

Electronic Supplementary Material:

Medication adherence in smoking cessation – Marteau 2012:

As can be seen in the Table below only age and individual-level SES were statistically significant positive predictors of objective measures of medication adherence in smoking cessation. None of the interactions between SES measured at individual- or area-level with intention or self-efficacy was statistically significant.

Objective adherence in 28 days after quite date

Step	Predictors	Unstandardised B	SE of B	95% CI	Model Fit
1	Gender	-0.04	0.08	-0.20, 0.12	$R^2=0.01$
	Age	0.004	0.003	-0.002, 0.01	$F(586)=0.92$
	Area-level SES	0.02	0.11	-0.20, 0.24	$p=0.48$
	Gender	-0.05	0.08	-0.21, 0.10	$R^2=0.02$
	Age	0.01*	0.003	0.001, 0.01	$F(609)=2.55$
	Individual-level SES	0.28**	0.11	0.07, 0.50	$p=0.02$
2	Gender	-0.04	0.08	-0.21, 0.12	
	Age	0.004	0.003	-0.002, 0.01	
	Area-level SES	0.02	0.11	-0.20, 0.24	$R^2=0.01$
	Intention	0.004	0.05	-0.09, 0.10	$F(584)=0.70$
	Self-efficacy	0.006	0.04	-0.07, 0.09	$p=0.70$
	Gender	-0.05	0.08	-0.21, 0.11	
	Age	0.01*	0.003	0.001, 0.01	
	Individual-level SES	0.29**	0.11	0.07, 0.50	$R^2=0.02$
	Intention	0.02	0.04	-0.07, 0.10	$F(607)=1.92$
	Self-efficacy	-0.01	0.04	-0.08, 0.07	$p=0.05$
3	Gender	-0.04	0.08	-0.20, 0.13	
	Age	0.004	0.003	-0.002, 0.01	
	Area-level SES	0.02	0.11	-0.20, 0.24	
	Intention	-0.01	0.05	-0.11, 0.09	
	Self-efficacy	0.001	0.04	-0.08, 0.09	$R^2=0.01$
	Area-level SES x Intentions	0.09	0.14	-0.19, 0.37	$F(582)=0.64$
	Area-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.02	0.14	-0.24, 0.29	$p=0.78$
	Gender	-0.04	0.08	-0.20, 0.12	
	Age	0.01*	0.003	0.001, 0.01	
	Individual-level SES	0.28*	0.11	0.06, 0.49	
	Intention	0.02	0.05	-0.07, 0.12	
	Self-efficacy	0.01	0.04	-0.07, 0.09	$R^2=0.03$
	Individual-level SES x Intentions	-0.01	0.13	-0.26, 0.24	$F(605)=1.71$
	Individual-level SES x Self-efficacy	-0.12	0.12	-0.37, 0.12	$p=0.08$

Note: significance denoted as * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

Physical Activity – Griffin 2011:

As shown in the Table below none of the interactions between intention/self-efficacy and objective measure of physical activity was statistically significant. The indices of gender (positively) and age (negatively) were the only significant predictors of physical activity in our models.

