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Abstract

**Purpose**

To determine the impact of financial conflict of interest (FCI) disclosure on dietary behavioural intention related to the glycaemic index (GI) of food.

**Design/methodology/approach**

Seventy-two participants were randomly allocated to two conditions by reading an academic journal article about GI that contained an FCI disclosure (conflict) or a statement detailing that the authors had no FCI to declare (no-conflict). Using a questionnaire, participants made judgments about the article and authors as well as intention to perform GI-related behaviour. These were then analysed for significant differences between the two conditions.

**Findings**

Although no significant differences emerged between group means of judgments about the article, those in the conflict condition judged the authors as significantly less trustworthy and credible than those in the conflict condition. Contrary to expectation, those in the conflict condition reported significantly higher intentions to perform GI-related behaviour.

**Research limitations/implications**

The present research must be conducted in other populations of interest in order to establish if the results can be generalised.

**Practical implications**

The results suggest that FCI disclosure might be best placed at the beginning of articles and that education about FCI be made available to the general public.
Originality/value
This paper examines the practical implications of FCI disclosure. It also focuses on a readership beyond an academic community who is well-acquainted with the subject area and issues pertaining to FCI.
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Introduction

Recent developments in the area of food consumption have led to a lack of consumer trust in health professionals. For example, the bovine spongiform encephalitis (BSE) scare in the UK exposed a great deal of confusion amongst politicians and the scientific community, which was propagated by mass media (Knox, 2000). In addition, consumer perceptions of risk in relation to genetically engineered food products are largely influenced by qualitative concerns confluent with a general fear of ‘nature versus science’ (Grove-White, MacNaughton, Mayer, & Wynne, 1997).

The first step in working toward positive consumer reactions is to ensure that the integrity of scientific research is made a primary concern. If this integrity is placed in jeopardy, the possible consequences for human safety and wellbeing can be severe. For this reason, research institutions and reviewing bodies aim to safeguard the welfare of those affected at all levels of the research process by the promotion, implementation and regulation of ethical practice. There is heightened concern amongst scientists about what the recent and continuing increase in the economic and commercial interests of scientific research can mean for the responsible conduct of research (Shamoo & Resnik, 2003). In particular, concern is directed upon the prevalence of conflicts of interest.

Conflicts of interest are “a set of conditions in which professional judgment concerning a primary interest (such as a patient's welfare or the validity of research) tends to be unduly influenced by a secondary interest (such as financial gain)” (Thompson, 1993, p 573). It has been suggested that financial conflicts of interest (FCI), such as sponsorship that is received from industry bodies who have a vested interest in the outcome of research, may potentially affect many aspects of how scientific research is conducted and reported (Truscott, Baumgart, & Rogers, 2004).
Indeed, investigations that have focussed on this issue, such as journal database analyses (Patsopoulos, Analatos, & Ioannidis, 2006), reviewing reporting trends in studies (Melander, Ahlqvist-Rastad, Meijer, & Beermann, 2003) and systematic reviews of literature (Bekelman, Li, & Gross, 2003; Lexchin, Bero, Djulbegovic, & Clark, 2003; Perlis et al., 2005), have generally found that studies affected by some kind of FCI result in more favourable outcomes being reported. Some go as far as to suggest that a publication bias is present (Lexchin et al., 2003; Melander et al., 2003) and that financial relationships pose a serious threat to scientific integrity (Bekelman et al., 2003).

In addition to the potentially biased contributions introduced to the research and publication process, readers of these publications may also be affected by the knowledge that a FCI exists. Many scientific journals have acknowledged this by implementing mandatory disclosure policies, in an attempt to keep themselves accountable to their readership and to engender impartiality by encouraging transparency of motives (Thompson, 1993). Many journals have designed guidelines and policies for such disclosure by authors (Campbell, 2001; Nature Publications Group, 2003, 2006; van Kolfschooten, 2002).

