***	0.06**	0.20***
(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.02)	(0.07)
DisgustGame vs Game (N=545)					
0.09**	0.01	0.03	0.09*	0.02	0.06
(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.02)	(0.08)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Control (N=817)					
0.20***	0.14**	0.21***	0.22***	0.04***	0.17***
(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.00)	(0.06)
Game/DisgustGame (pooled) vs Info (N=815)					
0.06	0.07	0.15***	0.05	0.02**	0.15**
(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.01)	(0.07)

Differences-in-differences estimates with bootstrapped standard errors in parentheses : * p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01. Regressions with control variables are available upon request.
[a] With bootstrapped standard errors (1,000 replications).
[b] Quantile difference-in-difference regression for the median.

Table S.15: Moderation analysis

	Efficacy beliefs^a	Beliefs in myths^b	Behavior^c Behavior^c
Game vs Control (N=526)			
Game^c	0.17***	0.17***	0.20***
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Disgust sensitivity	-0.001	-0.04	0.01
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Game · (Disgust sensitivity)^d	-0.02	0.03	0.02
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Info vs Control (N=536)			
Info^c	0.15***	0.09**	0.07***
	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Disgust sensitivity	0.001	-0.04	0.02
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Info · (Disgust sensitivity)^d	0.03	0.07*	-0.01
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)
DisgustGame vs Control (N=547)			
DisgustGame^c	0.24***	0.16***	0.23***
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Disgust sensitivity	-0.0003	-0.04	0.002
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)
DisgustGame · (Disgust sensitivity)^d	-0.04	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)

Outcome measures: ^{a} targeted efficacy beliefs, ^{b} beliefs in myths, ^{c} targeted behavior.
Coefficients with standard errors in parentheses: * p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01.
^{c} Treatment dummy. ^{d} Interaction of treatment dummy and disgust senssitivity
Controls (not reported): targeted efficacy beliefs or beliefs in myths and behavior at baseline and the basic and extended control variables listed in Supplementary Section S.2.1.

961 ## S.4 Outcome variables

Table S.16: Items in "Beliefs in myths"

Description	Recoded
Targeted beliefs in myths	
Fruit and vegetables that will be peeled don't have to be washed	Yes[a]
Any food that has fallen to the floor and did not stay there longer than 5 seconds, is still edible	Yes[a]
Only poultry, not other meats, need to be well-done to be safe to eat	Yes[a]
Non-targeted beliefs in myths	
Washing your kitchen too often creates a sterile environment that is bad for building up a good immune system	Yes[a]
A small amount of alcohol is good to avoid food poisoning	Yes[a]
If the food smells and taste fine it is safe to eat	Yes[a]
Eggs with brown shells are safer than eggs with white shells	Yes[a]
Vegetarians don't get food poisoning	Yes[a]

Scale: Agree with statement: Yes (1) No (2). [a] Recoded 0=Yes, 1=No.

Table S.17: Items in "Efficacy beliefs"

Description	Recoded
Targeted efficacy beliefs	
Directly targeted	
Peeling unwashed vegetables/fruit	Yes[a]
Rinsing unwashed vegetables/fruit	No
Picking up within 5 seconds any food that has fallen to the ground	Yes[a]
Heating hamburger meat such that only the inside is pink	Yes[a]
Cooking chicken to an inside temperature of 63 degrees Celsius	Yes[a]
Rinsing a whole chicken before preparation	Yes[a]
Rinsing hands under running water without using soap	Yes[a]
Washing hands with soap under running water	No
Washing cutting boards and kitchen tools in between preparing different food items	No
Rinsing a whole melon	No
[c] Cooking an egg until soft-boiled (that is, the white is firm and the yolk is soft)	Yes[a]
Indirectly targeted	
Checking whether a food item smells fine	Yes[a]
Checking with a fork whether the chicken is well done	Yes[a]
Non-targeted efficacy beliefs	
Using brown eggs rather than white eggs	Yes[b]
Only eating organic food	Yes[b]
Only eating home grown food	Yes[b]
Only eating food produced in [UK/Norway]	Yes[b]
Drinking a small amount of alcohol with a meal	Yes[b]
Switching to a vegetarian diet	Yes[b]
Only eating raw food	Yes[a]

Scale: Increases risk by a (1) large amount (2) small amount, Has no effect on risk (3), Decreases risk by a (4) small amount (5) large amount [a] Reverse coded, [b] Recoded 3-absolute distance from (3) [c] Targeted only in the video.