Objective PAEE from free living measurement (kJ/kg/day) at 12th month

Step	Predictors	Unstandardised B	SE of B	95% CI	Model Fit
1	Gender	0.47***	0.10	0.27, 0.67	$R^2=0.15$
	Age	-0.04***	0.01	-0.05, -0.03	$F(375)=13.32$
	Area-level SES	-0.14	0.12	-0.37, 0.10	$p<0.001$
	Gender	0.47***	0.09	0.29, 0.66	$R^2=0.17$
	Age	-0.04***	0.01	-0.06, -0.03	$F(419)=16.58$
	Individual-level SES	-0.19	0.12	-0.43, 0.05	$p<0.001$
2	Gender	0.47***	0.10	0.27, 0.67	
	Age	-0.04***	0.01	-0.05, -0.03	
	Area-level SES	-0.14	0.12	-0.38, 0.10	$R^2=0.15$
	Intention	-0.07	0.09	-0.23, 0.10	$F(370)=12.92$
	Self-efficacy	0.08	0.08	-0.07, 0.24	$p<0.001$
	Gender	0.45***	0.09	0.27, 0.64	
	Age	-0.04***	0.01	-0.05, -0.03	
	Individual-level SES	-0.21	0.12	-0.44, 0.03	$R^2=0.17$
	Intention	-0.06	0.08	-0.21, 0.10	$F(414)=16.92$
	Self-efficacy	0.13	0.07	-0.01, 0.27	$p<0.001$
3	Gender	0.47***	0.10	0.26, 0.67	
	Age	-0.04***	0.01	-0.05, -0.02	
	Area-level SES	-0.15	0.12	-0.39, 0.09	
	Intention	0.04	0.19	-0.34, 0.42	
	Self-efficacy	-0.14	0.18	-0.50, 0.21	$R^2=0.15$
	Area-level SES x Intentions	-0.13	0.22	-0.55, 0.30	$F(368)=9.56$
	Area-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.28	0.20	-0.11, 0.67	$p<0.001$
	Gender	0.46***	0.10	0.27, 0.64	
	Age	-0.04***	0.01	-0.05, -0.03	
	Individual-level SES	-0.21	0.13	-0.46, 0.03	
	Intention	-0.09	0.09	-0.27, 0.08	
	Self-efficacy	0.14	0.08	-0.02, 0.30	$R^2=0.17$
	Individual-level SES x Intentions	0.15	0.20	-0.24, 0.54	$F(412)=12.14$
	Individual-level SES x Self-efficacy	-0.06	0.19	-0.42, 0.31	$p<0.001$

Note: significance denoted as * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

Physical Activity –Kinmonth 2008:

The Table below shows that none of the interactions between intention/self-efficacy and objective measure of physical activity was statistically significant. Furthermore, none of the other indices was significant.

Change in dayPAR parameters between 12th month and baseline

Step	Predictors	Unstandardised B	SE of B	95% CI	Model Fit
1	Gender	0.03	0.12	-0.20, 0.26	$R^2=0.002$
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	$F(313)=0.25$
	Area-level SES	-0.11	0.21	-0.52, 0.30	$p=0.86$
	Gender	0.03	0.12	-0.20, 0.26	$R^2=0.001$
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	$F(317)=0.15$
	Individual-level SES	-0.01	0.13	-0.27, 0.25	$p=0.93$
2	Gender	0.03	0.12	-0.20, 0.26	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.03	
	Area-level SES	-0.10	0.22	-0.53, 0.33	$R^2=0.004$
	Intention	0.07	0.10	-0.13, 0.28	$F(310)=0.24$
	Self-efficacy	-0.03	0.11	-0.24, 0.19	$p=0.94$
	Gender	0.03	0.12	-0.20, 0.26	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.03	
	Individual-level SES	-0.004	0.13	-0.27, 0.26	$R^2=0.003$
	Intention	0.07	0.10	-0.13, 0.27	$F(314)=0.19$
Self-efficacy	-0.04	0.11	-0.25, 0.18	$p=0.97$	
3	Gender	0.03	0.12	-0.20, 0.26	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.03	
	Area-level SES	0.03	0.23	-0.42, 0.48	
	Intention	0.51	0.40	-0.27, 1.30	
	Self-efficacy	-0.66	0.38	-1.41, 0.08	$R^2=0.01$
	Area-level SES x Intentions	-0.47	0.41	-0.28, 0.35	$F(308)=0.61$
	Area-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.69	0.40	-0.09, 1.47	$p=0.75$
	Gender	0.02	0.12	-0.21, 0.25	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.03	
	Individual-level SES	-0.01	0.14	-0.28, 0.25	
	Intention	0.14	0.12	-0.09, 0.36	
	Self-efficacy	-0.13	0.13	-0.38, 0.12	$R^2=0.01$
	Individual-level SES x Intentions	0.28	0.24	-0.76, 0.20	$F(312)=0.47$
	Individual-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.35	0.24	-0.13, 0.82	$p=0.86$

Note: significance denoted as * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

Physical Activity – Watkinson 2010:

As can be seen in the Table below only gender, self-efficacy, and individual-level SES significantly negatively predicted objective physical activity. None of the interactions between SES measured at individual- and area-level with intention or self-efficacy was statistically significant.