A paucity of research exists to support the assumption that readerships are actually affected by FCI disclosure statements. A search conducted within large journal databases yielded only two articles amongst published empirical studies that specifically analyse reader perceptions of FCI disclosure. Both studies suggest that FCI disclosure does indeed negatively affect readers (Chaudhry, Schroter, Smith, & Morris, 2002; Schroter, Morris, Chaudhry, Smith, & Barratt, 2004). In one study, participants who read a paper that contained a FCI indicated that the article’s believability, validity, importance and relevance were significantly lower than for readers of the same paper
containing a declaration that the authors had declared no relevant FCI (Chaudhry et al., 2002). In a follow-up study, the effects that different types of FCI disclosure statements have on such judgments were compared. Financial statements detailing employment and potential stock ownership more negatively affected readers’ perceptions of a journal article’s validity than statements declaring that the authors were recipients of a grant (Schroter et al., 2004).

The sample under investigation in both of these studies was drawn from the British Medical Association’s membership database. These are well-informed, highly educated and specifically interested academics and clinicians whom one might expect to be sensitive to the issue of FCI disclosure. Considering that subscribers are not the only people who have access to information in journal articles, and that the findings published in scientific journals apply to a much broader spectrum of people (e.g. Patients independently researching their medical condition, conscientious dieters exploring scientific research on weight-loss etc), investigation into the effects of FCI disclosure beyond this sample is of interest. The present study aims to investigate this possibility amongst undergraduate students. Further, as these previous studies are specifically related to medical rather than consumer issues, it may be that the judgments being made by participants were relevant only in their particular context. Other determinants of trust could be relevant and must be investigated within the domain of interest.

In addition, the judgments made by participants in the aforementioned studies may be lacking in external validity. Participants made their judgments in an abstracted, isolated situation and the questions asked were cognitively focussed appraisals. Considering that information published in scientific and medical journals is primarily designed to inform diagnostic and therapeutic decisions (Drazen & Curfman, 2002), the
impact of FCI disclosure beyond limited perceptual judgments on these more practical applications of published research is of particular interest to the present investigation.

Commercial conflicts of interest have become a serious concern in the field of health (van Kolfschooten, 2002). Public awareness of this issue has been raised in the area of smoking research, where FCIs have been noted as a possible cause of manipulated results, leading to mistaken recommendations being made to the public. For example, descriptive analysis work on tobacco company documents undertaken by Bero, Glantz and Hong (2005) revealed a deeply embedded network of financial and professional ties between the author of an article about the health effects of second-hand tobacco smoke and a cigarette company. Health is the focus of numerous campaigns toward lifestyle change and other initiatives to encourage the public to alter their everyday behaviour, or purchase consumer products and technologies. People are not likely to pursue or react positively to these initiatives if they do not trust its source For trust to exist, these sources must not be perceived as biased or self-seeking (Shamos, 1991). In support of this notion, Frewer et. al. (1995) found that information sources perceived as accurate, factual, knowledgeable and concerned for public welfare (such as medical doctors and university scientists) were the most trusted by consumers in terms of beliefs regarding health hazards whereas sources unlikely to be trusted were those perceived by people to be motivated by a need to protect themselves from economic losses, such as government scientists (Frewer et al., 1995).

Wandel (2004) conducted two surveys and found that consumers’ level of trust in expert advice significantly affected their choices about what they believe constitutes a healthy diet. However, it is unclear in the literature what kind of specific information or influences, if any, can significantly alter an individual’s thoughts and feelings regarding trust. Further, Wandel (2004) notes that between the years 1994 and 1999,
there was a significant decrease in the level of trust that consumers placed in expert advice. Considering that this is likely to be an ongoing trend in a society that is becoming increasingly educated and critical, it can be expected that FCI disclosure might be strong enough to negatively impact relevant behavioural intentions amongst consumers. Wandel’s (2004) conclusion, that trust is an essential part of how consumers respond to information about food and health, further reinforces this expectation.

A topic that has not received much attention until recent years is the avenue of dietary research investigating the glycaemic index (GI) of food. GI is a property of carbohydrates that pertains to its digestive properties and effect on blood-sugar levels (University of Sydney GI Group, 2007). GI has been extensively researched and found to be a beneficial dietary consideration for patients with diabetes (McMillan-Price & Brand-Miller, 2006). In addition, research has found positive effects of low GI foods for cardiovascular disease (Brynes et al., 2003) and obesity management (Ebbeling, Leidig, Sinclair, Hangen, & Ludwig, 2003). The concept of GI has only recently been popularised in the public domain, with the release of a best-selling book, The New Glucose Revolution (Brand-Miller, Foster-Powell, & Colagiuri, 2002). This topic is well suited for the focus of this study, as those not involved in this research or industry are not likely to have had much contact with scientific literature on GI, or with GI issues in general.