Table S.18: Items in "Targeted behavior"

Description	Recoded
Targeted behavior 1-3[a] (Scale 1)	
Did you wash your hands with soap?	No
Did you clean the kitchen surface?	No
Did you rinse a piece of raw meat?	No
Targeted behavior 4-5 (Scale 2)	
I used a food thermometer	No
I did not check whether the meat is done	Yes[b]
Targeted behavior 6-21 (Scale 3)	
A whole raw chicken	Yes[c]
Raw chicken breasts	Yes[c]
Raw beef	Yes[c]
A whole lettuce	No
A whole watermelon	No
An apple	No
A mango	No
An eggplant	No
An onion	No
String beans	No
Brussels sprouts	No
Potatoes	No
Carrots	No
Berries	No
An avocado	No
Bean sprouts	No

Scale 1: Never (1), Once (2), Twice (3), 3-4 times (4), 5 times or more (5). Scale 2: Yes (1), No (2). Scale 3: How likely would you be to rinse before further preparation/consumption? No chance or almost no chance (1 in 100) (1) ... Certain or practically certain (99 in 100) (11). [a] One pre-registered behavior question (Did you clean the kitchen surface?) was accidentally omitted by the survey company and this was only noticed half-way into the data collection. We perform the main analysis without it and report in additional analyses for this measure in Supplementary Figure S.5. [b] Recoded 0=Yes, 1=No. [c] Reverse coded.

Table S.19: Items in "Non-targeted behavior"

Description	Recoded
Non-targeted behavior 1[a] (Scale 1)	
Checked the temperature of the fridge last week?	Yes[a]
Non-targeted behavior 2-3[a] (Scale 2)	
Check the use-by-date of food item when you shop?	No
Check the use-by-date of food item when you are about to prepare food?	No
Non-targeted behavior 4[a] (Scale 3)	
Last week, how often did you seek information about how to safely handle food?	No

Scale 1: Yes (1), No (2). Scale 2: No chance or almost no chance (1 in 100) (1) ... Certain or practically certain (99 in 100) (11). Scale 3: Never (1), Once (2), Twice (3), 3-4 times (4), 5 times or more (5). [a] Recoded 0=Yes, 1=No. [c] Reverse coded.

Figure S.1: Illustration of standardization procedure



962 ## S.5 Analysis of individual items

Figure S.2: DID estimates for targeted efficacy beliefs



Notes: Whenever relevant, items are recoded so that a positive change between pre- and post-survey responses indicates an improvement in beliefs (see Table S.17).

Figure S.3: DID estimates for indirectly or non- targeted efficacy beliefs



Notes: Whenever relevant, items are recoded so that a positive change between pre- and post-survey responses indicates an improvement in beliefs (see Table S.17).

Figure S.4: DID estimates for beliefs in myths



Notes: Whenever relevant, items are recoded so that a positive change between pre- and post-survey responses indicates an improvement in beliefs (see Table S.16).

Figure S.5: DID estimates for targeted behavior



Notes: Whenever relevant, items are recoded so that a positive change between pre- and post-survey responses indicates an improvement in behavior (see Table S.18). *This pre-registered behavior question was accidentally omitted by the survey company and this was only noticed half-way into the data collection.

Figure S.6: DID estimates for targeted behavior



Notes: Whenever relevant, items are recoded so that a positive change between pre- and post-survey responses indicates an improvement in behavior (see Table S.18).

Figure S.7: DID estimates for non-targeted behavior



Notes: Whenever relevant, items are recoded so that a positive change between pre- and post-survey responses indicates an improvement in behavior (see Table S.19).

S.6 Extended sample and age effects

Figure S.9-S.11 shows that treatment effects are failry consistent across the age range. To avoid clutter, the figures show the 95-percent confidence band only for the control treatment (see Supplementary Table S.20). It is worth noting, however, that confidence bands become quite wide for some of the treatments above age 65 (not shown in the figures) because there are relatively few participants in this category and they are not balanced across treatments.

Figure S.8: Average treatment effects for the main outcomes (extended sample including all ages)



Note: Differences-in-differences estimates. * p<.1, ** p<.05, *** p<.01.

Figure S.9: Pre-post change in targeted efficacy beliefs by age



Figure S.10: Pre-post change in beliefs in myths by age



Figure S.11: Pre-post change in targeted behavior by age



Table S.20: Age distribution (extended sample including all ages)

Age	Control	Info	Game	DisgustGame	All
18 - 30	65	72	88	80	305
31-40	73	87	84	94	338
41-50	134	113	96	114	457
51-60	121	130	105	108	464
61-70	120	108	54	39	321
71- 89	34	45	3	6	88
N	547	555	430	441	1973

Figure S.12: Enjoyment and frequency of gaming



969 ## S.7 Screenshots

Figure S.13: Screenshot from the information video

Figure S.14: Screenshot from the information video with disgust frame

We design an online game to foster risk-reducing behavior among consumers.

We run a survey experiment with >1000 adults from the UK and Norway.

We study two treatments (online game; a video intervention) and a control condition.

Both interventions improve food safety beliefs to a similar extent relative control.

The game intervention significantly improves self-reported food safety behavior.