Change in objective PAEE from free living measurement (kJ/kg/day) between 2nd Month and baseline

Step	Predictors	Unstandardised B	SE of B	95% CI	Model Fit
1	Gender	-0.20	0.11	-0.41, 0.01	$R^2=0.02$
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	$F(356)=1.57$
	Area-level SES	-0.16	0.11	-0.37, 0.06	$p=0.17$
	Gender	-0.22*	0.10	-0.42, -0.02	$R^2=0.03$
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	$F(376)=2.02$
	Individual-level SES	-0.22	0.11	-0.44, 0.01	$p=0.08$
2	Gender	-0.19	0.11	-0.40, 0.01	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Area-level SES	-0.16	0.11	-0.37, 0.05	$R^2=0.04$
	Intention	-0.09	0.07	-0.22, 0.04	$F(355)=3.02$
	Self-efficacy	-0.13	0.08	-0.28, 0.20	$p=0.01$
	Gender	-0.21*	0.10	-0.41, -0.01	
	Age	0.003	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Individual-level SES	-0.22*	0.11	-0.44, -0.002	$R^2=0.04$
	Intention	-0.07	0.06	-0.20, 0.05	$F(375)=3.53$
	Self-efficacy	0.014*	0.07	-0.29, -0.001	$p=0.004$
3	Gender	-0.21	0.11	-0.41, 0.0005	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Area-level SES	-0.18	0.11	-0.39, 0.04	
	Intention	0.02	0.10	-0.17, 0.22	
	Self-efficacy	-0.26*	0.12	-0.50, -0.01	$R^2=0.05$
	Area-level SES x Intentions	-0.20	0.13	-0.46, 0.06	$F(353)=2.58$
	Area-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.21	0.16	-0.10, 0.52	$p=0.01$
	Gender	-0.21*	0.10	-0.41, -0.01	
	Age	0.002	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Individual-level SES	-0.22*	0.11	-0.44, -0.001	
	Intention	-0.04	0.07	-0.18, 0.11	
	Self-efficacy	-0.21*	0.09	-0.38, -0.03	$R^2=0.05$
	Individual-level SES x Intentions	-0.14	0.15	-0.43, 0.15	$F(373)=2.78$
	Individual-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.20	0.16	-0.11, 0.51	$p=0.01$

Note: significance denoted as * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

Physical Activity – Godino 2012:

As can be seen in the table below none of the interactions of interest was statistically significant. Moreover, none of the other indices was a significant predictor of physical activity in this dataset.

Step	Predictors	Unstandardised B	SE of B	95% CI	Model Fit
1	Gender	-0.005	0.09	-0.19, 0.18	$R^2=0.001$
	Age	0.001	0.01	-0.01, 0.01	$F(489)=0.12$
	Area-level SES	-0.06	0.09	-0.24, 0.13	$p=0.95$
	Gender	0.01	0.09	-0.16, 0.18	$R^2=0.0005$
	Age	0.003	0.01	-0.01, 0.01	$F(536)=0.08$
	Individual-level SES	0.02	0.09	-0.15, 0.19	$p=0.97$
2	Gender	0.001	0.09	-0.18, 0.18	
	Age	0.001	0.01	-0.01, 0.01	
	Area-level SES	-0.07	0.09	-0.26, 0.11	$R^2=0.006$
	Intention	0.05	0.06	-0.06, 0.16	$F(485)=0.63$
	Self-efficacy	0.06	0.06	-0.06, 0.19	$p=0.68$
	Gender	0.01	0.09	-0.16, 0.18	
	Age	0.004	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Individual-level SES	0.004	0.09	-0.17, 0.18	$R^2=0.01$
	Intention	0.06	0.05	-0.04, 0.17	$F(531)=0.79$
	Self-efficacy	0.06	0.06	-0.06, 0.18	$p=0.56$
3	Gender	0.001	0.09	-0.18, 0.18	
	Age	0.001	0.01	-0.01, 0.01	
	Area-level SES	-0.08	0.09	-0.26, 0.11	
	Intention	0.16	0.09	-0.02, 0.34	
	Self-efficacy	-0.03	0.10	-0.23, 0.16	$R^2=0.01$
	Area-level SES x Intentions	-0.18	0.12	-0.41, 0.05	$F(483)=0.91$
	Area-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.17	0.13	-0.08, 0.43	$p=0.50$
	Gender	0.01	0.09	-0.16, 0.18	
	Age	0.004	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Individual-level SES	0.01	0.09	-0.17, 0.18	
	Intention	0.04	0.08	-0.11, 0.19	
	Self-efficacy	0.13	0.08	-0.03, 0.29	$R^2=0.01$
	Individual-level SES x Intentions	0.06	0.11	-0.16, 0.27	$F(529)=0.82$
	Individual-level SES x Self-efficacy	-0.16	0.12	-0.39, 0.08	$p=0.57$

Note: significance denoted as * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

Further Analyses with self-reported measures of behavior:

Physical Activity – Griffin 2011:

As can be seen in the Table below gender positively, age negatively, and individual-level SES negatively were significant predictors of self-reported physical activity. None of the interactions of interest were statistically significant.