The discussion thus far indicates that there are two aims to be explored by the present study, each with relevant hypotheses. The first aim is to investigate the effects of FCI disclosure in a dietary context within a population that is not well-acquainted with the subject area of GI or necessarily well-informed about FCI disclosure policies. The following hypotheses are proposed:
H1: Participants who read a journal article promoting GI that has an FCI disclosure will rate it as less believable, valid, important and relevant than those who read the same article containing a disclosure statement asserting that the authors have no FCI.

H2: Participants who read a journal article promoting GI that has an FCI disclosure will rate its authors as less credible, trustworthy, friendly, believable and respectable than those who read the same article containing a disclosure statement asserting that the authors have no FCI.

The second aim of the present study is also related to trust. It will be determined whether FCI disclosure can impact on the effects of consumer behaviour, such as shopping and eating. Trust is a relationally embedded concept, therefore investigation into how the effects of FCI disclosure can become evident in social interactions, such as in the behaviour of recommending food, is also of interest. In pursuit of this goal, the effects of FCI disclosure on dietary behavioural intentions will be investigated. Specifically, this yields the following hypothesis:

H3: Participants who read a journal article promoting GI and containing a FCI declaration statement will report lower dietary behavioural intention than those who read the same article with a declaration stating that the authors have no FCI.
Method

Sample

Participants were 72 first-year undergraduate Psychology students (female $n = 49$), who participated in return for course credit. Participants were randomly allocated to one of two experimental conditions; conflict or no-conflict (see Procedure for more detail). An online appointment system was used for recruitment. The experiment was advertised as an investigation into attitudes toward eating. Ethical approval was granted by the University’s human ethics committee.

Measures

Participants’ perceptions of the journal article’s interest, importance, relevance, validity and believability were assessed on 7-point Likert scales. These categories were obtained from Chaudhry et al. (2002) (e.g. “I thought the paper was…” Extremely uninteresting; Neither interesting nor uninteresting; Extremely interesting)

Trust is a multidimensional construct (Frewer et al., 1995). For this reason, implementing multiple measures to capture the many perceived characteristics of sources that determine trustworthiness (particular to a population of interest) are desirable (Frewer et al., 1995; Lobb, Mazzocchi, & Traill, 2007). With this consideration in mind, additional measures that focused on the author were included to explore the concept of trust more thoroughly.

To ensure that these ratings were representative of the group to be studied, elicitation interviews were conducted with a convenience sample of 8 undergraduates. A questionnaire scale was constructed following elicitation interviews with eight
undergraduates. Further piloting of the quantitative instrument was conducted with 24 undergraduates.

Five aspects of trust emerged to be measured. These were credibility, trustworthiness, friendliness, believability and respectability. Each was rated on a 7 point Likert scale (e.g. “The author of this article is credible” Strongly disagree; Neither agree not disagree; Strongly agree)

Three behaviours of interest were selected as suitable for the present study. These were “Buying foods with a low GI the next time I shop for food” (shopping), “Recommending food that has a low GI to someone I know within the next month” (recommending) and “Eating a meal that has a low GI, next time I prepare my own dinner at home” (cooking/eating). These behaviours were chosen for their direct appeal to financial input, social implications and practical engagement with GI respectively.

The diverse aspects involved with performing each of these behaviours may be susceptible to different influences on intention, including issues of trust.

Measures of behavioural intention were constructed according to the guidelines of Ajzen (2002) in the context of the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). The perceived likelihood of performance was measured for each behaviour of interest. This involved evaluating an intention statement according to 7-point Likert scales. These ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree, extremely unlikely to extremely likely and definitely false to definitely true (e.g. “I will eat a meal that has a low GI, next time I prepare my own dinner at home.”)
**Procedure**

Participants were given an edited journal article about GI to read (McMillan-Price & Brand-Miller, 2006). The article was edited in such a way as to reduce length, with special attention being exercised so as not to cut out relevant content. Participants were randomly allocated to one of two conditions; conflict or no-conflict.

In the conflict condition, the article contained a declaration of FCI “*The authors declare competing financial interests: J McMillan Price holds a financial copyright license on the glycaemic index food labelling logo. J Brand Miller is employed as the CEO of the Glycaemic Index International Association (GIIA)*”. In contrast, the article in the no-conflict condition contained a statement indicating that the authors had stated that they had no FCI to declare; “*The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests*”. These statements were designed in line with disclosure policy guidelines of popular academic journals (Campbell, 2003; Nature Publications Group, 2001). All participants were then required to complete the survey containing measures of intention and perceptions of the article and authors.

To ensure the experimental manipulation was effective, participants were alerted to the potential existence of a FCI at the beginning of the questionnaire. Immediately after they read the journal article, participants were asked “Did you notice if the authors had any financial interests related to the paper?” and if not, were directed to the location of where such a statement might be located, and prompted to re-check before indicating if there was any such declaration, which they were then required to specify. Participants then completed the questionnaire.
Results

The mean age of the sample was 20.84 years, SD = 4.13, Range = 18.08 to 41.17 and 76 percent of respondents nominated English as their first language. Of those who stated that English was not their first language, 82% stated that their written English ability was very good; the rest indicated that it was satisfactory. Data from participants who did not correctly identify the FCI disclosure (n = 12) was excluded from the analyses.

The effect of FCI on judgements about the article Independent samples t-tests conducted on the means of each survey item revealed that there were no significant differences between ratings of the journal article’s interest, importance, relevance, validity and believability over the two test conditions, as indicated in Table 1.

Take in Table 1

The effect of FCI on judgements about the authors

Independent samples t-tests performed on ratings about whether the journal article’s authors were credible, trustworthy, friendly, believable or respectable showed that, on average, those in the conflict condition rated the authors as being significantly less credible and less trustworthy than those in the no-conflict condition. As indicated in Table 2, there were no significant differences observed between measures of the other variables, except to note that the mean difference of .43 points between each group’s rating of the authors’ believability approached significance, \( p = .059 \).

Take in Table 2
The effect of FCI on dietary behavioural intentions. A composite score for each behaviour of interest was calculated by adding the individual scores for the three items measuring agreement with the statement, perceived likelihood of the statement and perceived truth of the statement. A composite score representing the behavioural intention of all behaviours of interest was calculated by adding all of the behavioural intention items. The means of these composite scores for behavioural intention of those in the conflict group were compared with those in the no-conflict group using independent samples t-tests. Significant mean differences were observed for all behaviours of interest, and all behaviours combined, as depicted in Table 3. In all cases, the behavioural intention of those in the conflict group was higher than those in the no-conflict condition.

Take in Table 3

Discussion

The effect of FCI on judgments about the authors and article.

Unlike the results found by Chaudhry et al. (2002) there were no significant differences observed on ratings about the article’s interest, believability, validity, importance and relevance. Although declaration of FCI did not appear to impact upon these judgements about the article, it did significantly impact on judgments about the author’s credibility and trustworthiness. Ratings of believability bordered significance. These findings may appear to be in conflict, however there are a number of possible explanations.
The first explanation to be considered is that FCI disclosure may simply have no impact on trusting behaviour in a dietary context. However, this seems unlikely given the significant results of Chaudhry et al. (2002) and upon investigation of the judgments made by participants in the present study about the authors of the journal articles. Those with FCI disclosure statement in their journal article rated the authors as significantly less credible and trustworthy than those whose declaration stated that the authors had no FCI to declare. Difference between ratings of believability also neared significance. It must therefore be noted that FCI disclosure statements do appear to affect undergraduate students’ perceptions of trust.

To explain these results, it is worth considering that the judgment categories related to the journal article were applied straight from the study conducted by Chaudhry et al. (2002). The choice of these particular qualities as appropriate measurements was not theoretically justified by Chaudhry et al. (2002). Frewer et al. (1995) point out that there is no reason to expect that experimenter-generated characteristics and scales determined on a pre-selected basis will be relevant in a particular study and with a particular sample. Therefore, variation across situations can be expected because determinants of trust may be different. The present study looked at the reaction of first-year students in a dietary context, where perhaps other determinants of trust are applicable. Future investigations are encouraged to explore this possibility.