Subjective total activity energy expenditure at 12th month

Step	Predictors	Unstandardised B	SE of B	95% CI	Model Fit
1	Gender	0.32**	0.10	0.12, 0.52	$R^2=0.05$
	Age	-0.01*	0.01	-0.03, -0.001	$F(392)=3.78$
	Area-level SES	0.02	0.12	-0.23, 0.26	$p=0.002$
	Gender	0.34***	0.10	0.15, 0.53	$R^2=0.05$
	Age	-0.02**	0.01	-0.03, -0.01	$F(438)=5.07$
	Individual-level SES	-0.26*	0.13	-0.51, 0.01	$p<0.001$
2	Gender	0.34**	0.10	0.14, 0.55	
	Age	-0.01	0.01	-0.03, 0.001	
	Area-level SES	0.01	0.12	-0.23, 0.25	$R^2=0.05$
	Intention	0.13	0.09	-0.04, 0.31	$F(385)=4.12$
	Self-efficacy	-0.02	0.08	-0.18, 0.14	$p=0.001$
	Gender	0.35***	0.10	0.16, 0.54	
	Age	-0.02*	0.01	-0.03, -0.003	
	Individual-level SES	-0.33**	0.12	-0.58, -0.09	$R^2=0.07$
	Intention	0.11	0.08	-0.05, 0.28	$F(431)=6.52$
	Self-efficacy	0.02	0.08	-0.13, 0.17	$p<0.001$
3	Gender	0.35***	0.10	0.14, 0.55	
	Age	-0.01	0.01	-0.03, 0.001	
	Area-level SES	0.01	0.12	-0.23, 0.26	
	Intention	0.08	0.21	-0.33, 0.49	
	Self-efficacy	0.14	0.19	-0.23, 0.51	$R^2=0.05$
	Area-level SES x Intentions	0.05	0.23	-0.40, 0.51	$F(383)=3.14$
	Area-level SES x Self-efficacy	-0.20	0.21	-0.61, 0.20	$p=0.003$
	Gender	0.34***	0.10	0.15, 0.54	
	Age	-0.02*	0.01	-0.03, -0.004	
	Individual-level SES	-0.31*	0.13	-0.56, -0.05	
	Intention	0.09	0.09	-0.09, 0.27	
	Self-efficacy	0.06	0.08	-0.11, 0.22	$R^2=0.07$
	Individual-level SES x Intentions	0.12	0.21	-0.29, 0.53	$F(429)=4.76$
	Individual-level SES x Self-efficacy	-0.18	0.19	-0.56, 0.20	$p<0.001$

Note: significance denoted as * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

Diet – Griffin 2011:

None of the interactions of interest were statistically significant. As can be seen in the Table below only age and self-efficacy were significant negative predictors, and area-level SES was a significant positive predictor of self-reported physical activity in this dataset.

Step	Predictors	Unstandardised B	SE of B	95% CI	Model Fit
1	Gender	-0.06	0.10	-0.26, 0.15	$R^2=0.02$
	Age	-0.01	0.01	-0.02, 0.003	$F(388)=1.81$
	Area-level SES	0.28*	0.13	0.03, 0.53	$p=0.11$
	Gender	-0.05	0.10	-0.25, 0.14	$R^2=0.01$
	Age	-0.01	0.01	-0.02, 0.003	$F(434)=0.74$
	Individual-level SES	-0.08	0.13	-0.33, 0.17	$p=0.59$
2	Gender	-0.07	0.10	-0.27, 0.14	
	Age	-0.01*	0.01	-0.03, -0.0002	
	Area-level SES	0.28*	0.13	0.03, 0.52	$R^2=0.05$
	Intention	-0.12	0.09	-0.30, 0.05	$F(380)=3.74$
	Self-efficacy	-0.10	0.08	-0.26, 0.06	$p=0.003$
	Gender	-0.06	0.10	-0.26, 0.13	
	Age	-0.01*	0.01	-0.03, -0.0006	
	Individual-level SES	-0.07	0.12	-0.31, 0.18	$R^2=0.03$
	Intention	-0.10	0.09	-0.27, 0.07	$F(426)=2.67$
	Self-efficacy	-0.11	0.08	-0.26, 0.04	$p=0.02$
3	Gender	-0.05	0.10	-0.26, 0.15	
	Age	-0.01*	0.01	-0.03, -0.0003	
	Area-level SES	0.28*	0.13	0.03, 0.53	
	Intention	0.22	0.21	-0.20, 0.64	
	Self-efficacy	-0.46*	0.20	-0.85, -0.06	$R^2=0.06$
	Area-level SES x Intentions	-0.41	0.24	-0.88, 0.05	$F(378)=3.26$
	Area-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.42	0.22	-0.01, 0.85	$p=0.002$
	Gender	-0.06	0.10	-0.26, 0.13	
	Age	-0.01*	0.01	-0.03, -0.002	
	Individual-level SES	-0.07	0.12	-0.31, 0.18	
	Intention	-0.15	0.10	-0.34, 0.04	
	Self-efficacy	-0.12	0.09	-0.29, 0.05	$R^2=0.04$
	Individual-level SES x Intentions	0.26	0.21	-0.15, 0.67	$F(424)=2.38$
	Individual-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.01	0.18	-0.34, 0.67	$p=0.02$