There are two contextual differences between the present study and the study of Chaudhry et. al. (2002) that could also explain these findings. First, although Chaudhry et. al. (2002) found significant results, the domain of their investigation was the medical context. This may differ from the context of food in that there may be different considerations that need to be made when enacting dietary behaviours than when
making clinical decisions. This possibility will need to be investigated in future research in order to clarify the present results further.

Second, the sample used consisted of subscribers to the British Medical Journal whereas the participants used in the present study were undergraduate students. The likelihood that the former sample has more specialised education, experience, motivation and interest in the issue being investigated than the latter is quite high. These factors may have led to differences in attention and encoding of the FCI information. More research is required into the effects of FCI on different target audiences to better inform this conclusion.

In addition, Chaudhry et al. (2002) note that the unfamiliar name of the company used as part of their FCI disclosure statement may have had an effect on participants’ judgments. Although they do not elaborate on this, it is worth considering in light of the present results and may be in some way related to the exposure effect, whereby people express undue liking of things, simply because they are familiar with them (Zajonc, 1968). Extensive empirical support of this effect exists (see Bornstein, 1989, for a review), and has most recently been demonstrated in a study into internet advertising where repeated incidental exposures to internet banner advertisements resulted in increased perceptual fluency, which was accompanied by more positive evaluations of the advertisements (Fang, Singh, & AhluWalia, 2007).

The study conducted by Chaudhry et al. (2002) featured a non-familiar company in the FCI disclosure statement, which may have appeared unusual to respondents and elicited unease or fear. Further research on disclosure statements that address the familiarity of funding bodies as part of their design, and research into the possible role of the exposure effect is required to clarify this issue further.
Another finding of interest that needs explanation in the significant differences observed between judgements made about the authors. It may be that there exists some kind of separation or dissociation between the journal article and its authors, as objects of trust.

An example of dissociation between information and its source that exists in social psychological research is that entailed by the sleeper effect. According to this theory, information from a non-credible source is unlikely to induce immediate attitude change, but with the passage of time, attitude change can occur because the message becomes dissociated from its source in an individual’s memory (Hovland, Lumsdaine, & Sheffield, 1949). For further detail, see a meta-analytic study by Kumkale and Albarracín (2004).

According to empirical findings, a discounting cue placed at the end of a piece of information (in this case, the FCI disclosure at the end of the article) has a lesser effect on influencing the individual’s attitude, because processing of the information has occurred before taking this into consideration (Kumkale & Albarracín, 2004). Although this effect is observed to occur after the passage of time, the construction of journal articles containing disclosure statements typically has them appearing at the end. It may be that they do not have enough prominence to influence people’s processing of information presented in the article. Further investigation into what effects delaying FCI disclosure might have on people’s impressions, as well as the placement of FCI disclosure statements is required to refine this speculation.

This would provide an interesting avenue for future theoretical exploration, and contributes somewhat to the explanation of the present results. Whatever the case for perceptions about the article, perceptions about the author must also be considered. As mentioned previously, those with an FCI disclosure in their article judged the authors as
significantly less credible and trustworthy than those without. Similar results were observed for ratings of believability, and these bordered on significance.

The alternative avenue for exploration inspired by these results might be to investigate the possibility that judgments made about people may well be determined by different processes than for judgments made about information. Further research into the determinants of trust in relation to different stimuli must be conducted to clarify this possibility.

*The effect of FCI on dietary behavioural intention.*

Contrary to expectation, those in the conflict condition reported significantly higher intentions to perform each of the behaviours of interest, when compared with those in the no-conflict condition. These results appear to be in conflict with those obtained for judgments about the authors. A possible explanation is that FCI has different effects based on the level of integration that the information being presented needs to undergo. For example, a person’s simple cognitive appraisal of the author based on the evidence presented might result in reported distrust, however when this individual considers how the information might apply to them, considering a multiplicity of other factors such as interest in the topic, motivation toward achieving a certain goal and so on, they may begin to process the meaning of the FCI in a different way.

In addition, it may simply be that undergraduates feel less confident in evaluating the validity of scientific evidence than qualified academics, which could possibly offer further explanation for the apparent discrepancy in these findings. Further research using different populations is required to investigate this idea further.
Upon analysing these results with little reflection, it may seem as if the FCI disclosure actually makes people more trusting of information, and consequently more likely to act in accordance with it. However, in light of the concurrent results regarding trust of the author, further reflection is warranted. The above assumption is based on the preconceived notion that a greater level of perceived financial independence leads to a greater level of trust in information.

This may not necessarily be the case. In analysing the results of their study into determinants of consumer trust, Frewer et al. (1996) concluded that trust is largely determined by a sense of accountability associated with the information. That is, if consumers believe that a particular piece of information is being regulated (in this case, open declaration of relevant financial interests) they are more inclined to trust it, because they perceive more safeguards to be in place. This explanation seems plausible for the results observed in the present study. Perhaps with a broader range of considerations to be made when considering behavioural intention, individuals are inclined to adopt such a mindset.

However, this argument might equally apply to those in the no-conflict condition, whose articles still contained an FCI disclosure statement but claimed that the authors had no FCI to declare. Nevertheless, this statement may not have seemed as salient or interesting to participants as the one in the conflict condition and therefore no explicitly memorable acknowledgement of accountability was retained by participants for their subsequent decision-making. Further investigation is required into the effects that different types of FCI disclosure have on behavioural intention in order to clarify this conclusion.

Limitations and directions for future research
In addition to the limitations already mentioned thus far, there are several other issues worthy of mention. First, the results of this study have indicated a wide avenue of research to be conducted on the relationship between trust and level of processing generally, but especially in relation to FCIs.

Although an undergraduate sample is a good starting point, this research should be extended to other populations for the purposes of validation and generalisability. Psychology undergraduates are notorious for their attempts to figure out research aims, and there is no guarantee that they thoroughly read the article before completing the questionnaire. Further, it must be acknowledged that by re-directing participants attention to the FCI just before completing the questionnaire so as to ensure the manipulation was effective may have reduced the study’s ecological validity and allowed participants to guess the aims of the research. This is indeed a worthy criticism and future research would do well to investigate the discussed effects in a non-experimental study. However, Had the participants guessed the aims of the study, it is doubtful whether any effect would have emerged at all which actually strengthens the argument for the existence of any effects related to FCI disclosure.

Conclusion

It is evident that much further research is required to clarify the implications of the results obtained in the present investigation. Despite the limitations of the present results, there is certainly is much to be gained. The issues addressed by this paper may be related to the work of Bero and colleagues (2005) in that perhaps currently implemented FCI disclosure policies may not be sufficiently effective to appropriately communicating FCIs. Scientific journals would do well to note this indication, and invest resources to investigate factors related to the present study. These may include
what constitutes a relevant or related disclosure, how FCIs can be policed, and how institutional financial interests can impact the research process. This research must be conducted so that more appropriate and effective policies to deal with FCIs can be developed. This has specific application to the area of food information and its dissemination, as well as the aspects of this information that are attended to by the consumer.

Further, FCI disclosure does appear to have an effect on undergraduates’ perceptions of authors and associated behavioural intentions, and is also quite possibly affecting judgments about the information itself. Further investigation must be carried out to clarify these results and how they might generalise to other populations, and also to guide the design and implementation of appropriate FCI safeguards that allow both accountability and freedom in the conduct of research.
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Table 1

*Differences in Group Means for Judgments Made About the Journal Article.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Mean&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t (58)</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conflict no-conflict</td>
<td>conflict no-conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I thought the paper was interesting&quot;</td>
<td>.57 .50</td>
<td>1.55 1.61</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I thought the paper was important&quot;</td>
<td>1.27 1.33</td>
<td>.91 1.06</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I thought the paper was relevant&quot;</td>
<td>1.53 1.47</td>
<td>1.19 1.20</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I thought the paper was valid&quot;</td>
<td>.97 1.17</td>
<td>1.03 .83</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I thought the paper was believable&quot;</td>
<td>1.17 1.50</td>
<td>.86 1.05</td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Where -3= strongly disagree and 3=strongly agree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Mean¹</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t (58)</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The author of this article is credible”</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The author is this article is friendly”</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The author of this article is believable”</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The author of this article is respectable”</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Where -3= strongly disagree and 3=strongly agree.
Table 3

*Differences in Mean Behavioural Intentions between Groups.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t(58)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conflict</td>
<td>no-conflict</td>
<td>conflict</td>
<td>no-conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All (combined)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>-5.37</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores are composites constructed from TPB measures, where higher scores indicate a higher intention and likelihood to perform behaviour of interest.*