Note: significance denoted as * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

Physical Activity – Kinmonth 2008:

The Table below shows that none of the interactions of interest were statistically significant. Only area-level SES, and individual-level SES were significant negative predictors of self-reported physical activity.

Change in self-reported duration of activity (METhrs/week) between 12th month and baseline

Step	Predictors	Unstandardised B	SE of B	95% CI	Model Fit
1	Gender	0.13	0.11	-0.08, 0.34	$R^2=0.04$
	Age	0.005	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	$F(300)=4.11$
	Area-level SES	-0.63*	0.19	-0.01, -0.26	$p=0.01$
	Gender	0.21	0.12	-0.02, 0.44	$R^2=0.02$
	Age	0.002	0.01	-0.02, 0.02	$F(303)=2.22$
	Individual-level SES	-0.27*	0.13	-0.53-0.01	$p=0.09$
2	Gender	0.12	0.11	-0.08, 0.33	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Area-level SES	-0.61**	0.20	-1.00, -0.23	$R^2=0.05$
	Intention	0.19*	0.09	0.01, 0.38	$F(297)=3.29$
	Self-efficacy	-0.12	0.10	-0.32, 0.08	$p=0.01$
	Gender	0.20	0.12	-0.03, 0.43	
	Age	0.003	0.01	-0.02, 0.02	
	Individual-level SES	-0.26	0.13	-0.52, 0.0002	$R^2=0.03$
	Intention	0.16	0.10	-0.046, 0.36	$F(300)=1.88$
	Self-efficacy	-0.14	0.11	-0.36, 0.08	$p=0.10$
3	Gender	0.12	0.11	-0.09, 0.33	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Area-level SES	-0.62**	0.20	-1.02, -0.22	
	Intention	0.38	0.35	-0.32, 1.07	
	Self-efficacy	-0.03	0.35	-0.72, 0.66	$R^2=0.06$
	Area-level SES x Intentions	0.20	0.37	-0.92, 0.52	$F(295)=2.47$
	Area-level SES x Self-efficacy	-0.11	0.37	-0.82, 0.62	$p=0.02$
	Gender	0.20	0.12	-0.03, 0.43	
	Age	0.004	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Individual-level SES	-0.27*	0.13	-0.54, -0.01	
	Intention	0.18	0.12	-0.05, 0.41	
	Self-efficacy	-0.14	0.13	-0.50, 0.02	$R^2=0.04$
	Individual-level SES x Intentions	-0.11	0.26	-0.62, 0.40	$F(298)=1.65$
	Individual-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.37	0.26	-0.14, 0.88	$p=0.12$

Note: significance denoted as * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

Physical Activity – Watkinson 2010:

None of the interactions of interest were statistically significant. As can be seen in the Table below only self-efficacy was a significant positive predictor of self-reported physical activity in this dataset.

Change in self-reported EPAQ physical activity between 2nd month and baseline

Step	Predictors	Unstandardised B	SE of B	95% CI	Model Fit
1	Gender	-0.10	0.09	-0.28, 0.08	$R^2=0.01$
	Age	0.003	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	$F(492)=0.92$
	Area-level SES	0.14	0.09	-0.04, 0.32	$p=0.47$
	Gender	-0.06	0.09	-0.24, 0.11	$R^2=0.01$
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.005, 0.02	$F(532)=0.77$
	Individual-level SES	0.11	0.10	-0.09, 0.30	$p=0.57$
2	Gender	-0.12	0.09	-0.30, 0.05	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.08, 0.02	
	Area-level SES	0.13	0.09	-0.05, 0.31	$R^2=0.04$
	Intention	0.05	0.06	-0.06, 0.16	$F(493)=3.64$
	Self-efficacy	0.20**	0.06	0.07, 0.32	$p=0.003$
	Gender	-0.08	0.09	-0.25, 0.09	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.002, 0.02	
	Individual-level SES	0.11	0.10	-0.08, 0.30	$R^2=0.03$
	Intention	0.07	0.05	-0.04, 0.18	$F(532)=3.12$
	Self-efficacy	0.15*	0.06	0.03, 0.27	$p=0.009$
3	Gender	-0.12	0.09	-0.30, 0.05	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Area-level SES	0.13	0.09	-0.05, 0.31	
	Intention	0.08	0.08	-0.09, 0.24	
	Self-efficacy	0.26*	0.10	0.06, 0.46	$R^2=0.04$
	Area-level SES x Intentions	-0.05	0.11	-0.27, 0.17	$F(491)=2.78$
	Area-level SES x Self-efficacy	-0.10	0.13	-0.36, 0.15	$p=0.01$
	Gender	-0.8	0.09	-0.25, 0.10	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.002, 0.02	
	Individual-level SES	0.11	0.10	-0.08, 0.30	
	Intention	0.08	0.06	-0.04, 0.20	
	Self-efficacy	0.16*	0.08	0.01, 0.31	$R^2=0.03$
	Individual-level SES x Intentions	-0.04	0.13	-0.30, 0.21	$F(530)=2.25$
	Individual-level SES x Self-efficacy	-0.02	0.13	-0.28, 0.24	$p=0.03$

Note: significance denoted as * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

Diet – Godino 2012:

The table below shows that none of the interactions of interest were statistically significant. Furthermore, none of the other indices was significant indicator of diet in this dataset.

Step	Predictors	Unstandardised B	SE of B	95% CI	Model Fit
1	Gender	-0.09	0.09	-0.27, 0.09	$R^2=0.005$
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	$F(493)=0.79$
	Area-level SES	0.04	0.10	-0.15, 0.23	$p=0.50$
	Gender	-0.06	0.09	-0.23, 0.11	$R^2=0.01$
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	$F(542)=1.59$
	Individual-level SES	-0.14	0.09	-0.31, 0.03	$p=0.19$
2	Gender	-0.08	0.10	-0.26, 0.11	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Area-level SES	0.01	0.10	-0.18, 0.21	$R^2=0.01$
	Intention	0.12	0.07	-0.03, 0.26	$F(489)=1.00$
	Self-efficacy	-0.09	0.07	-0.24, 0.06	$p=0.42$
	Gender	-0.05	0.09	-0.22, 0.12	
	Age	0.005	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Individual-level SES	-0.14	0.09	-0.31, 0.03	$R^2=0.01$
	Intention	0.12	0.07	-0.01, 0.25	$F(537)=1.54$
	Self-efficacy	-0.10	0.07	-0.24, 0.03	$p=0.17$
3	Gender	-0.08	0.10	-0.26, 0.11	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Area-level SES	0.01	0.10	-0.18, 0.21	
	Intention	0.10	0.11	-0.12, 0.33	
	Self-efficacy	-0.11	0.12	-0.35, 0.13	$R^2=0.01$
	Area-level SES x Intentions	0.03	0.15	-0.26, 0.32	$F(487)=0.77$
	Area-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.04	0.15	-0.27, 0.34	$p=0.62$
	Gender	-0.05	0.09	-0.22, 0.13	
	Age	0.01	0.01	-0.01, 0.02	
	Individual-level SES	-0.14	0.09	-0.31, 0.03	
	Intention	0.15	0.09	-0.03, 0.34	
	Self-efficacy	-0.11	0.10	-0.30, 0.09	$R^2=0.02$
	Individual-level SES x Intentions	-0.08	0.13	-0.34, 0.19	$F(535)=1.19$
	Individual-level SES x Self-efficacy	0.01	0.14	-0.26, 0.28	$p0.31=$

Note: significance denoted as * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$